



On the taxonomy of the genus *Hymenicoides* Kemp, 1917 (Crustacea: Decapoda: Brachyura: Hymenosomatidae), with resurrection of *Limnopilos* Chuang & Ng, 1991, and descriptions of two new species

TOHRU NARUSE* & PETER K. L. NG

Department of Biological Sciences, National University of Singapore, 14 Science Drive 4, Singapore 117543, Republic of Singapore.
(*e-mail: dbstm@nus.edu.sg)

Abstract

The systematics of the false spider crab genus *Hymenicoides* Kemp, 1917 (Hymenosomatidae), is revised. *Hymenicoides carteri*, type species of the genus, has a distinct locking structure of male abdomen as well as possession of a strong tubercle on the palm of the chela, features which are quite different from *H. naiyanetri* (Chuang & Ng, 1991), and *H. microrhynchus* Ng, 1995. The present study restricts *Hymenicoides* Kemp, 1917, for *H. carteri* and resurrects *Limnopilos* Chuang & Ng, 1991, for the other two species. Two new species, one of *Hymenicoides* from Myanmar, and one of *Limnopilos* from Sumatra, are also described. A key to the species of both genera is provided.

Key words: *Hymenicoides*, *Limnopilos*, new species, taxonomy, Hymenosomatidae

Introduction

The false spider crabs of the genus *Hymenicoides* Kemp, 1917, currently contains three species from the Indo-West Pacific region, *H. carteri* Kemp, 1917 (from near Calcutta [=Kolkata], India), *H. naiyanetri* (Chuang & Ng, 1991) (from Thailand) and *H. microrhynchus* Ng, 1995 (from Sabah, Malaysian Borneo). *Hymenicoides naiyanetri* was originally placed in its own genus, *Limnopilos* Chuang & Ng, 1991, and distinguished from *Hymenicoides* by its less trilobed pleotelson and the simpler structure of its male first gonopod (Chuang & Ng, 1991). The male first gonopod of the type species of *Hymenicoides*, *H. carteri*, was first described by Lucas (1980: 197) as “strongly bent, with complex apex including long subterminal setae, semicircular lip and denticulate tooth”, although no figure was provided. Ng (1995), however, synonymised *Limnopilos* under *Hymenicoides*; with Ng & Chuang (1996: 50) commenting: “*Limnopilos* does not have the protuberance on the outer surface of palm of male cheliped, but this is probably more of an interspecific rather than an intergeneric difference. One of the main reasons for separating *Limnopilos naiyanetri* generically from *Hymenicoides carteri* was by the structures of their telsons (Chuang & Ng, 1991). In *Hymenicoides*, the telson is distinctively trilobate, with the lateral lobes large and distinctively produced. In *Limnopilos*, the trilobate condition is much less obvious, the lateral lobes being smaller and more confluent with the median part... After due reconsideration of this and the congruence of almost all other characters we regard as taxonomically important at the genus level, we feel that it would be better to synonymise *Limnopilos* under *Hymenicoides*.” Guinot & Richer de Forges (1997), in their appraisal of the Hymenosomatidae, however, suggested that *Limnopilos* may be separate from *Hymenicoides*, commenting that “*H. naiyanetri* (Chuang et Ng, 1991), aux Mxp3 pédiformes mais aux P11 un peu différents et au telson moins distinctement trilobé (Ng, 1995), devrait-il être réintégré dans son genre d’origine particulier, *Limnopilos* Chuang et Ng, 1991? En tout état de cause, *Cancrocaeca* et *Hymenicoides* (? et *Limnopilos*) sont étroitement apparentés.”