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**Abstract**

This chapter is concerned with standardisation within the perfume industry. How and when did the names of perfumes change from registering their contents or place of manufacture to the narrative, fantasy titles prevalent today? Did mid-Victorian discoveries in chemical synthesis result in naming changes? Data is taken from electronically-searchable London and Paris newspaper corpora. The shift from *Lavender Water* to *Kiss Me, You Dare!* is found to have been the work of a small group of closely-networked London perfumers who all had French (and German) connections. The Great Exhibition of 1851 (and subsequent exhibitions) were the main catalysts in naming shifts, and novelty became increasingly important as a marketing device. Perfume names which evoked love and romance developed rather late in the period, with allusion to flirtation the innovation of one specific perfume house. Discoveries in chemical manufacture had no linguistic effect at all on the names used for marketing.
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1. **Introduction**

The purpose of this contribution is to look at how certain industry-internal norms changed over the period, taking inspiration from Dossena’s citation (this volume) of Dr Johnson’s *Preface*, where he states that he

could not visit caverns to learn the miner’s language, [...] nor visit the warehouses of merchants, and shops of artificers, to gain the names of wares, tools and operations, of which no mention is found in books. (Johnson 1755: Preface)
Dr Johnson may not have been able to survey functional varieties\(^1\), but he lamented the lacuna, which a search of digital corpora can now partially fill. In what follows, I investigate changes in the marketing language of London perfumers by means of their advertisements. Perfume is chosen as a case-study because there was an industry-altering shift in technology in the 19th century, resulting in previously unsmeled synthesized smells requiring names *ab initio*. How perfumers rose to this challenge is expressed in the shift from simple [adj + N] Noun Phrases like *Lavender Water*, which factually describe the contents, to the structurally complex clauses of *Kiss Me, You Dare!* (marketed in 1876), which sell a fantasy. But far from being a relationship of cause and effect, this development had little, if anything, to do with methods of production. And it was not just linguistic: there was a corresponding shift in behaviours, as 18th-century perfumes had not been sex-specific in their marketing; sweetly-smelling scents had not yet been designated *feminine*; and perfume had had a function, that of overcoming bad smells, which were considered harbingers of germs\(^2\). Newspaper advertisements reveal that just a few, highly influential, perfumers caused shifts not only in naming norms but also in buying habits (and here, there was a direct relationship, the one causing the other), a state of affairs that lasts to this day. Research questions asked are:

a) What were the linguistic developments in the norms of naming perfume over the period?

b) Did technological developments result in language change?

2. Pre-synthesised perfume names

2.1 Head-nouns

In the early 18th century, perfumers’ wares were not perfume in the modern sense but medicinal, used externally and internally (lotions, disinfectants, antiseptics, cordials, etc.)\(^3\):

---

1. *Functional varieties* is a seemingly outdated term for what is now variously known as *specialized discourse*, or *language for special purposes*.

2. *Rimmel’s Toilet Vinegar* still featured in ambulance crews’ kit in World War I: “cologne sprinkled on a pad, hung up in the air, destroys bad smells and noxious effluvia in sick rooms, closets, etc.” (*Rimmel* advertisement, Adelphi Theatre programme, 24 April 1880, City of Westminster Archives).

3. Advertisements throughout are taken from the following electronic databases: *British Library Newspapers 1660-1950; 17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers; Chronicling America: Historic American Newspapers; Times Digital Archive; Gallica: La Presse Quotidienne*; and also from the City of Westminster Archives’ collection of theatre programmes.
The famous Issue-Plaister, prepared by a Surgeon of a very fragrant and pleasant Scent [...] at Mrs Croson’s Perfume-shop at the Black-Lion without Newgate. (*London Post with Intelligence Foreign and Domestick*, 14 February 1701)⁴

The Princely Perfume. Being a most delightful Powder, which incomparably scents Handkerchiefs, Gloves, and all Sorts of Linnen [...] it refreshes the Memory, cures the Head-ach, takes away Dulness and Melancholy, makes the Heart glad, and encreases all the Spirits, Naturals, Vital and Animal, to a Wonder. (*Daily Courant*, 5 March 1708)

The most Excellent Spirit of Ground-Ivy distill’d to its Perfection: It infallible cools and sweetens the Blood, and mightily helps to keep the Stomach in order. It hath likewise a more than ordinary Effect upon the Lungs, by preventing and wearing off short husking Coughs [...] the old Perfumer’s without Bishopsgate [...] At the same places are likewise sold the Sovereign Spirits of Broom, Elder, Scurvy-Grass, and the Flagrant Spirits of Wormwood. (*English Post with News Foreign and Domestick*, 4-7 February 1709)

Liquids of various sorts which were sold by 18th-century London perfumers included eye-water, hair-water (for both natural hair and wigs), mouth-water, scorbatic(k) water, oils, elixirs and essences, cordial drops, spirits and treacles, liquid to cure the bite of a mad dog, arquebusade water to cure gunshot wounds. *Water* was the prototypical head-noun, corresponding to French *eau de*, meaning not ‘water’ but ‘alcohol plus essential oil’:

At the Italian Warehouse, the Crown in Panton-street, near Leicester-Fields, Is Lately Imported, the following perfum’d Waters, viz. Cyprus, Pink Jessaman, Mistereuse, Milleur, Martecale, Cedrate, Bergamot, Violette, Supreme Sans Pareill; true French Lavender Water, Quintessence of Roses, Jessamin, Pink, Citron, Bergamot, Melissa, and Cedrate; Italian cordials call’d Rosa Solis, of Cinnamon, Cloves, Citron, Bergamot, Portugal Lemon. (*General Advertiser*, 14 April 1747)⁵

John Legg, Perfumer (And Snuff-Man) At the Civet-Cat, between Craig’s Court and Scotland-Yard, near Charing-Cross; Makes and Sells as usual, the following Articles, at the lowest Prices. [...] Lavender Water double distill’d; Hungary Water; French and English Aqua Mellis; or King’s Honey Water; Eau sans pareilé, and Eau de Larmes; Syrop de Capilaire, Orgeate, Rosata,

---

⁴ I presume the plaster was fragrant rather than the surgeon.

⁵ *Martecale* is a printer’s transposition of *marechale*; Piesse (1857: 146) gives a recipe. Note also typographical error *infallible for infallibly* (and possibly *flagrant for fragrant*) in the advertisement of 4-7 February 1709.
Saffron, Marshmallows, and Violets. (General Advertiser, 8 April 1751)\(^6\)

18\(^{th}\)-century perfumers sold snuff because snuff – powdered tobacco – could be scented, mixed with bergamot, myrtle, rose, orange.\(^7\) Medicinal use of water continued into the 19th century, as did perfume’s various functional purposes:

Edes Persian sweet bags, a rich perfume put up in satin bags, for scenting drawers, wardrobes &c. and is an effectual preventive against moths [...] Pangborn & Brinsmaid, Dealers in Perfumery, &c. (Burlington Free Press, 17 June 1836)

Waters sold in London included _eau de cologne, eau de Portugal, eau de Luce_, all with quasi-medicinal/restorative functions. _Vinegar_ (in a perfume context, short for _odorous or aromatic vinegar_) was a stronger concentration, filtered twice (see _OED_, s.v. _TOILET_, n. _toilet vinegar_, first attested there in English in a text of 1816, although advertised earlier in the London press, via French):

_Vinaigre de Toilette_, at 5s. per Quart Bottle. (Morning Herald and Daily Advertiser, 18 December 1781)

_Vinaigre de Toilette_. – J. Delcroix respectfully informs the Nobility, Gentry, and Public, that he has prepared a Vegetable Vinaigre de Toilette, of the most salubrious Herbs and Roses, for clearing and refreshing the skin. Persons heated in the blood, derive from it the most eminent and safe effects, without having recourse to the dangerous experiment of Lotion. It is particularly recommended as most grateful after washing the Face with Soap, and for Gentlemen after shaving, to remove the painful sensation occasioned by the Razor. It is excellent for cleansing and cooling the Mouth, and for restoring the enamel of the Teeth to original brilliance, while it leaves a pleasant fragrant perfume of Roses. Sold, wholesale, at No. 55, Poland-street; and retail by the principal Perfumers, in bottles, at 3s. and 5s. 6d. each. (Morning Post, 23 February 1807)

---

\(^6\) _Hungary water_; “rosemary flowers infused in rectified spirit of wine”, used for washing and drinking (_OED_, s.v. _HUNGARY_, n.a.). _Eau de Carmes;_ (the _L_ is a misprint for _C_) is still available, a cordial made originally by Carmelite nuns from lemon balm and other ingredients (see Bouvet 1953). _Syrup of Capillaire_; “sugared infusion of maidenhair fern and/or orange flower water” (_OED_, s.v. _CAPILLAIRE_, n., from the French word for the maidenhair fern). _Orgeat_; “syrup or drink made from barley or almonds and orange flower water” (_OED_, s.v. _ORGEAT_, n., from Old Occitan _orge_ ‘barley’).

\(^7\) For types of scented snuff, see _OED_, s.v. _BERGAMOT_, n.\(^3\); _MYRTLE_, n.4; _MACOUBA_, n.; _PRINCE_ n. _C2 prince’s mixture_, n.; _ORANGERY_, n.2. The sign of the civet cat was a traditional perfumers’ sign.
Jean Vincent Bully’s Celebrated Toilet Vinegar – This elegant Toilet Vinegar is one of the most efficacious and distinguished perfumes. It refreshes, softens, beautifies the skin. It is substituted, with the greatest superiority, to the Eau de Cologne, of which it has not the irritating principles. It soothes the irritation produced after shaving. It is of the most beneficial and delightful use in the ladies’ toilet, and in their baths. Imported in England. Sold, wholesale and retail, by A. Bouchet, 52, George-street, Portman-square; sold also by Sanger, 150, Oxford-street; T. Miles, 78, Gracechurch-street; Prout, 229, Strand; Farmar, 40, Mount-street, Lambeth; J. Brown, 1, Lombard-terrace, Chelsea. 3s. 6d. per bottle. (The Morning Post, 16 July 1847)

Rimmel’s Handkerchief Extracts and Toilet Vinegar. (Nashville Union and American, 2 April 1856)

By the 1850s, essence and extract signified a preparation of an essential plant oil plus alcohol (Piesse 1857: 68), and bouquet and nosegay signified a compound:

The perfumes for the handkerchief, as found in the shops of Paris and London, are either simple or compound; the former are called extracts, extraits, esprits, or essences, and the latter bouquets and nosegays, which are mixtures of the extracts so compounded in quantity that no one flower or odor can be discovered as predominating over another. (Piesse 1857: 40)

However, whether the distinction between eau de / water, vinegar, and perfume (being respectively more concentrated and costly) was always upheld is hard to determine, so all three will be considered here. Perfume could function as smelling salts, and as deodorant (or rather, as a smell-baffle):

The New Perfume. – Rowlands’ Aqua D’Oro. – This is the most fragrant and refreshing perfume ever yielded by the “Souls of Flowers.” It retains its fresh and delightful odorousness for days. It is invigorating, gently stimulating, yet sedative; and is an unrivalled quintessential spirituous product. For fainting fits, the fatigues of dancing, oppression from over-crowded rooms, or intense summer heat, its uses cannot be over-estimated. Price 3s. 6d. per bottle. Sold by A. Rowland and Sons, 20, Hatton Garden, London; and by chemists and perfumers. N. B. – A Golden Fountain of the Aqua D’Oro is exhibited at the Crystal Palace. (Daily News, 3 May 1851)

“Oppression from over-crowded rooms” is a euphemism for masking unpleasant body-odour, as Harriet Wilson described in her memoirs:

Brummell talked to Julia while he looked at me; and as soon as he could manage it with decency, he contrived to place himself by my side. “What do
you think of Colonel Cotton?” said he, when I mentioned Julia. “A very fine
dark man,” I answered, “though not at all to my taste, for I never admire dark
men.” “No man in England stinks like Cotton,” said Brummell. “Ah! ah!”
thought I, “me voilà au fait!” “A little Eau de Portugal would do no harm in
that quarter, at all events,” I remarked laughing, while alluding to his dislike
of perfumery. (Wilson [1825] 1909: 66)

In sum, the semantic field of pre-synthesised commercially-sold perfume contained the nouns *eau* / *water*, *vinegar*, *essence* / *quintessence*, *extract*, *spirit*, *nosegay*, *bouquet*, as well as *perfume*. These terms had their technical meanings (*bouquet* and *nosegay* signifying a mixture of plant oils + alcohol; *vinegar* signifying double-filtered), but their purposes were similar.

2.2. Modifiers

As can be seen above, the 18th-century perfume marketing norm was
to preface the head-noun (*spirit*, *extract*, *water*, etc.) with the name of
the main ingredient of the smell. There were some exceptions: *Supreme Sans Pareil, the Princely Perfume, Eau de Carmes*, and modifiers to do with place: *the Roman Essence* (1706), and to do with royalty: *The Royal Essence for the Hair of the Head and Perriwigs* (1704), *The Renowned Imperial Perfuming Essence […] for the Hair of the Head and Perriwigs* (1705); *Royal Water* (1755). Perfumes were not advertised to any great extent until the 1820s, when the first
development in naming norms began. This was not a radical departure
but an intensification of the previous century’s invocation of royal
patronage. Names such as *The King’s Honey Water* (1721) and

a most precious Paradise-water, used amongst the Quality instead of French
Hungary Water (*Daily Courant*, 16 January 1717)

sold their wares by means of association. If it was used by kings and
amongst the quality, who could afford to be choosy, then it must be
good stuff. By the end of the century a certain amount of aspirational
naming occurred within the cosmetics trade but it was not primarily
linked to perfume: *Maiden’s Blush Court Plaister* (1780), *Olympian
Dew or Grecian Bloom Water* (1782, a skincream); *Neapolitan Fruit*
(1783, a hair-thickener). A snapshot is provided by Charles Lillie’s
*The British Perfumer* of 1822, which lists only one perfume with a
name that is other than straightforwardly descriptive of its contents or
original place of manufacture, i.e. *Eau Sans Pareil* (Lillie 1822: 153),

---

8 *Cologne* as a noun was a 19th-century clipping; *scent* and *fragrance* were not
commonly used in the 18th century as headwords for the commercial commodity.
which had long been on the market, as *Incomparable Perfuming Drops for Handkerchiefs* (1711).

The prime movers in the first wave of name-shifting norms in the late 1820s were the houses of J. Delcroix of New Bond Street and Conduit Street, and Jean Devereaux of the Regent Quadrant, Oxford Street, and Lombard Street, who extended the convention of mentioning royal patronage to the naming of specific royal individuals:

---

**TABLE 1**

Early expansion of ‘royalty’ modifiers in perfume names.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Perfume Name</th>
<th>House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>Konigrauch, or Royal Perfume</td>
<td>S. James &amp; Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Royal Extract of Flowers</td>
<td>Rigge, Brockbank and Rigge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>Perfume Bouquet du Roi G. IV</td>
<td>Delcroix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>His Majesty’s Perfume, Bouquet du Roi G. IV</td>
<td>Jean Devereaux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>Her Majesty Queen Adelaide’s Refreshing Perfume</td>
<td>Price and Gosnell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>Royal Adelaide Perfume; Royal Perfume Lavender</td>
<td>W. Brewster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>Adelaide Bouquet; King William Perfume; Victoria Bouquet</td>
<td>Rigge, Brockbank and Rigge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>Bouquet de Haut Ton</td>
<td>R. Dickins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>Blount’s Royal Eau de Bouquet</td>
<td>William Blount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>The Court Bouquet</td>
<td>J. and E. Atkinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>Bouquet de la Famille Royale d’Angleterre</td>
<td>J. Delcroix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>The Royal Victoria Bouquet; Royal Bouquets Albert and Victoria Bouquet</td>
<td>H. L. Viner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>Bouquet Royal d’Albert; Victoria Bouquet</td>
<td>Price &amp; Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>the Queen’s Perfumed Lavender</td>
<td>Widow J. Delcroix &amp; Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>Bouquet du Prince Albert de Saxe Coburg, prepared expressly in honour of the approaching happy event</td>
<td>Widow J. Delcroix &amp; Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>Bouquet du Prince Albert; Bouquet de la Reine</td>
<td>J. and E. Atkinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Prince of Wales’ Bouquet</td>
<td>Rigge, Brockbank and Rigge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>Royal Bouquets: viz.- De la Reine Victoria, du Prince Albert, du</td>
<td>Widow J. Delcroix &amp; Son</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

9 *The Spectator*, 7 April 1711. Sold not at a perfumer’s but at “Mr. Payn’s Toyshop at the Angel and Crown in St. Paul’s Church-yard near Cheapside”, toyshops selling not things exclusively for children but ornamental articles at this date.
Prince of Wales, the Queen
Dowager’s, de la Princesse Royale

This extension of implied patronage (products were really “prepared in honour of” rather than “bought by”) was taken up in a flurry propelled by events within the royal family: in 1830 George IV died and Adelaide became Queen, in 1831 Adelaide was crowned, in 1837 William died and Victoria became Queen, in 1840 Victoria married Albert. At the same time, modifiers increased. From the two- or three-word Noun Phrase of Lavender Water or Orange Flower Water, perfume names began to get longer:

TABLE 2
Modifier increase in perfume names, first half of 19th century.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Perfume Name</th>
<th>House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1819</td>
<td>British Flower Water</td>
<td>S. W. Morris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>Viner’s British Otto of Lavender</td>
<td>H. L. Viner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>Atkinson’s Persian Bouquet de Rose</td>
<td>James Atkinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>Hubigant Chardin’s Bouquet du Printems</td>
<td>advertised by W. Brewster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>Concentrated Essence of Otto of Roses aux millefleurs</td>
<td>James Atkinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>Esprit Bouquet du Militaire</td>
<td>Price and Gosnell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>Hannay’s Fragrant Essence of Rondeletia</td>
<td>Hannay &amp; Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>Ethereal Extract of Spring Flowers</td>
<td>J. and E. Atkinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>Viner’s Fragrant Panthymian Leaves of Verbena</td>
<td>H. L. Viner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>Hedyosmia; or, Concentrated Persian Essence; Prince of Wales’s Royal Violet Perfume</td>
<td>Robert Best Ede</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Essentially, however, perfume names had barely changed over the preceding hundred years. Flower-sources were still the primary semantic marker, the main other modifier being royal. Specification of named royal individuals occurred from the late 1820s, but this was a development of an already established trend rather than a completely new innovation.

3. Influential perfumers: Rimmel, Breidenbach, Piesse
This brings us to the three great mid-century marketeers: Rimmel, Breidenbach, and Piesse (of Piesse and Lubin), all of whom had foreign names but spent their lives making and selling – and in the case of Rimmel and Piesse, writing about – perfume in London.\(^{10}\)

### 3.1. Rimmel

Eugène Rimmel (1820-1887) was trading from 39, Gerrard Street, Soho, by 1847\(^{11}\). In 1857 he moved to perfumer Charles Lillie’s old premises at Beaufort Buildings, 96, Strand; in 1859 he opened another branch at 24, Cornhill, and from 1864-1886 another at 128, Regent Street. Rimmel was the first, so far as I can discover, to reference a non-royal or noble celebrity in a perfume-name, with *Bouquet de Jenny Lind* in 1847\(^{12}\). He capitalised squarely on the Great Exhibition and similar gatherings. For the Great Exhibition of 1851 Rimmel sold the *Great Exhibition Bouquet* “which for cheapness, combined with the most refined quality, cannot be equalled” (*The Times*, 3 April 1851); and when the Great Exhibition moved to Sydenham, he sold the *Sydenham Bouquet* (see *The Examiner*, 10 June 1854). He was not alone – Barker & Co. of 1, Bream’s Buildings sold their *Eau d’Exposition* at the Great Exhibition too (*Daily News*, 24 December 1851). Nor was he the only perfumer to present a perfume fountain at public events that year, in which visitors soaked their handkerchiefs in flowing toilet water or toilet vinegar produced from what looked like a large, sculptured marble drinking-fountain. Barker’s perfume fountain stood in Class 4, No. 62, S.W. Gallery of the Crystal Palace, but Rimmel went one better, taking his fountain of toilet vinegar out on the road, touring the charity ball circuit. His fountain played at a

---

\(^{10}\) As heads of households, their names were used in advertisements and so I use the pronoun *he* throughout, but it must be borne in mind that wives and children worked in the business too, along with other employees. Any of these people may have been responsible for naming of products. Unlike fireworkers’ widows, perfumers’ widows are only occasionally visible in advertisements. This is because fireworkers were all too regularly blown up. Perfumers did not suffer the same occupational hazard (see Wright 2011a).

\(^{11}\) The only one of the trio to have an entry in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, see http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/92475. His father, Hyacinthe Mars Rimmel, had been a Regent Street perfumer, trading in partnership with Louis Jean Baptiste Vaudeau and Pierre J. Gabriel Augustine Bessan, but this firm went bankrupt in 1837 (see *Bell’s Life in London and Sporting Chronicle*, 12 March 1837). Before that Rimmel père had worked for the French house of Lubin (that is, the one mentioned in footnote 18, not Piesse and Lubin).

\(^{12}\) There were a few other perfumers who referenced celebrities in the 19\(^{th}\) century, but not many – e.g. *Sweet Lavender the New Perfume Maude Millett Brand* “each bottle bears an engraving of Miss Maude Millett” by R. Hovenden and Sons (*Illustrated London News*, 27 July 1889). Maude Millett was an actress.
Guildhall event attended by Queen Victoria in July 1851, and at the Ward Schools ball (see Daily News, 19 July 1851)\textsuperscript{13}, and from 1851 onwards perfume fountains became a standard piece of kit at exhibitions, balls and the like:

Opening of the Crystal Palace. – E. Rimmel, Perfumer to her Majesty, 39 Gerrard Street, Soho, London, will commence playing his Perfume Fountains for the accommodation of the visitors as follows: – The Toilet Vinegar, North-East End; the Sydenham Bouquet, South-East Corner of the Great Transept; the Eau-de-Cologne, South-East End. These perfumes may be had on the spot at 1s and 2s. 6d. per bottle. (The Examiner, 10 June 1854)

At the South Kensington International Exhibition of 1862, Rimmel, Breidenbach, and Piesse and Lubin all exhibited perfume fountains (see The Times, 3 May 1862), and it looks as though the public perfume fountains of the 1850s caused that dramatic change in Britain whereby perfume became the sole preserve of women:

Ladies visiting the London Crystal Palace can have their Handkerchiefs Perfumed Gratuitously at Rimmel’s Perfume Fountain. Rimmel’s Perfumed Almanac of the Language of Flowers, price 6d., by post for 7 stamps, now ready. – Rimmel, Perfumer, 96, Strand. (The Morning Post, 3 December 1858)

Rimmel’s Perfume Fountain, as used in Princess Alexandra’s bridal boudoir, forms an elegant adjunct to the drawing room, ball room, supper table, &c. Price from £1 10s. – E. Rimmel, perfumer, 96, Strand, and 24, Cornhill. (The Times, 21 March 1863)

“Ladies”, “bridal boudoir” – this kind of wording served to repel men, even though men still carried perfumed handkerchiefs too\textsuperscript{14}. Rimmel advertised extensively in theatre programmes in the second half of the 19th century. In these advertisements, perfumes for the handkerchief were largely named after plants and places: Furze Blossoms (Adelphi, 1873); Cyprus Flowers, Ihlang-Ihlang, Meadow Flowers (Criterion, 1880); Egyptian Lotus (Adelphi, 1883), as were those of his competitors: Blush Rose (John Gosnell & Co., Criterion, 1878); Eidelweiss (Royal Perfumery Co., Palace Theatre, 1892). However, unlike his competitors, Rimmel was positively nimble at presenting

\textsuperscript{13} For an image of a perfume fountain, see http://blogs.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/johnson/files/2013/01/johnson50-uqh-0009-left.jpg.

\textsuperscript{14} As well as shifting perfume to a female-only market, Rimmel left a linguistic legacy. The word rimmel is used in present-day French, Italian, Portuguese, Persian, Romanian, Spanish and Turkish as the generic noun for mascara.
novel perfume names to complement anything that was, in today’s parlance, trending:

- **Livingstone Bouquet** (1873, Adelphi) – heroic explorer David Livingstone had just died;
- **Romanoff Bouquet** (1874, Criterion): Grand Duchess Marie Alexandrovna of the Russian Imperial Romanoff family was about to marry Queen Victoria’s son Prince Alfred, Duke of Edinburgh;
- **L’Etoile du Nord** (1874, Criterion): another reference to the royal wedding, “respectfully dedicated to her Royal Highness the Duchess of Edinburgh”; Rimmel simultaneously advertised the *Duke of Edinburgh’s Bouquet* and the *Royal Bridal Bouquet* (*The Morning Post*, 13 January 1874);
- **Viennese Bouquet** (1874, Criterion): in reference to the Viennese Exhibition;
- **The Duke of Connaught’s Bouquet** (1875, Adelphi): referring to another of Victoria’s sons, Prince Arthur, Duke of Connaught. By 1880 Rimmel was advertising *Connaught, Canadian* perfumes, as Arthur had been serving in Canada since 1869 and was later to become Governor-General;
- **The Marimon Bouquet** (1875, Adelphi): referencing opera singer Marie Marimon;
- **La Belocca** (1875, Adelphi): referencing opera singer Anna de Belocca;
- **The Rising Star** “dedicated to Mlle Zaré Thalberg” (1875, Adelphi): opera singer Zaré Thalberg had just debuted at Covent Garden;
- **Alexandra Palace Bouquet** (1875, Adelphi): the Alexandra Palace reopened on 1 May 1875 after a massive fire;
- **Star of India** (1879, Criterion): the ceremony of investing Grand Vizier Safvet Pasha with the Order of the Star of India had been reported in the press;
- **Jungle Flowers** (1879, Criterion): perhaps a quotation from Sir Edwin Arnold’s enormously popular poem *The Light of Asia*, published that year.
- **Sarah Bernhardt Bouquet** (20 November 1880, Criterion): at a moment when Sarah Bernhardt was selling out in New York, and tickets for her upcoming London shows had just gone on sale.

---

15 Lines 10-14: “A winding track, paven with footworn slabs, / Leads thee by safflower fields and bamboo tufts / Under dark mangoes and the jujube-trees, / Past milk-white veins of rock and jasper crags, / Low cliff and flats of jungle-flowers” (Arnold: 1879 Book 5).
By contrast John Gosnell and Company’s theatre-programme advertisements, which also repeatedly mentioned perfume, offered nothing more topical than *Theatrical Bouquet* (Criterion Theatre programme, 28 May 1878).

### 3.2. Breidenbach

The house of Breidenbach was established in London in 1793, but little is known prior to 1837 when Henry Breidenbach, hair cutter and perfumer of 88, Park Street, Grosvenor Square, was listed in the *Post Office Directory*\[16\]. From 1853 to 1871 Breidenbach’s premises were 157B, New Bond Street, and the firm had opened branches at 7, Burlington Arcade and 29A, Great Portland Street by 1890, and at 17, Manchester Avenue by 1891. In 1892 a factory and head office was opened at 48, Greek Street, with, briefly, another branch at 90, Regent Street. However, it was not until 1852 that Breidenbach advertised in any quantity in the press:

> The New Laboratory of Flowers. – Breidenbach invites the nobility and gentry to visit, before they leave town, his new Perfumery Warehouse, 157 B, New Bond-street (facing Redmayne’s). Several novel bouquets and essences are now ready. The old establishment, 88, Park-street, Grosvenor-square, remains unaltered. ([*The Morning Post*], 18 August 1852)

Breidenbach’s perfumes advertised between 1852 and 1854 included *The Empress Eugenie’s Nosegay, Royal Hunt Bouquet, Bouquet of the Prado, Japanese Perfume, Flowers of Erin, The Chobham Camp Nosegay, The Jockey Club Perfume, The Yacht Club Nosegay*. Breidenbach was not the first to advertise *Jockey Club*; in July 1852 Rimmel had already advertised “Rimmel’s Guards’ Bouquet, Jockey Club Bouquet, and other fashionable perfumes” ([*Le Follet: Journal du Grand Monde, Fashion, Polite Literature, Beaux Arts &c. &c.*], 1 July 1852). Neither firm was first with the general idea, L.T. Piver & Co. of 160, Regent Street, having advertised *Guards’ Club Bouquet* in 1850. Nor was Breidenbach the first to include exotic foreign referents – S. Poole had advertised *Parfum D’Arabie* in 1839, and Robert Best Ede had advertised *The Emperor of China’s Perfume* in 1846.

Rather, Breidenbach capitalised on names invoking both an aspirational life-style and up-to-the-minute latest news. The *Chobham Camp Nosegay* refers to the camp of eight thousand soldiers mustered at Chobham in Surrey between June and August 1853 in order to train...

---

\[16\] Westminster City Archives catalogue. [*The Morning Post*], 10 September 1840, gives Heinrich Breidenbach’s addresses as 88, Park-street, Grosvenor-square, and also 88, Achter Strasse, Cologne.
in preparation for the Crimean War. Large crowds, royalty amongst them, went along to watch the spectacle, and Breidenbach advertised his eponymous perfume in July (The Morning Chronicle, 9 July 1853). In 1855, Breidenbach also targeted one sex only in his advertising, but it was the other sex:

Breidenbach’s Sportsman’s Perfumery. – Newmarket Jockey Club, Royal Hunt, and Yacht Club Nosegay; three bottles in a box, 7s. “We have used these ‘sweet odours;’ their fragrance is of the most exquisite nature, lasting on the handkerchief for many hours.” – Era. Perfumery warehouse, “within gunshot” of Limmer’s Hotel, 157B New Bond-street.” (Bell’s Life in London and Sporting Chronicle, 16 September 1855)\(^\text{17}\)

Breidenbach’s floral perfume names were also explicitly targeted at men: “Breidenbach recommends all sporting gentlemen to scent his Wood Violet Perfume, price 2s 6d, 5s, &c. – 157B, New Bond-street, W.” (Bell’s Life in London and Sporting Chronicle, 26 January 1862), with a hunting pun on the verb *scent.* The 1850s, then, is the decade when perfume marketing began to stratify into advertisements aimed at women and advertisements aimed at men, although the product could be the same in both cases, and most advertisements did not specify the sex of the proposed purchaser.

### 3.3. Piesse

George William Septimus Piesse (1820-1882) was trading by 1853 and in partnership by November 1855\(^\text{18}\). In that year, Piesse published

---

\(^{17}\) “At the corner of Conduit Street and George Street is Limmer’s Hotel, once an evening resort for the sporting world; in fact, it was a midnight ‘Tattersall’s,’ where nothing was heard but the language of the turf, and where men with not very clean hands used to make up their books. ‘Limmer’s,’ says a popular writer, ‘was the most dirty hotel in London; but in the gloomy, comfortless coffee-room might be seen many members of the rich squirearchy, who visited London during the sporting season. This hotel was frequently so crowded that a bed could not be had for any amount of money; but you could always get a good plain English dinner, an excellent bottle of port, and some famous gin-punch.” (Hanover Square and neighbourhood’, in Walford 1878: 314-326).

\(^{18}\) “Piesse and Lubin, perfumers, have Taken the Premises, No. 2, New Bond-street, which they will open for the Sale of first-class Perfumery early in November.” (Bell’s Life in London and Sporting Chronicle, 16 September, 1855). Piesse’s grandfather Louis Jean Joseph Piesse (c.1760-1819) had been a perfumer trading in Thayer Street, Marylebone. Little is known of Lubin, other than that he apparently had no connection with the long-established French perfume house of that name: “Lubin, Perfumer, No. 55, Rue Ste. Anne, Paris. Monsieur Félix Prot, sole successor of Mr. Lubin, No. 55, Rue Ste. Anne, Paris, begs to inform his friends and the public that he has NO CONNEXION WHATEVER with a HOUSE which he understands has recently been
The Art of Perfumery in which he detailed the process of manufacturing perfume. Like Rimmel’s The Book of Perfumes of 1856, it draws on Charles Lillie’s The British Perfumer of 1822, and several of Piesse and Lubin’s wares had already been named and sold by others: Eau de Cologne, Hungary Water, Portugal Water, Rondeletia, Eau de Mouselaïne, Millefleurs et Lavender, Bouquet du Marechale, Ess Bouquet (seemingly originated by Bayley and Co, Cockspur St, a contraction of essence), Bouquet du Roi, Ambergris, New Mown Hay.

Piesse and Lubin began advertising their wares in earnest in 1856, naming their premises “Laboratory of Flowers”, 2, New Bond Street, by March of that year (see The Morning Post, 17 March 1856)\(^1\). As with Rimmel and Breidenbach, Piesse and Lubin did not innovate so much as simply do what others were doing to a greater degree. Metcalfe, Bingley and Co. of 130B and 131, Oxford Street, for example, had taken the perfume fountain a step further with their “Pocket Perfume Fountains, at 6d. and 1s. each, admirably adapted for Christmas trees, &c.”, and continuing the theme of the pursuits of upper-class gentlemen with their Oxford and Cambridge Bouquet (Daily News, 3 July and 25 November 1856). E. Palmer, of 94½, Berwick Street, used romance as a marketing tool with E. Palmer’s Inexhaustible Sachet; or, True Lover’s Scent Packet (for drawers; Valentine’s Day: Or, How to Win a Lover) (Reynold’s Newspaper, 8 February 1857)\(^2\).

G.T. Jerram, of 69, Hatton Garden, continued the theme of just-breaking news used by Breidenbach, with his perfume Honour to the Brave. – The Victor’s Bouquet, an entirely New Perfume with emblematic device representing the glory and success of our heroes in India, at 2s. and 3s. 6d. per bottle. (The Morning Post, 16 December 1857)\(^3\)

By mid-century, novelty had become important. Piesse and Lubin’s extension of existing marketing strands included:

- Places: The Alhambra Perfume; The Bosphorus Bouquet; Flowers of Erin; Kew Garden Nosegay; Bouquet de Montpelier (1857); Our Village Nosegay (1862); Connaught Posy (1879);

Opening in London, in the names of Piesse and Lubin.” (The Morning Post, 28 February 1856).

\(^1\) Note Breidenbach was to use the same wording in his August advertisements.

\(^2\) This is the earliest use of love as a theme for marketing perfume that I have noted.

\(^3\) Reference is made here to the Second Battle of Cawnpore in India’s First War of Independence of 1857.
FROM "LAVENDER WATER" TO "KISS ME, YOU DARE!"

- Royalty: Buckingham Palace Bouquet; Windsor Castle Bouquet; Isle of Wight Bouquet (1857); the Sandringham Bouquet; Prince Arthur’s Choice (1862); Princess Alexandra’s Choice (1870); Shah of Persia’s Perfume (1873);
- Wealth/Nobility: Esterhazy Bouquet (1857); Baroness Rothschild’s Bouquet (1862);
- The armed forces: Neptune, or Naval Nosegay (1857); Zouave (1862); Rifle Volunteers Garland (1879);
- Current affairs: Little Dorrit’s Nosegay; Postage Perfume (1871); Suez Canal (1875); Pyramid Perfume (1882); Aesthetic;
- Romance: Bouquet d’Amour (1857); Love and Kisses (1862); Honey-and-Kisses; the Heart’s Content (1866); Choice-of-my-Heart; Love-Charm; Dawn of Love; Never Forgotten; Virgin’s Bower; The Wedding Ring Bouquet; Forget-Me-Not; Heartsease; The Honeymoon Bouquet; With “Love and Kisses”; No one to Love; The Bachelor’s Button; The Farewell Bouquet; Loved at last; The Course of Love; Love Lies Bleeding; First Love; Maiden’s Joy; Blushing Rose; “Love Among the Roses”; My Sweetheart’s Nosegay; The Little Treasure; Think of Me (1868); Love’s Triumph (1870); Love Lorne (1870); Mizpah (1873); Kiss-Me-Sweetly (1878);
- Flirtation: Stolen Kisses (1858); Kiss Me Quick, “Perfume of the Mistletoe” (1859); Be Mine!; Box-His-Ears; Laughing Water; Follow Me, Lads!; Kiss Me, and Let Me Go; The Secret Scent; The Thorny Rose; or, Kiss Me, You Dare! (all advertised for the Christmas market in The Times, 22 December 1868); Tom-Boy; Pop-Kiss (1876).

Some contexts for these jocular titles are as follows:

Stolen Kisses. – Piesse and Lubin’s New Perfumes for the festivities – Stolen Kisses and their sequel, Box His Ears, also Sir Roger de Coverly, his Savour,

---

22 Little Dorrit was first discussed in the press as being expected on 3 November 1855 (The Lady’s Newspaper) and the first instalment was out by 2 December, with Piesse and Lubin advertising their perfume in Bell’s Life in London and Sporting Chronicle for 16 December 1855.

23 The Times, 25 November 1871 – on 5 October 1871 postage prices had been reduced.

24 The Times, 16 December 1875, “stilled from the Sacred Lotus Flower of Egypt”; the British government had recently bought shares in the Suez Canal.

25 The Times, 25 October 1882. The Graphic had just shown (21 October 1882) a drawing of the Duke of Connaught ascending the Pyramid of Cheops whilst fighting the Anglo-Egyptian War, which Britain won.

26 The Times, 7 December 1881, “the perfume affected by the Aesthetics”.

three bottles, in a pretty case, 7s., or three cases for presents, carriage free anywhere, 21s. Single bottles, 2s. 6d. each. None genuine without our signature in writing. – Piesse and Lubin, 2, New Bond-street, London. All are copyright. (The Times, 7 December 1860)

Peas and Lupins. Every pod is full of scented seed. […] Love-and-kisses. – Piesse and Lubin have made several new Perfumes for the festive season: – Love-and-kisses. Choice-of-my-Heart, new Scent, 1868. Piesse and Lubin. New Railway Ticket. New Railway Ticket, during the Festive Season. Tickets are now being Issued, first-class return, from Gardenhurst to Flower Land, including Refreshing Perfumes at Olfactory Junction in profusion, 2s. 6d. Handker-Chief Station, 2, New Bond-street. – Piesse and Lubin, Managers. (The Times, 25 December 1867)

Christmastide in the second half of the 19th century afforded Piesse and Lubin an opportunity for jocular, flirtatious marketing aimed at unmarried women. The tone was light, but the niche turned out to be a serious market, one which is still dominant. Holiday-time in Victorian Britain licensed a set of behaviours not allowed to women at other times of year, in a society where females’ intercourse with unrelated males was strictly controlled. The fantasy invoked was that of selecting one’s own mate, a task more usually undertaken by women’s parents or guardians.

David H. Pybus asserts of present-day perfume marketing “Consumers do not buy fragrance; they buy aspiration” (2006: 299), and so far as can be judged from 19th-century advertisements, Piesse and Lubin drove – and possibly created – that market. But they were not alone. As the advertisements above demonstrate, London perfumers formed a strong-tie social network, with one perfumer’s innovation picked up and embroidered by the next. Rimmel’s theatre advertisements of the 1870s presented numerous different kinds of pasteboard valentines, which were also advertised in a language which was colloquial, if not quite so saucy: “Bows for Belles Bells for Beaux, 1s. Our Gents and Misses, 6d.” Nevertheless, Piesse and Lubin’s titles aimed at gents and misses were the most highly visible of their kind in the press for several decades, permitting a claim of dominant influence.

4. Technological Change

27 Gardenhurst was the name of a novel by Anna C. Steele (London: Chapman and Hall, 1867), which had been reviewed a month earlier. For the antecedents in music-hall song of some of these titles, and a discussion of evidence for Bank Holiday behaviour, see Wright (in press). It may be that customers invented the jocular title Peas and Lupins much as Marks and Spencer is known as Marks and Sparks.
Were any of these linguistic developments related to technological discoveries? From the 1850s onwards, chemists experimented with creating different kinds of smells in the laboratory in order to circumvent the costly and labour-intensive process of extracting smell-molecules from petals, leaves and roots (or animals, in the case of musk) and placing them into a carrier. In 1868 the great chemist-entrepreneur, William Perkin, working at his dye-factory at Greenford Green in Middlesex, synthesised coumarin. He was not the first chemist to be interested in the molecular make-up of smells, but having already built a factory in order to produce synthesised aniline dye he had the means to experiment and manufacture his discoveries. However, Perkin worked on the molecular components of smells at a time in his life when he no longer needed to make a living (his aniline dye discoveries having already done that for him), and so publishing his many findings in chemistry journals was of greater interest to him than the commercial manufacture and marketing of perfumes.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Synthesis</th>
<th>Chemist</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Piria</td>
<td>aliphatic aldehydes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Chiozza</td>
<td>cinnamic aldehyde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>Cahours</td>
<td>benzaldehyde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>Perkin</td>
<td>coumarin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Reimer, Tiemann</td>
<td>vanillin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Tiemann, Herzfeld</td>
<td>anisaldehyde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Skraup</td>
<td>quinolines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Dodge</td>
<td>citronellol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Eykmann</td>
<td>heliotropin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>Tiemann, Kruger</td>
<td>ionone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dates in Table 3 are dates of discovery and synthesis, not dates of commercial usage. Names proliferated as chemists created new compounds, but with a limited set of derivational morphemes – usually the suffixes -hyde, -in(e), -ol(e), -on(e). Manufacturers improved upon these names as they saw fit. The order and invoice book of the firm of Breidenbach survives for the year 1895-6, and in it there are invoices from chemical manufacturers. That year, Breidenbach bought

• from Burgoyne, Burbidges & Company, Wholesale & Export, Druggists, Manufacturing Chemists, &c. 16, Coleman Street: Coumarine Crystals, Heliotrope Crystals, Vannilline, Bromelia/Bromelia Crystals, Artificial Musk, Ionone, Crategine, Lavilline;

• from C. Westphal, 195, Upper Thames Street: Terpineol, Carven, Lavanole;

• from C. Faust & Company, 2, The Crescent, Tower Hill: Rosenol, Cumarol, Irisol;

• from E. Merck, 4, Cullum Street: Cumarine white small xals (i.e., crystals).

None of these words, so far as I can discover, featured in perfume names in the way that e.g. lavender boldly features in Lavender Water, or rose in Extract of Roses. It is generally held that Paul Parquet of the Parisian house Houbigant was the first perfumer to place substantial amounts of a synthesised ingredient in a commercially-sold perfume (or rather, the first to use a synthesised smell in a perfume that made money), when in the early 1880s he added coumarin to the compound he called Fougère Royale. The method of production may have been revolutionary but the name he chose was highly traditional: a plant-name (although seemingly no ferns were involved in the formula and ferns have no smell to speak of) plus the conventional perfume-modifier royale. The name did all it could to give the impression that the perfume had been around forever and to suppress any whiff of its new molecular components. Ferns were probably referenced because of the prevailing craze for growing them in one’s fernery; fougère royale is French for the fern Osmunda regalis, which had been thought to have medicinal qualities.

I especially thank City of Westminster Archives Conservator Megan Smith for allowing me to consult Breidenbach’s Order and Invoice book by helping me hold it open – it is more than a foot high, weak-spined, friable, and a two-person job, with numerous tightly-folded invoices on every page. For a description of Messrs. Burgoyne, Burbidges & Co.’s Coleman Street chemical works see The Engineer, 24 August 1888, pp. 164-165.

Bromelia is the name of a plant genus to which pineapple belongs, bestowed by Linnaeus after Olaus Bromel, a Swede: see OED, sv. Bromelia, n.

Found naturally in Crataegus oxyacantha.

?‘carvone’, the <e> graph may be an <o>.

These manufacturies all cluster within less than a mile of each other in the City of London.

The date varies according to source. The Osmothèque, the repository of the perfume industry, dates Fougère Royale soap to 1883 and the bottled perfume to a year later, but www.houbigant-parfum.com claims 1882. I have been unable to find it advertised before 1890: “la Fougère Royale, le chef-d’œuvre d’Houbigant, est une prodigieuse évocation de la verdure des forêts – dit Maupassant, qui s’y connaît.” (Le Figaro, Supplément Littéraire du Dimanche, 22 March 1890).
in earlier centuries and so was exactly the sort of plant that might be expected to have been made into a water: “L’extrait préparé avec le rhizome de l’Osmunda regalis (Fougère-royale) était autrefois prescrit contre les scrofules et le rachitisme” (Cosson and de Saint-Pierre 1854: 515).

I can find no robust evidence that technological change caused linguistic change in perfume nomenclature. Certainly there were some made-up names, such as “Rimmel’s New Perfume ‘Nessari’” (Illustrated London News, 24 September 1892 and 3 February 1894), but not many that invoked e.g. anisaldehyde, quinoline, lavanol, ionone, in the same way that dye-name pararosaniline was transparently derived from rose + aniline (1879), or drug-name aspirin was derived from acetylated spireic acid (1899)\(^\text{35}\). One which did sound like the name of a chemical, Atkinson’s Aoline of 1897, was accompanied by text proclaiming Nice always, but deliciously reviving in hot or crowded rooms. A true natural perfume made from flowers. Not a Chemical Preparation. (Illustrated London News, 31 July 1897)

Unsurprisingly, the house of Piesse and Lubin was the one to buck the trend, or rather lack of trend, with a perfume-bottle label reading Synthetic scents. This perfume is non-evanescent. Piesse & Lubin 2 New Bond Street London. Trade mark Musk Deer. Boronia. (Illustrated London News, 28 August 1897)\(^\text{36}\)

But boronia is the scientific name of a type of Australian shrub (Piesse’s brother was an Australian botanist), so the name did not register the contents.

To sum up: the main semantic developments of 19th-century perfume names preceded the synthesis of smells used in perfume, from referencing flowers in the early 1800s, to royalty and places from the 1830s, moving on to other important personages, the armed forces and upper-class leisure-pursuits mid-century, followed closely by love and romance, flirtatious humour for gents and misses, and

---

\(^{35}\) See OED, s.v. PARAROSANILINE, n.; ASPIRIN, n. Actually the names given by the inventors of aniline dye were not necessarily — indeed, not usually — the ones that lasted: Verguin’s fuchsine, Nicholson’s roseine, Hoffman’s rosaniline were all superseded by the borrowed Italian place-name magenta, after the Battle of Magenta in 1859. Perkin’s mauveine was superseded by the fashion-magazines’ borrowing of French mauve ‘mallow flower’ (see Wright 2011b).

\(^{36}\) See OED, s.v. BORONIA, n., named after Francesco Borone, an Italian botanist (1769-94).
current affairs/latest news. These naming categories had all developed by the middle of the 19th century. Changes in technology in perfume manufacture had little effect on naming, with no perfume names exhibiting or proclaiming their chemical components. A greater catalyst for change was probably the Great Exhibition of 1851 and subsequent similar events, driving a market for novelty. So far as can be seen from newspaper advertisements, Piesse and Lubin alone initiated humorous flirtation as a perfume name theme, referencing bank-holiday and music-hall licentiousness. This spoke directly to middle and lower-class women, as they were the ones who went flirting on bank holidays (as opposed to men, who went flirting on the other 361 days of the year as well). Yet it also spoke to upper-middle-class women, who although prohibited by the social norms of their class from joining in such rowdy horse-play as dragging one’s object of desire down a precipitous hill to get her to fall over and reveal what was under her skirt, were envious of those who did.

5. Parisian perfume names

I now turn to Paris, to ask whether French perfume names from the second half of the century exhibited new developments in molecular synthesis? London and Parisian perfumers were rivals in that they dominated the perfume market and competed for the prizes at the post-1851 European exhibitions but in practice they formed a close network. Rimmel, for example, had a shop in Paris; L.T. Piver had a shop in London. Rimmel advertised Ess. Bouquet, Jockey-Club, Guards’ Bouquet, West End, Rimmel’s Bouquet, Montagnes d’Ecosse in the French press; L.T. Piver advertised Val d’Andorre Bouquet in the London newspapers37. Paris perfumer Thomas Jones had shops in Soho and St James’s before becoming established in the Boulevard des Capucines; London perfumers Delcroix, Devereux, Rimmel and Piesse all had French family networks stretching back several generations. In the year 1895-6 London perfumer Breidenbach ordered from suppliers R. Hovenden and Sons, 31, 32, 33, Berners Street (agents for Pinaud, Robert Frs and Picard Frs amongst others) samples of Royal Houbigant, Peau d’Espagne, Blondeau’s Violet, Opopanax and Stephanotis perfumes, as well as from Cologne Mülhens’ Rhine Violets, Johann Maria Farina’s Genuine Eau de Cologne and Mary Clementine Martin’s Nun Cologne – and, closer to

---

37 See, for example, advertisements in Le Figaro, 22 December 1859, and The Morning Chronicle, 9 May 1850, respectively.
home, Penhaligon’s *Hammons Bouquet*. Keeping abreast of the field was clearly of import to the firm, as it would have been for all the larger houses.

---

**TABLE 4**

Some French perfume names of the second half of the 19th century.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Producer</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>Oxymel</td>
<td>Oger</td>
<td><em>Le Figaro</em>, Dec. 22, p. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Eau de Lys; Eau Delabriere</td>
<td>Delabriere-Vincent</td>
<td><em>Les Contemporains</em>, p. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Bouquet Impérial Français; Délices des Boudoirs; Bouquet du Pré Catelan; Eau de Toilette de L’Impératrice</td>
<td>Ed. Pinaud</td>
<td><em>Les Contemporains</em>, p. 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Eau de Verveine des Alpes</td>
<td>Ernest Camus</td>
<td><em>Les Contemporains</em>, p. 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>Vinaigre Anglais</td>
<td>imported by Chalmin</td>
<td><em>La Sylphide</em>, Jan. 10, p. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>La Rosée du Paradis</td>
<td>Oger</td>
<td><em>La Sylphide</em>, Jan. 10, p. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>Eau d’Albion</td>
<td>Gellé Frères</td>
<td><em>Publicité parisienne</em>, Nov., p. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>Vinaigre du Phénix; Extrait de Violettes de Nice</td>
<td>Henry Neyrac</td>
<td><em>Annuaire des Coiffures</em>, p. 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>Eau d’Albion; Ess. Bouquet L’Eau de Fleurs de Lys</td>
<td>Gellé Frères</td>
<td><em>Annuaire des Coiffures</em>, p. 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Vinaigre d’Italie; L’Eau de Verveine</td>
<td>H. Renou</td>
<td><em>Annuaire des Coiffures</em>, p. 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Extrait de Violettes de Nice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Quintessence d’Ylang-Ylang</td>
<td>Mouilleron</td>
<td><em>Annuaire des Coiffures</em>, p. 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>Parfums d’Opopanax</td>
<td>L. T. Piver</td>
<td><em>Le Temps</em>, May 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Eau d’Houbigant</td>
<td>Houbigant</td>
<td><em>Le Temps</em>, March 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.1890</td>
<td>Impérial Russe</td>
<td>Guerlain</td>
<td><em>Le Figaro</em>, Supplément, March 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.1890</td>
<td>Parfum Borghese;</td>
<td>Lubin</td>
<td><em>Le Figaro</em>, Supplément, March 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

38 Named after the Turkish Bath in Jermyn Street.
As with perfume names produced in London, synthesized chemical compounds did not feature in the names of Parisian wares. In both cities, scientific terminology that was recorded in perfume names came from botany:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Producer</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>Rezeda</td>
<td>Price &amp; Gosnell</td>
<td>The Standard, March 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>Essence of Hovenia</td>
<td>Jas. Pett</td>
<td>The Morning Post, Dec. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>Eau Botanique</td>
<td>W. Brewster</td>
<td>The Morning Post, Jan. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>Hannay’s Fragrant Essence of Rondeletia</td>
<td>Hannay &amp; Co.</td>
<td>The Morning Post, Jan. 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>Hedyosmia; or, Concentrated Persian Essence</td>
<td>Robert Best Ede</td>
<td>The Morning Chronicle, April 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>Psidium</td>
<td>Piesse &amp; Lubin</td>
<td>The Times, March 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Vanda</td>
<td>Rimmel</td>
<td>Criterion theatre programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.1890</td>
<td>Corylopsis du Japon</td>
<td>Pivert [sic]</td>
<td>Le Figaro, Supplément, March 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.1890</td>
<td>Ixora</td>
<td>Ed. Pinaud</td>
<td>Le Figaro, Supplément, March 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.1890</td>
<td>Amaryllis</td>
<td>Delettrez</td>
<td>Le Figaro, Supplément, March 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have not noted any latest news perfume names or any flirtation perfume names in French merchandise until the following century –
and even then, the category was expressed via the English language (e.g. Guerlain’s *Flirt*).

6. Conclusion

My initial research question was to enquire whether there were any linguistic developments in the norms of perfume names over the period. It was found that there was a movement from *[adj + N]* Noun Phrases to somewhat longer, more complex phrases and clauses, a change that gathered pace from the 1830s. The head-nouns of the 18th century continued to be used in the 19th century, and the traditional modifier categories of ingredients and place of manufacture continued to feature, but the *royal* category was expanded to include named royal personages and royal residences. This period of development within the field of royalty-modifiers began in the late 1820s, reaching non-royal referents by the 1840s (New York A.B. Sands & Co.’s *(imported) Bouquet d’Esterhazy*, 1844; Rimmel’s *Bouquet de Jenny Lind*, 1847). At the same time, novelty came to be a powerful marketing force, with new perfume titles (*La Bouquet d’Isabelle*, 1838) advertised alongside old ones (*Essence of Sweetbriar*, 1834). Layering occurred, whereby new and old name-types were used together rather than new naming customs ousting and replacing old ones. Throughout the period studied, plant-names continued to preponderate. From the mid-century onwards the houses of Rimmel, Breidenbach and Piesse became particularly influential and their advertisements targeted men and women separately, although not exclusively so. The language of advertisements for the mid-century perfume fountains of the public exhibitions seem to have been the main propellant of perfume as a female-only commodity, but it took decades to take hold. Piesse’s humorously-flirtatious perfume names acted to reinforce this directive.

So far as can be deduced from newspaper advertisements, London perfumers of French and German extraction (Delcroix and Devereux in the early part of the century, Rimmel, Breidenbach and Piesse in the latter) led the way in naming innovations rather than Parisian perfumers, but by and large their innovations consisted of developing strands already in use. Referencing royalty in product names dated back to previous centuries; Delcroix’s innovation was to incorporate a specific royal personage into the name of his perfume. Once this had happened, the entire royal family became available for naming purposes, followed by royal residences, foreign royalty, nobility, and celebrities in general. This led to invoking the glamour of what such people got up to, resulting in sporting, armed forces and current-
affairs perfume names. Place of manufacture had long featured in perfume titles, leading to all kinds of place-name referents which had nothing to do with the source of the ingredients. Botanical scientific terminology led to perfume names such as Psidium, Corylopsis du Japon, Ixora, and together, place-names and botanic names introduced exoticism as a naming strand. By contrast, referencing love and romance was not widespread before 1850 and did not have an obvious single predecessor. The innovation that does truly seem to stem from one perfume house alone is that of humour of a decidedly non-aristocratic sort, as exemplified by Piesse and Lubin’s perfume names of the 1860s and 1870s such as Peas and Lupin, Box-His-Ears, Laughing Water, Jolly Dogs, conveying music-hall humour. Piesse and Lubin led the way in advertising story-telling, narrative titles like Tom-Boy, Pop-Kiss, Follow Me, Lads!, Kiss Me, and Let Me go, Kiss Me, You Dare! which sold a fantasy of mate-selection to unmarried women (see The Times, 12 December 1876). Socially speaking this was not top-down but bottom-up, with colloquialisms conveying an informal register, not to mention an undercurrent of sauce. Aspiration shifted away from aping one’s social betters and towards alluring the opposite sex, but again, with layering rather than ousting. That this has proved to be a powerful marketing strategy needs no further comment here.

My second research question was to ask whether technological developments in the synthesis of chemical compounds resulted in language change. The answer was that they did not. Just as aniline dye-names had been marketed with current affairs names like magenta and solferino, perfume names came to reference events and behaviours that had nothing whatever to do with ingredients or how they were put together. Why was there a total absence of any allusion to coumarin, lavanole, heliotropin, ionone and their ilk? It cannot have been due to perceived resistance to Greek-based scientific nomenclature, as botanical names in perfume titles were common. The answer may lie in the dreadful things that synthesized dye was doing to human skin in the second half of the 19th century. The hot summer of 1884 proved to be a turning-point in getting the authorities to ban harmful substances in dye, when a surgeon at St. John’s

---

39 See e.g. Piesse and Lubin, The Times, 10 March 1875; Piver, and Pinaud, Le Figaro, 22 March 1890.
40 See The Times, 2 October 1862; The Times, 22 December 1868; Launceston Examiner, 13 January 1876. That Piesse and Lubin alone was responsible for this trend is not an entirely safe conclusion however, because not all perfume houses took out newspaper or theatre-programme advertisements. Both Penhaligon and Floris sold perfume in St James’s, for example, but no advertisements for either were retrieved by the newspaper archive search engines.
Hospital for Skin Diseases put on a display of the agonizing skin-complaints suffered by people wearing dyed underwear. The topic continued to be ventilated in the press over several decades, and not surprisingly, there was public distrust for anything worn close to the skin which smacked of chemical synthesis (see Wright 2011b: 358).

The journalist who wrote the piece on recent perfumes in the Sunday Supplement of Le Figaro in March 1890 made the observation that novels by Zola, music by Gounod, and paintings by Manet were afforded serious cultural respect (he had no idea how the value of Impressionist paintings was to multiply in years to come), so surely the artists who created Guerlain’s Impérial Russe, Lubin’s Parfum Borghese, Pinaud’s Ixora, Atkinson’s Chypre, Houbigant’s Fougère Royale, should be similarly revered? (He did not mean the chemists who originally isolated and synthesized the compounds, he meant the perfume-house chemists who mixed them, usually together with smells extracted by traditional means, to create specific new smells)41. That they were not has to do with the way in which they were marketed. I have suggested here that London and Parisian perfumers formed a tight network, so that when one innovated in a new direction, the others followed suit. Exhorting ladies to perfume their handkerchiefs at a perfume fountain decorated with disporting rose-laden cherubs had the effect of gendering the product42. By the 1880s the wording of English perfume advertising was largely culturally feminine. Consider “Breidenbach’s Wood Violet perfume, a dream of loveliness” (Illustrated London News, 4 June 1887). There is nothing inherently female about either violets or dreams, but the contrastively terse directive wording of Breidenbach’s Xylopia advertisements – “pronounced zy-lo-pia, one drop is sufficient to perfume a handkerchief” (Illustrated London News, 6 April 1889) – allows the inference that the Wood Violet advertisement was aimed at women, and Xylopia, another scientific plant name, at both sexes.

Within Anglophone culture, the linking of commercially-sold perfume with femininity prevailed, and predominated. To this day, Anglophone-speakers who have no trouble whatsoever in

41 Unlike Manet’s Olympia, or Zola’s L’Assomoir, or Gounod’s Faust, whatever was in Piesse’s Boronia, or Zeno’s Hyscenia, or Breidenbach’s Xylopia is now lost. Nobody can experience the perfumes named here, because it was nobody’s particular business to retain those early formulae. Even best-selling perfumes from the large, enduring houses are lost, because over the years formulae have been changed as the price of ingredients rose.

42 For images, see Piesse’s statue of “Christina with her Arrosoir” and Rimmel’s cherub-decorated “Fountain of Distilled Violet Water”, both in Class 4, Eastern Annexe, International Exhibition (Daily News, 8 May 1862). Note also Rimmel’s scented valentines with hearts, flowers and cherubs, at http://blogs.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/johnson.
distinguishing between the smell of orange peel and wet dog, aviation fuel and Christmas trees, grilled bacon and cigar smoke, and who would not dream of attributing a gender to said smells of orange, fur, fuel, tree, bacon or smoke, unthinkingly couple commercially-sold perfume with sexual allure. This coupling has nothing to do with smell – synthesized smells are attached to a range of goods from flyspray to washing-powder; we just do not call them perfume. The effect in the Anglophone world of advertisements devised by a small group of 19th-century London perfumers has been long lasting, and was entirely language-driven.
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