

flanks lighter. Hairs of back black, with subterminal ring of "ecru-drab"; underfur slaty grey, tipped with smoky brown. Under surface white, the fur in some parts grey at base. Throat-patch like back, more extensive than in *L. zuluensis*. Muzzle, interramia, and ring round eye dirty white; cheeks and forehead like back. Outer surface of ears similarly coloured to back, but rather darker than in *L. zuluensis*, margined with white and tipped with black. Nape-patch "ochraceous buff." Limbs white inside, outside similar to colour of back but lighter. Hind feet nearly white above. Tail white, with a broad black dorsal stripe.

Skull very similar to that of true *zuluensis*, but smaller. Incisors narrower than in typical *zuluensis*, with wider, shallower, more median grooves.

Dimensions of two co-types (measured in flesh) :—

Head and body 430, 435 mm.; tail 80, 87; hind foot 110, 108; ear 95, 95.

Skulls: greatest length 85, 88; basilar length 64, 67; zygomatic breadth 42, 41; nasals, oblique length 38, 37.5; greatest breadth 19, 19; interorbital breadth inside wings 18, 18.5; breadth of brain-case 28, 28.5; diastema 23.5, 25; palate length 34.5, 36; palatal foramina 21, 22 × 8, 9.5; length of cheek tooth series 14, 15.

Average measurements of six skins from Bulawayo :—

Head and body 435 mm.; tail 87; hind foot 107; ear 97.

Hab. Bulawayo, Southern Rhodesia.

Co-types. Nos. 11, 15, E.C.C. ♂, 12th April, 1907; ♂, 30th April, 1907.

Caught by natives near Bulawayo.

Matabele name "Umvundhla."

LXXV.—*The Nomenclature of certain Lorises.*

By OLDFIELD THOMAS.

IN a recent publication* Dr. A. Cabrera has made some remarks on the nomenclature of the Oriental Lemurines of the genera *Nycticebus* and *Loris*, but he comes to conclusions with which I am not prepared to agree, for the reasons explained below.

His chief contention is that Stone and Rehn† were wrong in assigning Linnæus's "*Lemur tardigradus*" to the Cingha-

* Bol. Soc. españ. Hist. Nat. 1908, p. 135.

† P. Ac. Philad. 1902, p. 137.

lese Slender Lemur (*Loris*), instead of to *Nycticebus*, as had been previously done. His conclusion is based on the argument that Linnæus's description agrees better with *Nycticebus*, whatever his references may refer to, an argument that is quite natural for any one to use who has not been forced by hard experience to learn that certain formal rules are necessary to be followed in such cases, and that with regard to Linnean names in particular there is no hope of anything like definiteness in our conclusions unless some formal routine is followed.

The only method that promises this definiteness is to trace back Linnæus's references through his own published works until the earliest is reached, and from that the original source of the name can be deduced. A description drawn up from some other specimen at a later date cannot be allowed to invalidate conclusions based on this formal method.

In the case of *Lemur tardigradus* Messrs. Stone and Rehn come to the right result, but only by the rather loose method of examining all the references and judging between their relative importance, a matter in which the personal equation might often come in with disconcerting results.

My conclusion would be obtained in the following way:—

1758. *Lemur tardigradus*, Linn. S. N. (10) i. p. 29.

“1. *L. ecaudatus*, Mus. Ad. Fr. i. p. 3.

Simia ecaudata, unguibus indicis subulatis. Syst. nat. 5.*
n. 2.

Animal cynocephalum tardigradum. Seb. mus. i. p. 55. &c.
Animal elegantissimum robinsoni. Rai. quadr. 161.”

Ignoring the other references, and taking the first of the two Linnean ones, we get

1754. *Lemur tardigradus*, Linn. Mus. Ad. Frid. i. p. 3.

“*Lemur ecaudatus*.

Simia ecaudata Syst. Nat. 3. n. 2.”

Therefore a mere transference of the importance to the second reference, which would be in full—

1748. Linn. Syst. Nat. (6) p. 3. no. 2.

“*Simia ecaudata*, unguibus indicis subulatis. Seb. thes. i.
t. 35. f. 1. 2.”

The reference, as with the still earlier 1740 edition, is here

* Misprint for 3. These numbers, as with all Linnæus's 10th edition quotations, refer to the pages of the 6th edition.

solely to Seba's admirable figure of the Slender Loris, and this should therefore be taken as the basis of the Linnean name.

The fact that Linnæus many years afterwards referred to his *Lemur tardigradus* a specimen of a *Nycticebus* which he then described, should not be allowed to affect our judgment as to what was the original and essential basis of the name he gave.

Loris tardigradus will therefore be the proper name of the Cinghalese animal, while Dr. Cabrera is of course right in saying that of Mr. Lydekker's two subspecies of *Loris** it is the S.-Indian one which needs the new name. He gives to this that of *lydekkerianus*, the co-types of which would be those referred to by Mr. Lydekker, B.M. nos. 3. 2. 19. 1-2.

Further, I am at issue both with Dr. Cabrera and Mr. Lyon in their contention that the name *menagensis* is to be treated as "*non est*" in the group. For while this *was* the case on the description of the animal when first published by Nachtrieb without a generic name, its reference to the genus *Nycticebus* by Trouessart † has technically to be taken as a giving of the name *menagensis* to the animal described by Nachtrieb, the name therefore having now validity as *Nycticebus menagensis*, Trouessart. The latter's "?" does not affect the question, as, although with the query, the animal is put into the genus *Nycticebus*, and also without a query by Stone and Rehn ‡ and Lydekker §, on whose authority, again, *menagensis* would antedate the new name *philippinus* given by Dr. Cabrera.

LXXVI.—*On a Stridulating-organ in certain African River-Crabs.* By W. T. CALMAN, D.Sc., British Museum (Natural History).

IN examining a collection of river-crabs (Potamonidæ) recently brought to the British Museum from the Gaboon by Dr. W. J. Ansorge, I observed in one of the species a stridulating-organ of a type hitherto undescribed. A search among the Potamonidæ of the Museum collection revealed the fact that a similar organ is present, though less perfectly developed, in certain other species more or less closely related to the first.

The species which presents this structure in its fullest

* P. Z. S. 1904, ii. p. 345, pl. xxiii.

† Cat. Mamm. i. p. 63 (1898).

‡ L. c. p. 138.

§ L. c. p. 345.



Thomas, Oldfield. 1908. "LXXV.—The nomenclature of certain lorises." *The Annals and magazine of natural history; zoology, botany, and geology* 1, 467–469.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00222930808692437>.

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/78381>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222930808692437>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/61942>

Holding Institution

University of Toronto - Gerstein Science Information Centre

Sponsored by

University of Toronto

Copyright & Reuse

Copyright Status: NOT_IN_COPYRIGHT

This document was created from content at the **Biodiversity Heritage Library**, the world's largest open access digital library for biodiversity literature and archives. Visit BHL at <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org>.