The subgenus Rhinosciurus of Trouessart.*

In the 'Catalogus Mammalium' (p. 410) Trouessart unites the Sciurus laticaudatus of Müller and Schlegel and the S. davidianus of A. Milne-Edwards to form the subgenus Rhinosciurus† placed at the end of the genus Xerus. Material in the United States National Museum shows that the two species are not congeneric, and that neither is closely related to Xerus. The genus Rhinosciurus (type R. tupaioides Blyth‡) is strikingly characterized by its greatly elongated, cylindric, Tupaia-like skull and small, slender incisors. The lower incisors are set more nearly in line with the mandibular ramus than in other squirrels, and the upper incisors are so small that in a skull 50 mm. in basal length they scarcely equal those in a skull of Sciuropterus volans only 27 mm. long. The 'Xerus' davidianus on the other hand has a skull practically identical with that of the Chinese Eutamias senesens, though much larger. Indeed the agreement with Eutamias in both cranial and dental characters appears to be complete. Externally, however, the animal resembles Sciurus in its well-haired, bushy tail and in the absence of stripes on the body. It also diverges from Eutamias in the direction of Sciurus in the reduction of the capacity of the cheek pouches. As the animal can therefore be properly referred to none of the recognized groups it may be made the type of a new genus Sciurotamias.—Gerrit S. Miller, Jr.

*Published here by permission of the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.
†First used by Gray in 1843 (List Mamm. Brit. Mus. p. 195) for a genus with B. tupaioides from Singapore as the type. Both generic and specific names are nomina nuda and must date from their earliest definition. The former was properly published by Gray in 1867 (Am. and Mag. Nat. Hist., 3d ser. XX, p. 286), the latter by Blyth in 1855 (Jour. Asiat. Soc. Bengal, XXIV, p. 477) as Sc[iurus] tupaioides, type locality Malacca.
‡The relationship of this animal to the Bornean Rhinosciurus laticaudatus given by Thomas (Proc. Zool. Soc. London, 1897, p. 933) as type of the subgenus is not fully understood.