

Dry grassland vegetation of Central Podolia (Ukraine) – a preliminary overview of its syntaxonomy, ecology and biodiversity

Die Trockenrasenvegetation Zentral-Podoliens (Ukraine) – eine vorläufige Übersicht zu Syntaxonomie, Ökologie und Biodiversität

Anna A. Kuzemko¹, Thomas Becker², Yakiv P. Didukh³, Ioana Violeta Ardelean⁴, Ute Becker⁵, Monica Beldean⁴, Christian Dolnik⁶, Michael Jeschke², Alireza Naqinezhad⁷, Emin Uğurlu⁸, Aslan Ünal⁹, Kiril Vassilev¹⁰, Evgeniy I. Vorona¹¹, Olena H. Yavorska¹¹ & Jürgen Dengler^{12,13,14,*}

¹National Dendrological Park “Sofiyvka”, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Kyivska Str. 12a, 20300 Uman’, Ukraine, anya_meadow@mail.ru; ²Geobotany, Faculty of Geography and Geosciences, University of Trier, Behringstr. 21, 54296 Trier, Germany, beckerth@uni-trier.de; jeschke@uni-trier.de; ³M.G. Kholodny Institute of Botany, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Tereshchenkivska Str. 2, 01601 Kyiv, Ukraine, didukh@mail.ru; ⁴Faculty of Biology and Geology, Babeş-Bolyai University Cluj-Napoca, Republicii Street 44, 400015 Cluj-Napoca, Romania, ioana.ardelean@ubbcluj.ro; beldean.monica@yahoo.com; ⁵Green School in the Botanic Garden, Johannes Gutenberg University, Anselm-Franz-von-Bentzel-Weg 9b, 55099 Mainz, Germany, beckeru@uni-mainz.de; ⁶Institute for Natural Resource Conservation, Ecology Centre, University of Kiel, Olshausenstr. 40, 24098 Kiel, Germany, cdolnik@ecology.uni-kiel.de; ⁷Department of Biology, Faculty of Basic Sciences, University of Mazandaran, Babolsar, P.O. Box. 47416-95447, Mazandaran, Iran, anaqinezhad@gmail.com; ⁸Department of Biology, Science and Art Faculty, Celal Bayar University, Muradiye, Yağcılar Campus, 45140 Manisa, Turkey, ugurlu@yahoo.com; ⁹Am Schießrain 10, 79219 Staufen, Germany, auenal@mail.ru; ¹⁰Institute of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Research, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Acad G. Bonchev str., bl. 2, 1113, Sofia, Bulgaria, kiril5914@abv.bg; ¹¹Vinnitsya Regional Ecological Association “Green World of Podillya”, Pershotravneva str. 70/2, 21050 Vinnitsya, Ukraine, yavorska08@meta.ua (for both); ¹²Biodiversity, Evolution and Ecology of Plants (BEE), Biocenter Klein Flottbek and Botanical Garden, University of Hamburg, Ohnhorststr. 18, 22609 Hamburg, Germany; ¹³Present address: Disturbance Ecology, Bayreuth Center of Ecology and Environmental Research (BayCEER), University of Bayreuth, Universitätsstr. 30, 95447 Bayreuth, Germany; ¹⁴Secondary affiliation: Synthesis Centre (sDiv), German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research (iDiv) Halle-Jena-Leipzig, Deutscher Platz 5e, 04103 Leipzig, Germany, juergen.dengler@uni-bayreuth.de

*Corresponding author

Abstract

We present the data of the 2nd research expedition of the European Dry Grassland Group (EDGG), which was conducted in 2010 in Central Podolia, Ukraine. The aim was to collect plot data to compare Ukrainian dry grasslands with those of other parts of Europe in terms of syntaxonomy and biodiversity. We sampled 21 nested-plot series (0.0001–100 m²) and 184 normal plots (10 m²) covering the full variety of dry grassland types occurring in the study region. For all plots, we recorded species composition of terrestrial vascular plants, bryophytes and lichens, while for the 226 10-m² plots we estimated

and measured percentage cover of all species, structural, topographic, soil and landuse parameters. The 10-m² plots were used for phytosociological classification based on iteratively refined TWINSpan classification as well as for DCA ordination. Differences between the derived vegetation types with respect to environmental conditions and species richness were assessed with ANOVAs. We assigned our plots to nine association-level units but refrained from placing them into formal associations with two exceptions. In the study area, dry grasslands of the *Festuco-Brometea* were far more common than those of the *Koelerio-Corynephoretea*. Among the *Festuco-Brometea*, xeric *Festucetalia valesiaca* grasslands were more frequent and represented by the *Festucion valesiaca* (2 associations, including the *Allio taurici-Dichanthietum ischaemi* ass. nova) and the *Stipion lessingiana* (1) compared to the *Brachypodietalia pinnati* with the *Agrostio vinealis-Avenulion schelliana* (3). The *Koelerio-Corynephoretea* were represented by three associations, each from a different order and alliance: basiphilous outcrops (*Alyso alyssoidis-Sedetalia: Alyso alyssoidis-Sedion?*), acidophilous outcrops (*Sedo-Scleranthetalia: Veronico dillenii-Sedion albi?*) and mesoxeric sandy grasslands (*Trifolio arvensis-Festucetalia ovinae: Agrostion vinealis*). We discuss the issue of the mesoxeric order *Galietales veri* placed within the *Molinio-Arrhenatheretea* by Ukrainian authors and conclude that the content of that order would probably be better placed in the mesoxeric orders of the *Koelerio-Corynephoretea* and *Festuco-Brometea*. Other syntaxonomic questions could not be solved with our geographically limited dataset and await a supraregional analysis, e.g. whether the Ukrainian outcrop communities should be assigned to the same alliances as known from Central Europe or rather represent new vicariant units. The analysis of the biodiversity patterns showed that at a grain size of 10 m², Podolian *Koelerio-Corynephoretea* communities were overall richer than *Festuco-Brometea* communities (46.4 vs. 40.6 species). This difference was due to the *Koelerio-Corynephoretea* containing twice as many bryophytes and nine times more lichens, while vascular plant species richness did not differ significantly between classes. The orders within the classes showed no real differences in species richness. The richness patterns observed in Podolia were almost the opposite of those usually found in dry grasslands, where *Brachypodietalia pinnati* are richer than *Festucetalia valesiaca*, and these richer than stands of the *Koelerio-Corynephoretea* – and we do not have a good explanation for these idiosyncrasies. In conclusion, Podolian dry grasslands behave quite unexpectedly regarding biodiversity, and their syntaxonomy is still poorly understood. These knowledge gaps can only be addressed with supra-national analyses based on comprehensive datasets.

Keywords: bryophyte, conservation, European Dry Grassland Group, *Festuco-Brometea*, *Galietales veri*, *Koelerio-Corynephoretea*, lichen, nomenclatural revision, species richness, vegetation classification

Erweiterte deutsche Zusammenfassung am Ende des Textes

1. Introduction

Palearctic dry grasslands and steppes are biodiversity hotspots for many taxa (VRAHNAKIS et al. 2013). They comprise the most species rich plant communities in terms of vascular plants at scales below 100 m², with, for example, 42 species on 0.04 m², 98 on 10 m² and 131 on 49 m² (KULL & ZOBEL 1991, KLIMEŠ et al. 2001, DENGLER et al. 2012a, WILSON et al. 2012). This finding is inspiring for ecologists who seek to explain how such extreme richness can emerge, i.e. how so many species manage to co-exist at small spatial scale (e.g. MERUNKOVÁ et al. 2012, WILSON et al. 2012, DENGLER et al. 2014). One particularly interesting aspect is that the other vegetation type holding the world records in vascular plant species densities (i.e. at grain sizes from 100 m² upwards) are neotropical rain forests (WILSON et al. 2012), which exist under completely different ecological conditions. The latter are natural communities, occupy extensive contiguous areas and have had a much longer habitat continuity than the semi-natural dry grasslands of eastern Central Europe, which inhabit much smaller and isolated habitat patches and could have existed at best for a

couple of thousand years. While the various European record grasslands listed by WILSON et al. (2012) are all man-made meadows resulting from continuous mowing, it is possible that the absence of natural steppes in this list simply could be due to the fact that almost no extensive biodiversity sampling has been carried out there. The few published richness counts on defined areas in natural Palaearctic steppes indeed indicate that these can also be extraordinarily rich, albeit below the global maxima, for example with 117 vascular plant species on 100 m² in a Russian meadow steppe near Kursk (European Russia: WALTER & BRECKLE 1986) or 87 species on 1 m² in a forest-steppe near Kharkov (Ukraine: LYSENKO 2007).

These considerations prompted the European Dry Grassland Group (EDGG; <http://www.edgg.org>; VRAHNAKIS et al. 2013) to conduct its second research expedition to Ukraine, where there are both man-made dry grasslands and zonal steppes. Generally, the lowland territory of the country is characterized from northwest to southeast by a sequence from temperate forests through forest steppes to steppes, following a precipitation gradient from 750 to 400 mm per year (WALTER & BRECKLE 1986, BARABASH et al. 2003, BOHN et al. 2004, see also KUZEMKO 2009). Specifically, our study was directed to the forest-steppe zone, which stretches as a transitional band of approx. 250–600 km width between forests and steppes across the whole of Eastern Europe and the southern part of Siberia, from the Carpathians to the Altai Mts. (nearly 6,000 km). This zone, with a mean annual precipitation of 530–650 mm, corresponds to zono-ecotones VII/VI (west of the Ural Mts.) and VII/VIII (to the east) of WALTER & BRECKLE (1986). The natural vegetation of forest steppes are mosaic macrocomplexes, in which, depending on aspect and slope, typical deciduous forest and meadow steppe co-exist as sharply delimited patches (BOHN et al. 2004). Nowadays, the meadow steppes of the European forest-steppe zone have been almost completely transformed into arable land, while the natural forests here have been cut down or replaced by plantations. The anthropogenic transformation of the forest steppe has led to a heated debate over its southern border and has prompted some authors to suggest that the forest steppe or even the steppe is of anthropogenic origin (see LAVRENKO 1980, WALTER & BRECKLE 1986). However, now it is largely accepted that the distinction between these two zones is caused by natural factors, especially climate (see DIDUKH 2007).

Studying steppes in Ukraine is also interesting from a phytosociological point of view since, compared to other parts of Europe, they cover (still) huge areas, comprise a wide variety of different community types and can be seen as one of the major floristic sources of the semi-natural dry grasslands in the forested part of Europe (e.g. POTT 1995, WILMANN 1997). These steppe communities have been extensively studied on the basis of the traditional approach of Soviet geobotany, the so-called eco-phytocenotic (dominant) approach (e.g. ALEKSANDROVA 1973), resulting in several monographs (BILYK 1973, LAVRENKO 1980, MALYNOVSKY 1991). Studies of the Ukrainian steppe vegetation using the Braun-Blanquet approach of phytosociology (BRAUN-BLANQUET 1964, WESTHOFF & VAN DER MAAREL 1973, DENGLER et al. 2008) began in the mid-1980s (KOSTYLIOV et al. 1984, 1986, OSYCHNIUK et al. 1984, SOLODKOVA et al., 1986). Since then, many papers on the basiphilous vegetation of the class *Festuco-Brometea* have been published from different regions of the country (KUKOVYTSIA et al. 1994, KOROTCHENKO & DIDUKH 1997, KONTAR 2000, GONCHARENKO 2003, KUZEMKO 2004, KOROTCHENKO et al. 2009a, 2009b, etc.). Similarly, following an early paper by a visiting Czech scientist (VICHEREK 1972), various regional studies have focussed on the communities of rocky outcrops and sands (class *Koelerio-Corynephoretea*, including *Sedo-Scleranthetea* and *Festucetea vaginatae*) (DIDUKH & KOROTCHENKO 1996, SHEVCHYK et al. 1996, DIDUKH & KONTAR 1999, KONTAR 2000, ONYSCHENKO 2001). Much of this

work has been summarized in the *Syntaxonomy of vegetation of Ukraine* (SOLOMAKHA 2008), which includes all syntaxa ever mentioned for Ukraine at the time of publication, but without critical evaluation and synthesis. Altogether 27 dry grassland alliances with 126 associations were listed at that point, often with unclear floristic and ecological differentiation, but the “inflation” of units has continued in recent years. Attempts to achieve a supraregionally valid system with floristically clearly defined units are rare, KUZEMKO (2009) with her study on the sandy dry grasslands in the forest and forest steppe zone being an exception. Moreover, the syntaxonomic system in Ukraine has so far developed in relative isolation from other parts of Europe due to limited access to relevant literature in both directions and linguistic constraints, leading to many inconsistencies towards recent plot-based classifications elsewhere (e.g. BERG et al. 2004, CHYTRÝ 2007, JANIŠOVÁ 2007, PEDASHENKO et al. 2013, WILLNER et al. 2013). Similarly, existing European-scale classifications of dry grasslands (ROYER 1991, RODWELL et al. 2002) have only marginally been driven by data from Ukraine, although it is doubtlessly a diversity centre of these community types. Finally, while the major role of bryophytes and lichens for overall biodiversity of dry grasslands (e.g. DENGLER 2005, LÖBEL et al. 2006) as well as their classification (e.g. BERG & DENGLER 2005) is often acknowledged, non-vascular plants have only rarely been included in studies of these communities in Ukraine (but see DIDUKH & KONTAR 1999, KONTAR 2000).

The aim of the second EDGG expedition in 2010 to Ukraine dry grasslands thus was to contribute to filling the knowledge gaps by collecting standardised biodiversity data of vascular plants, bryophytes and lichens and to bridge the divide in syntaxonomical concepts by bringing together experienced vegetation ecologists from different parts of Europe. As a concrete study region we chose Central Podolia because it hosts a high diversity of dry grasslands, caused by a variety of environmental conditions, but had rarely been sampled in terms of phytosociology before. While dry grasslands in Western Podolia are reasonably well documented (KUKOVYTSIA et al. 1994, ABDULOVA & DIDUKH 1999, ABDULOVA 2002, KOROTCHENKO 2004), we are not aware of any publication from the rest of the Podolian territory prior to our own study. With this publication based on the expedition data, we address the following topics: (1) Characterisation of the dry grassland communities occurring in the region and determination of their diagnostic taxa with statistical methods. (2) Placement of these community types into a supraregional classification scheme, including the search for correct syntaxon names. (3) Understanding the environmental factors that underly community differentiation. (4) Documentation of the plant diversity patterns of vascular plants, bryophytes and lichens in these vegetation types at various spatial scales.

In addition to these fundamental issues, the proper documentation of dry grasslands in Central Podolia, including an assessment of their conservation value, could contribute to optimizing the existing conservation network and proper organization of environmental management.

2. Study area

2.1 Location and climate

The study area covers Central Podolia (48.95°–48.10° N and 27.55°–29.35° E), which is located in the southern part of the Vinnytsia province of Ukraine, bordering in the south to Moldova (Fig. 1). It forms the central, lower lying part of the Podolian Upland, ranging only




Fig. 1. Map of the study area and its location within Ukraine. The numbers indicate the 18 studied dry grassland sites according to Table 1.

Abb. 1. Karte des Untersuchungsgebietes und deren Lage innerhalb der Ukraine. Die Zahlen geben die 18 Trockenrasen-Standorte gemäß Tabelle 1 an.

from 73 to 251 m a.s.l., compared to 471 m a.s.l. in the western part. Specifically, we studied the dry grassland vegetation in the interfluvium of the Dniester and South Bug rivers, in their valleys in the middle course, and in the valleys of Dniester tributaries (Kysyriak, Kami-anka, Tashlyk, Vilshanka, Liadova and Nemya).

The climate is subcontinental, with mean annual temperatures of 7 to 9 °C, January means of -4 to -6 °C and July means of +18 to +20 °C (LIPINSKY et al. 2003). Mean annual precipitation ranges from 600 to 650 mm, with the lowest values towards the south and southeast (LIPINSKY et al. 2003).

2.2 Geology and geomorphology

The study area is located on different geostructures of the East European Platform. The most ancient of them, the Ukrainian Crystalline Shield, is a stable crust, bounded by major faults of late Proterozoic and Archean age (RIABENKO 1986). The Southern Bug River Basin is a hilly plain with a network of river valleys. The surface is composed of loess deposits with an average thickness of 3–4 m in the watersheds, which increases to 10–25 m on valley bottoms. In the deeply incised Dniester valley, Jurassic and Cretaceous sandstone and limestone reach the surface as outcrops. Here, watershed areas are covered by loamy and clayey loess of 1.5–2 m thickness (MARINICH et al. 1985).

2.3 Soils

The soil typology of the study area is quite simple: grey and dark grey soils under forests and chernozems under (former) meadow steppes. The latter occur as typical, carbonate-rich and lixiviated ones (VERNANDER et al. 1986). Typical chernozems are found on flat plateaus, while in hilly regions carbonate-rich types occur and in depressions lixiviated types. Eroded types of chernozems are confined to the inflections between plateaus and slopes of valleys or ravines. Under the meadow-steppe vegetation on loess, chernozems with humus content of 3.5–5.0% and pH of 7.0–7.5 have developed. Around outcrops of limestone rendzinas transitional to chernozems (in Ukrainian classification: sod-calcareous soils) occur, and around granite outcrops soil cover is represented by detrital rankers (in Ukrainian classification detrital skeletal soils) (TYKHONENKO 2005, KYRYLCHUK 2013).

2.4 Potential natural vegetation and phytogeography

The study was conducted within two geobotanical districts, (i) the Central Podolian District of hornbeam-oak and oak forests and dry meadows (South Bug Basin) and (ii) the Southern Podolian District of oak forests and meadow steppes, located in the Dniestr Basin (BARBARYCH 1977).

In the Central Podolian District, grey forest soils with the features of podzolization are typical and natural meadow steppes absent. Therefore, BARBARYCH (1977) in their earlier zonation assigned this region to the forest zone. Essentially, this area corresponds to unit F41 (East Polish-Ukrainian lime-pedunculatae oak-hornbeam forests) of the *Map of potential natural vegetation of Europe* (BOHN et al. 2004), with smaller patches of F44 (Podolian-Moldavian thermophilous hornbeam-pedunculate oak forests) and F62 (East pre-Carpathian-Moldavian sessile oak-hornbeam forests).

The Southern Podolian District, by contrast, has a more dissected relief and is characterised by the presence of chernozemic soils, natural occurrence of vast areas of meadow steppes and minor areas of forests, including thermophilous types (BARBARYCH 1977, DIDUKH & SHELYAG-SOSONKO 2003). This area more or less coincides with unit L2 (Sub-Mediterranean-subcontinental herb-grass steppes) of BOHN et al. (2004).

Phytogeographically, the study area belongs to the west-Pontic subprovince of the Pontic-South Siberian floristic region (MEUSEL & JÄGER 1992). Many typical species of the Central European flora (*Fagus sylvatica*, *Quercus petraea*, *Tilia platyphyllos*, *Sorbus torminalis*, *Acer pseudoplatanus*, *Euphorbia amygdaloides*, *Dentaria glandulosa*, *Hepatica nobilis*, *Aconitum moldavicum*) reach their eastern distributional limits here, while steppic species such as *Herniaria polygama*, *Dianthus campestris*, *Delphinium cuneatum* and *Ranunculus pedatus* are at their western limits (KLEOPOV 1990, DIDUKH et al. 2004, 2010, ILJINSKA et

al. 2007). There are some subendemic taxa in the steppe vegetation of Central Podolia (e.g. *Anchusa pseudochroleuca*, *Euphorbia valdevillosocarpa*, *E. volhynica*, *Linum basarabicum*, *Carlina onopordifolia*, *Dianthus pseudoserotinus*) MOSYAKIN & FEDORONCHUK 1999), but of these, only *Allium podolicum* is accepted as valid taxon by *Flora Europaea* (TUTIN et al. 1968–1993).

2.5 Land use and conservation

Nowadays, the steppes of Ukraine have almost entirely been transformed into arable fields, which cover 53.8% of the national territory (STATE AGENCY OF LAND RESOURCES OF UKRAINE 2010). In Vinnitsa province, 76.2% of the area is used agriculturally, including 65.3% arable fields, 1.9% hayfields and 7.1% pastures (YAVORSKA 2005). The natural steppe vegetation of the region has survived only on small areas on the slopes of river valleys and ravines as well as along forest edges. In Ukraine, both natural and semi-natural grasslands were traditionally used as hayfields and pastures and played an important role also for beekeeping. However, in recent decades, changes in socio-economic conditions also led to changes in land use in the region, particularly a decrease in the number of livestock and thus reduced grazing impact. Many formerly agriculturally used grasslands have been abandoned and are now in different successional stages of shrub and tree encroachment, resulting in a significant reduction of areas of secondary grasslands. Moreover, for many years the steep slopes of river valleys had been afforested with non-native trees, especially *Pinus nigra* subsp. *pallasiana*. In recent years, afforestation of the steppe areas in forest-steppe and steppe regions of Ukraine has reached truly catastrophic scales. This policy destroyed the last remnants of the steppe vegetation by creating huge plantations of *Robinia pseudacacia*, *Elaeagnus angustifolia* and *Quercus rubra* (PARNIKOZA & VASILUK 2010, BURKOVSKY & TARASOVA 2011, BURKOVSKY et al. 2013).

Despite the high diversity of vegetation, flora and fauna, Vinnytsia province has one of the lowest fractions of protected areas within Ukraine of only 1.9% (MINISTRY OF ECOLOGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES OF UKRAINE 2011). Until recently, there were only few small reserves (*zakaznik*, corresponding to IUCN category IV) of national or local level: “Antsiopolovsky”, “Korostovetsky”, “Pribuz’ky”, “Romashkovo”, “Enchanted Valley”, “Grigorivska Hill”, “Bronnitska Hill”. In 2009, the National Park “Karmelukove Podillya” and the regional landscape park “Dniester” were established. All these reserves contain dry grassland vegetation to varying degrees. Some were investigated in the course of our expedition (see Table 1) and some others became protected after our expedition as the Regional Landscape Park “Nemyrivske Pobuzhzhia”.

3. Methods

3.1 Vegetation sampling

The field sampling was carried out in the second half of July 2010. With our sampling, we tried to represent as much as possible of the variability of dry grassland communities in the study region within the limited time of the expedition. To represent the geographic variability we selected 18 sites with dry grassland communities in the valleys of the Southern Bug, Dniester and the Dniester tributaries and their surroundings (Fig. 1, Table 1, Appendix S1). Within each site, we selected homogeneous plots subjectively so that they reflected the full range of grassland types in terms of physiognomy, slope exposition, bedrock, soil development and land use type.

Table 1. Overview of the studied dry grassland sites, with the number of plots sampled. The associations are numbered according to Section 4.1.

Tabelle 1. Übersicht der Untersuchungsflächen der Trockenrasen mit der Anzahl an Aufnahmen und Angabe der Assoziationen (Nummerierung wie in Kapitel 4.1).

No.	District	Locality	Protected area	Normal plots	Nested series	Total plots	Recorded associations
1	Nemiriv	Ancient settlement "Nemyrivske"		4	0	4	2.1.2
2	Tulchyn	Granite outcrops and steppe plots near villages Sokilets and Pechera	"Prybuz'ky" reserve	2	0	2	1.2.1, 2.1.2
3	Nemiriv	Granite outcrops near Antsypolivka village	"Antsypolovsky" reserve	5	1	7	1.2.1, 2.1.2
4	Nemiriv	Pivdenny Bug valley near Raihorod village	Regional Landscape Park "Nemirivske Pobuzhzhia"	0	1	2	2.1.2
5	Trostanets	Granite outcrops and steppe between villages Chetvertynivka and Mytkivka		6	2	10	1.2.1, 2.1.2, 2.2.1
6	Chechelnyk	<i>Carlina onopordifolia</i> site "Romashkovo"	National Nature Park "Karmelukove Podillya"	14	2	18	1.3.1, 2.1.1, 2.2.1
7	Pischanka	Kysymiak underground river valley near Bolgan village		13	2	17	2.1.3, 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3
8	Pischanka	Kamianka river valley between villages Bolgan and Kukuly		23	2	27	1.1.1, 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3
9	Pischanka	Locality "Enchanted valley" near Dmytrashkivka village	"Enchanted valley" reserve	24	2	28	1.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3, 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3
10	Kryzhopil	Limestone outcrops near Leonivka village		13	1	15	1.1.1, 2.1.1, 2.1.3, 2.2.1, 2.2.2
11	Kryzhopil	Tashlyk river valley near Verbka village		11	1	13	2.1.1, 2.1.3, 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3
12	Kryzhopil	Limestone outcrops near Faihorog village		10	1	12	2.1.3, 2.2.3
13	Kryzhopil	Pasture on the sand basis near Temivka village		3	1	5	2.1.3, 2.2.1
14	Yampil	Vilshanka river valley near Verkhnia Slobidka village		14	1	16	2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3
15	Yampil	Vilshanka river valley near Velyka Kisnytsia village		10	1	12	2.1.3, 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3
16	Yampil	Dnister river valley near Mykhailivka village		9	1	11	2.2.1, 2.2.3
17	Mohyliv-Podilsky	Locality "Ozarynetska mountain" in Nemya river valley near Mohyliv-Podilsky town	Regional Landscape Park "Dnister"	17	1	19	2.1.3, 2.2.1, 2.2.3
18	Mohyliv-Podilsky	Liadova river valley near Khonkivtsi village		6	1	8	2.2.1, 2.2.3
Total				184	21	226	

We followed the sampling approach of the EDGG Expeditions (DENGLER et al. 2012a), combining two types of plots: (i) nested-plot series ($n = 21$) with plots of the sizes of 0.0001, 0.001, 0.01, 1, 10 and 100 m², where all plot sizes except the largest are replicated in two opposite corners (see DENGLER 2009) and (ii) additional normal plots of 10 m² ($n = 184$). We recorded all terricolous vascular plants, bryophytes and lichens that were superficially present (i.e. shoot presence = any-part system; DENGLER 2008).

To verify the determination of lichens, extracts of some specimens were analyzed by thin-layer chromatography using solvent A (CULBERSON & AMMANN 1979). The taxonomy of vascular plants follows *Flora Europaea* (TUTIN et al. 1968–1993) or *Atlas Florae Europaeae* (JALAS & SUOMINEN 1994, JALAS et al. 1996, 1999, KURTTU et al. 2004–2010), depending on which of the treatments in the two series was the more recent. For mosses we followed HILL et al. (2006), for liverworts GROLLE & LONG (2000) and for lichens SANTESSON et al. (2004). In a few cases, additions to and deviations from these checklists were necessary as documented in Tables 2 and 3.

All vegetation-plot data used in this article are stored in and available from three vegetation-plot databases: *Database Species-Area Relationships in Palaeartic Grasslands* (DENGLER et al. 2012b; EU-00-003 in the *Global Index of Vegetation-Plot Databases* (GIVD, <http://www.givd.info>; see DENGLER et al. 2011), *Ukrainian Grasslands Database* (KUZEMKO 2012; EU-UA-001) and *European Vegetation Archive* (EVA; <http://euroveg.org/eva-database>).

3.2 Structural and environmental parameters

In the 10-m² plots ($n = 226$), we estimated the cover of the shrub, herb and moss layers and that of litter, dead wood, open fine earth, gravel as well as stones + rocks. We determined geographic coordinates and altitude with a GPS, aspect with a compass, and slope with an inclinometer. The latter two parameters were used to calculate the heat load index according to OLSSON et al. (2009), which is a relative measure that takes the highest positive values on steep southwest facing slopes, zero in level areas, and negative values on northeast facing slopes. Microrelief was measured as maximum vertical deviation from an imaginary plane through the plot. We classified present land use roughly into rough categories regarding “grazing intensity” (0 = not grazed; 1 = low; 2 = medium; 3 = high) and “burning” (0 = no; 1 = yes) based on our knowledge of the sites and/or visible signs in the plots.

Table 2. Supraspecific taxa used in the paper in addition to those defined in the given checklists.

Tabelle 2. Supraspezifische Taxa, die in dieser Publikation zusätzlich zu den in den angegebenen Referenzlisten definierten Aggregaten genutzt werden.

Group	Taxon	Reference	Included species
Vascular plants	<i>Centaurea jacea</i> agg.	EHRENDORFER (1973)	<i>C. haynaldii</i> , <i>C. bracteata</i> , <i>C. weldeniana</i> , <i>C. rocheliana</i> , <i>C. pannonica</i> , <i>C. vinyalsii</i> , <i>C. dracunculifolia</i> , <i>C. jacea</i> , <i>C. decipiens</i> , <i>C. subjacea</i> , <i>C. macroptilon</i> , <i>C. microptilon</i>
Vascular plant	<i>Festuca</i> Ser. <i>Valesiaca</i>	PAWLUS (1985)	<i>F. pseudodalmatica</i> , <i>F. pseudovina</i> , <i>F. rupicola</i> , <i>F. valesiaca</i>
Bryophyte	<i>Bryum capillare</i> agg.	FREY et al. (1995)	<i>B. canariense</i> , <i>B. capillare</i> , <i>B. donianum</i> , <i>B. elegans</i> , <i>B. moravicum</i> , <i>B. torquescens</i>
Bryophyte	<i>Hedwigia ciliata</i> agg.	Ad hoc taxon	<i>H. ciliata</i> , <i>H. stellata</i>
Bryophyte	<i>Schistidium apocarpum</i> agg.	BLOM (1996)	various
Bryophyte	<i>Syntrichia ruralis</i> agg.	Ad hoc taxon	<i>S. calcicola</i> , <i>S. montana</i> , <i>S. ruralis</i> var. <i>ruraliformis</i> , <i>S. ruralis</i> var. <i>ruralis</i> , <i>S. subpapillosissima</i>
Lichen	<i>Cladonia pyxidata</i> agg.	ad hoc taxon	<i>C. asahina</i> , <i>C. chlorophaea</i> , <i>C. cryptochlorophaea</i> , <i>C. grayi</i> , <i>C. merochlorophaea</i> , <i>C. monomorpha</i> , <i>C. novochlorophaea</i> , <i>C. pocillum</i> , <i>C. pyxidata</i>

Table 3. Additional vascular plant taxa used in this publication that are not listed in the given checklists.

Tabelle 3. Zusätzliche Gefäßpflanzentaxa die in dieser Publikation Verwendung finden, aber in den angeführten taxonomischen Referenzlisten nicht enthalten sind.

Taxon	Author citation	Reference	Treatment in <i>Flora Europaea</i>
<i>Carlina acanthifolia</i> subsp. <i>utzka</i>	(Hacq.) Meusel & Kästner	EURO+MED (2014)	<i>C. acanthifolia</i> subsp. <i>acanthifolia</i>
<i>Dactylis glomerata</i> subsp. <i>glomerata</i>		EURO+MED (2014)	No subspecies formally accepted, but “vide” taxon
<i>Euphorbia nicaeensis</i> subsp. <i>stepposa</i>	(Zoz) Greuter & Burdet	EURO+MED (2014)	<i>E. nicaeensis</i> subsp. <i>glareosa</i>
<i>Leucanthemum ircutianum</i>	DC.	EURO+MED (2014)	<i>L. vulgare</i> , with various “vide” taxa
<i>Medicago sativa</i> nothosp. <i>varia</i>	(Martyn) Arcang.	EURO+MED (2014)	= <i>M. sativa</i> subsp. <i>nigra</i> × <i>M. sativa</i> subsp. <i>sativa</i>
<i>Pimpinella saxifraga</i> subsp. <i>nigra</i>	(Mill.) Gaudin	MOSSBERG & STENBERG (2003)	No subspecies accepted
<i>Tulipa biebersteiniana</i>	Schult. & Schult. f.	EURO+MED (2014)	<i>T. sylvestris</i> subsp. <i>australis</i>

Mixed soil samples of the uppermost 10 cm were taken from three to five random locations within each plot and air-dried during the expedition. The soil type and the proportions of sand, silt and clay were estimated by finger test according to SCHLICHTING et al. (1995). Proportion of skeleton was measured by sieving soil with a 2-mm sieve after separation from organic sieving residue. Soil pH and electric conductivity were measured electrometrically in a suspension of 10 g soil and 25 ml and 50 ml deionised water, respectively. To determine total C and N content, soil samples were prepared by drying for 36 hours at 70 °C, passed through a 2-mm sieve and ground in a mill. The C/N ratio was measured with a C/N analyser (Elementar, Vario EL III). Inorganic C content was determined by measuring the C/N ratio of ashed soil (600 °C). To achieve the C_{org}/N_{tot} ratio, C_{org} was calculated as $C_{tot} - C_{inorg}$.

Additionally, we calculated mean unweighted indicator values (IVs) of the recorded vascular plants, based on the indicator system of DIDUKH (2011), which is similar to ELLENBERG et al. (1991), but includes more parameters (14) with an often finer resolution (9- to 23-step scales). Since our sampling was conducted in a climatically homogenous region, we used only six indicator values of the edaphotope, namely moisture (name in publication: “water regime”, scale 1–23), moisture variability (“variability of damping”, 1–11), pH (“soil acidity”, 1–15), carbonate content (1–13) and salinity (“total salt regime”, 1–19). To assess the conservation relevance of grassland stands and types, we calculated the number of vascular plant species with conservation values per plot, based on the *Red Data Book of Ukraine* (DIDUKH 2009) and the list of regionally rare plants of Vinnytsia province (ANDRIENKO & PEREGRYM 2012).

3.3 Data preparation for numerical analyses

Prior to numerical analyses (TWINSPAN, determination of diagnostic species, ordination) we standardised our relevé data (see JANSEN & DENGLER 2010): (i) occurrences of species in shrub and herb layer were combined; (ii) taxa determined only at genus level or coarser were removed except for *Nostoc* spp. and *Weissia* spp. (which were never/rarely determined at species level but have a clear diagnostic value even at genus level); (iii) taxa that were recorded with different taxonomic precision were joined at the aggregated level (aggregate level in case of closely related species, species level in case of polytypic species); (iv) records of the type “*Genus* cf. *species*” were joined with “*Genus species*”; (v) some cover values not applicable in JUICE were changed to the nearest allowed values. In the relevé tables (Tables 5–8 in the supplement) both the aggregated data are shown in normal font and the original data below these in smaller font and italics.

3.4 Vegetation classification

Vegetation classification was performed on all 226 relevés of 10-m² plots. To get an initial idea of the data structure, we conducted a TWINSpan (Two-Way Indicator Species Analysis; HILL 1979) in the modified version proposed by ROLEČEK et al. (2009) and implemented in JUICE (TICHÝ 2002). We used the default settings of JUICE (pseudospecies cut levels: 0%, 2%, 5% and 10%; minimum group size: 5) and tried cluster numbers up to 12.

As the TWINSpan analysis showed that the three-cluster resolution corresponded very closely to phytosociological orders known from the literature (“ordinal clusters”), and the nine-cluster resolution was the lowest resolution with floristically well-defined units (“association-level clusters”), we used these two TWINSpan resolutions as starting points for further refinement. We calculated phi coefficients of association (CHYTRÝ et al. 2002) for the TWINSpan units at the three- and nine-cluster resolutions, assuming equal cluster size (TICHÝ & CHYTRÝ 2006). First we sorted species according to decreasing phi values within the ordinal clusters. Then we identified relevés in which diagnostic species of another cluster than their own prevailed and reassigned them when this overall led to an increase of the phi values of diagnostic species as proposed and applied, *inter alia*, by LUTHER-MOSEBACH et al. (2012) and DENGLER et al. (2012a). The modified TWINSpan was then run within each of the three main clusters, followed by the same procedure (calculation of phi values, sorting of species blocks, checking for and reassigning of outlying relevés). The whole procedure was repeated iteratively until no further improvement in the crispness of the classification could be achieved. All manual rearrangements of relevés are indicated in the Tables 5–8 in the supplement.

We considered species as highly diagnostic when $\phi > 0.50$ and as diagnostic when $\phi > 0.25$ (see CHYTRÝ 2007), provided the concentration was significant according to Fisher’s exact test at $\alpha = 0.05$. According to this definition, species can be diagnostic for several nested syntaxa. Such “transgressive” diagnostic species were only accepted additionally at higher levels when the species had positive phi-values in more than half of the included associations. When a species was diagnostic for more than one association of a higher unit, it was accepted only on the higher level. Note that the term “diagnostic species” is meant in the regional context and encompasses both differential and character species. However, based on our knowledge of the literature on dry grasslands in various parts of Europe, we provide an expert assessment whether a taxon can only be considered as differential species (D), a character species of a higher syntaxon (C) or potentially a character species of an association (CC).

Finally, we tried to assign our units to phytosociological associations, alliances and orders described in the literature. This phytosociological classification involved an extensive search for original literature and check for validity and legitimacy of names according to the *International Code of Phytosociological Nomenclature* (WEBER et al. 2000; further ICPN). For all syntaxon names mentioned, the nomenclatural assessment is presented in Appendix S1.

In the association descriptions (Subsection 4.4), we characterise the communities within the context of this work, using standardised terminology in relation to the mean value found in all our stands.

3.5 Statistical evaluation of environmental factors and species composition

To visualise the multivariate floristic similarity patterns, we carried out a detrended correspondence analysis (DCA) with $\log(x + 1)$ -transformed percent cover values in PC-Ord 6.08 (MCCUNE & MEF-FORT 1999) with down-weighting of rare species. In the ordination diagram, environmental factors and vegetation parameters correlated to one of the axes with $r^2 \geq 0.20$ were displayed as vectors. Differences in environmental conditions and vegetation parameters between communities were assessed at different hierarchical levels (class, association) with one-way ANOVAs in SPSS 20 (SP Inc., Chicago, USA) after having tested whether the prerequisites of linear models (normal distribution, equal variance) were sufficiently met by visually inspecting the distribution of the residuals (QUINN & KEOUGH 2002). When an ANOVA resulted in a significant pattern, we used Tukey’s HSD *post hoc* test at $\alpha = 0.05$ to determine homogenous groups.

4. Vegetation classification

All syntaxon names mentioned in Section 4 are nomenclaturally evaluated in Appendix S2. The authors of all accepted syntaxon names are given in Section 4.1, those for other syntaxa in Appendix S2, while in the text we refrain from providing author citations and nomenclatural assessments except in ambiguous cases.

4.1 Proposed syntaxonomic scheme

Here we present the syntaxonomic scheme followed in the text and tables, although various aspects are still tentative or even disputed within the team of authors. Reasons for the applied system and alternative views are discussed in Sections 4.2–4.4. Unclear alliance assignments are marked with “???”.

Class 1: *Koelerio-Coryneporetea* Klika in Klika & Novák 1941

– Subclass 1a: *Sedo-Scleranthenea* (Br.-Bl. 1955) Dengler in Dengler et al. 2003

Order 1.1: *Alyssso alyssoidis-Sedetalia* Moravec 1967 – Basiphilous outcrop communities

Alliance???: *Alyssso alyssoidis-Sedion* Oberd. & T. Müller in T. Müller 1961

Association 1.1.1: *Ajuga chamaepitys* subsp. *chia-Sedum acre* community

Order 1.2: *Sedo-Scleranthetalia* Br.-Bl. 1955 – Acidophilous outcrop communities

Alliance???: *Sedo albi-Veronicion dillenii* Korneck 1974

Association 1.2.1: *Allium podolicum-Sedum acre* community

– Subclass 1b: *Koelerio-Coryneporenea* (Klika in Klika & Novák 1941) Dengler in Dengler et al. 2003

Order 1.3: *Trifolio arvensis-Festucetalia ovinae* Moravec 1967 – Mesoxeric grasslands of sandy soils

Alliance???: *Agrostion vinealis* Sipaylova et al. 1985

Association 1.3.1: *Trifolium arvense-Festuca valesiaca* community

Class 2: *Festuco-Brometea* Br.-Bl. & Tx. ex Klika & Hadač 1944

Order 2.1: *Brachypodietalia pinnati* Korneck 1974 nom. conserv. propos. – Mesoxeric grasslands of base-rich, loamy soils

Alliance: *Agrostio vinealis-Avenulion schellianae* Royer 1991

Association 2.1.1: *Linum hirsutum-Galium verum* community

Association 2.1.2: *Fissidens viridulus-Festuca rupicola* community

Association 2.1.3: *Homalothecium lutescens-Poa angustifolia* community

Order 2.2: *Festucetalia valesiaca* Soó 1947 – Xeric grasslands of base-rich, loamy soils

Alliance: *Festucion valesiaca* Klika 1931 nom. conserv. propos.

Association 2.2.1: *Teucro pannonic-Stipetum capillatae* Didukh & Korotchenko 2000

Association 2.2.2: *Allio taurici-Dichanthietum ischaemi* Kuzemko et al. 2014

Alliance: *Stipion lessingiana* Soó 1947

Association 2.2.3: *Salvia nutans-Carex humilis* community

4.2 Identity and placement of alliances and orders

Within the *Koelerio-Corynephoretea*, both the outcrop communities and the communities on deep sandy soils were represented. Since in the study area (Table 4 in the supplement) as well as Europe-wide (see Table 30 in DENGLER 2003) they share many joint character species, we consider them as subclasses *Sedo-Scleranthenea* and *Koelerio-Corynephorenea*, respectively, while in some syntaxonomic overviews they are treated as classes in their own right under equivalent names (e.g. SCHAMINÉE et al. 1996). The communities of our study could readily be assigned to three orders of common classification systems (e.g. MORAVEC 1967, MUCINA & KOLBEK 1993b, SCHAMINÉE et al. 1996, RODWELL et al. 2002, DENGLER 2003). There were both basiphilous (*Alyso alyssoidis-Sedetalia*) and acidophilous (*Sedo-Scleranthetalia*) outcrop communities, while the *Koelerio-Corynephorenea* were represented by the order of closed swards on meso-xeric sands (*Trifolio arvensis-Festucetalia ovinae*), which is geographically widespread in Europe.

The assignment to alliances within each of these three orders is more challenging, since larger-scale syntheses, particularly of the outcrop communities, are so far missing. For the basiphilous outcrop communities, we follow the common approach to place them in a common alliance for all stands in temperate Europe, *Alyso alyssoidis-Sedion*. In the case of the acidophilous outcrop communities of temperate European lowlands, the alliance would be the *Sedo albi-Veronicion dillenii*. However, Ukrainian researchers have also used the name *Hyperico perforati-Scleranthion perennis* for such stands, a name that according to the original description by MORAVEC (1967) refers to communities that are floristically, physiognomically and ecologically transitional between the orders *Sedo-Scleranthetalia* and *Trifolio-Festucetalia* in the delimitation of DENGLER (2003). If the *Hyperico-Scleranthion* were assigned to the acidophilous outcrop communities, the name *Trifolio-Festucetalia*, whose holotype it is, would become a later syntaxonomic synonym of the *Sedo-Scleranthetalia*. The name *Sedo-Scleranthetalia* would therefore not be applicable to communities of deeper sandy soils as intended by MORAVEC (1967), who intentionally distinguished this order from the *Sedo-Scleranthetalia* and adopted it in major recent syntaxonomic overviews (e.g. SCHAMINÉE et al. 1996, BERG et al. 2004). Therefore we assign our relevés preliminarily to the *Sedo-Veronicion*, whose delimitation against potential vicariant alliances, however, needs clarification (see also PEDASHENKO et al. 2013). For example, from Ukraine two new alliances of acidophilous outcrop communities have been described by DIDUKH & KONTAR (1999), *Poo compressae-Rumicion acetosellae* and *Thymo pulegioidis-Sedion sexangularis* nom. inval., based, however, on only few relevés from a limited spatial extent, leaving their supraregional relevance questionable.

For the *Trifolio-Festucetalia*, DENGLER (2003, 2004a) proposed a system of three largely vicariant alliances, which are also distinguished by different microspecies of the *Festuca ovina* aggregate that dominate the swards: (a) *Sedo-Cerastion arvensis* (temperate-atlantic Europe; *F. filiformis* and *F. lemanii*); (b) *Hyperico perforati-Scleranthion perennis* (boreo-montane; *F. ovina* and *F. guestfalica*); (c) *Armerion elongatae* (Pleistocene, subcontinental lowlands; *F. trachyphylla*). PEDASHENKO et al. (2013) then added the *Armerio rumelico-Potentillion* as fourth vicariant alliance for the Balkan Peninsula. The stands in Central Podolia do not fit into any of these four alliances either floristically or chorologically. Therefore, we assume that they belong to an eastern vicariant of the *Armerion elongatae*. A suitable alliance concept here would be the *Agrostion vinealis*, to which we assign our plots tentatively. This alliance has been described as mesoxeric, closed swards on sandy soils in alluvial plains of Ukraine and western Russia, and was originally placed in the *Molinio-*

Arrhenatheretea, either in the *Arrhenatheretalia elatioris* (SIPAYLOVA et al. 1985) or the *Galietaalia veri* (KUZEMKO 2009, ERMAKOV 2012). Another related alliance concept is the *Thymo pulegioidis-Sedion sexangularis* nom. inval. (DIDUKH & KONTAR 1999), which comprises communities transitional between open cryptogam-, succulent- and therophyte-rich granite outcrop communities and more closed swards.

Within the *Festuco-Brometea*, the two distinguished groups can be readily identified with the two orders widely accepted in more recent surveys of other parts of Europe (e.g. MUCINA & KOLBEK 1993a, DENGLER 1994, RODWELL et al. 2002, DENGLER et al. 2012a) based on a long list of well-established diagnostic species that were also common in the stands of Central Podolia (see Table 4 in the supplement), namely the *Brachypodietalia pinnati* (= *Brometalia erecti* nom. ambig. propos., 2.1) and *Festucetalia valesiacae* (2.2).

One should note, however, that Ukrainian and Russian phytosociologists often place at least part of the content of unit 2.1 as a separate order *Galietaalia veri* within the class *Molinio-Arrhenatheretea* (e.g. MIRKIN & NAUMOVA 1986, RODWELL et al. 2002, KUZEMKO 2009, 2011a, ERMAKOV 2012). This is particularly true for association 2.1.3 with several *Molinio-Arrhenatheretea* character species (e.g. *Trifolium pratense*, *Lolium perenne*) among the diagnostic species. Since generally accepted character species of the *Festuco-Brometea* and the order *Brachypodietalia pinnati* are clearly prevailing (Table 4 in the supplement) and since the three associations 2.1.1–2.1.3 appear overall as a homogenous group in Table 4 in the supplement and the ordination (Fig. 2), we place all of them preliminarily in the *Brachypodietalia pinnati*. Within this order the assignment to an alliance is less clear. The stands clearly differ from typical *Cirsio-Brachypodion pinnati* communities of subcontinental Europe (e.g. DENGLER 1994, BECKER et al. 2011, ŠKODOVÁ et al. 2011, DENGLER et al. 2012a, WILLNER et al. 2013, PEDASHENKO et al. 2013) through their physiognomy is dominated by forbs instead of graminoids. Moreover, various typical species of the *Cirsio-Brachypodion* are rare or absent in the *Brachypodietalia pinnati* stands of Central Podolia (e.g. *Brachypodium pinnatum*, *Filipendula vulgaris*, *Polygala comosa*, *Carex* spp.), while a few more easterly distributed taxa appear instead (e.g. *Agrimonia eupatoria* subsp. *grandis*, *Dianthus membranaceus*, *Silene donetzica*). Only our association 2.1.1 retains some resemblance to the *Cirsio-Brachypodion* of Transylvania (DENGLER et al. 2012a). In order not to split the Podolian *Brachypodietalia pinnati* communities prematurely, we consider all of them as belonging to the same alliance, that is, an eastern vicariant of the *Cirsio-Brachypodion*. Such a concept has already been proposed by ROYER (1991) under the name *Agrostio-Avenulion schellianae*. This alliance unites all mesoxeric *Festuco-Brometea* communities between the Carpathian and the Ural Mts., corresponding to the herb-rich meadow steppes, and is based on a type relevé from the Streletskaya steppe, Kursk region, Russia. If this unit should be geographically too broad, the name *Fragario viridis-Trifolion montani* (KOROTCHENKO & DIDUKH 1997) would be available for the western (Ukrainian) part. Note that the similar name *Trifolion montani*, which was described as *Molinio-Arrhenatheretea* alliance (NAUMOVA 1986), in the protologue contained one association that would also belong here. It generally (including the type association) consists of sandy dry grasslands without many *Festuco-Brometea* species, and thus according to our concept would be a later synonym of the *Agrostion vinealis* (*Koelerio-Corynephoretea*).

The xeric group of *Festuco-Brometea* communities (2.2) quite clearly belongs to the *Festucetalia valesiacae* (xeric communities on deep soils). Only few species indicate relationships to the rocky dry grasslands of the order *Stipo pulcherrimae-Festucetalia pallentis*




Fig. 2. Gradient analysis (DCA) of the investigated dry grassland vegetation of Central Podolia. The data set includes 226 samples with 474 species. Eigenvalue of axis 1 is 0.349 and gradient length 3.20 standard deviation units, axis 2: 0.262/3.69, axis 3 (not shown): 0.178/2.88. Significance of the three axes at $p = 0.001$ was given by randomisation tests with 999 runs. Vectors are only shown for relationships with $|r| > 0.44$.

Abb. 2. Gradientenanalyse (DCA) der untersuchten Trockenrasen Zentral-Podoliens. Der Datensatz beinhaltet 226 Aufnahmen mit 474 Arten. Achse 1 hat einen Eigenwert von 0,349 und eine Gradientenlänge von 3,20 Standardabweichungseinheiten, Achse 2: 0,262/3,69, Achse 3 (nicht dargestellt): 0,178/2,88. Es sind nur Vektoren dargestellt, die mit einer der beiden Achsen mit $|r| > 0.44$ korrelieren.

(compare JANIŠOVÁ et al. 2010, DENGLER et al. 2012a, PEDASHENKO et al. 2013, WILLNER et al. 2013). These are *Carex humilis*, which is typical and sometimes dominant in association 2.2.3, and *Allium flavum*, regionally diagnostic for association 2.2.2, which, albeit in a different subspecies has been recorded as diagnostic for *Stipo-Festucetalia* associations in Romania and Bulgaria (DENGLER et al. 2012a, PEDASHENKO et al. 2013). Overall, the recorded communities seem to fit more into the *Festucetalia valesiaca*, but a larger-scale revision might well conclude that some of the more stony plots should belong to a different association in the other order. Within the *Festucetalia valesiaca* the placement of our three associations is rather challenging. Associations 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 might still fit into a widely delimited *Festucion valesiaca*, while association 2.2.3 shows clear links to the *Stipion lessingiana* (e.g. high frequency of *Salvia nutans*), albeit a bit impoverished compared to the stands in Transylvania (DENGLER et al. 2012a). Ukrainian authors have additionally introduced many more alliances of xeric *Festucetalia valesiaca* communities (see SOLOMAKHA 1996), whose justification and delimitation are in need of supra-regional, data-based revision.

4.3 Description of the associations

(Tables 1, 11 and Tables 4–7 in the supplement, Appendix S3)

Association 1.1.1: *Ajuga chamaepitys* subsp. *chia*-*Sedum acre* community (Table 5 in the supplement)

Characterisation: A moderately species-rich community with significant cryptogam diversity, open herb layer (mean cover: 35%) and a well-developed moss layer (41%). The constant species in the herb layer are *Sedum acre* and *Acinos arvensis*, while *Arenaria serpyllifolia*, *Poa compressa* and *Dichanthium ischaemum* are also frequent and *Aurinia saxatilis* and *Ajuga chamaepitys* subsp. *chia* have highest diagnostic value. In the moss layer, the dominant species are *Syntrichia ruralis* agg., *Abietinella abietina* and *Bryum capillare*.

Ecology and distribution: The community occurs at the moderately steep slopes (mean: 22°) of mostly south-eastern or south-western aspect on loamy soils that originate from limestone rocks, which often come to the surface (cover up to 68%). Both soil pH (mean: 7.5) and carbonate content (mean: 12.8%) are particularly high, skeleton content (mean: 13%) and humus content (C_{org} : 7.7%) exceed all other associations. We found this association in the Dniester River basin in the three study sites where carbonate rocks were present on the surface. In most cases, these communities have no economic use, but sometimes they are used as pasture with an average intensity of grazing.

Syntaxonomy: We could not find any matching association description from Ukraine or neighbouring countries and thus treat the five plots preliminarily as an informal community.

Association 1.2.1: *Allium podolicum*-*Sedum acre* community (Table 5 in the supplement)

Characterisation: The community with the highest total species richness (mean 47.2) in the study area, including the most diverse moss layer with on average 9.6 bryophyte and 5.3 lichen taxa. The herb layer is moderately closed and the moss layer well developed. The most frequent species in the herb layer are *Sedum acre*, *Potentilla argentea* agg., *Hieracium echinoides* and *Trifolium arvense*. Grasses, such as *Festuca rupicola* and *F. valesiaca* are less frequent, but can dominate when they occur. The moss layer is typically formed from *Brachythecium albicans*, *Syntrichia ruralis* agg., *Ceratodon purpureus*, *Abietinella abietina*, and the lichens *Cladonia pyxidata* agg. and *C. furcata*. Of all studied associations, this one has the highest number of diagnostic species, among which several are potentially at least regional character species, e.g. *Viola tricolor* subsp. *matutina*, *Allium podolicum* and *Veronica spicata* subsp. *incana*.

Ecology and distribution: The community occurs on average on the steepest slopes of all dry grassland associations of the region (mean 27°), which are mostly north-facing, thus leading to a negative heat index (mean: -0.24). The sandy soils (mean sand fraction is 43%) with an appreciable skeleton content (mean: 9%) are derived from silicate rocks, mostly granite. The siliceous origin is reflected by moderately acidic soils (mean pH: 6.0, the lowest among all communities), low conductivity and practically absent carbonates. The association occurs in the valley of the Southern Bug River, where granite of the Ukrainian crystalline shield outcrops at the surface. The areas are used as pastures with low intensity of grazing.

Syntaxonomy: Similar acidophilous outcrop communities have previously been described from Ukraine under various names, namely *Vincetoxico hirundinarii-Rumicetum acetosellae*, *Thymo pulegioidis-Sedetum sexangularis*, *Artemisio austriaci-Teucrietum chamaedryos* (DIDUKH & KONTAR 1999), *Melico transylvanicae-Sedetum ruprechtii* (KONTAR 2000; *Sedum ruprechtii* = *Hylotelephium maximum* subsp. *ruprechtii*) and *Aurinio*

saxatilis-Allietum podolici (ONYSCHENKO 2001: the author claims that his community is basiphilous, but his species-composition rather suggests that it belongs to the *Sedo-Scleranthetalia*). While it appears that these are more associations than reasonably could be distinguished among the *Sedo-Scleranthetalia* of Ukraine, proper assignment should be based on a numerical revision on the basis of more extensive plot data; therefore, we prefer to present our relevés as informal unit.

Association 1.3.1: *Trifolium arvense-Festuca valesiaca* community (Table 5 in the supplement)

Characterisation: The association is represented by only two relevés, which might not be fully representative of the community type. These two relevés are very species rich and represent the most diverse community type of the study in terms of vascular plants (mean: 43.5 species on 10 m²). While the herb layer is dense and the litter cover highest among all associations (mean: 23%), the moss layer is much more poorly developed than in the other two communities of the *Koelerio-Corynephoretea* (10%). The herb layer is dominated by *Festuca valesiaca*, with *Trifolium arvense*, *Fragaria viridis*, *Achillea millefolium* agg., *Potentilla argentea* agg. and *Hieracium pilosella* also playing an important role. A larger number of weedy species (*Convolvulus arvensis*, *Setaria viridis*, *Anagallis arvensis* and others) are also present. The moss layer has *Brachythecium albicans* as the single dominant.

Ecology and distribution: The two relevés occupy nearly flat areas with deep, moderately acidic soils (mean pH: 6.2) with low conductivity and practically no carbonates. Unlike the two other *Koelerio-Corynephoretea* associations, there are no stones at the soil surface and hardly any skeleton in the upper soil horizons. We found this community only in the “Romashkovo” site in the National Nature Park “Karmelukove Podillya” in the ecotone of steppe and an abandoned field, which obviously caused the penetration of the weed species in the grassland community. The stands are used as pastures with low grazing intensity.

Syntaxonomy: We could not find any matching association description from Ukraine or neighbouring countries and thus treat the two plots preliminarily as an informal community. Only the *Thymo pulegioidis-Sedetum sexangularis* described from similar locations (DIDUKH & KONTAR 1999) was to some extent similar, but the dominant *Festuca* species was *F. ovina* instead of *F. valesiaca* and also many other aspects differ so much that these are not likely to be the same association. Note that SOPOTLIEVA & APOSTOLOVA (2014) described a *Trifolio arvensis-Festucetum valesiaca* from Bulgaria, which they considered transitional between the *Festuco-Brometea* and *Koelerio-Corynephoretea* and placed it in the *Festucion valesiaca*, but despite two dominant species being the same, otherwise the communities differ significantly in their composition.

Association 2.1.1: *Linum hirsutum-Galium verum* community (Table 6 in the supplement)

Characterisation: A moderately species rich community with a dense herb layer and a poorly developed moss layer. In this association, forbs such as *Galium verum*, *Plantago media*, *Achillea millefolium* agg., *Centaurea scabiosa*, *Origanum vulgare*, *Senecio jacobaea*, *Stachys recta* and the dwarf shrub *Chamaecytisus austriacus* are far more frequent than the most frequent grasses (*Festuca rupicola*, *Poa angustifolia*, *Koeleria macrantha*, *Brachypodium pinnatum*). Particularly diagnostic and potential character species of the association are *Linum hirsutum*, *Carlina vulgaris* subsp. *intermedia* and *Silene donetzica*. In the moss cover, the most frequent taxon is *Weissia* spp. (with *W. longifolia*), sometimes with considerable cover.

Ecology and distribution: The association grows on gentle (mean: 14°), rather northerly exposed slopes. The soils are neutral (pH: 7.2) with low carbonate content and very little skeleton. This community occurs in the watershed of the Southern Bug and the Dniester rivers. In most cases, the stands are abandoned; occasionally they are used as pastures, mostly of low intensity, and in some cases burned.

Syntaxonomy: According to our knowledge, such a community has not previously been described from Ukraine. Within Ukraine the most similar previously described association is the *Veronico austriacae-Chamaecytisetum austriaci*, the two eponymous taxa also being characteristic for our stands, which was placed in the *Fragario viridis-Trifolium montani* by KOROTCHENKO & DIDUKH (1997). Certain similarities exist also towards the *Brachypodio pinnati-Teucrietum chamaedryos* (Lublin Upland, Poland; FIJALKOWSKI 1964) and the *Festuco sulcatae-Brachypodietum pinnati* (Transylvania, Romania; DENGLER et al. 2012a), both typically placed in the *Cirsio-Brachypodion pinnati*, but our stands are much poorer in species.

Association 2.1.2: *Fissidens viridulus-Festuca rupicola* community (Table 6 in the supplement, Fig. 3)

Characterisation: This moderately species-poor community has the lowest density of vascular plant taxa within the study (31.1 on 10 m²) while on the other hand the herb layer cover is highest on average (85%). The most frequent species are the grasses *Festuca rupicola*, *Poa angustifolia*, *Koeleria macrantha* and *Elymus repens* and the forbs *Medicago sativa* subsp. *falcata*, *Galium verum*, *Eryngium campestre* and *Asperula cynanchica*. Regionally high diagnostic values have *Trifolium montanum*, *Falcaria vulgaris* and *Campanula bononiensis*. Among the bryophytes, *Oxyrrhynchium hians* and *Weissia* spp. (with *W. longifolia* and *W. condensata*) are the most frequent ones, the latter sometimes reaching higher cover, and *Fissidens viridulus* has particular diagnostic value.

Ecology and distribution: The association preferentially grows on moderately steep, northerly exposed slopes. The soils have a slightly lower pH than the previous association (mean: 6.6) while carbonate and skeleton content are similarly low. The association is fairly widespread in the valley of the Southern Bug River. The sites are used as pastures with low and medium grazing intensity and burned.

Syntaxonomy: This community fits well into the alliance *Fragario viridis-Trifolium montani*, but matching with one of the five very narrow associations contained in the original description (KOROTCHENKO & DIDUKH 1997) is problematic, *Betonico officinalis-Trifolietum montani* and *Salvio pratensis-Poetum angustifoliae* being the best matches.

Association 2.1.3: *Homalothecium lutescens-Poa angustifolia* community (Table 6 in the supplement)

Characterisation: Stands of this association have the highest mean total richness in the study (46.3). They have a dense herb layer, but at the same time the best developed moss layer among the *Brachypodietalia pinnati* communities (34%). *Festuca valesiaca*, *Poa angustifolia*, *F. rupicola*, *Dichanthium ischaemum* and *Agrostis gigantea* play the biggest role among the grasses. The forbs represent a peculiar mixture of widespread *Festuco-Brometea* species (*Fragaria viridis*, *Teucrium chamaedryos*, *Salvia verticillata*, *Plantago media*) and typical *Molinio-Arrhenatheretea* species (*Trifolium repens*, *T. pratense*, *Cerastium fontanum* subsp. *vulgare*). The moss layer consists mainly of mats of *Homalothecium lutescens* and *Abietinella abietina*.



Fig. 3. *Fissidens viridulus-Festuca rupicola* [*Agrostio vinealis-Avenulion schellianae*] community (2.1.2), ancient settlement “Nemyrivske” (Site 1) (Photo: A.A. Kuzemko).

Abb. 3. *Fissidens viridulus-Festuca rupicola*- [*Agrostio vinealis-Avenulion schellianae*] Gesellschaft (2.1.2), historische Siedlungsanlage “Nemyrivske” (Standort 1) (Foto: A.A. Kuzemko).

Ecology and distribution: Similarly to association 2.1.1, this community occurs on gentle, mostly north-facing slopes with neutral, carbonate- and skeleton-poor soils. The association is widespread in the Dniester basin. The stands are used as pastures with varying intensity of pressure, from very low to high, but on average more intensively than in any other community studied.

Syntaxonomy: This community matches quite well the *Festuco valesiacae-Poetum angustifoliae* described from the alliance *Trifolion montani* (DENISOVA et al. 1986).

Association 2.2.1: *Teucrio pannonici-Stipetum capillatae* (Table 7 in the supplement)

Characterisation: Stands of this association are moderately species poor (mean 34.4 species on 10 m²) and characterized by a dense herb layer. The stands are dominated by *Dichanthium ischaemum* and/or *Stipa capillata* or, more rarely, *Festuca valesiaca*. Among the forbs, *Teucrium chamaedrys*, *Salvia verticillata*, *Potentilla incana* and *Astragalus onobrychis* are the most dominant ones. In the mostly poorly developed moss layer, *Abietinella abietina* and *Weissia* spp. are the most relevant taxa in terms of constancy and cover.

Ecology and distribution: The stands grow on moderately steep (mean: 22°), southerly exposed slopes and thus have the highest heat index among all studied associations (mean: 0.16). The soils are moderately alkaline and have considerable carbonate content. The association is geographically the most widespread dry grassland type of the region, present in 13

out of 18 analysed sites (Table 1), mainly in the basin of the Dniester River and the valleys of the Dniester tributaries. In the valley of the Southern Bug River, these communities are less frequent, with one recorded site. The stands typically have no economic use.

Syntaxonomy: This central association corresponds very well to the *Teucro pannonici-Stipetum capillatae* described from Pokuttya (W Ukraine) (DIDUKH & KOROTCHENKO 2000) and we consider it the same, except we did not find the eponymous *Teucrium* species.

Association 2.2.2: *Allio taurici-Dichanthietum ischaemi* (Table 7 in the supplement)

Characterisation: A moderately species rich community with a moderately closed herb layer (71%) and the best developed moss layer among the *Festucetalia valesiaca* communities. Similar to the previous association, the stands are mostly dominated by *Dichanthium ischaemum*, *Stipa capillata*, *Festuca valesiaca* or in this case also *Stipa pulcherrima*. While also the dominant forb species are mostly the same as in association 2.2.1 (*Potentilla incana*, *Salvia verticillata*, *Teucrium chamaedrys*, *T. montanum*), a set of additional diagnostic forbs clearly differentiate this community, most notably *Allium flavum* subsp. *tauricum*, *Leontodon crispus*, *Teucrium polium* and *Alyssum rostratum*. In the moss layer, *Weissia* spp. and *Abietinella abietina* are most frequent, while *Homalothecium lutescens* sometimes dominates.

Ecology and distribution: The stands occur on slopes of varying steepness (mean 18°, maximum: 36°). The soils are moderately alkaline (mean pH: 7.5), and have the highest conductivity (186 µS/cm) and carbonate content (13.5%) among all identified associations. The association is present in those localities with significant limestone outcrops. It is common in the valleys of the Dniester River tributaries: Kysyrniak, Kamianka, Tashlyk and Vilshanka. The stands are used as pastures with varying grazing intensity or abandoned.

Syntaxonomy: As we could not find a convincing match in the literature for this regionally frequent and floristically clearly differentiated unit, we describe it as a new association: ***Allio taurici-Dichanthietum ischaemi* ass. nova hoc loco**; Holotypus: Table 7 in the supplement, relevé 137 = UAR051 of this paper.

Association 2.2.3: *Salvia nutans-Carex humilis* community (Table 8 in the supplement)

Characterisation: Moderately species rich community with a moderately dense herb layer and a generally little developed moss layer (mean cover: 8%), which in rare cases can reach 50–60%. Differing from the two other *Festucetalia valesiaca* communities, in this association *Carex humilis* plays the biggest role among the graminoids, together with *Dichanthium ischaemum*, while *Stipa capillata*, *Festuca valesiaca* and *Cleistogenes serotina* subsp. *bulgarica* play a subordinate role. Next to some widespread *Festucetalia valesiaca* species (*Teucrium chamaedrys*, *Potentilla incana*, *Chamaecytisus austriacus*) some peculiar forbs, such as *Salvia nutans*, *Jurinea ledebourii*, *Adonis vernalis*, *Aster amellus* and *Inula ensifolia* give this association its special character. Like in all associations of the order in the region, *Weissia* spp. is the most constant species in the moss layer, while *Abietinella abietina* and *Homalothecium lutescens* occur more rarely but sometimes dominate.

Ecology and distribution: This association typically grows on gentle, mostly southerly exposed slopes with moderately alkaline soils and moderate carbonate content. The association is widespread in the Dniester basin. The stands are used as pastures, rarely abandoned, occasionally burned.

Syntaxonomy: This association is very similar to the Transylvanian *Stipetum pulcherrimae*, considered as the central association of the *Stipion lessingiana* (DENGLER et al. 2012a), only in some species vicariant subspecies replace each other, e.g. *Cleistogenes serot-*

ina subsp. *serotina* vs. subsp. *bulgarica* and *Allium flavum* subsp. *flavum* vs. subsp. *tauricum* in Transylvania and Podolia, respectively. A large-scale synthesis is needed to clarify whether two separate associations are justified or not.

5. Ecology, biodiversity and conservation

5.1 Overall characterisation of the dry grassland stands (Table 9)

In the study region, the remaining dry grasslands occur in any exposition, but only very rarely on flat areas (mean slope is 19°). Typically, they are grazed at low intensity, and approximately 10% of the plots showed indications of burning. The soils are mostly loamy and base-rich, with a mean pH above the neutral point and only 8% of the plots more acidic than pH = 6.5.

The herb layer was, with a few exceptions, closed with around 80% cover, while the moss layer was very variable, from absent to 85%. The mean total species richness in 10 m² was 41 species, but varied by a factor of more than five between the poorest (13) and richest plots (67). Bryophytes and lichens contributed on average only 7.8% and 1.5% to the plot-scale richness, were completely absent in many plots, but could reach exceptionally up to 15 and 12 species, respectively.

5.2 Vegetation-environment relationships

According to the ordination diagram (Fig. 2), the main floristic gradient (first DCA axis) in the dry grasslands of the region is determined by soil pH (despite the relatively little variation in soil reaction present in the dataset, see Table 9), which more or less corresponds to CaCO₃ and electrical conductivity. The second DCA axis then differentiates from bottom to top between stands with a closed herb layer and open stands with significant surface cover of stones and gravel and higher diversity of non-vascular plants. Four of the five phytosociological orders distinguished above are clearly separated already on the plane of the first two ordination axes, the *Festucetalia valesiaca* in the lower left corner (closed, cryptogam-poor stands on particularly base-rich soils), *Brachypodietalia pinnati* in the lower right corner (closed, cryptogam-poor stands on less base-rich soils), *Alyso-Sedetalia* in the upper left corner (open, cryptogam-rich stands on particularly base-rich soils) and the *Sedo-Scleranthetalia* in the upper right corner (open, cryptogam-rich stands on less base-rich soils). Only the two relevés of the order *Trifolio-Festucetalia* were not separated on this ordination plane, but included in the polygon of the *Sedo-Scleranthetalia*. By contrast, the three associations within of each of the orders *Festucetalia valesiaca* and *Brachypodietalia pinnati* showed high overlap in the ordination diagram.

The two vegetation classes differed ecologically mainly with regard to soil reaction, the pH in stands of the *Koelerio-Coryneporetea* being on average 0.8 units lower than in the *Festuco-Brometea* (and carbonate content and electrical conductivity changing accordingly) (Table 10). Furthermore, the *Koelerio-Coryneporetea* inhabit more stony sites with more pronounced micro-relief and more often northerly exposed than the communities of the other class (Table 10). In consequence, the herb layer of the *Festuco-Brometea* is dense and the moss layer sparse, whereas in the *Koelerio-Coryneporetea* the herb layer is more open, allowing the development of a moss layer with on average four-fold coverage (Table 10). The ANOVAs at association level (Table 11) show significant patterns for most parameters,

Table 9. Characterisation of the analysed 10-m² dry grassland plots in Central Podolia in terms of environmental conditions, vegetation structure and biodiversity ($n = 226$ except for few parameters where values for a small number of plots were missing).

Table 9. Zusammenfassung von abiotischen Standortparametern, Vegetationsstruktur und Diversität der Vegetationsaufnahmen (10 m² Flächen; $n=226$, mit Ausnahmen weniger fehlender Werte einzelner Vegetationsaufnahmen) für Trockenrasen in Zentral Podolien.

Parameter	Min	Max	Mean \pm SD
Altitude [m a.s.l.]	73	251	161 \pm 39
Inclination [°]	1	48	19 \pm 9
Heat index	-0.94	0.85	0.02 \pm 0.30
Microrelief [cm]	0	100	7 \pm 12
Grazing intensity: 0 = none ($n = 100$); 1 = low ($n = 61$); 2 = medium ($n = 45$); 3 = high ($n = 20$)			
Burning: no ($n = 201$); unclear ($n = 3$); yes ($n = 22$)			
Total vegetation cover [%]	30	100	83 \pm 14
Cover shrub layer [%]	0	25	1 \pm 2
Cover herb layer [%]	15	100	78 \pm 16
Cover moss layer [%]	0	85	13 \pm 19
Cover dead wood [%]	0	2	0 \pm 0
Cover litter [%]	0	90	12 \pm 15
Cover stones and rocks [%]	0	68	4 \pm 9
Cover gravel [%]	0	75	3 \pm 8
Cover fine earth [%]	0	38	7 \pm 7
Proportion skeleton [%]	0	37	6 \pm 8
Proportion sand [%]	5	80	36 \pm 20
Proportion silt [%]	5	90	40 \pm 25
Proportion clay [%]	5	55	24 \pm 11
pH [H ₂ O]	4.89	7.79	7.29 \pm 0.46
CaCO ₃ content [%]	0.0	35.3	7 \pm 8
Conductivity [μ S/cm]	40	232	162 \pm 42
C _{total} [%]	1.3	15.8	6 \pm 3
N _{total} [%]	0.1	1.3	0 \pm 0
C _{org} /N _{org} [mol/mol]	6.0	27.4	13.5 \pm 2.4
Species richness (total)	15	67	41.1 \pm 10.3
Species richness (vascular plants)	14	64	37.2 \pm 9.6
Species richness (non-vascular plants)	0	20	3.9 \pm 3.5
Species richness (bryophytes)	0	15	3.2 \pm 2.5
Species richness (lichens)	0	12	0.6 \pm 1.5

for example, the five orders are more or less separated according to those parameters already identified in the ordination diagram. The three *Brachypodietalia pinnati* associations were differentiated significantly according to two ecological/structural parameters, with the association 2.1.2 growing on less base-rich soils than the other two, and the association 2.1.3 having a far more developed moss layer than the others. By contrast, within the *Festucetalia valesiaca* the three distinguished associations did not show significant differences in any of the considered parameters (Table 11).

Table 10. Environmental conditions with significant differences and vegetation parameters in comparison of the two classes of dry grasslands in Central Podolia. Means and standard deviations are given. IV = Indicator value, ^{log} = *p* calculation on basis of log (*x* + 1)-transformed data.

Tabelle 10. Umweltbedingungen mit signifikanten Differenzen und Vegetationseigenschaften im Vergleich der beiden Trockenrasenklassen in Zentral-Podolien. Mittelwerte und Standardabweichungen sind dargestellt. IV = Indikatorwert, ^{log} = *p*-Berechnung auf Basis von log (*x* + 1)-transformierten Daten.

Class	<i>Koelerio-Corynephoretea</i> <i>n</i> = 17	<i>Festuco-Brometea</i> <i>n</i> = 209	<i>p</i> from <i>t</i> -test
Heat index	-0.14 ± 0.36	0.03 ± 0.30	0.027
Microrelief (cm)	19 ± 31	6 ± 8	< 0.001
Cover stones and gravel (%)	19 ± 20	6 ± 11	< 0.001 ^{log}
Skeleton content of soil (weight %)	10 ± 9	6 ± 7	0.030 ^{log}
pH of soil (in H ₂ O)	6.5 ± 0.8	7.3 ± 0.3	< 0.001
CaCO ₃ content of soil (weight %)	3.9 ± 7.0	7.9 ± 7.7	< 0.001 ^{log}
Conductivity of soil (μS/cm)	111 ± 57	167 ± 36	< 0.001
N _{tot} (mmol/g dry soil)	0.4 ± 0.2	0.3 ± 0.1	0.001
C _{org} (mmol/g dry soil)	4.5 ± 2.7	3.6 ± 1.2	0.014
C _{org} /N _{org} ratio of soil	12.3 ± 0.9	13.6 ± 2.4	0.022
IV moisture variability (1–11)	6.9 ± 0.4	6.4 ± 0.3	< 0.001
IV pH (1–15)	8.4 ± 0.2	8.8 ± 0.2	< 0.001
IV carbonate content (1–13)	7.6 ± 0.5	8.9 ± 0.6	< 0.001
IV salinity (1–19)	8.1 ± 0.3	8.4 ± 0.3	< 0.001
Cover herb layer (%)	56 ± 22	79 ± 17	< 0.001
Cover moss layer (%)	40 ± 22	11 ± 17	< 0.001 ^{log}
Species richness of all taxa (10 m ²)	46.4 ± 9.4	40.7 ± 10.4	0.029
Species richness of vascular plants (10 m ²)	34.7 ± 9.5	37.4 ± 9.7	0.272
Species richness of bryophytes (10 m ²)	7.8 ± 3.8	3.3 ± 2.3	< 0.001
Species richness of lichens (10 m ²)	3.7 ± 3.7	0.4 ± 0.8	< 0.001 ^{log}

Regarding the indicator values, those for carbonate content and pH were well correlated with the measured soil properties. However, the relation between IV salinity and electrical conductivity was much looser and IV nitrogen content appeared unrelated to the actual nitrogen content – but in all cases the overall variability in the dataset was low. Since we had no directly measured soil moisture data, the indicator values of moisture and moisture variability contributed to the interpretation. While the overall differentiation between associations was small (maximum 1.1 units difference on the 23-point scale of moisture), the results indicated the stands of the orders *Trifolio-Festucetalia* and *Brachypodietalia pinnati* as more humid, those of the *Sedo-Scleranthetalia* as intermediate and those of the *Alyso-Sedetalia* and the *Festucetalia valesiacae* as driest (Table 11). Regarding the moisture variability, the differentiation was between the two classes, with the *Koelerio-Corynephoretea* being indicative of more variable moisture conditions (Table 10).

Table 11. Environmental conditions and vegetation characteristics with significant differences among the nine dry grassland associations of Central Podolia (for association codes, see Chapter 4.1). Means and standard deviations are given. Different letters indicate significant differences between associations at $p < 0.05$ from Tukey tests. IV = indicator value, \log_{10} = calculation of p on basis of $\log(x + 1)$ -transformed data.

Association	1.1.1 $n = 5$	1.2.1 $n = 10$	1.3.1 $n = 2$	2.1.1 $n = 11$	2.1.2 $n = 15$	2.1.3 $n = 19$	2.2.1 $n = 59$	2.2.2 $n = 38$	2.2.3 $n = 67$	p from ANOVA
Slope inclination (°)	22 ± 1.5 ^a	27 ± 9 ^a	7 ± 1 ^b	14 ± 9 ^{ab}	24 ± 10 ^a	16 ± 11 ^{ab}	22 ± 10 ^a	18 ± 9 ^{ab}	18 ± 7 ^{ab}	< 0.001
Heat index	0.05 ± 0.26	-0.24 ± 0.41	-0.12 ± 0.02	-0.08 ± 0.25	-0.21 ± 0.40	-0.19 ± 0.22	0.16 ± 0.31	0.00 ± 0.22	0.06 ± 0.25	< 0.001
Microrelief (cm)	29 ± 40 ^a	17 ± 30 ^{ab}	4 ± 2 ^b	6 ± 5 ^b	4 ± 2 ^b	4 ± 3 ^b	6 ± 6 ^b	8 ± 14 ^b	6 ± 6 ^b	< 0.001
Cover stones and gravel (%)	37 ± 23 ^a	13 ± 12 ^{ab}	0 ± 0 ^d	1 ± 3 ^{cd}	0 ± 2 ^d	3 ± 11 ^{cd}	6 ± 13 ^{bcd}	10 ± 13 ^{abc}	7 ± 9 ^{bcd}	< 0.001, \log
Skeleton content of soil (weight %)	13 ± 6 ^a	9 ± 11 ^{abc}	6 ± 9 ^{abc}	2 ± 4 ^c	3 ± 3 ^{bc}	5 ± 9 ^{bc}	6 ± 9 ^{abc}	10 ± 6 ^{ab}	6 ± 6 ^{abc}	< 0.001, \log
pH of soil (in HO)	7.5 ± 0.1 ^a	6.0 ± 0.6 ^d	6.2 ± 0.0 ^{cd}	7.2 ± 0.3 ^{ab}	6.6 ± 0.5 ^c	7.1 ± 0.4 ^b	7.4 ± 0.3 ^{ab}	7.5 ± 0.1 ^{ab}	7.5 ± 0.1 ^{ab}	< 0.001
CaCO ₃ content of soil (weight %)	12.8 ± 7.2 ^a	0.2 ± 0.1 ^d	0.1 ± 0.0 ^d	2.5 ± 4.6 ^{bcd}	1.2 ± 3.1 ^d	2.1 ± 5.2 ^{cd}	8.7 ± 9.1 ^{abc}	13.4 ± 6.1 ^a	8.2 ± 6.1 ^{ab}	< 0.001, \log
Conductivity of soil (µS/cm)	180 ± 20 ^a	86 ± 41 ^c	64 ± 4 ^c	152 ± 64 ^{ab}	107 ± 30 ^{bc}	158 ± 41 ^a	164 ± 36 ^a	186 ± 20 ^a	176 ± 19 ^a	< 0.001
N _{tot} (mmol/g dry soil)	0.6 ± 0.3 ^a	0.3 ± 0.1 ^b	0.2 ± 0.0 ^b	0.2 ± 0.1 ^b	0.2 ± 0.0 ^b	0.2 ± 0.1 ^b	0.2 ± 0.1 ^b	0.3 ± 0.1 ^b	0.3 ± 0.1 ^b	< 0.001
C _{org} (mmol/g dry soil)	7.7 ± 3.2 ^a	3.3 ± 0.9 ^{bc}	2.4 ± 0.1 ^c	3.2 ± 2.1 ^{bc}	3.0 ± 0.6 ^{bc}	3.0 ± 1.2 ^{bc}	3.3 ± 1.1 ^{bc}	4.3 ± 1.2 ^b	3.9 ± 0.9 ^{bc}	< 0.001
C _{org} /N _{org} ratio of soil	12.7 ± 1.4	12.0 ± 0.8	12.3 ± 0.2	12.6 ± 1.5	12.3 ± 0.8	12.9 ± 1.1	14.5 ± 3.5	13.1 ± 1.2	13.8 ± 1.9	0.001
IV moisture (1–23)	8.6 ± 0.4 ^d	9.0 ± 0.4 ^{bcd}	9.6 ± 0.3 ^a	9.4 ± 0.3 ^{ab}	9.3 ± 0.4 ^{abc}	9.5 ± 0.3 ^a	8.8 ± 0.3 ^{cd}	8.5 ± 0.2 ^d	8.6 ± 0.3 ^d	< 0.001
IV moisture variability (1–11)	7.0 ± 0.4 ^a	6.9 ± 0.4 ^{ab}	7.0 ± 0.4 ^a	6.5 ± 0.3 ^{cd}	6.5 ± 0.3 ^{bcd}	6.7 ± 0.3 ^{abc}	6.4 ± 0.2 ^{cd}	6.4 ± 0.3 ^{cd}	6.2 ± 0.2 ^d	< 0.001
IV pH (1–15)	8.6 ± 0.2 ^{cd}	8.4 ± 0.2 ^{de}	8.2 ± 0.2 ^e	8.6 ± 0.3 ^{bcd}	8.6 ± 0.2 ^{cd}	8.5 ± 0.3 ^d	8.9 ± 0.2 ^{abc}	8.9 ± 0.2 ^{ab}	9.0 ± 0.1 ^a	< 0.001
IV carbonate content (1–13)	7.9 ± 0.6 ^{cd}	7.4 ± 0.4 ^d	7.5 ± 0.4 ^d	8.3 ± 0.5 ^{bc}	8.2 ± 0.3 ^{bc}	8.3 ± 0.6 ^{bc}	8.8 ± 0.6 ^{ab}	9.1 ± 0.4 ^a	9.3 ± 0.3 ^a	< 0.001
IV salinity (1–19)	8.4 ± 0.3 ^{abc}	8.0 ± 0.2 ^d	8.0 ± 0.1 ^{cd}	8.0 ± 0.3 ^{bcd}	8.2 ± 0.5 ^{abcd}	8.3 ± 0.2 ^{abcd}	8.4 ± 0.3 ^{ab}	8.6 ± 0.3 ^a	8.3 ± 0.3 ^{abcd}	< 0.001
IV nitrogen content (1–11)	4.7 ± 0.5 ^{bc}	4.8 ± 0.4 ^{bc}	5.3 ± 0.6 ^a	5.1 ± 0.2 ^{ab}	5.1 ± 0.2 ^{ab}	5.0 ± 0.3 ^{abc}	4.9 ± 0.4 ^{abc}	4.7 ± 0.2 ^{bc}	4.6 ± 0.2 ^c	< 0.001
Cover herb layer (%)	35 ± 17 ^b	60 ± 18 ^{ab}	83 ± 11 ^a	84 ± 30 ^a	85 ± 25 ^a	83 ± 15 ^a	80 ± 14 ^a	71 ± 16 ^a	79 ± 15 ^{ab}	< 0.001
Cover moss layer (%)	41 ± 26 ^a	38 ± 14 ^a	46 ± 48 ^{abc}	4 ± 4 ^c	7 ± 11 ^{bc}	34 ± 30 ^{ab}	8 ± 15 ^{bc}	13 ± 12 ^{abc}	8 ± 13 ^{bc}	< 0.001, \log
Species richness all taxa (10 m ²)	44.8 ± 8.9	47.2 ± 10.9	46.0 ± 1.4	40.9 ± 8.1	34.9 ± 10.8	46.3 ± 11.3	34.7 ± 9.0	42.1 ± 8.5	44.8 ± 9.3	< 0.001
Species richness vascular plants (10 m ²)	36.2 ± 9.7	32.2 ± 9.6	43.5 ± 0.7	38.1 ± 7.0	31.1 ± 8.4	42.8 ± 10.8	32.1 ± 8.1	37.3 ± 8.1	41.8 ± 8.9	< 0.001
Species richness bryophytes (10 m ²)	6.2 ± 2.2 ^b	9.6 ± 3.3 ^a	2.5 ± 2.1 ^c	2.5 ± 2.0 ^c	3.7 ± 3.7 ^{bc}	3.3 ± 1.5 ^{bc}	2.4 ± 1.6 ^c	3.5 ± 1.8 ^{bc}	2.4 ± 1.7 ^c	< 0.001
Species richness lichens (10 m ²)	2.2 ± 1.5 ^{ab}	5.3 ± 4.1 ^a	0.0 ± 0.0 ^c	0.1 ± 0.3 ^c	0.1 ± 0.4 ^c	0.1 ± 0.3 ^c	0.2 ± 0.4 ^c	0.9 ± 1.1 ^{bc}	0.4 ± 0.8 ^c	< 0.001, \log

Table 11. Umweltbedingungen und Vegetationseigenschaften, die sich zwischen den neun Trockenrasen-Assoziationen Zentral-Podoliens signifikant unterscheiden (Assoziationsnummern, siehe Kapitel 4.1). Mittelwerte und Standardabweichungen sind dargestellt. Unterschiedliche Buchstaben kennzeichnen signifikante Unterschiede zwischen Assoziationen bei $p < 0.05$ nach Tukey-Tests. IV = Indikatorwert, \log_{10} = p -Wert-Berechnung auf Basis von $\log(x + 1)$ -transformierten Daten.

5.3 Biodiversity patterns

The plot-scale total richness at 10 m² varied only slightly between syntaxa. Stands of the *Koelerio-Corynephoretea* were on average 5 species (12%) more diverse than those of the *Festuco-Brometea* (Table 5). Also the variability among the nine associations was low, with a range from 34.9 species (in association 2.1.2, *Brachypodietalia pinnati*) to 47.2 species (*Sedo-Scleranthetalia*). Regarding vascular plant species richness, the two classes were not statistically different, while the *Koelerio-Corynephoretea* had more than twice as many bryophytes per plot and lichens were nearly absent from *Festuco-Brometea* stands (Table 10). For both cryptogam groups, the *Sedo-Scleranthetalia* were the richest order, followed by the *Alysso-Sedetalia* and then the associations of the three other orders on more or less similarly low levels.

The analysis of the scale-dependent biodiversity (available for three orders; Table 12) shows that the stands of the two *Festuco-Brometea* orders are nearly indistinguishable with respect to their richness across all scales. It is only at the two largest grain sizes (10 m² and 100 m²) that the *Festucetalia valesiaca* are slightly richer in vascular plants and slightly poorer in non-vascular plants than the *Brachypodietalia pinnati*. The sole analysed *Sedo-Scleranthetalia* stand, by contrast, deviates clearly from the *Festuco-Brometea* biodiversity plots in being species poorer at the two smallest scales (e.g. 1 species vs. 3 species on 1 cm²), but richer at the two largest scales (e.g. 108 vs. 72 species on 100 m²). The steeper species-area relationship of the *Sedo-Scleranthetalia* plot is mainly driven by bryophytes and lichens, with the vascular plants at 1 m² still being less diverse than in the *Festuco-Brometea* stands. However, on 100 m² the *Sedo-Scleranthetalia* had also 23% more vascular plants.

5.4 Conservation values

The associations with the highest number of red-listed species are 2.2.2 and 2.2.3 (Table 13). The most frequent red-listed species were *Stipa capillata*, *Carex humilis*, *Vinca herbacea* and *Adonis vernalis*. Most rare red-listed species were *Anchusa ochroleuca*, *Chamaecytisus albus*, *Gentiana cruciata* subsp. *cruciata*, *Pulsatilla vulgaris* subsp. *grandis* and *Stipa joannis* subsp. *joannis*. Some rare species are diagnostic for associations, including highly diagnostic species – *Allium podolicum* for association 1.2.1, *Carex humilis* and *Vinca herbacea* for association 2.2.3.

6. General discussion

6.1 Syntaxonomy

The syntaxonomic treatment of the nine distinguishable units at association level was challenging. In Ukraine, a large number of associations has been described in recent years, often based on small numbers of relevés (typically only 3–15 from a narrow region) and without ascertaining diagnostic species numerically. Comprehensive synoptic tables are still rather unusual in Ukrainian phytosociology (but see KUZEMKO 2009) as are numerical methods to seek the most appropriate classification (but see KUZEMKO 2011b). Generally, our assessment largely benefited from the different perspectives of phytosociologists from inside and outside Ukraine, and in most cases we could more or less achieve a consensus on the treatment (the few remaining controversial cases are indicated above).

Table 12. Scale-dependent richness values (means \pm standard deviations) for the three phytosociological orders in which we sampled nested “biodiversity plots”. The p -values from ANOVAs are given, and in case of significant differences homogeneous groups according to Tukey’s post-hoc test are indicated with superscript letters. The number of replicates (n) apply to all plot sizes except for 100 m² where the number is half of these.

Tabelle 12. Artenzahlen in Abhängigkeit von der Flächengröße (Mittelwert \pm Standardabweichung) der 21 Biodiversitätsplots, zusammengefasst für die Felsgrusfluren (KC2), basiphilen Halbtrockenrasen (FB1) und kontinentalen Trockenrasen (FB2). Unterschiedliche Kleinbuchstaben bezeichnen signifikante Unterschiede gemäß Tukey’s post-hoc test. In der letzten Spalte sind die p -Werte aus den Varianzanalysen (ANOVAs) angegeben. Jeder 100 m² großen Biodiversitätsplot ($n = 21$) enthält zwei geschachtelte Serien kleinerer Flächengrößen ($n = 42$).

Plot size n	Min	Max	KC2 2 (1)	FB1 10 (5)	FB2 30 (15)	p
Species richness all taxa						
0.0001 m ²	0	7	1.0 \pm 0.0	2.8 \pm 1.9	3.1 \pm 1.5	0.222
0.001 m ²	2	11	2.0 \pm 0.0	4.6 \pm 1.8	4.9 \pm 2.0	0.132
0.01 m ²	3	14	8.0 \pm 4.2	8.5 \pm 2.4	8.5 \pm 2.8	0.965
0.1 m ²	6	26	16.5 \pm 0.7	17 \pm 4.7	15.5 \pm 4.6	0.662
1 m ²	13	48	31.0 \pm 2.8	27.5 \pm 8.1	26.8 \pm 6.5	0.695
10 m ²	27	62	52.5 \pm 6.4	42.2 \pm 7.6	43.6 \pm 9.1	0.321
100 m ²	47	108	108	71 \pm 8.2 ^(b)	72.1 \pm 13.7 ^(a)	0.040
Species richness vascular plants						
0.0001 m ²	0	7	0.0 \pm 0.0 ^b	2.5 \pm 1.8 ^a	2.6 \pm 1.3 ^a	0.052
0.001 m ²	0	11	0.5 \pm 0.7 ^b	4.0 \pm 1.8 ^a	4.3 \pm 1.8 ^a	0.023
0.01 m ²	3	13	4.5 \pm 2.1	7.7 \pm 2.5	7.3 \pm 2.4	0.240
0.1 m ²	6	21	10.5 \pm 0.7	14.3 \pm 3.6	13.9 \pm 4.2	0.468
1 m ²	13	42	22.5 \pm 3.5	24.4 \pm 7	24.5 \pm 6.3	0.910
10 m ²	26	56	37.0 \pm 7.1	37 \pm 5.6	40.3 \pm 8.8	0.508
100 m ²	42	86	80	63.4 \pm 9.6	67 \pm 12.7	0.465
Species richness bryophytes						
0.0001 m ²	0	3	1.0 \pm 0.0	0.3 \pm 0.5	0.4 \pm 0.7	0.409
0.001 m ²	0	3	1.5 \pm 0.7	0.6 \pm 0.5	0.6 \pm 0.8	0.236
0.01 m ²	0	5	3.5 \pm 2.1 ^a	0.8 \pm 0.4 ^b	1.2 \pm 1.1 ^b	0.006
0.1 m ²	0	6	5.5 \pm 0.7 ^a	2.7 \pm 1.9 ^b	1.5 \pm 1.3 ^b	< 0.001
1 m ²	0	8	7.5 \pm 0.7 ^a	3.1 \pm 2 ^b	2.0 \pm 1.6 ^b	< 0.001
10 m ²	0	14	11 \pm 4.2 ^a	5.2 \pm 3.7 ^b	3.0 \pm 1.9 ^b	< 0.001
100 m ²	1	17	17	7.6 \pm 5.7 ^(a)	4.5 \pm 2.4 ^(b)	0.005
Species richness lichens						
0.0001 m ²	0	0	0	0	0	-
0.001 m ²	0	0	0	0	0	-
0.01 m ²	0	1	0.0 \pm 0.0	0.0 \pm 0.0	0.03 \pm 0.2	0.826
0.1 m ²	0	1	0.5 \pm 0.7 ^a	0.0 \pm 0.0 ^b	0.1 \pm 0.3 ^b	0.042
1 m ²	0	2	1.0 \pm 1.4 ^a	0.0 \pm 0.0 ^b	0.2 \pm 0.5 ^b	0.027
10 m ²	0	8	4.5 \pm 4.9 ^a	0.0 \pm 0.0 ^b	0.2 \pm 0.6 ^b	< 0.001
100 m ²	0	11	11	0.0 \pm 0.0 ^(b)	0.5 \pm 0.8 ^(a)	< 0.001

Table 13. Distribution of rare and endangered vascular plant taxa in nine dry grassland associations in Central Podolia (for association codes, see Section 4.1). Status of red-listed species: RBU – Red Data Book of Ukraine (DIDUKH et al. 2009), RLVP – Red Data Book of the Vinnytsia province (ANDRIENKO & PEREGRYM 2012); category: u = presumably threatened, v = vulnerable. For each taxon, percentage constancies for all relevés (= Total) and per association are given.

Tabelle 13. Verteilung seltener und gefährdeter Gefäßpflanzen auf die neun unterschiedenen Trockenrasen-Gesellschaften in Zentral-Podolien. (Zahlencode der Gesellschaften vgl. Kapitel 4.1). Rote Liste Status: RBU – Rote Liste der Ukraine (DIDUKH et al. 2009), RLVP – Rote Liste der Region Winnyzja (ANDRIENKO & PEREGRYM 2012); Kategorie: u = Gefährdung anzunehmen, v = gefährdet. Für jede Art wird die Stetigkeit (in %) innerhalb der Gesellschaft und bezogen auf alle Vegetationsaufnahmen (= Total, %) angegeben.

Taxon	Status	Total	1.1.1	1.2.1	1.3.1	2.1.1	2.1.2	2.1.3	2.2.1	2.2.2	2.2.3
<i>Adonis vernalis</i>	RBU/u	23.5	–	–	–	27	–	5	7	21	55
<i>Allium podolicum</i>	RLVP	3.5	–	50	–	9	13	–	–	–	–
<i>Anchusa ochroleuca</i>	RLVP	0.4	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	–	–
<i>Anemone sylvestris</i>	RLVP	6.6	–	–	–	18	–	21	2	–	12
<i>Aster amellus</i>	RLVP	18.6	–	–	–	27	7	16	3	–	49
<i>Carex humilis</i>	RLVP	23.9	–	–	–	–	–	5	7	16	64
<i>Chamaecytisus albus</i>	RBU/v	0.4	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	–	–
<i>Chamaecytisus podolicus</i>	RBU/v	1.8	–	–	–	–	7	–	5	–	–
<i>Clematis integrifolia</i>	RLVP	1.3	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	3	3
<i>Gentiana cruciata</i> subsp. <i>cruciata</i>	RLVP	0.4	–	–	–	–	–	5	–	–	–
<i>Iris aphylla</i>	RLVP	2.7	–	20	–	–	7	–	–	–	5
<i>Iris pumila</i> subsp. <i>pumila</i>	RLVP	1.3	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	–	3
<i>Linum tenuifolium</i>	RLVP	16.8	20	–	–	–	–	–	7	29	33
<i>Muscari tenuiflorum</i>	RLVP	11.5	–	20	–	–	7	–	14	3	21
<i>Phlomis tuberosa</i>	RLVP	3.5	–	10	–	27	13	–	–	3	2
<i>Polygala sibirica</i>	RLVP	22.6	40	–	–	–	–	11	14	53	28
<i>Potentilla alba</i>	RLVP	0.9	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	3	–
<i>Prunus fruticosa</i>	RLVP	3.1	–	10	–	36	–	–	3	–	–
<i>Prunus tenella</i>	RLVP	0.9	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	3
<i>Pulsatilla pratensis</i>	RBU/u	8.8	–	10	–	–	20	16	–	–	19
<i>Pulsatilla vulgaris</i> subsp. <i>grandis</i>	RBU/v	0.4	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	2
<i>Salvia aethiopsis</i>	RLVP	0.9	–	–	–	–	–	5	–	3	–
<i>Stipa capillata</i>	RBU/u	38.5	20	–	–	9	–	11	34	68	55
<i>Stipa joannis</i> subsp. <i>joannis</i>	RBU/v	0.4	–	–	–	–	7	–	–	–	–
<i>Stipa pulcherrima</i>	RBU/v	4.0	20	–	–	–	–	–	3	13	2
<i>Vinca herbacea</i>	RLVP	23.9	–	–	–	9	–	–	12	18	58
<i>Viola rupestris</i> subsp. <i>rupestris</i>	RLVP	2.2	–	–	–	–	–	5	3	–	3
<i>Xeranthemum annuum</i>	RLVP	5.8	–	–	–	–	–	5	7	21	–
Mean number of red-listed taxa on 10 m ²			1.0	1.2	0.0	1.6	0.8	1.1	1.3	2.5	4.2

Taking into account our spatially restricted dataset, we decided to adopt formal association names only in two cases of wide-spread *Festucetalia valesiaca* communities, one of which was described as new for science. At the higher syntaxonomic levels, our data together with our literature review support the occurrence of six (or seven, if association 2.1.1 is considered as belonging to the *Cirsio-Brachypodion*) alliances from five different orders.

Most notably from the Ukrainian perspective and relevant for the unification of classification schemes at continental level, our data did not support the traditional Ukrainian-Russian concept of a mesoxeric order *Galietales veri* within the *Molinio-Arrhenatheretea*. Instead, the stands could be well placed within the mesoxeric orders of the *Koelerio-Corynephoretea* and *Festuco-Brometea*, i.e. *Trifolium arvensis-Festucetalia ovinae* and *Brachypodietalia pinnati*. This finding coincides with unpublished results of a TWINSpan analysis of an extensive dataset of all grassland types of the Forest-Steppe zone of Ukraine by the first author (see KUZEMKO 2011b). She found that the main division was between dry grasslands (*Festuco-Brometea* and *Koelerio-Corynephoretea*) on the one hand and other grasslands (*Molinio-Arrhenatheretea* and *Phragmito-Magno-Caricetea*) on the other. The two main alliances normally placed in the *Galietales veri* by Ukrainian and Russian authors (MIRKIN & NAUMOVA 1986, ERMAKOV 2012), *Agrostion vinealis* and “*Trifolium montani*”, in her TWINSpan analysis were neatly placed within the two subclusters of the dry grasslands, exactly corresponding to the *Koelerio-Corynephoretea* and *Festuco-Brometea* (KUZEMKO 2011b). It appears that the *Galietales veri* are not needed any longer, but their content can be distributed between the two dry grassland classes and to a lesser extent between *Molinio-Arrhenatheretea* and *Trifolium-Geranietea*. However, our analyses also confirmed that the prevailing Ukrainian types of mesoxeric grasslands are sufficiently different from their counterparts in eastern Central Europe to justify the establishment of vicariant alliances. These are namely the *Agrostion vinealis* corresponding to the *Armerion elongatae*, and the *Agrostion vinealis-Avenulion schellianae* (*Trifolium montani* auct.) corresponding to the *Cirsio-Brachypodion*. Regarding the xeric *Festuco-Brometea* units, we could clearly distinguish two alliances, *Festucion valesiaca* and *Stipion lessingiana*, the latter being new to Ukraine compared to the overview of SOLOMAKHA (1996).

Finally, several other questions remain open and need to be addressed by a supra-national synthesis because our dataset was too limited in number and geographic extent: (a) Do some of our *Festucetalia valesiaca* relevés (from assoc. 2.2.2) rather belong to the *Stipo pulcherrimae-Festucetalia pallentis*? (b) Do some of our *Brachypodietalia pinnati* relevés (from assoc. 2.1.1) rather belong to the *Cirsio-Brachypodion*? (c) Do the basiphilous and acidophilous outcrop communities belong to the same alliances as those in Central Europe or does Ukraine have vicariant alliances?

6.2 Biodiversity

Compared to dry grasslands and steppes in other Palaearctic regions, the mean total richness values of 40.6 species on 10 m² in *Festuco-Brometea* communities are relatively low. For example, averages were lower in NE Germany (32.1; DENGLER 2004b) and Bulgaria (40.3; PEDASHENKO et al. 2013), but higher in Öland (48.2 on 9 m²; S. Löbel unpubl., see LÖBEL & DENGLER 2008), central Siberia (49.2; JANIŠOVÁ et al. 2013), Estonia (53.2 on 9 m²; S. Boch unpubl., see DENGLER & BOCH 2008) and Transylvania (60.5; DENGLER et al. 2012a). By contrast, the recorded mean richness of 46.4 species on 10 m² of *Koelerio-Corynephoretea* are higher than in most other European regions, such as NE Germany (20.8; DENGLER 2004b), Bulgaria (35.8; PEDASHENKO et al. 2013), Estonia (41.5 on 9 m²; S. Boch

unpubl., see DENGLER & BOCH 2008); only Öland had higher values (58.5 on 9 m²; S. Löbel unpubl., see LÖBEL & DENGLER 2008). The relatively low species densities in the Ukrainian *Festuco-Brometea* communities are counterintuitive because one should expect a higher regional species pool in a region where natural steppes were widespread until a few decades ago and this pool should cause also higher plot-scale richness. Likewise, also the unusually high diversity of the regionally rare *Koelerio-Corynephoretea* communities is unexpected.

Generally, the ranking of the different dry grassland types according to their richness in Central Podolia was quite unusual in comparison to other regions. Normally, *Brachypodietalia pinnati* plots are clearly richer than *Festucetalia valesicae* plots (e.g. DENGLER 2004b, BECKER & BRÄNDEL 2007, DENGLER et al. 2012a), while there was no appreciable difference in our case (see Table 4 in the supplement). This might partly be attributed to a species pool effect: in Central Podolia the stands of the xeric order were clearly more frequent than those of the mesoxeric order (164 vs. 45 relevés, with the sampling approximately proportional to frequency), while in Central Europe it is the other way round (e.g. DENGLER 2004b: 75 vs. 198 plots). Further, the more extreme summer droughts might exclude several mesophilic species that augment the species composition in *Brachypodietalia pinnati* stands in more oceanic regions of Europe. Also the usually higher richness in stands of the subclass *Sedo-Scleranthenea* (outcrop communities) vs. those of the subclass *Koelerio-Corynephorenea* (communities on deep sands) (e.g. DENGLER & BOCH 2008, LÖBEL & DENGLER 2008) did not occur in the study region, but this comparison might be biased by the fact that we had only two somewhat transitional relevés of the latter unit.

6.3 Ecology

According to our DCA, the main floristic gradient was strongly related to soil reaction. Because the pH range was short in our study (2.9 pH units, but 89% of plots within one pH unit), we had not expect this result. Typically, ordination analyses of dry grassland vegetation find soil reaction to define the main floristic gradient when the pH ranges are large (e.g. PEDASHENKO et al. 2013). For pH ranges similar to our case, other variables are usually more important for community composition, often those related to water supply (BECKER et al. 2011, 2012, DENGLER et al. 2012a). The fact that soil reaction in the study region was the strongest driver of community differentiation, despite the relatively small pH differences, could have two main explanations, both of which are at least partly true in our case. (1) Other ecological drivers, such as soil texture, land use and climate were even more homogenous among the plots. (2) The first axis of the DCA is not just a pH gradient, but evidently soil moisture and pH coincide, i.e. the mesoxeric sites are slightly but systematically less base-rich.

6.4 Conservation

Remarkably, the two most frequent dry grassland communities, associations 2.2.2 and 2.2.3, had the highest concentration of red-listed species. This particularly refers to stands in the Dniester basin. However, most sites of the associations with highest participation of red-listed species are outside existing protected areas, specifically in Kryzhopol and Pischanka districts. This demonstrates the need to optimize the network of protected areas in the territory of Central Podolia. Moreover, our finding might indicate that a sole focus on red-listed

vascular plants might ignore the value of the much rarer and supposedly regionally more threatened communities of the *Koelerio-Corynephoretea* as habitat for highly specialised organisms such as the many bryophyte and lichen species we only found there.

6.5 Conclusion and outlook

Our results are in many respects unexpected. Syntaxonomically, while we distinguished nine regionally well-defined communities at association rank, their placement into alliances and sometimes orders was not always clear due to “unusual” species combinations from a Central, Western and Northern European perspective. Diversity-wise, the recorded patterns were unusual and challenging for current explanations of diversity patterns in Palaeartic grassland communities. In many cases, we do not have good ideas how to explain this unusual behaviour. Rather, we feel that this riddle can only be solved when more such standardised biodiversity data together with comprehensive environmental data are sampled in grasslands from so far understudied regions. The EDGG Expeditions have proven to be a useful format to fill such knowledge gaps and thus have been and will be continued in the future (see VRAHNAKIS et al. 2013). With making the data of this and other EDGG expeditions available in public vegetation-plot databases, particularly the emerging European Vegetation Archive (EVA; <http://euroveg.org/eva-database>), other researchers are invited to use them for the development of large-scale consistent classification schemes and better understanding of small-scale species richness pattern.

Erweiterte deutsche Zusammenfassung

Einleitung – Halbnatürliche Grasländer gehören auf der Skalenebene unter 100 m² weltweit zu den artenreichsten bekannten Vegetationstypen (WILSON et al. 2012). Hierzu gehören insbesondere einige europäische Halbtrockenrasen, die alle eine enge Beziehung zur extensiven landwirtschaftlichen Nutzung aufweisen und damit anthropogenen Ursprungs sind. Es gibt dagegen wenig vergleichbare Daten zu den halbnatürlichen und natürlichen Graslandgesellschaften der europäischen Steppenregionen, etwa in der Ukraine. Die ukrainische Vegetationskunde stand lange in der Tradition der russischen Schule mit ihrem dominanzbasiertem Klassifikationssystem (ALEXANDROVA 1973). Seit etwa zwei Jahrzehnten werden aber zunehmend pflanzensoziologische Klassifikationen veröffentlicht. Ein transnationaler Datenvergleich mit Vegetationsaufnahmen aus anderen europäischen Ländern war bisher schwierig und soll daher mit dieser Studie unterstützt werden, um eine einheitliche Klassifikation der europäischen Trockenrasen zu ermöglichen. Die *European Dry Grassland Group* (EDDG) hat sich zum Ziel gesetzt, nach einer standardisierten Erfassungsmethode (DENGLER 2009) in bisher wenig untersuchten Gebieten Europas vergleichbares Datenmaterial zur Trockenrasenvegetation zu erheben und in eine konsistente supranationale Klassifikation einzubringen. Ziele der zweiten Forschungsexpedition der EDGG im Jahre 2010 nach Zentral-Podolien waren daher (1) die Abgrenzung der im Untersuchungsgebiet vorkommenden Trockenrasentypen und Ermittlung ihrer Kennarten mit statistischen Methoden; (2) die Einordnung dieser Einheiten in das europäische syntaxonomische System; (3) ein Grundverständnis der ökologischen Faktoren, welche zur Differenzierung dieser Einheiten führen; und (4) die Dokumentation der Diversitätsmuster von Gefäßpflanzen, Moosen und Flechten auf verschiedenen räumlichen Skalenebenen.

Untersuchungsgebiet – Unser Untersuchungsgebiet umfasst Zentral-Podolien, also das Hügeland zwischen den Stromtälern des Dnjestr und des südlichen Bug an der Grenze zu Moldawien (48,95°–48,10° N and 27,55°–29,35° O, Abb. 1). Das Klima ist subkontinental mit Jahresmitteltemperaturen von 7 bis 9 °C, einem Januarmittel von -4 bis -6 °C und Julimittel von +18 bis +20 °C sowie einem mittleren Jahresniederschlag zwischen 600 und 650 mm (LIPINSKY et al. 2003). Geologisch ist das Gebiet in den aus silikatischen Gesteinen aufgebauten ukrainischen Schild und das südliche Bug-

Becken geteilt. Letzteres ist in weiten Teilen mit Löss bedeckt, die nur stellenweise vom darunterliegenden Kalk- oder Sandstein durchbrochen werden. Entsprechend vielfältig sind die Böden. Es gibt sowohl basenarme Podsole wie auch fruchtbare Schwarzerden über basenreichen Löss. Die potentiell natürliche Vegetation Zentral-Podoliens stellen Hainbuchen-Eichenwälder und Eichenwälder sowie Halbtrocken- und Trockenrasen dar, die in Süd-Podolien von Eichenwäldern und Gras-Steppen abgelöst werden (BARBARYCH 1977).

Methoden –Die Erfassung der Daten zur Diversität von Pflanzenbeständen folgt einem standardisierten Design (DENGLER 2009). In der Ukraine wurden 21 „Biodiversitätsplots“ mit zwei Serien geschachtelter Flächen zwischen 0.0001 und 100 m² (*nested plots*) sowie weitere 184 normale Vegetationsaufnahmen mit einer Flächengröße von 10 m² aufgenommen, die das Spektrum der Trockenrasenvegetation im Untersuchungsgebiet widerspiegeln. Für alle Flächengrößen wurde die Präsenz der terrestrischen Gefäßpflanzen, Moose und Flechten erhoben. Für alle 10 m²-Flächen (226) wurden zudem die Vegetationsbedeckung geschätzt sowie Vegetationshöhe, Topographie, Bodenparameter und Landnutzung erfasst. Diese Vegetationsaufnahmen bildeten Grundlage der pflanzensoziologischen Klassifikation mittels TWINSpan und Ermittlung diagnostischer Arten basierend auf phi-Werten (CHYTRÝ et al. 2002). Zusätzlich wurde eine Ordination und indirekte Gradientenanalyse mittels DCA durchgeführt. Unterschiede der Vegetationseinheiten hinsichtlich abiotischen Standortfaktoren und Artenreichtum wurden durch Varianzanalysen (ANOVAs) statistisch geprüft.

Vegetation – Die Kombination von TWINSpan und Ermittlung diagnostischer Arten resultierte in neun Einheiten auf Assoziationsebene. Diese wurden dann höheren syntaxonomischen Einheiten im System der europäischen Trockenrasen zugeordnet (siehe syntaxonomische Übersicht in Kapitel 4.1). Eine der gefundenen Einheiten konnte einer zuvor beschriebenen Assoziation zugeordnet werden (*Teucrio pannonic-Stipetum capillatae* Didukh & Korotchenko 2000), eine weitere beschreiben wir neu (*Allio taurici-Dichanthietum ischaemi* ass. nova), während die restlichen aufgrund der unübersichtlichen syntaxonomischen Lage in der Ukraine vorläufig als ranglose Gesellschaften geführt und ihre Beziehungen zu in der Literatur beschriebenen Assoziationen diskutiert werden. Im Untersuchungsgebiet herrschen basiphile Trockenrasen der Klasse *Festuco-Brometea* vor, während Felsgrusfluren und Sandtrockenrasen der Klasse *Koelerio-Coryneporetea* auf wenige Sonderstandorte beschränkt sind. Unter den *Festuco-Brometea* wiederum sind die xerothermen kontinentalen Trockenrasen der Ordnung *Festucetalia valesiacae* häufiger und durch die Verbände *Festucion valesiacae* (2 Assoziationen) und *Stipion lessingianae* (1 Assoziation) vertreten. Die basiphilen Halbtrockenrasen der Ordnung *Brachypodietalia pinnati* sind mit dem Verband *Agrostio vinealis-Avenulion schellianae* und drei Gesellschaften vertreten. Die *Koelerio-Coryneporetea* kommen mit drei Gesellschaften aus verschiedenen Ordnungen zugeordnet werden können (Verbandszuordnung vorläufig): (1) Basiphile Felsgrusfluren (*Alyso alyssoidis-Sedetalia: Alyso alyssoidis-Sedion*), (2) azidophile Felsgrusfluren (*Sedo-Scleranthetalia: Veronico dillenii-Sedion albi*) und (3) mesophile Schafschwingel-Silikatmagerrasen (*Trifolio arvensis-Festucetalia ovinae: Agrostion vinealis*). Wir diskutieren die syntaxonomische Stellung der Ordnung *Galietalia veri*, die von ukrainischen Autoren normalerweise als mesophiles Grünland in die Klasse *Molinio-Arrhenatheretea* gestellt wird und schlussfolgern, dass die Gesellschaften bei einem supranationalen Vergleich eher zu den mesoxerischen Ordnungen der *Koelerio-Coryneporetea* und *Festuco-Brometea* gestellt werden sollten. Weitere syntaxonomische Fragen der Zuordnung ukrainischer Pflanzengesellschaften konnten aufgrund der noch geringen Aufnahmezahlen und des beschränkten Untersuchungsgebietes noch nicht geklärt werden und bedürfen weiterer Daten und einer supranationalen Auswertung.

Ökologie, Biodiversität und Naturschutz – Die standörtliche Differenzierung zwischen den Beständen der beiden Klassen *Festuco-Brometea* und *Koelerio-Coryneporetea* wird in Abbildung 2, Tabelle 10 und 11 zusammengefasst. Dabei fällt ein durchgehend hoher pH-Wert von ≥ 6 auch in den *Sedo-Scleranthetalia*- und *Trifolio-Festucetalia*-Gesellschaften auf silikatischen Böden auf. Die Auswertung der Biodiversitätsmuster der podolischen Trockenrasen ergab für Flächengrößen von 10 m² für die *Koelerio-Coryneporetea*-Gesellschaften im Mittel einen Artenreichtum von 46,4 Arten gegenüber

40,6 Arten in den *Festuco-Brometea*-Beständen. Unterschiede in der Artenzusammensetzung zeigen sich in der doppelt so hohen Anzahl von Moosen und sogar einem neunfach höherem Anteil an Flechten in den *Koelerio-Coryneporetea*-Gesellschaften, während die Unterschiede im Artenreichtum der Gefäßpflanzen nicht signifikant sind. Dies unterstreicht die Bedeutung der Flechten und Moose für die Artenvielfalt in Trockenrasengesellschaften. Die Ordnungen innerhalb der Klassen zeigten dagegen praktisch keine signifikanten Unterschiede im Artenreichtum. Bemerkenswert ist dennoch, dass die Gesellschaften der kontinentalen Trockenrasen (*Festucetalia valesiacae*) einen geringfügig höheren Artenreichtum aufweisen als die basiphilen Halbtrockenrasen (*Brachypodietalia pinnati*). Dies war in anderen Untersuchungen aus Mittel- und Osteuropa eher umgekehrt (BECKER et al. 2011). Auch wenn im Vergleich zu einer Trockenrasenstudie aus Rumänien (DENGLER et al. 2012) keine weltweiten Spitzenwerte im Artenreichtum der Trockenrasen in Podolien gefunden wurden, so ist doch der in allen Gesellschaften überdurchschnittlich hohe Artenreichtum von im Mittel 41 Arten auf 10 m² (Tab. 9) hervorzuheben, darunter zahlreiche seltene und gefährdete Arten (Tab. 13), die diese Vegetationstypen auch für den Arten- und Biotopschutz bedeutsam erscheinen lassen.

Schlussfolgerungen und Ausblick – Die Trockenrasengesellschaften Podoliens sind überdurchschnittlich artenreich und vielfältig, die Klärung ihrer syntaxonomische Stellung im gesamteuropäischen Kontext steht aber erst in den Anfängen und die Abgrenzung vieler Assoziationen ist noch unklar. Diese Wissenslücken sollten künftig durch eine verbesserte Datengrundlage und eine supranationale Auswertung der Daten geschlossen werden.

Acknowledgements

The research expedition was planned jointly by A.A.K. and O.H.Y. (selection of study sites, logistics) and J.D. (sampling scheme). All authors except C.D. and M.J. participated in the field sampling. Critical bryophytes and lichens were determined by C.D. and M.J., some lichens also by I.V.A., soil analyses were conducted by T.B. Cluster analyses and vegetation classification were carried out by A.A.K. and J.D., while T.B. conducted all other statistical analyses. J.D. was responsible for syntaxonomic and nomenclatural assessment with major support by A.A.K. and Y.P.D. The paper was mainly drafted by A.A.K. and J.D., with significant input by T.B. and Y.P.D., while U.B., Y.P.D., C.D., and M.J. contributed to the revision.

We thank the Förderkreis Angewandte Naturkunde (Biologie) (FAN(B)) and the European Dry Grassland Group (EDGG) for financial support of the expedition, IAVS for an EDGG Fellowship for A.A.K. in J.D.'s group in Hamburg. A.N. thanks the University of Mazandaran for support with a personal research grant. We thank Thomas Haberler, Yulia Kazmirova, Ina Cultasov and Igor Kuzemko for helping with logistics and plant determination during the expedition and the Department of Plant Ecology of the University of Göttingen for enabling us to carry out the soil analyses in its lab. Laura Sutcliffe improved the English of our contribution, her efforts kindly covered by a grant of the FlorSoz. Finally, we are particularly grateful to handling editor Eszter Ruprecht, Iva Apostolova and one anonymous reviewer who helped to improve the manuscript.

Supplements and Appendices

This article comprises five loose oversize supplements.

Zu diesem Artikel gehören fünf Loseblattbeilagen in Übergröße.

Supplement 1. Table 4. Abridged synoptic table of the dry grassland communities in Central Podolia (Ukraine).

Beilage 1. Tabelle 4. Gekürzte synoptische Tabelle der Trockenrasen-Gesellschaften von Zentral-Podolien (Ukraine).

Supplement 2. Table 5. Relevé table of the *Koelerio-Corynephoretea* communities (associations 1.1.1–1.3.1) in Central Podolia (Ukraine).

Beilage 2. Tabelle 5. Vegetationsaufnahmen der *Koelerio-Corynephoretea*-Gesellschaften (Assoziationen 1.1.1–1.3.1) in Zentral-Podolien (Ukraine).

Supplement 3. Table 6. Relevé table of the *Brachypodietalia pinnati* communities (associations 2.1.1–2.1.3) in Central Podolia (Ukraine).

Beilage 3. Tabelle 6. Vegetationsaufnahmen der *Brachypodietalia pinnati*-Gesellschaften (Assoziationen 2.1.1–2.1.3) in Zentral-Podolien (Ukraine).

Supplement 4. Table 7. Relevé table of the *Festucetalia valesiacae* communities, part A (associations 2.2.1–2.2.2) in Central Podolia (Ukraine).

Beilage 4. Tabelle 7. Vegetationsaufnahmen der *Festucetalia valesiacae*-Gesellschaften, Teil A (Assoziationen 2.2.1–2.2.2) in Zentral-Podolien (Ukraine).

Supplement 5. Table 8. Relevé table of the *Festucetalia valesiacae* communities, part B (association 2.2.3) in Central Podolia (Ukraine).

Beilage 5. Tabelle 8. Vegetationsaufnahmen der *Festucetalia valesiacae*-Gesellschaften, Teil B (Assoziation 2.2.3) in Zentral-Podolien (Ukraine).

Additional supporting information may be found in the online version of this article.

Zusätzliche unterstützende Information ist in der Online-Version dieses Artikels zu finden.

Appendix S1. Geographic origin of the relevés.

Anhang S1. Herkunftsnachweis der Aufnahmen.

Appendix S2. Nomenclatural assessment and revision of the syntaxa mentioned in Section 4.

Anhang S2. Nomenklatorische Bewertung und Revision der in Kapitel 4 erwähnten Syntaxa.

Appendix S3. Photo collection of the dry grassland types in Central Podolia.

Anhang S3. Fotoauswahl der Trockenrasentypen Zentral-Podoliens.

References

- ABDULOVA, O.S. (2002): Do syntaxonomii kserofitnoi trav'yanystoi roslynosti Zakhidnogo Lisostepu (Prydnistrovs'ke Podillya, Tovtrovyy kryazh, Kremenetsli hory) (On the syntaxonomy of xerophytic herbaceous vegetation of the Western Forest-Steppe (Near-Dnister Podillya, Tovtry reef, Kremenetski hills)) [in Ukrainian, with English summary]. – Ukr. Phytosociol. Collect., Ser. A, 1 (18): 124–144.
- ABDULOVA, O.S. & DIDUKH, Y.P. (1999): Luchno-stepova roslynist' erodovalykh skhylyv Prydnistrov'ya (natsional'nyy pryrodnyy park "Podilski Tovtry") v aspekti ii okhorony (Meadow-steppe vegetation of the eroded slopes in Prydnistrov'ya (National Natural Park "Podilski Tovtry") in the aspect of protection) [in Ukrainian, with English summary]. – Ukr. Phytosociol. Collect., Ser. A, 3 (14): 10–36.
- ALEKSANDROVA, V.D. (1973): Russian approaches to classification of vegetation. – In: WHITTAKER, R.H. (Ed.): Ordination and classification of communities. – Handbook of vegetation science 5: 493–427. Junk, The Hague.
- ANDRIENKO, T.L. & PEREGRYM, M.M. (2012): Ofitsiyni pereliky rehional'no ridkisykh roslyn administratyvnykh oblastey Ukrainy (dovidkove vydannya) (Official lists of regional rare plants of administrative territories of Ukraine (reference book)) [in Ukrainian, with English summary]. – Alterpress, Kyiv: 148 pp.

- BARABASH, M.B., TATARCHUK, O.G. & KORZ, T.B. (2003): Atmosferni opady. Kilkist opadiv // Klimat Ukrainy (Atmospheric precipitation. Amount of precipitations) [in Ukrainian]. – Wyd. Rajevskiy, Kyiv: 174–182.
- BARBARYCH, A.I. (Ed.) (1977): Geobotanichne rayonuvannia URSR (Geobotanical zonation of the USSR) [in Ukrainian]. – Naukova Dumka, Kyiv: 304 pp.
- BECKER, T. & BRÄNDEL, M. (2007): Vegetation-environment relationships in a heavy metal-dry grassland complex. – *Folia Geobot.* 42: 11–28.
- BECKER, T., ANDRES, C. & DIERSCHKE, H. (2011): Junge und alte Steppenrasen im NSG „Badraer Lehde–Großer Eller“ im Kyffhäusergebirge. – *Tuexenia* 31: 173–210.
- BECKER, T., SCHMIEGE, C., BERGMIEIER, E., DENGLER, J., NOWAK, B. (2012): Nutrient-poor grasslands on siliceous soil in the lower Aar valley (Middle Hesse, Germany) – neglected vegetation types in the intersection range of four classes. – *Tuexenia* 32: 281–318.
- BERG, C. & DENGLER, J. (2005): Moose und Flechten als diagnostische Arten von Pflanzengesellschaften – eine Übersicht aus Mecklenburg-Vorpommern. – *Herzogia* 18: 145–161.
- BERG, C., DENGLER, J., ABDANK, A. & ISERMANN, M. (Eds.) (2004): Die Pflanzengesellschaften Mecklenburg-Vorpommerns und ihre Gefährdung – Textband. – Weissdorn, Jena: 606 pp.
- BILYK, G.I. (1973): Roslynnist' URSR. Stepy, kamianysti vidslonennya, pisky (Vegetation of the USSR. Steppe, rocky outcrops, sands) [in Ukrainian]. – Naukova Dumka, Kyiv: 428 pp.
- BLOM, H.H. (1996): A revision of the *Schistidium apocarpum* complex in Norway and Sweden. – *Bryophytorum Bibl.* 49: 1–333.
- BOHN, U., GOLLUB, G., HETTWER, C., NEUHÄUSLOVÁ, Z., RAUS, T., SCHLÜTER, H., WEBER, H. & HENNEKENS, S. (Eds.) (2004): Map of the natural vegetation of Europe. Scale 1 : 2 500 000. Interactive CD-ROM: explanatory text, legend, maps. – Bundesamt für Naturschutz, Bonn: CD-ROM + 19 pp.
- BRAUN-BLANQUET, J. (1964): Pflanzensoziologie – Grundzüge der Vegetationskunde. 3rd ed. – Springer, Wien: XIV + 865 pp.
- BURKOVSKY, O. & TARASOVA, O. (2011): Destruction of last Ukrainian grasslands through afforestation. – In: KUZEMKO, A. (Ed.): 8th European Dry Grassland Meeting (13–17 June 2011, Uman', Ukraine). Abstracts & excursion guides: 10–10. Vizavi, Uman'.
- BURKOVSKY, O.P., VASYLIUK, O.V., YENA, A.V., KUZEMKO, A.A., MOVCHAN, Y.I., MOYSIENKO, I.I., SIRENKO, I.P. (2013): Ostanni stepy Ukrainy: buty chy ne buty (Last steppes of Ukraine: to be or not to be) [in Ukrainian]. – Geoprynt, Kyiv: 38 pp.
- CHYTRÝ, M. (Ed.) (2007): Vegetace České republiky 1. Travinná a keříčková vegetace (Vegetation of the Czech Republic 1. Grassland and heathland vegetation) [in Czech, with English summaries]. – Academia, Praha: 526 pp.
- CHYTRÝ, M., TICHÝ, L., HOLT, J. & BOTTA-DUKÁT, Z. (2002): Determination of diagnostic species with statistical fidelity measures. – *J. Veg. Sci.* 13: 79–90.
- CULBERSON, C.F. & AMMANN, K. (1979): Standardmethode zur Dünnschichtchromatographie von Flechtensubstanzen. – *Herzogia* 5: 1–24.
- DENGLER, J. (1994): Flora und Vegetation von Trockenrasen und verwandten Gesellschaften im Biosphärenreservat Schorfheide-Chorin. – *Gleditschia* 22: 179–321.
- DENGLER, J. (2003): Entwicklung und Bewertung neuer Ansätze in der Pflanzensoziologie unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Vegetationsklassifikation. – *Arch. Naturwiss. Diss.* 14: 1–297.
- DENGLER, J. (2004a): Klasse: *Koelerio-Corynepheretea* Klika in Klika & V. Novák 1941 – Sandtrockenrasen und Felsgrusfluren von der submeridionalen bis zur borealen Zone. – In: BERG C., DENGLER J., ABDANK A. & ISERMANN M. (Eds.): Die Pflanzengesellschaften Mecklenburg-Vorpommerns und ihre Gefährdung – Textband: 301–326. Weissdorn, Jena.
- DENGLER, J. (2004b): Phytodiversitätsmuster in nordostdeutschen Trockenrasen. – *Kiel. Not. Pflanzenkd. Schlesw.-Holst. Hamb.* 32: 14–19.
- DENGLER, J. (2005): Zwischen Estland und Portugal – Gemeinsamkeiten und Unterschiede der Phytodiversitätsmuster europäischer Trockenrasen. – *Tuexenia* 25: 387–405.
- DENGLER, J. (2008): Pitfalls in small-scale species-area sampling and analysis. – *Folia Geobot.* 43: 269–287.
- DENGLER, J. (2009): A flexible multi-scale approach for standardised recording of plant species richness patterns. – *Ecol. Indic.* 9: 1169–1178.

- DENGLER, J. & BOCH, S. (2008): Sampling-design effects on properties of species-area curves – A case study from Estonian dry grassland communities. – *Folia Geobot.* 43: 289–304.
- DENGLER, J., CHYTRÝ, M. & EWALD, J. (2008): Phytosociology. – In: JØRGENSEN, S.E. & FATH, B.D. (Eds.): *Encyclopedia of ecology*: 2767–2779. Elsevier, Oxford.
- DENGLER, J., JANSEN, F., GLÖCKLER, F., PEET, R.K., DE CÁCERES, M., CHYTRÝ, M., EWALD, J., OLDELAND, J., FINCKH, M., LOPEZ-GONZALEZ, G., MUCINA, L., RODWELL, J.S., SCHAMINÉE, J.H.J. & SPENCER, N. (2011): The Global Index of Vegetation-Plot Databases (GIVD): a new resource for vegetation science. – *J. Veg. Sci.* 22: 582–597.
- DENGLER, J., BECKER, T., RUPRECHT, E., SZABÓ, A., BECKER, U., BELDEAN, M., BITA-NICOLAE, C., DOLNIK, C., GOIA, I., PEYRAT, J., SUTCLIFFE, L.M.E., TURTUREANU, P.D. & UĞURLU, E. (2012a): *Festuco-Brometea* communities of the Transylvanian Plateau (Romania) – a preliminary overview on syntaxonomy, ecology, and biodiversity. – *Tuexenia* 32: 319–359 + 2 tables.
- DENGLER, J., TODOROVA, S., BECKER, T., BOCH, S., CHYTRÝ, M., DIEKMANN, M., DOLNIK, C., DUPRÉ, C., GIUSSO DEL GALDO, G.P., GUARINO, R., JESCHKE, M., KIEHL, K., KUZEMKO, A., LÖBEL, S., OTÝPKOVÁ, Z., PEDASHENKO, H., PEET, R.K., RUPRECHT, E., SZABÓ, A. & VASSILEV, K. (2012b): Database Species-Area Relationships in Palaeartic Grasslands. – *Biodivers. Ecol.* 4: 321–322.
- DENGLER, J., JANIŠOVÁ, M., TÖRÖK, P. & WELLSTEIN, C. (2014): Biodiversity of Palaeartic grasslands: a synthesis. – *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 182: 1–14.
- DENISOVA, A.V., MUKHAMETSHYNA V.S. & MUST N.M. (1986): Kratkaya kharakteristika osnovnykh asociacij pojmennykh lugov Bashkirii klassa *Molinio-Arrhenatheretea* (Brief characteristics of the major associations of floodplain meadows of Bashkortostan of the *Molinio-Arrhenatheretea* class) [in Russian]. – In: *Syntaxonomy and dynamics of anthropogenic vegetation: Interuniversity scientific collection*: 27–40. Publisher Bashkirian University, Ufa.
- DIDUKH, Y.P. (2007): Chto takoe Lesostep'? (What is a Forest-steppe?) [in Russian]. – In: SOZINOV A.A. (Ed.): *Botany and mycology: modern horizons*: 40–53. Akademiya, Kiev.
- DIDUKH, Y.P. (Ed.) (2009): Chervona knyha Ukrainy. Roslynniy svit (Red Data Book of Ukraine. Plant kingdom) [in Ukrainian]. – Kiev, Globalkonsalting: 900 pp.
- DIDUKH, Y.P. (2011): The ecological scales for the species of Ukrainian flora and their use in synphytoindication. – *Phytosociocentre*, Kyiv: 176 pp.
- DIDUKH, Y.P. & KONTAR, I.S. (1999): Syntaksonomiya roslynosti vidslonen' krystalichnykh porid lisovoi zony Ukrainy. I. Klasy *Asplenieta trichomanes* ta *Sedo-Scleranthetea* (Syntaxonomy of granite outcrops vegetation in Forest zone of Ukraine. I. *Asplenieta trichomanes* and *Sedo-Scleranthetea* classes) [in Ukrainian, with English summary]. — *Ukr. Phytosociol. Collect., Ser. A*, 2 (11): 42–61.
- DIDUKH, Y.P. & KOROTCHENKO, I.A. (1996): Stepova roslynist' pivdennoi chastyny Livoberezhnogo Lisostepu Ukrainy. I. Klasy *Festucetea vaginatae* ta *Helianthemo-Thymetea* (Steppe vegetation of the south part of Left-Bank Forest-Steppe of Ukraine. I. *Festucetea vaginatae* and *Helianthemo-Thymetea* classes) [in Ukrainian, with English summary]. – *Ukr. Phytosociol. Collect., Ser. A*, 2: 56–63.
- DIDUKH, Y.P. & KOROTCHENKO, I.A. (2000): Klasyfikatsia stepovoi roslynosti Pokuttia (Classification of the Pokuttia steppe vegetation) [in Ukrainian, with English summary]. – *Ukr. Phytosociol. Collect., Ser. A*, 16: 3–15.
- DIDUKH, Y.P. & SHEL'YAG-SOSONKO, Y.R. (2003): Geobotanichne rayonuvannia Ukrainy ta sumizhnykh terytoriy (Geobotanic zoning of Ukraine and adjacent areas) [in Ukrainian, with English summary]. – *Ukr. Bot. J.* 60 (1): 6–17.
- DIDUKH, Y., BURDA, R., ZIMAN, S., KOROTCHENKO, I., FEDORONCHUK, M. & FITSALO, T. (2004): Ecoflora of Ukraine. – Volume 2: *Aristolochiaceae, Nymphaeaceae, Ceratophyllaceae, Ranunculaceae, Berberidaceae, Papaveraceae, Hypecoaceae, Fumariaceae, Ulmaceae, Moraceae, Cannabaceae, Urticaceae, Fagaceae, Betulaceae, Corylaceae* [in Ukrainian, with English summary]. – *Phytosociocentre*, Kyiv: 480 pp.
- DIDUKH, Y., KOROTCHENKO, I., FITSALO, T., BURDA, R., MOYSIENKO, I., PASHKEVICH, N., IAKUSHENKO, D. & SHEVERA, M. (2010): Ecoflora of Ukraine. — Volume 6: *Limoniaceae, Paeoniaceae, Clusiaceae, Elatinaceae, Violaceae, Cistaceae, Cucurbitaceae, Primulaceae, Thymelaeaceae, Tiliaceae, Malvaceae, Ericaceae, Pyrolaceae, Monotropaceae, Empetraceae* [in Ukrainian, with English summary]. – *Phytosociocentre*, Kyiv: 422 p.

- EHRENDORFER, F. (Ed.) (1973): Liste der Gefäßpflanzen Mitteleuropas. 2nd ed. – Fischer, Stuttgart: 318 pp.
- ELLENBERG, H., WEBER, H.E., DÜLL, R., WIRTH, V., WERNER, W. & PAULIBEN, D. (1991): Zeigerwerte von Pflanzen in Mitteleuropa. – Scr. Geobot. 18: 1–248.
- ERMAKOV, N. (2012): Prodnom vysshikh edinit rastitelnosti Rossii (The prodrome of the higher units of the Russia vegetation) [in Russian]. – In: MIRKIN, B.M. & NAUMOVA, L.G. (Eds.): Sovremennoe sostoyanie osnovnykh kontseptsii nauki o rastitelnosti (Modern state of the basic concepts of vegetation science): 377–483. Gilem, Ufa.
- EURO+MED (2014): Euro+Med PlantBase – the information resource for Euro-Mediterranean plant diversity. – URL: <http://ww2.bgbm.org/EuroPlusMed/> [accessed 2014-06-05].
- FIJALKOWSKI, D. (1964): Zbiorowiska kserotermiczne okolic Izbicy na Wyzynie Lubelskiej (Xerothermic communities in the environs of Izbica in the Lublin Upland) [in Polish, with English summary]. – Ann. Univ. Mariae Curie-Skłodowska Lublin, Sect. C, 12: 239–259.
- FREY, W., FRAHM, J.-P., FISCHER, E. & LOBIN, W. (1995): Die Moos- und Farnpflanzen Europas. 6th ed. – Kleine Kryptogamenflora 4: 426 pp. Fischer, Stuttgart.
- GONCHARENKO, I.V. (2003): Analiz roslynnoho pokryvu pivnichno-skhidnogo Lisostepu Ukrainy (The analysis of vegetation cover of the northeast Forest-Steppe of Ukraine) [in Ukrainian, with English summary]. – Ukr. Phytosociol. Collect., Ser. A, 1 (19): 1–203.
- GROLLE, R. & LONG, D.G. (2000): An annotated check-list of the *Hepaticae* and *Anthocerotae* of Europe and Macaronesia. – J. Bryol. 22: 103–140.
- HILL, M.O. (1979): TWINSPAN – A FORTRAN program for arranging multivariate data in an ordered two-way table by classification of the individuals and attributes. – Cornell University, Ithaca, NY: 90 pp.
- HILL, M.O., BELL, N., BRUGGEMAN-NANNENGA, M.A., BRUGUÉS, M., CANO, M.J., ENROTH, J., FLATBERG, K.K., FRAHM, J.-P., GALLEGÓ, M.T., GARILLETI, R., GUERRA, J., HENDENÄS, L., HOYOAK, D.T., HYVÖNEN, J., IGNATOV, M.S., LARA, F., MAZIMPAKA, V., MUÑOZ, J. & SÖDERSTRÖM, L. (2006): An annotated checklist of the mosses of Europe and Macaronesia. – J. Bryol. 28: 198–267.
- ILJINSKA, A., DIDUKH, Y., BURDA, R. & KOROTCHENKO, I. (2007): Ecoflora Ukrainy 5: *Brassicaceae*, *Capparaceae*, *Resedaceae* (Ecoflora of Ukraine 5: *Brassicaceae*, *Capparaceae*, *Resedaceae*) [in Ukrainian, with English summary]. – Phytosociocentre, Kyiv: 584 pp.
- JALAS, J. & SUOMINEN, J. (Eds.) (1994): Atlas Florae Europaeae – Distribution of vascular plants in Europe 10: *Cruciferae* (*Sisymbrium* to *Aubrieta*). – Committee for Mapping the Flora of Europe & Societas Biologica Fennica Vanamo, Helsinki: 224 pp.
- JALAS, J., SUOMINEN, J. & LAMPINEN, R. (Eds.) (1996): Atlas Florae Europaeae – Distribution of vascular plants in Europe 11: *Cruciferae* (*Ricotia* to *Raphanus*). – Committee for Mapping the Flora of Europe & Societas Biologica Fennica Vanamo, Helsinki: 310 pp.
- JALAS, J., SUOMINEN, J., LAMPINEN, R. & KURTTO, A. (Eds.) (1999): Atlas Florae Europaeae – Distribution of vascular plants in Europe 12: *Resedaceae* to *Platanaceae*. – Committee for Mapping the Flora of Europe & Societas Biologica Fennica Vanamo, Helsinki: 250 pp.
- JANIŠOVÁ M. (Ed.) (2007): Travnobylinná vegetácia Slovenska – elektronický expertný systém na identifikáciu syntaxónov (Grassland vegetation of Slovak Republic - electronic expert system for identification of syntaxa) [in Slovak, with English summaries]. – Botanický ústav SAV, Bratislava: 263 pp.
- JANIŠOVÁ, M., UHLIAROVÁ, E. & RUŽIČKOVÁ, H. (2010): Expert system-based classification of semi-natural grasslands in submontane and montane regions of central Slovakia. – Tuexenia 30: 375–422.
- JANIŠOVÁ, M., BECKER, T., BECKER, U., DEMINA, O., DEMBICZ, I., ERMAKOV, N., FILIBECK, G., FRANK, D., GUARINO, R., JAUNATRE, R., KOZUB, Ł., POLYAKOVA, M., SUZUKI, K. & DENGLER, J. (2013): Steppes of Southern Siberia – Experiences from the 6th EDGG Research Expedition to Khakassia, Russia (22 July – 1 August 2013). – Bull. Eur. Dry Grassl. Group 19/20: 31–48.
- JANSEN, F. & DENGLER, J. (2010): Plant names in vegetation databases – a neglected source of bias. – J. Veg. Sci. 21: 1179–1186.
- KLEPOV, Y.D. (1990): Analiz flory shyrokolistvennykh lesov Evropeyskoy chasti SSSR (Analysis of the flora of deciduous forests of the European part of the USSR) [in Russian]. – Naukova Dumka, Kiev: 352 pp.
- KLIMEŠ, L., DANČÁK, M., HÁJEK, M., JONGEPIEROVÁ, I. & KUČERA, T. (2001): Scale-dependent biases in species counts in a grassland. – J. Veg. Sci. 12: 699–704.

- KONTAR, I.S. (2000): Syntaksonomiya roslynnosti vidslonen' krystalichnykh porid Lisostepu Ukrainy. II. Klasy *Festuco-Brometea* ta *Sedo-Scleranthetea* (Syntaxonomy of vegetation of granite outcrops Forest-Steppe of Ukraine. II. Classes *Festuco-Brometea* and *Sedo-Scleranthetea*) [in Ukrainian, with English summary]. – Ukr. Phytosociol. Collect., Ser. A, 1 (16): 16–28.
- KOROTCHENKO, I.A. (2004): Stepova roslynnist' pivdennoi chastyny Natsional'nogo pryrodnoho parku "Podil'ski Tovtry" (Steppe vegetation of the southern part of the National Park "Podil'ski Tovtry" [in Ukrainian, with English summary]. — Sci. Bull. Chernivtsi Univ., Biology, 223: 197–221.
- KOROTCHENKO, I.A. & DIDUKH, Y.P. (1997): The steppe vegetation of the southern part of the Left-Bank Forest-Steppe of the Ukraine. II. Class *Festuco-Brometea* [in Ukrainian, with English summary]. – Ukr. Phytosociol. Collect. Ser. A 1 (6): 20–39.
- KOROTCHENKO, I.A., MALA, Y.I. & FITSAILO, T.V. (2009a): Syntaksonomia stepovoi roslynnosti kraynioi pivnochi Pravoberezhnogo stepu Ukrainy (Syntaxonomy of steppe vegetation of the extreme north of Steppe of Right-Bank Dnieper Region of Ukraine) [in Ukrainian, with English summary]. – Biol. Syst. (Chernivtsi) 1 (1): 73–84.
- KOROTCHENKO, I.A., MALA, Y.I. & FITSAILO, T.V. (2009b): Syntaksonomia stepovoi roslynnosti kraynioho pivdnia Pravoberezhnogo Lisostepu Ukrainy (Syntaxonomy of steppe vegetation of the extreme south of Right Bank Dnieper Forest-Steppe of Ukraine [in Ukrainian, with English summary]. – Sci. Proc. Nat. Univ. Kyiv-Mohyla Acad., Biodiv. Ecol. 93: 54–69.
- KOSTYLIOV, O.V., MOVCHAN, Y.I., OSYCHNIUK, V.V. & SOLOMAKHA, V.A. (1984): Osnovni asotsiatsii stepovoi roslynnosti zapovidnyka "Khomutovs'kyi Step" (The main associations of steppe vegetation of the "Khomutovska Steppe" Reserve) [in Ukrainian, with English summary]. – Ukr. Bot. J. 41 (6): 12–17.
- KOSTYLIOV, O.V., MOVCHAN, Y.I., OSYCHNIUK, V.V. & SOLOMAKHA, V.A. (1986): Klass *Festuco-Brometea*. Soobshchestva soyuza *Astragalo-Stipion* v Khomutovskoy stepi (*Festuco-Brometea* class. Communities of the *Astragalo-Stipion* alliance in the Khomutovsky Steppe) [in Russian]. – In: MIRKIN B.M. (Ed.): Classification of USSR vegetation using floristic criteria: 93–101. Moscow University Publishers, Moscow.
- KULL, K. & ZOBEL, M. (1991): High species richness in an Estonian wooded meadow. – J. Veg. Sci. 2: 711–714.
- KUKOVYTSIA, H.S., MOVCHAN, Y.I., SOLOMAKHA, V.A. & SHELYAG-SOSONKO, Y.R. (1994): Syntaksonomiya luchnykh stepiv Zakhidnogo Podillya (The meadow-steppe syntaxonomy of the Western Podillya) [in Ukrainian, with English summary]. – Ukr. Bot. J. 51 (2–3): 35–48.
- KURTTO, A., LAMPINEN, R. & JUNIKKA, L. (Eds.) (2004): Atlas Florae Europaeae – Distribution of vascular plants in Europe 13: *Rosaceae* (*Spiraea* to *Fragaria*, excl. *Rubus*). – Committee for Mapping the Flora of Europe & Societas Biologica Fennica Vanamo, Helsinki: 320 pp. + supplement.
- KURTTO, A., FRÖHNER, S.E. & LAMPINEN, R. (Eds.) (2007): Atlas Florae Europaeae – Distribution of vascular plants in Europe 14: *Rosaceae* (*Alchemilla* and *Aphanes*). – Committee for Mapping the Flora of Europe & Societas Biologica Fennica Vanamo, Helsinki: 200 pp.
- KURTTO, A., WEBER, H.E., LAMPINEN, R. & SENNIKOV, A.N. (Eds.) (2010): Atlas Florae Europaeae – Distribution of vascular plants in Europe 15: *Rosaceae* (*Rubus*). – Committee for Mapping the Flora of Europe & Societas Biologica Fennica Vanamo, Helsinki: 362 pp. + supplement.
- KUZEMKO, A.A. (2004): Stepova roslynnist' dolyny richky Ros' (Steppe Vegetation of the Ros' River valley) [in Ukrainian, with English summary]. – In: TKACHENKO, V.S., SHELYAG-SOSONKO, Y.R. & DIDUKH, Y.P. (Eds.): Steppe and halophytic ecosystems of Ukraine. Scientific papers on the 100-year anniversary of Doctor of Biology, Professor Gavril Ivanovich Bilyk: 197–217. Institute of Botany of NASU, Kyiv.
- KUZEMKO, A.A. (2009): Dry grasslands on sandy soils in the forest and forest-steppe zones of the plains part of Ukraine: present state of syntaxonomy. – Tuexenia 29: 369–390 + 1 table.
- KUZEMKO A.A. (2011a): Stepova ta luchna roslynnist' dolyny richky Hirs'kyi Tikych (Steppe and meadow vegetation of the Hirs'kyi Tikych River valley). – Visnyk Donets'kogo Natsionalnogo Univ., Ser. A, 1: 141–150.
- KUZEMKO, A. (2011b): Dry grassland of the Forest and Forest-Steppe zones of Ukraine: where are the borders of classes? – Oral presentation at the 8th European Dry Grassland Meeting, Uman'. URL: <http://www.botanik.uni-greifswald.de/fileadmin/EDGG/2011/downloads/contributions/presentations/Kuzemko.pdf>.
- KUZEMKO, A. (2012): Ukrainian Grasslands Database. – Biodivers. Ecol. 4: 430–430.

- KYRYLCHUK, A. (2013): Peculiarities of Rendzic Leptosols distribution in Western region of Ukraine. – *Geografija* 49: 105–113.
- LAVRENKO, Y.M. (1980): Evropeiskie lugovye stepi i ostepnnyye luga (European meadow steppe and steppe meadow) [in Russian]. – In: GRIBOVA, S.A., ISACHENKO, T.I. & LAVRENKO, E.M. (Eds.): *Vegetation of European part of the USSR*: 220–231. Nauka, Leningrad.
- LIPINSKY, V.M., DIACHUK, V.A. & BABICHENKO, V.M. (Eds.) (2003): *Klimat Ukrainy (Climate of Ukraine)* [in Ukrainian]. – Vyd-vo Rayevs'kogo, Kyiv: 343 pp.
- LÖBEL, S. & DENGLER, J. (2008) [“2007”]: Dry grassland communities on southern Öland: phytosociology, ecology, and diversity. – *Acta Phytogeogr. Suec.* 88: 13–31.
- LÖBEL, S., DENGLER, J. & HOBHOM, C. (2006): Species richness of vascular plants, bryophytes and lichens in dry grasslands: The effects of environment, landscape structure and competition. – *Folia Geobot.* 41: 377–393.
- LUTHER-MOSEBACH, J., DENGLER, J., SCHMIEDEL, U., RÖWER, I. U., LABITZKY, T. & GRÖNGRÖFT, A. (2012): A first formal classification of Hardeveld vegetation in Namaqualand, South Africa. – *Appl. Veg. Sci.* 15: 401–431.
- LYSENKO, H.M. (2007): Sravnitel'naya fitoindikatsionnaya otsenka lesnykh i lugovo-stepnykh ecotopov Kazatskogo uchastka Tsentral'no-Chernozemnogo zapovednika (Comparative phytoindication estimate of forest and steppe ecotopes of Kazatskiy site of Central-Black-soil reserve) [in Russian]. – J. V.N. Karazin Kharkov Natl. Univ. Ser., Biol. 5: 99–105.
- MALYNOVSKY, K.A. (Ed.) (1991): *Prodromus rastitelnosti Ukrainy (Prodrome of the vegetation of Ukraine)* [in Russian]. – Naukova Dumka, Kiev: 272 pp.
- MARINICH, A.M., PASHCHENKO, V.M. & SHYSHCHENKO, P.G. (1985): *Priroda Ukrainy SSR. Landshafty i fiziko-geograficheskoe rayonirovanie (Nature of Ukrainian SSR. Landscapes and physiographic zonation)* [in Russian]. – Naukova Dumka, Kiev: 224 pp.
- MCCUNE, B. & MEFFORD, M.J. (1999): *Handbook–PC-ORD Multivariate analysis of ecological data.* – MjM Software Design, Gleneden Beach.
- MERUNKOVÁ, K., PREISLEROVÁ, Z. & CHYTRÝ, M. (2012): White Carpathian grasslands: can local ecological factors explain their extraordinary species richness? – *Preslia* 84: 311–325.
- MEUSEL, H. & JÄGER, E.J. (Eds.) (1992): *Chorologie der zentraleuropäischen Flora – Band III – Karten, Literatur, Register.* – Fischer, Jena: pp. I–IX + 422–688 + 1 map.
- MINISTRY OF ECOLOGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES OF UKRAINE (2011): *Information on Nature Protection Fund as at 01.11.2011* [in Ukrainian]. – URL: <http://www.menr.gov.ua>.
- MIRKIN, B.M. & NAUMOVA, L.G. (1986): On the highest units of syntaxonomy of plain glycophytous meadows of the European part of the USSR [in Russian, with English summary]. – *Bull. Mosk. Ova. Ispyt. Prir.* 91: 93–104.
- MORAVEC, J. (1967): Zu den azidophilen Trockenrasengesellschaften Südwestböhmens und Bemerkungen zur Syntaxonomie der Klasse *Sedo-Scleranthetea*. – *Folia Geobot. Phytotaxon.* 2: 137–178.
- MOSSBERG, B. & STENBERG, L. (2003): *Den nya nordiska floran (The new Nordic flora)* [in Swedish]. – Wahlström & Widstrand, Stockholm: 928 pp.
- MOSYAKIN, S.L., FEDORONCHUK M.M. (1999): *Vascular plants of Ukraine. A nomenclatural checklist* — Publishing House of the NAS of Ukraine, Kiev: 346 p.
- MUCINA, L. & KOLBEK, J. (1993a): *Festuco-Brometea*. – In: MUCINA, L., GRABHERR, G. & ELLMAUER, T. (Eds.): *Die Pflanzengesellschaften Österreichs – Teil I: Anthropogene Vegetation*: 420–492. Fischer, Jena.
- MUCINA, L. & KOLBEK, J. (1993b): *Koelerio-Corynepheretea*. – In: MUCINA, L., GRABHERR, G. & ELLMAUER, T. (Eds.): *Die Pflanzengesellschaften Österreichs – Teil I: Anthropogene Vegetation*: 493–521. Fischer, Jena.
- NAUMOVA, L.G. (1986): Floristicheskaya klassifikatsiya poimennykh lugov zony zatopleniya Kuibyshevskoy GES (Floristic classification of bottomland meadows in the flooding zone of Kuibyshev Heps) [in Russian, with English summary]. – *Bull. Mosk. Obva. Ispyt. Prir.* 91: 75–83.
- OLSSON, P.A., MÄRTENSSON, L.-M. & BRUUN, H.H. (2009): Acidification of sandy grasslands – consequences for plant diversity. – *Appl. Veg. Sci.* 12: 350–361.
- ONYSCHENKO, V.A. (2001): Roslynnist' karbonatnykh vidslonen' pryrodnogo zapovidnyka “Medobory” (Calcareous rock vegetation of the Medobory zapovednik) [in Ukrainian, with English summary]. – *Ukr. Phytosociol. Collect. Ser. A* 1 (17): 86–104.

- OSYCHNIUK, V.V., KOSTYLIOV, O.V., MOVCHAN, Y.I. & SOLOMAKHA, V.A. (1984): Florystychna klasyfikatsia roslynnosti zapovidnyka "Khomutovs'ky Step" (Floristic classification of the vegetation of the "Khomutovsky Steppe" reserve [in Ukrainian, with English summary]. – Ukr. Bot. J. 41 (2): 11–16.
- PARNIKOZA, I.Y. & VASILUK O.V. (2010): The last Ukrainian steppes face the threat of afforestation. – Proceeding of the international conference on Eurasian steppes: Status threats and adaptation to climate change (9th to 12th of September 2010 in Hustai National Park, Mongolia): 79–81. IUCN, Mongolia.
- PAWLUS, M. (1985): Systematyka i rozmieszczenie gatunków grupy *Festuca ovina* L. w Polsce (Taxonomy and distribution of the *Festuca ovina* group in Poland) [in Polish, with English summary]. – Fragn. Florist. Geobot. 29: 219–295.
- PEDASHENKO, H., APOSTOLOVA, I., BOCH, S., GANEVA, A., JANIŠOVÁ, M., SOPOTLIEVA, D., TODOROVA, S., ŮNAL, A., VASSILEV, K., VELEV, N. & DENGLER, J. (2013): Dry grasslands of NW Bulgarian mountains: first insights into diversity, ecology and syntaxonomy. – Tuexenia 33: 309–346.
- POTT, R. (1995): The origin of grassland plant species and grassland communities in Central Europe. – Fitosociologia 29: 7–32.
- QUINN, G.P. & KEOUGH, M.J. (2002): Experimental design and data analysis for biologists. – Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 537 pp.
- RIABENKO, V.A. (1986) Ukrains'kyi schyt (Ukrainian shield) [in Russian]. – In: SHNIUKOV, E.F. (Ed.): Nature of Ukrainian SSR. Geology and mineral resources: 30–42. Naukova Dumka, Kiev.
- RODWELL, J.S., SCHAMINÉE, J.H.J., MUCINA, L., PIGNATTI, S., DRING, J. & MOSS, D. (2002): The diversity of European vegetation – An overview of phytosociological alliances and their relationships to EUNIS habitats. – Rapp. EC-LNV 2002(054): 168 pp. National Reference Centre for Agriculture, Nature and Fisheries, Wageningen.
- ROLEČEK, J., TICHÝ, L., ZELENÝ, D. & CHYTRÝ, M. (2009): Modified TWINSpan classification in which the hierarchy represents cluster heterogeneity. – J. Veg. Sci. 20: 596–602.
- ROYER, J.-M. (1991): Synthèse eurosibérienne, phytosociologique et phytogéographique de la classe des *Festuco-Brometea* (Eurosiberian synthesis, phytosociology and phytogeography of the class *Festuco-Brometea*) [in French]. – Diss. Bot. 178: 1–296 + 8 tables.
- SANTESSON, R., MOBERG, R., NORDIN, A., TØNSBERG, T. & VITIKAINEN, O. (2004): Lichen-forming and lichenicolous fungi of Fennoscandia. – Museum of Evolution, Uppsala: 359 pp.
- SCHAMINÉE, J.H.J., STORTELDER, A.H.F. & WEEDA, E.J. (Eds.) (1996): De Vegetatie van Nederland – Deel 3. Plantengemeenschappen van graslanden, zomen en droge heiden (The vegetation of the Netherlands - Part 3: Plant communities of grasslands, forest edges and dry heathlands) [in Dutch]. – Opulus, Uppsala: 360 pp.
- SCHLICHTING, E., BLUME, H.-P. & STAHR, K. (1995): Bodenkundliches Praktikum. – Pareys Studientexte 81: 295 pp. Blackwell Wissenschaftsverlag, Berlin.
- SHEVCHYK, V.L., SOLOMAKHA, V.A. & VOITYUK, Y.O. (1996): Syntaksonomiya roslynnosti ta spysok flory Kanivs'kogo pryrodnoho zapovidnyka (The syntaxonomy of vegetation and list of the flora of Kaniv Natural Reserve) [in Ukrainian, with English summary]. — Ukr. Phytosociol. Collect., Ser. B, 1: 1–120.
- SIPAYLOVA, L.M., MIRKIN, B.M., SHELYAG-SOSONKO, Y.R. & SOLOMAKHAM V.A. (1985): Novi soiuzy *Agrostion vinealis* ta *Festucion pratensis* luchnoi roslynnosti (New alliances *Agrostion vinealis* and *Festucion pratensis* of the meadow vegetation) [in Ukrainian, with English summary]. – Ukr. Bot. J., 42 (4): 13–18.
- ŠKODOVÁ, I., DEVÁNOVÁ, K. & SENKO, D. (2011): Subxerophilous and mesophilous grasslands of the Biele Karpaty Mts. (White Carpathian Mts.) in Slovakia. – Tuexenia 31: 235–269.
- SOLODKOVA, T.I., BAIROVA, L.S. & ZAYETS, T.C. (1986): Florystychna klasyfikatsia stepovoi roslynnosti Bukovynskogo Prydnistrovia (Floristic classification of the steppe vegetation of the Bukovinsky Transdnistria [in Ukrainian, with English summary]. – Ukr. Bot. J. 43 (1): 28–34.
- SOLOMAKHA, V.A. (1996): Syntaksonomiya roslynnosti Ukrainy (The syntaxonomy of vegetation of the Ukraine) [in Ukrainian, with English summary]. – Ukr. Phytosociol. Collection, Ser. B, 4: 119 pp., Phytosociocentre, Kyiv.
- SOLOMAKHA, V.A. (2008): Syntaksonomiya roslynnosti Ukrainy. Tretie nablyzhenia (The syntaxonomy of vegetation of the Ukraine. The third approximation) [in Ukrainian, with English summary]. – Phytosociocentre, Kyiv: 296 pp.

- SOPOTLIEVA, D. & APOSTOLOVA, I. (2014): Dry grassland vegetation in the transition zone between two biogeographic regions. *Hacquetia* 13: 79–120.
- STATE AGENCY OF LAND RESOURCES OF UKRAINE (2010): Land in Ukraine as of January 1, 2010 and the dynamics of its changes from 2006 to 2010. – URL: <http://land.gov.ua/terytorialni-orhanyderzhzemahenstva.html>.
- TICHÝ, L. (2002): JUICE, software for vegetation classification. – *J. Veg. Sci.* 13: 451–453.
- TICHÝ, L. & CHYTRÝ, M. (2006): Statistical determination of diagnostic species for site groups of unequal size. – *J. Veg. Sci.* 17: 809–818.
- TUTIN, T.G., HEYWOOD, V.H., BURGESS, N.A., MOORE, D.M., VALENTINE, D.H., WALTERS, S.M. & WEBB, D.A. (Eds.) (1968): *Flora Europaea – Volume 2: Rosaceae to Umbelliferae*. – Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: XXVII + 455 pp. + 5 maps.
- TUTIN, T.G., HEYWOOD, V.H., BURGESS, N.A., VALENTINE, D.H., WALTERS, S.M. & WEBB, D.A. (Eds.) (1972): *Flora Europaea – Volume 3: Diapensiaceae to Myoporaceae*. – Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: XXIX + 370 pp. + 5 maps.
- TUTIN, T.G., HEYWOOD, V.H., BURGESS, N.A., VALENTINE, D.H., WALTERS, S.M. & WEBB, D.A. (Eds.) (1976): *Flora Europaea – Volume 4: Plantaginaceae to Compositae (and Rubiaceae)*. – Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: XXIX + 505 pp. + 5 maps.
- TUTIN, T.G., HEYWOOD, V.H., BURGESS, N.A., VALENTINE, D.H., WALTERS, S.M. & WEBB, D.A. (Eds.) (1980): *Flora Europaea – Volume 5: Alismataceae to Orchidaceae (Monocotyledones)*. – Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: XXXVI + 452 pp. + 5 maps.
- TUTIN, T.G., BURGESS, N.A., CHATER, A.O., EDMONDSON, J.R., HEYWOOD, V.H., MOORE, D.M., VALENTINE, D.H., WALTERS, S.M. & WEBB, D.A. (Eds.) (1993): *Flora Europaea – Volume 1: Psilotaceae to Platanaceae*. 2nd ed. – Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: XLVI + 581 pp.
- TYKHONENKO, D.H. (Ed.) (2005): *Gruntoznavstvo. Pidruchnyk (Soil Science. Textbook)* [in Ukrainian]. – Kiev, Vyscha Shkola: 703 pp.
- VERNANDER, N.B., GOGOLEV, I.N., KOVALISHIN, D.I., NOVAKOVSKY, L.Y., SIRENKO, N.A. & TIUTUNNIK, D.A. (1986): *Priroda Ukrainy SSR. Pochvy (Nature of Ukrainian SSR. Soils)* [in Russian]. – Kiev, Naukova Dumka: 216 pp.
- VICHEREK, J. (1972): Die Sandpflanzengesellschaften des unteren und mittleren Dnjeprstromgebietes (die Ukraine). – *Folia Geobot. Phytotaxon.* 7: 9–46 + 4 tables.
- VRAHNAKIS, M., JANIŠOVÁ, M., RUSINA, S., TÖRÖK, P., VENN, S. & DENGLER, J. (2013): The European Dry Grassland Group (EDGG): stewarding Europe's most diverse habitat type. – In: BAUMBACH, H. & PFÜTZENREUTER, S. (Ed. office): *Steppenlebensräume Europas – Gefährdung, Erhaltungsmaßnahmen und Schutz*: 417–434. Tagungsband: Thüringer Ministerium für Landwirtschaft, Forsten, Umwelt und Naturschutz (TMLFUN) (Ed.), Erfurt.
- WALTER, H. & BRECKLE, S.-W. (1986): *Ökologie der Erde – Band 3: Spezielle Ökologie der Gemäßigten und Arktischen Zonen Euro-Nordasiens*. – Fischer, Stuttgart: 587 pp.
- WEBER, H.E., MORAVEC, J. & THEURILLAT, J.-P. (2000): *International Code of Phytosociological Nomenclature*. 3rd edition. – *J. Veg. Sci.* 11: 739–768.
- WESTHOFF, V. & VAN DER MAAREL, E. (1973): *The Braun-Blanquet-Approach*. – WHITTAKER, R.H. (Ed.): *Ordination and classification of communities*. – *Handbook of vegetation science* 5: 617–726. Junk, The Hague.
- WILLNER, W., SAUBERER, N., STAUDINGER, M. & SCHRATT-EHRENDORFER, L. (2013): *Syntaxonomic revision of Pannonian grasslands of Austria – Part I: Introduction and general overview*. – *Tuexenia* 33: 399–420.
- WILMANN, O. (1997): Zur Geschichte der mitteleuropäischen Trockenrasen seit dem Spätglazial – Methoden, Tatsachen, Hypothesen. – *Phytocoenologia* 27: 213–233.
- WILSON, J.B., PEET, R.K., DENGLER, J. & PÄRTEL, M. (2012): Plant species richness: the world records. – *J. Veg. Sci.* 23: 796–802.
- YAVORSKA, O.H. (Ed.) (2005): *Ekologichnyy stan Vinnytskoi oblasti na mezhi tysyacholit'. Analychno-statystychnyy dovidnyk (Ecological state in Vinnytsia region at the turn of the millennium. Analytical and statistical handbook)* [in Ukrainian]. – Veles, Vinnytsia: 162 pp.

Table 4. Abridged synoptic table of the dry grassland communities in the study region in Central Podolia (Ukraine)

Species are arranged according to decreasing phi-values in the respective species blocks (only those species that were significant according to Fisher's exact test are included) and according to decreasing overall constancy for the non-diagnostic species. Diagnostic species of associations with 10% constancy or less in that association as well as companion taxa with 10% or less overall constancy are not shown. Percentage constancies are given, with the superscript symbols represent the phi values (** > 0.50; * > 0.25; ° > 0.00), and means of the header data, based on association means. Diagnostic species are highlighted in dark grey, while transgressive diagnostic species and differential species are highlighted in light grey and additionally marked in the column left of the species names. The symbols in the first column indicate whether a diagnostic species in the context of the present study, from a larger scale perspective likely is indeed a character species of that unit (CC), of a superior unit (C) or only a differential species (D). In the column immediately left of the species names, the life forms are indicated: A = "alga"; B = bryophyte; G = graminoid; H = other herb (i.e. forb); L = lichen; W = woody plant.

Tabelle 4. Gekürzte Stetigkeitstabelle der analysierten Trockenrasengesellschaften Zentral-Podoliens (Ukraine)

Die Arten sind nach fallenden phi-Werten im jeweiligen Block angeordnet (wobei nur Arten mit statistisch signifikanter Häufung gemäß Fishers exaktem Test gelistet sind) bzw. nach fallender Gesamtstetigkeit im Fall der nicht diagnostischen Arten (Begleiter). Diagnostische Arten von Assoziationen mit einer Stetigkeit von ≤ 10 % sowie Begleiter mit einer Gesamtstetigkeit von ≤ 10 % sind nicht dargestellt. Die Zahlen im Artenteil der Tabelle stellen prozentuale Stetigkeitswerte dar, wobei die hochgestellten Symbole die phi-Werte repräsentieren (** > 0.50; * > 0.25; ° > 0.00), während die Zahlen im Kopfteil der Tabelle Mittelwerte basierend auf den Assoziationsmittelwerte sind. Diagnostische Arten sind in dunkelgrau hervorgehoben, transgressive diagnostische Arten und Differenzialarten dagegen in hellgrau, mit zusätzlicher Kennzeichnung in der Spalte links vom Artnamen. Die Symbole in der Spalte ganz links zeigen, ob eine Art aus überregionaler Perspektive vermutlich Charakterart der betreffenden Einheit (CC), Charakterart einer übergeordneten Einheit (C) oder nur eine Differenzialart (D) ist. In der Spalte unmittelbar links vom Artnamen ist die Lebensform angegeben: A = "Alge"; B = Moos; G = Graminoide; H = andere Krautige; L = Flechte; W = Gehölz.

Syntaxon	All	Cl.1	Cl.2	O.1.1	O.1.2	O.1.3	O.2.1	O.2.2	1.1.1	1.2.1	1.3.1	2.1.1	2.1.2	2.1.3	2.2.1	2.2.2	2.2.3			
Number of associations	3	6	1	1	1	1	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			
Number of relevés	17	209	5	10	2	45	164	5	10	2	11	15	19	59	38	67				
Inclination [°]	19	19	22	27	7	18	19	22	27	7	14	24	16	22	18	18				
Heat index	0.02	-0.10	-0.04	0.05	-0.24	-0.12	-0.16	0.07	0.05	-0.24	-0.12	-0.08	-0.21	-0.19	0.16	0.00	0.06			
Microrelief [cm]	7	17	6	29	17	4	5	7	29	17	4	6	4	4	6	8	6			
Total vegetation cover [%]	83	79	86	59	82	95	91	80	59	82	95	92	92	88	82	76	83			
Cover shrub layer [%]	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1			
Cover herb layer [%]	77	59	80	35	60	83	84	77	35	60	83	84	85	83	80	71	79			
Cover moss layer [%]	14	42	12	41	38	10	15	9	41	38	46	4	7	34	8	13	8			
Cover litter [%]	12	11	11	4	7	23	10	13	4	7	23	8	13	9	13	15	10			
Cover stones and rocks [%]	4	16	2	37	11	0	1	4	37	11	0	1	0	1	1	7	4			
Cover gravel [%]	3	1	3	1	2	0	1	4	1	2	0	1	0	2	5	4	4			
Cover fine earth [%]	7	3	7	2	6	3	5	8	2	6	3	4	6	7	8	7	7			
Species richness (total)	41.0	46.0	40.6	44.8	47.2	46.0	40.7	40.4	44.8	47.2	46.0	40.9	34.9	46.3	34.7	42.1	44.8			
Species richness (vascular plants)	37.1	37.3	37.2	36.2	32.2	43.5	37.3	37.0	36.2	32.2	43.5	38.1	31.1	42.8	32.1	37.3	41.8			
Species richness (bryophytes)	3.2	6.1	3.0	6.2	9.6	2.5	3.2	2.8	6.2	9.6	2.5	2.5	3.7	3.3	2.4	3.5	2.4			
Species richness (lichens)	0.6	2.5	0.3	2.2	5.3	0.0	0.1	0.5	2.2	5.3	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.9	0.4			
Class 1: Koelerio-Coryneporetea																				
C	B	Brachythecium albicans	7.1	63**	4	90**	100**	7	0	90**	100**	7	16				1			
C	H	Sedum acre	11.1	63**	4	100**	90**		9	100**	90**					24	3			
D	H	Artemisia absinthium	9.7	67**	8	60*	40°	100**	11	4	60*	40°	100**		13	21	7	3		
C	G	Poa bulbosa	5.3	47**	1	80**	60*		2		80**	60*					5			
C	H	Acinos arvensis	25.2	80**	20	100*	40	100*	13	28	100*	40	100*	27		11	20	47°	16	
D	H	Berteroa incana	8.4	53**	7	40°	70*	50°	13	2	40°	70*	50°	9	20	11	3		1	
C	B	Bryum caespiticium	12.4	57*	11	80*	40°	50°	13	9	80*	40°	50°	27°	7	5	5	11	10	
D	H	Lactuca serriola	5.3	40*	3	60*	10	50*	2	4	60*	10	50*		7		7	3	1	
C	B	Syntrichia ruralis agg.	16.8	53*	10	80*	80*		20		80*	80*					3	45°	10	
C	H	Hylotelephium maximum	5.3	37*	3	40*	70**		4	1	40*	70**			13			3		
C	H	Arenaria serpyllifolia	36.3	80*	32	80°	60°	100*	27	37	80°	60°	100*	45	13	21	31	47	34	
C	H	Potentilla argentea agg.	14.2	63*	20		90*	100*	36°	3		90*	100*	18	53°	37°	3	5		
C	H	Trifolium arvense	11.9	60*	17		80*	100**	34°	1		80*	100**	27	33°	42°	2			
D	B	Grimmia pulvinata	6.2	27*	3	40*	40*		6		40*	40*						13°	4	
Order 1.1: Alyso alyssoidis-Sedetalia & Assoc. 1.1.1: Ajuga chamaepitys subsp. chia-Sedum acre comm.																				
D	Cl.	H	Ballota nigra subsp. nigra	2.2	23*	1	60**	10°		2		60**	10°		7					
D	H	Lappula squarrosa	4.9	20*	3	60**			2	5	60**			7			3	8	3	
CC	H	Aurinia saxatilis subsp. saxatilis	0.9	13*		40**					40**									
D	G	Bromus tectorum	0.9	13*		40**					40**									
D	L	Xanthoria sp.	0.9	13*		40**					40**									
D	H	Polycnemum arvense	7.1	20°	6	60**			2	9	60**			7			5	18°	3	
D	B	Schistidium apocarpum agg.	7.1	23*	4	60**	10			9	60**	10					3	18°	4	
D	B	Bryum argenteum	5.3	23*	5	60**	10		5	4	60**	10		9	7		5	5	1	
CC	H	Ajuga chamaepitys subsp. chia	12.4	20°	8	60**			2	14°	60**			5			15°	13°	15°	
D	G	Poa compressa	18.6	33°	16	80**	20		14	18	80**	20		9		32°	19	21	15	
C	B	Mannia fragrans	0.4	7°		20*					20*									
C	H	Potentilla cf. inclinata	0.4	7°		20*					20*									
D	G	Silene latifolia subsp. alba	0.4	7°		20*					20*									
D	G	Verbascum densiflorum	0.4	7°		20*					20*									
D	H	Veronica cf. persica	0.4	7°		20*					20*									
C	H	Centaurea diffusa	18.1	20°	15	60*			5	25°	60*			9		5	15	42°	16	
D	W	Prunus armeniaca	0.9	7°	0	20*				1	20*						2			
D	H	Asplenium ruta-muraria subsp. ruta-muraria	0.9	7°	0	20*				1	20*							3°		
C	L	Toninia sedifolia	0.9	7°	0	20*				1	20*							3°		
D	H	Polygonum aviculare agg.	0.9	7°	1	20*			2		20*			7°						
D	Cl.	G	Eragrostis minor	0.9	10*		20*	10°			20*	10°								
D	Cl.	H	Geranium pusillum	0.9	10*		20*	10°			20*	10°								
Order 1.2: Sedo-Scleranthetalia & Assoc. 1.2.1: Allium podolicum-Sedum acre comm.																				
C	L	Cladonia furcata	3.1	23*		70**					70**									
CC	H	Hieracium echinoides	11.9	30*	8	90**			8	8	90**			13	11		7	5	12	
C	H	Sedum sexangulare	2.2	17*		50**					50**									
CC	H	Viola tricolor subsp. matutina	2.2	17*		50**					50**									
C	L	Cladonia fimbriata	1.8	13*		40**					40**									
C	L	Cladonia furcata	1.8	13*		40**					40**									
C	Cl.	L	Cladonia pyxidata agg.	4.9	27*	2	20°	60**		2	2	20°	60**			5		3	3	
CC	H	Allium podolicum	3.5	17°	4	50**			7		50**			9°	13°					
C	Cl.	B	Ceratodon purpureus	14.6	40**	9	40°	80**		5	14	40°	80**		9		5	5	21°	15
CC	H	Veronica spicata subsp. incana	6.6	17°	4		50**		4	4		50**			7	5		3	10°	
D	H	Asplenium trichomanes	1.3	10*		30**					30**									
D	L	Cladonia coniocraea	1.3	10*		30**					30**									
C	L	Cladonia glauca	1.3	10*		30**					30**									
C	L	Peltigera rufescens	1.3	10*		30**					30**									
D	B	Pleuroidium acuminatum	1.3	10*		30**					30**									
C	B	Polytrichum juniperinum	1.3	10*		30**					30**									
C	B	Polytrichum piliferum	1.3	10*		30**					30**									
C	H	Rumex acetosella	1.3	10*		30**					30**									
D	Cl.#	B	Hypnum cupressiforme var. lacunosum	3.5	23*	1	20°	50**		2	1	20°	50**			5	2			
D	H	Centaurea rhenana	15.9	23°	13	70**			13	12	70**			7	32°	19°	5	13		
C	H	Veronica verna	1.8	10°	1	30*			2		30*				5°					
D	H	Rumex thyrsoiflorus subsp. thyrsoiflorus	1.8	10°	1	30*			2		30*			7°						
D	Cl.	B	Bryum capillare agg.	15.0	37*	14	40°	70*		14	13	40°	70*		18	20	5	15	18	6
C	H																			

Syntaxon			All	Cl.1	Cl.2	O.1.1	O.1.2	O.1.3	O.2.1	O.2.2	1.1.1	1.2.1	1.3.1	2.1.1	2.1.2	2.1.3	2.2.1	2.2.2	2.2.3	
Number of associations			3	6	1	1	1		3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Number of relevés			17	209	5	10	2		45	164	5	10	2	11	15	19	59	38	67	
Cl. 2: Festuco-Brometea																				
C	H	Teucrium chamaedrys	75.7	13	72**	20	20	.	57°	86*	20	20	.	45	53°	74°	78°	89*	91*	
C	H	Chamaecytisus austriacus	33.2	.	33*	.	.	.	32°	33°	.	.	.	73*	13	11	27°	5	67*	
C	H	Scabiosa ochroleuca	38.9	7	39*	20	.	.	35°	42°	20	.	.	45°	7	53°	36°	39°	52°	
C	H	Jurinea ledebourii	29.2	.	26*	.	.	.	20°	31*	.	.	.	45*	.	16	20°	11	63*	
C	H	Pimpinella saxifraga subsp. nigra	20.8	.	25*	.	.	.	33*	18°	.	.	.	18°	33°	47*	17°	11	25°	
C	H	Thalictrum minus	23.5	.	23*	.	.	.	23°	24°	.	.	.	45*	13	11	25°	5	40°	
C	H	Galium ser. Octonaria	23.5	.	21*	.	.	.	14°	27*	.	.	.	27°	.	16°	27°	18°	36°	
C	H	Medicago sativa subsp. falcata	61.1	37	65*	60°	50	.	74*	56°	60°	50	.	55	93*	74°	51	42	76°	
D	H	Vincetoxicum hirundinaria	18.6	.	18*	.	.	.	13°	23°	.	.	.	27°	7	5	17°	26°	25°	
Order 2.1: Brachypodietalia pinnati																				
C	Cl.	H Plantago media subsp. media	36.3	.	49*	.	.	.	71**	27	.	.	.	91*	33°	89*	20	11	51°	
C	H	Ranunculus polyanthemos subsp. polyanthemos	19.0	.	27*	.	.	.	41*	13	.	.	.	18°	47*	58*	17	5	16	
D	G	Poa angustifolia	31.9	40	46°	40	30	50°	72*	20	40	30	50°	55°	87*	74°	31	13	15	
C	H	Seseli annuum subsp. annuum	10.6	.	20*	.	.	.	34*	7	.	.	.	55*	47*	.	8	5	6	
C	Cl.	H Agrimonia eupatoria subsp. grandis	43.4	23	51*	20	.	50°	61*	41	20	.	50°	64°	47°	74°	49°	39	36	
C	G	Koeleria macrantha	30.1	23	41°	20	50°	.	62*	19	20	50°	.	55°	73*	58°	20	11	27	
C	H	Campanula glomerata	8.8	.	13°	.	.	.	21*	5	.	.	.	18°	20°	26°	2	3	12°	
C	H	Galium verum subsp. verum	38.9	23	50*	70°	.	.	70*	30	70°	.	.	91*	87*	32	32	18	39	
C	H	Dianthus membranaceus	12.8	10	21°	30°	.	.	35*	6	30°	.	.	36°	53*	16	12	.	6	
C	G	Festuca rupicola subsp. rupicola	25.7	23	38°	20	50°	.	61*	15	20	50°	.	55°	87*	42°	17	11	16	
Assoc. 2.1.1: Linum hirsutum-Galium verum comm.																				
D	H	Origanum vulgare	4.9	.	13°	.	.	.	24*	2	.	.	.	73**	.	.	2	.	3	
C	Ord.	H Centaurea scabiosa	13.3	.	25*	.	.	.	41*	9	.	.	.	82**	27°	16	14	8	4	
C	H	Veronica austriaca subsp. austriaca	12.4	10	19°	20°	10	.	26°	11	20°	10	.	73**	13	.	10	16	7	
CC	H	Linum hirsutum subsp. hirsutum	15.5	.	17*	.	.	.	18°	16°	.	.	.	55*	.	.	14°	5	28°	
CC	Ord.	H Carlina vulgaris subsp. intermedia	11.9	.	17*	.	.	.	25*	9	.	.	.	55*	.	21°	7	3	18°	
D	W	Prunus fruticosa	3.1	3	7°	10°	.	.	12°	1	10°	.	.	36*	.	.	3	.	.	
C	Ord.	H Senecio jacobaea	16.4	17	25°	50°	.	.	39*	12	.	50°	.	73*	7	37°	12	8	15	
C	H	Stachys officinalis	3.5	.	6°	.	.	.	9°	3	.	.	.	27*	.	.	2	3	4°	
C	B	Microbryum davallianum	1.8	.	4°	.	.	.	6°	1	.	.	.	18*	.	.	2	.	1	
D	H	Hieracium umbellatum	1.8	.	4°	.	.	.	6°	1	.	.	.	18*	.	.	3°	.	.	
D	H	Odontites verna subsp. serotina	5.8	.	8°	.	.	.	11°	5	.	.	.	27*	.	5	3	5	7°	
C	H	Cuscuta epithymum subsp. epithymum	7.1	.	8°	.	.	.	9°	7°	.	.	.	27*	.	.	3	5	13°	
C	H	Viola hirta	1.3	.	4°	.	.	.	8°	18*	7°	
C	G	Brachypodium pinnatum subsp. pinnatum	3.1	.	4°	.	.	.	6°	3	.	.	.	18*	.	.	3°	.	4°	
CC	H	Phlomis tuberosa	3.5	3	7°	10°	.	.	14°	1	10°	.	.	27*	13°	.	.	3	1	
C	H	Stachys recta subsp. recta	33.2	27	36°	40°	40°	.	37°	35°	40°	40°	.	73*	27	11	17	50°	39°	
CC	H	Silene donetzica	19.0	7	20°	20°	.	.	19°	22°	20°	.	.	45*	.	11	19°	26°	21°	
Assoc. 2.1.2: Fissidens viridulus-Festuca rupicola comm.																				
C	B	Fissidens viridulus	2.2	.	6°	.	.	.	11*	33**	
C	H	Trifolium montanum	4.4	7	8°	20°	.	.	16°	0	20°	.	.	.	47**	.	.	.	1	
D	Ord.	H Falcaria vulgaris	8.0	.	12°	.	.	.	19*	5	.	.	.	9°	47**	.	10°	.	6	
C	Ord.	H Campanula bononiensis	5.8	3	14°	10	.	.	27*	0	10	.	.	27°	53**	.	.	.	1	
D	B	Barbula convoluta	1.3	.	3°	.	.	.	7°	20*	
C	B	Plagiomnium rostratum	1.3	.	3°	.	.	.	7°	20*	
C	H	Veronica spicata subsp. spicata	3.1	.	4°	.	.	.	7°	2	20*	.	.	.	6°	
D	G	Arrhenatherum elatius subsp. elatius	0.9	.	2°	.	.	.	4°	13*	
C	Cl.	H Eryngium campestre	46.9	20	50*	60°	.	.	60*	41°	60°	.	.	18	87*	74°	58°	24	42°	
D	B	Pleuridium subulatum	1.8	3	3	10°	.	.	7°	.	10°	.	.	.	20*	
D	H	Carex praecox	4.4	7°	6	20°	.	.	9°	2	20°	.	.	.	27*	.	7°	.	.	
D	H	Veronica chamaedrys	5.3	3	8°	10°	.	.	14°	2	10°	.	.	.	27*	16°	2	3	3	
D	B	Physcomitrium pyriforme	2.2	3	5°	10°	.	.	10°	.	10°	.	.	9°	20*	
C	H	Filipendula vulgaris	9.3	7	12°	20°	.	.	17°	7	20°	.	.	18°	33*	.	5	8	9	
D	H	Knautia arvensis	2.7	3	5°	10°	.	.	10°	1	10°	.	.	9°	20*	.	2	.	.	
D	B	Barbula unguiculata	2.7	.	4°	.	.	.	4°	3°	13*	.	5°	3°	.	
D	G	Bromus inermis	17.3	3	21°	10	.	.	26°	15°	10	.	.	27°	40*	11	24°	5	16°	
Assoc. 2.1.3: Homalothecium lutescens-Poa angustifolia comm.																				
D	G	Agrostis gigantea subsp. gigantea	4.0	.	7°	.	.	.	14*	1	42**	2	.	.	
D	Ord.	H Trifolium pratense	10.2	3	18°	10	.	.	33*	3	10	.	.	9	20°	68**	7	3	.	
D	G	Lolium perenne	3.5	.	6°	.	.	.	12*	1	37**	.	2	.	.	
D	Ord.	H Centaurea jacea agg.	12.4	.	18*	.	.	.	29*	7	.	.	.	18°	7	63**	10	3	9	
C	Ord.	H Polygala comosa	4.4	.	8°	.	.	.	15*	1	.	.	.	9°	.	37*	2	.	1	
D	H	Daucus carota subsp. carota	17.3	23°	22	20	50°	.	34°	10	20	50°	.	9	13	79*	15	3	13	
C	Ord.	H Leontodon hispidus subsp. hispidus	16.4	.	21*	.	.	.	30*	12	.	.	50°	18°	13	58*	10	8	19°	
D	G	Festuca rubra	1.8	.	4°	.	.	.	7°	21*	
C	H	Senecio erucifolius	2.7	.	3°	.	.	.	5°	1	16*	.	.	.	4°	
D	H	Myosotis arvensis subsp. arvensis	0.9	.	2°	.	.	.	4°	11*	
C	H	Prunella grandiflora subsp. grandiflora	0.9	.	2°	.	.	.	4°	11*	
D	W	Crataegus monogyna	8.8	.	9°	.	.	.	9°	9°	26*	.	7°	11°	10°	
C	H	Thymelaea passerina	3.1	.	4°	.	.	.	5°	3°	16*	.	2	5°	1	
D	H	Veronica prostrata subsp. prostrata	7.5	7	11°	20°	.	.	17°	4	20°	.	.	.	20°	32*	5	5	1	
D	H	Cichorium intybus	7.1	.	7°	.	.	.	7°	7°	21*	.	12°	5°	4	
D	H	Inula britannica	4.9	.	8°	.	.	.	12°	3	.	.	.	9°	7°	21*	3	3	3	
Order 2.2: Festucetalia valesiacae																				
C	H	Teucrium montanum	55.3	13	39*	40°	.	.	4	74**	40°	11	51°	84*	88*	
C	Cl.	H Coronilla varia	62.4	.	56**	.	.	.	36	75**	.	.	.	55°	7	47°	75*	71°	81*	
C	Cl.	H Viola ambigua	56.2	7	47*	20	.	.	24	70**	20	.	.	36°	37°	.	64°	71*	75*	
C	G	Dichanthium ischaemum	73.9	37	58°	80°	30	.	25	91**	80°	30	.	27	.	47	88*	95*	90*	
C	G	Cleistogenes serotina subsp. bulgarica	45.6	20	32°	60*	.	.	4	61**	60*	.	.	.	11	.	41°	71*	70*	
C	G	Stipa capillata	38.5	7	30*	20	.	.	7	53**	20	.	.	9	.	11	34°	68*	55*	
C	Cl.	H Salvia verticillata	61.5	20	54°	60°	.	.	32	76*	60°	.	.	64°	7	26	64°	84*	79*	
C	H	Euphorbia nicaeensis subsp. stepposa	52.2	20	42°	60°	.	.	16	68*	60°	.	.	9	7	32	49°	89*	66°	
C	Cl.	H Astragalus austriacus	36.7	.	28*	.	.	.	11	45*										

Kuzemko et al.: Dry grasslands of Central Podolia

Appendix S1. Geographic origin of the relevés.

No. is the consecutive plot number used in the vegetation tables S2–S5; geographic coordinates are according to WGS-84.

Anhang S1. Herkunftsnachweis der Aufnahmen.

No. ist die fortlaufende Aufnahmenummer aus den Vegetationstabellen S2–S5; die geografischen Koordinaten sind gemäß WGS-84.

No.	Plot No.	Site No.	Date	Latitude [° N]	Longitude [°E]	Altitude [m a.s.l.]	Association
1	UAR061	8	17.7.2010	48.15038	28.75430	159	1.1.1
2	UAR077	9	18.7.2010	48.20935	28.79617	187	1.1.1
3	UAR078	9	18.7.2010	48.20310	28.78500	177	1.1.1
4	UAR094	9	18.7.2010	48.20455	28.78674	194	1.1.1
5	UAR113	10	19.7.2010	48.33954	28.56988	174	1.1.1
6	UA04NW	5	14.7.2010	48.57458	29.32827	153	1.2.1
7	UA04SE	5	14.7.2010	48.57450	29.32830	158	1.2.1
8	UAR005	2	12.7.2010	48.85705	28.72192	232	1.2.1
9	UAR010	3	13.7.2010	48.78751	29.11308	197	1.2.1
10	UAR011	3	13.7.2010	48.78833	29.11358	195	1.2.1
11	UAR012	3	13.7.2010	48.79007	29.11526	183	1.2.1
12	UAR013	5	14.7.2010	48.57536	29.32584	160	1.2.1
13	UAR014	5	14.7.2010	48.57477	29.32755	170	1.2.1
14	UAR016	5	14.7.2010	48.57494	29.32683	169	1.2.1
15	UAR017	5	14.7.2010	48.57488	29.32685	158	1.2.1
16	UAR018	6	15.7.2010	48.23588	29.31128	162	1.3.1
17	UAR019	6	15.7.2010	48.23518	29.31041	176	1.3.1
18	UA06NW	6	15.7.2010	48.24601	29.30591	201	2.1.1
19	UA06SE	6	15.7.2010	48.24598	29.30606	205	2.1.1
20	UAR024	6	15.7.2010	48.24268	29.31516	207	2.1.1
21	UAR028	6	15.7.2010	48.24735	29.30643	206	2.1.1
22	UAR029	6	15.7.2010	48.24761	29.30519	179	2.1.1
23	UAR030	6	15.7.2010	48.24831	29.30577	208	2.1.1
24	UAR031	6	15.7.2010	48.24884	29.30553	202	2.1.1
25	UAR096	10	19.7.2010	48.33392	28.57095	160	2.1.1
26	UAR120	12	20.7.2010	48.25853	28.72272	177	2.1.1
27	UAR141	12	20.7.2010	48.25940	28.72366	189	2.1.1
28	UAR142	12	20.7.2010	48.25894	28.72455	190	2.1.1
29	UA01NW	4	13.7.2010	48.87309	29.07154	179	2.1.2
30	UA01SE	4	13.7.2010	48.87301	29.07162	178	2.1.2
31	UA02NW	3	13.7.2010	48.79347	29.11111	188	2.1.2
32	UA02SE	3	13.7.2010	48.79348	29.11128	183	2.1.2
33	UA03NW	5	14.7.2010	48.57477	29.32720	162	2.1.2
34	UA03SE	5	14.7.2010	48.57467	29.32735	165	2.1.2
35	UAR001	1	12.7.2010	48.94489	28.88376	242	2.1.2
36	UAR002	1	12.7.2010	48.94487	28.88380	242	2.1.2
37	UAR003	1	12.7.2010	48.94349	28.88847	250	2.1.2
38	UAR004	1	12.7.2010	48.94469	28.88469	239	2.1.2
39	UAR007	2	13.7.2010	48.85720	28.72194	226	2.1.2
40	UAR008	3	13.7.2010	48.79143	29.11255	202	2.1.2
41	UAR009	3	13.7.2010	48.78991	29.11503	184	2.1.2
42	UAR015	5	14.7.2010	48.57681	29.32768	174	2.1.2
43	UAR080	9	18.7.2010	48.20077	28.78429	156	2.1.2

No.	Plot No.	Site No.	Date	Latitude [° N]	Longitude [°E]	Altitude [m a.s.l.]	Association
44	UA16NW	13	20.7.2010	48.39073	28.96361	224	2.1.3
45	UA16SE	13	20.7.2010	48.39070	28.96345	231	2.1.3
46	UAR035	7	16.7.2010	48.13853	28.69557	102	2.1.3
47	UAR079	9	18.7.2010	48.20383	28.78467	183	2.1.3
48	UAR110	13	20.7.2010	48.39001	28.96520	230	2.1.3
49	UAR114	10	19.7.2010	48.33963	28.57001	175	2.1.3
50	UAR119	12	20.7.2010	48.25876	28.72271	178	2.1.3
51	UAR137	11	19.7.2010	48.31030	28.56558	139	2.1.3
52	UAR143	13	20.7.2010	48.38917	28.96391	251	2.1.3
53	UAR152	15	21.7.2010	48.15522	28.51027	140	2.1.3
54	UAR158	15	21.7.2010	48.14482	28.47470	83	2.1.3
55	UAR159	15	21.7.2010	48.14460	28.47396	118	2.1.3
56	UAR166	17	23.7.2010	48.46719	27.79500	188	2.1.3
57	UAR167	17	23.7.2010	48.46730	27.79404	171	2.1.3
58	UAR183	17	22.7.2010	48.46750	27.79594	188	2.1.3
59	UAR194	17	23.7.2010	48.46747	27.79477	185	2.1.3
60	UAR195	17	23.7.2010	48.46742	27.79598	171	2.1.3
61	UAR196	17	23.7.2010	48.46165	27.78764	179	2.1.3
62	UAR197	17	23.7.2010	48.46747	27.79477	171	2.1.3
63	UA05NW	6	15.7.2010	48.24173	29.31665	192	2.2.1
64	UA05SE	6	15.7.2010	48.24164	29.31662	197	2.2.1
65	UA07NW	7	16.7.2010	48.13979	28.69904	99	2.2.1
66	UA10NW	8	17.7.2010	48.15201	28.74464	123	2.2.1
67	UA10SE	8	17.7.2010	48.15192	28.74477	129	2.2.1
68	UA11NW	9	18.7.2010	48.20919	28.79681	194	2.2.1
69	UA12NW	9	18.7.2010	48.20425	28.78557	179	2.2.1
70	UA14NW	11	19.7.2010	48.31010	28.56610	140	2.2.1
71	UA14SE	11	19.7.2010	48.31007	28.56632	140	2.2.1
72	UA19NW	16	22.7.2010	48.26333	28.13984	85	2.2.1
73	UA19SE	16	22.7.2010	48.26326	28.13996	99	2.2.1
74	UA21NW	18	23.7.2010	48.52707	27.56812	190	2.2.1
75	UA21SE	18	23.7.2010	48.52698	27.56819	186	2.2.1
76	UAR020	5	14.7.2010	48.57477	29.33759	186	2.2.1
77	UAR021	6	15.7.2010	48.24109	29.31780	191	2.2.1
78	UAR022	6	15.7.2010	48.24610	29.30675	204	2.2.1
79	UAR023	6	15.7.2010	48.24271	29.31531	208	2.2.1
80	UAR025	6	15.7.2010	48.24592	29.30517	202	2.2.1
81	UAR026	6	15.7.2010	48.24674	29.30715	205	2.2.1
82	UAR027	6	15.7.2010	48.24767	29.30614	206	2.2.1
83	UAR032	6	15.7.2010	48.24598	29.30647	207	2.2.1
84	UAR049	8	17.7.2010	48.15260	28.74519	148	2.2.1
85	UAR052	8	17.7.2010	48.14957	28.73372	134	2.2.1
86	UAR055	8	17.7.2010	48.15276	28.74492	132	2.2.1
87	UAR065	8	17.7.2010	48.15683	28.73732	161	2.2.1
88	UAR066	8	17.7.2010	48.15652	28.73781	164	2.2.1
89	UAR071	9	18.7.2010	48.21173	28.80024	195	2.2.1
90	UAR072	9	18.7.2010	48.21204	28.80117	192	2.2.1
91	UAR073	9	18.7.2010	48.20310	28.78553	154	2.2.1

No.	Plot No.	Site No.	Date	Latitude [° N]	Longitude [°E]	Altitude [m a.s.l.]	Association
92	UAR074	10	19.7.2010	48.33474	28.57159	156	2.2.1
93	UAR085	10	19.7.2010	48.33372	28.57187	158	2.2.1
94	UAR088	9	18.7.2010	48.21162	28.80060	194	2.2.1
95	UAR089	9	18.7.2010	48.21269	28.80130	195	2.2.1
96	UAR100	10	19.7.2010	48.31990	28.57300	152	2.2.1
97	UAR101	10	19.7.2010	48.33551	28.57070	156	2.2.1
98	UAR102	10	19.7.2010	48.33595	28.56951	141	2.2.1
99	UAR103	10	19.7.2010	48.33644	28.56946	147	2.2.1
100	UAR104	11	19.7.2010	48.31327	28.56714	149	2.2.1
101	UAR112	10	19.7.2010	48.33540	28.56965	166	2.2.1
102	UAR117	10	19.7.2010	48.33333	28.57256	150	2.2.1
103	UAR124	15	21.7.2010	48.15355	28.50720	93	2.2.1
104	UAR134	15	21.7.2010	48.15414	28.50413	90	2.2.1
105	UAR138	13	21.7.2010	48.39073	28.96361	225	2.2.1
106	UAR147	16	22.7.2010	48.26320	28.14009	94	2.2.1
107	UAR148	16	22.7.2010	48.26333	28.14029	103	2.2.1
108	UAR149	18	23.7.2010	48.52652	27.57021	206	2.2.1
109	UAR153	16	22.7.2010	48.26181	28.13887	82	2.2.1
110	UAR154	16	22.7.2010	48.26277	28.14067	73	2.2.1
111	UAR157	14	21.7.2010	48.17926	28.56402	100	2.2.1
112	UAR162	15	21.7.2010	48.14524	28.47402	84	2.2.1
113	UAR163	15	21.7.2010	48.14512	28.47342	102	2.2.1
114	UAR164	16	22.7.2010	48.26347	28.14024	115	2.2.1
115	UAR165	16	22.7.2010	48.26353	28.14038	114	2.2.1
116	UAR168	17	23.7.2010	48.46828	27.79556	173	2.2.1
117	UAR169	17	23.7.2010	48.46930	27.79462	166	2.2.1
118	UAR179	18	23.7.2010	48.52725	27.56805	194	2.2.1
119	UAR181	16	22.7.2010	48.26241	28.13882	89	2.2.1
120	UAR182	17	22.7.2010	48.46814	27.79513	163	2.2.1
121	UAR186	16	22.7.2010	48.26344	28.14106	101	2.2.1
122	UA09NW	8	17.7.2010	48.15046	28.73527	169	2.2.2
123	UA09SE	8	17.7.2010	48.15038	28.73525	166	2.2.2
124	UA11SE	9	18.7.2010	48.20907	28.79662	194	2.2.2
125	UA12SE	9	18.7.2010	48.20413	28.78538	177	2.2.2
126	UA13SE	10	19.7.2010	48.33408	28.57184	163	2.2.2
127	UA18NW	15	21.7.2010	48.15407	28.50299	82	2.2.2
128	UAR033	7	16.7.2010	48.13919	28.69791	94	2.2.2
129	UAR034	7	16.7.2010	48.13920	28.69852	104	2.2.2
130	UAR036	7	16.7.2010	48.13737	28.69152	96	2.2.2
131	UAR037	7	16.7.2010	48.14047	28.70048	96	2.2.2
132	UAR038	7	16.7.2010	48.14018	28.69972	96	2.2.2
133	UAR046	8	17.7.2010	48.14964	28.73485	159	2.2.2
134	UAR047	8	17.7.2010	48.14933	28.73469	152	2.2.2
135	UAR048	8	17.7.2010	48.15146	28.73502	162	2.2.2
136	UAR050	8	17.7.2010	48.15211	28.73575	175	2.2.2
137	UAR051	8	17.7.2010	48.14932	28.73523	122	2.2.2
138	UAR053	8	17.7.2010	48.14837	28.73451	132	2.2.2
139	UAR054	8	17.7.2010	48.14951	28.73570	109	2.2.2

No.	Plot No.	Site No.	Date	Latitude [° N]	Longitude [°E]	Altitude [m a.s.l.]	Association
140	UAR058	8	17.7.2010	48.15175	28.73547	178	2.2.2
141	UAR059	8	17.7.2010	48.15265	28.73612	170	2.2.2
142	UAR062	8	17.7.2010	48.15004	28.70353	149	2.2.2
143	UAR063	8	17.7.2010	48.15228	28.73626	152	2.2.2
144	UAR068	8	17.7.2010	48.15513	28.73827	155	2.2.2
145	UAR069	9	18.7.2010	48.21050	28.79762	188	2.2.2
146	UAR070	9	18.7.2010	48.21135	28.79855	193	2.2.2
147	UAR076	9	18.7.2010	48.20904	28.79628	178	2.2.2
148	UAR081	9	18.7.2010	48.20948	28.79613	190	2.2.2
149	UAR082	9	18.7.2010	48.20977	28.79559	187	2.2.2
150	UAR083	9	18.7.2010	48.20427	28.78712	163	2.2.2
151	UAR084	9	18.7.2010	48.20460	28.78798	160	2.2.2
152	UAR086	9	18.7.2010	48.21065	28.79779	197	2.2.2
153	UAR087	9	18.7.2010	48.21107	28.79842	190	2.2.2
154	UAR090	9	18.7.2010	48.20416	28.78600	191	2.2.2
155	UAR091	9	18.7.2010	48.20941	28.79707	192	2.2.2
156	UAR092	9	18.7.2010	48.20971	28.79719	192	2.2.2
157	UAR093	9	18.7.2010	48.20405	28.78631	174	2.2.2
158	UAR115	11	19.7.2010	48.31498	28.56546	148	2.2.2
159	UAR161	14	21.7.2010	48.17675	28.56075	115	2.2.2
160	UA07SE	7	16.7.2010	48.13969	28.69916	97	2.2.3
161	UA08NW	7	16.7.2010	48.14212	28.69715	125	2.2.3
162	UA08SE	7	16.7.2010	48.14199	28.69723	122	2.2.3
163	UA13NW	10	19.7.2010	48.33408	28.57165	163	2.2.3
164	UA15NW	12	20.7.2010	48.25883	28.72910	188	2.2.3
165	UA15SE	12	20.7.2010	48.25874	28.72197	186	2.2.3
166	UA17NW	14	21.7.2010	48.18124	28.56288	103	2.2.3
167	UA17SE	14	21.7.2010	48.18123	28.56312	109	2.2.3
168	UA18SE	15	21.7.2010	48.15396	28.50308	78	2.2.3
169	UA20NW	17	22.7.2010	48.46845	27.79681	203	2.2.3
170	UA20SE	17	22.7.2010	48.46843	27.79672	201	2.2.3
171	UAR039	7	16.7.2010	48.13708	28.69125	95	2.2.3
172	UAR040	7	16.7.2010	48.14154	28.69335	135	2.2.3
173	UAR041	7	16.7.2010	48.14156	28.69597	135	2.2.3
174	UAR042	7	16.7.2010	48.14161	28.69655	128	2.2.3
175	UAR043	7	16.7.2010	48.14083	28.69284	134	2.2.3
176	UAR044	7	16.7.2010	48.14116	28.69354	136	2.2.3
177	UAR045	7	16.7.2010	48.14107	28.69336	130	2.2.3
178	UAR056	8	17.7.2010	48.14903	28.73485	145	2.2.3
179	UAR057	8	17.7.2010	48.14825	28.73416	148	2.2.3
180	UAR060	8	17.7.2010	48.15446	28.73695	172	2.2.3
181	UAR064	8	17.7.2010	48.15549	28.73607	169	2.2.3
182	UAR067	8	17.7.2010	48.15356	28.73722	156	2.2.3
183	UAR095	10	19.7.2010	48.33363	28.57265	165	2.2.3
184	UAR097	11	19.7.2010	48.31228	28.56804	144	2.2.3
185	UAR098	11	19.7.2010	48.31130	28.56972	158	2.2.3
186	UAR099	11	19.7.2010	48.31078	28.57039	168	2.2.3
187	UAR105	11	19.7.2010	48.31383	28.56634	150	2.2.3

No.	Plot No.	Site No.	Date	Latitude [° N]	Longitude [°E]	Altitude [m a.s.l.]	Association
188	UAR106	11	19.7.2010	48.31193	28.56918	155	2.2.3
189	UAR107	11	19.7.2010	48.31159	28.56949	153	2.2.3
190	UAR108	11	19.7.2010	48.31094	28.56977	149	2.2.3
191	UAR109	12	20.7.2010	48.25947	28.72222	188	2.2.3
192	UAR111	9	19.7.2010	48.20071	28.78437	163	2.2.3
193	UAR116	10	19.7.2010	48.33368	28.57330	162	2.2.3
194	UAR118	11	19.7.2010	48.31085	28.56469	153	2.2.3
195	UAR121	12	20.7.2010	48.25839	28.72152	187	2.2.3
196	UAR122	14	21.7.2010	48.18131	28.56503	141	2.2.3
197	UAR123	14	21.7.2010	48.18193	28.56365	138	2.2.3
198	UAR126	12	20.7.2010	48.25927	28.72311	188	2.2.3
199	UAR127	12	20.7.2010	48.25963	28.72257	186	2.2.3
200	UAR128	12	20.7.2010	48.25947	28.72209	188	2.2.3
201	UAR129	14	21.7.2010	48.18084	28.56387	111	2.2.3
202	UAR130	14	21.7.2010	48.18029	28.56231	107	2.2.3
203	UAR131	14	21.7.2010	48.18005	28.56104	125	2.2.3
204	UAR132	14	21.7.2010	48.17934	28.56190	122	2.2.3
205	UAR133	14	21.7.2010	48.17772	28.56122	134	2.2.3
206	UAR135	17	22.7.2010	48.46906	27.79655	205	2.2.3
207	UAR136	12	20.7.2010	48.25853	28.72183	183	2.2.3
208	UAR139	14	21.7.2010	48.18031	28.56759	83	2.2.3
209	UAR140	14	21.7.2010	48.17964	28.56638	107	2.2.3
210	UAR144	14	21.7.2010	48.17944	28.56149	129	2.2.3
211	UAR145	14	21.7.2010	48.17778	28.56196	129	2.2.3
212	UAR146	15	21.7.2010	48.15515	28.50256	102	2.2.3
213	UAR150	18	23.7.2010	48.52631	27.56949	185	2.2.3
214	UAR151	15	21.7.2010	48.15417	28.50550	114	2.2.3
215	UAR155	16	22.7.2010	48.26290	28.13793	96	2.2.3
216	UAR156	14	21.7.2010	48.17994	28.56543	100	2.2.3
217	UAR160	15	21.7.2010	48.14468	28.47402	109	2.2.3
218	UAR170	17	23.7.2010	48.46983	27.79616	199	2.2.3
219	UAR171	18	23.7.2010	48.52681	27.56930	87	2.2.3
220	UAR172	18	23.7.2010	48.52654	27.54963	186	2.2.3
221	UAR176	17	23.7.2010	48.46960	27.79613	196	2.2.3
222	UAR177	17	23.7.2010	48.46967	27.79649	207	2.2.3
223	UAR180	18	23.7.2010	48.52694	27.56868	190	2.2.3
224	UAR187	17	22.7.2010	48.46926	27.79655	210	2.2.3
225	UAR188	17	22.7.2010	48.47101	27.79659	199	2.2.3
226	UAR198	17	23.7.2010	48.46142	27.78315	205	2.2.3

Kuzemko et al.: Dry grasslands of Central Podolia

Appendix S2. Nomenclatural assessment of the syntaxa mentioned in Section 4.

An asterisk (*) after the year of an author citation indicates that the protologue (original description) of the syntaxon has been checked by us and the source is included in the reference list at the bottom.

Anhang S2. Nomenklatorische Bewertung der in Kapitel 4 erwähnten Syntaxa.

Ein Stern (*) nach einem Autorenzitat zeigt, dass wir den Protolog (Originalbeschreibung) des Syntaxons eingesehen und geprüft und die zugehörige Quellen am Ende des Anhangs aufgelistet haben.

Class: *Festuco-Brometea* Br.-Bl. & Tx. ex Klika & Hadač 1944

Protologue: „*Festuco-Brometea* Br.-Bl. u. Tx. 1943“ (KLIKA & HADAČ 1944b: p. 288)

Typus: *Brometalia erecti* W. Koch 1926* (= *Brachypodietalia pinnati* Korneck 1974*) [Holotypus]

Syn.: *Festuco-Brometea* Br.-Bl. & Tx. 1943* nom. inval. [Art. 8]

Festuco-Brometea Br.-Bl. & Tx. ex Soó 1947* nom. illeg. [Art. 31]

Notes: For the validity of this validation, see DENGLER et al. (2012).

Class: *Koelerio-Corynephoretea* Klika in Klika & Novák 1941

Protologue: “*Koelerio-Corynephoretales*” (KLIKA in KLIKA & NOVÁK 1941: p. 59)

Type: *Corynephoretalia* Klika 1934* [Lectotypus, designated by MORAVEC (1967: p. 173)]

Syn.: *Festucetea ovinæ* R. Knapp 1942* nom. ined. p.p. [Art. 1]

Corynephoretea canescentis Br.-Bl. & Tx. 1943* nom. inval. [Art. 8]

Corynephoretea Lebrun et al. 1949* [Syntax. Syn.]

Sedo-Scleranthetea Br.-Bl. 1955* [Syntax. Syn.]

Festuco-Sedetetea Oberd. 1957* nom. inval. [Art. 3b]

Caricetea arenariae Doing 1963* nom. inval. [Art. 8]

Xero-Bromo-Sedetetea Doing 1963* nom. inval. p.p. [Art. 8]

Festucetea vaginatae Soó 1968* nom. inval. [Art. 8]

Festucetea vaginatae Soó ex Vicherek 1972* [Syntax. Syn.]

Class: *Molinio-Arrhenatheretea* Tx. 1937

Protologue: TÜXEN (1937: p. 73)

Typus: *Arrhenatheretalia* [“Pawłowski 1926”] Tx. 1937* (= *Arrhenatheretalia* Tx. 1931*) [Lectotypus, designated by JANSEN et al. (in DENGLER et al. 2003: p. 610)]

Subclass: *Koelerio-Corynephorenea* (Klika in Klika & Novák 1941) Dengler in Dengler et al. 2003

Protologue: “*Koelerio-Corynephorenea* (Klika in Klika & Novák 1941) Dengler stat. nov.” (DENGLER et al. (2003: p. 603)

Basionym: “*Koelerio-Corynephoretales*” (KLIKA in KLIKA & NOVÁK 1941: p. 59)

Typus: *Corynephoretalia* Klika 1934* [Holotypus (Art. 27a) – designated as Lectotypus of the class by MORAVEC (1967: p. 173)]

Subclass: *Sedo-Sclerantheneae* (Br.-Bl. 1955) Dengler in Dengler et al. 2003

Protologue: “*Sedo-Sclerantheneae* (Br.-Bl. 1955) Dengler stat. nov.” (DENGLER et al. (2003: pp. 603 et seq.)

Basionym: *Sedo-Scleranthetea* (BRAUN-BLANQUET 1955: p. 484)

Typus: *Sedo-Scleranthetalia* Br.-Bl. 1955* [Holotypus (Art. 27a)]

Order: *Alyssso alyssoidis-Sedetalia* Moravec 1967

Protologue: „*Alyssso-Sedetalia*“ (MORAVEC 1967: 171)

Typus: *Alyssso-Sedion* Oberd. & T. Müller in T. Müller 1961* [Holotypus]

Syn.: *Sedo-Scleranthetalia* Br.-Bl. 1955* sensu auct. p.p. [typo excl.]

Order: *Arrhenatheretalia elatioris* Tx. 1931

Protologue: „*Arrhenatheretalia*“ (TÜXEN 1931: 70)

Typus: *Arrhenatherion elatioris* W. Koch 1926* [Holotypus]

Syn.: *Arrhenatheretalia* Pawłowski 1928 nom. inval. [Art. 8; according to ELLMAUER & MUCINA (1993: p. 340)]

Trifolio-Cynosuretalia Sougnez & Limbourg 1963* [Syntax. Syn.]

Trifolio-Phleetalia (Sougnez 1963) Passarge 1969* nom. illeg. [Art. 29a]

Order: *Brachypodietalia pinnati* Korneck 1974 nom. cons. propos.

Protologue: KORNECK (1974: pp. 123 et seq.)

Type: *Cirsio-Brachypodion pinnati* Hadač & Klika in Klika & Hadač 1944* [Lectotypus designated by DENGLENER et al. (2003: p. 608)]

Syn.: *Brometalia erecti* W. Koch 1926* nom. amb. propos. [Holotypus: *Bromion erecti* W. Koch 1926*]
Scorzonerio villosae-Chrysopogonetalia grylli Horvatic & Horvat in Horvatic 1963 p.p. [typo incl.; Holotypus: *Scorzonerion villosae* Horvatic 1963, see TERZI (2011)]

Notes: DENGLENER et al. (2003: p. 608) explain why *Brometalia erecti* should be rejected as a *nomen ambiguum*. If the Phytosociological Nomenclature Commission follows this proposal, *Brachypodietalia pinnati* would be the next younger valid and thus the correct name of the order. Further, the name *Brachypodietalia pinnati* needs to be conserved against the older order name *Scorzonerio villosae-Chrysopogonetalia grylli* Horvatic & Horvat in Horvatic 1963. This order in its traditional delimitation comprises both xeric and meso-xeric alliances from the Dinaric-Illyric region, but its type alliance *Scorzonerion villosae* Horvatic 1963 (see TERZI 2011) is a meso-xeric unit that would fall under our concept of the *Brachypodietalia pinnati*.

Order: *Festucetalia valesiaca* Soó 1947

Protologue: “*Festucetalia (valesiaca)* Soó 1940 (N. A.)” (Soó 1947: pp. 22–34)

Typus: *Stipion lessingiana* Soó 1947* [Lectotypus, designated by DENGLENER et al. (2012: p. 348)]

Syn.: *Festucetalia valesiaca* Br.-Bl. & Tx. 1943* nom. inval. [Art. 8]

Festucetalia valesiaca Br.-Bl. & Tx. ex Br.-Bl. 1950* nom. illeg. [Art. 31]

Notes: It is unclear to which paper Soó (1947: p. 22) refers with “Soó 1940”; there is no such publication in his reference list.

Order: *Galietaia veri* Mirkin & Naumova 1986

Protologue: MIRKIN & NAUMOVA (1986: pp. 96 et seq.)

Typus: *Trifolion montani* Naumova 1986* [Holotypus]

Notes: While some traditional content of the *Galietaia veri* belongs indeed to the *Brachypodietalia pinnati* (*Festuco-Brometea*), the type association of the type alliance comprises sandy alluvial grasslands, which we place in the alliance *Agrostion vinealis*; thus *Galietaia veri* becomes a later syntaxonomic synonym of the *Trifolio arvensis-Festucetalia ovinae*.

Order: *Sedo-Scleranthetalia* Br.-Bl. 1955

Protologue: BRAUN-BLANQUET (1955: 484)

Type: *Sedo-Scleranthion* Br.-Bl. 1955* [Holotypus]

Syn.: *Sempervivo-Sedetalia* (Br.-Bl. 1955*) T. Müller 1961* nom. illeg. [Art. 29a]

Excl.: *Alysso alyssoidis-Sedion* Oberd. & T. Müller in T. Müller 1961*

Notes: The frequently found addition of the epitheta “*albi*” and “*biennis*” to the order name (e.g. BARDAT et al. 2004) are not allowed according to ICPN since the protologue contained several species of both genera (Recomm. 10C).

Order: *Stipo pulcherrimae-Festucetalia pallentis* Pop 1968

Protologue: POP (1968: p. 272)

Typus: *Seslerio-Festucion pallentis* [“Klika 1931”] Pop 1968* [Lectotypus, designated by DENGLENER et al. (2012)]

Syn.: *Stipo eriocaulis-Festucetalia pallentis* (Pop 1968*) Pop 1991* nom. illeg. [Art. 29a]

Order: *Trifolio arvensis-Festucetalia ovinae* Moravec 1967

Protologue: “*Trifolio (arvensi)-Festucetalia ovinae*” (MORAVEC 1967: pp. 172 et seq.)

Type: *Hyperico perforati-Scleranthion perennis* Moravec 1967* [Holotypus]

Syn.: *Festuco-Sedetalia acris* Tx. 1951* p.p. [typo excl.; Lectotypus of the order, designated by MORAVEC (1967: p. 163): *Helichryson arenarii* Tx. 1951* (= *Koelerion glaucae* Volk 1931*)]

Festucetalia tenuifoliae Doing 1963* nom. inval. [Art. 8]

Koelerio-Phleetalia phleoidis Korneck 1974* p.p. [Syntax. Syn.; Holotypus: *Koelerio-Phleion phleoidis* Korneck 1974* (= *Hyperico perforati-Scleranthion perennis* Moravec 1967*)]

Notes: If one considers the type association of the *Hyperico perforati-Scleranthion perennis* as belonging to the acidophilous outcrop communities (as some researchers do, see Notes under that alliance), this order name would become a younger synonym of the *Sedo-Scleranthetalia*, and for the order in our sense (see also SCHAMINÉE et al. 1996, BERG et al. 2004) seemingly no valid name would be available.

Alliance: *Agrostio vinealis-Avenulion schellianae* Royer 1991

Protologue: “*Agrostio-Avenulion schellianae* nov.” (ROYER 1991: p. 207)

Typus: *Agrostio-Avenuletum schellianae* Royer 1991* [Holotypus; Holotypus of the association: ALECHIN (1951: pp. 280–281)]

Notes: The name is based on *Agrostis syreistschikowi* = *A. vinealis* (ROYER 1991: p. 42).

Alliance: *Agrostion vinealis* Sipaylova et al. 1985

Protologue: SIPAYLOVA et al. (1985: pp. 13 et seq.)

Typus: *Agrostietum vinealis* Sipaylova et al. 1985* [Holotypus]

Notes: The *Agrostietum vinealis* Sipaylova et al. 1985* (order *Trifolio arvensis-Festucetalia ovinae*, with some *Molinio-Arrhenatheretea* influence) is different from the *Agrostietum vinealis* Kobendza 1930* corr. Kratzert & Dengler 1999* nom. cons. propos. (order *Corynephoretalia canescentis*).

Alliance: *Alyssso alyssoidis-Sedion* Oberd. & T. Müller in T. Müller 1961

Protologue: „*Alyssso-Sedion* Oberd. et Th. Müller 61“ (MÜLLER 1961: 116 ff.)

Typus: *Alyssso alyssoidis-Sedetum albi* Oberd. & T. Müller in T. Müller 1961* [Lectotypus (Art. 20)]

Syn.: *Rumici-Veronicion dillenii* Passarge 1977* p.p. [typo excl.]

Valerianello-Veronicion arvensis Passarge 1995* p.p. [Syntax. Syn.; Holotypus: *Veronico arvensis-Cerastietum glutinosi* Passarge 1995*]

Alliance: *Armerio rumelicae-Potentillion* Micevski 1978

Protologue: “*Armerio-Potentillion*” MICEVSKI (1978: pp. 21 et seq.)

Type: *Genisto carinalis-Agrostietum byzanthinae* Micevski 1978* [Lectotypus, designated by PEDASHENKO et al. (2013: pp. 340)]

Notes: While it is clear from the protologue that *Armeria rumelica* was meant, MICEVSKI (1978) mentions two *Potentilla* species as diagnostic (*P. argentea*, *P. inclinata*). According to Recomm. 10C ICPN therefore an epitheton is added to “*Armeria*” but not to “*Potentilla*”. The eponymous grass species of the type association is *Agrostis castellana* (= *A. byzanthina*).

Alliance: *Armerion elongatae* Pötsch 1962

Protologue: PÖTSCH (1962: 199)

Type: *Diantho deltoidis-Armerietum elongatae* Krausch ex Pötsch 1962* [Holotypus]

Syn.: *Helichryson arenarii* Tx. 1951* p.p. [typo excl.]

Armerion elongatae Krausch 1959a* nom. ined. [Art. 1]

Armerion elongatae Krausch 1959b* nom. inval. [Art. 8]

Armerion elongatae Krausch 1962* nom. inval. [Art. 8]

Gageo-Allion Passarge 1964* p.p.

Plantagini-Festucion Passarge 1964* nom. dub. p.max.p. [Art. 38]

Armerion elongatae Krausch 1967* nom. illeg. [Art. 31]

Hyperico perforati-Scleranthion perennis Moravec 1967* p.min.p. [typo excl.]

Koelerio-Phleion phleoidis Korneck 1974* p.p. [typo excl.]

Vicio lathyroidis-Potentillion argenteae Brzeg in Brzeg & Wojterska 1996* p.p.

Plantagini lanceolatae-Festucion brevopilae Passarge 1964* corr. Kratzert & Dengler 1999* nom. dub. p.max.p. [Art. 38]

Notes: Since *Plantagini-Festucion* through the typification by GREGOR (2001, see entry of *Hyperico perforati-Scleranthion perennis*) became a *nomen dubium*, the name correction by KRATZERT & DENGLER (1964) became superfluous and wrong *post hoc*.

***Cirsio-Brachypodion pinnati* Hadač & Klika in Klika & Hadač 1944**

Protologue: “*Cirsio-Brachypodion pinnati* Hadač-Klika 1944” (KLIKA & HADAČ 1944: p. 289)

Type: *Seslerio calcariae-Cirsietum pannonicum* Klika 1933* [Lectotypus, designated by HADAČ (in TOMAN 1981: p. 569)]

Notes: For the justification of the nomenclatural authority and for the non-addition of “*pannonicum*” to the name, see DENGLER et al. (2012).

Alliance: *Festucion valesiaca* Klika 1931 nom. conserv. propos.

Protologue: „*Festucion valesiaca*“ (KLIKA 1931: pp. 376 et seq.)

Typus: *Festuco valesiaca-Ranunculetum illyricum* Klika 1931* [Lectotypus, designated TOMAN (1976, cited in TOMAN 1981a: p. 329)]

Syn.: *Festucion sulcatae* Soó 1929* nom. inval. p.p. [Art. 8]

Festucion sulcatae Soó 1930* nom. amb. propos.

Astragalo-Stipion R. Knapp 1942* nom. ined. [Art. 1]

Eu-Festucion valesiaca Br.-Bl. & Tx. 1943* nom. inval. [Art. 8, 34b]

Festuco-Stipion (Klika 1931b*) Krausch 1961* nom. illeg. [Art. 29a]

Notes: We propose to conserve the generally applied name *Festucion valesiacae* Klika 1931* against the older, but rarely used *Festucion sulcatae* Soó 1930*. Moreover, the older name is ambiguous as it refers to *Festuca sulcata* (= *rupicola*) which normally is restricted to mesoxerix communities (*Cirsio-Brachypodium pinnati*), but is largely absent from the *Festucion valesiacae*.

Alliance: *Fragario viridis-Trifolium montani* Korotchenko & Didukh 1997

Protologue: KOROTCHENKO & DIDUKH (1997: pp. 23 et seq.)

Typus: *Salvio pratensis-Poetum angustifoliae* Korotchenko & Didukh 1997* [Holotypus]

Alliance: *Hyperico perforati-Scleranthion perennis* Moravec 1967

Protologue: „*Hyperico (perforato)-Scleranthion perennis*“ (MORAVEC 1967: 172)

Typus: *Polytricho piliferi-Scleranthetum perennis* Moravec 1967* [Holotypus]

Syn.: *Koelerion albescentis* Tx. 1937* p.p. [typo excl.]

Helichryson arenarii Tx. 1951* p.min.p. [typo excl.]

Plantagini-Festucion Passarge 1964* nom. dub. p.p. [Art. 38; Lectotypus, designated by GREGOR (2001: p. 12): *Festuco ovinae-Thymetum angustifolii* Tx. 1937* nom. dub.)]

Koelerio-Phleion phleoidis Korneck 1974* p.p. [Syntax. Syn.; Lectotypus, designated by DENGLER in DENGLER et al. (2003: p. 604): *Genistello-Phleietum phleoidis* Korneck 1974*]

Incl.: *Plantagini-Festucion ovinae* Passarge (1964*) 2002* [Art. 3i; desc. incl., typo excl.]

Notes: The concept of the *Hyperico-Scleranthion* as adopted by us is modified compared to the original diagnosis of MORAVEC (1967). According to our understanding, the type relevé of the type association and the majority of content included in the original description would remain in our emendated alliance and thus in the order of the meso-xeric sandy grassland with closed swards (*Trifolio arvensis-Festucetalia ovinae*), while smaller amounts should be transferred to the alliances *Armerion elongatae* and *Sedo albi-Veronicion dillenii*. By contrast, some researchers consider the type relevé of the type association as belonging to the acidophilous rock outcrop communities. If one follows this interpretation, *Hyperico-Scleranthion* would be the oldest and thus valid name for the alliance *Sedo albi-Veronicion dillenii*. The older name *Plantagini-Festucion* is not applicable here because its type association is considered as a *nomen dubium* since from the microspecies of *Festuca ovina* agg. is not determined in its protologue without which it is not possible to assign it to a present-day association or alliance.

Alliance: *Poo compressae-Rumicion acetosellae* Didukh & Kontar 1999

Protologue: “*Poo compressae-Rumicion acetosellae* all. nov.” (DIDUKH & KONTAR 1999: pp. 57 et seq.)

Typus: *Vincetoxico hirundinariae-Rumicetum acetosellae* Didukh & Kontar 1999 [Holotypus]

Notes: Whether this alliance should be separated from the *Sedo albi-Veronicion dillenii* needs to be addressed in a large-scale synthesis.

Alliance: *Sedo albi-Veronicion dillenii* Korneck 1974

Protologue: “*Sedo albi-Veronicion dillenii* (Oberd. 1957) Korneck“ (KORNECK 1974: pp. 64 et seq.)

Type: *Gageo saxatilis-Veronicetum dillenii* (Oberd. 1957*) Korneck 1974* (= *Festuco-Veronicetum dillenii* Oberd. 1957*) [Holotypus]

Syn.: *Veronicion* Oberd. 1957* nom. inval. [Art. 3b]

Hyperico perforati-Scleranthion perennis Moravec 1967* p.min.p. [typo excl.]

Polytricho piliferi-Festucion pallentis R. Schubert 1974* corr. R. Schubert et al. 2001* p.min.p. [typo excl.]

Arabidopsion [“*Arabidopsidion*”] *thalianae* Passarge 1964* nom. dub. sensu auct. [typo excl.; Holotypus of the alliance: *Arabidopsietum thalianae* Passarge 1964* nom. dub.; Art. 38]

Notes: The *Arabidopsion thalianae* Passarge 1964 is frequently equated with the above alliance of acidophilous rock outcrop communities in the lower mountain ranges of Central Europe (e.g. MUCINA & KOLBEK 1993b, SÁDLO et al. 2007). However, PASSARGE (1964) did not describe any outcrop communities (such acidic outcrops do not occur at all in his study area!) but small-scale therophyte synusiae, which can be found in the xerothermic vegetation of various classes (e.g. *Koelerio-Corynephortea*, *Stellarietea mediae*, *Artemisietea vulgaris*). Accordingly, PASSARGE’s name should be rejected as a *nomen dubium* (Art. 37, 38 ICPN) as his vegetation plots presumably (he does not mention plot sizes, but describes the synusial character) were far too small to allow an assignment to any of the present-day syntaxa.

Alliance: *Sedo-Cerastion arvensis* Sissingh & Tideman 1960

Protologue: „*Sedo-Cerastion*“ (SISSINGH & TIDEMAN 1960: 23)

Typus: *Euphorbietum seguierano-cyparissiae* Sissingh & Tideman 1960* (= *Aveno pubescentis-Medicaginetum falcatae* de Leeuw in Br.-Bl. & Moor 1938*) [Holotypus]

Syn.: *Koelerion albescentis* Tx. 1937* sensu auct. p.p. [typo excl.]

Hieracio-Festucion tenuifoliae Doing 1963* nom. inval. [Art. 8]

Sedo-Koelerion gracilis Doing 1963* nom. inval. [Art. 8]

Galio-Koelerion (Tx. 1937*) Westhoff & den Held 1969* nom. illeg. p.p. [Art. 29a]
Pilosello-Festucion tenuifoliae Doing 1974* nom. inval. p.max.p. [Art. 8]
Carici arenariae-Festucion filiformis de Foucault 1993
Plantagini-Festucion Passarge 1964* nom. dub. sensu Weeda et al. 1996* [typo excl.]
Polygalo vulgaris-Koelerion macranthae (Boerboom 1960*) Weeda et al. 1996* nom. illeg. [Art. 27 Abs. 2]

Incl.: *Luzulo-Koelerienion albescens* Boerboom 1960*
Hieracio pilosellae-Festucion filiformis Doing ex Passarge 2002* [Holotypus: *Galio veri-Festucetum capillatae* Br.-Bl. & de Leeuw 1936* nom. invers. et mut. propos.]

Alliance: *Stipion lessingianae* 1947

Protologue: SOO (1947: pp. 29–34)

Typus: *Stipetum lessingianae* Soó 1947* [Lectotypus (Art. 20 ICPN)]

Syn.: *Astragalo-Stipion* R. Knapp 1944* nom. ined. p.p. [Art. 1]

Notes: The *Stipetum pennatae* described by SOÓ (1927: pp. 98–99) is invalid as the author refers with his name evidently to *Stipa pennata* agg., while in his synoptic table only four different microspecies are listed (*S. longifolia*, *S. joannis*, *S. pulcherrima*, *S. lessingiana*).

Alliance: *Thymo pulegioidis-Sedion sexangularis* Didukh & Kontar 1999 nom. inval.

Protologue: “*Thymo pulegioides-Sedion sexangulare* all. nov.” (DIDUKH & KONTAR 1999: pp. 57 et seq.)

Typus: “*Trifolio arvensi-Teucrietum chamaedrycis*” [Holotypus, but not valid]

Notes: The name *Thymo pulegioidis-Sedion sexangularis* is invalid according to Art. 5 ICPN since DIDUKH & KONTAR (1999: p. 84) only gave the name of the type association, but no authority and reference. Anyway, the floristic separation between the two alliances *Poo compressae-Rumicion acetosellae* and *Thymo pulegioidis-Sedion sexangularis* according to the tables in DIDUKH & KONTAR (1999) would be only moderate so that it is reasonable to combine them.

Alliance: *Trifolion montani* Naumova 1986

Protologue: NAUMOVA (1986: pp. 82 et seq.)

Typus: *Trifolion montani-Agrostietum vinealis* Naumova 1986 [Holotypus]

Notes: MIRKIN & NAUMOVA (1986) in the year of the description of the alliance suggested the *Koelerio delavignei-Festucetum valesiacae* Naumova 1986* as nomenclatural type, but this lectotypification was not valid since in the protologue NAUMOVA (1986: p. 81) had already correctly defined the *Trifolion montani-Agrostietum vinealis* as holotype. While the *Koelerio delavignei-Festucetum valesiacae* according to the table of NAUMOVA (1986) clearly belongs to the order *Brachypodietalia pinnati* (*Festuco-Brometea*), the *Trifolion montani-Agrostietum vinealis* rather belongs to the *Trifolio arvensis-Festucetalia ovinae* (*Koelerio-Coryneporetea*). Based on this valid type, the *Trifolion montani* must be considered as a later syntaxonomic synonym of the *Agrostion vinealis* Sipaylova et al. 1985*. Being unaware of this situation, later authors who accept both *Agrostion vinealis* and *Trifolion montani* seemingly mostly based their description and differentiations of the two units on the second, invalid typification of the *Trifolion montani* (e.g. KUZEMKO 2011, ERMAKOV 2012).

***Allio taurici-Dichanthietum ischaemi* Kuzemko et al. 2014**

Protologue: this paper

Typus: this paper (Table S4, relevé 137 = UAR051) [Holotypus]

***Artemisio austriaci-Teucrietum chamaedryos* Didukh & Kontar 1999**

Protologue: “*Artemisio austriacii-Teucrietum chamaedrycis* ass. nov.” (DIDUKH & KONTAR 1999: pp. 86 et seq.)

Typus: DIDUKH & KONTAR (1999: Table 4, relevé 18) [Holotypus]

Notes: DIDUKH & KONTAR (1999: p. 86) indicate relevé 18 of Table 3 as type relevé. While the association is not contained in Table 3, but in Table 4, we consider this as a simple typo that does not invalidate the typification.

***Aurinio saxatilis-Allietum podolici* Onyschenko 2001**

Protologue: “*Aurinio saxatilis-Allietum podolici* ass. nova” (ONYSCHENKO 2001: pp. 95 et seq.)

Typus: ONYSCHENKO (2001: Table 2, rel. 13) [Holotypus]

***Betonico officinalis-Trifolietum montani* Popova in Popova et al. 1986**

Notes: This association was cited by KOROTCHENKO & DIDUKH (1997), but we could not check the original source so far.

***Brachypodio pinnati-Teucrietum chamaedryos* Fijalkowski 1964**

Protologue: “Zbiorowisko *Brachypodium pinnatum-Teucrium chamaedryos* (*Brachypodio-Teucrietum*)” (FIJALKOWSKI 1964).

Typus: As to our knowledge not yet lectotypified.

***Festuco sulcatae-Brachypodietum pinnati* Soó 1927**

Protologue: „*Festuceto (sulcatae)-Brachypodietum (pinnati)*“ (SOÓ 1927: pp. 85, 87–89)

Typus: DENGLER et al. (2012: Table 3: rel. 1 = RO01NW) [neotypus, selected by DENGLER et al. (2012)]

Syn.: *Brachypodio pinnati-Caricetum montanae* Soó 1947* [Syntax. syn.]

Danthonio-Brachypodietum pinnati Soó 1947* nom. inval. p.max.p. [Art. 3b]

Pediculari campestris-Caricetum montanae Soó 1947* [Syntax. syn.]

Notes: Note that this association is not identical with the *Festuco rupicolae-Brachypodietum pinnati* Mahn 1965* described from Germany. As *Festuca sulcata* (Hack.) Nyman and *F. rupicola* Heuff. are heterotypic synonyms, both association names are valid, and Art. 32b ICPN does not apply. As SOÓ (1927) published only a synoptic table, a neotype from the same region is selected here. Note that the microspecies of *Festuca* ser. *Valesiaca* in the type relevé is *F. rupicola* = *F. sulcata*.

***Festuco valesiaca-Poetum angustifoliae* Mirkin in Denisova et al. 1986**

Protologue: “*Festuco valesiaca-Poetum angustifoliae* Mirkin in Denisova et al. 1986“ (DENISOVA et al. (1986: pp. 28 et seq.)

Typus: As to our knowledge not yet neotypified.

***Melico transsilvanicae-Sedetum ruprechtii* Kontar 2000**

Protologue: “*Melicoso transsilvanicae-Sedetum ruprechtii* ass. nov.” (KONTAR 2000: pp. 17 et seq.)

Typus: KONTAR (2000: Table 1, rel. 5) [Holotypus]

***Salvio pratensis-Poetum angustifoliae* Korotchenko & Didukh 1997**

Protologue: KOROTCHENKO & DIDUKH (1997: p. 27)

Typus: KOROTCHENKO & DIDUKH (1997: Table 1, rel. 17) [Holotypus]

***Stipetum pulcherrimae* Soó 1942**

Protologue: SOO (1942: pp. 147 + 149)

Typus: SOO (1949: table 29, rel. 8) [Neotypus, selected by DENGLER et al. (2012)]

Syn.: *Caricetum humilis* Soó 1942* p.p. [Syntax. syn.; Lectotypus designated by DENGLER et al. (2012: p. 348): SOO (1942: pp. 146–147, rel. 4)]

Salvio nutantis-Stipetum pulcherrimae (Soó 1942*) Boşcaiu et al. 1984* nom. illeg. [Art. 29a]

Notes: SOÓ (1942: p. 149) presented a vegetation table with three individual relevés, however, the companion species occurring in only one of these relevés were only listed and not assigned to any of these relevés. Therefore, we consider this table only as an equivalent to a synoptic table, and accordingly the designation of a neotype according to Art. 21 ICPN became necessary.

***Teucro pannonici-Stipetum capillatae* Didukh & Korotchenko 2000**

Protologue: DIDUKH & KOROTCHENKO (2000: pp. 13 et seq.)

Typus: DIDUKH & KOROTCHENKO (2000: Table 2, rel. 9) [Holotypus]

***Thymo pulegioidis-Sedetum sexangularis* Didukh & Kontar 1999**

Protologue: “*Thymo pulegioides-Sedetum sexangulare* ass. nov.” (DIDUKH & KONTAR 1999: pp. 85 et seq.)

Typus: DIDUKH & KONTAR (1999: Table 4, rel. 6) [Holotypus]

***Trifolio arvensis-Festucetum valesiaca* Sopotlieva & Apostolova 2014**

Protologue: SOPOTLIEVA & APOSTOLOVA (2014: p. 83)

Typus: SOPOTLIEVA & APOSTOLOVA (2014: Table 5, rel. 5) [Holotypus]

***Veronico austriaca-Chamaecysetum austriaci* Korotchenko & Didukh 1997**

Protologue: KOROTCHENKO & DIDUKH (1997: pp. 27 et seq.)

Typus: KOROTCHENKO & DIDUKH (1997: Table 1, rel. 21) [Holotypus]

***Vincetoxico hirundinariae-Rumicetum acetosellae* Didukh & Kontar 1999**

Protologue: “*Vincetoxico hirundinarii-Rumicetum acetosellae* ass. nov.” (DIDUKH & KONTAR 1999: pp. 78 et seq.)

Typus: DIDUKH & KONTAR (1999: Table 3, rel. 21) [Holotypus]

References

- ALECHIN, W.W. (1951): Rastitelnost SSSR w osnovnykh zonakh [in Russian]. – 512 pp, Sovetskaja nauka, Moskva.
- BARDAT, J., BIRET, F., BOTINEAU, M., BOULLET, V., DELPECH, R., GÉHU, J.-M., HAURY, J., LACOSTE, A., RAMEAU, J.-C., ROYER, J.-M., ROUX, G. & TOUFFET, J. (2004): Prodrome des végétations de France. – Patrimoines Nat. 61: 171 pp. Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, Paris.
- BERG, C., DENGLER, J., ABDANK, A. & ISERMANN, M. (2004) (Eds.): Die Pflanzengesellschaften Mecklenburg-Vorpommerns und ihre Gefährdung – Textband. – Weissdorn, Jena: 606 pp.
- BOERBOOM, J.H.A. (1960): De Plantengemeenschappen van de Wassenaarse duinen [in Dutch, with English summary]. – Meded. Landbouwhoges. Wageningen 60(10): 135 pp. Wageningen.
- BOŞCAIU, N., TÄUBER, F. & RĂULEA, M. (1984): Aspects de végétation de “Rîpa Roşie” (Département d’Alba) [in Romanian, with French summary]. – Ocrot. Nat. Med. Înconj 28: 36–44, Bucuresti.
- BRAUN-BLANQUET, J., TÜXEN, R. (1943): Übersicht der höheren Vegetationseinheiten Mitteleuropas (unter Ausschluss der Hochgebirge). – Commun. Stn. Intern. Géobot. Méditerr. Alpine 84: 11 pp., Charité, Montpellier.
- BRAUN-BLANQUET, J. (1950): Übersicht der Pflanzengesellschaften Rätians (VI). – Vegetatio 2: 341–360.
- BRAUN-BLANQUET, J. (1955): Das *Sedo-Scleranthion* – neu für die Westalpen. – Österr. Bot. Z. 102: 476–485.
- BRAUN-BLANQUET, J. & MOOR, M. (1938): Verband des *Bromion erecti*. – Comité International du Prodrome Phytosociologique [Ed.]: Prodromus der Pflanzengesellschaften 5: 64 pp., S. I. G. M. A., Montpellier.
- BRZEG, A. & WOJTERSKA, M. (1996): Systematic survey of plant communities of Wielkopolska, with evaluation of their vulnerability [in Polish, with English summary]. – Badania Fizjogr. Pol. Zachodnią Ser. B 45: 7–40.
- DENGLER, J., BECKER, T., RUPRECHT, E., SZABÓ, A., BECKER, U., BELDEAN, M., BITA-NICOLAE, C., DOLNIK, C., GOIA, I., PEYRAT, J., SUTCLIFFE, L.M.E., TURTUREANU, P.D. & UĞURLU, E. (2012): *Festuco-Brometea* communities of the Transylvanian Plateau (Romania) – a preliminary overview on syntaxonomy, ecology, and biodiversity. – Tuexenia 32: 319–359 + 2 tables.
- DENGLER, J., BERG, C., EISENBERG, M., ISERMANN, M., JANSEN, F., KOSKA, I., LÖBEL, S., MANTHEY, M., PÄZOLT, J., SPANGENBERG, A., TIMMERMANN, T. & WOLLERT, H. (2003): New descriptions and typifications of syntaxa within the project ‘Plant communities of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern and their vulnerability’ – Part I. – Feddes Repert. 114: 587–631.
- DENISOVA, A.V., MUKHAMETSHYNA V.S. & MUST N.M. (1986): Kratkaya kharakteristika osnovnykh asociacij pojmenykh lugov Bashkirii klassa *Molinio-Arrhenatheretea* (Brief characteristics of the major associations of floodplain meadows of Bashkortostan of the *Molinio-Arrhenatheretea* class) [in Russian]. – In: Syntaxonomy and dynamics of anthropogenic vegetation: Interuniversity scientific collection: pp. 27–40. Publisher Bashkirian University, Ufa.
- DIDUKH, Y.P. & KONTAR, I.S. (1999): Syntaksonomiya roslynnosti vidslonen’ krystalichnykh porid lisovoi zony Ukrainy. I. Klasy *Asplenetetea trichomanes* ta *Sedo-Scleranthetea* (Syntaxonomy of granite outcrops vegetation in Forest zone of Ukraine. I. *Asplenetetea trichomanes* and *Sedo-Scleranthetea* classes). — Ukr. Phytosociol. Collect., Ser. A, 2(11): 42–61.
- DIDUKH, Y.P. & KOROTCHENKO, I.A. (2000): Klasyfikatsia stepovoi roslynnosti Pokuttia (Classification of the Pokuttia steppe vegetation) [in Ukrainian, with English summary]. – Ukr. Phytosociol. Collect., Ser. A, 16: 3–15.
- DOING, H. (1963): Übersicht der floristischen Zusammensetzung, der Struktur und der dynamischen Beziehungen niederländischer Wald- und Gebüschgesellschaften. – Meded. Landbouwhoges. Wageningen 63(2): 60 pp., Veenman & Zonen, Wageningen.
- DOING, H. (1974): Landscape ecology of sand dune areas between Wassenaar and Ijmuiden (Netherlands) [in Dutch, with English summary]. – Meded. Landbouwhoges. Wageningen 74(12): 111 pp. + supplement, Veenman & Zonen, Wageningen
- ELLMAUER, T. & MUCINA, L. (1993): *Molinio-Arrhenatheretea*. – In: MUCINA, L., GRABHERR, G. & ELLMAUER, T. (Eds.): Die Pflanzengesellschaften Österreichs – Teil I: Anthropogene Vegetation: pp. 297–401, Fischer, Jena.
- ERMAKOV, N. (2012): Prodromus vysshikh edinit rastitelnosti Rossii (The prodrome of the higher units of the Russia vegetation) [in Russian]. – In: MIRKIN, B.M. & NAUMOVA, L.G. (Eds.): Sovremennoe sostoyanie osnovnykh kontseptsii nauki o rastitelnosti (Modern state of the basic concepts of vegetation science): 377–483. Gilem, Ufa.
- FIJALKOWSKI, D. (1964): Xerothermic communities in the environs of Izbica in the Lublin Upland [in Polish, with English summary]. – Ann. Univ. Mariae Curie-Skłodowska Lublin, Sect. C, 12: 239–259.
- GREGOR, T. (2001): Acidophile schafschwingelreiche Magerrasen im osthessischen Buntsandsteingebiet. – Bot. Naturschutz Hessen 13: 5–19.
- KLIKA, J. (1931): Studien über die xerotherme Vegetation Mitteleuropas – I. Die Pollauer Berge im südlichen Mähren. – Beih. Bot. Centralbl., 2. Abt., 47: 343–398.
- KLIKA, J. (1933): Studien über die xerotherme Vegetation Mitteleuropas. – II. Xerotherme Gesellschaften in Böhmen. – Beih. Bot. Centralbl., 2. Abt., 50: 707–773.
- KLIKA, J. & HADAČ, E. (1944): Rostlinná společenstva střední Evropy. (Dokončení.) [in Czech]. – Příroda (Praha) 36: 281–295.
- KLIKA, J. & NOVÁK, J. (1941) (Eds.): Praktikum rostlinné sociologie, půdoznalství, klimatologie a ekologie [in Czech]. – 385 pp. Melantrich, Praha.
- KNAPP, R. (1942): Die Systematik der Wälder, Zwergstrauchheiden und Trockenrasen des eurosibirischen Vegetationskreises. – Beilage Rundbrief Zentralstelle Vegetationskartierung Reiches Kameraden Felde 12: 84 pp. + 35 maps. Unpubl. report, Halle (Saale).
- KNAPP, R. (1944): Die Eurosibirischen Kalk- und Silikat-Trockenrasen (Brometalia) – Eine Beschreibung einer höheren Einheit im System der Pflanzengesellschaften. – 24 pp. Unpubl. report, Halle (Saale).
- KOBENDZA, R. (1930): Les Rapports Phytosociologiques dans l’ancienne grand Forêt de Kampinos [in Polish, with French summary]. – Planta Pol. 2: 200 pp. + 19 tables + 13 plates. Nakładem Towarzystwa Naukowego., Warszawa.
- KOCH, W. (1926): Die Vegetationseinheiten der Linthebene unter Berücksichtigung der Verhältnisse in der Nordostschweiz. – 144 pp. Zollikofer, St. Gallen.

- KONTAR, I.S. (2000): Syntaksonomiya roslynnosti vid slonen' krystalichnykh porid Lisostepu Ukrainy. II. Klasy *Festuco-Brometea* ta *Sedo-Scleranthetea* (Syntaxonomy of vegetation of granite outcrops Forest-Steppe of Ukraine. II. Classes *Festuco-Brometea* and *Sedo-Scleranthetea*) [in Ukrainian, with English summary]. – Ukr. Phytosociol. Collect., Ser. A, 1(16): 16–28.
- KORNECK, D. (1974): Xerothermvegetation von Rheinland-Pfalz und Nachbargebieten. – Schriften. Vegetationskd. 7: 196 pp. + 158 tables. Bundesforschungsanstalt für Naturschutz und Landschaftsökologie, Bonn.
- KOROTCHENKO, I.A. & DIDUKH, Y.P. (1997): The steppe vegetation of the southern part of the Left-Bank Forest-Steppe of the Ukraine. II. Class *Festuco-Brometea* [in Ukrainian, with English summary]. – Ukr. Phytosociol. Collect. Ser. A 1(6): 20–39.
- KRATZERT, G. & DENGLER, J. (1999): Die Trockenrasen der „Gabower Hänge“ am Oderbruch. – Verh. Bot. Ver. Berl. Brandenb. 132: 285–329, 10 tables, 1 map.
- KRAUSCH, H.-D. (1959a): Vegetationsstudien an xerothermen Trockenrasen in Brandenburg. – 159 pp. PhD Thesis, Mathematisch-Naturwissenschaftliche Fakultät, Pädagogische Hochschule, Potsdam.
- KRAUSCH, H.-D. (1959b): Vegetationsstudien an xerothermen Trockenrasen in Brandenburg. Autorreferat einer Dissertation. – Wiss. Z. Pädagog. Hochsch. Potsdam, Math.-Naturwiss. Reihe, 4: 234–235.
- KRAUSCH, H.-D. (1961): Die kontinentalen Steppenrasen (*Festucetalia valesiaceae*) in Brandenburg. – Feddes Repert. Beih. 139: 167–227.
- KRAUSCH, H.-D. (1962): Vorschläge zur Gliederung der mitteleuropäischen Sand- und Silikat-Trockenrasen. – Mitt. Florist.-Soziol. Arbeitsgem. N. F. 9: 266–269.
- KRAUSCH, H.-D. (1967): Die Pflanzengesellschaften des Stechlinsee-Gebietes – 3. Grünlandgesellschaften und Sandtrockenrasen. – Limnologica 5: 331–366.
- KUZEMKO, A. (2011): Dry grassland of the Forest and Forest-Steppe zones of Ukraine: where are the borders of classes? – Oral presentation at the 8th European Dry Grassland Meeting, Uman'. URL: <http://www.botanik.uni-greifswald.de/fileadmin/EDGG/2011/downloads/contributions/presentations/Kuzemko.pdf>.
- LEBRUN, J., NOIRFALISE, A., HEINEMANN, P. & VANDEN BERGHEN, C. (1949): Les associations végétales de Belgique. – Bull. Soc. R. Bot. Belg. 82: 105–207.
- MAHN, E.-G. (1965): Vegetationsaufbau und Standortverhältnisse der kontinental beeinflussten Xerothermrasengesellschaften Mitteldeutschlands. – Abh. Sächs. Akad. Wiss. Leipz., Math.-Naturwiss. Kl., 49(1): 138 pp. + 8 plates. Akademie-Verlag, Berlin.
- MICEVSKI, K. (1978): Typologische Untersuchungen der Wiesen- und Weidenvegetation der Gebeite Maleš und Pijanec [in Macedonian, with German summary]. – Maleš i Pijanec 1: pp. 9–41 + 8 tables, MANU, Skopje.
- MIRKIN, B.M. & NAUMOVA, L.G. (1986): On the highest units of syntaxonomy of plain glycophytous meadows of the European part of the USSR [in Russian, with English summary]. – Bull. Mosk. Ova. Ispy. Prir. 91: 93–104.
- MORAVEC, J. (1967): Zu den azidophilen Trockenrasengesellschaften Südwestböhmens und Bemerkungen zur Syntaxonomie der Klasse *Sedo-Scleranthetea*. – Folia Geobot. Phytotaxon. 2: 137–178.
- MUCINA, L. & KOLBEK, J. (1993): *Koelerio-Corynephoretea*. – In: MUCINA, L., GRABHERR, G. & ELLMAUER, T. (Eds.): Die Pflanzengesellschaften Österreichs – Teil I: Anthropogene Vegetation: 493–521. Fischer, Jena.
- MÜLLER, T. (1961): Ergebnisse pflanzensoziologischer Untersuchungen in Südwestdeutschland. – Beitr. Naturkd. Forsch. Südwestdschl. 20: 111–122.
- NAUMOVA, L.G. (1986): Floristic classification of bottomland meadows in the flooding zone of Kuibyshev Heps [in Russian, with English summary]. – Bull. Mosk. Ova. Ispy. Prir. 91: 75–83.
- OBERDORFER, E. (1957): Süddeutsche Pflanzengesellschaften. – Pflanzensoziologie 10: XXVIII + 564 pp., Fischer, Jena.
- ONYSCHENKO, V.A. (2001): Roslynnist' karbonatnykh vid slonen' pryrodnogo zapovidnyka "Medobory" (Calcareous rock vegetation of the Medobory zapovednik) [in Ukrainian, with English summary]. – Ukr. Phytosociol. Collect. Ser. A 1(17): 86–104.
- PASSARGE, H. (1969): Zur soziologischen Gliederung mitteleuropäischer Weißklee-Weiden. – Feddes Repert. 80: 413–435.
- PASSARGE, H. (1977): Über Initialfluren der *Sedo-Scleranthetea* auf pleistozänen Böden. – Feddes Repert. 88: 503–525.
- PASSARGE, H. (1995): *Sedo-Scleranthetea*-Gesellschaften in N-Franken. – Ber. Bayer. Bot. Ges. Erforsch. Heim. Flora 65: 33–42.
- PASSARGE, H. (2002): Pflanzengesellschaften Nordostdeutschlands 3 – III. Cespitosa und Herbosa. – XX + 304 pp. Cramer, Berlin.
- PEDASHENKO, H., APOSTOLOVA, I., BOCH, S., GANEVA, A., JANISOVÁ, M., SOPOTLIEVA, D., TODOROVA, S., ÚNAL, A., VASSILEV, K., VELEV, N. & DENGLER, J. (2013): Dry grasslands of NW Bulgarian mountains: first insights into diversity, ecology and syntaxonomy. – Tuexenia 33: 309–346.
- POP, I. (1968): Aufzählung der Rasengesellschaften aus den Kalkmassiven der rumänischen Karpaten [in Romanian, with German summary]. – Contrib. Bot. 1968: 267–275.
- POP, I. (1991): General considerations regarding the order *Stipo eriocaulis-Festucetalia pallentis* Pop (1968) emend. 1989. – Stud. Univ. Babeş-Bolyai, Biol., 36: 3–33.
- PÖTSCH, J. (1962): Die Grünlandgesellschaften des Fiener Bruchs in West-Brandenburg. – Wiss. Z. Pädagog. Hochsch. Potsdam, Math.-Naturwiss. Reihe, 7: 167–200.
- ROYER, J.-M. (1991): Synthèse eurosibérienne, phytosociologique et phytogéographique de la classe des *Festuco-Brometea*. – Diss. Bot. 178: 1–296 + 8 tables.
- SÁDLO, J., CHYTRÝ, M. & ČERNÝ, T. (2007): Pionýrská vegetace písčin a mělkých půd (*Koelerio-Corynephoretea*) [in Czech, with English summary]. – In: Chytrý, M. (2007) [Ed.]: Vegetation of the Czech Republic – 1. Grassland and heathland vegetation: pp. 320–370. Academia, Praha.
- SCHAMINÉE, J.H.J., STORTELDER, A.H.F. & WEEDA, E.J. (Eds.) (1996): De Vegetatie van Nederland – Deel 3. Plantengemeenschappen van graslanden, zomen en droge heiden [in Dutch]. – Opulus, Uppsala: 360 pp.
- SCHUBERT, R. (1974): Übersicht über die Pflanzengesellschaften des südlichen Teiles der DDR – IX. Mauerpfefferreiche Pionierfluren. – Hercynia N. F. 11: 201–214.

- SCHUBERT, R., HILBIG, W. & KLOTZ, S. (2001): Bestimmungsbuch der Pflanzengesellschaften Deutschlands. – 472 pp. Spektrum Akademischer Verlag, Heidelberg.
- SIPAYLOVA, L.M., MIRKIN, B.M., SHELYAG-SOSONKO, Y.R. & SOLOMAKHAM V.A. (1985): Novi soiuzy *Agrostion vinealis* ta *Festucion pratensis* luchnoi roslynnosti (New alliances *Agrostion vinealis* and *Festucion pratensis* of the meadow vegetation) [in Ukrainian, with English summary]. – Ukr. Bot. J., 42(4): 13–18.
- SISSINGH, G. & TIDEMAN, P. (1960): De plantengemeenschappen uit de omgeving van Didam en Zevenaar [in Dutch, with English summary]. – Meded. Landbouwhoges. Wageningen 60(13): 30 pp., Wageningen.
- SOÓ, R. VON (1927): Geobotanische Monographie von Koloszvár (Klausenburg). I. Teil. – Mitt. Komm. Heimatkd. Wiss. Gr. Stefan Tisza Ges. Debrecen 4(15–16): 151 pp. A Studium Könyvkiadó R.T. Bizmánya, Budapest.
- SOÓ, R. DE (1929): Die Vegetation und die Entstehung der ungarischen Puszta. – J. Ecol. 17: 329–350.
- SOÓ, R. VON (1930): Über Probleme, Richtungen und Literatur der modernen Geobotanik. Die Pflanzensoziologie in Ungarn [in Hungarian, with German summary]. – A Magy. Biol. Kutató Intézet Munkái 3: 1–51.
- SOÓ, R. DE (1947): Revue systématique des associations végétales des environs de Koloszvár (respectivement de la Mezőség et de la région de la Szamos, en Transylvanie). – Acta Geobot. Hung. 6: 3–50.
- SOÓ, R. (1968): Neue Übersicht der höheren zöologischen Einheiten der ungarischen Vegetation. – Acta Bot. Acad. Sci. Hung. 14: 385–394.
- SOPOTLIEVA, D. & APOSTOLOVA, I. (2014): Dry grassland vegetation in the transition zone between two biogeographic regions. Hacquetia 13: 79–120.
- SOUNGNEZ, N. & LIMBOURG, P. (1963): Les herbages de la Famenne et de la Fagne. – Bull. Inst. Agron. Stn. Rech. Gembloux 31: 359–413.
- TERZI, M. (2011): Nomenclatural revision of the order *Scorzonero-Chrysopogonetalia*. – Folia Geobot. 46: 411–444.
- TOMAN, M. (1981a): Die Gesellschaften der Klasse *Festuco-Brometea* im westlichen Teil des böhmischen Xerothermgebietes – 1. Teil. – Feddes Repert. 92: 303–332.
- TOMAN, M. (1981b): Die Gesellschaften der Klasse *Festuco-Brometea* im westlichen Teil des böhmischen Xerothermgebietes – 3. Teil. – Feddes Repert. 92: 569–601.
- TÜXEN, R. (1931): Die Pflanzendecke zwischen Hildesheimer Wald und Ith in ihren Beziehungen zu Klima, Boden und Mensch. – BARNER, W. [Ed.]: Unsere Heimat – Das Land zwischen Hildesheimer Wald und Ith – Erster Band: 55–131. Lar, Hildesheim.
- TÜXEN, R. (1937): Die Pflanzengesellschaften Nordwestdeutschlands. – Mitt. Florist.-Soziol. Arbeitsgem. Niedersachsen 3: 1–170.
- TÜXEN, R. (1951): Eindrücke während der pflanzengeographischen Exkursionen durch Süd-Schweden. – Vegetatio 3: 149–172.
- VICHEREK, J. (1972): Die Sandpflanzengesellschaften des unteren und mittleren Dnjeprstromgebietes (die Ukraine). – Folia Geobot. Phytotaxon. 7: 9–46 + 4 tables.
- VOLK, O.H. (1931): Beiträge zur Ökologie der Sandvegetation der oberrheinischen Tiefebene. – Z. Bot. 24: 81–185.
- WEEDA, E.J., DOING, H. & SCHAMINÉE, J.H.J. (1996): *Koelerio-Corynephoretea* [in Dutch]. – In: SCHAMINÉE, J.H.J., STORTELDER, A.H.F. & WEEDA, E.J. (Eds.): De Vegetatie van Nederland – Deel 3. Plantengemeenschappen van graslanden, zomen en droge heiden: pp. 61–144. Opulus, Uppsala.
- WESTHOFF, V. & DEN HELD, A.J. (1969) (Eds.): Plantengemeenschappen in Nederland [in Dutch]. – 324 pp. Thieme, Zutphen.

Kuzemko et al.: Dry grasslands of Central Podolia

Appendix S3. Photo collection of the dry grassland types in Central Podolia.

Anhang S3. Fotoauswahl der Trockenrasentypen Zentral-Podoliens.



Ajuga chamaepitys subsp. *chia*-*Sedum acre* [*Alyso alyssoidis*-*Sedion*?] community (1.1.1), “Enchanted valley” near Dmytrashkivka (Site 9) (Photo: T. Becker).



Ajuga chamaepitys subsp. *chia*-*Sedum acre* [*Alyso alyssoidis*-*Sedion*?] community (1.1.1), Locality “Enchanted valley” near Dmytrashkivka village (Site 9) (Photo: J. Dengler, JD104047).



Allium podolicum-*Sedum acre* [*Sedo albi*-*Veronicion dillenii*?] community (1.2.1), Granite outcrops near Antsipolivka village (Site 3) (Photo: J. Dengler, JD103425).



Allium podolicum-*Sedum acre* [*Sedo albi*-*Veronicion dillenii*?] community (1.2.1), Granite outcrops near Antsipolivka village (Site 3) (Photo: O.H. Yavorska).



Linum hirsutum-Galium verum [*Agrostio vinealis-Avenulion schellianae*] community (2.1.1), *Carlina onopordifolia* site “Romashkovo” (Site 6) (Photo: J. Dengler, JD103751).



Fissidens viridulus-Festuca rupicola [*Agrostio vinealis-Avenulion schellianae*] community (2.1.2), Granite outcrops near Antsipolivka village (Site 3) (Photo: O.H. Yavorska).



Fissidens viridulus-Festuca rupicola [*Agrostio vinealis-Avenulion schellianae*] community (2.1.2), Granite outcrops near Antsipolivka village (Site 3) (Photo: J. Dengler, JD103449).



Homalothecium lutescens-Poa angustifolia [*Agrostio vinealis-Avenulion schellianae*] community (2.1.3), Pasture on the sand basis near Ternivka village (Site 13) (Photo: O.H. Yavorska).



Homalothecium lutescens-Poa angustifolia [*Agrostio vinealis-Avenulion schellianae*] community (2.1.3), Pasture on the sand basis near Ternivka village (Site 13) (Photo: O.H. Yavorska).



Teucrio pannonici-Stipetum capillatae (2.2.1), *Carlina onopordifolia* site “Romashkovo” (Site 6) (Photo: J. Dengler, 103737).



Teucro pannonici-Stipetum capillatae (2.2.1), Kyrkiniak underground river valley near Bolgan village (Site 7) (Photo: T. Becker).



Teucro pannonici-Stipetum capillatae (2.2.1), Vilshanka river valley near Verkhnia Slobidka village (Site 14) (Photo: T. Becker).



Teucrio pannonici-Stipetum capillatae (2.2.1), Locality “Ozarynetska mountain” in Nemya river valley near Mohyliv-Podilsky town (Site 17) (Photo: J. Dengler, JD104630).



Allio taurici-Dichanthietum ischaemi (2.2.2), Kamianka river valley between villages Bolgan and Kukuly (Site 8) (Photo: J. Dengler, JD103915).



Allio taurici-Dichanthietum ischaemi (2.2.2), Kamianka river valley between villages Bolgan and Kukuly (Site 8) (Photo: J. Dengler, JD103972).



Salvia nutans-Carex humilis [*Stipion lessingianae*] community (2.2.3), Vilshanska river valley near Verkhnia Slobidka village (Site 14) (Photo: T. Becker).



Salvia nutans-Carex humilis [*Stipion lessingianae*] community (2.2.3), Limestone outcrops near Faihorog village (Site 12) (Photo: J. Dengler, JD104257).