

The Peoples of Asia

By

L. H. DUDLEY BUXTON, M.A., F.S.A.

Lecturer in Physical Anthropology, University of Oxford
Author of "The Eastern Road"

LONDON

KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRUBNER & CO. LTD.

NEW YORK: ALFRED A. KNOPF

1925

Printed in Great Britain at
The Mayflower Press, Plymouth. William Brendon & Son, Ltd.

PREFACE

HE who attempts to collect the information which is available on the races of Asia is confronted almost more than in any other study by the many languages in which his authorities have written. The vast mass of Chinese literature which bears on the ethnology of Eastern Asia must perforce remain unexplored by the ordinary anthropologist, and though Western scholars have made a beginning of translating it into more familiar tongues it will probably remain for Chinese scholars of the future, persed in "barbarian" as well as their native learning to unlock the closed book. A beginning has already been made by the collaboration of Chinese and foreigners in the very interesting ethnological publications of the Chinese Geological Survey. Most of their publications, as well as many Japanese publications, are written both in the native tongue and in some European language, and are therefore addressed to a wide public, while the practice of quoting tribal and place-names both in character and in transliteration avoids the confusion which may easily occur where only transliterations, often on different systems, are given.

Even in Western languages, however, the literature on the subject is vast and ever increasing. I have tried in the bibliography to indicate those books which I have found of the greatest service to me in my own work, and the student by referring to them will be enabled to trace at least a large part of the specialized literature on various parts of Asia. Considerable prominence has been given to easily-accessible books and publications, the advanced student will know his own way about the big libraries; and from my own experience I believe that there is no more annoying experience for the more elementary student than to find that the library he frequents does not possess the work

which he is told is the most useful one on the subject he is studying, or if it does possess it, when the book arrives, it turns out to be written in a language which is imperfectly understood. In many cases, therefore, I have referred to a summary in English, French or German, as well as the original article. The summary will give the elementary student all he requires, the advanced student can then go on to the full work in a less-known language.

It is difficult for me to express adequately my debt to very many scholars both here and abroad. My friend and chief, Professor Arthur Thomson, Dr. Lee's Professor of Human Anatomy in the University of Oxford, has never ceased to offer every assistance in his power to further my work, and to his advice and kindly criticism, never grudged on the busiest of busy mornings, I owe more than I can ever acknowledge. Mr. Henry Balfour, F.R.S., Keeper of the Pitt Rivers Museum, has continuously and generously helped me in many matters with his extensive knowledge and wide experience, and this volume owes much to him. Professor Myres first introduced me to Asia and, more important still, to field work; he has not failed to see that I did not neglect the introduction which he had given. To Dr. Marett I owe an especial debt in regard to the technique of anthropological writing. Abroad my especial thanks are due to Dr. Black, of the Rockefeller Institute in Peking, and to the Director of that Institute for admitting me as a temporary member of their staff and giving me the use of their laboratories. Professor Adachi allowed me to examine at leisure, under his guidance, the magnificent collections of the Imperial University at Kyoto, and Dr. Nieuwenhuis escorted me in person and by deputy through Java. The opportunity to undertake this extensive travel was given me by the generous Fellowship endowed by M. Kahn. I feel that thanks are also due to a series of Chinese and Mongol scholars in Peking, some of whose photographs have been utilized in this volume for demonstrating on their own persons and on those of their friends—dwellers in the remoter parts of Asia—some of the different racial types of that vast continent.

PREFACE

vii

I feel sure that these scholars would consider that one whose beard is not yet grey is guilty of filial impiety in attempting to discuss so vast a subject. No one is more conscious than I am that this is but a vindematio prima of the harvest-fields of Asia. I have written in the hope that even such a scanty gleanings may help to attract others better equipped to reap the treasures which are to be found in abundance. In so short a space it is impossible to do more than indicate the general trend of the published work on the subject, and to incorporate here and there the little bits of actual original work which I have been able to do in one or two places.

My father, Dr. Dudley Buxton, and Mr. G. R. Carline have been kind enough to read through the typescript, and I owe very much to their careful and thorough revision. Mr. Charles Henderson, I.C.S., read through the chapter on India in typescript and proof, and Mr. Ernest Thomas, the chapter on the Near East. My pupil, Mr. Fraser of Queen's College, rendered invaluable help with the index. Mr. Chesterman, Assistant in the Department of Human Anatomy, Oxford, has prepared the prints for publication from my own negatives.

To all these gentlemen and to many others who have assisted me at various times, I owe a deep debt of gratitude.

L. H. D. B.

Oxford, June, 1925.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	v
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE RACES OF ASIA	32
III. THE ORIGIN OF THE ASIATIC RACES	71
IV. WESTERN ASIA	84
V. INDIA	115
VI. CHINA	148
VII. THE FRINGING LANDS OF CHINA	167
VIII. ARCTIC ASIA	192
IX. JAPAN	205
X. SOUTH-EASTERN ASIA AND INDONESIA	220
XI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	245
BIBLIOGRAPHY	250
INDEX OF TRIBAL NAMES	261
GENERAL INDEX	265

THE PEOPLES OF ASIA

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

ONE of the greatest difficulties which the student of anthropology has to face is the selection of criteria which he is to adopt in order to distinguish the various peoples he is describing. Many such criteria have been suggested in the past and have been variously accepted. Most books therefore which deal with any country, other than a restricted area, are apt to be very confusing because the same basis of classification has not been adhered to throughout. In some cases the authors, although consistent, have used criteria which have not won general acceptance, and therefore their works have proved less useful because it has been hardly possible to compare them with other investigations in the same field.

The divisions of mankind, which have become traditional, are based either on physique or culture. Herodotus is one of the earliest ethnologists to suggest the former. He says that it was possible on a certain battlefield to distinguish between the crania of the Egyptians and the Persians because the former were less easily broken. This statement, which has been widely accepted even in modern textbooks, is unfortunately not correct. Aristotle also would apparently accept a physical criterion when he says that the Greeks differ (*φυσει*) from the barbarians. He seems however to mean a psychological rather than an anatomical difference, as he is not concerned with what he would no doubt have considered a branch of medicine.

Language as a test of race was also widely accepted by the Greeks, and even as early as Homer the Carians are classified as speaking a "barbarian" tongue. This form of

classification has been very widely accepted by ethnologists, owing, no doubt, to the rapid advances made at the beginning of the last century by the comparative philologists, and we still speak in the same breath of Semitic and Mongoloid races when in the latter case we mean a physical type and in the former people speaking kindred languages. Nationality has also formed a frequent test for race, although this criterion has been less widely accepted than the linguistic test. In this volume the basis of classification will be physique, and as far as possible all linguistic and national terms will be avoided. It is not possible at present however to adopt a terminology which entirely eliminates such words except by coining an entirely new set of names, a procedure which is only likely to lead to confusion. We can hardly avoid words like "Turk" or "Arab," although these two words have rather a linguistic and a cultural than a physical connotation.

The history of the classification of mankind is not without great significance at the present juncture, describing as it does the reason for the modern acceptance of certain terms as well as explaining their exact significance which otherwise is often apt to be confusing.

The work of Herodotus and Aristotle has already been mentioned. It was not till the beginning of the seventeenth century that Western Europe seriously began to reconsider the problems of ethnology which had been bequeathed to her by the ancient world. In the meantime much material for comparison had been accumulating owing to the voyages of the Elizabethan mariners, many of whom brought back succinct accounts of new types of "barbarians" which had been unknown to the ancient world.

It is unnecessary to consider in detail the many classifications of mankind which have been suggested since the Renaissance. The reader will find them fully described in Keane's *Ethnology* (I. 1). Some of the more important may however be mentioned in so far as they relate to Asia. Bernier who died in 1688 suggests that there are four main divisions of mankind: Europeans, who are white, Africans, who are black, Asiatics, who are yellow, and Lapps. Linnæus (I. 2), writing nearly a century later (he died in 1783), still adopts the three same main groups but

includes hair and eye colour, so that the Asiatics are classed as yellow with brown eyes and black hair. He also includes the Americans as a fourth class, but removes the Lapps from their solitary eminence.

It is to Blumenbach (I. 3) however that we really owe the foundations of modern anthropology and some of his terms have survived until to-day. His contributions to racial study are summarized by Duckworth (I. 4, 4) as follows. He first employed the term "anthropology" in descriptive morphological studies. He recognized the fact that no sharp lines demarcate the several varieties of mankind, and realized that the transition from type to type is imperceptible. Further, he clearly enunciated a classificatory scheme of the varieties of mankind, admittedly arbitrary but with the object of facilitating study, the classification being based on the characters of the skin, hair and skull. Finally, he recognized the influence of external causes in producing and perpetuating variation in animals, including man; he also recognized the origin of varieties through degeneration and very nearly anticipated Darwin.¹

His terms have survived until to-day; he called the White races "Caucasic," because in trying to obtain a non-territorial name he was struck by some fine Georgian skulls among some skulls he happened to be examining and so called the race "Caucasic" after them. His term for African Ethiopic has not survived, but Mongolic (or the variety Mongolian) is still in use. Modern anthropology has not accepted his separate classification for Malay.

An immense amount of work was done in the next eighty years, but this need not be discussed here; it is of great interest however to note Huxley's classification, published in the *Journal of the Ethnological Society* in 1870 (I. 5). Here we find that further exploration has borne fruit in a more elaborate classification, although the main lines are not different. Asiatic peoples are included in all Huxley's

¹ As Keane somewhat inaccurately states Blumenbach's position the following note, which I owe to my colleague, Miss Blackwood, is of interest. In his first edition (*De generis humani varietate nativa* 1775, p. 99) he follows Linnæus and divides mankind into four varieties. In the second edition, 1781, he alters the four to five, adding the group Malay "after I had more accurately investigated the different nations of Eastern Asia." This later division he elaborates in the third edition in 1795.

groups. Under the Negroes he includes the Negritos, but unlike modern observers he groups together under that name the Andamanese, the Papuans and the Tasmanians. His second classification, the Australoid, is also of interest for our purpose; these include the Australian aborigines, the hill tribes of the Deccan (Dravidians) and the Egyptians. His Mongoloid group comprises the Mongols, from Lapland to Siam, the Malays, the Indonesians and Polynesians, and the Eskimo and American Indians. His group of fair Whites do not enter into the present consideration, but under the dark Whites or Melanocroid he includes the inhabitants of Syria, Arabia, Persia, and "Hindustan."

The writers of the next thirty years put forward various classifications most of which differed from Huxley in minor points. It is important to note that in some cases different criteria were used. Colour and hair form had on the whole been the criteria adopted by the older writers, some of the more modern have preferred to rely on hair alone. Topinard (I. 6) introduced the combination of colour and the nasal index and classed the Yellow races of Asia as "Yellow Mesorrhine." His classification has been generally followed.

Sergi's work (I. 7) is of importance because he suggested an entirely original form of classification, that of head form. He considered that the brachycephalic element which has penetrated into Europe was essentially Asiatic in origin as opposed to the Eurafrian longheads. His classification is therefore in many ways a greater challenge to students of Africa than to those of Asia. Dependence on skull form is however a new method. It has not received wide acceptance owing to the difficulties which are encountered in understanding the various subgroups suggested by him.

The classification indicated by Duckworth in his *Morphology and Anthropology* (I. 4, ch. xvi.) is one of the most important of modern attempts. It depends on criteria which, although they have been much used by anthropologists for many years, have not, so far as I am aware, been employed to any great extent for general classifications. He has introduced a method which is not dissimilar in principle to that used by many morphologists for classifying other animals, and his results, although they naturally agree in many cases with the work of previous observers, have certain differences,

which if proved to be true will profoundly alter many of our views on the population of Asia.

He takes three main criteria and divides mankind on the basis provided by these criteria. They are: cranial capacity, cephalic index, and the projection of the face. Thus his Group I includes men of small cranial capacity, dolichocephalic heads and prognathous faces, the type being called the Australian. Group II have similar characters but differ in other morphological details, the type being the African Negro. Of the Asiatic peoples he has made a classification as follows: the first, Group IV which he describes as Eurasiatic, all have a large cranial capacity and are orthognathous. They are divided into a dolichocephalic and a brachycephalic subgroup; this type includes the inhabitants of Europe, part of North Africa, all of Asia, with small exceptions, and most of the continent of America. In the other Asiatic group are the Andamanese, who have small capacity, are brachycephalic and orthognathous. The contrast in size and importance between the two groups is very striking and brings out clearly the distinguishing point between Duckworth's classification and that of previous authors. He appears to hold the view that the greater part of mankind belongs to the same group, but that a few varieties have specialized either in response to environmental or other conditions. These varieties include the peoples who are most generally conceded to be backward races, and include not only those very clearly specialized peoples, the Andamanese and the Eskimo, but also the Negro, the Bushman, the Australian aborigines and the Polynesians.

Most classifications have considered that the differences between the Yellow races and the White are sufficient to justify their being included in the two great varieties of mankind; Duckworth, however, insisting on their resemblances rather than on their differences, refuses to separate them by as wide a gap as that which divides them both from, say, the Negro. His subdivision is also of fundamental importance as it links up the brachycephals of Europe with the Yellow peoples of Asia more closely than with their long-headed European neighbours, in much the same way that some authors, notably the Italian School of Anthropologists, are inclined to link up the Mediterranean race with the Negro.

An examination of the crania of, say, Chinese and of the round heads of Western Asia must reveal the similarity of cranial form; indeed, it is often difficult if not impossible on an examination of the calvaria alone to distinguish between the two. The difference in the bony framework of the face and of the rest of the skeleton however suggests that there is considerable difference between the two. Duckworth's criteria however are based in two cases on the calvarial form, and therefore tend to mask the differences. The exact degree of relationship between the different groups of mankind is still so uncertain that this particular classification deserves greater recognition than it has received by most writers on the classification of mankind, many of whom have been content to follow the more traditional and at first sight clearer classifications.

Ripley (I. 8) who, unlike most of the authors we have been considering, did not discuss the population of the whole world, but limited himself to one continent, Europe, adopted three criteria, the cephalic index, that is the percentage ratio of the head breadth to the head length, stature, and colour. On this basis the inhabitants of Europe instead of forming six races, as they do according to the criteria adopted by Deniker (I. 9), are divided into three. In the north there is a fair, tall long-headed race called the Nordic, on the central massif is found a round-headed race of medium colouring and stature, "Alpine," and on the shores of the Mediterranean a short, long-headed *brunet* race, which coincides with Sergi's Mediterranean race. Although there are certain objections to Ripley's theories, especially his views on the Negroes and his treatment of the round-headed races of Central Europe, his views may be said to dominate the field of anthropology at the present time, even where they are not accepted in full, and any student of the ethnology of Europe or Asia must delve deeply into the material collected in his brilliant and exhaustive monograph.

The majority of the workers who have been quoted above were by training and interests anatomists. Following the lead of Quetelet (I. 20) and Retzius (I. 21) they had been in the habit of taking certain measurements, but being for the most part not interested in the mathematical aspects of the problem they failed to make the full use of their

figures or to follow the path indicated by Quetelet. To Professor Pearson (I. 10) is due the introduction of the scientific study of numerical data into anthropology. He saw that there were ready to hand a series of methods, many of which were in general use by statisticians and astronomers, which could be applied with every hope of success to biological problems. Of the original workers in this field, of whom the most distinguished were Galton and Weldon, Pearson is the only survivor, and he has gathered round him a school of "Biometricians," many of whom have devoted considerable attention to anthropology.¹ Although the members of this school published their earliest papers nearly thirty years ago, their views have not met with universal acceptance, partly perhaps owing to the fact that many anthropologists are unacquainted with the comparatively obscure method of writing which has characterized some of their publications and partly also because many of the Biometricians, owing, no doubt, to an early specialization in the principles of applied mathematics, sometimes showed a lack of anatomical training. In considering the work of this school it must always be remembered that the mathematical treatment of data is merely mechanical and that nothing can emerge from the machine which was not originally put into it. It is however possible to grade by mathematical methods great quantities of data which might otherwise be very unwieldy if not impossible to handle.

The older anthropologists had been content to take measurements and to work out "averages" by rule-of-thumb methods without considering at all accurately how far these averages could really be taken as typical measurements of the group from which the original measurements were obtained. To the Biometric School we owe the introduction into anthropology of certain concepts of great practical value. These may be conveniently grouped under three headings: measures of dispersion, probable errors, and the theory of contingency and correlation. It must not be supposed that these ideas originated with or were even introduced into anthropology by this school, their use in anthropological work had previously been suggested with a

¹ A special periodical, *Biometrika*, is published devoted to biometric research.

slightly different terminology by Quetelet. The Biometric School, however, popularized them and extended their scope far beyond what had been done by any previous workers, and the debt which anthropology owes to Pearson, both for developing old methods and for devising new ones, is even now hardly sufficiently recognized.

It had been recognized by all writers from Herodotus onwards that certain races were more mixed than others, in other words that the component stocks from which certain tribes had originated presented similar features, while in the case of other tribes their origin had to be sought in less closely related stocks which had mixed together and produced a hybrid people. By the use of the standard deviation and the coefficient of variation Pearson has shown that it is possible to measure the comparative pureness of various peoples.

The standard deviation is found by taking the square root of the mean square deviation from the mean. It should be noted that "mean" is the technical term for what is called, in popular language, the "average." It would, of course, be possible to take the mean of a series of measurements and then to take the average deviation of the measurements from that mean. It has been found in practice, however, that greater accuracy is obtained by taking not the actual deviation but the square of those deviations, and then taking the average of those squares and finally the square root of this average. The figure thus obtained is called a measure of dispersion, because it shows how far the various individuals of the series which is being examined are "dispersed" or scattered in relation to the central point or average. If the standard deviation is small, that is, if the dispersion is not great, the mean will be typical of the group, but if it is widely scattered then obviously but few individuals in one group will have measurements which approximate to the mean. In other words, our mean will be a less reliable indication of the racial type. The matter may be understood more simply if we compare anthropological measurements with cricket scores. If one batsman makes in three innings 0, 15, and 30, and another 13, 15, and 17, we should say that, though both have the same average, one was a more steady player than the other, although, of course, we should want his score for more than three innings before we could pass a definite judgment, a point which we shall return to later. The steadier player we may suppose was always good to make about 15 runs, or,

in other words, his average closely approximated to the score we might expect him to make. With so few figures this can be seen at a glance. If both had played fifty innings it would be less easy. Let us therefore work out their standard deviations. The mean in both cases is 15, the first player's first innings deviates from the mean by 15, the square of which is 225, his second innings is equal to the mean and the third innings has the same deviation as the first. The total square deviation is therefore 450. To get the mean or average of this we must divide by the total number of innings, three. The mean square deviation is therefore 150, i.e. $\frac{450}{3}$. The square root is just over 12, which represents the standard deviation of his score. Using the same method the mean square deviation of the second player's score is $\frac{8}{3}$, i.e. 1.67, the square root of which is under 1.3. This example will serve to show in an exaggerated form how the standard deviation may be used, but we can hardly apply the theory of mixed races to a single player's scores.

It will be clear that if we mix two series, say one in which the heads are short and another in which the heads are long, the average measurement will represent not a typical member of the series, but a compromise between the two. The standard deviation will be great, because the short-headed series will extend on one side and the long-headed on the other. In some cases, no doubt, this would be revealed by a graph, but there are many cases when the use of a measure of dispersion is more convenient and for comparative purposes it is infinitely less unwieldy. It will happen sometimes that we may wish to compare measurements whose means differ very much. We might wish to know whether a certain race had a more variable head length or stature. In order to do this we must have some common factor. This is to be found by the "coefficient of variation," which is obtained by multiplying the standard deviation by a hundred and dividing the product by the mean. To return to our cricket analogy, on examining A's scores at the end of the season a member of the club decides that he is a more reliable bat than bowler, another member takes an opposite view. If the club possessed a biometrician he might suggest that by comparing the coefficients of variation of A's batting and bowling averages the matter could easily be settled. All that has to be done is to work out his batting average, say 15, with its standard deviation, say 9, the coefficient of variation will be $\frac{900}{18}$, i.e. 60, and to do the same for his bowling average, and we can compare the two figures and decide which member of the club was right.

The great value of such methods will be seen where we have reason to suspect that a race is the result of the mixture of two

racess which present some features in common, but which differ in other respects. We should expect the hybrid to show little variation in those characters in which the two alleged original stocks are alike, and to have a wide measure of dispersion where they differed. This suggestion could be measured by comparing the coefficients of variation.

While it is possible by using familiar analogies to illustrate the meaning of the standard deviation, it is less easy to explain that of probable errors. It will be clear that if I take a series of measurements on a savage tribe and at a subsequent date take another series, I shall not by the law of chance which, as Laplace says, is common sense reduced to calculation, get exactly similar results on both occasions. It will also appear that the larger the number of individuals in my series the more likely the two are to agree. Now, although it would be better to work out my averages from as large a series as possible, it is convenient to know how far my average does really represent the population under review. This will depend on two things, first, how variable the population is and, secondly, the number of individuals measured. The more I measure and the lower my standard deviation the more likely is my series to approximate to the true mean of the population. The value of the probable error is estimated from these two factors, it therefore supplies a method of showing in a convenient way the reliability of the data. If the probable error is great the mean value calculated must be accepted with caution, if small, then the calculated value probably approximates to the true mean value. The probable error can be calculated for mean standard deviations, coefficients of variation of correlation and so on. The name is perhaps unfortunate, as it does not signify the error that is likely to have occurred in the calculation owing to personal equation or any other cause.

The theories of contingency and correlation are different aspects of the same problem, the former deals with characters which cannot and the latter with those that can be measured. It is of the greatest importance in anthropology. A coefficient has been constructed, the actual methods of calculation of which need not concern us here. If two variables vary exactly in relation to one another, such as mass and weight, they are exactly correlated and the coefficient if calculated would be one. If there is no relationship between the variables the coefficient is in the neighbourhood of zero. In anthropological work we seldom or never get either unity or zero, owing to many accidental features, but the varying size of the coefficients serve to show that two features are closely connected, either as cause and effect or else both as effects of the

same cause. It is unnecessary to give examples here, as there will be numerous occasions when various coefficients will be quoted in the sequel.

I have considered at some length these aspects, perhaps the simplest but, at the same time, not the least important of Pearson's work, because a proper understanding of them is necessary if we are to make use of much of the data on the peoples of Asia which have been collected by workers in the field.¹

Biometricians have been for the most part interested in method. They have seldom therefore, with one or two exceptions, applied themselves to wide ethnological problems. Recently however an attempt based on the study of certain Asiatic peoples has been made to supersede the older methods of analysis by the construction of a provisional "Coefficient of Racial Likeness" (I. 14). This coefficient attempts to give a numerical value to the combined characters of a race.

It has been felt by many anthropologists that reliance on a single character or index or even on two or three arbitrarily selected criteria, as for instance stature, the cephalic index and so on, is not a sufficient method of gauging racial differences. In some cases also it is found that the apparent evidence is very contradictory, Groups A and B, let us say, differing from one another but little in two criteria selected and much in two others, the reverse being the case between A and C. It is not then an easy task to decide on the relationship between B and C who may differ in a different way from one another.

The suggested coefficient gets over this difficulty by combining all the characters and indices together and reducing them to a single index figure. It is well known that the significant difference between the mean values of the same character in two different races can be estimated by dividing this difference by its probable error. When the quotient of this division is more than three the difference is said to be significant.² The probable error of any mean depends on two things, the standard deviation and the number of cases used to obtain the mean, and the constant .6745. The coefficient of racial likeness is found by dividing the difference be-

¹ The biometric aspect of anthropology has a bibliography of its own. The student may most profitably study the papers quoted in later chapters. For general works see I. 10, 11, 12. A very clear statement of *method* will be found in I. 14.

² For a further discussion of this point see my paper on Cyprus (I. 13, 194).