

ON THE ALLOCATION OF THE NAME *SCIURUS FINLAYSONI*.

HORSFIELD.

BY OLDFIELD THOMAS, British Museum.

(Published by permission of the Trustees of the British Museum),

A controversy has recently arisen between Messrs. Robinson and Kloss as to the respective names of the white squirrels of the Siam Mainland and of Si-chang Island in the Gulf of Siam, and since I have access to what seems the essential piece of evidence in the matter—Horsfield's type—I may venture to express an opinion on the subject.

The three recent notes on the subject are as follows:—

- (1). Kloss, C. B. Journ. Nat. Hist. Soc. Siam, i, p. 157, 1915. Discovery of difference between mainland and island forms. Original *finlaysoni* applied to mainland one, and *portus* given to that of the island.
- (2). Robinson, H. C. Journ. Fed. States Museum, vii, p. 35, 1916. Statement that Kloss was wrong in assigning *finlaysoni* to the mainland squirrel, since it is shown by Wroughton's descriptions of "the type" that it is the smaller, island form. The latter therefore is true *finlaysoni* and the name *tachardi* is given to the mainland one.
- (3). Kloss, C. B. Journ. Nat. Hist. Soc. Siam, ii, p. 179, 1916. Reiteration of previous opinion, partly on the ground that Horsfield had in his mind the mainland form and quoted Buffon's *Ecureuil blanc de Siam*, and partly that Anderson quoted "Siam" as the locality of the type of *finlaysoni* and might be considered a "first reviser" in the matter.

In discussing what Horsfield "had in his mind" and similar lines of argument, Mr. Kloss appears to me to have overlooked the advisability of making inquiry as to what types exist, bearing on the question.

Far from giving the name primarily to Buffon's White Squirrel

Horsfield, after describing the species from Finlayson's notes, definitely places, in accordance with the custom of his time, the words "Museum of the East India Company" as the collection in which the original of his name was preserved.

Later on, in his Catalogue of that very Museum, we have :—

"*Sciurus finlaysoni*, Horsfield.

Hab. Siam.

A. From G. Finlayson's Collection."

No one accustomed to dealing with the older collections would refuse to admit that this specimen A, the only one in the Museum said originally to contain the animal described, should be regarded as the type. The word "Siam," whether used by Horsfield or Anderson would of course, as pointed out by Robinson, have been of general application, and would have included a little coastal island like Si-chang.

The British Museum now contains both this type specimen, received with the India Museum Collections in 1879, and one from Si-chang given by the East India Company about 1830, which was also obtained by Finlayson, and referred to by Anderson. The former's Museum number is 79.11.21.521., and the latter's, 71a.

Supposing these specimens to represent the two quite distinct forms concerned, both Robinson and Kloss estimate very lightly Anderson's statement that "these two specimens are exactly alike", and give reasons explaining how he might have come to such a conclusion.

But in this case Anderson is absolutely right. They *are* exactly alike, being both referable to the small island squirrel, and not to that of the mainland.

That the specimen he called the type belonged to the insular form was of course evident from Wroughton's measurements of its skull, but that it was *rightly* called the type I claim firstly from Horsfield's "Museum of the East India Company" following the description, this specimen being then and always the only example there preserved, and secondly, if that is not considered sufficient, and Anderson is called in as a first reviser, then his words "The type of *S.*

finlaysoni".....referring, as is evident from the context, to this specimen (for the other is quoted separately), would of themselves fix it as the type.

Since, as stated above, this type is the small island form, that will stand as *Callosciurus finlaysoni finlaysoni*, with *portus* as a synonym, while the mainland squirrel will bear Robinson's appropriate name of *tachardi*, the type of the latter, so designated by its author, being B. M. No. 0.10.7.7.

Mr. Robinson's conclusion, therefore, is in my opinion fully justified, as opposed to that come to by Mr. Kloss.

Finally as a small point I should like to demur to Mr. Robinson's use of the word "co-types" (in paper (2), p. 36), for specimens which do not form part of the series on which the name concerned was originally founded. Definitions of the words "co-type," "paratype," and "metatype" (which last Mr. Robinson's specimens might possibly be considered to be), will be found in P. Z. S., 1893, p. 242.

[I doubt whether Horsfield recognised any particular specimen as the type: it is rather a case of what part of the material he referred to and the question is not so much what existed in 1824.

Contrary to Thomas' statement ("then and always the only example there preserved") this material consisted at that time of two or more specimens since one was transferred to the British Museum about 1830 (No. 74 a) and another in 1879 (No. 79. 11. 21. 521). Horsfield's Catalogue, compiled in 1851, obviously does not record all the specimens that the East India Company formerly possessed. Thus there is no indication of any particular type and I do not think because only one example was subsequently retained that we have, of necessity, any right to consider it as such.

No. 74. a. came from Koh Si-chang (*vide* Thomas) and was so localised by Anderson, and since only two specimens now appear to have been in question in his time, the other (No. 79. etc., A of Horsfield's Catalogue) may perhaps be that regarded by him as the type, with the statement that it came from Siam: nowhere does it seem to be definitely said that it came from Koh Si-chang as is the case with

the former, and Thomas himself only infers this on account of both being of similar size.

The view held by Robinson and Thomas, contrary to mine, that "Siam" was used by Horsfield and Anderson as a term of general application does not seem to me warranted, since Finlayson and Anderson both go out of their way to state deliberately that only one of the specimens came from the island: the obvious inference being that the remaining material was obtained elsewhere. Anderson's statements certainly cannot be explained away in the above fashion.

I did not, as suggested, overlook the matter of the material now existing, but, accepting Anderson's statement that a specimen came from Siam proper, considered that it might have since disappeared—no isolated occurrence. Thomas shows that only two white squirrels from Finlayson's collection are in the British Museum to-day and though Anderson says he examined other specimens from Siam, they might not have been of the typical series or he may have seen them elsewhere, while the two he refers to specially were probably those mentioned above: thus the question may perhaps be limited to whence came the example not specifically recorded as from Koh Si-chang (No. 79, etc.). It is, says Thomas, the specimen of which Wroughton has given measurements (with the statement that it is fully adult), so the arguments now put forward certainly point to Koh Si-chang as the type locality—if we are to believe that Finlayson only obtained these two specimens, in spite of what Anderson says and Horsfield indicates.

Mr. Thomas reflects on Mr. Robinson's use of the word "co-type" but he himself is equally at fault. There is no type of *finlaysoni*: the only specimen specifically mentioned, even indirectly, by Horsfield is Rutherford's animal from Koh Si-chang which Mr. Thomas does not accept as the type: in strict accuracy, therefore, any specimen of the original series subsequently selected can only be a lecto-type*. The other specimens referred to by Mr. Robinson as co-types of his *tachardi* would be idiotypes* since they are not of the original series (Mr. Lyle's). C. Boden Kloss].

*Ann. and Mag. Nat. Hist. (7) xvi., p. 102 (1905).