Characterization of Some Italian Ornamental Thyme by Their Aroma

Alessandra Bertoli^a, Szilvia Sárosi^b, Jenő Bernáth^b and Luisa Pistelli^a

^aDipartimento di Scienza Farmaceutiche, Università di Pisa, Via Bonanno 33, I-56126 Pisa, Italy ^bDepartment of Medicinal and Aromatic Plants, Faculty of Horticultural Sciences, Corvinus University of Budapest, 29-43 Villányi út, H-1118 Budapest, Hungary

bertoli@farm.unipi.it

Received: October 14th, 2009; Accepted: December 11th, 2009

The aromatic profiles of five commercial thyme cultivars (*T. vulgaris* 'Silver Poise', *T. vulgaris* 'Erectus', *T. vulgaris* 'Faustini', *T. × citriodorus* 'Anderson's Gold', and *T. × citriodorus* 'Silver Queen'), cultivated in Italy, were defined both by their static headspaces (HS) and essential oils (EOs). In addition, a botanical garden sample of *T. vulgaris* was considered as reference material to evaluate the morphological and phytochemical differences from the selected market samples. Extractions of the volatile constituents of the different plant material were carried out by SPME (static headspace, HS) and hydrodistillation (HD) processes. GC-MS analysis provided the separation and identification of approximately 70 components in the HS samples and 50 in the hydrodistilled essential oils, accounting for more than 95% of the total. The typical main constituents of *T. vulgaris* were detected in all the EO samples, although qualitative and quantitative differences were found among the selected ornamental *Thymus* varieties. Thymol (50-55%) was the marker constituent for the three *T. vulgaris* cultivars, while geraniol (61-67%) characterized the essential oils of the two *T. × citriodorus* varieties. In all the analyzed essential oils, non-oxygenated (16-79%) and oxygenated (5-26%) monoterpenes were the typical volatile constituents. Specific target compounds (thymol, geraniol and 6-methyl-5-hepten-2-one) were selected to characterize the five thyme cultivars that are considered at present only as ornamental plants. A comparative evaluation of their EO quality was carried out in order to propose them as alternative sources of Italian raw plant material for industrial production.

Keywords: Thymus vulgaris L., cultivar, essential oil, static headspace, SPME, hydrodistillation, GC-MS.

Thymus vulgaris L. (Lamiaceae) is a well-known natural food preservative and medicinal plant native to the Mediterranean region. [1a] The beneficial effects of this plant, mainly its antioxidant properties, have been described [1b,1c]. Besides these uses, Thymus is also commercialized worldwide as an important source of ornamental plants, owing to its great variability. With respect to the essential oil composition, at least six different chemotypes have been described for wild thyme [1d], with thymol, carvacrol, geraniol, linalool, terpinene-4-ol and 4-thujanol as the main components. Later, a new chemotype was found in the Spanish flora containing a great amount of 1,8-cineole [1e]. Spain, Morocco, Albania and Hungary are important producers of garden thyme, with most being exported to the USA (1000 t/year) [1f].

However, garden thyme is native to Italy, where there are ideal ecological conditions for its cultivation, with an average production of 100-600 t, drug yield, per year. In the case of *T. x citriodorus* "Silver Queen" (TC5),

the Liguria Region is one of the main Italian suppliers and produces generally 1.5 million pots per year.

Over-collection of natural populations, and annual changes in drug yields and quality of garden thyme made it necessary to initiate a program of selection on this species [2a]. Two different populations of T. vulgaris were utilized for producing varieties: a less frost-sensitive one from Germany and a natural population from the northern border of the natural habitat of garden thyme in Valle d'Aosta (north Italy). In 1994, the first officially registered variety was 'Varico I'. This was homogeneous (having exclusively female individuals) and the three-year-old plants contained an average EO level of 3.9 %, with a high content of thymol (at least 50 %) [2b]. These results were acquired during the selection work and there is no evidence that the same yields are obtained in different ecological circumstances. Due to the high price of hybrid varieties, as well as the long process of the hybrid breeding work, it was thought desirable to

evaluate the production and EO quality of those cultivars that have been selected only for ornamental purposes. Ornamental *Thymus* cultivars are usually selected by clone selection, a process that is less expensive than hybrid breeding.

Previous work on the cultivation of *T. vulgaris* varieties has been carried out in Canada and Germany [2c,2d]. However, the chosen cultivars (in the first case, 'Laval-1', 'RH-1', 'RH-2', 'QDLB' and 'Madrid'; in the second, 'Varico I', 'Varico II', 'Krajovy', 'Deutscher Winter', 'Rieger I' and 'Deutscher Winter Junghanns') were selected for flavoring and medicinal purposes. Although Echeverrigaray *et al.* [2e] analyzed commercial thyme cultivars ('Burpee', 'Battle', 'Tropical', 'Blumen', 'SEM', 'ISLA'), their experiments were focused on the potential relationship between chemical and genetic features since the harvesting time and real botanical origin of the commercial cultivars were often unknown.

Very few data on the characterization of the volatile constituents of *Thymus* cultivars have been reported. In 2006, *T. vulgaris, Thymus* × *citriodorus* (Pers.) Schreb. and *Thymus* × *citriodorus* 'Archer's gold' were compared by their aroma profile [2f]. The T. × *citriodorus* cultivar had a high level of carvacrol, but its essential oil level was rather low (0.29 g/100g $_{dry wt}$).

The aim of this study was to define the aromatic profiles of three different ornamental cultivars of *T. vulgaris* and two varieties of *Thymus x citriodorus* (*T. vulgaris* x *T. pulegioides* L.) [3a] by the static headspaces of their fresh plant material and the essential oils extracted by hydrodistillation (HD) of air-dried samples.

A comparative evaluation of the morphological features, EO contents and volatile composition were carried out in order to standardize these thyme cultivars for novel industrial usages. The five ornamental thyme varieties chosen for this study are some of the most requested for their plant structure, leaf and flower colors. All the plant samples were cultivated in Italy and collected at the full blooming stage. The plant origin, morphological features and their EOs yields are summarized in Table 1. The plant height, diameter, fresh and dry weights were determined in order to characterize the five market varieties of thyme (TV1-3, TC4-5) and compare them with a 12-year-old control plant sample (control, TVC), collected at the Botanical Garden (Lucca).

The *T. vulgaris* 'Erectus' (TV2) samples were characterized by a significantly bigger plant diameter (average 22.0 cm), as well as higher fresh and dry weight yields (average 46.9 g and 16.2 g, respectively) than the others. This variety showed fairly similar morphological features to the Botanical Garden

 Table 1: Morphological features of the selected garden thyme samples.

 (mean±standard deviation) and their EOs yields.

| Cultivars | Bush diameter (cm) | Plant height (cm) | Fresh Wt (g) | Dry Wt (g) |
|-----------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| TVC | 70.0 | 43.1 | 180.0 | 82.0 |
| TV1 | 20.0±1.00 | 15.7±1.53 | 31.5±3.66 | 9.0±1.00 |
| TV2 | 22.0±1.73 | 15.0±1.73 | 46.9±3.81 | 16.2±1.06 |
| TV3 | 25.3±2.08 | 14.7±1.53 | 30.7±3.91 | 8.7±1.53 |
| TC4 | 17.7±2.52 | 17.0±3.61 | 27.9±4.11 | 8.7±1.53 |
| TC5 | 19.0±1.00 | 17.0±1.00 | 38.1±5.55 | 8.2±0.76 |

T. vulgaris sample (TVC). The lowest EO contents were recorded for T. x citriodorus "Silver Queen" (TC5, 0.49 mg/100g_{drv wt}) and T. vulgaris "Silver Poise" (TV1, 0.33 mg/100gdry wt). Only T. vulgaris "Erectus" (TV2, 1.45 mg/100gdry wt) and T. vulgaris "Faustini" (TV3, 1.48 mg/100gdry wt) satisfied the Pharmacopoeia requirements for *Thymi herba* EO yield [3b,3c]. It is important to point out that the thyme aerial parts were collected at the full blooming period, as recommended by the Official Pharmacopoeia, but ornamental thyme is generally sold at a young age (seven months). On the other hand, the T. vulgaris collected from the Botanical Garden of Lucca was an old plant, transplanted 12 years previously from Palmaria Island. However, the T. vulgaris 'Erectus' (TV2) and T. vulgaris 'Faustini' (TV3) cultivars showed the biggest EO yields, not only in comparison with the other market samples, but also with the botanical garden sample (1.36 mg/100 g $_{dry wt}$, respectively).

The headspace profile of the fresh plant material was useful in order to define which type of volatiles characterized the aroma emitted spontaneously. The GC-MS results of EO and HS are summarized in Tables 2 and 3. The HS composition of the fresh samples showed significant qualitative and quantitative differences in comparison with the corresponding EOs, especially in the hydrocarbon and oxygenated monoterpene content (Table 4). Furthermore, the HS profiles of both T. x citriodorus varieties were characterized by significant amounts of 6-methyl-5hepten-2-one (TC4, 45.1±1.89; TC5 15.3±1.56%), a carotenoid-derived volatile, which was present in traces only in the HS profile of T. vulgaris "Silver Poise" (TV1 0.68±0.36, Table 2). Lower amounts of 6-methyl-5-hepten-2-one has already been reported for the essential oil of other wild thyme species, such as T. serpyllum praecox [4], T. camphoratus [5a], T. zygioides subsp. zygioides [5b], and T. herba-barona [6a]. However, in the present study, 6-methyl-5-hepten-2-one was detected in higher amounts only in the headspace of the two T. x citriodorus samples and not in their EOs, apart from a very low content in the T. xcitriodorus Silver Queen' EO (TC5, 0.89 ±0.34 %). Therefore, this is the first time that it has been detected as a main constituent of the static HS of some fresh thyme samples. In addition, 6-methyl-5-hepten-2-one was the target compound in the fresh aroma of the two

Table 2: GC-MS results of the static-headspace analysis (relative composition %) of the selected thyme cultivars.

| Compound | LRI* ¹ | | Thymus vulgaris (TV)*2 | | | Thymus x citriodorus (TC)*2 | | |
|---|-------------------|------------|------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------------------|-------------|--|
| | | TVC *2 | 'TV1' | 'TV2' | 'TV3' | 'TC4' | 'TC5' | |
| α-Thujene | 933 | 2.5 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 4.8 | - | 1.3 | |
| x-Pinene | 942 | 1.8 | 6.6 | 1.9 | 3.6 | 0.9 | 0.9 | |
| Camphene | 959 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 0.5 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 1.7 | |
| Sabinene | 979 | 0.2 | - | 0.3 | 0.5 | - | 0.9 | |
| I-Octen-3-ol | 984 | - | 2.2 | - | - | 0.9 | - | |
| 8-Pinene 6-Methyl-5-hepten-2-one | 984 988 | 0.5 | - 0.7 | 0.6 | 1.1 - | - 45.1 | 0.8 15.3 | |
| Myrcene | 992 | 2.1 | 1.5 | 3.8 | - | - | - | |
| 6-Methly-5-heptene-2-ol | 995 | - | - | - | - | - | 2.4 | |
| 3-Octanol | 999 | - | - | - | - | 2.3 | 2.7 | |
| Octanal | 1005 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.3 | |
| p-Mentha-1(7),8-diene | 1008 | - | - | - | - | 0.3 | - | |
| a-Phellandrene | 1010 | 0.1 | - | 0.2 | 0.3 | - | - | |
| 53-Carene 1,4-Cineole | 1013 1020 | 0.2 | - | 0.4 | - 1.0 | - | - | |
| x-Terpinene | 1020 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 2.8 | 4.3 | - | - 0.8 | |
| p-Cymene | 1022 | 29.2 | 19.6 | 40.6 | 35.6 | 1.1 | 3.5 | |
| Limonene | 1030 | - | - | - | - | 0.2 | 1.10 | |
| 1,8-Cineole | 1039 | - | 2.2 | 5.3 | - | 4.6 | 5.5 | |
| E)-Ocimene | 1039 | - | 0.1 | | - | - | - | |
| -Terpinene | 1064 | 5.7 | 3.0 | 21.5 | 22.5 | 0.2 | 4.0 | |
| cis-Sabinene hydrate | 1075 | 0.7 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 0.2 | 0.5 | |
| Ferpinolene | 1089 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.2 | - | |
| Fenchone | 1094 | 0.5 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Linalool | 1101 | | 1.0 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 5.0 | 5.9 | |
| trans-Sabinene hydrate Nonanal | 1104 1104 | 0.2 | 0.4 0.2 | 0.4 0.1 | - | - | - | |
| Camphor | 1104 | 5.0 | 2.0 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 2.6 | 0.5 | |
| Menthone | 1154 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.9 | - | - | - | |
| Borneol | 1177 | 1.6 | 0.7 | - | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.5 | |
| Terpinen-4-ol | 1177 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | - | - | |
| a-Terpineol | 1182 | 0.1 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| cis-Dihydrocarvone | 1197 | 0.1 | - | - | - | 0.1 | - | |
| trans-Dihydrocarvone | 1200 | 0.1 | - | - | - | - | 0.2 | |
| Decanal | 1206 | - | - | - | - | 0.3 | - | |
| Nerol | 1227 | - | - | - | - | 2.1 | 4.0 | |
| Thymol methyl ether | 1233 1242 | 0.2 0.2 | 6.7 5.4 | 0.1 | 0.8 2.1 | 1.6 2.1 | 3.5 1.9 | |
| Carvacrol methyl ether Thymoquinone | 1242 | 0.2 | 0.2 | - | 0.6 | - | 1.9 | |
| Geraniol | 1254 | - | - | - | - | 5.3 | 18.0 | |
| Geranial | 1274 | - | - | - | - | 2.2 | 2.5 | |
| Isobornylacetate | 1286 | 0.7 | 0.3 | - | 0.4 | - | - | |
| Anethole | 1289 | 7.3 | 10.7 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 2.7 | 5.0 | |
| Thymol | 1292 | 14.1 | 20.7 | 2.7 | 5.4 | - | - | |
| Carvacrol | 1300 | 0.7 | - | - | 0.1 | - | - | |
| Methyl geranate | 1323 | - | - | - | - | 0.4 | 0.9 | |
| Isobutyl benzoate | 1331 | 0.8 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Longicyclene - Copaene | 1375 1377 | 0.7 | - | 0.2 | 0.2 | - | - | |
| Geranyl acetate | 1381 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.2 | |
| B-Bourbonene | 1381 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | - | 1.9 | 0.2 | |
| B-Elemene | 1390 | - | - | - | 0.2 | - | - | |
| Longifolene | 1410 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.1 | - | 0.3 | 0.2 | |
| B-Caryophyllene | 1420 | 6.9 | 4.2 | 6.4 | 3.5 | 4.9 | 5.1 | |
| B-Gurjunene | 1420 | - | - | 0.1 | - | 0.2 | - | |
| trans-a-Bergamotene | 1434 | 1.3 | - | - | 0.6 | 0.2 | - | |
| x-Humulene | 1457 | 0.2 | - | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | - | |
| Alloaromadendrene | 1462 | 0.3 | - | - | - | - 0.2 | - | |
| B-Cadinene cis-Muurola-4(14),5-diene | 1462 1464 | - | - | - | 0.2 | 0.2 0.2 | 0.3 | |
| y-Muurolene | 1464 | 0.2 | - | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.5 | |
| Germacrene D | 1470 | 1.5 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 1.1 | - | 2.3 | |
| Bicyclogermacrene | 1496 | 0.4 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 3-Himachalene | 1499 | 0.2 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| a-Farnesene | 1503 | 0.7 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 8-Bisabolene | 1506 | 2.7 | - | - | - | 4.2 | 5.2 | |
| cis-y-Cadinene | 1511 | 0.2 | - | 0.2 | 0.4 | - | - | |
| 8-Cadinene | 1519 | 0.5 | - | 0.4 | - | - | - | |
| 3-Sesquiphellandrene | 1525 | 0.1 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Spathulenol | 1578 | 0.6 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Caryophyllene-oxide | 1584 | 0.6 | 1.3 | 0.3 | - | 0.5 | - | |
| -Cadinol | 1645 | - | - | - | 0.1 | - | | |

*¹L.R.I. = linear retention index relative to C_8 - C_{23} *n*-alkanes on an HP-5 column. *² TVC — *Thymus vulgaris* control sample, TV1 – *T. vulgaris* 'Silver Poise', TV2 – *T. vulgaris* 'Erectus', TV3 – *T. vulgaris* 'Faustini', TC4 – *Thymus* × *citriodorus* 'Anderson's Gold', TC5 – *Thymus* × *citriodorus* 'Silver Queen'.

| Table 3: GC-MS results (r | elative composition %) of | f the essential oils (EOs) obtain | ned by hydrodistillation | n from the selected |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|
| thyme cultivars. | | | | |
| | | | , | ^ |

| Compound | LRI* ¹ | | Thymus vulgaris (TV)* ² | | | <i>Thymus x citriodorus</i> $(TC)^{*2}$ | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|-------|------------------------------------|-------|-------|---|-------|--|
| | | TVC*2 | 'TV1' | 'TV2' | 'TV3' | 'TC4' | 'TC5' | |
| α-Thujene | 933 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | - | - | |
| a-Pinene | 942 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.1 | - | |
| Camphene | 959 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | |
| Sabinene | 979 | - | - | - | 0.1 | - | - | |
| -Octen-3-ol | 984 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.2 | |
| 3-Octanone | 985 | - | 0.2 | - | - | 1.8 | - | |
| 5-Methyl-5-hepten-2-one | 988 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.9 | |
| Myrcene | 992 | 1.5 | 0.9 | 1.5 | 1.4 | - | 0.1 | |
| -Octanol | 999 | 0.1 | 0.2 | - | - | 0.7 | 3.4 | |
| x-Phellandrene | 1010 | 0.1 | - | 0.2 | 0.2 | - | - | |
| 3-Carene | 1013 | 0.1 | - | 0.1 | 0.1 | - | - | |
| x-Terpinene | 1022 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 1.4 | 1.7 | - | - | |
| p-Cymene | 1030 | 11.6 | 12.4 | 11.4 | 10.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | |
| imonene | 1030 | 0.3 | - | 0.3 | 0.3 | - | - | |
| 3-Phellandrene | 1037 | 0.1 | 0.2 | - | - | - | - | |
| ,8 Cineole | 1039 | 0.3 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | |
| -Terpinene | 1064 | 8.5 | 4.4 | 11.1 | 6.6 | - | 0.2 | |
| cis-Sabinene hydrate | 1075 | 1.2 | - | 1.3 | 1.5 | - | - | |
| I-Nonen-3-ol | 1084 | 0.1 | 1.3 | - | - | - | - | |
| Terpinolene | 1089 | 0.1 | - | 0.1 | - | - | - | |
| Linalool | 1101 | 0.7 | 2.2 | 5.1 | 1.9 | 0.4 | 0.4 | |
| rans-Sabinene hydrate | 1104 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 | - | - | |
| Nonanal | 1107 | 0.1 | - | - | - | _ | - | |
| Camphor | 1154 | - | 1.1 | _ | - | 0.3 | _ | |
| Borneol | 1177 | 1.8 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.6 | |
| Terpinene-4-ol | 1182 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.0 | |
| <i>i</i> -Terpineol | 1197 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.4 | - | 0.1 | |
| | 1200 | - | 0.2 | - | - | - | 0.1 | |
| cis-Dihydrocarvone Nerol | 1200 | - | 0.1 - | - | - | 1.8 | 1.2 | |
| | 1227 | 0.1 | 2.1 | - | 1.0 | 0.3 | 0.4 | |
| Thymol methyl ether | 1233 | - | 3.5 | - | 1.0 | 0.5 | 0.4 | |
| Carvacrol methyl ether | 1242 | - | | | - | - 9.1 | 4.8 | |
| Neral | | | - | - | 0.7 | 9.1 | 4.0 | |
| Thymoquinone | 1254 1254 | - | | - 0.8 | | - 61.4 | 67.1 | |
| Geraniol | | - | - | | - | | | |
| Geranial | 1274 | | | 0.2 | | 14.3 | 9.7 | |
| sobornyl acetate | 1286 | - | 0.1 | - | - | - | - | |
| Thymol | 1292 | 55.1 | 56.8 | 50.4 | 54.4 | 0.2 | 1.5 | |
| Carvacrol | 1300 | 3.9 | 1.8 | 4.1 | 3.4 | - | - | |
| Methyl geranate | 1323 | - | - | - | - | 0.1 | 0.1 | |
| a-Terpinil acetate | 1349 | - | - | - | 0.4 | - | - | |
| Eugenol | 1356 | - | - | - | 0.1 | - | - | |
| Geranyl acetate | 1381 | - | - | - | - | 0.2 | 0.9 | |
| B-Bourbonene | 1384 | - | - | - | - | 0.2 | 0.1 | |
| 3-Caryophyllene | 1420 | 2.0 | - | 2.6 | 3.9 | 1.8 | 2.4 | |
| -Humulene | 1457 | - | - | 0.1 | - | - | 0.2 | |
| -Muurolene | 1476 | - | - | 0.1 | 0.2 | - | - | |
| Germacrene D | 1482 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 1.1 | |
| Bicyclogermacrene | 1496 | 0.6 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 3-Bisabolene | 1506 | 0.9 | - | - | - | 1.7 | 2.6 | |
| cis-γ-Cadinene | 1511 | - | - | 0.1 | 0.3 | - | - | |
| -Cadinene | 1519 | 0.1 | - | 0.2 | 0.3 | - | - | |
| Spathulenol | 1578 | 0.1 | - | 0.1 | 0.1 | - | 0.1 | |
| Caryophyllene oxide | 1584 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | |
| tau-Cadinol | 1600 | - | - | - | 0.7 | - | - | |
| Total | | 96.5 | 95.2 | 98.6 | 97.2 | 95.7 | 99.4 | |

*¹LRI = retention index relative to C₈-C₂₁ *n*-alkanes on an HP-5 column; *² TVC — *Thymus vulgaris* control sample, TV1 – *T. vulgaris* 'Silver Poise', TV2 – *T. vulgaris* 'Erectus', TV3 – *T. vulgaris* 'Faustini', TC4 – *Thymus* × *citriodorus* 'Anderson's Gold', TC5 – *Thymus* × *citriodorus* 'Silver Queen'.

Table 4: The different terpenic classes (% composition) in the HSs and EOs of the selected thyme cultivars.

| | | Monoter | penes | | Sesquiterpenes | | | |
|-------------|---------|----------------|-------|------------|----------------|----------------|-----|------|
| | Non-oxy | Non-oxygenated | | Oxygenated | | Non-oxygenated | | ated |
| Cultivars*1 | HS | EO | HS | EO | HS | EO | HS | EO |
| TVC | 45.6 | 25.4 | 34.0 | 66.1 | 25.6 | 12.8 | 2.9 | 0.2 |
| TV1 | 36.9 | 21.1 | 55.4 | 74.9 | 4.8 | 0.1 | 1.2 | 0.6 |
| TV2 | 75.7 | 14.7 | 14.4 | 65.2 | 8.1 | 3.5 | 0.3 | 0.4 |
| TV3 | 79.0 | 22.4 | 15.9 | 69.1 | 6.3 | 6.3 | - | 0.2 |
| TC4 | 4.6 | 0.4 | 78.9 | 92.1 | 13.3 | 4.2 | 0.5 | 0.4 |
| TC5 | 15.2 | 0.6 | 54.7 | 68.4 | 13.5 | 6.4 | - | 0.1 |

*¹TVC — Thymus vulgaris. control sample, TV1 – T. vulgaris 'Silver Poise', TV2 – T. vulgaris 'Erectus', TV3 – T. vulgaris 'Faustini', TC4 – Thymus × citriodorus 'Anderson's Gold', TC5 – Thymus × citriodorus 'Silver Queen'.

T. x citriodorus samples, which were the only varieties with colored leaves (bright golden TC4, creamvariegated TC5). According to the literature data, some Thymus species (T. pulegioides L. and T. glabrescens

Willd.) can be characterized by a typical lemon scent that is mainly due to the high level of geraniol in the essential oil. The accumulation of this component is influenced by genetic and ecological circumstances [6b,6c]. Thymus \times citriodorus is also lemon-scented because in the EO the main compounds are geraniol (trans-citral), neral (cis-citral) and geranyl acetate [2f,6d,6e]. Taking into account the EO composition, the T. x citriodorus cultivars were specialized in the production of geraniol-type EOs (TC4, 61.4±1.4%; TC5, $67.4\pm1.3\%$). On the contrary, thymol was the target monoterpene in the EOs of T. vulgaris: 56.7± 1.90% in T. vulgaris "Silver Poise" (TV1), 50.4± 1.76% in T. vulgaris "Erectus" (TV2), and 54.4± 1.89% in T. vulgaris "Faustini" (TV3). Significant amounts of thymol were found also in the Botanical garden T. vulgaris control sample (55.1±0.98 %).

In the thymol-enriched EO samples (TV1, TV2, TV3), the oxygenated monoterpenes (65-75%) were predominant in comparison with the hydrocarbon monoterpenes (15-22%), while the corresponding HS fingerprints showed higher amounts of *p*-cymene (20-41%) and γ -terpinene (3-23%), well-known precursors of thymol. This was confirmed also in the EO of the control sample (TVC) (Tables 2-4). It is generally reported that, for fresh samples, the non-oxygenated compounds were higher than in the essential oils obtained from the dried plant material, due to the drying process.

Several studies have been focused on the variability in mono- and sesquiterpenes, hydrocarbon and oxygenated volatiles, during the plant drying process, after storage and by applying different extraction methods [6f,7a-7d]. Therefore, the significant qualitative and quantitative differences found in this study between the EO constituents obtained from air-dried plant material and the HS volatiles of the fresh samples could be the result of the different status of the plant material used in the study. Furthermore, the HS technique largely depends on many factors related to the coating fiber, but also on the volatility and the location of aroma in the plant structures. It is well known that the correlation between the HP-SPME and the conventional distilled EO profiles cannot be proven in every case [7e]. This finding was confirmed also for the different T. vulgaris varieties analyzed in the present study. In fact, the static SPME method used on the fresh plant material showed a lesser recovery of thymol than the hydrodistillation method used for the dried thyme samples (Table 2-3). In conclusion, the GC-MS screening of the static headspace and the essential oils allowed us to discriminate the five commercial ornamental thyme into two different groups: thymol type (TV1, TV1, and TV3) and geraniol type (TC4, TC5). Considering the availability of the selected plant material, which is already produced by standardized agronomic protocols to supply the ornamental plant market, the two *T. x citriodorus* varieties could represent a potential source of geraniol (TC4, TC5 more than 60%), and the other *T. vulgaris* cultivars of thymol (TV1,TV2, and TV3 more than 50%) for industrial purposes.

Experimental

Plant material: The analysed *T. vulgaris* 'Silver Poise' (TV1) (silver leaves with cream edges and purple undersides, tinged red stems), T. vulgaris 'Erectus' (TV2) (upright growing, white and narrow flowers, gravish- green leaves), T. vulgaris 'Faustini' (TV3) (light or deep green small leaves, fragrant, white and lilac-rose flowers), *Thymus* cultivars -T. × *citriodorus* 'Anderson's Gold' (TC4) (dwarf carpeting variety, evergreen bright golden leaves with strong, aromatic smell), and T. x citriodorus 'Silver Queen' (TC5) (citrus aroma, cream-variegated leaves, pale-pink flowers) were kindly supplied by the Centro Regionale di Sperimentazione e Assistenza Agricola (Albenga, Italia). All the cultivars were propagated by vegetative shoots in the previous winter and were 5 months old at the time of collection. Three plants were examined in each case to analyze the morphological characteristics, while average samples were used for essential oil analysis. The foliage of the plants was collected during their full flowering period (May 2007). Aliquots of the fresh plant material (3.0-5.7 g) were sampled for the static headspaces and extracted by SPME (PDMS fiber, 100 µm, Supelco). Air-dried plant samples (10.0-12.5g) were hydrodistilled (2 h, 2 L water distilled, flow 2.0 mL/min) using a Clevenger apparatus described in the Italian Pharmacopoeia F.U.I.XI Ed. The EO contents (mg/100 g plant material) are summarized in Table 1. GC-FID analyses of the essential oils were accomplished using a HP-5890 Series II instrument equipped with HP-WAX and HP-5 capillary columns (30 m x 0.25 mm, 0.25 µm film thickness), working with the following temperature program: 60°C for 10 min, ramp of 5°C/min up to 220°C; injector and detector temperatures 250° C; carrier gas nitrogen (2 mL/min); detector dual FID; split ratio 1:30; injection volume 1 uL (10%, *n*-hexane).

Identification of the essential oil constituents was performed, for both columns, by comparison of their retention times with those of pure authentic samples and by means of their Linear Retention Indices (L.R.I.) relative to a series of *n*-hydrocarbons (C_9-C_{23}). The GC/EI-MS analyses were performed on a Varian CP-3800 gas chromatograph equipped with a HP DB-5 capillary column (30 m x 0.25 mm; coating thickness 0.25 µm) and a Varian Saturn 2000 ion trap mass detector. Analytical conditions: injector and transfer line temperatures 220 and 240°C, respectively; oven temperature programmed from 60°C to 240°C, at 3°C/min; carrier gas helium at 1 mL/min; injection volume 1 μ L (10% *n*-hexane solution); split ratio 1:30; scan time 1s; mass range m/z 35-400; 70 eV. The identification of the constituents was based on comparison of the retention times with those of authentic samples, comparing their linear retention indices relative to a series of *n*-hydrocarbons (C₉-C₂₃) and on computer matching against two commercial data baseS (NIST 98, ADAMS) and literature [7f-7h], as well as an experimental home-made library of MS built up from pure substances and known oils.

Statistical analysis: All measured and derived data were analyzed by one-way ANOVA using Statistica 6 program.

Acknowledgments - The authors thank Dr Giovanni Minuto (Centro Regionale di Sperimentazione e Assistenza Agricola, Albenga, Italia) for providing plant material.

References

- (a) Lacroix M, Smoragiewicz W, Pazdernik L, Koné MI, Krzystyniak K. (1997) Prevention of lipid radiolysis by natural antioxidants from rosemary (*Rosmarinus officinalis* L.) and thyme (*Thymus vulgaris* L.). Food Research International, 30, 457-462; (b) Deans GG, Noble RC, Penzes L, Imre GG. (1993) Promotional effects of plant volatile oils an the poly-unsaturated fatty-acid. Age (Chester, PA.), 16, 71-74; (c) Dorman HJD, Deans SG, Noble RC. (1995) Evaluation in vitro of plant essential oils as natural antioxidants. Journal of Essential Oil Research, 7, 645-651; (d) Granger R, Passet J. (1973) Thymus vulgaris spontané en France: races chimiques et chemotaxonomie. Phytochemistry, 2, 1683-1691; (e) Adzet T, Granger R, Passet J, San Martin R. (1977) Le polymorphisme chimique dans le genre Thymus: a signification taxonomique. Biochemical Systematics and Ecology, 5, 269-272; (f) Verlet N. (1994) An overview of the medicinal and aromatic plant industry. Atti Conv. Coltivazione e miglioramento di piante officinali 2-3 June Trento.
- (a) Rey Ch. (1990) Selection of thyme (*Thymus vulgaris* L.) for extreme areas. *Herba Hungarica*, 3, 30-33; (b) Rey Ch, Sáez F.
 (2002) Field culture, *in vitro* culture and selection of *Thymus*. In: *Thyme-The genus Thymus*. Stahl-Biskup E, Sáez, F. (Eds) Taylor and Francis, London and New York, 177-196; (c) Letchamo W, Gosselin A, Hoelzl J, Marquard R. (1999) The selection of *Thymus vulgaris* cultivars to grow in Canada. *Journal of Essential Oil Research*, 11, 337-342; (d) Pank F, Krüger H. (2003) Sources of variability of thyme populations (*Thymus vulgaris* L.) and conclusions of breeding. *Zeitschrift für Arznei- & Gewürzpflanzen*, 8, 117-124; (e) Echeverrigaray S, Agostini G, Atti-Serfini L, Paroul N, Pauletti GF, Atti dos Santos AC. (2001) Correlation between the chemical and genetic relationships among commercial thyme cultivars. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 49, 4220-4223; (f) Horváth Gy, Szabó LGY, Héthelyi É, Lemberkovics É. (2006) Essential oil composition of three cultivated *Thymus* chemotypes from Hungary. *Journal of Essential Oil Research*, 18, 315-317.
- [3] (a) Hegi G. (1906) Illustrierte Flora von Mittel-Europa, Band V. Carl Hansen Verlag, München; (b) European Pharmacopoeia (5th ed.) (2005) Council of Europe, Strasbourg, France; (c) Farmacopea Ufficiale Italiana (1997), 9th Ed., Poligrafica dello Stato, 296.
- [4] Vernin G, Ghiglione C, Parkanyi C. (**1994**) GC-MS-SPECMA bank analysis of *Thymus serpyllum praecox* (Opiz) Wollm (wild thyme) from Hautes Alpes (France). *Developments in Food Science*, **34** (SPICES, HERBS AND EDIBLE FUNGI), 501-515.
- [5] (a) Salgueiro LR, Vila R, Tomi F, Tomas X, Canigueral S, Casanova J. (1997) Composition and infraspecific variability of essential oil from *Thymus camphoratus*. *Phytochemistry*, 45, 1177-1183; (b) Baser KHC, Demirci B, Kurkcuoglu M, Tumen G. (1999) Essential oil of *Thymus zygioides* Griseb. var. *zygioides* from Turkey. *Journal of Essential Oil Research*, 11, 409-410.
- (a) Juliano C, Mattana A, Usai M. (2000) Composition and *in vitro* antimicrobial activity of the essential oil of *Thymus herbabarona* Loisel growing wild in Sardinia. Journal of Essential Oil Research, 12, 516-522; (b) Mockute D, Bernotiene G. (1999) The main citral-geraniol and carvacrol chemotypes of the essential oil of *Thymus pulegioides* L. growing wild in Vilnius district (Lithuania). Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry, 47, 3787-3790; (c) Pluhár Zs, Sárosi Sz, Novák I, Kutta G (2008) Essential oil polymorphism of Hungarian common thyme (*Thymus glabrescens* Willd.) populations. Natural Product Communications, 3, 1151-1154; (d) Lundgren L., Stenhagen G. (1982) Leaf volatiles from *Thymus vulgaris, T. serpyllum, T. praecox, T. pulgioides* and *T. × citriodorus* (Labiatae). Nordic Journal of Botany, 2, 445-452; (e) Stahl-Biskup E, Holthuijzen J. (1995) Essential oil and glycosidicaly bound volatiles of lemon-scented *Thymus, Thymus × citriodorus* (Pers.) Schreb. Flavour and Fragrance Journal, 10, 225-229; (f) Tkachev AV, Korolyuk EA, Yusubov MS, Gurjev AM. (2002) Changes in essential oil composition depending on various periods of the raw material storage. Khimiya Rastitel'nogo Syrjya, 1, 19-30.
- (a) Venskutonis PR. (1997) Effect of drying on the volatile constituents of thyme (*Thymus vulgaris* L.) and sage (*Salvia officinalis* L.). Food Chemistry, 59, 219-227; (b) Jordán MJ, Martínez RM, Goodner KL, Baldwin EA, Sotomayor JA. (2006) Seasonal variation of *Thymus hyemalis* Lange and Spanish *Thymus vulgaris* L. essential oils composition. *Industrial Crops and Products*, 24, 253-263; (c) USDA, ARS (2003) National Genetic Resources Program. Phytochemical and Ethnobotanical Databases (Online Database). National Germplast Resources Laboratory, Beltsville, Maryland. Available from http://www.ars-grin.gov/cgibin/duke/farmacy2.pl); (d) Sacchetti G, Maietti S, Muzzoli M, Scaglianti M, Manfredini S, Radice M, Bruni R. (2005): Comparative evaluation of 11 essential oils of different origin as functional antioxidants, antiradicals and antimicrobials in foods. *Food Chemistry*, 91, 621-632; (e) Bicchi C, Joulain D. (1990) Headspace-gas chromathography analysis of medicinal and aromatic plants and flavours, *Flavour and Fragrance Journal*, 5, 131-145; (f) Adams RP. (1995) In: *Identification of essential oil components by gas chromatography-mass spectroscopy*, Allured Publ. Corp., Carol Stream, Illinois; (g) Swigar AA, Silverstein RM. (1981) In: *Monoterpenes*, Aldrich Chem. Comp., Milwaukee; (h) Stenhagen E, Abrahamsson S, McLafferty FW. (1974) In: *Registry of Mass Spectral Data*, Wiley & Sons, New York.