

intimate knowledge of human anatomy; that he dissected animals is no doubt true, and also that he had a marvellously accurate knowledge of marine animals, but to say that he was a profound anatomist is absurd, and is not substantiated by what we find in his writings. For instance, in his writings he states that the kidney of man resembles that of the ox (which consists of many reniform bodies), and is not smooth like the sheep, that the human uterus is double, that the back part of the skull is empty, that the brain is without blood, and many other things equally absurd. His knowledge of osteology was also limited. He asserted that man had no astragalus (a bone in man forming the keystone of the arch of the foot), "neither," he says, "have many-toed animals, nor solid-footed animals." Now this bone is never absent in mammalian animals with limbs, and it is evident that Aristotle never looked for it, but asserted that these animals were without it on theoretical grounds alone, for in one of his works, "*De partibus Animalium*," he gives elaborate reasons why certain animals have no astragaloid bones. He also stated that the bones of the lion had no marrow, and that the necks of wolves and lions consisted of a single bone and had no flexibility. These points he could easily have made clear by actual examination. He, like Hippocrates, thought that nerves, ligaments and tendons were the same thing; he gave, however, a fairly accurate description of the great blood-vessel, the aorta, and distinguished the wind-pipe from the gullet; he also had some acquaintance with the structure of the larynx, and knew that the ear and throat communicated. No doubt Aristotle, for his time, was a good comparative anatomist, and some of his observations are valuable, but he so mixed up his facts with fiction that it is not easy to separate the one from the other. He was the first to write a treatise on Comparative Anatomy.

Plato, although he did not study anatomy practically, frequently refers to it in his writings. His references represent, no doubt, fairly well the condition anatomy and physiology had reached in his time, for all philosophers were supposed to know much of physic, under which anatomy was included, but sup-