# Taxa not Considered

The following taxa, included in the urostyloids or holostichids by some modern (post 1970) workers (e.g., Tables 2–11), are either based on insufficiently described species or they lack a more or less distinct midventral complex and are therefore not considered in the present monograph. Moreover, *Uroleptus* and its supposed synonym *Paruroleptus* are briefly discussed in this chapter.

***Amphisiella*** **Gourret & Roeser, 1888**, Archs Biol., 8: 180. Type species (by monotypy): *Amphisiella marioni* Gourret & Roeser, 1888. Remarks: Classified in the Urostylidae by Borror (1972, p. 9) and in the Holostichidae by Stiller (1974b, p. 94), Corliss (1979, p. 309), Tuffrau (1979, p. 526; 1987, p. 115), and Carey (1992, p. 178). *Amphisiella* species lack a midventral complex and are therefore not closely related to the urostyloids (e.g., Wicklow 1982, Eigner & Foissner 1994, Petz & Foissner 1996, Berger 2004a). *Amphisiella* will be treated in the third volume of the hypotrich monograph.

***Balladyna*** **Kowalewskiego, 1882**, Pam. fizyogr.; 2: 408. Type species (by original designation and monotypy): *Balladyna parvula* Kowalewskiego, 1882. Remarks: Classified in the Urostylidae by Borror (1972, p. 9) and in the Holostichidae by Stiller (1974b, p. 96), Corliss (1979, p. 309), Tuffrau (1979, p. 526; 1987, p. 115), and Carey (1992, p. 180). *Balladyna parvula* is a very small hypotrich with about seven frontoventral cirri, five prominent transverse cirri, and relatively long marginal cirri and dorsal bristles. The habitus closely resembles that of species of the *Oxytricha setigera* group, a relationship not discussed by Berger (1999). Since there is no evidence for a midventral complex, it is not treated in the present book.

***Balladinopsis*** **Ghosh, 1921**, J. R. microsc. Soc., year 1921: 248. Type species (by original designation and monotypy): *Balladinopsis nuda* Ghosh, 1921. Remarks: Classified in the Holostichidae by Stiller (1974b, p. 99). The type species has no frontoventral cirri, that is, lacks a midventral complex. Thus, it is not considered in the present review. Very likely *B. nuda* is a misobserved oxytrichid, that is, a species indeterminata.

***Balladynella*** **Stiller, 1974**, Annls hist.-nat. Mus. natn. hung., 66: 129, 130. Remarks: Stiller (1974a) overlooked to fix a type species. Consequently, *Balladynella* Stiller, 1974 is not available (ICZN 1964, Article 13b). According to Aescht (2001, p. 30), now available as *Balladynella* Jankowski, 1979 (p. 51) with *Balladyna fusiformis* Kahl, 1932 as type species by original designation. Classified in the Holostichidae by Stiller (1974b, p. 98), Corliss (1979, p. 309), and Tuffrau (1979, p. 526; 1987, p. 115). Since there is no evidence for a midventral complex, it is not treated in the present book.

***Banyulsella*** **Dragesco, 1954**, Vie Milieu, 4: 637. Type species (by monotypy): *Banyulsella viridis* Dragesco, 1954. Remarks: First mentioned, as nomen nudum, in a species list by Dragesco (1953, p. 629), and described in detail by Dragesco (1960, p. 316).

Classified in the Urostylidae, inter alia, by Borror (1972, p. 9), Corliss (1979, p. 309), and Carey (1992, p. 177). The single species, *B. viridis*, is very small (about 50 µm), has a very large (more than 50% of body length), U-shaped adoral zone, three enlarged frontal cirri, two short and two long "fronto-ventral" cirral rows, and a long row of transverse(?) cirri. Marginal cirri obviously lacking. One row of fine cirri on rear portion of dorsal side. Six small macronuclear nodules. Mesopsammon of Banyuls-sur-Mer, Mediterranean Sea, France. The two long ventral rows are distinctly separated, strongly indicating that *B. viridis* does not have a midventral complex. Thus, it is not treated in the present monograph. Jankowski (1975, p. 27) established the Banyulsellidae (incorrectly spelled Banylsellidae) for this species. It will be treated in one of the next volumes of the hypotrich monograph.

***Coniculostomum* Njine, 1979**, Protistologica, 15: 353. Type species (by monotypy): *Laurentia monilata* Dragesco & Njine, 1971. Remarks: Classified in the Holostichidae by Tuffrau (1979, p. 526; 1987, p. 115). A rigid oxytrichid and therefore assigned to the Stylonychinae (for review, see Berger 1999, p. 606).

***Discocephalus* Ehrenberg, 1829**, Abh. preuss. Akad. Wiss., year 1929: 9, 16. Type species (by monotypy): *Discocephalus rotatorius* Ehrenberg, 1829. Remarks: Classified in the Holostichidae by Tuffrau (1979, p. 526). Name-bearing type of the discocephalids (see Berger 2001, p. 106). This species lacks an urostyloid midventral pattern and is therefore not treated in the present book. However, in some taxa – for example, *Marginotricha faurei* (Dragesco, 1963) Lin, Song & Warren, 2004 – of the discocephalids oblique cirral anlagen, which form cirral pairs, are produced (Wicklow 1982, his Fig. 43). Later, one cirrus of each pair is resorbed so that pairs (and a zigzagging cirral pattern) are lacking during interphase. Thus, I would not be surprised if molecular data indicate a close relationship of urostyloids and discocephalids. On the other hand, a relationship with the stylonychines cannot be excluded because both groups have a rigid body and lack cortical granules. An increase in the number of cirral anlagen from six to more occurred several times independently (see general section).

***Gonostomum* Sterki, 1878**, Z. wiss. Zool., 31: 57. Type species (by original designation): *Oxytricha affinis* Stein, 1859. Remarks: Classified in the Holostichidae by Stiller (1974b, p. 88). Morphological and cell division data indicate that *Gonostomum* is a modified 18-cirri oxytrichid (for review see Berger 1999, p. 367). Molecular studies support (Modeo et al. 2003), respectively, contradict (Affa'a et al. 2004) this view.

***Isosticha* Kiesselbach, 1936**, Thalassia, 2: 18. Type species (by monotypy): *Isosticha contractilis* Kiesselbach, 1936. Remarks: Kiesselbach (1936a) established this monotypic genus in the family Oxytrichidae. Later, it was assigned to the Urostylidae by Corliss (1977, p. 137; 1979, p. 309), Tuffrau (1979, p. 526; 1987, p. 115), and Tuffrau & Fleury (1994, p. 128). By contrast, Borror (1972) and Jankowski (1979) did not mention it in their papers indicating that they did not consider it as hypotrich. Hemberger (1982, p. 275) also assumed that Kiesselbach's species does not belong to