

in force. Were they not then on their way north from some locality down the coast westwards, where the frost did not reach them?—Mouru.

NEW SPECIES OF THE ONE-HORNED INDIAN RHINOCEROS.

—As naturalists at present recognise only two species of the one-horned rhinoceros as being actually found alive in India, i.e., the so-called common Indian rhinoceros (*R. indicus*, Cuvier) and the Sundarban rhinoceros (*R. sondaicus*, Muller), a mere sportsman, with a limited knowledge of zoology, naturally feels extreme diffidence in forming a contrary opinion, and much more so in announcing it publicly; but one can't well resist ocular demonstration, for facts are stubborn things, so I shall record as concisely as possible my views on the subject, leaving it for competent authorities to decide thereon. And, in so doing, I think I can choose no better medium than the columns of *The Field*, for it is there that English sportsmen all over the world seek for assistance when in difficulty, and rarely, if ever, in vain. Some time last year I saw two young one-horned Indian rhinoceroses, completely differing from one another, and yet belonging to neither of the two acknowledged species referred to above; and, as they were then shortly to be forwarded to England (to Mr Wm. Jamrach, I believe), I had hoped that English naturalists would have been able to examine them, and give us sportsmen out here the benefit of their views there-

sided
if sti
is no
affec
of m
whic
is ne
the s
resto
dang
para
best
mod
whil
that
reas
be r

ament. But, unfortunately, the one that had far more prominent tubercles than even *R. sondaicus* died *en route*, and was cast overboard I hear; and the other one, with skin comparatively smooth, head elongated and narrower than *R. indicus*, and provided with a double fold forward, almost similar to *R. sondaicus*, after remaining a short time in England, was sold to someone in Berlin, I learn, as *R. sondaicus* with the tubercles undeveloped. This it most decidedly is not; for a very young one of that species, about three months old, as well as even the foetus of one preserved in spirits, taken from the uterus of a large female rhinoceros shot during the past year in the Sundarban, are in the Indian Museum here, with the tubercles in both of them fully developed. Besides, during my experience as a shikari for nearly a score of years in the Sundarban—my estates border thereon, and I reside there—I have seen innumerable rhinoceroses of this species in all stages of growth, but never otherwise than with their tubercles thoroughly formed. I have only very lately seen another young one-horned Indian rhinoceros, less than one year old, which is also, I understand, the property of Mr Wm. Jamrach, and is, I heard, about to be shipped to England. It is specially with reference to this that I am writing, for I find it to differ from any one of those above enumerated. In this one I found the surface of the skin more rough and uneven than that of *R. indicus*, and of a black colour throughout; ears broad, and devoid of the fold in the neck which is characteristic of *R. sondaicus*; habitat, Bhootan Terai, I was told. This brief notice of it will, I hope, induce English naturalists to carefully examine this interesting animal when it reaches its destination; and I need hardly say that by so doing a boon will be conferred on all Indian sportsmen, who are at present sorely puzzled to account for such marked and striking differences in the various specimens of, what I submit, are erroneously considered the only two species of the one-horned rhinoceros actually found alive in India, which is all, I believe, that naturalists will allow.—YOUNG NIMROD (Calcutta, Jan. 20, 1875). [The rhinoceros sent over a few months since by Mr Jamrach, which he named himself Rhinoceros Jamrachii, was seen when in London by Messrs Solater, Garrod, and Bartlett, of the Zoological Society, and was believed by them not to differ from the *R. indicus*. The animal is now in Berlin. At the last meeting of the Zoological Society, a drawing by a native of the second animal mentioned by our correspondent was shown, but the species could not be determined from the sketch, although it appeared to be decidedly not *R. sondaicus*.—ED.]

