



<http://dx.doi.org/10.11646/zootaxa.3957.2.10>

<http://zoobank.org/urn:lsid:zoobank.org:pub:6F4F762F-0964-4A27-86E2-FAF374543E28>

## ***Apostolepis parassimilis* Lema & Renner, 2012 an objective synonym of *A. tertulianobeui* Lema, 2004 (Dipsadidae: Elapomorhini)**

HENRIQUE C. COSTA<sup>1,3</sup> & RENATO S. BÉRNILS<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Laboratório de Herpetologia, Departamento de Zoologia, Instituto de Ciências Biológicas, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Avenida Antônio Carlos 6627, Pampulha, Belo Horizonte 31270-90, Minas Gerais, Brazil

<sup>2</sup>Departamento de Ciências Agrárias e Biológicas, Centro Universitário Norte do Espírito Santo, Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo, Rodovia BR-101 Norte km 60, São Mateus 29932-540, Espírito Santo, Brazil

<sup>3</sup>Corresponding author. E-mail: [ccostah@gmail.com](mailto:ccostah@gmail.com)

Lema (2004) described *Apostolepis tertulianobeui* based on a single specimen (a young male) from “hinterland Minas Gerais state”. The holotype was originally housed in the collection of Instituto Pinheiros Produtos Terapêuticos S.A. and labeled as IP 1934 (Lema 2004). The Instituto Pinheiros was founded in 1928 in the city of São Paulo, Brazil and became the largest producer of vaccines and antitoxins of the country (Ribeiro 2001). It was purchased in 1972 by the company Sintex do Brasil (Edler 2006) and its former collection was partitioned among several institutions (Lema 2004). As a result, the specimen IP 1934 was donated to the collection of the Museu de Ciências Naturais from Fundação Zoobotânica do Rio Grande do Sul (MCN hereafter) in Porto Alegre, Brazil, and labeled as MCN 8535 (Fig. 1A–D).

Ferrarezzi *et al.* (2005) synonymized *A. tertulianobeui* with *A. assimilis* as follows: ‘In most relevant diagnostic features presented by Lema (2004b), the holotype of *A. tertulianobeui* does not differ from the range of variation we have observed in a large sample of *A. assimilis* [...]. Therefore, even though we did not examine the holotype of *A. tertulianobeui*, we have no doubt that this name must be relegated as a junior synonym of *A. assimilis*.’ (Ferrarezzi *et al.* 2005: 218). Two years later, Lema & Renner (2007:129–130) compared the holotype of *A. tertulianobeui* with over 100 specimens of *A. assimilis* and resurrected *A. tertulianobeui* from the synonymy of the last species.

Recently, Lema & Renner (2012) described *A. parassimilis*, another member of the *Apostolepis assimilis* group (sensu Ferrarezzi *et al.* 2005), based on two specimens. The paratype is housed at the Museu Nacional (MNRJ hereafter) in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil (MNRJ 6524, a young female, from the state of Bahia, without locality data in the catalogue of the reptiles collection [P. Passos, pers. comm.]). Oddly, the holotype of *A. parassimilis* is MCN 8535, the same onomatophore that based the description of *A. tertulianobeui* (although the provenance has been attributed by Lema & Renner 2012 to the municipality of Uberlândia, state of Minas Gerais, Brazil). Despite minor rephrasing and other writing details, the description of the holotype of *A. parassimilis* is virtually identical to that of *A. tertulianobeui*. The main difference is that Lema & Renner (2012) describe the snout of MCN 8535 as ‘not projecting’, in contrast to Lema’s (2004) description of the same specimen. Lema & Renner (2012) also make no reference to *A. tertulianobeui*; it is also worth noting that illustrations of the holotype of *A. tertulianobeui* and *A. parassimilis* are clearly based on different specimens. Actually, Figures 5–8 in Lema & Renner (2012) are based on MNRJ 6524, the paratype of *A. parassimilis* (Fig. 1E–H). This confusion can also be observed comparing the paratype description (Lema & Renner 2012:75) with Figures 5 and 7 in Lema & Renner (2012), especially because the refereed specimen (MNRJ 6524) has scale anomalies in the parietal region and in the underside of head.

According to the curator in charge of the reptile collection from MCN the specimen MCN 8535 was loaned to MNRJ in 2005. This specimen was registered as *A. assimilis* in the collection’s catalogue, but posteriorly loaned as the holotype of *A. tertulianobeui* in the invoice (R.B. Oliveira, pers. com.). When we decided to investigate the nomenclature issue between *A. tertulianobeui* and *A. parassimilis*, MCN 8535 was still in loan to MNRJ, and no specimen has ever been assigned to *A. parassimilis* at the MCN collection (R.B. Oliveira, pers. com.). Therefore, we discard the hypothesis of the description of *A. parassimilis* being based on another specimen housed at the MCN collection. Apparently, Lema & Renner (2012) examined MCN 8535 before its loan to MNRJ collection.