

rhinoceros \*, and said to resemble deer and goats in form †; the *Indian ass*, having solid hoofs; and the *monoceros*, properly so called, whose feet are sometimes compared to those of the lion ‡, and sometimes to those of the elephant §, and which is therefore considered as having divided feet. The one-horned horse || and one-horned bull are doubtless both to be referred to the Indian ass, for even the latter is described as having solid hoofs ¶. I would ask, If these animals exist as distinct species, should we not at least have their horns in our collections? And what single horns do we possess, excepting those of the rhinoceros and narwal?

How is it possible, after this, to refer to rude figures traced by savages upon rocks \*\*? Ignorant of perspective, and wishing to represent a straight horned antelope in profile, they could only give it a single horn, and thus they produced an oryx. The oryxes, too, that are seen on the Egyptian monuments, are probably nothing more than productions of the stiff style, imposed upon the ar-

\* Oppian, Cyneg. ii. vers. 551.

† Plin. viii. 53.

‡ Philostorg. iii. 11.

§ Plin. viii. 21.

|| Onesicrit, ap. Strab. lib. xv. Ælian, xiii. 42.

¶ Plin. viii. 31.

\*\* Barrow's Voyage to the Cape, Fr. transl. ii. 178.