ON A COLLECTION OF MAMMALIAN FOSSILS FROM LIUHSIA, HONGCHOW, CHEKIANG, CHINA

PEI WEN-CHUNG and CHIU CHUNG-LANG

(Laboratory of Vertebrate Paleontology, Academia Sinica)

In 1954, some pieces of mammalian fossils were discovered from a fissure-like cave, near the town Liuhsia, not far from Hongchow in Chekiang province. Later the members of both Chekiang Provincial Museum in Hongchow and Laboratory of Vertebrate Paleontology of Academia Sinica went to the place, made certain observation and collected further material.

The fossiliferous cave of Liuhsia was formed by enlarging a longitudinal fissure in limestone by running water from a spring. The lower part of the cave had been filled by a layer, about 2 meters in thickness, of brownish violet clay which is similar to that outside of the cave.

Fossil bones are found in the violet clay. Since sometimes we found some small pebbles in the clayish deposits, it is possible that most of the fossils was originally introduced from outside by running water. This is also evidenced by that the Liuhsia fossils are chiefly very fragmentary. Of course the remains of *Hyaena*, to be described below, might be left by the individuals which had actually inhabited in the cave.

A plaster-cast of Stegodon molar was submitted to us by Prof. Miao Ti-ching of Shanghai Normal University. According to Prof. Miao the original specimen was also collected from Liuhsia, probably from the same cave as our fossils, and hence we consider it together with the others.

The collected fossil forms of Liuhsia consist of: two forms of Rodents, one indeterminable Bovidae—which are too fragmentary for more precise identification; *Rhinoceros sinensis* Owen, Sus sp., Cervus (Sika) sp. and Elephus sp. are well known in South China caves and for the scanty of material, not worthy for detailed description.

The interesting fossils in the present collection are only those of Hyaena and Stegodon.

In our Liuhsia material there are: one right-mandible with P₃—M₁ (No. V. 1641), one broken maxilla with P¹ and P², another with complete P⁴, and some isolated teeth more or less broken may well be identified as *Crocuta ultima* Matsumoto (Pl. I, Figs. 1, 2). By the characters such as that the 1st lobe is decidedly smaller than the 2nd (Pl. I, Figs. 3, 4),

in P^4 and that the talonid of M_1 is considerably small and trenchant, it differs evidently from *Hyaena* 'sinensis' Owen as redefined by Zdansky (Pei, 1934).

The Stegodon of Prof. Miao is too large for ordinary Stegodon orientalis Owen, which is commonly found in South China caves and associated with the forms of the present collection. However, if we compare it with the largest specimen of S. orientalis from Yenchingkou in our Laboratory, it is approximately comparable. According to its size, it is closer to Stegodon zdanskyi Hopwood of Early Pliocene of North China.

Therefore, with regards to the fossil *Stegodon* of Liuhsia, there may be two alteratives: either Prof. Miao's specimen is exceptionally large in size, if it was actually found in the Liuhsia cave in association with the others, or there exists one stratum of deposits of Pliocene age outside or inside of the cave in Liuhsia region. For the lack of more informations, no decision could be made at present.

At last we would like to point out that, except some fossil bones were recorded from Chiangshan in the same Chekiang Province (Wang, 1931), it is the first time to report the same fossil mammalian fauna occurred in such an eastern part, as Hongchow, though it is widely found in the more western and southern part of China. As the knowledge of the distribution of *Ailuropoda-Stegodon* fauna of South China cave is hence extended and we may expect more discoveries of this fauna in eastern part of China.

浙江杭州留下洞穴哺乳動物化石

裴文中 邱中郎

(中國科學院古脊椎動物研究室)

(一) 序 言

1954年,浙江杭州留下鎮一個工地在荆山嶺開採石灰岩時,會在一山洞的棕色土中,發現了哺乳動物化石。後經杭州浙江省博物館派員前往採集,並函知我室前往協助調查。筆者(邱)與我室柴鳳歧同志於 1955 年 5 月前往,在該地進行了調查和採集。

當我們到達留下鎮荆山嶺時,出產化石的山洞已在開採石灰岩時破壞,僅在石灰岩上遺留高約2米的洞壁的痕跡。洞的底部原填有棕色土,其性質與洞外的棕色土相同,化石即發現在此洞底的棕色土中。

據當地工人稱,荆山嶺的山洞,原形爲狹長者。後經破壞而殘存的洞底, 微向山外傾斜。 在洞壁上有一填滿棕色土的裂隙通至山頂, 並有泉水由此裂隙的深處流出。 由此情况看來, 原來狹長的山洞,很可能是因由裂隙中流出的泉水,冲溶開擴而成的。

筆者很感謝浙江省博物館將所採的化石標本全部寄交給我室研究。華東師範學院苗迪 青教授也寄來一塊劍齒象牙齒的模型,要我們研究,筆者也一併誌謝。

(二) 哺乳動物化石

由留下鎮荆山嶺所採的化石,多很破碎,石化程度不深,牙齒大多是單獨者,但牙根很少 被齧齒類動物咬掉,像其他江南山洞中的哺乳動物化石一樣。 體骨也多半是破碎的,不能鑑 定。其中能鑑定者,記述於下:

齧歯類 (Rodentia)

只有二個門齒,一個下門齒(編號 V.1639) 形狀較大,可以同一般鼠類 (Murinae) 相比; 一個上門齒(編號 V.1640) 形狀較小,可以同小鼠 (*Micromys*) 相比。

"最晚"鬣狗(Crocuta ultima Matsumoto)

(圖版Ⅰ,圖 1-4)

材料:至少代表二個個體:一個比較年青的,牙齒磨蝕少,計有一個右下顎,上有 P_3 - M_1 (編號 V.1641) 和一個沒有根的 P^3 。另一個個體;牙齒磨蝕較深,計有破上顎一段,上有 P^1 和 P^2 ;又上顎一段,上有完整的 P^4 (編號 V.1642)。另外還有一個破的 P^4 ,只保存後邊一部;二個下右大齒和一個完整的 M_1 和破的 M_1 (編號 V.1643)。

描述:這種鬣狗的 P4, 很顯然的,具有一個很短的第一葉 (Parastyle),約較第二葉 (Protocone) 小一倍; 但第三葉 (Tritocone) 又較第二葉長得多(圖版 I, 圖 3)。在 M_I 上,前葉 (Paraconid) 較後葉 (Protoconid) 稍寬和稍大,後邊的附阜 (talonid) 短小,而中間為 刃形。

尺度(單位毫米)	長 (Length)	寬 (Width)
(V. 1641) P ₃	22	15
P_4	23	14
M_1	30.6	13
$\mathbf{p_1}$	7	8
P^2	17.5	13
(V. 1642) P ⁴	41	20

討論:由上述荆山嶺的蠶狗的 P^4 和 M_1 的性質來看,很清楚地是屬於"最晚"蠶狗。它與中國鬣狗 (*Crocuta sinensis* Owen) 的區別是: P_4 的第一葉比第二葉小得多; M_1 的附阜小而1形。

中國犀牛 (Rhinoceros sinensis Owen)

(圖版 I, 圖 7)

一個完整的上乳齒 (DP^3) (編號 V.1644) 和二個破碎的下臼齒。(編號 V.1645-1646)

這個犀牛的上乳齒,構造比較簡單,尺寸也較小(長 30 毫米,寬 32 毫米),與 Koken 所描述的 Rhinoceros simplicidens Koken 有些相似 (Koken 1885, Pl. 5, Fig. 7)。但是

Colbert 和 Hooijer (1953) 在研究四川萬縣鹽井溝的壓牛時會散,中國壓牛 (Rh. sinensis Owen)的上乳齒的個體差別很大。因此,我們在這裏仍名之爲中國犀牛。

野 猪 (Sus sp.)

一個破下門齒,一個磨蝕很深的上臼齒(M^1)和一個完整的(編號 V.1647)及三個破 的下第三臼齒,代表了一種野猪。 遺個完整的 M₃ (長為 44.5 毫米, 寬為 18.2 毫米), 與中 國北部的化石李氏猪 (Sus lydekkeri Zdansky) 和歐亞大陸的現代野猪 (Sus scrofa L.) 都觀察不出有什麼區別。

斑 鹿 (Cervus (Sika) sp.)

(圖版 I, 图 5)

由杭州留下所發現的化石,以鹿類者爲最多,有破碎的小段犄角 9 塊,破體骨十幾塊,牙 齒 2 個。

由一塊帶有角柄的標本(編號 V.1648) 觀察,這種應的犄角根很短,分叉的地方距角環 很近, 犄角表面有綫狀的縱紋和小的點狀突起, 都與水鹿不相似。因之, 筆者認爲浙江留下的 鹿是班鹿 [Cervus (Sika)], 不是江南山洞中常見的水鹿 [Cervus (Rusa)], 至於種的鑑 定,因標本貧乏,勢不可能。

牛科 (Bovidae indet.)

屬於牛科的標本,計有破碎的上下牙(包括臼齒和前臼齒)15個。 遺是一種比較小的牛, 因爲標本太破碎,不可能作更進一步的鑑定。(編號 V.1649)

東方劍曲象(Stegodon cf. orientalis Owen)

(國版工, 岡 6)

苗迪青教授會寄給我室劍齒象臼齒的碎塊模型一個(編號 V.1650),謂原物亦係來自浙 江留下鎮,很可能也是由荆山嶺遺個已經破壞的山洞中採得。

由模型上看,這個標本是臼齒的一塊,只保存着兩個齒板邊上的一部分,兩個齒板上都有 兩個乳突,齒板的距離很大(在牙面上。二齒板中間的距離約為 51 毫米),與師氏劍齒象(Stegodon zdanskyi Hopwood) 相似。但是師氏劍齒象一般發現在華北的上新世地層中。如 果我們的標本也發現在荆山嶺的山洞中,由它共生的化石和地質年代上看,(參考後之結論) 它不可能是上新世的師氏劍齒象,可能是東方劍齒象 (S. orientalis)。另外它與我們室內由 四川萬縣鹽井溝採來的特別大的東方劍齒象的臼齒比較,也差不很多。

也可能遭塊標本,是由留下鎮另外一個地點的更古的地層中採得。如此,則說明留下附 近還有上新世的地層存在,但還需要更多的調查和採集方可證實。

象 (Elephas sp.)

在我們的標本中,有一小塊象的齒板,(編號 V.1651)由齒板兩邊的牙磁上看,小折綯很 多,再從齒板和厚度來衡量,遺塊標本很可能是納瑪象 (Elephas namadicus Falconer & Cautley), 但沒有其他性質可以補充證明。

(三) 結 論

棕色土和化石的堆積時代,由所可能鑑定的化石來看,與江南各**地的**洞穴堆積大致相同, 同爲更新世中期。

就化石種類而言,除苗迪青教授所採的東方劍齒象似較大,可能代表較古的種類和鹿化 石不是水鹿而是斑鹿外,其餘各種都是江南各山洞中智見的動物,沒有值得特別注意之處。

在過去,浙江境內只有江山縣山洞中發現過哺乳動物化石,會由王恭睦研究過。 杭州留下的發現,在這樣偏東的地區,還是第一次。我們相信,在福建和浙江的石灰岩地區,如同江南西部諸省(四川,雲南,貴州)一樣,含有哺乳動物化石的山洞,一定還很多。

參 考 文 獻

(References)

- Colbert, F. H. & Hooijer, D. A., 1953. Pleistocene Mammals from the Limestone Fissures of Szechwan, China. Buli. Am. Mus. Nat. Hist., Vol. 102, Article 1.
- [2] Kurtén, Bjorm, 1956. The Status and Affinities of Hyaena sinensis Owen and Hyaena ultima Matsumoto. Am. Mus. Novi., No. 1764.
- [3] Matsumoto, H., 1915. On Some Fossil Mammals from Szechuan, China. Sci. Repts. Tohoku Imp. Univ., Ser. 2, 3(1), 1-28, Pls. 1-10.
- [4] Pei, W. C., 1934. On the Carnivora from Locality 1 of Choukoutien, Pal. Sin., Ser. C, 8(1), 1—216, Pls 1—24...
- [5] Wang, K. M., 1931. Die Höhlenablagerungen und Fauna in der Drachen-Maul-Höhle von Kiangsen, Chekiang. Contributions from the National Research Institute of Geology. No. 1, pp. 41—67.
- [6] Young, C. C., 1932. On the Artiadactyla from the Sinanthropus Site at Choukoutien, Pal. Sin., Ser. C. Vol. 8, Fasc. 3.

圖版說明

- 圖 1. "最晚"重狗(Crocuta ultima Matsumoto)
 右上颚,上連 P₃—M₁,內側面,× ⅓ (V. 1641)
- 圖 2. "最晚"戲狗 (Crocuta ultima Matsumoto) 同圖 1 標本,外側面
- **圖 4. "最晚"賦**狗 (Crocuta ultima Matsumoto) 同圖 3 標本,內側面
- 圈 5. 斑鹿 [Cervus (Sika) sp.] 角根部分, × ½ (V. 1648)
- 圖 6. 東方劍齒象 (Stegodon cf. Orientalis Owen) 臼齒碎塊,臀面,× ½ (V. 1650)
- 图 7. 中國犀牛 (Rhinoceros sinensis Owen) DP³, × ⅓ (V. 1644)

