PLANT TAXONOMY,
GEOGRAPHY AND FLORISTICS

СИСТЕМАТИКА, ФЛОРИСТИКА,
ГЕОГРАФІЯ РОСЛИН

https://doi.org/10.15407/ukrbotj80.01.117
RESEARCH ARTICLE

Nomenclatural notes on South American *Gentianella* (*Swertiinae*, *Gentianeae*, *Gentianaceae*): *Gentianella calanchoides*, *G. ernestii*, and *G. rima*

James S. PRINGLE
Royal Botanical Gardens, Box 399, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada L8N 3H8
Address for correspondence: *jpringle@rbg.ca*

Abstract. The name *Gentianella rima* (D. Don ex G. Don) Fabris is correctly applied to a species native to central Peru. The name *G. ernestii* (Briq.) Fabris ex J.S. Pringle is correctly applied to a similar species native to southern Peru. These species, along with *G. calanchoides* (Gilg) Fabris, are contrasted here.

Keywords: *Gentianaceae*, *Gentianella*, nomenclature, Peru, taxonomy

Gentianella rima (D. Don ex G. Don) Fabris and *Gentianella ernestii* (Briq.) Fabris ex J.S. Pringle (*Gentianaceae*) have been listed as a species of conservation concern by Castillo Ramón et al. (2006) and as of this writing are listed in *Tropicos* (https://www.tropicos.org/name/13801730, https://www.tropicos.org/name/13801813) with the IUCN conservation status EN B1a (Endangered Global). It is highly desirable, therefore, that the longstanding uncertainties as to the correct application of these names be resolved.

Gentiana rima D. Don ex G. Don is one of several problematic names published by George Don (1837) for new species of *Gentianaceae* in *A General History of the Dichlamydeous Plants.* Don's descriptions of new species of *Gentianaceae* in the *General History* are brief, imprecise, and limited in the number of diagnostic characters described, but, as the specific epithets have priority from 1837, some are of nomenclatural concern.

Some of these names, including *Gentiana rima*, although not previously published, were attributed by George Don to his brother David, who had given these names to species of which he had seen specimens in the herbarium of Aylmer Bourke Lambert, where he had worked from 1820 to 1836. Lambert had acquired a large quantity of specimens collected in South America by the Ruiz and Pavón expedition (D. Don, 1828), which after Lambert's death in 1842 were acquired by the British Museum (BM, acronyms of herbaria follow Thiers, 2023–onward). (On George and David Don and the Lambert herbarium, see D. Don, 1837, Murray, 1904, and Miller, 1970: 502–509, 538–540, 547–549) George Don based his descriptions of the taxa so named from manuscript notes acquired from David, but David Don (1837) noted, shortly after the *General History* was published, that "some errors have crept into [*General History*] in transcribing from [his, David's] notes, and from the circumstances of [his]

ARTICLE HISTORY. Submitted 13 December 2022. Revised 02 March 2023. Published 14 June 2023

CITATION. Pringle J.S. 2023. Nomenclatural notes on South American *Gentianella* (*Swertiinae*, *Gentianeae*, *Gentianaceae*): *Gentianella calanchoides*, *G. ernestii*, and *G. rima*. *Ukrainian Botanical Journal*, 80 (2): 117–127.

not having had the opportunity of seeing the proofsheets." George Don visited Lambert's herbarium, but it is not known to what extent, if at all, his descriptions of new gentianaceous species were based on his own observations of specimens there rather than only on manuscript material from David.

Grisebach (1845) listed *Gentiana rima* among species described by Don, but he did not cite any specimens or indicate that he had seen specimens so identified. Gilg (1916), in his monograph on the South American species that would now be placed in the genus *Gentianella* Moench, listed *Gentiana rima* Don as a name that he had been unable to associate with any species that he recognized, because of the inadequacy of the description and the absence of any specimens known to him by which the name could be typified.

According to the protologue (G. Don, 1837), the name *Gentiana rima* was based on a specimen or specimens collected by the Ruiz and Pavón expedition in Peru at a locality not specified by Don, representing a species that had been called *rima-rima* in Peru. As reported by Fabris (1958), such a collection exists. One component specimen is at BM and two are at MA, fragments are at F, ex MA, and a probable component is at G. The specimen at BM and one of those at MA are labelled as having been collected in the vicinity of Tarma, in present-day Departamento Junín in the central Peruvian Andes in 1794, and as having been called *rima-rima* or variants of that name in Peru. The collector was probably Juan Tafalla, a member of the expedition who was in the Tarma area at that time; Ruiz and Pavón had been at Tarma earlier, but had left Peru in 1788 (Steele, 1964; Tepe, 2018). Fabris appropriately designated the specimen at BM, which now has the barcode number BM000953030, the holotype of the name *Gentiana rima*, as most of the specimens studied by David and George Don are now in that herbarium (Stafleu and Cowan 1976) and it is not likely that they would have seen the duplicates of this collection in other herbaria. Those at MA were designated isotypes by Fabris. Although David Don annotated some specimens in the Lambert herbarium, he did not annotate this specimen now at BM. In the paragraphs that follow, the name *Gentianella rima* is applied to the species from central Peru represented by these specimens.

The Ruiz and Pavón expedition also collected another species referable to *Gentianella* in the vicinity of Tarma, similar in some respects to *G. rima*. In both species the flowering stems arise below vegetative rosettes of the current season, with the leaves of the rosette being larger than those of the flowering stems, and in both species the corollas are deeply lobed. This other species, now called *Gentianella calanchoides* (Gilg) Fabris, differs from *G. rima* in having decumbent rather than erect or nearly erect stems; more numerous rosette leaves (seen in the lectotype at BM and the isotypes at G and MA cited below; rosettes are not included in the isotype at P or in the original type formerly at B); narrower leaves, both rosette and cauline, most of which are nearly parallel-sided their whole length rather than tapering as much toward the base as those of *G. rima*; more flowers per inflorescence; shorter pedicels; smaller flowers, with corollas mostly 20–25 mm long vs. mostly 25–30 mm in *Gentianella rima*; corolla lobes 2.5–3× as long as the tube vs. 3–3.5× as long as the tube in *G. rima*; and trichomes on the adaxial surface of the corolla tube. These two species, as *Gentianella calanchoides* and *G. rima*, are contrasted, with a key, descriptions, and illustrations, by Castillo Ramón (2019: 37, 110–114). In the present paper, representative specimens are shown in Figs. 1 and 2.

When Gilg (1896) published the name *Gentiana calanchoides* for this smaller-flowered species, he noted that the species had been called *rima-rima* in Peru. According to a much later study by Castillo Ramón (2019), the vernacular name *rima-rima* is applied to several species of *Gentianella* in central Peru. Gilg probably based this statement on the specimen from the Barbey-Boissier herbarium, now at G with the barcode number G00369658, which he annotated as *Gentiana calanchoides* in 1896, the year in which he published the name. Corresponding to Gilg's wording in the protologue, this specimen is accompanied by a slip of paper bearing the unpublished name *Gentiana rima-rima* (although the handwriting is that of Pierre Edmond Boissier) and stating that the specimen was from Pavón's herbarium and had been collected at Tarma. The label of the original type formerly at B, as seen in the photograph at F (negative 10287), includes, as a synonym, the unpublished name *G. rima-rima*, attributed to Ruiz and Pavón, but this is in Gilg's handwriting, added when he annotated the specimen as *G. calanchoides*.

Although George Don (1837) had said that the species he named *Gentiana rima* had been called *rima-rima* in Peru, Gilg (1896) believed that

Fig. 1. Lectotype, *Gentianella calanchoides*, specimen in upper right (BM). The other specimens are *G. incurva*; note the difference in leaf shape

Fig. 2. Representative specimen of *Gentianella rima*, Peru: Junín: Prov. Tarma, pampa cerca Huaracayoc, encima de Tapo, 4000 m, *Goepfert s.n.* (USM)

Fig. 3. Representative specimen of *Gentianella ernestii*, Peru: Cusco: Distr. Urubamba, Pumahuanca, *Tupayachi 6414* (HAM)

G. calanchoides could not be the species described by Don, as Don had described the calyx lobes of *G. rima* as oblong and the apices of the calyx lobes and leaves as obtuse, whereas in *G. calanchoides* the calyx lobes were linear-lanceolate and the apices of the calyx lobes and leaves were very acute.

An herbarium sheet at MA, now with the barcode number MA814421, was annotated in its entirety as *Gentiana calanchoides* by Gilg at an unspecified date. This sheet contains mixed material, all of which is attributed to Ruiz and Pavón. The upper two specimens are of *Gentianella calanchoides*. The lower specimen was identified in the present study as *Gentianella incurva* (Hook.) Fabris. The name *Gentiana lutea*, in handwriting that is probably Pavón's, appears near the lower specimen. No other identifying annotations are on this sheet. On no herbarium sheet is the name *Gentiana lutea* Pavón associated solely or explicitly with a specimen of *Gentianella calanchoides*, whereas the name *G. lutea*, in an annotation probably by Pavón, is present on a sheet at MA, barcode MA814410, on which only a specimen of *Gentianella incurva* is mounted. This specimen was annotated as *Gentianella incurva* by Fabris in 1957. The name *Gentiana lutea* Pavón would have been an illegitimate homonym of *G. lutea* L., but it remained unpublished except *pro syn.* by G. Don (1837) for *Gentiana peduncularis* D. Don ex G. Don. The latter name, an illegitimate homonym of *G. peduncularis* Willd. ex Schult., is now included in the synonymy of *Gentianella incurva* (Fabris, 1958; Zarucchi, 1993).

Fabris (1958) transferred the specific epithets *rima* and *calanchoides* to *Gentianella* and treated *G. rima* and *G. calanchoides* as distinct species. Because the original type of the basionym *Gentiana calanchoides* at B had been destroyed, he designated a component of the *Ruiz and Pavón* collection of this species at BM the "neotype" (properly the lectotype, correctable under Art. 9.10 of the *ICN*: Turland et al., 2018). This is presumably the specimen now having the barcode number BM013860947, shown in Fig. 1 in the present paper, as BM has no other specimens of *G. calanchoides* collected by the Ruiz and Pavón expedition (Ranee Prakash, pers. comm. 26 Aug 2022). It was identified and annotated by Fabris as *Gentianella calanchoides* in 1957, although he did not indicate its type status in his annotation. All specimens mounted on this herbarium sheet appear originally to have been identified by Pavón as *Gentiana lutea*, but, as indicated by a line drawn, presumably by Fabris, around the specimen in the upper right, only that specimen constitutes the lectotype of the name *G. calanchoides*. The barcode number cited above applies only to that specimen. The other specimens mounted on the same sheet were identified as *Gentianella incurva* by Fabris. The isotype at G, having been annotated as *Gentiana calanchoides* by Gilg, would more appropriately have been chosen as the lectotype of that name, but it was not annotated by Fabris and presumably was not seen by him.

By 1896, Gilg had seen at least two specimens of the larger-flowered species that the Ruiz and Pavón expedition had collected in the vicinity of Tarma in central Peru, probable components of the collection that includes the type of the name *Gentiana rima.* Gilg (1896) recognized that these specimens represented a species different from his *G. calanchoides,* but he described it as a new species, *G. exacoides* Gilg, concurrently with his description of *G. calanchoides*. One of these specimens, from the herbarium of Pierre Edmond Boissier, is now at G, with the barcode number G00369667. It has a printed label "Peruvia. Herb. Pavón," but Pavón's original labeling is not present and there is no mention of Tarma or the vernacular name *rima-rima.* This specimen is annotated "*Gentiana exacoides* – E. Gilg 1896" in Gilg's handwriting. It has been annotated at G as the type of that name.

Gilg, at the botanical museum in Berlin, would also have seen a specimen of this species then at B, now represented by a photograph at F (negative 10311). Except for the additions noted below, the photograph depicts only the specimen; no labels or annotations that might have been associated with the specimen prior to its being photographed are shown. A label added when the photograph was taken, written on a ruler, contains the plant name *Gentiana exacoides* and identifies the collector as Pavón. Subsequent anonymous annotations, citing Fabris, designate the specimen as the type of both names *G. exacoides* Gilg and *G. rima*. Another of the later annotations associates the specimen with Tarma, on the basis of Fabris's (1958) having recognized the vicinity of Tarma as the type locality for these names. This specimen, too, may have lacked any mention of the vernacular name *rima-rima* when it was seen by Gilg. The specimen at BM that Fabris later designated the holotype of the name *G. rima* was annotated, presumably by Tafalla or from information supplied by him, as "*Gentiana*

(*rimarri Vulgo*)" [sic] and as having been collected at Tarma in 1794, but Gilg did not annotate that specimen and there is no indication that he ever saw it. As of 1896, therefore, Gilg had seen the vernacular name *rima-rima* associated with the species that he called *Gentiana calanchoides*, but he probably had not seen that vernacular name or any variant of it associated with the species that he called *G. exacoides*.

In 1906 Gilg cited the specimen *Weberbauer 4870*, collected near Cusco, in southern Peru, as *Gentiana exacoides*, and probably about that time he annotated a component of that collection that was then at B (photograph at F, negative 49782) as the type of that name. In his 1906 publication, Gilg did not mention the specimen now at G that he had annotated as *G. exacoides* in 1896, nor did he explicitly either exclude or include any previously cited collection by the Ruiz and Pavón expedition. Under the current rules of botanical nomenclature, no component specimen from *Weberbauer 4870* can be accepted as the holotype or lectotype of the name *G. exacoides*. It could not have been any part of Gilg's original material when he described *G. exacoides* in 1896, because August Weberbauer first came to Peru in 1901 (Rodríguez Rodríguez 2019) and, according to the label of the component of *Weberbauer 4870* at F ex B, he collected these specimens in 1905.

In 1916, Gilg included Ruiz and Pavón among those he said had collected specimens of *Gentiana exacoides,* but the only specimen he cited was *Weberbauer 4870.*

At some time, Gilg annotated two specimens at MA, now bearing the barcode numbers MA814416 and MA814417, as *Gentiana exacoides*. Both were collected by the Ruiz and Pavón expedition, probably by Tafalla, and represent the central Peruvian species treated in the present study as *Gentianella rima*. The first of these two specimens is labeled by the collector as *Gentiana rima-rrima* [sic] and as having been collected at Tarma and having the vernacular name *rrima-rrima* [sic]. Gilg's annotations on these specimens are not dated. His annotation slips on both of the specimens cited above bear the number 6/18, but as the numbers 6/10, 6/13, and 6/27 are on Gilg's annotation slips on other specimens of *Gentianella* at MA and the ink differs from that used by Gilg, these figures evidently do not indicate dates. If, as might be inferred from his comments on the name *Gentiana rima* in 1916, the only specimens of this central Peruvian species that Gilg had seen up to that time had been the specimen formerly at B and the one now at G, this occasion, probably post-1916, may have been the first time that Gilg saw the name *rima-rima* or any variant of that vernacular name associated with this species.

The specimens at MA that Gilg annotated as *Gentiana exacoides* were the same specimens as those that Fabris (1958) later recognized as isotypes of the name *G. rima*. Fabris therefore concluded that the names *Gentiana rima* D. Don ex G. Don and *G. exacoides* Gilg (*quoad typi*) were synonymous, having been based on components presumably of the same collection from the vicinity of Tarma. This conclusion is accepted here, as to the typification although not as to all later usage.

In the interim, Briquet (1931) noted that although Gilg, in 1906 and 1916, had applied the name *Gentiana exacoides* to *Weberbauer 4870*, from the vicinity of Cusco, Gilg (1896) had originally based the name on specimens collected by the Ruiz and Pavón expedition. Although Briquet did not state the provenance more exactly, he would have assumed that these specimens were collected in central Peru, probably near Tarma, as many of the botanical collections by the Ruiz and Pavón expedition, including some of those by Tafalla, were from that area and the expedition's explorations in Peru had extended only as far south as the vicinity of Huancayo (Ruiz 1940; Steele 1964). While in Chile, Ruiz and Pavón remained in the central part of that country and did not approach the southern border of Peru. By 1931 Briquet, who was based at Geneva, had seen the specimen collected by the Ruiz and Pavón expedition that Gilg had annotated as *G. exacoides* in 1896, as the Université de Genève had acquired the Barbey-Boissier herbarium in 1918 (annotation, G00369667). He had also seen the component of *Weberbauer 4870* that at that time was at B. He concluded that *Weberbauer 4870*, from the vicinity of Cusco, in southern Peru, represented a species different from the plants from the vicinity of Tarma, in central Peru, and explicitly excluded *Weberbauer 4870* from *G. exacoides*. He named the Cusco species *Gentiana ernestii*, citing *Weberbauer 4870* at G as the type of that name. As Briquet did not believe that *G. ernestii* was the species to which Gilg had originally applied the name *G. exacoides* in 1896, and as he typified the name *G. ernestii* with a specimen collected in 1905, the name *G. ernestii* should not be interpreted as a direct replacement for the name *G. exacoides* Gilg.

Briquet described the corolla tube of *Gentiana ernestii* as ca. 1.5 cm long and the lobes as ca. 1 cm, and said that the corolla tube of *G. exacoides* (as represented by the type specimen at G) was much shorter than the lobes. He also noted some vegetative differences.

Briquet accepted the name *Gentiana exacoides* Gilg for the central Peruvian species represented by the *Ruiz and Pavón expedition* specimen at G, but, as is now generally recognized in nomenclatural compilations, this name is a later homonym of *G. exacoides* L., which Linnaeus had applied to the South African species now called *Sebaea exacoides* (L.) Schinz. Briquet did not mention the name *G. calanchoides* or *G. rima.*

Macbride (1959), in his treatment of the *Gentianaceae* for the *Flora of Peru*, accepted the name *Gentiana exacoides* Gilg and treated *G. exacoides* and *G. ernestii* as different species. He applied both names to specimens of the species from the vicinity of Cusco, but questioned, not surprisingly, the reliability of some of the alleged distinctions between the two that he had cobbled together from Gilg's and Briquet's publications. He cited "without data, *Ruiz & Pavon*," referring to the specimen formerly at B, as the type of the name *G. exacoides*, incorrectly assuming that it had been collected in Dpto. Cusco. He also cited several other specimens, all from Dpto. Cusco, as representing *G. exacoides*. In accord with Briquet, he cited *Weberbauer 4870* as the type of the name *G. ernestii*, referring to the replicate of *Weberbauer 4870* at G. He excluded the component that had been at B, and by implication the component that F had acquired from B, citing it as *G. exacoides* in accord with its identification by Gilg. Macbride cited only one other specimen under *G. ernestii*. It was also from Dpto. Cusco, but was cited only as perhaps being referable to that species. He did not mention the name *G. rima.*

By the 1960s, as a result of its use by Gilg (1916) and Macbride (1959) in the references then standard for the identification of Peruvian gentians, the name *Gentiana exacoides* had become generally associated with the southern Peruvian species. This species was increasingly well represented in herbaria, while the central Peruvian species was not. Consequently, when the name *Gentiana exacoides* Gilg was shown to be an illegitimate homonym and *G. rima*, an older name, was said by Fabris (1958) to be synonymous, it appeared that the name *Gentianella rima* was legitimately available for the southern Peruvian species that had widely, although incorrectly, been known as *Gentiana exacoides.* Consequently, subsequent to Fabris's publication, the name *Gentianella rima* was sometimes applied to this southern Peruvian species.

In his 1958 publication, Fabris did not mention the name *Gentiana ernestii.* In 1962, evidently having distinguished the southern Peruvian species from the central Peruvian species that he correctly called *Gentianella rima*, he annotated the replicate of *Weberbauer 4870* at F as *Gentianella ernestii*, attributing the combination to himself, but he did not publish it. Since my publication of the nomenclatural combination *Gentianella ernestii* (Briq.) Fabris ex J.S. Pringle in 1981, specimens of the species from Dpto. Cusco have perhaps more often been identified as *G. ernestii*, but specimens of this species are still sometimes identified as *G. rima*. As of this writing, *Plants of the World Online* (POWO, 2019+) gives the range of *G. rima* only as Dpto. Cusco, even though the name is typified by a collection from Dpto. Junín.

Until recently no specimens similar to the type of the name *Gentianella rima* were known to have been collected in central Peru since the late eighteenth century, when it was collected at Tarma, presumably by Tafalla. In 2019 Castillo Ramón reported *G. rima* from Dpto. Junín, Prov. Tarma, pampa cerca Huaracayoc, encima de Tapo, 4000 m, the documentation being *Goepfert s.n.* (USM, accession no. 77631, shown in Fig. 2 in this paper). This specimen, the identification of which is accepted here, confirms that a species corresponding to the type of the name *G. rima* is native to the vicinity of Tarma. It was collected in 1976 but was not identified until Ms. Castillo encountered it in her studies. Her discovery permits the plants from southern Peru to be compared not only with the specimens collected in the vicinity of Tarma by Tafalla but also with another collection of that species from the Tarma area. The *Goepfert* specimen had been received at USM from TRT, but Deborah Metsger has informed me that the herbarium of the Royal Ontario Museum no longer holds any component of that collection.

Ca. 400 km separates Tarma from the northernmost sites at which *Gentianella ernestii* has been collected. *Gentianella rima* and *G. ernestii* are contrasted in Figs. 2 and 3. The inflorescences of *G. rima* have a terminal umbelloid or corymboid component, with several flowers at more or less the same level. The inflorescences of *G. ernestii* often

comprise only one to three flowers; when they comprise several flowers the inflorescences are paniculoid throughout, with branches each bearing one to three flowers arising at more than one level from the primary stem, without an umbelloid or corymboid terminal component. The distal cauline leaves of *G. rima* are narrowly elliptic to lanceolate, with the apex acute; those of *G. ernestii* are linear or nearly so, giving the inflorescence a less leafy aspect, and the apex is acuminate. The rosette leaves of *G. rima* are distally elliptic, abruptly subacute or acute at the apex and tapering to a petiolar base, larger and proportionately wider than those of *G. ernestii*, with a maximum width of ca. 25 mm; those of *G. ernestii* are linear or narrowly oblanceolate, to a maximum width of ca. 8 or occasionally 10 mm, tapering more gradually to an acute or acuminate apex.

The calyx lobes of *Gentianella rima* are narrowly triangular, tapering from the base or from near the base to the apex, with the apex acute. Those of *G. ernestii* are narrowly oblong, parallel-sided for much of their length, with the apices acuminate, often strongly so. George Don's (1837) description of the calyx-lobe apices of *Gentiana rima* as obtuse, although an exaggeration for *G. rima*, would be strikingly inappropriate for the acuminate calyx lobes of *G. ernestii.* The proportionate lobing of the corollas is often difficult to determine from herbarium specimens, as the sinuses between the lobes may be concealed by the calyx lobes or the base of a sinus may not be clearly distinguishable from a fold in the corolla tube below it. From this study it appears that the corolla lobes of *G. rima* are generally 3–3.5× as long as the tube and those of *G. ernestii* are 2–2.5× as long as the tube, a somewhat lesser difference than was attributed to these species by Briquet (1931).

George Don (1837) described the corollas of *Gentiana rima* as yellow. This was probably based on the label on the type specimen at BM, on which an annotation attributed to Ruiz describes the flowers as "*sulphurea.*" Castillo Ramón (2019) described the corollas of *G. rima* as probably creamy white. The corollas of *Gentianella ernestii* are blue or occasionally white, less often rose-violet. Adaxial trichomes are present on the corolla tube of *G. ernestii* but, as implied although not expressly stated by Castillo Ramón, absent in *Gentianella rima.*

Like *Gentianella rima*, *G. incurva*, contrasted above with *G. calanchoides*, is native to the central Peruvian Andes. *Gentianella incurva* and *G. rima* are similar in the shape of the basal leaves and in the size and lobing of the corollas, but the plants of *G. incurva* are much lower in stature, generally with only one to three or occasionally four flowers per stem. Its corollas are bright yellow and scarlet. Specimens of *G. incurva* are shown, along with *G. calanchoides*, in Fig. 1.

No specimens of authentic *Gentianella rima* collected more recently than 1976 were found in this study, but it is to be hoped that further botanical exploration in central Peru will lead to the rediscovery of this species, permitting further comparisons of these species.

Nomenclatural citations for the species discussed above are as follows:

Gentianella calanchoides (Gilg) Fabris, Boletín de la Sociedad Argentina de Botánica 7: 92. 1958. ≡ *Gentiana calanchoides* Gilg, Botanische Jahrbücher für Systematik, Pflanzengeschichte und Pflanzengeographie 23: 30. 189. 1906, basionym. **Type**: PERU: Dpto. Junín: Prov. Tarma, *Ruiz and Pavón expedition s.n.* (original type B, destroyed, photograph F negative 10287, image!; **lectotype**, designated by Fabris [1958], BM barcode BM013860947, image!; **isotypes**, G barcode G00369658, MA barcode MA814421, upper two specimens only, and P barcode P00524527, images!; fragments F!)

Gentianella ernestii (Briq.) Fabris ex J.S. Pringle, Phytologia 48: 281. 1981. ≡ *Gentiana ernestii* Briq., Candollea 4: 326. 1931, basionym. **Type**: PERU: Dpto. Cusco: Near Cusco, *Weberbauer 4870* (original type G barcode G00378318, image!; **isotype** F barcode F0041197F, image!; **isotype** formerly at B, destroyed, photograph F negative 49782!).

Gentianella rima (D. Don ex G. Don) Fabris, Boletín de la Sociedad Argentina de Botánica 7: 90. 1958. *Gentiana rima* D. Don ex G. Don, A General History of the Dichlamydeous Plants 4: 181. 1837, basionym. **Type**: PERU: Dpto. Junín: Prov. Tarma, *Tafalla (Ruiz and Pavón expedition) s.n.* (original type BM, barcode BM000953030, image!; **isotypes** MA barcodes MA814416 and MA814417, images!; fragments F, barcode F0060377F, image!; **probable isotype** G barcode G00369667, image!).

Gentiana exacoides Gilg, Botanische Jahrbücher für Systematik, Pflanzengeschichte und Pflanzengeographie 22: 329. 1896, nom. illeg., *quoad typum* synonym of *Gentianella rima.* **Type**: PERU: Sine loco, *Ruiz and Pavón expedition s.n.* (original type G, barcode G00369667, image!) Non *Gentiana exacoides* L., Species Plantarum, ed. 2, 1: 332. 1762.

Acknowledgments

I congratulate Susy J. Castillo Ramón for her recognizing the *Goepfert* specimen as the long-mysterious *Gentianella rima*, and I thank her for helpful correspondence and for her search of the USM herbarium for relevant specimens. I am grateful to her and to Joaquina A. Albán Castillo for scans of the *Goepfert* specimen of *Gentianella rima*. I thank Ranee Prakash for information on the lectotype specimen of *G. calanchoides*, for her providing it with a barcode number, and for searching the BM herbarium for other Ruiz and Pavón collections of that species.

This paper was submitted to the *Ukrainian Botanical Journal* in support of this journal and in support of, and respect for, its editorial team, the staff at the M.G. Kholodny Institute of Botany, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine in Kyiv, and the Ukrainian people as they deal with the impact of the conflict to which that nation has been subjected.

Ethics declaration

The author declares no conflict of interest.

ORCID

J.S. Pringle: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9086-2645

REFERENCES

Briquet J. 1931. Decades plantarum novarum vel minus cognitarum: series altera, decades 26–28. *Candollea*, 4: 317–352.

Castillo Ramón S.J. 2019. *Taxonomía del género Gentianella Moench (Gentianaceae) en Andes centrales del Perú: Junín, Lima y Pasco.* Tesis ... de Magister. Lima, Perú,, Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos, 171 p.

Castillo Ramón S., Salinas Revilla N., León B, Sánchez Vega I.M. 2006. *Gentianaceae* endémicas del Perú. In: León B., Roque J., Ulloa Ulloa C., Pitman N.C.A., Jørgensen P.M., Cano Echevarría A. El libro rojo de las plantas endémicas del Perú. *Revista Peruana de Biología*, 13(2 especial): 339–354.

Don D. 1828. Appendix by Mr. Don, comprising an account of the Lambertian herbarium. In: Lambert A.B. *A Description of the Genus Pinus*. 2nd ed. Vol. 2. London, U.K.: Messrs. Weddell, pp. 27–40 (pagination is irregular).

Don D. 1837. Descriptions of Indian *Gentianeae*. *Transactions of the Linnean Society of London*, 1: 503–532.

Don G. 1831–1838. *A General History of the Dichlamydeous Plants*. London, U.K.: J.G. and F. Rivington. [*Gentianeae* in vol. 4, part 1. 1837.]

Fabris H.A. 1958. Notas sobre *Gentianella* del Perú. *Boletín de la Sociedad Argentina de Botánica*, 7: 86–93.

Gilg E. 1896. Beiträge zur Kenntnis der *Gentianaceae*. I. *Botanische Jahrbücher für Systematik, Pflanzengeschichte und Pflanzengeographie*, 22: 301–347.

Gilg E. 1906. Beiträge zur Kenntniss der *Gentianaceae* III. *Feddes Repertorium Specierum Novarum Regni Vegetabilis*, 2(16/17): 33–56.

Gilg E. 1916. *Gentianaceae* Andinae. A. Monographische Zusammenstellung der *Gentiana*-Arten Süd-Amerikas. [In: Gilg E. (ed.). Plantae novae andinae imprimis Weberbauerianae. VIII]. *Botanische Jahrbücher für Systematik, Pflanzengeschichte und Pflanzengeographie*, 54(2, Beiblatt 118): 4–89. https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/717#page/672/mode/1up

Grisebach A.H.R. 1845. *Gentianaceae*. In: de Candolle A.P., de Candolle A. (eds.) *Prodromus systematis naturalis regni vegetabilis*. Vol. 9. Parisiis [Paris], France: Fortin, Masson et Sociorum, pp. 38–141, 561–563.

Macbride J.F. 1959. Flora of Peru: *Gentianaceae*. Gentian family. *Publications of the Field Museum of Natural History. Botanical Series*, 13(5): 270–363. https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/19687#page/277/mode/1up

Miller H.S. 1970. The herbarium of Aylmer Bourke Lambert: Notes on its acquisition, dispersal, and present whereabouts. *Taxon*, 19: 489–656. https://doi.org/10.2307/1218947

Murray G. 1904. The Department of Botany. In: *The History of the Collections Contained in the Natural History Departments of the British Museum*. Vol. 1. London, U.K.: The Trustees of the British Museum, pp. 77–193.

POWO. 2022–onward. *Plants of the World Online*. Facilitated by the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew. Available at: http://www.plantsoftheworldonline.org/ (Accessed 30 June 2022).

Pringle J.S. 1981. Nomenclatural transfers and taxonomic notes on some South American *Gentianaceae*. *Phytologia*, 48: 281–285.

Rodríguez Rodríguez E.F. 2019. Augusto Weberbauer (Breslau, Alemania, 1871; Lima, Perú, 1948). *Sagasteguiana*, 7(2): 253–258.

Ruiz H. (translated by Dahlgren B.E.). 1940. Travels of Ruiz, Pavón, and Dombey in Peru and Chile (1777–1788). *Publications of the Field Museum of Natural History, Botanical Series*, 21: 1–372.

Stafleu F.A., Cowan R.S. 1976. *Taxonomic Literature: A selective guide to botanical publications and collections with dates, commentaries and types.* Vol. 1: *A-G.* 2nd ed. Utrecht: Bohm, Scheltema & Holkema, 1136 p.

Steele A.R. 1964. *Flowers for the King: The Expedition of Ruiz and Pavon and the* Flora of Peru. Durham, NC, U.S.A.: Duke University Press, 378 p.

Tepe E.J. 2018. A series of unfortunate events: the forgotten botanist and the misattribution of a type collection. *PhytoKeys*, 109: 33–39. https://doi.org/10.3897/phytokeys.109.28144

Thiers B. 2023–onward. *Index Herbariorum. A global directory of public herbaria and associated staff*. New York Botanical Garden. (Accessed May 2023). http://sweetgum.nybg.org/ih/

Turland N.J., Wiersema J.H., Barrie F.R., Greuter W., Hawksworth D.L., Herendeen P.S., Knapp S., Kusber W.-H., Li D.-Z., Marhold K., May T.W., McNeill J., Monro A.M., Prado J., Price M.J., Smith G.F. 2018. *International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants (Shenzhen Code) adopted by the Nineteenth International Botanical Congress, Shenzhen, China, July 2017* [*Regnum Vegetabile*, vol. 159]. Glashütten: Koeltz Botanical Books, xxxviii + 254 pp. https://doi.org/10.12705/Code.2018

Zarucchi J.L. 1993. *Gentianaceae*. In: Brako L., Zarucchi J.L. (eds.). *Catalogue of the flowering plants and gymnosperms of Peru*. *Monographs in Systematic Botany from the Missouri Botanical Garden*. Vol. 45. St. Louis, MO, U.S.A.: Missouri Botanical Garden Press, pp. 534–545.

Дж.С. ПРІНГЛ
Королівський ботанічний сад, Онтаріо, Канада

Номенклатурні нотатки щодо південноамериканських видів роду *Gentianella* (*Swertiinae*, *Gentianeae, Gentianaceae*): *Gentianella calanchoides*, *G. ernestii* та *G. rima*

Реферат. Назву *Gentianella rima* (D. Don ex G. Don) Fabris правильно застосовувати для виду, що природно поширений у центральній частини Перу. Відповідно, *G. ernestii* (Briq.) Fabris ex J.S. Pringle є правильною назвою для схожого виду з південної частини Перу. Наводиться порівняння цих видів між собою, а також із *G. calanchoides* (Gilg) Fabris.

Ключові слова: *Gentianaceae*, *Gentianella*, номенклатура, Перу, систематика