



*Zootaxa* 3459: 1–156 (2012)  
www.mapress.com/zootaxa/

Copyright © 2012 · Magnolia Press

ISSN 1175-5326 (print edition)

**ZOOTAXA**

ISSN 1175-5334 (online edition)

# Monograph

urn:lsid:zoobank.org:pub:457C2AD0-E5CF-4A41-B6CB-11722700BC5F

# ZOOTAXA

3459

## Review of Teiid Morphology with a Revised Taxonomy and Phylogeny of the Teiidae (Lepidosauria: Squamata)

MICHAEL B. HARVEY<sup>1</sup>, GABRIEL N. UGUETO<sup>2</sup> & RONALD L. GUTBERLET, Jr.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Biological Sciences, Broward College, Davie, FL 33314, USA, mharvey@broward.edu*

<sup>2</sup>*11111 Biscayne Boulevard, #556; Miami, FL 33181, USA, gabrieluguetto@yahoo.com*

<sup>3</sup>*Department of Biological Sciences, Salisbury University, Salisbury, MD 21801, USA, rgutberlet@salisbury.edu*



Magnolia Press  
Auckland, New Zealand

*Accepted by S. Carranza: 4 Jul. 2012; published: 7 Sept. 2012*

MICHAEL B. HARVEY, GABRIEL N. UGUETO, & RONALD L. GUTBERLET, JR.  
**Review of Teiid Morphology with a Revised Taxonomy and Phylogeny of the Teiidae (Lepidosauria:  
Squamata)**

(*Zootaxa* 3459)

156 pp.; 30 cm.

7 Sept. 2012

ISBN 978-1-86977-987-0 (paperback)

ISBN 978-1-86977-988-7 (Online edition)

FIRST PUBLISHED IN 2012 BY

Magnolia Press

P.O. Box 41-383

Auckland 1346

New Zealand

e-mail: [zootaxa@mapress.com](mailto:zootaxa@mapress.com)

<http://www.mapress.com/zootaxa/>

© 2012 Magnolia Press

All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, transmitted or disseminated, in any form, or by any means, without prior written permission from the publisher, to whom all requests to reproduce copyright material should be directed in writing.

This authorization does not extend to any other kind of copying, by any means, in any form, and for any purpose other than private research use.

ISSN 1175-5326 (Print edition)

ISSN 1175-5334 (Online edition)

## Table of contents

Abstract	4
Introduction	4
Material and Methods	5
Review of Teiid Morphology and Synopsis of Characters	6
Morphometrics	6
Teeth	7
Eye	7
Cephalic Roofing Scales	8
Nasal and Loreal Regions	14
Ocular Series	16
Auditory Region	21
Labial Series and Chin	22
Axial Scalation	27
Appendicular Scalation	37
Scale Surface Morphology and Generation Glands	49
Coloration	52
Hemipenis	59
Other Characters	67
Polyphyly of Tupinambis and Status of Salvator	69
Generic Boundaries within Cnemidophorus	71
Generic Boundaries within Ameiva	74
Phylogeny of Teiid Genera	76
Revised Taxonomy of Extant Teiidae	77
<i>Callopistinae</i> New Subfamily	77
<i>Callopistes</i> Gravenhorst	78
Teiinae Estes, de Queiroz, and Gauthier	80
<i>Ameiva</i> Meyer	80
<i>Ameiva ameiva</i> Group	88
<i>Ameiva bifrontata</i> Group	89
<i>Ameiva dorsalis</i> Group	89
<i>Ameiva erythrocephala</i> Group	92
<i>Ameiva Incertae Sedis</i>	93
<i>Ameivula</i> New Genus	93
<i>Aspidoscelis</i> Fitzinger	99
<i>Aurivela</i> New Genus	99
<i>Cnemidophorus</i> Wagler	102
<i>Cnemidophorus lemniscatus</i> Group	109
<i>Cnemidophorus murinus</i> Group	110
<i>Cnemidophorus nigricolor</i> Group	111
<i>Cnemidophorus vanzoi</i> Group	112
<i>Contomastix</i> New Genus	112
<i>Dicrodon</i> Duméril and Bibron	116
<i>Holcosus</i> Cope	118
<i>Holcosus orcesi</i> Group	123
<i>Holcosus septemlineatus</i> Group	124
<i>Holcosus undulatus</i> Group	124
<i>Kentropyx</i> Spix	124
<i>Kentropyx calcarata</i> Group	128
<i>Kentropyx paulensis</i> Group	128
<i>Kentropyx striata</i> Group	128
<i>Medopheos</i> New Genus	129
<i>Teius</i> Merrem	131
Tupinambinae Estes, de Queiroz, and Gauthier	133
<i>Crocodylurus</i> Spix	133
<i>Dracaena</i> Daudin	136
<i>Salvator</i> Duméril and Bibron	137
<i>Tupinambis</i> Daudin	140
Key to Genera and Species Groups of Extant Teiidae	142
Conclusion and Some Directions for Future Research	144
Acknowledgments	144
References	145
Appendix	151

## Abstract

Despite advances within particular groups, systematics of the Teiidae has long been unsatisfactory, because few morphological characters have been described for this family. Consequently, most species have been assigned to the large, polyphyletic, and poorly defined genera *Ameiva* and *Cnemidophorus*. We describe 137 morphological characters and score them for most species of Neotropical Teiidae. Important, but previously undescribed, character suites include pupil shape; the frontal ridge; longitudinal division of the interparietal; the rostral groove; patterns of supraciliary fusion; the preauricular skin fold; the “toothy” first supralabial; modified apical granules; the pectoral sulcus; expansion of scales at the heel; tibiotarsal shields; scales between the digital lamellae along the postaxial edges of the toes; scale surface microstructure of macrohoneycomb, macroridges, or lamellae; distribution patterns and morphology of lenticular scale organs; types of epidermal generation glands; and several hemipenial structures. We propose a new taxonomy of the Teiidae based on recovered evolutionary history and numerous morphological characters surveyed in this study. We recognize three subfamilies: Callopiinae **new subfamily**, Teiinae Estes *et al.*, and Tupinambinae Estes *et al.* To resolve polyphyly of *Ameiva* and *Cnemidophorus*, we erect four new genera for various groups of Neotropical Teiidae: *Ameivula* **new genus**, *Aurivela* **new genus**, *Contomastix* **new genus**, and *Medopheos* **new genus**. We resurrect *Holcosus* Cope from the synonymy of *Ameiva* and *Salvator* Duméril and Bibron from the synonymy of *Tupinambis*. On the basis of shared derived characters, we propose new species groups of our redefined *Ameiva* and *Cnemidophorus*. We incorporate our new characters into a key to the genera and species groups of Teiidae. A phylogenetic hypothesis of Teiidae based on morphological characters differs substantially from hypotheses based on mitochondrial DNA. The phylogeny based on morphology is consistent with well-established biogeographic patterns of Neotropical vertebrates and explains extreme morphological divergence in such genera as *Kentropyx* and *Aurivela*.

**Key words:** *Ameivula* new genus, *Aurivela* new genus, Callopiinae new subfamily, *Contomastix* new genus, generation glands, *Holcosus*, *Medopheos* new genus, scale surface morphology, *Salvator*

## Introduction

Prior to Boulenger’s systematic rearrangement of lizards, the various teiid genera were scattered among several families. In his key to genera, Boulenger (1885b) divided the teiids up into four groups; his Group I was defined by nasals not separated medially by a frontonasal, limbs well developed, and body moderate to large. The group included the various genera of “macroteiids,” a term perhaps first used by Ruibal (1952). The remaining groups included various genera of microteiids and are currently assigned to the Gymnophthalmidae. Later, the macroteiids were placed in a separate subfamily containing two clades formally recognized as the tribes Teiini and Tupinambini by Presch (1970, 1974a). Little doubt remains that the Teiidae and Gymnophthalmidae are monophyletic groups (Castoe *et al.* 2004; Pellegrino *et al.* 2001), and Presch’s clades are generally regarded as subfamilies (Estes *et al.* 1988). Recognition of these subfamilies has received mostly unambiguous support from separate analyses of chromosomal (Gorman 1970), hemipenial (Böhme 1988), osteological (Presch 1974a), integumental (Vanzolini & Valencia 1965), myological (Rieppel 1980, but see Abdala & Moro 2000), neurological (Northcutt 1978), and mitochondrial DNA (Giugliano *et al.* 2007) character sets. A third subfamily Chamopsiinae accommodates extinct genera from North America and may be the sister group of the extant subfamilies (Denton & O’Neill 1995; but see note added to proof of Sullivan & Estes 1997). The Teiidae is almost certainly the sister group of the Gymnophthalmidae, and teiids likely arose in the middle Cretaceous from a common ancestor shared with the extinct Polyglyphanodontidae (Conrad 2008; this group has been considered an additional subfamily of the Teiidae by some authors, e.g., Estes 1983a; Gao & Norell 2000).

The genus-level taxonomy of the Teiidae has long been unsatisfactory. This problem is particularly acute within the speciose radiation of cnemidophorines in which most tropical species are assigned to the large polyphyletic genera *Ameiva* and *Cnemidophorus*. Polyphyly urgently requires resolution, because teiids are often the most conspicuous elements of many New World herpetofaunas and have been the subject of numerous detailed ecological studies. As researchers make ecological comparisons among teiid species, draw inferences about their biogeography, propose conservation strategies, and conduct other studies of their comparative biology, polyphyly of genera such as *Ameiva*, *Cnemidophorus*, and *Tupinambis* will likely produce what Bortolus (2008) called “error cascades,” where seemingly trivial taxonomic problems become magnified in the development of scientific knowledge. However, the problem is not just one of polyphyly. Some genera have never been adequately diagnosed, whereas others are defined by apparent symplesiomorphies. These problems contribute to misidentification in the field and incorrect or uncertain assignment of newly discovered species.