This article was downloaded by: [UQ Library]
On: 07 November 2014, At: 23:13
Publisher: Taylor & Francis
Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number:
1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street,
London W1T 3JH, UK

Annals and Magazine of Natural History: Series 4

Publication details, including instructions
for authors and subscription information:
<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/tnah10>

XL.—Note on Ælian's wart- hog

P.L. Sclater M.A. Ph.D. F.R.S.

Published online: 19 Oct 2009.

To cite this article: P.L. Sclater M.A. Ph.D. F.R.S. (1870) XL.—Note on Ælian's wart-hog , Annals and Magazine of Natural History: Series 4, 6:35, 404-405, DOI: [10.1080/00222937008696275](https://doi.org/10.1080/00222937008696275)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00222937008696275>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly

or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

in the collection of M. Sallé, that the species found in Texas and in the western part of Louisiana is quite different from the Mexican *S. femoralis*, with which I confounded it. The published descriptions of the two species will enable them to be easily distinguished.

104. *Ectopria*, Lec. This genus, which represents in North America the European *Eubria*, does not appear to be sufficiently distinct from the Mexican genus *Dicranopselaphus*, Chev.

105. *Platydemia pallens*, Lap. This species is found in South America, and must therefore be erased from the list of the Coleoptera of North America. I have not seen *P. quadrimaculata* and *cyanea*, Lap., nor *Hoplocephala chalybea* and *collaris*, Lap., but believe that they were wrongly attributed to North America at a time when geographical accuracy in localities was esteemed of less importance than at present.

106. *Megetra cancellata* (Er.). This Mexican species is quite distinct from the New-Mexican and Arizona one which I published under its name, but which, with the study of a larger series of specimens, I think is a variety of *M. vittata*, Lec., with irregular markings.

XL.—Note on *Ælian's Wart-Hog*.

By P. L. SCLATER, M.A., Ph.D., F.R.S.

IN the 'Annals' for August last (*anteà*, p. 190) Dr. Gray has proposed to found a new species of wart-hog (*Phacochærus Sclateri*) upon an animal now living in the gardens of the Zoological Society of London. On the same page Dr. Gray had already stated his belief that this animal was "only the usual form of the female African wart-hog," *i. e.* the *Ph. æthiopicus*. How the same specimen could be at once the type of a new species and the female of a well-known one, it is not easy to understand.

In a second note on the same subject, in the following number of the 'Annals' (*anteà*, p. 263), Dr. Gray acknowledges his error in "believing" that the before-mentioned animal could be the female of *Ph. æthiopicus*, but pays me the additional compliment of supposing that it may not be a wart-hog at all, and that it is possible that I do not know the difference between *Sus* and *Phacochærus*!

I had hoped that the October Number of the 'Annals' would contain a further communication from Dr. Gray on the subject, in rectification of his second error; but such

not having been the case, I think it right in the interests of science to state that the so-called *Phacochoerus* sive *Sus Slateri* of Dr. Gray is, in my opinion, simply a female of the well-known *Phacochoerus Æliani*, Rüppell. It is quite true, as Dr. Gray has pointed out, that the animal in the Society's Gardens has the ears rather more naked than is represented in Rüppell's figure (Zool. Atlas, tab. 25); but in other respects the animal in question perfectly agrees with the figure, and with Dr. Cretzschmar's excellent description in the letter-press.

In my note on the arrival of this animal (Proc. Zool. Soc. 1869, p. 276) I have already pointed out the most obvious external differences between it and the *Phacochoerus aethiopicus*, of which the fine pair presented to the Society, in May 1866, by H.R.H. the Duke of Edinburgh, are still living in the Society's gardens. Although we have only the female of *Ph. Æliani*, yet the comparison of the latter with the corresponding sex of *Ph. aethiopicus* will be sufficient to show that those naturalists (F. Cuvier, Cretzschmar, and Sundevall) who have distinguished the two species had ample grounds to go upon as far as external appearance goes.

As regards the remarkable and well-known difference in the dentition of the two *Phacochoeri*, viz. the permanent presence of two upper incisor teeth in *Phacochoerus Æliani*, which are entirely absent in *Ph. aethiopicus*, I have re-read what Dr. Gray has written upon this subject in his 'Catalogue of Carnivorous, Pachydermatous, and Edentate Mammalia,' but have quite failed to see that he has upset the conclusions arrived at upon this point by F. Cuvier, Cretzschmar, Owen, Sundevall, and Van der Hoeven. The localities marked on specimens in the British Museum are so frequently erroneous that no argument can be based upon them; and besides, from what Sundevall has said*, it appears certain that both species occur in South Africa, though perhaps not quite in the same district. I may add that Mr. Blanford, who recently examined the question when engaged upon his work on Abyssinian zoology, likewise came to the same conclusion, viz. that Dr. Gray had made a great mistake in attempting to unite these two well-marked species†.

* Œfv. af K. Vet. Akad. Förh. 1846, p. 121.

† Blanford, Geology and Zoology of Abyssinia, p. 242.