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.
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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
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”.
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