Zootaxa 2176: 65–68 (2009)
www.mapress.com/zootaxa/

Correspondence

ISSN 1175-5326 (print edition)
ZOOTAXA
ISSN 1175-5334 (online edition)

Correction of the type locality of *Neomorphus geoffroyi* (Temminck, 1820), with lectotype designation

MARCOS A. RAPOSO[1], JOSÉ EDUARDO SIMON[2, 3] & DANTE MARTINS TEIXEIRA[1]

[1]*Museu Nacional / UFRJ, Rio de Janeiro. E-mail: raposo@mn.ufrj.br.*
[2]*Museu de Biologia Mello Leitão. Santa Teresa, ES. E-mail: simon@ebr.com.br.*
[3]*Faculdades Integradas de São Pedro, FAESA. Campus II. Laboratório de Zoologia dos Vertebrados. Vitória, ES. Brasil. CEP 29030-001.*

Neomorphus geoffroyi was described without reference to a locality (Temminck 1820, the plate only and Temminck 1823, the text). Pará, Brazil, is currently considered the type locality of the species (e.g., Payne 1997, 2005), following Peters (1940). This designation contrasts with the earlier conclusion of Hellmayr (1905), who considered Bahia the probable provenance of the specimens described by Temminck (1820). Peters (1940) presented no detailed justification for changing the type locality and only commented that "the original description and plate do not agree with Bahia specimens", providing no indication as to which characters in the original description were inconsistent with Bahia specimens (and consistent with the specimens from Pará).

Many of the seven subspecies of *N. geoffroyi* (Payne 1987, 2005) feature solid diagnostic characters and may, in the future, be elevated to species status. Such is the case with *Neomorphus squamiger,* which was described as a species and was subsequently considered a subspecies of *N. geoffroyi* (Sick 1985, Payne 1997, 2005, but see also Dickinson 2003). The revision of these taxa, however, first requires a more precise definition of the type locality of the senior synonym *Neomorphus geoffroyi* and, consequently, of the nominate subspecies.

In this paper we review the type locality of *N. geoffroyi*, based on the relevant literature and the existing syntypes. We searched for syntypes in the following collections mentioned in the textual description of the species (Temminck 1823): Museum National d' Histoire Naturelle, Paris (MNHN); Naturhistorisches Museum, Vienna (NMW); the Museum für Naturkunde, Berlin; the Naturalis, National Natuurhistorisch Museum, Leiden (NNM); and the American Museum of Natural History, New York (AMNH). To provide a proper comparison of the type material with specimens from a broad geographic area, we have also analyzed the collections of the Museum of Comparative Zoology, Cambridge (MCZ); Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago (FMNH); Carnegie Museum, Pittsburgh (CM); National Museum of Natural History, Washington (NMNH); and the three largest Brazilian collections: Museu Nacional, Rio de Janeiro (MNRJ); Museu de Zoologia da Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo (MZUSP); and Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi, Pará (MPEG).

Although Temminck's plate (Figure 1) has only the vernacular French name ("Coua Geoffroy"), the original plate wrappers had the binominal species name, legitimizing 1820 as the correct date of the name (for further explanations on Temminck's dates see Dickinson 2001). The original description was based on specimens from the collections of Leiden, Berlin, Vienna, and Paris, and on skins in Prince Wied-Neuwied's private collection (Temminck 1823), currently housed at the American Museum of Natural History. All recent literature has followed Peters' (1940) proposition that Pará is the type locality, despite the conclusion of Hellmayr (1905) and Pinto (1964) that Bahia is the type locality because the specimens in the Wied collection came from that state. As noted above, Peters mentioned, but did not specify, some morphological incompatibility between Temminck's description and the specimens from Bahia.

Our analysis revealed a perfect compatibility of the type series of *N. geoffroyi* with other skins from Bahia (*e.g.*, MZUSP 14147). In contrast, the Leiden syntype (in fact the only specimen labeled as syntype: NNH 8824000, Figure 2), does not match the specimens from Pará (*e.g.*, MPEG 28441). A comparison of specimens from Bahia (including the Leiden syntype) and Pará clearly shows that the former differ in their darker abdomen, more extensive chestnut on the forehead and more extensive blue wash on the mantle. Such differences were already noted by Pinto (1962, 1964).

Thus, the only specimen previously identified as a type (syntype) of *Neomorphus geoffroyi* contradicts Peters (1940) assertions and supports Hellmayr's (1905) and Pinto's (1964) view on the case, despite the lack of any precise locality indication on its label other than "Brazil".

Accepted by T. Chesser: 8 Jul. 2009; published: 5 Aug. 2009