

NOTE II.

ON A NEW ANTELOPE, *CEPHALOPHUS COXI*,
FROM NORTH-WESTERN RHODESIA

BY

Dr. F. A. JENTINK.

March 1906.

In Part I of the well-known Book of Antelopes there is a figure (Plate XIV, fig. 2), under the name *Cephalophus sylvicultrix*, representing an animal of a color quite different from all the known specimens of *C. silvicultor* and therefore too differing from the animal figured l.c. plate XIII. The authors of the Book of Antelopes, p. 130, relate: »our »second figure (Plate XIV, fig. 2), which was prepared by »Mr. Smit under Sir Victor Brooke's directions, probably »represents a young male of this species; but we do not »know for certain from what specimen it was taken." That this figure represents a young animal, as the authors of the Book of Antelopes suggested, is not very likely, as the figure agrees in size with that of the full-grown very old specimen on plate XIII, and as the horns are of the same size apparently as those of plate XIII; we may therefore be sure that this aberrant form has been drawn after an adult individual; nothing is to be seen in that drawing to base upon the suggestion about its sex; the locality too is unknown.

There is now in our Museum an Antelope shot by Mr. Cox in North-Western Rhodesia; it is an adult male, an ex-

Notes from the Leyden Museum, Vol. XXVIII.

ceedingly splendid animal, so exactly agreeing with the figure 2, Plate XIV, of the Book of Antelopes, that a better portrait cannot be desired! Compared side by side with our *Cephalophus silvicultor*-specimens, every one must be struck by the distinctness of the animals. Now all specimens of *C. silvicultor* are from the West-Coast of Africa and it therefore may be no wonder to meet with a differently colored species in a locality as Rhodesia, so far from the West-Coast of Africa. In the P. Z. S. L. 1902, Vol. I, p. 2, there is however a communication by Mr. Oldfield Thomas, relating an Antelope from North-Eastern Rhodesia; he said: »that there are no differences of importance perceptible between the Rhodesian specimen and examples »from West-Africa.” »No differences of importance,” this means that there *are* some differences, meanwhile »importance” is a very tensible word! The authors of the Book of Antelopes did not think the differences between the two above mentioned figures of enough importance to make a distinct species of the animal of unknown origin — but of a so different color — as that figured on Plate XIV, fig. 2! I should be inclined to suggest, that the Rhodesia-specimen in the British Museum perhaps agrees with the latter figure and therefore belongs to the same species as our Rhodesia-specimen! And that this perhaps is the case with a frontlet and a piece of skin also received from Mr. Baragwanath of Bulawayo, obtained in the same district and now in the British Museum! This may be a correct hypothesis or not, a fact is that our Rhodesia-specimen is quite distinct from the West-African *C. silvicultor*, so that I propose to regard it as the type of a new species:

Cephalophus Coxi,

after its discoverer Mr. Cox.

Sex: male.

Locality: Rhodesia.

Figured in the Book of Antelopes, Part I, Plate XIV, fig. 2, under the name of *Cephalophus sylvicultrix*. The

Notes from the Leyden Museum, Vol. XXVIII.

animal is of about the size of our adult Congo-specimen of *C. silvicultor* (N. L. M. Vol. XXII, p.p. 179—187), therefore a trifle smaller than our Liberia-female; horns shorter and hoofs more slender than in *C. silvicultor*; color quite different from and triangle on back larger than in the latter species; buttocks colored like triangle and not like sides of the animal as in *C. silvicultor*; triangle not separated from the rump-disk by a black band as in that species.

Description of the type-specimen, an adult male: the figure in the Book of Antelopes, Plate XIV, fig. 2, may give a fairly impression as to the general color and its distribution, so that I here have to add mere small peculiarities not so easily to reproduce in such a small drawing. In *C. silvicultor* is a light colored streak above each eye, in *C. Coxi* not; between the horns is a very good developed crest of very long bright rufous hairs; basal part of horns anteriorly concealed by the same kind of elongated rufous hairs. Whitish triangle beginning on the back above the fore-legs, ending a good deal nearer to the tail than in *C. silvicultor*; the disk is much less developed than in *silvicultor* and clad with black hairs; buttocks largely adorned with the same kind of beautiful whitish hairs as the triangle; upper part of tail for its basal part with brownish rufous hairs, for the rest whitish; distal part of tail and tuft with a mixtum of elongated black and rufous black hairs.

Horns shaped like in *C. silvicultor* and for their basal half more strongly roughened than in that species, however shorter as they measure 104 mm. only. Hoofs more slender than in *silvicultor* and relatively as well as absolutely larger and more elongated than in that species. I got the animal stuffed with the skull in it; I do not like to run risk of destroying the skin by removing the skull.