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REMEMBERING DAVID AUSTIN
By CHARLES QUEST-RITSON

Much has been written about David Austin, who died on 18 December 2018. The obituaries and memoirs usually dwell upon the source of his success—the development of a new race created by crossing old roses with modern that he called English roses. Less has been written about the man himself, and less still about the learning that formed the basis for his work.

David—I knew him well—was a student of rose genealogy. His mastery of pedigrees defined his approach to rose-breeding and remains fundamental to understanding the evolution of his roses over the last sixty years. He studied the history of cultivated roses in infinite detail. He knew where to look for genes that might be useful in the development of his rose-breeding. And, in the advancement of his English roses, he employed the DNA of many more cultivars than is commonly supposed.

Most of those roses were “old”. David grew and loved old roses long before he began to cross them with modern cultivars. And he saw his work not as the introduction of new cultivars but as a continuation of the development of old roses. In his early years as a nurseryman, it was old roses and climbers that formed by far the most important part of his business. He offered a very extensive list of historic and heritage roses for sale and never forsook them, even when the success of his own roses began to account for the greater part of his company’s income. I would date this to the early
1980s, when he introduced several cultivars that were an immediate success and continue to be very widely grown today: Mary Rose (1983), Graham Thomas (1983), Abraham Darby (1985) and Gertrude Jekyll (1986)—but one could only confirm the moment when his rose-breeding took off commercially by studying the company’s old accounts and, as his was a private company, that will never be known.

David was careful to conceal the parentages of his roses. Each was carefully recorded in a small notebook that he carried at all times, but the exact details would not be published until a cultivar was well-established in cultivation and he had exhausted its potential for the development of further generations of English roses. He was not above dissimulation: he let it be thought that the pollen parent of his early once-flowering hybrid ‘Chianti’ was ‘Marcel Bourgouin’ (other breeders thought it was ‘Vanity’, Pemberton 1920). In February 1970, he wrote in the *RHS Journal* that ‘Chianti’ came from a cross between ‘Cardinal de Richelieu’ and ‘Dusky Maiden’. Eventually he conceded that its parentage was ‘Dusky Maiden’ × ‘Tuscany’.

His interest in rose pedigrees led to some interesting results. ‘Chaucer’ [1970], for example, was a repeat-flowering rose, bred from two once-flowering cultivars ‘Duchesse de Montebello’ and ‘Constance Spry’. David knew that ‘Constance Spry’ carries the recessive gene for remontancy, but one outcome of this cross was to show that ‘Duchesse de Montebello’ does too.
But it is in the choice of parents for his rose-breeding that the extent of David's knowledge of old roses shows through. 'Chianti' was sensitive to blackspot, at least in the English climate, but it was clearly a very promising rose and would in due course form the foundation of his line of purple-crimson roses. But the path that leads from 'Chianti' [1967] to the success of his more recent crimson roses like Munstead Wood (2008), includes genetic input from such disparate oldies as the Hybrid Perpetual 'Gloire de Ducher' (Ducher, 1865), the Setigera hybrid 'Zigeunerknabe' (Geschwind, 1909) and the Hybrid Tea 'Château de Clos Vougeot' (Pernet-Ducher, 1908). David could have chosen to work with any of the sumptuous crimson Hybrid Teas and Floribundas of the last fifty years, but he preferred to go back to the older roses that would impart the characters that he valued, notably scent and shapeliness in the flower and proper shrubbiness in the plant.

That said, David seldom went back to the really old once-flowering roses in the course of his breeding work. Once he had established a line that carried the gene for repeat-flowering, he saw no need to re-use the Gallica roses that had brought him 'Constance Spry' and 'Chianti,' the two pillars of his later career. And despite his preference for remontant parents, it could still be said that many of his roses are not as generous in their second flowering as are modern Hybrid Teas and Floribundas.

It would be wrong to give the impression that all the genes that give character to David's more recent roses came from Hybrid Perpetuals and early Hybrid Teas. He was essentially a line-breeder, in the sense that he used the English roses that he most
admired to breed his further generations of roses. But he also introduced “new” blood from more recent Hybrid Teas and Floribundas, including 'Aloha' [Boerner, 1949], 'Monique' (Meilland, 1949), 'Schneewittchen' (syn. 'Iceberg', Kordes, 1958), 'Ivory Fashion' (Boerner, 1958), 'Chinatown' (Poulsen, 1963) and 'Pascali' (Lens, 1963). One consequence of this policy of bringing such roses into his breeding lines is that most of David's more recent introductions owe only a small proportion of their genetic make-up to the Gallica roses that were his original inspiration. This has potential implications for other factors like the best pruning regime to follow. If a rose like Olivia Rose Austin or Princess Alexandra of Kent is by descent seven-eights “modern” and only one-eighth “old”--and we won't know this until their pedigrees are released in ten years' time (or longer)--does this not have a bearing on how they should be pruned? David would probably have replied that he always selected his roses for the pleasing shape that the bush makes and that bushiness is now fixed in the genes of all his roses, so that only the lightest of pruning (plus some deadheading) is needed.

Strange though it may seem, I think David's rose-breeding was in some ways not as inventive or adventurous as it might be. This statement needs some explanation, bearing in mind that he brought new genes into his work right up to the end. Rosa bracteata, for example, found its way into the making of such roses as Princess Anne (2011) because it could bring--and did bring--exceptional resistance to black spot. I said to him that it seemed to me, and perhaps to others, that there was no substantial difference in shape, scent and freedom of flower between the roses he introduced in the 1980s and the roses he was introducing three or four years ago. He replied that it was their greater vigour and, above all, their improved health that showed what an advancement they were upon his older roses. I do not know whether or not this
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improvement was reflected in sales, but I suspect that many rose-lovers find such beauty in all-round favourites like Mary Rose and Gertrude Jekyll that they do not bother to move on to David’s more recent introductions.

One thing that I have never understood is the way David started to divide his roses into such groups as the Old Rose Hybrids, the Leander types and the English Musk Roses. He believed that these were perfectly natural divisions—they were absolutely clear to him and should be immediately recognisable to all rose-lovers. On one occasion, I questioned him closely and asked whether these categories were based on the roses’ parentage; he replied that their individual characters determined how they would be classified. Over the years, he had bred and interbred his own lines so that all his roses had a complex parentage with many shared ancestors; it was quite possible for a cross, for example, between an Old Rose Hybrid and a Leander type to give rise to a seedling that was best described as an English Musk Rose.

But there is another consequence of this perception, right or wrong, that English roses do not differ much from generation to generation and that it is, therefore, difficult to know whether a 2010’s English rose is really better than a 1980’s introduction. It is possible, perhaps even probable, that eventually the demand for new introductions will weaken— that there will be too many roses available that appear so very similar to each other that the market will in effect become saturated. It will be interesting to see what will be the effect of this for the future of the Austin business.
On one occasion I suggested a number of new lines that David could consider developing to keep up his reputation for novelty. He could, perhaps, cross roses like 'Duchesse de Montebello' with Portland roses to breed a race of repeat-flowering Gallica hybrids. Or he could re-make the Hybrid Musk roses using modern Floribundas as the pollen parents in place of the rather feeble Hybrid Teas that Pemberton employed. David replied, quite simply, that he had quite enough to do with his existing lines and that these new ideas just did not interest him. It was, after all, the sight of all his thousands of seedlings flowering for the first time, year after year, that gave him the greatest pleasure.

And David could also point out that he had indeed been very adventurous in his selection of the roses from which to breed and in the seedlings that he then introduced. No-one else used Scotch roses, Noisettes and Rugosas on the scale that he did and other cultivars like Francine Austin and Kew Gardens are likewise far-removed from the race of English roses for which David will always be remembered. Occasionally I told him of roses that he did not know but which, I thought, might make suitable parents for future introductions. (I am keen on Kordes roses.) And sometimes he took them into his breeding houses. He also recognised that all the great advances in rose-breeding have been the result of introducing new genetic material and, in his last years, he built up a collection of Rosa species that is now a match for any other in Britain.

And the man himself? Shy, perhaps a little gruff, dyslexic, kind, courteous and quietly determined. But he was also a dreamer and a romantic. His study was lined with books of English history and classics from English literature. Classical music from the late romantic period was a source of great joy.
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to him. And, though I have said it before (in the obituary I wrote for the English magazine *Country Life*) it is worth repeating that it was above all his Englishness that defined David Austin: if you want to know what exemplified the tastes of a civilised 20th-century Englishman, you have only to look through the names that he gave to his roses. Those names are immutable. No concession was made to foreign markets where the significance of Hilda Murrell, Malvern Hills or Lady of Megginch did not resound. Those were the names that he chose for his roses and his English roses would bear English names wherever they were grown. All we lack now is a rose that bears the most English of name: that of David Austin himself.

*  *  *

The author Charles Quest-Ritson wrote *The Encyclopedia of Roses* (2003) and *Climbing Roses of the World* (2003), and articles too numerous to count. He is married to Brigid who, he says, knows more about roses than he does. All the photographs in this article were taken by him.
A QUESTION ABOUT THE NAME OF THE SINGLE FORM OF
ROSA GALLICA L.

By YUKI MIKANAGI

One day in September 2018, I visited the website of GBIF (the Global Biodiversity Information Facility) to see the distribution map of the localities where specimens of wild *Rosa gallica* L. were collected (https://www.gbif.org/species/3002530). I found, to my surprise, there were far more dots indicating such localities than I had expected. I asked myself, “What is *Rosa gallica*?”

I had wanted to know the distribution areas of the single form of *R. gallica*. However, when I saw the dots on the map on the GBIF website, I realized that they included the distribution of specimens of the double form of *R. gallica* in gardens. I consider that the wild form of a rose has only five petals, and that if a rose gives flowers with more petals, it should be regarded as an irregularly mutated plant or a cultivar.

The next action I took was to look at the photo of the type specimen of Linné stored in the herbarium of the Linnean Society in London (http://linnean-online.org/4815/). The photo I saw met my expectation. The number of petals counted was between ten and fifteen, not five.

*Rosa gallica* is named by Carl von Linné in his book “Species Plantarum” (1753). The description given to it is very short: “ROSA foliis carinatis subtus scabris. Dalib. Paris. 145. Habitat in Gallia.” There are no comments on the number of petals, but just about the shape of leaves.
François Crépin wrote about the name of *R. gallica* in pp. 11-12 of his article “La question de la priorité des noms spécifiques envisagée au point de vue du Genre *Rosa*” (The question of the priority of specific names considered from the viewpoint of the genus *Rosa*) in “Extrait du Bulletin de l’Herbier Boissier” Tome V. No 3. Mars 1897.

Crépin said, ‘Nous sommes donc ici devant un nom princeps tout à fait énigmatique et que l’on applique depuis longtemps à la plus belle espèce du genre en Europe. (So here we face a very enigmatic original name that has been applied for a long time to the most beautiful species of its kind in Europe.)’ and ‘Lors de la publication de la 2ème édition de son Species, avait-il vu des spécimens du *R. gallica* sauvage à fleurs simples? C'est ce qu'il est difficile de dire, même en consultant son herbier. (When he (= Linné) published the 2nd edition of his Species (= Species Plantarum), had he seen specimens of *R. gallica* wild with single flowers? This is difficult to say, even by consulting his herbarium.)’

I am sure that in those days it was difficult for Crépin to see the type specimen. Fortunately, now it is easy for anybody in the world to see it on the website of the Linnean Society. The type specimen has absolute authority for botanists. In this case, the type specimen of *R. gallica* has a double flower. We should separate the wild form with single flowers from the original *R. gallica* described by Linné. We need a name for it, and further discussion about *R. gallica* var. *officinalis* Thory. How can we identify *R. gallica* var. *officinalis* from the *R. gallica* described by Linné?

![Image of Rosa gallica](image_url)

**Fig. 2 - The single form of Rosa gallica L. The City of Sakura Rose Garden in Japan. © Koichi Osaku**
In the same article, Crépin suggested to us some possible names for the single form of *R. gallica*. According to the International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants, a guiding principle in botanical nomenclature is that priority should be given to the first publication of the name for a taxon. The formal starting date to which priority is to be given is 1 May 1753, the date of the publication of "Species Plantarum" by Linné. The dates of two of the names below suggested by Crépin were after 1753: *R. pumila*: Clusius (Rar et al, stirp, per Pannon, 1583) a name later taken up by Jacquin in 1774 (Fl. Austr.) *R. austriaca*: Crantz (Stirp Austr., 1763) The year of publication of *R. austriaca* precedes that of *R. pumila*.

Now, both of these names are regarded as synonyms of *R. gallica*. However, in other roses, we have similar examples: *R. banksiae* R.Br. ex Aiton, *R. chinensis* Jacq., and *R. roxburghii*. For all of them, cultivated forms were described as species at first, and later, wild forms were discovered and named *R. banksiae* var. *normalis* Regel, *R. chinensis* var. *spontanea* (Rehder & E.H.Wilson) T.T.Yu & T.C.Ku, and *R. roxburghii* f. *normalis* Rehd. & E.H.Wilson.

Is it possible to change the name of the single form of *R. gallica* to *R. gallica* var. *pumila* or *R. gallica* var. *austriaca*?
Though I think we need careful study for these names, in my opinion, the name *Rosa gallica* L. should be used just for the double form of *R. gallica*, and we should use another name for the single wild form of *R. gallica*: *R. gallica* var. *pumila*, *R. gallica* var. *austriaca*, or something else.

I would like to hear the opinions of rose experts throughout the world.

---

**Fig. 4** - Illustration of *Rosa pumila* in *Florae Austriacae, sive, Plantarum selectarum* 2. t. 198

---

* * *

The author Dr. Yuki Mikanagi is Curator of the Herbarium of the Natural History Museum and Institute, Chiba, Japan, former Chairperson of the Committee for Conservation and Heritage 2012-2018, and an active participant in WFRS affairs and conferences. Contact: mikanagi@chiba-muse.or.jp

As a researcher, Dr. Mikanagi would like to thank the Linnean Society in London for permission to use Fig. 1, Koichi Osaku for Fig. 2 and provide the following information regarding Fig. 3 and Fig.4. Both images are from the *Florae Austriacae sive Plantarum selectarum* 2 (N. J. Jacquin, 1774) in the Peter H. Raven Library and digitized by the Missouri Botanical Garden. The images are in the Biodiversity Heritage Library: https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/9676#page/
The rose is a splendid flower. It has the asset of offering its scents. Unlocking the mysteries of the fragrances of the rose is the aim of this presentation, whose initial version in French was written for visitors to the Rose Garden located near the Royal and International Trial (grounds) for New Roses in “Le Roeulx” (Belgium). For the amateur to describe the perfume of a rose is a delicate and subjective venture. In fact a rose never contains a single perfume, but rather one perfume can mask another. One must consider that the strength of some olfactory notes may overcome others. A sense of smell is highly personal and often linked to scents which we have unconsciously stored in our memories.

The Pyramid of Scents

For anyone wishing to describe what they are smelling when sniffing a rose, a useful “tool” is the olfactory pyramid or olfactory cone. Among the models in literature, the pyramid described here is one developed in 2017 by the French breeder H. Delbard and the professional “nose” M. Schlienger (see ref no. 1). Vertically viewed, the pyramid is comprised of three sections, each corresponding to the perfume’s increasing persistence or staying power. The cross-section shows the circles of scent similarly arranged by their persistence.
In the vertical chart the perfumes are identified by their scents’ persistence as being in the “top or head note”, “middle or heart note” or “base note,” according to their smell and type. The nouns in italics are the authors’ suggestions while those in regular type font describe particular scents which are not exclusively floral. It is important to remember that the separation between the top notes, heart notes or base notes is not firmly fixed.

Mastering the craft of creating a perfume by professionals, as in nature, requires lengthening the different phrases of scent perception often until the final note of the composition. This is a result of the synergy between the primary matters used and the evaporation of the more volatile elements effected by those less volatile.

An example would be to combine the scent of lemon (a top note) with musk (a base note). The musky lemon scent would remain for the duration of its evaporation, but the intensity of both components will be perceived differently from beginning to end. It is easy to imagine that the scent of lemon in the top-note zone, due to its intensity, might flow into the less volatile middle zone. In the same way a base note such as musk might be discovered in the middle zone.

Among other methods of determining the scents in a rose, consider one put forth by Giannotti (see ref no. 2). He suggests training one’s nose to recognize and remember four types of perfume (examples found in the Rose Garden): a soft powdery one such as *Rosa centifolia* ‘Fantin Latour,’ a sweet heavy one as from *Rosa X damascena* ‘Madame Hardy,’ a lemon-scented one like the *Rosa portlandica* ‘Rose de Rescht,’ and the musk scent of ‘Rosa X moschata’ ‘Guirlande d’Amour.’

**The Art of Identifying the Perfumes of a Rose**

The art of determining a rose’s perfumes entails the interaction between a nose and a flower. It is a learning process. One must keep in mind that the perception of a fragrance can vary from one person to the next, or more accurately from one nose to the next! First of all, anyone wishing to discover the fragrance must ignore all body odors. As for smokers, let them admire roses from afar as they are only able to appreciate their colors and shapes.

Your encounter with the blossom should be when it is sunny and with no wind, in the morning around 10 o’clock when the sunbeams have warmed the atmosphere to between 16 and 20 degrees Celsius and the dew has evaporated, or else in the early evening when the heat of midday has abated. Having chosen his “lady in full bloom,” the amateur must
first assure that there is no pollinating insect hidden among the petals. Then he must be calm and concentrated, closing his eyes if necessary. He must not “tire his nose” by inhaling too deeply or too quickly in order to distinguish the subtle nuances of the most delicate scents. If necessary, especially if the perfume is over-powering, he should step back and take time to smell another odor, such as a piece of clothing.

The start of the process is to inhale lightly, allowing the nose to roam around the entire blossom, allowing him to perceive the more volatile scents known as the “top or head notes,” the spirit of its perfume. Then he should gently shake the flower, trying to detect the deeper “middle or heart” notes which can persist for several hours. In the third and final inhalation, he attempts to find the scents which last the longest, known as the “base notes,” which can last for several days and which were present at his first inhalation.

Think of opening a bottle of perfume. The “top notes” are those you smell first. The “heart notes” are revealed after the perfume has been applied in the skin, where it can last several hours, keeping in mind that one needs to be close to the source to smell them. As for the “base notes,” they are deep aromas which we can smell when meeting somebody and which can at times be so overwhelming as to be unpleasant.

As an example, let us describe the perfume of the rose “Mc Cartney,” also known as ‘Meizeli.’ The “top note” is slightly lemony. The middle “heart note” is that of a typical rose with a discrete violet scent which remains as long as the petals are alive, even when separated from the plant itself. One cannot detect a “base note.”
When speaking of the perfume of a rose, it is often with the preconceived notion that one will smell a pleasant odor. This is not necessarily the case. The blossom of *Rosa foetida Persiana* smells like bedbugs, and the flower of *Rosa primula* like incense. As for the gaseous molecules carrying the perfumes, they may come not just from the base of the flower (see ref no. 3) but also other parts such as the stamens, the leaves or the hairs surrounding the sepals. Such is the case with the leaves of *Rosa rubiginosa Eglanteria* which, when bruised, smell of green apples, and if you would rub the hairs around the sepals of *Rosa X centifolia ‘Quatre saisons blanc mousseux,’* the smell would be that of camphor.

**The Rose and the Perfume Industry**

Roses with very different scents are mainly cultivated for use in the perfume industry. *Rosa X damascena ‘Trigintipetalata,’* also called “the Damask Rose,” “rose of Kazanlik,” “rose of Puteaux,” “rose of Four Seasons,” or sometimes the “rose of Provins,” introduced in the 12th century in Bulgaria around the town of Kazanlak (not Kazanlik). It can also be found in Iran and India. *Rosa X centifolia,* also known as the “Provence Rose,” or the “May rose,” introduced in Grasse in France in the 18th century, where it is still grown on a small scale to this day. It is also grown in Egypt, Morocco, Tunisia as well as in Turkey which is the world’s leading producer. Let us mention that C. Testu (see ref no. 4) indicates “May rose” for *Rosa majalis.* To a lesser extent in making perfumes, *Rosa alba* is also used in Bulgaria, Morocco (as Dadès’s rose), Tunisia (as Ariana’s rose) and in Egypt.
For the making of a perfume, we will follow an outline of the process by P. Nuyens (see ref no. 1). Traditional steam distillation results in a hydrosol which is a mixture of essential oil and water. As their weights differ, a simple decanting separates the essential oil or rose essence which floats to the top. What remains is known as rose water, often used in cooking and as “loukoum” in Middle Eastern sweets.

Two other perfumed components are called the concrete and the absolute. Originally obtained by a process known as “enfleurage à froid” which relied on the absorption of an essence by a fatty matter. The rose petals are placed on animal fat, and the process is repeated with fresh petals several times. The perfumed grease is then washed with a solvent which evaporates leaving a scented paste called the concrete. The absolute is the result of the extraction of the perfumes from the concrete with volatile solvents. Dark in color, the absolute is the most opulent essence and the richest in perfume. “Enfleurage à chaud”, to extract the perfumes of the hardier blossoms, has been used since the very earliest of recorded times.

Today’s modern methods, derived from laboratories and research, using volatile solvents, CO₂ molecular distillation, and cold extraction to distill natural perfumes are highly efficient. Moreover, modern chemistry has created synthetic-scented molecules which are used in making new perfumes.

Some data are also interesting to report. Four tons of fresh rose petals, picked from 400,000 flowers grown on one hectare, can produce one kilo of essential rose oil using Damask roses; four times the quantity is needed if using Provence roses. The price for one kilo of oil can vary from €2,500 to €3,000. Another calculation is the following: these two roses have at least 50 petals or more per plant which when still fresh will weight only 10 grams. Five kilos of fresh roses are required to produce one kilo of dried blossoms.

To complete the above description of the chemistry involved, we note that the majority of the essential oil extracted from Rosa X damascena ‘Trigintipetala’ is composed of three alcohols: 2-phenylethanol or phenethyl alcohol (C₈H₁₀O), geraniol (C₁₀H₁₈O), and citronellol (C₁₀H₂₀O). Also present are nerol (nerodol, nerolol or neraniol) and linalool. The latter has a fresh floral note and is an important component in Lily of the Valley, bergamot, lavender and other floral essential oils. The fundamental olfactive traces are rose oxide, nerol oxide, oxide furan and the damascenones. One also may detect citral (nesal/geranial), alcohol esters (acetate and formate), and aldehydes in C₉. One mainly finds the three alcohols mentioned above when dealing with Rosa X centifolia and only a few of the fundamental olfactive factors noted above.
In South America (in particular in Chile), the cosmetic industry harvests rosehips (the false fruits) of *Rosa rubiginosa* or *Rosa moschata* for their seeds (true fruits) whose oil is rich in essential fatty acids used on skin, especially as a cell regenerator. Approximately 60,000 rosehips are needed to produce one liter of oil. In Bulgaria, *Rosa alba ‘Semiplena’* is frequently used in distillation due to its richness in citronellol, linalool and nerol. Its extracts, which are astringent and toning, are used to heal skin inflammations, eczema, acne, bronchitis and asthma. (It is also used to treat frigidity, impotence, and alcoholism!) At the request of the pharmaceutical industry, research is underway in Tunisia to optimize the multiplication of *Rosa canina* and increase its rosehip production, not only for its essential oils but also for the vitamins contained: A, C and PP. As for the rosehips of *Rosa rugosa* they are used in cookery. Picked after the first frosts, they also make excellent jams.

In conclusion: to discover the fragrance of a rose, one must take time, both figuratively and concretely. This magical flower loves to be courted. Maybe you will need to try several times before discovering the more subtle fragrances. When you wish to plant a rose, choose a variety whose shape and color meet your wishes, and, above all, pick one that pleases you. You will visit her often and, without uttering a word, she will not fail but to thank you with her scent.

* * *
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Peter Lambert was a German rose breeder, living from 1860 to 1939. His specialized rose nursery was located in Trèves (Trier) close to the German border with Luxemburg. Although Peter Lambert was certainly the most prominent and successful rose breeder of his time, and his life is well-documented, there is some uncertainty about his year of birth. While the Rosenjahrbuch 1992 (the yearbook of the German Rose Society) claims his year of birth to be 1860, another publication Gartenwelt (periodical for horticulture) states it was 1859.

Peter Lambert was the son of Jean Lambert, who in 1860 founded, together with brother Nicolaus and the landscape gardener Johann Reiter the nursery Lambert & Reiter, which in later years should become the nursery Lambert Söhne, where Peter Lambert took his first steps into the rose world. He continued his education in France and Luxemburg and finally at the Höhere Lehranstalt at Potsdam where he earned the title "Königlicher Obergärtner" (Royal Senior Gardener). After his apprenticeship he returned to Trèves and joined the nursery of his father. At that time, Lambert & Reiter was already into new roses, but solely their propagation. The breeding of new rose cultivars had not yet been tried or intended.
The Breeder

In 1888, certainly under the influence of Peter Lambert, three new rose cultivars were introduced by Lambert & Reiter: ‘Moselblümchen’ (Hybrid China), ‘Rheingold’ (Hybrid China) and ‘Frau Anna Bloethner’ (China). One year later, in 1899, ‘Moselblümchen’ and ‘Rheingold’ came into commerce. The fate of ‘Frau Anna Bloethner’ is unknown.

Lambert finally in 1890 established his own specialized rose nursery: Peter Lambert Rose-Spezial-Kulturen. He began his business with introducing ‘Kaiserin Auguste Viktoria’ (HT) which became the basis for his worldwide reputation as a rose breeder and was a tremendous commercial success. His next and probably most famous rose ever was the pure white ‘Frau Karl Druschki’ (HP). The story of this rose is not as straightforward as it might seem. Introduced in 1899 as ‘Schneekönigin’ (“The Snow Queen”) it failed at the competition managed by Praktischer Ratgeber (a well-known horticultural periodical) in 1900. The next year Lambert had renamed this rose as ‘Frau Karl Druschki’ to honor the wife of the president of the German rose Society at that time. It was a grand success and remains so.

Today, people tend to think if a rose is successful only in regard to those planted (and sold) garden roses. More often the fact is that the cut flower business is at least as important as the business for complete plants. A pure white cut rose flower was and is essential, for example, for any bridal bouquet.

One more word about ‘Frau Karl Druschki’. This rose–and its name–became synonymous for a healthy, successful rose. The result was that in a few years quite a lot of new roses, not necessarily bred by Lambert, had ‘Druschki’ as part of their name, quite independently from their actual ancestry and more often than not with no relation to the original ‘Frau Karl Druschki’.
In the beginning of the 1890s, Lambert had bought the rights for three Multiflora Hybrids from the J.B. Schmitt nursery at Bischweiler, Alsace: ‘Aglaia’, ‘Thalia’ and ‘Euphrosyne’, once-blooming large flowered climbers, which were called by Lambert “The Three Graces.” Apart from bringing them into commerce, these three cultivars were used by Lambert to reach a rather ambitious aim: Breeding repeat-flowering climbers. To reach that goal, Lambert used once blooming climbers and shrub roses on the one hand and polyanthas and Hybrid polyanthas on the other. These crossings produced once-flowering climbers as well as repeat-flowering roses. In 1903 Lambert introduced his first repeat-flowering climber ‘Thalia Remontant’ (‘Thalia’ x ‘Mme. Laurette Messimy’). ‘Trier’, which is regarded as the first repeat-flowering shrub rose, followed in 1904.

Creating the “Lambertianas”

One of the main characteristics of these crossings were--of course--the repeat-flowering capabilities. It was and is sometimes difficult to recognize differences between large repeat-flowering shrub roses and repeat-flowering climbers. Lambert’s shrubs grew fairly tall (1.50- 2.0 meters) while his climbers were--for a climber--of relatively restrained growth (2.0-2.5 meters). The new roses which emerged from the crossings of once-blooming climbers and the polyanthas and polyantha hybrids with repeat-flowering abilities, created a small climber (or a large shrub rose) were finally summed up in a new class of roses, the “Lambertianas.” The “Lambertiana” class existed by this definition for several decades until merged into the Hybrid Multiflora class.
In total, Lambert introduced 28 “Lambertianas.” Nearly all of them before 1922. During the next 17 years only four more emerged from Lambert’s rose nursery. It seems that he had lost interest in “his” creation. A fact that may have its origin in the success or lack thereof over time, of these roses in commerce. From the catalogues of the Lambert nursery from the 1920s to 1937 this is evident as more and more of his “Lambertianas” seemed to vanish from commerce.

Also, the aftermath of WWI did quite a lot to hamper Lambert’s activities as a rose breeder. As result of the loss of the war, the Rhineland and other western parts of Germany were occupied for several years by France, which led to boundaries and customs’ payments in both directions to France and to Germany, since Treves was in the heart of an occupied zone.

However, in addition to the “Lambertianas,” Lambert had also introduced 18 once-blooming climbers. A lot of them have since been lost, but ‘Helene’ (originally named ‘Helene Cordes’), ‘Gruss an Zabern’, ‘Ausonius’, as well as a few others that still exist and are still in commerce.

While going after his goal to breed repeat-flowering climbers, Lambert did not neglect breeding and introducing roses of other classes. After his tremendous success with the Hybrid-Tea ‘Kaiserin Auguste Viktoria,’ Lambert continued to breed in this rose class. More than 40 new Hybrid Teas were introduced by Lambert in the years between 1898 and 1933, when his last Hybrid Tea, ‘Reichspräsident von Hindenburg’ came into commerce. To sum up, as a child of the time when the breeding of new rose cultivars in Germany was nearly non-existant, Lambert had been from the start, influenced especially by French breeders, to want to introduce as many new cultivars as possible. Over the years 27 more Hybrid Perpetuals followed, some are still available. But Lambert never succeeded in repeating the success of ‘Kaiserin Auguste Viktoria’ and ‘Frau Karl Druschki’. By 1939, the year of Lambert’s death, quite a few of his roses already were lost or were no longer available for sale, and like so many other rose nurseries of that time, the Rose-Spezial-Kulturen nursery did not outlive its owner. It closed in 1939 after Peter Lambert’s death.
All in all, more than 170 new rose cultivars are attributed to Lambert. According to the database of the Europarosarium Sangerhausen, 89 of Lambert’s roses still exist there. This vast amount of newly-introduced rose cultivars leaves open to discussion the question: were all of these breedings indeed done by Lambert? Probably some skepticism is appropriate. Over the years in some of his catalogues, Lambert omitted the name of actual breeders of roses he was propagating and selling, a circumstance that moved, for example, Rudolf Geschwind to publish a note in the Rosen-Zeitung to make clear that some of the roses in Lambert’s catalog were actually bred by him, Geschwind. It can, therefore, not be excluded that other roses from other breeders shared the same fate; the difference is that those breeders did not complain for whatever reasons they might have had.

The Rose Official

Already back in 1883 it was clear to Peter Lambert that the rise of the Hybrid Teas could lead to the imminent loss of old roses and their genetic pool to rose breeders. As a founding member of the Verein deutscher Rosenfreunde (German Rose Society, also created in 1883), Lambert introduced his plan for a rose garden where these old roses should be planted and kept for future generations of rose breeders. This idea was accepted and promoted by the German Rose Society in the next years, and finally in 1903 the Sangerhausen Rose Garden, located in Saxony-Anhalt, was opened to the public. (Even when after WW II Sangerhausen was in East Germany its gardens were still maintained.)

The “Hows” and “Whens” which led to creating this rose garden are still debated. Certainly, in the year of its opening, the rose garden already was too small to include all the different rose cultivars which came to Sangerhausen, and it was Peter Lambert who designed the first enhancement and expansion for the rose garden. At that time, Lambert was already the secretary of the German Rose Society and editor of the Rosen-Zeitung, the periodical of the society. Of course, as the editor of this publication, Lambert defined the content. And he did so quite on his own terms. He got rid of one of
his hardest opponents: Wilhelm Hinner who had attacked Lambert and wanted Lambert to resign as editor. (See my article in Baon #17 of March 2018: “Rebel with a Cause: The Life of Wilhelm Hinner.”)

During his career as editor, from 1891 to 1910, Lambert had also used the *Rosen-Zeitung* to introduce 21 of his own new cultivars in a prominent place at the very beginning of each issue with achromolithograph of the rose and a detailed description. Keep in mind that since these lithographs were exchanged with other rose publications at home and abroad, Lambert had the perfect promotion instrument for his roses. Combined, of course, with his great advantage of having the German Rose Society pay for the production of the chromolithographs and the printing of the *Rosen-Zeitung*. Certainly during the first years of Lambert’s engagement as secretary of the German Rose Society and editor, nobody (except Hinner) really opposed this behaviour. But as rose breeding in Germany became more prominent and profitable, certainly other breeders of rose novelties became more and more unhappy with the given *status quo*.

Finally in 1910, Lambert stepped down as secretary of the Rose Society and editor of the *Rosen-Zeitung*. Not happily and certainly not by choice. In the *Rosen-Zeitung, 1910*, Peter Lambert announces his retirement or retreat: “...this is the last issue I shall edit, because I am not capable to continue with these functions which I enjoyed so much, due to certain circumstances, over which I have no control.”

It seems that these “circumstances” were the fact that Lambert was--for the first time--criticized openly by other leading members of the German Rose Society (i.e. Wilhelm Kordes) for the failed organization of the cut flower section of the 1910 rose show at Liegnitz and even more by how Lambert handled this criticism. An openly *ad hominem* attack in the *Rosen-Zeitung* towards a horticultural journalist who had written a critical statement about the rose show in *Möller’s Deutsche Gärtnerzeitung* (the most influential horticultural magazine of that time) started the ball rolling. The editor of *Möller’s*, Walter Dänhardt, one of the heavyweights in German horticulture, of course, safeguarded his journalist against any personal attacks. This sparked a discussion
among other rose breeders and horticulturists in Möller’s and other horticultural magazines. The articles and letters to the editor had one thing in common: a more or less profound criticism of Lambert’s high-handedness as editor of the Rosen-Zeitung and as secretary of the German Rose Society.

Lambert remained as the editor of the Rosen-Zeitung only until the end of 1910. On the final page of the last edition of the Rosen-Zeitung for 1910 he offers a farewell to the members and readers, denying that the “… scribbling in the M.D.G.Z. (Möller’s Deutsche Gärtnerzeitung) had […] influence in his decision to step back as editor of the Rosen-Zeitung and secretary of the German Rose Society.” Denials like that can be more telling in what they do not express than in what they actually say.

Abstract

Peter Lambert, the most prominent German rose breeder of his time, was born in 1859 (or 1860?), living through a turbulent time in Germany’s history to his death in 1939. During his career as a rose breeder Lambert introduced more than 170 rose cultivars in different rose classes. His plan to cross once-blooming large flowered climbers with polyanthas led to a new class of roses: the “Lambertianas.” Decades later this class merged into the Hybrid Multiflora class. Peter Lambert was deeply involved in the decision to found a specialized rose garden in Germany. His engagement, together with that of other rosarians, led to the founding of the Rosarium Sangerhausen (today: Europarosarium Sangerhausen, the grandest in Europe). From 1891 until 1910 Lambert was the secretary of the V.d.R. (German Rose Society) and editor of Germany’s most prominent and influential rose periodical, the Rosen-Zeitung.

* * * * *

The Author Harald Enders and his wife live in Northern Germany where his private garden has almost 400 different cultivars, half of which are old German roses. Enders is a dedicated historian of German roses, rose breeder and contributor to several rose journals. (See his previous articles in BAON #12, #14, #17.) His book on “Bourbon Rosen” (2006) is a classic in German rose literature. His contact email is: harald_enders@web.de His rose collection is on line at: http://fitzbek-rose-garden.jimdo.com
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‘E. Veyrat Hermanos’ - A ROSE AND A LINEAGE

By Inés Díaz de Licandro and Roberto Duato Veyrat

Inés never imagined a few years ago when venturing into the search for and preservation of the heritage roses project in Uruguay that she would find in the most unlikely sites so many beautiful but unknown roses. This awoke in her a burning curiosity to decipher the identity of those varieties, so that they might reclaim their original given names rather than being simply assigned a code “found roses” name.

Rediscovering ‘E. Veyrat Hermanos’

On a hot summer day in January, Inés set out on a rose rustling journey in San Carlos, Maldonado, accompanied by two friends. Along the route, they spotted a huge rosebush in among other long-neglected plants that was covered in blooms of a damask color with darker pink central petals. The rather wild but beautiful plant so struck them that they stopped the car and contacted the resident of the garden. He urged them to take photographs as well as to smell the soft and delicious fragrance of the flowers. It was a climbing Tea rose of great vigor and growth, which, Inés thought, should be able to be reproduced very easily from cuttings. Plump buds opened into a very double apricot-yellow and carmine-rose flower. The blossoms seemed to span a myriad of colors depending on how open they were. The whole mass giving the illusion of several plants rather than one. The new growth was tinted bronze-red. Hooked prickles predominated at the base of shoots and some branches were totally smooth and unarmed.
Once at home, Inés plunged into her library and archives to try to discover the identity of the found rose. It was some days before she unraveled the mystery: it was the Tea-Noisette ‘E. Veyrat Hermanos’. Rose breeder and landscape architect Luis Carrau confirmed its identity comparing it with a specimen in his garden which had been started from a cutting of a plant that still survives in the Quinta de Vaz Ferreira, in the Prado of Montevideo. Mr Luis Carrau had confirmed the identity of the rose and assured her that it blooms continually throughout the growing season.

This rose had been imported to the Rio de la Plata region and distributed by the most important commercial growers: in Uruguay, Domingo Basso S.A., and in Argentina, by Vicente Peluffo’s nursery. It was offered in Domingo Basso S.A. catalogs starting in 1906-07 and for most years until 1935. In the 1906-07 and 1912 issues its description has been highlighted: “very floriferous variety of fast growth; in our Colón nursery it was planted against a fence and developed admirably. The large flowers are very double, of a beautiful orange-yellow.” (It was also known by the name of “Pillar of Gold”.) She also noted that ‘E. Veyrat Hermanos’ was one of the 1,023 rose varieties present in the Montevideo Rose Garden during 1917-1919. This Rose Garden was the first one to be inaugurated in South America, in November 1912, and contained roses of all existing classes of that time, including 170 Teas and 43 Noisettes.
The rose ‘E. Veyrat Hermanos’ was obtained from seed by Alexandre Bernaix in Villeurbanne, Lyon, France. In November 1894 it was introduced to trade in France and then in other parts of the world. The Journal des Roses in its November 1894 journal carried an announcement of the rose’s availability and devoted a full review of it written by Pierre, du Plouy, along with a chromolithograph in the January 1895 edition: “It is a shrub with big and strong canes, with thick and shiny foliage. Inflorescences usually present from three to six large, full and perfumed flowers, a quality that is currently sought by amateurs. The bud, of a beautiful shape, turns into a bicolor corolla which displays beautiful damask-yellow petals in the lower half and light carmine-rose with amaranth pink highlights in its supper half. The contrast produced by the two remarkable shades of this rose, its great vigor as well as its intense soft perfume make it a variety of the greatest merit. The rose ‘E. Veyrat Hermanos’ will like to grow in the Midi region because it is very full and has some difficulties to open in rainy weather. During periods of high temperatures, it is gorgeous.”

The Journal of the Royal Horticultural Society (currently “The Garden” magazine) in January 22 1898 issue stated that “…New varieties of climbing Roses are very slow to establish their claims upon rosarians, for their true character cannot be developed under three or four years. Those who were fortunate to see the above rose flower last summer immediately resolved to obtain a good stock of it. The flowers have a certain resemblance to those of ‘Comtesse de Nadaillac’ and ‘Jean Ducher’ when those roses assume their best bronzy yellow tints. One cannot well give a rose a better character than this, and I shall be much surprised if this variety does not speedily take a leading position…”

Paul and Clément Nabonnand catalogs of 1898-99 described this rose as “…large, very double flower, bicolor corolla with damask-yellow and light carmine-rose, beautiful” as did P. Guillot in his 1905 catalog with a similar description. Nomenclatura de Rosales by Horacio M. Peluffo in March 1914, also carrying the same description and adds “… it is
necessary to plant it exposed to the sun. A floriferous climber.” The E. Veyrat Hermanos nursery catalogs include this rose among its collection of the best varieties of roses according to the Rose Trial held in Paris in 1900 during the *Exposition universelle* and its features are described as “big flower, very double, pretty shape, apricot-yellow and carmine-rose bicolor corolla with amaranth-rose highlights, a very fragrant climber.” The rose's breeder Alexandre Bernaix (1831-1905) was born in Ruy, Isère, France. He later settled in Lyon, and in 1855 married a woman who worked in the silk industry. In 1860 he installed his nursery in Villeurbanne, north of Lyon, where he specialized in roses, many of which were grafted by Guillot père. Among his best achievements were *'Duchesse d'Auerstädt'* (1887), *'Claire Jacquier'* (1887), *'Baronne Henriette Snoy'* (1897) and *'Souvenir de Mme. Léonie Viennot'* (1898). But it was the Franco-Spanish name *'E. Veyrat Hermanos'* so different to the usual French and English onomastics that intrigued Inés. Why would a Frenchman name a rose in honor of two Spanish brothers based in Valencia? More research connected her with a living descendant of the Veyrat Brothers, who continues the family tradition in landscape design and the developed friendship led to Roberto and Inés jointly writing this article.

**The Veyrat lineage**

At the end of the 19th Century, after several decades of frantic hybridisation, roses evolved from “aristocratic” or “bourgeois” to become popular flowers. The naming of roses led that evolution; They were no longer solely to indicate their use or geographical origin or iconic character, nor using only the names of kings or nobles as dedications. Instead, they carried the memories of breeders’ relationships or relevant people at the time or simply for reasons of family love or friendship. This was the case for *'E. Veyrat Hermanos'* , a rose that bears the name of a lineage of horticulturists and landscapers of French origin, established in Valencia, Spain.

Founder of the renowned Veyrat lineage, Étienne (Esteban) Veyrat Arnol was born on February 25, 1839 in Vénosc, Isère, France, very close to the hometown of his contemporary Alexandre Bernaix. He probably knew and learned the art of gardening in Lyon, surrounded by the great French breeders of that fabled period of rose creation. He was married to Marie Pellorce, and they had five children, two of which are of interest to us: Esteban and Pedro.

Étienne Veyrat started by making commercial trips to Spain, particularly coastal cities. Veyrat would buy plants, rosebushes and fruit trees in Lyon and Cabannes, (near Avignon), transferring the acquired goods to the port of Marseille, where he took ship to the Spanish Mediterranean coast. In Valencia, Veyrat got in touch with horticulturists, flower and fruit growers, such as Canet and Vicente Roca. After trading there, he continued southwards to the cities
of Almería, Jerez, Cádiz and Málaga. Around Christmastime, he would return via Alicante to Valencia arriving by May in Mont-de-Lans, France, to dedicate himself again to his agricultural work. He did this year after year, until in 1875 he returned to Valencia and rented the large courtyard of a house on Calle del Mar (later to be called by Valencians the “Patio de las Plantas”) where he established his business. Once settled in Valencia, his two sons joined him there, and Esteban and Pedro Veyrat Pellorce would work with him until his death in 1891.

The first commercial catalogues of “Casa Veyrat,” dating from 1884, cited the numerous awards received by the firm: “Awarded in several Exhibitions and lately in those of Valencia with the Gran Premio de Honor and Gold Medals, and in the first Exposición Nacional de Horticultura, of Madrid, with Five Silver Medals and three trophies, including the Cup of the Asociación de Ingenieros Agrónomos”.

Moving into the 20th Century

Before the Spanish Civil War Casa Veyrat offered an extensive collection of rosebushes: three hundred and eighty-five varieties of different types. As Corbín (1985) writes, “The prestige achieved by the firm Veyrat is evidenced by the awarding of the Gold Medal of the Sociedad Económica de Amigos del País, several awards for the rare colors in the roses, the quality of the fruits, as well as the Gran Premio de Honor and three Gold medals in the Regional and National Exhibitions of Valencia, in 1909 and 1910”. The
Veyrat Pellorce brothers continued producing and marketing plants, introducing new species and varieties. Esteban married Sidonie Turc from France. The sad deaths of his children Maria, only aged four, and Esteban at the age of thirty three who was destined to be the future manager of the firm Veyrat, prompted Esteban to leave the family business in the hands of his brother Pedro.

The connection with France continued as the 1901 Lyon Horticole publication refers to an enjoyable, instructive and adventurous excursion in July to the Alps region, which was attended by twelve people, including Veyrat. Joseph Viviand-Morel, editor in chief of the journal commented that “after dinner, he had the great pleasure to meet again M. Veyrat, member of the Association Horticole Lyonnaise, who lives habitually in Spain, Valencia, the country of good oranges. This horticulturist was born in Mont-de-Lans and every year he returns to see his mother. I did not expect to meet (him) in this town!”

Esteban later was awarded the medal of Chevalier du Mérite Agricole by the French government. He designed the gardens of the Count of Trespalacios Garden in the port of Béjar (Salamanca), declared as “Bien de Interés Cultural” in 2005 by the Junta de Castilla y León. The Historical Garden file states: "It was a whim of this Count who commissioned the project to an excellent landscape architect, the Valencian of French origin Esteban Veyrat, who began his work at the end of the 19th century and finished it in 1910." This centennial garden is in the late-romantic style within the naturalist-English style, housing more than 100 giant trees and conifers, many unique to Spain and Europe. It is known that Rosa ‘E. Veyrat Hermanos’ was grown in this garden. Esteban died in 1952.

His brother Pedro Veyrat Pellorce was married to Maria Eugenia Colín. Their two sons Pedro (1908) and Edmundo (1909) joined their father in the family business which had

---
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been renamed Viveros Pedro Veyrat. The company moved in 1933, creating a new agricultural plantation on the Route of Algirós, covering more than 20 hanegadas. The Office and Central gardens were established there, and named "el Huerto de Veyrat" while retail sales at “Patio de las Plantas” on Calle del Mar also continued until 1967. The house would be the headquarters of the company for more than 50 years. It was also where the brothers Veyrat Pellorce and their families lived. The company fostered strong commercial relations in many countries such as Algeria and Tunisia, where Veyrat entreprise created a large part of the plantations of orange and fruit trees with Valencian plants. They also started commercial relations with countries in Latin America, such as Venezuela, Uruguay and Argentina, mainly in the olive and fruit business.

During the Civil War of Spain, the Veyrat family left Valencia for France, which meant a serious cessation in their activities. On their return to Spain, they started a new productive and commercial activity dedicated to seeds, cooperating with the Spanish Administration during the difficult years of the postwar period, becoming concessionaries since 1948 of the Ministry of Agriculture of Spain. Pedro was decorated Commandant du Mérite Agricole by the French government adding to the many awards that honored the brothers Veyrat Pellorce.

The sad demise of Pedro in 1959 did not put an end to this remarkable family’s connection with agriculture and roses. His two sons, Pedro Veyrat Colín (1908-1999) and Edmundo Veyrat Colín (1909-1971) continued in their grand-father’s and father’s footsteps as renowned plantsmen and landscape architects.

Each brother also received numerous awards both in France and in Spain. Pedro’s sons Jaime and Juan Manuel continued in the family business until its final closure in the 1980’s.

1. An extremely variable land measure, in Valencia 1 hanegada equalled 831 square meters

---

Pedro Veyrat Pellorce – 1873-1959

---
Valencia, famous for its silk industry, named an “espolín” pattern in honor of the “Huerto de Veyrat” the design of which includes various roses. Today the city still remembers this famous family of horticulturists and landscapers and their beautiful orchard with the name "Huerto de Veyrat" Street, located near the site where the Veyrats had their nurseries on the Route to Algirós.

As for the rose ‘E. Veyrat Hermanos’, it is still grown in gardens all over the world but is only marketed by specialised nurseries.

* * *
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**Acknowledgments:** For the help and information they provided, the authors thank M. Jean Brun of France, Arq. Luis Carrrau of Uruguay, Mme Patricia Cavallo of France, and Mrs Ana Curotto de Basso of Uruguay.

---

2. The “espolín” or spur is the small shuttle that passes the threads to draw/pull the silk and which gives it the name. It is done manually and gives its name to this type of textile.
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A FEW WORDS ABOUT THE NEW WEBSITE
FOR THE WORLD FEDERATION OF ROSE SOCIETIES

It is amazing, beautiful and easy to navigate—a great resource for any and all rose questions. We would like to congratulate and thank Paul Hains, the new webmaster for making this possible.

To open, go to [www.worldrose.org](http://www.worldrose.org), to find updates on future WFRS rose conferences and regional conventions, the official “WFRS Newsletter” (issues going back to November 1997) and all issues of “By Any Other Name,” including the most recent. Then open the “Conservation and Heritage” box to access other sites, such as “Help Me Find” (some 44,000 roses named and identified) or the Database for the world-famous German rose garden at Sangerhausen as well as that of the *Roseraie du Val-de-Marne* in France, and again all the issues of *BAON*, from which individual articles will be easy to print.

Many kudos are due to Crenagh Elliott who in recent months has been trolling through all the *BAON* back issues, to create an Excel spreadsheet data resource cross-referencing the roses, authors, photographs, as they have appeared since the first issue in March 2008. We, as certainly will future researchers, deeply appreciate the care and attention this effort represents. It is hoped that we can give you an update on this project in our next issue #20 in September 2019.