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Abstract Pfendericonus mindanaoensis Matsumaru, 2017 from the Thanetian? of the Philippine Archipelago and Pfendericonus globulus Sirel & Deceviler (in Sirel et al. 2020) from the Priabonian of Turkey display the same internal structure, similar dimensions and both are characterized by possessing wedge-like adult chambers. These species are thus considered synonymous and therefore based on priority date of publication, P. globulus should be considered a subjective junior synonym of P. mindanaoensis.
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INTRODUCTION

The genus Pfendericonus represents an exclusively Paleogene genus within the group of agglutinated conical foraminifera (Hottinger & Drobne, 1980). Within this group, Pfendericonus represents a comparatively simply structured taxon (e.g. lacking exoskeleton). Originally it was described as a subgenus of Chrysalidina later elevated to genus status by Loeblich & Tappan (1987). The type-species is Lituonella makarskae van Soest, 1942 from the Eocene of Croatia. A second species was introduced by Hottinger & Drobne (1980) as Chrysalidina (Pfendericonus) kahleri from the late Paleocene-early Eocene of Pakistan. Both species are high-spired (height-diameter ratio H/D > 1), but P. makarskae has a larger test and higher number of both chambers and pillars. In Recent times, two new species of globular test morphology (H = D) have been described as Pfendericonus mindanaoensis by Matsumaru (2017) and Pfendericonus globulus by Sirel & Deceviler in Sirel et al. (2020). The present contribution deals with these two species concluding that no characters were found for distinction hence proposing their synonymy

MICROPALAEONTOLOGIC PART
Pfendericonus mindanaoensis Matsumaru 2017

Fig. 1a-b

This species was described by Matsumaru (2017) from the Island of Mindanao, Philippine Archipelago and two specimens were figured. The two illustrated specimens of Chrysalidina sp. (Matsumaru, 2017, pl. 4, figs. 10-11) are here also considered to belong to P. mindanaoensis. The description includes a low-conical test (almost globular; diameter up to 1.36 mm) displaying wedge-like chambers and a test diameter up to 1.36 mm. The age was indicated as Selandian (= “Tertiary a0 stage of larger foraminifera” sensu Matsumaru). Comparing the assemblage of this stage which includes species such as Broeckinella arabi-ca Henson (=? Vania anatolica Sirel & Gündüz), Coskii-non rajkai Hottinger & Drobne, Idalina sinjatica Grims-dale (Assemblage 2 in Matsumaru, 2017), a Thanetian age is more likely (e.g., Pignatti et al., 2008; Di Carlo et al., 2010).

Pfendericonus globulus Sirel & Deceviler in Sirel et al. (2020)

Fig. 1c-d

This species was described by Sirel & Deceviler in Sirel (2020) from the Priabonian of northwest Turkey. The description includes a subspherical (globular) test (diameter up to 1.2 mm), wedge-like chambers and “incomplete spur-like septa”. Other occurrences were reported from the early Oligocene of Turkey.

The following synonymy is adopted herein for Pfendericonus mindanaoensis:
Genus Pfendericonus Hottinger & Drobne, 1980
Type-species: Lituonella makarskae van Soest, 1942
Pfendericonus mindanaoensis Matsumaru, 2017
2016 Pfendericonus aff. makarskae van Soest – Serra-Kiel et al., p. 54, fig. 40.8-40.15.
*2017 Pfendericonus mindanaoensis n. sp. – Matsumaru, p. 146, pl. 4, figs. 8-9, 10-11 (as Chrysalidina sp.).
2020 Pfendericonus globulus n. sp. – Sirel & Deceviler in Sirel et al., p. 12, fig. 5pars, fig. 6E-F, fig. 11A-J.

CONCLUSIONS

Since no characters were found to clearly distinguish the two species, P. globulus is herein considered to be a junior synonym of P. mindanaoensis. Besides the occurrences in the western Pacific realm (Philippine Archipelago) and northwestern Turkey, this species might also be present in the Eocene (Bartonian-Priabonian) of Oman.
where it has been recorded as *Pfendericonus* aff. *makarskae* by Serra-Kiel et al. (2016, p. 55: “possible attribution to a new species”). The comparably long stratigraphic range (Selandian?-Thanetian? to early Oligocene) is striking, also the lack of any data from the early Eocene.
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