

This of course may cause confusion. It would seem rather absurd if a person by the name of Müller obtained a genus *Mülleria* and if afterwards he changed his name to Muller and in addition obtained a genus *Mulleria*! But even so, I would stick to the principle and only recommend the latter naming not to be done.

- (4) I think (but I am not sure) that Tornquist is a German name, not a germanized version of the Swedish Törnquist.

In the Scandinavian countries you will find both ö and ø. These are *identical* letters, ö is used in Sweden and ø in Denmark and Norway. The letters are the same as oe in other languages. Since ö is better known outside Scandinavia than ø, I think that ö might be used internationally even in Norwegian and Danish names. (The letter ø makes trouble in printing outside Scandinavia.) You may also know that ü and y are identical and correspond to "ue" abroad.

ON THE USE OF DIACRITIC MARKS OVER LETTERS IN WORDS USED AS ZOOLOGICAL NAMES

By JOSHUA L. BAILY, Jr.
(*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)538)

(Enclosure to letter dated 24th October 1951)

I would suggest that it would be advisable to rule that generic and specific trivial names (in the broad sense of these terms) derived from German patronymics and which contain the letters ä, ö, ü be spelled with these letters transliterated as ae, oe, ue. This, I have been informed, was the original spelling, the umlaut being the schematized form of the modifying vowel, which at one time was written above the vowel which was modified. This schematized form is identical with that of the Latin diaeresis, which has a widely different meaning; in fact the diaeresis in Spanish is not the same thing as the diaeresis in English. Also I have been informed that the Scandinavian umlaut is not the same as the German umlaut, but I am not sure on this point. I am not opposed to the use of diacritic marks in general; in fact, I think we will have to have recourse to them in the transliteration of words from languages using the Latin alphabet but which have super-numerary letters that do not occur in Latin. The disadvantages of using symbols which have more than one meaning is too obvious to need further comment; my objection applies only to ambiguous diacritic marks.



Baily, Joshua L. 1952. "On the use of diacritic marks over letters in words used as zoological names." *The Bulletin of zoological nomenclature* 6, 254.

<https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.16049>.

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/44304>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.16049>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/16049>

Holding Institution

Natural History Museum Library, London

Sponsored by

Natural History Museum Library, London

Copyright & Reuse

Copyright Status: In copyright. Digitized with the permission of the rights holder.

Rights Holder: International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>

Rights: <https://biodiversitylibrary.org/permissions>

This document was created from content at the **Biodiversity Heritage Library**, the world's largest open access digital library for biodiversity literature and archives. Visit BHL at <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org>.