

BOARD OF CONTROL

GOVERNOR CHARLES E. HUGHES, ALBANY  
COMMISSIONER RAYMOND A. PEARSON, ALBANY  
LYMAN P. HAVILAND, CAMDEN  
EDGAR G. DUSENBURY, PORTVILLE  
THOMAS B. WILSON, HALLS CORNERS  
IRVING ROUSE, ROCHESTER  
ALFRED G. LEWIS, GENEVA  
LEWIS L. MORRELL, KINDERHOOK  
ELIHU S. MILLER, WADING RIVER

NEW YORK  
AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION

GENEVA, N. Y.

W. H. JORDAN, DIRECTOR

ADDRESS ALL COMMUNICATIONS TO  
THE N. Y. AGRIC. EXPER. STATION

Jan. 18, 1910.

Prof. R. A. Saccardo,

R. Instituts Botanico, Padova, Italy.

Dear Sir:-- I am studying a fungus which has an unusually complicated life-history, and since botanists seem to differ in describing and naming the various fruiting forms of a fungus, I would like to have your opinion as to the naming of this one. Its various spore forms may be put into *Phoma*, *Dothiorella*, *Bagnisiella* and *Botryosphaeria*; *Botryosphaeria* seems to be a combination of *Dothiorella* and *Bagnisiella*.

Should each distinct fruiting-form of this fungus be specifically described, named and placed into its genus, referring it to its other forms as is done by Dr. Driosi, or should the secondary forms be briefly described along with the highest (?) spore-form, giving them no separate names, as is done by Dr. Shear in his paper on "Cranberry Diseases" (Bulletin Bureau of Plant Industry 110). Which has precedence, *Bagnisiella* or *Botryosphaeria*? Do you consider *Botryosphaeria* an established genus, if so, what is its type species?

Hoping that I am not troubling you too much, I am

Yours sincerely,

*J. G. Grossenbacher*  
Associate Botanist.

N