

2. With equal certainty it follows that the Anau horse is ancestrally closely related to the *Equus przewalskii* Poljakoff. The difference is chiefly in the more slender form of the limbs of the Anau horse.

3. With similar certainty it is ascertained that the Anau horse is closely connected with the small horse which appears on the scene in Europe in the late-neolithic and bronze ages and in the La Tène period, and has a wide distribution.

4. As a consequence, it is probable that the Przewalski horse stands, presumably through the Anau horse, in close relationship with that of La Tène, etc.

5. The relationship and similarity, however, of the southern, Italian, French, and Swiss paleolithic and early-neolithic horses to the North German horse are slighter, chiefly because of the greater size and the stouter, heavier build of the latter.

6. Thus the horses of Solutré, etc., notwithstanding their ancestral relationship, stand more distantly removed from *Equus przewalskii* than from the North German diluvial horse, naturally because of their geographical distribution.

7. The horses of the Schlossberg, especially on account of their stouter limbs, do not stand in as close a relationship to the Anau horse as do the La Tène horses.

8. The horse of Anau agrees still less with that of Solutré and Kesslerloch, and though there exists a resemblance this is much slighter than to *Equus przewalskii*.

These, therefore, are the theses on which we will now base our conclusions.

THE TERTIARY HORSES OF EUROPE.

If, following the assertion of the always cautious Tscherski, we look upon *Equus stenonis* Cocchi as the precursor of the diluvial horse of Southern Europe, which agrees on one side with the diluvial horse of Siberia, and on the other side with that of Remagen and Westeregeln (that is, with *Equus caballus fossilis robustus seu germanicus* Nehring); and if we consider the other varieties of diluvial horses: *Equus spelæus*, varieties A and B, and *Equus plicidens* Owen, *Equus piscinensis* Gervais, *Equus quaggoides* F. Major (formerly called *intermedius*), *Equus stenonis affinis* Woldrich and *Equus quaggoides affinis* of the same author,* all of which will perhaps disappear some day, before a more far-seeing and more scientific criticism, based on more abundant and better preserved material, we must assume the existence during Pliocene and Pleistocene times, on the whole Eurasiatic continent of *only one* type of wild horse, which without doubt was differentiated into many local varieties or species, according to hairiness and color, size and shape, which (and I emphasize this) we can not determine with certainty by osteological and paleontological methods. As Major already insists, *Equus stenonis* Cocchi agreed absolutely in type with the horses of the uppermost Miocene of the Sivalik Hills and Narbada Valley of India—*Equus sivalensis* and *namadicus* Falconer and Cautley. It can, therefore, be assumed at once that *Equus przewalskii* Poljakoff stands as the last representative of that Tertiary and Quaternary horse, although Salenski would await more abundant data concerning *Equus przewalskii* before reaching such a conclusion. I hardly believe that, reasoning from osteological data, and this is here the only applicable method, more can ever be said than we have here indicated. Notwithstanding conclusion No. 6, which does not exclude it, I would state that *Equus przewalskii*, in the examples published by Salenski and Noack,

*Woldrich, Beiträge z. Fauna d. Breccien u. a. Diluvialgebilde Oesterreichs, etc. Jahrb. k. k. Geolog. Reichsanstalt, Wien, 1882, Bd. 32, pp. 435-470.