

France present the same proportion of children, born of relations, as his own establishment.

On this subject of consanguinity, M. Isidor, a gentleman well known to the literary world, replies to Dr. Bondin's arguments in so far as his community is concerned. He states that the Jewish population of Paris amounts to 25,000 souls, which, he affirms, does not comprise four deaf and dumb in all. Dr. Bondin, he thinks, greatly exaggerates the frequency of consanguineous marriages among the Jews: the Mosaic law, indeed, permits marriages between uncles and nieces, but the civil law forbids them, and dispensations are not easily obtainable. As to marriages between cousins, they are everywhere allowed, and the Jews therefore do not monopolise them. 100,000 Israelites of all France could scarcely furnish from 12 to 15 deaf and dumb. M. Isidor receives with incredulity Dr. Liebreich's statement of the existence of 27 deaf and dumb for every 10,000 souls at Berlin, as well as Mr. Elliotson's assertion that no country offers more instances of squinting, stammering, &c., than England. Those assertions, according to M. Isidor, are not founded on well authenticated facts.

M. Sanson publishes an article relating to consanguinity amongst animals. M. Sanson, far from confirming Dr. Bondin's view of the effects of consanguinity, endeavours to show from the English stud-book, that the circumstance in question has always been favourable to the physical development of the progeny. *Flying-Childers*, for instance, one of the most famous thorough-bred horses on record, was the brother of his maternal great grand-sire, and so on about a number of celebrated horses. Passing from the horse to the horned cattle, M. Sanson shows that the best bulls on record were the result of consanguineous intercourse. The small Breton race, of the department of Morbihan, remarkable for its vigour, and for the rich milk it yields, is generally propagated by consanguinity. Sheep, pigs, and fowls offer similar instances. Hence, M. Sanson concludes that consanguinity, since it does not lead to disastrous consequences in domestic animals, is not likely to be injurious to the human race, and that Dr. Bondin's statistics must be regarded with caution. To this argument, I believe it might be replied that the disastrous effects of consanguineous marriages seem to bear particularly upon the organs of hearing and speech, more especially important to the higher organisation of man. No one denies that a child born of consanguineous parents may grow as fat and muscular as any other, or that its hair may be as silky as that of others or more so; but will it not be deprived of speech and hearing? This is what no arguments, founded on the observation of cattle, can answer.

The *Journal des Connaissances Médicales* publishes some curious remarks, by Dr. Caffé, on hoarseness. A sore throat, having its seat in the larynx, is often followed by a partial loss of voice, which it is very difficult to remove. Singers and public orators are frequently attacked with sudden and obstinate hoarseness. When Napoleon I. returned from Elba, he was seized with this affection but a few hours before he had to reply to the harangue of the municipality of Lyons. His physician, Dr. Fourreau de Beauregard, prescribed the following potion: