



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.

San Bernardino Cal.

Dec. 21. 1911

Dear Prof. Abrams,

Some years ago, as you will probably recall, when you proposed to me to assist in the preparation of a Flora of Southern California I was unable to do so, as I had previously promised to do what I could for a similar project of Dr. Jepson's - This, I understand, is now abandoned, so that I am free to say that I shall be glad to assist in your proposed work -

I hope Hall may be willing to take part, for not only would his knowledge of our flora be of great value, but it would be a very happy thing to have the two universities represented in the work -

When Dr. Hitchcock was here

year or two ago, and we were talking of the desirability of a Flora of Southern California, he expressed a willingness to contribute the grasses to such a work, if it were undertaken by a suitable person. If you chose to interest him in your proposed Flora, our difficult family would be provided for.

In the matter of nomenclature it seems to me that the only sensible course is to adopt the International Laws. No code will be satisfactory to every one, and, after all, codes are matters of convenience, not of conscience, so that the decisions of the majority should command the concurrence ~~consensus~~ of all. And this is the code of the botanical world, and is likely to so remain for years. Even in our own country it is without, when men like Bessey, Nelson &c. record, that the American Laws

are losing ground.

I take it that in the ~~addition~~
supplement to your L. A. Flora, you
desire to include additions to the
flora of L. A. County only - so
understanding I will go over the
book and make notes of any
such additions as may occur to me.

I wish you would send me ²⁻³ a
few capsules of your No. "gigas
bifarius." Fernald writes me
that, as he has it, it is *J. ophascopus*.
Please also give me the exact date
of the lobule.

Mr. Grant has given me his
entire collection of western plants. Among
his own collections are a number of
duplicates. Would you ~~care~~ like me
to send you some of them?

Faithfully yours

S. B. Parish