

I WISH to call attention to the fact that *POMATORHINUS OLIVACEUS*, Blyth, J. A. S. B., Vol. XVI., p. 451, 1847, from the Ye district of Tenasserim, and which Blyth later united with *P. leucogaster*, Gould, is, in my opinion, a perfectly good and distinct species, though doubtless very closely allied to *leucogaster*.

In *leucogaster*, (from the Himalayas) the whole upper surface is darker and greener; in *olivaceus* (from the Ye district) it is lighter and far more rufescent, the difference in the colour of the tails being striking.

In *leucogaster*, the deep ferruginous patch behind the ear-coverts is continued down the sides of the body and flanks, the head is much grayer than the rest of the upper surface of the body, the frontal feathers are much edged with blackish, and there is only a faint trace of a rufous collar on the base of the neck.

In *olivaceus*, the deep ferruginous patch is not extended down the sides of the body, &c., the head is not a bit grayer than the body, there is very little black edging to the frontal feathers and from the ferruginous patch on either side, a broad ferruginous half-collar, almost as deep in colour as the patch itself, runs across the base of the back of the neck.

Blyth's specimen can never have been a good one, and it is doubtless easy as I have found, when I had only one or two indifferent specimens to confound the two, but with a series of each laid out before one, it seems wonderful how one can ever have considered the two species the same.

In size, the two races do not differ perceptibly. In both I find the wings vary from about 3·4 in the smallest female to 3·85 in the largest male.

In *schisticeps*, I find specimens in which the wing considerably exceeds 4.

WITHOUT EXAMINING Verreaux's type it is impossible to speak positively, but so far as measurement, description, and figure go, his *Siphia Hodgsoni* (Nouv. Archiv. du Mus. VI. Bull. 34, 1870; VII. Bull. 29, 1871, IX. pl. IV. f. 4, 1873) is nothing else than *S. erythaca*, Blyth and Jerd. (P. Z. S. 1861, 201.

No doubt the description there given is most faulty, as I have already pointed out (S. F. Vol. II., p. 458) and this may have misled Verreaux who refers to Jerd. and Bly.'s *Siphia erythrura* (sic) as apparently nearly related.

On a former occasion, (S. F. Vol. I., p. 429, Dec. 1873) I discriminated the Ceylon *Phodilus* and pointed out clearly wherein it differed from the Himalayan birds. I did not then name it,

because I was under the impression that Malayan specimens differed similarly. This, however, does not seem to be the case, and having now seen a second Ceylon specimen, presenting the same specific characters as the first, I desire to propose for it provisionally the name of *PHODILUS ASSIMILIS*.

THERE IS A species to which I desire to call the attention of all Indian ornithologists, as I have been quite unable to make it out.

It is mentioned in Blyth's commentary on Dr. Jerdon's "Birds of India," Ibis 1867, 23, as follows.

"*SUYA GANGETICA*, Jerdon, *in lit.* sp. nov.

"Plain brown above, rufescent on the head; lower parts, much paler; throat, whitish. Wing, 2.25 inches; tail, 3.75 inches.

"Common along the upper Ganges."

I have never been able to procure a specimen, or even to hear of any one else who had.

I should be very thankful for any information in regard to this species.

*SUTHORA DAFLAENSIS*, God.-Aust, (S. F., IV, 490), is, it would seem, now admitted by its describer to be identical with his *S. munipurensis*, (S. F., IV, 216); at least so says Gould in the last number (XXIX) of the Birds of Asia.

MR. HOWARD SAUNDERS has merited the gratitude of all ornithologists, by his very valuable monographic note on the *Sterninae*, (P. Z. S. 1876, 638).

I shall notice this in detail hereafter, as there seems to me to be a good deal to add as regards distribution, and there are a good many points in regard to which I am unable to agree with Mr. Saunders, but at present I only desire to note, that the bird that he has figured, pl. LXI, figure 2, as *Anous melanogenys*, is, in my opinion, beyond all doubt, *A. leucocapillus*, while although the bird that he figures (pl. cit, figure, 3) as *leucocapillus*, may be one stage of *melanogenys*; it differs altogether, both from Mr. Gray's original figure of, and from a specimen I identify as, the true *melanogenys*.

MR. ELLIOT seems to me to be in error in uniting, as he does in his monograph of the Phasianidæ, *Pucrasia castanea*, Gould, with *Duvauceli* of Temminck, P. C. 545.

Mr. Elliot begins by saying "Duvaucel's Pucras pheasant was figured and described by Temminck in the Planches Colorées as long ago as the year 1834."