



Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation
5th Floor, Hunt Library
Carnegie Mellon University
4909 Frew Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15213-3890
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 item.

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.

June 27, 1939.

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. C. O. ERLANSON
Bureau of Plant Industry

Dear Mr. Erlanson:

In further reference to our recent conversation regarding specific descriptions of salix for filing in your herbarium, I am sending you herewith the following material:

Notes on North American Willows. I.
Notes on North American Willows. II.
Undescribed Willows of the Section Cordatas.
Willows of the Sections Pentandreae and Nigrae.
Fruinose Branchlets and Salix Lemmonii.
Two New Varieties of S. scouleriana.
New Varieties of Western Willows.
New Varieties and Combinations of Salix.
New or Little Known Western Willows.

All except two of these are sent in duplicate so that they may be cut and pasted if desired. Of North American Willows I, I have only one copies, so that some typing will be necessary to get complete discussion. The plates, however, will furnish a complete set. There is only one copy also of the paper on Two New Varieties of *S. scouleriana*, but a little typing will complete the job.

I am sending also a set of carbon copies of descriptions of a number of foreign species which you may find useful in the same way. I am enclosing also a copy of the preface written by Seaman for the Botany of the Voyage of H.M.S. Herald in which he discusses caution in naming new species.

Trusting that these may be of some value to you, I am

Cordially yours,

Carleton R. Ball,
Executive Secretary

C
O
F
Y

February 5, 1942

MEMORANDUM FOR DR. C. O. ERLANSON
Division of Plant Exploration & Introduction
Bureau of Plant Industry

Dear Mr. Erlanson:

Your memorandum of January 29 returning the annotated copy of my manuscript on the genus *Salix* for the Salicaceae of Nevada was promptly received. I have not yet had time to check carefully on the suggestions and corrections made but apparently you have done a very thorough job and have caught some misspellings which I had not noted at the time the pages were written.

I will be glad to substitute USNA for the citation BPI which I had used for specimens in the arboretum herbarium. I should have thought of this possibly before. I am wondering now if there should be a change in my designation of specimens from the U.S. National Herbarium. I have used merely USN. Is it the custom of the herbarium workers to use the full initials USNH?

I am glad you pointed out the absence of a list of herbarium citations. This was not in the portion of the introduction so far copied because it was not known at the beginning how many herbariums would be cited before the work was concluded. I can now make a complete list.

Appreciating your help in these matters, I am

Cordially yours,

Carleton R. Ball
Executive Secretary

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY
WASHINGTON

DIVISION OF
PLANT EXPLORATION AND INTRODUCTION

January 29, 1942

To: Dr. C. R. Ball, Extension Service

From: C. O. Erlanson, Ecologist, Division of Plant Exploration
and Introduction

Subject: Comment on manuscript covering the genus Salix, for the
"Salicaceae of Nevada."

We think it a good idea to be as full as possible both as to description and citation of material, especially when the author is an authority on the group in which he is writing. Our cooperative agreement with the Works Progress Administration in Nevada has terminated and it will be necessary for us to have the Contributions mimeographed here in Washington. We have received informal approval to do this, and as far as we know now, the editorial policy and form will continue as previously.

Somewhere in the paper it will be necessary for you to explain the symbols used for herbaria from which specimens are cited. We note that you use "BPI" for material cited from the Herbarium of the National Arboretum. It has become rather general usage to use "USNA" for this herbarium.

In accordance with our conversation of some weeks back, please disregard my correction in the first few pages as to the use of the word "in" in the literature citations. It has been our policy to consider the "in" as an unnecessary refinement except in certain cases. There are many, however, who use it as you do.

Although, as you say in your memorandum, this is only a draft and has some keys to be added, we have gone over it with a fair amount of care in order to make your final copy as free from error as possible.

C. O. Erlanson

Attachment

extra

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE: EXTENSION SERVICE
WASHINGTON, D.C.

September 24, 1943

Dr. Rogers McVaugh,
National Arboretum Herbarium,
Plant Industry Station, Beltsville, Md.

Dear Dr. McVaugh:

I have finished the keys to Nevada willows and am inclosing a copy to go with the copy of the manuscript which you have already. These keys are in two sections: A, based on floral characters (pp. 1-5) and B, based on vegetative characters (pp. 6-9). They are prepared in the rather full form which I have found very helpful and instructive to amateurs (all botanists seem to regard themselves as amateurs in regard to *Salix*). Similar keys prepared in California, enabled school teachers to identify the Sierran willows correctly to species and variety.

I now will proceed to revise the manuscript, citing additional collections, and work over the keys again later. I will do no rewriting until it is known where and how the manuscript is to be reproduced. The original form of the proposed Nevada flora was very fine for purposes of addition and revision of temporary material but was very expensive of paper, stencils, and labor because of the double-spacing, printing on only one side of paper, wide spacing after the heading, rapid indentation of keys, etc. Reproduction elsewhere probably would not follow this form.

I am putting the following queries with complete frankness and a desire not to embarrass you in any way:

1. Is it possible for the Division to reproduce this manuscript in the form employed for the cooperative project?
2. If not, is it possible for the Division to reproduce it in the less expensive form of double-spacing, using both sides of sheet, closing wide spaces, etc.?
3. Has any discussion been had, or any arrangement been made, with the Univ. of Nevada, or its Experiment Station, for continuing to reproduce papers prepared?
4. If the answers to Nos. 1-3 are "No", would there be any objection to my undertaking to get it done by Nevada, or Univ. of California, or Forest Service, or other source?

I am using the descriptions and keys as the basis for a write-up of the willows of Idaho, to be included in the manual under preparation by Professor Ray J. Davis, of Pocatello.

Thanking you in advance for consideration of these problems, I am

Cordially yours,

Carleton A. Bell
Collaborator

2nd copy sent

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY,

Soils, and Agricultural Engineering

DIVISION OF

PLANT EXPLORATION AND
INTRODUCTION

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY STATION
BELTSVILLE, MARYLAND

September 27, 1943

To: Dr. C. R. Ball, Extension Service, Department of Agriculture
From: C. O. Erlanson, Ecologist *COE*
Subject: Manuscripts sent this Division

Your letter of September 24, 1943, addressed to Rogers McVaugh has been referred to me for answer since it has to do with the now defunct project, "the contributions toward a flora of Nevada".

Due to the contraction of our botanical staff and the change in emphasis of our work, this project had to be cancelled for the duration of the war, and I have no idea whether it will be picked up again after the war. You have made certain queries concerning the publication of this manuscript, and our answer to your queries one, two and three is "no". We have no arrangements or facilities for continuing these contributions on any basis. Please feel free to publish this contribution anywhere and in any shape that you see fit, as any arrangement you may feel that you had with us no longer holds as the project is dead.

You state in the first paragraph of your letter that we have a copy of your manuscript on "Salix" to which the keys you now send are to be a part. I do not have this manuscript. You sent it to us in January, 1942, and at that time, I went over it indicating certain corrections which I suggested you make so that the manuscript would be in line with the things that had been published. I returned this manuscript to you with a memorandum on January 29, 1942, and you acknowledged it February 5, 1942. Since that time, we have not again seen it. I am attaching copies of these two letters in order to save you trouble in going through your files.

The manuscript of the "Keys," which we are returning looks very good to me and I am sure that the paper as a whole will find a ready avenue for publication.

Attachments - 3

	<i>Nevada Salix Mss</i>	<i>+ Keys</i>
Copy 1	Office	Office
2	Nevada	Home
3	Home	B&J
4	B&J	Nev
5	Exp. Attia	Exp. Attia

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

EXTENSION SERVICE

WASHINGTON, D. C.

October 2, 1943

Mr. C.O. Erlanson,
Div. Plant Introduction, BPI.,
Plant Industry Station, Beltsville, Md.

Dear Mr. Erlanson:

Many thanks for your memo of Sept. 27, replying to mine of Sept. 24, to Dr. McVaugh. I overlooked the fact that I did not return a copy of the Nevada-willow manuscript after I received the edited copy originally sent to you.

I now inclose the edited copy, together with a set of the keys. I feel that the Arboretum Herbarium should have one copy, pending publication from any source, especially in view of my advancing age.

I have transferred your appreciated corrections to another copy and will continue the work on the manuscript. If you or any of your associates has opportunity to try out the keys, I will appreciate and comments at any time.

Professor Lehenbauer has a copy. I should have noted that my use of the word *genuses* is deliberate. Half the scientific writers in American can not use Latin plurals correctly (for example, data) and the English plurals are as simple, more easily learned, and understood by laymen. Why not use them.

Cordially yours,

Carleton R. Ball
Collaborator



PLANT EXPLORATION
AND INTRODUCTION
Rec'd OCT 5 - 1943
Answered

Room 5046
South Bldg.