



Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation
5th Floor, Hunt Library
Carnegie Mellon University
4909 Frew Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15213-3890
Contact: Archives
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 version of an item from our Archives.

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.

Libbie 6-21-1911
#1

Z. Collins an old
botanist & quite eminent

Gaillardia Collinsii
Phila. Hooker

Z. Collins has not his Plukenet
at home to refer to, but he believes
the mere flower of D. B.'s specimen
to bear close resemblance to the
figure cited in that work by Mx
+ Pursh for scariosa and Squam-
ulosa. There is much difference
in the leaves, according to those
usually given for scariosa vel Squam-
ulosa, which led Z. C. to hesi-
tate from the first, partly
as D. B.'s plant was a so-
litary garden specimen.

Z. C. sends to Dr. B. a
Liatris given to him by Lyons
from Ohio a *Texense*, or the
"Rattle snake plant," which
he believes to be the same
with the Fever Root of Dr.
Bleight, and the plant Muhl-

would have called *Scariora*?

L.C. sends also a specimen
from the fine upper part of one
which he himself plucked last
summer in West Plains
and was told at the time
that it was used for the
bite of a snake —
are they not both
varieties of one species,
Squarrosia or a *Scariora*?

The ~~flowers~~ ^{flowers} are pedicel
as well as pedicelled —

Dr. B.'s hesitation as
well as mine, has arisen
from having figured from
one specimen — a garden
one, which supposing it
even to be *Scariora*, may
not in figure prove a
good type of the species.

L. C. will endeavor to
tomorrow to look into Plukenet
net at the Pen. Hospital
and perhaps Muhl. herb.
If any matter more de-
cisive offer, It shall
readily be communicated

With the respects
of L. Collins

July 5.

There is in the herbarium a specimen
sent by L. C. to Muhl. from Oatowmark
and so marked, on which Muhl.
has written squamulosa Mx and
for such L. C. took it on comparing
with that author, L. C. had
quite forgotten that he sent it
to Muhl. Mx & Pursh take scariosa
fo squamulosa for
the same
It is probable ~~that it is the same~~