

Hamadryad Vol. 30, No. 1, pp: xx-xx, 2006.
Copyright 2006 Centre for Herpetology
Madras Crocodile Bank Trust.

**FIRST RECORD OF *UPERODON GLOBULOSUS*
(GÜNTHER, 1864) (ANURA: MICROHYLIDAE)
FROM ANDHRA PRADESH, INDIA**

(with one text-figure)

Uperodon globulosus (Günther, 1864) was originally described from Russelkonda, Orissa, in eastern India. This species has been sporadically collected from isolated localities in India, including Arunachal Pradesh (Bordoloi et al. 2000; Borah and Bordoloi, 2001), Assam (Bhaduri and Saha, 1980; Chanda, 1994; Choudhury et al. 1999), Bihar (Dutta, 1997; Molur and Walker, 1998), Goa (Molur and Walker, 1998), Gujarat (Daniel and Shull, 1963), Karnataka (Daniels, 1992), Kerala (George and Leelamma, 1995), Chattisgarh (then in Madhya Pradesh, now a separate district) (Abdulali and Daniel, 1954), Maharashtra (Abdulali and Daniel, 1954; Bhaduri and Daniel, 1956; Daniel, 1963; Daniels, 1992; Padhye and Ghate, 2002; Padhye et al., 2002), Orissa (Thurston, 1888; Boulenger, 1890; Satyamurti, 1967; Dutta, 1997) and West Bengal (Bhaduri, 1945; Bhaduri and Basu, 1956; Bhaduri and Saha, 1980; Sarkar, et al., 1992; Deuti and Bharathi Goswami, 1995), and from Bangladesh (Khan, 1982).

During a faunistic survey in the Nallamala Hills (14° 26'–16° 31'N; 78° 30'–80° 10'E), Eastern Ghats, Andhra Pradesh, between 3-16 June 2003, we recorded its occurrence from two different localities. On 14 June 2003, an adult female (Fig. 1) was collected between Mananur and Farahabad (16° 19'N; 78° 44'E) on the Amrabad Plateau, Nagarjunasagar Srisailem Tiger Reserve. This specimen was collected at ca. 2125 h while it was crossing the road during a heavy downpour. This constitutes the first record of the species from Andhra Pradesh. The voucher specimen (FBS/ZSI/N/1138) is deposited in the Freshwater Biology Station, Zoological Survey of India, Hyderabad. Subsequently on the same night, three male specimens were also encountered near Shikaram (16° 02'N; 78° 55'E), ca. 79 km s of the location from where

the voucher was collected. These were not collected as they were badly damaged by vehicular traffic.

Description of voucher collected.— Abbreviations used – SVL (snout to vent length), HW (head width), HL (head length), MN (mandible to nasal opening length), MFE (mandible to front of eye length), MBE (mandible to back of eye length), SL (distance between front of the eye to tip of the snout), EL (horizontal diameter of eye), IUE (maximum distance between upper eyelids), UEW (maximum width of inter upper eyelid), IN (distance between the nasal opening), IFE (distance between front of the eyes), IBE (distance between back of the eyes), EN (distance between front of the eye and the nostril), SN (distance between tip of the snout and the nostril), FLL (forelimb length), HAL (hand length), TFL (length of the third finger), TL (length of the tibia), TW (width of the tibia), FL (femur length), FOL (foot length), IMT (length of the inner metatarsal tubercle), OMT (length of the outer metatarsal tubercle), and ITL (inner toe length)]

A.] Size: Specimen of medium size (SVL 75.6 mm; males were between 55.1 – 62.0 mm), body stout and globular.

B.] Head: Head small, wider (HW 16.3 mm) than long (HL 13.7 mm; MN 9.8 mm; MFE 8.1 mm; MBE 7.9 mm), convex. Snout rounded, not protruding, its length (SL 6.5 mm) almost equal to the horizontal diameter of eye (EL 6.6 mm). Canthus rostralis distinct, loreal region obtuse. Interorbital space convex, broader (IUE 11.4 mm) than upper eyelid (UEW 4.84 mm) and internasal distance (IN 7.3 mm). Distance between the front of the eyes (IFE 12.3 mm) about three fourth the distance between the back of the eyes (IBE 16.2 mm). Nostrils round, closer to the eye (EN 3.1 mm) than to snout (SN 4.1 mm). Pupil vertical. Tympanum indistinct. Maxillary and vomerine teeth absent. Choanae large with movable integumentary flap. Tongue oval, free behind.

C.] Forelimbs: Arm shorter (FLL 15.1 mm) than hand (HAL 19.3 mm), not enlarged. Fingers long (TFL 10.0 mm), stout. Relative length of fingers, shortest to longest: IV < I < II < III.

Fingers free, tips not dilated, without dermal fringe or webbing. Subarticular tubercles indistinct.

D.] Hind limbs: Shank about two times longer (TL 18.1 mm) than wide (TL 10.0 mm), smaller than thigh (FL 27.3 mm) and also smaller than the distance from the base of inner metatarsal tubercle to the tip of toe IV (FOL 29.1 mm). Relative length of toes, shortest to longest: I < II < V < III < IV. Tips of toes rounded, dermal fringe absent, webbing rudimentary. Subarticular tubercles indistinct. Inner metatarsal tubercle prominent, shovel-shaped, its length (IMT 6.3 mm) more than one and a half times in length of the outer metatarsal tubercle (OMT 4.1 mm) and the length of the toe I (ITL 4.0 mm). Supernumerary tubercles and tarsal tubercle absent.

E.] Skin: Dorsal skin smooth throughout excepting near vent where it is granular. Ventral surface smooth. Dorsolateral folds absent. Occipital fold rather prominent.

F.] Colouration: Dorsal parts of head and dorsum brown with olive tinge, with black on snout, between the nasal openings and between the shoulders. Upper and lower flanks on either side, dorsal and lateral parts of the limbs spotted dark brown to black. Ventral parts of head, body and limbs pale with yellowish tinge. Vocal sac subgular and black.

All four specimens encountered were from well-wooded tracts of the Reserve. Owing to their fossorial habits, these frogs are seldom encountered and have been recorded sporadically. As all the males encountered had well-developed black vocal sac, we presume that their breeding in the Nallamala Hills, Eastern Ghats also com-



Figure 1. *Uperodon globulosus* (Günther, 1864) from Nagarjunasagar Srisailem Tiger Reserve, Andhra Pradesh, southern India.

mences from June with the onset of monsoon as reported earlier (Chanda, 2002).

We thank J. R. B. Alfred, Director, Zoological Survey of India, Kolkata and Head, Department of Zoology, Osmania University, Hyderabad for facilities and encouragement. We acknowledge Zoo Outreach Organization, Coimbatore for partial funding of the expedition. We also thank the Chief Wildlife Warden for collection permits; the Field Director and other staff of Nagarjunasagar Srisailem Tiger Reserve for hospitality. We thank Sanjay Molur, Zoo Outreach Organization for his comments on the first draft. The first author acknowledges a Research Associateship from CSIR, New Delhi.

LITERATURE CITED

- ABDULALI, H. & J. C. DANIEL. 1954.** Extension of the range of the frog *Uperodon globulosum*. Journal of the Bombay Natural History Society 52(2-3):637–639.
- BHADURI, J. L. 1945.** Notes on the rare and interesting narrow mouthed frog *Uperodon globulosum* Günther. Journal of the Bombay Natural History Society 45(2):251–254.
- ____ & **S. L. BASU. 1956.** Further extension of the range of the frog *Uperodon globulosum* (Günther) in Jalpaiguri, West Bengal. Journal of the Bombay Natural History Society 53(4):712–713.
- ____ & **J. C. DANIEL. 1956.** The tadpoles of *Uperodon globulosum*. Journal of the Bombay Natural History Society 53(4):713–716.
- ____ & **S. S. SAHA. 1980.** Extension of the range of the narrow mouthed frog, *Uperodon globulosum* Günther to Kamrup District, Assam. Journal of the Bombay Natural History Society 77(1):151–152.
- BORAH, M. M. & S. BORDOLOI. 2001.** Nine new records of Amphibia (Anura) from Arunachal Pradesh. Journal of the Bombay Natural History Society 98(1):123–126.
- BORDOLOI, S., M. M. BORAH, K. K. SHARMA & S. N. KALITA. 2000.** An overview of amphibian fauna of Arunachal Pradesh. Journal of the Assam Science Society 41(4):363–371.
- BOULENGER, G. A. 1890.** The fauna of British India, including Ceylon and Burma, Reptilia and Batrachia. Taylor and Francis, London. 541 pp + xviii.

- CHANDA, S. K. 1994.** Anura (Amphibia) of North Eastern India. *Memoirs of the Zoological Survey of India* 18:1–143.
- _____. 2002. Hand book- Indian amphibians. Zoological Survey of India, Kolkata. 335 pp.
- CHOUDHURY, P., M. BARUAH & S. SENGUPTA. 1999.** Range extension in *Uperodon globulosus* (Günther, 1864) in Assam. *Journal of the Bombay Natural History Society* 96(1):157.
- DANIEL, J. C. 1963.** Field guide to the amphibians of Western India, Part II. *Journal of the Bombay Natural History Society* 60(3):690–702.
- DANIEL, J. C. & E. M. SHULL. 1963.** A list of reptiles and amphibians of the Surat Dangs, South Gujarat. *Journal of the Bombay Natural History Society* 60(3):737–743.
- DANIELS, R. J. R. 1992.** Geographical distribution patterns of amphibians in the Western Ghats. *Journal of Biogeography* 19:521–529.
- DEUTI, K. & B. C. BHARATHI GOSWAMI. 1995.** Amphibians of West Bengal plains. World Wide Fund for Nature- India, Eastern Region, Calcutta. 53 pp.
- DUTTA, S. K. 1997.** Amphibians of India and Sri Lanka (checklist and bibliography). Odyssey Publishing House, Bhubaneswar. 342 pp + xxii.
- GEORGE, S. & A. LEELAMMA. 1995.** First record of *Uperodon globulosus* (Anura: Microhylidae) from Kerala. *Journal of the Bombay Natural History Society* 92(3):427.
- KHAN, M. A. R. 1982.** Wildlife of Bangladesh – a checklist. University of Dhaka, Dhaka. 173 pp.
- MOLUR, S. & S. WALKER. (Eds). 1998.** Report of the Workshop “Conservation Assessment and Management Plan for Amphibians of India”, (BCPP– Endangered Species Project), Zoo Outreach Organisation, Conservation Breeding Specialist Group - India, Coimbatore. 102 pp.
- PADHYE, A. D. & H. V. GHATE. 2002.** An overview of amphibian fauna of Maharashtra state. *Zoos’ Print Journal* 17(3):735–740.
- _____, **M. MAHABALESHWAR & H. V. GHATE. 2002.** An overview of amphibian fauna of Pune district with special reference to their status in and around Pune City. *Zoos’ Print Journal* 17(4):757–763.
- PARKER, H. W. 1934.** A monograph of the frogs of the family Microhylidae. Trustees of the British Museum, London. 208 pp + viii.
- SARKAR, A. K., M. L. BISWAS & S. RAY. 1992.** Fauna of West Bengal: Amphibia, State Fauna Series 3(2):67–100. Zoological Survey of India, Calcutta.
- SATYAMURTI, S. T. 1967.** The south Indian Amphibia in the collection of the Madras Government Museum. *Bulletin of the Madras Government Museum (new series)* 8(2):1–87.
- THURSTON, E. 1888.** Catalogue of the Batrachia Salientia and Apoda of South India. *Bulletin of the Madras Government Museum (old series)*: 1–54.

C. Srinivasulu^{1*}, Manju Siliwal², A. Rajesh³, P. Venkateshwarulu¹, I. Siva Rama Krishna⁴, C. A. N. Rao³ and K. Thulsi Rao⁴

¹Department of Zoology, Osmania University, Hyderabad 500 007, Andhra Pradesh, India.
*Email: masawa@hd2.dot.net.in

²Zoo Outreach Organization/WILD Society, 29/1, Bharathi Colony, Peelamedu, Coimbatore 641 004, Tamil Nadu, India.

³Freshwater Biology Station, Zoological Survey of India, Hyderabad 500 020, Andhra Pradesh, India.

⁴ERM Labs, Nagajunasagar Srisailem Tiger Reserve, Srisailem 514 102, Kurnool Dist., Andhra Pradesh, India.

Received: 20 October 2003.

Accepted: 7 January 2004.

Hamadryad Vol. 30, No. 1, pp: xx–xx, 2006.
Copyright 2006 Centre for Herpetology
Madras Crocodile Bank Trust.

**ON TWO REMARKABLE COLOUR VARIANTS IN
BOIGA DENDROPHILA MELANOTA (BOULENGER,
1896) (SERPENTES: COLUBRIDAE)**

(with five text–figures)

A multitude of articles deal with colour variants of snakes (e.g., Clark, 1997; Love, 1997, 2003; Vosjoli, 1997; Northcott, 1999), and entire books have covered this subject (e.g., Bechtel, 1995; Broghammer, 1999; Bartlett and Bartlett,



Figure 1. *Boiga dendrophila melanota*, a nearly melanotic male from Pattalung, with white dots instead of yellow bands.



Figure 2. *Boiga dendrophila melanota*, a nearly melanotic male from Pattalung, with white dots instead of yellow bands.



Figure 3. *Boiga dendrophila melanota*, a nearly melanotic male from Pattalung, with white dots instead of yellow bands. Close up of head.



Figure 4. Female of *Boiga dendrophila melanota* from Nakhon Sri Tammarat, with stripes instead of bands.



Figure 5. Female of *Boiga dendrophila melanota* from Nakhon Sri Tammarat, with stripes instead of bands.

2002), that deal mainly with variants resulting from offspring, especially bred for this purpose, or occasionally obtained as a result of inbreeding in captivity. Most of them concern albinos, leucistic animals or other unusual developments of the chromophores. Presumably, a majority of these animals would not be able to survive for a

long time in nature. On the other hand, aberrant colour varieties of snakes found in the wild are rarely reported.

Colouration is of importance for systematics within *Boiga dendrophila* (Boie, 1827). Nine subspecies are currently known (Gaulke et al., 2003 [2005]), and the differences between these depend primarily on colouration (Brongersma, 1934; Vogel, 2000). Adults are black, with yellow bands for all but two forms. The taxon from

Sulawesi has silver rings for periods of its life and turns unpatterned black with maturity (Vogel, 2000; Lang and Vogel, in prep.). Juvenile specimens are more vividly coloured than the adults and sometimes tend to be a shade of red in colouration. However, there appears to be no literature on abnormal colouration within a subspecies.

Boiga dendrophila melanota (Boulenger, 1896) inhabits West Malaysia and Thailand. The northern limit of its distribution is not precisely known, as there are reports from Vietnam that need to be confirmed (Campden-Main, 1970; Nguyen and Ho, 1996; Szyndlar and Nguyen, 1996). This is a common species, widely collected for the leather industry. Nevertheless, the major standard works do not mention any variations in the colouration beside the number of the rings (e.g., Tweedie, 1983; Taylor, 1965; Cox, 1991; Manthey and Grossmann, 1997). Brongersma (1934) examined 40 specimens and found a consistent pattern in all of them.

Figures 1–5 depict photos of two unpreserved specimens of *Boiga dendrophila melanota*. Both animals were collected for trade, but the animals can be traced back to their province of origin. They are both adults.

Description of specimen 1: An adult male, collected in the Province of Pattalung, Thailand, in 2001. The upper side of the body is totally black. On the lowest dorsal row, there are white dots expanding to the ventrals. These white dots replace the yellow bands of the more typical colour morph. They are also present on the tail. The head is black. The upper labials are white with black posterior margins. The underside of the head is white.

Description of specimen 2: An adult female, collected in the Province of Nakhon Sri Thammarat, Thailand, in 2000. This specimen has a striped, instead of a banded pattern. The body is black, on each side there is a bright yellow stripe dorsolaterally. This is no lateral stripe. Dorsolateral stripe about one dorsal row wide. A part of the streak is straight but a smaller part is wavy and interrupted. The tail is banded, as is usual for this subspecies. The head is black, the white upper labials have small black margins; this is also typical for the subspecies.

The first of these two remarkable specimens is a nearly melanotic animal. This is not the astonishing fact, but the remainder of the bands are white instead of yellow. This leads to the hypothetical question: whether this animal had white bands when it was a juvenile, as animals of this species tend to get darker with age and the bands tend to get reduced to dots.

There is one report of specimens of *Boiga dendrophila* with white instead of yellow bands (Vogel, 2000). These animals were members of the nominate form, supposedly originating from Java or an adjacent island, and belong to a population with the offspring being white and black, with no exception. Vogel (2000) noted that *Boiga dendrophila melanota* and *Boiga dendrophila dendrophila* (Boie, 1827) are closely related, resulting in hybridisation at Vanicek (1993) (see Vogel, 2000, for an explanation). Only from these two subspecies are white, instead of yellow, banded specimens known so far. Gaulke et al. (2003 [2005]) showed a nearly melanotic animal from Sumatra (1997), but in this specimen, the reduced bands were yellow.

We do not think that this animal is a member of a white population. A population with this colouration cannot be unnoticed by snake catchers and traders in this country. It is obviously an individual variant showing an axanthic mutation and melanistic tendencies.

The second specimen has a striped instead of a banded pattern. This is not really a rare phenomenon with banded snakes. A well known example is *Lampropeltis getula californica* (Blainville, 1835), with a banded and a striped phase. This case has been thoroughly discussed in the past (Klauber, 1936, 1944; Smith, 1943; Mayr, 1944; Dunn, 1944). A striped pattern is also known for *Pituophis melanoleucus* (Daudin, 1803). In contrast to *Lampropeltis getula*, it is rarely found in this species, but it is also a regular component of some populations (Riemer, 1958). In *Boiga dendrophila*, this colouration was not noted before and is not a phase. There is another example of a banded snake with aberrant striped specimens. Whitaker (1968) and Kuch (1991; 1993) reported on several specimens of striped *Bungarus fasciatus* (Schneider, 1801) from two widely separated localities (India and Java). In the specimen of *B. fasciatus*

reported by Whitaker (1968), there were, beside the stripes, two bands across the tail. This snake was a gravid female. All neonates had a striped pattern, similar to the female. The parallelism in colouration is obvious.

Broghammer (1999) called this pattern mutation "striped mutation" and associated it with low incubation temperatures or a dominant or recessive genetic deposition. As this animal was wild caught, a genetic defect seems to be likely.

It is a mystery that such conspicuous colour variants has remained unnoticed for such a long time in a common species such as *Boiga dendrophila*. This is another example of the limited knowledge we have of the tropical fauna.

The first author wishes to thank Justin Mark Lester for the corrections of the English language. We also thank Stefan Broghammer and Patrick David for their comments on earlier drafts of the manuscript.

LITERATURE CITED

- BARTLETT, R. D & P. P. BARTLETT. 2002.** Designer reptiles and amphibians. Barron's Educational Series, New York. 96 pp.
- BECHTEL, H. B. 1995.** Reptile and amphibian variants: colors, patterns, and scales. Krieger Publishing Co., Melbourne, Florida. xvii + 206 pp.
- BROGHAMMER, S. 1999.** Albinos Farb- und Zeichnungsvarianten bei Schlangen und anderen Reptilien. Chimaira, Frankfurt am Main. 96 pp.
- BRONGERSMA, L. D. 1934.** Contributions to Indo-Australian herpetology. Zoologischer Mededelingen, Leiden 17:161–251.
- CAMPDEN-MAIN, S. M. 1970.** A field guide to the snakes of south Vietnam. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C. v + 112 pp, 1 pl.
- CLARK, B. 1997.** Tiger, tiger... Vivarium 8(4):37.
- COX, M. J. 1991.** The snakes of Thailand and their husbandry. Krieger Publishing Co., Malabar, Florida. xxx + 526 pp.
- DUNN, L. C. 1944.** The possible genetic basis of the ringed and striped patterns. American Midlandland Naturalist 31:91–95.
- GAULKE, M., A. DEMEGILLO & G. VOGEL. 2003 [2005].** Eine neue Unterart der Mangroven-Nachtbäumatter von den Philippinen. Herpetofauna 24(142): in press.
- _____, **A., F. ABEL & W. ERDELEN. 1997.** Zur Herpetofauna Nord-Sumatras. Herpetofauna 19(111):5–15.
- KLAUBER, L. M. 1936.** The California King Snake, a case of pattern dimorphism. Herpetologica 1:18–27.
- _____. **1944.** The California King Snake: a further discussion. American Midlandland Naturalist 31:85–87.
- KUCH, U. 1991.** Abnormal colouration in the banded krait, *Bungarus fasciatus* (Schneider, 1801). The Snake 23:25–28.
- _____. **1993.** Addendum. The Snake 25:65.
- LANG, R. DE & G. VOGEL. In prep.** The snakes of Sulawesi. Chimaira, Frankfurt am Main.
- LOVE, K. 1997.** Hypomenalism in colubrids. Vivarium 9(1):32–36.
- _____. **2003.** Ever-evolving *Elaphe guttata*. Reptiles Magazine 11(6):48–61.
- MAYR, E. 1944.** Remarks on Hobart Smith's analysis of the Western King Snakes. American Midland Naturalist 31:88–90.
- MANTHEY, U. & W. GROSSMANN. 1997.** Amphibien und Reptilien Südasiens. Natur & Tier-Verlag, Münster. 512 pp.
- NGUYÊN, V. S. & T. C. HỒ. 1996.** Danh lục bò sát và êch nhái Việt Nam [Amphibians and reptiles of Vietnam]. Science & Technology Publ. House, Hanoi. 264 pp. [in Vietnamese.]
- NORTHCOTT, D. 1999.** The "paradox" *Boa constrictor*. The Vivarium 10(2):32.
- RIEMER, W. J. 1958.** Longitudinal striping as a pattern modification in the snake *Pituophis melanoleucus*. Natural History Miscellanea 165:1–9.
- SMITH, H. M. 1943.** Another analysis of the status of the Western King Snakes of the *getulus* group. American Midland Naturalist 29:245–251.
- SZYNDLAR, Z. & V. S. NGUYEN. 1996.** Terrestrial snake fauna of Vietnam: distributional records. The Snake 27:91–98.
- TAYLOR, E. H. 1965.** The serpents of Thailand and adjacent waters. University of Kansas Science Bulletin 45(9):609–1096.
- TWEEDIE, M. W. F. 1983. 1983.** The snakes of Malaya. Third edition. Singapore National Printers (Pte) Ltd., Singapore. (6) + 167 pp; 12 pl.
- VANICEK, P. 1993.** Zkusenosti s chovem hada *Boiga*

dendrophila [Breeding experience with *Boiga dendrophila*]. Akvárium Terárium 8:34–37. [in Czech.]

VOGEL, G. 2000. Zur Bestimmung der Unterarten von *Boiga dendrophila* (BOIE, 1827) nebst einigen Neuigkeiten zu *Boiga dendrophila gemmicincta* (Duméril, Bibron & Duméril, 1854). Sauria, Berlin 22(1):27–43.

VOSJOLI DE, P. 1997. Cutting edge of herpetoculture. Vivarium 9(2):33–51 & 73–75.

WHITAKER, R. 1968. Abnormal coloration in the banded krait, *Bungarus fasciatus* (Schneider). Journal of the Bombay Natural History Society 66:184 + 1 pl.

Gernot Vogel¹ and Lawan Chanhome²

¹ Im Sand 3, 69115 Heidelberg, Germany.
Email: gernot.vogel.SSEAH@t-online.de

² Queen Saovabha Memorial Institute, 1871
Rama IV Road, Bangkok 10330, Thailand.

Received: 25 August 2004.

Accepted: 17 February 2005.

Hamadryad Vol. 30, No. 1, pp. xx – xx, 2006.
Copyright 2006 Centre for Herpetology,
Madras Crocodile Bank Trust.

UROPELTIS MACROLEPIS IN THE DIET OF CALLIOPHIS NIGRESCENS

On 25 September 2004 at 1900 h, a specimen of *Calliophis nigrescens* (Günther, 1862) was collected from the leaf litter under a shrub on the Surla Plateau in the northern part of the Madhei Wildlife Sanctuary, Goa, India. The Sanctuary is located in the Western Ghats of north Goa and is contiguous with the Amboli forests in Maharashtra to the north, Bhimgad forests of Karnataka to the east and the Bhagwan Mahaveer (Mollem) Wildlife Sanctuary to the south. It covers an area of 208.48 km².

Probably due to stress of capture, handling or transport, the specimen regurgitated a freshly ingested snake. Although parts of the head of this snake were partially digested, based on other scalation data, it was identified as *Uropeltis macrolepis* (Peters, 1861). The identity was also

confirmed by comparing with a live conspecific specimen captured at this locality.

Oriental coral snakes are included in three genera: *Calliophis*, *Hemibungarus* and *Sinom-icrurus* by Slowinski et al. (2001). There is little information on their ecology and most published information on these species is based on anecdotal observations (e.g., Takahashi and Kawamura, 1982; Anon., 1988; Mori and Hikida, 1991; Nobusaka et al., 1995; Cox, 2000). These snakes are known to primarily prey on fossorial snakes (Smith, 1943, Mattison, 1995), and in some cases, are also known to consume skinks, lizards and amphibians (Cox, 1991). Apart from this, there is a report of captive specimens of *Calliophis melanurus* being fed on *Ramphotyphlops braminus* in captivity (Vyas and Vyas, 1981). The present observation of *Uropeltis macrolepis* in the diet of *Calliophis nigrescens* is first prey record for *Calliophis nigrescens*.

I thank D. Pandey, Chief Conservator of Forests, Goa, for supporting and encouraging my work, and my friend Ryan Meredith for drawing my attention to the snake. Special thanks are due to Varad Giri and Eric Smith for their useful comments on this note.

LITERATURE CITED

- ANON. 1988.** Extension range of the striped coral snake (*Callophis nigrescens*). *Hamadryad* 13(2):4–5.
- COX, M. J. 1991.** The snakes of Thailand and their husbandry. Krieger Publishing Co., Malabar, Florida. xxx + 526 pp.
- _____. 2000. The status of the subspecies of *Calliophis maculiceps*. *Bulletin of the Maryland Herpetological Society* 36(3):76–85.
- MORI, A. & T. HIKIDA. 1991.** Notes on the defensive behavior of the Asian elapid, *Maticora intestinalis*. *The Snake* 23(2):107–109.
- MATTISON, C. 1995.** The encyclopaedia of snakes. Blandford Press, London. 256 pp.
- NOBUSAKA, R., E. NAKAMOTO, S. MISHIMA & Y. SAWAI. 1995.** Note on the reproduction of hyan, *Calliophis japonicus japonicus* (Günther). *The Snake* 27(1):57–59.
- SHRESTHA, T. K. & T. C. MAJUPURIA. 1977.** Redescription of coral snake *Calliophis maccellandi* from Kathmandu. *Journal of Natural History Museum of Tribhuvan University*

1(2–4):103–112.

- SLOWINSKI, J. B., J. BOUNDY & R. LAWSON. 2001.** The phylogenetic relationships of Asian coral snakes (Elapidae: *Calliophis* and *Maticora*) based on morphological and molecular characters. *Herpetologica* 57:233–245.
- SMITH, M. A. 1943.** The fauna of British India. Reptilia and Amphibia. Vol. III - Serpentes. Taylor and Francis, London. xii + 583 pp + 1 map.
- TAKAHASHI, H. & Y. KAWAMURA. 1982.** A large individual of *Calliophis maccllellandii iwasakii* and its living conditions in captivity. *Japanese Journal of Herpetology* 9(4):122.
- VYAS, T. P. & M. VYAS. 1981.** A note on the slender coral snake, *Callophis melanurus*. *Journal of the Bombay Natural History Society* 78(3):611–612.

Aaron Savio Lobo

House 12A, Paitona, Salvador – Do – Mundo,
Bardez, Goa 403 101, India.
Email: aaronlobo79@yahoo.co.uk

Received: 21 February 2005.

Accepted: 31 March 2005.

Hamadryad Vol. 30. No. 1, pp. xx-xx, 2006.
Copyright 2006, Center for Herpetology
Madras Crocodile Bank Trust

**TWINNING IN PYTHON MOLURUS
MOLURUS IN CAPTIVITY**

The Indian rock python, *Python molurus molurus*, is one of several reptiles to have been successfully bred at the Arignar Anna Zoological Park, Chennai, India. There are several reports on management, captive breeding, gestation, clutch size, incubation, feeding and growth rates in this species (e.g., Acharjyo and Misra, 1976; Paulraj and Thiruthalinathan, 1983; Kalaiarasan and Rathinasabapathy, 1991; Sekar and Rao, 1995; Baskar et al., 1999). The first report on twinning in *Python molurus bivittatus* was reported by Clark and Tytle (1983). The present study reports observation on twinning in *Python molurus molurus* for the first time in captivity.

The animals are housed in a custom-built enclosure, measuring 6.2 x 3.3 x 1.8 m. The three side of the enclosure are concrete walls and the side of the viewing gallery is covered with 8 mm glass of dimensions 3.72 x 1.26 m above the viewing glass. Perforated aluminium sheet is provided for ventilation. The door towards the service path has perforated iron sheet for cross ventilation. A cement trough of dimensions 0.92 x 0.58 m is provided inside the enclosure at ground level to provide water, and dried leaves, few logs, stones, sands are provided to facilitate moulting and to landscape the enclosure. A total of three adult female pythons, inclusive of the incubating female, are maintained in the enclosure.

The incubating female python was continuously monitored and the hatchlings measured and weighed. The twins were isolated and maintained in separate ventilated boxes to study their growth.

Mating was not observed, but on 11 April 2001, muscular contractions of the body were noticed in the gravid female, who was found in a corner of the enclosure laying eggs in the leaf litter. The clutch was left alone for natural incubation and the eggs were not manipulated. On 23 May, the female abandoned the clutch and swallowed a 1.5 kg chicken. It then resumed the position of coiling around the clutch. During this feeding interval, 30 eggs were counted. On the afternoon of 5 June, the first hatching was observed. A total of three pipped eggs were found, including one that contained the two hatchlings with a single yolk mass. The other two eggs contained a single hatchling each. The calculated incubation period was 56 days, inclusive of the hatchling day. On 6 June 2001, the remaining 25 eggs were examined and proved to be fertile. However, there were 30 to start with and three were removed on 5 June. The remaining two infertile eggs contained well developed but dead embryos. The mother abandoned the clutch and the young ones were observed emerging from the respective eggs on the 58th day. Of 30 eggs, 29 hatchlings were produced.

The python babies were released into a ca. 1 x 0.3 m plastic tray, covered with newspaper and the twin python babies were separated from

the single yolk. Later liquid Wocadine™ was applied on the cut portion as an antiseptic. The hatchlings were found to be active and agile.

On 15 June 2001, the twins were measured and weighed. The length and weight were 55 cm and 48 gm, respectively. The length of the other hatchlings varied from 55–70, mean 61.08 cm (n = 25), and weight 78–130, mean 111.56 gm (n = 25). The twins were marked and kept separately and are being monitored.

The two siblings born at a time for a mother (twins) are due to multiple pregnancy. There are three types of twins: identical twins, fraternal twins and Siamese twins. Identical twins are extremely similar in their characters, they are developed from a single zygote and called monozygotic twins. During cleavage, the zygote divides into two blastomers, the blastomer separate and each blastomere develop into a sibling (Meyyan, 1988). Fraternal twins are like ordinary brother and sisters, they develop from two independent zygotes (dizygitic twins) or (non-identical twins). Siamese twins are similar to identical twins, they develop from a single egg (monozygotic twins) and they are joined together physically.

From the above references it indicates that the python hatchlings are identical twins. Interestingly, the length and weight were similar. The sex of the twins has not been identified. This is the first report of the twins in captivity observed in this species. The literature survey revealed the rarity of identical twins in *Python molurus molurus*, and there are no published reports.

Our earlier studies revealed that while incubating, the female never abandoned the clutch (n = 6) for feeding. In the present study we observed that on the 43rd day, the female abandoned the clutch for feeding. Murthy (1990) reported that female pythons display a remarkable maternal instinct by remaining coiled around the clutch till hatchling.

Yadav (1967) observed that incubation period was 53 days, Paulraj and Thiruthalinathan (1989) noted the incubation period of 55 days at Arignar Anna Zoological Park, and Basker et al. (1999) reported 57 days at Arignar Anna Zoological Park. In present study, the incubation period was 56 days for 25 remaining eggs closely coincide with the above findings.

The clutch size varies from 8 to 100 (Daniel, 1983), Murthy (1990) reported that clutch size of python were 100 to 107. In the present study, the clutch size was 30 eggs with hatching percentage of 93.33.

The authors are thankful to Dr. Sukhdev, I.F.S., Chief Wildlife Warden Tamil Nadu Forest Department, for his constant support and encouragement. We also thank K. Senthil Kumar, Veterinarian Assistant Surgeon, for his help during hatching.

LITERATURE CITED

- ACHARJYO, L.N. & R. MISRA.** 1976. Aspects of reproduction and growth of the Indian python (*Python molurus molurus*) in captivity. British Journal of Herpetology 5:562–565.
- BASKAR, N., N. KRISHNAKUMAR & B. RATHINASABAPATHY.** 1991. Breeding of the Indian rock pythons (*Python molurus*) Cobra 3:10–11.
- CLARK, B. & T. TYTLE,** 1983. A note on twinning *Python molurus bivittatus* (Burmese Python). Morphology. Herpetological Review 14 (4):124.
- DANIEL, J. C.** 1983. The book of Indian reptiles. Oxford University Press/Bombay Natural History Society, Bombay. 141 pp.
- KALAIARASAN, V. & B. RATHINASABAPATHY.** 1991. Breeding of the Indian rock pythons (*Python molurus*) Cobra 3:10–11.
- MEYYAN, R.** 1998. Genetics. Third Edition, Saras Publications, Shanmugapuram. 245 pp.
- PAULRAJ, S. & R. THIRUTHALINATHAN.** 1989. Breeding behavior of Indian rock python (*Python molurus*) International Zoo News 36(3): 11–15.
- MURTHY, T. S. N.** 1990. The snake book of India. International Book Distributors, Dehradun. 701 pp.
- SEKAR, M. & M. J. RAO.** 1995. Management of Indian rock pythons (*Python molurus*) in captivity at AAZP, Vandalur, Chennai. Cobra 22:14–16.
- YADAV, R. N.** 1967. A note on the breeding of Indian rock python (*Python molurus*) at Jaipur Zoo. International Zoo Yearbook 7:182–183.

A. Manimozhi, N. Baskar and M. Sekar

Arignar Anna Zoological Park, Vandalur,
Chennai 400 048 India.

Email: aazp@hotmail.com and
aazp@vsnl.com

Received: 26 September 2001.

Accepted: 9 February 2005.

Hamadryad Vol. 30, No. 1, pp. xx – xx, 2006.
Copyright 2006 Centre for Herpetology,
Madras Crocodile Bank Trust.

**EVIDENCE FOR THE HISTORIC OCCURRENCE
OF *CROCODYLUS POROSUS* SCHNEIDER,
1801 IN TONLE SAP, CAMBODIA**

(with one text-figure)

Two species of crocodiles are known from Cambodia: the Siamese crocodile (*Crocodylus siamensis*) and estuarine crocodile (*C. porosus*) (Thorbjarnarson, 1992). The Siamese crocodile formerly occurred in freshwater wetlands throughout the country (Campbell, 1860; Smith, 1931; Kimura, 1969; Thuok and Tana, 1994; Thuok, 1998; Platt et al., in press), but populations are now much reduced due to habitat destruction, unrestricted hunting, and over-collecting to stock crocodile farms (Platt et al., in press). Extant populations in Cambodia are restricted to the Cardamom Mountains (Daltry and Chheang, 2000; Barr, 2002), Sre Ambel River and floodplain wetlands (Platt et al., 2003), and parts of the Tonle Sap (Platt et al., in press). In contrast to *C. siamensis*, little is known regarding the past or present distribution of *C. porosus* in Cambodia. Tirant (1885) stated that *C. porosus* was widespread in Cambodia and responsible for more human fatalities than tigers (*Panthera tigris*), but provided little specific locality data. Kimura (1969) noted that *C. porosus* occurred in Kampong Som Bay near Sihanoukville, and according to Thuok and Tana (1994), *C. porosus* was present, albeit rare in coastal habitats of Koh Kong Province. Two large adult *C. porosus* on display in the Government-owned Siem Reap Crocodile Farm (S. Platt, pers. obs.) were reportedly captured in the latter region during the early 1980's (Nao Thuok, pers. comm.).

The situation regarding *Crocodylus porosus* in Tonle Sap is equivocal; anecdotal evidence suggests that estuarine crocodiles may have formerly occurred in the lake, but verified records

are apparently lacking. A Chinese diplomat living in Angkor during the 13th century mentions exceptionally large crocodiles inhabiting Tonle Sap (Chou, 1987), and Thorbjarnarson (2001) notes that Bas-reliefs at the Angkor ruins depict crocodiles attacking and eating humans, a behaviour more likely attributable to *C. porosus* (Platt et al., 2001 and references therein) than *C. siamensis*. Indeed, confirmed reports of anthropophagy by *C. siamensis* are extremely rare (Smith, 1931; S. Platt, unpubl. data). In another likely reference to *C. porosus*, villagers living on the lake described a large, aggressive crocodile known locally as *krapear* (sea crocodile) that once occurred in Tonle Sap, but disappeared 30 to 50 years ago (Platt et al., in press). Furthermore, *C. porosus* was present in the lower Mekong River and delta until recently (Cao and Jenkins, 1998; Stuart et al., 2002), and occasional upstream dispersal to the Tonle Sap is likely, especially given that transoceanic movements of over 1000 km have been reported in this species (Allen, 1974; Bustard and Choudhury, 1980). Likewise, other estuarine reptiles, such as the river terrapin (*Batagur baska*) and file snake (*Acrochordus granulatus*) are known to have historically occurred in the Mekong River system as far upstream as Tonle Sap (Saint Girons, 1972; Platt et al., 2003). Herein we provide physical evidence for the past occurrence of *C. porosus* in Tonle Sap.

Tonle Sap (Great Lake), located in the central plain of Cambodia, is the largest permanent freshwater lake in south-east Asia, and linked to the Mekong River system by the Tonle Sap River near Phnom Penh (Scott, 1989; Giesen, 1998). The areal extent of Tonle Sap varies widely depending on the season; during the dry months (December to mid-May) it covers 250,000 to 300,000 ha, expanding to 1.3 million ha at the height of the wet season when floodwaters from the Mekong River fill the lake (Scott, 1989; Giesen, 1998). Extensive seasonally flooded wetlands consisting of swamp forest, wet shrub lands, and open marshland surround the lake (MacDonald et al., 1997). The Tonle Sap ecosystem is described elsewhere in greater detail (Scott, 1989; MacDonald et al., 1997; Platt et al., in press).



Figure 1. Left crocodile mandible found by a villager in swamp forest surrounding Tonle Sap in Cambodia. The mandibular length (86.0 cm) indicates this bone is from a large, adult estuarine crocodile (*Crocodylus porosus*).

In May 2004, we obtained the left mandible of an adult crocodile from a local villager (Fig. 1). The mandible was found by the villager during April 2004 in swamp forest near Koh Ray (ca. 13°15'N; 103° 48'W), a remote hamlet on the northern shore of Tonle Sap approximately 6 km E of Port Choeng Khneas. This specimen is currently on display in the natural history collection of the GECKO (Greater Environment of Choeng Khneas Organization) Environment Center in Choeng Khneas. Based on the weathered appearance of the bone, we estimate the mandible to be 25 to 50 years old. However, in the absence of detailed information on how taphonomic processes (Behrensmeyer, 1978) affect crocodile bone, our estimate should be regarded as wholly subjective and we lack the means to make a more accurate determination at this time.

The straight-line mandibular length (ML) of the Tonle Sap specimen measures 86.0 cm. To our knowledge, *Crocodylus porosus* and *C. siamensis* cannot be distinguished solely on the basis of mandibular characteristics, but the ML suggests this mandible is that of a large adult *C. porosus*. Regression equations that relate ML to skull length (SL), head length (HL), snout-vent length (SVL), or total length (TL) are unavailable for either *C. siamensis* or *C. porosus*. However, the ratio of SL to ML in four large *C. porosus* skulls from Australia ranged from 0.76 to 0.80 (Grahame J. W. Webb, unpubl. data). Using the median value of 0.78, the SL of the

Tonle Sap specimen is estimated to be 67.0 cm. Because SL is generally 4 to 5% less than HL owing to tissue loss (Webb and Messel, 1978), the latter was calculated by adding 3.0 cm to SL, yielding a value of 70.0 cm. Webb and Messel (1978) found that HL predicted SVL of adult *C. porosus* by the equation $SVL = 3.60 (HL) - 4.30$; using a value of 70.0 cm for HL gives an estimated SVL of 247.7 cm. The TL of the Tonle Sap specimen can then be calculated by solving the equation $SVL = 0.49 (TL) - 0.72$ (Webb and Messel, 1978) yielding a value of 506 cm.

This value should be considered a conservative estimate of the TL of the Tonle Sap crocodile. The regression equations of Webb and Messel (1978) were derived from a sample of 1354 crocodiles ranging in TL from 25 to 425 cm; in larger *C. porosus*, HL is proportionally shorter in relation to TL and the equation relating HL to TL appears to considerably underestimate TL (Montague, 1983). Using these equations Montague (1983) found that a 620 cm *C. porosus* which he measured in New Guinea had a predicted TL of only 520 cm. Thus, it is likely that the actual TL of the Tonle Sap specimen was somewhat larger than indicated by our estimate.

Although *C. porosus* cannot be distinguished from *C. siamensis* on the basis of mandibular characteristics, the estimated TL of the Tonle Sap crocodile is consistent with the body size of *C. porosus* and considerably exceeds the maximum TL reported for *C. siamensis*. The former commonly attain total lengths of 3 to 4 m and specimens as long as 6 to 7 m are known (Daniel and Hussain, 1973; Greer, 1974; Webb and Messel, 1978; Montague, 1983). In contrast, while adult male *C. siamensis* occasionally reach 4 m (Brazaitis, 1973), most individuals do not exceed 3 m (Smith, 1931; Thorbjarnarson, 1992).

This report constitutes the first physical evidence that *C. porosus* formerly inhabited the Tonle Sap ecosystem in sympatry with *C. siamensis*. This is not unexpected; although the ecological relationship between *C. porosus* and *C. siamensis* is unknown, elsewhere (Australia, India, New Guinea, Philippines, Sri Lanka) in its extensive distribution, *C. porosus* inhabits inland freshwater wetlands with a congener (Thorbjarnarson, 1992). Unlike *C. siamensis*,

of which small numbers persist in remote, inaccessible wetlands surrounding Tonle Sap, recent survey data indicate that *C. porosus* was extirpated from the lake 30 to 50 years ago (Platt et al., in press). We posit that large body size and aggressive behaviour rendered *C. porosus* especially vulnerable to over-hunting and hastened its local demise.

We thank Grahame Webb for providing unpublished morphometric data from large *C. porosus* skulls, Bryan Stuart for supplying an obscure reference, and Kalyar for translating a Japanese document. Comments by Bryan Stuart, Romulus Whitaker, John Shaft, and Tanny Brown improved an earlier draft of this manuscript. Support for SGP was provided by the Department of Math and Science, Oglala Lakota College.

LITERATURE CITED

- ALLEN, G. R. 1974.** The marine crocodile, *Crocodylus porosus*, from Ponape, Eastern Caroline Islands, with notes on food habits of crocodiles from the Palau Archipelago. *Copeia* 1974:553.
- BARR, B. 2002.** Capture of wild Siamese crocodile. *Crocodile Specialist Group Newsletter* 21:5.
- BEHRENSMEYER, A. K. 1978.** Taphonomic and ecologic information from bone weathering. *Paleobiology* 4:150–162.
- BRAZAITIS, P. 1973.** The identification of living crocodylians. *Zoologica* 58:59–101.
- BUSTARD, H. R. & B. C. CHOUDHURY. 1980.** Long distance movement by a saltwater crocodile (*Crocodylus porosus*). *British Journal of Herpetology* 6:87.
- CAMPBELL, J. 1860.** Notes on the antiquities, natural history, &c. &c., of Cambodia, compiled from manuscripts of the late E.F.J. Forrest, Esq., and from information derived from the Rev. Dr. House, &c. &c. *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society* 30:182–198.
- CAO, V. S. & R. W. G. JENKINS. 1998.** Crocodile conservation and development in Vietnam. In: *Crocodiles: Proceedings of the 14th Meeting of the Crocodile Specialist Group*. pp: 135–140. IUCN Publications, Gland, Switzerland.
- CHOU, T. K. 1987.** The customs of Cambodia. Siam Society, Bangkok. 211 pp.
- DALTRY, J. & D. CHHEANG. 2000.** Siamese crocodiles discovered in the Cardamom Mountains. *Crocodile Specialist Group Newsletter* 19:7–8.
- DANIEL, J. C. & S. A. HUSSAIN. 1973.** The record (?) salt water crocodile (*Crocodylus porosus* Schneider). *Journal of the Bombay Natural History Society* 71:309–312.
- GIESEN, W. 1998.** Natural resources based development strategy for the Tonle Sap area, Cambodia. Sectoral Studies 1. Environment in the Tonle Sap area. Unpublished report to Cambodia National Mekong Committee, Mekong River Commission, and United Nations Development Programme, Phnom Penh. 122 pp.
- GREER, A. E. 1974.** On the maximum total length of the saltwater crocodile (*Crocodylus porosus*). *Journal of Herpetology* 8:381–384.
- KIMURA, W. 1969.** Crocodiles in Cambodia. Research Report No. 3, Atagawa Tropical Garden and Alligator Farm, Atagawa Higashi Izu Town, Japan. 23 pp. [in Japanese with English summary.]
- MacDONALD, A., B. PECH & B. LEEU. 1997.** Plant communities of the Tonle Sap floodplain. Unpubl. Report to UNESCO, IUCN, Wetlands International, and SPEC (European Commission), Phnom Penh. 142 pp.
- MONTAGUE, J. J. 1983.** A new size record for the saltwater crocodile (*Crocodylus porosus*). *Herpetological Review* 14:36–37.
- PLATT, S. G., H. SOVANNARA, L. KHENG, B. L. STUART & J. WALSTON. 2003.** *Crocodylus siamensis* along the Sre Ambel River, southern Cambodia: habitat, nesting, and conservation. *Herpetological Natural History* 9:165–169.
- _____, _____, _____, **J. B. THORBJARNARSON & T. R. RAINWATER. In press.** Population status and conservation of wild Siamese crocodiles (*Crocodylus siamensis*) in the Tonle Sap Biosphere Reserve, Cambodia. *Natural History Bulletin of the Siam Society*.
- _____, **B. L. STUART, H. SOVANNARA, L. KHENG, KALYAR, & H. KIMCHHAY. 2003.** Rediscovery of the critically endangered river terrapin, *Batagur baska*, in Cambodia, with notes on occurrence, reproduction, and conservation status. *Chelonian Conservation and Biology*

- 4:691–695.
- _____, WIN KO KO, KALYAR, MYO MYO, LAY LAY KHAING & T. R. RAINWATER. 2001. Man-eating by estuarine crocodiles: the Ramree Island massacre revisited. *Herpetological Bulletin* 75:15–18.
- SAINT GIRONS, H. 1972. Les serpents du Cambodge. Mémoires du Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Nouvelle Série A, Zoologie 74:1–170.
- SCOTT, D. A. 1989. A directory of Asian wetlands. IUCN Publications, Gland, Switzerland. 1181 pp.
- SMITH, M. A. 1931. The fauna of British India, including Ceylon and Burma. Vol. 1. Loricata, Testudines. Taylor & Francis, London. 185 pp.
- STUART, B. L., B. HAYES, B. H. MANH & S. G. PLATT. 2002. Status of crocodiles in the U Minh Thuong Nature Reserve, southern Vietnam. *Pacific Conservation Biology* 8:62–65.
- THORBJARNARSON, J. 1992. Crocodiles: an action plan for their conservation. IUCN Publications, Gland, Switzerland. 136 pp.
- _____. 2001. Herpetology trip report: Cambodia. Unpublished report to Wildlife Conservation Society, Bronx, New York. 17 pp.
- THUOK, N. 1998. Current status of crocodiles in Cambodia in captivity and in the wild. In: *Crocodiles: Proceedings of the 14th Meeting of the Crocodile Specialist Group*. pp. 141–154. IUCN Publications, Gland, Switzerland.
- _____ & T. S. TANA. 1994. Country report on crocodile conservation in Cambodia. In: *Crocodiles: Proceedings of the 12th Meeting of the Crocodile Specialist Group*. pp: 3–15. IUCN Publications, Gland, Switzerland.
- TIRANT, G. 1885. Notes sur les reptiles et les batraciens de la Cochincine et du Cambodge. Government Printers, Saigon. 104 pp.
- WEBB, G. J. W. & H. MESSEL. 1978. Morphometric analysis of *Crocodylus porosus* from the north coast of Arnhem Land, northern Australia. *Australian Journal of Zoology* 26:1–27.
- ¹Department of Math and Science, Oglala Lakota College, P. O. Box 490, Kyle, South Dakota, 57752-0490, U.S.A.
- ²Applied Ecology Group, University of Canberra, Australian Capital Territory, 2601, Australia.
- ³FAO, P.O. Box 2, Siem Reap, Cambodia.
- ⁴Department of Animal Science, One Shields Avenue, University of California, Davis, California, 95616-8521, U.S.A.

Received: 11 March 2005.

Accepted: 23 April 2005.

Hamadryad Vol. 30, No. 1, pp. xx – xx, 2006.

Copyright 2006 Centre for Herpetology,
Madras Crocodile Bank Trust.

**FIRST RECORD OF *HEMIDACTYLUS PERSICUS*
ANDERSON, 1872 (SQAMATA: SAURIA:
GEKKONIDAE) FROM THE REPUBLIC OF INDIA,
WITH NOTES ON ITS DISTRIBUTION**

The Persian gecko, *Hemidactylus persicus*, is widely distributed, from eastern Arabia to southern Iran, and in the east, it reaches Sindh and Waziristan in Pakistan (Smith, 1935; Anderson, 1999). In Pakistan, Minton (1966) did not record the species east of the Indus River. The species is a member of a chiefly arid zone clade of *Hemidactylus*, which also includes the widespread Mediterranean form *H. turcicus* (Carranza and Arnold, 2005). It prefers xeric habitats, especially rocky deserts, flood plains and thorny *Euphorbia* forests, and it is occasionally observed in edificarian situations (Smith, 1935).

During the study of the reptilian fauna of Gujarat State, one of the authors (RV) collected specimens of an unusual gecko in and around the Jassore Wildlife Sanctuary, Gujarat State, India. After examination it was identified as *Hemidactylus persicus* Anderson, 1872.

The Jassore Wildlife Sanctuary (JWS) is in Banaskantha District, Gujarat State, and is one of the prime habitats of the Sloth Bear, *Melursus ursinus*. The sanctuary lies between 24° 20' and 24° 31'N; 72° 23' and 72° 37'E, and encompasses an area 180.66 km². The area is in the most south-westerly part of the Aravalli

Steven G. Platt¹, Rohan H. P. Holloway², Patrick T. Evans³, Kiran Paudyal³, Has Piron³, and Thomas R. Rainwater⁴

Hills and the habitat continues into the adjacent portion of Rajasthan State. Champion and Seth (1968) classified the area as a dry deciduous mixed with dry arid and grasslands. The dominant tree species in the area are *Acacia catech* (Khair), *Acacia nilolica* (Baval), *Zizyphus sp.* (Bor), *Butea monosperma* (Khakharo) *Anogeisus latifolia* (Dhav), *Wrightia tinctoria* (Dudhalo), *Boswellia serrata* (Saledi) and *Prosopis juliflora*.

Recent survey result shows that the sanctuary harbours 12 species of amphibians and 35 species of reptiles (Vyas, 2005). Four adult specimens of *Hemidactylus persicus* were collected in and around the JWS as voucher. All were deposited in the museum of Bombay Natural History Society (BNHS 1710 to 1713), Mumbai. Measurements and pholidosis of these specimens are provided in Table 1.

This species is locally uncommon and found in and around areas used by humans, including under rocks and tree logs, on large boulders and in ruined houses along with two other congeners, *H. flaviviridis* and *H. brookii*. It is active from early to late evening, emerging from diurnal retreats to forage shortly after sunset. At present, the species has been recorded at three localities: Balundra village, Forest Guest House and the campus of the Kedarnath Shrine; the last two localities lie within the protected area.

If this species is naturally distributed in and around the tropical deciduous forest of Jassore, it is possible that *Hemidactylus persicus* is distributed in other parts of the state from Kachchh to northern Gujarat and most probably adjacent areas of Rajasthan State, which share similar habitats. Therefore, a survey is needed to determine the actual distributional range of the species, especially in two protected areas, namely Balaram-Ambaji Wildlife Sanctuary, Gujarat and Abu Wildlife Sanctuary, Rajasthan, that provide environments similar to that at Jassore. Further, survey in such protected areas, relatively free of human disturbance, would help to rule out the possibilities that *H. persicus* has become established in India through human agency as have several of its congeners in other parts of the world.

The present localities of JWS and its environs in the Banaskantha District of Gujarat State are

east of Indus River at an approximate airline distance of 600 km from Karachi, Pakistan, previously the most south-easterly recorded locality for the species. *Hemidactylus persicus* has not previously been recorded from Gujarat (Gayen, 1999; Vyas, 2000; Sharma, 2000), nor from the Republic of India (Murthy, 1990; Tikader and Sharma, 1992; Sharma, 2002), thus, the records presented here represent not only a significant eastern range extension for the species, but also new state and national records.

RV thanks the Director, Gujarat Ecological Education Research (GEER) Foundation, Gandhinagar, India for logistic support and for permission for the study.

LITERATURE CITED

- ANDERSON, S. C. 1999.** The lizards of Iran. Society for the Study of Amphibians and Reptiles, Oxford, Ohio. vii + 442 pp., 25 pls.
- CARRANZA, S. & E. N. ARNOLD. 2005.** Systematics, biogeography, and evolution of *Hemidactylus* geckos (Reptilia: Gekkonidae) elucidated using mitochondrial DNA sequences. Mol. Phylogenet. Evol. in press.
- CHAMPION, H. G. & S. K. SETH. 1968.** A revised survey of the forest types of India. Manager of Publication, Government of India, New Delhi. 7 map + 103 Pl. + 404 pp.
- GAYEN, N. C. 1999.** A synopsis of the reptiles of Gujarat, western India. Hamadryad 24:1–22.
- MINTON, S. A. 1966.** A contribution to the herpetology of West Pakistan. Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History 134:27–184.
- MURTHY, T. S. N. 1990.** A field book of the lizards of India. Records of the Zoological Survey of India, Occasional Papers (115):1–122.
- SHARMA, R. C. 2000.** Reptilia. In: State Fauna Series no. 8 Fauna of Gujarat (Part 1) Vertebrates. pp: 243–297. Q. H. Bagri (Ed). Zoological Survey of India, Calcutta.
- _____. 2002. The fauna of India and adjacent countries. Reptilia, Volume II (Sauria). Zoological Survey of India, Kolkata, India. xxv + 430 pp.
- SMITH, M. A. 1935.** The fauna of British India, including Ceylon and Burma. Reptilia and Amphibia. Vol. II. Sauria. Taylor and Francis, London. xiii + 440 pp., 1 pl.
- TIKADER, B. K. & R. C. SHARMA. 1992.** Handbook.

Indian lizards. Zoological Survey of India, Calcutta. xv + 250 pp., 42 pls.

VYAS, R. 2000. Comments on 'A synopsis of the reptiles of Gujarat, India'. *Hamadryad* 25:203–207.

_____. 2005. Herpetofauna of the Jassore Wildlife Sanctuary. A technical report submitted to Gujarat Ecological Education Research (GEER) Foundation, Gandhinagar. 7 pl. +18 pp.

Raju Vyas¹, Varad Giri² and Aaron M. Bauer³

¹ 505 Krishnadeep Tower, Mission Road, Fatehgunj, Vadodara 390 002, Gujarat, India.
Email: razoovyas@hotmail.com

² Bombay Natural History Society, Hornbill House, S. B. Singh Road, Mumbai 400 023, Maharashtra, India.
Email: bnhs@bom4.vsnl.net.in

³ Department of Biology, Villanova University, 800 Lancaster Avenue, Villanova, Pennsylvania 19085, U.S.A.
Email: aaron.bauer@villanova.edu

Received: 11 July 2005.

Accepted: 31 July 2005.

Hamadryad Vol. 30, No. 1, pp. xx – xx, 2006.
Copyright 2006 Centre for Herpetology,
Madras Crocodile Bank Trust.

LEPIDODACTYLUS (SQUAMATA: GEKKONIDAE) IN ISLANDS ASIA: A *L. AUREOLINEATUS* FROM SULAWESI

Lepidodactylus geckos are modestly abundant lizards in many Oceania herpetofaunas but become increasingly uncommon to rare in the faunas of the larger islands and island groups of the Pacific Rim, and even more uncommon in Islands Asia. This rarity has no current explanation, nor am I aware that anyone has attempted to explain it. Thus, a specimen of *Lepidodactylus* from Sulawesi in the Naturalis collection was unexpected.

Presently, four species of *Lepidodactylus* are reported from Islands Asia. *L. lugubris* is the most widespread of these four and occurs in Cu Lao (Vietnam), Borneo, Sulawesi, Ambon, Halmahera, Ternate, Komodo, and Lombok in this

area (Ineich, 1999). Because of its occurrence also throughout the Pacific and coastally from other Asian islands and mainland (de Rooij, 1915), *L. lugubris* must be considered an exotic species, probably beginning its human-mediated dispersal within the last five centuries through European shipping. Its hybrid origin lies in eastern Micronesia and is relatively recent (Radtkey et al., 1996). The other species are older island residents, arriving and differentiating presumably well before the arrival of humans in Asia. These species have limited distributions: *L. lombocensis*, Lombok; *L. intermedius*, Komodo and Rintja Islands.; *L. ranauensis*, Borneo (Sabah). Another species, *L. listeri*, occurs to the west on Christmas Island in the Indian Ocean.

The preceding five taxa represent the three phenetic groups (Brown and Parker, 1977) of *Lepidodactylus*. *L. lugubris* is a Group III member, *L. intermedius* and *L. lombocensis* Group II, *L. listeri* Group I, and *L. ranauensis* intermediate between Group I and II (Ota and Hikida, 1988; Bauer, 1994; Ota et al., 2000). Group III appears to be most derived “clade” of *Lepidodactylus*, and with the exception of *L. lugubris*, Group III members occur on Pacific islands with the greatest diversity in the Philippines. The Naturalis specimen (RMNH 7341, Groot Sanghis, e/o [=vicinity of] Soemalata) from the north coast of Sulawesi was hidden under the *lugubris* epithet but a close examination revealed its misidentification and dissection revealed that it was a mature male. My initial assumption was that this specimen represented a new species, but further examination revealed it to be a *L. aureolineatus* and a likely introduction from the Philippines.

Brown and Alcalá (1994:78–101) provide a thorough overview of the Philippine *Lepidodactylus*. They recognize two sections of Group III *Lepidodactylus*. Section A geckos have 4ToeL (see Zug et al., 2003 for character abbreviations and definitions) greater than 12, tail only moderately depressed and no lateral skin flange, and combined femoral-precloacal pores greater than 26. RMNH 7341 has 13 4ToeLm, moderately depressed tail without flange, and 29 FemPor + PreclPor. Additionally, it has 115 Midb, which differentiates it from *L. herrei*, the other section A *Lepidodactylus*. In summary, RMNH 7341 is an adult male with large testes and epididymi-

des, 35.7 mm SVL, 15.7 mm TrunkL, 42 mm TailL (regenerated tip), 9.4 mm HeadL, 6.5 mm HeadW, 9 Suplab, 8 Inflab, 3 CircNa, 31 IntorbS, 2 CloacS, 16 PreclP, and 8 4FingLm.

The northern peninsula of Sulawesi is ca. 400 km from southern Mindanao and linked by an arc of islands (Kepulauan Sangihe). This arc might have permitted natural dispersal; however, regular boat traffic occurs between these two coasts (C. A. Ross, pers. comm. Sept. 2005). As a regular resident of coconut palms and aerial ferns, individuals of *Lepidodactylus aureolineatus* might commonly be transported to Sulawesi. Fortunately, a single individual was captured and preserved by a Dutch biologist in the late 1930s.

I wish to thank M. Hoogmoed and J. W. Arntzen for assisting my study of the specimens in the Netherlands' National Museum of Natural History (Naturalis, RMNH). I also appreciate H. Ota's careful reading and comments for improving this manuscript; in review, A. M. Bauer, I. Ineich and R. M. Brown further clarified my statements. My research into the biology and evolution of the Pacific and Australasian herpetofauna has been supported by the Smithsonian's Scholarly Studies Program, the Research Opportunity Fund of National Museum of Natural History and the NMNH Department of Vertebrate Zoology.

LITERATURE CITED

- BAUER, A. M. 1994.** Familia Gekkonidae (Reptilia, Sauria). Part I Australia and Oceania. Das Tierreich 109. Berlin, Walter de Gruyter. pp. xiii + 306.
- BROWN, W. C. & A. C. ALCALA. 1977.** Philippine lizards of the family Gekkonidae. Silliman University, Dumaguete City, Philippines. 146 pp.
- BROWN, W. C. & F. PARKER. 1977.** Lizards of the genus *Lepidodactylus* (Gekkonidae) from the Indo-Australian Archipelago and the islands of the Pacific, with descriptions of new species. Proceedings of the California Academy of Sciences, 4th ser. 41:253–265.
- DE ROOIJ, N. 1915.** The reptiles of the Indo-Australian Archipelago. I. Lacertilia, Chelonia, Emydosauria. E. J. Brill Ltd., Leiden. xiv + 384 pp.
- INEICH, I. 1999.** Spatio-temporal analysis of the unisexual-bisexual *Lepidodactylus lugubris* complex (Reptilia, Gekkonidae). In: Tropical island herpetofauna: origin, current diversity, and conservation. pp:199–228. H. Ota (Ed). Elsevier Science B.V., Amsterdam.
- OTA, H, R. I. S. DAREVSKY, I. INEICH & S. YAMASHIRO. 2000.** Reevaluation of the taxonomic status of two *Lepidodactylus* species (Squamata: Gekkonidae) from the Lesser Sunda Archipelago, Indonesia. Copeia 2002(4):1109–1113.
- ____ & **T. HIKIDA. 1988.** A new species of *Lepidodactylus* (Sauria: Gekkonidae) from Sabah. Copeia 1988:616–621.
- RADTKEY, R. R., B. BECKER, R. D. MILLER, R. RIBLET, & T. J. CASE. 1996.** Variation and evolution of class I Mhc in sexual and parthenogenetic geckos. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B 263:1023–1032.
- ZUG, G. R., D. WATLING, T. ALEFAIO, S. ALEFAIO & C. LUDESCHER. 2003.** A new gecko (Reptilia: Squamata: genus *Lepidodactylus*) from Tuvalu, south-central Pacific. Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington 116:38–46.

George R. Zug

Department of Vertebrate Zoology, National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20013–7012, U.S.A.
Email: zuggs@si.edu

Received: 7 October 2005.

Accepted: 27 October 2005.