

## A note on *Rosa zalana* (*Rosaceae*) in Northern Burgenland

Ivan SCHANZER

**Abstract:** *Rosa zalana* (*sect. Caninae subsect. Rubigineae*), up to recently considered to be obscure in Austria, is not extinct but still existing in very few specimens on the hills between Jois and Winden in N. Burgenland.

**Key Words:** *Rosa zalana*, floristics.

**Zusammenfassung:** Eine Anmerkung zu *Rosa zalana* (*Rosaceae*) im Nord-Burgenland.

*Rosa zalana* (= *R. caryophyllacea* var. *zalana*), aus *sect. Caninae subsect. Rubigineae*, galt – z. B. noch in der 2. Auflage der österreichischen Roten Liste – bis vor kurzem als verschollen. Diese gut charakterisierbare Sippe (gleichwohl in der Exkursionsflora merkmalsmäßig leider nicht berücksichtigt, obwohl dort – zufolge Flora Europaea und Liste der Gefäßpflanzen Mitteleuropas – als „*R. caryophyllacea*“ aufscheinend) wurde nun in zwei Exemplaren am „klassischen“ und in Österreich einzigen Fundort „am Haglersberge und um das Dorf Goyss“, also auf dem Hackelsberg bei Jois (W von Neusiedl am See), wo sie gegen Ende des 19. Jh. mehrfach gesammelt und als „sehr zahlreich“ angegeben worden ist, wiedergefunden. Sie unterscheidet sich von *R. rubiginosa* durch die auch oberseits stieldrüsigen Blättchen und die kugelige Hagebutte. Das angebliche ehemalige Vorkommen in Niederösterreich (bei Baden) erwies sich als irrig.

*Rosa zalana* was described by J. WIESBAUR (1879) as a species related to *R. caryophyllacea* and probably deserving the rank of just a form of the latter species. According to the original description, *R. zalana* differs from it in having stipitate glands on the pedicels (glabrous in *R. caryophyllacea* s. str.) and globose to slightly compressed fruits (elliptic or ovate in *R. caryophyllacea* s. str.). The most characteristic feature of both these species, which allows to readily distinguish them from *R. rubiginosa* and other related taxa, is their leaves being rather densely glandular on both surfaces.

Later on, *R. zalana* was treated by various authors either as a separate species (HALÁCSY 1896; HENKER 2000) or as a variety of *R. caryophyllacea* (BRAUN 1892; JANCHEN 1977). The taxonomic status as a species was explicitly discussed and confirmed in more recent literature (KLÁŠTERSKÝ 1974; VĚTVIČKA & ZIELIŃSKI 1981). In the latter paper, the authors suppose that *R. zalana* could be a species of hybrid origin, and that its putative parents are *R. rubiginosa* and *R. agrestis*. I think this hypothesis can hardly be supported since neither of the parental species ever possesses glands on the upper leaf surface.

However, whether treated as a separate species or not, *R. zalana* has an enough stable combination of diagnostic characters which allow to distinguish it from other related species of dog-roses quite easily. Besides that, this species seems to have a more or less sharply outlined area of its distribution, which includes most of the Slovak Republic and the NW part of Hungary, with a few localities known also from Poland, Romania and

Austria (VĚTVIČKA & ZIELIŃSKI 1981). The westernmost locality of *R. zalana* is in N. Burgenland, Austria. Here it is only known from a small area of two hills, Hackelsberg and Jungerberg, close to the village Jois near Neusiedl am See, to the N of Lake Neusiedler See. From this site the species was repeatedly reported in the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> to the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, which is documented by the following collections at the herbarium of the Museum of Natural History in Vienna (W): Keller 1882; Braun 1881, 1883; Beck 1887; Vetter 1914; Ronniger 1916. Amazingly, I have failed finding any more recent collections neither there nor in the herbarium of the Botanical Institute of the Vienna University (WU). VĚTVIČKA & ZIELIŃSKI (1981), in their paper, cite one more locality of *R. zalana* in Austria: [Niederösterreich], “südlich v. Baden, 1916, Ronniger (W)” Examination of this specimen shows that it has pedicels and fruits armed with stiff glandular setae, leaves devoid of any glands on the upper surface and nearly glabrous styles. By these and other characters it can be determined as *R. micrantha*. To the same species I refer one more collection, [Niederösterreich], “Leithagebirge, ad pagum Mannersdorf, 1888, Walz” (W), bearing a determination as *R. zalana* by H. Braun. Thus, Hackelsberg and Jungerberg in N. Burgenland seem to be the only known localities of *R. zalana* in Austria.

In the Red Data Book of Austria (NIKLFELD & SCHRATT-EHRENDORFER 1999: 102, 125) as well as in FISCHER & FALLY (2000: 247) *R. zalana* is regarded as possibly no longer existing in Austria, since no other collections of this species have been made since 1916. However, according to HENKER (2000), who cites “DUNKEL 1995 briefl.”, and to an oral communication of Mr. M. Haberhofer (in spring 2001), *R. zalana* still can be found in the area of Hackelsberg. To check this information I visited the hills of Hackelsberg and Jungerberg together with Univ.-Prof. Dr. Manfred A. Fischer and Mrs. Mag. Gerlinde Fischer on June 16, 2001.

The hills are surrounded by vineyards and covered with the remnants of Pannonian steppe vegetation alternating with patches of oak (mainly *Quercus pubescens*) wood and afforestations of Austrian pine (*Pinus nigra*) and False Acacia (*Robinia pseudacacia*). In some places, the hill slopes are densely overgrown with numerous rose bushes, especially along trails and wood edges.

During the excursion we have found one specimen (clone) of *R. gallica* and two specimens (clones) of *R. spinosissima*. All the other rose plants appeared to be various species of the subsection *Caninae*. Field examination and comparison with keys, descriptions and figures in WIESBAUR (1879), BRAUN (1892), KLÁŠTERSKÝ (1968, 1974), VĚTVIČKA & ZIELIŃSKI (1981), and HENKER (2000) in the laboratory have revealed that most of them belong to *R. canina* s. str. Two plants with pubescent but not glandular leaves we have determined as *R. corymbifera*. There have also been found one individual of *R. rubiginosa*, two of *R. agrestis*, and two of *R. zalana*. The latter is represented by two bushes, one of which is very low and does not exceed 50 cm, the other one is relatively tall, about 1.5–1.7 m. Voucher specimens (Austria, Northern Burgenland: Nature Reserve “Jungerberg-Hackelsberg”, Jungerberg [= “Tannenberg”], on the SW. slope, closely below the top of the hill, 200 m s. m., (8066/2)<sup>1</sup>; 16.6.2001,

<sup>1</sup> Central European Floristic Mapping Grid System

I. Schanzer, M. A. & G. Fischer; – between Jungerberg [= “Tannenbergr”] and Hackelsberg [= “Haglersbergr”], 180 m s. m., (8066/2); 16.6.2001, I. Schanzer, M. A. & G. Fischer; both specimens with immature fruits) are kept at WU and MHA.

*Rosa zalana* is not mentioned in the “Exkursionsflora von Österreich” (FISCHER 1994: 430) because – following KLÁŠTERSKÝ 1968 and EHRENDORFER 1973 – included there within *R. caryophyllacea*. The characters given in the key, however, refer to *R. caryophyllacea* s. str., a species probably absent from Austria, and do not include *R. zalana*. To avoid confusion, the crucial characters of *R. zalana*, as observed on the two specimens investigated (which are both quite alike, the distance between them being 0.5 km) are presented here: leaflets biserrate, glandular (shortly stipitate glands) and pubescent (thin eglandular hairs) on both surfaces (upper surface sparsely, lower surface more densely, but less strongly scented compared to usual *R. rubiginosa*); pedicels stipitate-glandular; fruit globose, glabrous; sepals (after anthesis) reflexed to  $\pm$  patent; styles villous.

In the “Flora Exsiccata Austro-Hungarica” (861. *Rosa zalana*. In valle Čabad “v stráni” ad oppidum Schemnitz [= Banska Stiavnica, Slovakia], Kmet’) H. Braun, in particular, wrote: “*Rosa Zalana* ist im mittleren, südlichen und westlichen Ungarn weit verbreitet und erreicht die Westgrenze ihrer Verbreitung am Neusiedlersee, wo sie am Haglersberge [= Hackelsberg] und um das Dorf Goys [ = Jois] sehr zahlreich auftritt.” So we can conclude, that since the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century *R. zalana* has greatly reduced its abundance in this area and just survives being mostly substituted by *R. canina*. A reason for such a substitution is not clear. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that *R. zalana* is an extremely rare species in Austria and deserves further conservation and study along with its whole environment on the Hackelsberg and Jungerberg hills.

#### Acknowledgements

I wish to thank Prof. Dr. Manfred A. Fischer for that extremely interesting and fruitful excursion to Hackelsberg and Jungerberg, a lot of valuable discussions on roses and the kind suggestion to write this note. I am also grateful to Prof. emer. Dr. Friedrich Ehrendorfer for arranging my visit to Vienna. The grant of the Russian Foundation for Basic Research towards general support of the *Rosa* project (no. 01-04-48777) is gratefully acknowledged.

#### References

- BRAUN H. (1892): *Rosa* L. – In: BECK VON MANNAGETTA G. (1890–1893): Flora von Niederösterreich: 768–816. – Wien: Carl Gerold’s Sohn.
- EHRENDORFER F. (Ed.) (1973): Liste der Gefäßpflanzen Mitteleuropas (2. Aufl., bearb. v. W. GUTERMANN und H. NIKLFELD). – Stuttgart: G. Fischer.
- FISCHER M. A. (Ed.) (1994): Exkursionsflora von Österreich. – Stuttgart: E. Ulmer.
- FISCHER M. A. & FALLY J. (2000): Pflanzenführer Burgenland. – Deutschkreutz: Eigenverlag J. Fally.
- HALÁCSY E. (1896): Flora von Niederösterreich. – Wien: F. Tempsky.
- HENKER H. (2000): *Rosa*. – In: Gustav Hegi, Illustrierte Flora von Mitteleuropa (2. Aufl.) **IV/2C**: 1–108. – Berlin: P. Parey.

- JANCHEN E. (1977): Flora von Wien, Niederösterreich und Nordburgenland (2. Aufl.). – Wien: Verein für Landeskunde von Niederösterreich und Wien.
- KLAŠTERSKÝ I. (1968): *Rosa* L. – In: TUTIN T. G. & al. (Eds.): Flora Europaea 2: 25–32. – Cambridge (U. K.): Cambridge University Press.
- KLAŠTERSKÝ I. (1974): Subsekce *Rubiginosae* rodu *Rosa* L. v Československu. – Preslia 46: 319–332.
- NIKLFIELD H. & SCHRATT-EHRENDORFER L. (1999): Rote Liste gefährdeter Farn- und Blütenpflanzen (*Pteridophyta* und *Spermatophyta*) Österreichs. 2. Fassung. – In: NIKLFELD H. (Ed.): Rote Listen gefährdeter Pflanzen Österreichs (2. Aufl.). – Grüne Reihe des Bundesministeriums für Umwelt, Jugend und Familie 10: 33–129. – Graz: austria medien service.
- VĚTVIČKA V & ZIELIŃSKI J. (1981): *Rosa zalana* Wiesb., its systematics and geographic distribution. – Fragm. Florist. Geobot. 27: 343–348.
- WIESBAUR J. (1879): Floristische Beiträge. – Österr. Bot. Z. 29: 141–148.

**Address of the author:** Dr. Ivan SCHANZER, Main Botanical Garden, Russian Academy of Sciences, Botanicheskaya 4, RU-127276 Moscow, Russia. E-Mail: schanzer@online.ru

# ZOBODAT - [www.zobodat.at](http://www.zobodat.at)

Zoologisch-Botanische Datenbank/Zoological-Botanical Database

Digitale Literatur/Digital Literature

Zeitschrift/Journal: [Neilreichia - Zeitschrift für Pflanzensystematik und Floristik Österreichs](#)

Jahr/Year: 2001

Band/Volume: [1](#)

Autor(en)/Author(s): Schanzer I.

Artikel/Article: [A note on Rosa zalana \(Rosaceae\) in Northern Burgenland 133-136](#)