



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.

Sept. 5. 1833.

W. Friday

Dear Sir

I had hoped to have one with Astor for
 me this at least - for I am heartily tired of
 them. I will however look at them you now send,
 at the first opportunity, for which purpose I
 have sent them to my house. If A. Norton
 should prove new I will not fail to preserve the
 name. No doubt my *fragilis* is decussate of
 linear fls. - but I take Nees's book for my test
 without regard to the linear synonym which has
 been so long misunderstood that it would only
 augment confusion to return to them. My *fragi-*
lis is the species so called by Nees, beyond all
 doubt - but it varies very much - I have an
 authentic spec. of Nees's form - but the speci-
 men I have is marked is I have little doubt his
 plant - for it clearly belongs to the section - and
 can scarcely be any thing else - which I have
 found out that his characters & description will

I can understand them for without finding out I was writing on
a halfpenny sheet) but always has a rigorous in-
terpretation. I will look on my duplicate notes
to you with great pleasure - I am what I can find.
I am afraid I am not well off for them for
I lay down a great many in my own hands
in order to see how they vary.
I have begged you to send his notes to you
when I had done with them, as I supposed
you would know what to do with his solidages.

Do you note about A. lewis I suppose you -
that of Stem. Lycopodium? is not A. lewis of leaves
which is strongly either A. cyaneus or A. rubricans
his I forget which - I am known by no means
sure that lewis of me is in fact any thing but a
green var. of A. cyaneus. I should like to see
A. granis fr. Mattall - I have his A. oblongifolius &
leaves - but with some idea of A. montanus, I
Sollersia serrata. I do not see anything in the list
of lewis notes - they apparently are things sent long since
by Rees, before his ideas are well fixed upon the
subject; I am however exceedingly obliged to you for the
offer -

Yours very faithfully

John Lindley