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 Deiropteryx 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


(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'.
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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 cyanus 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 exanthermatica 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 tautonomy 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