

As remarked by Prof. Th. Studer, to whom I gave simply the occipital bone and piece of skull of the still unreconstructed cranium for examination, this piece of the skull possesses in a high degree the peculiarity and character of the dingo or the pariah dog. However, after closer comparison made later with the completely reconstructed skull, I was able to decide that it has a very strongly marked resemblance to the European shepherd-dog, especially in the facial part. The only differences that this skull shows from the *Canis matrís optimæ* of Jeitteles are that the upper jaw is less pointed and the palate a little broader than in the latter. This means that the muzzle of the Anau dog was somewhat shorter and broader than that of the prehistoric European shepherd-dog. As appears from the measurements, indeed, the skulls of the dingo and pariah dog agree very well with those of the Anau dog. Here, too, the muzzle is always a little longer and narrower, and the zygomatic arch a little wider than in our dog. Nevertheless, these differences are not great. They are even smaller than those produced by the difference in sex between two upper Egyptian pariah dogs published by Studer.

That the Anau dog belongs to the shepherd-dog or to the pariah dog, which resembles the shepherd-dog, will be made clear by the following relations of the basicranial axis to the basifacial axis.

Table showing relations between the basicranial axis and the basifacial axis expressed in proportions to 100.

European wolf.	Indian wolf.	Pariah dog.	Dingo.	Shepherd-dog.	Anau dog, North Kurgan.
36.5	36.3	36.5 Nepaul.	38.1	40 Germany.	41.8
36.8	38.3	39.0 Egypt.	41.3	41.9 France.	
37.7	38.7	39.1 Egypt.	41.9	41.9 <i>Canis matrís optimæ</i> fossil.	
38.7	39.4	39.8 Bengal.			
39.1		39.8 Sumatra.			
		40.8 Egypt.			

Here again it is clear that the Anau dog can have nothing to do with the wolves or wolf-dogs, in which the basicranial axis is 36 to 39 per cent of the basifacial axis, or with the hound, in which this is 35 to 37 per cent.

What we deduced, from direct measurements as to the form and size of the skull, is thus clearly illustrated in these very constant ratios; and it appears that our dog, standing near to the dingo as well as to the small Russian fossil wild dog, (*Canis poutiatini*), must be assigned to the shepherd-dogs or to the pariah dogs which resemble them. This relation is very well shown further in the ratio between the cranial height and length, which is clearly expressed in the following table:

Table showing the cranial height expressed in percentages of the length.

Indian wolf.	Dingo.	Shepherd-dog.	Pariah dog.
27.2	30.9	32.7 <i>Canis matrís optimæ</i> , fossil dog.	31.7 Nepaul.
27.8	31.1	32.9 Anau dog.	33.8 Egypt.
28	....	33.5 France.	35.0 Egypt.
30.2	....	34.5 Germany.	....