

CONCLUSIONS.

To present, free from subjective influence, not only the methods of investigation, but also the inferences; that is, to build objectively and scientifically, I apply here the known system of points, thus avoiding bias by some pronounced characteristic and premature or wrong conclusions through neglect of other important points. The plan is as follows: The questions which are of especial interest are listed and each one considered with regard to each characteristic treated in this investigation. Where there is absolute agreement, the highest degree of positive answer to the question, a value of 10 points is assigned, which decreases by units to 0 for a directly negative answer. Adding the points obtained and dividing by the number of answers, the result is an objective answer to the question and as accurate as the accidents of the find and a comparison of the material investigated will permit. The questions which we will here present are eight in number.

1. How does the horse of Anau agree with that of the late neolithic and bronze ages and the La Tène time, with the exception of the Schlossberg horse?
2. How does the Anau horse agree with those of Solutré, Kesslerloch and of the paleolithic and early-neolithic localities of Italy and France?
3. How does the horse of Vindonissa compare with these?
4. What relation do these paleolithic and neolithic horses bear to those of Westeregeln and Thiede of the North German lowland?
5. How does the Anau horse agree with *Equus przewalskii* Poljakoff?
6. How do the above-mentioned horses of Solutré, etc., stand in relation to *Equus przewalskii*.
7. How do the Bronze and La Tène horses stand in relation to the Anau horse?
8. How does the horse of Anau compare with that of the Schlossberg?

The answers yield the following:

	Question—							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Dentition.....	5	5	5	5	8	7	8	5
2. Skull and indices.....	8	4	9	8
3. Scapula.....	6	6
4. Humerus.....	6	8	7
5. Radius.....	8	10	6	6
6. Metacarpus.....	8	4	9	8	7	10	8	4
7. Femur.....	10	5	5	9	9	6	8
8. Tibia.....	9	2	10	8	8	6	8
9. Tarsalia.....	6	8	9	7
10. Metatarsus.....	9	7	10	7	7	6	10	9
11. Phalanges.....	8	4	9	8	8	5	8
12. Size.....	10	9	8	7	9	8	8	8
Total.....	87	42	66	78	74	55	79	32
Resulting answer =.....	8.0	5.2	8.2	7.1	8.2	6.8	7.9	6.4

These results are, therefore, to be expressed in the following manner:

1. From our foregoing investigation it follows with the greatest certainty that the Roman horse of Vindonissa was a horse of the size and shape of those of Solutré, Kesslerloch, Cardamone, Arezzo, Devenzano, etc., and it was apparently closely related to these animals, since only very slight osteological differences can be recognized.