

Subgenus *Pseudocella* FILIPJEV 1925b

Two groups:

- A. Head capsule long, cephalic ring weakly developed, lobes strongly developed; either all or some of the lobes separated by narrow and deep furrows. The amphids reaching with their posterior end at most to the posterior rim of the head capsule:
1. Amphids very small (not more than one seventh of the corresponding diameter in width), situated in the middle of the head capsule or still more anteriorly; their posterior opening very small and continuing into a narrow and deep furrow of the head capsule.
    - a. Amphids in front of the cephalic setae; no cervical setae; tail pointed: *T. obliqua* DITLEVSEN 1926.
    - b. Amphids behind the cephalic setae; cervical setae present; tail rounded: *T. saveljevi* FILIPJEV 1925b.  
*T. conicaudatum* KREIS 1928 is closely related to the above species and it is very difficult to evaluate the distinguishing characters set forth by KREIS himself. It is not impossible that both species are synonymous.
  2. Amphids one sixth to one fourth of the corresponding diameter in width, situated in the posterior portion of the cephalic capsule; their posterior opening empties into a broad and shallow notch between the two sublateral lobes whilst the latter are separated from the medial lobes by narrow and deep furrows.
    - a. Pigment in the esophageal region strongly developed; no cuticular lists on the cephalic mail:  
*T. trichodes* (LEUCKART 1849) with numerous synonyms. Confer FILIPJEV 1925b.
    - b. Pigment in the esophageal region absent or weakly developed; cuticular lists on the cephalic mail present:
      - aa. L=13 mm; amphids one sixth of head diameter wide:  
*T. pseudocellum* FILIPJEV 1925b (= *T. coecum* FIL. 1916 nec SAVELJEV 1912)
      - bb. L=4—5 mm; amphids one fourth of head diameter wide:  
*T. panamaense* ALLGÉN 1947d; redescription below.
  3. Amphids one fourth of head diameter wide, their posterior opening on a level with the posterior rim of the cephalic lobes, therefore only partly surrounded by the latter. The medial and sublateral lobes are still separated from each other by narrow furrows:

*T. coecum* SAVELJEV 1912; FILIPJEV 1925b.

*T. elegans* DITLEVSEN 1926 is most probably identical with the above species. As a matter of fact, there is no difference between these two species except that DITLEVSEN did not see the 6—8 small papillae in front of the supplement in male. DITLEVSEN's specimens, it is true, were shorter (6—7 mm against 8—9 mm) and stouter ( $a=32$  against 67—75) than the specimens described as *T. coecum* by SAVELJEV and FILIPJEV, but STEKHOVEN (1946) reports specimens of *T. elegans* with exactly the same dimensions as *T. coecum*. The possibility remains that STEKHOVEN actually had before him *P. coecum*, and DITLEVSEN's type-specimens could be distinguished from the latter by their shortness and stoutness. However, since these characters are only meristic they are not very useful just in this genus. The lack of preanal papillae (or rather the fact that they were not observed by DITLEVSEN) can hardly be used as a specific character.

B. Head capsule short, cephalic ring strongly developed and dividing the head capsule into two portions: an anterior and a posterior one. Lobes weakly developed and at most separated from each other by shallow notches; there are no narrow furrows. Amphids totally or with their greatest part behind the posterior rim of the cephalic capsule.

1. Cephalic setae more than one third of the head diameter long; the head diameter  $24 \mu$  in male:

*T. filipjevi* KREIS 1928.

2. Cephalic setae only one fourth of the head diameter long; head diameter already in juveniles  $40 \mu$ :

*T. kreisi* n.sp.