1908 Groves claimed to validate the name *manyema*, clearly attributed this name to Alix and Bouvier⁵, who in 1877 described *G. mayema* from the River Quilo, near Landana, lower Congo (that is, in the range of the western gorilla, *G. g. gorilla*). A *lapsus* (an interpretation admitted by Groves), *manyema* of Rothschild therefore has no validity and in any case clearly referred to gorillas from "South Congo Region" which from the context clearly means the lower Congo, south of Gabon, that is, the same region as referred to by Alix and Bouvier. Rothschild nowhere mentioned the upper Congo in connexion with *manyema*.

By deliberately accepting the amended spelling *manyema* with a type locality "Upper Congo", Groves has created a junior synonym of *graueri*, which is dubiously available even in the event of future sub-division of the sub-species because he gave no characters by which his sub-species could be recognized. The supposed holotype on which it is based is a skull with no locality other than "Upper Congo" (British Museum 1939.945). This skull was acquired by Rothschild from a dealer, and although the words "*Gorilla gorilla manyema* Upper Congo" are written on the skull, no details of the specimen were published by Rothschild. This specimen has no standing as the type of any name other than *manyema* Groves, 1967.

G. B. CORBET

British Museum (Natural History),
London.

Received July 7, 1967.

¹ Groves, C. P., *Nature*, **213**, 890 (1967).

² Matschie, P., *Sber. Ges. Naturf. Freunde Berl.*, **323** (1914).

³ Schwarz, E., *Revue Zool. Afr.*, **14**, 333 (1927).

⁴ Rothschild, W., *Novit. Zool.*, **15**, 391 (1908).

⁵ Alix, E., and Bouvier, A., *Bull. Soc. Zool. France*, **2**, 488 (1877).

Nomenclature of the "Eastern Lowland Gorilla"

I GREATLY regret that I did not make myself entirely clear in my last communication¹. Dr Corbet implies that I rejected the name *Gorilla graueri* because it referred to an atypical population; this is not the case. I am well aware that the name would have to stand for the sub-species were it the earliest available name. I tried to show, however, that it is not the earliest available name.

The reasons why I accepted *Gorilla gorilla manyema* Rothschild, 1908, as the valid name for the eastern lowland gorilla may be summarized as follows.

It is not clear to the casual reader of Alix and Bouvier's report² whether the locality Landana, on the banks of the Quilo (type locality of their *Gorilla mayema*), is in the (former) Belgian or French area of the Congo region. Elliot³ clearly thought it was in the Belgian region, as he gives the type locality as "Upper Congo"; it is equally clear that Rothschild also did, as he^{4,5} spells the trivial name as *manyema*—an obvious confusion with the province of that name on the Upper Congo. The specimens on which Rothschild based his description must therefore have come from the Upper Congo. Landana is in fact on the Lower Congo: so that the type localities of Alix and Bouvier's *mayema* and of Rothschild's *manyema* are not the same. This prevents the name *manyema* from coming under the heading of Emendation or of Incorrect Subsequent Spelling (International Code of Zoological Nomenclature, Art. 33, *a* and *b*), for the taxon referred to by Alix and Bouvier and by Rothschild was not the same. Also the name is not a homonym, because the difference of a single letter is sufficient to prevent homonymy (Art. 57, *d*).

In two papers, Rothschild describes his *G. g. manyema* with the characters of the Eastern lowland gorilla. In 1908 he says⁴, "I have recently received an adult male skull and photograph which clearly show that the Congo gorillas have . . . very sharply defined pale and dark

areas in the pelage"; while in 1923 (ref. 5) he states, "the two or three adult males examined . . . appear to have the pelage brighter in colour and more sharply contrasted". This corresponds to the difference between the eastern gorillas (both *G. g. manyema* and *beringei*) and their western relative: in the former the white "saddle-patch" of the adult male is very sharply defined from the jet black of the surrounding pelage, while in the western gorilla there is a much more gradual change. So Rothschild is clearly describing an eastern gorilla.

Rothschild never mentions more than one skull of *manyema* in his collection. He says that it is⁴ "a still narrower and more elongated skull than those from Gaboon". This is true of B.M. No. 1939.945 which in my communication I accepted as Rothschild's holotype: it measures 305 mm in inion-prosthion length, and 144 mm in cranial breadth, while the mean of nine Gabon skulls, all of the Rothschild collection in the British Museum, except for one which is still in Tring, is 286 mm in length and 138 mm in breadth. The Rothschild skull is certainly "narrower and more elongated". Not only is the inscription "Upper Congo" written on the skull, but application of the results of the statistical analysis to it shows that without a doubt it belongs to the Eastern lowland sub-species, most likely of the Utu deme.

This further information may make my decision to use the name *manyema* a little clearer than in my original paper; reading my paper along it is not surprising that Dr Corbet had concluded that I was at fault. It remains to be pointed out that the name *manyema* is not a *nomen oblitum* as Rothschild used it in 1923, less than fifty years ago. It is to be hoped that all is now settled satisfactorily.

COLIN P. GROVES

Department of Anthropology,
University of California,
Berkeley.

Received July 27, 1967.

¹ Groves, C. P., *Nature*, **213**, 890 (1967).

² Alix, E., and Bouvier, A., *Bull. Soc. Zool. France, Paris*, **2**, 488 (1877).

³ Elliot, D. G., *Review of the Primates* (A.M.H.N. publ., New York, 1914).

⁴ Rothschild, W., *Novit. Zool.*, **15**, 391 (1908).

⁵ Rothschild, W., *Proc. Zool. Soc., London*, **1**, 176 (1923).

Contraceptive Action of Intrauterine Devices in the Rhesus Monkey

Kelly and Marston¹ have provided important information on the influence of the intrauterine device (IUD) on the distribution of ova in the spontaneously ovulating monkey.

They refer to our report² in which the influence of an intrauterine coil on ovum distribution was studied in the superovulated rhesus monkey. In this series, a 50 per cent rate of recovery of tubal ova was noted in control animals without coils. Among similarly treated animals with coils no ova were recovered from the fallopian tubes but four unfertilized ova were found in the uterine cavity. Unlike the animals used by Kelly and Marston all animals in this series were superovulated with gonadotropin, and the IUD was applied by the vaginal route. These studies have now been extended. Among eleven animals with coils which had forty-nine ovulation points, no tubal ova but seven uterine ova were recovered. The non-coil group revealed fifty-five ovulation points, sixteen tubal ova and no uterine ova. Thus, in the superovulated monkey, the coil appears to speed the rate of transfer of ova from the tube, and ova are not extruded promptly from the uterine cavity. Kelly and Marston did not find ova in the uterus in their coil group which had ovulated spontaneously.

Among spontaneously ovulating coil monkeys recently studied in our laboratory, tubal ova have been recovered. Thus our recent data³ also support the conclusion that in the spontaneously ovulating animal, ova are not delivered