



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.

Sept. 8, 1937.

Dr. Carleton R. Ball,
3843 So. Bldg.

Dear Dr. Ball:

Reference is made to our
conversation of this morning.

I am enclosing herewith the
willow specimen from St. Anne
on the north side of
the Gaspe Peninsula. It was
from a shrub about 8 feet
high.

I shall appreciate it if you
will please determine it for me.

Sincerely yours,

David W. Boye
603 Atlantic Bldg.
Forest Service.

Extension Service

Sept. 9, 1937

Miss Doris W. Hayes,
Forest Service,
603 Atlantic Bldg., City.

My dear Miss Hayes:

Your note of yesterday and the willow from the Caspe Peninsula are just received.

The plant is *Salix pentandra* L., a species from Europe often cultivated as an ornamental in this country. There are several trees of this species in the Soldiers Home grounds near the lake, and a few in the city parks.

It is closely related to the shining willow, *Salix lucida* Muhl., and to *S. serissima* (Bail.) Fern., the autumn willow, of the Eastern U.S., and to *Ss. caudata* and *lasianдра* of the West.

Cordially Y^{ours},

Carleton R. Ball

2945 20. 10. 37.
D. W. Hayes
2945 20. 10. 37.
D. W. Hayes

2945 20. 10. 37.
D. W. Hayes

Miss Doris W. Hayes,
Forest Service Herbarium,
South Bldg., U.S.D.A.

3814 Jocelyn St., N.W.,
Washington 15, D.C.

29 September, 1952.

Dear Miss Hayes:

I have studied the keys to your Washington willows and am venturing a few suggestions, based partly on the universal desire for clear understanding and partly on my normal desire to be mean. ~~How~~ they are (you sort'em).

16 (1). *S. melanopsis* is nearly hairless, as described, but its var. *Bolanderiana* (Rowlee) Schneider, has the young twigs, petioles, and lower surfaces of leaves more or less hairy, the leaves sometimes densely so.

17 (1). I doubt if I would know just what is meant by callous-pointed, but I may not have quite the mental ability in colloquial language, which your readers will possess.

18 (1). I might say the same about "dot-like glands". A dot in popular language is a spot, not a protuberance. A spot is a different color but not necessarily a different texture, whereas the gland does have a different texture from the epidermis. Would they be "short or longer wart-like glands"?

19 (1). *S. caudata* is hairy as described. But its var. *Bryantiana* Ball and Bracelin is essentially hairless (also glabrous), and that is the only difference.

19 (2). Here conditions are exactly reversed. *S. lasiantha* is glabrate as described but var. *lanceifolia* (Andersson) Bebb is hairy like *S. caudata*.

I have not checked to determine just how far the three species discussed above have the same range as the varieties but all overlap somewhat in the Pacific Northwest. I do not know just what range you cover, nor whether the varieties were not mentioned because you do not discuss varieties or because they were not supposed to occur in your range.

But if they do occur, and your reader gets hold of them, he will be puzzled, if not misled. I think the recent knowledge of ranges of these three species and their varieties is shown in Davis' *Flora of Idaho*, which you have available.

Regretting that I cannot make you any more trouble, I am Cordially Yours,

Carleton R. Ball

Spring and Summer Keys.

- P. 1 and after: Should name of all tree groups (oak, aspen, cottonwood) be plural?
- P. 1a. ~~XXXX~~ Illust. of Oteg. White Oak: "Pollen producing" requires a hyphen.
- P. 2, par. 7a: Drop "s" from Cascades, as it is one of a series of mountains.
- par. 8a & b: Margins rolled-under. Could you use "in-rolled"?
- P. 4, par. 4 & 12. "bottle-shaped". What bottle? (shapes vary from linear to ovate).
- P. 4a: No hairs are shown on hairy leaf here, and on many others.
- P. 6, par. 18a: Glands are usually on edges of leaf-stalk; occasionally on upper surface
- par. 19a: Leaf as well as leafstalks hairy in *S. caudata* but not in var. *Belander*
- par. 19b. Leaf and leafstalks both hairless in *S. lasiandra*, but both are hairy in var. *lancifolia*, which is not mentioned.
- par. 18b: and in several later cases, as 23a, 24, 21b, and 26 a & b.
It does not seem proper to refer to the glaucous under-surface of leaves as having a "bloom". Glaucousness cannot be brushed or washed off. The powdery condition on pruinose twigs can be removed easily and is more properly called a "bloom". Nicht wahr?
- par. 22: It does not seem consistent to use the term "oblong-elliptical" when the use of simple words like lanceolate, ovate, etc., is denied.
- P. 8, par. 24: The key number 24 is given for the first sp. but not for *S. lasiolepis*.
- Par 24a. I will bring down my herbarium material of *S. Drummondiana* Barratt, var. *bella* (Piper) Ball, and let you decide what you wish to do about it.
- P. 9, par. 25a: *S. Bebbiana* is remarkable for capsules and pedicels, so I would suggest capsules "very slender and long-beaked; footstalks very long and slender".
- Var. *perrestrata* often would not be recognized from the species key, so why not mention it as only shallowly net-veined, and from thinly hairy to almost entirely without hairs on leaf and petioles?
- P. 11, par. 30: *S. commutata* var. *puberula* Bebb has capsules hairy, while var. *demodata* Bebb has the leaf glabrate. If these occur in your area, they should be mentioned to avoid confusing readers.
- par. 29: I rather doubt if leaf of *S. commutata* are noticeably "thin". It may be better to rekey and separate it on leaf and twig hairiness and monochrome and pseudocordata from it by glabrousness.

This reminds me that style length are not mentioned in these keys. But *S. commutata* (Sect. *Commutatae*) has styles 1-1.5 mm. while the other two (in Sect. *Cordatae*) have styles 0.4-0.8 mm. long (approximately).

I will be glad to help further in any way possible if you will let me know in what ways I may be of some use.

Cordially yours,

Carleton R. Ball