

32 Westleigh

May 12 1868

Dear Mr. Sartet

Since reading your remarks
on Rhinoceros in your last
Paper I have been not a little
puzzled for the reason that
I had you to consider Rhin.
Merckii of Kaub as identical
with Ph. hemitochus. In
the British Museum there
are two or three sets of casts
of teeth of a Rhinoceros
which were prepared &
presented by Kaub himself

as typical exemplifications
of his Rhin. Merckii. He
appears to have presented
a similar set of casts to
the Collège de Surgeons, but these
are not now to be found.

Dr Falconer also had a
similar set from him, so that
it seems strange he should
not also have given one to the
Paris Museum. Now
these teeth are so manifestly
those of Rhin. Megasthinus
& Christol = leptosthinus
Cuv. & Falconer that I
am quite at a loss to know
why you consider his R.

Merckii as synonymous with
R. hemitechus. I have no
doubt you have good reason
for doing so but I cannot
conceive what it is in the face
of such a fact. It seems to
me, that Kaub must either
have regarded *Rh. megasternus*
as his *Rh. Merckii*, or must
have confounded two species
under the same name; in
either case his name surely
cannot stand - & if so
what better name can be
substituted than the now
well known one of *R.!*
hemitechus. I hope Mr.

Bourquignat will be well
advised before he sets up
four new species of Ursus.
So far as I can see we have
a great deal too many
at present. I have
again compared the cast
you were good enough to send
me of the dentition of U.
Bourquignati, with that of
U. perox & can see no difference
whatever between them, & I
am more & more convinced
that the dental characters are
in that genus as in most others
the only ones that can be relied
upon — Believe me your obedient
servant
G. B. S.