ACTA UNIVERSITATIS AGRICULTURAE ET SILVICULTURAE MENDELIANAE BRUNENSIS

Volume 67 106 Number 5, 2019

AN ASSORTMENT OF WOODY PLANTS PRODUCED IN THE MANOR OF NOVÉ DVORY AT THE TURN OF THE 18TH AND 19TH CENTURIES: EUROPEAN, ASIAN AND NORTH AFRICAN TAXA

Miloš Pejchal[1,2], Lukáš Štefl[1,2]

[1] Department of Planting Design and Maintenance, Faculty of Horticulture, Mendel University in Brno, Zemědělská 1, 613 00 Brno, Czech Republic
[2] Institute of Botany of the CAS, v. v. i., Zámek 1, 252 43 Průhonice, Czech Republic

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.11118/actaun201967051195
Received: 22. 11. 2018, Accepted: 2. 9. 2019

To cite this article: PEJCHAL MILOŠ, ŠTEFL LUKÁŠ. 2019. An Assortment of Woody Plants Produced in the Manor of Nové Dvory at the Turn of the 18th and 19th Centuries: European, Asian and North African Taxa. *Acta Universitatis Agriculturae et Silviculturae Mendelianae Brunensis,* 67(5): 1195–1212.

Abstract

Lists of woody plants produced in nurseries were preserved from the years 1794, 1800 and 1814 in the manor of Nové Dvory of the noble family of Chotek. 276 taxa of woody plants in the current concept, permanently cultivated outdoors, have been determined in these lists at least to the level of the species. According to the existing findings, for 241 of them were documented for the first time their production for the needs of the landscape architecture in the territory of the Czech Republic. In the case of foreign natural and all cultural taxa, it is also the oldest evidence of their presence in this territory; for native taxa it is the first evidence of their usage in garden culture. Approximately 21.5% of taxa are autochthonous in the Czech Republic, 24% have at least part of their native territory in Europe and 1.5% in the Middle East, 2% come from Central Asia and Siberia and 4% from East Asia. Taxa produced in culture account for approximately 13%. Woody plants of North American origin (they are given a separate contribution) are represented by 34%.

Keywords: woody plants, introduction, history, Nové Dvory, Czech Republic

INTRODUCTION

The endurance and strength of the above-ground part of the woody plants together with longevity make them the most important plant compositional elements in landscape architecture. The knowledge of their assortment and ways of using in individual periods is therefore very important both for understanding the history of this field and for preserving and restoring the authenticity of woody elements in historical objects. Knowledge of the time of introducing foreign woody plants into a particular territory is also needed for the most complete assessment of the degree of their acclimatization and the resulting possibilities and limitations (e.g. invasive potential) for their future use.

The study of the history of woody plant introduction into culture in the gardens and parks in the Czech Republic has been given more attention after World War II. The first partial data was published by Nožička (1966a, b) in the work on the history of introduction of foreign woody plants in Moravia and Silesia and in the publication on the history of landscape architecture in the Czech lands. So far, the most extensive and most significant summary works on the history of introducing woody plants into gardens and parks in the Czech Republic are by Svoboda (1976, 1981). However, their certain limitation lies in the fact that

they are based on sources dating back to the 1830s and, they do not include the historical names of the woody plants and they do not deal with native taxa. Later, the data of both publications were partly supplemented by the results of the study of several older archive materials (Svoboda, 1990). Tábor (1987, 1991) elaborated an overview of the woody plants offered by the princely nurseries in the Lednice-Valtice Cultural Landscape in 1811. The history of woody plant growing in this area at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries was dealt with by Pejchal and Krejčiřík (2010, 2012, 2015), Krejčiřík, Pejchal, Šimek *et al.* (2015). In their works, they do not state only the year in which the cultivation of individual taxa is documented for the first time, but also the ways of using of the most important ones. Other important publications on individual objects (e. g. Tábor, 2013; Tábor and Šantrůčková, 2014) refer to a later period than this contribution deals with. The general characteristics of the individual phases of the woody plant introduction into the territory of Czechoslovakia are given in very detail by Benčať (1982).

The former manor of Nové Dvory is located in the Central Bohemian region, east of the town Kutná Hora. During the reign of Count Jan Rudolf Chotek (Johann Rudolph Chotek), one of the most prominent figures of the enlightenment nobility, extensive landscaping was in this manor (see Weber and Šantrůčková, 2013). An important part of these activities was the acquiring the foreign woody plants and then the production of their seedlings (Ledr, 1884; Borusík, 2009).

The aim of the contribution is to extend the knowledge of woody plants of European, Asian and North African origin, that can be cultivated outdoors all year round and were applied in parks and gardens in the Czech lands at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries. Their assortment and time of introduction into culture have been studied. The article builds on the paper (Pejchal and Štefl, 2019) on North American woody plants.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The following basic archive sources were used:

- Archive of the Czech Academy of Sciences – Institute of Art History, inv. no. 05942, WDXIII 2507, the List of Plant Material on the plan of nurseries in the Nové Dvory of 1794.
- The State Regional Archives in Prague, archive of Chotek family, inv. no. 1796, cardboard no. 117, Neues Verzeichniss Inn- und ausländische Bäume und Sträuche, welche..., 1800.
- The State Regional Archives in Prague, archive of Chotek family, inv. č. 1796, cardboard no. 117, Neues Verzeichniss inn- und ausländischer Bäume und Sträuche, wie auch Glashaus-Pflanzen und perennierender Staudengewächse, welche..., 1814.

The main source for contemporary the taxonomic concept and scientific nomenclature of natural woody plant taxa were the portals The Plant List, WCSP: World Checklist of Selected Plant Families, GBIF: Global Biodiversity Information Facility and Catalogue of Life; as supplementary were used especially portals IPNI: The International Plant Names Index and IOPI: The International Organization for Plant Information; and the book publications Erhardt *et al.* (2014) and Roloff *et al.* (2014). The names of the cultivars were modified primarily according to Hoffman (2016), as supplementary according to Krüssmann (1976–1978, 1983).

The period (historical) names of the woody plants are presented in the form mentioned in the primary source, i.e. including any errors. To identify them with current names, both Internet portals mentioned above and the publications by Rehder (1940, 1949), Krüssmann (1976–1978, 1983), Beissner (1887) and Beissner *et al.* (1903) were used first. From central European publications from the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries, works from Borkhausen (1800, 1803) and Wendt (1804) were most used, and, if necessary, also other historical publications available through the Internet portal BHL: Biodiversity Heritage Library.

The origins of individual woody plants were – in a simplified form – mainly processed according to Erhardt *et al.* (2014) and are expressed in abbreviations: AFN = North Africa, ASC = Central Asia and Siberia, ASE = East Asia, C = of cultural origin, E = Europe, EE = Eastern Europe, EN = Northern Europe, ES = Southern Europe, ESE = Southeastern Europe, ESW = Southwestern Europe, MAK = Macaronesia (Azores, Canary Islands, Madeira), ME = Middle East (Turkey, Caucasus, Iran, Levant), N = native in the Czech Republic (the entire area of natural occurrence has not been reported for these taxa).

Information on the time of introduction to Europe, or the introduction of a European taxa into culture, was taken from the following sources: Rehder (1940), Krüssmann (1976–1978, 1983) and Bärtels and Schmidt (2014), additionally from Boom (1978), Goeze (1916) and Wein (1931); references to sources are given for individual taxa only when the author's data is different. The time of introduction into culture in the Czech Republic is based on the data published by Svoboda (1978, 1981, 1990), Tábor (1987), Tábor and Šantrůčková (2014) and Pejchal and Krejčiřík (2015). In the case of woody plants for which the manor of Nové Dvory is according to previous knowledge the first documented place of the introduction in the territory of the Czech Republic, or the first place of production of seedlings for landscaping, this fact is marked by a grey fill in the column of the respective year (1794, 1800, 1814).

Notes on individual taxa are identified by a sequence number and are found after the table overview. They are mentioned especially in those cases where the identification of the historical name of taxon with the current name is complicated and they justify the solution adopted and, where appropriate, they express its reliability.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Detailed survey results are listed in the table overview (Tab. I).

In 1794 a total of 165 taxa were registered in the current concept, 164 were determined at least to the level of the species: approximately 17% are autochthonous in the Czech Republic, 24.5% have at least part of their natural habitat in Europe and 0.5% in the Middle East (not in Europe at the same time), 3% comes from Central Asia and Siberia and 3.5% from East Asia. Woody plants of North American origin which are the subject of another contribution (Pejchal and Štefl, 2019) are represented by 37%. The taxa created in culture account for 10%, almost half of them being derived from autochthonous species in the territory of the Czech Republic; cultural taxa of the American, Central Asian and Siberian species are completely missing. Deciduous woody plants are distinctly dominant: for all taxa, including American and cultural, they account for approximately 95.5%, and non-American for 96.5%. There is no cultivar of conifers among the taxa produced in culture.

In 1800, the situation was similar. A total of 202 taxa have been registered in the current concept, 200 were determined at least to the level of the species: approximately 25% are autochthonous in the Czech Republic, 25% have at least part of their natural habitat in Europe and 1.5% in the Middle East (not in Europe at the same time), 2% comes from Central Asia and Siberia and 4.5% from East Asia. Woody plants of North American origin are represented by 33%. The taxa created in culture account for 9%, almost half of them being derived from autochthonous species in the territory of the Czech Republic; cultural taxa of the American, Central Asian and Siberian species are again completely missing. Deciduous woody plants are distinctly dominant: for all taxa, including American and cultural, they account for approximately 94.5%, and non-American for 95.5%. Also this year there is no cultivar of conifers among the taxa produced in culture.

The data from 1814 cannot be fully compared to the above values because the list of plants is not fully preserved: it starts with the Acer genus and ends with an incomplete overview of the Pinus genus. A total of 131 taxa have been registered in the current concept, determined at least to the level of the species: approximately 20% are autochthonous in the Czech Republic, 27.5% have at least part of their natural habitat in Europe and 1.5% in the Middle East (not in Europe at the same time), 2% comes from Central Asia and Siberia and 4.5% from East Asia. Woody plants of North American origin are represented by 34.5%. The taxa created in culture account for 10%, about half of them being derived from autochthonous species in the territory of the Czech Republic, and there are no cultural taxa from the American, Central Asian and Siberian species. As in previous lists, deciduous woody plants dominate also in this list: for all taxa, including American and cultural, they account for approximately 95.5%, and non-American for 96.5%. There is only one cultivar of conifers among the taxa produced in culture. Data expressed in percent are similar to those of 1800. It is possible to speculate that the also absolute frequency was at least similar. This is also suggested by the comparison of number of the historical names of all the foreign woody plants with the genus names beginning with “A” to “O”: in 1800, there were 84, in 1814 another eight more.

In all three woody plant offerings, 279 taxa were registered in the current concept, of which 276 were determined at least to the level of the species, with eight not quite clearly and with eight the historical name was identified with a similar probability with two taxa in the current concept. In 13 cases, this was an intraspecific cultural taxon, which was not able to be determined in more detail, or not with sufficient certainty. Of the 276 aforementioned taxa there account for 21.5% autochthonous in the Czech Republic, 24% have at least part of their natural habitat in Europe and 1.5% in the Middle East (not in Europe at the same time), 2% come from Central Asia and Siberia and 4.5% from East Asia. Woody plants of North American origin represent 33%. The taxa created in culture are about 13.5%, about half of them being derived from autochthonous species in the territory of the Czech Republic, and there are no cultural taxa from the American, Central Asian and Siberian species. Deciduous woody plants are distinctly dominant: for all taxa (including American and cultural), they account for approximately 94%, non-American (including cultural) for 94.5%. There is only one cultivar of conifers among cultural taxa.

Of all the taxa offered in the years 1794, 1800 and 1814, according to the existing findings, for 241 of them were documented for the first time their production for the needs of landscape architecture in the territory of the Czech Republic. In case of foreign natural and all cultural taxa, it is also the oldest evidence of their presence in this territory; for native taxa it is the first evidence of their usage in garden culture. Approximately 21.5% of taxa are autochthonous in the Czech Republic, 24% have at least part of their native territory in Europe and 1.5% in the Middle East (not in Europe at the same time), 2% come from Central Asia and Siberia and 4% from East Asia. Woody plants of North American origin are represented by 34%. Taxa created in culture account for approximately 13%. The period

of their introduction into the territory of the Czech Republic known so far, or their use in the garden culture, has been shifted from 1 to 71 years ahead in case of woody plants of European, Asian and North African origin, most often in the range of 1 to 10 years; the greatest difference was found at *Vitex agnus-castus* (71 years), *Quercus cerris* (31 years), *Daphne laureola*, *Prunus cerasus* 'Semperflorens', *Vinca major* (29 years), *Euonymus verrucosus*, *Ostrya carpinifolia*, *Prunus lusitanica* and *Ulex europaeus* (23 years). For North American woody plants this shift is 1 to 35 years, most often again in the range of 1 and 10 years.

The distinct predominance of foreign woody plant taxa above native in all three offerings of nurseries is consistent with the spirit of the time (Zeitgeist) in Europe at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries. In the forests, the intensive management methods began to promote with expected increase of the wood production in conjunction with the usage of foreign woody plants (Nožička, 1966a; Benčať, 1982: 71–100; Pejchal and Krejčiřík, 2015: 16–19). In garden art, more and more importance has been placed to a more varied and detailed sophisticated composition of woody elements in landscaped gardens, intially poor in species and with little emphasis on woody plant individuality (Wimmer, 2014: 165, 171). Among the foreign plants, the North American woody plants and perennials introduced into Europe through France and England took the lead. East Asian taxa were still difficult to access and the same applied to Siberian woody plants as well, since closer contacts with Russia in this area have been established only in the 70's of the 18th century (Wimmer, 2014: 171). Significantly then were applied foreign woody plants from Europe and the Middle East.

Significant dominance of natural taxa over culture stems from the fact that it is a period before the intensive development of breeding in Europe as well as from the difficult accessibility of plants from China and Japan. More complex technologies of cultivar propagation could have a certain effect on their limited number. It could also be that the commercial offers did not include taxa from which only a small number of immature plants were available; this fact is mentioned in the text of the woody plant offer from 1800.

The presented results should be interpreted with caution, since the interpretation of the historical sources and the comparison of the results with other contemporary works is complicated for the following reasons: (1) the names of the plants in the archival sources are cited without their authors; (2) some authors present in their works contemporary, but not historical names of plants; (3) there exist different width of the concept of taxa for individual authors and periods; (4) the boundary between taxa that can be cultivated and no longer cultivated in outdoor culture is difficult to determine; (5) the influence of some historical publications, using increasingly invalidly published and illegitimate names, on their spread in practice.

I: *Woody plants produced at the manor of Nové Dvory*

Current name	Historical name	Origin	Introduction into culture					
			Europe	Czech Republic – existing data	Nové dvory 1794	Nové dvory 1800	Nové dvory 1814	Note
Abies alba Mill.	*Pinus picea*	N		1802		/		1
Acer campestre L.	*Acer campestre*	N	1582	1801	/	/	/	
Acer monspessulanum L.	*Acer monspeliensis*	ES	1737	1802	/			
Acer platanoides L.	*Acer platanoides*	N	1683	1802		/	/	
Acer platanoides L. **'Laciniatum'**	*Acer laciniatum*	C	1683	1801	/	/	/	2
Acer pseudoplatanus L.	*Acer pseudoplatanus*	N	1551	1801	/	/	/	
Acer pseudoplatanus L. **'Variegatum'**	*Acer pseudoplatanus foliis varieg.*	C		1801	/	/	/	3
Acer tataricum L. subsp. ***tataricum***	*Acer tartaricum,* (1814) *A. tataricum*	E-ME	1759	1801	/	/	/	
Aesculus hippocastanum L.	*Aesculus hippocastanum,* (1800) *A. hipocastanum,* (1814) *A. Hipocastanum*	ESE	1576	1756	/	/	/	
Aesculus hippocastanum L. **'Albovariegata'** or ***A. h.*** **'Luteovariegata'**	*Aesculus hypocastanum foliis variegatis*	C	1770			/		4

Current name	Historical name	Origin	Introduction into culture					
			Europe	Czech Republic – existing data	Nové dvory 1794	Nové dvory 1800	Nové dvory 1814	Note
Alnus glutinosa (L.) Gaertn. ?	*Betula alnus*	N		1802	/	/	/	5
Alnus incana (L.) Moench	*Betula incana*	N		1801		/	/	
Amelanchier ovalis Medik.	*Mespilus amelanchier*	E-ME-AFN	1596	1804	/			6
Artemisia abrotanum L.	*Artemisia abrotanum*	ES-ME-ASC	1548			/	/	
Berberis vulgaris L.	*Berberis vulgaris*	N		1803	/		/	
Betula pendula Roth	*Betula alba*	N		1799		/	/	7
Broussonetia papyrifera (L.) L'Hér. ex Vent.	*Morus papyrifera*	ASE	1750	1801	/	/	/	
Buxus sempervirens L.	*Buxus arborescens*	ES-ME-ASC		1804		/		
Buxus sempervirens L. 'Argenteovariegata' or ***B s.*** 'Aureovariegata'	*Buxus foliis varieg.,* (1814) *B. arborescens fol. varieg.*	C	1770/ 1755		/	/	/	8
Caragana arborescens Lam.	*Robinia caragana*	ASC	1752	1802	/	/		
Caragana frutex (L.) K. Koch	*Robinia frutescens*	EE-ME-ASC	1752	1802	/	/		
Caragana pygmaea (L.) DC.	*Robinia pygmea*	ASC	1751	1802	/			
Carpinus betulus L.	*Carpinus betulus,* (1800) *C. Betulus*	N		1803	/	/	/	
Carpinus orientalis Mill.	*Carpinus orientalis*	ES-ME	1739	1803			/	
Castanea sativa Mill.	*Fagus castanea*	ES-ME-AFN		1679	/	/	/	
Cedrus libani A. Rich.	*Pinus Cedrus*	ME	1638	1812		/		
Celtis australis L.	*Celtis australis*	ES-ME-AFN	16th century	1803		/		
Celtis tournefortii Lam. ?	*Celtis orientalis*	ESE-ME	1739	1823			/	9
Cercis siliquastrum L.	*Cercis siliquastrum,* (1814) *C. Siliquastrum*	ES-ME	1600	1802	/	/	/	
Clematis flammula L.	*Clematis flammula*	ES-ME-ASC-AFN	1590	1803		/	/	
Clematis vitalba L.	*Clematis vitalba*	N	1569	1802			/	
Clematis viticella L.	*Clematis viticella*	ES-ME	1569	1803			/	
Colutea arborescens L.	*Colutea arborescens*	E	1570	1801	/	/	/	
Colutea orientalis Mill.	*Colutea orientalis,* (1814) *C. cruenta*	ES-ME	1710	1802	/	/	/	10
Cornus alba L.	*Cornus alba,* (1814) *C. Sibirica*	ASC	1741	1801	/	/	/	
Cornus mas L.	*Cornus mascula,* (1800) *C. mas*	N	1596	1801	/	/	/	
Cornus sanguinea L.	*Cornus sanguinea,* (1814) *C. Sanguinea*	N		1801		/	/	
Corylus avellana L.	*Corylus avellana*	N		1802		/		
Corylus avellana L. **cv.**	*Corylus avellana fructu max.*	C					/	

Current name	Historical name	Origin	Introduction into culture					
			Europe	Czech Republic – existing data	Nové dvory 1794	Nové dvory 1800	Nové dvory 1814	Note
Corylus colurna L.	*Corylus colurna*	ES-ME	1582	1800	/	/	/	
Cotinus coggygria Scop.	*Rhus cotinus*	ES-ME-ASC	1656	1808	/	/		
Cotoneaster integerrimus Medik.	*Mespilus cotoneaster*	N	1656	1804		/	/	
Crataegus azarolus L.	*Crataegus Azarolus*	ES	1640	1805			/	
Crataegus laevigata (Poir.) DC. 'Plena'	*Crataegus oxyacantha flo: pleno*	C	before 1770	1801	/		/	11
Crataegus laevigata (Poir.) DC. 'Rosea'	*Crataegus oxyacantha flo: roseo*	C	1736		/		/	12
Crataegus monogyna Jacq.	*Crataegus monogynia*	N		1801			/	
Crataegus nigra Waldst. & Kit.	*Mespilus fructu nigra,* (1814) *Crataegus nigra*	EJ ?	1808	1802	/?		/	13
Cytisophyllum sessilifolium (L.) O. Lang [*Cytisus sessilifolius* L.]	*Cytissus sessilifoliis*	ES-AFN	1600	1802	/	/		
Cytisus nigricans L. [*Lembotropis nigricans* (L.) Griseb.]	*Cytisus nigricans*	N	1730	1804	/	/	/	
Cytisus purpureus Scop. [*Chamaecytisus purpureus* (Scop.) Link]	*Cytisus purpureus*	ES	1792	1802			/	
Cytisus scoparius (L.) Link [*Sarothamnus scoparius* (L.) W. D. J. Koch]	*Spartium scoparium*	N		1801		/		14
Daphne laureola L.	*Daphne laureola*	ES-MAK	1561	1823	/		/	15
Daphne mezereum L.	*Daphne mezereon,* (1814) *D. Mezereum*	N	1561	1806	/		/	
Diospyros lotus L.	*Diospyros lotus*	ASE	1597	1804	/			
Elaeagnus angustifolia L.	*Eleagnus angustifolia,* (1814) *E. orientalis*	ME-ASC	16th century	1801	/	/	/	16
Euonymus europaeus L.	*Evonymus europaeus*	N		1802		/	/	
Euonymus latifolius (L.) Mill.	*Evonymus latifolius*	ES-ME-AFN	1730	1803	/	/	/	17
Euonymus verrucosus Scop.	*Evonymus verucosus*	N	1730	1817	/	/	/	
Fagus sylvatica L.	*Fagus sylvatica*	N		1801	/	/	/	
Fagus sylvatica L. Atropurpurea Group	*Fagus sylvatica atropurpurea*	C	1680	1805		/		18
Fraxinus excelsior L.	*Fraxinus excelsior*	N		1801	/	/	/	
Fraxinus excelsior L. 'Diversifolia'	*Fraxinus excelsior simplicifolia*	C	1789	1801			/	19
Fraxinus excelsior L. 'Pendula'	*Fraxinus pendula*	C	1725	1801			/	20
Fraxinus ornus L.	*Fraxinus ornus,* (1814) *F. Ornus*	ES-ME	1710	1801	/	/	/	
Genista tinctoria L.	*Genista tinctoria*	N			/	/	/	
Ginkgo biloba L.	*Ginkgo biloba*	ASE	1727	1801		/		
Hedera helix L.	*Hedera Helix*	N		1802			/	

Current name	Historical name	Origin	Introduction into culture					
			Europe	Czech Republic – existing data	Nové dvory 1794	Nové dvory 1800	Nové dvory 1814	Note
Hibiscus syriacus L. **cv.**	*Hybiscus syriacus flore coeruleo,* (1800) *Hibisus Syriacus flore caeruleo*	C		1807	/	/		
Hibiscus syriacus L. **cv.**	*Hybiscus syriacus flore albo,* (1800) *Hibisus Syriacus flore albo*	C		1807	/	/		
Hibiscus syriacus L. **cv.**	*Hybiscus syriacus flore rubro,* (1800) *Hibisus Syriacus flore rubro*	C			/	/	/	
Hibiscus syriacus L. **cv.**	*Hibiscus Syriacus,* mit verschiedenfärbiger Blüthe	C					/	
Hippocrepis emerus (L.) Lassen	*Coronilla Emerus*	ES-ME-AFN	before 1600	1816			/	
Hippophae rhamnoides L. [*Elaeagnus rhamnoides* (L.) A. Nelson]	*Hyppophae rhamnoides*	E-ME-ASC		1802	/	/	/	
Hydrangea macrophylla (Thunb.) Ser.	*Hortensia mutabilis*	ASE		1823			/	
Hypericum hircinum L.	*Hypericum hircinum*	E-ME-AFN	1640	1807	/	/	/	
Chamaecytisus austriacus (L.) Link [*Cytisus austriacus* L.]	*Cytisus austriacus*	N	1741	1814		/	/	
Chamaecytisus supinus (L.) Link [*Cytisus supinus* L.]	*Cytisus hirsutus*	N	1774	1802			/	
Iberis sempervirens L.	*Iberis sempervirens*	E-ME	1731	1823			/	
Ilex aquifolium L.	*Ilex aquifolium*	E-ME-AFN		1805	/	/		
Juglans regia L.	*Juglans regia*	ESE-ME-ASC		1801		/	/	
Juniperus sabina L.	*Juniperus Sabina*	E-ME-AF-ASC	1548			/	/	
Juniperus sabina L.**'Variegata'**	*Juniperus sabina foliis variegata*	C	1730	1803			/	21
Koelreuteria paniculata Laxm.	*Koelreuteria paniculata*	ASE	1763	1801			/	
Laburnum alpinum (Mill.) Bercht. & J. Presl	*Cytisus alpinus*	ES	1596	1802	/	/	/	
Laburnum anagyroides Medik.	*Cytisus laburnum,* (1814) *C. Laburnum*	ES	1560	1801	/	/	/	
Larix decidua Mill.	*Pinus Larix*	N		1801		/		
Ligustrum vulgare L.	*Ligustrum vulgare*	N		1801	/	/	/	
Ligustrum vulgare var. ***italicum*** (Mill.) Vahl	*Ligustrum sempervirens,* (1800) *L. italicum semperv.,* (1814) *L. italicum*	ES ?	1768		/	/	/	22
Lonicera ×americana (Mill.) K. Koch	*Lonicera Grata*	ESE	1730	1823			/	23
Lonicera alpigena L.	*Lonicera alpigena*	E	1600	1802			/	
Lonicera caerulea L.	*Lonicera coerulea*	E-ASC	1724	1802		/		
Lonicera caprifolium L.	*Lonicera caprifolium*, L. *peryclymenum ital.*	E-ME				/	/	24

Current name	Historical name	Origin	Introduction into culture					
			Europe	Czech Republic – existing data	Nové dvory 1794	Nové dvory 1800	Nové dvory 1814	Note
Lonicera nigra L.	*Lonicera nigra*	N	1596		/	/		
Lonicera periclymenum L.	*Lonicera periclymemum vulgare,* (1814) *L. Periclymenum*	E-AFN	1596	1801	/		/	25
Lonicera periclymenum L. 'Belgica'	*Lonicera periclymemum germanicum*	C	1616		/			26
Lonicera tatarica L.	*Lonicera tartarica,* (1814*) L. tatarica*	ASC	1752	1801	/	/	/	
Lonicera xylosteum L.	*Lonicera Aylosteum*	N	1683	1801			/	
Lycium barbarum L.	*Lycium barbarum, L. Europaeum,* (1814) *L. europaeum*	ASE	1770	1801		/	/	27
Malus baccata (L.) Borkh.	*Pyrus malus baccata*	ASE	1784	1804	/	/		
Malus domestica Borkh. cv.	*Pyrus malus mit durchsichtiger Frucht,* (1800) *P. mit durchsichtiger Frucht*	C			/	/		
Malus L. cv. ?	*Pyrus flore pleno*	C				/		
Mespilus germanica L.	*Mespilus germanica*	ES-ME-ASC		1801			/	
Morus alba L.	*Morus alba*	ASE	1596	1722	/	/	/	28
Morus nigra L.	*Morus nigra*	ASC	1548	1803	/	/	/	
Myricaria germanica (L.) Desv.	*Tamarix germanica*	N	1582			/		
Ostrya carpinifolia Scop.	*Carpinus ostrya*	ES-ME	1724	1823		/		
Paliurus spina-christi Mill.	*Rhamnus paliurus*	ES-AF-ME-ASC	1597	1665	/	/		29
Periploca graeca L.	*Periploca graeca*	ES-ME	1579	1802	/	/	/	
Philadelphus coronarius L.	*Philadelphus coronarius*	E	1560	1801	/	/	/	
Philadelphus coronarius L. 'Duplex'	*Philadelphus nanus*	C	1770	1801			/	30
Picea abies (L.) H. Karst.	*Pinus Abies*	N	1548	1656		/		31
Pinus cembra L.	*Pinus cembro,* (1800) *P. Cembro,* (1814*) P. cembra*	E	1746	1805	/	/	/	
Pinus sylvestris L.	*Pinus rubra,* (1800) *Pinus sylvestris*	N		1804	/	/		32
Platanus orientalis L.	*Platanus orientalis*	ES-ME	16th century	1804	/	/		
Platycladus orientalis (L.) Franco [*Thuja orientalis* L.]	*Thuja orientalis*	ASE	around 1690	1802	/	/		33
Populus ×canadensis Moench or ***Populus deltoides*** Marshall	*Populus Canadensis*	E or AMN	around 1750	1804		/		34
Populus alba L.	*Populus alba*	N		1801		/		
Populus nigra L.	*Populus nigra*	N		1804		/		
Populus nigra L. 'Italica'	*Populus italica*	C	before 1750	1797		/		
Populus tremula L.	*Populus tremula*	N		1789		/		

Current name	Historical name	Origin	Introduction into culture					
			Europe	Czech Republic – existing data	Nové dvory 1794	Nové dvory 1800	Nové dvory 1814	Note
Potentilla fruticosa L. [*Dasiphora fruticosa* (L.) Rydb.]	*Pottentilla fruticosa*	E-ASC-ASE-AMN	1700	1801	/	/		
Prunus argentea (Lam.) Rehder [*Prunus orientalis* (Mill.) Koehne]	*Amygdalus orientalis*	ME	1756	1823			/	35
Prunus avium (L.) L. **'Plena'**?	*Prunus avium flore pleno*	C	1700	1811		/		36
Prunus cerasus L. 'Semperflorens'	*Prunus cerassus continue florens,* (1800) *Prunus avium cont. florens*	C	1623	1823	/			37
Prunus cerasus L. **cv.**	*Prunus cerassus flore pleno*	C		1801	/			38
Prunus dulcis (Mill.) D. A. Webb var. ***dulcis***	*Amygdalus comunis*	C?	1570	1799	/			
Prunus glandulosa Thunb. 'Sinensis'	*Amygdalus pumila*	ASE	1774		/	/	/	39
Prunus laurocerasus L.	*Prunus Laurocerasus*	ES-ME	1576	1803		/		
Prunus lusitanica L.	*Prunus luritanica*	ESW-MAK	1648	1823		/		40
Prunus mahaleb L.	*Prunus Mahaleb*	N		1801		/		
Prunus padus L.	*Prunus padus,* (1800) *Prunus Padus*	N		1802	/	/		
Prunus persica (L.) Batsch 'Duplex'	*Amygdalus persica flore pleno*	C	1636	1811			/	41
Prunus tenella Batsch	*Amygdalus nana*	N	1683	1803		/	/	
Pyracantha coccinea M. Roem.	*Mespilus pyracantha*	ES-ME	1629	1801	/	/	/	
Pyrus nivalis Jacq.	*Pyrus nivalis*	ES-ME	1800	1799	/			
Quercus cerris L.	*Quercus cerris*	N		before 1825	/	/		42
Quercus robur L.	*Quercus robur*	N		1799	/	/		
Rhamnus cathartica L.	*Rhamnus catharticus*	N		1801		/		
Rhus coriaria L.	*Rhus coriaria*	ES-ME-AFN-MAK	1629	1801	/	/		
Ribes alpinum L.	*Ribes alpinum*	N	1588	1801		/		
Ribes nigrum L.	*Ribes nigra*	N	1588	1802		/		43
Ribes rubrum L.	*Ribes rubrum*	E	around 1600	1802	/	/		44
Ribes rubrum L. **cv. ?**	*Ribes rubrum major*	C			/			
Ribes uva-crispa L.	*Ribes grossularia*	N		1802	/	/		
Rosa alba L.	*Rosa alba,* (1800) *R. alba fl. pl.*	C	16th century or earlier	1808	/	/		
Rosa centifolia L.	*Rosa centifolia*	C	1710	1801	/			
Rosa hemisphaerica Herrm. ?	*Rosa lutea fl. pl.*	C	before 1625			/		45
Rosa villosa L.	*Rosa villosa*	E-ME	1771		/			46

Current name	Historical name	Origin	Introduction into culture					
			Europe	Czech Republic – existing data	Nové dvory 1794	Nové dvory 1800	Nové dvory 1814	Note
Ruscus aculeatus L.	*Ruscus aculeatus*	E-ME-AFN-MAK	before 1750	1806		/		47
Salix babylonica L.	*Salix babylonica*	ME-ASC-ASE?	1730	1801		/		
Salix cinerea L. 'Tricolor'	*Salix caprea foliis varieg.*	C	around 1772		/			48
Salix lapponum L.	*Salix buxifolia*	N	1789		/			49
Salix pentandra L.	*Salix pentandra*	N				/		
Salix purpurea L.	*Salix purpurea,* (1800) *S. helix*	N		1803	/	/		50
Salix repens L. or ***S. myrsinites*** L.	*Salix fusca*	N/ES-ASC	?/1789	1802/?		/		51
Salix rosmarinifolia L. [*S. repens* subsp. *rosmarinifolia* (L.) C. Hartman]	*Salix rosmarinifolia*	N				/		
Salix triandra L.	*Salix amydalina*	N	1772	1802		/		
Sambucus nigra L. 'Alba' or 'Fructo-luteo'	*Sambucus alba*	C	1650		/			52
Sambucus nigra L. 'Laciniata'	*Sambucus laciniata*	C	1650	1802	/			53
Sambucus racemosa L.	*Sambucus racemosa*	N	1596	1801	/			
×***Sorbopyrus auricularis*** C. K. Schneid.	*Pyrus irregularis* oder *polveria*	C	1599	1807		/		54
Sorbus aucuparia L.	*Sorbus aucuparia,*	N		1801	/	/		
Sorbus domestica L.	*Sorbus domestica*	N		1806	/	/		55
Sorbus hybrida L.	*Sorbus hybrida*	E	1779	1801	/	/		
Sorbus chamaemespilus (L.) Crantz	*Mespilus Chamaemespilus*	E	1683	1804		/		
Spartium junceum L.	*Spartium junceum*	ES-ME	1584	1801		/		56
Spiraea crenata L.	*Spiraea crenata*	EE-ME-ASC	1800	1804	/	/		
Spiraea hypericifolia L.	*Spiraea hypericifolia*	ES-ME-ASC	1640	1804	/	/		
Spiraea salicifolia L.	*Spiraea salicifolia*	N	1586	1804	/	/		57
Staphylea pinnata L.	*Staphylea pinnata*	N	1596	1804	/	/		
Syringa persica L.	*Syringa persica*	ASE	1640	1801		/		
Syringa persica L. 'Laciniata' [*Syringa laciniata* (L.) Mill.]	*Syringa laciniata*	ASE	1755	1803		/		58
Syringa vulgaris L.	*Syringa vulgaris*	ESE	around 1500	1801		/		
Syringa vulgaris L. cv.	*Syringa vulgare flore rubro*	C			/			59
Tamarix gallica L.	*Tamarix gallica*	ES-AFN-MAK	1596	1803	/	/		

Current name	Historical name	Origin	Introduction into culture					
			Europe	Czech Republic – existing data	Nové dvory 1794	Nové dvory 1800	Nové dvory 1814	Note
Tilia ×europaea L. [*T. ×vulgaris* Hayne]	*Tilia europea*	N		1801	/	/		
Ulex europaeus L.	*Ulex Europaeus*	E		1823		/		60
Ulmus minor Mill. **cv.**	*Ulmus foliis varieg.*	C		1801	/			61
Viburnum lantana L.	*Viburnum lantana*	N		1802	/	/		
Viburnum opulus L.	*Viburnum opulus*	N	1560	1802		/		
Viburnum opulus L. **'Roseum'** [*V. opulus* var. *sterile* DC.]	*Viburnum roseum,* (1800) *V. opulus flore pleno*	C	1594	1802	/	/		62
Vinca major L.	*Vinca major*	ES-ME	1789	1823	/	/		
Vinca minor L.	*Vinca minor*	N		1804		/		63
Vinca minor L. **'Multiplex'**	*Vinca minor flore pleno*	C	1770	1808	/	/		64
Vinca minor L. **Variegata Group**	*Vinca minor fol. varieg.*	C	1770	1803	/	/		65
Vitex agnus-castus L.	*Vitex agnus castus*	ES-ME	before 16th century	1865	/	/		

1. According to The Plant List (2018) and WCSP (2018), *Pinus picea* L. is a synonym of *Abies alba* Mill. and *P. picea* Du Roi [Illegitimate] is a synonym of *Picea abies* (L.) H. Karst. It could not be ruled out that it was meant here taxon according to Du Roi because, in some Central European sources, the name he created was considered valid (Borkhausen, 1800: 383; Wendt, 1804: 42, 69).
2. Krauss (1802, plate 113) mentions a description and illustration of *Acer Laciniatum* Du Roi, synonym of *A. Platanoides-Laciniatum* Aitton. Similarly, Vietz *et al.* (1806, vol. III: 16, plate 227b) describes and displays this taxon as *Acer laciniatum* des du Roy, synonym of *Acer platanoides laciniatum* horti Kew. See also Rehder (1949: 413). Krüssmann (1976, vol. I: 98), Bärtels and Schmidt (2014: 69) and Gelderen (1994: 311) mentions the origin of the variety, or its introduction into culture, in 1683, Rehder (1940: 569) then in 1789.
3. In the list of plants cultivated in Wörlitz in 1798, to the historical name *A. majus foliis variegatis* correspond the current name of *A. pseudoplatanus* 'Albo-variegatum' (Rode *et al.*, 1994: 351). Krüssmann (1976, vol. I: 102) states for the cultivar 'Variegatum' the synonym of *albo-variegatum*. Gelderen *et al.* (1994: 315, 320) mention both variety 'Albo-variegatum' and 'Variegatum'. Hoffman (2016: 90) only states the variety 'Variegatum'; see also Rehder (1949: 413). Historical illustration is provided by Krauss (1802, plate 118) under the name of *Acer pseudo-platanus foliis variegatis.*
4. Weston (1770, vol. 1: 2; 1775: 1) states *Aesculus hippocastanum albo-variegatum* and *A. h. luteovariegatum,* similarly Hoffman (2016: 96) *A. hippocastanum* 'Albovariegatum' and *A. h.* 'Luteovariegatum'.
5. *Betula alnus* L. is currently considered synonymous with *B. incana* (L.) Moench, grey alder. However, in some Central European period literature (Wendt, 1804: 21) it is denoted as common or black alder: *B. alnus* L., Gemeine Erle. Grey or speckled alder this author mentions as *B. incana* Aiton, Weiße Erle. The same solution (*Betula alnus* = *Alnus glutinosa*) was chosen by Jork and Wette (1986: 121) to identify taxa in German objects from the end of the 18th century.
6. Description and illustration of *Mespilus amelanchier* L. see Schmidt (1794: 37, plate 85). It is very unlikely that *Mespilus amelanchier* Walter (1788) was cultivated in the nursery, because it is synonymous with *Amelanchier obovalis* (Michx.) Ashe according to The Plant List (2018) and in Flora (2018) is named *A. canadensis* (Linnaeus) Medikus var. *obovalis* (Michaux) Britton, Sterns & Poggenburg, Prelim.
7. According to The Plant List (2018) and WCSP (2018), *Betula alba* L. is synonymous with *B. pubescens* Ehrh. However, Beissner (1903: 53) refers to *B. alba* L. as synonym for *B. verruculosa* Ehrh. The same author states (p. 52) for *B. pubescens* Ehrh. synonym of *B. odorata* Bechstein. Borkhausen (1800: 493) considers *B. odorata* to be valid and its description corresponds to *B. pubescens;* besides, he mentioned also *B. alba* L. (p. 479), with the characteristic corresponding to *B. pendula.* The same concept has also Wendt (1804: 20, 21).
8. Year of introduction into culture by Boom (1978: 160): *Buxus sempervirens* 'Argenteovariegata' (1770, England), *B. s.* 'Aureovariegata' (1755, France). Both cultivars are mentioned also by Hoffman (2016: 137).
9. *Celtis orientalis* L. is a synonym for *Trema orientalis* (L.) Blume, the species that can be cultivated only in the greenhouse in the Czech Republic. It is highly probable that it was *Celtis orientalis* Mill., which is by a large majority of sources (The Plant List, 2018; Rehder, 1940: 186, 1949: 146; Beissner *et al.*, 1903: 88; Krüssmann, 1976: 332–333) considered to be synonymous with *C. tournefortii* Lam.; only GBIF (2018) mentions this name as a synonym for *C. australis* L. The significant period Central European author Borkhausen (1803: 1095) mentions besides *C. occidentalis* L. and *C. australis* L. also *C. orientalis* L., but from his German name (levantischer Zürgelbaum), stated origin (Greece and

Levant) and the data on resistance in Germany (as resistant as other species) it is obvious that he did not mean *Trema orientalis*.

10. For *Colutea cruenta* Aiton, Wildenow, Borkkhausen (1803: 956) mentions synonym *C. orientalis* Du Roi, Roth; the description corresponds to *C. orientalis* Mill.
11. Jork and Wette (1986: 125) and Tábor (1987: 276) identified the historical name *Crataegus oxyacantha flore pleno* with *C. laevigata* 'Plena'. Krüssmann (1976, vol. I: 432) and Rehder (1940: 370) give the origin of taxa before 1770. Holub (1992: 496) states that cultivars count in horticultural literature among this species mosty refer to the taxon *C. monogyna* Jacq. or *C.* ×*media* Bechst.; he did not see cultivars with diagnostic features typical for the species of *C. laevigata*. On p. 506, Holub similarly writes that many cultivars reported among *C. laevigata* taxonomically belong to the plants of *C.* ×*media* or its backcrossing. Hoffman (2016: 235) ranks this cultivar to *C. laevigata*.
12. Jork and Wette (1986: 125) identified the historical name *Crataegus oxyacantha fl. roseo* with *C. laevigata* 'Rosea'. Krüssmann (1976, vol. I: 432) states from that time only this cultivar with corresponding characteristics. Hoffman (2016) does not mention it. For introduction into culture see Boom (1978: 249).
13. Identification of *Mespilus fructu nigra* with *Mespilus nigra* (Waldst. & Kit.) Willd. is not clear. It cannot be ruled out that it could have been the corrupted name of some species of *Cotoneaster* Medik. Rehder (1949: 236) reports *Mespilus Cotoneaster* var. *nigra* Ehrhart as synonym for *C. melanocarpa* Loddiges. According to The Plant List (2018), *Mespilus cotoneaster* var. *niger* Wahlb. is synonym of *Cotoneaster melanocarpus* G. Lodd.
14. Originality in the Czech Republic is questioned (Kubát *et al*., 2002: 401; Úradníček *et al*., 2009: 106).
15. Taxon is at the border of possible cultivation in outdoor culture in the Czech Republic.
16. Catalogue of Life (2018) and GBIF (2018) consider *Elaeagnus orientalis* L. to be synonymous with *E. angustifolia* subsp. *orientalis* (L.) Soják. Hoffman (2016: 251) mentions *E. angustifolia* var. *orientalis* as a valid name.
17. It is very likely that this species is European and not *Euonymus atropurpureus* Jacq., a synonym for *E. latifolius* Marshall. Both taxa are mentioned in the Central Eurpean literature as two different species, whereas in case of *E. atropurpureus*, synonym of *E. latifolius* is not ever reported; see Borkhausen (1803: 884, 1536–1537) and Wendt (1804: 30), the same concept is in the Codex Liechtenstein, created in Valtice between 1776 and 1804 (Lack, 2000). Introduction into culture have been taken from Krüssmann (1977: 60) and Bärtels and Schmidt (2014: 303); Goeze (1916: 131) puts them until 1700.
18. The name of the intraspecific unit is reported according to Hoffman (2016: 276). Krüssmann (1977, vol. II: 71) puts introduction into culture before and Rehder (1940: 148) since 1680. It was probably *Fagus sylvatica* 'Atropunicea'.
19. Borkhausen (1800: 822) states for *Fraxinus simplicifolia* Willd. synonym of *F. excelsior diversifolia* Aiton, Wendt (1804: 32, 67) *F. diversifolia* Aiton and Rehder (1949: 560) *F. excelsior* f. *diversifolia* (Ait.) Lingelsheim. It is therefore very likely that this is not *F. diversifolia* Rochel ex Boiss., synonym of *F. ornus* L. For the period of introduction into culture see Krüssmann (1977, vol. II: 89).
20. Borkhausen (1800: 817) for this historical name states the synonym of *Fraxinus excelsior pendula* Aiton. For the period of introduction into culture see Krüssmann (1977, vol. II: 91).
21. For origin of variety see Bremt (2009: 155).
22. Loudon (1838, vol. 2: 1199) states synonym *Ligustrum italicum* Mill. (1768) for *Ligustrum vulgare* var. *sempervirens*. See also Rehder (1949: 571), Krüssmann (1977, vol. 2: 230) and Hoffmann (2016: 401). Introduction into culture according to Boom (1978: 394).
23. *Lonicera grata* Ait. is a synonym for *L.* ×*americana* (Mill.) K. Koch., probably a natural hybrid (Krüssmann, 1977, vol. 2: 243; Beissner *et al*., 1903: 448; Rehder, 1949: 629).
24. According to The Plant List (2018), *Periclymenum italicum* Mill. is an unresolved name, but some data suggest that it is synonymous with *Lonicera caprifolium* L. Schmidt (1794, vol. 2: 55–56, plate 106) states *Lonicera Caprifolium Italicum* var. *rubra* Aiton.
25. According to some authors, this woody plant is probably original in Western Bohemia (Kubát, 2002: 489). The data on introduction to culture in Europe is taken from Goeze (1916: 133); it is possible that this happened earlier.
26. Rehder (1949: 630) states for *Lonicera Periclymenum* f. *belgica* (Ait.) Rehder following synonyms: *Periclymenum germanicum* Miller (1768), *Lonicera germanica* Weston (1770), *Lonicera Periclymenum* var. *Germanicum* s. *serotinum* C. F. Ludwig (1783). See also Hoffman (2016: 408). The year of introduction into culture is indicated by Boom (1978: 409) and Bärtels and Schmidt (2014: 428).
27. Historical name *Lycium europaeum* is unlikely to be a taxon in the Linné concept, but a horticultural designation that Krüssmann (1977, vol. II: 270) considers to be synonymous with *L. barbarum* L. and at the same time highlights both the frequent confusion of the names of both species in practice and the fact that *L. europaeum* L. is not sufficiently frost-resistant in Central Europe. Borkhausen (1803: 1005–1006) mentions only *L. barbarum* and also states that it is confused with *L. europaeum*, which is not sufficiently frost-resistant in Germany.
28. The place of the first introduction in the Czech Republic is the Lednice-Valtice Cultural Landscape (Pejchal and Krejčiřík, 2015: 74). In 1722, over 4000 trees were purchased, but the cultivation in the area had to begin before 1716, from which exist records of silk production in Lednice (Křesadlová, 2006: 41 ex Witzany, 1901: 366). For the introduction of the taxon into Europe, see Goeze (1916: 175).
29. Taxon is at the border of possible cultivation in outdoor culture in the Czech Republic. The place of the first introduction in the Czech Republic is the Lednice-Valtice Cultural Landscape; Křesadlová (2006: 143–144) states that also Dornchrist-baum was in the orangery in Lednice in 1665. For historical illustration see Schmidt (1800, vol. 3: 30, plate 151).
30. Schmidt (1792, vol. 1: 57, plate 60) describes and displays *Philadelphus coronarius nanus*, which corresponds to the description of *P. coronarius* L. 'Duplex', as mentioned by Krüssmann (1977, vol. II: 395). This description matches the taxon that presents Borkhausen (1803: 1869) as *P. nanus* Mill. and denotes it as a *P. coronarius* variety. See also Rehder (1949: 193).

31. According to The Plant List (2018) and WCSP (2018), *Pinus abies* L. is a synonym of *Picea abies* (L.) H.Karst. and *P. abies* Du Roi [Illegitimate] is a synonym of *Abies alba* Mill. It could not be ruled out that it was meant here taxon according to Du Roi because, in some Central European sources, the name he created was considered valid (Borkhausen, 1800: 372; Wendt, 1804: 41, 69).
32. Borkhausen (1800: 420) mentions *P. silvestris rubra*, die schottische oder rothe Kiefer, Wendt (1804: 42) states *P. rubra* Mill., Aiton (1789, vol. 3: 366) *P. sylvestris* var. *communis*, syn. *P. rubra* Mill., Scotch Fir, or Pine Tree. However, the name *P. rubra* F. Michx., which is synonymous with *P. resinosa* Ait., originates from 1810. Similarly, it is unlikely to be the name of *P. rubra* Lambert from 1804, which is synonymous with *Picea rubens* Sarg.
33. The period of introduction into Europe varies considerably from one author to another. Bärtels and Schmidt (2014: 540) state around 1690, Rehder (1940: 54) before 1737, Goeze (1916: 177) and Krüssmann (1983: 345) then mentions year 1752.
34. The knowledge of poplars from the Aigeros section was inadequate in Central Europe in the early 19th century. E.g. Borkhausen (1800: 557) states the origin of *P. canadensis* Moench in America and for *P. carolinensis* Moench and *P. monilifera* Aiton – at the present time classified to *P. deltoides* Marschall – he uses „canadische Pappel“ as one of the German names (p. 550); also Wendt (1804: 43) applied this German name for *P. monilifera* Aiton. Still Koch (1872 vol. 2.I: 191) and Lauche (1883: 317) states *P. canadensis* Moench as synonymous with *P. monilifera* Aiton and *P. laevigata* Aiton. The woody plant marked *P. canadensis* is documented in the Lednicko-Valtice Cultural Landscape documented in 1804.
35. Taxon is at the border of possible cultivation in outdoor culture in the Czech Republic. As *Amygdalus argentea* is this taxon described and illustrated by Schmidt (1822, vol. 4: 22, plate 201), also mentioning its next name *A. orientalis*.
36. In 1794, *Prunus cerasus cont. flor*. and *P. c. flore pleno* were offered; in 1800 they are already listed as *P. avium cont. flor*. and *P. a. flore pleno*. However, *Prunus avium* does not have the cultivar of type “continue florens”. Thus, in the list of 1800, specific epithet was changed in the first taxon and in the second it cannot be rule dout either.
37. Description and illustration of the taxon provides Mayer (1779, vol. 2: 38, plate 21). Introduction into culture according to Krüssmann (1978, vol. III: 22). *Prunus avium* does not have a cultivar of type “continue florens”, in the offer of 1800 it seems to be a kind of species change.
38. Krüssmann (1978, vol. 3: 22) states that of the full-flowered cultivars, *Prunus cerasus* ‘Rhexii’ (since 1594) and *P. cerasus* ‘Persiciflora’ (since 1623) were cultured at the time. Boom (1978: 245) count among them also *P. cerasus* ‘Plena’ (since 1581).
39. For description and illustration of the taxon see Schmidt (1822, vol. 4: 28, plate 208). Time of introduction into culture according to Bärtels and Schmidt (2014: 557), Krüssmann (1978, vol. III: 26) and Boom (1978: 244). Rehder (1940: 467) states the year 1687.
40. Taxon is at the border of possible cultivation in outdoor culture in the Czech Republic. It is unlikely that it was *Prunus lusitanica* Walter, synonym of *Prunus caroliniana* (Mill.) Aiton.
41. The colourful representation of the *Amygdalus persica fore pleno* from 1801–1825 in the collection of Österreichisches Museum für angewandte kunst (Deutsches Dokumentationszentrum, 2018) corresponds to the description of *Prunus persica* ‘Duplex’ in Krüssmann (1978: Vol. III: 40).
42. Data on the introduction into culture in the territory of the Czech Republic is based on an orientation annual ring analysis of tree stumps near the Belvedere in the Lednice-Valtice Cultural Landscape (Krejčiřík, 2015).
43. Originality in the territory of the Czech Republic is questioned (Úradníček *et al*., 2009: 264).
44. It is possible that it was already a cultural taxon.
45. *Rosa lutea* Mill. is a synonym of *Rosa foetida* Herrm. Full-flowered taxa derived from *R. foetida* (*R. foetida* f. *persiana* (Lem.) Rehd., *R.* ×*harisonii* Rivers) have been documented since the 1930s (Rehder, 1940: 432; Krüssmann, 1978, vol. III: 249, 251; Beales *et al*., 1999: 51). It is therefore likely that this was a related rose of *R. hemisphaerica* Herrm., which was introduced in Europe before 1625. Borkhausen (1803: 1812–1813) and Wendt (1804: 54, 71) states for *R. sulphurea* Ait. (synonym for *R. hemisphaerica*) synonym *R. lutea multiplex* Du Roi.
46. It cannot be excluded altogether, although it is unlikely that it was a different taxon than *R. villosa* L., since more authors used the name *R. villosa* in a different concept at that time. For introduction into culture in Europe, see Rehder (1940: 434).
47. This taxon is at the border of possible cultivation in outdoor culture in the Czech Republic.
48. Krüssmann (1978, vol. III: 298): *Salix cinerea* ‘Tricolor’ has the synonyms *S. caprea tricolor* Hort. and *S. caprea variegata* Hort. The same synonyms states also Rehder (1949: 79) and the first of them states also Beissner *et al.* (1903: 24). Hoffman (2016: 743) considers the name of *S. cinerea* ‘Tricolor’ to be valid.
49. According to The Plant List (2018), *Salix buxifolia* Schleich. ex Ser. (1815) is an unclarified name, but some data suggest that it is synonymous with *S. lapponum* L. The GBIF (2018) portal considers *S. buxifolia* Schleich. and *S. buxifolia* Schleich. ex Ser. to be synonymous with *S. lapponum* subsp. *lapponum*.
50. Identification of *Salix helix* with *S. purpurea* L. is not entirely clear: according to The Plant List (2018), *Salix helix* L. is an unresolved name, but some data suggest that it is synonymous with *Salix purpurea* L. According to the Catalogue of Life (2018) and GBIF (2018), *Salix heli*x J. Walker (1808) is synonym of *Salix purpurea* subsp. *purpurea* L. and *Salix helix* L. is an accepted name. In the historical Central European sources, Borkhausen (1800: 560) gives *Salix puprurea* Scop. and *S. monandra* Hoffm., Willd., Haller etc. as a synonym for *S. helix* L. and Wendt (1804: 71) presents *S. helix* Du Roi & Borkh. as a synonym for *S. monandra* Willd.
51. According to The Plant List (2018) and GBIF (2018): *Salix fusca* L. is a synonym of *Salix repens* L., *Salix fusca* Jacq. [Illegitimate] is a synonym of *Salix myrsinites* L. The historical Central European sources state both *S. fusca* L. and *S. myrsinites* L. (Borkhausen, 1800: 620, 598; Wendt, 1804: 55, 56); this increases the likelihood that this was *Salix*

fusca L. Borkhausen (1800: 592) states also *Salix fusca* Hoffm. as a synonym for *S. alpina* Scop.; it cannot be ruled out that this related taxon may also be involved.

52. Schwerin (1909: 29, 30) mentions *Sambucus nigra viridis* Aiton (1811) and as its synonym *S. alba Rafinesque* (1838); in this work is also mentioned that in the catalogs this taxon is sometimes called *fructu luteo.* Krüssmann (1978, vol. III: 320) lists only cultivar 'Alba', Hoffman (2016: 750) lists only cultivar 'Fructo-luteo'. See also Rehder (1949: 599).
53. Historical literature (Borkhausen, 1803: 1164–1665) lists the *Sambucus laciniata*, synonymous with *S. nigra laciniata* L.; the description of its inflorescence corresoponds to *S. nigra.* Similarly, Rehder (1949: 598) and Beissner *et al.* (1903: 437) incorporate *S. laciniata* Mill. to *S. nigra* L.
54. Data on the time of introduction into culture is different: Boom (1978: 270) reports 1599, Bärtels and Schmidt (2014: 760) before 1619, Rehder (1940: 382) before 1620 and Krüssmann (1978, vol. III: 348) before 1690.
55. Originality of the taxon in the territory of the Czech Republic is not clear (Kubát, 2002: 384; Úradníček *et al.*, 2009: 142).
56. This taxon is at the border of possible cultivation in outdoor culture in the Czech Republic.
57. Some authors doubt the originality in the Czech lands (Hejný *et al.*, 1992, vol. 3: 433; Úradníček *et al.*, 2009: 284).
58. Data on the time of introduction into culture in Europe is considerably different. Boom (1978: 391) states the introduction to France in 1755, Krüssmann (1978, vol. III: 399) mentions 1768, Bärtels and Schmidt (2014: 790) write about the introduction of this species from Turkey in the 17th century.
59. It might be a lilac that Schmidt (1794, vol. 2: 26, plate 77) displays as *Syringa vulgaris purp.*
60. This taxon is at the border of possible cultivation in outdoor culture in the Czech Republic.
61. Hoffman (2016: 795) mentions two relevant cultivars: *U. minor* Mill. ´Argenteovariegata´ and *U. m.* ´Variegata´. Rehder (1949: 138, 141), Krüssmann (vol. III, 1978: 436, 431) and Boom (1978: 157) rank the first cultivar to *U. procera* Salisb. and second cultivar to *U. minor* Mill., or *U. carpinifolia* Gled. The first named was according to Boom introduced into culture in 1677 and according to Krüssmann in 1770, the second according to Boom in 1772.
62. Schneider (1911, vol. 2: 640) states *Viburnum roseum* Hort. as a synonym for *V. opulus* var. *roseum* L. Beissner (1903: 439) considers *V. opulus flore pleno* hort. synonym for *V. opulus sterile* Schmidt.
63. Originality in the Czech Republic is sometimes considered controversial (Úradníček *et al.*, 2009: 10).
64. Veston (1775: 45) mentions one relevant taxon: *Vinca minor purpurea plena*, which Krüssmann (1978, vol. III: 471) identified with *V. m.* 'Multiplex' and mentions the introduction into culture in 1770. In the same year, also full-flowered cultivar *V. m.* 'Alba Plena' was introduced into culture according to Krüssmann, but it was unlikely to happen because the color of the flower, distinctly different from the original species, would most likely be reflected in its name.
65. Veston (1775: 45) states two relevant taxa: *Vinca minor argenteo-variegata* and *V. m. aureo-variegata*, which Krüssmann (1978, vol. III: 471) identified with *V. m.* 'Argenteovariegata' and *V. m.* 'Variegata', the first of which was to be introduced into culture in 1770. The name of the intraspecific unit was taken from Hoffman (2016: 806).

CONCLUSION

The paper presents the data on the assortment of woody plants produced for the needs of landscape architecture in 1794, 1800 and 1814, from which only an incomplete list was kept. A total of 276 taxa in the current concept (in individual years 164, 200 and 131 taxa) have been registered, determined at least to the level of the species, with eight not quite clearly and with eight the historical name was identified with a similar probability with two taxa in the current concept. In 13 cases, this was an intraspecific cultural taxon, which was not able to be determined in more detail, or not with sufficient certainty.

Approximately 21.5% of taxa are autochthonous in the Czech Republic, 24% have at least part of their natural habitat in Europe and 1.5% in the Middle East (not in Europe at the same time), 2% come from Central Asia and Siberia and 4.5% from East Asia. Woody plants of North American origin, who are given a separate contribution (see Pejchal and Štefl, 2019), account for 33%. The taxa created in culture are about 13.5%, about half of them being derived from autochthonous species in the territory of the Czech Republic, and there are no cultural taxa from the American, Central Asian and Siberian species. Deciduous woody plants are distinctly dominant: for all taxa (including American and cultural), they account for approximately 94%, non-American (including cultural) for 94.5%. There is only one cultivar of conifers among cultural taxa.

According to the existing findings, for 241 of taxa were documented for the first time their production for the needs of the landscape architecture in the territory of the Czech Republic. In the case of foreign natural and all cultural taxa, it is also the oldest evidence of their presence in this territory; for native taxa it is the first evidence of their usage in garden culture. Approximately 21.5% of taxa are autochthonous in the Czech Republic, 24% have at least part of their native territory in Europe and 1.5% in the Middle East (not in Europe at the same time), 2% come from Central Asia and Siberia and 4% from East Asia. Woody plants of North American origin are represented by 34%. Taxa produced in culture account for approximately 13%.

The period of their introduction into the territory of the Czech Republic known so far, or their use in the garden culture, has been shifted from 1 to 71 years ahead in case of woody plants of European, Asian and North African origin, most often in the range of 1 to 10 years; the greatest difference was found at *Vitex agnus-castus* (71 years), *Quercus cerris* (31 years), *Daphne laureola*, *Prunus cerasus* 'Semperflorens', *Vinca major* (29 years), *Euonymus verrucosus*, *Ostrya carpinifolia*, *Prunus lusitanica* and *Ulex europaeus* (23 years). For North American woody plants this shift is 1 to 35 years, most often again in the range of 1 and 10 years.

Acknowledgements

This contribution was created within the framework of the project "Biotic threats to garden monuments: algae, cyanobacteria and invasive plant species" (DG16P02M041), implemented in the years 2016–2020 within the Program of Applied Research and Development of National and Cultural Identity (NAKI II) of the Ministry of Culture of the Czech Republic.

REFERENCES

AITON, W. 1789. *Hortus Kewensis*. 3 Volumes. London: George Nicol.

BÄRTELS, A. and SCHMIDT, P. A. 2014. *Encyclopedia of garden woody plants* [in German: *Enzyklopädie der Gartengehölze*]. 2nd Edition. Stuttgart: Ulmer.

BEALES, P., CAIRNS, T., DUNCAN, W. et al. 1999. *Encyclopedia of Roses* [in German: *Rosen Enzyklopädie*]. Köln: Könemann.

BEISSNER, L. 1887. *Handbook of conifer naming* [in German: *Handbuch der Coniferen-Benennung*]. Erfurt: Ludwig Möller.

BEISSNER, L., SCHELLE, E. and ZABEL, H. 1903. *Handbook of broad-leaved trees and shrubs naming.* [in German: *Handbuch der Laubholz-Benennung*]. Berlin: Parey.

BENČAŤ, F. 1982. *Atlas of the distribution of exotic woody plants in Sovakia and zoning of their cultivation* [in Slovak: *Atlas rozšírenia cudzokrajných drevín na Slovensku a rajonizácia ich pestovania*]. Bratislava: Veda.

BHL. 2019. *BHL: Biodiversity Heritage Library*. [Online]. Available at: www.biodiversitylibrary.org [Accessed: 2018, May 15].

BOOM, B. K. 1978. *Dutch dendrology* [in Dutch: *Nederlandse dendrologie*]. Wageningen: Veenman.

BORKHAUSEN, M. B. 1800. *Theoretical-practical handbook of forest botany and forest technology* [in German: *Theoretisch-praktisches Handbuch der Forstbotanik und Forsttechnologie*]. 1st Volume. Giessen: Heper.

BORKHAUSEN, M. B. 1803. *Theoretical-practical handbook of forest botany and forest technology* [in German: *Theoretisch-praktisches Handbuch der Forstbotanik und Forsttechnologie*]. 2nd Volume. Giessen: Heper.

BORUSÍK, P. 2009. *Use of silvicultural analytics of solitary trees, groups of trees and tree stands in the historical gardens.* [in Czech: *Využití pěstební analytiky solitérních stromů, skupin stromů a stromových porostů v historických zahradách*]. Ph.D. Thesis. Brno: Mendel University in Brno. Faculty of Horticulture.

DEN BREMT, P. V. 2009. An interesting list of plants from 1791 of the english gardens of castle Hex (Heers, Heks, prov. Limburg): a historical-botanical and cultural-historical analysis [in Dutch: Een interessante plantenlijst uit 1791 van de Engelse tuinen van kasteel Hex (Heers, Heks, prov. Limburg): een historisch-botanische en cultuurhistorische analyse]. *Relicta,* 5: 143–288.

CATALOGUE OF LIFE. 2015. *Catalogue of Life*. [Online]. Available at: https://www.catalogueoflife.org/col/search/all [Accessed: 2018, May 15].

DEUTSCHES DOKUMENTATIONSZENTRUM FÜR KUNSTGESCHICHTE. 2018. Amygdalus persica [Prunus persica/Pfirsich/Pflanzenstudie]. *Graphikportal*. [Online]. Available at: https://www.graphikportal.org/document/gpo00206399 [Accessed: 2018, May 25].

ERHARDT, W., GÖTZ, E., BÖDEKER, N. et al. 2014. *Zander hand dictionary of plant names* [in German: *Zander Handwörterbuch der Pflanzennamen*]. 19th Edition. Stuttgart (Hohenheim): Ulmer.

FLORA OF NORTH AMERICA ASSOCIATION. 2008. *Flora of North America*. [Online]. Available at: https://www.fna.org [Accessed: 2017, December 19].

GBIF. 2001. *GBIF: The Global Biodiversity Information Facility*. [Online]. Available at: data.gbif.org/species [Accessed: 2018, May 15].

VAN GELDEREN, D. M., DE JONG, P. C. and OTERDOOM, J. J. 1994. *Maples of the World*. Portland, Oregon: Timber.

GOEZE, E. 1916. List of trees and shrubs introduced since the 16th century to the present day in the gardens and parks of Europe [in German: Liste der seit 16. Jahrhundert bis auf die Gegenwart in die Gärten und Parks Europas eingeführten Bäume und Sträucher]. *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Dendrologischen Gesellschaft*, 25: 129–201.

HEJNÝ, S., SLAVÍK, B., KIRSCHNER, J. et al. 1992. *Flora of the Czech Republic 3* [in Czech: *Květena České republiky 3*]. Praha: Academia.

HOFFMAN, M. H. A. 2016. *List of names of woody plants: international standard ENA 2016–2020*. 9th Edition. Reolofarendsveen: Naktuinbouw.

IOPI. 1999. *IOPI: International Organization for Plant Information: Provisional Global Plant Checklist*. [Online]. Available at: bgbm3.bgbm.fu-berlin.de/iopi/gpc [Accessed: 2018, May 18].

IPNI. 2005. *IPNI: The International Plant Names Index*. [Online]. Available at: www.ipni.org/index.html [Accessed: 2018, May 18].

JORK, F. and WETTE, W. 1986. Use of woody plants in german landscape gardens of the late 18th century [in German: Gehölzverwendung in deutschen Landsschaftsgärten des ausgehenden 18. Jahrhunderts]. *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Dendrologischen Gesellschaft*, 76: 105–148.

KOCH, K. 1869–1873. *Dendrologie*. 2 Volumes. Erlangen: Enke.

KRAUSS, J. C. 1802. *Pictures of the most beautiful and most exotic trees and shrubs…* [in Dutch: *Afbeeldingen der fraaiste, meest uitheemsche boomen en heesters…*]. [Online]. Amsterdam: J. Allart. Available at: https://ia800501.us.archive.org/27/items/mobot31753000770948/mobot31753000770948.pdf [Accessed: 2018, Jun 15].

KREJČIŘÍK, P. 2015. Oral communication about an orientation annual ring analysis of tree stumps near the Belvedere in the Lednice-Valtice Cultural Landscape.

KREJČIŘÍK, P., PEJCHAL, M., ŠIMEK, P. et al. 2015. *The woody plants of the chateau park in Lednice* [in Czech: *Dřeviny zámeckého parku* v *Lednici*]. Brno: Mendelova univerzita v Brně.

KRÜSSMANN, G. 1976–1978. *Manual of broad-leaved trees and shrubs*. [in German: *Handbuch der Laubgehölze*]. 3 Volumes. 2nd Edition. Berlin: Parey.

KRÜSSMANN, G. 1983. *Manual of conifers* [in German: *Handbuch der Nadelgehölze*]. 2nd Edition. Berlin: Parey.

KŘESADLOVÁ, L. 2006. *Use of plants and horticultural practice in individual stages of development of garden art in the manors of Liechtenstein, analysis and interpretation of archive materials* [in Czech: *Použití rostlin a zahradnická praxe v jednotlivých etapách vývoje zahradního umění na panstvích Liechtensteinů, analýza a interpretace archivních materiálů*]. Ph.D. Thesis. Brno: Mendel University in Brno. Faculty of Horticulture.

KUBÁT, K. 2002. *The key to the flora of the Czech Republic* [in Czech: *Klíč ke květeně České republiky*]. Praha: Academia.

LACK, H. W. 2000. *A garden for eternity: the Codex Liechtenstein* [in German: *Ein Garten für die Ewigkeit: der Codex Liechtenstein*]. Bern: Benteli.

LAUCHE, W. 1883. *German Dendrology: systematic overview, description, instructions for cultivation and use of the trees and shrubs persistent in Germany with or without protection.* [in German: *Deutsche Dendrologie: Systematische Uebersicht, Beschreibung, Kulturanweisung und Verwendung der in Deutschland ohne oder mit Decke aushaltenden Bäume und Sträucher*]. 2nd Edition. Berlin: Parey.

LEDR, J. 1884. *The history of the manor and the town of Nové Dvory* [in Czech: *Děje panství a města Nových Dvorů*]. Kutná Hora: Karel Šolc.

LOUDON, J. C. 1838. *Arboretum et fruticetum britannicum; or, The trees and shrubs…* Volume II. London: James Ridgway and sons.

MAYER, J. P. 1779. *Pomona Franconica.* Volume 2. Nürnberg: A. W. Winterschmidt Kunsthandlung.

MAYER, J. 1786. *List of domestic and foreign flowers, perennials, shrubs and trees, which are found in the local princely court and residence garden…* [in German: *Verzeichniß der In- und ausländischen Gewächse an Blumen, Stauden, Sträuchern und Bäumen, welche sich dermalen im hiesigen hochfürstlichen Hof- und Residenzgarten vorfinden…*]. Wirzburg: Sebastian Sartorius.

NOŽIČKA, J. 1966a. Beginnings and development of introduction of exotic woody plants in Moravia and Silesia [in Czech: Počátky a vývoj zavádění cizokrajných dřevin na Moravě a ve Slezsku]. *Acta Musei Silesiae, Series C*, 5: 21–32.

NOŽIČKA, J. 1966b. Overview of the development of ornamental horticulture and landscape architecture in the Czech lands [in Czech: Přehled vývoje okrasného zahradnictví a sadovnictví v českých zemích]. *Vědecké práce Čs. zemědělského muzea*, 5: 7–75.

PEJCHAL, M. and KREJČIŘÍK, P. 2010. History report of a tree and shrub species introduction in the Lednice-Valtice Area [in Czech: Příspěvek k historii introdukce dřevin v Lednicko-valtickém areálu]. *Acta Pruhoniciana*, 95: 97–114.

PEJCHAL, M. and KREJČIŘÍK, P. 2012. Contribution to the history of cultivation of domestic woody species and their cultivars in the Lednice-Valtice cultural landscape [in Czech: Příspěvek k historii pěstování domácích dřevin a jejich kultivarů v Lednicko-valtickém areálu]. *Acta Pruhoniciana*, 100: 99–107.

PEJCHAL, M. and KREJČIŘÍK, P. 2015. *The history of woody plant cultivation in Lednice-Valtice cultural landscape until the First World War* [in Czech: *Historie pěstování dřevin v Lednicko-valtickém areálu do první světové války*]. Brno: Mendelova univerzita v Brně.

PEJCHAL, M. and ŠTEFL, L. 2019. An assortment of woody plants produced in the manor of Nové Dvory at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries: North American taxa. *Acta Universitatis Agriculturae et Silviculturae Mendelianae Brunensis*, 67(4): 981–992.

PIGOTT, D. 2012. *Lime-trees and basswoods: a biological monograph of the genus Tilia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

REHDER, A. 1940. *Manual of cultivated trees and shrubs: hardy in North America*. 2nd Edition. New York: MacMillan.

REHDER, A. 1949. *Bibliography of cultivated trees and shrubs hardy in the cooler temperate regions of the Northern Hemisphere*. Jamaica Plain: Arnold Arboretum of Harvard University.

RODE, A., ROSS, H. and TRAUZETTEL, L. 1994. *The English Garden in Wörlitz* [in German: *Der Englische Garten zu Wörlitz*]. 2nd Edition. Berlin: Verlag für Bauwesen.

ROLOFF, A., BÄRTELS, A., SCHULZ, B. et al. 2014. *Flora of the woody plants: determination, properties and use* [in German: *Flora der Gehölze: Bestimmung, Eigenschaften und Verwendung*]. 4th Edition. Stuttgart: Ulmer.

SCHMIDT, F. 1792–1822. *Austria's general Arboriculture, or pictures of domestic and foreign trees and shrubs whose planting in Austria is possible and useful* [in German: Österreichs allgemeine Baumzucht, oder Abbildungen in- und ausländischer Bäume und Sträucher, deren Anpflanzung in Österreich möglich und nützlich ist]. 4 Volumes. Wien: Albertisch (1792–1800), Strauss (1822).

SCHWERIN, GRAF VON F. 1909. Monograph of the genus Sambucus [in German: Monographie der Gattung Sambucus]. *Mitteilungen der Deutschen dendrologischen Gesellschaft*, 18: 1–56.

SVOBODA, A. M. 1976. *Introduction of ornamental conifers* [in Czech: *Introdukce okrasných jehličnatých dřevin*]. Studie ČSAV, 5. Praha: Academia.

SVOBODA, A. M. 1981. *Introduction of ornamental broad-leaved trees and shrubs* [in Czech: *Introdukce okrasných listnatých dřevin*]. Studie ČSAV, 12. Praha: Academia.

SVOBODA, A. M. 1990. History of the introduction of woody plants - their significance for the evaluation of frost hardiness [in German: Geschichte der Introduktion von Gehölzen – ihre Bedeutung für die Bewertung der Frosthärte]. *Fólia dendrologica*, 17: 125–152.

TÁBOR, I. 1987. Historical findings about the beginnings of introduction in our country [in Czech: Historické poznatky o počátcích introdukce u nás]. In: *Zahradnictví do 3. tisíciletí*. Lednice na Moravě, 8.–10. September. Lednice na Moravě: Vysoká škola zemědělská v Brně, Zahradnická fakulta, pp. 271–281.

TÁBOR, I. 1991. Historical documents about the beginnings of the introduction in Lednice na Moravě and Orlík [in Czech: Historické doklady o počátcích introdukce v Lednici na Moravě a Orlíku]. In: *Konference Parky jižních Čech*: e*vropské přírodní a krajinářské parky*. České Budějovice, 30. September–2. October. České Budějovice: Česká vědeckotechnická společnost, pp. 136–143.

TÁBOR, I. 2013. Plant registry of Dendrological society – a significant document about the history of the introduction of woody plants in Bohemia – conifers [in Czech: Matrika rostlin Dendrologické společnosti – významný dokument o historii introdukce dřevin do Čech – jehličnany]. *Acta Pruhoniciana*, 105: 23–48.

TÁBOR I. and ŠANTRŮČKOVÁ, M. 2014. Significant historical documentation about the introduction of woody plants in Červený Hrádek and Nové Hrady [Významný historický doklad o introdukci dřevin v Červeném Hrádku a Nových Hradech]. *Acta Pruhoniciana*, 107: 45–68.

THE PLANT LIST. 2013. *The Plant List*. [Online]. Available at: www.theplantlist.org [Accessed: 2018, May 18].

ÚRADNÍČEK, L., MADĚRA, P., TICHÁ, S. et al. 2009. *Woody plants of the Czech Republic* [in Czech: *Dřeviny České republiky*]. 2nd Edition. Kostelec nad Černými lesy: Lesnická práce.

WCSP. 2017. *World Checklist of Selected Plant Families.* [Online]. Available at: http://wcsp.science.kew.org/home.do [Accessed: 2018, May 28].

WEBER, M. and ŠANTRŮČKOVÁ, M. 2013. Landscape park Kačina in context with other designed areas [in Czech: Paralely krajinářských úprav na Kačině]. *Acta Pruhoniciana*, 105: 11–21.

WEIN, K. 1931. The first introduction of North American woody plants in Europe [in German: Die erste Einführung nordamerikanischer Gehölze in Europa]. *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Dendrologischen Gesellschaft*, 43: 95–154.

WENDT, G. F. K. 1804. *Germany's arboriculture* [in German: *Deutschlands Baumzucht*]. Eisenach: Wittekindt.
WESTON, R. 1770. *The Universal Botanist and Nurseryman*. London: printed for J. Bell; G. Riley; J. Wheble; and C. Etherington, at York.
WESTON, R. 1775. *The English flora, or, A catalogue of trees, shrubs, plants and fruits, natives as well as exotics, cultivated, for use or ornament, in the…* London: Printed for the author, and sold by J. Millan.
WIMMER, C. A. 2014. *Pleasure forest, bed and rose hill: history of the use of plants in the garden art* [in German*: Lustwald, Beet und Rosenhügel: Geschichte der Pflanzenverwendung in der Gartenkunst*]. Weimar: VDG Verlag.

Contact information

Miloš Pejchal: pejchal@zf.mendelu.cz