

A redescription of *Ramanella marmorata* Rao, 1937 (Anura, Microhylidae)

Indraneil DAS & Romulus WHITAKER

Centre for Herpetology, Madras Crocodile Bank Trust, Post Bag 4,
Mamallapuram, Tamil Nadu 603 104, India

Ramanella marmorata Rao, 1937, hitherto known only from the syntypes collected over half a century ago from "Saklespur, Hassan District, Mysore", at present in Karnataka State (south-western India), that are now lost, is redescribed, based on a new specimen from Cotigao Wildlife Sanctuary (Goa, south-western India), and an older one from "Malabar" in the collection of the Museum of Comparative Zoology. The species is compared with congeneric species from southern India and Sri Lanka.

INTRODUCTION

The genus *Ramanella* was described by RAO and RAMANNA (1925), and named for the junior author, the type species (by monotypy) being *Ramanella symbiotica* Rao & Ramanna, 1925 (apparently a misprint for *Ramanella symbiotica*), a name considered a junior synonym of *Callula variegata* Stoliczka, 1872 by PARKER (1934: 93) and FROST (1985: 389). The genus, redefined by PARKER (1934), is restricted to peninsular India and Sri Lanka, and eight nominal species are currently recognized, five from India, two from Sri Lanka and one from both regions (see FROST, 1985: 389). Of these, perhaps the least known are three species from the Western Ghats of south-western India, *Ramanella anamalaiensis*, *Ramanella minor* and *Ramanella marmorata*, that are known only from the types described sixty years ago by RAO (1937) and then deposited in the Central College Museum in Bangalore. Since then, the whole collection of specimens described by RAO (1937) has been lost (see DUBOIS, 1984: 156-157). The present paper is devoted to one of these species, *R. marmorata*, the lost type specimens of which were stated to be from "Saklespur, Hassan District, Mysore" (currently spelt "Sakleshpur"; 12°59'N 75°43'E; at present in Karnataka State, south-western India).

When he prepared the original description of *Ramanella marmorata*, although the number of types was not specified, RAO (1937) clearly had several specimens of his new species, including "young specimens", "immature specimens", "mature males" and "mature females", but he presented measurements of a single specimen. As no holotype was desig-