

How to distinguish *Neocallichirus*, *Sergio*, *Podocallichirus* and *Grynaminna* (Decapoda: Callianassidae: Callichirinae) from each other in the fossil record?

Matúš Hyžný¹ and Hiroaki Karasawa²

¹Department of Geology and Palaeontology, Faculty of Natural Sciences, Comenius University, Mlynská dolina G1, Bratislava 842 15, Slovakia <hyzny.matus@gmail.com>

²Mizunami Fossil Museum, Yamanouchi, Akeyo, Mizunami, Gifu 509-6132, Japan <GHA06103@nifty.com>

Abstract

This contribution discusses the generic assignment of several callianassid genera of the subfamily Callichirinae Manning and Felder, 1991 in the fossil record, namely *Neocallichirus* Sakai, 1988; *Sergio* Manning and Lemaitre, 1994; *Podocallichirus* Sakai, 1999; and *Grynaminna* Poore, 2000. We argue that generic assignment of fossil callianassid remains can be done successfully on the basis of chelipeds, but only if all cheliped elements (ischium, merus, carpus, propodus and dactylus) are at hand. Moreover, thorough comparisons between fossils and extant material should be always made before assignment of the fossil remains to the genus level. "*Neocallichirus*" *grandis* Karasawa and Goda, 1996 from the Middle Pleistocene of Japan is revised and assigned to the genus *Grynaminna*.

Key words: Decapoda, Callianassidae, *Neocallichirus*, *Sergio*, *Podocallichirus*, *Grynaminna*, fossil record, systematics

Introduction

One of the greatest challenges of modern decapod crustacean palaeontology is the interpretation, both systematic and ecological, of callianassid burrowing ghost shrimps (Decapoda: Axiidea: Callianassidae). Their fossil record is very robust and they are present in most associations of Cenozoic decapod crustaceans described so far. However, the generic assignment of the callianassid remains is very difficult, partly because there is great inconsistency also in the biological classification and taxonomy of this group.

This contribution aims to discuss the generic assignment of several callianassid genera of the subfamily Callichirinae Manning and Felder, 1991 in the fossil record when dealing with chelipeds only. In biological literature there is often little attention paid to the nature of chelipeds when defining genera (but see the discussion on differences between eucalliace genera in Ngoc-Ho, 2003), which are usually the only fossil remains of these animals. In this respect assigning fossil material to the genera *Neocallichirus* Sakai, 1988; *Sergio* Manning and Lemaitre, 1994; *Podocallichirus* Sakai, 1999; and *Grynaminna* Poore, 2000 is a very complex topic, as no general agreement about their systematic status is currently at hand.

Generic assignment of callianassid ghost shrimps

The biological classification of the Callianassidae Dana, 1852 is based mainly on soft part morphology, which include the dorsal carapace architecture, the nature of maxillipeds, form of the abdomen, pleopods, uropods and telson; for discussion on this issue with respect to the fossil record see e.g. Schweitzer and Feldmann (2002) and Schweitzer *et al.* (2006a). The classification itself is, however, not consistent throughout the biological literature and is in a need of comprehensive revision. Major monographs focused on this group recently published by Sakai (1999, 2005, 2011) met little agreement from the side of other workers (Tudge *et al.*, 2000; Poore, 2000, 2008; Dworschak, 2007; Felder and Robles, 2009). In general, there are several different views on the evaluation of taxonomically important characters as exemplified by works of Biffar (1971), Manning and Felder (1991), Poore (1994, 2008) and Sakai (1999, 2005, 2011).

Many extant callianassid genera have been erected without taking detailed account on their chelipeds. No wonder, because chelipeds in general are very variable features. There are many species with proven polymorphism in their nature (e.g. Sakai, 1969); in several genera chelipeds are sexually dimorphic which is often connected with the allometric growth (e.g. Felder and Lovett, 1989; Dworschak, 2006). On the other hand there are characters present on chelipeds which can be considered of taxonomic importance. The work of Biffar (1971) can

be considered as first such step towards the systematic evaluation of such characters. He provided two separate keys to the Western Atlantic *Callianassa* species; one of them evaluates major chelipeds only. Later Manning and Felder (1991) emphasized the importance of some hard-part morphology characters for generic assignment, some of them present on merus of major cheliped. Following their work biologists usually add a presence or absence of a meral hook in the diagnoses of new genera or emendations of older ones. Unfortunately, it is of little help to palaeontologists, because there are many genera both with and without meral hook. Because chelipeds are most durable parts of ghost shrimps and are very frequent in the fossil record, palaeontologists can often rely solely on the characters present on them. Therefore an effort to identify diagnostic characters present not only on merus but also on other cheliped elements is needed.

In the world of palaeontology the work of Manning and Felder (1991) triggered several reassignments of fossil taxa previously referred to "*Callianassa sensu lato*". Since then there is always an attempt to classify fossil callianassids within biologically defined genera.

We discuss here basically two approaches of assignment of the fossil material to respective callianassid genera:

1) An approach refusing to identify the genus on the hard part morphology (chelipeds only), simply because of lack of soft part morphology characters on which the diagnoses of genera are usually based. This approach may use approximate generic assignment as "*Callianassa*" or *Callianassa sensu lato* as exemplified by works of Müller (1984) and Karasawa (1998, 2000), respectively. If the fossil material fails to be assigned more closely, it is recommended to classify fossil specimens within Callianassidae (or *Callianassa sensu lato* without reference to a subfamily or genus (Collins *et al.*,

1996). Sometimes the material may belong to a closely related family, Ctenochelidae *sensu* Manning and Felder (1991), not Sakai (2005, 2011).

2) An approach trying to find unifying characters present on chelipeds of taxa classified within a certain genus concept based on soft part morphology. In this approach extant congeneric taxa are studied in detail to identify these common characters on chelipeds. It is needed to test different generic concepts to see whether presence of chosen characters is consistent throughout the supposedly congeneric taxa or not. This approach is basically about looking for a generic diagnosis based on chelipeds only which would not contradict the diagnosis based on soft part morphology.

Neocallichirus in the fossil record

The genus *Neocallichirus* is relatively widely defined and after *Callianassa* it is the most speciose extant callianassid genus (De Grave *et al.*, 2009). For generic assignment always a combination of characters has to be used, as also such important taxonomic character as 3rd maxilliped is not specific solely for *Neocallichirus* (Sakai, 1988). Manning and Felder (1991) reconsidered the diagnosis of *Neocallichirus* and added also the characters on the chelipeds, notably on the merus. The merus of *Neocallichirus* is variable in shape but is always serrated along the lower margin. According to Manning and Felder (1991) it lacks a meral spine or hook; according to Sakai (1999, 2005) it is with or without meral hook (mainly due to the synonymisation with the genus *Sergio*), whereas Sakai (2011) stated that merus is with or without ventral convexity. Schweitzer and Feldmann (2002) and Schweitzer *et al.* (2006a) discussed usage of the characters on major cheliped (not

Table 1. List of fossil taxa presently classified as *Neocallichirus* (after Schweitzer *et al.*, 2010; Karasawa and Nakagawa, 2010; Garassino *et al.*, 2011). Note that *N. rodfeldmanni* Hyžný, 2010 is a replacement name for *N. manningi* Schweitzer, Feldmann, Fam, Hessin, Hetrick, Nyborg and Ross, 2003 (name preoccupied).

Taxon	Age	Occurrence	Remarks
<i>N. aetodes</i> Schweitzer <i>et al.</i> , 2006b	Early Oligocene	Puerto Rico	
<i>N. agadirensis</i> Garassino <i>et al.</i> , 2011	Cenomanian	Morocco	generic assignment doubtful
<i>N. allegranzi</i> Beschin <i>et al.</i> , 2005	Middle Eocene	Italy	generic assignment doubtful
<i>N. bona</i> (Imaizumi, 1959)	Early–Middle Miocene	Japan	generic assignment doubtful
<i>N. borensis</i> Beschin <i>et al.</i> , 2006	Late Eocene	Italy	
<i>N. dijki</i> (Martin, 1883)	Late Miocene	Phillipines, Java	
<i>N. fortisi</i> Beschin <i>et al.</i> , 2002	Middle Eocene	Italy	generic assignment doubtful
<i>N. hattai</i> Karasawa and Nakagawa, 2010	Early–Middle Miocene	Japan	
<i>N. matsoni</i> (Rathbun, 1935)	Early Miocene	USA (Florida)	generic assignment doubtful
<i>N. maxima</i> (A. Milne-Edwards, 1870)	subfossil	Thailand, India (?)	
<i>N. nishikawai</i> (Karasawa, 1993)	Miocene	Japan	generic assignment doubtful
<i>N. okamotoi</i> (Karasawa, 1993)	Late Oligocene	Japan	generic assignment doubtful
<i>N. peraensis</i> Collins <i>et al.</i> , 1996	Late Pleistocene	Jamaica	
<i>N. porterensis</i> (Rathbun, 1926)	Oligocene	USA (Washington, Oregon)	
<i>N. quisquellanus</i> Schweitzer <i>et al.</i> , 2006b	Middle Miocene	Dominican Republic	generic assignment doubtful
<i>N. rhinos</i> Schweitzer and Feldmann, 2002	Middle Eocene	USA (California)	
<i>N. rodfeldmanni</i> Hyžný, 2010	Campanian	Canada (British Columbia)	generic assignment doubtful
<i>N. sakiae</i> Karasawa and Fudouji, 2000	Oligocene	Japan	generic assignment doubtful
<i>N. scotti</i> (Brown and Pilsbry, 1913)	Oligocene–Pleistocene	Caribbean	
<i>N. wellsii</i> Schweitzer <i>et al.</i> , 2004	Late Eocene	Pakistan	

only on merus, but also on carpus, propodus and dactylus) in the fossil record for assignment to the genus *Neocallichirus*.

There are several genera different from *Neocallichirus*, namely *Sergio*, *Podocallichirus*, and *Grynaminna*, which share very similar chelipeds. Much confusion has been created by Sakai (2005) when he synonymized *Sergio* with *Neocallichirus* and *Grynaminna* with *Podocallichirus*. Recently, Sakai (2011) redefined all these genera. The taxonomic history of all four of them is very complex and until now no general agreement has been achieved.

Cheliped morphology seen in the genera mentioned above is in palaeontological literature connected virtually with *Neocallichirus* only. According to De Grave *et al.* (2009) and Schweitzer *et al.* (2010) there are 18 fossil species identified as *Neocallichirus*, one fossil species as *Podocallichirus*, one extant species of *Sergio* is also known from the fossil state and no fossil *Grynaminna* is known. Since then two more *Neocallichirus* species have been described (Karasawa and Nakagawa, 2010; Garassino *et al.*, 2011) (see Table 1).

The morphology of fossil taxa assigned to *Neocallichirus* is just as variable (and maybe even more) as that of the extant species of the genus. In this context it should be noted that the characteristics of the chelipeds typical for the genus *Neocallichirus* were summarized only in several papers dedicated to fossil taxa (Schweitzer and Feldmann, 2002; Schweitzer *et al.*, 2006a; see also Hyžný and Hudáčková, submitted) and according to published figures only. No exhaustive study has been made to make attempt to evaluate chelipeds within this speciose genus. According to Schweitzer *et al.* (2006a: 278): “assignment of fossils to *Neocallichirus* must be based on the highly variable morphology of the major cheliped of extant species, and truly confident assignment of fossils to the genus will probably only occur when other aspects of the body of the animal are recovered”. Many fossil taxa were assigned to *Neocallichirus* on the basis of very few characters (mainly on propodus only); thus, revision of all fossil *Neocallichirus* species referred at some time to this genus is needed to specify precisely the morphological variability of the taxonomically important species and compare it to the variability seen in the extant taxa. As in neontological studies the genus *Neocallichirus* is usually recognized on soft part morphology only, the genus concept as used in palaeontological practice, and thus as discussed herein, should be regarded as preliminary one until more

Table 2. List of extant taxa classified at some time within the genus *Sergio* Manning and Lemaitre, 1994.

Neocallichirus cacahuete Felder and Manning, 1995
Sergio guaiqueri Blanco Rambla, Liñero Arana and Beltán Lares, 1995
Callianassa (Callichirus) guara Rodrigues, 1971
Callianassa (Callichirus) guassutinga Rodrigues, 1971
Neocallichirus lemaitrei Manning, 1993
Sergio mericeae Manning and Felder, 1995
Callianassa (Callichirus) mirim Rodrigues, 1971
Callichirus monodi de Saint Laurent and Le Loeuff, 1979
Callianassa pachydactyla A. Milne-Edwards, 1870
Sergio sulfureus Lemaitre and Felder, 1996
Callianassa trilobata Biffar, 1970

comprehensive study is provided.

Considering the difficulties with assigning fossil material to extant callianassid taxa and different approaches applied when erecting fossil taxa, it is fairly possible that the genus *Neocallichirus* as usually recognized in the fossil record is a mixture of different genera as the personal re-examination of some of them by one of the authors (MH) might show.

Neocallichirus vs. Sergio

Originally, the genus *Sergio* was erected to accommodate four species previously referred to *Neocallichirus*, based upon the characters of the telson and uropods (Manning and Lemaitre, 1994). The diagnosis was based on four species firstly described by Biffar (1970): *Callianassa trilobata*; and Rodrigues (1971): *C. guara*, *C. guassutinga*, and *C. mirim*. Later, another three species were described under this genus: Blanco Rambla *et al.* (1995) introduced *Sergio guaiqueri*; Manning and Felder (1995) described *Sergio mericeae* and reexamined *S. guassutinga*; and the last systematic study devoted to the genus *Sergio* was that by Lemaitre and Felder (1996) who described *S. sulfureus*. It is worth mentioning that the generic diagnosis was not amended in these studies. *Sergio* was then synonymised with *Neocallichirus* by Sakai (1999), however, many workers did not accept this synonymisation (Poore, 2000; Schweitzer *et al.*, 2006a; Dworschak, 2007; Poore, 2008; De Grave *et al.*, 2009; Felder and Robles, 2009). Sakai (1999, 2005) argued with the presence of intermediate forms between *Neocallichirus* and *Sergio* concerning the nature of telson and uropods. He stated (Sakai, 2005: 125) that within “the species assigned to *Sergio*, the character of the tail fan should be defined as a specific character within the genus *Neocallichirus*”. He (Sakai, 1999: 85) also pointed out on the presence of the meral hook in *Sergio* contrary to the diagnosis of the genus (Manning and Lemaitre, 1994: 40). Schweitzer *et al.* (2006a) suggested that palaeontologists should use the presence or absence of a proximal meral hook to distinguish between *Sergio* and *Neocallichirus*. This issue deserves more discussion.

Although Manning and Lemaitre (1994) stated that *Sergio* does not possess a meral hook, Rodrigues (1971: 206) in the description of *C. guassutinga* (type species of *Sergio*) noted, that “there are two or three moderately long spines followed by five short irregular spines and about eight rounded granules” on the lower margin of merus in males and “two large proximal spines followed by five to eight smaller ones” in females. Similarly in *C. guara*, “the merus has a strong serrated tooth near the proximal extremity of the lower margin which is denticulated (Rodrigues, 1971: 211).” *Callianassa trilobata* and *C. mirim* are in their original descriptions characterized also by “triangular ventral keel on merus (Biffar, 1970: 36)” in *C. trilobata* and “the lower edge produced into a laminar serrated tooth (Rodrigues, 1971: 216)” on merus in *C. mirim*. *Sergio mericeae* has major cheliped “with inferior margin of merus armed proximally by elongate process of 2–3 fused spines, beyond which is short gap in marginal dentition (Manning and Felder, 1995: 268).” *Sergio sulfureus* has lower margin of merus “armed with small spines and strong bifid process proximally (Lemaitre and Felder,

1996: 458”).

The only exception is *S. guaiqueri* which clearly lacks any proximal meral hook, spine or tooth (Blanco Rambla *et al.*, 1995). However, this species was based on only four rather small specimens. Thus, when assuming that degree of spinosity of chelipeds depends on age of the animal, we can conclude that those specimens represent immature stages. This view can be supported with described and figured major chelipeds of immature specimens of *S. sulfureus* (Lemaitre and Felder, 1996: figs. 4a, b) and *S. mericeae* (Manning and Felder, 1995: fig. 5f) which do not have any proximal tooth or spine either, but only a serrated lower margin. It should also be noted that the figured male of *S. guaiqueri* does not possess strongly armed dactylus and fixed finger, which are otherwise quite typical for mature specimens of the genus as described and figured in literature (Rodrigues, 1971; Manning and Felder, 1995; Lemaitre and Felder, 1996). Increased spinosity with size (or age) of the specimens was documented also in *Neocallichirus karumba* Poore and Griffin, 1979 (= *Neocallichirus kemp* Sakai, 1999) by Dworschak (2008). Major chelipeds of larger specimens in this species interestingly possess a similar bi- or trifid proximal projection on lower margin of merus. The same conclusion concerning the immaturity of the type material of *S. guaiqueri* was reached also by Sakai (1999: 90): “It seems that the male holotype is immature because the carapace is only 4.2 mm long, and the male Plp1–2 are undeveloped (Blanco Rambla *et al.*, 1995: figs. 3a, b).”

Finally, recent molecular studies (Tudge *et al.*, 2000; Felder and Robles, 2009) resolved *Sergio* as of paraphyletic nature in the arrangement presented above (see also Table 3). In Felder and Robles (2009: fig. 1) two tested taxa, *S. mericeae* and *S. trilobata* were positioned in distinctly different branches. *Sergio mericeae* (considered to be a close relative of the type species of *Sergio*) was allied with otherwise monophyletic *Neocallichirus*, *S. trilobata* was, however, positioned basally to the grouping of genera *Corallianassa* Manning, 1987, *Glypturus* Stimpson, 1866, *Grynaminna* and *Neocallichirus*. Felder and Robles (2009: 334) noted that such arrangement “raises a question as to the validity of the genus and, regardless of that issue, argues for generic reassignment of *S. trilobata*”. Sakai (2011) erected a new genus, *Glypturoides*, for this taxon. We agree with this generic

reassignment.

Reassessment of the genus *Sergio* by Sakai (2011) (in fact, its resurrection when considering the previous synonymisation) does not really help to resolve the relationship between the taxa discussed above, as it is based on variable characters which may change during ontogeny, i.e. first two pairs of male pleopods. Already Biffar (1971: 643) mentioned that callianassid juveniles lack the characteristic shape of the adult appendages. Similarly Felder and Manning (1995) reported the same for *Neocallichirus cacahuete* Felder and Manning, 1995 and pointed on differences in male pleopod shape between *N. cacahuete* and *N. lemaitrei* Manning, 1993; Sakai (2011) treats both species as *Sergio*. Dworschak (2008, 2011a, 2011b) reported the variability in the shape of the first two male pleopods in *N. karumba*, *N. jousseaumei* (Nobili, 1904) (= *Callianassa indica* de Man, 1905; *Neocallichirus taiaro* Ngoc-Ho, 1995) and *N. vigilax* (de Man, 1916) (= *N. denticulatus* Ngoc-Ho, 1994), respectively.

The fossil record of the genus *Sergio* is obscure. Interestingly, Todd and Collins (2005) recognized *Callianassa scotti* Brown and Pilsbry, 1913 (= *Callianassa vaughani* Rathbun, 1918; *C. crassimana* Rathbun, 1918; *C. miocenica* Rathbun, 1919; *C. rathbunae* Glaessner, 1929) from the Oligocene to Pleistocene of the Caribbean as a member of the genus *Sergio*. However, under influence of Sakai's (2005) synonymisation of the genus with *Neocallichirus*, they treated the taxon as *Neocallichirus scotti*. As such it appeared also in the fossil decapod species list by Schweitzer *et al.* (2010). Another fossil occurrence coming from the Pliocene–Pleistocene strata of Florida (Portell and Agnew, 2004) has been identified as extant *Sergio trilobatus* (Biffar, 1970).

As shown above, the problem of distinguishing *Neocallichirus* and *Sergio* from one another in the fossil record is more-less a matter of their definition as biologically defined taxa. In this respect, the fossil record can tell only little to solve this issue.

Neocallichirus* vs. *Podocallichirus

The present status of the genus *Podocallichirus* is rather confusing. It was erected by Sakai (1999) to accommodate seven species previously mostly treated as *Callichirus sensu* Le Loeuf and Intès (1974) (see

Table 3. Taxonomic history of generic assignment of extant taxa treated as *Sergio* Manning and Lemaitre, 1994.

Taxon	Sakai (1999)	Tudge <i>et al.</i> (2000)	Sakai (2005)	Poore (2010)	Sakai (2011)
<i>N. cacahuete</i>	<i>Neocallichirus</i>	<i>Neocallichirus</i>	<i>Neocallichirus</i>	<i>Neocallichirus</i>	<i>Sergio</i>
<i>S. guaiqueri</i>	<i>Neocallichirus</i>	<i>Sergio</i>	<i>Neocallichirus</i>	<i>Sergio</i>	<i>Neocallichirus</i>
<i>C. guara</i>	<i>Neocallichirus</i>	<i>Sergio</i>	<i>Neocallichirus</i>	<i>Sergio</i>	<i>Neocallichirus</i>
<i>C. guassutinga</i>	<i>Neocallichirus</i>	<i>Sergio</i>	<i>Neocallichirus</i>	<i>Sergio</i>	<i>Sergio</i>
<i>N. lemaitrei</i>	<i>Neocallichirus</i>	<i>Neocallichirus</i>	<i>Neocallichirus</i>	<i>Neocallichirus</i>	<i>Sergio</i>
<i>S. mericeae</i>	<i>Neocallichirus</i>	<i>Sergio</i>	<i>Neocallichirus</i>	<i>Sergio</i>	<i>Sergio</i>
<i>C. mirim</i>	<i>Neocallichirus</i>	<i>Sergio</i>	<i>Neocallichirus</i>	<i>Sergio</i>	<i>Neocallichirus</i>
<i>C. monodi</i>	<i>Neocallichirus</i>	<i>Callichirus</i>	<i>Neocallichirus</i>	<i>Neocallichirus</i>	<i>Sergio</i>
<i>C. pachydactyla</i>	<i>Neocallichirus</i>	<i>Neocallichirus</i>	<i>Neocallichirus</i>	<i>Neocallichirus</i>	<i>Sergio</i>
<i>S. sulfureus</i>	<i>Neocallichirus</i>	<i>Sergio</i>	<i>Neocallichirus</i>	<i>Sergio</i>	<i>Sergio</i>
<i>C. trilobata</i>	<i>Neocallichirus</i>	<i>Sergio</i>	<i>Neocallichirus</i>	<i>Sergio</i>	<i>Glypturoides</i>

Tables 4 and 5). *Podocallichirus* as understood in the classification of De Grave *et al.* (2009) apparently comprises these seven taxa. Poore (2000) erected the genus *Grynaminna* to accommodate the new species *G. tamakii*. This genus was considered as a junior synonym of *Podocallichirus* by Sakai (2005). Later he (Sakai, 2011) recognized *Grynaminna* as a separate genus and divided *Podocallichirus* in five(!) independent genera; *Podocallichirus* remained monotypic containing only its type species (*Callianassa madagassa* Lenz and Richters, 1881). The remaining species are accommodated within the newly established genera *Balsscallichirus*, *Barnardcallichirus*, *Forestcallichirus* and *Tirmizicallichirus*. Their recognition as separate genera is obscure, as they are based on characters changing during ontogeny (see above), and thus conclusions based on their nature can be misleading. It is worth mentioning that restriction of *Podocallichirus* to *C. madagassa* only is supported also by Poore (2010). He classifies the rest of *Podocallichirus* species *sensu* Sakai (1999) as members of broadly defined *Callichirus* (Table 5).

As a result we can talk about two distinctly different concepts of the genus *Podocallichirus* 1) original concept given by Sakai (1999) comprising type species plus six other species, here referred as *Podocallichirus sensu lato*; and 2) concept of the monotypic genus *Podocallichirus* comprising the type species, *Callianassa madagassa*, only, thus *Podocallichirus sensu stricto* (supported by Poore, 2010 and Sakai, 2011). When comparing chelipeds of these two concepts, one can have difficulties to find a suite of common characters which are not present also in *Neocallichirus*. *Podocallichirus sensu lato* possesses several characters which are not very common in *Neocallichirus*, such

as proximally positioned serrated meral blade, however, in general, the states of these characters overlap in many cases with typical *Neocallichirus* species. Contrary to that, *Podocallichirus sensu stricto* comprises very unusual species, whose minor cheliped and also some characters of the major one, is different than majority of callianassid taxa (see Lenz and Richters, 1881: figs. 20, 21; virtually the only species with broadly similar minor chela has been described as *Lepidophthalmus socotrensis* Sakai and Apel, 2002). Nothing similar has been found in the fossil record so far. As a consequence, when dealing with fragmentary material, *Podocallichirus sensu lato* would be identifiable in the fossil record as a member of broadly defined *Neocallichirus*.

Neocallichirus vs. *Grynaminna*

The monotypic genus *Grynaminna* was erected for a distinct species from Kyushu, Japan. As defined by Poore (2000) it is very similar to *Neocallichirus*, however, it differs in the nature of antennae, uropods and pleopods (Poore, 2000: 151). It lacks the meral hook on major cheliped, and possesses non-tapering chelae which are otherwise quite typical for *Neocallichirus* and *Sergio*.

It seems that chelipeds of *Grynaminna tamakii* Poore, 2000 (type species of *Grynaminna*) are sexually dimorphic. In males there is a notch at the base of the fixed finger of major chela which is not present in females. In males the dactylus is armed with several teeth, whereas in females it is straight (Poore, 2000: fig. 3).

Sakai (2005) synonymised *Grynaminna* with *Podocallichirus* Sakai, 1999, however, in his later work (Sakai, 2011) he recognized it as a distinct genus (see Table 5). We concur.

The fossil record of *Grynaminna* is obscure, however, we argue that “*Neocallichirus*” *grandis* Karasawa and Goda, 1996 from the Middle Pleistocene of Japan (Aichi Prefecture) can be accommodated within the genus. Although very well preserved, the material comprises chelipeds only. Based on cheliped morphology Obata and Hayashi (2001) removed “*N.*” *grandis* to *Grynaminna*. Later, Karasawa *et al.* (2006), following the work of Sakai (2005), removed the species to *Podocallichirus* and as such the species appeared in a list of fossil decapod crustaceans by Schweitzer *et al.* (2010). Now, after the publication of Sakai's (2011) systematic reconsideration of callianassoid ghost shrimps one has difficulties to judge how to classify “*Neocallichirus*” *grandis*. Virtually

Table 4. List of extant taxa classified at some time within the genus *Podocallichirus* Sakai, 1999.

<i>Callianassa (Callichirus) balssi</i> Monod, 1933
<i>Callichirus foresti</i> Le Loeff and Intès, 1974
<i>Callianassa gilchristi</i> Barnard, 1947
<i>Callianassa (Callichirus) guineensis</i> de Man, 1928
<i>Callianassa madagassa</i> Lenz and Richters, 1881
<i>Callianassa (Callichirus) masoomi</i> Tirmizi, 1970
<i>Grynaminna tamakii</i> Poore, 2000
<i>Callichirus tenuimanus</i> de Saint Laurent and Le Loeff, 1979

Table 5. Taxonomic history of generic assignment of extant taxa treated as *Podocallichirus* Sakai, 1999.

Taxon	Sakai (1999)	Tudge <i>et al.</i> (2000)	Sakai (2005)	Poore (2010)	Sakai (2011)
<i>C. balsii</i>	<i>Podocallichirus</i>	<i>Callichirus</i>	<i>Podocallichirus</i>	<i>Callichirus</i>	<i>Balsscallichirus</i>
<i>C. foresti</i>	<i>Podocallichirus</i>	<i>Callichirus</i>	<i>Podocallichirus</i>	<i>Callichirus</i>	<i>Forestcallichirus</i>
<i>C. gilchristi</i>	<i>Podocallichirus</i>	<i>Callianassa</i>	<i>Podocallichirus</i>	<i>Callichirus</i>	<i>Barnardcallichirus</i>
<i>C. guineensis</i>	<i>Podocallichirus</i>	<i>Callichirus</i>	<i>Podocallichirus</i>	<i>Callichirus</i>	<i>Balsscallichirus</i>
<i>C. madagassa</i>	<i>Podocallichirus</i>	<i>Callianassa</i>	<i>Podocallichirus</i>	<i>Podocallichirus</i>	<i>Podocallichirus</i>
<i>C. masoomi</i>	<i>Podocallichirus</i>	<i>Callianassa</i>	<i>Podocallichirus</i>	<i>Callichirus</i>	<i>Tirmizicallichirus</i>
<i>G. tamakii</i>	-	<i>Grynaminna</i>	<i>Podocallichirus</i>	<i>Grynaminna</i>	<i>Grynaminna</i>
<i>C. tenuimanus</i>	<i>Podocallichirus</i>	<i>Callichirus</i>	<i>Podocallichirus</i>	<i>Callichirus</i>	<i>Barnardcallichirus</i>

two options are available: 1) if following Poore (2000) and Sakai (2011) in recognition of *Grynaminna* as a distinct genus, and considering the similarity between *N. grandis* and *G. tamakii* as of taxonomic importance, then "*N.*" *grandis* should be classified within the genus *Grynaminna* as recognized by Obata and Hayashi (2001; 2) another option is to consider *Neocallichirus*, *Grynaminna* and *Podocallichirus*

as undistinguishable when dealing with chelipeds only. In that case it should be classified within the genus *Neocallichirus* (as originally proposed) in the broadest sense, thus as defined by Manning and Felder (1991). We assume that at the present state of knowledge the classification of "*N.*" *grandis* within the genus *Podocallichirus* seems to be misleading.




Fig. 1. *Grynaminna grandis* (Karasawa and Goda, 1996) from the Middle Pleistocene, Atsumi Group (Japan). A–B, both chelipeds of a presumed male specimen in lateral (A) and dorsal view (B) (MFM142381), note serrated lower margin of propodus (B), which is preserved turned over in contrast to the rest of the cheliped; C–D, both chelipeds of a presumed female specimen in mesial (major chela) and lateral view (minor chela) (MFM142497), note keeled upper and lower margins of propodus and carpus; E, ischium, merus and carpus from mesial view (MFM142500), note serrated lower margin of the merus; F, remains of both chelipeds of the same specimen (MFM142500); G, both chelipeds of a presumed male specimen (MFM142499), major cheliped in lateral view and minor cheliped in mesial view; H, major cheliped of a presumed female specimen in mesial view (MFM142498). All specimens were covered with ammonium chloride prior the photography. All specimens are preserved within the burrows.

Systematic palaeontology

Order Decapoda Latreille, 1802

Infraorder Axiidea de Saint Laurent, 1979

Family Callianassidae Dana, 1852

Subfamily Callichirinae Manning and Felder, 1991

Genus *Grynaminna* Poore, 2000

Type species: Grynaminna tamakii Poore, 2000, by original designation and monotypy.

Included fossil species: Grynaminna grandis (Karasawa and Goda, 1996).

Diagnosis: See Poore (2000: 150). We argue that the genus concept as presented by Sakai (2011: 438), i.e. based on the first two pairs of male pleopods is not enable (see above).

Grynaminna grandis (Karasawa and Goda, 1996)

(Fig. 1A–H)

Callianassa sp. Kato and Koizumi, 1992, p. 49, fig. 3–3.

Calliax sp. Karasawa and Tanaka, 1994, p. 12, fig. 2-1–12.

Neocallichirus sp. Karasawa, Nohara and Shimoji, 1995, p. 128, fig. 2.

“*Neocallichirus*” *grandis* Karasawa and Goda, 1996, p. 1, fig. 1; Karasawa, 1997, p. 33, pl. 5, figs. 1–4 (refigured from Karasawa and Goda, 1996).

Neocallichirus grandis Karasawa and Goda; Kato and Karasawa, 1998, p. 5, pl. 2, figs. 7–16; Schweitzer *et al.*, 2006b, p. 115 (in a list).

Grynaminna grandis (Karasawa and Goda); Obata and Hayashi, 2001, p. 46, fig. 3.1–12.

Podocallichirus grandis (Karasawa and Goda); Karasawa *et al.*, 2006, p. 127, pl. 2, figs. 1–6; Schweitzer *et al.*, 2010 p. 39 (in a list).

Material examined: MFM142381, MFM142497–142500 deposited at the Mizunami Fossil Museum, Gifu, Japan.

Remarks: The morphology of major and minor chelipeds of “*Neocallichirus*” *grandis* has been sufficiently described by Karasawa and Goda (1996). The species has major morphological similarities to *Grynaminna tamakii* Poore, 2000, as was already pointed out by Obata and Hayashi (2001). The similarities include characters on the major cheliped: the ovoid-shaped merus with serrated lower margin and without a pronounced meral blade or hook; nearly quadrate carpus; short, triangular fixed finger; and the dactylus armature in supposed male specimens (see below). *Grynaminna grandis* bears a large, blunt triangular tooth on the fixed finger, which *G. tamakii* lacks. In this case the characters on the fixed finger can be considered of taxonomic importance on the species level. Otherwise, the overall cheliped dimensions and ratios are virtually the same in both species. Thus, “*Neocallichirus*” *grandis* can be best accommodated within the genus *Grynaminna*.

The material of *Grynaminna grandis* comprises two morphotypes which seem to mirror sexual dimorphism and can be compared with sexually dimorphic chelipeds of *G. tamakii* (i.e., Kato and Karasawa, 2009; Kato, in preparation). The major propodus of *G. grandis* supposedly attributed to male has a distinct notch at the base of the fixed finger and armed both fixed finger and dactylus (Fig. 1G), whereas

specimens supposedly attributed to females do not possess a distinct notch and the armature of fingers is not well pronounced (Figs. 1C, H).

It seems that the genus *Grynaminna* is biogeographically restricted to Japan (Poore, 2000; Sakai, 2011). So far there is only one reported occurrence of extant *Neocallichirus* from Japan. Sakai (1999, 2005, 2011) reported *N. indicus* (= *N. jousseaumei*) from the Ryukyus; Dworschak (2011a) did not list this occurrence because of its unresolved species identity (P. C. Dworschak, pers. comm. 2011). The fossil record of the genus *Neocallichirus* in Japan extends back to the Miocene (Karasawa and Nakagawa, 2010). The extant and extinct *Podocallichirus sensu lato* and *Sergio* has not yet been reported from Japan.

Conclusions

From the present contribution several conclusions can be made:

1) Generic assignment of fossil callianassid remains can be done successfully on the basis of chelipeds only, but only if all cheliped elements (ischium, merus, carpus, propodus and dactylus) are at hand. Thorough comparisons between fossils and extant material should be always made before assigning the fossil remains to the genus level.

2) More comparative studies among the extant callianassids using the chelipeds is needed to recognize important characters which are consistent throughout all the members of the genus. In this respect a paper by Sakai (1969) on the major cheliped variations in some Japanese callianassids is very useful for palaeontological practice. Manning and Felder (1991) pointed out that some characters occurring on the merus (usually in the combination of other features of hard part morphology) can be used for generic assignment; since then, however, nearly twenty(!) new extant callianassid genera were designated, in many cases without any or little attention paid to the nature of the chelipeds.

3) Revision of all fossil species referred to *Neocallichirus* is needed to specify precisely the morphological variability of taxonomically important characters and compare it to the variability seen in extant *Neocallichirus* species.

Acknowledgements

We would like to express the deepest thank to Peter C. Dworschak (Natural History Museum, Wien, Austria) for fruitful discussions on systematics and biology of the extant Callianassidae and helpful comments of the earlier version of the manuscript. The work has been supported by research grants APVV 0280-07 to Daniela Reháková (Comenius University, Bratislava, Slovakia), KEGA K-09-009-00 to Natália Hudáčková (Comenius University, Bratislava, Slovakia), and Comenius University Grant UK/168/2011 and PalSIRP Sepkoski Grant 2011 to Matúš Hyžný.

References

Barnard, K. H. (1947), Descriptions of new species of South African decapod Crustacea, with notes on synonymy and new records. The Annals and

- Magazine of Natural History, series 11, 13 [for 1946], 361–392.
- Beschin, C., A. Busulini, A. De Angeli, and G. Tessier (2002), Aggiornamento ai crostacei eocenici di Cava “Main” di Arzignano (Vicenza-Italia settentrionale) (Crustacea, Decapoda). Studi e Ricerche, Associazione Amici del Museo, Museo Civico “G. Zannato”, Montecchio Maggiore (Vicenza), 2002, 7–28.
- Beschin, C., A. De Angeli, A. Checchi, and P. Mietto (2006), Crostacei del Priaboniano di Priabona (Vicenza – Italia settentrionale). Lavori Società Veneziana di Scienze Naturali, **31**, 95–112.
- Beschin, C., A. De Angeli, A. Checchi, and G. Zantonello (2005), Crostacei di Grola presso Spagnago (Vicenza, Italia settentrionale). Studi e Ricerche, Associazione Amici del Museo, Museo Civico “G. Zannato”, Montecchio Maggiore (Vicenza), **12**, 5–35.
- Biffar, T. A. (1970), Three new species of callianassid shrimp (Decapoda, Thalassinidea) from the western Atlantic. Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington, **83**, 34–50.
- Biffar, T. A. (1971), The genus *Callianassa* (Crustacea, Decapoda, Thalassinidea) in south Florida, with keys to the Western Atlantic species. Bulletin of Marine Science, **21**(3), 637–715.
- Blanco Rambla, J. P., I. Liñero Arana, and L. Beltán Lares (1995), A new callianassid (Decapoda: Thalassinidea) from the southern Caribbean Sea. Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington, **108**(1), 102–106.
- Brown, H. P. and H. A. Pilsbry (1913), Fauna of the Gatun Formation, Isthmus of Panama, II. Proceedings of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia, **64** (for 1912), 500–519.
- Collins, J. S. H., S. K. Donovan, and H. L. Dixon (1996), Crabs and barnacles (Crustacea: Decapoda & Cirripedia) from the late Pleistocene Port Morant Formation of southeast Jamaica. Bulletin of the Mizunami Fossil Museum, **23**, 51–63.
- Dana, J. D. (1852), Crustacea. Part I. United States Exploring Expedition, during the years 1838, 1839, 1840, 1841, 1842, under the command of Charles Wilkes, U.S.N.13, viii + 685 pp. Philadelphia: C. Sherman.
- De Grave, S., N. D. Pentcheff, S. T. Ahyong, T.-Y. Chan, K. A. Crandall, P. C. Dworschak, D. L. Felder, R. M. Feldmann, C. H. J. M. Fransen, L. Y. D. Goulding, R. Lemaitre, M. E. Y. Low, J. W. Martin, P. K. L. Ng, C. E. Schweitzer, S. H. Tan, D. Tshudy and R. Wetzer (2009), A classification of living and fossil genera of decapods crustaceans. Raffles Bulletin of Zoology, Supplement **21**, 1–109.
- Dworschak, P. C. (2005), A new species of *Eucalliax* Manning & Felder, 1991 (Decapoda: Callianassidae) from the Red Sea. Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington, **118**, 209–217.
- Dworschak, P. C. (2006), A new species of *Eucalliax* Manning & Felder, 1991 (Decapoda: Callianassidae) from the Philippines. Raffles Bulletin of Zoology, **54**, 349–359.
- Dworschak, P. C. (2007), Book review. Sakai, K. 2005: Callianassoidea of the world (Decapoda: Thalassinidea). Crustaceana Monographs 4, i-vi, 285 pp., 44 textfigs. Koninklijke Brill, NV, Leiden, The Netherlands. Journal of Crustacean Biology, **27**, 158–169.
- Dworschak, P. C. (2008), *Neocallichirus kempii* Sakai, 1999, a junior synonym of *Callianassa karumba* Poore & Griffin, 1979 (Decapoda: Callianassidae). Raffles Bulletin of Zoology, **56**(1), 75–84.
- Dworschak, P. C. (2011a), Redescription of *Callianassa jousseaumei* Nobili, 1904, a junior (sic!) subjective synonym of *Callianassa indica* de Man, 1905 with description of a new species of *Neocallichirus* (Decapoda: Axiidea: Callianassidae). Zootaxa, **2746**, 1–19.
- Dworschak, P. C. (2011b), Redescription of *Callianassa vigilax* de Man, 1916, a subjective synonym of *Neocallichirus denticulatus* Ngoc-Ho, 1994 (Crustacea: Decapoda: Callianassidae). Annalen des Naturhistorischen Museums in Wien, **B112**, 137–151.
- Felder, D. L. and D. L. Lovett (1989), Relative Growth and Sexual Maturation in the Estuarine Ghost Shrimp *Callianassa louisianensis* Schmitt, 1935. Journal of Crustacean Biology, **9**(4), 540–553.
- Felder, D. L. and R. B. Manning (1995), *Neocallichirus cacahuatate*, a new species of ghost shrimp from the Atlantic coast of Florida, with reexamination of *N. grandimana* and *N. lemaitrei* (Crustacea: Decapoda: Callianassidae). Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington, **108**(3), 477–490.
- Felder, D. L. and R. Robles (2009), Molecular phylogeny of the family Callianassidae based on preliminary analysis of two mitochondrial genes. 327-342. In Martin, J. W., K. A. Crandall and D. L. Felder (eds.), Decapod Crustacean Phylogenetics. Taylor & Francis/CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 632 pp.
- Garassino, A., A. De Angeli and G. Pasini (2011), A new species of ghost shrimp (Decapoda, Thalassinidae, Callianassidae) from the Late Cretaceous (Cenomanian) of Agadir (W Morocco). Atti della Società italiana di Scienze naturali e del Museo civico di Storia naturale di Milano, **147**(1), 3–17.
- Glaessner, M. F. (1929), Crustacea Decapoda. In: Pompeckj, J. F. (ed.) Fossilium Catalogus I: Animalia Pt. 41. Berlin, W. Junk. 1–464.
- Hyžný, M. (2010), *Neocallichirus rodfeldmanni*, a proposed replacement name for *Neocallichirus manningi* Schweitzer, Feldmann, Fam Hessin, Hetrick, Nyborg & Ross, 2003 (Crustacea: Decapoda: Axiidea: Callianassidae). Bulletin of the Mizunami Fossil Museum, **36**, 129.
- Hyžný, M. and N. Hudáčková (submitted), Redescription of two ghost shrimps (Decapoda: Axiidea: Callianassidae) from the Middle Miocene of the Central Paratethys: systematics, intraspecific variation, and *in situ* preservation. Zootaxa.
- Imaizumi, R. (1959), *Callianassa bona* n. sp. from near Sendai, Miyagi Prefecture. Japanese Journal of Geology and Geography, **30**, 31–37.
- Karasawa, H. (1993), Cenozoic decapod Crustacea from southwest Japan. Bulletin of the Mizunami Fossil Museum, **20**(1), 1–92.
- Karasawa, H. (1997), A Monograph of Cenozoic stomatopod, decapod, isopod and amphipod Crustacea from West Japan. Monograph of the Mizunami Fossil Museum, **8**, 1–81.
- Karasawa, H. (1998), Two new species of Decapoda (Crustacea) from the Upper Cretaceous Izumi Group, Japan. Paleontological Research, **2**, 217–223.
- Karasawa, H. (2000), Discovery of Early Cretaceous (Barremian) decapod Crustacea from the Arida Formation of Wakayama Prefecture, Japan. Paleontological Research, **4**, 235–238.
- Karasawa, H. and Y. Fudouji (2000), Palaeogene decapod Crustacea from the Kishima and Okinoshima Groups, Kyushu, Japan. Paleontological Research, **4**(4), 239–253.
- Karasawa, H. and T. Goda (1996), Two species of decapod crustaceans from the Middle Pleistocene Atsumi Group, Japan. Scientific Reports of the Toyohashi Museum of Natural History, **6**, 1–4.
- Karasawa, H. and T. Nakagawa (2010), A new species of ghost shrimp (Decapoda: Thalassinidea) from the Miocene Kunimi Formation, Fukui Prefecture, Japan. Bulletin of the Mizunami Fossil Museum, **36**, 31–36.
- Karasawa, H., T. Nohara and S. Shimoji (1995), Decapod Crustacea from the Ryukyu Group (Pleistocene), Okinawa-Jima, Japan. Bulletin of the Mizunami Fossil Museum, **22**, 127–132.
- Karasawa, H. and T. Tanaka (1994), Decapod Crustacea from the Atsumi Group (Middle Pleistocene) of Aichi Prefecture, Central Japan. Science Reports of the Toyohashi Museum of Natural History, **4**, 11–19. [in Japanese]
- Karasawa, H., T. Tanaka, N. Kobayashi, T. Goda, N. Ohira and J. Shinya (2006), *Podocallichirus grandis* (Crustacea: Decapoda: Thalassinidea) preserved within burrows from the middle Pleistocene Atsumi Group of Aichi Prefecture, Japan. Bulletin of the Mizunami Fossil Museum,

- 33, 127–133. [in Japanese]
- Kato, H. and H. Karasawa (1998), Pleistocene fossil decapod Crustacea from the Boso Peninsula, Japan. *Natural History Research, Special issue*, **5**, 1–31.
- Kato, H. and H. Karasawa (2009), Sexual dimorphisms of fossil Callianassoidea (Decapoda: Thalassinidea): examples in Japanese Cenozoic species. The Crustacean Society Summer Meeting & the 47th Annual Meeting of the Carcinological Society of Japan, p. 69.
- Kato, H. and A. Koizumi (1992), Decapod fossils from the Pleistocene Shimosueyoshi Formation in the northern part of Yokohama City. *Bulletin of the Kanagawa Prefectural Museum (Natural Science)*, **21**, 45–53. [in Japanese]
- Le Loeuff, P. and A. Intès (1974), Les Thalassinidea (Crustacea, Decapoda) du Golfe de Guinée systématique-écologie. *Cahiers de l'Office de Recherches Scientifiques et Techniques Outre Mer, série Océanographique*, **12**, 17–69.
- Lemaitre, R. and D. L. Felder (1996), A new species of ghost shrimp of the genus *Sergio* Manning and Lemaitre, 1994 (Crustacea: Decapoda: Callianassidae) from the Caribbean coast of Colombia. *Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington*, **109**, 453–463.
- Lenz, H. and F. Richters (1881), Beitrag zur Crustaceenfauna von Madagascar. *Abhandlungen der Senckenbergischen Naturforschenden Gesellschaft*, **12**, 421–428, Plate 1.
- Man, J. G. de (1905), Diagnoses of new species of macrurous decapod Crustacea from the “Siboga-Expedition”. *Tijdschrift der Nederlandsche Dierkundige Vereeniging*, **9**(3/4), 587–614.
- Man, J. G. de (1916), Description of a new species of the genus *Callianassa* Leach and of a species of the genus *Alpheus* Fabr., both from the Indian archipelago. *Zoologische Mededeelingen*, **2**, 57–61.
- Man, J. G. de (1928), The Decapoda of the Siboga-Expedition. Part 7. The Thalassinidae and Callianassidae collected by the Siboga-Expedition with some remarks on the Laomediidae. *Siboga Expédition*, **39**(A6), 1–187.
- Manning, R. B. (1987), Notes on western Atlantic Callianassidae (Crustacea: Decapoda: Thalassinidea). *Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington*, **100**(2), 386–401.
- Manning, R. B. (1993), Two new species of *Neocallichirus* from the Caribbean Sea (Crustacea: Decapoda: Callianassidae). *Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington*, **106**, 106–114.
- Manning, R. B. and D. L. Felder (1991), Revision of the American Callianassidae (Crustacea: Decapoda: Thalassinidea). *Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington*, **104**, 764–792.
- Manning, R. B. and D. L. Felder (1995), Description of the ghost shrimp *Sergio mericae*, a new species from south Florida, with reexamination of *S. guassutunga* (Crustacea: Decapoda: Callianassidae). *Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington*, **108**(2), 266–280.
- Manning, R. B. and R. Lemaitre (1994), *Sergio*, a new genus of ghost shrimp from the Americas (Crustacea: Decapoda: Callianassidae). *Nauplius*, **1**, 39–43.
- Martin, K. (1883–1887), Paläontologische Ergebnisse von Tiefbohrungen auf Java nebst allgemeinen Studien über d. Tertiär von Java, Timor und einigen anderen Inseln. *Sammlungen des Geologischen Reichs-Museums, Leiden, ser. 1*, **3**, 1–380.
- Milne-Edwards, A. (1870), Revision du genre *Callianassa* (Leach) et description de plusieurs espèces nouvelles de ce groupe. *Nouvelles Archives du Muséum d'Histoire naturelle, Paris*, **6**, 75–102.
- Monod, T. (1933), Sur quelques Crustacés de l'Afrique occidentale (liste des Décapodes Mauritanien et des Xanthidés ouest-Africains). *Bulletin du Comité d'Études Historiques et Scientifiques de l'Afrique Occidentale Française*, **15**, 456–548.
- Müller, P. (1984), Decapod Crustacea of the Badenian. *Geologica Hungarica, Series Palaeontologica*, **42**, 3–317.
- Ngoc-Ho, N. (1994), Some Callianassidae and Upogebidae from Australia with description of four new species (Crustacea: Decapoda: Thalassinidea). *Memoirs of Museum Victoria*, **54**: 51–78.
- Ngoc-Ho, N. (1995), Une espèce nouvelle de *Neocallichirus* aus îles Tuamotu, Polynésie française (Crustacea, Decapoda, Thalassinidea). *Bulletin du Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, Section A, Zoologie, Biologie et Ecologie Animales, Paris, 4e série*, **17**, 211–218.
- Ngoc-Ho, N. (2003), European and Mediterranean Thalassinidea (Crustacea, Decapoda). *Zoosystema*, **25**, 439–555.
- Nobili, G. (1904), Diagnoses préliminaires de vingt-huit espèces nouvelles de Stomatopodes et Décapodes Macroures de la Mer Rouge. *Bulletin du Muséum d'Histoire naturelle, Paris [1er série]*, **10**(5), 228–238.
- Obata, K. and Y. Hayashi (2001), Decapod Crustacea from the upper Pleistocene Kioroshi Formation in Showa-machi, Saitama Prefecture, Central Japan. *Bulletin of the Saitama Museum of Natural History*, **19**, 45–52.
- Poore, G. C. B. (1994), A phylogeny of the families of Thalassinidea (Crustacea: Decapoda) with keys to families and genera. *Memoirs of Museum Victoria*, **54**, 79–120.
- Poore, G. C. B. (2000), A new genus and species of callianassid ghost shrimp from Kyushu, Japan (Decapoda: Thalassinidea). *Journal of Crustacean Biology*, **20**(Special Number 2), 150–156.
- Poore, G. C. B. (2008), Thalassinidean shrimps (Crustacea: Decapoda) from north-western Australia, including five new species. *Records of the Western Australian Museum, Supplement*, **73**, 161–179.
- Poore, G. (2010), Callichirinae. Accessed through: World Register of Marine Species at <http://www.marinespecies.org/aphia.php?p=taxdetails&id=367973> on 2011–10–14.
- Poore, G. C. B. and D. J. G. Griffin (1979), The Thalassinidea (Crustacea: Decapoda) of Australia. *Records of the Australian Museum*, **32**(6), 217–321.
- Portell, R. W. and J. G. Agnew (2004), Pliocene and Pleistocene decapod crustaceans. *Florida Fossil Invertebrates*, **4**, 1–29.
- Rathbun, M. J. (1918), Decapod crustaceans from the Panama Region. In: Vaughan, T. W. (ed.) *Contributions to the geology and paleontology of the Canal Zone, Panama, and geologically related areas in Central America and the West Indies*. *Bulletin of the United States National Museum*, **103**: 123–184.
- Rathbun, M. J. (1919), West Indian Tertiary decapod crustaceans. *Contributions to the Geology and Paleontology of the West Indies*. *Carnegie Institution of Washington Publication*, **291**, 159–184.
- Rathbun, M. J. (1926), The fossil stalk-eyed Crustacea of the Pacific Slope of North America. *Bulletin of the United States National Museum*, **138**, 1–155.
- Rathbun, M. J. (1935), Fossil Crustacea of the Atlantic and Gulf Coastal Plain. *Special Papers of the Geological Society of America*, **2**, 1–160.
- Rodrigues, S. de A. (1971), Mud shrimps of the genus *Callianassa* Leach from the Brazilian coast (Crustacea, Decapoda). *Arquivos de Zoologia*, **20**, 191–223.
- Saint Laurent, M. de (1979), Sur la classification et la phylogénie des Thalassinides: définitions de la superfamille des Axioidea, de la sous-famille des Thomassiniinae et de deux genres nouveaux (Crustacea Decapoda). *Comptes Rendus Hebdomadaires de Séances de l'Académie des Sciences, Paris*, **288**, 1395–1397.
- Saint Laurent, M. de and P. Le Loeuff (1979), Campagnes de la *Calypso* au large des côtes Atlantiques Africaines (1956 et 1959) (suite) 22. Crustacés Décapodes Thalassinidea. I. Upogebidae et Callianassidae. *Résultats Scientifiques des Campagnes de la Calypso*, **11**, 29–101.
- Sakai, K. (1969), Revision of Japanese callianassids based on the variations of larger cheliped in *Callianassa petalura* Stimpson and *C. japonica*

- Ortmann (Decapoda: Anomura). Publications of the Seto Marine Biological Laboratory, **17**(4), 209–252.
- Sakai, K. (1988), A new genus and five new species of Callianassidae (Crustacea: Decapoda: Thalassinidea) from Northern Australia. The Beagle, Records of the Northern Territory Museum of Arts and Sciences, **5**(1), 51–69.
- Sakai, K. (1999), Synopsis of the family Callianassidae, with keys to subfamilies, genera and species, and the description of new taxa (Crustacea: Decapoda: Thalassinidea). Zoologische Verhandlungen (Leiden), **326**, 1–152.
- Sakai, K. (2005), Callianassoidea of the world (Decapoda: Thalassinidea). Crustaceana Monographs, **4**, 1–285.
- Sakai, K. (2011), Axioidea of the World and a Reconsideration of the Callianassoidea (Decapoda, Thalassinidea, Callianassida). Crustaceana Monographs, **13**, 1–520.
- Sakai, K. and M. Apel (2002), Thalassinidea (Crustacea: Decapoda) from Socotra Archipelago, Yemen, with a new species of *Lepidophthalmus*. Fauna of Saudi Arabia, **19**, 273–288.
- Schweitzer, C. E. and R. M. Feldmann (2002), New Eocene decapods (Thalassinidea and Brachyura) from Southern California. Journal of Crustacean Biology, **22**, 938–967.
- Schweitzer, C. E., R. M. Feldmann, J. M. Fam, W. A. Hessin, S. W. Hetrick, T. G. Nyborg, and R. L. M. Ross (2003), Cretaceous and Eocene decapod crustaceans from southern Vancouver Island, British Columbia, Canada. Ottawa, Ontario, NRC Research Press. 1–66.
- Schweitzer, C. E., R. M. Feldmann, A. Garassino, H. Karasawa, and G. Schweigert (2010), Systematic list of fossil decapod crustacean species. Crustaceana Monographs, **10**, 1–222.
- Schweitzer, C. E., R. M. Feldmann, and P. D. Gingerich (2004), New Decapoda (Crustacea) from the middle and late Eocene of Pakistan and a revision of *Lobonotus* A. Milne Edwards, 1864. Contributions from the Museum of Paleontology, University of Michigan, **31**(4), 89–118.
- Schweitzer, C. E., G. González-Barba, R. M. Feldmann, and D. A. Waugh (2006a), Decapoda (Thalassinidea and Paguroidea) from the Eocene Bateque and Tepetate formations, Baja California Sur, México: systematics, cuticle microstructure, and paleoecology. Annals of Carnegie Museum, **74**, 275–293.
- Schweitzer, C. E., M. Iturralde-Vinent, J. L. Hetler, and J. Velez-Juarbe (2006b), Oligocene and Miocene decapods (Thalassinidea and Brachyura) from the Caribbean. Annals of Carnegie Museum, **75**, 111–136.
- Stimpson, W. (1866), Descriptions of new genera and species of Macrurous Crustacea from the coasts of North America. Proceedings of the Chicago Academy of Sciences, **1**, 46–48.
- Tirmizi, N. M. (1970), A new species of Callianassa (Decapoda, Thalassinidea) from West Pakistan. Crustaceana, **19**(3), 245–250.
- Todd, J. A. and J. S. H. Collins (2005), Neogene and Quaternary [sic] crabs (Crustacea, Decapoda) collected from Costa Rica and Panama by members of the Panama Paleontology Project. Bulletin of the Mizunami Fossil Museum, **32**, 53–85.
- Tudge, C. C., G. C. B. Poore and R. Lemaitre (2000), Preliminary phylogenetic analysis of generic relationships within the Callianassidae and Ctenochelidae (Decapoda: Thalassinidea: Callianassoidea). Journal of Crustacean Biology, **20** (Special Issue 2), 129–149.