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Abstract

*Marygrande mirabilis* Pesta, 1911 has not been found since its description. As a result the name has been considered a species inquirenda, although Kemp (1922) proposed that two species were involved, one of which was possibly a synonym of *Anchistus custos*. A re-examination of the type series, held in the Naturhistorisches Museum in Wien (Austria) has demonstrated that two species were confused in the type description. As a result, *Marygrande mirabilis* Pesta, 1911 is relegated to the synonymy of *Anchistus custos* (Forskal, 1775) and *Anchistus miersi* (De Man, 1888).
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Introduction

*Marygrande mirabilis* Pesta, 1911 was described on the basis of five specimens, collected by Dr. K. Rechinger from Samoa, from the mantle cavity of *Tridacna gigas* Linnaeus, 1758 (Pesta 1911). The genus *Marygrande* Pesta, 1911 was established to incorporate the new taxon, on the basis of the antepenultimate segment of the third maxilliped, which is described as being broad, with the penultimate and the ultimate segment being much narrower. In contrast, in the key, the genus *Anchistus* Borradaile, 1898 is described as having a narrow antepenultimate segment on the third maxilliped, not broader than the last two segments (Pesta 1911: 572). Pesta (1913) repeated his original description verbatim, without adding any additional information.

Borradaile (1917) established the synonymy of *Marygrande* with *Anchistus*. Although no details are provided to support the proposed synonymy, it can be assumed that it was based on the form of the third maxilliped in *Anchistus*, which is given in the generic diagnosis as either broad or narrow. Nevertheless, *Anchistus mirabilis* (Pesta, 1911) is listed in the key (p. 388) and again on p. 389 as a separate species. Borradaile (1917) also highlighted the differences in rostral morphology between *A. mirabilis* and *A. custos*
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(FORSKÅL, 1775) (as A. inermis MIERS, 1884). KEMP (1922) questioned the validity of the taxon and suggested that the description was based on two species. This opinion was based on the fact that PESTA (1911) included a form with biunguiculate ambulatory pereiopods and simple pereiopods in the type description. Indeed, the structure of the dactyl is highly diagnostic at the species level, and as already stated by KEMP (1922), no species have been found which exhibit both forms of dactylar development. Kemp also suggested that the form with a simple dactyl is closely related to A. custos (as A. inermis), although he hinted that it may not be synonymous with this species. This assumption was based on the fact that M. mirabilis was collected from the mantle cavity of Tridacna gigas, whilst A. custos is invariably encountered in bivalves of the family Pinnidae. Similarly, insufficient details in the type description were highlighted and a re-examination of the type material recommended, before definitive conclusions could be reached.

Following this, HOLTHUIS (1952) treated Marygrande mirabilis as a species incertae, repeating the statement that in all probability two species were involved. Similarly, CHACE & BRUCE (1997) listed the species (as Anchistus mirabilis) as species inquirenda.

The type material of Marygrande mirabilis is still extant in the collections of the Naturhistorisches Museum in Vienna (NHMW) and consists of the following material. One bottle (NHMW 7819) containing two vials: NHMW 7819/1 complete body with both first pereiopods attached and one detached second pereiopod; NHMW 7819/2 abdomen (of specimen NHMW 7820/2) and numerous loose mouthparts and pereiopods. A second bottle (NHMW 7820) contains four vials: NHMW 7820/1 complete body with both first pereiopods and left third to fifth pereiopod attached; NHMW 7820/2 incomplete body (posterior part of abdomen missing), left third and right fourth pereiopod attached (rest missing); NHMW 7820/3 ovigerous female with both first pereiopods attached, left fourth and fifth pereiopod attached, rest missing; NHMW 7820/4 five loose second pereiopods. Originally, all material from NHMW 7820 was contained in one vial and only later separated into 4 vials (P. Dworschak pers. comm.).

Systematic account

The type series of Marygrande mirabilis consists of two distinct taxa. Taxon A is characterised by an unarmed rostrum, apically truncate and a small antennal spine (Fig. 1), a simple dactyl on the ambulatory pereiopods (Fig. 2) and the first pereiopod harbouring a cannulate chelae. Two syntypic specimens belong to this taxon, both males (NHMW 7819/1 post-orbital carapace length 3.80 mm, NHMW 7819/1 pocl 4.05 mm).

The specimen(s) illustrated in PESTA (1911, 1913) clearly belong to this taxon, with the exception of fig. 5a (PESTA 1911) and fig. 31e (PESTA 1913), which are based on specimen(s) belonging to taxon B. Taxon B is characterised by an apically acute rostrum, bearing several dorsal teeth, with a larger antennal spine below the orbital angle (Fig. 4) and a biunguiculate dactyl on the ambulatory pereiopods (Fig. 5). Two syntypic specimens belong to this taxon, an ovigerous female (NHMW 7820/3, pocl 4.20 mm) and a male (NHMW 7820/2, pocl 3.90 mm). In Pesta's account, two specimens (including an ovigerous female) were assigned to a variety having a biunguiculate dactyl, corresponding to taxon B. The illustrations by Pesta (PESTA 1911: fig. 5a, PESTA 1913: fig. 31e) of the varietal dactyl are based on specimens belonging to this taxon. The present whereabouts of the fifth syntypic specimen are unknown.
De Grave: On the taxonomic status of *Marygrande mirabilis* Pesta, 1911

Figs 1-5: *Marygrande mirabilis* Pesta, 1911. Taxon A: 1, frontal region of carapace NHMW 7819/1; 2, chelae of second pereiopod NHMW 7819/1; 3, dactyl of ambulatory (third?) pereiopod NHMW 7819/2. Taxon B: 4, frontal region of carapace NHMW 7820/1; 5, dactyl of ambulatory (third?) pereiopod NHMW 7819/2.
Clearly, taxon A is indistinguishable from *Anchistus custos* (FORSKål, 1775), a species mainly characterised by the cannulate chelae of the first pereiopod and the presence of simple dactyli of the ambulatory pereiopods (HOLTHUIS, 1952; BRUCE, 1982; DE GRAVE, 1999). Although both specimens correspond closely to previous descriptions of *A. custos*, one of the specimens harbours several minute crenulations on the dorso-distal margin of the rostrum (Fig. 1). BRUCE (1977) used this as one of the characters to separate his *Anchistus custoides* BRUCE, 1977 from *A. custos*. Nevertheless, the syntypic specimen still has both first pereiopods attached, which are cannulate in nature. The syntypic specimens were compared with an ovigerous female (pocl 9.00 mm) of *A. custos* from Oman in the collections of the Oxford University Museum of Natural History. Although this specimen shows no evidence of rostral crenulations and harbours a proportionally smaller antennal spine, the chelae of the first pereiopod are highly similar to the cannulate chelae displayed by the *M. mirabilis* taxon A syntypic specimens. Therefore, these two syntypic specimens are both referred to *A. custos* and not to *A. custoides*, which does not display a cannulate chelae. *Anchistus custos* is a widespread Indo-Pacific species, ranging from the Red Sea to Fiji, but has not previously been recorded from Samoa. Nine species of bivalve have been recorded as hosts for this species, eight of which are Pinnidae (FRANSEN 1995).

Taxon B is indistinguishable from *Anchistus miersi* (DE MAN, 1888), a species characterised by its rostral dentition and the characteristic biunguiculate dactyli of P3-5, as well as the detailed structure of the dorsal side of the dactyli. Both specimens agree closely with the type description (DE MAN 1888) and subsequent descriptions (BRUCE 1973, MONOD 1976, DE GRAVE 1999). *Anchistus miersi* is a widespread Indo-Pacific species, ranging from the Red Sea through to French Polynesia, but has not been recorded from Samoa. Eight species of bivalve have been recorded as hosts for this species, five of which are Tridacnidae (FRANSEN 1995). Although the records from Pteriidae and Pinnidae were questioned by FRANSEN (1995), DE GRAVE (1999) recorded the species from *Magnavicula penguin* RÖDING, 1798, thus confirming the occurrence with at least one species of Pteriidae.

PESTA (1911) indicates that the specimens came from the mantle cavity of a single *Tridacna gigas*. However, available evidence is strongly supportive of the fact that the type series was obtained from several specimens of bivalve host, possibly not all of the same species. Usually, Pontoniinae which inhabit the mantle cavity of bivalves occur in male-female pairs, with single males or females being far less frequent (JOHNSON & LIANG 1966). Couples of the same sex are very rare, but have been found (FRANSEN 1995). In addition, no examples have been encountered in which two species co-inhabit the same bivalve. This would appear to suggest that the type series of *M. mirabilis* came from at least two, possibly three different individual bivalves. The male and ovigerous female of *A. miersi* (NHMW 7820/2, 7820/3) presumably came from the same bivalve host, whilst the two male *A. custos* (NHMW 7819/1, 7820/1) in all likelihood came from an additional two bivalves, although as noted above, they may have originated from the same host. It also seems likely that the hosts belonged to two different species and were not all *Tridacna gigas*. Indeed, *A. custos* has not been recorded from any species of Tridacnidae, whilst *A. miersi* utilises several species of this family. Indirect support for this, is provided by the fact that the mollusc collection of the NHMW (P. Dworschak pers. comm.) contains specimens of *Pinna zebuensis* REEVE, 1858 (presently considered
a junior synonym of \textit{Pinna muricata} \textit{Linnaeus}, 1758) and \textit{Tridacna elongata} \textit{Lamarck}, 1819 [presently considered a junior synonym of \textit{Tridacna maxima} (Rodin, 1798)], collected by Rechinger in Samoa. It therefore seems possible that the \textit{A. miersi} specimens were collected from \textit{T. maxima}, and the \textit{A. custos} specimens from \textit{P. muricata}.

Lastly, \textit{PESTA} (1911) states that the colour of the specimens was light blue, contrasting to the mantle colour of its host, the giant clam. This statement is puzzling, as \textit{A. miersi} is transparent bluish, with clearly visible red dots (Fransen 1994, De Grave 1999) and \textit{A. custos} is also transparent bluish, but with yellow-orange dots (De Grave 1999). Furthermore, the mantle of \textit{T. maxima} is usually of a bright blue colour. As the mantle colour of \textit{P. bicolor} is mainly black, it seems possible that the colour description refers to the \textit{A. miersi} specimens, and not to the \textit{A. custos} specimens.

The present restudy of the type series of \textit{Marygrande mirabilis} \textit{PESTA}, 1911 has demonstrated that two species were confused in the type description, a fact already suspected by \textit{KEMP} (1922). As a result, \textit{Marygrande mirabilis} \textit{PESTA}, 1911 is relegated to the synonymy of \textit{Anchistus custos} (Forskal 1775) and \textit{Anchistus miersi} (De Man 1888).
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