

transactions with Burke and Hare, is that by his laxity of the regulations under which bodies were received into his rooms he unintentionally gave a degree of facility to the disposal of the victims of their crimes which, under better regulations, would not have existed; and which is doubtless matter of deep and lasting regret not only to himself but to all who have reflected on the importance and are therefore interested in the prosecution of the study of Anatomy. But while they point out this circumstance as the only ground of censure which they can discover in the conduct of Dr. Knox, it is fair to observe that perhaps the recent disclosures have made it appear reprehensible to many who would not otherwise have adverted to its possible consequences."

The committee was clearly satisfied that there was no evidence that Knox had any guilty knowledge of the murders or that he had, in fact, any suspicion of foul play, although there were circumstances which might have created such suspicion in his mind. What ought to have been the really suspicious thing about the whole affair was that all the bodies were "fresh", that is, had evidently never been confined or buried. We have to remember that before the passing of the Anatomy Act in 1832, the only sources for "subjects", besides the bodies of murderers sentenced to be hanged and dissected, were corpses disinterred by "resurrectionists".

Therefore, Professor Wilson, in his attack on Knox, in the "Noctes", is perfectly justified in saying that Knox ought to have had his suspicions aroused by the arrival in his rooms of a whole series of bodies which showed no signs of having been buried. The idea that so many bodies could have been purchased in so short a time was perfectly absurd, and was clearly a stupid but impudent falsehood. Knox knew as well as anybody else that the Scottish poor did not sell the bodies of their dead relatives; and he must

have known there is no property in a corpse. Of course, the plain truth is that Knox did not want to inquire, and was far too occupied with his teaching and his researches ever to trouble to cross-question two illiterate blackguards, whom he left to be interviewed by his porter and occasionally by his assistants.

Robert Knox, who attained to this highly undesirable notoriety, was probably one of the most successful lecturers on Anatomy or anything else that Scotland has ever produced. There is no doubt that, an able man naturally, he had the gift of teaching so that he showed up all the more advantageously against the third Monro, who was as stale, flat and unprofitable a lecturer as one could well conceive. The first and second Monros had been towers of strength to the Edinburgh School of Medicine, the third was unoriginal and inept. The students had to "take out" Monro's lectures to qualify for their examination, but they went to Knox to learn the subject. Dr. Knox researched widely in Comparative Anatomy, and was one of the first to grasp and teach the views of Xavier Bichat on the classification and structure of the tissues. He was born in Scotland in 1791 and died in London in 1862. Undoubtedly some of his popularity with the students was due to his theatrical style of lecturing. He had what we should consider some objectionable mannerisms, and he was dandified to a nauseous degree. He lectured in a dress coat (the object of that being to avoid soiling the skirts of a coat not cut away at the sides); he wore several rings, he displayed much more than the usual amount of frills on his shirt, and he used scent freely. Notwithstanding all this, Knox was not in the least effeminate. When the popular outcry against him was at its height, he knocked a man down in College Street for shouting some insulting remark at him. When, on the 12th of February, 1829, a mob