

INTERNATIONAL CONSULTATION ON THE DEFINITION OF DIV. 9

**Independent support by Malcolm Bradbury for Option 1**

It is common ground between advocates of each option that for classification purposes division 9 is defined more restrictively than the other species based divisions 5-8 and 10. In particular, division 9 is defined in a way which ensures that cultivars are similar in both form and colour to the species in SECTION NARCISSUS of the botanic classification. As a consequence it is not possible for example to register cultivars in division 9 which are all white, or have a corona coloured entirely green, white, yellow or pink. The 1910 definition of division 9 was amended by the RHS in 1950, 1977, 1989 and 1998. All but the most recent minor amendment, which permitted wholly orange or red coronas on the reasonable grounds that they were a characteristic of some true poeticus, have maintained this more restrictive approach to what cultivars can be registered in division 9.

The present definition of division 9 and its evolution since 1910 is neither an accident of history nor a failure to recognize the concerns of daffodil hybridizers. It reflects the considered opinion of successive generations of daffodil enthusiasts that it was the only way to ensure the survival of a clear distinction between division 3 and division 9 cultivars and hence the continued existence of our beautiful and distinctive poeticus heritage. The creation of a wider range of corona colours in division 9 cultivars will inevitably require the making of crosses which are also likely to introduce characteristics from other divisions, which will detract from the previously dominant poeticus characteristics. Examples of this type of problem already arise from time to time in the remaining species based divisions e.g. the ongoing debate about the extent to which some cultivars in division 6 adequately reflect the characteristics of *N. cyclamineus*.

There is of course no reason why hybridizers should not experiment by crossing division 9 cultivars with flowers from other divisions and there are many examples of where this has been done successfully. However, where the appearance of the resulting flower(s) does not fit the definition of division 9, they should be registered elsewhere (often, but not inevitably in division 3). Given the growing popularity of miniature and intermediate daffodils and the ongoing search for distinctive plants for cut flower, show and garden purposes, there remains a viable outlet for successful seedlings from such experiments and consequently, it is not clear that option 1 is a significant restriction on daffodil hybridizers.

In option 2 it is envisaged that corona/perianth segment proportions should be used as a safeguard when defining division 9. Though potentially useful in some circumstances, the example of 'Merlin' shows that it is at best a necessary, but not a sufficient safeguard. It can also be argued that the measurements involved require considerable precision and that using no less than four sets of proportions to distinguish between daffodils in divisions 1-3 and 9 is unduly complex.

The three underlined amendments to the existing definition in the 'conservationists' proposal are self evident clarifications which it is hoped will prove helpful.