

NUMBER 2.

DECEMBER 27, 1913.

OCCASIONAL PAPERS OF THE MUSEUM OF
ZOOLOGY

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN.

PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY.

ON *AMEIVA BIFRONTATA* COPE AND *AMEIVA*
DIVISUS (FISCHER).

BY ALEXANDER G. RUTHVEN.

In the course of a study of the reptiles of the Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta, Colombia, and environs, the writer has been led to investigate the status of *Ameiva bifrontata* Cope and *Cnemidophorus divisus* Fischer, with the results set forward in this paper.

In the original description Cope¹ gives as one of the characters of *Ameiva bifrontata* "three posterior supraoculars surrounded with granular scales in the male," whereas "in females the anterior supraocular is in contact with the second." The type locality is given as the island of St. Thomas, but it is remarked that "the specimens described as females are labeled as coming from New Grenada, probably incorrectly." Boul-

¹ Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Phila., 1862, 67.

ger² subsequently listed a male specimen from Venezuela, but in his description does not mention the alleged sexual differences in the original material.

To make certain of the correctness of Cope's description the writer requested Mr. Henry W. Fowler, of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia, to re-examine the type material, which is in that institution, and he has kindly done this and submitted the following account: "The type of *Ameiva bifrontata* shows but a single series of granules separating the first and second supraoculars. Three other examples from St. Thomas agree. Two without data, and labeled females, are without granules, the first and second supraoculars being in contact." It seems evident that the *Ameiva bifrontata* of Cope and Boulenger are the same, and that the males at least have the first and second supraoculars separated by granular scales, but it has not been shown that the females described by Cope unquestionably belong to that species.

In 1879, Fischer³ described, under the name *Cnemidophorus divisis*, a new species of teiid lizard with a divided frontal from Baranquilla, Colombia, and in this description remarks on the similarity between this form and the females described by Cope and suggests that the latter are to be referred to his *Cnemidophorus divisis*. This name has been doubtfully referred to the synonymy of *A. bifrontata* by Boulenger.

The writer has examined 29 specimens⁴ of an *Ameiva* from the region of the Santa Marta Mountains, Colombia (Santa Marta to Minca, San Lorenzo; Salamanca Coast; Fundacion) that has the divided frontal of *A. bifrontata*. In these specimens the arrangement of the supraocular scales and granules

² Catalogue of Lizards in the British Museum, II, pp. 351-352.

³ Verh. Naturw. Ver. Hamb. (2) iii, 1879, pp. 99-102, pl. V.

⁴ Obtained by the Bryant Walker Expedition of the University of Michigan (1913), and now in the Museum of Zoology.

is very constant, no sexual differences being apparent, and the series of granules on the inner margin of the supraoculars ends in every specimen but one at the posterior corner of the second supraocular, while in the exception the series on one side fails to reach that scute. It is quite evident that these specimens are not to be referred to *A. bifrontata*, and, except that the scaly portion of the tongue is not arrow-headed, they correspond so closely to the detailed description and figures of *Cnemidophorus divisus* that one cannot but believe that they represent the same form.

From the study of the Santa Marta material the writer has thus been led to conclude, first, with Fischer, that the females described by Cope were probably not incorrectly labeled as he supposed but actually came from Colombia and represent a different species, and, second, as suspected by Boulenger, that Fischer was in error in referring the Colombian form to the genus *Cnemidophorus*. Indeed there is good reason to believe that it was the males examined by Cope that were incorrectly labeled. Reinhardt and Luetkin,⁵ as has been pointed out to me by Dr. Stejneger, questioned this locality as early as 1863, and it seems that no specimens have since been recorded from the island. It is highly probable that *Ameiva bifrontata* does not occur on St. Thomas but is a Venezuelan form that is represented in Colombia by *Ameiva divisus* (Fischer).

⁵ Vidensk. Meddel. Naturhist. Foren. (Copenhagen), 1862, pp. 168-169. I am indebted to Mr. Thomas Barbour for transcripts of the original description of *Cnemidophorus divisus* and the references to *Ameiva bifrontata* by Reinhardt and Luetkin.

