



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.

Brit. Mus. Jan^y 28. 1818

My dear Sir

I am sorry to find, by your Letter of the 20.th Inst: that I have totally failed in my endeavours to bring to a clear elucidation the arguments you adduce in favor of the Theory you mean to establish. All I can say as far as concerns myself, that I have in vain tried to make out the series of proofs from which you deduce your conclusions: but as it is now upwards of 15 Years since I have ceased to ~~render~~ analyse the ^{chemical} papers read before the Royal Society, and in that interval much progress has been made in that Science to which I have paid no attention, my Opinion can go for little or Nothing. — Nor do I by any Means pretend that the friend to whom I referred your three papers, though of an established reputation in that line, is infallible — I wish and hope therefore that, as Chemistry is now very much cultivated, you would look out for some thorough practical Proficiency to whom you might refer your Data, & Viva

Voce, & coolly and deliberately discuss ^{both accuracy} their & their bearings.
Dr Noedhen I know to be a very good Philologist, but I never
heard that he pretended to much Philosophical knowledge.

I remain with sincere regard -

My dear Sir

Your most faithful humble
servant Blaxter