



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.

From M. Williams

Juneau, Alaska
December 26, 1950

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

Dear Dr. Ball:

Read your letter at Club meeting before Christmas and we all enjoyed it. We feel very fortunate to have you to help us out with the Salix. I guess that's what you get for being so good--or so willing? Everybody depends on you.

We never expect an answer from you very soon as we realize that you have many, many other commitments. So don't ever feel "diacombobulated" on our account. We are very glad to hear from you but we try to be understanding too.

Will your mss. on the willows of Alaska-Yukon contain information on all these collections you have been going thru? Or do you put out lists for each collector or what? Have you ever had time to do the Salix for J. P. Anderson's book?

I had made a list for you of the changes on some numbers of the Salix you determined from our trip to the Interior but can only find one page of it now. So will go over them again and send you the corrected sheet. We did not make many changes but put numbers on all that were not numbered and made a few other changes.

We got a big box of our plants back from Dr. Fulten and a long list of those we sent him for his herbarium. He had changed most of the names on our few plants that he returned. We have not had time to see how his names agree with what Dr. Anderson looked over of ours.

We also got a nice collection from our auxiliary membership at Iliamna Lake. The only trouble with them was they did not collect enough for a good plate. Just one plant, regardless of its size! But at least they made a beginning and some of them will be sufficient to make a decent plate. We will mount all of them but some, like *Pin-guicula villosa*, are going to look mighty lonesome! Will have a few willows for you from them. Then we got a nice box of well pressed plants from a young girl whose father ~~is~~ works at McKinley Park. So we have added a few things this year. We have also enlisted the help of 4 new members (we were down to 3 active ones) so we hope to catch up with our mounting this winter.

About the book. Thru Christine I have been in contact with a lady from Fairbanks who has a gold mine and who might be willing to back this thing. We are trying to get estimates of cost now from different presses to see what it would cost. If it isn't too steep she might back it. I have my fingers crossed. And in the meantime I am trying to get back at it. I would still be interested in Mrs. Henry's book. But don't trouble yourself about the Smithsonian just now. The book, as planned now, would have 200 color pictures, two to a page, and 200 pages of text--making 300 pages in all. About 5x8.

Dec 26, 1950

You say you saw Dr. Anderson briefly on his way home from Sweden. But you do not mention seeing him in November when he attended the Alaska conference. We have had reports from one who attended the meeting, from here, that he looked like he had had a stroke. This party said the left side of his face looked very sagged. We are greatly concerned and are trying to find out if it is so. He is on the last part of his book and do so hope nothing happens to him before he gets it finished.

We have had a wet Christmas. It snowed Saturday night but turned to rain by Sunday and has rained steadily ever since. The streets are clear again--at least all those down town---and walking is not such a gamble as it is when they are icy. Of course the children were disappointed but they have plenty of time yet to use those sleds!

With the world in such a turmoil one wonders if he can wish anyone a happy new year, but anyway the Club wants to wish you and Mrs. Ball the very best of everything.

Sincerely yours,

Maxine Williams

(over)

Mrs. V. F. Williams,
Box 2327, Juneau, Alaska.

3814 Jocelyn St., N.W.
Washington 18, D. C.

24 January, 1951.

Dear Mrs. Williams:

Apparently I never have answered your letter of 26 Dec., 1950. I try to answer letters at least every half-century, but missed it on this one.

I am very happy to know just what your proposed book covers and feel that it will be well worth while. I hope your fingers may become relaxed soon, with a knowledge of costs and of the willingness of the mine lady to meet them. My friend, Dr. Ray J. Davis, of Idaho, has spent 20 years preparing a Flora of Idaho, and wrote me recently that the manuscript has been completed for several months but that he cannot find a publisher. I gave him some suggestions to follow up, and will take it up with the Contr. U.S. Nat. Herbarium next time I'm down there.

By the way, you sent me a beautiful photo of a pussy willow in bloom, but I was unable to identify it. Have just looked at it again. What I had thought to be staminate catkins, now appear to be the pistillate catkins with the seed hairs nearly covering the capsules. Is that right?
the

Yes, when Dr. Andersen was here for the Alaska Conference, I did see him and noted that his face was badly sagged and that his shoulders did seem more bent but we were so busy in the brief time I had he had that health did not get any time at all. I'm sure that he will appreciate hearing from you now. I will keep in touch with him frequently.

I was amused at your statement regarding the changed names on the plants you had sent Dr. Hulten. That is his specialty. He starts by saying that what some one else said is not so, but gives no proof whatever. Then he goes on to make his new species and varieties. He did just that with the willows in his Alaska Flora. I have got to finish up my review of his three "new Species" and publish soon.

I'm happy that you gradually are developing cooperation by other groups on your Alaska problems. I spent most of my life developing cooperation between government agencies at the successive levels, Federal, State, District, County, and City. It pays, both in money saved and strained feelings avoided, as well as in greater speed in getting things done.

Have just discovered an obvious error of mine in the list of determinations of your 1949 collections. On page 1, No. 169 is listed as *S. myrtilloides*. That is a European species, nearest to *S. pedicellaris* Pursh. Probably what I intended to write was *S. myrtillofolia* Anderson. Please tell me what is on the label.

I am sending a couple of clippings with this. Think I mentioned them in the earlier letter.

Cordially yours,

Carleton R. Ball



Juneau, Alaska
July 6, 1952

Dear Dr. Ball:

Thought you might like to see my little booklet on Alaska wild flowers so am inclosing a copy for you. It was hastily done and didn't catch all the mistakes (*Pentstemon gormanii* instead of *P. procerus*, for example) but will know better next time. The boat strike has curtailed sales to tourists, as there hasn't been too many of them. But otherwise it is going quite well. If I had some more outlets in the other towns of Alaska it would help but have had trouble finding names and addresses. But the booklet will be good next year so am not worried about it.

We have had a very backward year--at least 2 weeks ^{late} and perhaps three. Our lilacs are just now in full bloom and the hawthorn trees are not quite full bloom. They should be thru blooming by now. And wild flowers are the same altho I think they are catching up.

Our 4th of July was sunny in the morning but clouded up by afternoon and was cool. And yesterday was cloudy and cool all day and to-day it is pouring. Wish we could trade you some rain for a little of your heat.

We recieved the last part of Dr. Anderson's book last week. Hope he is making good progress on his supplement. Do you have the willows done for him yet? We all hope he will be able to complete his work. With a dropsical condition tho, one never knows.

Hope this finds you and your wife well.
Sincerely yours,
Maxine Williams

Mrs. Maxine Gage Williams,
Box 23, Juneau, Alaska.

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

12 July, 1952

Dear Mrs. Williams:

I was delighted to receive the autographed copy of your splendid booklet on Alaska Wildflower Glimpses. I have delayed reply until I could read it through.

Congratulations on having finished this phase of the work, in spite of labor involved and financial discouragements encountered. We need much more of this publication which helps to make nature lovers and conservationists.

I have noted the References to willows on pp. 8, 23, 27-28, and 46. The pussy willow (p. 8) was *Salix Scouleriana*, I suppose, altho it could have been *S. alaxensis*, or both. I received the data on uses of willows for feed by Eskime some time ago (from Miss Heller, I think) and greatly appreciated the courtesy).

In the Preface to your "Glimpses", I note your reference to your larger work on the plants of Alaska, with 200 illustrations in color, for which you cannot find a publisher. If I had more knowledge of its size and scope, I would be very glad to see if some help for publication cannot be obtained. One of the Foundations might support it, or the Interior Dept. might help.

Will it be an octave or quarto volume, and about how many pages would it make? Are the 200 colored illustrations intended to be full-page plates, or would two or three or four go on one page, as in your "Glimpses"? Is it primarily a guide to the flowers of Alaska, or does it have botanical descriptions?

Sorry that I cannot ship you our excess of heat. It has caused some terrific storms, in which lightning and wind tore up enough trees so that I obtained almost a winter's supply of fireplace wood right in this neighborhood. Then the D.C. cut an enormous dead oak three feet away and I took everything up to 8 inches in diameter. Have it all piled near my garage but much of the sawing will wait for cooler weather or be done at night.

My constructive work on the willows of Alaska has been held up for many weeks while I have studied the mess created by Hulten in his Flora of Alaska and Yukon. Never in all my days have I had such a job. Take the Section *Glaucæ*, for example. He inserts *S. glauca*, then he places *S. desertorum* under it as a subspecies, and then describes a new variety *sericea* under that. The specimens he cites as var. *sericea* all are just *glauca* itself. Then he redescribes *S. desertorum* as *S. Miriei*, n. sp. Then he asserts that *S. nipheclada* really is just a series of hybrids but he will leave them as *S. nipheclada* temporarily.

Under *S. glauca* he cites 35 specimens. Then as a supposed hybrid of *S. glauca* and *S. pseudomenticola* he cited 79 specimens, divided into three groups which he named as new forms. I have studied critically, a very large number of these, and they show no signs of being hybrids at all, and certainly not with *S. pseudomenticola*. Then he inserts *S. fullertonensis*, from Hudson Bay area, as an Alaska plant, based on one specimen, and that proves to be a juvenile *S. glauca*. And so on through his whole work. Mrs. Chase, the grass specialist, tells me that his treatment of the grasses is "unusable". I am nearly there with his treatment but it has taken a lot of time and more energy. When one makes assertions, he does not have to give proof. But when one refutes such assertions he has to give full proof.

With all good wishes, I am

Cordially yours,

P.S. Two bits of paper inclosed.

Carleton R. Ball

11/22/52
from M. Williams

Dear Dr. Ball: -

I finally remembered to look up my manuscript, to send you. Also found this mock up on my second choice of type of book - which of course led to the ~~only~~ one I did put out. However the picture size is about what I would like in the more detailed book. The cover pictures are just a dress up & of course would not be necessary. Could use

one for a frontis piece Tho. The
dummy would give you the
map idea & the plate I
would want them. Had
the flowers in the dummy
in sections, by color. That
would not be the placement,
of course, in the more detailed
book.

Will be interested to see
what you think of these ideas

P.S. The manuscript
& dummy can be
returned regular
insured mail when you are finished with it.

Cordially yours,
Maxine Williams.

Mrs V. F. Williams,
Box 2327, Juneau Alaska.

3814 Federal St., N.W.,
Washington 15, D.C.
20 March, 1953.

Dear Mrs. Williams:

I am greatly ashamed that your letter of 22 November, and your manuscript and picture for the Alaskan Book of Flowers has been so long neglected. At 80, I forget many, many things, and the pressure of work has been terrific this last winter.

Today I have gone through your mss. and I think that you are doing a wonderful job, which will be very helpful to man. Because it is so good, I have ventured to edit it a little (I have been an editor of scientific journals most of my life, and have taught manuscript-writing). Please believe me that this is not done in criticism but in a real desire to be helpful. You will find my suggested changes in pencil. Probably you would have made most of them in your revision. Here are my reasons for a few.

Where a sentence contained three clauses, there was a comma after the first, and I have placed one after the second also, to make the meaning more easily grasped. Occasionally we write a clause of two parts and then no comma is need between the two parts, but only between clauses.

Dashes have been inserted in all such descriptions as "3- to 5-lobed", "3- to 5-pinnate" etc. You already had them in some of these. These are quite different from "3 to 5 feet high".

Under one genus, I noted the names of a large number of species arranged in three columns. Would they not be found more readily, when wanted, if arranged alphabetically?

In a few cases, you had used the word genera (plural) when you needed the word genus (singular). In a popular work, it is proper to use the English plural, *genuses*, instead of the Latin plural, *genera*, if you wish.

In several cases, I have suggested changing the position of the word "only" in a sentence. It should not be placed between two parts of a verb, and it may have two or even three different meanings, depending on where it is placed. "Only that one was collected" means that no other one was. "That species was collected only at Juneau" but nowhere else. "That species was observed only" but not collected.

On page 45, "smooth" is used for glabrous, or hairless, or without hairs. Yet you had just said that some very hairy leaves were smooth as a cat's fur. Many hairless leaves (glabrous) are quite rough, the opposite of smooth.

On your map, and in citing ranges of plants, you use "S.E. Alaska" as meaning the narrow strip bordering on Brit. Columbia. Many people might consider the Copper River area and perhaps the east side of the Alaska Range to be in S.E. Alaska. Perhaps it would be helpful to mention your map in the preface, calling attention to the various "Areas", and noting the special limitation on "S.E. Alaska".

At several points, ranges are given as "Alaska and adjacent Canada." In most cases this seemed to refer to Alaska and adjacent Yukon, and not to include Brit. Columbia. Where this is true, it might be clearer to say "Alaska and adjacent Yukon."

A statement on p. 40 is not clear to me. Perhaps it should read: "except the extreme Arctic Coast, the Aleutians (including Kodiak), and S.E. Alaska."

I note many references to the hybridization of two or more species. Have these been determined by careful study, or are they guesses, or theories? Dr. Hulten has done a great disservice to American botany by his assertions (following Fiederus) that most willows are hybrids, because this is completely untrue. In his Flora, he actually lists more collections under hybrids, than under species and varieties or subspecies. Fernald and others have described many species without realizing that they were hybrids.

I see many references to both subspecies and varieties and assume that all were published as such. But we must admit that certain botanists now are changing names from one category to another just to get a new combination bearing their name. Hulten has done a lot of this. I think that it would be more honest to stick to varieties. OVER
(See over)

I am sending this air-mail today. The manuscript I will send by insured mail tomorrow.

If I can help you in any way, please give me a chance to make up for my carelessness this time.

Cordially yours

Carleton R. Ball

Today I have gone through your paper and I think that you are doing a wonderful job, which will be very helpful to me. Because it is no good, I have ventured to edit it a little (I have been an editor of scientific journals most of my life, and have thought manuscript-writing). Please believe me that this is not done in criticism but it is a real desire to be helpful. You will find my suggested changes in pencil. I hope you would have made much of them in your revision. Here are my reasons for a few.

Where a sentence contained three clauses, there was a comma after the first, and I have placed one after the second also, so that the meaning was easily grasped. Usually we write a clause of two parts and then no comma is needed between the two parts but only between clauses.

Changes have been made in all such descriptions as "3- to 5-lobed", "3- to 5-lobed", etc. You already had them in some of them. These are quite different from "3 to 5 lobed" and "3- to 5-lobed".

Under one genus, I noted the names of a large number of species arranged in three columns. With that not be found more readily, when wanted, it seemed appropriate to change. In a few cases, you had used the word genus (plural) when you needed the word genus (singular). In a popular work, it is proper to use the English plural, genera, instead of the Latin plural, genera, if you wish.

I have suggested changing the position of the word "only" in several places. It is not always clear where it is placed. "Only that one was collected" means that no other was. "That species was collected only at Juneau" but nowhere else. "A species was observed only" but not collected.

On page 45, "unusually" is used for glabrous, or hairless, or without being. Yet you had just said that some very hairy leaves were smooth as a cat's fur. Many hairless leaves (glabrous) are quite rough, the opposite of smooth.

On your map, and in citing regions etc. plants, you use "S.E. Alaska" as meaning the narrow strip bordering on the Gulf of Alaska. But people might consider the Copper River area and perhaps the rest of the Alaska Range to be in S.E. Alaska. Perhaps it would be helpful to mention your map in the preface, calling attention to the various "Areas", and noting the special limitation on "S.E. Alaska".

At several places, ranges are given as "Alaska and adjacent Canada". In most cases this seemed to refer to Alaska and adjacent Yukon, and not to include British Columbia. Where this is true, it might be clearer to say "Alaska and adjacent Yukon".

A statement on p. 45 is not clear to me. Perhaps it should read: "except the extreme Arctic coast, the Aleutians (including Kodiak), and S.E. Alaska".

I note many references to the hybridization of two or more species. Have these been determined by careful study, or are they guesses, or theories? Dr. Hitchcock has done a great deal of work on the hybridization of plants by his experiments (following Hillebrand) that most willows are hybrids, because this is completely untrue. In his time, he actually listed more collections under hybrids, than under species and varieties or subspecies. Terminalia and others have described many species without realizing that they were hybrids.

I see many references to both subspecies and varieties and assume that all were published as such. But we must admit that certain botanists now are changing names from one category to another just to get a new combination bearing their name. I have seen a lot of this. I think that it would be more honest to stick to varieties.

-from McWilliams

P. O. Box 2327
Juneau, Alaska
March 24, 1953

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

Dear Dr. Ball:

I'm certainly glad I sent you the Newsletter about Dr. Anderson's death. I can't understand why it wasn't in the Iowa paper you got--almost sounds like they thought little of him.

And along that line---we up here don't know much about how Universities or Colleges run their business or how they get money to carry on but we felt that Iowa State seemed very apathetic about Dr. Anderson's collection and any possible use they may put it too. We haven't expressed ourselves to them, as yet, as we don't want to antagonize them and spoil any chance there might be of getting Dr. Anderson's work done. Perhaps now, when they know the content of the will they will have a better idea of what they can do. It struck us as rather odd that they would have no plans formulated as to the upkeep of the collection or any plan to finish his book upon his death. They were aware of his poor health, I presume, and could realize that he had little chance of finishing it. It was a shame such a fine collection had to leave Alaska, especially one collected by an old time Alaskan. Of course we realize the reason for it--he couldn't have written the book without a suitable place to concentrate his whole energy on the task. But \$60 a month, with never a raise, seemed a small salary too. Of course we are only looking at it from our side and perhaps the other side has sufficient justification for its actions. Sure wish the University of Alaska had that collection! Maybe they would finish the book.

We would certainly appreciate it if you would write the Arctic Institute. I believe some organization like that would be the logical one to finish it--if Iowa State won't.

I was only worried to think the manuscript might have ended up in the Dead Letter Office and that perhaps I would have a hard time tracing it after waiting so long. Am relieved to know it had not gone astray. Am sorry to have caused you so much trouble. You were very kind to take time to examine it and give me valuable criticism. I am aware that my English ~~xxxxxx~~ needs polishing and had a good friend here constantly on my neck editing it for me--she is a former Librarian. But I haven't looked at this manuscript for about two years now--as I took time to put out this tourist booklet, which I have now revised somewhat and added 20 photographs of pictures in black and white. They are running it off this week I think.

2 march 24, 1953

Some day I hope to finish it--but with out hope of financial backing I have sort of lost interest. Now I have a job so hard on my eyes I can't do too much home work. Maybe when we retire and go Outside to live I can have time to finish it up. My husband intends to buy a little farm or acreage within the next year or two and just relax and take it easy--and he was raised on a farm too! Well one can dream can't they? But we really are planning on going Outside within the next two or three years. Personally I like Alaska and would just as soon stay here--except for the winters. Am getting so I can't take the snow and Taku winds. Now if we could only figure a way to live six months in Alaska and six in the States!

On your changes---I believe I used Alaska and Adjacent Canada from Dr. Anderson. I will reexamine the text and see if I was too vague. I think the hybridization references were from Dr. Anderson--his letters or personal comments--but they may have been based in part on Dr. Hultén's book. Some may have been from our own personal observations. If I used subspecies or varieties I was following Dr. Anderson or Dr. Hultén. I tried to follow Anderson on everything but perhaps I did not. I thought my map had clearly defined lines marking off the various areas--will note that. Am glad you mention my use of the word "only". I have always been confused as to how to use it. I will study your corrections and hope to clear that matter up. Your comments will be invaluable to me and I sincerely thank you for taking the time to give them.

Digitized by Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation

About a month ago I made some Nagoonberry jelly from some two year old juice and put it up in cans so I could ship it to my friends. The sample I tried showed me the juice had lost some of its flavor but still wasn't too bad. I'm sending you and Mrs. Ball a can of it on the next south bound boat--due south next Sunday. I hope you will like it. But to get the real flavor and aroma I guess you will have to come to Alaska!

We are all looking forward to the Alaska Science Conference to be held in Juneau next September. We thing we should bring the story of Dr. Anderson's book up to them--if nothing has been accomplished before then. Am afraid our collection is not going to be completely indexed as we are so short handed but at least it will be ~~in~~ in shape so it can be examined. If we can get a suitable Club room between now and then so visiting scientists can ~~vaw~~ view it whenever they have time, we will feel like we have accomplished a great deal. In a members basement, as it is now, it is not readily available.

Thank you again for all you have done for us--and me. We will give you the data on the last willow collection as soon as we have had time to examine it--I believe we can supply all the missing information.

Cordially yours,

Maxine Williams