



Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation
5th Floor, Hunt Library
Carnegie Mellon University
4909 Frew Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15213-3890
Telephone: 412-268-2434
Email: huntinst@andrew.cmu.edu
Web site: www.huntbotanical.org

The Hunt Institute is committed to making its collections accessible for research. We are pleased to offer this digitized item.

Usage guidelines

We have provided this low-resolution, digitized version for research purposes. To inquire about publishing any images from this item, please contact the Institute.

About the Institute

The Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation, a research division of Carnegie Mellon University, specializes in the history of botany and all aspects of plant science and serves the international scientific community through research and documentation. To this end, the Institute acquires and maintains authoritative collections of books, plant images, manuscripts, portraits and data files, and provides publications and other modes of information service. The Institute meets the reference needs of botanists, biologists, historians, conservationists, librarians, bibliographers and the public at large, especially those concerned with any aspect of the North American flora.

Hunt Institute was dedicated in 1961 as the Rachel McMasters Miller Hunt Botanical Library, an international center for bibliographical research and service in the interests of botany and horticulture, as well as a center for the study of all aspects of the history of the plant sciences. By 1971 the Library's activities had so diversified that the name was changed to Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation. Growth in collections and research projects led to the establishment of four programmatic departments: Archives, Art, Bibliography and the Library.

Digitized by Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation

I have a word to say
to the Botanical Documentation
specimen which you gave me
and which I thought to be
H. destruens was sent to
H. von Waldheim who confirmed
the diagnosis. Since then I
sent you an Panicum sanguinalis

an Ustilago which I thought
also U. destruens. The latter is
what is known as U. Rakenhorstiana
taken according to some authorities.
For my part I have been uncertain
what to say about it. I have
been looking over the numerous
Ustilagoes in Rakenh. Fung. Europ.
and I must confess that
I do not so clearly see that
U. destruens and U. Rakenhorstiana
are so distinct. The former has
~~no~~ ^{few} spiculae seen only with a
high power; the latter has more
^{or broader spiculae}.
What it all amounts to I
cannot say. I do not clearly
see the difference. The truth is
that a number of transcendental
species, as I call them, have
been made by German botanists
out of the different forms

found all Panicum and related
grasses. I will not now say that
I would unite them all but
evidently several must be
united.

Did you see Winter's
note calling attention to Lesslie's
note in the Annales in which he
gives his reason for changing
Calceoladia to Microsphaera
not sphaeria as Roumeguières
declares and as Coghe pretends
to have been the case. There is
no authority for Microsphaeria.
I have ~~on~~ ⁱⁿ ~~Calceoladia~~ ^{on} my papers. I shall stay
here as long as the weather
permits. Arthur came last
week.

Yours, in haste
W. D. Harlow.