of cattle designated as Tschomru and Tshorwa, who intermarry and whose children choose either the life of nomads or of farmers.

If breeders of cattle or cultivators of the soil lived separated in primeval times, it is certain that there was no opportunity to adopt a nomadic life unless animals who supplied food had already been domesticated. Consequently, the first domestication of cattle must have been made—in my opinion—by a settled agricultural people such as the ancient Anau-li were. Hence, either Mucke's theory does not satisfy the requirements, and a settled agricultural people was able to effect domestication; or if nomads wandering from oasis to oasis, from plateau to plateau, were able to accomplish this, then it is certain that this people came from within the local sphere of culture of Anau. That the sphere of Anau's intercourse widened later and was brought by nomadic tribes into relations with other spheres—perhaps the Indian—is shown, aside from the importation of metals, by the sudden appearance of Canis familiaris matris optimæ, the shepherd-dog of the European bronze period, as well as by that of the camel and the goat—animals which arrived during the æneolithic period of Anau's culture II, between 6000 and 5100 B. C.

Until this time, therefore, the Turkestan-Iranian sphere of culture remained free from foreign influences, and the domestic animals—whether tamed by the settled Anau-li or by nomadic neighbors—were autochthonous products. This is the essential point. For this reason, as far as the theory of the descent of the domesticated animals is concerned, it matters little whether domestication was effected by the settled Anau-li or by their nomadic neighbors. The most important point for us now is the fact already noted, that the climatic and physiographic conditions at Anau facilitated the domestication of the wild animals, which sought refuge on the oases during the dry time before the foundation of the settlement. Another very probable change to aridity took place at the end of culture I, possibly initiating a migration westward of the nomadic cattle-breeders, accompanied perhaps by some cultivators of the soil, who, passing through the Caucasus, brought the domestic animals of Anau to Europe.

What influence the climatic and physiographic conditions exercised upon the fauna of Anau is made very clear by the following combination of the relations of the approximate ratio of distribution, mentioned before on pages 341, 342.

Culture Ia, the lowest 8 feet of culture-strata, extending down to 7800 B.C., contains: Cattle, 27 per cent; sheep, 22 per cent; horse, 20 per cent; gazelle, 20 per cent; wolf, 11 per cent. The bovines keep the principal place, and by the same percentage of occurrence of the horse and gazelle the opinion can be intimated that the horse here occurs in a wild state like the antelope.

The following period, the æneolithic culture, from 7800 to 6000 B. C., shows us a very changed relation: Horse, 28 per cent; cattle, 25 per cent; sheep, 25 per cent; pig, 12 per cent; gazelle, 7 per cent; fox, 2 per cent; deer, 1 per cent. The horse forms now the most important stock, and this would seem to indicate that the people had become in part nomads, as I mentioned in my hypothesis in opposition to Mucke's.