

loop; but as it would not hang in a normal position such a purpose would probably only be possible if it were intended to accompany the dead.

Plate XXXV no. 7 seems entirely to lack all Chinese influence. Here too the holes were certainly not accidentally made, but in this case they are placed so that the object might hang in a natural way. The monkey astride a horse corresponds to the hooks of Plate XXIX no. 3, but more primitively and summarily treated, and so lacking in careful details that its date must be brought forward into the II millennium. The monkey has been replaced by a loop above the saddled horse of Plate XXXV no. 8, that is otherwise so similar to the preceding example that we are able to give it the same date. A monkey eating fruit, cast in two halves (Plate XXXV no. 9), is a repetition of the rider of Plate XXXV no. 7 and stylistically certainly belongs to the II millennium. This crouching animal, moreover, goes back to very ancient Steppe models. We may remember the monkey with its young, carved in bone, found by Radloff in a tomb in the Altai (6), which must be dated Han, and which is proof that this motive survived for more than a thousand years with little alteration, unless a weakening in form should be so considered.

The ram-head (Plate XXXV no. 10), is so well modeled that it may be placed at the end of the I millennium in spite of its somewhat summary treatment. The same date seems possible for the doubled human-heads (Plate XXXV no. 11), the features and hair arrangement of which are not in the least Chinese. The motive itself is part of the original inheritance from the Near East. It has already reached the Eurasiatic Steppes in the pre-Scythian period of the Caucasus about 800 B.C. (example in the Historical Museum of Moscow, unpublished). The heaviness of this object suggests that it may have served as a weight, as it appears too heavy to have been designed as a pendant. In any case, had it been so used, it would have had to be suspended upside down.

The bird (Plate XXXV no. 12) which may be a duck, has no parallel although the loop on its back leaves no doubt as to its purpose. Small accessories could be attached to the breast and to each end of the transversal bar which is pierced. The date of this object should also be about 1000.

The probable date for all the flat pendant drops is about the year 1000. The loop on the object of Plate XXXV no. 13 combines its use as a pendant with that of an applique, as is the case with other examples of this type. The large protuberances at the back correspond to those of an applique. The hare seems well observed but with stylized details.

The pendants (Plate XXXV nos. 14 & 15), certainly unrecognisable as such, have adopted without alteration the tiger and the hare of the harness-appliques on Plate XXX no. 4. As for the stags (Plate XXXV nos. 16 & 17), once more to be hung only upside down, the first corresponds artistically with the above