NOTE ON THE COMPARATIVE SIZE OF THE SO-CALLED COMMON INDIAN RHINOCEROS (R: INDICUS, CUVIER,) AND THE SUNDERBUN RHINOCEROS. (R. SONDAICUS, MULLER).

As Jerdon, in his Mammals of India, gives the size of the first-named species, which he designates "the great Indian rhinoceros"—"length, about 9 to 10 feet, occasionally it is said 12 feet, tail 2, height 4½ to 5 feet," and that of the last-named species, which he calls "the Lesser Indian rhinoceros,"—"length 7 to 8 feet, height 3½ to 3½ feet," those sportsmen who are unacquainted with the Sunderbun animal will be apt to consider it comparatively insignificant in size, but as such is not really the case, I am induced to give the actual measurements* of a huge specimen of each one of the two aforesaid species, both of which are exhibited in the *Indian Museum*, Calcutta.

R. Indicus. - Length 12 feet 3 inches + tail 2 feet 1 inch = 14 feet 4

inches. Height 6 feet 3 inches.

R. Sondatcus.—Length 12 feet 3 inches + tail 2 feet 4½ inches=14 feet 4½ inches. Height 5 feet 6 inches.

Thus it will be seen that the differences between the two species de not vary so much as Jerdon's figures would lead one to suppose : in fact, while the Sunderbun rhinoceros is inferior in height by several inches, three-fourths of a foot, than what he calls "the great Indian rhinoceros," the former is absolutely of greater length, if we include the candal appendage, or minus it, well-nigh inappreciably smaller.

· Khulna, Jessors: Murch 26th, 1875.

YOUNG NIMROD.

P.S.—I ought, I think, to add here, that I find in the Asiatic Journal, Vol. IX, Part II., p. 167, an account of the destruction. I cannot give it any other name—of an enormous "Saugar Island rhinoceros" with a 6-pounder, taken from the Oriental Sporting Magazine of that time—the year of grace 1832—the dimensions of which are stated therein thus:—"12 feet in length without the tail, and height 7 feet!" This would go to show that the Sunderbun rhinoceros is superior even in height to the so-called Indian rhinoceros; "but, I venture to think, the statement needs confirmation, being doubtless written merely from memory, in the same way as some sportsmen, good and true, are wont in careless strains to chronicle the slaying of tigers in length 13 feet, and even 14 feet!! Enough.

Kindly supplied to me by Mr. Oscar L. Fraser, Osteologist of the Indian Museum.
Calcutta, sometime last year, I entered in my Note-book at the time. —Y.N.