- MUELLER, R. L., J. R. MACEY, M. JAEKEL, D. B. WAKE, AND J. L. BOORE. 2004. Morphological homoplasy, life history evolution, and historical biogeography of plethodontid salamanders inferred from complete mitochondrial genomes. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci., USA. 101:13820–13825.
- Petranka, J. W. 1998. Salamanders of the United States and Canada. Smithsonian Instit. Press, Washington, D.C. 587 pp.
- ROGERS, B. T., M. D. PETERSON, AND T. C. KAUFMAN. 2002. The development and evolution of insect mouthparts as revealed by the expression patterns of gnathocephalic genes. Evol. Devel. 4:96–110.
- TCHERNOV, E., O. RIEPPEL, H. ZAHER, M. J. POLCYN, AND L. L. JACOBS. 2000. A fossil snake with limbs. Science 287:2010–2013.
- TITUS, T. A., AND A. LARSON. 1996. Molecular phylogenetics of desmognathine salamanders (Caudata: Plethodontidae): a reevaluation of evolution in ecology, life history, and morphology. Syst. Biol. 45:451– 472.
- Wake, D. B. 1966. Comparative osteology and evolution of the lungless salamanders, family Plethodontidae. Mem. So. California Acad. Sci. 4·1–111
- WHITING, M. F., S. BRADLER, AND T. MAXWELL. 2003. Loss and recovery of wings in stick insects. Nature 421:264–267.
- WIENS, J. J., R. M. BONETT, AND P. T. CHIPPINDALE. 2005. Ontogeny discombobulates phylogeny: paedomorphosis and higher-level salamander relationships. Syst. Biol. 54:91–110.
- WILKINS, A. S. 2001. The Evolution of Developmental Pathways. Sinauer Assoc., Sunderland, Massachusetts. 603 pp.

ARTICLES

 ${\it Herpetological Review}, 2005, 36(2), 117-118.$ © 2005 by Society for the Study of Amphibians and Reptiles

Nomenclatural Notes on the Generic Nomen *Luperosaurus* Gray, 1845 (Squamata: Gekkonidae)

INDRANEIL DAS

Institute of Biodiversity and Environmental Conservation Universiti Malaysia Sarawak 94300 Kota Samarahan, Sarawak, Malaysia e-mail: idas@ibec.unimas.my

Gray (1845) occupied the nomen Lyperosaurus (p. 145, and later, on p. 283, in the index) and subsequently *Luperosaurus* (p. 163) for a genus of Southeast Asian gekkonid lizards. The root 'Lyper,' Greek for 'difficult' or 'vexing,' is presumably for sharing characters of Amydosaurus Gray, 1845 (synonymous with Lepidodactylus Fitzinger, 1843 and *Ptychozoon* Kuhl and van Hasselt, 1822). The type species of the genus is Luperosaurus cumingii Gray, 1845, by monotypy. The content of *Luperosaurus* has been reviewed by Boulenger (1885), W. C. Brown and Alcala (1978), Russell (1979), and R. M. Brown and Diesmos (2000), and the latter nomen appears in checklists compiled by Kluge (1991, 1993, 2001), Rösler (2000), Welch (1994), Welch et al. (1990), and Wermuth (1966), but none of these reviews or lists give reference to the other original spelling (Lyperosaurus) of the generic nomen. In the most recent checklist of constituent species of the genus, Kluge (2001) recognized eight species within the genus, including Luperosaurus browni Russell, 1979 and Luperosaurus yasumai Ota, Sengoku, and Hikida, 1996, from the Sundas, Luperosaurus iskandari R.

M. Brown et al., 2000, from Sulawesi, and *brooksii* Boulenger, 1920, *cumingii* Gray, 1845, *joloensis* Taylor, 1918, *macgregori* Stejneger, 1907 and *palawanensis* W. C. Brown and Alcala, 1978, from the Philippines (Brown and Alcala 1978).

Although the lack of citation of the nomen *Lyperosaurus* by Boulenger (1885:181), in the next monograph of the lizard collection of the British Museum (Natural History) can be interpreted that the name is a *lapsus calami*, argument against include its inclusion on p. 283 of the index of the work by Gray (1845), which notes its usage on p. 163 (where it is spelled *Luperosaurus*). The manuscript of the original work does not exist at The Natural History Museum, London, and Gray's annotated copy of the printed work (kindly examined by C. J. McCarthy at my request) has no corrections or remarks concerning these nomina.

Article 24.2.3 of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (International Commission of Zoological Nomenclature, 1999, hereafter, The Code) states that if more than a single original spelling for the same taxon exists, the first author to cite them together can select one spelling as correct (the First Reviser Principle), whereupon the other original spelling is incorrect and therefore unavailable. No such selection has ever been made. In accordance with Article 24.2.3 and Recommendation 24a of The Code, which states that the selection should be the one that "best serves stability and universality of nomenclature," I here select, as First Reviser, the nomen *Luperosaurus* Gray, 1845 as valid for the taxon, instead of *Lyperosaurus*. The spelling *Lyperosaurus*, with this action and in conformance with that article, has no nomenclatural status.

Acknowledgments.— I thank A. M. Bauer, P. David, C. J. McCarthy, R. Pethiyagoda, and H. M. Smith for comments.

LITERATURE CITED

BOULENGER, G. A. 1885. Catalogue of Lizards in the British Museum (Natural History). Second ed. Vol. 1. Geckonidae, Eublepharidae, Uroplatidae, Pygopodidae, Agamidae. British Museum (Natural History), London. xii + 436 pp + Pls. I–XXXII.

Brown, R. M., and A. C. Diesmos. 2000. The lizard genus *Luperosaurus*: taxonomy, history, and conservation prospects for some of the world's rarest lizards. Sylvatrop 10:107–124.

Brown, W. C., and A. C. Alcala. 1978. Philippine Lizards of the Family Gekkonidae. Silliman Univ. Nat. Sci. Monogr. Ser. No. 1, Dumaguete City. $v+146\ pp+(1)$.

Gray, J. E. 1845. Catalogue of the Specimens of Lizards in the Collection of the British Museum. British Museum (Natural History), London. xxviii + 289 pp.

International Commission of Zoological Nomenclature. 1999. International Code of Zoological Nomenclature. Fourth Ed. Internat. Trust Zool. Nomen., London. XXIX + 306 pp.

 $\label{eq:kluge} \begin{tabular}{ll} Kluge, A. G. 1991. Checklist of gekkonoid lizards. Smithsonian Herpetol. \\ Info. Serv. (85):1–35. \end{tabular}$

Rösler, H. 2000. Kommentierte Liste der rezenten, subrezenten und fossilen Gecko-Taxa (Reptilia: Gekkomorpha). Gekkota 2:28–153.

Russell, A. P. 1979. A new species of *Luperosaurus* (Gekkonidae) with comments on the genus. Herpetologica 35:282–288.

Welch, K. R. G. 1994. Lizards of the World. A Checklist. 1. Geckos. R & A Research Info. Ltd./KCM Books, Taunton. 165 pp.

——, P. S. Сооке, AND A. S. WRIGHT. 1990. Lizards of the Orient: a Checklist. Robert E. Krieger Publishing Company, Malabar, Florida. v + 162 pp.

WERMUTH, H. 1966. Liste der rezenten Amphibien und Reptilien. Gekkonidae, Pygopodidae, Xantusiidae. Das Tierreich 80. Walter de Gruyter and Co. I–XXII + 246 pp.

 ${\it Herpetological Review}, 2005, 36(2), 118-119.$ © 2005 by Society for the Study of Amphibians and Reptiles

Variation in and Natural History Notes on Tropidophis fuscus (Serpentes: Tropidophiidae) from Cuba

ANSEL FONG G.

BIOECO, Museo de Historia Natural "Tomás Romay," Enramadas # 601 Santiago de Cuba 90100, Cuba e-mail: ansel@bioeco.ciges.inf.cu

The Cuban snake *Tropidophis fuscus* Hedges and Garrido, 1992 was described from two specimens from Minas Amores (Baracoa municipality) and Cruzata (Yateras municipality), both in Guantánamo Province, eastern Cuba (Hedges and Garrido 1992). Until now, this species has been included only in checklists (Powell et al. 1996; Estrada and Ruibal 1999; Fong and Navarro 2001) and in range extension notes (Fong 2000, 2002). Because of the rarity of this species, herein I report new data on the seven specimens included in those range extensions, all of which have been deposited in the herpetological collection of BIOECO in Santiago de Cuba (BSC.H) and "Carlos de la Torre" Natural History Museum in Holguín (MHNH). Data on localities, dates of collection, and collectors of these specimens have been published elsewhere (Fong 2000, 2002).

Specimens from El Toldo plateau, northeastern Cuba (Fong 2000), were collected by day, coiled under stones, where they were apparently inactive; one male (BSC.H 2026) was partially underground. This locality is a mixture of pine forest (*Pinus cubensis*) and broadleaf woods growing in a red lateritic soil, similar to the type locality (Hedges and Garrido 1992). The specimen from

Sabana, Guantánamo Province (Fong 2002) was collected under a fallen tree trunk along the edge of a coffee plantation in a semideciduous woodland.

Two captive specimens underwent color changes similar to those observed in other species of the genus (Hedges et al. 1989; Rehák 1987). This was not observed in the type specimens, perhaps due to their brief time in captivity (Hedges and Garrido 1992). At night and with lights off, the two snakes were very light, almost gray, with very dark dorsal blotches. During the day or with lights on, the snakes had the dark coloration described for the type specimens (Hedges and Garrido 1992). When first captured, all individuals showed this dark pattern.

The new material of *T. fuscus* conforms well with the meristic and morphometric characteristics of the type specimens (Table 1), except that they expand the range of postocular scale numbers (from 3 to 2–4), subcaudal scale numbers (from 32 to 30–36), and dorsal rows of blotches (from 8 to 6–8, although only one specimen had six rows).

As in other species of *Tropidophis* (Schwartz and Marsh 1960), males of *T. fuscus* have one spur on each side of the vent. Females lack these spurs and tend to be larger than males. Except for MHNH w/n (original number AFG 369), the other two males have shorter snout-vent lengths than the two females (Table 1). The female holotype remains the largest known specimen. Males tend to have longer tails (14.5–17.8% of SVL) than females (11.2–11.6% of SVL), in contrast with the difference in SVL.

The female I collected was maintained in captivity and gave birth on 12 October 1996 to three neonates (BSC.H 750–752). The female weighed 7 g immediately after parturition, whereas the neonates weighed 0.75 g each. Measurements and counts of the young are given in Table 1. The only data about reproduction are those given by Hedges and Garrido (1992), who noted that the holotype (MNHNCU 2705) contained four or five well-developed young (they could not determine the exact number).

The neonates have a similar coloration pattern to that of the adults, except that the dorsal body blotches are surrounded by a few faint whitish scales (not present in adults), tail tips are bright yellow (no differently colored than body in adults), tops of the heads are brownish yellow (uniformly dark brown or black in

Table 1. Measurements (in mm), counts, and proportions of *Tropidophis fuscus*. Data for the holotype and paratype are from Hedges and Garrido (1992). All specimens with dorsal scales weakly keeled and parietal scales not in contact. F = female, M = male, J = juvenile, SVL = snout-vent length, TL = tail length, V = ventrals, S = subcaudals, SL = supralabials, IL = infralabials, P = preoculars, O = postoculars, DS = dorsal scales, DB = dorsal body blotches, LR = longitudinal rows at midbody, ED = eye diameter, HW = head width, NW = neck width.

	SVL	TL	V	S	SL	IL	P	0	DS	DB	LR	ED/HW	HW/NW
BSC.H 753 (F)	258	30	177	31	9	11	1:1	3:2	21-23-15	46	8	0.30	2.11
BSC.H 2026 (M)	223	36	169	36	10	11	1:1	3:3	24-23-17	48	6	0.26	1.80
MHNH w/n (M)	287	42	170	30	9	10	1:1	3:3	23-23-16	52	8	_	_
BSC.H 1730 (M)	247	44	181	34	10	11	1:1	3:4	23-23-18	52	8	0.32	1.99
BSC.H 751 (J)	110	11	175	30	10	10	1:1	2:3	22-23-15	_	_	_	_
BSC.H 752 (J)	113	8	178	32	10	10	1:1	3:3	23-23-17	_	_	_	
MNHNCu 2705 (F)*	304	34	185	32	10	11	2:2	3:3	23-23-16	46	8	0.33	1.83
USNM 309777 (M)**	220	32	160	32	10	11	1:2	3:3	23-23-19	43	8	0.30	1.99

^{*} Holotype, ** Paratype