

quite impossible that a people limited in time and space should alone have influenced China. Their successors were no farther away from her, often even nearer. Therefore we must give up a designation that takes the name of only one people of the Steppes. Different geographic appellations have been suggested at various times for this art, as for example, after the Mongol country of the Ordos (2), or after a locality where discoveries were accidentally made, situated in the province of Shan-si, named Sui yüan (3). Occasionally the adjective "Eurasian" has been adopted, which to my mind is more suitable, as it permits these artistic manifestations to be connected with various regions in the circle of the Steppes. In order to emphasize the creation under Chinese influence, as well as the confusion of influences from lands to the north of China, we have chosen the term "Sino-Siberian", which is easy to remember.

Light cannot be thrown on the obscurity surrounding this art without comparing it with that of the Steppes. If in countries bordering China all basis for scientific work is lacking, we have at our disposal at the other side of the Great Wall, at least now and then, reports on excavations and tomb inventories, but unfortunately very rarely what is most important: inscriptions. And above all in south Russia, the Caucasus, the Ural and Siberia, there is a certain relative chronology based on actual facts that should help us to group the vast number of pieces coming from the north of China. The first to point out the possibility of grouping monuments brought out by dealers without too great an archeological burden was Pelliot (4). He enumerates the intercrossing of influences to be encountered in the quest for the creators of these works of art:

1) "Siberian, influenced by western Sarmatian art and even by Greek art." This possibility arises for articles that have been imported and that are found, therefore, only separately. But nearly all articles are part of a series that may be typified by one specimen alone.

2) "Siberian, properly so called." What we have just stated must be repeated for this case.

3) "Siberian, made by Turco-Mongolian tribes." Certainly the most frequent case.

4) "Siberian, reproduced by Turco-Mongols settled on Chinese soil". This possibility seems to me to be closely connected with the preceding case.

5) "Chinese, which still shows a Siberian origin more or less remote." This case also is not rare, it may easily be explained by assimilation.

It might be added: "Chinese, but imitated at a later date in the country of assimilated neighbours", since peculiarities in material and in patina are encountered which are not found among the majority of similar Chinese objects, but which are usual at the northern frontier.

If, finally, we decide to examine these objects from the point of view of their connection with the north and northwest, we continually run into the question: