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ABSTRACT

Comments are made on three lists of South American reptiles in the collection of the Natural History Museum in Vienna, mostly focusing on specimens collected by Natterer and by the 1903 expedition to northeastern Brazil, as well as on types of species described by Franz Werner.
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INTRODUCTION

The naturalists who visited Brasil in the early XIX Century saw a country closer to its pristine state than those who came later, with or after the rush of colonization. Their surviving materials have great value, eventually enhanced by the quality of accompanying information, especially geographical.

Among the early explorers there was a strong contingent of Austrians. There was a rather close relationship between the Portuguese royal house of Bragança and the Austro-Hungarian empire (Ramirez, 1968); Austrian scientists had facility to enter the country, otherwise jealously guarded against intrusion. There were capable early groups (Vanzolini, 1996), especially those who came in 1817 with the Archduchess Leopoldine, newly-wed and much beloved Empress of Brasil. Johann Natterer, the most assiduous, stayed for eighteen years and took home an extremely fine collection (Vanzolini, 1993). The well-
organized museum at Vienna thus amassed large and valuable collections, which were the object of sound publication (e.g., Pelzeln, 1868-1870 1883; Siebenrock, 1904). In later days there was still one important expedition, the “Brasilien Expedition”, led by the renowned Franz Steindachner, which crossed the back country of northeastern Brasil (Reiser, 1926; Vanzolini, 1992), collecting all classes of vertebrates.

Of course, museums also increased their holdings by purchase, and Vienna was at the time a client of several dealers, such as Rosenberg, Schlueter and others. Steindachner (the “Intendant”) seems to have contributed heavily from his own pocket to these activities. An especially important acquisition was the private collection of Franz Werner, in part bought during his lifetime, in part donated by the family after his demise. Werner was a systematist of barbaric courage, who described as new every specimen within sight, with a strong penchant for no-locality materials. On the other hand, however, he had much experience. His work can neither be accepted nor dismissed *prima facie*: the specimens have to be seen.

In recent years three very important papers were published on the Vienna reptiles: Tiedemann & Háupl (1980), a catalog of type specimens; Tiedemann, Háupl & Grillitsch (1994), a second catalog of types; and Grillitsch, Schleiffer & Tiedemann (1996), on the dry (skeletal and stuffed) specimens. For present purposes of cross-reference these papers are henceforth respectively referred to as TH, THG and GST.

In the present notes I try to clarify what seems to need clarification, to enhance whatever information may be present in the data, but not immediately apparent, and to call attention to issues remaining. I have taken special care with the geographical side. At the risk of being repetitious, I have included in every case all the information relevant to the understanding of the issue and for cross-reference within this paper.

**Arrangement**

The entries are sequentially numbered for each of the three papers reviewed, and the respective pages mentioned. Each entry contains

1. The name under which it is cited in the catalogs (in the case of types, the original scientific names).
2. In the case of members of a hypodigm, besides the categories sanctioned by the ICZN, I adopt the category “syntypes”, which indicates that the description is
Based on more than one specimen, and no one has been designated as a holotype.

3. NMW catalog numbers.

4. Locality, literally transcribed, within inverted commas (to stress that it is a transcription, not an interpretation).

5. As available, the collector ("coll.") or other eventual source of the specimens ("ex").

6. The final reference (preceded by = ) is to the present disposition of the name. When the name adopted in the catalog is valid, the fact is indicated by "= ipse". Otherwise a bibliographical reference is given.

7. In the geographical coordinates, South and West are omitted, only North (N) being used when necessary.

8. Comments are placed wherever they are thought opportune.

Notes

Tiedemann & Háupl, 1980


6 (p. 11). Anisolepis grilli Boulenger, 1891. Syntype, NMW 12970, "Province Parana”. This reference is incomplete. Boulenger (1891: 301) states: “Two specimens, males, were obtained by Dr. G. Franco Grillo at Palmeira, in the province of Parana, Brazil”. Palmeira was then the ranch of Dr. Giuseppe Franco Grillo (my revered great-grandfather); it is a now a city of the same name. = ipse.


17 (p. 16). *Cnemidophorus heterolepis* Tschudi, 1845. Holotype, NMW 14856, “Ostabheng der Anden”, Tschudi coll. = *Dicrodon heterolepis* (Tschudi, 1845). There is a problem here. The original description, in the *Conspictrus* (Tschudi, 1845), does not refer to distribution. The subsequent mention (Tschudi, 1846), in the *Herpetologie*, states explicitly “in heissen Wälder des Ostabhengung der Anden”, in the warm forests of the eastern slope of the Andes. It happens that the species occurs only west of the Andes, on the arid coast (Carrillo de Espinoza, 1970).


21 (p. 17). *Cnemidophorus tumbezanus* Steindachner, 1891. Holotype, NMW 14854, “Tumbez, Peru”, Stolzmann, Taez. = *Dicrodon heterolepis*
(Tschudi, 1845). I suspect “Taez” is an aborted abbreviation of Taczanowsky. Tumbez, being the name of a department and of its capital, is not without ambiguity. In the case of the Polish collectors it seems the town (now preferably spelled Tumbes) is meant (Stephens & Traylor, 1983: 223).


27 (p. 18). Enyalius zonatus Wettstein, 1926. Syntype, NMW 17188, 17189, “Ecuador”. The authors synonymize this form with “Enyalius pictus (Wiedmann, 1825)”. Something is seriously wrong here; the species has been actually been synonymized (Jackson, 1978) with Enyalius catenatus pictus (Wied, 1825) (not Wiedmann), but this is a form known only from the Atlantic Forest of northeastern Brasil.

28 (p. 20). Eumeces (Mabouya) nattereri Steindachner, 1870. Syntypes, NMW 9591: 1, 2. “Brasilien”, Natterer coll. = Mabuya f. frenata (Cope, 1862). A date of collection not being given, there is no way to guess about the type locality.


30 (p. 41). Liolaemus fitzgeraldi Boulenger, 1899. Syntype, NMW 14857, “ohne Angabe”. = ipse. If this is really a syntype, it is not without a locality. Boulenger (1899: 355) states explicitly that his description was based on several specimens collected by “Mr. Gosse” at Puente del Inca.


34 (p. 48). *Tejovaranus Branickii* Steindachner, 1877. Syntypes, NMW 13122, “Tumbez, Peru”; MNW 13123, “Peru”, Branicki coll. = *Callopistes flavipunctatus* (Duméril & Bibron, 1839). In the original description it is stated that the types were collected by Jelski and Stolzmann for Branicki of the Warsaw Museum. As to the locality see 21 above.


42 (p. 52). *Diaphorolepis wagneri* Werner, 1897. Holotype, NMW 18915, “Palmar, W Anden, Ecuador”, Haensch coll. = *Diaphorolepis wagneri* Jan, 1863. A synonym and a homonym. Palmar is a common place name in South America. The additional information given by Werner, west of the Andes at an altitude of 150 meters, is not sufficient for a choice. Concern about this locality is not new. Werner (1901: 600) described from there *Hyla pellucens*. In his list of Ecuadorian type localities Peters (1955) placed Palmar in Manabi, without further comment. There are, however, two Palmares in Manabi, at 0014, 7920, and at 0056, 8014 (U.S. Board on Geographical Names, 1957). Duellman (1977: 82) elected the first, and better known one, on the Rio Chila, as the type locality of record. I think this is a reasonable choice.


44 (p. 53). *Elaps decipiens* Werner, 1926. Holotype, NMW 18285, “Conon del Monte Tolima, Rio Combame, Kolumbien”, 1700 m, Fassl coll. This species was summarily synonymized by Amaral (1930: 53) with *Micrurus bipartitus* and never discussed again. The latest revision (Roze, 1996) omits the name. “Conon” is a misprint for “Cañon”. I cannot find a Rio Combame in
Colombia. There is, however, a Río Combeima exactly in the valley of Tolima, and I think this is it.


48 (p. 54). *Epicrates versicolor* Steindachner, 1863. Holotype, NMW 18930, “Columbien”, Pareyss coll. Stimson (1969: 15) laconically placed this form in the synonymy of the West Indian *Epicrates s. striatus* (Fischer, 1856), which raises problems, at least as to the locality. I would have appreciated a comment.


50 (p. 54). *Geophis ruthveni* Werner, 1925. Holotype, NMW 16508, “Saragigui, Brasilien”. In the original description “Sarapigui”. There is no such place in Brasil, nor Saragigui, either; nor does *G. ruthveni* occur there. Downs (1967: 77) very reasonably corrects the locality to Sarapiqui, Prov. Heredia, Costa Rica. = *ipse*.


65 (p. 58). *Micrurus steindachneri orcesi* Roze, 1967. Paratype, NMW 13383: 1. “Chimbo, Peru” = ipse. Chimbo is in Ecuador. The original description (Roze 1967: 43) has “Chimbo (probably the Rio Chambo, near Baños)”, an unnecessary conjecture, as Chimbo was a well-known locality (see the gazetteer below). = ipse.


68 (p. 59). *Oxyrhopus iridescens* Werner, Holotype, NMW 20295, “Huancabamba, Peru”, bought from Rosenberg. = *Oxyrhopus formosus* (Wied,
On zoogeographical grounds I find this synonymy little probable — unless, of course, there is a mistake in the locality.


**Tiedemann, Haupl & Grillitsch, 1994**

*Note*: Only those forms not included in the previous list of types (Tiedmann & Haupl, 1980) are recognized here.


3 (p. 68). *Heterodon nattereri* Steindachner, 1867. Holotype, NMW 23378. "Brasilien", Natterer coll. Without the date of collection it is not possible to hazard a guess as to the locality. = *Lystrophis histrionicus* (Jan, 1864).
1 (pg. 8). *Caiman c. crocodilus* (L., 1758). NMW 530. "Rio Parnahyba-Pianhy", Brasilien Expedition. The current spelling is Rio Parnaiba, in the state of Piauí (then Piauhy). This is a most interesting record, as the species of *Caiman* in Brasil are restricted to drainages, and the Parnaiba is an autonomous drainage. The form is otherwise known only from the Amazonian basin. = ipse.

2 (pg. 10). *Caiman crocodilus matogrosiensis* Fuchs, 1971. NMW 31586. "Jacare-Guau, Mato Grosso". Natterer coll., 10.vii.1828. "Jacare Guau" does not exist. It is certainly a mistaken rendition of "jacaré guaçu", meaning, in "Lingua Geral", big caiman (an epithet usually applied, however, to *Melanosuchus niger*). The date of collection, July 10, permits constraint of the locality (Vanzolini, 1993). On the 6th of July Natterer was in Cuiabá, on the 11th in Fazenda de Cima, some 60 km to the southwest. The specimen was certainly collected in the drainage of the Rio Cuiabá. It should then be *Caiman yacare*. Fuchs's (1971) new forms, based on commercial skins, do not deserve attention.

3 (pg. 10). *Caiman crocodilus yacare* (Daudin, 1802). NMW 491. "Marajó Insel, Baia de Marajó, Mündung Rio do Pará", Brasilien Expedition. There is a problem here: *Caiman yacare* does not occur on the island of Marajó; it is restricted to the drainage of the Rio Paraguai.


5 (pg. 10). *Caiman latirostris* (Daudin, 1802). NMW 31558. "Rio Petro", Brasilien Expedition, 12.iv.1903. The expedition arrived at the mouth of the Rio Preto (not Petro) on April 18, 1903 (Vanzolini, 1992). The Preto enters the Rio Grande, a tributary of the Rio São Francisco, from the left, at 1125, 4251. On the date of collection the expedition was some 50 km to the northwest.

6 (pg. 18). *Melanosuchus niger* (Spix, 1825). NMW 2024. "Rio Tocatins bei Estado do Pará", Brasilien Expedition. The proper spelling is Tocantins. The river flows through the state of Pará, but the 1903 expedition was never there (Vanzolini, 1992: fig. 1). = ipse.

7 (pg. 19). *Paleosuchus palpebrosus* (Cuvier, 1807). NMW 31557, 31565. "Uvai Aschanea-Jakobina in der Bororo". Natterer coll. 25.iii.1828. Jacobina is beyond doubt the cattle ranch of Coronel João Pereira Leite, nowadays a town. Natterer was in fact there in March, 1828 (Vanzolini, 1993: 35). "Uvai", however, is not a locality. It is the collective name of the caimans in the Bororo Indian language. "Aschanea" remains unexplained, but the locality is no doubt Jacobina. = ipse.


11 (pg. 31). *Liolaemus pictus* Duméril & Bibron, 1837. NMW 898, “Desague, Argentina” (pg. 54). *Tachymenis peruviana*, NMW 1583. “Desague, Chile”. Both specimens were bought from G. Hopke in 1896, so it seems there is only one Desague, attributed however to two countries. I can find no locality of that name in Argentina; on the contrary, the CIA (U.S. Board on Geographical Names, 1967) lists for Chile two Desagues, plus one Brazo, two Esteros, one Quebrada and one Río del Desague. Taking into account the distribution of the two species involved, the more probable candidates are Desague, Osorno (4047, 7242), Desague, Llanquihue (4115, 7301) and Estero Desague, Bio-bio (3717, 7247), in the Rio Bio-bio drainage. = ipse.

12 (pg. 42). *Boa c. constrictor* (L., 1758). NMW 23360. “Oberlauf des Amazonas, zwischen Iberinga and Manaus”, specimen obtained from Jívaro Indians. Manaus is irrelevant (1,400 km from Jívaro territory), but Iberinga, when (and if) found, will help to constrain the locality. = ipse.


15 (pg. 66). *Chelonooides carbonaria* Spix, 1824. NMW 1943. “Joaceiro”, Brasilien Exped. (pg. 106). *Phrynops geoffroanus*, NMW 1831. “Idoazeiro”. At the time of collection, the locality was spelled Joaizero, now it is Juazeiro. = ipse.

16 (pg. 67). *Chelonooides denticulata* (L., 1766). NMW 1944. “Rio Araguay”, Natterer coll., 1828. There is no Río Aragua in Brasil, at least in the areas where Natterer worked. The closest approaches to the locality as spelled are the Río Aragua and the Río Paraguay, each differing by a single letter. Natterer never worked in the Araguaia, but spent much time on the upper reaches of the Río Paraguai, especially in 1828. I would thus emend the locality. = ipse.

17 (pg. 70). *Chelus fimbriatus* (Schneider, 1783). NMW 239, 1299, 1879, 31500, 31612. “Mato Grosso”. Natterer coll. Natterer’s “Mato Grosso” is Vila Bela da Santissima Trindade (see TH5 above). Only one specimen has date of collection, 24.x.1828, a day in which Natterer was effectively in Vila Bela (Vanzolini, 1993: 35). = ipse.
18 (pg. 106). *Phrynops geoffroanus* (Schweigger, 1812). NMW 1282. “Parnaiba am Rio Parahym, Bundesstaat Maranhao”. NMW 1689, “Parnaiba am Rio Parnahym”. NMW 1833, “Rio Parnahym”. All collected by the Brasilien Expedition. The river (now spelled Paraím) is not mentioned by Reiser (1926) in the expedition’s report, but is easy to find. It enters the Rio Gurugeia from the left, on the overland route of the expedition between Parnaguá and their first station on the Rio Parnaíba, Santa Filomena (Vanzolini, 1992: fig. 1, points 7 and 8). The state is Piauí, not Maranhão. = ipse.

19 (pg. 107). *Phrynops nasutus* (Schweigger, 1812). NMW 24932. “Guapora, Provinz Rio Grande do Sul”, Natterer coll. 1828. The correct spelling is Guaporé; there is no Guapora. Natterer never was in Rio Grande do Sul. In 1828, however, he spent much time at or near the Rio Guaporé in Mato Grosso (Vanzolini, 1993: 35). His basis of operations was Vila Bela da Santíssima Trindade. Guaporé in this context probably means the vicinity of the present town of Pontes e Lacerda, where the road has crossed the river since the earliest times. = ipse.

**GAZETTEER**

Altos (Paraguay: Cordillera) 2514, 5715.

Bellavista (Peru: Cajamarca) 0535, 7845.

Belo Horizonte (Brasil: Minas Gerais) 1955, 4355

Blumenau (Brasil: Santa Catarina) 2655, 4934.

Bogotá (Colombia: Distrito Federal) 0436N, 7405.

Cáceres (Brasil: Mato Grosso) 1603, 5740.

Caçara (Brasil: Mato Grosso) 1603, 5743

Calilegua (Argentina: Jujuy) 2347, 6446.

Cañon del Tolima (Colombia: Tolima) 0425N, 7520

Carondelet (Ecuador: Esmeraldas) 0106N, 7842.

Chimbo (Ecuador: Guayas) 0210, 7907. (An old railroad station on the Guayaquil-Quito route).

Chota (Peru: Cajamarca) 0634, 7840

Combeima, Rio (Colombia: Tolima) enters the Rio Coello, on its right bank, at 0419N, 7509; Magdalena drainage.

Cotinguiba (Brasil: Sergipe) 1051, 3707.

Cuiabá (Brasil: Mato Grosso) 1536, 5605.
Dagua, Río (Colombia, Valle del Cauca) enters the Río Cauca (right bank) at 0325 N, 7704 (Magdalena-Cauca drainage).
Desague (Chile). See GST 10.

Esperanza (Argentina:?). See THG 58.

Fazenda de Cima (Brasil: Mato Grosso) 1556, 5636. A ranch, no longer exists.

General Lavalle (Argentina: Buenos Aires) 3624, 5658.
Grande, Río (Brasil: Bahia), a major tributary of the Río São Francisco (left bank) at 1105, 4308.

Huancabamba (Peru: Piura) 0514, 7927.
Huasco (Chile: Atacama) 2828, 7114.

Ibagué (Colombia: Tolima) 0427 N, 7514.
Ibarra (Ecuador: Imbabura) 0021 N, 7807.
Iberinga (Ecuador?). Not located.

Jacobina (Brasil: Mato Grosso) 1615, 5734. An old ranch, now a town.
Joinville (Brasil: Santa Catarina) 2618, 4850.
Juazeiro (Brasil: Bahia) 0924, 4030, see GST 14.

Magdalena, Río (Colombia), enters the Caribbean Sea at 1106, 7459.
Manaus (Brasil: Amazonas) 0307, 6000.
Marajó, Island (Brasil: Pará). Closes the mouth of the Amazon.
Maruim (Brasil: Sergipe) 1044, 3705.
Montevideo (Uruguay: Montevideo) 3455, 5610; always suspect of being only a shipping locality.

Nóvita (Colombia: Chocó) 0457 N, 7634.

"Ostabhang der Anden" (Peru) see TH 17.
Pacasmayo (Peru: Libertad) 0725, 7936.
Palmar (Ecuador). See TH 42.
Palmeira (Brasil: Paraná) 2526, 5000. An old farm, now a city.
Pará, Río do (Brasil: Pará) the southern branch of the mouth of the Amazonas, between the coast of the continent and the island of Marajó.
Paraím, Río (Brasil: Piauí) enters the Río Gurgueia (left bank) at 0933, 4436 (Parnaíba drainage).
Paramaribo (Surinam) 0550N, 5510.
Parnaguá (Brasil: Piauí) 1013, 4438.
Paulay (Brasil: Bahia) not located
Perico (Peru: Cajamarca) 0521, 7847.
Pontes e Lacerda (Brasil: Mato Grosso) 1517, 5921.
Preto, Rio (Brasil: Bahia) enters the Rio Grande (left bank) at 1121, 4350
(S. Francisco drainage).
Puente del Inca (Argentina: Mendoza) 3249, 6955.
Puerto Cabello (Venezuela: Carabobo) 1028N, 6801.

Quinindé (Ecuador: Esmeraldas) 0020N, 928.

Rio de Janeiro (Brasil: Rio de Janeiro) 2248, 4314.

Salamanca, Isla (Colombia: Magdalena) 1058N, 7430. Not a proper island;
a very long sand bar closing the mouth of the Rio Magdalena.
San Esteban (Venezuela) see TH 60.
Santa Filomena (Brasil: Piauí) 0907, 4555.
Santa Rita de Cassia (Brasil: Bahia) 100, 4432.
São Paulo (Brasil: São Paulo) 2332, 4637.
Sullana (Peru: Piura) 0454, 8041.

Tamaná, Rio (Colombia: Chocó) enters the Rio San Juan (left bank) at
0459N, 7644.
Tambillo (Peru: Cajamarca) 0557, 7837.
Taperinha (Brasil: Pará) 0232, 5418.
Tavaí (Paraguay: Caazapá), 2607, 5532.
Tihuanaco (Bolivia: La Paz) 1633, 6842.
Tocantins, Rio (Brasil) enters the Rio do Pará, from the south, at 0145, 4910;
autonomous drainage.
Tumbes (Peru: Tumbes) 0330, 8027.

Vila Bela da Santíssima Trindade (Brasil: Mato Grosso) 1501, 5957.
Villa Rica (Paraguay, Guairá) 2545, 5626.
INDEX TO SCIENTIFIC NAMES

adspersa, Ctenoblepharys, TH 24
aequatorialis, Anolis, TH 8
affinis, Herpetodryas, TH 52
amarali, Apostolepis, TH 38
   Liophis, TH 56
amazonicus, Coleodactylus, TH 22
ameiva, Ameiva, GST 8,9
angulifer, Phrynonax, TH 71
bahiana, Amphisbaena, TH 4
   Cercolophia, TH 4
barbouri, Dicrodon, TH 25
   Lepidoblepharis, TH 29
   Pseudogonatodes, TH 29
branickii, Tejovaranus, TH 34
burmeisteri, Philodryas, TH 42
carbonaria, Chelonoidis, GST 14
carinicauda, Micrurus, TH 61
centropyx, Cnemidophorus, TH 16
carvalhoi, Micrurus lemniscatus, TH 63
cearensis, Apostolepis, TH 38
chilensis, Dromicus, TH 43
constrictor, Boa, GST 11
corais, Drymarchon, TH & 1
crocodilus, Caiman, GST 1
decipiens, Elaps, TH 44
denticulata, Chelonoidis, GST 11
dorbignyi, Lystrophis, GST 12
dumerilii, Ophryoessoides, TH 32
ellipsifera, Leptognathus, TH 54
   Dipsas, TH 54
festae, Enyalioides laticeps, GST 11
fimbriatus, Chelus, GST 16
fitzgeraldi, Liolaemus, TH 30
flavipunctatus, Callopistes, TH 34
flavotorquata, Apostolepis, TH 39
formosus, Oxyrhopus, TH 68
frenata, Mabuya, TH 28
geoffroanus, Phrynops, GST 14, 17
gracilipes, Anolis, TH 9
grandisquamis, Chironius, TH 53
granuliceps, Anolis, TH 10
grilli, Anisolepis, TH 6, 7
guerini Phimophis, GST 13
guttulatum, Dicrodon, TH 25
heterodermus, Anolis, TH 11
   Phenacosaurus, TH 11
heterolepis, Cnemidophorus, TH 17
   Dicrodon, TH 6, 17, 20, 21
histrionicus, Lystrophis, THG 3
hygomi, Cnemidophorus, TH 18
   Tropidurus, TH 35
ibague, Anolis, TH 12
intermedia, Bachia, TH 15
   Leptognathus, TH 55
intermedius, Oxyrhopus, TH 67
iridescens, Oxyrhopus, TH 68
jani, Micrurus ancoralis, TH 60
lacertoides, Cnemidophorus, TH 19
laevis, Diaphorolepis, TH 41
latirostris, Caiman, GST 4, 5
leachi, Cnemidophorus, TH 19
lemniscatus, Anolis, TH 13
lionotus, Anisolepis, TH 7
lugubris, Pseudopareas, TH 73
macrocephala, Platemys, THG 1
macrops, Liophis, TH 57
maculiventris, Anolis, TH 14
marginatus, Leptophis ahaetulla TH 52
matogrossiensi, Caiman GST 2
maximiliani, Emys, TH 1
   Hydromedusa, TH 1
mertensi, Micrurus, TH 64
mipartitus, Micrurus, TH 44
nasutus, Phrynops, GST 18
nattereri, Eumeces, TH 28
   Heterodon, THG 3
   Philodryas, TH 69
niger, Melanosuchus, GST 2
nigrostris, Micrurus dissoleucus, TH 62
notaeus, Eunectes, TH 49
ocellifer, Cnemidophorus, TH 18
orcesi, Micrurus steindachneri, TH 65
ocellifer, Cnemidophorus, TH 18
orcesi, Micrurus steindachneri, TH 65
ornatus, Liolaemus, TH 31
pallidus, Philodryas, TH 70
  Proctotretus, TH 33
palpebrosus, Paleosuchus, GST 7
paraguayensis, Atractus, TH 40
peruviana, Tachymenis, GST 10
pictiventris, Helicops, TH 51
pictus, Enyalius, TH 27
  Liolaemus, GST 10
pulcher, Liophis, TH 31, 58
radiolata, Acanthochelys, TH 2, 3
  Emys, TH 3
reticulatus, Atractus, TH 40
ruthveni, Geophis, TH 50
sagittifer, Liophis, TH 58
sanctae-ritae, Apostolepis, TH 39
schlueteri, Herpetodryas, TH 53
steinbachi, Rhadinaea, TH 74
steindachneri, Amphisbaena, TH 5
  Cercolophia, TH 5
  Elaps, TH 46
  Micrurus, TH 46
stolzmanni, Ctenoblepharis, TH 23
  Tropidurus, TH 36
striatus, Ecpleopus, TH 26
  Epicrates, TH 48
  Proctoporus, TH 26
taczanowskyi, Tropidophis, TH 76
  Ungaliophis, TH 76
transandinus, Micrurus, TH 66
tricristatus, Ophryoessoides, TH 32
trifasciatus, Liophis, TH 59
tschudii, Elaps, TH 47
tumbezanus, Cnemidophorus, TH 21
typhlus, Liophis, TH 57
umbra, Tropidurus, TH 37
ungalioides, Sympeltophis, TH 75
unicarinatus, Tropidurus, TH 37
vagrans, Pseudopareas, TH 72
Sibynomorphus, TH 72
ventrimaculatus, Sibynomorphus, TH 55
versicolor, Epicrates, TH 48
villaricae, Apostolepis, THG 2
wagneri, Diaphorolpeis, TH 42
werneri, Platemys, TH 3
wieningeri, Epicrates, TH 49
yacare, Caiman, GST 2, 3, 6
zonatus, Enyalius, TH 27
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