

Through the investigations of A. Weisbach we possess considerable information on the form and dimensions of the pelvis in ten of the races in the Austrian empire. His measurements were made on the unmacerated pelvises of men between twenty and thirty years of age. The mean brim index in these races is as follows. The mean of eight South Slavs 81·5, of twelve Germans 82·5, of six Slovaks 84·1, of eight Czechs 84·3, of twenty Magyars 88·3, of twenty Italians 89·1, of thirteen Ruthenians 89·2, of five Gipsies 90·4, of eleven Poles 91·2, and of nine Roumanians 91·6.

The lowest mean brim index recorded in any European race or nation is 77 for the males in the Scottish pelvis, and 69 for the females in the Irish pelvis; and almost without exception this index amongst European races, both males and females, is below 90. The highest mean of these races is met with in the male Magyars with a brim index 88·3 in the male Italians with a brim index 89·1, and in the Ruthenians with a brim index 89·2, so that the European pelvis is platypellic (platylekanic). In three however of the races in the Austrian empire the mean brim index, as Weisbach's measurements show, rises above 90, viz., the Gipsies, Roumanians, and Poles. The Gipsies however are not a European race, and the Roumanians have in all probability a strong Oriental admixture. It may be, I think, a question whether the eleven pelvises described by Weisbach as Polish, and to which he gives a mean brim index 91·2, were either altogether or in great part of a pure Slavonic race, for the mean index of his eight South Slav pelvises was only 81·5, and that of his eight Bohemian Czechs was 84·3. I do not consider therefore that the higher mean index of these so-called Polish pelvises should interfere with the general statement already made that the European pelvis is platypellic (platylekanic).

In placing the European pelvis, both male and female, so far as it is represented by these nations, in the platypellic division, it is not of course to be understood that no individual European pelvis ever attains a brim index of 90 or upwards, but that the mean in both sexes is below 90, and as a rule is markedly below that number.

In the next place I shall speak of another type of pelvis, and shall begin by considering the brim index in the Australian pelvis. All the anatomists who have written on the characters of the male pelvis in this race agree in stating that the pelvic brim is narrow in its transverse diameter as compared with the conjugate. Professor Huxley, who was one of the first, if not the first, to give a numerical expression to these diameters in this race, gives the mean pelvic index of five males which he had measured as 101, and of one female as 87. In only one of these males was the transverse diameter in excess of the conjugate. In Ecker's Australian male the index was 100, in Keferstein's 95, and the mean index of the five Australian males in the Blumenbach collection, as measured by Spengel, was 92. In the single male Australian measured by M. Verneau the brim index was 98, and the mean of this index in two females was 80. Professor Flower, in his account of the osteology of the Andaman Islanders, incidentally stated that ten male