On the name of the hermit-crab anemone, *Adamsia palliata* 
(O.F. Müller, 1776)
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The long-used scientific name of the common European sea-anemone *Adamsia palliata* should be retained in use and an unfamiliar name used in some recent synoptic works should be abandoned. We show this to be so under the Code of Zoological Nomenclature and also on pragmatic grounds.

Introduction

This note was prepared in response to the need for a definitive list of British Isles cnidarian species recently prepared by PFSC, in which the anthozoan names have been provided by Dr R.B. Williams. The list will be made available through the relevant part of the Species Dictionaries of the UK National Biodiversity Network, to be hosted on the website of the Natural History Museum, London.

Discussion

Two distinctive hermit-crab anemones are familiar in north-west European coastal waters. One has been universally known for several decades as *Calliactis parasitica* (Couch, 1842) and is not discussed further. For some two hundred years the other was known as *Adamsia palliata* (Bohadsch, 1761, as *Medusa palliata*) by virtually all compilers until the early 1980s in both formal scientific works (e.g. Johnston, 1847; Gosse, 1858; Stephenson, 1935, which see for page citations in these and several other earlier works; Marine Biological Association, 1957) and in many popular works (e.g. Barrett & Yonge, 1958). Many citations under this binominal could be listed. But in a review of the Anthozoa of the British Isles Manuel (1981: 176-177) sought to apply the Code of Nomenclature strictly, in order to promote stability of names in this group. His nomenclatural revision acknowledged under most of the species of which the names were changed, that he had considered the opinion of R.B. Williams from the latter’s then and still unpublished draft manuscript on names in British Actiniaria, but no acknowledgement of Williams was included under *Adamsia*. In this genus, Manuel became so far as we know the first for 158 years to employ the name *Adamsia carciniopados* (Otto, 1823). We consider that this name change was not only unwise, in upsetting rather than promoting nomenclatural stability of a rather familiar coastal animal, but was and is actually wrong under all editions of the Code of Nomenclature (ICZN, 1999).

Manuel (1981: 177) correctly noted that the names used in Bohadsch’s (1761) work, in which the name *palliata* had first been mentioned, had been designated as outside
of zoological nomenclature by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (I.C.Z.N., 1944, Opinion 185). This was because that work was not consistently binominal. Following this Opinion, no name from this book can properly be used under the Code unless one of certain other special conditions apply. A subsequent translation of the Bohadsch work (1776) was also placed outside of nomenclature by this Opinion. Manuel proposed, therefore, that the next chronologically available species-name should be used in place of palliata. This was the virtually unknown name carciopiados Otto, 1823 (as Actinia carciopiados), and this he used. However, apparently unknown to Manuel, O.F. Müller (1776: 233) had earlier employed the binominal Medusa palliata, objectively citing Bohadsch’s plate and figure by number (1761: pl. 11, fig. 1) and text (incidentally giving the incorrect page citation as p. 164 when it is in fact pp. 135-138, but this error has no influence on the arguments). The species-name palliata was thus made available by Müller. Essentially, under the Code the names included in a rejected work can be made available if used in another work by a subsequent author (ICZN, 1999: Article 12.2.2.1) and if no alternative name has been introduced in the meantime.

The species name palliata had, therefore, always been available for this anemone under the Code. This was argued and noted by Ates (1985) in a Dutch periodical perhaps not readily available to many recent actinian workers. But though his opinion was promulgated through usual informal scientific channels, and though acceptance of it is obligatory under the Code, it was not adopted by subsequent faunal compilers (Manuel, 1990, 1995; Williams, 1997). As Ates pointed out, use of the specific name carciopiados Otto, 1823, has always been incorrect under all the editions of the Code, given the existence of the Müller (1776) work. Incidentally, Sherborn (1902: 708), in his nomenclatural bibliography, had correctly listed and cited the combination Medusa palliata as used by Müller, 1776, from which the availability of palliata derives, but this seems to have been overlooked by compilers too.
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