

drawn from them. What we have to state has been the result of the studies of many naturalists; but although they have laboured, as it were, in their own department of comparative anatomy, they have failed to seize upon it with the privilege of genius, and to handle it in the masterly manner of Cuvier.

Suppose a man ignorant of anatomy to pick up a bone in an unexplored country, he learns nothing, except that some animal has lived and died there; but the anatomist can, by that single bone, estimate, not merely the size of the animal, as well as if he saw the print of its foot, but the form and joints of the skeleton, the structure of its jaws and teeth, the nature of its food, and its internal economy. This, to one ignorant of the subject, must appear wonderful, but it is after this manner that the anatomist proceeds. Let us suppose that he has taken up that portion of bone in the limb of the quadruped which corresponds to the human radius; and that he finds that the form of the bone does not admit of free motion in various directions, like the paw of the carnivorous creature. It is obvious, by the structure of the part, that the limb must have been merely for supporting the animal, and for progression, and not for seizing prey. This leads him to the fact that there were no bones resembling those of the hand and fingers, or those of the claws of