

## CHAPTER VI

### CONCLUSIONS.

In the present last chapter I shall formulate the general deductions I have already drawn and some generalizations and suppositions, which can be deduced of the preceding exposition.

#### §56. The Anthropological Distinctions of the Chinese.

*I. The absolute measurements of the Chinese correlate each other. The stature and the head-breadth are the fundamental characters that determine other absolute measurements, except nasal, frontal and auricular characteristics. Some of these characteristics cannot be useful from the point of view of the differentiation of the groups and types because of the insignificant variations.*

*II. The stature, head-breadth, height of the forehead, also the breadth and length of the nose are fundamental measurements, that form the basis of the anthropological differentiations. Other measurements can be used also as the characteristics of the differentiated groups, because they correlate the stature and head-breadth.*

*III. The relative measurements follow the same regularity as the absolute measurements. The indices related to the stature do not show significant differences, but the indices related to the head-breadth, frontal and nasal measurements, also the interzygomatic breadth, show very accentuated differences.*

*IV. The differences of the Chinese groups are based on the peculiar characters of the anthropological types that compose these groups. The types are not abstract ones, but quite concrete. Also the extreme variations and hypothetic types, which I have supposed to influence the amalgamated series, are concrete too, but the number of individuals which represent these types are generally in an insignificant minority.*

#### *Note on Section IV.*

All these deductions are based on the supposition that the amalgamation of two and more types creates a great number of individuals who can be characterized by the intermediary characters.

*V. The differentiation of the types is based on the stature, cephalic index, nasal index and frontal index. Therefore I admit that the differentiation of the Chinese cannot be based on a preliminary limited number of measurements and indices. For example the type  $\Delta$  and type B are differentiated by the characteristic nasal index and frontal index while the stature and cephalic index of these types are so close that these types cannot be surely distinguished in the fields of correlation (See Tables A and F). The types A and  $\Gamma$  have about the same cephalic index, but very different stature, the variations*

of which sometimes might be considered as "normal dispersion" if the difference of the nasal index and frontal index were not so significant and characteristic for these types. Thus, generally, *a choice of the characteristics to differentiate groups and types must be made unless the analysis of the materials is complete.*

## §57 The Method of Interserial Differences and Method of Correlation.

I. The method of interserial differences can be applied to the different (territorial) series of ethnical groups, if these series show the difference of MM. The best results can be drawn if there are neighbouring series. This method can be considered as an analytical method, but the results of application must be always verified by other analytical methods, because this method is based on MM, which sometimes confuse the real anthropological components of the ethnical groups under discussion.

II. The method of correlation must be always applied. If the coefficient has no numerical value or very insignificant one the analysis of the series can be done by superimposing of the fields of correlation of the same characters, but belonging to different groups or series. The insignificant coefficients resulting from the calculation of the amalgamated series composed of many anthropological types have no importance as such, but such coefficients cannot be considered as absolutely meaningless, if other series taken in comparison show significant coefficients or opposite signs. Thus this method may be applied *comparatively* to the analysis of the territorial and ethnical series. For instance the differentiation of the cephalic index and similarity of the stature of two types will show no correlation, but this result can be controlled by the correlation of the stature and cephalic index with other measurements and indices separately. Then, perhaps, there will be discovered some more complicated amalgamations in which may be distinguished two types of the same stature and different cephalic index, and, on the other hand, two types of different stature and similar cephalic index. At the same time all these types may be distinguishable by other characteristics, as for example nasal and frontal indices or colour of the skin and hair, and so on, which characterize four different types.

### *Note on Section II.*

It might be that in the Anthropology the application of this method cannot give at all the high numerical meaning of coefficients, except the cases of the anatomical (constructive) correlation or very simple amalgamations of the types, as for example, one type of very high stature with very high cephalic index and other type of very low stature and very low cephalic index.

III. The calculation of the coefficients of correlation and especially the putting of the individuals in the field of correlation must be done for several pairs of measurements and indices, because the anthropological types in the state of amalgamation can sometimes produce very insignificant differentiation of some characters and very significant differentiation of other ones.

## §58. The Ethnographical and Anthropological Evidences Combined.

I. From an anthropological point of view the Chinese are a complex of different anthropological types, which may be distinguished in an amalgamated state among the

Chinese, These types are more or less distinguishable among other ethnical groups. The present distribution of these types in the territory furnishes some data for establishing the ethnical movements in the past.

II. The Chinese lived within the limits of West-Central China, whence they moved eastward, northward and southward. The Chinese movement eastward resulted in the amalgamation of the Chinese with the native ethnical groups of this region, i.e. Tungus and Palaeoasiatic groups. The influence of the Chinese type may be observed among the present population of Manchuria and partly Korea. The interaction of the Chinese and other ethnical groups resulted in the continuous amalgamation of the fundamental Tungus and Palaeoasiatic types.

III. The interaction of the Chinese and Mongols resulted in the Mongol movement eastward, northward and westward. Thus the Chinese movement had exclusively important influence on the history of Europe,—the Huns provoked the Great Migration in Europe and removed the German and other ethnical groups who lived at that time in Europe. Also indirectly this movement influenced the failure of the Roman Empire. The Mongol pressure on the east caused probably the Tungus migrations and the formation of the new states. The decline of the Mongol Empire resulted in the formation of two great powers—Russia on the west and Manchu on the east.

This movement interrupted the peaceful trade between Ancient China and the Mediterranean cultural circle.

IV. The Chinese movement eastward and northward was stopped only by the Russian migration. In Manchuria the Chinese movement always grows and forms now the majority of population.

## §59. Ethnological Deductions.

I. The anthropological differentiation from the ethnological standpoint cannot explain the real importance of the Chinese among other ethnical groups of Asia. Though the Chinese are not at all homogeneous, they form a peculiar ethnical unit, which acts as such among other ethnical groups. The ethnical unity of the Chinese is based on the cultural complex that produces the peculiar position of the Chinese among other ethnical groups, but it cannot be discovered by the anthropological methods.

II. The anthropological differentiation in the cases of the complexes, as the Chinese are, cannot help in the discovery of the real causes of the interethnical position of some ethnical groups, but the anthropological analysis can be used only as an historical method. It seems to me that at the present time the ethnical differentiation is operated on the basis of the psychological characters, whose external manifestations can be observed in the cultural complexes.

III. The language is not a stable characteristic for ethnical units. As is shown by the example of the Manchu, Mongol and Tungus the languages alter very easily. The ethnical environment is one of the most important factors of the variations, but the variation can occur only in such a case, when the alteration of the language is necessary for selfdefence of the ethnical unit.