

ing spike broadly obovoid instead of oblong; the anthers cordate-elliptic, about 1 mm. long, instead of linear, about 1 line (1.5-3 mm. long; and the bristles bright white instead of reddish. These differences were perfectly understood by Meyer when he originally published *E. Chamissonis*; and it is quite clear that those botanists who, like your correspondent, maintain that Meyer had in mind *E. Scheuchzeri* (*E. capitatum*) cannot have taken the trouble to read carefully Meyer's original discussion of *E. Chamissonis*, for there Meyer says "*Er. capitatum Hoffm. differt spica subrotunda spatham aequante nec non antheris brevibus cordato-ellipticis.*"¹

9. When, however, we compare *Eriophorum russeolum*, or Fries's own description of it, with the original detailed description of *E. Chamissonis* and the fine plate of Chamisso's plant, we must admit that in their oblong spikes, long linear anthers, and reddish bristles, they are quite identical; and that in 1839, before being prejudiced by the confusion of the Altai element with the Kamchatkan and Unalaskan type of *E. Chamissonis*, Fries was quite right in deciding that it was best to suppress his own *E. russeolum*, a course which is followed not only by the writer but by Richter, and some other European students of the group.

The foregoing notes are much longer than I should ordinarily ask you to publish, but, since your correspondent has seen fit to doubt the care with which the identity of *E. russeolum* and the earlier *E. Chamissonis* has been worked out, it is necessary to restate what is already published in my earlier notes.

M. L. FERNALD.

Gray Herbarium,

Cambridge, Mass., May 24, 1906.

¹ C. A. Meyer in Mém. Sav. Etrang. Acad. St. Pétersb. i. 205 (1831).