5. Westbourne Grove Terrace, W.

ASK pardon for a few facts and suggestions on the above subject. Some weeks since I was informed by an old amateur that a friend of his, who has explored a good deal of North-Western Borneo, that he had found a quantity of bones in a cave in that country. I communicated this to Sir Charles Lyell's "Antiquity of Man," he thought the fact might be of some interest. On inquiring particularly I found that it was situated in the district between Sarawak and Brani, on a mountain some distance inland. Mr. Coulson had marked a spot on the map, and the general information from him was that the bones had been reported to be found in these caves, and in this particular case he found the floor covered with a thick layer of bones, and that the cavity was nearly as thick.

He had some of this broken up with pick, and found it to contain abundance of bones, especially at the bottom, the rocky floor of the cave. He assured me there were great numbers of bones of many sorts, and numbers of teeth of all kinds. The number of those that they did not break up much of them. There were also some human skulls lying on the surface, about which the gentry who accompanied him could tell him nothing.

The presence of this layer of solid bone in a cave, where it has been accumulated for ages, the accumulation of the small bats, and perhaps a few swifts or gleaning species that may frequent these caves, it would be difficult to understand how this layer has been formed. There are no animals in Borneo that would be likely to frequent caves, the only modernly large carnivores, the Malayan bear and F. jaccus, being no longer animals. The mere fact therefore of large quantities of bones found in a cave, would indicate a state of things which has now passed away; and the examination of these bones might reveal some interesting details in the peculiar zoological character which the productions of the island present.

The natural productions of Borneo resemble on the whole so closely those of the other Indo-Malayan peninsula, that there can be little doubt of these having been a geologically recent connection between the two. All that is known to inhabit Borneo, only too peculiar to it, the remaining sixty occurring, with but slight modifications, in the flora of the adjacent islands. In birds and insects about the same proportion are really distinct, though there are many common species, and have therefore received distinct specific names. Nowhere, however, this great and very general similarity, there are not Borneo and Sumatra coincide in nature, and there are certain differences which give it a marked character. Several genera are peculiar to it, as Na-sarites, Dendrocolaptes and Ficalites, and that singular bird Piligrina. The tiger, which abounds on all the other islands and in the peninsula of Malaya, does not occur in Borneo, and the orang-outang, which, being free from the attacks of such a ferocious beast, would be expected to find in greater number its more western brethren, is now actually dying out. The elephant and rhinoceros, which in Sumatra and the Malay Peninsula exist in considerable numbers, are both absent from Borneo that their very existence has been for some time doubtful, and even the early authorities on the island do not mention these places mentioned above. The wild ox (Bos javanicus), only exists in the north-east extremity of Borneo.

The most striking feature of Borneo is, however, undoubtedly the presence and comparative abundance of the large family of Macaque (Macaca assimilis), as well as a second species, Simia satyrus, and Macaca silenus.

One or both of these is met with over the whole extent of Borneo, whereas, though there can be no doubt that the former occurs also in Sumatra, it seems confined to a limited district, and in the whole southern half of the island is entirely unknown. The Malay region (of which Borneo forms an important section), though of limited extent, has a highly characteristic and peculiar fauna. It possesses many genera entirely restricted to the animal, and from these I will proceed to develop the natural history of the island.

From the foregoing facts the following conclusions are, I think, rendered very probable. (1st) That the Malay region as a whole; (2nd) a considerable antiquity of that portion of it which now forms the island of Borneo, and is separated from the island of Borneo in physical geognosy, and great consequent changes in animal life, which have resulted in the present formation of the island.

I think I can be certain, that the remains of the animals which inhabited Borneo at a comparatively recent period, do not indicate the nature of the changes that have been recently, and are probably still, going on.

Independently, however, of the fact that bones are known to exist in a particular cave in Borneo, it appears to me that that island cannot be so considered as a separate zoological province in the globe. Limestone caverns abound in it. There are several very extensive ones in the Sarawak territory. The character of the existing fauna, as well as the extent of the land area, and many families of animals attached to the island, make it a region of much interest, and it would be of some geological antiquity. Now, in every other country which has been explored, the animals have been found to be divided according to those now living in the same region, and are often of gigantic size or remarkable forms. Europe, America, Africa, and Australia, are examples of this. In Borneo, there are no such enormous and wondrous, South America, is the only continent in which the world of nature is represented by a single animal.

I am not so far in the discovery, on which Professor Huxley lays such contemptuous stress, as to either name or that of M. Pruner-Bey in Dr. Huxley's paper. The manner in which Professor Huxley employs the evidence in the case of the Borneo ape is, however, quite clear, and I would state it in my previous letter, in my previous paragraph. The word "discovery," on which Professor Huxley lays such contemptuous stress, I do not think is at all the same as that of M. Pruner-Bey in Dr. Huxley's paper. The manner in which Professor Huxley employs the evidence is, however, quite clear, and I would state it in my previous letter.

The delicate way in which Professor Huxley uses the evidence in the case of the Borneo ape is, however, quite clear, and I would state it in my previous letter.

"Not discoveries of "discovery," on which Professor Huxley lays such contemptuous stress, I do not think is at all the same as that of M. Pruner-Bey in Dr. Huxley's paper. The manner in which Professor Huxley employs the evidence is, however, quite clear, and I would state it in my previous letter.

"Not discoveries of "discovery," on which Professor Huxley lays such contemptuous stress, I do not think is at all the same as that of M. Pruner-Bey in Dr. Huxley's paper. The manner in which Professor Huxley employs the evidence is, however, quite clear, and I would state it in my previous letter.