

3. *Eurystomina assimilis* (de Man, 1876), **species dubia**

Oncholaimus assimilis de Man, 1876, p. 95. Pl. 7, figs. 5, a-b.

non *Eurystoma assimile* of Filipjev, 1918, pp. 157-161. Pl. 5, fig. 29 (= in part *E. ornatum* and *E. filiforme*).

non *Eurystomina assimilis* of Allgén, 1929a, p. 20 (*species dubia*); of Allgén, 1931, p. 230 (listed as *E. filiforme* on p. 213; *species dubia*); of Allgén, 1933, p. 36 (*species dubia*).

non *Eurystomina assimilis* of Filipjev, 1922, p. 568 (= in part *E. ornatum* and *E. filiforme*).

non *Eurystomina assimile* of Schuurmans Stekhoven, 1943, pp. 348-349. Figs. 19, A-C (= ? *E. gerlachi*, in part and *E. pettiti*, in part).

non *Eurystomina assimile* of Gerlach, 1951, pp. 199-200. Fig. 4, a-c (= *E. gerlachi* nom. nov.).

LOCALITY. Coast of Holland (type locality).

The original description of this species is based on a female only and, in spite of the good description given by de Man (1876) the redescriptions given by Filipjev (1918) and Gerlach (1951) clearly refer to different species. Filipjev in fact has confused two species, *E. ornata* and *E. filiformis*, as apparently has Schuurmans Stekhoven (1943). *E. assimilis* has also been treated as a synonym of *E. ornatum* by various authors (e.g. Micoletzky, 1924; Wieser, 1953; Allgén, 1959; among others) thus demonstrating the difficulties involved in attempting to identify the species de Man actually studied. As a result I propose that *E. assimilis* be treated as a *species dubia*. Allgén's records (1931 and 1933) are based on females and his 1929a record is, as are the others, without a description.