



UB

28. Jermyn Street London

29. May. 1866.

My dear Sir,

My absence from London has prevented my answering your note of the 9th May, and of thanking you for the information you have given me about the hyenas.

Some two months ago Mr. Busk convinced me that the three skulls which following Dr. Falconer, I had considered as belonging to H. brunnea, were varieties merely of H. crocata. The skull in the Coll. Surg. catalogued by Prof. Owen as belonging to H. crocata was on the authority of Dr. Falconer altered by Mr. Flower in the amended catalogue into H. brunnea. The two skulls in the Brit. Mus. were both down in the Gray's Cat. as belonging to H. brunnea, and one of them was taken out of the skin of the Red-fox. These also were con-

sidered by Dr. Falconer to belong to that species.
 Under these circumstances, when working
 at the vast stores of remains of H.
spelaea, which I and Mr Sanford have
 obtained from the caverns of Somerset, I thought
 I might safely state it as proved that
 these skulls actually belonged to the H. brunnea
 of Thunberg, as determined by the English
 zoologists. On the other hand I knew that this
 species differed from the Hygine brunnea of
 Mr. M. Croiset & Jobert, and the H. fusca
 described and figured by M. de Blainville,
 and especially in the small size of the upper
 true molar. I therefore compared the spelaea
 remains with the three recent species which
 I could find in the English coll. H. striata
H. brunnea (of cat.) & H. crocuta, and with respect
 to the second of these as read by the English specimens
 I was so dissatisfied of the specific distinctions, that
 I raised the point in part of my memoir. Now
 thanks to you and Mr Buxle I am quite
 satisfied that what I considered to be
H. brunnea is a mere variety of H.
crocuta, and I will take the first opportunity

of acknowledging my error in public. In
 the Introduction to the British ~~Fossil~~ Pleisto-
 -cene Mammalia written in the Autumn
 of last year, (p 21) I have omitted purposely
 all reference to H. brunnea in writing of H.
shelae. A comparison of a very large
 number of skulls & bones of H. shelae with
 those of H. crocata led me to infer that
 they belong to the same species, modified
 by different conditions of life. Indeed I find it
 quite as easy to split up the H. shelae
 into species as M. Goldfuss, & Dr. Schmalzer,
 found the ~~Ursus shelae~~ fossil bears, and
 although the comparison of one skull of H. shelae
 with another, or with one of H. crocata shows
 many differences, yet on extended, the essential
characteristic differences of specific nature
 elude me, at least. So I find it with the
 fossil bears, the H. shelae, the Bison, the
 musk sheep, the reindeer, and the wolf.

I shall await with very great pleasure
 your essay on the Hyenas, and hope that
 it will soon be published.

My memoir on the
 dentition of P. leptorhynchus (Owen) is being printed

and I hope in a few weeks to be able to send you a copy. I do not agree with my late friend Dr. Falconer on all points. With the points in the definition of R. megarhinus, of which you say "vous n'avez pas figuré la présence ou l'absence d'un collet (cingulaire) continue ou discontinue aux faces antérieures et intérieures des 2^e 3^e & 4^e prémolaires supérieures," are alluded to on p. 11. of my memoir as follows: "The ascending ridge or guard (collet) on the anterior aspect sweeps round the inner base of the crown and ascends the median collis." They are seen in Premolars 3 & 4 of Fig 9 but best on Premolar 4. I have today written to Prof. Owen to ask him to send you the casts of the originals.

I have been working out the dentition of the 4th Brit. spec. of Rhinoceros - R. Etruscus of Falconer: the upper true molars one & two are so small and low crowned that they can hardly be differentiated from the fourth milk upper molar of R. megarhinus. In a drawer in the Brit Mus. I found among some remains from Serrolles two molars

described as *Trichonina* in the Ms. Catalogue of Mr. Woodward (? I think) which agree precisely with those in the Coll. of Mr. King of Norwich from the Norfolk shore that came from the Forest Bed, and belong to the *Etrusca* species. I have M 3. M 2. M 1. Pm 4. and Jm 1. 2. 3. 4

I want the upper milk teeth, and Pm 3. 2 of the upper jaw to finish the entire series. Do you know of any more remains from Bevels that may perhaps fill up the blank? The lower jaw contains the permanent teeth, and casts of all the teeth from Italy and Malaga I have at my command. The species is 'demicloisomies' and apparently of an older type than *R. megarhinus*.

The account of the discovery of the engraving of the Mammoth I have read with the greatest interest, and I thank you very much for it.

The rest of the numbers of the British Pleistocene mammalia I will send to you as they come

Authentic in sample in
to us 10th, rather which are of dark interest

I am
also in

Yours very truly

Wm. H. D. & Co.

Mr. Zantet

True Face hide



out. The first is posted along with this note.

You will I hope, excuse my inability to see the evidence for the ^{skeltons} ~~evidence~~ in the Case of Auvignac being of the same date as the extinct Mammals. In an article in the Quart. Journ. of Science now being printed I have been compelled to state my convictions on an analysis of the evidence, as to the Habits of the Prehistoric Races. I differ from so great an authority in fear and trembling. I will send you a copy.

Mr. Scouped and myself have at our command perhaps the best collection of Pleistocene Mammalia in Europe. I do not think that it would advance science if we were to bring a typical series to be exhibited in the Paris Exhibition of 1867. I should value and abide by your advice in this matter, ~~or~~ Could you cross over to see them?

I must apologise for the length of this letter which I cannot make shorter in writing to the first