

FURTHER COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF A
TYPE SPECIES FOR *ANOLIS* DAUDIN, 1802. Z.N.(S.)1603
(see vol. 20, pp. 438–439; vol. 40, pp. 15–19)

(1) By Jay M. Savage (*Department of Biology, University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida 33124*)

The recent comments regarding the 1963 proposal by Smith, Williams & Lazell to fix the type species of *Anolis* presented by Sabrosky and by Stimson & Underwood are essentially correct. However, the underemphasis on the result of fixing *Lacerta bullaris* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of *Anolis*, as designated by Stejneger in 1904 creates problems that are best resolved by accepting the proposal of Smith, Williams & Lazell to designate *Anolis carolinensis* Voigt, 1832 as type species, by fiat of the Commission.

Etheridge, 1967, p. 171, in the interim between the Smith, Williams & Lazell proposal and those of Sabrosky and Stimson & Underwood, split *Anolis* into two species groups, the alpha and beta sections, based on differences in caudal vertebrae. While he did not formally recognise the groups as distinct genera, all subsequent workers on the genus recognise that the name *Anolis* referred to alpha anoles and *Norops* Wagler, 1830 (type species, by monotypy, *Anolis auratus* Daudin, 1802) to beta anoles. This practice, deeply embedded in the minds of students in this field, would be reversed by Sabrosky and Stimson & Underwood's proposal. Alpha anoles would then become *Deiropyx* Fitzinger, 1843 (type species, by original designation, *Anolis vermiculatus* Duméril & Bibron, 1837), and the betas would become *Anolis*.

While the proposals of Sabrosky and Stimson & Underwood, had they been published and acted on earlier, are correct under strict interpretation of the rules, the intervening 20 years of custom and usage counter their arguments for stability. For these reasons I now support completely the request of Smith, Williams & Lazell, 1963, although I opposed it on the same grounds as Sabrosky and Stimson & Underwood at the time it was made.

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES

- FITZINGER, L. J. F. J. 1843. *Systema Reptilium*. Vienna, 106 VI pp.
WAGLER, J. 1830. *Natürliches System der Amphibien* ... Munich, VI 354 pp.

(2) Reply by A. F. Stimson & G. L. Underwood

Since 1967 workers generally have referred to Etheridge's two groups simply as alpha anoles and beta anoles, placing both groups in the genus *Anolis* without formal use of subgeneric names. The only exception of which we are aware is Savage (1980, pp. 69–73; 1982, pp. 468, 475, 509, 519) who used *Anolis* for alpha anoles and *Norops* for beta anoles. We do not consider this to represent '20 years of custom and usage'.

REFERENCES

- SAVAGE, J. M. 1980. *A handlist with preliminary keys to the herpetofauna of Costa Rica*. 111 pp.

—1982. The enigma of the Central American herpetofauna: dispersal or vicariance? *Ann. Missouri Bot. Gard.* 69, pp. 464–547.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF
TEIIDAE GRAY, 1827. Z.N.(S.)1920
(see vol. 38, pp. 194–196; vol. 39, pp. 157–158)

By Andrew Stimson (*British Museum (Natural History), London*)

The family-group name TEIIDAE is so well entrenched in the herpetological literature that there can be no doubt that the use of the plenary powers to conserve it is justified. I agree with Smith, Smith & Chiszar (vol. 39, pp. 157–158) that those powers need not be used in relation to the unavailable TUPINAMBIDAE and support their use to give TEIIDAE precedence over AMEIVIDAE.

There are, however, a couple of errors in Presch's original proposal that should be corrected. He states that the type species of *Teius* Merrem, 1820 is *Lacerta teyou* Daudin, 1802, by monotypy, and that that of *Tupinambis* Daudin, 1802 is *Lacerta teguixin* Linnaeus, 1758, also by monotypy. Since both genera originally included several nominal species neither type species can be fixed by monotypy.

Teius Merrem was based on seven species regarded as valid: viz: *Teius viridis* sp. nov. (with *Lacerta teyou* Daudin, 1802 in synonymy); *L. lemniscata* Linnaeus; *L. ameiva* Linnaeus; '*L. monitor* Bonnat.', i.e. *Tupinambis monitor* Daudin; *Teius cyaneus* sp. nov.; *L. bicarinata* Linnaeus; and *Teius crocodilinus* sp. nov. No type species was designated in the original description. In their checklist of South American lizards, Burt & Burt (1933, p. 76) gave *viridis* as the type species of *Teius*, all the other originally included species having been earlier placed in other genera. *Teius viridis* is without doubt a junior synonym of *Teius teyou* (Daudin), the only species currently recognised in this genus. Thus, while the biological type species is *Teius teyou* (Daudin) and that is the valid name for that species, the nominal type species should be cited as *Teius viridis* Merrem, 1820, p. 60, by subsequent designation by Burt & Burt, 1933, p. 76.

In the genus *Tupinambis* Daudin a similar situation exists. The 12 originally included species were: *Tupinambis monitor* sp. nov.; *T. elegans* sp. nov.; *T. cepedianus* sp. nov.; *T. indicus* sp. nov.; *T. maculatus* sp. nov.; *Lacerta nilotica* Linnaeus; *T. stellatus* sp. nov.; *T. bengalensis* sp. nov.; *T. albigularis* sp. nov.; *T. variegatus* sp. nov.; *Lacerta exanthematica* Bosc.; and *T. lacertina* sp. nov. The first-mentioned of these, *T. monitor*, contained among its cited synonyms *Temapara tupinambis* Ray, 1693, p. 265. Thus the type species of *Tupinambis* Daudin, 1802, p. 5 is *Tupinambis monitor* Daudin, 1802, p. 20, by absolute tautonymy through *Temapara tupinambis* Ray. This is the only one of the originally included species remaining in the genus. *T. monitor* is generally regarded as a synonym of *T. teguixin* (Linnaeus) sensu Boulenger (1885, p. 335), i.e. *T. rufescens* Günther sensu Presch (1973, p. 743) although Presch (p. 741) placed it in the synonymy of *T. teguixin* sensu Presch, i.e. *T. nigropunctatus*



Savage, Jay Mathers. 1983. "Further comments on the proposed designation of a type species for *Anolis Daudin*, 1802. Z. N. (S.) 1603 (see vol. 20, pp. 438-439; vol. 40, pp. 15-19)." *The Bulletin of zoological nomenclature* 40, 195–196.

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/44482>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/31263>

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>.