



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.

Who is E. W. Holway? He asked me
for some pamphlets on fungi? Is he a
student of yours? I suppose the Peronoschiza
and Eupatorium Cambridge, Oct. 26.
to Bessey

Dear Prof.;

Again I am at home
and, to a certain extent, settled
down for winter work. Your
letter with the Ustilago was
received at Gloucester. I examined
the specimen at the time and
have examined it again today
but only find one thing, the
Ustilago intriculosa. The
Curtis specimens of Ustilago
are not to be trusted. I saw
a bit of the real U. intriculosa
which grew at Newton, Mass.
Perhaps the Curtis specimens
you have are really U. Candollei
which also occurs on Polygonum.

What I find in the specimens
to correspond to your drawing
are the young stages of the
Huterea. The young spores are
not reticulated and are in
a sac, not an ascus however.
The development has been too
well made out to allow one
to place the Hutereae with
the Ascomycetes. I agree with
you that I see no particular
reason for placing them near
the Uredineae. What was said
about Pachysoma referred to a
paper with plates which I
presented to the Boston Nat. History
Society last winter. Publication
was delayed because I wished
to repeat my experiments last
spring which I did. as soon as
I can find time the thing will
go to press.

By a slip of the pen I believe
I wrote Ustilago Setariae
instead of U. neglecta in the
specimen I sent a short
time ago. I now enclose a
list of Sporisorium bullatum
from Cambridge.

Ellis writes that you
will furnish Puccinia amorphae
and U. neglecta. I have
enough of the latter if you
have not. Have you any
Phaeophora atrovirens?

Yours, in haste,

M. G. Fernald

I have myself about 75
species for Mass. III of N.A. Hays.
If you wish to know what
I have, I can send a list.