

Egypt; it is that which the hieroglyphics seem to represent; its figure is nearly that of a stag; its height equals that of the ox; the hair of its back is directed towards the head; its horns are formidable weapons, sharp as darts, hard as iron; its hair is whitish, its countenance has marks and black streaks; and this is all that naturalists have described of it; and, as to the motives of the priests of Egypt, who spread abroad fables concerning it, and adopted it in their hieroglyphics, there is no occasion for their having a foundation in reality. Suppose then that an oryx with only one horn has been seen; that they have taken it for a perfect being, a type of its whole species; suppose that Aristotle, who adopted this error, has been copied by others; it is all possible, and even natural, but proves nothing in favour of the existence of a unicorn species.

As to the ass of the Indies, we have only to read of the anti-poisonous properties attributed to its horn by the ancients, and we shall see that they are precisely similar to those which the orientals of the present day assign to the horn of the rhinoceros. When the horn was first introduced amongst the Greeks, they could not have known the animal which had borne it. Indeed, Aristotle makes no mention of the rhinoceros, and Agatharchides is the first who has described it. In the same manner, the ancients possessed ivory long before they became acquainted with the elephant. Perhaps some traveller may have named the rhinoceros *the ass of the Indies*, with as much justice as the Romans had named the elephant *the bull of Lucania*. All that has been said of the strength, height and ferocity of the wild ass, agrees very well with the