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The 4 insular populations of the Hawaiian finch (Drepanidini) known in some quarters under the native name "Akepa," are now generally regarded as subspecies of Loxops coccinea (Gmelin) [Loxops coccimus if one regards "-ops" as masculine, following the unfortunate imposition of Art. 30a(ii) (ICZN, 1985)]. These 4 constitute Loxops in the strict sense, the type of the genus being the Fringilla coccinea of Gmelin (1788). Whether more than one species is included in this group of 4 is still the subject of investigation, but each discrete population (Hawaii, Maui, Oahu and Kauai) differs in plumage from the others and is recognisably distinct at least at the subspecific level.

The form from Oahu was first collected by Andrew Bloxam in 1825, who described it under the name Fringilla rufa (Bloxam 1827). Rothschild (1893), in the erroneous belief that all previously taken specimens of Loxops (sensu stricto) had come from Hawaii and were referable to L. coccinea, described a specimen in his own collection, the last to be taken on Oahu, as Loxops wolstenholmei. He later found (Rothschild 1895) that Bloxam's specimens, which I have also examined, agreed in plumage with the Oahu form. Therefore, he resurrected Bloxam's name rufa and placed wolstenholmei in synonymy. The name Loxops rufa, or Loxops coccinea rufa, has been in all but universal use for the Oahu bird ever since. I have examined microfilms of Bloxam's field notes and other records in the British Museum (Natural History) which indicate that all the specimens of birds he obtained in the Hawaiian islands, save for one of Chasiempis sandtichensis, came from Oahu, thus further confirming what Rothschild had established on the basis of plumage.

As it turns out, however, Rothschild's name must be employed after all, because Fringilla rufa Bloxam, 1827, is a junior homonym of Fringilla rufa Wilson, 1811, which, as established by Bonaparte (1824), is a synonym of Fringilla iliaca Merrem 1786, the Fox Sparrow of North America. Stejneger (1900) called attention to the preoccupation of Fringilla rufa Bloxam some 85 years ago, but his remarks have been entirely overlooked. Because Bloxam's name is clearly unavailable for the species in question, the Akepa of Oahu must
The former occurrence of African Green Pigeons on Anjouan and Grande Comore

The first formal record of green pigeons in the Comores was one collected on Moheli in 1958 by Griveaud and described by Benson (1960) as a new race, griveaudi, of Treron australis. At the same time Benson claimed that there was “no evidence of its occurrence on the other three islands”. There are in fact quite strong indications of past presence of the species at least on Anjouan and probably also Grande Comore.

Bewsher (in Newton 1877), a conscientious observer and collector, listed birds he saw on Anjouan but did not collect, including a “green and brown pigeon”. Gevrey (1970) included “pigeon vert” as “TC” (=tre’s commun) in his list of the Comorian fauna. His list is far from complete, but there is no sign that Gevrey had any significant information from Moheli, nor would he have described as very common a bird confined to the forests of only one island. Finally...
be known under the next available name: *Loxops wolstenholmei* Rothschild, 1893.
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Few authors have discussed the taxonomic status of the Yellow-breasted Wren-warbler (or Flyeater) *Gerygone sulphurea* in the Philippines. In his monograph of the genus *Gerygone*, Meise (1931) included the Philippine populations in a comprehensive species *G. fusca*. Mayr (1944) showed that subdivision of *fusca* into 4 species was a preferable treatment, with the Philippine populations considered to be conspecific with *G. sulphurea* (Type locality Solor, Lesser Sunda Islands). The oldest valid name available for a Philippine population is *G. simplex* Cabanis, 1872, from Luzon.

The name *Gerygone rhizophorae* was proposed by Mearns (1905), based on a series of 7 specimens from Mindanao. As pointed out by McGregor (1909: 448), Mearns inexplicably failed to compare his alleged new form with *simplex* from Luzon and other islands in the northern Philippines, but McGregor himself gave only a single character to differentiate *simplex* and *rhizophorae*,
namely the darker crown colour of rhizophorae, of which he saw only a single specimen. Meise (1931: 373), without having examined specimens but partly on the authority of a letter from J. H. Riley of the U.S. National Museum, believed rhizophorae to be unworthy of recognition. Furthermore, Meise stated that he could not separate Philippine simplex (and numerous other proposed subspecies) from sulphurea of the Lesser Sunda Islands on the basis of his material. He did not say how many Philippine specimens he had seen, but it could not have been very many, as he had examined only 25 skins of his comprehensive sulphurea, to which he assigned a range extending from the Malay Peninsula through the Greater and Lesser Sunda Islands to Borneo and the Philippines.

Mearn’s rhizophorae seems to have been largely ignored (and inferentially synonymized with simplex) subsequent to Meise’s paper. Peters (1939), although mentioning simplex and rhizophorae, followed Meise uncritically in calling all Philippine populations sulphurea. Finally, in 1959, Meyer de Schauensee & du Pont, contra Meise, listed characters that differentiate simplex from sulphurea. They also examined a single specimen from Lake Lanao, Mindanao, which they described as agreeing “with Sumatra birds [sulphurea] in having gray [as opposed to white] lores and with Luzon birds in the amount of white in the tail” and continued “It is quite possible that Mearn’s [sic] name rhizophora [sic] based on a Mindanao bird [actually 7 birds] is valid.” I have found no subsequent comment on the status of rhizophorae, and it was synonymized with simplex by du Pont (1971: 303).

By utilizing the collection resources of the Delaware Museum of Natural History (DMNH) and the American Museum of Natural History (AMNH), I have been able to study a larger and more geographically diverse series of Philippine Gerygone than was examined by previous writers. The material at the 2 museums will be considered separately because of an important difference in the age of the specimens. The DMNH collection consists entirely of recent specimens, less than 25 years old. In the AMNH series, on the other hand, there are only 5 “recently” collected specimens; 3 from Negros (1955), 1 from Mindoro (1966), and 1 from Saluag, southern Sulus (1971), obtained on exchange from DMNH.

At DMNH I compared 6 specimens from Luzon (type locality of simplex) with 3 from Marinduque, 2 from Mindoro, 10 from Cebu, 2 from Mindanao, and 18 from various islands of the Sulu Archipelago (see du Pont & Rabor 1973 for localities). The combined series from Luzon, Marinduque and Mindoro is slightly but perceptibly paler and browner (less dark olive) dorsally than the series from Mindanao and the Sulus. There is a tendency for the southern birds to have the crown darker than the back; this is not true of all of the specimens in this series, but none of the northern birds exhibits this contrast. This colour difference between the 2 series is certainly not a striking one, and if this were indeed the only character to separate 2 Philippine races (as indicated by McGregor), I could support the suppression of rhizophorae. However, the loral character suggested by Meyer de Schauensee & du Pont proves to be an excellent and consistent means of separating the northern (simplex) and southern (rhizophorae) Philippine populations of Gerygone sulphurea. All specimens of the northern sample have a conspicuous white area between the eye and the base of the bill. This mark is present in none of the southern sample. A few southern specimens have 3 or 4 small white or