ANOLIS NANNODES COPE, 1864: REQUEST FOR A RULING ON LECTOTYPE SELECTION (CLASS REPTILIA). (Z.N.(S.) 1189)

By Hobart M. Smith (Department of Zoology, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, U.S.A.); and W. I. Follett (California Academy of Sciences, San Francisco, California, U.S.A.)

In the most recent account of Guatemalan anoles (Stuart, 1955, Misc. Publ. Mus. Zool. Univ. Michigan 91 : 20) the name Anolis nannodes Cope (1864, Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philadelphia 16 : 173) is used for the same species referred to by Smith and Taylor (1950, Bull. U.S. nat. Mus. 199 : 63) as Anolis stuarti Smith (in Smith and Taylor, loc. cit.). In view of information now available, it appears that the proper name actually is not objectively determinable from the International Code, and may well be Anolis cortezi Stuart (1942, Occ. Papers Mus. Zool. Univ. Michigan 464 : 8). That this last name is available for this species was first pointed out in 1955 (Stuart, op. cit.) ; previously it had been regarded as pertaining to a distinct and different species. Anolis stuarti therefore no longer enters into consideration of the valid name for this species, since it is antedated by Anolis cortezi. The question of the valid name now hinges entirely upon what constitutes an authoritative selection of lectotype for Anolis nannodes, since three species were represented among the syntypes. It is believed that no question of maintenance of nomenclatural stability is involved, since confusion has reigned in the nomenclature of the species concerned; therefore no reason exists for suspension of the Rules on this ground. Furthermore, none of the names figures in any problems of types for genus or family.

2. In the original description of Anolis nannodes, Cope (loc. cit.) cited several specimens but designated none as type; thus the name was based upon a series of syntypes. The syntypes were stated to be five in number: three in the British Museum, two from Cobán, Alta Verapaz, Guatemala (the third, although not so stated by Cope, lacks data); and two in the U.S. National Museum, one from "Arriba", Costa Rica, the other from Jalapa, Veracruz, Mexico. Three species are represented by these cotypes, one from each geographic region; for present discussion the three species may be designated "M", "G" and "C" for the Mexican, Guatemalan and Costa Rican species respectively.

3. The names Anolis intermedius Peters (1863, Monatsh. Akad. Wiss. Berlin : 143, type-locality Veragua, Panamá), and Anolis tessellatus O'Shaughnessy (1875, Ann. Mag. nat. Hist., ser. 4, 15 : 279 ; type-locality Costa Rica) are without ambiguity available for species C, and are the only names other than nannodes based upon types identifiable as species C. The name Anolis laeviventris (Wiegmann) (1834, Herpetologia Mexicana : 47, type-locality "Mexico"), restricted by Smith and Taylor loc. cit. to Jalapa, Veracruz) is without ambiguity available for species M, and is the only name based upon types identifiable as species M. For species G the names Anolis cortezi Stuart (1942, loc. cit.;
type-locality Finca Los Alpes, Alta Verapaz, Guat.) and Anolis stuarti Smith (1950, in Smith and Taylor, loc. cit.; type-locality Cobán, Alta Verapaz, based upon the two syntypes of nannodes in the British Museum) are the only ones, other than nannodes, based upon types representing species G. Since names older than nannodes (1864) are available for both species M (laevisventris, 1834) and C (intermedius, 1863), the disposition of nannodes would not affect these names. Species G, however, is directly affected; if nannodes were restricted to species G, it would constitute the valid name for that species; on the contrary, if nannodes were restricted to either species M or C, the Guatemalan species would bear the name cortezi.

4. In four works “types” of some sort are mentioned in connection with Anolis nannodes. The earliest is by Bocourt (1873, Miss. Sci. Mex., Rept., Livr. 2: 71, pl. 15, fig. 5). This author mentions having examined the particular type-specimen sent from the British Museum (in reference to four specimens of his own from Cobán, he says “... ils offrent, comparés au type communiqué par le musée de Londres, cette seule différence: ...”), and identifies the illustrated specimen as “Anolis Nannodes, type 2” (actually the illustrated specimen is the male from Cobán, as has kindly been determined by Miss Alice Grandison). If Bocourt’s action were accepted as selection of lectotype, the Guatemalan species would be known as nannodes.

5. In 1885, Boulenger (Cat. Lix. Brit. Mus., 2: 79) listed the specimens of Anolis intermedius Peters, 1863, and included in that list two (3?) from Cobán, Guatemala, and one (2) without data, all cited as “Types of A. nannodes”. Cope’s name Anolis nannodes was cited in the synonymy of Anolis intermedius by Boulenger, who thus clearly regarded the latter as a subjective senior synonym of Anolis nannodes Cope. The two species are now held to be distinct, so that if Boulenger’s action were accepted as selection of a lectotype, species G would be known as nannodes.

6. In 1930, Dunn (Proc. New England Zool. Club 12: 18), in discussing Anolis intermedius of Costa Rica, mentions “the type of nannodes, U.S.N.M., No. 12206, Costa Rica”, stating that upon comparison with the type of Anolis intermedius the two proved identical. If Dunn’s action were accepted as constituting a selection of lectotype, species G would be known as cortezi since nannodes would become a junior synonym of intermedius.

7. Finally, in 1948, Stuart (Misc. Publ. Mus. Zool. Univ. Michigan 69: 50) pointed out that three species were represented by the syntypes of Cope’s Anolis nannodes: Anolis laevisventris Wiegmann, 1834 (the “Jalapa” syntype), Anolis intermedius of Panamá and Costa Rica, and a Guatemalan species to which he restricted the name nannodes through limitation of type-locality and through selection of the British Museum specimens as “lectotypes”. This restriction was subsequently fortified (Stuart, 1955, loc. cit.) by listing the “lectotype” as Brit. Mus. Nat. Hist. Nos. 1946.8.5.66–67. If Stuart’s action were accepted as constituting a selection of lectotype, species G would be known as nannodes.

8. Returning to the first of these four authors, and considering the significance of each reference in turn, there is no evidence that Bocourt (loc. cit.) meant to select the illustrated specimen as “the” type, since there were also
types in the U.S. National Museum; at least it can reasonably be construed that he simply referred to "the" particular syntype that was sent to him by the British Museum. Likewise Boulenger seemingly had no intent of selection in any manner by citing certain specimens as "types". The sense of the word "type" in both cases is rather clearly that of "syntype" in the more precise terminology of today.

9. Dunn (loc. cit.), however, unquestionably was familiar with modern type terminology, and with the facts that (1) Cope cited syntypes of Anolis nannodes from several areas, and that (2) the syntypes could possibly thus represent more than one species. Whether he intended deliberately by his own action to select U.S.N.M., no. 12206 as lectotype is dubious, but there is no question from the context that he at least construed that specimen to be the name-bearer, else he could not fix (as he so stated) the application of the name Anolis nannodes. His action was taken by Smith and Taylor (loc. cit.) as constituting a selection of lectotype. On the other hand it can be construed that Dunn's treatment does not constitute a valid selection, since he did not use the word "lectotype" or expressly state that he selected a specimen as the type. The latter interpretation would perhaps be justified by the statement of Rule (g) in Article 30 (incorporated into Article 31) which formerly provided that "The meaning of the expression 'select the type' is to be rigidly construed ...". Such interpretation would be favoured still further by action of the Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in Paris (1950, Bull. zool. Nomencl. 4: 75, Conclusion 11(2)(b)(iii), whereby the provision quoted was repeated and augmented by the requirement of "a clear indication that a selection is being made "). The Paris interpretation was revoked, however, by the Copenhagen Colloquium (1953, Copenhagen Decisions zool. Nomencl.: 73), which substituted no equally rigid requirement. In Dunn and Stuart (1951, Copeia: 57) it is stated that Dunn had no intention of selection of lectotype or restriction of nannodes to intermedius. This disavowal by Dunn of intent to select a lectotype is an excellent example in support of the view that "selection of type" should be rigidly construed, for without Dunn's later disavowal his 1930 action could very reasonably be construed as constituting a type selection, as indeed Smith and Taylor (op. cit.) thought.

10. If "selection of the type" is to be rigidly construed, Stuart's selection in 1948 is invalid, for a lectotype can be but a single specimen (1953, Copenhagen Decisions zool. Nomencl.: 77), whereas Stuart (1948 and 1955, loc. cit.) actually selected two "lectotypes" (called "lectotypes" by Stuart in 1955, a name and concept not recognised by the Rules). Thus, so far as selection of lectotype is concerned, if Dunn's selection is ruled out, so also is Stuart's, leaving unsettled even yet the objective definition of the name (1953, Copenhagen Decisions zool. Nomencl.: 72).

11. The problem might be complicated by the further consideration of restriction of type-locality. If Dunn's treatment is ruled out as inadequate for type fixation it is likewise eliminated as a valid restriction of type-locality, but Stuart's (1948) treatment clearly is valid, for there is an express statement (loc. cit.) that the type-locality is "here restricted to Cobán, Alta Verapaz". Fortunately at the London (1958) Congress the Section on Zoological Nomen-
clature voted for disregard of restriction and designation of type-locality in name-fixation, relying wholly upon earliest lectotype designation.

12. Since it can reasonably be construed that no acceptable designation of lectotype yet exists for *Anolis nannodes*, we hereby designate Brit. Mus. Nat. Hist. 1946.8.5.66 (male, specimen a in Boulenger, loc. cit., from Cobán) as lectotype of *Anolis nannodes*.

13. In order to remove present uncertainties, the Commission is requested to place the following names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:

(a) the specific name *nannodes* Cope, 1864, as published in the binomen *Anolis nannodes*, lectotype by present designation Brit. Mus. Nat. Hist. No. 1946.8.5.66;

(b) the specific name *intermedius* Peters, 1863, as published in the binomen *Anolis intermedius*, holotype Berlin Mus. No. 503;

(c) the specific name *laevisventris* Wiegmann, 1834, as published in the binomen *Anolis laevisventris*, holotype Berlin Mus. No. 525 (Berlin Mus. type numbers courtesy Dr. H. Wermuth).

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED ADDITION OF CERTAIN GENERIC AND SPECIFIC NAMES IN THE FAMILY PHASMATIDAE TO THE OFFICIAL LISTS AND INDEXES.

Z.N.(S.) 1167.

(See Volume 17, pages 235–240.)

By H. F. Lower (Waite Agricultural Research Institute, University of Adelaide, South Australia)

In the best interests of taxonomy, I strongly support the submission made by Dr. K. H. L. Key to the International Commission.

His proposed corrections do more than clear up a series of nomenclatorial errors which have accumulated over the years. They have an added practical importance in view of the work on certain Phasmatidae at present in progress in Australia, and contemplated in the future. For this work to be most productive, an established nomenclature is essential.

As a result of his painstaking and scholarly research, Dr. Key has made a valuable contribution to taxonomy, and I sincerely trust that the Commission will, in its wisdom, see fit to approve of his submissions.

By L. R. Clark (Division of Entomology, Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, Canberra, Australia)

I strongly support the application made by Dr. K. H. L. Key of C.S.I.R.O. (Australia) to have added to the Official Lists and Indexes certain generic and specific names in the family Phasmatidae.

These insects are of much economic importance in Australia and in the near future I expect to be involved, together with colleagues in C.S.I.R.O. and various State Authorities, in extensive ecological investigations on them.

Placing of names on the Official Lists will remove any doubts as to the future application of them to these phasmatids.

By D. R. Ragge (British Museum (Natural History), London)

I have read Dr. K. H. L. Key's proposals concerning the names of certain stick-insects and am in full agreement with them. Since some of the species concerned are of economic importance, it is most desirable that the nomenclature involved should be stabilized.