

THE K'UAI-T'I 駃騠, THE TAO-YU 騊駼,
AND THE TAN-HSI 騊駼, THE STRANGE
DOMESTIC ANIMALS OF THE
HSIUNG-NU 匈奴

By

NAMIO EGAMI.

(I)

As to the kinds of the domestic animals in the possession of the Hsiung-nu 匈奴, there is found a passage in *Hsiung-nu-chuan* 匈奴傳 of the *Shih-chi* 史記, which reads as follows⁽¹⁾: The commonest animals in the land are the horse, cattle, and sheep, while the more un-common are *t'o-sbib* 橐駝; *lü-lo* 騶騾, *k'uai-t'i* 駃騠, *t'ao-yü* 騊駼; *tan-hsi* 騊駼.) It is quite unnecessary to discuss what *ma* 馬 (horse), *niu* 牛 (cattle), *yang* 羊 (sheep), and *lu* 驢 (asses) actually represent. That *t'o-sbib* 橐駝 refers to the camel 駱駝, and *lo* 騾 to the mule 騾 is also fairly plain. It is regrettable, however, that the accurate facts concerning *k'uai-t'i* 駃騠, *t'ao-yü* 騊駼, *tan-hsi* 騊駼 have not yet been investigated. Their reputation as beasts of the Hsiung-nu 匈奴 during the Han dynasty may be proved by the following references *Li-kêng-pien* 力耕篇 in the *Yen-t'ieh-lun* 鹽鐵論 (Bk. 1) by HUAN K'uan 桓寬, in discussing the profits of authorized trading with the Hsiung-nu, says: One *tuan*-18 feet of Chinese silk secures in return such a large quantity of most valuable commodities of the Hsiung-nu that they suffer from the effect. For example *lo-lü* 騶驢, *t'o-sbib* 橐駝 in procession enter the Great Wall, and *Tan-hsi* 騊駼, *yüan-ma* 騶馬

(1) 其畜之所多則馬牛羊其奇畜則橐駝騶騾駃騠騊駼騶駼

become domestic animals of our land⁽¹⁾. *Wei-tung-pien* 未通篇, *ibid.*, (Bk. 3), in discussing the results of the campaign by the Emperor Wu-ti 武帝, says: The official in charge says that the Emperor Hsiao-wu 孝武 expelled the *Ch'iang-hu* 羌胡 (Ch'iang tribes and the Hsiung-nu) and founded the Imperial preserves. Therefore, the inner palaces were filled with curiosities, and the outer stables were crowded with *t'ao-yü* 駒駘 and *k'uai-t'i* 駃騠⁽²⁾. In these passages, the terms *tan-bsi* 驪駘, *t'ao-yü* 駒駘, and *k'uai-t'i* 駃騠 are all found. Now, as to the term *t'ao-yü* 駒駘, *Chu-shu-hsün* 主術訓 in the *Huai-nan-tzu* 淮南子 (Bk. 9) contains the following simile: I Yin 伊尹, though a shrewd minister of state, can neither drive the *yüan-ma* 驪馬 nor control the *t'ao-yü* 駒駘 like the Hsiung-nu⁽³⁾. Here is suggested that controlling the *t'ao-yü* 駒駘 was regarded as the special talent of the Hsiung-nu people. As to the *k'uai-t'i* 駃騠, *Chi-su-hsün* 齊俗訓, *ibid.*, (Bk. 11), has the following passage: (六騏驎) To harness a team of six *chi-chi* 騏驎 and a team of four *k'uai-t'i* 駃騠. In the Notes by *Kao Yu* 高誘, it is explained by the passage: The *k'uai-t'i* 駃騠 is an excellent horse of northern nomads. (駃騠北翟之良馬也) A passage in the *Lun-tu-fu* 論都賦 by Tu Tu 杜篤 of the Latter Han dynasty reads: Driving deep into the land of the Hsiung-nu 匈奴, they destroyed the royal court. They drove mules and asses, managed Ferghana horses and whipped *k'uai-t'i* 匈奴. Land was occupied for ten thousand Chinese miles. Their power was felt all over the world⁽⁴⁾. Again the *T'ien-tsu-yu-lieh-fu* 天子游獵賦 by Ssu-ma Hsiang-ju 司馬相如 contains verses describing in the most romantic fashion the animals from the north and south inhabiting the northern and southern parts of the Imperial preserves of Shang-line 上林: (If you went south, it would be in midwinter when everything is in full growth, with water splashed and disturbed into waves. The animals there are *yung-mao* 橐駝, *mo*

(1) 夫中國一端之纒得匈奴累金之物而捐損敵之用是以羸驢駝駘銜尾入塞驪駘馬盡爲我畜。

(2) 御史曰孝武皇帝(中略)却羌胡以爲苑囿是以珍怪充於後宮駒駘駃騠實於外廄。

(3) 伊尹賢相也而不能與胡人騎驪馬而服駒駘。

(4) 深入匈奴割裂王庭(中略)羸驢駝駘宛馬鞭駃騠拓地萬里威震八荒。

貊 yak 犛, water buffalos 沈牛, *chu-mi* 麀, *ch'ih-shou* 赤首 (red-heads), *nuan-ti* 圖題 (round-heads) *ch'iung-ch'i* 窮奇, elephants and rhinoceroses 象犀. If you went north, it would be in midsummer when the ground is frozen and cracked. Ice raises the river. The animals there are *ch'i-lin* 麒麟, *chias-chuan* 角犛 (kind of ox), *t'ao-yu* 駒駝 camels 橐駝, *ch'iung* 蚩蚩, *tan-hsi* 驪騮, *k'uai-t'í* 騊駼, asses and mules 驢騾⁽¹⁾. Here again *t'ao-yü* 駒駝, *tan-hsi* 驪騮, *k'uai-t'í* 騊駼, along with *to-shih* 橐駝, *lü* 驢 and *lo* 羸, are enumerated as animals of the north; this account seems to coincide with that previously cited from *Hsiung-nu-chuan* 匈奴傳 in the *Shih-chi* 史記. In short, it is obvious that *k'uai-t'í* 騊駼, *t'ao-yü* 駒駝, and *tan-hsi* 驪騮 were well-known in the Han dynasty as the strange domestic beasts coming from the northern nomads.

Now, it would seem that no one has yet attempted to definitely identify these so-called strange beasts of the Hsiung-nu. Even those scholars, both Japanese and foreign, who elucidated or translated the above cited *Hsiung-nu-chuan* 匈奴傳 in the *Shih-chi* 史記 (or in the *Chien-han-shu* 前漢書), and the *Yen-t'ieh-lun* 鹽鐵論 have all touched this question very lightly. No one has yet attempted to identify these animals⁽²⁾. All that has been done is that attention has been called to the queer terms *k'uai-t'í* 騊駼, *t'ao-yü* 駒駝, and *tan-hsi* 驪騮: and, as part of the problem of the Hsiung-nu language, I tentative transliteration of these

(1) 其南則隆冬生長縮水躍波獸則犛羴橐駝沈牛麀犛赤首圖題窮奇象犀其北則盛夏合凍地涉水揭河獸則麒麟角犛駒駝橐駝蚩蚩驪騮騊駼驢騾

(2) Монаха Іакно, in his translation of *Hsiung-nu-chuan* 匈奴傳 in the *Ch'ien han-shu* 前漢書, gives for 橐駝 驢羸 驪騮 駒駝 驪騮 camels, asses, mules and horses of a better genera

) De Groot gives "橐駝 tók-tó, Sack-kamele, Esel und Maulesel, 騊駼 k'ut-t'í, 駒駝 to-tu und 驪騮 to-h'í," translating the terms almost transliterally, and says in his notes "Aus der Zusammensetzung der sechs letzten Schriftzeichen ist ersichtlich, dass hier von drei pferd-order eselartigen Tieren die Rede ist. Diese näher zu deuten, ist unmöglich, weil hier Kommentare und Glossare versagen Die drei Benennungen sind höchst wahrscheinlich nicht chinesisches." (Die Hannen der vorchristlichen Zeit, Berlin und Leipzig 1921, ss. 2, 3) E. M. Gale, in translating the *Yen-t'ieh-lun* 鹽鐵論, gives for 驪騮 羴 羴 爲我畜 "horses, dapples and bays and prancing mounts, come into our possession," and for 駒駝 騊駼 實於外廄 "fleet-footed palfreys and chargers pack the Outer Stables." In short, no western scholar seems to have made concrete interpretation as to the identity of 駒駝, 騊駼, and 驪騮.

terms in the Mongolian or Manchu language have been attempted⁽¹⁾. However, in order to investigate the nomenclatures of the strange domestic animals of the Hsiung-nu, is it not imperative as their premises to study their actual forms and natures? Hence the present brief paper.

II

(a) *K'uai-t'i* 𩇑𩇑

The term *k'uai-t'i* 𩇑𩇑 is found in the *Shih-chi* 史記, under *Li-ssa-chuan* 李斯傳 *Tsou-yang-chuan* 鄒陽傳, *Ssu-ma-bsiang-ju-chuan* 司馬相如傳 and *Hsiung-nu-chuan* 匈奴傳: in the *Huai-nan-tzu* 淮南子, under *Chi-su-bsün* 齊俗訓: and in the *Shuo-wên-chieh-tzu* 說文解字 by Hsü Shên 許慎, under the section for *Ma* 馬 (Bk. 10). As to its identity, there seem to have been two views.

One view is that the *k'uai-t'i* 𩇑𩇑 was a swift horse. In the above-cited Notes by KAO Yu 高誘 of the Latter Han dynasty, on *Chi-su-bsün* 齊俗訓 in the *Huai-nan-tzu* 淮南子, there is a passage that the *K'uai-t'i* is a splendid horse of the northern nomads⁽²⁾. A note by Hsü-kuang 徐廣 of the Chin dynasty 晉 quoted in the *Pei-yin-chi-chieh* 裴駰集解 on *Hsiung-nu-chuan* in the *Shih-chi* gives it as (a swift horse of the northern nomads⁽³⁾). A note on *k'uai-t'i* 𩇑𩇑 in *Tsou-yang-chuan* 鄒陽傳 in the *Shih-chi* given in the *Han-shu-yin-i* 漢書音義 by Wei-hao 韋昭 of the Wu dynasty 吳, quoted by PEI Yin 裴郭, reads the *K'uai-t'i* is a superior horse, which on the seventh day of its birth jumps over its mother⁽⁴⁾. The note by KUO-p'o 郭璞 of the Chin dynasty 晉 on the *Tien-tzu-yu-lieh-fu* 天子遊獵賦 says the *k'uai-t'i*, on the third day of its birth, jumps over its mother⁽⁵⁾. The statement to

(1) Dr. Michisaburo MIYAZAKI 宮崎道三郎: *Futatabi Fuku-toku* 服匿(保止支 Hotogi) no koto wo ronjite Kyôdo-go to Môko-go no Hikaku-dan ni oyobu 再び服匿(保止支)の事を論じて匈奴語と蒙古語の比較談に及ぶ (A Comparison of the Hsiung-nu Language with the Mongolian, after discussing again the problem of Fukutoku 服匿(保止支 Hotogi) Shigaku-zasshi, Vol. XVIII, No. 7, pp. 10-11. Dr. Kurakichi SHIRATORI 白鳥庫吉: *seiiki-shijono Shin-kenkyu* 西域史上の新研究 (A New Study on the History of the Western Regions from China 西域), Part 4, Tôyô-gakuhô Vol. III, p. 188.

(2) 𩇑𩇑北羆之良馬也。

(3) 北狄駿馬。

(4) 𩇑𩇑駿馬也生七日而超其母。

(5) 𩇑𩇑生三日而超其母。

the effect that it jumps over its mother on the third or seventh day of its birth is evidently an example of hyperbolic emphasizing that it is a superior horse full of mettle. All these references favour the view that the *K'uai-t'i* 騊駼 was a superior horse.

The other is the view that the *K'uai-t'i* was an offspring of a horse and mule. Under the section for Ma 馬 in the *Shuo-wên-chieh-tzu* 說文解字 by Hsū Shên 許慎 of the Latter Han dynasty one finds the following passage: The *K'uai-t'i* is an offspring of a mule with a horse as its father⁽¹⁾. The *Tzu-lin* 字林 by Lü Shên 呂忱 of the Chin 晉 dynasty cited in the *So-yin* 索隱 by Ssü-ma-chên 司馬貞, on *Tsow-yang-chuan* 鄒陽傳 in the *Shih-chi* 史記, explains the term as it is an offspring of a mule with a horse as its father—a good horse of the northern nomads. It may be seen that the view held by Lü Shên 呂忱 is only a compromise of both views. Which, then, is the more adequate of those two views? The latter could by no means be adequate, because it is well-known that a union of two mules, or that of a mule and a horse or an ass, will bring forth absolutely no offspring⁽²⁾. There exists no such thing as an offspring of *lo* 羸 (mule). The character *tsu* 子 in the passage 馬又羸子 found in the *Shuo-wên* 說文 may be taken as a redundant character, and the passage may be read as 馬父羸 (The mule with a horse as its father), or it may be emendable to the effect 馬父驢母羸也 (It is the mule with a horse as its father and an ass as its mother) as suggested in the *Shuo-wên-chieh-tzu-chu* 說文解字注 by TUAN Yü-ts'ai 段玉裁. Should this view be adopted, the *k'uai-t'i* 騊駼 would be *lo* 羸, an animal obtained by a union of a horse and a female ass, namely hinny. Now the hinny is as a rule smaller in size, weaker-legged, and less imposing in appearance than the common mule 騾 (羸)—an offspring of a mare and a male ass⁽³⁾. Therefore, should the *k'uai-t'i* 騊駼 be the

(1) 馬父羸子北狄之良馬也。

(2) The Encyclopaedia Britannica, 14th ed., 1929, Vol. XV, p. 948.

(3) *Ibid.*, p. 948. In China the hinny is at present called *lü-lo* 驢騾 or *k'uai-t'i* 騊駼, and is generally known to be inferior to the mule—so-called *ma-lo* 馬騾 (horse-mule). See Dr. Shinshichiro YOSHIDA 吉田新七郎: A Study of Domestic Animals in China 支那に於ける家畜の研究. Vol. 1, A Study of Horses Bred in China 支那産馬族の研究 p. 211; Kôkan Nakano 中野江漢: Chinese Horses 支那の馬 [Things Chinese, 支那風物叢書 Series VII], pp. 155-160.

hinny, it would not be a superior horse and would conflict with the former view.

On the other hand, there are a few references which incidentally prove the adequacy of the former view that the *k'uai-t'i* was a superior horse. The remnant of a passage from Shih-tzū 尸子⁽¹⁾ reads: even if a team of six *k'uai-t'i* 馱題 were harnessed to the wên-hsien 文軒 (carriage), but the wheel pin of four-tsun length on the axle-head were missing, then the carriage would fail to roll. With small part missing, no great affair is complete⁽²⁾. The *k'uai-t'i* 馱題 here must be identical with the *k'uai-t'i* 馱騾 and the reference suggests the animal as the domestic beast for cartage. The letter to the Throne from Li Ssü 李斯 of the Ch'in 秦 dynasty⁽³⁾, on the prohibition of the use of luxurious articles imported from foreign countries other than Ch'in 秦 state, says as follows: only the products of Ch'in 秦 state are permitted. No glass *Pei* 璧 shall adorn the Court, no wares made of rhinoceros horn and elephant tusk shall be admired as curios: no maids of Chêng 鄭 and Wei 衛 shall occupy the inner palaces; no *k'uai-t'i* 馱騾 the superior horse fill the outer stables⁽⁴⁾. This is a well-known passage, in which the *k'uai-t'i* 馱騾 is regarded as a superior horse. *Chi-su-bsün* 齊俗訓 in the *Huainan-tzu* 淮南子 says: therefore, even though a team of six *ch'i-chi* 騏驎 or four *k'uai-t'i* 馱騾 were harnessed to a carriage for the purpose of crossing the Yangtzu River or the Yellow River, it would not prove more convenient than a hollowed tree (canoe), because everything has its own place⁽⁵⁾. According to this, the *k'uai-t'i* was no doubt a superior carriage horse along with *ch'i-chi* 騏驎. Then it may be inferred that, as early as the Chan-kuo 戰國, Ch'in 秦 and Han 漢 periods, the *k'uai-t'i* was well-known as a splendid carriage-horse. This would support the first view that the *k'uai-t'i* 馱騾 was a superior horse. If so the *k'uai-t'i* would

(1) Quoted in I-wên-lei-chü 藝文類聚 (Bk. 71), Section of Chou 舟 and Ch'è 車 and Ta-p'ing-yü-lan 太平御覽 (Bk. 773), Section of Ch'è 車.

(2) 文軒六馱題無四寸之鑿則車不行小亡則大者不成也。

(3) *Shih-chi* 史記 (Bk. 87), *Li-ssu-chuan* 李斯傳。

(4) 秦國之所生然後可則是夜光之璧不飾朝廷犀象之器不為玩好鄭衛之女不充後宮而駘良馱騾不賞外庭。

(5) 故六騏驎駘騾以濟江河不若窳木便者處勢然也。

not have been the hinny. The second view would be quite impossible.

Should the *k'uai-t'i* 缺驥 be accepted as a superior carriage-horse, the next step would be to investigate the genus and lineage of the animal. The following would be most important points of the study.

(1) Seeing that the *k'uai-t'i* 缺驥 was, above everything, the fleet horse of the northern nomads and the strange beast of the Hsiung-nu 匈奴, it would follow that it was not the common horse of the Hsiung-nu,—namely the so-called Mongolian horse bred from remote antiquity in Mongolia and its surrounding regions all over East Asia, that is, *Equus Przewalskii* domesticated. This may be seen rather definitely from the next item.

(2) It is suggested that the *k'uai-t'i* 缺驥 was rather a comparatively heavy variety as a carriage-horse, while the Mongolian horse was decidedly a light variety, originally being a riding horse. The fact that the *k'uai-t'i* jumped over its mother on the third or seventh day of its birth shows its marked mettle as well as the unusual leaping power of its legs (especially that of its hind legs), while the lack of leaping power and cowardice of the Mongolian horse are well-known⁽¹⁾.

(3) It is certain that the *k'uai-t'i* existed in North Asia, especially in Mongolia, as a fleet horse of the northern nomads or the strange beast of the Hsiung-nu, but the report that it was a strange beast distinct from the common horse of the Hsiung-nu 匈奴 makes us doubt whether it was a native one. It may be suspected that the Chinese who put an account of the *k'uai-t'i* 缺驥 on record probably did not know its correct lineage; but, merely from the fact that the *k'uai-t'i* was sometimes kept among the Hsiung-nu, put it as the strange beast of the Hsiung-nu and as the fleet horse of the northern nomads.

Did there actually exist a genus of horse in ancient Asia which might at once satisfy these three basic points of investigation concerning the identity of the *k'uai-t'i* 缺驥? The first genus which would suggest itself would be the Aryan horse,

(1) Dr. YOSHIDA 吉田博士: *op. cit.*, p. 73.

so-called *Ta-Wan-ma* 大宛馬, *Erh-shih-ma* 貳師馬 in China of the Han dynasty, as that is the Nesaian (Nisaeen) horse, or the Median horse⁽¹⁾ frequently recorded in Greek and Latin classics. The Aryan horse, as is well-known was bred extensively in the west, especially in Ferghana, Bactria, Parthia, Media, Persia, Armenia—the regions adjoining the Aral and Caspian Seas, and it was especially noted for being fleet-footed. Besides, the shape of the body may be realistically visualized from the figures represented on the gold relic discovered from Oxus and dated about the 4th century B. C., a Persian coin dated the same Period, and the Bactrian coin dated the 2nd century B. C. (Fig. 1)⁽²⁾. It is plain that compared with the Mongolian horse, it was one with more mettle and nimbler limbs, with greater leaping-power, and very probably one larger-sized. That the Aryan was a carriage-horse may be seen from the gold carriage found at Oxus, and from the carriage represented on the coins of a Persian territory under the Achaemenid dynasty. (Fig. 2)⁽³⁾. The range

(1) C. A. PIÉTREMENT: *Les chevaux dans les temps préhistoriques et historiques*, Paris, 1883, Chapitre IV. Histoire de la race chevaline aryenne chez les peuples aryens de l'Orient; Chapitre V. Histoire de la race chevaline mongolique chez les peuples mongoliques de l'Orient. T. de Lacouperie: *Western Origin of the Early Chinese Civilization*, 1894, pp. 220-224. V. Hehn: *Kulturpflanzen und Haustiere in ihrem Ubergang aus Asien nach Griechenland und Italien sowie in das übrige Europa*, Berlin, 1894, SS. 32-34. F. Hirth: *The Story of Chang K'ên, China's Pioneer in Western Asia* (Journal of the American Oriental Society, XXXVII, 1917) pp. 141, 142. Dr. Shizatori: 大宛國考 (A Study of *Ta-yüan-kuo* 大宛國) *Tôyô-gakuhô*, Vol. VI, No. 1, pp. 54-55. Mr. Yoshihiko Izushi 出石誠彦: 天馬考 (A Study of the *T'ien-ma* 天馬 (Heaven-Horse)), *Tôyô-gakuhô*, Vol. XVIII, No. 3. P. Yelts: *The Horse, A Factor in Early Chinese History* (Eurasia Septentrionalis Antiqua IX) pp. 243-250. The Aryan horse is often called *seiho-ba* 西方馬 (the western horse) in Japan. In that case, there is danger of its being confused with the so-called Occidental horse by the westerners—or what Frank calls *Equus robustus*. Now the Oriental horse as the Westerners call it includes both the Mongolian horse and the Aryan horse. For this reason, I have here adopted the term "Aryan horse," according to Piétrement's classification (C. A. Piétrement: *op. cit.*, pp. 316-318), not because I have thoroughly accepted his views, but because I think it the most proper term for the name of the horse originally bred in Ferghana, Bactria, and Persia, that is in Russian Turkestan or Iran, commonly acknowledged as the home of the Aryan.

(2) Quoted from C. M. Dalton: *The Treasure of the Oxus with other Examples of Early Oriental Metal-Work*, London, 1926. Pl. XIII, 46. from C. Seltman: *Greek Coins, A History of Metallic Currency and Coinage down to the Fall of the Hellenistic Kingdoms*, London, 1933, Pl. LV 5. and from B. V. Head: *The International Numismata Orientalia, The Coinage of Lydia and Persia*, London, 1877, Pl. III 14, 15.

(3) Quoted from O. M. Dalton: *op. cit.*, Pl. IV 7. and from B. V. Head: *op. cit.*, Pl. III 1, 5.

in which the Aryan horse was bred was so vast that it naturally comprised pasture zones. However the principal provinces such as Bactria, Parthia, and Persia were agricultural regions in which developed towns where chariots were greatly favoured from ancient times, as is seen from various relics, as well as Greek and Roman records⁽¹⁾. It is easy to suppose that in these provinces the Aryan horse had especially developed as a carriage-horse.

It would be evident that the Aryan horse alleged as one with considerable mettle, and nimble limbs with great leaping-power, comparatively large-sized, and valued as a carriage-horse would be definitely identified as the *k'uai-t'i* 馱驥. Now the next question is whether or not the Aryan horse principally bred in the vast pastures on the shores of the Aral and Caspian Seas had an opportunity to be transported to the homeland of the Hsiung-nu in the east. This question would be readily settled if we take into consideration the importation of the nephrite or the so-called Kun-lun jade (崑崙之玉 昆山之玉) into China during the three-Dynasty period 三代, and that of the glass-wares known as *Yeh-kuang-chih-pei* 夜光之璧 from the Roman Orient into China and Japan during the Chan-kuo 戰國 and Han 漢 period, as Dr. Harada 原田 pointed out some years ago⁽²⁾. If so, it would not be unreasonable to assume that the *k'uai-t'i* 馱驥 which is mentioned side by side with the *Yeh-Kuang-pei* 夜光璧 (a kind of glass-wares) in the above mentioned report to the Throne by Li Ssü 李斯 and also in the *Yu-chung-shu* 獄中書 by Tsou-yang 鄒陽 which will be referred to later on, was really the Aryan horse transported east from Ferghana and Bactria, and in those days was raised in the homeland of the Hsiung-nu and North China.

So the theory that the so-called *k'uai-t'i* 馱驥 of the Chan-kuo period and the Han dynasty was the Aryan horse transported to the east may be safely established.

(1) See O. Schrader: Prehistoric Antiquities of the Aryan Peoples, London, 1890, pp. 262-263. I. Taylor: The Origin of the Aryans, An Account of the Prehistoric Ethnology and Civilization of Europe, London, 1892, pp. 160, 161.

(2) See Dr. Yoshito HARADA 原田淑人: 夜光の璧について (On the Night-Glowing Pei 璧), *Kôkogaku-zasshi*, Vol. XXVI, No. 7.

The only open question now would be why the *k'uai-t'i* originally a native of West Asia, was recorded by the Chinese as the strange beast of the Hsiung-nu 匈奴, or the superior horse of the northern nomads—namely, a product of North Asia. Might this not, however, merely serve to show the various stages of the introduction of the *k'uai-t'i* into China? In other words, in the Chan-kuo period—that is, before the Emperor Wu-ti 武帝 of the former Han dynasty obtained the Wu-sun horse (烏孫馬) and the Ferghana horse (大宛馬), the Aryan horse was introduced into China not directly from the west, but from the north through the interchange of the Hsiung-nu. This being the case, the Chinese of those days did not know the original home of the *k'uai-t'i*, namely the Aryan horse, and probably assumed it to be the strange beast of the Hsiung-nu and the superior horse of the northern nomads. And this interpretation alone would account for the fact that the pasture of the *k'uai-t'i* in China during the Chan-kuo period, according to various records, were in Yen 燕 and Ch'in 秦, both provinces in the northern frontier adjoining the Hsiung-nu. The existence of the *k'uai-t'i* in Yen 燕 is found in the *Yü-chung-shu* by Tsou Yang⁽¹⁾ in the following passage: Su-ch'in 蘇秦 was a minister of state in Yen 燕. The people of Yen falsely accused him to the Throne. The king grasped his sword, and was so angry that he gave him *k'uai-t'i* meat to eat. Pai Kuei 白圭 became prominent in Chung-shan 中山. The people of Chung-shan falsely accused him to Prince Wên 文 of the Wei state. Prince Wên 文 threw some *Yeh-Kuang-pei* (glass-wares) for him to keep⁽²⁾. Keeping of the *k'uai-t'i* at the palace of the Ch'in dynasty is clearly referred to in the above-cited report to the Throne by Li Ssü 李斯. Under the chapter of Hsiang-wang 襄王, in *Han-ts'ê* 韓策 of the Chan-kuo-ts'ê 戰國策, Chang-i 張儀 is reported to have said to the King Hsiang-wang 襄王 of Han 韓 on the military greatness of Ch'in 秦 in the following words: The superiority of the horses and the troops of Ch'in 秦 is considerable.

(1) *Shih-chi* 史記 (Bk. 83), *Tsou-yang-chuan* 鄒陽傳.

(2) 蘇秦相燕燕人惡之於王王按劍而怒食以駃騠白圭顯於中山中山人惡之魏文侯文侯投之以夜光璧。

They explore forward and jump backward. Those which can leap over three fathoms between hoof and hoof are more than one can count⁽¹⁾. The superior horses of Ch'in here mentioned which can leap, making three fathoms between hoof and hoof may be understood to refer to the *k'uai-t'í* of the land. It is natural to suppose that, because the *k'uai-t'í* was introduced direct from the Hsiung-nu, it was especially raised in the areas adjoining the land of the Hsiung-nu during the Chan-kuo period. In short, it may be now clear that the *k'uai-t'í*, originally the Aryan horse was introduced through the Hsiung-nu into the northern frontier of China as early as in the Chan-kuo period. And, before the King Lao-shang 老上單于 of the Hsiung-nu drove the Yüe-shih 月氏 westward and came into direct contact with the Western Regions 西域, the Aryan horse must have been imported to the Hsiung-nu, not direct from its native land, but indirect through the western neighbours of the Hsiung-nu such as the Yüe-shih and the Wu-sun 烏孫. The existence of the superior horse in the land of the Yüe-shih 月氏 and its introduction into the Hsiung-nu may be seen from the following account in *Hsiung-nu-chuan* 匈奴傳 of the *Shih-chi* 史記; (The King Tow-man 頭曼 had a crown prince named Mao-tun 冒頓. Later the queen whom he loved had a little boy. So the king wished to replace Mao-tun 冒頓 with the little boy. Thereupon, the king caused Mao-tun 冒頓 to be taken as hostage by the Yüe-shih 月氏. Now that Mao-tun 冒頓 was a hostage of the Yüe-shih, Tow-man 頭曼 all of a sudden assaulted the Yüe-shih 月氏, who intended to slay the hostage. Mao-tun 冒頓, however, stealing and riding a superior horse, came away. Tow-man 頭曼 admiring his bravery, appointed him Commander of ten thousand soldiers⁽²⁾. The same *Hsiung-nu-chuan* 匈奴傳 contains the following passage; At this time the Tung-hu 東胡 (Eastern nomads) were powerful and mighty. Hearing that Mao-tun 冒頓 had killed his father and made himself king, they sent a messenger to Mao-tun

(1) 秦馬之良，戎兵之衆，探前越後，歸間三尋，勝者不可勝數也。

(2) 頭曼單于有太子，名冒頓，後有所愛閼氏，生少子，而單于欲廢冒頓而立少子，乃使冒頓質於月氏，冒頓既質於月氏，而頭曼急擊月氏，月氏欲殺冒頓，冒頓盜其善馬，騎之亡歸，頭曼以為將萬騎。

冒頓 and demanded the *Ch'ien-li-ma* 千里馬 (The horse capable of running a thousand Chinese miles a day). Mao-tun 冒頓 consulted his retainers. They all answered "The *Ch'ien-li-ma* 千里馬 is a treasure of the Hsiung-nu. Don't give it away." Mao-tun 冒頓 said, "Why should two neighbours love one horse?" and gave away the thousand-mile-horse⁽¹⁾. It is probable that the thousand-mile-horse was not a common Hsiung-nu horse, but a *k'uai-t'i* 騊駼, namely the Aryan horse, the superior horse imported from the west.

Now if the view that the *k'uai-t'i* 騊駼 was the Aryan horse imported by the Hsiung-nu through the Yüe-shih 月氏 and Wu-sun 烏孫 and was brought and raised in some part of China even in the Chan-kuo 戰國 period should be reasonable the accepted view that the origin of the keeping of the Aryan horse in China dated from the transportation of the *Hsi-chi-ma* 西極馬 (Far-west-horse) of Wu-sun 烏孫 and the *Han-hsieh-ma* 汗血馬 (sweat-blood-horse) of Ferghana (Ta-wan 大宛) direct from the west could hardly be adequate.

The last question on the subject concerns the term *k'uai-t'i* 騊駼 itself. Wang Nien-sun 王念孫 of the Ch'ing 清 dynasty says in his *Kuang-va-su-cheng* 廣雅疏證 (Bk. 10, Latter Part) The word *k'uai* 騊 means 越, *t'i* 駼 means 踉; the phrase implies fast running. The Shih-ku 釋詁 says that 騊 means 疾 (fast). The *shih-kung* 釋宮 says that 騊 means 奔 (running). The Shuo-wên 說文 says that 騊 is a word describing the manner of running of a horse. 越 is equivalent to 踉. *Hsiu-wu-bsün* 修務訓 in the *Huai-nan-tzu* 淮南子 commented by KAO Yu 高誘 says that *t'i* 踉 means fast running⁽²⁾. Though the term *k'uai-t'i* 騊駼 is there interpreted as a Chinese phrase meaning fast running, it is evidently a transliteration of a foreign word. Dr. MIYAZAKI 宮崎 some time ago determined *k'uai-t'i* 騊駼 as a transliteration of *kuti* in the Mongolian phrase *kuti lagusa* and *kutitu* of the Manchu phrase

(1) 是時東胡彌盛聞冒頓殺父自立乃使使謂冒頓欲得頭曼時有千里馬冒頓問羣臣羣臣皆曰千里馬匈奴寶馬也勿與冒頓曰奈何與人鄰國而愛一馬乎遂與之千里馬

(2) 騊之音越駼之音踉疾走之名也釋詁云騊疾也釋宮云騊奔也說文駼馬行貌越踉也高誘注淮南子修務訓云越踉走也

kutitu lorin⁽¹⁾. Since the Mongolian *lagusa* and the Manchu *lorin* both refer to the mule 騾 (騾)⁽²⁾, and the view of taking of the k'uai-t'i as the offspring of a mule, which is taken by the Shuo-wên 說文 is evidently false as proved in the foregoing, Dr. Miyazaki's interpretation can hardly be accepted. The k'uai-t'i must necessarily be explained as the name of a genus of horse.

To begin with, the names of horses seem to be divided into two kinds:—one includes the Arabian horse, the Cossack horse, the Tai 代 horse, and Mongolian horse etc.,—that is, the attributives being the names of their homelands, the localities of their horse fairs, or the people who breed them, while the other includes the white horse, the red-maned horse 朱鬃馬, the Ch'ien-li-ma 千里馬 (thousand-mile-horse), the han-hsieh-ma 汗血馬 (sweat-blood-horse) etc.—that is, the attributives being given on the basis of their physical constitutions or characteristics. In other words, the former are in accordance with the principle of naming objects from their external conditions, while the latter that of naming them on the basis of their internal conditions. And the category to which the name k'uai-t'i belongs can hardly be the former, because the name of horses given from the provinces or cities which originally produced them, or the names of the people who bred them, in the days—between the 4th and 1st centuries B. C.—when the Aryan horse was transported to the east under the name k'uai-t'i, are rather accurately known according to eastern and western records; but there is found no one which corresponds to the k'uai-t'i⁽³⁾. On the other hand, the Aryan horse was famous in the west as the horse of Meida or the horse of Nesaia, and on its introduction into China direct from the west after the Emperor Wu-ti 武帝 of the former Han dynasty, it was called Ta-wan-ma 大宛馬 or Erh-shih-ma 貳師馬 etc., as is commonly known. These names seem to represent the provinces in which the horse was originally produced or the principal cities regarded as the sites of the horse fairs from which the horse came. Thus

(1) Dr. MIYAZAKI; *op. cit.*, p. 10.

(2) Dr. TÔRU HANEDA 羽田亨博士: 滿和辭典 *The Manchu-Japanese Dictionary*, p. 294.

(3) See HERODOTUS; Bk. VII, Chap. 40. STRABON; Bk. XI, Chap. 13, 14. PLINIUS; Bk. VI, 29. ARRIAN; Bk. III, IV. C. A. PIÉTREMENT; *op. cit.*, Dr. SHIRATORI 白鳥庫吉博士; *op. cit.*

the names of the Aryan horse given from external conditions are rather well-known according to eastern and western records. As there is found no one which corresponds to k'uai-t'í, is it not one given from internal condition? The physical and functional characteristics of the Aryan horse, were, as previously discussed, (1) its mettle and capacity of leaping; and (2) its superiority as a carriage-horse; but here comes up as a third characteristic its *han-hsieh* 汗血 (sweating and bleeding) habit. It is true, there is no record to the effect that the k'uai-t'í had this physical habit of sweating and bleeding. In view of the fact, however, that the genus known as the *han-hsieh* 汗血 horse in later times was the Aryan horse, is it not possible to infer backward that the k'uai-t'í, the same genus of horse, likewise had the same sweating and bleeding habit? As to the meaning of *han-hsieh* 汗血, a passage in *Tung-p'ing-hsien-wan-ts'ang-chuan* 東平憲王蒼傳 in the *Tung-kuan-han-chi* 東觀漢記 (Bk. 7) reads⁽¹⁾ thus: It is said that the Emperor Wu-ti 武帝 had a poem on the heaven-horse besprinkled with red sweat. Now I have personally seen how it was. The blood came out of the small holes in the skin of the forelegs⁽²⁾. From this it is plain that the meaning of *han-hsieh* 汗血 refers to the unique habit of a horse to bleed through the small holes in the skin. The present-day horse in Turkestan, especially of the superior genus issues blood (Blutschwitzen) from the neck and shoulders, during the spring, and always retains blood-stains, according to Mr. Schwartz's report. This explains away the so-called sweating and bleeding habit as Mr. Izushi 出石 had pointed out⁽³⁾. And from the fact that it was referred to, not simply as a *hsieh-ma* 血馬 (bleeding horse), but as a *han-hsieh-ma* 汗血馬 (sweating and bleeding horse) and a phrase occurs in the *T'ien-ma-chih-ko* 天馬之歌 which reads "Red sweat ran streaming with red foams and drops" 露赤汗沫流赭⁽⁴⁾.

(1) 聞武帝歌天馬露赤汗今親見其然血從前膊上小孔中出

(2) A passage almost identical with this may be found in the *Hou-han-shu* 後漢書 (Bk. 72), *Tung-p'ing-hsien-wang-ts'ang-chuan* in *K'ung-wu-shih-wang-lich-chuan* 光武十王列傳東平憲王倉傳

(3) Mr. Izushi; *op. cit.*, pp. 375-6.

(4) *Ch'ien-han-shu* 前漢書 (Bk. 22), *Li-yueh-chih* 禮樂志

it is easily supposed that copious sweat as well as blood ran. It is well-known that the stone reliefs of the six horses at the Chao-ling 昭陵 of the Emperor T'ai-sung 太宗 of the T'ang dynasty all graphically represent the Aryan horse; and the inscription in praise of the Shih-fa-ch'ih 什伐赤, one of the six inscriptions in praise of the equestrian statues at the Chao-ling 昭陵, contains a phrase *han-ch'ieng* 汗騁 (sweating and galloping)⁽¹⁾. This seems to explain that sweating was a peculiar habit of the horse. In short, it may be inferred that the Aryan horse which was an excellent carriage-horse, had a physical peculiarity of copious sweating and sometimes bleeding through the skin.

Here we may consider the nomenclatural correlation of the Aryan horse and the k'uai-t'í, with these three physical and functional peculiarities in mind. The view that Indo-Germanic words for horse, *acva* (Sanskrit), *aspa* (Zendavesta), *ἵππος* (Greek) *aspa* (Lethaurian)⁽²⁾ are derived from the *ac, ak* (ancient Iranian, which meant "go fast (fleet-footed), go in hurry at a quick pace,") is not yet decisively accepted⁽³⁾. It is, however, evident that k'uai-t'í could not be traced to *acva, aspa*. Then an etymological study of the name k'uai-t'í on the basis of its peculiarity "full of mettle, with a great power of leaping" would hardly be successful. Only when studied from its physical peculiarity, that of sweating, or sweating and bleeding, a solution may be reached. The Mongolian for sweat 汗 is *külüsün*⁽⁴⁾. The Commentary, First Part, Section for *Shen-t'í* 身體 in the *Lu-lung-sai-liao* 盧龍塞略 (Bk. 19) by Kuo Tsao-hsiang 郭造卿 of the Ming dynasty contains the characters K'uo-lich-sun 濶列孫, and the Tartarian Glossary 韃靼館雜字 of the Hua-i-i-yü 華夷譯語 in the possession of the Toyo Bunko contains in the Section for body

(1) See LIN Tung 林圖; *T'ang-chao-ling-shih-chi-k'ao-luch* 唐昭陵石蹟考略 (in the *Kuan-tzu-te-chi-ts'ung-shu* 觀自得齋叢書) (Bk. 5) *Shih-fa-ch'ih-tsan* 什伐赤贊, and Lo Chên-yü 羅振玉: *Chao-ling-pei-lu* 昭陵碑錄.

(2) O. SCHRÄDER; *Prehistoric Antiquities of the Aryan People, A Manual of Comparative Philology and the Earliest Culture*, London, 1890, pp. 248, 261.

(3) V. HEHN; *op. cit.* S. 36. J. J. MODI; The Horse in Ancient Iran, *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Bombay*, Vol. IV, No. 1, p. 5.

(4) I. J. SCHMIDT; *Mongolisch-Deutsch-Russisches Wörterbuch*, St. Petersburg, 1835, S.

身體門 the characters K'uo-lieh-sun 濶劣孫, which are both transliterations of the Mongolian. Besides, there is a custom in the Mongolian language to add *sun* at the end of a word⁽¹⁾. This *külüsun* must have been such a word, and the stem of the word was no doubt *külü*. It is highly probable that sweat in the Mongolian language was either *külüsun* or simply *külü* as a walled city was either *balgasun* or *balga*. Again, there is a way of forming an adjective by adding to the stem *-tai* (*-tei*), which means having, containing. It was to F. Hirth's great credit that at so early a date he pointed out the presence of this suffix *-tai* (*-tei*) in the Hsiung-nu language⁽²⁾. Thus the Mongolian for "having sweat" or "sweating" is *külütei*. May this not correspond to k'uai-t'i 缺驥? If this view be accepted, it would be easily seen how the Aryan horse, when introduced to the east was called k'uai-t'i 缺驥 in the land of the Hsiung-nu and *han-hsieh* 汗血 "sweating and bleeding" in China during the Han dynasty, which were after all synonymous terms adopted for physically distinguishing from the Mongolian horse which was the native of East Asia, the copiously sweating horse, which was imported from the West. The horse of any improved stock is generally known to be sensitive and to sweat easily. It is only natural that the Aryan horse sweated more than the Mongolian. Moreover, if k'uai-t'i 缺驥 should mean *han-hsieh* 汗血 (sweating and bleeding), the k'uai-t'i 缺驥 and the *han-hsieh-ma* 汗血馬 would be one and the same thing even in nomenclature, and add to the view that it was the Aryan horse.

To summarize, the k'uai-t'i 缺驥 was the Aryan horse originally bred on the shores of the Aral and Caspian Seas,—an excellent carriage-horse, which, when imported by the Hsiung-nu was called k'uai-t'i 缺驥, that is, the sweating horse, and, when imported into the northern frontiers of China since the Chan-kuo period, was styled the superior horse of the northern savages and the strange beast of the Hsiung-nu, because the Chinese in these days never dreamed the horse had original-

(1) See Dr. SHIRATORI: 高麗史に見えたる蒙古語の解釋 (Interpretation of Mongolian Words Found in Korai Shi 高麗史), *Toyo-gakuno* Vol. XVIII, No. 1, pp. 152-3.

(2) F. HIRTH; *Sinologische Beiträge zur Geschichte der Turkvölker*, I. Die Ahnentafel Attila's nach Johannes von Thurocz, St. Petersburg, 1900, S. 226.

ly come from the West.

(b) T'ao-yü 駒駘

T'ao-yü 駒駘 occurs in *Chu-shu-bsün* 主術訓 of the *Huai-nan-tzu* 淮南子, in the *T'ien-tzu-yu-lieh-fu* 天子游獵賦 by Ssu-ma Hsiang-ju 司馬相如, *Hsiung-nu-chuan* 匈奴傳 in the *Sbib-chi* 史記 and the *Cb'ien-han-shu* 前漢書, and the Section for Ma 馬 of the *Shuo-wên-chieh-tzu* 說文解字 by Hsu Shên 許慎, besides, an account of it is found in the Section for beasts of the *Erh-ya* 爾雅釋畜 and the *Hai-wai-pei-ching* 海外北經 of *Shang-hai-ching* 山海經. And as to its identity, the Notes by KAO Yu 高誘 on *Chu-shu-bsün* 主術訓 of the *Huai-nan-tzu* 淮南子 says: the t'ao-yü 駒駘 is a wild horse. 駒駘野馬也. The explanation by J'ü Ch'un 如淳 of the Wei dynasty quoted in the notes by YEN Shih-ku 顏師古 under T'ai-p'ü 太僕 in the table of the *Pai-kuan-kung-hsiang* 百官公卿 in the *Cb'ien-han-shu* 前漢書⁽¹⁾ also says: the t'ao-yü is a wild horse. According to the view of Hsü Kuang 徐廣 of the Chin dynasty quoted in the *Pei-yin-chu-chieh* 裴駘集解 on *Hsiung-nu-chuan* 匈奴傳 of the *Sbib-chi* the animal is described as it resembles a horse and is black in colour 似馬而青. And the *Tzu-lin* 字林 by Lu Shên 呂忱 quoted in the *So-yin* 索隱 by Ssu-ma Chên 司馬貞 on the same work calls it *yeb-ma* 野馬 a wild horse. The notes by Kuo P'ö 郭璞 on the Section for beasts of the *Erh-ya* reads the *Shang-hai-ching* 山海經 says that in the north sea there is a beast which is like a horse in appearance, is called t'ao-yü 駒駘 and is black in colour⁽²⁾. In the light of the above references, it may be inferred that the t'ao-yü 駒駘 was not a common horse, but an animal which resembled a horse in appearance, a wild horse, and was black-haired. Only the explanation by Hsü Shên 許慎 under the Section for Ma 馬 in the *Shuo-wên-chieh-tzu* 說文解字 differs from the other views, defining it as a good horse of the northern fields. However, TUAN Yü-t'sai 段玉裁 interprets it as follows; T'ao-yü 駒駘 is said to be a superior horse of the northern

(1) Bk. 19, Former Part.

(2) 山海經云北海內有獸狀如馬名駒駘色青

fields⁽¹⁾, so it is called (a field horse) 野馬. Should this view be accepted, a connection with the others may be made. But it is open to question whether the yeh-ma 野馬 ascribed to the t'ao-yü in other records means a horse in the field, that is, a horse put to pasture as TUAN Yü-ts'ai thinks, or really a wild horse. If it should be taken to refer to "a horse in the field", there would be no reason why the t'ao-yü alone should be so referred to, because all Hsiung-nu horses were no doubt put to vast fields. If it should be taken to refer to "a wild horse," on the other hand, it would not contradict the view that the t'ao-yü was not a common horse, but an animal resembling a horse in appearance—a theory held by Hsü Kuang 徐廣 and Kuo P'o 郭璞. Moreover, the previously quoted passage from *Cbu-bsu-shün* 主術訓 in the *Huai-nan-tzu* 淮南子 says: I Yin 伊尹, though a shrewd minister of state, can neither drive the yüan-ma 驪馬, nor control the t'ao-yü 駒駘, like the Hsiung-nu⁽²⁾. Here the passage 服駒駘 (controlling the t'ao-yü), is referred to as the most difficult performance only attainable by the Hsiung-nu. The *t'ao-yü-tsan* 駒駘贊 by Kuo P'o 郭璞 of the Chin dynasty also says: The t'ao-yü are wild horses bred in the northern region. They gather together, crossing their necks and putting their shoulders together. Even Sun-yang 孫陽 could not control it⁽³⁾. Here it is referred to as a horse impossible of controlling even for Sung-yang 孫陽, a famous horse-appreciator. This plainly shows that the t'ao-yü was a wild horse. If it had been the superior horse of the northern field as Hsü Shên supposes, it would have been quite easy to control it; and the accounts in the *Huai-nan-tzu* and the *t'ao-yü-tsan* would have no meaning whatever. If the t'ao-yü should be taken to refer to an untrainable genus of horse, there would be no doubt that the yeh-ma 野馬 or yeh-chün 野駿 referred to by KAO Yu 高誘 of the latter Han dynasty, Lü-Shên 呂忱 and Kuo P'o 郭璞 of the Chin dynasty, meant the wild horse.

Now if the view that t'ao-yü 駒駘 was a yeh-ma 野馬 (wild horse) should be

(1) 駒駘爲北野之良馬故謂之野馬

(2) 伊尹賢相也而不能與胡人騎驪馬而服駒駘

(3) 駒駘野駿產自北域交頸相摩分背翹陸雖有孫陽終不能服

accepted, it may be inferred that in the phrase "To hurry the yeh-ma 野馬 (wild horse) and to harness the t'ao-yü 騊駼⁽¹⁾" which occurs in the *T'ien-tzu-yu-lieh-fu* 天子游獵賦 by Ssu-ma Hsiang-ju 司馬相如, the two terms yeh-ma 野馬 and t'ao-yü 騊駼 referred to one and the same thing, and are only symmetrically arranged. And likewise the phrase in the Section for beasts of the *Erb-ya* 爾雅 should be read "The t'ao-yü horse, namely a wild horse", not "The t'ao-yü horse and the wild horse" though it is commonly rendered to imply two separate things. Subordinately the notes by Kuo P'ò on the horse yeh-ma 野馬 in the Section for beasts of the *Erb-ya* and the *T'ien-tzu-yu-lieh-fu* by Ssu-ma Hsiang-ju saying "It resembles a horse, but smaller, and is raised outside the frontiers⁽²⁾" and the Notes by Chang-I 張揖 of the Wei 魏 dynasty quoted in the notes by Li Shan 李善, which says "It resembles a horse, but is smaller⁽³⁾" may serve to supplement the various notes on the t'ao-yü.

It may thus be seen that the t'ao-yü was an untrainable wild horse, small-bodied and black-haired and lived gregariously as seen in the passage in the *t'ao-yü-tsan* 騊駼贊, which reads "Crossing their necks and putting their shoulders together⁽⁴⁾."

Did such a wild horse actually live in the regions inhabited by the Hsiung-nü? What occurs to our minds is *Equus Przewalskii* Polyakoff, regarded as the only genuine wild horse which gregariously lives to this day in the wilderness of Dzungaria in West Mongolia. This genus lives in a drove of from five to fifteen in Dzungaria, the region on the southwestern slope of the Gobi Altai mountains. As to the physical characteristics, the body is small, being only 153 cm. in height (at the line of the mane); the head exceedingly large, with a profile of the so-called fish-head type; the small eyes receding far away from the nostrils, the facial expression, one of cowardice; the ears longer than those of an ordinary horse, but much shorter than those of an ass; mane short and standing upright, blackish red; no

(1) 騊野馬轉騊駼

(2) 如馬而小出塞外

(3) 似馬而小

(4) 交頸相摩分背離陸

forelock; the neck stout and short; the limbs likewise stout and short; so the barrel appears to be relatively long; the tail extremely long, with no long hair on the upper half like the tail of an ass, but with long black hair on the lower half. The colour of the body is dun or grey on the barrel; on the back and limbs almost black; that of the knees, shins, and the fetlock is black. In a word, the Przewalski horse is a grey or black horse.⁽¹⁾ (Pl. 1). And although the range of this horse is at present limited to the wilderness of Dzungaria, it is known to have flourished in vast areas of Eastern and Central Asia in ancient times⁽²⁾ and to have been gradually domesticated in various regions into the two genuses, the Mongolian and Aryan. It seems that until rather recent times this genus lived as a genuine wild horse scattered over various districts. Tarpan (*Equus gmelini*) which flourished in the steppe of South Russia until the latter half of the 19th century; but is now extinct⁽³⁾, and Przewalski horse of Dzungaria seem to be nothing but the last survivals. This being the case, it is not hard to suppose that this wild horse lived in the land of the Hsiung-nu and that it was witnessed and captured by them. Moreover, there exists a relic which proves the fact. This is one of the Sui-yuan bronzes believed to be a piece of work by the Hsiung-nu. (Pl. 2)⁽⁴⁾. The horse represented on it shows physical characteristics incredibly like those of the Przewalski horse. (Pl. 1) The representation is even more to nature than the illustration given in the original report of N. M. Przewalski. (Pl. 3)⁽⁵⁾ And on another of the Sui-yuan

(1) N. M. Prjeval'skii. *Iz Zaisana cherez Kharai v Tibet i na verkhov'ya Jeltoi* 1883, cc. 40-42. W. Zalenski; *Prjevalskij's Horse* (*Equus przewalskii* Pol.), London, 1907. rieki
S. Peterburg. G. E. Grum-Grjimailo; *Zapadnaya Mongoliya i Uryankhaiskii kraj*.
ss. 506-509. Pl. adopted from Yetts; *op. cit.*, Fig. 3. Tom I. S.-Peterburg. 1914

(2) J. ULRICH Duerst, *The Horse of Anau in its Relation to History and the Races of Domestic Horses* (R. PUMPELLY; *Explorations in Turkestan, Expedition of 1904*, Vol. II, Washington, 1908, Chap. 19.) pp. 428-429, 431. O. KELLER; *Die antike Tierwelt*, Leipzig, 1909, Bd. I. SS. 271, 272.

(3) There is however, another view which regards the Tarpan as a domestic which got loose and became a wild horse. See V. HEHN; *op. cit.*, SS. 19, 20. C. KELLER; *Die Stammesgeschichte Unserer Haustiere*, 1919.

(4) Adopted from J. G. ANDERSSON: *Hunting Magic in the Animal Style* (The Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities, Stockholm, 1932, Bulletin No. 4) pl. XX, 5.

(5) Adopted from N. M. Prjeval'skii; *op. cit.*, cc. 40-41.

bronzes an animal design is found to represent the same genus, as Pr. Yetts has pointed out,⁽¹⁾ not so accurately as the former, but quite doubtlessly. (Pl. 4)⁽²⁾ It is thus confirmed that the Przewalski horse, the genuine wild horse, lived in the land of the Hsiung-nu, and that the people was familiar with the beast; and therefore, it may be inferred that the t'ao-yü, the wild horse of the Hsiung-nu, was no other than the horse of this genus. That the t'ao-yü was, as discussed already, a small-bodied black horse and lived gregariously will coincide with the facts of the Przewalski horse, and it goes far in supporting the above inference.

Now the t'ao-yü being ascribed to the Przewalski horse, the next question is that it not only lived as a wild horse, but was included among the domestic beasts of the Hsinung-nu. This may be seen from the fact that the passage cited already from *Hsiung-nu-chuan* 匈奴傳 in the *Shih-chi* 史記 enumerates the t'ao-yü 駒駱 along with camels, asses, mules, and k'uai-t'i 騊駼; and also *Chu-shu-hsün* 主訓術 in the *Huai-nan-tzu* 淮南子 suggests it as a special talent of the Hsiung-nu 胡 to control the t'ao-yü. If so, in what way did the Hsiung-nu capture the wild horse and in what way did they use it?

As to the way in which they captured, it may be suggested from the following passage in the note on "The Horse-sprouting from the River Wu-kuei 馬生渥洼水中" in the *Ch'ien-han-shu* 前漢書 (Bk. 6), which occurs under the autumn of the 4th year of *Yuan-ting* 元鼎 of the Emperor Wu-ti 武帝: Li Pei 李斐 says that there dwelt a man named Pao Li-ch'ang 暴利長 at Hsin-yeh 新野 in Nan-yang 南陽. In the reign of the Emperor Wu-ti, he was exiled to the frontier of T'un-huang 燉煌 where he became a colonial soldier. So often did he witness on the river-side in a drove of wild horses, a queer beast which came down with common horses to drink from the river. Li-ch'ang 利長 first put a native on the shore with a strap

(1) P. YETTS; *op. cit.*, p. 239.

(2) Adopted from A. SALMONY; *Sino-Siberian Art* in the Collection of C. T. LOO, Paris, 1933, Pl. VIII 3. Mr. Yetts also uses this in his *op. cit.*

(3) 李斐曰南陽新野有暴利長當武帝時遇刑屯田燉煌界數於此水傍見羣野馬中有奇異者與凡馬來飲此水利長先使土人持勒繫於水傍後馬玩習久之代土人持勒收得其馬獻之欲神異云馬從水中出

behind a horse for a long time, until the beast got used to it. Then he, holding the strap in his hand, replaced the native, and succeeded in capturing its horse, and he offered it to the Emperor. In order to mystify it, he claimed that the horse had sprouted from the water. The natives near T'un-huang thus seem to have hidden behind their horses and captured alive wild horses with a strap when the latter came down to drink. It is not clear whether the native near T'un-Khung at the Emperor Wu-ti's time was the Hsiung-nu 胡, the Ch'iang savages 羌 or the remnant of the Yüeh-shih. The same method is commonly used even to this day among the Mongols and Turks⁽¹⁾. The Hsiung-nu seem to have also resorted to this method in capturing the wild horse.

In what way did the Hsiung-nu use the t'ao-yü which they caught? The passage already quoted from the *T'ien-tzu-yu-lieh-fu* by Ssu-ma Hsiang-ju says "To hurry the wild horse and harness the t'ao-yü, 軼野馬轉駒駘" The character 軼 used here, according to the notes interpretation in the Ch'ê 車 section of the *Shuo-ên-chieh-tzu* (Bk. 14, First part), means 'Carriages roll together'; while the character 轉, according to the notes by Kuo P'ò 郭璞, means head of the axle. Both characters pertain to wheel or carriage, and the passage must mean harnessing the t'ao-yü or wild horses to a carriage and hurrying them back and forth. Therefore, if this description by Ssu-ma Hsiang-ju had been based on fact, the t'ao-yü would have probably been used as a carriage horse. Now it seems to be easier to train a wild horse for cartage than for riding. The horse of Sigynnae described by Herodotus and Strabon seems to have been a hairy small-sized wild horse, probably the so-called Tarpan of later days—which it is said, could not be used for riding, but was a very fast carriage horse⁽²⁾. Thus the t'ao-yü may also be inferred to have been a carriage horse.

Finally, the term t'ao-yü may be investigated. As to the pronunciation of t'ao-

(1) In South Siberia a hunter is said to approach a wild ass behind a yellowish horse. Among the Sarik-turkmans, a camel is used for this purpose. J. G. ANDERSSON; *op. cit.*, p. 259.

(2) G. RAWLINSON; *History of Herodotus*, Vol. III, London, 1875, p. 215. V. Hehn; *op. cit.*, S. 35.

yü, the *Shuo-wên-chieh-tzu* says: 駒 pertains to *ma* 馬 (horse), and is pronounced like *t'ao* 匏⁽¹⁾. 駮 pertains to *ma* 馬 (horse) and is pronounced like *yü* 余. The notes by Kuo P'ö on the *Erb-ya* says 'It is pronounced *t'ao-t'u* 陶塗⁽²⁾'. The Notes by YEN Shih-ku 顏師古 on *Hsiung-nu-chuan* in the *Cb'ien-han-shu* says 'The pronunciation of 駒 is *t'ao* 桃 and that of 駮 is *t'u* 塗⁽³⁾'. In short, Hsü Shên 許慎, Kuo P'ö 郭璞, and YEN Shih-ku 顏師古, all approximately agree on the pronunciation of the character 駒, while as to the pronunciation of 駮, *t'u* 塗 is ascribed to it by Kuo P'ö and YEN Shih-ku, against which *yü* 余 is held by Hsü Shên 許慎. Only the Chieh-ch'ao 解嘲 by Yang-Hsiung 楊雄 included in the *Ch'ien-han-shu* 前漢書 contains the well-known passage, "The great Han State now adjoins the Eastern Sea on the left, Ch'ü-sou 渠搜 on the right, Fan-yü 番禺 on the front, and T'ao-t'u 陶塗 on the back."⁽⁴⁾ This last term *t'ao-t'u* 陶塗, is explained by Yen Shih-ku 顏師古 as follows: "The *t'ao-yü* 駒駮 horse is raised in the northern region. Now saying that *t'ao-t'u* is at the back of the Han State it must be the name of the northern state. Because the country produced the horse, it was so named."⁽⁵⁾ Should his view be right, the view which holds that *yü* 駮 was pronounced *t'u* 塗 might be accepted. However, unless evidence is produced that *t'ao-t'u* 陶塗 in the north mentioned in contrast with *Fang-yü* 番禺 in the south, was really the country which raised the *t'ao-yü*, this may be taken as a kind of folk-etymology based on the view that the pronunciation of *t'ao-yü* was *t'ao-t'u* as advocated by Kuo P'ö. Moreover, according to the Chieh-ch'ao 解嘲 included in the *Wên-hsüan* 文選 (Bk. 4), the term *t'ao-t'u* 陶塗 is *chiao-t'u* 椒塗 and the notes by Li Shan 李善 says on it "Ying Shao 應劭 says that is the northern frontier of Yu-yang 漁陽". According to this, *t'ao-t'u* is probably a mistake, and should be read *chiao-t'u* 椒塗 with no connection with the question of the pronunciation of

(1) 駒从匏聲駮从馬余聲

(2) 音陶塗

(3) 駒音桃駮音塗

(4) 今大漢左東海右渠搜前番禺後陶塗

(5) 駒駮馬出北海上,今此言後陶塗則是北方國名也,本國出馬因以爲名

the characters 駒餘. Therefore, it cannot be decided now whether the pronunciation of 餘 was yü 余 or t'u 塗. It may be said, however, that in ancient times the pronunciation of yü 余 and that of t'u 塗 were very alike and, I should think, either of them in ancient times had such initial sound as t-, d-, or s-, dz-. This might be easily inferred from a study of the pronunciation of 途, 涂, 除, 叙, 斜, etc., the characters in the same category with yü 余. The ancient pronunciation of t'ao-yü may be supposed to have been dau-du, dau-tu, dau-dzu, dau-su, tau-su, tau-du, tau-su, tau-dzu. If this should be accepted, one might compare t'ao-yü with to-su 奪速 in the phrase 生馬奪速 which occurs in the Section for An-ma 鞍馬 in the *Cbih-yüan-i-yü* 至元譯語. Shêng 生 in the phrase shêng-ma 生馬 being naturally what is the opposite of shou 熟 (tame, trained), shêng-ma 生馬 is nothing but a wild horse; and the substance of to-su 奪速 is equivalent to t'ao-yü. Besides, the pronunciation of to-su 奪速 so considerably approaches the ancient pronunciations of t'ao-yü, especially dau-dzu (tau-dzu), dau-su (tau-su), that both t'ao-yü and to-su 奪速 may be interpreted as transliterations adopted at different periods for the original name.

So here is a hint that similar terms for the wild horse existed in the Mongolian area from the days of the Hsiung-nu down to the Yüan dynasty at least. At present it is said that the above-mentioned wild horse of Dzungaria is called *taky-gurasyn* by the Altai Mongols, simply *taky* by the Altai Torgutes, and *taky* or *kei-tag* by the Kirghiz⁽¹⁾. *Taky* or *tag* here mentioned is a term which has probably no connection with t'ao-yü or to-su 奪速. On the other hand, this *taky* or *tag* may be taken as a word originated from the Hsiung-nu word *tan-bsi* 驢騾, as will be discussed later, and originally referred to the wild ass. I am of the opinion that the reason why the term came to be erroneously applied to the wild horse is probably that, as the genuine wild horse has become so scarce even in Mongolia that it survives only locally in Dzungaria, the knowledge concerning the wild horse has become more and more inaccurate until it has come to refer to the sort of wild ass

(1) G. E. Grum-Grjimalo; op. cit., s. 507.

which physically resembles the wild horse to a considerable extent⁽¹⁾ and one of the names for the ass has come to be applied to the animal.

(c) Tan-hsi 驪駮

Accounts concerning the tan-hsi 驪駮 occur in *Hsiung-nu-chuan* in the *Sbib-chi*, in the *T'ien-tzu-yu-lieb-fu* by SSU-ma Hsiang-ju, in *Li-k'eng-pien* 力耕篇 in the *Yen-t'eb-lun* 塩鉄論 by HUAN K'uan 桓寬, and under the Ma 馬 Section of the *Shuo-wên-chieh-t-u*. The *Shuo-wên* 說文 explains it as follows: "Tan 驪 refers to the tan-hsi 驪駮, a kind of wild horse. It pertains to the horse and it is pronounced like tan 單. It is also said that the tan 驪 horse is black and has white spots the figures of which are like those of the crocodile. Hsi 駮 refers to tan hsi 驪駮. It pertains to the horse and is pronounced like Hsi 奚⁽²⁾." Now that the view advocated by SHU Shên on the horse is often wide of the mark, as discussed previously, we must see others; the notes by Hsu Kuang 徐廣 of the Chin dynasty on the tan-hsi 驪駮 cited in the *P'ei-yin-chi-chieh* 斐駮集解 in *Hsiung-nu-chuan*, says a kind of chü-hsü 巨虛之屬, and the notes by Kuo P'ò on the *Yu-lieb-fu* 游獵賦 says: "The tan-hsi 驪駮 is a variety of chü-hsü 駮駮", and the notes by YEN Shih-ku in the *Ch'ien-han-shu* 前漢書 follows it.

It is now a prerequisite to find out the identity of the chü-hsü 巨虛 or chü-hsü 駮駮. It will be recalled that chü-hsü 巨虛 (駮駮), sometimes spelt chü-hsü 距虛 and chü-hsü 距虛, has often been mentioned as mysterious beasts in various books. For instance, *Wu-kung-pien* of *Shen-ta-lan* 慎大覽不廣篇 in the *Lü-shih-ch'uan-ch'ien* 呂氏春秋 has the following passage. In the north there is a beast named chüeh 璽. It is a rat in its fore part, but a hare in its hind part. When it runs, it stumbles and falls. Now the chiung-chiung-chü-hsü 邛邛距虛 is a rat in its hind part, but a hare in its fore part. The front is so high that it cannot get kan-ts'ao 甘草. So

(1) J. H. Miller records that the Kazaks and Kalmuks described the Przewalski horse to resemble the wild ass extremely. D. Carruthers; Unknown Mongolia, London, 1914. Vol. II, Chap. 20, The Game of the Plain by J. H. Miller, p. 608.

(2) 驪駮野馬屬从馬單聲一曰驪馬青驪白驪文如蠶魚也驪駮也从馬奚聲。

with the help of the chüeh 蟹, it manages to eat the grass.⁽¹⁾ A passage in the Section for earth of the *ERH-ya* reads: 'In the west there is a gregarious beast. It always lives with the chiung-chiung-chü-hsü 邛邛距虛. It gets kan-ts'ao 甘草 for the chiung-chiung-chü-hsü 邛邛距虛. When in danger, the chiung-chiung-chü-hsü 邛邛距虛 runs away carrying the other on its back. The animal is called chüeh 蟹⁽²⁾.' There is an account in *Tao-ying-hsün* 道應訓 in the *Huai-nan-tzu* 淮南子 (Bk. 12), which seems to be a compromise of the preceding two. It reads; 'In the north there is a beast which is called chüeh 蟹. It is a rat in its fore part, but a hare in its hind part. When it runs, it stumbles and falls. It always gets Kan-ts'ao 甘草 for the ch'üung-ch'üung-chü-hsü 蝚蝚駘驪 to eat. Whenever there is danger for the chüeh 蟹, the ch'üung-ch'üung-chü-hsü 蝚蝚駘驪 puts it on the back and runs away⁽³⁾.' It may be seen that the *Lü-shih-ch'ün-ch'iu* and the *Huai-nan-tzu* give "in the north" while the *Erb-ya* gives "in the west". According to the *Lü-shih* and *Huai-nan-tzu* the beast called chüeh 蟹 (蟹) lives together with the chiung-chiung-chü-hsü 邛邛距虛 (蝚蝚駘驪). It is a rat in its fore part, but a hare in its hind part. However, the description that the chiung-chiung-chü-hsü 邛邛距虛 is a rat in its hind part, but a hare in its fore part, is found only in the *Lü-lan* 呂覽, and nowhere else. And this description in the *Lü-lan* 呂覽 about the appearance of the chiung-chiung-chü-hsü 邛邛距虛 could not be taken literally, because the following accounts almost definitely prove that the chiung-chiung-chü-hsü 邛邛距虛 was not a small animal like a rat or a hare, but a comparatively large beast belonging to the genus of horse. The *T'ien-tzu-yu-lieh-fu* says: 'To rush the ch'üung-ch'üung 蝚蝚 and drive the chü-hsü 距虛, and to gallop the wild horse and harness the t'ao-yü 駒駘⁽⁴⁾.' Thus the ch'üung-ch'üung 蝚蝚 (距虛) and the yeh-ma 野馬 (駒駘)

(1) 北方有獸其名爲蟹鼠前而免後趨則頓走則顛然則邛邛距虛亦鼠後而免前高不得取甘草故須蟹食之。

(2) 西方有比肩獸焉與邛邛距虛比爲邛邛距虛蟹甘草有難邛邛距虛負而走其名謂之蟹。

(3) 北方有獸其名曰蟹鼠前而免後趨則頓走則顛常爲蝚蝚駘驪取甘草以與之蟹有患害蝚蝚駘驪必負而走。

(4) 蟹蝚蝚駘驪距虛駘野馬轉駒駘。

駢) form an antithesis, and the notes on it reads, "Chang I 張揖 says that the ch'ung-ch'ung 蛩蛩 is a black animal which looks like a horse. The chü-hsü 距虛 resembles a mule, but is smaller. Kuo P'ò 郭璞 says that the chü-hsü 距虛 is identical with the ch'ung-ch'ung 蛩蛩, these being different phrases and words used interchangeably. Shih-ku 師古 says that in the light of the account in the *Erb-ya* the view held by Kuo 郭 is to be accepted⁽¹⁾." The notes by KUNG-Chao 孔晁 of the Chin dynasty on Ku-chu-chü-hsü 孤竹距虛 in the *I-chou-shu-wang-hui-pien* 逸周書王會篇 says: "The chü-hsü is a wild animal and belongs to the genus of the ass and mule⁽²⁾." The notes by Kuo P'ò 郭璞 on the passage (the chiung-chiung-chü-hsü 邛邛距虛 runs a hundred Chinese miles⁽³⁾) in the *Mu-t'ien-tzu-chuan* 穆天子傳 (Bk. 1), says (this also belongs to the genus of horse). Thus it is almost evident that the chiung-chiung-chü-hsü 邛邛距虛 (蛩蛩駘驢) was not a genus of rat or hare, but a genus of horse. The *Lü-shih-ch'un-ch'iu* alone interpreted it as an animal which was a hare in its fore part and a rat in its hind part, perhaps because this would make an excellent contrast with the chüeh 蟹 which was a rat in its fore part and a hare in its hind part—merely an attempt to make the romance of co-existence and co-operation of the two still more romantic. It would not do to assert that the view which holds that the chiung-chiung-chü-hsü 邛邛距虛 was a hare in its fore part and a rat in its hind part is in every point a false one. There may have been some partial resemblance,—for instance, its head might have resembled the head of a hare or the hind legs those of a rat. This will be discussed later.

As to the term chiung-chiung-chü-hsü 邛邛距虛, it may be found that the *T'ien-tzu-yu-lieb-fu* gives ch'ung-ch'ung 蛩蛩 and chü-hsü 距虛 side by side, and Kuo P'ò is probably right in commenting on the phrases (The chü-hsü 距虛 is identical with the ch'ung-ch'ung 蛩蛩, these being different phrases and words

(1) 張揖曰蛩蛩獸狀如馬距虛似驢而小郭璞曰距虛即蛩蛩變文互言耳師古曰據爾雅文郭說是也

(2) 距虛野獸驢驘之屬

(3) 邛邛距虛走百里

used interchangeably.⁽¹⁾ *Shên-ming-pien* 審名篇 in the *Hsin-lun* 新論 by LIU Hsieh 劉勰 of the Liang dynasty also says: "The ch'ung-ch'ung 蚩蚩 and chü-hsü 巨虛 are really one and the same beasts⁽²⁾." It would seem that chiung-chiung, chü-hsü, ch'ung-ch'ung, chü-hsü 邛邛距虛蚩蚩駟驢, are different transliterations of one and the same pronunciation. If this is the case, we may get near the identity of the chü-hsü 駟驢, comparing and adjusting the various notes on each of them previously quoted.

First, as for the chü-hsü 駟驢, according to CHANG I 張揖, it looks like a horse 狀如馬, it resembles the mule, but is smaller 似羸(驪)而小; according to Kuo P'ò, it is a genus of horse 馬屬; and according to KUNG Chao 孔晁, it is a genus of ass or mule 驢驪之屬. It certainly belongs to *Equus*, and it seems that it considerably resembled the mule 驪(羸)—the creature between the horse and the ass. This is the reason why there was no agreement of views, some classifying it either under the genus of ass, or mule, others under the genus of horse.

Secondly, that the chü-hsü 駟驢 was a wild beast may be inferred from the fact that the notes by KUNG Chao says, the chü-hsü 距虛 is a wild beast, and the *T'ien-tzu-yu-lieh-fu* mentions it side by side with the yeh-ma 野馬 (wild horse) 駒駘 (T'ao-yü). Moreover, the description of the chü-hsü 駟驢 as a strange animal living together with the chüeh 蟹 in the *Lü-lan*, the *Erb-ya*, the *Huai-nan-tzu*, definitely proves that it was not a domestic animal.

Thirdly, the chü-hsü 駟驢 seems to have lived together with the beast called chüeh 蟹 which was a rat in its fore part and a hare in its hind part.

Fourthly, it seems that the chü-hsü 駟驢 was an extremely fleet-footed beast. This may be known from the following passages: "The thousand-mile-horse is always a chü-hsü 距虛⁽³⁾," in the remnant of *Fan Tzu* 范子; "The chü-hsü 距虛 runs round with no respect to the ground⁽⁴⁾," in the remnant of *Shih-tzu* 尸子

(1) 距虛即蚩蚩變文互音耳

(2) 蚩蚩巨虛其實一獸

(3) 千里馬必有距虛

(4) 距虛不擇地而走

quoted in the notes by Kuo P'ö in the *Mu-t'ien-tzu-chuan*; "The chiung-chiung-chü-hsü 邛邛距虛 runs well."⁽¹⁾ in *Wang-hui-pien* 王會篇 in the *I-chou-shu* 逸周書; and (The chiung-chiung-chü-hsü runs a hundred Chinese miles" in the *Mu-t'ien-t-u-chuan* (Bk. 1).

It is thus interpreted that the chü-hsü 驅騶 was a wild animal belonging to *Equus*, which considerably resembled the lo 騾 (驢) (mule), was extremely fleet-footed, and lived together with the chüeh 麀, the genus of rat or hare.

Did such a wild beast actually exist in Mongolia? Writings of the Ming and Ch'ing dynasties are often found to report the existence of the yeh-lo 野驢 (野騾) (wild mule). For instance, the *Pei-chêng-lu* 北征錄 by CHIN Yu-tzu 金幼孜 of the Ming dynasty says: it happened that Chung-kuan 中官 shot a wild horse which came forward. The Emperor summoned (Chin) Yu-tzu (金) 幼孜. Accompanied by Kuang-ta Mien-jên 光大勉仁 and Fang Pin 方賓 (尙書), he proceeded to see it. The Emperor said "A wild horse resembles a horse. This is a wild mule, not a wild horse. You should look at it closely. Coming north and looking at everything, you would increase your information."⁽²⁾ The *Chang-chia-kou chih Uliyasutai Chu-chih-ssu*⁽³⁾ 張家口至烏里雅蘇台竹枝詞 by CHIH Jui 志鏡 of the Ch'ing dynasty contains this passage, No-sa-chün t'ai 諾薩軍台 produces wild mules. Fleet herds gallop about like shuttles⁽⁴⁾. And an account in the *Ch'in-ting-Jê-ho-chih* 欽定熱河志 (Bk. 95, the Species of Animals 獸之屬 in the Products IV 物產四), reads: I am of the opinion that there is no ass outside the frontier. So no one keeps the mule. However, there are wild mules. They are found in the desert. In the Mongolian language, "ear" is 齊克特 (dshiggetei, chigetai). Because wild mules have long ears, they are called by this

(1) The notes by Li Shan 李善 in the *Wen-hsuan* 文選 on the phrase of *Chi-fa* 七發 (前似飛鳥, 後類距虛) by Mei-shu 枚叔.

(2) 適中官射一野馬來進上召(金)幼孜與光大勉仁及尙書方賓前觀,上曰野馬如馬,此野騾非野馬,汝輩詳觀之,北來每物見之,足廣見聞.

(3) Included in 滿蒙叢書 (Manchuria-Mongolia Series) Vol. II, compiled by Dr. Torajirô Naitô 內藤虎次郎.

(4) 諾薩軍台產野驢,遠羣馳騶似飛梭.

term⁽¹⁾ It is a well-known fact that the mule is an offspring of a male ass and a mare artificially crossed, and the mule has no fecundity in itself. Thus there could not have been in the nature of things what might be called a wild mule. Therefore, it is proper to interpret that this wild mule of Mongolia referred to a wild ass or horse which physically resembled the mule to a considerable extent. And if it was called 齊克特 (*dshiggetei chigetai*)⁽²⁾ as the *Jé-bo-chih* 熱河志 records, it is almost clear that the animal was the wild ass.

The chigetai is the beast which still thrives to a great extent on the Mongolian plateaus, especially in the north-western mountain regions. I. Messerschmidt, the first European who investigated this animal scientifically named it *Mulus dauricus foecundus*, namely the fecundate mule. So closely does it resemble the mule physically. It is quite natural that the Chinese of the Ming and Ch'ing dynasties mistook it for the wild mule. On the other hand, however, W. Rubruck in his travels commented on Mongolian beasts that I saw a very large number of wild asses. They looked exceedingly like mules. ⁽³⁾ he made quite exact observation. The chigetai is now definitely accepted as a kind of wild ass, under the scientific term *Equus hemionus*⁽⁴⁾. According to the descriptions by Pallas, J. H. Miller, and R. Ch. Andrews⁽⁵⁾, its physical characteristics are as follows; the ears much longer than those of a horse; the mane short and standing upright; the head looking rather heavy; the chest rather large; the forelegs slender; the hindlegs also delicate; therefore, the height seems to be greater in comparison with the trunk, giving an impression of a tall creature. The female specimen which A. N. Formozoff captured measured 135 cm. at the height of the back and 140 cm. at that of the hip,

(1) 考塞外無驢故無畜，惟野驢則有之，產沙漠中，蒙古語謂耳為齊克特，野驢耳長，故以名之。

(2) Pallas gave the native word *dshiggetei*, while J. H. Miller had about the same word *chigetai*. In Schmidt's Dictionary, this is represented as *tschagatai*. I. J. Schmidt: *op. cit.*, S. 326, b.

(3) W. W. Rockhill; *The Journey of William of Rubruck to the Eastern Part of the World 1253-55*, London, 1900, p. 69.

(4) C. E. Grum-Grjimalo; *op. cit.*, s. 509. D. Carruthers; *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 607-608.

(5) *Voyages du Professeur Pallas dans plusieurs provinces de l'Empire de Russie et dans l'Asie septentrionale*, Paris, Tome 5, pp. 426-428. D. Carruthers; *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 606-607. R. Ch. Andrews; *The New Conquest of Central Asia*, New York, 1932, pp. 109-116.

though smaller than the average Chinese female mule which stands 138.5 cm. and 143.5 cm. respectively in height, but larger than the common horse or ass.⁽¹⁾ The colour of the body is generally bay (yellow-fawn colour); but the hair on the inside of the limbs is grey or white, while the mane and the tail are dark brown, almost black. J. H. Miller says "This beast in its general form is more like the mule than the ass." And R. Ch. Andrews also says "This beast (the wild ass) resembles the well-formed mule" And the chigetai lives in a small drove usually of from two to ten. It is clever and so fleet-footed as to be seen galloping frequently at from 36 to 40 miles per hour. So Pallas says that no other beast can follow it⁽¹⁾.

Now it may be evident that the chigetai living in a drove on the Mongolian plateau is a wild beast of the genus *Equus* which exceedingly resembles the mule 騾 (騾) and most precisely corresponds in its physical and functional characteristics to the *chü-hsü* 駞 which was known to be fleet-footed. The smallness of the size of the chigetai, compared with that of the mule, corresponds to the Notes by CHANG I 張揖, which says The *chü-hsü* 駞 resembles the mule, but is smaller (駞似騾而小); and the fact that the length of its ears is so characteristic that its name *dshiggetei*—the Mongolian word for "ear"—is explained by it, and that its head looks like that of an ass, which Japanese calls *usagiuma*, meaning hare-horse, its suggests that the account in the *Lü-lan* 呂覽, which says, the *chiung-chiung* is a rat in its hind part and a hare in its fore part 邛邛岵虛鼠後而兔前) is not entirely false.

Does, then, the view which ascribes the chigetai to the *chü-hsü* 駞 settle the most unique question that it lived together with a rat-hare called *chiieb* 蟹? Before touching this question, however, it may be necessary to make sure of the identity of the *chiieb* 蟹, a beast which was called a rat in its fore part and a hare in its hind part (鼠前而兔後).

(1) Dr. YOSHIDA 吉田博士; *op. cit.*, p. 214.

1929, c. 99.

As to the *chüeh* 蟹, besides the references "above-cited, the *Shuo-wên-chieh-i* 說文解字 (Bk. 13, Section of Ch'ung 虫) says: the *chüeh* 蟹 is a rat. It is said that in the west, there is a beast whose fore limbs are short and which lives together with the *ch'üung-ch'üung* chü-hsü 蝥蝥巨虛. Its name is *chüeh* 蟹⁽¹⁾. And the notes by Kuo P'ò 郭璞 on the passage previously cited from the Section for earth of the *Erh-ya* 爾雅釋地 says: "in the mountains of Hsia-wu 夏屋 of Kuang-wu-hsien 廣武縣 in Yen-mên Province 雁門, there is now found a beast which is like a hare in shape, but larger. Two of them walk together carrying each other. The natives call it *chüeh-shu* 蟹鼠⁽²⁾." Both Hsü Shên 許慎 and Kuo P'ò 郭璞 seem to consider the *chüeh* 蟹 as a species of the rat, but it is almost clear that it was like a hare in appearance, this is the reason why the beast was explained as one which was a rat in its fore part and a hare in its hind part. However, men of later times interpreted it as a beast identical with the *t'iao-t'u* 跳兔 (leaping hare) found in Mongolia. Ch'ên Kua 沈括 of the Sung dynasty brought several *t'iao t'u* 跳兔 (leaping-hares) when he came home from Li ng 遼 whither he had been sent as an embassy. In his work *Mêng-ch'i-pi-t'an* 夢溪筆談 (Bk. 24, *Tsai-nih* 雜誌), he says as follows:— on the northern frontier of Kitan 契丹, the *t'iao-t'u* 跳兔 (leaping-hare) is found. It is a hare to all appearance; only the fore limbs are about 1 *t'sun* 寸 (1 Chinese inch) long, while the hind limbs almost 1 *ch'ib* 尺 (1 Chinese foot). When it walks, it uses the hind limbs. It can jump several *ch'ib* 尺 at a bound. When it stops, it stumbles and falls on the ground. It is bred in the great desert in Ch'ing-chou 慶州 of Kitan. When I went on an embassy to the country, I captured several hares and brought them home. I am of the opinion that they are what the *Erh-ya* 爾雅 calls *chüeh-t'u* 蟹兔⁽³⁾. Lo-yüan 羅願 in his *Erh-ya-i* 爾雅翼 (Bk. 21, *Shih-shou* 釋獸) quotes the account by CH'EN-KUA 沈括 and supports the view that the *t'iao-t'u* 跳兔 is the *chüeh* 蟹. Li Shih-chên 李時珍

(1) 蟹鼠也。一曰西方有獸前足短與蝥蝥巨虛比其名謂之蟹。

(2) 今雁門廣武縣夏屋山中有獸形如兔而大相負共行土俗名之爲蟹鼠。

(3) 契丹北境有跳兔形皆兔也，但前足纔寸許，後足幾一尺，行則用後足跳，一躍數尺，止則蹶然仆地，生於契丹慶州之地，大漠中，予使虜日捕得數兔，持歸，蓋爾雅所謂蟹兔也。

of the Ming dynasty, in his *Pen-ts'ao-Kang-mu* 本草綱目 (Bk. 51, Shou 獸 Section 3) also says ; in the northern frontier of Kitan and Chiao-ho 交河, there is a beast called *t'iao-tu* 跳兔. So far as the head, the eyes, and colour of the hair are concerned, it is like a hare. But the claws and the legs are like those of the rat. The fore legs are only 1 *ts'um* 寸 long, while the hind legs almost 1 *chib* 尺. The tail is long and has hair on its end. It jumps several *chib* 尺 at a bound. When it stops, it stumbles and falls. This is what they call *chüeh-shu* 蟹鼠. The natives hunt it in the ground and eat it⁽¹⁾. Thus he, on the basis of the account in the *Pei-chêng-lu* 北征錄 by CHIN Yu-tzu 金幼孜, describes the *t'iao-t'u* 跳兔 in greater detail and identifies it with the *chüeh-shu* 蟹鼠. So it may be evident that the *t'iao-t'u* 跳兔 of later times was *chüeh* (shu) 蟹 (鼠) of remote antiquity as Ch'ên kua 沈括, Lo-yüan 羅願, and Li Shih-chên 李時珍 assert, because this interpretation of the *chüeh* 蟹 alone would most naturally reconcile the above cited accounts in the *Lü-shih-ch'ün-ch'iu* 呂氏春秋 and *Tao-ying-hsün* 道應訓 in the *Huai nan-tzu* 淮南子, the *Shuo-wên* 說文 and the notes by Kuo 郭 on the Section for earth of the *Erh-ya* 爾雅釋地.

Now if the *chüeh* 蟹 was *t'iao-t'u* 跳兔 (leaping-hare), it may be inferred that the animal in question was nothing but a small beast called *tarbagan* by the Mongols. The *tarbagan* is transliterated *tarbat* 塔兒巴合惕 (pl. form) in the *Yüan-chao-pi-shih* 元朝秘史 (Bk. 2). A side note₁ given for it is as the *t'u-po-shu* 土撥鼠 (ground-hollowing rat) and the *Yüan-chao-pi-shih* states that T'ieh-mu-shên 帖木真 in poverty used to kill and eat it. The *Yin-shan-chêng-yao* 飲膳正要 (Bk. 3, *Shou-p'in* 獸品) by Hu Ssu-hui 忽思慧 of the Yüan dynasty says the *ta-ra-bu-ka* 塔刺不花 is also called *t'u-po-hu* 土撥鼠 (ground-hollowing rat). It is found in a grassy marsh behind the mountains. The northern people dig it from the ground and eat it⁽²⁾. This coincides with the passage on the *t'iao-t'u* 跳兔 already cited

(1) 今契丹及交河北境有跳兔頭目毛色皆似兔而爪足似鼠前足僅寸許後足近尺尾亦長其端有毛一跳數足止即蹶仆此即蟹鼠也土人掘食之。

(2) 塔刺不花一名土撥鼠中略生山後草澤中北人掘取以食。

from the *Pên-tsao-Kang-mu* 本草綱目, which reads 土人掘食之 (The natives dig it out and eat it.) The *tarbagan* really lives underground gregariously in the steppes and mountain regions in Mongolia and Central Asia, and the head and fore legs resemble those of a rat, while the hind legs and the tail have the characteristics of a hare. (Pl. 3)⁽¹⁾. All this not only perfectly agrees with the accounts on the t'iao-t'u 跳兔 (leaping-hare) by Ch'ên Kua 沈括, Lo Yüan 羅願, Chin Yu-tzu 金幼孜, and Li Shih-chên 李時珍, but also coincides with the accounts on the chüeh 蟹 in the *Lü-lan* 呂覽, the *Huai-nan-tzu* 淮南子, and the *Shuo-wên* 說文. It is almost evident, therefore, that the t'iao-t'u 跳兔 or chüeh 蟹 was nothing but the *tarbagan* (*Arctomys bobak sibirica* Radde, *Marmota bobak sibirica* Radde.)

Coming back to the question of the chü-hsü 駟驢 again, did the *tarbagan* which was chüeh 蟹 and the *chigetai* which is supposed to have been the chü-hsü 駟驢 live together helping each other as the *Lü-lan* 呂覽 and *Erh-ya* 爾雅 recorded? A. N. Formozoff and S. Hedin who personally observed the actual conditions of animal distribution in Mongolia and Central Asia will answer this question. Formozoff, in discussing the geographical environment concerning the distribution of mammals in Outer Mongolia, assigns an extending from the desert to the steppes in the mountains for the range of the *tarbagan*, and suggests that this coincides with the geographical environment of *Equus hemionus*, (that is, the wild ass) and gazelle⁽²⁾. Indeed, Hedin, in his diary of his exploration of Central Asia, records that he found at the same spot the wild ass and the *tarbagan*⁽³⁾. Thus it may be conceded that the *tarbagan* and the *chigetai* actually lived together. Therefore, the tradition of the chüeh 蟹 and the chü-hsü 駟驢 living at the same quarters might not be entirely groundless. The tradition saying that the chüeh 蟹 plucked kan-ts'ao 甘草 for the

(1) B. P. YAKOVLEV; Manchurian animals based on the collections stored in the Museum, Manchuria Research Society, Natural History Section, Ser. A. Fasc. 10, [Harbin, 1926, Fig. 16, p. 17. G. M. Allen; Squirrels collected by the American Museum Asiatic Expedition (*American Museum Novitates*, 1935, No. 163), A. H. FORMOZOV: *op. cit.*, ss. 25-26.

(2) A. N. FORMOZOV: *ibid.*, ss. 108-110.

(3) Sven Hedin; *Scientific Results of A Journey in Central Asia 1899-1902*, Vol. III, pp. 53, 128,

chü-hsü 駟驢 and the latter ran carrying the former on its back,—that is, they were gregarious, living together, helping each other,—might be interpreted as a case in which the fact that the two animals lived together is exaggerated into a kind of romance, as is often found in folklore.

Thus, the identification of the chiung-chiung-chü-hsü 邛邛距虛 with the *chigetai*, a kind of wild ass, would most naturally solve all the problems involved. If so, it would be as well supposed that the tan-hsi 驢驘 described as 尺虛之屬 (a genus of the chü-hsü 巨虛) or 駟驢類 (a kind of the chü-hsü 駟驢) was also a kind of wild ass. The view held by Hsü Shên 許慎 ascribing yeh-ma 野馬 (wild horse) to the tan-hsi 驢驘 must be corrected to ascribe yeh-lo 野驢 (wild ass) to it. As to the wild ass, there are besides the above-mentioned *chigetai* (*Equus hemionus* Pallas), two genera, the *kulan* (*Equus onager* Pallas) and the *kiang* (*Equus kiang* Moorcr⁽¹⁾). The *kulan* which is found in the vast area of West Mongolia on the east, the northern frontier of Tibet on the south, and Russian Turkestan on the west, is often confused with the *chigetai*. This is not only because the two beasts resemble each other in physical construction, but also because the Kirghiz and other Turks as well as the Mongols⁽²⁾ often call the *chigetai* *kulan* or *kulon*⁽³⁾. On the other hand, the *kiang*, the Tibetan wild ass, is reported to thrive in an area extending from Yarkand on the west to Kashmir on the south. J. H. Miller, pointing out the difference between the *kiang* and the *dshigeteti*, asserts that the chief difference is in the colour of the fore and hind limbs. (Fig. 4)⁽⁴⁾ In brief, it may be seen that there are three kinds of Asiatic wild asses,—*dshigeteti*, *kulan*, and *kiang*;—and if the *dshigeteti* should be ascribed to the chü-hsü 駟驢, it would not be far wrong to ascribe

(1) ; *op. cit.*, c. 509, S. Hedin; *op. cit.*, Vol. VI, Part I, Zoologic von W. Leche, SS. 61-63. J. G. Andersson; *op. cit.*, p. 259.

(2) D. Carruthers; *op. cit.*, p. 607.

(3) For instance, the *Chih-yen-e-yu* 至言譯語 contains the term Hu-lan 胡蘭. It is obvious that the Mongols introduced the term *kulan* to the Chinese. According to W. W. Rockhill, the first person who introduced the term *kulan* (*culan*) to the west was Rubruck, but he also puts it as a Mongolian word. W. Rockhill; *op. cit.*, p. 69, note 4, p. 134.

(4) D. Carruthers; *op. cit.*, p. 607.

one or the other of the remaining two, preferably the *kulan*, to the tan-hsi 驪騮 described as 巨虛之屬 (a genus of the chü-hsü) or 距驪之類 (a kind of the chü-hsü). The existence of the animal design alleged to represent the dshiggetei or kulan (Fig. 5)⁽¹⁾ on the Suiyüan bronzes which are believed to be a work by the Hsiung-nu indicates their comparative familiarity with the wild asses.

If thus the dshiggetei and kulan, two kinds of wild asses, be attributed to chü-hsü 駃騠 and tan-hsi 驪騮 respectively, it is not unreasonable to find the passage previously quoted from the *T'ien-tzu-yu-lieh-fu* 天子游獵賦, which reads 蹙蹙躡距虛軼野馬轉駒駃 (to rush the ch'üung-ch'üung 蹙蹙 and drive the chü-hsü 距虛, and to gallop the wild horse and harness the t'ao-yü 駒駃.) in which the ch'üung-ch'üung (chü-hsü) 蹙蹙 (距虛), namely, chü-hsü 駃騠, and the t'ao-yü 駒駃 (yeh-ma 野馬, wild horse) are mentioned as a pair; and also a passage from *Hsiung-nu-chuan* 匈奴傳 of the *Shih-chi* 史記 in which the t'ao-yü 駒駃 and the tan-hsi 驪騮 are described side by side as the strange beasts of the Hsiung-nu 匈奴. These might be seen as specifically given in a distinct consciousness of the existence of the wild horse and the wild ass in the land of the Hsiung-nu. Now I should venture to suggest that the chü-hsü 駃騠 and tan-hsi 驪騮, like the t'ao-yü 駒駃, were employed for cartage. The passage previously cited from the *T'ien-tzu-yu-lieh-fu* 天子游獵賦, that is, 蹙蹙躡距虛 (to rush the ch'üung-ch'üung 蹙蹙 and drive the chü-hsü 距虛) does suggest this and there is a tradition in the south that the ancient Hindoos employed the wild asses for their chariots⁽²⁾, which proves the greatest suitability for cartage of the wild horse and the wild ass belonging to the genus *Equus*.

Finally, a word may be added on the terms chü-hsü 駃騠 and tan-hsi 驪騮. On the basis of the Yü-chih-wu-t'i-ch'ing-wên-chien 御製五休清文鑑, Dr. SHIRATORI seems to ascribe *gibintu* in *gibintu-dorin* of the Manchu phrase to chü-hsü 駃騠⁽³⁾,

(1) Adopted from A. Salmony; *op. cit.*, Pls. XI, XVI 17.

(2) G. Rawlinson; *op. cit.*, Vol. IV, p. 72.

(3) Dr. SHIRATORI: 西域史上の新研究 (A New Study on the History of the Western Regions) *op. cit.*, no. 4, p. 188.

and there is *giki lagusa* also in a Mongolian phrase. Now *lorin* and *lagus*, both being the mule 騾, they could not be terms for the wild ass. However, the wild ass as previously discussed, which is so very like the mule in appearance that it was frequently called the wild mule (yeh-lo 野騾, or 野羴), it would not be far wrong to suppose that the name for the mule was also applied for the wild ass. I am willing, therefore, to favour Dr. Shiratori's view for the time being at least.

As to the etymology of tan-hsi 驢騾, Dr. Miyazaki has already ascribed to it the Mongolian word *taki* and the Manchu *tabe* (*tabi*)⁽¹⁾. He is probably right in his inference. At present, *taki* (*taky*), *tag* are, as previously mentioned, terms for the wild horse, not for the wild ass; but as it is inferred that to-su 騶速, t'ao-yü 駒駘 (*dan-du*, *tar-du*, *dan-su*, *tan-su*) referred to the wild horse in ancient times, the use of *taki*, *tag* for the wild horse, must date from rather recent times, presumably after the Yüan period. On the other hand, in view of the fact that the word very accurately coincides with the pronunciation of tan-hsi 驢騾, the wild ass of the Hsiung nu, it may be inferred that *taki*, *tag* originally the term for the wild ass came later to refer to the wild horse. Thus Dr. Miyazaki's view in ascribing *taki* to tan-hsi 驢騾 may be accepted.

III

To summarize, the k'uai-t'i 騶駘, t'ao-yü 駒駘 and tan-hsi 驢騾 known as the strange beasts of the Hsiung-nu, we have seen, were respectively (1) the Aryan horse imported from the west by the Hsiung-nu, (2) the Przewalski horse or the wild horse bred in Mongolia and (3) the wild ass, probably the *kulan* bred in Mongolia. This study has shown that the Hsiung-nu, in addition to their common domestic horse—namely, the Mongolian horse, imported a superior horse of the west on the one hand, and captured the wild horse and the wild ass on the other hand, which they domesticated,—thus increasing the number of their domestic animals. This may suggest that so far as their stock-farming was concerned, the people did not succeed in achieving self-sufficiency through ordinarily increasing their animals by means of purely natural breeding.

(1) Dr. Miyazaki: *op. cit.*, p. 10.