

TABLE I.

NUMBER OF ADULT CHILDREN OF VARIOUS STATURES BORN OF 205 MID-PARENTS OF VARIOUS STATURES.

(All Female heights have been multiplied by 1·08).

Heights of the Mid-parents in inches.	Heights of the Adult Children.														Total Number of		Medians.
	Below	62·2	63·2	64·2	65·2	66·2	67·2	68·2	69·2	70·2	71·2	72·2	73·2	Above	Adult Children.	Mid-parents.	
Above	1	3	..	4	5	..
72·5	1	2	1	2	7	2	4	19	6	72·2
71·5	1	3	4	3	5	10	4	9	2	2	43	11	69·9
70·5	1	..	1	..	1	1	3	12	18	14	7	4	3	3	68	22	69·5
69·5	1	16	4	17	27	20	33	25	20	11	4	5	183	41	68·9
68·5	1	..	7	11	16	25	31	34	48	21	18	4	3	..	219	49	68·2
67·5	..	3	5	14	15	36	38	28	38	19	11	4	211	33	67·6
66·5	..	3	3	5	2	17	17	14	13	4	78	20	67·2
65·5	1	..	9	5	7	11	11	7	7	5	2	1	66	12	66·7
64·5	1	1	4	4	1	5	5	..	2	23	5	65·8
Below ..	1	..	2	4	1	2	2	1	1	14	1	..
Totals ..	5	7	32	59	48	117	138	120	167	99	64	41	17	14	928	205	..
Medians	66·3	67·8	67·9	67·7	67·9	68·3	68·5	69·0	69·0	70·0

NOTE.—In calculating the Medians, the entries have been taken as referring to the middle of the squares in which they stand. The reason why the headings run 62·2, 63·2, &c., instead of 62·5, 63·5, &c., is that the observations are unequally distributed between 62 and 63, 63 and 64, &c., there being a strong bias in favour of integral inches. After careful consideration, I concluded that the headings, as adopted, best satisfied the conditions. This inequality was not apparent in the case of the Mid-parents.

race at large.

My data consisted of the heights of 930 adult children and of their respective parentages, 205 in number. In every case I transmuted the female statures to their corresponding male equivalents and used them in their transmuted form, so that no objection grounded on the sexual difference of stature need be raised when I speak of averages. The factor I used was 1.08, which is equivalent to adding a little less than one-twelfth to each female height. It differs a very little from the factors employed by other anthropologists, who, moreover, differ a trifle between themselves; anyhow, it suits my data better than 1.07 or 1.09. The final result is not of a kind to be affected by these minute details, for it happened that, owing to a mistaken direction, the computer to whom I first entrusted the figures used a somewhat different factor, yet the result came out closely the same.

I shall now explain with fulness why I chose stature for the