

Two solutions occur to me that would avoid "spoiling the Code", though neither is really satisfactory. One would be, as suggested in my original application, to treat domestic forms as hypothetical concepts (which in a way they are) and so exclude them under Article 1. The other would be to exclude them under Article 24(c), one of the Monaco Amendments, as probable hybrids: most domestic breeds are likely to have received an occasional injection of genes from wild stock in the vicinity, even if they are not the produce of subspecific or even specific crossing in the first place (see, for example, Hemmer, 1975, where it is suggested that the Alpaca may be a stable hybrid between *Lama guanicoe* and *Lama vicugna*). Either course would be open to objections, not least that both courses are based on implicit interpretations of the Code with which not everybody might agree; and I would be much happier if any exclusion were made explicit.

In the final analysis, nomenclature is supposed to be an aid to taxonomy, to assist clarity of taxonomic thought; at the moment it is only contributing to confusion of thought where domestic animals are concerned, and the sooner some way is found to remove this source of confusion, the easier it will be to get on with the job of constructing classifications which can make some claim to reflect biological reality.

REFERENCES CITED

- CLUTTON-BROCK, J., CORBET, G.B. & HILLS, M. 1976. A review of the family Canidae, with a classification by numerical methods. *Bull. BMNH, Zool.*, vol. 29: 119-199.
- EISENMANN, E. 1972. Comment on proposal to exclude from Zoological Nomenclature names for domestic animals. *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* vol. 29: 108.
- GROVES, C.P. 1970. Request for a declaration modifying Article 1 so as to exclude names proposed for domestic animals from Zoological Nomenclature. *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* vol. 27: 269-272.
- HEMMER, H. 1975. Zur Herkunft des Alpakas. *Z.d. Kölner Zoo*, vol. 18: 59-66.
- HOLTHUIS, L.B. & HUSSON, A.M. 1971. Comments on Dr. C.P. Groves's request for a declaration modifying Art. 1 so as to exclude names proposed for domestic animals. *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* vol. 28: 77-78.
- LEMICHE, H. 1971. Comment on the request to modify Art. 1 so as to exclude names proposed for domestic animals. *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* vol. 28: 140.

(2) By R.V. Melville (*Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

Having studied the papers in this case, I have come to the conclusion that Dr. Groves's request for the exclusion of names given to domesticates as such from the Code should be granted, but only after the extent of the problem has been more clearly defined. It is for specialists

in the groups concerned, preferably working collectively, to present to the Commission lists of available names based on domesticates so that they could be formally excluded from zoological nomenclature (where mammals are concerned, this would almost certainly entail a re-examination of Opinions 75 and 91 among others).

A further step that might be considered would be the stabilisation of certain names - for example, such Linnean names as *Felis catus* and *Canis familiaris* - by the designation of neotypes from wild populations, if it was thought that the exclusion of such names would cause too much confusion and dismay. If, on the other hand, the exclusion of such names was preferred, then measures might be considered for stabilising the names of the corresponding wild types.

If some such steps are not taken, then it seems obvious that the names in question, being available names under the Code (and in many cases already on the Official Lists), will continue to be used in various ways, not all of them conformable with the Code. There are, however, serious implications in the course I propose: for example, where a genus (such as *Canis*) includes both species named from domestic animals (*C. familiaris*) and species named from wild types, and where the type-species is that named from domestic animals, steps would have to be taken to ensure that the exclusion of the specific name did not entail also the exclusion of the generic name.

Dr. Groves's request, although couched in general terms, relates principally to mammals, and it is here that the most familiar names will be found. Fortunately the number of species involved is not very large, and it is to be hoped that mammalogists could agree on how to proceed. But the problem may be much larger than we can at present see. There may be species of aquarium fishes named on domesticated forms, for example, in addition to birds first described from tame individuals. It is such considerations as these that lead me to suggest that the Commission ought to have a better idea than it now has of the extent of the problem before altering the Code to deal with it.

We should also be clear about the subject under discussion. The Oxford English Dictionary gives under domestic "4. Of animals: living under the care of man, in or near his habitations; tame, not wild". Webster gives two definitions: under domestic "5a. living near or about the habitations of man (rats, roaches and other domestic vermin)"; and under domestic animals "any of various animals (as the horse, ox or sheep) which have been domesticated by man so as to live and breed in a tame condition". I suggest that any definition that includes vermin is too wide for our purposes, since it would be difficult to exclude epizootics and parasites which are not at all involved in the present controversy.

I therefore propose the following definition for the purposes of the present discussion: "domestic animal. Any animal of which the living conditions and breeding are controlled by man for his use or pleasure, other than individuals taken in the wild for purposes of conservation or research and their progeny".



Melville, R. V. 1977. "Comments on request for a declaration modifying Article 1 so as to exclude names proposed for domesticated animals from zoological nomenclature. Z.N. (S.) 1935." *The Bulletin of zoological nomenclature* 34, 139–140.

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/44476>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/76167>

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>.