If we compare these heights of the withers with those of some known subfossil and fossil horses, we obtain the following picture:

	cm.
Diluvial horse:	
Westeregeln, after Nehring	155
Remagen, after Nehring	151
Siberia, Yana River, after Tscherski	146
Solutré, after Gaillard*	125
Subfossil horse:	
Ligerz (bronze age)	149
Schlossberg (iron age)	146
Petersinsel (bronze age)	142
La Tène (iron age)	141
Auvernier (bronze age)	138
Anau (neolithic age)	137
Zielkanal (bronze-iron age)	136
Schlossberg	118

The horse of Anau belongs, therefore, to the smallest of the prehistoric domestic horses and also, as we have already seen, to the most narrow-footed. It shows in this respect a most remarkable agreement with the so-called Helveto-Gallic horses, or the iron-age horses of Europe.

We can now summarize the characteristics of the Anau horse in the following terms: While its dental system shows certain characters, leaning closely to those of the fossil Siberian horse—characters which according to certain authors belong only to the group of Occidental horses—it shows, on the other hand, characters which belong to the purely Oriental horse group. In the characteristics of the extremities, also, in common with a small percentage of the fossil Siberian horses, it ranges itself wholly on the side of the group distinguished as Oriental horses.

We can, therefore, consider the Anau domestic horse as an altogether Oriental horse resembling the Siberian equine only in the structure of the teeth. The Anau horse is, therefore, the oldest domestic Oriental horse. I designate it, in distinction from other forms of subfossil horses, by the race or subspecies name *Equus caballus pumpellii* mihi. It is, however, difficult to say to what extent this subfossil horse resembles the equine from Maragha which Wilckens† from the data of a few incisors and molars, has named "*Equus fossilis persicus.*" The material at Wilckens's disposition does not suffice for a careful comparison. Further, such careful manifold enamel plications as recur in *Equus fossilis persicus* are not observable on the 60 or more molars examined by me in *Equus caballus pumpellii.*

As has already been stated by Tscherski (p. 356), the study of a large number of teeth of similar Siberian horses shows a wide range of variation in respect to enamel plications, the extremest types seeming to stand so far apart that, if one were to use only the enamel plications as a basis, two or three different species might be established.

Is it not possible that Wilckens has given too little value to the variation in *Hipparion,* which is chiefly represented in his material? I can, therefore, regard the existence of *Equus fossilis persicus* Wilckens only as very problematical! As

* Written communication.
† *Op. cit.*, p. 280.