

number of boys and girls in all of the families of his acquaintance, summing up the characteristics and taking the portraits of the parents, and reading Darwin and other authors who have handled the question. The great discovery is the law that "sex is determined by what I shall designate as the superior parent; also that the superior parent produces the opposite sex;" that is to say, that if the husband is superior to the wife the family will consist mostly of girls, and *vice versa*. Hence, as the author explains, results the preservation of the remainder of the sexes; for in the next generation the girls, inheriting their father's superiority, will in most cases produce families with a larger proportion of boys. In future there will be no need to pry in order to determine who rules the roost in one's neighbor's family—it will only be necessary to count his boys and girls in order to determine the point; hence it is to be expected that the desire for male offspring will scarcely remain so strongly developed in fathers as hitherto.

Dark complexion is superior to light; dark plants and trees are the most hardy, and dark horses the best. A square forehead and prominent veins are "superior;" a large, prominent eye (which "indicates conversational powers") is the reverse. But the best indication of superiority is a large and prominent nose, Roman or aquiline, full one-third the length of the face. As an illustration of the method of summing up the characteristics of parents from the rules laid down, the several portraits of opposite sex given in the plates are hypothetically married, pair by pair, and their superiority or inferiority is estimated numerically, 100 being taken as a standard number; hence the number of children of either sex which such pairs ought to produce, according to the new theory, is arrived at. One of the most ill-favored of the ugly women is mated, for example, with the man with the head which is biggest at the top, and the result is that if the pair have twenty children they will all be girls.

Then comes a series of cases from the personal experience of the author. M. B., a man of genius, with large head and slender body, with a corpulent wife of moderate intelligence, had five daughters. Mme. A., a strong woman with masculine voice and slightly bearded chin, had seven children, all sons.

"I became acquainted with a man of

good address, with a well-shaped head and a Roman nose. His wife was of consumptive tendency, literary tastes, but with an infantile nose and an expression of general inefficiency. Imagine my surprise when I found they had three boys."

But the law remains unshaken: "All was satisfactorily explained;" the husband was extremely illiterate and addicted to drink. "Nothing more surely degrades the nature."

Philosophers, lawyers, editors, poets, literary men and brain-workers generally have a large excess of daughters. Wine merchants, tavern-keepers, small retail dealers, orators, physicians and musicians have a preponderance of boys. Clergymen appear just to struggle through the ordeal without incurring the stigma of inferiority, being equally intelligent, sober and moral with their wives, and producing an equal number of boys and girls.

Of course, for the stability of the new law it becomes necessary to show that musicians, medical men and orators are inferior. Accordingly, the first are lymphatic; the second are made rather than born to their profession (and the most distinguished as an exception have large families of daughters), and mere public speakers do not possess "the highest order of faculties or intellect," while in most of them "the base of the brain will be found to predominate over the superior position."

Were the theory established, no married member of the learned professions would be able to get any employment at all unless they had large families of girls. They could not afford to run risks, and it would become a matter of common prudence with them to secure idiots for wives for fear of mishap.

—*London Athenæum*.

Shoeing Horses.

THE nature of our roads demands that all road horses be kept shod. During the busy months of summer, farm horses that are not put upon the highways more than once or twice per week, and then for a short time only, do not need shoes unless their feet are very tender, or are otherwise disabled. But all horses must be shod during the frozen months of winter. This is necessary in order that they may obtain a firm, unyielding hold upon the hard, slippery ground. In its primitive state, a horse's foot was made to walk upon a carpet—nature's greensward.