

32 Rue de la
April 2 1848

Dear M. Sartet

I take the opportunity of Mr. Bostwick
visiting France to send you a copy of my
paper on the Maltese Fossil Elephants
which will I have no doubt interest you.
It is to be regarded however only as
a commencement of the subject, for I
have received since it was written
a large quantity of fresh materials
collected by Dr. Smith Adams, which, when
I come to examine it, will I have no
doubt clear up the question of the
Species of the largest of the three forms
and throw much additional light upon the
others.

I have read your last paper in the
Annales with much interest, especially

on the synonymy of the Rhinoceroses.
You seem, in the main to agree with
Dr Falconer, & I presume we must
in future call his R. hemitectus

R. Dierckii (not Dierckii as Cuvier &
you have it). — It is much to be regretted
that Mr Boyd Dawkins has continued
to use the absurd name of Leptorhinus
for it.

I must be surprised to hear that
I have determined, so far as Jean, that
the Gibraltar Rhinoceros, is, after
all, neither more nor less than
R. Dierckii seu hemitectus. Having
compared not only the teeth but numerous
other bones with those of that species
in the British Museum, and also with
those of R. tichorhinus, Megatherium ^{Christ} ₁₂

- etruscus I am unable to entertain
 any doubt on the subject, & with regard
 that in the pro 3 the posterior
 valve has not the median cusp you
 notice as so characteristic of N. Merckii

- I have also been much interested
 in your account of U. Bourguignate
 although I must, with the utmost
 deference, confess that I can not see
 why it should be separated from
U. Priscus. I have sent you
 a cast of the palate of a magnificent
 specimen of U. Priscus as I regard it
 from Ballinamore in Ireland, belonging
 to Lord Enniskillen & now in my hands
 and also unprepared, which I took a few
 days since of the two Irish specimens in
 the Leeds Museum - & both of which I
 look upon

is also as U. priscus. In the matter
 one you wish, I think, find an exact
 similarity with your U. Bonapartei.
 That is to say if you compare it with
 the ~~cast~~ original or with the cast
 of what you were good enough to send
 me a copy long ago. The teeth in
 Fig 2 of your plate appear to be
 drawn too narrow. As regards the
 Leeds U. planifrons there may be
 difference of opinion but I see no
 reason why it should not also be a
 larger variety of U. priscus. By the
 way can you tell me by whom & when
 the name of U. priscus was first
 bestowed on Goldfuss' U. fossilis?
 I cannot find it in his memoir.
 Also what is the difference in cranial

an accidental character between
U. priscus & U. ferox of N. America
 & U. Asiæ - for I am unable to
 perceive any & am much disposed
 as I have already stated at the
 Anthropical Society to consider them
 as identical.

I am very sorry that I am
 unable at the present time to see
 you & have a long talk about Bears
 & Rhinoceros - but hope before long
 to do so - I am

Yours very truly

Edw. Blyth

McManis

4



Museum
America
LK