The mean palato-maxillary index of eleven crania was 112, and this index was practically the same in the two sexes. The maximum palato-maxillary index was 121 (female), the minimum was 104, also a female. The palate exhibited, therefore, as a rule, no great disproportion between its breadth and its length, it was mesuranic, and like the crania of the Fiji Islanders measured by Prof. Flower, was in its form rather intermediate between the parabolic and the hypsiloid.

As seven of the crania had holes in the squamous temporals, and one other was slightly imperfect near the foramen magnum, the cubic capacities could only be estimated approximately. The mean capacity of eleven crania was 1285 cubic centimetres.<sup>1</sup> That of six males was 1377<sup>.5</sup>, that of five females was 1154. The maximum cranial capacity in one (male) was 1528; the minimum in one (female) was 1068. Only one skull classified as female exceeded in capacity the lowest of the skulls classified as males. This classification was based upon the general characters of the skulls, and not upon their capacities. If we take 1350 cubic centimetres as the lowest limit of mesocephalism, then four of the eleven skulls exceeded it, and these were probably male skulls. Of these four, one was megacephalic, and three were mesocephalic. The two remaining male skulls were microcephalic. The male crania, therefore, may be regarded as in the average mesocephalic in capacity, the female as microcephalic ; and the general average capacity of the series was microcephalic. The ratio between the sexes is as 100 to 84, which is a low average for the female.<sup>2</sup>

To summarise the conclusions now arrived at from the analysis of the table of measurements, I may state that the crania of the Admiralty Islanders are distinctly dolichocephalic; on the line between tapeinocephalic and metriocephalic; cryptozygous; on the line between mesognathism and prognathism; on the line between the leptor-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> These figures of the cubic capacity differ somewhat from those printed in the abstract in the *Trans. Inter. Med. Congr.*, for the measurements I had made at that time were with sand, whereas those now given have been taken with shot in the manner described in the introduction to this Report.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> In the collection was another skull, marked in Prof. Moseley's handwriting, "Admiralty Islander?" In a letter to me, Mr. Moseley states that he found the skull unlabelled in one of the cupboards of the laboratory on the Challenger, but could get no one to identify it with certainty. From various circumstances he was disposed to think that it came from the Admiralty Islands, and wrote therefore upon it, but with a query. Owing to the uncertainty as to where it came from, and from the differences between it and the skulls which undoubtedly came from one of those islands, I have not included it in the description. The length of the cranium was 178 mm., its greatest breadth was 142 mm.; its basibregmatic height 135 mm. It was not only absolutely shorter than the greater number of the Admiralty Island skulls described above, but it was very much wider than even the widest of them, so that its cephalic index was 80. Its vertical index was 76, which places it considerably above the mean of the other crania. The gnathic index was 100; the palatomaxillary index was 126, the palate being distinguished by its great width in relation to its length. This skull had a very different appearance from those above described. Its great width gave it the rounded brachycephalic form. Its interzygomatic breadth was 140 mm., which gave a breadth to the face much in excess of the widest face amongst the above crania. No pigment had been smeared over the bones. If they were natives of the Admiralty Islands I have no hesitation in saying that this skull did not belong to the same race, so that if it were collected on Wild Island, it was a representative of a different people from those whose crania are described in the text. As they were the rule and it the exception, it was, granting the accuracy of its place of collection, probably an imported specimen, not unlikely a brachycephalic brown Polynesian.