



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.

December 12, 1927.

Dr. Edward W. Berry,
Professor of Paleontology,
The Johns Hopkins University,
Baltimore, Maryland.

Dear Dr. Berry:

I will greatly appreciate your advice on the following questions:

1. Did the genus Populus appear earlier geologically than the genus Salix?

2. Is Populus considered to be more primitive in its characteristics than Salix?

Thanking you in advance, I am

Very sincerely yours,

Carleton R. Ball,
Senior Agronomist in Charge.

CRB:RL

GEOLOGICAL DEPARTMENT

HARRY FIELDING REID
DYNAMIC GEOLOGY AND GEOGRAPHY
EDWARD B. MATHEWS, CHAIRMAN
MINERALOGY AND PETROGRAPHY
CHARLES K. SWARTZ
GENERAL GEOLOGY
EDWARD W. BERRY
PALEONTOLOGY AND HISTORICAL GEOLOGY
JOSEPH T. SINGEWALD, JR., SECT.
ECONOMIC GEOLOGY

The Johns Hopkins University



OFFICES OF
MARYLAND GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

EDWARD B. MATHEWS,
STATE GEOLOGIST

EDWARD W. BERRY
ASST. STATE GEOLOGIST

Baltimore, Md., U. S. A. 19-Dec. 1927

Dear Doctor Ball:

The questions which you propounded in your letter of the twelvth instant are especially perplexing. I do not know of any valid reasons for considering *Populus* more primitive than *Salix* or vice versa. Fossil forms referred to *Populus* appear slightly earlier in the geological record than do the willows, but this is complicated by uncertainties of identification. I personally believe that these early forms referred to *Populus* are not that genus, but belong to the *Trochodendraceae*, but I have not yet convinced my colleagues that I am right in this.

Very truly,

E. W. Berry
Edward W. Berry.



December 20, 1927.

Dr. Edward W. Berry,
Geological Department,
The Johns Hopkins University,
Baltimore, Md.

Dear Dr. Berry:

Your good letter of December 19 just received
and noted. I appreciate the uncertainties of identification
of fossil material. As you know, these uncertainties are
by no means confined to extinct plants. Thanking you for
your consideration of my problem, I am

Very sincerely yours,

Carleton R. Ball,
Senior Agronomist in Charge.

CRB:RL

June 14, 1929.

Dr. Edward W. Berry,
U. S. Geological Survey,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

Dept. of Paleontology
Johns Hopkins Univ
Balto. Md.

Dear Dr. Berry:

I have just received and scanned with much interest your paper entitled "A Revision of the Flora of the Latah Formation," published as Professional Paper 154-H of the U. S. Geological Survey. In reading the paper a few comments occur to me.

In your discussion, on page 242, of the pistillate flower of *Salix*, you describe the style as "practically nonexistent." This would remove the species entirely from the section Cordatae in which the styles vary in length from .5 to 1 millimeter, or more. Sections of the genus with obsolete styles, and which occur commonly in that area, are the Longifoliae, or sand-bar willows, and the Pontandrae, represented by such species as *S. caudata* (Nutt.) Sudw., and *S. lasiandra* Benth.

In your discussion of *S. cordata*, I note that you give its range as extending to the Pacific Coast. As it has been understood during the past 20 years, it does not occur in or west of the Rocky Mountains. In the western half of the United States, it is replaced by such species as *S. ligulifolia* Ball., *S. lutea* Nutt., *S. pseudomyrsinites* Anderss., *S. monochroma* Ball., *S. mackenziana* (Hook.) Barr., and *S. farrae* Ball., all but the first and last of which occur in the Spokane area.

In your discussion of the *Salix* stipule, on page 424, you do not assign the stipule to any species, but state that "the fossil can be exactly matched by selected stipules from the living tree." If you can tell me what living species you use as a basis of comparison, I will be very glad to have this information. The illustration strongly suggests the stipule of such present species as *S. lutea* Nutt., *S. monochroma* Ball., *S. mackenziana* (Hook.) Barr., and *S. pseudomonticola* Ball.

Very sincerely yours,

Carleton R. Ball,
Principal Agronomist in Charge.