Oriental Cuckoo in Finland

ANTERO LINDHOLM & ANDREAS LINDÉN

n Finland, the first birds to be identified as Oriental Cuckoo were at Lieksa (easternmost part of central Finland) and Karstula (west-central Finland), in June 1998 (Koukila 1998, Lappi 1998, Lindroos et al. 1999, Vasamies 1998). The next year both birds returned and a third individual was recorded in Joutsa (south-central Finland) (Lindroos et al. 2000). In 2000 and 2001 the old territory at Lieksa was still occupied, but in 2002 this was no longer the case. All of the birds were singing males. Little by little, it became evident that there was something strange in the songs. As early as the first contact with the Karstula bird, the original finder of the bird called attention to the fact that the call was tri-syllabic while the literature mostly described bi-syllabic songs (Koukila 1998). In the same year, at Lieksa, it was noted that the bird sometimes used a tri-syllabic song (Lappi 1998). In Lieksa, some observers noted that the second syllable was of slightly higher frequency and sometimes slightly shrill. From a distance, all the birds were very much what was expected of Oriental Cuckoo but close up, oddities became apparent.

Species, subspecies and distribution

According to Cramp (1985) the nominate Oriental Cuckoo *Cuculus saturatus saturatus* is a medium to short distance migrant, which breeds in Pakistan, Kashmir, the Himalayas and Southern China, two subspecies are tropical residents and the northern long-distance migrant is called *horsfieldi*. According to Robert Payne (*in litt.* and *in prep.*), and Higgins (1999) the valid name for *horsfieldi* is *optatus* (Gould 1845), as an older syn-

onym. Optatus also occurs in Europe, where the normal distribution area continues west into the northern boreal zone as far as the mouth of the river Vychegda, that is, approximately to the western border of the Komi Republic (Hagemeijer et al. 1997). From 11 to 16 June 2002, Annika Forsten, Antero Lindholm and Visa Rauste observed 22 singing Oriental Cuckoos (and 126 Eurasian Cuckoos Cuculus canorus) near the Komi capital, Syktyvkar. The species seemed to be more numerous in the east, near Ust-Kulom, but we even recorded them west of Syktyvkar. In the eastern parts of Komi, near the Ural Mountains, Oriental Cuckoo is more numerous (Aalto 2002. Hagemeijer et al. 1997, Vuolanto 1999), but even in Siberia, it continues to be generally less numerous than Eurasian Cuckoo (Rogacheva 1992), and only locally more common (Dement'ev et al 1966). On the Asian side, the distribution continues as a broad zone through the Siberian boreal forests to the Pacific shores, Sakhalin I, Kuril Is, Japan and China southwards to the region of the River Yangtze (Cramp 1985, Dement'ev et al 1966, Hagemeijer et al 1997). The relative distribution of optatus and saturatus in China is poorly known and the above information seems to be partly erroneous (pers. obs.) Payne (1997) splits Oriental Cuckoo into two species: Horsfield's Cuckoo Cuculus horsfieldi (=optatus) and Himalayan Cuckoo Cuculus saturatus. The most important argument for splitting optatus is the different courtship call.




Figure I Oriental Cuckoo Cuculus optatus song sequence. The soft phrase consists of ten syllables in this case. The basic rhythm phrases are bi-syllabic and follow each other after about one second (i.e. the period is one second). This sequence – recorded in Komi - has an irregularity between the third and fourth phrase in the basic rhythm. The basic rhythm can continue much longer than this.




Figure 2. Recording locations.

The voice of Oriental Cuckoo

In this study, the whole advertisement call or song (cf. fig 1) of Oriental Cuckoo is termed "sequence". Its components ("BU-BU") are "phrases" and the components of phrases (single "BU") are called "syllables". The "period" of the song is the time interval between subsequent beginnings of phrases. "Basic rhythm" is the part of the sequence consisting of similar, repeated phrases. In some song types there is a weaker initial syllable in the phrases that is termed the "weak note".

The song of optatus Oriental Cuckoo is essentially a repeated series of bi-syllabic. soft, "BU"s. For example, in 1994 Visa Rauste (in litt.) recorded the following at Mirnoye, in the middle reaches of the river Yenisei: "At the beginning there were (almost) without exception 6-8 syllables po-po-po-po-po followed by 10-20 invariably bi-syllabic po-posounds. The rhythm was very stable. There was almost no variation in several dozen individuals heard". Descriptions of Cramp (1985), Dement'ev et. al (1965) and Svensson et al (1999) are similar. Flint et.al. (1984) and Knystautas (1987) describe the song with three similar notes. We think that the description by Payne (1997) actually refers to saturatus.

Using the data collected for this study (Siberian and European groups, *cf.* later in this study and Table 2), the basic rhythm of *optatus* Oriental Cuckoo could be described

as invariably having bi-syllabic phrases. The period is on average one second, that is, the next phrase follows after one second, but there can be some irregularities. At the beginning of the sequence there is a softer and faster phrase with 4-10 syllables and sometimes these multi-syllabic phrases can occur irregularly in other parts of the sequence. This multi-syllabic part (termed "soft phrase") is almost always present but, if the pause after the preceding sequence is very short, the soft phrase can be absent. Sometimes the bird can utter several soft phrases one after another without phrases of the basic rhythm in between. The number of syllables in these sequential soft phrases may vary, but otherwise there is not much individual variation. Some birds have a harsher tone, and this same type of variation occurs in Eurasian Cuckoo. Syllables are of the same frequency, but Oriental Cuckoo tends to have the first syllable slightly higherpitched than the second. On average, the difference in pitch is less than two Hz, so minimal that it is difficult to detect this by ear. There is often no measurable difference, or the first note can also be slightly lower-pitched. Apart from this possible minimal difference in pitch, both syllables of the song of northern Oriental Cuckoo are very similar to each other. The amplitude of the second note is, on average, lower (in 16 cases out of 62, the first note in any given resolution was stronger than the second, except for one case, which

There seems to be no geographical variation in the song of Oriental Cuckoo from European Russia to Sakhalin Is and Kuril Is in the Pacific. In this analysis there are no samples from Japan or Korea, but we have heard some recordings from that area and they have been of the Siberian type. In China, there is another song type, attributable to nominate saturatus. (We are preparing a separate article on saturatus. Its song has three or four syllables and the first note is shorter, higher-pitched and weaker than the others.)

Eurasian Cuckoo has a bi-syllabic call. The first syllable shows a maximum energy at 620 – 710 Hz and the second at 470-550 Hz. That is, the first is clearly higher pitched than the second, and the whole call is higher pitched than that of Oriental Cuckoo. The first syllable may be slightly cracked (cf. fig 3 where the first part of the graph is high).

When assessing the records of Oriental Cuckoo in Finland, we have to take into account various abnormal song types of Eurasian Cuckoo. In Russian Karelia, in June 2003, Annika Forsten and Antero Lindholm heard 200 Eurasian Cuckoos of which five seemed abnormal. The commonest abnormality was cracking of the second note, almost as if the bird does not have enough power to utter the song completely. In addition, there was one bird with a very odd song, which was harsh and muted, sounding hoarse, and almost difficult to identify as a Eurasian Cuckoo. At this stage in our assessment, the bird that sang in Suomussalmi (central-northern





Figure 3. Eurasian Cuckoo Cuculus canorus song. 6.5.2002, Espoo, Finland. Two syllables which are different from each other. The first is higher-pitched and shriller. The Figures 3- 6 are drawn with Sound Ruler by Marcos Gridi Papp, spectrogram parameters, cf. sound measurement methods.



was reversed).

Figure 4. Very strange cuckoo song, probably Eurasian Cuckoo, June 2002, Suomussalmi, Finland. Recorded by Hannu Rönkkö. Here are two phrases, which are quite different from each other. The first note is quite Eurasian Cuckoo – like, but the second is broken, stammering, multi-syllabic.




Figure 5. Oriental Cuckoo Cuculus optatus phrase, June 2002, Komi, Russia. The syllables are clearly lower-pitched than in Eurasian Cuckoo and very similar to each other. The difference between syllables in timing is 0.2 seconds. Most of the energy lies at about 400 Hz. This structure is little affected by individual variation. The first syllable has a slight tendency to be higher and stronger than the second, but this is often not possible to hear.




Figure 6. Unidentified Cuckoo, 6 June 2001, Lieksa, Finland. The phrases are trisyllabic, the first is a weaker and slightly lower-pitched "weak note". The second is higher-pitched than the third; the difference is easy to hear. The second syllable glides slightly downward.

Finland) in 2002 and 2003, has to be considered a variant of Eurasian Cuckoo. Several observers thought this bird resembled Oriental Cuckoo (Fig 4).

The call of Hoopoe *Upupa epops* is quite similar to that of Oriental Cuckoo and this caveat should not be underestimated. Normally it is tri-syllabic, while the call of *optatus* is bi-syllabic. Sometimes Hoopoe has a bi-syllabic call (Cramp 1985). Hoopoe does not have anything like the soft phrase of Oriental Cuckoo in its song. The Hoopoe's call is higher-pitched and most of the energy is concentrated at 560-580 Hz area (in Oriental Cuckoo at 390-440 Hz). In the tri-syllabic phrases the initial syllable is somewhat different from the others and all syllables are slightly ascending, which makes them sound slightly inhaled.

Recordings

The recording locations of the samples are plotted on the map in fig 2.




Figure 7. Unidentified Cuckoo 7 June 2000, Lieksa, Finland. The same bird as in Fig. 6, but a year earlier. Very similar call. The weak note is weaker, but still easy to hear. Recorded by Jan-Erik Bruun.

The number of syllables in the basic rhythm phrases was counted, and the timing, frequency and amplitude differences of the syllables, and the frequency of the whole call were measured. The aim was to measure and count such properties of the recordings audible to the human ear. The spectrograms for measurements in the time axis were plotted using the CoolEdit 2000 - program. The time scale was chosen so that three phrases were visible in the spectrogram. These were chosen randomly from some point, where the bird had called its basic rhythm regularly. The resolution was chosen so that in every syllable there was a narrow band in the vertical direction that was darker than the other frequencies. For every syllable the centre of this area was marked on the x-axis and this point was chosen as describing the time of each syllable. The value was measured in hundredths of seconds. All three syllables were measured the same way and the av-

erage values were chosen as values for that individual. The frequency was measured using Sound Ruler software written by Marcos Gridi-Papp. A basic rhythm phrase was randomly chosen, the recording was sampled down to 22,050 Hz and the spectrogram was drawn using FFT size 8192. This resulted in good frequency resolution. Both notes were measured at three points: the onset of the strong part, the strongest point of the call and the end of the strong part - that means six measurements for every individual. At 400 Hz frequency, the human ear is at best, just capable of hearing a one Hz difference in pure sine wave. Using this method, the software was similarly capable of recording a one Hz difference. The difference in amplitude was measured using the second and fifth measurements.

Comparison material

The "Siberian" group includes all recordings from the Asian part of Russia, and of these, forty were provided by Olga Veprintseva, three by Christoph Zöckler (from Indigirka, Yakutia, near the town of Belaja Gora), and one is from Mild (1987). In every sample, the basic rhythm phrases are bi-syllabic.

The songs of the "European" group, consisting of twelve different Oriental Cuckoos, are from the Komi Republic, near its capital Syktyvkar on 10-16 June 2002 (recorded by A. Lindholm) which is currently the westernmost-known part of the Oriental Cuckoo's range. In every case in this group the basic rhythm phrases are bi-syllabic. All statistics are very similar to those of the Siberian recordings.

Table I. Some measurements from the Finnish Oriental Cuckoo recordings.

Sample	Year	Period secs	Difference between notes Hz	Difference between notes secs	First main note Hz	Last note Hz
Lieksa, Hallikainen	1998	1.35	14	0.30	472	457
Lieksa, Rajasärkkä	2000	1.32	96	0.35	540	444
Lieksa, Bruun	2000	1.47	13	0.31		
Lieksa, Lindholm	2001	1.65	14	0.34	452	438
Karstula, Bruun	1998	1.53	13	0.39	450	437
Joutsa, Husa	1999	1.31	7	0.33	464	461
Joutsa, Heiskanen	1999	1.56	12	0.30	460	448

Finland

Cf. Table 1 for the measured values of the Finnish individuals.

The Lieksa bird

Four recordings were available for study. 1) A recording by Lauri Hallikainen 28 June 1998 (published in Hallikainen 1999). The recording lasts a minute during which the bird sings 34 phrases, of which ten are clearly tri-syllabic (the rest we cannot be sure about, even using graphical presentation). The first syllable in the tri-syllabic phrases is clearly different from the others, softer, lower and lower pitched. The saturatus weak note comes to mind, but the first syllable of the recording (and all the other Finnish recordings) is lower in frequency than the later syllables. This sample is recorded from a considerable distance (L.Hallikainen. pers.comm.), and it seems possible that the weak note is just not audible in most of the phrases. Otherwise, the rhythm is very regular and the phrases with the weak note are not different from the others. The last note is slightly lower pitched than the preceding one. The recording is not a natural sequence, but put together from several pieces (L.Hallikainen. pers. comm.). 2) A recording by Ari Rajasärkkä, from 24 May 2000. This is somewhat different from the other recordings. Like the others, a constantly tri-syllabic call: a short weak note, a longer and stronger middle syllable, and third note as long as the middle one, but lower pitched. The middle note is shriller and less uniform than in the other recordings (more Eurasian Cuckoo-like!). Of all recordings, this one shows the largest difference between averages of individual notes (the second and third, with the short weak note not taken into account), but the period and pause between syllables are quite typical for a recording of the claimed Finnish Oriental Cuckoos. Cf. Fig 9. 3) A recording by Jan-Erik Bruun, from 7 June 2000. Quite similar to the preceding recording, the same tri-syllabic rhythm, but the second note is not similarly "broken". Cf. fig 7. 4) A recording by Antero Lindholm from 6 June 2001. Mainly tri-syllabic phrases, a couple of bi-syllabic phrases at the beginning, but those are otherwise similar to the tri-syllabic ones. A couple of times




Figure 8. Unidentified Cuckoo. 28 May 1999 Joutsa, Finland. Similar to Lieksa bird. Recorded by Ilkka Heiskanen.





Figure 9. Unidentified Cuckoo, 27 May 2000, Lieksa, Finland. The middle syllable is different from the other Finnish recordings. Recorded by Ari Rajasärkkä.

the middle syllable is more broken than the third. Some hoarse barking caused by the excited state of the bird can be heard

(this recording is on the Web of. reference list, of. Fig 6). There are no soft phrases in any of these recordings.

Table 2. Properties of the song. Some confidence levels: The Russian samples are different from the Finnish ones, both sample C and D. (Mann-Whitney U-test). Periods: AI+BI CI, P=0.005. AI+BI DI, P<0.001. timing: A2+B2 C2, P=0.004. A2+B2 D2, P<0.001. Frequency difference: A3+B3 C3, P=0.004. A3+B3 D3, P<0.001. Frequency: A4+B4 C4, P=0.006. A4+B4 D4, P<0.001. A5+B5 C5, P=0.024. A5+B5 D5, P<0.001. The only difference, which is not clearly supported by data, is that in the second note frequency between the smaller Finnish sample and the Russian sample (but this is only because of the small size of the C – sample).

A) 011 1 (17)	Avg (Min – Max) Stdev.			
A) Siberia (n=45)				
1. Period length sec.	1.07 (0.79-1.86)			
2. Difference between notes sec.	0.22 (0.18-0.26)			
3. Difference between notes Hz	1.89 (-7 - 11) 3.95			
4. First main note Hz	402 (357-440) 18.94			
5. Last note Hz	400 (354-437) 11.59			
B) Komi (n=12)	(and the contract of the cont			
1. Period length sec.	1.09 (0.9-1.45)			
2. Difference between notes sec.	0.22 (0.20-0.25)			
3. Difference between notes Hz	1.44 (-10-10) 4.22			
4. First main note Hz	396 (380-419) 11.01			
5. Last note Hz	395 (377-417) 11.55			
C) Finland (n=3)				
1. Period length sec.	1.58 (1.53 – 1.65)			
2. Difference between notes sec.	0.34 (0.30-0.39)			
3. Difference between notes Hz	12.83 (12-13) 0.48			
4. First main note Hz	444 (422-460) 19.36			
5. Last note Hz	431 (409-448) 19.85			
D) Finland (n=7)				
1. Period length sec.	1.45 (1.31-1.65)			
2. Difference between notes sec.	0.33 (0.30-0.39)			
3. Difference between notes Hz	23.89 (4-96) 32.13			
4. First main note Hz	466 (422-540) 36.36			
5. Last note Hz	442 (409-461) 17.07			






Figure 10. Eurasian Cuckoo (blue) and Oriental Cuckoo (red) relative distributions according to the model (function), with all the variables and using the reduced model. Black dashed line indicates the position of the Lieksa individual.

The Karstula bird

A recording by Jan-Erik Bruun 4 July 1998. The tri-syllabic rhythm is present and the middle syllable is higher pitched than the last, that is, very similar to the Lieksa recordings. No soft phrases.

The Joutsa bird

Two recordings were available, one by Jukka Husa, 2 June 1999 and another by Ilkka Heiskanen, 28 May 1999. Both belong to this same tri-syllabic group and lack soft phrases.

Comparison of the recordings

Some statistics are calculated in Table 2. The initial weak notes are ignored. The group (n=3) from Finland is chosen so that there is one recording from every individual (the technically-best was chosen). Group (n=7) from Finland, every available recording was used. The period length correlates strongly with the typical number of syllables, it is therefore longer in the tri-syllabic Finnish group (and nominate saturatus). Naturally, the period length and distance between syllables are not independent as they are measured on the same axis. Both Finnish (n=3) and (n=7) groups are statistically significantly different from the Siberian and Komi groups in most single variables. In addition, we studied two spectrograms made from the recordings in Lieksa (from 1998 by Pentti Zetterberg and 2000 by Jorma Sorjonen). These two seemed to be quite similar to other recordings. Typical for the "Finnish song type" is a slow rhythm, greater frequency difference between notes and the tri-syllabic nature. The weak note is not audible in many of the recorded phrases and it was not at all evident in many field situations. Probably there was true variation, at least in Lieksa. In addition, the first main note is somewhat descending in pitch in the Finnish recordings, so it is not of exactly the same shape as the last note.

Discriminant analysis of song parameters 'Two sample discriminant analysis' is a multivariate statistical method, in which it is possible to maximise variation between samples in relation to variation within samples. This is done by weighting every variable by some coefficient, after which, the weighted variables are summed. The discriminant function includes a constant and coefficients for every variable and operates as a formula for recognition, when, for example, the aim is to classify new observations as belonging to first or the second group. Discriminant analysis also shows if the groups are different or not, and in what way they are different. The null hypothesis is that the mean values of the samples are the same. R2 is the coefficient of determination of the model (0-1), F is the

Table 3 Cuckoo measurements (by A.Lindholm). Wing measured using maximum chord method, bill using callipers. Bill length to nostril (to nostril hole, not to the wall around nostril) and bill height at the proximal edge of the nostril. Some confidence levels, wing length, t-test: 1a) 5a), P=0.510 (Northern European and Siberian canorus cannot be separated using this sample). 1a) 6a) P<0.001 (canorus is larger than optatus). Primary barring U-test: 1d) 5d) P=0.079 (European and Siberian canorus not separable). 1d) 6d) P<0.001 (optatus has less barring than canorus). 10d) 11d), P<0.001 (Oriental Cuckoo has less barring than Eurasian). 1d) 2d), P=0.15 (females have more bars than males).

	a) Wing	b) Bill height	c) Bill length	d) Primary bars
Eurasian Cuckoo from Finland, Sweden, Norway and British Isles (<i>canorus</i>), skins, male (HZM, NHM)	225.8 (202-240) n=39	76.2 (70-84) n=42	157.6 (140-180) n=37	45.6 (41-52) n=28
2. Eurasian Cuckoo from Finland, Sweden, Norway and British Isles (<i>canorus</i>), skins, grey female (HZM, NHM)	213 (190-226) n=11	74.2 (65-80) n=10	146.0 (131-160) n=8	49.4 (44-57) n=10
Eurasian Cuckoo from Siberia, Mongolia and Manchu- ria, male (NHM), primary bar measurements (d) include live birds	227.7 (216-240) n=9	77.8 (73-81) n=8	159.9 (150-170) n=8	47.5 (37-55) n=10
4. Oriental Cuckoo from Siberia, Japan, Manchuria, Indonesia and Australia, male (<i>optatus</i>), (NHM), primary bar measurements (d) include live birds	208.8 (202-216) n=10	80.6 (77-85) n=10	165.8 (151-180) n=10	35.5 (29-43) n=14
5. Oriental Cuckoos, migrants, Eastern China, male (optatus), live birds	204.5 (197-211) n=4	68.6 (66-72) n=4	156.5 (152-160) n=4	
 Oriental Cuckoos Siberia, Japan, Manchuria, Indonesia and Australia, female (optatus), (NHM), primary bar mea- surements (d) include live birds 	199.5 (194-212) n=6	73.2 (68-80) n=6	162 (142-180) n=5	37.3 (24-42) n=7
7. All Eurasian Cuckoos				47.61 (35-59) n=62
8. All Oriental Cuckoos				35.32 (24-43) n=38



Figure 11. Unidentified cuckoo, male, 6 June 2001 Lieksa, Finland. The foremost underwing-coverts are barred, but less distinct than the other barred coverts, and within the variation of Oriental Cuckoo. However, the median coverts are more narrowly barred than is usual in Oriental Cuckoo. The greater coverts are slightly barred and their ground-colour is quite pale. The primary-coverts are more barred than in typical Oriental Cuckoos. The wing-bar continues outwards to P7 and is quite Oriental Cuckoo - shaped. On the right wing, there are 38 bars on P4-P10 and 40 on the left wing, which is good for Oriental. On the underparts, there are 7-8 uniform bars (depending on angle and position). The bars are not typical for optatus but narrower and more irregular - similar to many Eurasian Cuckoos. The ratio between white and black bars on the flanks is 2.88-3.20 in different repetitions of measuring, that is, they are quite narrow for Oriental Cuckoo. The undertail-coverts show 3-4 narrow, incomplete dark bars, narrower than is typical for optatus, but within the variation. The buff tone to the vent and undertail-coverts is strong and continues to the belly and underwing-coverts. This is very like Oriental Cuckoo. © Osmo Huupponen & Antero Lindholm.

More photos of this birds can be found in Alula (Vasamies 1998) and on the Internet: www.birdlife.fi/rk/identification/oriental-cuckoo.html and www.jmp.fi/'pslty/kuvagalleria/idankaki.jpg

test variable (> 0) and p is the probability of the null hypothesis (0-1).

The method presupposes the variables are continuous and that the observations obey a multivariate normal distribution. In addition, it is presumed that the variances and correlations (the linear connections between the variables) between groups are similar. However, the discriminant analysis is a quite stable method and performs well even if all assumptions are not completely satisfied (Flury & Riedwyl 1988). Our material fulfills the assumptions reasonably well, and the method is suitable for our needs.

Five variables are used in the following analyses: period (T), time difference between the last note and the one preceding it (Δt), amplitude difference between these same notes (ΔA), mean frequency of the first main note (F1) and mean frequency of the second main note (F2). We performed

discriminant analysis between "Siberian" (n = 45) and "European" (n = 12) optatus-recordings. The groups did not differ at all $(R^2 = 0.062, F = 0.670, p = 0.648)$, which means that the geographical variation in optatus song is small or non-existent. Therefore, it was possible to combine these samples into one (n = 57).

Identification analysis is a special case of discriminant analysis where the size of the other sample is one. The null hypothesis is: the new observation is from the same group as the comparison sample. If the null hypothesis is rejected, the method will reveal to which group the observation actually belongs.

We did identification analysis for the Lieksa, Joutsa and Karstula birds using the means of variables measured from the recordings. According to the analysis, not one of the Finnish individuals is like *optatus*. The Lieksa bird has a higher-pitched first

note and longer time difference between notes (F = 13.482, p < 0.0001), the Joutsa bird has a higher-pitched call and longer time difference (F = 44.875, p < 0.0001), the Karstula bird has a slower rhythm, both because of longer period and the greater difference between notes (F = 14.920, p < 0.0001). We also tested the similarity of identification functions of these individuals, that is, if the birds differed in a similar manner from optatus. The coefficient of concordance between the identification functions - or multivariate rank correlation - was significant (W = 0,784, p = 0,038). That means that the Finnish birds differed from Oriental Cuckoo in a similar way.

Identification using visual characters

Identification of Oriental and Eurasian Cuckoos are dealt with in the following articles: Baker (1993), Beaman & Madge (1998), Blom (1989), Cramp (1985), Dement'ev et al (1966), Flint et al (1984), Kennerley & Leader (1991), King et al (1975), Lehman (2000), Parkes (1990) and Vasamies (1998). We shall review their identification characters, but will confine ourselves to optatus, adult males and grey-morph females — and only those characters we have found useful. These are applied to the Lieksa and Joutsa birds, of which there are available photographs.

The Lieksa bird was trapped for measurements, photographs and ringing in 6 June 2001. The purpose was to collect as complete documentation as possible in order to compare the bird with known Eurasian and Oriental Cuckoos. We studied 35 Eurasian Cuckoo skins (all adult grey-morph birds from Finland or nearby areas) and one skin of Oriental Cuckoo at the Helsinki Zoological Museum. At The Natural History Museum, Tring (NHM) we studied 60 Eurasian Cuckoo skins from the British Isles, Nordic Countries, Iberia, Central Asia, Siberia and Northern China, 50 Oriental Cuckoo skins from Siberia, Japan, China, Indonesia, Australia and Pakistan, dozens of published and unpublished photos, three trapped adult Eurasian Cuckoo males and five trapped Oriental Cuckoos from Happy Island, Hebei, China (these were identified from plumage and measurements, not from song, the birds were migrants). Regarding measuring methods, cf. Table 3. Grey scales were estimated by comparing to Kodak Gray Scale (scale 1-20). The colour of the hindneck is estimated from the upper hindneck where the brown tinge is not as evident (and influential) as on the lower hindneck, the rump colour from the true rump area, not from the uppertail-coverts, which are darker. All these grey scale comparisons were confined to males.

Geographical variation of Eurasian Cuckoo

The geographical variation of Eurasian Cuckoo must be taken into account when studying the identification of Oriental Cuckoo. This is a very short summary.

Northern European and northern Asian birds are large and belong to nominate *canorus*. Using the Kodak Gray Scale, the breast was estimated as 5-6, the hindneck as 9-10 and the rump 9-10 (n=6). Wing length 213-230 mm. avg. 221 mm. (adult males, n=52), 204-216 mm. avg. 210 mm. (adult female, n=35) (Baker 1993), *cf.* also table 3 for our own measurements. The birds from northern East Asia are intermediate between the nominate *canorus* and *subtelephonus*.

In Iberia and Northern Africa there is *bangsi*, which is similar but smaller and therefore more difficult to separate from Oriental Cuckoo (Vaurie 1965, Baker 1993). The adult male has wing length 203-221 mm., avg. 210 mm., n=14 (Baker 1993), *cf.* also Table 2. *Bangsi* is quite a subtle subspecies.

Even Central Asian *subtelephonus* is small (Cramp 1985, Vaurie 1965). It is pale, with the grey colour especially on the breast but also on the hindneck and rump, quite clearly paler than on European birds (breast Kodak 3-4, hindneck 8-9, rump 8-9, n=5). The breast barring is narrower (pale bars 2.39-5.18 times wider than the dark ones, av.3.61, std dev. 0.890, n=10) and the underwing-coverts are paler and more sparsely marked.

The most important identification characters

Size. Oriental Cuckoo is smaller, wing length 198-221 mm, average 210 mm (adult male), 191-209 mm., avg. 198



Figure 12. Unidentified cuckoo, male, 1999, Joutsa, Finland. The white under greater-covert – primary band is strong and contrasting, but shorter and narrower than it normally is in Oriental Cuckoo, and seems to continue uniformly on to P5 or possibly to P6. It is not possible to count exactly the number of primary bars from the published photos, but it seems that the undertail-coverts are less distinctly buff, but more clearly barred than in the Lieksa bird. The buff tone seems to continue to the underwing-coverts. © Jari Kostet. More photos of this individual can be seen in *Alula* 1999, vol. 5 (3) p.90.

mm(adult female) (Baker 1993), *of.* Table 3. The Lieksa bird had a wing of 222 mm. It should be stressed that one should be critical when comparing wing lengths measured by different people and when comparing skin biometrics to live birds. Anyway, the wing length makes it clear that *optatus* is a smaller bird than *canorus* and the Lieksa bird was largish among the *optatus*.

Barring of underparts. The colour, width and density of the barring on the breast and belly are important characters. On Oriental Cuckoo, the barring is blacker, more well defined, sparser, and the individual bars are broader. The bars are difficult to measure, because the width varies throughout the length of each bar, and one bar can become broader or narrower inside a short distance. Both species have bars that are broader and more clearcut on the flanks and become narrower and more irregular in the centre. Typically Oriental Cuckoo has 6-7 black bars crossing the whole belly. The barring of Eurasian Cuckoo is browner, not so clear-cut, and the individual bars thus more difficult to count, but there are 7-10 bars crossing the belly. The difference is at its clearest on the upper breast where even male Eurasian Cuckoos have narrower and more irregular barring. On Oriental Cuckoo the bars also become narrower on the upper breast, but not as much, and they remain quite easy to count. The Eurasian Cuckoos with few bars usually show very narrow bars (and such barring points strongly to Eurasian Cuckoo). This kind of pattern seems to be common only in eastern and southeastern populations, but can also occur in Northern Europe. Some individuals are difficult, or impossible to identify using only the underpart barring.

The width of underpart barring was measured from high-resolution digital photographs by making the image seem larger so that only an area with five black bars was visible on the screen. The area was chosen from the flanks where the barring was most clear-cut and regular. From a straight line running across bars, every border between black and white was measured, and, using these coordinates, the ratio between the width of the white and the black bars was measured. Optatus - Oriental Cuckoo had on average 1.74 (1.07-2.88, stddev. 0.448, n=25) and canorus 2.15 (1.15-3.58, stddev. 0.634, n=33). There is much overlap but it is important to remember that this is only a part of the story of the underpart barring. The colour and the number of



Figure 13. Eurasian Cuckoo, 2cy male, 27 June 2002 Lågskär, Lemland, Finland. The base colour on the underwing-coverts is greyish-white and the dense barring continues throughout the whole area, although it is narrower on the foremost coverts. The primary-coverts are similarly uniformly barred. The wing bar continues to P7 but is slightly narrower and ends more sharply than in typical Oriental Cuckoos. The innermost barring on the outermost primaries is narrow and ends sharply. The undertail-coverts and vent are slightly buffish and indistinctly barred. The longest undertail-coverts are clearly paler. The underpart barring is typical for a Finnish Cuckoo. Secondary 2-5 are still juvenile – and easy to recognise as such because of the brown incomplete bars (but they are not always this distinct) and even some post juvenile primaries show a brownish tinge. This is a very difficult individual to sex, some 2cy males can be this brownish on the breast – this individual was heard singing. © Petro Pynnönen.

bars and their regularity are also important characters. The width of the barring is used further in the discriminant analysis later in this study.

Cf. photo captions for underpart barring of the Lieksa and Joutsa birds (Photos 11 and 12).

The pattern of vent and undertailcoverts is quite variable. It is often similar to the flank pattern in Eurasian Cuckoo: quite sparse regular barring (although even more sparse than on the flanks), or irregular bar-like patterning, or even one or two more heavy bars. The lateral feathers are typically less patterned. Some birds have almost unpatterned undertail-coverts. Typical for Oriental Cuckoo, but very atypical for Eurasian is a pattern with about four broad black bars, almost as broad as the intervening pale area with almost unpatterned shorter undertail-coverts. But on many Orientals this area is patterned like that in many Eurasians, with sparse, more or less regular barring (or almost no barring).

Underparts ground-colour. Oriental Cuckoo has a deeper, more yellowish or ochre/buff-coloured ground colour on the vent, undertail-coverts and, to a

lesser extent, on the belly and underwingcoverts. The most common ground colour on the vent and underwing-coverts is white on Eurasian Cuckoo. However, quite often, Eurasian Cuckoos show yellowish ground-colour on the vent and undertail-coverts, this colour being not intense but sometimes quite contrasting. It becomes paler on the tips of the longest undertail-coverts on both species and on Eurasian it is quite pale if not totally lacking on the very tips. However, strong buff or ochrous colour on the vent, undertail-coverts, flanks and underwing-coverts points clearly to Oriental Cuckoo. On some Orientals it is not so evident, but we have not seen any that completely lack it. The ground-colour of the underwing-coverts is a more important character than Parkes (1990)

Grey parts colour. The grey on the breast of *optatus* is similar to nominate *canorus* of Eurasian Cuckoo (Kodak 4-6, n=5). On the hindneck (Kodak 11-13) and rump (Kodak 10-12) the grey colour is somewhat darker and especially more bluish *(canorus* has ashy-grey tinge). The clearest colour difference is on the scapu-

lars, tertials and mantle. On all Eurasian Cuckoos, but especially the most difficult European birds, these areas and even the lower hindneck are brownish, while Oriental Cuckoo has these areas more bluish-grey, and less brown. It is often difficult to interpret upperpart tones in differing light conditions, but if carefully checked, they can be used even in field identification. The difference is easiest to see on males.

Pattern of underwing. The underwing of Oriental Cuckoo is quite dark and in the middle there is a clear, contrasting pale panel, created by the bases of the innermost primaries and underwingcoverts. However, the length of the midwing panel overlaps considerably. The base of the outermost primary to which the white underwing-bar seemed to continue was P5 three times on Eurasian Cuckoo, P6 11 times, P7 11 times and P8 twice. Oriental Cuckoo had P6 six times and P7 six times (adult birds - skins and photographs). Oriental Cuckoo has, on average, larger white area on the bases of the inner primaries. The shape of this area is more square-shaped, while on Eurasian Cuckoo it is narrower and more tapering. Oriental Cuckoo has on average, larger and more square basal white patches and these patches continue to the shaft without much tapering. But, on many Eurasian Cuckoos, the basal patches on P9 and P10 are quite square-shaped and large, so this feature is far from a diagnostic character. Considerably more important is that the primaries of Oriental Cuckoo show on average fewer white bars than those of Eurasian Cuckoo. The total number of bars on P10-P4 on Oriental Cuckoo (males, females, optatus, saturatus) was 24 - 43, avg.35.32 (n=38), on Eurasian Cuckoo 37-59, avg.47.61 (n=62), cf. also Table 2. If the rule is: "amount of bars > 40 means Eurasian Cuckoo, otherwise Oriental Cuckoo", in this sample only three Orientals (with numbers 41, 42 and 43) and one Eurasian (with number 37) would be misidentified. If we confine this to optatus males and Northern European canorus males only, we will get comparable figures (cf. Table 3). The method of counting primary bars is explained later. Both species may have the outermost primaries uniformly blackish basally and greater under primary-coverts dark grey. The groundcolour of the greater underwing secondary-coverts is paler, almost white

on Oriental, while on Eurasian the groundcolour is darker grey, but again, there are difficult borderline cases. These feathers are variably barred in both species.

An unbarred leading edge of the underwing-coverts (the lesser coverts) is typical for Oriental Cuckoo. Typically optatus have blacker, sparser and broader bars than canorus but this barring ends completely, or almost completely, clearly before the forewing. The primary-coverts show only sparse markings. Eurasian Cuckoo typically shows uniform, dense barring on the whole covert area. The most difficult birds are those with the lesser covert area barred, but with clearly weaker bars there, than in the rest of the covert area. Subtelephonus and some East-Asian Eurasian Cuckoos have clearly paler and less patterned coverts and are more Oriental Cuckoo like in this respect. However, the barring is narrower, and, in any case, subtelephonus is not the most difficult variant of Eurasian Cuckoo to identify (paler than optatus, underpart barring narrower).

Cf. photographs of the Lieksa and Joutsa birds (photos 11 and 12)

Colour of outermost median upper primary-coverts. These feathers with white ground-colour are situated near the leading edge of the hand and the alula feather-group normally hides them. The pattern of this area is a practical although subtle character, cf. Fig.16. There is a lot of variation. Eurasian Cuckoo normally has regular, narrow bars or extensive irregular black patterns on a white background. It is quite normal for this patterning to discontinue before the outer part of this area and therefore there is often a white unbarred area visible in field conditions making it useless for field identification. Oriental Cuckoo either shows more confined barring, normally at most three strong, welldefined bars on the proximal part of this area, or a mostly white area. (Unfortunately, we have seen several Eurasian Cuckoo skins where this area was very whitish.) The Lieksa bird resembled Oriental Cuckoo in this respect.

Eye colour. Bengtsson (2002) suggests that eye colour can be an identification character but thinks that it can be dependent on the age of the bird. Our material for this character is far too small, but we believe that both of these remarks are true. In spring, 2cy Oriental Cuckoo can show quite darkish, only slightly yellowish, brown eyes. The eyes of 2cy Eur-



Figure 14. Oriental Cuckoo, 17 May 2002, Hebei, China. The underwing-coverts are buffish-tinged, the barring is sparse and prominent but totally lacking on the foremost coverts. The uniform wing bars end on P7/P6 but the innermost primary bars on P9 and P10 are still broad, square-shaped and still broad near the pen (typical for Oriental but possible for Eurasian). The flank barring is prominent, broad and sparse. The undertail-coverts and vent are distinctly buff. © Annika Forsten.

asian Cuckoo are normally yellow, slightly brown - or even greenish-toned. Adult male Eurasian Cuckoo typically shows orange-toned yellow, quite pale eyes. Many adult male Oriental Cuckoos have honey-toned brown eyes that are quite darkish. In addition, there is sexual dimorphism and females have darker eyes. The eyes of the Lieksa bird were brownish-yellow.

Advertising position. According to the literature (Cramp 1985, Vasamies 1998), Oriental Cuckoo sings in a humpbacked position, with the tail parallel to the wings or even lowered, head lowered and throat swollen. Eurasian Cuckoo keeps the head and tail upwards, and the tail fanned. According to our own observations, when advertising, Eurasian Cuckoo lowers its wings and most often holds its tail slightly fanned upwards, it evens wags it from side to side. However, it is easy to find a canorus, that will sing with its tail parallel to the wings, slightly fanned. The head wags a little in every phrase, sideways or upwards, and the bill will open. Often, Eurasian Cuckoo first sits on a branch of a tree, tail held upwards, but then little by little lowers it below the wings. Our experience of the advertising position of Oriental Cuckoo is very limited, but even so it is evident that the difference is much smaller than understood from the literature. The tail can be held upwards just as in Eurasian Cuckoo (*cf.* e.g. photo in Redman 1985) or parallel to the wings. The head will wag sideways. The bill is held slightly downwards and it opens at every note and the whole bird will flinch.

The Lieksa bird called with the tail positioned just as in Eurasian Cuckoo: upwards and fanned. The head was held upwards like *canorus*, but the bill pointed slightly downwards (and seemed to remain shut when the bird was singing). The bird lowered its head at both the main syllables, first only a little, then more. This behaviour can be seen in a published video (Kontiokorpi 2002). Other observers saw the bird singing tail downwards. To summarise, the advertising position of the Lieksa bird was not as exaggerated as is sometimes described for Oriental Cuckoo, but fitted what many *optatus* males use.

The structure of Oriental Cuckoo is lighter and the tail is shorter (Beaman & Madge 1998). The head is relatively larger and the body shorter. Structural differences are small and difficult to use, but, probably, with experience, at locations where both are known to occur, the identification of many individuals can be guessed correctly.

Discriminant analysis

The number of white bars on the primaries is counted on the underside of the



Figure 15. Eurasian Cuckoo, 11 June 2003, Aunus, Karelian Republic, Russia. The underwing details can be seen even in good field photos, but usually not in the field. This bird shows quite broad and square-shaped barring on the outermost primaries—Oriental Cuckoo like, but this bird still has more bars. © Annika Forsten.

wing by including every white bar, also the white base of the feather and the most distal pattern, if it clearly is a barshaped or largish white pattern. Pale brownish spots are not counted as bars if they are not clearly bar-shaped. The basal white area can also be difficult to interpret, if it is only partly broken by an irregular, dark bar. It should be counted as two if the dark bar clearly divides at least half of its width.

We used five variables in the discriminant analysis: maximum length of wing (WL), bill height at the distal edge of nostril (BH), bill length (BL), the amount of bars on primaries P10-P4 (PR), and the relative width of underpart barring (B). Only males were analysed. We made a discriminant analysis between Eurasian Cuckoo C. canorus canorus (n = 23) and northern Oriental Cuckoo C. (saturatus) optatus (n = 15). The groups were very significantly different (R2 = 0.846, F = 35.137, p < 0.001), especially because of wing and bill length, and primary barring. We constructed a discriminant function using all these variables. Its discriminant scores X_{ALL} are calculated this way: $X_{ALL} = 75.893$ – 0.397*WL - 0.007*BH + 0.280*BL -0.769*PR - 1.902*B

We could leave out bill height and underpart barring without losing much of the coefficient of determination ($R^2 = 0.837$, F = 58.007, p < 0.001). The coefficient of B (-1.902) seems to be quite large,

but it is small in relation to its standard error. A simpler model often will describe the situation more clearly. The reduced model has the following discriminant score values X_{RED} : X_{RED} = 71.928 – 0.381*WL + 0.280*BL – 0.857*PR

Discriminant functions work as "species identification formulas", but it is presumed that the observation being classified belongs to one or other group. We have Eurasian Cuckoo values negative and Oriental Cuckoo values positive. When re-classifying the sample (n = 38), over 97% of observations can be correctly classified (one canorus has a small positive value). The Lieksa bird gets the values X_{ALL} = 2.111 and X_{RED} = 4.618, which means that the bird is closer to Oriental Cuckoo. It should be noted that this will hold true only when placing the individual at the optatus - canorus axis. Although the result is interesting as it is, it will not tell us if the bird differs in some other way, which may be supposed possible from, for example, a hybrid.

With identification analysis we tested the following null hypothesis using all the variables 1) The Lieksa bird resembles *canorus*, 2) The Lieksa bird resembles *optatus*. The difference from *canorus* was significant (F = 3,786, p = 0,016), mostly because of the longer bill and small number of bars on the primaries. The differences from *optatus* were also significant (F = 4,413, p = 0,022), but this was almost

solely because of the underpart barring, which was narrower.

Behaviour

Finnish Eurasian Cuckoos did not respond to the song of the Lieksa bird (several tests in Central Finland). The Lieksa bird apparently did not react to the song of male Cuckoo, and surprisingly not even to its own song or the song of a normal Oriental Cuckoo. However, it became very agitated at the female call of Eurasian Cuckoo. In Komi, male optatus reacted strongly to this same recording of female Eurasian Cuckoo, but the response to Oriental Cuckoo male song was weaker. The female calls of both species are quite similar (Oriental Cuckoo female call is published in Mild 1987) and it seems that males do not discriminate between them

Discussion and conclusions

The mitochondrial DNA (cytochrome b) of the Lieksa bird was of Oriental Cuckoo type (Urban Olsson *in litt*). Comparison material is limited, however, and the results are non-conclusive. In any case, the method used in DNA analysis in this case will not reveal possible hybrids.

The Lieksa bird in 2001 was a +2cy bird and very similar to the 1998 individual and most probably the same bird. The song was also very similar. Both territory and habits were very similar in 1998-2001. The Joutsa bird in 1999 was probably a 2cy bird, because it had some unmoulted secondaries that were browner, and seemed to show remnants of juvenile patterning.

The strangeness of the song of the Finnish birds is indisputable. Similar calls are unknown from other parts of the world and even the most western Oriental Cuckoos of European Russia sing like those in Siberia. The tri-syllabic basic rhythm and the pitch of the second syllable were discussed earlier. According to the discriminant analysis, the Finnish birds did not sing like *optatus* Oriental Cuckoo. They differ from *optatus* similarly: slower tempo and higher-pitched first main note. A quite important detail is that the initial soft phrase, so typical for Siberian Oriental Cuckoos, was quite

rare in these Finnish birds. It was never sound-recorded or written up in verbal descriptions sent to the Rarities Committee. A. Lindholm did not hear it in Lieksa 1998 or 2001, nor in Karstula 1998. Some observers report having heard something like it in Karstula.

Visually, the Lieksa bird was quite like Oriental Cuckoo. However, it was not entirely typical, especially because of its large size and quite narrow barring on the underparts and underwing-coverts. We managed to create discriminant functions, which could make a distinction between canorus and optatus males. According to those functions, the Lieksa bird does not resemble either Eurasian Cuckoo or Oriental Cuckoo very closely. The discriminant function places it nearer Oriental, but it is not able to recognise a hybrid.

The spring arrival time of these birds is also quite interesting. In 1998, the birds became known among birdwatchers in late June, and they were presumed to have just arrived (e.g. Vasamies 1998). But local residents in Lieksa heard the song as early as 24 May (Lappi 1998). In 1999, the first record in Lieksa was 23 May, in Karstula 26 May and in Joutsa 27 May (Lindroos et al 2000). In 2000, the Lieksa bird arrived 20 May and in 2001, as early as 7 May (Luoto et al 2002). Thus, the birds arrived considerably earlier than is normally the case in South-East Asian migrants (even the vanguard of Yellowbreasted Bunting Emberiza aureola and Arctic Warbler Phylloscopus borealis will arrive in Finland as late as early June). Oriental Cuckoo reaches the middle reaches of River Yenisei in Mirnoye region near the end of May or in early June (Rogacheva 1992), but the first individuals will arrive in the areas even west of the Urals during May (Cramp 1985). There is a report of a bird from Northern Urals on 11 May. In Yenisei Oriental Cuckoo arrives later than Eurasian Cuckoo, in Krasnojarsk in mid-May, in areas near the Arctic Circle in early June (Dement'ev et al. 1966). V.Rauste (pers.comm.) heard no Oriental Cuckoos in the Mirnoye area in May 1994 when Eurasian Cuckoo was already numerous, but Oriental Cuckoos arrived in the area rapidly during the first days of June. According to a local scientist, this is typical.

It has been asked, how do we know that these birds are not just atypically singing Eurasian Cuckoos? To answer, the Lieksa bird has many optatus-like characters and would be quite abnormal as a Eurasian Cuckoo. Also, it would be very odd if one species had by accident, a song so much like the song of another, largely sympatric species, and it appears that the song must be the single most important feature for species distinction for these birds. It must be stressed that the song of these Finnish birds was quite like Oriental Cuckoo, especially from a distance. Hundreds of observers heard the song, and not many differing opinions were initially heard. The only exception was in May 2000, when many observers in Lieksa were confused when they heard that bird sing. The recording by Ari Rajasärkkä is from that period and it really is slightly different from typical recordings. Still, we think that these differences are unimportant and that the recording belongs to the "Finnish songtype", too.

It has been suggested that Oriental Cuckoos, when greatly outnumbered by their Eurasian relatives, have taken some elements of their song from them. Some bird species learn their song, or at least important parts of it, from their parents or other individuals of the same species or adopt it from other species (mimicry). These species typically have some geographical variation in their song - these include oscine passerines and even some parrots and hummingbirds (Babtista & Kroodsma 2001). But, the song of cuckoo species is genetically inherited, not learned and geographical variation in large areas is minimal (Payne 1986 & 1997). There are no known examples of intermediate singers from the large sympatric area, although it would be very easy to overlook them.

Can the Finnish birds be hybrids Eurasian X Oriental Cuckoo? It would be odd to have three, similar-sounding hybrids, when no "pure" Orientals have been recorded. As far as we know, no hybrids between these species are described in the literature. In principle, it is not at all unimaginable that two largely sympatric species will occasionally hybridise in areas where the one is scarce or rare and the other comparatively numerous. phenomenon is known in many species, where song is an important part of pair formation. It has been suggested that it is possible that a single Oriental Cuckoo male or female could produce a great



Figure 16. The outermost median upper primary-coverts of cuckoo species, wing tip pointing upwards. From left to right downwards. Three typical Eurasian Cuckoos (from Finland, Russia and China). The whole whitish area is patterned with irregular and strong barring. Far right in the upper row is an atypical Eurasian Cuckoo (from Finland), which almost lacks patterning in the white area. The lower row are Oriental Cuckoos, migrants photographed in China. The patterning is strongest on the distal part. The far right in the lower row is the Lieksa bird. The black "bars" on the lower part are due to vanes dishevelled because of wetness.

number of hybrid offspring, which could explain the "invasion" in Finland (L. Svensson, *in litt.*). The song of hybrids in non-passerines is typically intermediate between parent species (Payne 1986). Because no song like this "Finnish song" is known from other parts of the world, the hybrid theory should be seriously considered.

In this article, some reasons to doubt these "easy" identifications of Oriental Cuckoo are presented, identifications that have had hundreds of supporters for many years. It seems probable that a single answer acceptable to everyone will not emerge if we do not find more birds of this type. At the very least, all "Oriental Cuckoo-like" singers seen in this country in future, should be thoroughly documented. A shy cuckoo, living in the deep forest and calling hidden in the nighttime with a call like a human heart beating, is a challenge even to modern bird identification. In any case, Oriental Cuckoo breeds comparatively close to the Finnish border and we can only hope for more individuals, even individuals sounding good enough for every purist.

Additional information

More photos, graphs and recordings can be found on the Internet at www.alula.fi/kakijuttu

Acknowledgement

Many have helped in this project. Some are mentioned here. Material about songs (sound recordings or descriptions) was supplied by Jan-Erik Bruun, Ilkka Heiskanen, Jukka Husa, Hannu Jännes, Mika Ilari Koskinen, Alpo Koukila, Jaakko Kullberg, Tom Lindroos, Juha Niemi, Ari Rajasärkkä, Jouni Riihimäki, Jorma Sorjonen, Olga Veprintseva (Veprintsev Phonotheca of Animal Voices), Pentti Zetterberg Christoph Zöckler. The following loaned photographs: Tapio Aalto, Jari Kostet, Aleksi and Petteri Lehikoinen, Jari Peltomäki, Petro Pynnönen, Sami Timonen and William Velmala. At the Finnish Museum of Natural History, helpers include Ann Forstén and Seppo Niiranen. The visit to The Natural History Museum, Tring was made possible by Mark Adams and Robert Prys-Jones. Useful discussions were enjoyed with the following: Antti Below, Martin Helin. Krister Mild, Esko Pasanen, Robert Payne, Pekka Pouttu, Jyrki Pynnönen, Lars Svensson and Heikki Vasamies. Trips to the UK and Russia were made possible by Sergei Gabov, Moira and Roy Hargreaves, Paula Kokkonen, Jari Kontiokorpi, Evgeni Lopatin and Seppo Vuolanto. In the field and on other trips A. Lindholm's companions included Annika Forsten, Osmo Huupponen and Visa Rauste. Heikki Liehu helped with Internet publication and Urban Olsson with facts about DNA. Earlier drafts of this article were commented on by Jari Halonen, Heikki Luoto, Jyrki Normaja and Juha T. Tanttu.

Literature

- Aalto, E. 2002: Linjalaskentaa Komin tasavallassa Venäjällä. Suomenselän linnut 37 (2).
- Baker, K. 1993: *Identification Guide to European Non-Passerines*, BTO Guide 24. British Trust for Ornithology, Thetford.
- Babtista, L. & Kroodsma, D. 2001: *Avian bioacustics*, pages 11–53 in del Hoyo, J., Elliott, A. & Sargatal, J.

- (eds.): Handbook of the Birds of the World. Vol 6. Lynx Edicions, Barcelona.
- Beaman, M. & Madge, S. 1998: The Handbook of Bird Identification. Helm, London.
- Bengtsson, D. 2002: Bestämning av taigagök. Roadrunner 10 (3): 18.
- Blom, E. A. T. 1989: Cuculus Cuckoos and the NGS Guide. Birding XXI (4): 183–184.
- Cramp, S. (eds.) 1985: The Birds of the Western Palearctic. Vol. IV. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Dementjev, G. P. & Gladkov, N. A. (eds.) 1966: *Birds of the Soviet Union*. Moskow 1951, volume I transl. Jerusalem 1966 Israel Program for Scientific Translations Ltd.
- Flint, V. E., Boehme, R. L., Kostin, Y. V. & Kuznetsov, A. A. 1984: A Field Guide to Birds of the USSR. Princeton University Press.
- Flury, B. & Riedwyl, H. 1988: *Multivariate* statistics: a practical approach. Chapman and Hall Ltd., London.
- Hagemeijer, E. J. M. & Blair, M. J. (eds.) 1997: The EBCC Atlas of European Breeding Birds: Their Distribution and Abundance. T & A D Poyser, London.
- Hallikainen, L. 1999: *Luonto soi Erämaan kertomaa*, CD, Kultasointu.
- Higgins, P. J. (ed.) 1999: Handbook of Australian, New Zeeland and Antarctic Birds. Volume 4: Parrots to Dollarbird. Oxford University Press. Melbourne.
- Kennerley, P. R. & Leader, P. J. 1991: Separation of Cuckoo and Oriental Cuckoo. Dutch Birding 13: 143–145.
- King, B. F., Dickinson, E. C. & Wood-cock, M. W. 1975: A Field Guide to the Birds of South-East Asia. Collins, London.
- Knystautas, A. 1987: Natural History of USSR. Century.
- Koukila, A. 1998: *Maailman läntisin idän-käki*. Suomenselän linnut 33 (4): 129–131.
- Lappi, E. 1998: Suomen ensimmäinen idänkäki Lieksassa 24.5.–15.7.1998. Siipirikko 25 (2): 25–26.
- Lehman, P. 2000: Oriental Cuckoo versus Common Cuckoo. Birding World 13: 321–323.
- Lindroos, T. & Luoto, H. 1999: Vuoden 1998 hyväksytyt harvinaisuushavainnot. Linnut 34 (4): 26–39.

- Lindroos, T. & Luoto, H. 2000: Vuoden 1999 hyväksytyt harvinaisuushavainnot. Linnut 35 (4): 19–31.
- Luoto, H., Aalto, T., Lindholm, A., Numminen, T. & Rauste, V. 2002: Rariteettikomitean hyväksymät vuoden 2001 harvinaisuushavainnot. Linnutvuosikirja 2001: 49–62.
- Mild, K. 1987: *Soviet Bird Songs* (two cassettes and a leaflet), Stockholm.
- Mullarney, K., Zetterström, D., Svensson, L. & Grant, P. J. 1999: *Fåglarna*. Albert Bonniers Förlag.
- Parkes, C. P. 1990: Identification of Common and Oriental Cuckoos. Birding XXII (4): 191–193.
- Payne, R. 1986: *Bird Songs and Avian Systematics*. Current Ornithology vol 3.
- Payne, R. 1997: Family Cuculidae (Cuckoos), sivut 508–607 teoksessa del Hoyo, J., Elliott, A., Sargatal, J. (eds.): Handbook of the Birds of the World. Vol 4, Sandgrouse to Cuckoos. Lynx Edicions, Barcelona.
- Redman, N. 1985: *Photospot 15: Oriental Cuckoo*. British Birds 78: 473–475.
- Robson, C. 2000: A Field Guide to the Birds of South-East Asia. New Holland.
- Rogacheva, E. 1992: The Birds of Central Siberia. Moscow.
- Vasamies, H. 1998: The First Oriental Cuckoos in Western Europe. Alula 4 (3): 114–116.
- Vaurie, C. 1965: The Birds of Palearctic Fauna. Non-Passeriformes. Witherby, London.
- Vuolanto, S. 1999: Retkellä Komissa Euroopan koillisessa kolkassa. Tringa 26 (2): 113-118.
- Wells, D. R. & Becking, J. H. 1975: Vocalizations and Status of Little and Himalayan Cuckoos, Cuculus poliocephalus and C. saturatus, in Southeast Asia. Ibis 117: 366–371.

Antero Lindholm, Tornfalksvägen 2 bst 15, FIN-02620 Esbo, Finland. Email antero.lindholm@panasoft.fi Andreas Lindén, Korkeavuorenkatu 4 A 7, FIN-00150 Helsinki, Finland. Email andreas.linden@helsinki.fi