



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.

Spraguey 29th Jan 9/68

My Dear Waring

I have gone
over the preface with due
care and consideration
and think it will do
very well it is neither
boastful nor over modest.

You will see I have
proposed some verbal
alterations - better for best
classification but sounds
too dogmatical to my ear
but that of course is matter
of opinion - "conveniently"

I think ~~read~~, more
euphonorously than ~~read~~
and is moreover a
expressive word in its
place but that ~~too~~ is
more matter of taste
for either will do.

The "omit" clause ~~may~~
is still susceptible of
improvement. I don't like
the negative as either of us
have used it, I fancy, on
reperusal, that it would
be better to say it was "de-
cided to retain the whole"
negations seem to me

better avoided when an
equally good positive is
available. But that too
is matter of opinion.

I propose taking a run
up on Friday to see Charlie
lest we should be hurried
at the last have to be off
without any thing able to
get up to see him. Adieu.
With united kind love
Regards to you all

Ever truly yours

Robt Wight

Had a letter from Robt. all
well, on Sunday morning