

but not here - my notion is that his ordinary con-
struction is deeper than Cook or Clark - his Gauss
is $\frac{1}{2}$ or $\frac{1}{4}$ more than his ordinary - but by no means
dear. If he send me one for trial - ~~and~~ and I mean
to rub up his memory very shortly - & I find it equal
to my expectations, it might suit you well - perhaps
you can wait a little, & I will let you know. If it were
your case I sh^d. be quite satisfied with any approximate
equatorial - ^{accurate} ~~perfect~~ division of circles being so very im-
material for finding an object. But the notion sh^d.
be smooth, on measurements w^d. be defeated: & that is so
easily obtained that I think Slater's c^d. mount for you -
but I w^d. on no account have eyes of his unless it
had been well tried by some competent observer - He may
have once or twice blundered into excellence - but that
is another matter. - Since I wrote before I have
somewhere seen another high commendation of Wray.
Don't scruple about troubling me - it will be a plea-
sure, tho' I can't always answer speedily
Yours very sincerely
J. W. Webb