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Note on Borelis de Montfort, 1808 (Foraminiferida) and the neotype of its type species
(Case 2225/6: see BZN 45: 116–117, 217–219)

P. K. Tubbs
Executive Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, c/o The Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.

In a comment on this case (BZN 45: 217–219) Dr F. T. Banner pointed out that a neotype of Nautilus melo Fichtel & Moll, 1798 had been validly designated by Smout (1963, pp. 265–266). This neotype is a specimen corresponding to *N. melo* "var. β" of Fichtel & Moll, which de Montfort (1808) named as *Borelis melonoides*, the only species he included in *Borelis*. This neotype defines *Borelis* and *B. melo*, the valid synonym of the type species, and is in accord with established usage (see Loeblich & Tappan, 1988, p. 362). Drs H. J. Hansen and F. Rögl, the authors of the case, have accepted this and have stated that *N. melo* "var. α" Fichtel & Moll (i.e. *Clausulius indicator* de Montfort, 1808) and *Alveolina haueri* d’Orbigny, 1846 should be considered conspecific with *Borelis melo*. This case therefore requires no action and is closed.

Comments on the proposed fixation of type species for Laranaudia and Ranguna Bott, 1966 (Crustacea, Decapoda)
(Case 2624; see BZN 46: 101–103)

(1) Peter K. L. Ng
Department of Zoology, National University of Singapore, Kent Ridge, Singapore 0511

Türkay & Naiyanetr have demonstrated that the type species designations for *Ranguna* and *Laranaudia* by Bott (1966) were based on incorrectly identified material. Their application to fix the type species for these two genera in a group whose taxonomy is particularly volatile is welcomed. There is, however, no strong reason to recommend that the nominal type species be changed for either genus.

I fully agree with the retention of Thelphusa laranaudia A. Milne Edwards, 1869 as the type species of *Laranaudia* Bott, 1966. *Laranaudia* was originally established as a subgenus of *Potamiscus* Alcock, 1909, but was later raised to a full genus (Bott, 1970) with two species, the type and *L. browneana* (Kemp, 1918). One more species from Thailand, *Laranaudia chatiyaphumi* Naiyanetr, 1982, was later added. Türkay & Naiyanetr (1987) redefined the genus after showing that Bott’s type species had been based on misidentified material, and transferred *Tiwariapotamon beausekomae* Bott, 1970 to *Laranaudia*. They noted that *L. browneana* was closely related to *Ranguna browsmichei* (Rathbun, 1904), and transferred *L. browneana* to *Ranguna*. Other than these publications and several by Naiyanetr pertaining to the identification, ecology and general biology of Thai crabs, there has not been wide usage of *Laranaudia*.

The problem with *Ranguna* Bott, 1966 is more complex because of the larger number of species that have been assigned to it. Bott (1970) established *Ranguna* with *Potamon (Potamon) rangoonensis* Rathbun, 1904 as type species, although he did not examine the type specimens. He recognised two subgenera, *Ranguna* and *Demeniietta* Bott, 1966, both of which were distinguished by the form of their male first pleopods. In the
nominate subgenus, Bott (1970) recognised 17 species and subspecies. He noted that three other taxa could also possibly be included in Ranguna (Ranguna). More species from Thailand have since been described by Naiyanetr. Ng (1988), however, transferred two of the Malayan species to a redefined Stoliczka Bott, 1966. I have also pointed out (Ng, 1985, 1987, 1988) that the character used by Bott (1966, 1970) to characterise the genus (presence of a dorsal fold on the terminal segment of the male first pleopod) is not always reliable. My present studies also indicate that the genus Ranguna as defined by Bott (1970) is probably heterogeneous, and that several of the species should be classified in other genera. The name Ranguna has only been used by a restricted circle of carcinologists, and, other than some local studies on crabs and Paragonimus in Thailand, the name has not been used widely.

Another point that must be considered is that if the type species for Ranguna is changed, it might lead to unnecessary confusion, especially if future studies show that Ranguna is not found in the vicinity of Rangoon or even Burma (the present Myanmar). In establishing Ranguna, Bott (1966) clearly wanted the name to match his chosen type species. Additional confusion might also arise as there will then be a species called Potamiscus rangoonensis (Rathbun, 1904) as well as a genus Ranguna, which by the application of Türkay & Naiyanetr would specifically exclude that species.

I would thus prefer that the type species of Ranguna remain as Potamom rangoonense. As Türkay & Naiyanetr (1987) have already noted after their re-examination of the type specimen of Potamon rangoonense, this would make Ranguna Bott, 1966 a junior subjective synonym of Potamiscus Alcock, 1909. There are no serious problems with this. The applicants’ choice of Thelphusa longipes A. Milne Edwards, 1869 as a replacement type species is based mainly on the form of that species’ male first pleopod, which fits Bott’s diagnosis (Bott & Türkay, 1977). Other than this character, the other features of T. longipes agree with those of Potamiscus quite well. There is thus the possibility that a future revision will require the transfer of T. longipes to Potamiscus. To designate T. longipes as the type species in place of Potamon rangoonense might thus be a futile exercise.

Additional references


(2) L. B. Holthuis

Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Postbus 9517, 2300 R A Leiden, The Netherlands

Larnaudia Bott, 1966

I agree with the applicants that this is a case of a genus based on a misidentified type species. Notwithstanding the fact that Bott (1970, pp. 176, 302, pl. 50, fig. 46) positively declared that he had examined, measured and figured the lectotype of the species, he actually did not have access to it. The solution proposed by Türkay & Naiyanetr,
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