

## NOTES ON FISHES IN THE INDIAN MUSEUM.

### XL. ON FISHES OF THE GENUS *ROHTEE*<sup>1</sup> SYKES.

(Plate IV.)

By SUNDER LAL HORA, D. Sc., F.R.S.E., F.N.I., Assistant Superintendent, and K. S. MISRA, M.Sc., Laboratory Assistant, Zoological Survey of India, Calcutta.

In an earlier note, one of us<sup>2</sup> discussed the systematic position of *Matsya argentea*, a species discovered by Day<sup>3</sup> among Col. Tickell's "Volume of beautiful coloured drawings of Burmese fishes with their descriptions", and attention was directed to two other freshwater fishes, *Leiocassis fluviatilis* and *Rohtee cunma* described by Day<sup>4</sup> from the same source. Of these, the taxonomy of *Rohtee cunma* has been involved in great confusion, particularly as Day described its dorsal spine as "not serrated". In the fishes of the genus *Rohtee*, however, Sykes<sup>5</sup> characterised the dorsal "with the first complete ray serrated posteriorly". Vinciguerra<sup>6</sup>, on the nature of the dorsal spine alone, doubted the inclusion of *R. cunma* in the genus *Rohtee*, but adduced evidence to show that it may be a synonym of *R. cotio* (Ham.). Day's account of the dorsal spine also led Hora<sup>7</sup> to treat *R. cunma* in a separate group of *Rohtee* and to assign it to *Parabramis* Bleeker. Among the fishes collected by Mr. D. E. B. Manning, Divisional Forest Officer, Tavoy Division, Tavoy, Burma, we have found specimens which agree with *R. cunma* in all respects,

---

<sup>1</sup> Some authors prefer the use of *Osteobrama* Heckel (Russegger's *Reisen in Europa, Asien und Africa*, etc., pt. 1, p. 1033, 1842) to *Rohtee* Sykes (*Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist.* IV, p. 364, 1840), but Hora (*Rec. Ind. Mus.* XXII, p. 187, 1921) and Mukerji (*Journ. Bombay Nat. Hist. Soc.* XXXVII, p. 69, 1934) have shown that *Rohtee* has priority over *Osteobrama*. Jordan (*Genera of Fishes*, pp. 210, 211, 1919) also had pointed out that *Osteobrama* is a synonym of *Rohtee*.

The first species described by Sykes under *Rohtee* is *R. ogilbii* but this has been shown by Hora (*Rec. Ind. Mus.* XXXIX, p. 312, 1937) to belong to *Mystacoleucus* Günther (*Cat. Fish. Brit. Mus.* VII, p. 206, 1858). If *R. ogilbii* is to be regarded as the type of the genus *Rohtee* then *Mystacoleucus* will have to be treated as a synonym of *Rohtee*, and in that case the species now included under *Rohtee* should bear the generic designation *Osteobrama*. Jordan (*loc. cit.*, p. 210), whose main object in writing the *Genera of Fishes* was the fixation of the types for the various genera, however, named *R. vigorsii* Sykes as the orthotype of the genus *Rohtee* and if this is accepted then the present-day nomenclature of these fishes remains intact. In this paper we have followed Jordan and adopted the name *Rohtee* with *R. vigorsii* as its orthotype and have excluded *R. ogilbii* from it as it has a precumbent predorsal spine.

<sup>2</sup> Hora, S. L., *Rec. Ind. Mus.* XLI, pp. 401-406 (1939).

<sup>3</sup> Day, F., *Fish. India Suppl.*, p. 807 (1888); *Faun. Brit. Ind. Fish.* I, p. 292, fig. 102 (1889).

<sup>4</sup> Day, F., *Fish. India Suppl.*, pp. 805, 807 (1888); *Faun. Brit. Ind. Fish.* I, pp. 164, 343 (1889).

<sup>5</sup> Sykes, W. H., *Trans. Zool. Soc. London* II, p. 364 (1841).

<sup>6</sup> Vinciguerra, D., *Ann. Mus. Civ. Stor. Nat. Genova* (2) IX, p. 188 (1890).

<sup>7</sup> Hora, S. L., *Rec. Ind. Mus.* XXXIX, pp. 313, 314 (1937).

except that their dorsal spine is minutely serrated along the posterior border. Since the type of the species was obtained from Moulmein, an adjacent locality, we have no doubt that our specimens represent Day's *R. cunma*. A study of these examples has enabled us to confirm Vinciguerra's tentative conclusion that *R. cunma* is probably synonymous with *R. cotio* (Ham.).

An examination of the extensive material of *Rohtee* in the collection of the Indian Museum and a detailed study of the literature on this group of fishes has shown that considerable confusion prevails regarding the taxonomy of some of the species and that a very wide interpretation has been assigned to *Rohtee cotio* (Ham.). We propose to define the specific limits and the geographical range of each of the species represented in the material examined by us.

### Key to the species of *Rohtee* Sykes.

- I. With four well defined barbels—
- A. More than 20 branched rays in anal fin ; more than 60 scales along lateral line .. .. *R. feae*.
- B. Less than 20 branched rays in anal fin ; less than 60 scales along lateral line—
1. A. 3/17 ; L. l. 59 .. .. *R. neilli*.
2. A. 3/11 ; L. l. 44 .. .. *R. bakeri*.
- II. With two rudimentary maxillary barbels—
1. A. 3/21-27 ; L. l. 73-85 .. .. *R. vigorsii*.
2. A. 3/16-18 ; L. l. 68-70 .. .. *R. dayi*, sp. nov.
- III. Without barbels—
- A. Less than 20 branched rays in anal fin (A. 3/16-17) ; abdominal edge keeled throughout .. .. *R. belangeri*.
- B. More than 20 branched rays in anal fin ; abdominal edge keeled only between pelvic and anal fins—
1. Generally more than 10½ scales between lateral line and pelvic fin ; A. 3/28-33 ; L. l. 57-70 .. .. *R. cotio*.
2. Less than 10½ scales between lateral line and pelvic fin ; A. 3/25-31 ; L. l. 42-60 .. .. *R. cotio* var. *cunma*.

*Rohtee ogilbii* Sykes is not included in the above key as Hora<sup>1</sup> has shown that it belongs to the genus *Mystacoleucus* Günther. In the collection of the Indian Museum this species is represented from the Deccan, Poona, Kurnool and the Coorg State, and would thus seem to be generally distributed along the Western Ghats.

### *Rohtee feae* (Vinciguerra).

1877. *Rohtee cotio*, Day (in part, nec Hamilton), *Fish. India*, p. 587.
1878. *Osteobrama cotio*, Anderson (nec Hamilton), *Zool. Res. Yunnan Exped.* I, p. 869.
1889. *Rohtee cotio*, Day (in part, nec Hamilton), *Faun. Brit. Ind. Fish.* I, p. 340.

<sup>1</sup> Hora, S. I., *Rec. Ind. Mus.* XXXIX, p. 312, text-figs. 1, 2 (1937).

1890. *Osteobrama feae*, Vinciguerra, *Ann. Mus. Civ. Stor. Nat. Genova* (2), IX, p. 183, pl. x, fig. 10.

1890. *Osteobrama Alfrediana*, Vinciguerra (*nec* Cuvier & Valenciennes) *ibid.*, p. 188.

1929. *Rohtee feae*, Prashad & Mukerji, *Rec. Ind. Mus.* XXXI, p. 205.

In the old collection of the Indian Museum we have found specimens belonging to *Rohtee feae* which had been assigned to *R. cotio* (Cat. No. 891 from Tagoung, Yunnan, collected by Dr. J. Anderson) and *R. microlepis belangeri* (Cat. No. 897, Burma, purchased from Dr. F. Day). Day seems to have confused *R. feae* with *R. cotio*, and for this reason he described the barbels of the latter as "absent or very rudimentary". In *R. cotio* the barbels are always absent; while small, but well defined, barbels are always present in *R. feae*.

According to Vinciguerra, in typical examples of *R. feae* the scales along the lateral line vary from 72 to 75, but in one specimen from the Myitkyina District and 3 specimens from Kalewa, Upper Chindwin Drainage, we found fewer scales, about 63 to 69. This difference is still more marked in the number of scales in transverse series. In typical examples there are  $14\frac{1}{2}$  to  $16\frac{1}{2}$  rows between the lateral line and the base of pelvic fin, while in the examples referred to above this number varies from 11 to 13. These differences in scale counts are sufficient to recognise varieties, but the material at our disposal is not enough at present to justify such a course, especially on account of the marked variations exhibited by the few specimens that we have examined.

The two examples, one from Mandalay and the other from Bhamo, referred by Vinciguerra to *Osteobrama alfrediana* were stated to be closely allied to *O. feae* but differed from it in having fewer scales, in the position of the dorsal fin, in having more rays in the anal fin and in possessing longer barbels. In our opinion Vinciguerra's *O. alfrediana* corresponds with the examples of *R. feae* with comparatively fewer scales referred to above, and treating the differences as individual variations, we have, for the time being, referred Vinciguerra's *O. alfrediana* to the synonymy of his *O. feae*.

*Rohtee feae* is found in Burma and Yunnan; it has so far been recorded from the Myitkyina District (Prashad & Mukerji), and from Bhamo, Mandalay and Kokarait (Vinciguerra). We have also examined specimens of this species from Kalewa, Upper Chindwin Drainage, collected by Mr. R. C. Raven, Vernay-Hopwood Chindwin Expedition, and Tagoung, Yunnan (Anderson).

In the collection of the Indian Museum the species is represented from the following localities:—

Burma	..	..	Purchased from Dr. F. day	1 specimen.
Bhamo, Burma			Genova Mus. (Fea Coll.)	2 specimens.
Myitkyina Dist., Burma.	Upper		Dr. B. N. Chopra	3 specimens.
Kalewa, Upper Drainage.	Chindwin		Mr. H. C. Raven	.. 3 specimens.
Tagoung, Yunnan	..		Dr. J. Anderson	.. 2 specimens.

We give below a table of measurements, number of anal rays and scale counts of nine specimens of *R. feae* from different localities :—

*Measurements in millimetres, number of anal rays and scale counts.*

	Burma.	Bhamo.	Myitkyina Dist.			Kalewa.		Tagoung.	
			81.5	153.5	156.0	100.0	108.0	114.0	132.0
Standard length .. ..	155.4	67.0	81.5	153.5	156.0	100.0	108.0	114.0	132.0
Length of head .. ..	36.2	18.0	21.0	36.0	37.0	23.0	26.5	27.5	22.0
Depth of body .. ..	79.0	31.0	41.5	77.0	75.5	42.3	46.0	62.5	68.3
Width of body .. ..	18.0	5.5	10.0	21.5	22.0	8.0	8.0	12.5	14.5
Diameter of eye .. ..	12.0	7.0	8.8	12.5	12.5	9.0	9.0	10.0	10.5
Length of snout .. ..	11.0	5.0	5.5	10.2	11.0	7.0	8.0	8.0	9.3
Interorbital width ..	15.5	5.0	8.0	16.0	16.0	8.2	8.5	11.5	13.0
Length of dorsal spine ..	44.0	20.0	20.0	D <sup>1</sup> .	44.5	D.	31.5	D.	35.0
No. of scales along L. 1. ..	77	73	74	73	63	66	69	72	76
No. of scales between L. 1. and V. ..	16½	16	16	14½	11	12	13	16½	16½
No. of predorsal scales ..	39	37	38	D.	34	34	34	38	38
No. of rays in anal fin ..	3/26	3/28	3/27	3/27	3/28	3/27	3/27	3/28	3/29

**Rohtee neilli** Day.

1877. *Rohtee neilli*, Day, *Fish. India*, p. 586, pl. cxlvi, fig. 5.

1889. *Rohtee neilli*, Day, *Faun. Brit. Ind. Fish.* I, p. 340.

1937. *Rohtee duvaucelii*, Hora (*nec* Cuvier and Valenciennes), *Rec. Ind. Mus.* XXXIX, p. 17 (Tunga R., at Shimoga).

1937. *Rohtee neilli*, Hora, *Rec. Ind. Mus.* XXXIX, p. 19 (Coorg State).

*Rohtee neilli* was described by Day from the Bhavani River at the base of the Nilgiri Hills. We have examined one of the typical specimens from the Bhavani River which is now preserved in the collection of the Indian Museum. The species was recorded by Hora from the Cauveri River in Coorg State, and we have found that a very young specimen recorded by Hora from the Tunga River at Shimoga as *Rohtee duvaucelii* also belongs to this species. In the collection of the Indian Museum, *R. neilli* is represented from the following localities :—

Bhavani River, Nilgiri Hills, Madras.	Purchased from Dr. F. Day	1 specimen.
Sunkesula, Madras	Madras Fisheries Department.	3 specimens.
Cauveri River, Coorg State.	Mr. C. R. Narayan Rao ..	3 specimens.
Tunga River, Shimoga, Mysore.	Dr. H. S. Rao	1 specimen.
Mutha-Mula River, Poona	Mr. A. G. L. Fraser	1 specimen.

<sup>1</sup> D, indicates that the structure is damaged,

We give below a table of measurements, number of anal rays and scale counts of the specimens of *R. neilli* from different localities as listed above :—

*Measurements in millimetres, number of anal rays and scale counts.*

	Bhavani River.	Sunkesula.			Cauveri River.			Tunga River.	Mutha-Mula River.
Standard length .. ..	94.5	62.0	65.5	70.0	53.2	69.5	83.0	42.5	78.0
Length of head .. ..	25.0	17.0	17.0	18.0	15.0	18.0	22.0	12.0	19.0
Depth of body .. ..	34.5	25.0	26.2	28.5	17.0	25.5	D.	15.0	27.5
Width of body .. ..	10.5	8.5	9.0	9.5	6.8	7.5	12.5	5.3	10.0
Diameter of eye .. ..	11.3	7.5	7.5	8.0	6.9	8.0	14.0	5.5	7.5
Length of snout .. ..	5.8	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.0	5.0	6.0	3.5	5.0
Interorbital width .. ..	5.5	3.4	3.8	4.3	3.3	4.0	4.6	2.5	4.5
Length of dorsal spine .. ..	D.	16.5	16.0	16.5	13.0	16.0	20.5	12.5	22.0
No. of scales along L. 1. .. ..	59	57	57	58	57	55	56	55	D.
No. of scales between L. 1. and V. .. ..	7½	8	8	8	8	8	8½	7½	D.
No. of predorsal scales .. ..	21	21	21	20	21	22	21	22	20
No. of rays in anal fin .. ..	3/17	3/17	3/17	3/16	3/16	3/18	3/17	3/17	3/16

**Rohtee bakeri** Day.

1877. *Rohtee Bakeri*, Day, *Fish. India*, p. 586, pl. cxlvii, fig. 1.  
1889. *Rohtee bakeri*, Day, *Faun. Brit. Ind. Fish. I*, p. 340.

*Rohtee bakeri* is represented by a single specimen in the collection of the Indian Museum ; it is one of Day's original specimens collected in Travancore. So far as we are aware this remarkable species, with fewer scales and only 11 branched rays in the anal fin, is restricted to the extreme southern part of Peninsular India.

We give below a table of measurements, number of anal rays and scale counts of the only specimen of *R. bakeri* examined by us :—

*Measurements in millimetres, number of anal rays and scale counts.*

Standard length .. ..	68.3
Length of head .. ..	19.0
Depth of body .. ..	22.0
Width of body .. ..	8.0
Diameter of eye .. ..	7.3
Length of snout .. ..	5.0
Interorbital width .. ..	4.0
No. of scales along L. 1. .. ..	44
No. of scales between L. 1. and V. .. ..	5½
No. of predorsal scales .. ..	15
No. of rays in anal fin .. ..	3/11

**Rohtee vigorsii** Sykes.

1841. *Rohtee Vigorsii*, Sykes, *Trans. Zool. Soc. London*, II, p. 364, pl. lxxiii, fig. 3.  
 1844. *Leuciscus Duvaucelii*, Cuvier & Valenciennes, *Hist. Nat. Poiss.* XVII, p. 77 (figured as *Leuciscus Alfredianus* on pl. cccxxxviii) and not *L. duvaucelii* described on p. 95.  
 1849. *Abramis Vigorsii*, Jordan, *Madras Journ. Litt. & Sci.* XV, p. 319.  
 1853. *Systemus Vigorsii*, Bleeker, *Verh. Bat. Gen.* XXV, p. 62.  
 1868. *Osteobrama cotio*, Günther (*nec* Hamilton), *Cat. Fish. Brit. Mus.* VII, p. 323.  
 1868. *Osteobrama rapax*, Günther, *ibid.*, p. 324.  
 1877. *Rohtee Vigorsii*, Day, *Fish. India*, p. 587, pl. cxlvii, fig. 3.  
 1889. *Rohtee vigorsii*, Day, *Faun. Brit. Ind. Fish.* I, p. 341.

Though *Rohtee ogilbii* is the first species described by Sykes in his genus *Rohtee*, Jordan<sup>1</sup> regarded *R. vigorsii* as the orthotype of the genus. The latter species was described by Sykes from "the Beema river, at Pairgaon" and on account of its long anal fin and small scales it has often been confused with *R. cotio*. The two species can, however, be distinguished readily by their general facies, especially by the form of the dorsal profile, and the nature of the dorsal spine. In *R. vigorsii* there is a distinct concavity from the snout to over the nape, while in *R. cotio* the profile is concave just over the nape. The dorsal spine is very strong in *R. vigorsii*, while it is weak in *R. cotio*. The other main differences in the two species are given in the key on page 156.

*Leuciscus duvaucelii* (= *L. alfredianus*) has generally been regarded as a subspecies of *R. cotio*, but the study of the relevant literature has convinced us that it is a synonym of *R. vigorsii*. Though in describing the species Cuvier and Valenciennes gave Nepal as its locality, in an introductory paragraph to *Cyprinus cotio*, *Leuciscus duvaucelii* and *L. rhomboidalis* on page 76 they stated that :

"M. Agassiz dit qu'il connaît des brèmes de l'Inde. On doit, en effet, rapporter à ce groupe la description suivante tirée de M. Buchanan. Je n'ai pas vu ce poisson, mais il nous en est venu de Bombay une autre espèce, voisine de celui de Buchanan.

"Les figures des dessins chinois, si souvent citées par Lacépède, représentent aussi une brème."

The above note hardly leaves any doubt as to the provenance of *L. duvaucelii*, a species allied to *Cyprinus cotio*; it was not found in Nepal but in Bombay. Further, the type specimen of *L. duvaucelii* is stated to be over 10 inches in length which also indicates that it cannot belong to *R. cotio*, but may belong to the Deccan form, *R. vigorsii*. Moreover, in *L. duvaucelii* the dorsal spine is stated to be strong whereas in *R. cotio* it is comparatively weak. Our studies have shown that the typical form of *Rohtee cotio*, with small scales, is not found in Peninsular India where it is replaced by the variety *cunma* (*vide infra*, p. 169). Cuvier and Valenciennes' figure, labelled as *L. alfredianus*, though bearing a general similarity to *R. cotio*, shows a form with very small scales. In view of the above considerations, we have no hesitation in assigning *L. duvaucelii* to the synonymy of *R. vigorsii*. It may be noted that in the fin formula of *L. duvaucelii* "A. 36" is probably a misprint for "A. 26", or "A. 30". In *R. vigorsii* the anal rays do not exceed 30 in number.

<sup>1</sup> Jordan, D. S., *Genera of Fishes*, p. 210 (1919); for further details see foot-note 1 on page 155.

Enquiries were made from Dr. J. Pellegrin regarding the precise diagnosis and provenance of Cuvier and Valenciennes' type of *L. duvaucelii*, but he replied that the type could not be found in the collection of the Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris. He further informed us that Alfred Duvaucel, the French Naturalist, who died in Madras in 1824, made his collections of fishes in Bengal, Sylhet and the Indian Peninsula. This information also supports our contention that *L. duvaucelii* was described from a specimen obtained in Bombay and not in Nepal.

We are in entire agreement with Day<sup>1</sup> that *Osteobrama cotio* and *O. rapax* (characterised by long anal fin and small scales) described by Günther in his *Catalogue* should be treated as synonyms of *R. vigorsii*.

In the collection of the Indian Museum, *R. vigorsii* is represented by a large number of specimens from Deolali, Poona, Deccan and the Kistna River. A damaged specimen from Orissa (Cat. No. 889) and two other specimens from Kistna river (Cat. No. 888) identified by Day as *R. cotio*, are also referred to this species.

In the collection of the Indian Museum *R. vigorsii* is represented from the following localities :—

Deccan ..	..	Purchased from Dr. F. Day	1 specimen.
Darna R., Deolali	..	Mr. A. G. L. Fraser	.. 1 specimen.
Mutha-Mula R., Poona	..	Mr. A. G. L. Fraser	Several specimens.
Mutha-Mula R., Poona		Mr. C. V. Kulkarni	.. 3 specimens.
Kistna River ..	..	Purchased from Dr. F. Day	2 specimens.
Orissa ..	..	Purchased from Dr. F. Day	1 specimen.

We give below a table of measurements, number of anal rays and scale counts of the specimens of *R. vigorsii* from different localities as noted above :—

*Measurements in millimetres, number of anal rays and scale counts.*

	Deccan.	Deolali.	Poona.						Kistna River.		Orissa.
Standard length	.. 115.0	133.0	46.0	115.0	120.0	131.0	150.0	66.0	106.0	74.0	
Length of head	.. 30.5	37.0	12.5	30.5	32.0	35.0	45.0	10.0	26.5	20.0	
Depth of body	.. 40.5	46.0	18.0	41.5	41.0	47.1	58.0	25.0	37.0	20.3	
Width of body	.. 10.5	15.3	4.3	13.2	12.0	15.0	18.0	7.0	10.0	7.1	
Diameter of eye	.. 10.0	10.3	4.3	9.2	11.0	10.2	12.0	6.5	8.0	7.1	
Length of snout	.. 9.0	8.8	3.5	8.6	9.0	9.0	13.0	5.5	7.5	6.0	
Interorbital width	.. 6.5	7.0	2.8	5.7	5.0	6.5	7.5	4.0	5.5	4.2	
Length of dorsal spine.	.. D.	35.0	12.5	30.5	D.	D.	D.	D.	D.	D.	
No. of scales along L. 1.	.. 85	73	D.	83	79	81	78	78	74	74	
No. of scales between L. 1. and V.	.. 11½	11	D.	11½	11	11	11	11½	11½	11	
No. of predorsal scales.	.. 87	84	D.	85	84	84	84	84	83	84	
No. of rays in anal fin.	.. 3/27	3/21	3/22	3/22	3/24	3/24	3/23	3/23	3/27	3/25	

**Rohtee dayi**, sp. nov.

1877. *Rohtee Belangeri* Day (in part), *Fish. India*, p. 587.

1889. *Rohtee belangeri*, Day (in part), *Faun. Brit. Ind. Fish. I*, p. 342.

D. 4/8 ; A. 19-21 (3/16-18) ; P. 16-17 ; V. 9 ; L. 1. 68-70.

In *Rohtee dayi* the body is much compressed and both the dorsal and the ventral profiles are greatly arched ; the form is that of a trapezoid. The rise in the dorsal profile is more sharp posterior to the head, which is short and bluntly pointed anteriorly. The length of the head is contained from 4.1 to 4.3 times in the standard length. The greatest width of the head is contained about 1.7 times and its height at occiput from 1.1 to 1.2 times in its length. The eyes are large and lateral in position ; the diameter of the eye is contained from 2.6 to 2.9 times in the length of the head, from 0.6 to 0.8 times in the length of the snout and from 0.7 to 1.2 times in the interorbital width. The eyes are proportionately larger in younger specimens. The mouth is small and somewhat directed upwards and forwards ; its gape does not extend to the anterior border of the eye. There are two minute maxillary barbels, which are liable to be overlooked if not properly searched.

The greatest depth of the body is below the commencement of the dorsal fin and is contained from 2.1 to 2.3 times in standard length. The caudal peduncle is almost as high as long. The body is covered with small, closely set scales ; there are 68-70 scales along the lateral line,  $13\frac{1}{2}$  to  $14\frac{1}{2}$  rows between the lateral line and the base of the pelvic fin and 28-30 scales in front of the dorsal fin.

The commencement of the dorsal fin is almost equidistant between the base of the caudal fin and the tip of the snout or is somewhat nearer to the former than to the latter ; its last denticulated spine is moderately strong and about  $1\frac{1}{2}$  times as long as head. Towards the end the spine is devoid of serrations, is flexible and filamentous. The pectoral fins are placed low, pointed above, and slightly shorter than the head ; they almost reach the base of the pelvic fins. The pelvic fins are similar to the pectorals, but do not extend to the base of the anal fin. The anal fin is considerably higher anteriorly and is moderately long. The caudal fin is deeply forked.

The colour is bleached in all the three examples, but there is a marked indication of a black band behind the gill-cover.

*Type-specimen*.—Cat. No. 902, Zoological Survey of India, Indian Museum, Calcutta.

*Distribution*.—Godavari river ; ? Deccan.

*Remarks*.—*Rohtee dayi* is proposed for two specimens from the Godavari river and one other specimen, presumably from the Deccan, identified by Day as *R. belangeri* and *R. ogilbii* respectively. In these examples the ventral surface in front of the pelvic fins is rounded, and the dorsal spine is moderately strong. Moreover, they possess two rudimentary maxillary barbels. In the small size of its scales and the length of the anal fin, *R. dayi* shows a superficial resemblance to *R. belangeri*, but the two species can readily be distinguished by the nature of their ventral edge.



*Measurements in millimetres, number of anal rays and scale counts.*

			Godavari.		Locality ?
Standard length	..	..	92.5	112.0	127.5
Length of head	..	..	22.5	26.0	29.5
Width of head	..	..	13.3	15.5	18.0
Height of head	..	..	19.0	22.5	25.0
Height of body	..	..	43.0	48.0	57.0
Width of body	..	..	11.0	13.0	16.0
Diameter of eye	..	..	8.5	10.0	10.0
Length of snout	..	..	5.5	7.0	8.0
Interorbital width	..	..	6.0	10.0	12.0
Length of dorsal fin	..	..	31.5	36.5	43.5
Length of pectoral fin	..	..	22.0	24.0	26.5
Length of pelvic fin	..	..	19.0	23.0	23.5
No. of scales along lateral line	..	..	68	68	70
No. of scales between lateral line and v.	..	..	14	14½	13½
No. of predorsal scales	..	..	28	30	29
No. of rays in anal fin	..	..	⅓	⅓	⅓

### **Rohtee belangeri** Cuvier & Valenciennes.

1844. *Leuciscus Belangeri*, Cuvier & Valenciennes, *His. Nat. Poiss.* XXII, p. 99.
1858. *Systemus microlepis*, Blyth, *Journ. As. Soc. Bengal* XXVII, p. 289.
1860. *Osteobrama microlepis*, Blyth, *Journ. As. Soc. Bengal* XXIX, p. 158.
1863. *Smiliogaster Belangeri*, Bleeker, *Atl. Ichth. Cyprinidae* III, p. 33.
1868. *Osteobrama microlepis*, Günther, *Cat. Fish. Brit. Mus.* VII, p. 325.
1868. *Smiliogaster belangeri*, Günther, *Cat. Fish. Brit. Mus.* VII, p. 328.
1871. *Rohtee microlepis*, Day, *Journ. As. Soc. Bengal* XL, p. 139.
1877. *Rohtee Belangeri*, Day (in part), *Fish. India*, p. 587, pl. cxlvii, fig. 4.
1878. *Osteobrama microlepis*, Anderson, *Zool. Res. Yunnan Exped.* I, p. 869.
1889. *Rohtee belangeri*, Day (in part), *Faun. Brit. Ind. Fish.* I, p. 342.
1890. *Osteobrama Belangeri*, Vinciguerra, *Ann. Mus. Civ. Stor. Nat. Genova* (2) IX, p. 318.
1921. *Rohtee belangeri*, Hora, *Rec. Ind. Mus.* XXII, p. 188, fig. 2a.
1929. *Rohtee belangeri*, Prashad & Mukerji, *Rec. Ind. Mus.* XXXI, p. 204.

*Rohtee belangeri* can be readily distinguished from all the other species of the genus by the fact that the whole of its abdominal edge is trenchant and sharp, whereas in other species it is sharp only between the bases of the pelvic and anal fins. On this character alone it was placed by Bleeker<sup>1</sup> in a separate genus *Smiliogaster*, which is now regarded as a synonym of *Rohtee*. The relationships of these forms could be better expressed by treating *Smiliogaster* as a subgenus of *Rohtee*.

Cuvier and Valenciennes described this species from the fresh waters of Bengal, but we think there must have been some inaccuracy about the locality label. This fish has not since been found in Bengal waters<sup>2</sup>, but is very common in Burma and the adjacent territories<sup>3</sup>. Day recorded it from the Godavari, and we have examined two specimens from Godavari (Cat. No. 902) referred by him to this species. In these

<sup>1</sup> Bleeker, P., *Nat. Tijdschr. Neder.-Indie* XX, p. 428 (1859).

<sup>2</sup> Day in his *Fishes of India* (p. 588) refers to 'Bengal specimens' of *R. belangeri*, though in the habitat of the species no mention is made of Bengal. Presumably Day refers to the type-specimens which he may have examined in the Paris Museum.

<sup>3</sup> It may be noted that Hora's specimens from the Manipur Valley in Assam were collected from the Chindwin Drainage System which forms part of the Irrawaddy System.

examples the ventral surface in front of the pelvic fins is rounded and they possess two rudimentary maxillary barbels. Another specimen (No. 2698), determined by Day as *R. ogilbii*, is similar to the above-mentioned Godavari examples, but unfortunately it bears no locality label though from the specific name given to it by Day it can be inferred that the example may have been collected in South India. These specimens possess fewer scales along the lateral line (68-70 *versus* 70-78) and also between the lateral line and the base of the pelvic fins ( $13\frac{1}{2}$ - $14\frac{1}{2}$  *versus*  $15\frac{1}{2}$ - $18\frac{1}{2}$ ). The number of predorsal scales is also less (30 *versus* 31-34). In view of the above noted differences we regard the Godavari examples as representing a distinct species which we have described above as new, *R. dayi*, sp. nov.

In 1871, Day doubted the specific validity of Cuvier and Valenciennes' *Leuciscus belangeri* and recognised *Systemus microlepis* Blyth as a valid species. Though he gave the habitat of the species as "The Godavery river, and throughout Burma," he seems to have described it from the examples collected in Burma; this is clear from the fact that the anal fin formula is given as  $\frac{3}{18}$  and the scales along the lateral line as 71-73. In the description of *R. belangeri* in the *Fishes of India* he included the characters of the Godavari specimens (A. 3/17-18; L. 1. 68-73; 14 rows of scales between L. 1. and base of pelvic fins, etc.), which we have now referred to a new species.

In giving the distribution of *Osteobrama belangeri*, Vinciguerra states that "La specie si trova nel Bengala e in Birmania, Anderson la raccolse nel fiume Godavery" Anderson collected two specimens of this species, which are now preserved in the collection of the Indian Museum, in Yunnan and not from the Godavari river as stated by Vinciguerra.

In the collection of the Indian Museum *R. belangeri* is represented from the following localities<sup>1</sup>:—

Indo-China		?	..	2 specimens.
Tagoung, Yunnan	..	Dr. J. Anderson		2 specimens.
Burma	..	?	..	3 specimens.
Indawgyi Lake, Myitkyina District.		Dr. B.N. Chopra		1 specimen.
Mandalay		Purchased from Dr. F. Day.		5 specimens.
Mandalay Market		Dr. N. Annandale		2 specimens.
Prome		Purchased from Dr. F. Day.		3 specimens.
Pegu	..	Purchased from Dr. F. Day.		1 specimen.
Rangoon	.	..	Genova Mus. (Fea Coll.)	1 specimen.
Rangoon	.	..	Mr. V. Ball	.. 1 specimen.
Rangoon	.	..	Prof. F. J. Meggitt	1 specimen.
?	..	..	Purchased from Dr. F. Day.	1 specimen.

We give below a table of measurements, number of anal rays and scale counts of the specimens of *R. belangeri* from different localities.

<sup>1</sup> Hora (*Rec. Ind. Mus.* XXII, p. 189, 1921) obtained two specimens of this species from the Manipur Valley (Loktak Lake and Khurda stream), but we could not find them in the collection now.

*Measurements in millimetres, number of anal rays and scale counts of Rohtee belangeri Cuvier & Valenciennes.*

		Indo-China.		Tagoung, Yunnan.		Myitkyina District.	Mandalay.		Prome.	Pegu.	Rangoon.	
Standard length	.. ..	110.0	127.0	175.0	192.5	231.5	189.0	220.0	82.5	107.5	60.0	136.3
Length of head	.. ..	27.0	29.3	40.0	45.3	62.0	44.5	50.0	23.0	27.0	18.5	32.5
Depth of body	.. ..	56.5	60.0	77.0	82.0	106.0	68.0	83.0	37.0	50.0	35.5	59.0
Width of body	.. ..	16.5	16.5	25.5	27.5	40.0	22.3	30.0	10.0	13.0	10.0	18.0
Diameter of eye	.. ..	9.6	10.0	12.5	13.7	18.0	13.0	16.0	8.0	9.8	9.0	10.5
Length of snout	.. ..	7.0	7.5	10.0	11.5	18.0	10.3	13.5	5.5	8.0	6.0	8.0
Interorbital width	.. ..	11.0	12.5	18.0	19.0	27.5	16.0	20.0	8.0	10.0	7.5	12.5
No. of scales along L. 1.	.. ..	76	75	78	78	78	78	73	73	77	70	77
No. of scales between L. 1. and V.		18½	17	16½	16½	16½	16½	16½	16½	16½	15½	16½
No. of predorsal scales	.. ..	33	33	34	33	33	34	32	33	32	31	34
No. of rays in anal fin	.. ..	3/18	3/17	3/18	3/17	3/19	3/18	3/18	3/17	3/17	3/17	3/17

1940.]

S. L. HORA & K. S. MISRA: *Notes on Fishes.*

165

**Rohtee cotio** (Hamilton).

1822. *Cyprinus (Cabdio) cotio*, Hamilton, *Fish. Ganges*, pp. 339, 393, pl. xxxix, fig. 93.

According to Hamilton, *Rohtee cotio* is common in the ponds and ditches of Bengal, grows to about four inches in length and is full of bones. From the literature we find that a very wide interpretation has been given to this species and in the collection of the Indian Museum there are specimens belonging to *R. feae*, *R. vigorsii*, etc., which had been assigned by earlier workers to *R. cotio*. To a certain extent the cause of this confusion can be traced to *Leuciscus duvaucelii* Cuv. & Val., the precise specific limits of which have been elucidated above (*vide supra*, p. 160); its type was obtained from Bombay, but in the description it was wrongly stated to have come from Nepal. In view of the confusion of *L. duvaucelii* with *R. cotio* widely divergent forms, with and without barbels, with comparatively small and very small scales, etc., came to be included in the latter species.

Though in its diagnostic features, *R. cotio* is a very variable species, its most salient features are a very long anal fin, small scales, absence of barbels and a rounded abdominal edge in front of the pelvic fins. The scales are somewhat deciduous and irregularly arranged. The number of scales along the lateral line varies from 57 to 70, and that of the scales between the lateral line and the base of the pelvic fins from  $10\frac{1}{2}$  to 13. The number of branched rays in the anal fin varies from 28 to 33. For variation in proportions, etc., reference may be made to the table of measurements, scale counts and number of fin rays given below.

We have examined a very large number of specimens of *R. cotio* in the collection of the Indian Museum, and find that it is distributed in Assam (Brahmaputra Drainage), Bengal, Bihar, Central Provinces and the Punjab. The following list gives the localities of the specimens examined by us and definitely assigned to *R. cotio (sensu stricto)* :—

Sibsagar, Assam	Mr. S. E. Peal	2 specimens.
Tangrai, D. S. Ry., Assam	Mr. B. H. Singh	28 specimens.
Mangaldai, Assam	Dr. S. L. Hora	1 specimen.
Tezpur, Assam	Drs. B. Prashad and S. L. Hora.	4 specimens.
Cachar, Assam	Purchased	8 specimens.
Siliguri, Bengal	Messrs. G. E. Shaw and E. O. Shebbeare.	1 specimen.
Maltipur, Bengal	Dr. S. L. Hora	2 specimens.
Pulta Waterworks, Calcutta.	Pulta Survey	5 specimens.
Calcutta ..	Purchased from Dr. F. Day.	1 specimen.
Saraghat, Bihar	Mr. R. A. Hodgart	3 specimens.
Champaran, Bihar	.. Messrs. McKenzie and Walker.	1 specimen.
Purneah, Bihar	.. Museum Collector	2 specimens.
Bhagalpur, Bihar	.. Mr. D. D. Mukerji	1 specimen.

Santal Parganas, Bihar	Dr. H. A. Hafiz	..	1 specimen.
Deoli, C. P.	.. Col. Biddulph		1 specimen.
Jubbulpore, C. P.	.. Purchased from Dr. F. Day.		1 specimen.
Orissa	.. .. Purchased from Dr. F. Day.		2 specimens.
?	.. .. Purchased from Dr. F. Day.		1 specimen.
Lahore, Punjab	.. Purchased from Dr. F. Day.		1 specimen.
Amritsar, Punjab	.. Mr. G. C. L. Howell	..	1 specimen.
Ludhiana, Punjab	Acad. Nat. Sci. Philadelphia.		1 specimen.
Sursutta R., Punjab	.. Acad. Nat. Sci. Philadelphia.		6 specimens.

We give below a table of measurements, number of anal rays and scale counts of specimens of *Rohtee cotio* (Ham.) from different localities.

*Measurements in millimetres, number of anal rays and scale counts of Rohtee cotio (Hamilton).*

			Calcutta.	Pulta.		Sibsagar.	Tengrai.	Bhagalpur.
Standard length	..	..	55.0	45.0	35.0	71.0	52.5	75.0
Length of head	..	..	12.5	10.3	8.2	17.0	15.0	18.5
Depth of body	..	..	21.5	17.0	18.0	34.3	22.5	35.0
Width of body	..	..	5.0	5.0	4.0	7.2	5.5	8.0
Diameter of eye	.	..	5.5	4.5	3.5	7.5	5.5	8.0
Length of snout	..	..	3.0	3.0	2.1	5.0	4.5	4.0
Interorbital width	..	..	4.0	3.8	2.8	5.0	3.6	5.0
Length of dorsal spine	..	..	D.	D <sub>4</sub>	9.4	D.	15.0	D.
No. of scales along L. 1		..	59	58	60	62	70	62
No. of scales between L. 1. and V.			11	10½	11½	13	13	11½
No. of predorsal scales		..	24	24	24	27	27	20
No. of rays in anal fin		..	3/32	3/31	3/33	3/32	3/30	3/31

Measurements in millimetres, number of anal rays and scale counts of  
Rohtee cotio (Hamilton)—contd.

	Purneah.		Santal Parganas.	Orissa.	Jubbul- pore.	Amritsar.	Sursutta River.
Standard length ..	81.5	78.0	40.5	61.0	59.0	70.0	43.0
Length of head ...	19.0	19.0	10.0	14.5	15.0	18.0	12.0
Depth of body ..	36.0	35.0	15.5	23.5	25.5	30.5	18.3
Width of body ..	9.0	9.5	4.5	6.0	6.0	8.0	4.5
Diameter of eye ..	8.0	8.0	4.5	6.3	6.5	7.0	4.5
Length of snout ..	4.3	5.0	2.8	4.0	4.0	5.0	3.0
Interorbital width ..	4.3	4.5	3.0	4.0	4.0	5.4	3.0
Length of dorsal spine ..	D.	21.5	D.	15.0	D.	18.5	D.
No. of scales along L. 1.	62	62	58	65	70	61	62
No. of scales between L. 1. and V.	11	11½	10½	11½	12½	11½	11
No. of predorsal scales ..	28	D.	24	29	28	27	25
No. of rays in anal fin ..	3/32	3/30	3/28	3/31	3/31	3/28	3/38

**Rohtee cotio var. cunma Day.**

Plate IV, figs. 1—9.

1860. *Osteobrama cotio*, Blyth (*nec* Hamilton), *Journ. As. Soc. Bengal* XXIX, p. 158.
1877. *Rohtee cotio* var. *Alfrediana*, Day (*nec* Cuvier & Valenciennes), *Fish. India*, p. 587, pl. cxlvii, fig. 2.
1888. *Rohtee cunma*, Day, *Fish. India Suppl.*, p. 807.
1889. *Rohtee cunma*, Day, *Faun. Brit. Ind. Fish.* I, p. 343.
1889. *Rohtee cotio* var. *alfrediana*, Day (*nec* Cuvier & Valenciennes), *Faun. Brit. Ind. Fish.* I, p. 341, fig. 109.
1889. *Rohtee cunma*, Day *Faun. Brit. Ind. Fish.* I, p. 343.
1890. *Osteobrama cotio*, Vinciguerra (*nec* Hamilton), *Ann. Mus. Civ. Stor. Nat. Genova* (2) IX, p. 186.
1921. *Rohtee alfrediana*, Hora (*nec* Cuvier & Valenciennes), *Rec. Ind. Mus.* XXII, p. 188.
1924. *Rohtee roeboides*, Myers, *Amer. Mus. Novitates*, No. 150, p. 3 (1924).
1929. *Rohtee alfrediana*, Prashad & Mukerji (*nec* Cuvier & Valenciennes), *Rec. Ind. Mus.* XXXI, p. 203.
1934. *Rohtee duvaucelii*, Mukerji (*nec* Cuvier & Valenciennes), *Journ. Bombay Nat. Hist. Soc.* XXXVII, p. 71.

As indicated in the introduction, Day's wrong description of the nature of the dorsal spine in *Rohtee cunma* was mainly responsible for

our lack of knowledge regarding the precise systematic position of this variety in spite of the fact that Col. Tickell had found it to be common at Moulmein. From the number of specimens which can now be assigned to this form, it seems that it is the commonest form of *Rohtee* in Burma and Peninsular India. It differs from *Rohtee cotio* in having somewhat larger and more regularly arranged scales (L. l. 42-58 *versus* 57-70; predorsal 18-24 *versus* 24-28; between lateral line and pelvics  $7\frac{1}{2}$ - $9\frac{1}{2}$  *versus*  $10\frac{1}{2}$ -13) and fewer rays in the anal fin (28-34 *versus* 31-36). In all other respects, except that the variety *cunma* probably grows to a somewhat larger size, the two forms are very similar, and there seems no doubt that they must have become differentiated not very long ago. Even now there is no hard and fast dividing line between the two forms, but it is significant that while *cotio* is found only in northern India, *cunma* is found in Burma and Peninsular India. The distribution of the two forms indicates that *cunma* is probably a more generalised type.

In the collection of the Indian Museum the variety *cunma* is represented from the following localities :—

Tavoy, Lower Burma	..	Mr. D. E. B. Manning	6 specimens.
Irrawaddy, Burma	..	Purchased from Dr. F. Day.	2 specimens.
Rangoon, Burma	..	Purchased from Dr. F. Day.	2 specimens.
Mandalay, Burma	..	Purchased from Dr. F. Day.	1 specimen.
Bhamo, Burma	..	Mr. Coggin Brown	.. 8 specimens.
Indawgyi Lake, Burma	..	Dr. B. N. Chopra	.. 9 specimens.
Mali Hka R., Myitkyina District, Burma.	..	Lt.-Col. R. W. Burton	.. 1 specimen.
Kaung Hein, Chindwin Drainage.	..	Amer. Mus. Nat. Hist.	.. 1 specimen.
Manipur Valley, Chindwin Drainage.	..	Dr. S. L. Hora	.. 7 specimens.
Deccan	..	Purchased from Dr. F. Day.	1 specimen.
Darna R., Deolali, Bombay Presidency.	..	Mr. A. G. L. Fraser	.. 3 specimens.
Poona, Bombay Presidency	..	Mr. A. G. L. Fraser	.. 73 specimens.
Sabari R., tributary of Godavari R.	..	Mr. M. N. Datta	.. 2 specimens.
Orissa	..	Purchased from Dr. F. Day.	1 specimen.
Sind	..	Purchased from Dr. F. Day.	1 specimen.

We give below two tables of measurements, number of anal rays and scale counts of specimens of *R. cotio* var. *cunma* from Burma and Peninsular India respectively.

*Measurements in millimetres, number of anal rays and scale counts of specimens of Rohtee cotio var. cunma Day from Burma.*

			Tavoy.					Irrawady.	Rangoon.	Mandalay.	Bhamo.	Indawgyi L.	Mali Hka R.	Kaung Hein.	Manipur.
Standard length	..	..	116.5	90.0	89.0	79.0	68.0	82.0	87.0	115.5	70.0	105.5	101.5	64.0	45.0
Length of head	..	..	27.0	22.5	22.0	18.5	17.5	20.0	20.5	27.0	19.0	28.3	27.8	16.0	12.0
Depth of body	..	..	57.0	40.5	40.7	35.5	29.5	35.0	37.0	51.0	29.0	43.0	43.0	24.5	15.0
Width of body	..	..	15.0	11.0	10.7	9.0	7.0	8.7	9.0	13.0	8.0	12.7	11.5	7.0	5.3
Diameter of eye	..	..	10.0	8.5	8.5	7.5	7.0	8.1	8.1	10.0	7.0	10.1	9.9	7.0	5.0
Length of snout	..	..	8.5	7.0	7.0	5.0	4.9	5.5	5.8	8.0	5.0	9.0	7.0	5.0	3.0
Interorbital width	..		7.0	6.0	6.0	5.0	4.3	5.5	5.5	7.0	4.0	7.0	6.5	5.0	3.0
Length of dorsal spine	..		D.	28.5	29.0	25.5	22.5	D.	D.	33.0	D.	D.	30.0	D.	D.
No. of scales along L. 1.		..	46	44	45	42	42	48	45	53	45	48	49	44	48
No. of scales between L. 1. and V.			7½	7½	7½	7½	7½	8½	7½	8½	7½	8½	8½	7½	8½
No. of predorsal scales		..	20	19	19	19	18	20	19	20	19	19	20	19	20
No. of rays in anal fin		..	3/29	3/29	3/26	3/29	3/27	3/29	3/29	3/28	3/27	3/25	3/26	3/27	3/28



*Measurements in millimetres, number of anal rays and scale counts of specimens of Rohtee cunma Day from Peninsular India.*

	Deccan.	Deolali.	Poona.				Godavari R.	Orissa.
Standard length ..	70.0	35.0	80.0	72.0	71.0	68.0	48.0	55.0
Length of head ..	16.0	9.0	18.0	16.5	15.5	15.5	11.0	13.0
Depth of body ..	30.0	13.0	35.0	31.5	28.5	27.0	10.0	20.0
Width of body ..	6.5	4.0	11.5	8.5	7.5	9.0	5.5	4.0
Diameter of eye ..	6.5	4.3	7.1	6.5	6.5	6.5	5.0	5.0
Length of snout ..	4.0	2.5	5.5	4.7	4.5	4.5	3.0	3.0
Interorbital width ..	5.0	2.5	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.9	3.0	3.5
Length of dorsal spine ..	D.	D.	D.	D.	D.	20	14	D.
No. of scales along L. 1. ..	56	55	55	60	55	58	56	55
No. of scales between L. 1. and V.	7½	9½	9½	9½	8½	9½	9	9½
No. of predorsal scales ..	24	21	23	22	22	22	24	23
No. of rays in anal fin ..	3/29	3/29	3/30	3/28	3/28	3/28	3/31	3/31

#### GENERAL REMARKS.

Recently one of us<sup>1</sup> discussed the systematics and geographical distribution of the fishes of the genus *Rohtee*, but unfortunately he was not then aware of the precise specific limits of *R. cunma*. It is now possible to say that *Rohtee*-like fishes without a serrated dorsal spine included in the genus *Parabramis* Bleeker are restricted to the Amur System, North China, Kiao-Ho, Yangtse-Kiang and Hainan, while *Rohtee* is found in Yunnan, Burma and India. Anderson<sup>2</sup> recorded two species of *Rohtee* (= *Osteobrama*) from Tagoung in Yunnan, viz., *R. cotio* (Ham.) and *R. microlepis* (Blyth) (= *R. belangeri*). We have examined Anderson's specimens and find that those assigned to *R. cotio* belong to *R. feae*. Thus the two species of *Rohtee* from Yunnan are the same as are to be commonly found in Burma.

In dealing collectively with the fishes of the genus *Rohtee*, it is of interest to note the great similarity between the forms found in Peninsular India on the one hand and in Burma on the other. Though there is only one species, *R. cotio* (*sensu stricto*), found throughout Northern India, in Peninsular India we have 5 species and in Burma 3 species. One form, *R. cotio* var. *cunma*, is common to both Peninsular India and Burma, and among the species found in both the regions we have forms with and without barbels. The geographical distribution of *Rohtee* thus affords a striking instance of the great similarity between the fauna of Southern India and Burma. In this connection attention may also be invited to the similar distribution<sup>3</sup> of *Mystacoleucus* Günther, an allied genus with a procumbent, predorsal spine.

<sup>1</sup> Hora, S. L., *Rec. Ind. Mus.* XXXIX, pp. 314, 315 (1937).

<sup>2</sup> Anderson, J., *Zool. Res. Yunnan Exped.* I, p. 869 (1878).

<sup>3</sup> Hora, S. L., *Rec. Ind. Mus.* XXXIX, p. 314 (1937); *ibid.* XLI, pp. 401-406 (1939).

## SUMMARY.

A revision of the fishes of the genus *Rohtee* Sykes, based on the material preserved in the collection of the Indian Museum, is given. A key to various species is given and notes are added to elucidate the taxonomy of each. One new species, *R. dayi*, is described from the Godavari River.

The specimens of the various species in the collection of the Indian Museum are listed, and tables of measurements and counts of anal fin rays and scales are given to indicate individual variations.

Geographical distribution of the genus is discussed and attention is directed to the great similarity between the species found in Burma and Yunnan on the one hand and in Peninsular India on the other. Reference is also made to the parallelism between the distribution of the genera *Rohtee* and *Mystacoleucus*.