Recently Tamaki (2003) rebutted me on a case of callianassid taxonomy. Apparently, his view of taxonomy does not account for sexual dimorphism in the variation of *Callianassa japonica* (Ortmann, 1891) and *C. harmandi* (Bouvier, 1901), and he thus concludes erroneously that the common Japanese callianassids, *Callianassa japonica* and *C. harmandi* are to be classified as species by the size of the cornea alone. In neither the Insecta nor the Crustacea such an approach has ever been practised, and it might reflect the present, serious situation where professional taxonomists have been reducing in number, which is also pointed out by UNEP under the title of the Global Taxonomy Initiative. This says “Governments, through the Convention on Biological Diversity, have acknowledged the existence of a “taxonomic impediment” to the sound management of biodiversity. The purpose of the Global Taxonomic Initiative (GTI) is to remove or reduce this taxonomic impediment – in other words, the knowledge gaps in our taxonomic system (including those associated with genetic systems), the shortage of trained taxonomists and curators, and the impact these deficiencies have on our ability to conserve, use and share the benefits of our biological diversity”. (UNEP, United Nations Environment Program, http://www.biodiv.org/programmes/cross-cuttingtaxonomy/default.asp).

Tamaki’s (2003) article is found in Crustaceana, 76 (1): 115-124, and is entitled “A rebuttal to Sakai (2001): “A review of the common Japanese callianassid species, *Callianassa japonica* and *C. petalura* (Decapoda, Thalassinidea)””. The author insists that two Japanese callianassid forms, *Nihonotrypea japonica* and *N. harmandi*, occurring in intertidal habitats in Japan, are to be recognized as valid species. I synonymized, however, *Nihonotrypea* with *Callianassa* (cf. Sakai, 1999), and *Callianassa harmandi* is synonymous with *C. japonica*. 
REBUTTAL

1. Tamaki is inaccurate and apparently somewhat confused as regards the callianassid taxa. He mentioned (Tamaki, 2003: 117) “It must be said, therefore, that his methodology, with the use of the syntypes in Paris, was in vain”. However, it was inevitable for me to establish a neotype for *Callianassa subterranea* var. *japonica* Ortmann, 1891 for the reason that (1) I tried to examine the type specimen and visited Strasbourg on 25-27 September 2000, but could not find it in the Museum, because it had been taken out by the late Dr. R. B. Manning. So Dr. E. Lang, director of the Museum, and Dr. M.-D. Wandhammer, curator of the Museum, asked Dr. B. Kelsey of the Smithsonian Institution about the type specimen. However, I had not received any response from him about the type up to 14 October 2000. Dr. Wandhammer promised me to send me the type when it was returned from Washington, but since then I had not heard from her about the type. A year later the holotype of *Callianassa japonica* was found and returned to Strasbourg on 09 January 2001 by Dr. R. Lemaitre (cf. Tamaki, 2003: 117) three months later than the first submission of my manuscript, on 04 November 2000, to Dr. P. Y. Noël, Muséum national d’Histoire naturelle, Paris, who was editor of the Special Issue for Prof. Forest. Later on, my manuscript was transferred to a regular issue of Crustaceana and accepted on 20 February 2001, and the final version on 22 May 2001. So, Tamaki’s (2003) rebuttal is unfounded, because he cannot blame me for the choice of a neotype, which, moreover, now becomes invalid due to the Art. 75.8 of the new International Code of Zoological Nomenclature, saying that if a neotype is designated and later the original type material is found, the neotype loses its standing and the old holotype takes its place, since the type was brought back after a long absence [without any information about where it was kept in the meantime].

2. My re-examination of the returned holotype during my stay in Strasbourg on 19 September 2003 shows that there are differences in morphology between the returned holotype and the figures of Ortmann (1891). These will be treated below under item (8) in detail.

3. *Nihonotrypaea* Manning & Tamaki, 1998, in my opinion, is not acceptable. Tamaki usually follows Manning and thus uses the genus *Nihonotrypaea* for the Japanese callianassids. However, as I pointed out in 1999, the genus should not be defined by the form of the 3rd maxilliped, because maxilliped 3 shows variable and intermediate forms in the genus *Callianassa*, and it is difficult to distinguish one type from the other by its form. So, I deliberately treated it as a synonym of *Callianassa*. For example, maxilliped 3 in *Callianassa tyrrhena* (Petagna, 1792)\(^1\)

\(^1\) Ngoc-Ho (2003: 479) recently treated *Callianassa tyrrhena* (Petagna, 1792) under the name of *Pestarella tyrrhena*. However, it is difficult to accept the new genus *Pestarella*, because the varying morphology of Plp1-2, of the rounded telson, and of Mxp3 all fall well within the range of variation of the genus *Callianassa*. 