Nemachilichthys ruppelli (Teleostei: Nemacheilidae) and the proper correction of the German umlaut
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In a re-description of the South Asian fish species Nemachilichthys ruppelli (Sykes, 1839a) Keskar et al. (2015) noticed—as also pointed out by Kottelat (2012)—that the original spelling of the species name was rupelli [actually: Rupelli, with regular font and capital R], but that information in Sykes (1839a: 162) showed clearly that the species was named for [Eduard] Rüppell with the explicit dedication "I have dedicated this beautiful little fish to Rüppell, who did me the favor to look over my drawings ..." Rüppell is also mentioned twice on page 159. Sykes’s (1839a) paper was reprinted in Sykes (1839b) with exactly the same spelling, but there the species name appears in italics. A third publication by Sykes (1841), based on the same material, also uses the spelling Rupelli for the species, but does not mention Rüppell.

The species name in question has been spelt in different ways in subsequent literature. It was cited as rupelli by Günther (1868: 347) and ruppelli by Kottelat (1990: 20), and listed or described in various combinations with generic names as rupelli (Banarescu & Nalbant, 1968: 329); ruppelli (e.g., Day, 1878: 612; Jayaram, 1991: 200, 201; Arunachalam et al., 2000: 221; Menon, 1987: 30, 158); and rueppelli (e.g., Jayaram, 1981: 150, 158; Talwar & Jhingran, 1991: 499; Heda, 2009: 90). Only Menon (1999:183) explicitly adhered to the original spelling rupelli.

Both Keskar et al. (2015) and Kottelat (2012) affirmed that the spelling rupelli must be corrected in accordance with International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (“the Code” below) fourth edition (International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, 1999), Article 32.5.1: “If there is in the original publication itself without recourse to any external source of information, clear evidence of an inadvertent error, such as a lapsus calami or a copyist’s or printer’s error, it must be corrected. Incorrect Latinisation or use of an inappropriate connecting vowel, are not to be considered inadvertent errors.”

Kottelat (2012:11, 93) confirmed the spelling ruppelli marking that “The omission of the umlaut is correct; if Sykes had written “Rüppell”, ü should have been corrected into ue, but as Sykes used "Ruppell", u should not be corrected” (page 11); and “ruppelli is an incorrect original spelling since the species is explicitly named for Rüpplle and must be emended into ruppelli, Code art. 32.5.1.1” (page 93). (The reference to Article 32.5.1.1 is irrelevant here; possibly a lapsus for Article 32.5.1.)

Keskar et al. (2015) dismissed Kottelat’s correction, proposing instead that the name should be rueppelli, remarking that “in Sykes (1839) Rüppell’s name is in fact spelt with an umlaut, which may not have been distinct in the copy of Sykes (1839[a]) examined by Kottelat (2012)”.

There are two sources of confusion here leading to the mistaken conclusion by Keskar et al. (2015). First, Kottelat (2012: 11) used “Ruppell” where he should have used “Rupelli”, and he was indeed working from a photocopy where the umlaut was absent from Rüppell’s name (M. Kottelat, personal communication). Second, Keskar et al. (2015) apparently confounded the name of the species with the name of the person and based their correction on Rüppell instead of the name of the taxon, Cobitis rupelli. Keskar et al. are publishing a correction of their 2015 conclusion (Keskar et al. 2016), but the case inspires to look deeper into the name of Rüppell, and the treatment of the umlaut sign in the Code.

Starting with the first edition of the Code (International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, 1961), two Code articles deal with umlauts. An umlaut refers to a change of sound of a vowel. In written German such vowels are marked by a diaeresis or trema (two dots) above the original vowel (ä, ö, ü). In other languages, the diaeresis may have other functions, e.g., marking distinct pronunciation in the French ê, and representing distinct vowels â and ô in Swedish and Finnish.

Code Article 32.5.2 in the fourth edition (1999) states: “A name published with a diacritic or other mark, ligature, apostrophe, or hyphen, or a species-group name published as separate words of which any is an abbreviation, is to be corrected.”
Code Article 32.5.2.1 in the fourth edition (1999) states: “In the case of a diacritic or other mark, the mark concerned is deleted, except that in a name published before 1985 and based upon a German word, the umlaut sign is deleted from a vowel and the letter ‘e’ is to be inserted after that vowel (if there is any doubt that the name is based upon a German word, it is to be so treated).”

This means that if a name published after 1984 contains a diaeresis (or umlaut), it must be deleted, i.e., irrespective of original language an â becomes a, an ô becomes o, and a ü becomes u. If a species group name published before 1985 contains a diaeresis representing an umlaut and can be considered to be based on a German word, the diacritic mark should be deleted and an e inserted after the vowel. (All diacritic marks in a name not based on a German word must simply be deleted.) The article was copied from the third edition (1985) of the Code. In the first and second editions of the Code (1961, 1964) Article 32(c)(i) is slightly different: “… and except that when, in a German word, the umlaut sign is deleted from a vowel, the letter ‘e’ is to be inserted after that vowel.” The 1985 text is open to interpretation whether it refers to the umlaut sign in the original word, or to the instance in the scientific name.

The modern editions of the Code (International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, 1961, 1964, 1985, 1999) differ radically from its predecessor, the Règles internationales de la nomenclature zoologique from 1905 (Blanchard, 1906), in which Article 20 stated: “In forming names derived from languages in which the Latin alphabet is used, the exact original spelling, including diacritic marks, is to be retained.” (As translated by Stiles, 1905.) With the article came examples like Köllikeria, Stâlia, and Ibañezia. Article 13 of the Règles allowed the use in species names of a capital initial letter in names of persons; lower case species names became mandatory only with the first edition of the Code (1961: Article 27). This explains why patronyms in older literature look like they did not follow the present Code. They were actually Règles compliant, but the rule has changed.

Although a decision was made in 1953 (Hemming, 1953: 58) to drop diacritics from the Règles, including all diaeresis categories, a new edition of the Règles was never completed, and the modified rules did not come into effect. Until the first edition of the Code (1961) names like Cobitis Rüppelli were fully acceptable. Treatment of diacritic marks were the subject of considerable discussion during the development of the Règles and the Code (e.g., Richter, 1948:129), and Article 20 in the Règles was moderately successful not least because the required characters were not available to all printers. In the present Code (1999) diacritic marks of any kind are disallowed in Article 27: “No diacritic or other mark (such as an apostrophe), or ligature of the letters a and e (æ) or o and e (œ) is to be used in a scientific name.”

Articles 27, 32.5.2 and 32.5.2.1, however, do not apply to N. ruppelli because Sykes demonstrably wrote rupelli, i.e., without umlaut. Because the German ü is not represented in Latin, it must be considered reasonable to render it simply as u, to conform to the Latin alphabet. As seen from article 32.5.2.1, replacing ü with u is the current standard, although it is still possible to use û, æ, and oe in place of umlaut letters in new names. Rüppell may be considered to be a German word as the person in question was German (Eduard Rüppell, 1794–1884), but see below.

As a complicating factor the index to the volume of the Proceedings of the Zoological Society containing Sykes (1839a), page 169, refers to Cobitis Rupelli on page 162. The index to a journal volume should not be considered part of the individual works it contains, and should not to be considered a source of corrigenda, unless it is a single-paper volume. If anyway the index would be admitted as part of the publication, and consequently we would have to deal with two different original spellings, however, article 24.2 applies: “When the author, or one of joint authors, of two different original spellings of the same name subsequently uses one of them as valid in a work (including the author’s or publisher’s corrigenda), and neither had previously been selected as the correct spelling by a First Reviser, the author is deemed to be the First Reviser, whether or not the author cites both spellings together (that used as valid becomes the correct original spelling).” The subsequent publication by Sykes (1839b) uses Rupelli, and the index does not list the species. This text is, however, only a reprint of Sykes (1839a) and not really a new publication. The next publication by Sykes (1841) is different in format from the 1839 publications but still uses the name Cobitis Rupelli. Interestingly, in the index to that particular volume of the Transactions of the Zoological Society (page 414) the name is spelt Ruppell. Again, the spelling in the index is irrelevant for deciding on multiple spellings and in this case a spelling different from the original cannot be accepted as an original spelling. In the same volume of the Transactions there is incidentally also a paper by Eduard Rüppell, with the author name correctly spelt in the paper, but misspelt Ruppell in the Table of Contents.

Regardless of whether names in an index may be considered part of the work, Sykes consistently used the spelling Rupelli. Consequently, because Sykes did not use any name containing an umlaut sign (Rupelli, Rüppelli, rüppelli, ruppelli) that could have motivated the corrected spelling rupeppelli, Article 32.5.2.1 is irrelevant, and the correct spelling of the name in question is ruppelli. Both spellings (ruppelli and rupelli) have been used after 1899 and therefore there is no case for prevailing usage (Article 23.9.1) of one or the other name.

A critical aspect when dealing with Article 32.5.2.1 is how to understand “based on a German word.” In the
French version of the Code (1999) it is expressed as “noms dérivés de l’allemand”, which clearly refers to scientific names originating from words in the German language, and not restricted to words used in Germany or excluding person names. According to Mertens (1949: 9), referring to an “old family tradition” the family of Eduard Rüppell descended from Bourgogne in France, and was known then as Rupel or possibly Ruple. About 1565 they emigrated to Flanders (now in Belgium), and from there in 1567 or 1568 to Strasbourg (Alsace, France). Before the end of the 16th Century, some Rupel family descendants had left Alsace for Hessen (Germany). The family name Rupel is still frequent in Alsace (Tous les noms de famille, 2016). Mertens (1949) considers Antonius Rupel (1580?–1637), resident of Kammerbach in Hessen, as the earliest ancestor of Eduard Rüppell’s family lineage. Antonius’s grandson was known as Simon Rüppel 1624–1692). The next three generations kept the spelling Rüpp. Simon Rüppell (1759–1812), the father of Eduard Rüppell, was the first to use the spelling Rüppell.

There is no German word Rüppell. The closest is rüpel, designating a rude person (Grimm & Grimm, 1854–1961; Kluge, 2003). Heintze (1903: 167) does not include it in his list of German family names, but has Ruppel and Rübel, apparently derived from rüpel. Whereas Rüppell apparently has been used only as a family name (also written Rüpp and Rüp); is not included in Heintze’s (1903) list; and apparently is of French origin, it has been used as a family name in Germany at least since Simon Rüppell, born 1759; and with variant spellings in a family living in Germany since the late 16th Century. Variants on Rupel are more widespread, but the spelling Rüppell is apparently not used outside German speaking countries. Rüppell thus qualifies as a German word.

Other fish taxa named for Rüppell. Other fish taxa explicitly or implicitly named for Eduard Rüppell are, in chronological order:

- *Scolopside Rupellii* Cuvier in Cuvier & Valenciennes, 1830:332; *Rupellii* in the index, p. xx. Based on *Scolopsis kurite* Rüppell (1828: 9, pl. 2, fig. 3). Rüppell’s name is spelt Ruppel throughout the volume. Kottelat (2013:350) corrected the name to *rupellii*.

- *Julis rupellii* Bennett, 1831:128. Bennett refers to Dr. Rüppel and applies the name to “M. Rüppel’s fish”, which is indicated as *Julis aygula* as described in Rüppell (1828:25, pl. 6, fig. 2), and indicates that the fish is named for Eduard Rüppell.

- *Olistus? Rupelli* Cuvier in Cuvier & Valenciennes, 1833: xix,144. New name for *Citula ciliaria* Rüppell (1830: 102, pl. 25, fig. 8). The spelling Rupel is used consistently in this volume. Kottelat (2013: 334) corrected the name to *rupelli*.

- *Seriola Rupelli*, Valenciennes in Cuvier & Valenciennes, 1833: xxj, 216. A new name for *Nomeus nigrofasciatus* Rüppell (1829: 82 [error for 92], pl. 24, fig. 1). Kottelat (2013: 337) corrected the name to *rupelli*.

- *Acanthus Rupelii* Bennett, 1836:207. The reference to the description of *Acanthus velifer* in Rüppell (1829) is evidence that the name refers to Eduard Rüppell, although he is referred to only as “Rüpp.” and “Rupp.” in the paper itself.

- *Rhinobates Rupelli* Swainson, 1838: 185, fig. 24. There is no indication of why the species is so named, but Eduard Rüppell’s work on Red Sea fishes is mentioned on pages 66 and 67. The name must be corrected to *rueppelli*.

- *Rupella* Swainson, 1839:184; *Rupellia* on p. 281; *Ruppelia* in the index, page 446. In Opinion 27 (Hemming, 1958), the Commission corrected the two spellings *Rupella* and *Rupellia* to *Ruppelia*, referring to articles 19 and 20 of the *Règles* and Opinion 26 on typographical errors in Swainson (1839), considering Swainson’s names to be typographical errors.

- *Synodotes [sic] Rupelli* Swainson, 1838: 339, fig. 82. The name is not explained, but Rüppell’s work on African fishes is mentioned on pages 66 and 67, and it remains *rupelli*.

- *Platyosomus (Scyris) Rupelli* Swainson, 1839: 251. Based on “Rüpp. i. pl. 33” [=Rüppell (1830, p. 33, *Scyris indicus*) and “Indicus. Cuv. pl. 252.” The name must be corrected to *ruppellii*.

- *Acanthurus (Ctenodon) Rupelli* Swainson, 1839: 256, fig. 74. Based on “Rüpp. 16”, i.e. Rüppell (1829, pl. 16, fig. 1), identified by Rüppell as *Acanthus sohal* (Forskål, 1775). This description refers to a work by Eduard Rüppell (1829), discussed by Swainson (1838: 66), and referred to in the Index of Swainson (1839: 436). Rüppell’s name is spelt with double l elsewhere in the work (e.g., 1838: 66, 67; 1839: 436), also in *Synodontes rupelli* (1838: 339) and *Rhinobates Rupelli* (1838: 185). Kottelat (2013:442) corrected the name to *ruppellii*.

- *Peloria Rupelli* Cocco, 1844: 10. The name is explained as: “Debbio all’ottimo mio amico Sig. Rüppel …” and in the introduction (page 2) to the paper Eduard Rüppell is referred to ”Né me incuora meno l’incitamento, che mi viene dal nostro ch. amico il sig. Eduardo Rüppel di Franchfort, nome carissimoá cultori delle scienze naturali, il quale le lillustro e grandemente accrebbe co’ suoi viaggi scientifici Nella Numbia, e nell’ Abissinia.”

In this case the name must refer to a German person corresponding to Eduard Rüppell in all aspects except the spelling of the last name.

- *Dalophis ruppelliae* McClelland, 1844: 213. Dr. Rüppell is mentioned. The ending -iae is somewhat unexpected; is
also used in Murennesox hamiltoniae on page 182, of the same paper, but this name is written as Murennesox Hamiltonii on page 203 and Murennesox hamiltoni on page 210; and in Alabes cuvieriae on page 221. The only other dedicative name in the paper are Anguilla Elphinstonei on pages 179 and 208; Ptyobranchus hardwickei on page 222; and Leptocephalus spalzani on page 224. The paper features several significant misspellings, e.g., Conger Mystar (for C. Mystar), page 209; Murenna helana (for M. Helena), page 214; Leptognathus oxyrhythmchun (for L. oxyrhythmchus), page 211; Straphidon longicanauda (for S. longicanauda), page 215; Symbranchus immacula (for S. immacula), page 220; Alabes cuvieriae (for A. cuvieri or cuvieriæ), page 221. Böhle & Smith (2002) correctly cite the original spelling of the name in the header of their description of the species but in the text they refer to the original spelling as rueppeliae and come to the conclusion that it was based on a Latinisation (Ruppelius) of Rüppell and that the feminine ending (ae) must be corrected (to i). The feminine -ae ending cannot be emended, however, because incorrect Latinisations cannot be corrected (Code article 32.5.1), and despite the frequent spelling errors in the paper it is not certain that the -ae ending is in error. At the time, the so-called Strickland Code established in 1842 was current as nomenclatural code in zoology, and it considers as genitive endings for person names only -i (when ending in a consonant), and -ii (when ending in a vowel) (Strickland et al., 1843), and does not mention the -ae option. Apparently McClelland was not following those rules.

Ginglymostoma Rüppellii Bleeker, 1852: 60, 83. The synonymy includes a reference to “Nebrius concolor Rüpp. N. W. F. Abyss. F. R. M. p. 62 tab. 17 fig. 2.” Apparently named for Eduard Rüppell, the name must be corrected to rueppellii.

Dilobomyctere Rüppelli Bibron in Duménil, 1855: 279. The species is based on the description of Tetraodon Honkenii by “Rüpp.” At the time, there were not many ichthyologists around, and “Rüpp.” may be taken as evidence that the species was named for Eduard Rüppell. Kottelat (2001: 613) preferred the spelling rueppellii. Kottelat (2013: 480) corrected to rueppellii. Although standard abbreviations of author names have been abandoned in zoology, they were common particularly in the 19th Century. Such include L. for Carl Linnaeus, Blgr. for George Albert Boulenger, Cuv. for Georges Cuvier, and Gthr. for Albert Günther. The abbreviations were used both in authorship of names, and in abbreviated references. Doubtless, “Rupp.” or “Rüpp.” were short forms for Eduard Rüppell and should always translate to Rüppell.

Monacanthus rueppelli Castelnau, 1855: 97, pl. 47, fig 2. “Ce Monacanthe est confundu, au Muséum de Paris, avec le Monacanthus pardalis de Ruppel (Neue Werbelthiere [sic], p. 57, pl. 15, fig. 3)” Later: “C’est avec un vrai plaisir que je dédie ce Monacanthe au savant voyageur et naturaliste M. Ruppel. There is also one more use of Ruppel on the same page. The species is listed as Ruppellii in the index, page 111. I here act as first reviser and select rueppellii as the correct spelling.

Caranx rueppellii Günther, 1860: 445; also in the index page 544. Based on Caranx petaurista in "Rüpp. Atl. Fische, p. 95. pl. 25, fig. 2.” Clearly to be corrected to rueppellii.

Apogon rueppelli Günther, 1859: 236, the name repeated in the index, but not explicitly explained. Three works by Eduard Rüppell appear in the list of references, page x. The name must be corrected to rueppellii.

Trachypterus rueppelli Günther, 1861: 304; and in the index, page 582. The description includes details on a specimen donated by “Dr. E. Rüppell.” The name must be corrected to rueppellii.

Magil rueppelli Günther, 1861: 458; and in the index, page 582. The species is based on the description of Magil crenilabris in Rüppell (1828–1830), with explicit reference to “One of Dr. Rüppell’s typical specimens.” The name must be corrected to rueppellii (Kottelat, 2013:275).

Brachyalestes rueppelli Günther, 1864: xiii, 315, 452. Mention is made in the text of “Rüppell”. The name must be corrected to rueppellii.

Julis Rueppelli Klunzinger, 1871: 536. Based on material identified by Rüppel as Julis purpureus; a colour description attributed to Rüppell is included. Rüppell is mentioned both with complete name and the abbreviation “Rp” in several places in the paper. The name must be corrected to rueppellii. It is not a homonym of Julis rueppelli Bennett, 1831.

Rupelia, Castelnau, 1873: 51, 151, type by monotypy Rupelia prolongata Castelnau, 1873, was “...dedicated to the celebrated traveller and naturalist, Rupp...” In the annotation to Opinion 27 (Hemming, 1958), Rupelia Castelnau was listed as preoccupied by Rupelia Swainson, 1839. Because Opinion 27 explicitly corrected Swainson’s name from Rupelia to Rupella, but did not explicitly change Castelnau’s name (although under articles 19 and 20 of the Règles it should have been corrected to Rüppellia), the Opinion removed the potential homonymy. As of the 1985 Code Rupella Swainson must be corrected to Rueppellia, whereas Castelnau’s name can only be corrected to Rupella (based on the Latinisation Ruppelius) or Rupella. Because Castelnau’s name was never replaced while potentially a junior homonym, it cannot be now be rejected (Code article 59.2).
...nearly allied in form to Ruppel's *Amph. Bicinctus*..." Rüppell's name is also spelt Ruppel on pages 51 and 89. Diacritic marks are absent from the whole work.

_Gerres Rüpellii_ Klunzinger, 1884: VI, 47, 48, pl. 5, fig. 6 [= fig. 1b], pl. 13, fig. 2. Explicitly based in part on material described by Rüppell (1830). The name must be corrected to *ruepellii* (Kottelat, 2013: 346).

_Barbatus Rueppelii_ Boulenger, 1902: 427. Eduard Rüppell is clearly indicated, and the ü is validly expressed as ue.

_Chrysichthys rueppelli_ Boulenger, 1907: 337, pl. 60, fig. 2. The spelling is repeated on pages 337 and 338, and in the figure legend: and reference to a specimen on a drawing by Rüppell is given on page 337.

_Gymnocranius rueppelli_ Smith, 1941: 441, 445, 449. Replacement name for *Dentex rivulatus* Rüppell, 1838, preoccupied by *Dentex rivulatus* Bennett, 1835.

_Pranesus pinguis rueppelli_ Smith, 1965: 611–615, 617, 631. The description is explicitly based partly on an analysis of syntypes of *Atherina forskalli* Rüppell (1838). Diacritic marks are absent from the paper as a whole. In this case, and some of the other references, the umlaut sign may be missing simply because the printer did not have the type. That is not a printer’s error in the meaning of the Code. Both ü and ae are acceptable renderings of ü in scientific names, so it does not matter in this regard if the family name Rüppell is spelt with or without umlaut.

**Double or single L.** In addition to the umlaut problem, Rüppell's name is spelt in different ways, commonly Rupel and Rüppel. Code article 32.5.1 in the fourth edition (1999) demands correction of names that are obviously misspelt, but only using internal evidence, as cited in full above.

Kottelat (2013) has argued that even where there is no hard internal evidence, an obvious misspelling of a patronym must be corrected. A dedicatory patronym that is misspelt would be embarrassing for the person whose name is misspelt. It would probably also lead to inadvertent automatic corrections by those who know the correct spelling. A typical example is *Apistogramma mendezi* Römer (1994), named for “Brazilian rubber tapper, trade unionist, and ecologist Chico Mendez.” The problem here is that the correct name, Francisco Mendes, does not occur in the paper itself. We can only know that the spelling is wrong by connecting global publicity of Francisco “Chico” Mendes, with the identification in the paper of a Brazilian union leader and environmentalist with a similar name.

In the case of species named for Eduard Rüppell, most sources have a clear reference to Rüppell, but his name is spelt in different ways. In Smith’s (1941, 1965) papers, there is apparently no inadvertent error involved in dropping the umlaut sign, as the printer may not have been able to print it. In the cases where Rüppell is spelled with single p or single l, there is commonly no way of detecting an error except from external knowledge about Rüppell or variation in spelling within the paper. The example in the Code for article 32.5.1 provides guidance: “If an author in proposing a new species-name were to state that he or she was naming the species after Linnaeus, yet the name was published as *ninaei*, it would be an incorrect original spelling to be corrected to *linnaei*.” Consequently, under article 32.5.1, if there is no mention of “Rüppell” in the publication, using any spelling, the name may not be eligible for correction if not spelt ruppelli-, or rueppel-. In all cases where a fish is named for Rüppell, it is obvious which spelling is the correct one. There is, however, an exception to using the exact original spelling of a person’s name. A name may be intentionally Latinised, and then look different from the original. A patronym ending in -i represents a noun in genitive form of a name ending in -us or simply an unaltered modern name which ends in i with the simple -i genitive ending appended (and which then in a way becomes Latinised, and then look different from the original). A patronym ending in -ii represents a Latin name ending in -ius or simply an unaltered modern name with this genitive ending appended (and which then in a way becomes Latinised, and then look different from the original).

A good example of Latinisation of a modern name is *Parachromis dovi* ( Günther, 1864), named for John M. Dow. In this case, because w is not part of classical Latin, Dow was Latinised to Dovius, which becomes *dovi* as a genitive. In the case of Rüppell names ending in -ii, are based on a Latinized form of Rüppell employing the -ius ending. They may be based on the actually existing family name Rupelius or be an independent Latinisation Ruppellius or Rupelius.

The following names have the -ii ending but only one l, and also spells Rüppell’s name with one l; we cannot know if the names were based on a Latinised name or simply misspelt: *Olistius Rupellii* Cuvier; *Julis ruppelli* Bennett; *Seriola Ruppeli* Valenciennes; *Peloria Ruppeli* Cocco; *Monacanthus ruppelli* Castelnau; *Amphiprion ruppelli* Castelnau.

One name has the -ii ending but only one l, and Rüppell’s name is correctly spelt; it must not be corrected to ruppelli, but remains rueppellii: *Acanthurus (Ctenodon) Ruppelli* Swainson.

*Acanthus ruppelli* Bennett and *Dilobomyctere Ruppelii* Bibron have the -ii ending but Rüppell’s name is not spelt out in full in the publication; we cannot know if the names were based on a Latinised name or simply misspelt.

The generic name *Rupella* Swainson was fixed as *Rueppella* in Opinion 27.

The best rule for dealing with variant spellings of Rüppell’s name may be to consider the variants (Ruppel, Rüppel) as errors, and consequently correct the associated species names to *rueppell-* or *ruppell-*, depending on the use...
of the umlaut. In most of the cases, however, correcting the name is a pure formality, because besides *Nemachilichthys ruppellii*, only three names are currently considered valid: *Dalophis rüppelliae* McClelland, now *Gymnothorax rueppellii*; *Apogon rüppelli* Günther, now *Ostorhinchus rueppelli*; and *Chrysichthys rueppelli* Boulenger. It may even be desirable to maintain the original spelling of junior synonyms to facilitate their recognition.

**Relevance of article 32.5.2.1.** Anyone having read so far must by now have asked the question about the usefulness of Code article 32.5.2.1. The Strickland Code and the *Règles* permitted or prescribed that geographical and personal names using the Latin alphabet should be spelt as in the original, apparently for one or more of three reasons: (1) modern names would look funny if fully latinised, e.g., Woodward becoming *Vudvardi* (Strickland et al., 1843); (2) dropping the diacritics would make the name unrecognizable, e.g., *Stähl*, is very different from *Stähl* both in look and pronunciation (Blanchard, 1905); and (3) similar-looking names might create unwanted homonyms or distort the name, e.g., confounding different family names Müller, Muller, and Mueller (Richter, 1948). Inasmuch as the current Code has done away with diacritics except one, we cannot reclaim exact original spelling of names using the Latin alphabet but must treat names as arbitrary combinations of letters. It may even be questioned if corrections of misspellings of names originally in the Latin alphabet should be permitted. Similar corrections of transliterated names must then also be permitted and the standard for judging on correct transliteration might then become problematic.

The special ruling on names originally including an ä, ö and/or ü based on a German word, is however, an anachronism. There is no reason today (or was ever before) why the only German language diacritic mark should be observed, and then not also the identical-looking diaereses, umlauts or trema in other languages. The ruling also fails to consider that German (High and Low German) is just one of several languages in northern Europe with the same roots and consequently identification of the origin of a word containing an ä, ö, or ü can be problematic. From an internal Code perspective, it is also potentially problematic that Article 58, which lists words with slightly different spelling that must not be considered as identical for the purpose of homonymy, does not consider *ü* as equivalent to *u*, *oe* to *ö*, or *ae* to *ä* when based on a word, or personal or geographic name identical in spelling. As an example, *Julius rueppelli* Bennett and the corrected *Julius rueppellii* Klunzinger are not homonyms in combination with the same generic name; neither would be *ruppelli* and *rueppelli* if referred to the same genus, although that would most likely result in confusion over the two species.

Consequently, and as exemplified by the “Rüppell case”, there is reason to do away with the “German umlaut” in a future edition of the Code.

Critical comments by Maurice Kottelat on drafts of this paper have been most helpful and are gratefully acknowledged.
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