



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.

27377

HOWARD RIVER

CUMBERLAND MD

JUNE 1894



Dear Sir Please return me the Phlox?

with name. The flowers are pleasantly fragrant. This is the only plant I found.

I also send a white *Agalea* (*arborescens*?) which can hardly be *viscosa*. If it were rose colored I would have no hesitation in putting it *Arborescens* but I see no rose color about it.

The *Sedum* grows at a distance from me, if I interest I will procure other plants. take it to be *S. pusillum*. I think this is the plant Dr. Vasey presumed might be *S. Nevii*: the leaves however round up as the plants get larger. It is a straggly little thing growing on the face of a cliff. *S. tomentosum* grows not far off with large round leaves and characteristic stem leaves. So this plant can hardly

dam seldom in their neighborhood.

The azalea is said to be abundant up the W. Va. R. R.

At Cumberland I know but two plants: one a single scraggy bush a foot high; the other a nice clump a mile further down the river. Yesterday I was shown flowers from a spot four miles north W. of town - from a single plant. And a R.R. man spoke of the same about 6 or 7 miles on the Eckhard R.R. H. Small (N.Y.) brought leaves from Ellerslie 8 or 10 miles. This completes the category at this spot, Mr. Canby thinks it *Arborescens*. And if I remember Dr. Gray showed me plants collected on his last tour south which were white. Now what do you say?²

I send you a preliminary list of our flora.

Very truly
Asa Gray

Frederick Coville

See also