Kew March 6/64

My dear Gray

I received yesterday your letter of 4th Feb - and hasten to tell you that your Banara Mexicana seems to be a good species - but not of the § Pineda - I can find nothing in the flowers to divide the Banaras into sections but merely distribute them into three groups chiefly by the inflorescence which is simple in Pineda and in two new species one from S. Domingo and one from Mexico which I was going to call B. Mexicana in a paper I am to read tomorrow at the

the characters are mostly artificial and yet not constant — but we must take Nature as we find her and not attempt mathematical precision where there is none.

They have persuaded me to send some observations on species & genera which I read in 1860 at the Linnean Society to the Natural History Review they will appear in the April Number. - I expect soon to have the commencement for the Australian Flora - In the mean time I am working at Geneva.

Your distribution of your plants are named except the leaves which Sir W. Hooker has in hand and I hope your paper will be at Washington by the end of the month

Yours very sincerely

George Bentham

Linnean Society — but your letter having come just in time I adopt your B. Mexicana and give another name to mine the only difference in the flowers I can find is that in ~~the~~ my 1st group which includes Kunth's Kuhlia ulmifolia the sepals are less closely valvate being usually open in the bud showing part of the petals (or inner series of sepals) in my 2d group to which your B. Mexicana belongs the sepals are strictly valvate & completely enclosing the petals

My species are

§1 H. paniculati Sepala in alabastro non omnino stricte clausa

1 B. parviflora Kuhlia A. Gray } perhaps both one
2 B. tomentosa Clos } and the same as a plant of Poeppig's I have

I have seen no authentic specimens of your or Clos's

3 B. ulmifolia Kuhlia HBK
4 B. laxiflora Spruce sp. n.
5 B. pubescens Spruce sp. n.

§2 H. paniculati Sepala in alabastro stricte valvata

7 B. glauca Kuhlia HBK — Not seen perhaps only B. guianensis
8 B. guianensis Aubl.
9 B. Vellozii Gardn. very near B. guianensis
10 B. Ibaguensis Lindl.? I think a good species
11 B. brasiliensis — Aurea Schott — certainly distinct from B. Vellozii

6 B. Mexicana A. Gr. — the short petioles, obtuse ribbed leaves, loose panicle and connivent flowers seem good characters in some respects it is near B. laxiflora

12 B. nitida Spruce

§3 Flores simpliciter racemosi v. paniculati.

13 B. grandiflora Spruce
14 B. micrana?, Pineda A.R.
15 B. dioica sp. n. Veracruz Mexico
16 B. domingensis sp. n.

With regard to Trichospermum it was on studying Clos's detailed character taken from Blume's specimen and especially his describing the thick valvate sepals that led me to identifying it with Diclidocarpus — for I knew there was nothing of the kind in Bixaceae.

I am now at Caryophylleae among which I am much bewildered