



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.

65 Hammond Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts
April 12, 1946.

Dr. Carleton R. Ball
3814 Jocelyn, N. W.
Washington, D. C.

Dear Dr. Ball:

Both my wife and I were sorry we didn't get a chance to see you again before we left Washington. We were sorry that we didn't get a chance to have lunch with you that Thursday. Perhaps we misunderstood, but we thought it was indefinite and that you might be up Thursday or Friday. On Wednesday Mrs. Chase called our landlady and asked her to tell us that she wanted us to have lunch with her Thursday noon. We were having dinner with Charlotte's sister that evening and didn't get back until late. Since Mrs. Chase had gone to some trouble to prepare a lunch to eat in the building, we felt that we should stay. We rather hoped that you might be at the Smithsonian again on Friday.

Thanks very much for the Willows of Virginia. We especially enjoyed the part on uses. After reading your paper I remembered having seen willows used as windbreaks in muck-farming areas. Willows as a source of charcoal was a new one for us. How many plants are there, I wonder, which do not serve man in some way? We are anxious to see a reprint of the paper you are preparing for Dr. Merrill's retirement volume, and enclosing a little reprint which may interest you. Perhaps this is more or less along the same line of more careful study and less names.

Your grass library interests me very much. I imagine you have many things which it would be virtually impossible to duplicate. I hoped that I might have an opportunity to discuss this with you further. Please keep me in mind as one who is definitely interested. We expect to be back in Washington again probably in the fall. After being there I can see that the National Herbarium is the place to work up a grass flora of a little known region. I hope I shall be able to spend a year there.

Please give our regards to Mrs. Chase and Dr. Maxon when you see them.

Sincerely,

John R. Reeder
John R. Reeder

(over)

Mr. John R. Reeder,
65 Hammond Street,
Cambridge, Massachusetts.

April 22, 1946

Dear Mr. Reeder:

Your letter of April 12 came promptly and I was glad to hear from you. I'm sorry that we could not get together but hope that there will other opportunities.

Many thanks for your reprint. It is down the alley of my Merrill-memorial paper. All of Rydberg's work must be viewed with suspicion because (1) he was a confirmed splitter on principle; and (2), he prepared a series of mammals for sale (Flora Colo.; Rocky Mountains; Rockies and adjacent Plains) and a perfect record of novelties (in name) appears in each one. We never get honest botany under those conditions.

If you want to read my Harvard paper before publication, you probably can get it from Dr. A. C. Smith, Herbarium of Arnold Arboretum, to whom I sent it several days ago. He said that manuscripts would begin moving to the printer early in May altho July 1 is dead line for receipt.

As to the contents of my library on grasses, it is not so much for I sayed in the work but briefly. On the other hand I have consciously acquired many bulletins and reprints during the years since. It covers about 5 ft. of shelf.

It includes all the publications of the Div. Agrastology, both bulletins and circulars, including all editions. That means 3 editions of AM. Grasses I, and 2 each for AM. Gr. II and III, as well as diff. editions of some circulars, as I remember. It includes also grass publications of the Bureau of Plant Industry.

It has Hitchcock's Genera, and Manual, as also his Man. of Farm Gr.; also Scribner's Gr. of Bernhardt Herb, described by Presl. Of old stuff it has Hackel, True G Vasey, Ill. Am. Gr. 2 vols, 4to; the grass bulletins of the old Div. Botany (Vasey); extracts from the annual reports of the U.S. Dept. Agr. from 1869 on until these other agencies got to publishing; Flint, Gr. & For. Pls., and N.Y. State Agr. Soc. Trans. for 1869.

State publications over 45 years (including some on range and forage grasses, chem. composition, etc.), include Ariz., Calif., Colo., Ill., Ia. (2 bd. vols. and the separate bulls. which comprise Vol 1), Kan. (1 man., 4 papers), Ky. (anal), Mass. (230 pp., 1856), Mich., Mont., Nebr. (5 papers), Nev. (man), N. Mex. (2), No. Car. Penn. (3), No. Dak. So. Dak., Tenn. (3), Tex., W. Va., Wyo. These are official State pubs, mostly; not reprints of authors in those States.

Then there are many reprints of grass papers, read. from authors, and a lot cut from copies of Jour. Washn. Acad. Sci., which I cut up regularly.

Now as to disposal. I shall not donate them to anyone. I did that once and the recipient thought (and hinted) that he should be given more. You may have an option on them until you come down next time. Or if you think that they are worth \$25.00, sight-unseen, I'll ship them now and you can pay as you please, a dollar now and a dollar then as you have it to slip in an envelope. Should you not think that they are worth \$25.00, we'll arbitrate.

With personal remembrances to both, I am

Cordially yours,

Carleton R. Ball
Collaborator

May 2, 1946

Dr. Carleton R. Ball
3814 Jocelyn Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C.

Dear Dr. Ball:

Thank you for your letter of April 22. I would have answered before except I was awaiting a check so that I might send you some money in this letter. Enclosed you should find a money order for twenty-five dollars (\$25.00). You see, I wasn't long in making up my mind. I know that the books and pamphlets are worth much more than the price you are asking. Many of them are practically impossible to get in any way or at any price. When you can conveniently get them together please send them. We are anxious to have an opportunity to look through them. Some of them we have, but many we do not. This will be a very worth while addition to our small grass library.

In connection with that little Distichlis paper I sent to you, you may be interested to know that we collected plants of this genus in several places as we drove from Arizona last summer. The long exerted panicles of the staminate plants are quite striking in the field. In contrast it is difficult to find the pistillate plants since the panicles are hidden among the leaves which are usually considerably longer. This accounts, in large part, for the fact that many collections are represented by staminate plants alone. In all herbaria I have looked into (including U. S.) there is a predominance of staminate plants in the D. stricta folder and a predominance of pistillate plants in the D. dentata covers. The dentations on the palea wings, relative length of lemma to palea, etc. also prove to be differences between the sexes. Once a person has hit upon a thing such as this, it is a bit hard to imagine how it could be overlooked for so long. The fault is, I think, in large measure with the collectors who often collect only one sex of a dioecious plant. Working with the genus Salix, you are probably much more acutely aware of this than I.

How do you account for the fact that as a person gets older and has had broad experience he sometimes becomes an intense "splitter?" I should think that the more material he examined the more he would realize that perhaps the differences he was calling species, or varieties are merely slight variations. I can understand, for example, how a person might see the extreme ends of a species and name them as separate entities. However, as he sees more material and sees the intermediate forms shouldn't he see that they all belong in one species? With experience I should think a person would become more cautious about describing new forms--often it seems to be quite the contrary. Since you have had a great deal of experience in taxonomic botany, perhaps you can answer these questions. I couldn't ask this question to a person who is guilty of the above. Your Merrill-memorial paper indicates that you are a botanist of quite different ideas.

With kindest regards from both my wife and I, I remain

Sincerely

John R. Reeder
John R. Reeder

(See c

Mr. John R. Reeder,
65 Hammond Street,
Cambridge, Massachusetts.

3814 Jocelyn St., N.W.
Washington 15, D.C.
May 4, 1946

Dear Mr. Reeder:

Your letter of May 2, with check for \$25.99, is here. I hope you did not go out of your way to get the money all paid at once.

The books and pamphlets have been packed, after tying and wrapping in parcels, in a single carton and stoutly roped. I think that they will come thro safely. For good measure, I included a few separates on Carices, which I found.

The carton will be shipped, express prepaid, to your house address, just as soon as a pick-up truck comes out. I am to be in N.J. most of week but Mrs. Hall will dispatch it.

Forgot to mention that I have an old Wood's Classbook of Botany, Gray's Manual of 1850, etc. If you care for them will mail them free.

I charged for the books because: 1, I believe that they will be more appreciated and 2, because I honestly believe that they are worth more than price of admission. But I wanted you to have them: 1, because you are a grass student, as I started, and 2, because you seem to have a sense of taxonomic responsibility, and 3, because Charlotte's father has been a splendid helper with difficult western problems.

I will write more about your grass problem, after I return.

Cordially yours,

Carleton R. Hall
Collaborator

Digitized by Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation

May 16, 1946

Dr. Carleton R. Ball
3814 Jocelyn St., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

Dear Dr. Ball:

The carton of books, pamphlets, etc. came yesterday. I suspect that John L. Lewis is responsible for its not getting here sooner. We had been waiting rather anxiously for it since you wrote that you were sending it. It came through in good shape and nothing was damaged. We have looked over the things only rather hurriedly as yet, but we can see that the things are worth far more than the price you asked.

You really had a marvelous collection of grass literature, especially since you were in the work only a short time. Much of this seems to me to be papers and books which it would be practically impossible to acquire now. I was especially happy to see that there was a copy of Hackel's "True Grasses" among them. Even more amazing was the original treatment by Hackel in the Pflanzenfamilien. I was also very happy to find a reprint of Schuster's paper on the Morphologie der Grasblüte. I have consulted this paper in Flora on a number of occasions and so I am especially happy to have a reprint. I was also happy to have reprints of the work by Holm and others (including C. R. Ball) on the anatomy of grass leaves. I have done some work of this nature on Distichlis and allied genera. I don't think it means very much in the case of species separation, but it does seem to be of some value in separating genera.

Wood's Classbook and old ed. of Gray's Manual would be very welcome. However, there is so much valuable material in the lot you have already sent at so reasonable a price that I feel a little reluctant at asking you to send them. This grass library is worth so much more than the small fee you asked that I feel that it is almost a gift. However, I am glad that there was a fee involved as it avoids embarrassment to everyone concerned.

Let me again express the appreciation of both Charlotte and myself for having the opportunity of acquiring this important addition to our grass library. I shall write you again after we have had an opportunity to look over the books and papers in more detail.

Sincerely,

John R. Reeder

John R. Reeder

(over)

(See ov

P.S. You may be interested in an article (of a popular tone) on Sycamore Canyon, Ariz. written by Luther. See Journ. New York Bot. Garden 47: 86-96 (April, 1946). There is a discussion of plants there. Hold be interested in your comments. C.R.

3814 Jocelyn St., N.W.,
Washington 15, D.C.
May 20, 1946

Mr. John R. Reeder
65 Hammond Street,
Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Dear Mr. Reeder:

week before

On returning to Washn. at the end of/last, I discovered that the Ry. Exp. did not call for the carton until Thursday, so that it is not surprising that you did not receive it until May 15, even without John L.

I am glad that you are happy over the collection. It was dear to me once and I am glad now that the Univ. of Minn. did not buy it when they got the grass herb. many years ago. I am glad that you have it, for several reasons:

1. you are a grass specialist, and young, which means that it will be well worn out by you.

2. You are not yet possessed by the evil spirit which drives so many taxonomists to see only differences and not similarities, and therefore your contributions to agrostology are likely to be helpful in promoting knowledge rather than synonymy.

3. Charlotte is the daughter of a man who has been most helpful to me through several years and by reason of whose labors my monograph of *Salix* will be better than otherwise would be possible. Perhaps I have repaid a part of the debt.

I neglected to say in previous letter that there should be duplicates of a few of the Scribner North American Grasses, which may be useful to you for exchange purposes. It is my memory that I had separate copies of these for actual daily use, instead of using the "set" copies.

I will send the old botanies later. Just now I have offered some of my library (mostly sets of periodicals) to the Library of Congress for help in restoring war-damaged European libraries. They have accepted and I am trying to get them ready for sending down to the L.C. as soon as possible. I have to to the Midwest for much of June, and will be pressed before then.

Cordially yours,

Carleton R. Ball

Dear Charlotte :

Thanks for your P.S. but you had best bet you to it by sending me a copy of the paper, which I had read with great pleasure. I love pioneers and pioneering. You will note that he opened the account with the two willows, and did not get to the grasses till much later. By the way, do you or he have a photo of the ferocious snake in the willow tree? I would love to buy one for my "Private Lives of The Willows" which is not yet written altho most of the material is assembled.

He will get my comments, all right. The very idea of seeing a snake like that, and then having the nerve to locate it in a willow tree!

2014 Josoph St., N.W.
Washington 15, D.C.

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Reeder:

June 7, 1946

I have packed a lot of lot volumes of Journals for shipment by the Library of Congress to destroyed libraries abroad. I had intended to include my complete set of Contributions from the U.S. Natl. Herbarium, but decided against that until I was sure that I was about done with them and that I had duplicates of one or two willow papers therein, or could get them.

It has just occurred to me that that you and Charlotte might be interested in them, unless you have been able to pick up a fair set of them. I have no guess as to how many grass papers are in them, or what percentage of these you have been able to pick up as reprints.

I shall hold on to them for a year or more, so that there is no hurry for a decision. If you are at all interested, you may be able to scan the tables of contents some time in the next 12 or 15 months and thereby decide how they look to you. Should you want them later, the price would not be "for free" as to devastated Europe, ^{at} but it would not be exorbitant (not more than \$2000-3000 at most).

Had a fine letter from Charlotte's father recently, in which he said that you were busy (which I was very glad to know). He was giving me some data on ducks eating willows in Colo. (or willows eating ducks, I forget which).

I am leaving on June 12 for Iowa State College, to attend my 50th anniversary of graduation and get a gold medal for daring to live 50 years after they had mauled me around. Then to another 8-day Council as delegate (also in Iowa) and so to home.

With all good wishes, I am

Cordially yours

Carleton R. Ball

P.S. Did I tell you that Dr. Fernald has accepted (for Rhodora) my paper criticizing some of his recent work in Salix and showing how it should have been done?

Mr. & Mrs. John R. Reeder,
65 Hammond St., Cambridge, Mass.

65 Hammond Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts
September 15, 1946

Dear Dr. Ball:

Thank you for sending the Chou article on a second species of Hackelochloa. We weren't even aware of the paper before. We appreciated getting all those papers cut out of the Washington Journal of Science which you included with the grass library. I have been able to make good use of that collection of grass literature several times already.

I am scheduled to take my qualifying (prelim) exam on the fourth of next month and then I will have all the work completed for my degree except my thesis. When that is over we will come to Washington so I can do my thesis there. This summer was a pretty busy one because I had a couple of courses in addition to getting my languages out of the way. Now I am using my time to do some general reading in preparation for the exam.

Finally we have taken time to look through the contributions to see how many of the papers included therein we don't have. We seem not to have very many. If your offer is still good, we are definitely interested in acquiring the set--if the cost isn't prohibitive. I don't have much of an idea what they are worth. After looking them over, I was surprised to find that so many of the papers are agrostological. It seems that every volume has at least one grass paper (usually).

I have been interested in late in Hubbard's placing of some of the grasses, which were generally put in the Chlorideae, in the tribe Eragrostae. Particularly of interest to me were Eleusine, Dactyloctenium, Leptochloa. These all have several florets per spikelet and three nerves in the lemma like Eragrostis. Eleusine had always seemed to me to be in an unnatural position. Henrard took up this classification and also the Japanese agrostologist Ohwi. I had an idea that the embryo might show something. As far as I could find no one had cut a section of the embryo of Eragrostis--I can understand why, they are small. I am just in the midst of sectioning them now, but already I have seen that the embryos of Eragrostis cilianensis and Eleusine coracana are strikingly similar. This, in addition to the other evidence seems to indicate that they should be placed together rather than in widely separated tribes. The Chlorideae is set up mainly on inflorescence characters and all this other evidence is more striking, I think. At any rate it is interesting and I am anxious to see what the others will show.

With best wishes,

John Beeder

(See over)

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

April 4, 1947

Mr. John L. Reeder,
U.S. Natl. Herbarium,
Smithsonian Institution,
Washington 25, D.C.

Dear Reader:

On September 15, 1946, you wrote me a letter. Probably you have forgotten it, and I certainly have neglected it, so far as a written answer is concerned. I think I spoke to you about the Contrib. U.S. Natl. Herbarium.

To put the matter on record, I hereby agree to sell you the complete set of Contributions from the United States National Herbarium for the sum of twentyfive dollars (\$25.00).

They are on shelves on the west wall of my attic and will so remain as I use them. Should anything happen to me, this letter is your warrant for obtaining them from my estate for the sum mentioned. And don't be bashful about doing it, for I want you to have them.

Have just let a half ton of journals go to the war-devastated libraries for free, as a small contribution to world need.

I am interested in your determination to rob the poor Chloridaceae to build up the evil-smelling and pestiferous Eragrostaceae. Please tell me more about it when I see you next, if time permits. If you run short of Eleusine, I might find you some tough specimens here next summer.

Cordially yours,

Carleton R. Ball

Digitized by Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation

(over)

Mr. and Mrs. John R. Reeder,
Dept. of Botany,
Yale University,
New Haven, Connecticut.

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

16 December, 1948

Dear John and Charlotte:

Your Christmas card just here and we were very glad to be remembered by you. I was thinking of you again a few days ago while going through a lot of publications looking for satisfactory pictures to illustrate my Scientific Monthly paper on the 1,001 uses of willows. I went thro the Goodding paper on uses of willows in the arid southwest, and came to that famous picture of the alleged ponies tethered under a gigantic specimen of *Salix Gooddingii*. I told the story to the Editor and we had a good laugh all round.

The National Herbarium seems very quiet since you left. Only Mrs. Chase makes much noise now, and she is working so hard and fast that she has little time. For the last 3 months all of the low cases and tables in the section where *Salix* is have been piled high with specimens supposedly in process of distribution but with no one working on them at all. One day I asked if one table could be cleared so that I could study willows near their cases instead of carrying them far away. I was curtly told that that could not be done. I am wondering what I will say the next time they want me to name some willows.

I hope that everything is going well for you and yours. There ought to be splendid opportunities for growth and progress there at Yale. And you are right in the midst of the famed playground of America, with skating, snow-shoeing, ski-ing, hiking, mountain climbing, bathing, boating, and collecting right at your very door. Just think, if the Mayflower had only reached Virginia, as intended, New England might have been left to become one gigantic National Park, as nature intended. Of course, I would have been a Virginian then, and never have seen New England, probably, but what of that.

I'm writing so much that I don't take time to send out what I get published. I'll take a look and see if I have anything that would interest you on hand at the moment, and, if so, send it along after the Christmas rush is over. My paper removing the epidermis from certain kinds of taxonomists has been rejected once but I still have hopes. (for the paper, I mean, - not the taxonomists).

If and when you come prowling this way again, let us know and we might have a room that would keep you out of the rain. (Of which we are haing more than a plenty right now).

With all good wishes for the Christmas tide and the New Year and all the tears that come thereafter, I am

Cordially yours,

Carleton R. Ball

Will try to send a line to Charlotte's dad presently.
If he dislikes me too much about those jack-rabbits,
he can return it unopened.

P. S. Our Mt. Pleasant Congregational Christian Church has just called the Rev. Philip Gordon Scott, of the Church of the Redeemer in New Haven. I liked him immensely when he was here recently. He is coming in mid-February. (His wife too)



Dr. and Mrs. John R. Heeder,
Dept. of Botany, Yale University,
New Haven, Connecticut.

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

19 April, 1950.

Dear John and Charlotte:

Every time I go to the Natl. ⁴arb., which is about twice a week now, I look about in the hope of spying you there again. No luck so far.

I hear from Leslie N. quite frequently because he and I both are still wallowing in willows. When I wrote him recently that Mrs. ⁴all and I had both had severe attacks of the epidemic virus flu, he immediately invited us to move down to the Rha-chucos because he and his wife didn't have anything like that down there.

In his last letter he said that you were planning to visit the Sierra Madre in Mexico this summer. If I recall rightly, they are in the extreme south, extending from Chiapas into Guatemala. That is nearly terra incognita and I urge you to grab every willow you see, especially at the ^{high} altitude. ~~low~~ There is a group of willows in the high mountains of Mexico which do not extend north into the U.S. at all, and they are very poorly represented in American herbariums.

At the lower elevations, you probably will find *S. Humboldtiana* HEK a common and probably about the only species. It is possible, however, that the rare *S. jaliscensis* Jones, extends that far east. It is much like *S. Bonplandiana* of northern Mexico and Arizona, but has the twigs and usually the leaves also quite densely pubescent. It was named from Jalisco, but has been found farther east.

By the way, have I never sent you any reprints of willow papers? I cannot find any cards in my mailing file. If you want them, I'll be glad to send them as far as now available. How about the Botany Dept., or the Herbarium? Does it maintain a reprint collection, and would they like willow reprints? I think none are going t there now.

Hoping that you are recovered both from the Master Parade and the Ride of Paul Revere, and with best wishes, I am

Cordially yours,

Carlton R. Ball

Dr. John R. Reeder,
Osborn Botanical Laboratory,
Yale University,
New Haven, Connecticut.

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

14 March, 1951.

Dear Dr. Reeder:

In further reference to your letter of March 6 and my reply of March 11, I am happy to inclose the list of determinations of the Mexican willows. I will send a copy of it to Leslie N. and congratulate him on a good job.

You will note No. 1227, *S. Hartwegii*, is regarded somewhat doubtfully as a valid species. Cannot go further without studying much more material than I have here.

No. 1256 is the most extreme specimen I have seen of that very variable variety. You give the habitat as in a cultivated and irrigated valley, but was this plant perhaps growing in a dry location above the irrigation supply? It is depauperate except in length of leaves. No height is given for it.

I take it that No. 1334 comes from extreme eastern Jalisco, tho I cannot find La Punta in the atlas.

Three of the Section *Nigrae* occur in Mexico but I take all four of these to be var. *lindheimeri*, as labelled. *S. Humboldtiana* extends from southern Mexico southward across So. Am. *S. Gooddingii* var. *braceliinae* Ball occurs in Baja Calif., Sonora, perhaps into Chihuahua, but these do not fit into it.

You will note that there is the making of 3 specimens of each number except 1221, *S. babylonica*. You will note also that there are but two labels with Nos. 1242, 1274, and 1334.

I will be most happy to keep a set of these and to turn one set over to the U.S. Natl. Herb., in accordance with your letter. Shall I return the third set to you or send it to some other herbarium you may wish to designate? If I am to send it elsewhere, I will need labels for the 3 mentioned.

Many thanks for your courtesy in giving me a set of these. You all must have had a busy time in those few days.

With personal regards to you both, I am

Cordially yours,

P.S. You may wish to get in touch with Dr. H. J. Iutz of the Forestry School, and see the "diamond" willow material he brought back from Alaska.

Carleton R. Ball