

- p. 120 *Pycnonotus squamatus weberi*: we accepted the emended spelling believing that this is in prevailing usage and should be sustained. However, the Code's articles dealing with prevailing usage are too vague to be applied and the original spelling *webberi* is recommended.

- p. 122 Since we listed *Pycnonotus cafer wetmorei* as the accepted name it has become necessary to remark that Dickinson (2003: 569), after accepting *Andropadus* as distinct from *Pycnonotus*, listed a species *A. latirostris*. Thus the name *saturatus* in the synonymy thereof is now in a different genus from the name *Molpastes cafer saturatus* Whistler & Kinnear. However, under Art. 59.3 of The Code names replaced before 1961 are permanently invalid and so *saturatus* cannot be restored. Whistler & Kinnear's name dates from 1932 not 1933 – shown by Pittie (2003) to date from 15 July 1932.
- p. 123 Line 21. *Brachypus eutilotus*: date 1837 not 1836, see Sherborn, 1899, Ibis, pp. 483–484.
- p. 123 Footnote 30 is incorrect (see above).
- p. 125 *Pycnonotus luteolus insulae* Whistler & Kinnear dates from 1932 not 1933; see Pittie (2003) – mentioned above.
- p. 130 Footnote 56 is in error. Art. 11.6.1. of the present Code (ICZN, 1999) requires that the name *sericeus* Blyth, 1865, be brought into use as the Code requires that the name be dated from "its first publication as a synonym"; Blyth's type material is probably the same as that of Robinson & Kloss.
- p. 132 In mid page both *Iole mindorensis* Steere and *Iole* [sic] *schmackeri* are dated 1890 without qualification. Hartert (1895, Novit. Zool. 2: 487) conceded that Steere's name dated from July and his had probably not appeared until October.
- p. 133 *Criniger mystacalis* (listed as the original spelling) should have read *mysticalis*. Since we believe that the original spelling should be used the taxon should be known as *Thapsinillas affinis mysticalis*, as treated in HBW.
- p. 135 *Hypsipetes leucocephalus humii* (originally *Microscelis psaroides humii*) of Whistler & Kinnear dates from 1932 not 1933; see Pittie (2003) – mentioned above.
- p. 143 Comment 75. Within this delete from "If Sclater was correct ..." to "... yet. If so" and replace by: "Sclater (1892: 77) also listed two specimens from Barbe. However, Blyth (1852: 207) listed these as presented in 1846. As this form had been described from a single specimen in 1845 neither is likely to be the type, and". Thanks to Michael Walters for noting a problem with the earlier text.