

2. *Solidago puberula* (religiosa)

I have it from Mr. Morong (Mass) and I thought I got it in the North Woods in '79. Probably I sent you my specimen. I puzzled over it long and compared it carefully at the Herb. Rept. Ag., but the collection there is meager and the labels often unreliable. I probably made the mistake.

3. *Potamogeton lonchites* (claytonii).

Is your specimen from here or from the St. Lawrence? I have never found any good fruiting specimens here. Probably I sent you the Thousand Islands plant. The genus is a difficult one and no one here understands it. I had just received a good lot of *Potamogetons* from Mr. Morong and thought I had made mine all out correctly but may have missed it in this case. Our own *claytonii* looks very different.

1464 R. I. Ave.

Washington D.C.

October 15, 1884.

Mr. Walter Deane,
Cambridge, Mass.

Dear Sir:

Your letter of the 4th inst. reached me as I was on the point of leaving home for a week, and on reading it in the cars I felt some little concern lest serious mistakes might have crept into our local flora, although I soon saw that most of the discrepancies you point out were in cases where plants had been sent me in exchange and furnished you under the names attached to

to them by my correspondents. For such cases I can scarcely be held responsible, as I have no great herbarium like that of Harvard to compare them in. I have, however, compared many such at the Department of Agriculture where I had doubts, but that collection is poor in Eastern species.

Most of the cases you give that refer to Washington plants occur with Carices, and these I do not profess to be an expert in, and all my leafices have been submitted to Dr. Vasey (or Mr. Conant), with whom you will have to have your quarrel. There is only one way in which I may be at fault here and that is in sending you plants which I collected at the same place

as those they had verified and thus supposed them to be the same when in fact they were not, but this I can not tell until I can get from you the date of collection of the particular specimen I sent you.

I will explain each of the cases you enumerate the best I can, but often I have more than one plant labeled with the same name by different collectors and have no means of knowing which I had a duplicate of to send you until you inform me by whom collected.

1. *Reseda Luteola* (lutea). I have two specimens so named, both from Martindale (ballast), one dated June 1878, the other Aug. 1880. They look different and one is probably *R. Luteola*. Which did I send you?

H. B. Jesup, Amhurst, Mass.

I presume you have the former, +
I think Mr. Smith's plant is wrongly
labeled.

15. *Arundinaria tecta* (= *A.*
macrosperma). I am very
glad to have this settled. Prof.
G. W. Chickering and Mr. Morong
were with me when this was collected
in the Dismal Swamp and the
chances for it to be *A. macrosperma*
were thoroughly canvassed by us all.
I analysed it and told them it would
pass for that if far enough south
but after we all got home and studied
it we remained still in doubt +
so called it *A. tecta*. It was in poor
condition but the parts are all from
the same spot + cannot belong to two
different plants.

16. *Lobelia leptostachys* (= *L. spicata*)

14. *Carex foenea* var. *ferruginea*
(= *C. straminea*). From Mr.
A. P. Morgan, Dayton, O. I suppose.
So labeled by him, as I supposed
correctly.

5. *Carex foenea*, var. *sabulonum*
(= *C. adusta*). This I presume
is from Mr. Morong (Kennebunk-
port, Me.). I always relied upon
his determination of *Carex*es.

6. *Carex straminea* var. *tenera*
(= *C. straminea*). Your specimen
is probably labeled Washington, June
8, 1879. If so it is a form differ-
ing from our typical plant which
Dr. Vasey said was the variety *tenera*.

7. *Carex riparia* (= *C. utriculata*).

Is your specimen dated May 11,
1878 or June 8, 1879? If the former
it is vouchered for by Dr. Vasey as
C. riparia, who named it for me. If
the latter, as is more probably, it

is one collected in the very same spot and rashly assumed ~~to~~ to be the same thing. I have compared it with *Utricularia* from two different sources and do not doubt that it is that. It makes an addition to our flora if the other is *riparia*.

8. *Carex canescens* (= *C. canescens*, var. *vitis*). Mr. Morong has sent me plants labeled both ways, all from the White Mountains, and I can not see much difference in them. I supposed he had both forms & have mounted them separately.

9. *Carex Nova-Angliae* (= *C. Pennsylvanica*)
Dr. Vasey was with me when I got this (May 23/77) and my original field label contains the words "Dr. Vasey says." Still, perhaps he should not be held to account for what he has only seen growing.

10. *Carex Muhlbergii* (= *C. vul-*

pinoides and *C. cephaloides*).

I can give no account of this until I know whether the specimens are from here or from Mr. Morong. In the former case the date will be essential as I have collected *C. Muhlbergia* very often here, as we supposed. If we have *C. cephaloides* from here it is something new to us.

11. *Carex trichocarpa* (= *C. hirta*).

Another of Mr. Morong's, but as you say a very pardonable mistake as the ~~tax~~ name does not occur in Carey & Booth's revision for the Manual.

13. *Aristida gracilis* (= *A. dichotoma*)

Is this labeled Washington Oct. 3, 1876, or is it from Dr. Sattinger?

14. *Oryzopsis asperifolia* (= *O. melanocarpa*). I have received this from Edwin F. Smith, Mich., also from some one bearing the label of Mr.

pointing out these corrections. When I find such in plants sent me, as I often do, I rarely do this, partly for want of time and partly to avoid giving offence. But I want you to feel that I appreciate it highly and only regret that I did not in all cases give you just the plant you asked for.

In most of the cases I had been treated in the same way, and while I have gained at least one addition to my stock I have lost several that I thought I had. I hope you will persevere and subject the whole to a searching criticism + give me the result.

You are quite right in saying that the pressure of other work has probably prevented me from the critical examination of plants

that come to me well authenticated, and it is just this pressure that has driven me against all my inclinations to suspend such operations altogether in the future and dispose entirely of my duplicate collections. I am now giving away all my commoner plants to amateurs + beginners, but not without first labeling them so that they may be of some service. I still have many rare plants that I must dispose of in some way, but the coming winter must close it out.

Again thanking you for your information

I remain

Very truly yours
Lester F. Ward

I have specimens so named from Tennessee (Dr. Eschinger) and from Ohio (A.P. Morgan). The latter have no root leaves but are probably correctly labeled. The former are much too near our common *L. spicata* in general appearance and I presume these are what I sent you. Dr. E. is generally pretty careful.

17. *Lobelia canbyi* (= *L. Nuttallii*)

I have *L. canbyi* from Messrs. Commons, Martindale, and Hyams. I doubt not I sent you the North Carolina specimen. This correspondent is very unreliable + I generally verify all his plants. This case must have escaped my notice. The mounted specimen I have from him, though still labeled *canbyi* is *Nuttallii*.

I am greatly obliged to you for



Ward, Lester F. 1884. "Ward, Lester Frank Oct. 15, 1884." *Walter Deane correspondence*

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/163304>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/304038>

Holding Institution

Harvard University Botany Libraries

Sponsored by

IMLS

Copyright & Reuse

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

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>.