



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.

ans. Sept. 15th

Frederick V. Coville Botanist
Washington D. C.

215.



My dear Sir;

Herewith I return, and, as desired, thanking
you for past Botanical contributions.

I much desire any or all of Bebb's work on the
Genus *Salix*. Heller writes me that there is some
in some one of your Contributions but which one I
can not now say, for you send me nothing? I have
studied the genus considerably, & have not much confidence
in general determinations. Have you any pure types of *S. alba*?
Have you any of the following you can spare Pot. Check List nos. 9783-9784
9785-9786-9788-9790-9791-9792-9793-9794-9795-9797-9798
9799-9800-9801-9806-9807-9808-9809-9811-9812-9814-9815-
9816-9817-9818-9820-9821-9822-9823-9825-9826-9829-
9830-9832-9834-9835-9836-9837-9838-9839-9840-9841
9844-9845-9847-9848-9849-9850-9855-9856-9857-9858
9859-9860-9861-9863-9865-9867-9868-9871-9872-9873-
9875-9877-9878-9879-9881-9882-9883-9884-9885-9887-
9888-9889. Have been unable to get any of these from the
Sandberg Ex. Few seem to collect the genus.

I would like numerous species of *Laurex* & *Sambucus* & *Sorbus*.
My private Herbarium now must embrace over 5000 species
and is rich in some groups, especially Solanaceae & Aster.
Yet after 17 years of exchanging these groups are not complete.
I sent 1840 sheets to Minneapolis last year & shall send a lot
there this fall. How do you like Flute's work on the

Susquehanna Flora? I shall eventually get out my
own work here as his does not suit me in some
lines, he is not a critical botanist, the work in
reality should have compared the whole range of the
Susquehanna & its tributaries. This I believe to be the
best way to get at our Eastern distribution of species
Flora's change, & it has here within my line of work.
I see Gray's Flora sticks to the old cut Botany has advanced
so much in the past 25 yrs. that we should coincide more
with European methods.

Hoping you are enjoying the best of health

I remain sincerely yours.

Thomas G. Lucy M.D.