

of consanguineous marriages as it relates to degeneracy and disease is by no means settled. It is *sub judice*. Experiments upon animals tend rather to show the harmlessness of endogamy. Statistics upon the questions are conflicting, in fact they are untrustworthy, because often obtained for controversial purposes. For instance should a statistician select cases where heredity existed, or where there was a chance accumulation of idiosyncrasy and intermarriage combined, much material from such cases might be drawn to prove the theory. We must say, however, that so far as our own observation has extended it has strongly tended to establish the belief that intermarriage in the human animal is damaging to both his body and mind, but not necessarily so. What we mean by this will be understood when we remark that inbreeding in the case of the lower animals is done under professional and scientific guidance, whereas in the animal possessing reason, mostly nothing more than a sort of abnormal affinity operates in the choice of a subject for the experiment. Among the ancient Jews we have no reason to believe that there was great suffering from the causes under consideration. We, however, have holy writ for the authority, "that the poor should never cease out of the land," and we have them repeatedly mentioned in the Jewish writings. The mode of living, and the surrounding conditions that appertained during the lives of the patriarchs, were much less complete than at the present time, and yet we find the evidences of art and learning present. And at a period a little later a development of luxurious living which could scarcely have been free from the attendant vices. The splendors of Egypt and her eternal monuments were produced through a system of grinding among the common people worse than slavery. The miseries and hardships which Egyptians of the lower classes endured—being often, as they were, driven to their labors and into the mines under the lash by brutal soldiers, could not fail to produce degradation and disease and madness. But under such a condition of things no friendly asylum would be open to receive them, and no statistician would record their admission, recovery or death. In Grecian history there does not appear to have been any period when there existed, side by side with wealth and luxury, great poverty, hardship and degradation such as we find under civilization at the present age but that pauperism did, to an appreciable extent, exist there can be no doubt. The Romans

certainly were not free from the effects of malnutrition. Under the iron hoof of taxation and oppression poverty and misery prevailed. It is true that Roman temples and palaces were abundant and magnificent, but these, as the Roman poets were wont to show, served to mark in bold contrast the extremes of luxury and poverty.

MORAL CAUSES.

Under this head we shall consider the moral causes—those that act upon the emotions, which may include such as excite and depress, as may be observed in false views of religion, in sorrow, losses, disappointments and over-anxiety. Following the same course as in treating other causes, we may inquire to what extent these existed in the distant past. Savages are not greatly affected by their emotions of love, nor would we expect among them excitement of a political or religious character. Neither would they be likely to come to grief from speculation in stocks. But whilst theology and æsthetics might not jar our brethren of the Drift period, it is certain they were not free from affective impulses, such as might upset and overturn their heads. Their strong belief in ghosts and demons, and their fears therewith, are well known; and from their fits of rage and jealousy and club battles, we may conclude that their heads were not free from disturbance. The Jews suffered losses and estrangements; they were captives in a foreign land, and hung their harps upon the willows but they were mostly sound and well grounded in their religion, and on the whole not greatly moved in their affective natures. Our third class of causes would not touch the Hebrew people but feebly, compared with its grasp upon modern society. The Egyptians were divided into two great castes—the government, priests and military, and the slaves—and these continued from generation to generation. No great and sudden change in their affairs was likely to occur that would stir the emotional nature. In fact immutability was stamped upon everything Egyptian to an extent scarcely found elsewhere, and it characterizes the subjects of the Khedive to-day. Causes of insanity of a moral character, in a much greater degree, existed among the Greeks than the Egyptians. They, the Greeks, were a warlike as well as a poetic people and over a large portion of their history had the elements of excitement and emotion. It is true that at a period the theory "that the rule of many is not a good thing" prevailed, but for a much great-