

tion (9). We read that the body of a Saiga antelope is thick-set; the nose, longer than the jaws, is grooved; the nostrils and eyelids are hairless, and the lyre-shaped horns are curled down to their smooth tips. The artist only forsakes his model in the treatment of the ears. He substitutes for their actual rather short size, a length reaching to the tips of the horns. This arbitrary change has a technical explanation in that some support for the horns was needed. A favourite motive from Minussinsk is the pierced eye and nostril, the holes being surrounded by a raised ring, but it does not interfere with the naturalistic effect of the head. It is rather the modeling of the legs as in many other pieces that contrasts with the rest. They are entirely out of proportion, nothing but supports with rings for joints, resting on hooves that are merely notched. Therefore this "true to nature" art of Minussinsk about which so much has been said, is sometimes limited to the head, and even there has adopted stylization since the effects of light and shade attained by piercing must be so termed. This example should be placed at about the beginning of our era.

The characteristics of Kurgan art at Minussinsk are repeated at the Chinese frontier. There too the soliped is clearly represented. The antlers of this stag (Pl. V no. 3) make it unmistakable. Represented more or less schematically it is found over all the Steppes. The eyeholes, slightly ringed, have without doubt been borrowed from the Jenissei valley, as has its stylised form. The animal stands upon a little ball-shaped rattle, under which there is a ring which passes through a loop that allows for the tying of ribbons. The imitation of nature is not limited to the head as the rattle is not one with the body, and it is therefore fresher and more natural than the Minussinsk antelope. But the artist has been satisfied with a summary repetition of what has already been done in the Jenissei valley, and details in the modeling are not clear. Its subjugation to the Siberian centre is certain. An approximate date of 500 A.D. seems to allow for the slight difference that separates it artistically from Plate V no. 2.

Plate VI no. 1 repeats the stag, with the artistic characteristics of Minussinsk, but with some considerable change. The fact that the slashed body has lost its natural appearance and yet is not exactly a rattle, speaks for a later period. Only the pierced eye reminds us of the original manner of reproducing this motive. The essential features, such as the antlers and upturned tail, are here subject to an ornamentation having nothing to do with nature. The legs are bent unrealistically, and decorated so that the lines repeat the slashing of the body. It is certain that such an untrue representation should be considered as belonging to the end of the Eurasiatic animal style. This final phase, when nature is forgotten, carries with it a dissolution in form. It should therefore be dated about 1000 A.D.

A pole-top crowned with a wild ass, of which there are several examples (Pl. VI no. 2), was also created under the influence of Minussinsk. The neck