

crania, when I was gratified by receiving the gift of a skull, including the lower jaw, brought from Kertch, and described by the donor, as that of a Circassian lady. In form it presented no correspondence with the Macrocephalic type to which my inquiries had been previously directed, for the forehead is markedly vertical, and in its general proportions it is strikingly characterised as a brachycephalic cranium of unusual width at the parietal protuberances, while marked by much delicacy and beauty, especially in the facial bones.

A special interest attaches to the evidences of physical form, as well as of philological characteristics, pertaining to the tribes of the Caucasian area, owing to the factitious importance that has been assigned to certain of them in modern Ethnology. It may not, therefore, be altogether valueless to put on record the facts connected with the recovery of the Crimean cranium in question; and to note the peculiarities of its form and measurements; though, from the mixed character of the population of Kertch it would not be safe to assign the crania of its modern cemetery to any absolute ethnological group, or to make them the basis whereon to found data for classification, or for any comprehensive generalization.

Dr. Latham, in his "Varieties of Man," classes the nations and tribes of the area within the range of Mount Caucasus under the generic designation of Dioscurian Mongolidæ, including in its chief divisions: The Georgians; the Lesgians; the Mizjegî; the Irôn; and the Circassians. He derives the term Dioscurian, from the ancient sea-port of Dioscurias, where the chief commerce between the Greeks and Romans and the natives of the Caucasian range took place. According to Pliny, it was carried on by one hundred and thirty interpreters, so numerous were the languages; and one striking characteristic of the locality, still noticeable, is the great multiplicity of mutually unintelligible tongues. This therefore is the idea designed to be conveyed by the term Dioscurian. Caucasian would have been a preferable, because more familiar and precise term, but it has been already appropriated as an Ethnological division, in a way sufficiently confusing and indefinite, without adding thereto by the creation of such a contradictory union of terms, as would arise from such a designation as Caucasian Mongolidæ,—almost equivalent, in popular acceptance, to European Asiatics!

The use of both epithets, Caucasian and Mongolian, is traceable to Blumenbâch, and the history of his adoption of the former supplies