

thus perhaps the carnivorous bull is only a rhinoceros with his two horns. M. de Weltheim asserts, that the auriferous ants of Herodotus are *corsacs*.

One of the most famous amongst the animals of the ancients is the *unicorn*. Naturalists were fully bent, even down to our times, on finding it, or at least in seeking arguments in favour of its existence. Three animals are frequently mentioned by the ancients as having only one horn in front. The *oryx of Africa*, which has at the same time cloven feet, the hair reversed,(1) is of great size, equal to the ox,(2) or even the rhinoceros,(3) and which it is agreed approaches sheep or goats in form;(4) the *ass of the Indies*, which is solid footed; and the *monoceros*, properly so called, whose feet are sometimes compared with those of a lion,(5) sometimes with those of an elephant,(6) and consequently cloven-footed. The horse(7) and the unicorn oxen have a mutual relation certainly to the ass of the Indies,(8) for the ox is mentioned as even solid footed. I ask, if these animals existed as distinct species, should we not at least have their horns in our collections? And what single horns have we but those of the rhinoceros and the narwal?

How, after this, can we refer to the coarse figures

orifice which has given rise to the opinion of its being an hermaphrodite.

(1) Arist. Anim. ii. 1. iii. 1; Plin. xl. 46.

(2) Herod. iv. 192.

(3) Oppian Cyneg. ii. vers. 551.

(4) Plin. viii. 53.

(5) Philostorge, iii. 11.

(6) Plin. viii. 21.

(7) Onesicrite, ap. Strab. lib. xv.; Ælian, Anim. xiii. 42.

(8) Plin. viii. 31.