



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.

Fragment
Spec received

Astutula 2/4/41

November 17, 1941

See 50K

Javies

Dec 5 5 (see
Feb 5 5 (see
1/4/41)

Dr. William A. Merrill,
Department of Botany,
Agricultural Experiment Station,
University of Florida,
Gainesville, Florida.

Dear Dr. Merrill:

I have noted with much interest the publication of *Salix astatulana* by yourself and Mr. Palmer in the October issue of the Journal of the Arnold Arboretum.

Because of the extremely local occurrence of this species, I seem to have no material representing it in my herbarium of some seventeen thousand sheets of the species and varieties of this genus. Naturally, I am extremely desirous of obtaining some authentic material. If you have any duplicates remaining, I would be very glad to obtain them either by purchase or by exchange. If any were sent in exchange, I would assume that they would be worth much more than an equal exchange of specimen for specimen.

In case you have no duplicates for sale or exchange, perhaps you will be willing to let me have the University Herbarium material for study and return, as I wish to become acquainted with this new species as quickly as possible.

While in Chicago last week, I looked for the species in the Herbarium of the Field Museum of Natural History but did not find it there.

Separately I am sending you one or two of my own papers which relate to willows in the Southern States. As time permits I am mapping the distribution of all species and varieties by counties and hope to publish the maps presently.

Cordially yours,

Southern

Carleton R. Ball,
Botanical Laboratory

S. astatum
Was favored spec Dec. 5 or 15,
Dec 5 or

W. A. Merrill
Nov (17-24) - 41

Were leaves young Cuff Hemlock

Length of petiole in text & fig
Look up *S. canadensis*

Digitized by Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation

W. A. Merrill
Nov (17-24) 41
Delighted to give you
these fragments now.
Another season may have
good ones.
Merrill

COORDINATING COMMITTEE

OF THE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
AND VALLEY-STATES AGRICULTURAL COLLEGES

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

November 25, 1941

Dr. Wm. A. Murrill,
Department of Botany
University of Florida,
Gainesville, Florida.

Dear Dr. Murrill:

Many thanks for the fragments of *S. astatulana*, sent with
your pencilled note. Just now I have no free time to study them
goat w. but they awaken memories of something I have seen before. When
I get back from my next trip, I hope to get busy with ~~them~~ them. In
the meantime a question or two. no use. New

The published paper says the first *Taxares* specimen was collected
typh. error on Dec. 15. The pencilled note with the fragments said Dec. 15. OK

Which is correct? The two leaves collected on Dec. 5 (or 15)
look young and tender. Was this a late fall shoot? Yes, normal

In the printed description, the longest petiole is recorded as
Correct, I think 1.5 cm. In the figure, the petiole is 2 cm. and, as the figure is
said to be $\times \frac{1}{2}$, this would seem to make the petiole at least 4 cm. Seems much exag. to me; in many
long. I wonder about that.

Please excuse typing, as my secy. is away and I am inexpert.

This is Turkey Day
and Univ. closed for
holiday sev'l days.
What a pain!!

Murrill

Cordially yours,

Carleton R. Ball
Carleton R. Ball
Executive Secretary

February 7, 1942

Dr. Wm. A. Merrill,
Department of Botany,
University of Florida,
Gainesville, Florida.

Dear Dr. Merrill:

Long ago I received your Thanksgiving annotations on my letter of November 25 to you and thank you for the information regarding collection dates, petiole length, etc.

Since that time I have had opportunity to study excellent isotypes of *S. floridana* from the Torrey Herbarium and the Gray Herbarium. Specimens of Harper's 1361 and 1364 from five different herbariums, the types and additional collection of *S. astatulana* from the Arnold Arboretum, and the excellent fragments from the isotypes of that species in the University of Florida.

This study shows conclusively that *S. floridana* Chapman, *S. Chapmanii* Small, and *S. astatulana* Merrill and Palmer are one and the same species, for which *S. floridana* Chapman is the oldest and valid name.

I am embodying the history of these species and a complete redescription of *S. floridana* in a paper which I am sending forward today for publication. I greatly appreciate the help you have given me.

Cordially yours,

Carleton R. Ball,
Executive Secretary

2-11-42

Univ. of Fla

Dear Mr. Ball

I am glad you have settled the S. alb question. For me the clarification of an old species is much more important - and exciting than describing a new one. Small should have been able to interpret Chapman's S. floridana, with everything right at his hand. We have here a sheaf of specimens from Lake City - det. by Hitchcock years ago as S. floridana. The fruits are ripe; the leaves short, elongate-elliptic. It is apparently S. longipes - not my species. Why, pray, did Chapman say S. floridana grow on rocky banks? Mine never does.

Please ~~not~~ ^{only} look in water specimens of S. astatucana from Lake Co (1st flowers Feb. 8th) and from Gulf. Have mock; also twigs of S. longipes in flower (forced). The differences between astat. longipes are several and distinct. The scales of the σ catkin in longipes are closely imbricate and very hairy; those of ast. more distant and with fewer, shorter hairs. The twigs of longipes are very purple; those of ast. scarcely purple at all fresh but become so on drying. The leaves of longipes are shiny-green with veins scarcely visible; those of astat. slightly yellowish-green with greenish-venation very prominent beneath, as in lucens geminata. There is a difference of 2 μ in the width of the pollen grains, the S. longipes thicker. The bark soon becomes very rough, on ast. it remains smooth and pale.

Much luck to you in your interesting researches. I have plenty of material but no facilities.

May I see your paper when published?

Sincerely,

W. A. Merrill

Feb. 16

Dear Dr. Ball

Glad to hear from you. As I said before, I have no facilities. We take Small as gospel. His "Manual" cites S. floridana Chapm. as a synonym of S. longipes Anders. Turning to Chapman's "Flora", I find no S. longipes, only S. floridana Chapm. Considering the abundance of the latter in the state, he seems to bear out Small's position that the two are identical. Further, he says S. floridana grows on rocky banks, W. Fla., fruiting in April, flowers not seen. Of course, he must have seen flowers of the common S. longipes, so there you go again. The only way (as I have always done with fungi) is to get at the type specimens, if possible, which you have done. Kitchcock also misled me in determining the Lake City specimen as S. floridana, when it seems only S. longipes. The distribution of S. astatulana also fooled me. It occurs just where several other plants of central Fla. do, creeping up into Gulf Hammock as their northern limit. Well, I'm glad you have cleared this up for everybody. There was certainly considerable misapprehension abroad. Palmer will be glad also. As to Small's S. chapmanii, it has the right habitat. Sounds as though Small thought the Chapman had mixed things, one going to longipes and the other being the basis of chapmanii, but that is a matter of material, which you have and I have not. I will get the ventral glands if not too late.

Sincerely

W.A. Merrill

February 25, 1942

Dr. W. A. Merrill,
Department of Botany,
University of Florida,
Gainesville, Florida.

Dear Dr. Merrill:

Your letter of February 16 was promptly received and I greatly appreciate your various comments.

The reasons why people do the things they do are past finding out. We can only guess partly from knowledge of individuals concerned and partly from feelings as to what we would do under given circumstances.

Perhaps, however, I can clear up some of your expressed confusion.

Dr. Chapman undoubtedly did not separate *S. longipes* from *S. nigra* and, therefore, included only the latter in his manual. This is not surprising. Many later botanists did not make this separation and when the present *S. longipes* variety *Wardii* was described it was assigned by Bebb as a variety of *S. nigra*. In the same way *S. amygdaloides* was described first as a variety of *S. nigra* although it is just as different from *S. nigra* as is *S. longipes*. Most of the manual and other records of *S. nigra* in Minnesota, the Dakotas, Nebraska, and westward were based on *S. amygdaloides*.

The action of Small, which is completely unexplainable, is that of basing his *S. Chapmanii* on the type of *S. floridana* after he had listed *S. floridana* as a synonym of *S. longipes*. Not only was there only one type specimen of *S. floridana* but the type was the only collection known at that time. I did not know Dr. Small at all well, but those who have worked with him say that he had numerous unaccountabilities.

If the specimens you are growing in water still have flowers, I will appreciate the measurements of the ventral glands.

Cordially yours,

Carleton R. Ball,
Executive Secretary

3-7-42

I hear Dr. Ball

of S. longipes fls in Vasco) off to you today. Very late while. Had to force these

Letter from Harper. Claims very little knowledge of S. Florida and S. Chapmanii because no flowers. Wonder what Code would say about - describing a plant - without - flowers. Told me of his two collections in Fla.

Said type loc. of latter was Middle Fla., prob. near Quincy, while former - West Fla.
 Digitized by Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation
 flowers.

Sincerely

W.A. Merrill

Fine sunny day after cold and rain.

March 28, 1942

Dr. W. A. Merrill
Department of Botany
Experiment Station
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

Dear Dr. Merrill:

Two hand written notes from you recently, or not so recently, are still unanswered, and your extreme courtesy in sending me the package containing numerous fragments of flowering material of *S. longipes* and *S. astatulana* likewise has remained unacknowledged. I am sorry for these sins of omission.

I have had no opportunity to study the material but am taking it home with me today on the chance that I can give it attention before leaving on a field trip tomorrow. After I return I shall hope to write you fully as to my findings.

Cordially yours,

Carleton R. Ball,
Executive Secretary

Dear Mr. Ball

Year 1942

Your letter of Feb. 25 certainly does clarify things for me. Yes, I knew Small well - but not that well. Naturally, because I was then devoting all my time to fungi.

Now, if you want to help me and our herbarium here immensely, just send me one sample each of the species and vars. of Salix occurring in Fla. as you recognize them. The specimens need not be large ones. Scraps will do.

A box of willow material went to you yesterday for you to keep. Anything else? Just ask for it.

Sincerely

W. A. Murrill

(Year 1911?)

I can Dr. Ball

Here are γ S. longipes and
S. astatalana in 3% Vasco, which keeps
them indefinitely. Also young γ of
of astat from last year

Am unable to get γ of astat fls
this year because 400 mi. is too hard
on tires

Digitized by ~~Am~~ John Institute for Botanical Documentation

Sincerely

W. A. Murrill

S. astat is a crack willow - twigs brittle
S. longipes is anything but - no crack

W.A. Merrill to Dayton
Thanks for letter & check recd.

My rebuttal of Ball's mistaken
views about willow will appear
in Fla. Acad. Journal 1946

I have plants of *S. astatulana*
growing (and blooming every spring)
on our campus.

Sincerely W.A. Merrill