

1. CHLAMYDODERA CERVINIVENTRIS.

Add:—
Chlamydodera cerviniventris, Meyer, Abhandl. k. zool. Mus. Dresden, vii. no. 2, p. 55 (1898).—Sharpe, Monogr. Parad. part viii. (1898).
Chlamydera cerviniventris, Rothschild, Thierreich, Lief. 2, Parad. p. 9 (1898).
Chlamydodera recondita, Meyer, Abhandl. k. zool. Mus. Dresden, vii. no. 2, p. 55.—Sharpe, Monogr. Parad. part viii. (1898).

Dr. Meyer now believes that the egg on which he founded his *C. recondita*, though somewhat aberrant in colour, is really that of *C. cerviniventris*, and so the identity of *C. recondita* and *C. lauterbachii* is no longer in question.

2. CHLAMYDODERA MACULATA.

Add:—
Chlamydodera maculata, Meyer, Abhandl. k. zool. Mus. Dresden, vii. no. 2, p. 54 (1898).—Sharpe, Monogr. Parad. part viii. (1898).
Chlamydera maculata, Rothschild, Thierreich, Lief. 2, Parad. p. 9 (1898).

3. CHLAMYDODERA OCCIPITALIS.

Add:—
Chlamydodera occipitalis, Sharpe, Bull. Brit. Orn. Club, iv. p. xiv (1894).—Id. Monogr. Parad. part iii. (1894).—Meyer, Abhandl. k. zool. Mus. Dresden, vii. no. 2, p. 54 (1898).
Chlamydera maculata, pt., Rothschild, Thierreich, Lief. 2, Parad. p. 9 (1898).

The Hon. Walter Rothschild has united this species to *C. maculata*, as I did myself in the 'Catalogue of Birds.' Now that the range of *C. maculata* is known to extend to Cape York, there is nothing wonderful in the occurrence of the species at Port Albany, and I am quite prepared to accept the identity of *C. occipitalis* and *C. maculata*. Gould was always very emphatic as to my having made a mistake in uniting the two species, and as his judgment on the questions of Australian birds was always worthy of consideration, I preferred to consider *C. occipitalis* distinct, influenced also perhaps, as Mr. Rothschild suggests, by a desire to "bring in Gould's very beautiful original plate." I now believe that *C. occipitalis* is nothing more than a finely plumaged male of *C. maculata*, as Dr. Ramsay long ago suggested.

4. CHLAMYDODERA GUTTATA.

Add:—
Chlamydodera guttata, Meyer, Abhandl. k. zool. Mus. Dresden, vii. no. 2, p. 54 (1898).—Sharpe, Monogr. Parad. part viii. (1898).
Chlamydera guttata, Rothschild, Thierreich, Lief. 2, Parad. p. 10 (1898).

5. CHLAMYDODERA NUCHALIS.

Add:—
Chlamydodera nuchalis, Meyer, Abhandl. k. zool. Mus. Dresden, vii. no. 2, p. 54 (1898).—Sharpe, Monogr. Parad. part viii. (1898).
Chlamydera nuchalis, Rothschild, Novit. Zool. v. p. 86 (1898).—Id. Thierreich, Lief. 2, Parad. p. 10 (1898).

6. CHLAMYDODERA ORIENTALIS.

Add:—
Chlamydodera orientalis, Sharpe, Monogr. Parad. part i. (1891).—Id. Bull. Brit. Orn. Club, iv. p. xiv (1894).—Meyer, Abhandl. k. zool. Mus. Dresden, vii. no. 2, p. 54 (1898).
Chlamydera orientalis, Rothschild, Novit. Zool. v. p. 86 (1898).
Chlamydera nuchalis, Rothschild, Thierreich, Lief. 2, Parad. p. 10 (1898).

The Hon. Walter Rothschild does not recognize this species as distinct from *C. nuchalis*, as he says that "in the British Museum there are examples of both forms, together with a specimen almost intermediate, all from one and the same locality." Although there is an approach to *C. nuchalis* in some specimens, I think the two forms can be fairly well divided.