



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.

Wilmington Sept. 5 1891

My dear Rose

I do not know any-
thing which has delighted me
more than to see a specimen
of the original *Frosthameria*.

I felt certain before that the
Craymas plant was a new sp.
but now you can have no doubt.

But as to your question of the fam-
ily I am sadly at fault. It does
not seem to me to be a *Capparis*
and so far as I can see I like
Benthams' reference to *Euphorbia-*
ceae better. Yet it does not seem
to be satisfactory there - at least there

are essential differences. At one
time I thought of *Santalaceae* in
connection with *Gonolopia* which
the fruit somewhat resembles - but
that is out of the question.

Reuth. & Hook make a point of
saying "albumen 0". Now I
am probably wrong but it seems
true that the embryo has its an-
duplicate cotyledones in copious
albumen or else the cotyledones
are crasso-caruncos like a pea
or bean. These are of *F. cordata*
cordata - how are they in the
original species? or have you
the fruit of this?

With regard to Delaware College
you have the collection for
a short time. I am in com-
munication with the authorities
and will soon know what they
will do; then I will let you
know.

What a great pleasure the
Alamos and Arizona plants
are giving me! I shall have
a few unimportant notes
after while.

Adieu now - and let me
hear from you -

Yours ever
J. M. Coulter