



Uptonister  
Monford  
Sunday even.

My dear Sir,

I yesterday examined the megachile premolars in the Brit. Mus., and send the enclosed diagrams of the crown-surface and the external carmine. The letters are the same as those I have used - the essay on R. megachilus which sent you some time ago. I regret that I could get neither moulage nor estampe: but will finally apply to the trustees tomorrow. When they will notice my applicati-

I do not know. I have chose  
the two crowns as typical out  
of 10 from the same locality. The  
following is the summary of the  
characters of all.

*R. megatherium*, locality  
Grays Thurrock, Brit. Mus.

Number examined 7 Premolars  
4; 3 Premolars 3.

Premolar 3 does not differ in  
form from Premolar 4, but in  
size only. The head of the  
anterior valley A is traversed  
by a variable number of combing  
plates E. which sometimes  
meet and insulate a small  
accessory valley. Their section is

The worn tooth gives the  
enamel the appearance of crushing.  
There is no cusp on the posterior  
Collis I' which is notched. The  
guard is very strongly marked. The  
other characters are given in the Essay  
on R. megalurus.

The closely allied form R. leptorhynchus of  
Owen = R. hemitrichus of Falconer, possesses  
upper premolars differentiated from the  
preceding by the excavation of the  
base of the external lamina, and  
by the presence of a third fold  
or costa at the point marked  
N in the external lamina, and by  
the roughness of the enamel, and by their  
both the species are well defined from  
the R. tichorhynchus by the absence of  
the anterior coning plate (G of my first  
Essay in the Nat. Hist. Rev., & the

large size of the quad., and  
very many oth. characters which  
one I hope to send you in the Essay on  
R. leptotinus which is now being  
printed.

There are two points on which I am  
doubtful. Had R. megalinus 4  
Premolars? Is it synonymous with  
R. schliezeracheni? ? ? ? I am almost  
persuaded that it is identical with  
Cuvier's R. leptotinus.

You have asked the range of the  
megaline species in Britain.  
A fine upper Premolar 4 in the  
possession of the Rev. J. Gunn, from  
the Forest Bed of Norfolk proves  
that it coexisted in Britain  
with R. stromae, Elephas  
meridionalis, and Trogontherium  
Cuvieri. It lived here therefore

before the glacial epoch. It has only been found in three other localities in the lower valley of the Thames, at Bradford in Kent, and Grays Thurrock and Ilford in Essex, where it is very abundant. The boulders in which it occurs are not far above the level of the sea. Though their exact relation to the London clay is a open question, the remains they contain, incline me to the belief that they are vastly older than the ordinary low-level series of Mr. Frestwich, and that they are but a stage removed in point of time from the ~~and almost every~~ alluvium.

Meglaunal Forest Bed. His  
opinion of mine is endorsed by  
Mr Godwin-Austen, and Sir  
Charles Lyell, and the whole matter  
is now in the hands of the printer.  
The name I have applied to the  
is "the Lower trilobite bed." The  
mammalia with which it is associated  
are *Felis spelaea*, *Hyaena spelaea*, *Canis*  
*lupus*, *Ursus arctos*, *U. spelæas*,  
*Bos primigenius*, *Bison prisca*,  
*Cervus elaphus*, *Elephas antiquus*, *E.*  
*primigenius*, *E. prisca*, *Equus*  
*frontalis*, *Rhinoceros leptorhinus* of  
Owen (*R. hemitoechus* Fall) *R. tichor-*  
*hinus*, *Castor Europæus*, and *Aniota*  
*amplidens*. It contains also there are  
also numerous fluvialite and land  
shells, *Cyprea fluminalis* *Unio*

Pictou, H. littoralis, Anodonta greenii,  
Bithynia tentaculata <sup>Helix nemoralis</sup> etc. There can  
be no doubt about the accuracy

of these names because they have  
stood the test of some hard fighting  
in London this last winter, and  
I have taken the greatest pains about  
the. There is one other case of R.

Megalonium occurs in Butcher's  
except the above. It is absent from  
all the postglacial gravels; it is  
indeed quoted by Mr Prestwich from  
Bedford, but he acknowledges that  
it is ~~large~~, <sup>open to very great doubt</sup> determined, being a  
mutilated fragment, and not  
warrant of being quoted at all.

In  
describing the Megalonium teeth

I have altogether ignored the  
R. Etienne, because no naturalist  
could confound the two species  
together. If you will further  
inquire about any animals here  
I will be happy  
to help as far as I can, I have  
been over every museum in the  
United Kingdom, and noted every  
specimen worth of note in my  
books.

I am  
Your truly  
W. H. Wood-Davies  
M. Ed. Lartet  
15 Rue Lapeyrière.  
P.S. I hope Mr. Franklin had a fine  
voyage!