

Discussion

Polygastrophora omercooperi is distinct from all the other species referred to the genus by the presence of nine bulbs in the posterior end of the oesophagus.

Wieser (1953a and b) suggests that all the genera referred to the subfamily Enchiliidiinae may be characterized by sexual dimorphism and points out that it is definitely known to occur in three of the genera of that subfamily, one of the genera in question being *Polygastrophora*. However, I find it difficult to believe that all the male specimens I have seen are fourth stage larvae as in many of them the reproductive organs appear to be fully developed and the spicules are frequently protruded from the cloacal opening. In addition it is difficult to believe that among nineteen male specimens found in association with gravid females none of the males is fully adult but that many of them are fourth stage larvae just about to moult to the adult condition. I therefore suggest that it is more probable that sexual dimorphism, involving a highly modified head in the male, does not necessarily occur in all the species of the genus *Polygastrophora* but only in some of them. In fact such a male is only known in *P. quinquebulba* Micoletzky, 1930.

Allgén (1959) describes a new species of *Bolbella*, *B. cylindricauda*, based on one female specimen. Although the description is extremely poor, without measurements other than a statement of the length of the body and the values of *a*, *b* and *c* ("The vulva was not to be stated."), it is clearly a species of *Polygastrophora* since Allgén refers to "light-refracting small bodies behind the buccal cavity". Such bodies are characteristic of *Polygastrophora* but do not occur in *Bolbella* as Wieser points out (1953b, p. 132). Further Allgén draws attention to the similarities between his new species and the redescription of *Polygastrophora hexabulba* (Filipjev, 1918)—which Allgén attributes to Wieser—given by Wieser (1953b). While acknowledging that Allgén's description is insufficient and that his figures are virtually impossible to analyze, I have little doubt that *B. cylindricauda* is the same species as that described by Wieser as *P. hexabulba*, since the characters on which Allgén considers them distinct are such as could be due to poor preservation. Certainly the figure of the tail (Allgén, 1959, fig. 83c) could only have been drawn from a distorted specimen. I therefore propose that *B. cylindricauda* Allgén, 1959 be treated as a synonym of *P. hexabulba* (Filipjev, 1918).