

. . .

581.526.422.3 (477.5)

, (-):

03.00.05 –

. . .

: , ,
. . . ,

: , ,
,
,
,
. . . ,

«21» 2013 . _ :
.26.211.01 . . .
01601, . , . , 2

: 01025, . , . , 28

«_» _____ 20_ .

. . .

. . .

(2011 .)

(2010 .).

(-)

(),

() .

(

0106U000231)

Carpino-Fagetea, Quercetea roboris, Molinio-Betuletea

Robinietea

«

»,

«

» (

0106U000232)

—

—

—

—

— ;
 — ;
 — , , .
 , , — .
 , — () , —
 , - () ().
 , .
 , 680
 , 366 97 .
 (15
 , 27 , 58 , 122)
 (, , 13 25) .

: *Melico pictae-Quercetum roboris* (*Querceto-Fagetea*) i *Poo angustifoliae-Fraxinetum excelsioris* (*Robinietae*),

34,7%

9,4% —

(28 « » (2009), ,
 —) (,
 « » (2009)), -

2,5)

(

« 377 » « ».

« , ».
- .
« ».

.
15 , ,
- , .
.

(2009–2011 .),
- : « » (. ,
, 2006 .), « : » (. ,
, 2006 .), « » (. , 2007
, 2007 .),
« » (. , ,
2007 2009 .), « : ,
» (. , 2008 2010 .), « , 2011
: 2011–2020 » (. , , 2011
, 2011 .).

. 20 ,
() (.
« » , «
» «
»), 14

. 408
149. (247 , 198
, 49), 204 .
30 57 .

30 000², – 12%.

– 30- (1855, 1869), . . . (1886, 1895, 1897), . . . (1886, 1888), . . . (1890, 1894), . . . (1927, 1928, 1929)

– 90- (, 1890; , 1928). (30-

(1937), . . . (1949), . . . - (1966, 1971, 1974), . . . (1968, 1970), . . . (1969), . . . (1972, 1975, 1978), . . . (1988) . . . (90-

(, 1996, 1997; , 1996, 2008; , 2005; ., 2008; Onyshchenko, 2009).

« . . .», 2003 .). (, , 1992; « . . .», 1996;

2009–2011 .

, (, 1964).
 . (, 1980).
 1968, 1972). (Meusel et al., 1965).
 . (, , 1975).
 - () -
 .
 . (Ellenberg, 1956),
 (, 2001).
 ,
 .
 .
 (, 1982).
 « , » (2009),
 (, , 1996).
 -
 , 97 680 , 366
 , 13,8% 42,8%
 ,
 -
 (397 58,4%)
Quercus-Fagetum (QF-)
Vaccinio-Piceetum (VP-)
 - 181 (26,6%).
), 172 (25,3%).
Alnetum glutinosae (AG-),
 118 (17,4%)
), 116 (17,1%).
Salicetum purpureae (SP-

, 34%

QF-, VP- R-
25%

(53%)

Alnetea glutinosae i *Salicetea purpureae*,
(. 1).

()	QF	VP	AG	SP	R	, %
<i>Quercus-Fagetetea</i>	–	24	17	21	25	
<i>Vaccinio-Piceetea</i>	24	–	6	7	13	
<i>Alnetea glutinosae</i>	17	6	–	53	9	
<i>Salicetea purpureae</i>	21	7	53	–	29	
<i>Robinietea</i>	25	13	9	29	–	

Magnoliophyta (653 96,03%).

: *Polypodiophyta* (21 (3,09%),
Equisetophyta) – (0,59%), *Pinophyta* – (0,29%).
(1: 3,8: 7,0)

(. 2).

	.	%	.	%	.	%	
<i>Lycopodiophyta</i>	2	2,0	3	0,8	4	0,6	1 : 1,5 : 2,0
<i>Polypodiophyta</i>	9	9,2	12	3,3	21	3,1	1 : 1,3 : 2,3
<i>Psilotopsida</i>	1	1,0	2	0,6	3	0,4	1 : 2,0 : 3,0
<i>Equisetopsida</i>	1	1,0	1	0,2	6	0,9	1 : 1,0 : 6,0
<i>Polypodiopsida</i>	7	7,2	9	2,5	12	1,8	1 : 1,3 : 1,7
<i>Pinophyta</i>	2	2,0	2	0,6	2	0,3	1 : 1,0 : 1,0
<i>Magnoliophyta</i>	84	86,8	349	95,3	653	96,0	1 : 4,2 : 7,8
<i>Magnoliopsida</i>	68	70,2	285	77,9	522	75,9	1 : 4,2 : 7,7
<i>Liliopsida</i>	16	16,6	64	17,4	131	20,1	1 : 4,0 : 8,2
	97	100	366	100	680	100	1 : 3,8 : 7,0

Asteraceae, Poaceae, Brassicaceae, Cyperaceae, Rosaceae, Lamiaceae, Apiaceae, Fabaceae, Scrophulariaceae Caryophyllaceae. , 57,8% 55,1% .

Poaceae , *Asteraceae* i
Poaceae ,
 (*Asteraceae* AG, *Cyperaceae,*
). *Poaceae* VP, R SP,
 – (AG *Cyperaceae* *Rosaceae,*
 QF – *Asteraceae* *Rosaceae*). *Caryophyllaceae*
 VP-
) (R-
) *Brassicaceae,*

Asteraceae i *Poaceae,* ,
Caryophyllaceae, Lamiaceae *Apiaceae.*

(65,3%).
Carex L. (30), *Veronica* L. (13), *Galium* L., *Viola* L. (10), *Trifolium* L.
 (9), *Salix* L. (8). ,
 (VP , *Carex*
Veronica, R).
 (R-), *Chenopodium,*
Atriplex L., *Arctium* Mill., *Artemisia* L., *Medicago* L.,

,
 (4,6%), (582 87,1%), 31
 (2,6%), – 39 (5,7%), – 18
 ,
 – 517 (76,0%).
 67 (9,9%), – 96 (14,1%).
 (350 51,5%). (119 17,5%).
 114 (16,7%).
 9,4%) (33 , 4,8%) , (64 ,
 (, 1997; , 2000; , 2001;
 , 2003; , 2005; , , 2008; , 2008).

- , 28,0% .
 (14,7%) - (16,6%), -
 (35,3%), (12,5%) .
 - (12,8%) (12,6%) (31,5%),
 (46,3%) (30,0%) .

(35,4%)). 241
), 139 (57,7%
 - 102 (42,3%).
 1,4: 1, (, 2003; , 2003;
 , 2010).

(48; 34,5%) (59 ; 42,4%),
 (32; 23,1%).
 (80; 78,4%),
 22 (21,6%).
 (52 ; 51,0%). (25; 24,5%)
 (24; 23,5%)

(74; 73,0%).
 (9,0%), - 12 (12,0%), -
 (7,0%).

Carpinus betulus L.,

(- , 1966).

Carex rhizina Blytt ex Lindbl.

(-)
 Carpineto (betuli)–Quercetum (roboris),
 (-) – Acereto (platanoiditis)–Tilieto (cordatae)–Querceta (roboris), Carpineto
 (betuli)–Tilieto (cordatae)–Querceta (roboris) Carpineto (betuli)–Querceta (roboris)
 (-), (-) –
 Acereto (platanoiditis)–Tilieto (cordatae)–Querceta (roboris) Querceta roboris.

122

, ' 58 , 27 , 15 ,

34,7% 9,4% – Querceta roboris (56)

Pineta sylvestris (17).

25 , 14 , 20%

Robinietea (), *Querco-Fagetea* (), *Vaccinio-Piceetea* (), *Alnetea*
glutinosae (), *Salicetea purpurea* ().
Robinietea ,

(, 2005): (*Melico pictae-Quercetum roboris*
Querco-Fagetea Poo angustifoliae-Fraxinetum excelsioris Robinietea)

, : ;
 , .
 (,) ()
). , ,
 , .
 - - .
 , .
 , ,
 . ,
 - - , - , ,
 . ,
 , .
 : , (, 1985).

(Pinetum (sylvestris)
 calamagrostidosum (epigeioris)), - (Carpineto (betuli)-
 Quercetum (roboris) aegopodiosum (podagrariae) i C.-Q. stellariosum (holosteae))
 - - (Acereto (platanoiditis)-Tilieto (cordatae)-
 Quercetum (roboris) aegopodiosum (podagrariae) A.-T.-Q. caricosum (pilosae)) .

, , -
 . ,
 .
 , - ,
 . , ,
 , - .
 , - .

(, 1992).

(Cariceta colchicae, Festuceta beckeri, Koelerieta sabuletori).

tenuis Sibth.).

(*Poa angustifolia* L., *Agrostis*

40%
(1–5) (6–50).

124 (18,2%). (*Botrychium multifidum* (S.G. Gmel.) Rupr., *Dracocephalum ruyschiana* L., *Jurinea cyanoides* (L.) Rchb., *Pulsatilla patens* (L.) Mill., *Thesium ebracteatum* Hayne)

(. , 1979),

(*Vincetoxicum rossicum* (Kleopow) Barbar.) –

(*Senecio borysthenticus* (DC.) Andr. ex Czern., *Vincetoxicum rossicum*) –

, 28 (*Allium ursinum* L., *Pulsatilla pratensis* (L.)

Mill., *Securigera elegans* (Panicum) Lassen) – « » (2009).

(1–2) – 37
 (3–5) – 34 ;
 – 53)

35 (10,7%
),
 (Carpinetum (betuli) caricosum (rhizinae), Carpineto
 (betuli)–Quercetum (roboris) caricosum (rhizinae), Pinetum (sylvestris) juniperoso
 (communis)–sparsiherbosum), ()
 « » (2009). 32

1. 680 366
 , 97
 Quercu-Fagetea (397 ;
 – Alnetea glutinosae (118
 58,4%) Vaccinio-Piceetea (181; 26,6%),
 ; 17,4%) i Salicetea purpur ae (116; 17,1%).
 Asteraceae (79 ; 11,6%), Poaceae (55; 8,1%), Brassicaceae (38;
 5,1%), Cyperaceae (33; 4,9%), Rosaceae (32; 4,7%). : Carex (30 ;
 4,4%), Veronica (13; 1,9%), Galium i Viola (10; 1,5%).

2. (582 ; 87,1%), (517; 76,0%), – (350; 51,5%). (320 ; 47,1%) (302; 44,4%).
3. (28,0%), (16,6%), (14,7%) – (12,5%) , (35,3%) (31,5%), (46,3%) (30,0%)
4. 241 (35,4%) (1,4: 1).
5. 122 , 57 , 27 , 15 , Querceta roboris (56) Pineta sylvestris (17).
6. 25 , 14 , Robinietea (), Querceto-Fagetea (), Vaccinio-Piceetea (), Alnetea glutinosae (), Salicetea purpurea (): Melico pictae-Quercetum roboris i Poo angustifoliae-Fraxinetum excelsioris.
7. (34,7% 9,4% –) (11
8.) . Carpineto (betuli)–Quercetum (roboris), – Acereto (platanoiditis)–Tilieto (cordatae)–Querceta (roboris), Carpineto (betuli)–Tilieto (cordatae)–Querceta (roboris) Carpineto (betuli)–Querceta (roboris), – Acereto (platanoiditis)–Tilieto (cordatae)–Querceta (roboris) Querceta roboris.
- 9.

- 2009. – . 24, 4 (1). – . 73–77.
6. (.),
/ //
: – 2008. – . 2. – . 100–101.
7. Davydov D.A. Classification of the vegetation of floodplain forests (all. *Alnion incanae* Pawłowski et al. 1928) in the Romny-Poltava geobotanical district / D.A. Davydov // : 2011–2020 : (. , 6–8 2011 .). – ., 2011. – . 122–123.
8. *Symphytum tauricum* Willd. / ,
//
: –
(. , 14–15 2006 .). – : - “ ”, 2006. – . 88.
9. / , // :
:
- – , 2006. – . 216–218.
10. *Scilla* L.
/ // :
(. , 25–26
2007 .). – , 2007. – . 4.
11. *Vinca* L.
/ , //
:
(. , 17–20 2007 .). – , 2007. – . 88.
12. / , //
:
- – :
, 2007. – . 103–104.
13. / , // :
:
- , 2008. – . 144–145.
14. / //
:
- – :
, 2009. – . 97–98.
15. *arex brevicollis* DC.
/ // :
:
- – , 2010. – . 74–75.

16.) / // : , , 2010. – . 75–77.
17. / // : , , 2010. – . 77–78.
18. *Orchidaceae* Juss. / // : , 26–30 2011 .). – .: , 2011. – . 143–145.
19. / // : , 2010. – . 115–116.
20. / // : , 2010. – . 116–117.
- () : , . – . 03.00.05 – . – , 2012.
- , 680 . , . , . , . (15 , 27 , 58 , 122) – (, , 13 25) : *Melico pictae-Quercetum roboris* (*Quercu-Fagetea*) i *Poo angustifoliae-Fraxinetum excelsioris* (*Robinietae*), . , . 124 35

24 32

-

():

03.00.05 –
, 2012.

(),

680

, 366 , 97

Quercus-Fagetum (397 ; 58,4%) *Vaccinio-Piceetum* (181; 26,6%),
Alnetum glutinosae (118; 17,4%) *Salicetum purpureae* (116; 17,1%).

(35,4%

122

, 57

, 27

, 15

Querceta roboris (56) *Pineta sylvestris* (17).

25

14

Robinieta (), *Quercus-Fagetum*

(), *Vaccinio-Piceetum* (), *Alnetum glutinosae* (), *Salicetum purpureum* ()
) : *Melico pictae-Quercetum*

roboris Poo angustifoliae-Fraxinetum excelsioris.

(35 (124 ; 18,2%)).

Davydov D.A. Forest vegetation of the Romny-Poltava geobotanical district (Ukraine): syntaxonomy, antropogenic changings and protection. – Manuscript.

The thesis for on competition of a scientific degree of the candidate of biological science by the speciality 03.00.05 – botany. – M.G. Kholodny Institute of Botany of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv, 2012.

The work is devoted to the modern condition of forest vegetation of Romny-Poltava geobotanical district, its syntaxonomy, antropogenic changings and protection. Comparative-structural analysis of the flora which is represented by 680 species of higher vascular plants was conducted. Five coenofloras corresponded to classes of vegetation in ecological-floristic classification were distinguished. Systematical, biomorphological, geographical structures of flora and its synantropization were studied. Classification schemes based on dominated (15 formations, 27 subformations, 58 association groups, 122 associations) and ecological-floristical (5 classes, 8 orders, 13 alliances, 25 associations) classifications were elaborated. Two new associations (*Melico pictae-Quercetum roboris* and *Poo angustifoliae-Fraxinetum excelsioris*) were distinguished. Three nomenclatural combinations were realized. Main directions and tendencies of antropogenic changings of forest vegetation were established. Choped and recreation changings are predominated in this region. The sozological estimation of forest vegetation has been carried out. 124 rare species and 35 rare communities were distinguished. 24 species and 32 associations are proposed for regional conservation. Strategy of optimization of plant diversity in this region was created.

Key words: Romny-Poltava geobotanical district, forest vegetation, forest flora, comparative-structural analysis, classification, syntaxonomy, antropogenic changings, protection.