

femur, male, right 27° , left 22° ; on modern Europeans I measured 36° and 45° . I would, therefore, look upon this steep position of the linea obliqua as another primitive mark which our Anau individual seems to share with recent lower races and also with *Homo primigenius*.

The strongly-drawn-out trochanter minor extends considerably beyond the inner edge of the femur in the manner described and represented by Martin (1905, p. 614); for the rest this condition seems to occur also among modern Europeans of strong muscular development. With this movement of the trochanter minor towards the medial side, there is related the more transverse course of the strongly developed crista intertrochanterica (plate 95, fig. 1). The upper end of the linea aspera rises to a strong trochanter tertius.

The lower epiphysis is, as stated above, attached rather abruptly to the slender shaft of the diaphysis. It is specially characterized by the far backward extension of the condyles. This shows itself also in the relation of the radii of the ligamenta (see Bumüller), that is, of the vertical and horizontal distances (in projection) of the places, where the ligamenta collateralia are attached, from the joint-surface. If we take the points of attachment of the ligamenta on the epicondylar tuberosities, the horizontal radius is in all cases considerably greater than the vertical. If, however, we assume also that the ligamenta had their origin in the slight grooves which lie behind every epicondyle, then the horizontal radius would be reached by the vertical only on the lateral side (plate 95, fig. 4). All this would represent a condition which Bumüller considers so typical of the apes that on this account he declared the pithecanthropus femur to be that of an ape.

The planum popliteum is in all directions concave, and the concavity increases vertically from above downward. There is also a distinct transverse concavity in the middle (curvature value, right 6, left 4).

Notwithstanding the decided prominence of the condyles towards the rear, the length of the projection of the lateral condyle is somewhat slight, from which there results a very low condyle index, right 73.9 and left 74.7, which is still below the value of 75, given by Bumüller as the minimum of Europeans.

In comparison with the length of the bone the lower epiphysis can not be thought especially broad. This is at once evident if, using Klaatsch's method (1900, p. 652), we calculate an index from the two measurements, taking for length, as Klaatsch does, the trochanter length, in order to have comparable figures. Unfortunately Klaatsch has, probably through mistake, calculated the reverse ratio and moved the point one place to the left, and other authors have followed his procedure. Therefore we, too, are forced to express the trochanter length in percentage of the width of the epiphysis; but in doing this we have put the point in its proper place, and have added the values found by Martin for Senoi.

It would have been more useful to have calculated the index as was originally intended, that is, to express the condyle width in percentage of the length. We should then, in using Klaatsch's trochanter length, have values of 19.7 right and 19.2 left. Comparing the width of the lower epiphysis with the diaphysis