

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED STABILIZATION OF THE GENERIC NAME *MACROPUS* SHAW, 1790. Z.N.(S.). 1584

(see volume 20, pages 376-379; volume 21, pages 249-259)

By H. H. Finlayson (*South Australian Museum, Adelaide*)

I am informed by Dr. W. D. L. Ride of the Western Australian Museum, that the question of the official names to be adopted for the Grey Kangaroo, Grey Wallaroo, and Parry's Wallaby is now before the Commission.

In view of the unambiguous use of the name *Macropus giganteus*, *Macropus robustus*, and *Macropus parryi* respectively for these three species, for a long period of years and in a voluminous literature, their retention is a matter of great practical convenience.

I beg to record my opinion, that if necessary, the plenary powers of the Commission should be invoked to regularize such a course.

By T. C. S. Morrison-Scott (*British Museum (Natural History), London*)

I should like to support the revised application of Ride and Calaby (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 21 : 250-255) which, by removing *canguru* separates the nomenclatural problems from the taxonomic and historical problems. Their proposal achieves the desirable object of preserving well known specific names at the same time as it stabilizes *Macropus* Shaw, 1790. And it still leaves everyone free to take their own view of the identity of Captain Cook's Kangaroo (or Kangaroos) without causing any inconvenience to anyone else.

By E. Le G. Troughton & Donald F. McMichael
(*The Australian Museum, Sydney*)

We have not, as yet, seen the published comments on the application of Calaby, Mack and Ride concerning the names of Australian Kangaroos, but we have been favoured with manuscript copies of comments by Kirkpatrick and Woods, through the courtesy of Mr. J. T. Woods, Director of the Queensland Museum, and with additional comments by Calaby and Ride through the courtesy of Dr. W. D. L. Ride, Director of the Western Australian Museum. The result of these appears to be that Kirkpatrick and Woods believe the holotype of *Mus canguru* Müller to have been a Grey Wallaroo on the basis of (a) their analysis of the dental features of the macropod skull illustrated in a painting by Nathaniel Dance and (b) their possession of specimens of the Grey Wallaroo from the vicinity of Cooktown, north Queensland, one of which is proposed as Neotype of *Mus canguru*. Furthermore, Calaby and Ride have accepted the evidence of Kirkpatrick and Woods which suggests that the Hunterian skull previously thought by them to have belonged to the holotype of *Mus canguru*, could not have come from a 38 lb Great Grey Kangaroo, and now support Kirkpatrick and Woods claim that the holotype was a Grey Wallaroo.

On these matters we would make the following comment:

- (1) The fact that Calaby and Ride have abandoned their case completely justifies our earlier comments on the subject and proves the weakness of the original argument.
- (2) We believe that the identification of the 38 lb holotype as a Grey Wallaroo is equally unsound for the following reasons.
 - (a) The skull painted by Dance is of doubtful origin. There is no real evidence that it is one of the original Endeavour River specimens, the only link being the reference to it in Dryander's Catalogue of Parkinson Drawings from the Banks Library. The date at which this Catalogue was prepared is unknown, but it is undoubtedly while Dryander was librarian to Sir Joseph Banks after Solander's death, and thus could have been prepared at any time between 1782 and about 1808. It seems most likely that it was prepared at the time Dryander was making his famous Catalogue of the Library of Sir Joseph Banks which was published between 1796 and 1800. The date when the painting was

made is also unknown. Morrison-Scott and Sawyer state "Captain Cook sat to him (Dance) for his portrait in 1776 . . . after which year Dance appears to have given up painting." However, this is not quite correct. Dance was a successful portrait painter and a Royal Academician but in 1776 he ceased to exhibit. He did not renounce his academic distinction until after his marriage in 1790, and even then did not give up painting as an amateur, since he exhibited some landscapes after his marriage. He lived until 1811, and the Dictionary of National Biography states that "Even late in life he continued to paint landscapes with considerable success." It is therefore not impossible that he painted the skull at a date subsequent to the settlement at Port Jackson, from which locality Wallaroo skulls would soon have been available. The interpretation of the dentition by Kirkpatrick and Woods indicates that this skull almost certainly came from an animal weighing about 40 lbs but they also state that "It is conceded that imperfections in Dance's drawing weaken any detailed argument on many of the characters depicted." Because of the uncertainty as to its origin, and the time at which it was painted, and the lack of diagnostic detail in the painting, we reject this skull as having any real value in the determination of the species *Mus kanguru* Müller.

- (b) The proportions of a Wallaroo, especially of the ears and the tail, do not agree with the Parkinson drawings or Solander's description. The slenderness of the limbs and tail and the proportionate length of the tail compared with the total length are characteristic of the Whiptail Wallaby and do not agree with a Wallaroo at any stage subsequent to leaving the pouch. The Cooktown Wallaroo skin (Aust. Mus. No. M.4606) shows the broadly based tail to reach barely between the shoulders, whereas the tail of the holotype equals the body length. The illustration of the animals in Hawkesworth also agrees with the naturalists description of the "slender made" kangaroo resembling a greyhound. The Parkinson sketches, together with the description that "the head and ears were most like a Hare's of any animal I know" also suit a Whiptail Wallaby but do not agree with the shorter, triangular ears of the Wallaroo.
- (c) The colour of the Wallaroo found close to Cooktown, as evidenced by specimens in both the Australian and Queensland Museums, is a rich rufous tone. The dorsal colouring of the long hair of these Wallaroos from shoulders to rump is from russet to tawny (Ridgway) in striking contrast to the short "hairy furr of a darkmouse or grey colour" or the "short ash-coloured hair" described for the holotype of *Mus kanguru*. The backs of the ears of Wallaroos from Cooktown are a uniform ochraceous-tawny colour, in contrast with the holotype of *Mus kanguru* which Solander described as "colour of the whole animal ashy, with darker ears" and elsewhere as "ears, excepting the base, fine sprinkled grey". The neotype proposed by Kirkpatrick and Woods is however not the rufous or antilopine Wallaroo, but a specimen of a Grey Wallaroo, which would be nearer the holotype of *Mus kanguru* in colour. However, this specimen was collected at the Annan River, some 17 miles South of Cooktown, and thus beyond the range from which the holotype came. On the other hand, Wallaroos obtained by the Queensland Museum at Oakey Creek, 6 miles West of Cooktown are all "antilopine" specimens (Woods, pers. comm.)

In view of these facts we maintain our original submissions that the 38 lb animal shot within a day's journey of Cooktown by Lt. Gore on July 14th, 1770 was a Whiptail Wallaby and request the Commission to take appropriate action in conformity with our submissions. We oppose the suggested suppression of *Mus kanguru* Müller,

because we consider that its identity is quite certain, and because the specific name *canguru* is appropriately linked with the first described Australian macropod, which is of considerable historical interest.

COMMENT ON THE VALIDATION OF *BORIOMYIA* BANKS, 1905.

Z.N.(S.) 1531

(see volume 20, pages 305–306, and volume 21, page 91)

By Bo Tjeder (*Entomological Institute of Lund University, Lund, Sweden*)

An important paper by Nathan Banks appeared in 1905, entitled "A revision of the Nearctic Hemerobiidae" (*Trans. Amer. Ent. Soc.* 32, pp. 21–51, pls. 3–5). In that paper Banks carried out a much needed division of the genus *Hemerobius* L. (as that genus had been interpreted since the middle of the nineteenth century). He divided the genus into three genera, with diagnoses and designations of type species:

Hemerobius L. (s. str.) Type: *H. humuli* L. 1758

Boriomyia n. gen. Type: *H. disjunctus* Banks, 1897

Symphorobius n. gen. Type: *H. amicus* Fitch, 1856.

This division was well-based and so accepted, not only in the U.S.A. but everywhere. The genus name *Boriomyia* became thus used for species allied to *B. disjuncta* (Banks, 1897) not only by Banks himself in a number of papers but also in several papers by, among others:

Andreu (1911), Eglin (1936, 1937), Esben-Petersen (1920, 1924, 1925, 1929, 1931, 1932, 1934, 1936, 1938, 1939, 1940), Essig (1926), Handschin (1936), Anton Jansson (1925), Killington (1926, 1927, 1928, 1929, 1931, 1932, 1933, 1934, 1935, 1936), Kimmins (1928, 1929, 1933, 1934, 1963), Klingstedt (1929, 1932, 1934, 1935), Krüger (1922), Lackschewitz (1929), Lindroth (1931), Lucas (1922, 1926, 1927, 1929), Morton (1914, 1921, 1932, 1933, 1935, 1936), Mosely (1932, 1933, 1934, 1935), Navás (1910, 1912, 1913), Stitz (1927, 1931), Tillyard (1923, 1926), Withycombe (1922, 1923, 1925) and by the present writer (1931, 1932, 1936, 1938, 1939, 1940, 1941, 1943, 1944, 1945, 1946, 1948, 1951, 1953, 1954, 1955, 1961, 1963, 1964).

The genus name *Boriomyia* Banks, 1905, so became universally adopted and familiar to all students of the order Neuroptera.

Until 1937 all the authors have dealt with *Boriomyia* in the sense intended by Banks in the above mentioned revision. In 1937, however, Killington observed that Banks in a local list, "A list of the neuropteroid insects, exclusive of Odonata, from the vicinity of Washington, D.C." had used the genus name *Boriomyia* for two species, thus:

"*Boriomyia fidelis* Banks.

Taken near Glencarlyn, Va, 23rd June, in pine woods.

Boriomyia speciosus Banks.

The type is from Plummer's Island, Md., 9th Sept. "

This local list was published in November 1904 (*Proc. Ent. Soc. Wash.*, 6, pp. 201–217).

Killington claimed, therefore, in Appendix B of volume II of his work "A Monograph of the Neuroptera", printed in 1937, that:

"*Boriomyia* (1904) was valid under the International Rules of Nomenclature, containing as it did two described species, that Banks was incorrect in 1906 in describing the genus as new, and that his designation of *Hemerobius disjunctus* as the genotype could not stand "

(The stated year "1906" should correctly be 1905, because the revision bears the printed publication date: "December 1905".) Killington continues:

"Banks's unfortunate action in this latter paper . . ."

Carpenter has, however, in 1940 (*Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts and Science*, 74) in a foot-note on page 215 informed:



Finlayson, H H et al. 1964. "Comments on the proposed stabilization of the generic name *Macropus* Shaw, 1790." *The Bulletin of zoological nomenclature* 21, 329–331. <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.28510>.

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/44463>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.28510>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/28510>

Holding Institution

Natural History Museum Library, London

Sponsored by

Natural History Museum Library, London

Copyright & Reuse

Copyright Status: In copyright. Digitized with the permission of the rights holder.

Rights Holder: International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>

Rights: <https://biodiversitylibrary.org/permissions>

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>.