INTRODUCTION

Virginia is unique because such extensive plant collections from the state are held by large eastern herbaria, for the flora of the Old Dominion has intrigued great numbers of field workers over a stretch of more than two hundred years. Due to this keen interest by so many field botanists over such a long period of time, the Virginia holdings in the Smithsonian Institution, Harvard University Herbaria, Philadelphia Academy of Natural Sciences, and the University of North Carolina are very impressive, and also essential for definitive work on the flora of Virginia. Still other important collections are at the New York Botanical Garden, Patuxent Wildlife Center, and West Virginia University. To the curators and other staff members of these institutions, who have always been so helpful, we express our deep appreciation.

The following Virginia herbaria provided the chief basis for this work: College of William and Mary, Emory and Henry College, George Mason University, Longwood College, Lynchburg College, Virginia Commonwealth University, and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. We are grateful to their curators for their generosity.

Over a period of many years the Virginia Academy of Science has given both financial and moral support to work on the Old Dominion flora, and we gratefully acknowledge our indebtedness for this invaluable and long-sustained interest.

Although this atlas has its roots in Colonial Virginia, so skillfully recounted by Edmund Berkeley in the historical section, its ultimate branches extend right up to press time.

Among the other authors, Charles E. Stevens contributed not only the work on the pteridophytes, but more than 14,000 specimens, 50 or more new species for the state, and many critical distributional records within the state, all so important to unravel the vegetational history of the region. His contributions to the introductory materials were invaluable.

Donna M. E. Ware fought the battle of the maps right up to press time, read proofs, took on many other important chores, and kept us from going off the deep end many times.


Very important collections for the atlas, more than 9000 numbers, were made throughout the state, except the Eastern Shore, by Bernard M. Mikula from 1949 to 1951. This work was done under the direction of the late J.T. Baldwin, Jr., who, along with Bernice M. Speese, made these specimens available to the atlas authors. We are especially indebted to Dr. Speese who bore the major burden of organizing and preparing these plants for dissemination and study.

More recently, Ted Bradley's coverage of the northern tier of counties has made distribution in this region authentic; W. T. Hathaway has concentrated on Pittsylvania County, our largest county; and Thomas F. Wieboldt has contributed many critical distributional records, both from the mountains and the Eastern Shore.

Other large collections in the state came from Harry Ahles, Phyllis Appler, J.T. Baldwin, Jr., Allene Barans, T.S. Cooperrider, O.C. Davis, R.M. Downs, F.R Fosberg, Ruskin Freer, Gustav Hall, Winifred J. Harley, Barbara J. Harvill, F.J. Hermann,

My own Virginia numbers, with the generous help of many colleagues, now run beyond 26,000.


For aid with difficult groups we are indebted to Donovan Correll, Orchidaceae; Larry Harms, Eleocharis; Robert Kral, Xyris; Eugene Ogden, Potamogeton; Alfred Schuyler, Scirpus; Henry Svenson, Cyperaceae; and Warren Wagner, Pteridophyta. Frank Gould generously advised us on Dichanthelium, but because his studies in this genus are not yet completed, the interpretations here are our own. We are very appreciative to all of these workers for their many kindnesses.

We are also indebted to W.R. Chitwood, M.D., and Joseph Ewan for historical data on A.H. Curtiss and Howard Shriver; and to Dorothy C. Bliss and Peter M. Mazzeo for the distributional studies on the Liliaceae and gymnosperms.

The last decade has been a very active one for Virginia botanists in the field, bringing an accumulation of specimens, especially of critical species and critical range extensions. These vast data now permit the delineation of the principal distributional patterns, and a beginning of a history of the vegetation of the region. Continuing field work will, no doubt, fill in many details during the next decade.

Families, genera, and species are in alphabetical order within the lycosphens (fern allies), followed by the ferns, then gymnosperms, and finally the monocotyledons. Introduced species are in lighter type, but waifs and native species escaping from plantings out of their range will be listed in a later part. The distribution maps are based on specimens examined, with the addition of a few citations from recent monographs.

Because of Virginia's odd system of independent cities, many specimens would be difficult to place if modern political boundaries were used. Moreover, boundaries are still changing, further complicating the situation. Although the entire counties of Elizabeth City, Warwick, and Nansemond are now the cities of Hampton, Newport News, and Suffolk, other counties have not fared so well. Since the main purpose of this work is to map the distribution of the state's species of vascular plants, for phytogeographic and many other uses, the most practical solution to the problem is to retain the old and well-known boundaries. Validation of new combinations of Dichanthelium is in the press.
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