



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.

from Trelow

1881

Cambridge, Mass., Jan. 1, 1881.

Dear Prof. Bessey,
Your letter
was received by me while I
was in Bermuda and I have
not been able to find any
time to reply until today.
With regard to *Puccinia*
microspora, it first appeared
in Curtis's North Carolina
Plants in 1867. The name is
wrongly given in Fl. Am.
as *P. microspora*. Wierherd

am responsible for the mistake
originally, I do not know, but
as all cutyoon specimens are
labelled P. microsperma, I do not
think it likely that I on this
occasion only spelled it
microspora but it is certainly
my fault for not calling
the attention of Ellis to the
mistake. Whether ^{the} species
is P. lobeliae of Gerard I cannot
say but think it likely. I have
written to Gerard on that
point. If you find other
errors in Cent. III I shall be
very glad to hear them as I
am preparing a number
paper for the academy as a
commentary on the forms pub-
lished in Cent. III with a
revision of the N.A. species
of some of the genera.

to Bessey 4-IV-1891

The specimen on Yernonia
is the P. Yernoniae of Schumannitz
and it would be a nice
thing for the next century, I
still think, however, from
an examination of the specimen
last sent that the species
is not distinct from P. Heliantha.

Schroeter has expressed
no opinion to me on P. Graminis
var. brevicarpa.

With regard to the
Alg. Ann. Bot. I am not
certain whether I can furnish
a whole set. There is a
set minus part I; II & III
are in good condition. Part
IV will appear in a fortnight.

I hardly know whether
you would care for an
incomplete set.

I presume that you
have received my *Gymno-*
sporangium paper. It is
no 1. of a set on *Uredineae*
and two other genera
will soon follow.

Yours, in haste
W. G. Harlow.