

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
BIOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF WASHINGTON

FIVE NEW GENERA OF BIRDS.

BY J. H. RILEY.¹

In working upon a collection of birds from Celebes, I have found trouble in placing a number of species in currently accepted genera, as others have in the past. It seems to me that such species had better be removed and accordingly I propose the following genera for their reception:

Compsoenas, gen. nov.

Type, *Columba radiata* Quoy and Gaimard.

Similar to *Zonophaps* Salvadori (type, *Hemiphaga forsteni* Bonaparte), but the inner web of the three outer primaries widened about the middle, then sinuated to the tips, instead of having the two outer primaries scooped out about the middle; tail proportionally shorter, the feathers not so broad.

The two species will stand as: *Compsoenas radiata* (Quoy and Gaimard) and *Compsoenas mindorensis* (Whitehead).

Lamprura, gen. nov.

Type, *Columba rufigaster* Quoy and Gaimard.

Similar to *Zonophaps* Salvadori, but the inner web of the outer primary slightly tapering towards the tip with a small elongated nick near the end, instead of having the two outer primaries scooped out on the inner web near the middle; tail proportionally shorter, the under tail-coverts reaching more than half way to the tip of the tail, instead of not more than half way; coloration quite different, rump and tail purple, the tail band apical.

Remarks.—Whether the remaining species put in *Zonophaps* by Sharpe² are congeneric with the above, I am unable to say, as they are autotopically unknown to me, but judging from descriptions alone, *Carpophaga finschi* Ramsay is not.

Meyer and Wiglesworth³ have already called attention to the fact that *Zonophaps* Salvadori is a composite genus, the only species congeneric with

¹Published by permission of the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

²Hand-list, I, 1899, 66.

³Birds Celebes, 2, 1898, 623, 625, 626.

the type (*Hemiphaga forsteni* Bonaparte) being *Carpophaga poliocephala* Gray. They indicated the sections into which the genus can be divided, but unfortunately provided no names for these sections, probably because following Salvadori they only recognized *Zonophaps* as a subgenus of *Carpophaga*.

Diopezus, gen. nov.

Type, *Phlegaenas tristigmata* Bonaparte.

Similar to *Gallucolumba* Heck (type *Columba luzonica* Scopoli), but the tarsus about a fifth longer than the middle toe with claw, instead of nearly equal; the breast spot of decomposed feathers more diffused and of a different texture; bill heavier, the covering of the nostril proportionally less swollen; type of coloration different.

Remarks.—Dr. Chas. W. Richmond¹ has shown that *Plegoenas* Reichenbach, 1851, is antedated by *Gallucolumba* Heck, 1849, both names having the same type. The group of pigeons placed by authors in *Plegoenas* (usually written *Phlogoenas*, but there are many variations) is a composite one and needs revision, but which I have neither the material or inclination to undertake at present. *Phlegaenas tristigmata* Bonaparte is so aberrant that it should be removed, however.

Cranobrontes, gen. nov.

Type, *Buceros leucocephalus* Vieillot.

Similar to *Cranorrhinus* Cabanis and Heine (type *Buceros cassidix* Temminck), but maxilla without a grooved plate at the base; casque smaller, not so arched, and corrugations more pronounced; the two outer primaries more attenuate at the tip.

The three species of the genus will stand as:

Cranobrontes leucocephalus (Vieillot).

Cranobrontes corrugatus (Temminck).

Cranobrontes waldeni (Sharpe).

Remarks.—Meyer and Wiglesworth² have suggested that *Cranorrhinus* be restricted to the Celebes species and as it is clear that the other three species usually placed in the same genus are not congeneric I have acted upon their suggestion.

Orodytes, gen. nov.

Type, *Arachnothera? celebensis* Meyer and Wiglesworth.

Similar to *Stigmatops* Gould (type, *Glyciphila ocularis* Gould) but the bare skin around the eye more extensive, extending above as well as below the orbit; the eyelid above and below surrounded by small feathers, these feathers meeting behind on the naked area; ear-coverts not composed of small specialized silky feathers; bill proportionally longer and heavier (culmen much longer than the tarsus instead of only slightly); tail rounded instead of truncate; body feathers coarser and harsher, not so blended and silky.

¹Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus., 53, 1917, 591.

²Birds Celebes, I, 1898, 239.

The two forms will stand as:

Orodytes celebensis celebensis (Meyer and Wiglesworth), and
Orodytes celebensis meridionalis (Meyer and Wiglesworth).

Remarks:—Meyer and Wiglesworth place their *Arachnothera? celebensis* in *Melilestes Salvadori* (type, *Ptilotis megarhynchus* Gray) but say “the foot and tarsus is * * * smaller and more delicate in the Celebes form, the tarsus is indeed about $\frac{1}{4}$ the length of the wing and longer than the middle toe, while in *Melilestes megarhynchus* the tarsus is about $\frac{1}{10}$ longer and equal to the middle toe; the space of bare skin behind and above the eye is also peculiar to the Celebes form. Still it appears to us to stand as near (or nearer) to the typical *Melilestes* as does *M. iliolophus* and its allies, and it would be disadvantageous to bury its affinities under a new generic name.”¹

As the above shows *Melilestes celebensis* clearly did not belong in the genus *Melilestes*, Stresemann² removed and placed it in *Stigmatops* Gould, but in my opinion this was not a happy disposition and it seems to me the only solution of the difficulty is to erect a genus for its reception.

¹Birds Celebes, 2, 1898, 482.

²Nov. Zool., 21, 1914, 393.