Rec Oct 30
Ans Oct 2

Cambridge, Oct 25
1858

Dear Sir;

I take the liberty of asking you a few questions with regard to some plants of this region. I send a small package by mail containing plants numbered to correspond to the numbers of my own collection. No. 1. Was collected in a shallow pool at Newport, R. I. where it was abundant. I presume that it is Isoetes Engelmanni without doubt. No. 2. Is from Hammond's Pond, Newton, near Boston. I suppose it to be I. echinospora. Dur

3. Was also found at Hammond pond but out of water.
4. & 5. also from same locality.

No. 5 has only microspores but probably the outer leaves have fallen away, being late in the season, and the plant thus appears to be approaching a monoecious condition. As far as I can make out, the above are all S. echinospora.

The Juncus is an abundant form at Newport Rhode Island near Mr. Agassiz's house. I suppose it must be J. tenuis but it is not the form common near Boston.

Yours, respectfully
W. G. Farlow.
30 Holyoke House Cambridge.

Rec^d April 22^d 1876

Boston, Apr. 19th.

Dear Sir;

I am much obliged for your very kind letter of Apr. 10th. Last summer Prof. Gray gave me some specimens of Phoma uvicola which you had sent him, and I have found that our own grapes are also attacked by it but not badly. You are, of course, familiar with De Bary's article ~~on~~ Ueber den sogenannten Brenner (Peck) der Reben in which he refers to your notice in the Proc. St. Louis academy.

I should like to study the disease myself but it is not

common enough near Boston to make it at all probable that I should be able to make anything out of it. Do you not have an abundance of Peronospora viticola near St. Louis?

I hope you will not consider it rude if I ask for information on certain points of interest about the fungi of your region. I should like very much to find out exactly whether Sphaeria morbosa is found on Prunus Chickasa and, if so, to get a specimen, also a specimen on P. americana. Do you have what is called the peach blight or the onion mildew near St. Louis? If so, I should like to get some specimens.

Yours, respectfully
W. G. Farlow,
6 St. James Ave. Boston

Rec. April 14th 1877

Apr. 9th. Boston.

Dear Sir;

Your letter of April 5th was received a few days ago. With regard to Oidium Tuckeri there is a great deal of "glib talk" as you suggest but what is meant is very doubtful. There is one specimen in the Curtis Collection from Texas marked Oidium Tuckeri. From Washington one also hears a good deal about Oidium Tuckeri but that source cannot be considered reliable.

As a matter of fact, the Oidium Tuckeri of Europe is evidently only a conidial

form of some of the Erysiphei and Fuckel thought it might belong to E. communis. This is of course a supposition on his part but possibly it is a fact.

In this country it is quite superfluous to speak of Oidium Tuckeri. There is a conidial form produced on our grapes which looks exactly like what is called Oidium Tuckeri in Europe. Our form, however, clearly belongs to Uncinula spiralis, B. & C. (one of the Erysiphei) a species which is common from Boston to Santa Cruz Cal.! It is not a sign of knowledge to speak of Oidium Tuckeri in this country but rather of ignorance for what is included under that name is the conidial form of Uncinula spiralis, B. & C. and

in all probability nothing more.

Next year, beginning in July '77, I am to have a laboratory in Cambridge and shall only occasionally go to the Bussey. If you have occasion to send anything to me after that date please send to Cambridge:

Yours, respectfully
W. G. Farlow.

6 Park Square. Boston.

Rec Febr 6 1880
Ans same day

Cambridge, Jan. 31.

Dear Sir,

Can you tell me whether there is a disease of the grape-vine known as the rot in your region? A question has arisen as to what the rot is. We have the grape mildew and ~~rot~~ other diseases with us but I do not know to what pathological condition to refer the rot.

I enclose a specimen from the stomach of a patient who has ulcer of the stomach. The fluid contained rot

only Sarcina Ventriculi but also Saccharomyces apiculatus. I have sent specimens of the latter to Berlin and the botanists agree with my determination. I have heard from Nordstedt about some of the Chaetae which I sent him. The form looking like N. opaca which I gave you, (from Cambridge) he thinks may be N. acuminata or N. fradeloya but he is not certain. I expect Halsted in Cambridge again before long and hope he will review the Gymnodoae which are not satisfactorily done.

Yours, respectfully
N. G. Farlow.

Cor Apr 15 1880
Ans — 18 —

Cambridge, Apr. 12.

Dear Sir,

I am much obliged for a copy of the Revision of the genus Pinus which was given to me this morning by Prof. Gray.

I should like to ask a few questions about Nitellae. There are only two specimens of the species which Halsted called N. gelatinosa in the Gray Herbarium. Both were collected in the Sunken Canal by Ravenel. This is what I understand you think is N. hyalina, a of Braun

Mr. Lindheimer thinks that the Mitella found by me in Cambridge which looks like M. ovata and which is monoecious, may be M. prolonga but he must be mistaken. He only knows M. prolonga by name and has never seen a specimen. Do you know whether M. prolonga was ever described?

In the Gray Herbarium are two large Mitellae collected by Lindheimer in Texas and one collected by Wright in Western Texas. They are both sterile and were referred by Halsted to M. translucens. I think that they are probably the M. Lindheimeri of Brown. Although they may however have been his M. prolonga. I cannot find any description.

of N. Lindheimeri. Have you any authentic specimens of N. Lindheimeri? It is very singular that Braun did not mention the gelatinous fruit of N. proelongata which is certainly very remarkable and resembles the fruit of N. gelatinosa so signified by Kützing from Braun's Specimens in the Tabulae Phycologicae.

F. L. Harvey
Orono Me.

Another species troubles me, N. clavata (a. Br.) Kütz. I think I have it from Mexico and possibly from California. Have you specimens of that species?

I hope that some time another or Characeae will be straightened out but just now it looks as though

M. Droelonza, M. Lindheimeri and some others, from want of a description by Braun, were in an equivocal position. I am in correspondence with Dordstedt who is well informed on European species but I hardly think he is much acquainted with some of the species from America to which Braun has given names.

Yours respectfully

J. G. Parlier.

Thes April 25th

Cambridge, Apr. 21.

Dear Sir,

I should like to ask if you recognize the enclosed grass from Bermuda. When I gathered it I supposed that it was Polypogon littoralis but examination shows that it is not a Polypogon.

The specimen from salt water was Cymodocea Manatorum. I looked over all the genera near Fosteria

except a modelocw omitting the latter because C. Antarctica which I already knew had such a different aspect. Mr. Watson thought that it was probably a Juncus and so I sent it to you.

I enclose three Pavetes just received from F. H. Hasford Charlotte Vt. I have not examined the specimens. Probably you have already received the same things from Mr. Pringle.

Yours, respectfully
N. L. Britton.

there is a mistake, Nordstedt will soon correct it. I presume that there is no longer any doubt as to what Braun meant to call the Juatee Canal Nitella.

Yours, respectfully, W. G. Farlow.

Cambridge, May 2.

Rec May 5 1880
Ans — 21

Dear Sir,

I am much obliged for your two letters which contained valuable information for me. I was already familiar with the Char. Afr. and Char. ans Columbia and it was in consequence of the reference in the former that I wrote about N. clavato. I have a specimen from a chaffner of San Luis Potosi which may be that species. I sent a piece to Nordstedt but have not yet heard from him. I presume the specimen

from Orlander which seems to me to be N. clavata is the same as that in your herbarium. In Herb. Gray are two specimens glued down so that I cannot conveniently send them. They are marked "San Francisco Water Works". One is a foot and a half long and somewhat incrusted. The other is about six inches long and not coated with lime and is a bright green colour. Very likely you will recognize the specimens in this note. The N. clavata is principally of immediate interest because Mr. Watson has written the Characeae of California for the Flora and I have looked over the few specimens which we have from California and told him what I thought they were. I think we cannot do better now than to say N. clavata Br. with a description of our own and if

Rec'd May 28, 1880
Ans June 2

Cambridge, May 23.

Dear Sir,

Your package has just arrived and I have sent the Euphorbia to Prof. Gray. Yesterday, I heard from Nordskott. He has received Braun's notes and drawings but did not say anything about Braun's specimens themselves. Nordskott says that the specimens from San Francisco Water-works are certainly N. clavata and the form which I have received from San Luis Potosi (Schaffner) is N. clavata var. inflata. The doubtful form of Nitella from Cambridge

collected by me in October 1879 is not yet settled

Many thanks for the Chara. I will return the drawings in a few days. If I am not mistaken, I understand that you intend to have me keep the specimens. If such is the case, I am very much obliged.

Do you want any specimens of N. flexilis from this region? I have an abundance collected this spring. I am now correcting proof of a long paper and make no excursions not wishing to have any greater confusion in my laboratory.

Yours, respectfully
W. G. Farlow.

Rec'd Jan 14 1880

Cambridge, Jan'y.

Dear Sir,

I am glad to hear that you are going to California. There is nothing which I should like more than to go to Puget Sound where the algae are superb.

About the Sphaeria Bidwellii, I would say that there are certainly asci and spores. I send a bit for you to examine. Whether the ascigerous form really belongs to the Phoma umicola is a point about which I do not care to express an opinion. I have not been well lately,

and have not been able to study Ellis's specimen thoroughly. I have sent Ellis's note to De Bary and perhaps he will have something to say on the subject in the Bot. Zeitung.

Yours, respectfully,
W. G. Farlow.

Rec Nov 8°

Cambridge, Nov. 5

Dear Sir,

I am much obliged for the specimens which you sent. The fungus on Claytonia is Aecidium Claytonianum, Schw. The names of Aecidia have but little value, however, I am afraid.

The yeast seems to be the ordinary Saccharomyces cerevisiae and is of interest in enabling me to compare the form found in St. Louis with that used in this region.

Yours, respectfully
W. G. Farlow.

Rio Empire City Aug 13' 1881
Ans Rec'd 9

Rectus Semith

Wood's Hall, Aug 6,

Dear Sir,

Your letter with specimen of fungus was received at this place where I am spending some time at the seashore away from books on fungi.

I have examined the specimen which is very interesting, It is, however, sterile and I can only say that the fungus consists of mycelium which may belong to a species of Hydnum. On looking at it I expected to find the mycelial form known as Aitemaria pinophila

but I was mistaken. It is not that species. There are plenty of mycologists who would give a name to the mycelium you send and perhaps make a new species. I presume that you will agree with me in not thinking it necessary to do so.

The fungus reminds me of some forms found on trees which have been attacked by insects, the fungus growing rather on the insect remains than the tree itself. Did you see any insects,

You speak of the covering of the lower branches where the fungus alone is found by the snow. Does not this perhaps indicate that the branches are killed by the

snow, or the melting of the snow, and that the fungus then grows on them as a saprophyte rather than a true parasite.

Did you ever receive a copy of my paper on Gymnosporangia? I should like very much to get species of Peridermium on Coniferae or Gymnosporangia on Juniperus occidentalis, or any notes with regard to the distribution of Rocky Mt. Roestelia.

Do you remember a grass from Bermuda which I sent you? I sent a specimen to Prof. Gray and in a letter just sent from Kew he says that it is Koehleria phleoides.

I shall not return to
Cambridge permanently
until the end of September.

Yours, respectfully
W. G. Farlow.

Rec Febr 17th 1882
AG

Cambridge, Feb. 14.

Dear Sir,

Your letter of Feb. 7 was received yesterday. I hardly think that I shall be able to make much more of the Fumago which you sent judging from my experience of last summer.

I was very much interested in your remarks on Lactuca and Silphium and have sent a copy of them to Stahl. I did not know that you had read a paper on the subject at

the St. Louis meeting. I looked at the volume of the proceedings for that year but only found the title of the paper without further report. Was it ever published as a separate paper? If so I should like to read it. I have looked for references the the Torrey Bulletin and Bot. Gazette but did not succeed in finding any allusion to it, although I may have overlooked something in my haste,

Yours, respectfully,

W. G. Farlow.