



Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation
5th Floor, Hunt Library
Carnegie Mellon University
4909 Frew Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15213-3890
Contact: Archives
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 version of an item from our Archives.

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.

I should be very sorry if anything should ^{be} intended
to prevent your going on with ~~the~~ these monographs
how in these days when material is accumulating so
fast on all sides the work of systematic botany can
only be carried ^{on} by the division of labour. It seems to
me to be the bounden duty of all who wish well to
science to encourage monographers by every means
in their power. From what I know of you, Mr. Hunt,
I have felt ^{fully} thoroughly satisfied that ~~you~~ should
a general monograph of the ~~area~~ ^{the genus} ~~should~~ ^{be} sent into your
hands, to one that has not ^{yet} been ^{used} ⁱⁿ ^{the} ^{work} ^{of} ^{the}
genus for himself can form a fair judgment
of the amount of labour in collecting and sorting
material and the care and patience ^{we} ^{may} ^{value}
the value of character that is needed. In such a
genus I would say emphatically that to the first
thing that is needed is a careful acquaintance
with ~~so~~ ^{the} ^{large} ^{continued} ^{study} ^{of} ^a ^{good} ^{series} ^{of}
forms in the field, ^{very} ^{many} ^{specimens} ^{taken}
as one commonly finds them, are just as likely
to mislead as to help unless ^{they} ^{are} ^{viewed} ^{with} ^{the}
acumen which nothing but ^a ^{large} ^{amount} ^{of} ^{personal}
knowledge can give. I know not ^{of} ^{any} ^{of} ^{the} ^{personal}
differences in Belgium but I am sure it is
the unanimous judgment of all the botanists here

SKETCH MAP OF THE PARIS & DECATUR

