

Zootaxa 3718 (3): 297–298 www.mapress.com/zootaxa/

Copyright © 2013 Magnolia Press

## Correspondence



http://dx.doi.org/10.11646/zootaxa.3718.3.7

http://zoobank.org/urn:lsid:zoobank.org:pub:5B916BE3-DE3B-4B0A-9B4E-CDB87F78E8A7

## The gender of *"cleis"*: correct spelling of *Chiasmocleis supercilialbus* Morales and McDiarmid, 2009, and *Elachistocleis magnus* Toledo, 2010 (Anura, Microhylidae)

## PEDRO L. V. PELOSO<sup>1</sup>, ROY W. MCDIARMID<sup>2</sup> & ULISSES CARAMASCHI<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Division of Vertebrate Zoology (Herpetology), and Richard Gilder Graduate School, American Museum of Natural History, Central Park West at 79th street, 10024, New York, NY, USA. E-mail: pedropeloso@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup>USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, Smithsonian Institution, National Museum of Natural History, PO Box 37012, Washington, DC 20013-7012, USA. E-mail: mcdiarmr@si.edu

<sup>3</sup>Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Museu Nacional, Departamento de Vertebrados, Quinta da Boa Vista, 20940-040 Rio de Janeiro – RJ, Brasil. E-mail: ulisses@acd.ufrj.br

Morales and McDiarmid (2009) and Toledo (2010) described and named, respectively, *Chiasmocleis supercilialbus* and *Elachistocleis magnus*. We argue that the specific epithets of both names are discordant with the gender of their respective genera and need correction.

Méhelÿ (1904) described *Chiasmocleis* to accommodate a single species, *Engystoma albopunctatum* Boettger, 1885. Despite not providing an etymology for his new genus, Méhelÿ (1904) changed the gender of the specific epithet to feminine, presumably to be in accord with the gender of *Chiasmocleis*, resulting in the combination *Chiasmocleis albopunctata*. Parker (1927) described *Elachistocleis* to accommodate *Rana ovalis* Schneider, 1799 and elevated *Rana ovale bicolor* Guérin-Méneville, 1838 to full species status, in the combination *Elachistocleis bicolor*. The type species of *Elachistocleis* is *Rana ovalis* Schneider, 1799<sup>1</sup>, by original designation. Originally, Parker (1927) provided the new combination *Elachistocleis ovale* (specific epithet neuter in gender) for the type species, but later (Parker 1934) corrected the name to *Elachistocleis ovalis*.

Because neither Méhelÿ (1904) nor Parker (1927) provided etymologies for their genera, it was difficult for some workers to ascertain their original intent, and subsequent decisions about gender were sometimes made by implication. The diagnoses of both *Chiasmocleis* and *Elachistocleis* are largely based on pectoral girdle characters (Méhelÿ 1904; Parker 1927, 1934; Carvalho 1954), and therefore we can trace the construction of the names based on those characteristics:

- (1)  $kleis = \kappa \lambda \epsilon i \zeta$  (from the Greek) = clavicle, and is a feminine substantive.
- (2) chiasmos = Chiasmós = χιασμός (from the Greek); refers to a diagonal "X" shape, and is hence also used as an adjective.
- elachistos = ?λάχιστος (from the Greek); meaning "small", "least" or "minimum", and is hence also used as an adjective.

Therefore, Chiasmocleis = Chiasmos + cleis and Elachistocleis = Elachistos + cleis both should be treated as feminine genera.

De Sá *et al.* (2012) recently transferred *Chiasmocleis supercilialbus* to *Syncope* using the combination *Syncope supercilialbus. Syncope* is also feminine in gender and the species name needs correction too. Walker (1973) explicitly stated in the etymology that *Syncope* is derived from the Greek. By implication, Walker (1973) meant:

*Syncope* =  $\sigma$ υγκόπτω (from the Greek) = *sunkoptō*; derived from the Greek verb meaning "cut up"— in allusion to the shortening of the number of vertebrae, by loss of an anterior pre-sacral.

*sunkoptō* is a combination of two words, σύν (*sun*, "with") + κόπτω (*koptō*, "cut"). Given the above, the names of two microhylid species need correction. Below are the recommended mandatory changes:

<sup>1.</sup> *Rana ovalis* is considered a *nomen dubium* (name of unknown or doubtful application) referred to a *species inquirenda* (species of doubtful identity needing further investigation) (see Caramaschi 2010). The status of *R. ovalis* is, nonetheless, irrelevant to the problem being treated here, and *Rana ovalis* should still be considered the type species of *Elachistocleis*.