

926 Grand Ave
Rockford Ills
Jan 14 /11

Mr. dear Mr. Watson

In handing you the MS of Salter for the new ed of his Manual I wish to say a few words about what I have done - with the understanding right at the start that this letter is not to be tucked away somewhere in the hubbards as a kind of personal commentary on the whole performance - I would write too fully for that. There is no person upon whom criticism I should so readily feel like doubting and revising my own opinion as your own - certainly no one to whom I can trust so much to correct any imperfections in literary style - In a matter of fact you would not have had me write the Salter if you did not trust my judgment - in a matter of treatment I have by no means the experience of a constant writer like yourself. Well this is a long prelude to my few words - The two main sections are briefly and yet fully defined - I would leave

adopted Fries's name Americia for the
first if I could have found another
equally good, for the second not
underscores Dianthidium would work -
there are too many disastrous species
in this other group -

My first division under 31 eliminates
S. longistylis by a good tangible character
- at the same time leaving all the other
species with capsules glabrous -

The next subdivision by the number of
stamens I do not like but it is the
best that can be hit upon. To separate
our native species from the introduced
Fragiles. It is best to avoid sectional
characters drawn from the male but in
this case it is unavoidable - as I imagine
it also must have appeared to Mr. Carey.

Don't be dismayed when you strike my
first description S. nigra - it has given
lots of bother and is as good now as I
can make it; the forms are so variable
and so difficult to define in a few
words. The remark about Vahlardii is
not wholly superfluous - it gives emphasis
to the fact that the leaves bear a close
enough likeness to S. cordata to deceive

even Anderson! Let me beg of you
to admit the way in which I have
given authors names after reduced
species - following in this respect
Hookers Student Flora. Among the
Tillous I do not see what else I can
do. There are some reduced species where it
is not certainly known to whom the credit
of a first reduction really belongs. Besides
it saves space.

S. alba var *vittellina* L. (sp.)

S. alba var *vittellina*, Koch. — (*S. vittellina* L.)

I think I have the species in a nice
natural-lineal arrangement
nigra-among *Dalaides*-*Licidea*-*fragilis*. *alba*,
bryopholia — *Soyjolia* is really belongs
to this section - but deserves a separate
group — Now about the note after
S. fragilis. it is the briefest and seems
to me the best way the adoption of
Russelliana - *Fragilis viridis* &c. instead
of attempting separate descriptions - would
you write Note before or after it stand
as a paragraph under the last species of
the group?

Notwithstanding the fact that we have
only one esp of *S. Babylonica* I think

it should be regarded as a venture -
I am assured that when a stream in
Pennsylvania runs 9 or miles through
a trackless mountain forest, its banks
are lined with S. Babyloca -

Under § 2 Capsulis Tomentosa - Capsules
glutinous seems at a glance very artificial
- but it divides our species decisively -
without doing violence to natural
sequence - bring the alpinæ where
they belong &c. It won't work at all
in Europe - with us it works first rate
seems to me. Style short or none as
against style elongated is not likely to
be misleading - The first section
following wings discolor and rostrata
together (as they should be) - and places
rostrata of all our species next the
Americæ which is also as it should
be -

The next section (the same repetition) combines
the characters as far as possible of S. humilis
and S. tristis -

The next group (Argenteæ) fits S. argentea
where it belongs. After defining the
subgroup there seems to be little left
of S. sericea and S. petiolaris but the

differentiating characters - and this
wings me to say why I have marked
these in pencil - Will it look well
- as in the present instance the stations
the whole description - You can deepen
the lines if you think yes - or run out
some if you think no.

16. *S. physcifolia*, Z. This once appears in
the Jour. Bulletin of February my reasons
in extenso for restoring, the old Linnaean
name for the White Mtn plants - I shall
also restore *S. Uva-dasi* for good reasons
which met Dr Gray's approval.

The cordatae group owing to the number
of additions is necessarily expanded
beyond the old limits - You will see I
have combined characters in defining
groups as far as I could. *S. myricoides*
Kuhl. is such a common hybrid. has been
so long in the books - has created so
much confusion and been so little
understood I think a brief description
would be better than the mere mention
given the newer (but not less interesting) hybrids.
It was not until I received the catalogues
of the Harvard herbarium last week that it

dawned upon me when Carey got his
S. angustata with "Cattails resembling
S. discolor in size and aspect" The
specimens were collected by Dr Lapham
at Milwaukee - and belong to my
S. glaucoptera which is - I am more
and more convinced - a good species -
I thought best to add the var angustifolia
and brevifolia, beginning left out reluctantly
on the score of economy in space -

If I have made the descriptions of
the Alpine species a little fuller than
they appeared before it has only been
because so much misapprehension has
hitherto existed as to make the
discrimination of these little millets a
by word for expressing the ability of
the brahma-cultivated intellect to do
what the savage instinct could not -

Nobody - not even fairly good botanists
seemed to get the names straight

I had better stop right here and whatever
& else I may have to say - say it another
time - I hope (I can not deny that) that
my work will be approved - but now that it
is done I am in no mood to regard it
myself as satisfactory - cordially Bill

P.S. Section including *S. lecidea*. one species
more & you use the singular as I
have written it or say Shrubs or
small bushy trees instead? Top of page 2

3. *S. lecidea* - Dudley first observed the persistence
of the fertile ament - Bailey afterward
ment off at half-cock and described this
as a new var. - not giving Dudley a word
of credit - I was glad to find deliverance
from the whole business - $\frac{4}{5}$ of my species
without persistent fruit

On some accounts - with my little experience - I
do not altogether like eliminating from the
description of the species - characters before
mentioned in the group - The average botanist
will not - (the average student such as will
use the Manual I mean) - go back and combine
the synoptical group with the species
description - You have ~~seen~~ noticed this
no doubt in the quotations that are often
made from the "Synoptical flora" without
giving more than much ^{which} follows the name
of the species - But then it saves space -



Bebb, M. S. 1888. "Bebb, Michael S. Jan. 14, 1888 [to S. Watson]." *Michael Schuck Bebb letters to Asa Gray*

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/226809>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/261489>

Holding Institution

Harvard University Botany Libraries

Sponsored by

Arcadia 19th Century Collections Digitization/Harvard Library

Copyright & Reuse

Copyright Status: Public domain. The Library considers that this work is no longer under copyright protection

License: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>

This document was created from content at the **Biodiversity Heritage Library**, the world's largest open access digital library for biodiversity literature and archives. Visit BHL at <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org>.