



УДК / UDC 630  
УДК / UDC 635.9  
УДК / UDC 674

Online ISSN 1857-9507  
[www.sf.ukim.edu.mk/sumarski\\_pregled.htm](http://www.sf.ukim.edu.mk/sumarski_pregled.htm)

# ШУМАРСКИ ПРЕГЛЕД FOREST REVIEW

МЕЃУНАРОДНО НАУЧНО СПИСАНИЕ  
INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL

80 ГОДИНИ ОД РАЃАЊЕТО НА РАДОСЛАВ РИЗОВСКИ  
YEARS OF RADOŠLAV RIZOVSKI'S BIRTH



Шум. преглед (Šum. pregled)  
For. review

Год. 46  
Vol. 46

Стр. 1-95  
Pag. 1-95

Скопје, 2015  
Skopje, 2015







УНИВЕРЗИТЕТ „СВ. КИРИЛ И МЕТОДИЈ“ ВО СКОПЈЕ  
Ss. CYRIL AND METHODIUS UNIVERSITY IN SKOPJE  
ШУМАРСКИ ФАКУЛТЕТ ВО СКОПЈЕ  
FACULTY OF FORESTRY IN SKOPJE



УДК / UDC 630  
УДК / UDC 635.9  
УДК / UDC 674

Online ISSN 1857-9507  
[www.sf.ukim.edu.mk/sumarski\\_pregled.htm](http://www.sf.ukim.edu.mk/sumarski_pregled.htm)

# ШУМАРСКИ ПРЕГЛЕД FOREST REVIEW

МЕЃУНАРОДНО НАУЧНО СПИСАНИЕ  
INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL

Шум. преглед (Šum. pregled)  
For. review

Год. 46  
Vol. 46

Стр. 1-95  
Pag. 1-95

Скопје, 2015  
Skopje, 2015

**ШУМАРСКИ ПРЕГЛЕД FOREST REVIEW**

Меѓународно научно списание International Scientific Journal  
Год. 46 / Стр. 1-95 Vol. 46 / Pag. 1-95  
Скопје, 2015 Skopje, 2015

Online ISSN 1857-9507 Online ISSN 1857-9507  
УДК 630 UDC 630  
УДК 635.9 UDC 635.9  
УДК 674 UDC 674

**Издавач Publisher**

Универзитет „Св. Кирил и Методиј“ во Скопје Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje  
Шумарски факултет во Скопје Faculty of Forestry in Skopje  
Декан Dean  
Д-р Јане Ацевски Jane Acevski PhD

**Главен и одговорен уредник Editor-in-chief**

Д-р Бојан Симовски Bojan Simovski PhD

**Уредувачки одбор Editorial board**

Д-р Љупчо Несторовски (Скопје, Македонија) Ljupčo Nestorovski PhD (Skopje, Macedonia)  
Д-р Марилена Идојтиќ (Загреб, Хрватска) Marilena Idžojić PhD (Zagreb, Croatia)  
Д-р Милосав Анѓелиќ (Подгорица, Црна Гора) Milosav Anđelić PhD (Podgorica, Montenegro)  
Д-р Милорад Даниловиќ (Белград, Србија) Milorad Danilović PhD (Belgrade, Serbia)  
Д-р Ирена Папазова-Анакиева (Скопје, Македонија) Irena Papazova-Anakieva PhD (Skopje, Macedonia)  
Д-р Роберт Брус (Љубљана, Словенија) Robert Brus PhD (Ljubljana, Slovenia)  
Д-р Чиприан Палагиану (Сучава, Романија) Ciprian Palaghianu PhD (Suceava, Romania)  
Д-р Влатко Андоновски (Скопје, Македонија) Vlatko Andonovski PhD (Skopje, Macedonia)  
Д-р Саша Орловиќ (Нови Сад, Србија) Saša Orlović (Novi Sad, Serbia)  
Д-р Маргарита Георгиева (Софија, Бугарија) Margarita Georgieva PhD (Sofia, Bulgaria)  
Д-р Зоран Говедар (Бања Лука, Р. Српска, БИХ) Zoran Govedar PhD (Banja Luka, R. Srpska, BiH)  
Д-р Јасминка Ризовска Атанасовска (Скопје, Македонија) Jasminka Rizovska Atanasovska PhD (Skopje, Macedonia)  
Д-р Мариус Димитров (Софија, Бугарија) Marius Dimitrov PhD (Sofia, Bulgaria)  
М-р Дејан Манџуковски (Скопје, Македонија) Dejan Mandžukovski MSc (Skopje, Macedonia)

**Технички уредник Technical editor**

М-р Дејан Манџуковски Dejan Mandžukovski MSc

**Корица и насловна фотографија Cover page and photography**

Д-р Бојан Симовски, *Ramonda nathaliae* Bojan Simovski PhD, *Ramonda nathaliae*

Излегува еднаш годишно Published once a year

**Интернет-страница Web page (on-line)**

[www.sf.ukim.edu.mk/sumarski\\_pregled.htm](http://www.sf.ukim.edu.mk/sumarski_pregled.htm) [www.sf.ukim.edu.mk/sumarski\\_pregled.htm](http://www.sf.ukim.edu.mk/sumarski_pregled.htm)

**Адреса на издавачот Publisher's address**

УКИМ-Шумарски факултет во Скопје UKiM Faculty of Forestry in Skopje  
Редакција на Шумарски преглед Editorial Board of the Forest Review  
Ул. „16 Македонска бригада“ бр. 1 Ul. 16 Makedonska brigada br. 1  
(П. факс 235) (P.O. box 235)  
1 000 Скопје MK-1000 Skopje  
Република Македонија Republic of Macedonia  
Е-пошта: [sumpregled@sf.ukim.edu.mk](mailto:sumpregled@sf.ukim.edu.mk) E-mail: [sumpregled@sf.ukim.edu.mk](mailto:sumpregled@sf.ukim.edu.mk)  
[www.sf.ukim.edu.mk](http://www.sf.ukim.edu.mk) [www.sf.ukim.edu.mk](http://www.sf.ukim.edu.mk)

**ШУМАРСКИ ПРЕГЛЕД      FOREST REVIEW**

Меѓународно научно списание      International Scientific Journal

Год. 46 / Стр. 1-95      Vol. 46 / Pag. 1-95

Скопје, 2015      Скопје, 2015

Online ISSN 1857-9507      Online ISSN 1857-9507

УДК 630      UDC 630

УДК 635.9      UDC 635.9

УДК 674      UDC 674

**Научен и рецензентски одбор**

Акад. Владо Матевски (Скопје, Македонија)  
Д-р Андраж Чарни (Љубљана, Словенија)  
Д-р Дмитро Јакушенко (Зелена Гора, Полска)  
Д-р Маријана Новаковиќ-Вуковиќ (Белград, Србија)  
Д-р Јане Ацевски (Скопје, Македонија)  
Д-р Југослав Брујиќ (Бања Лука, Р. Српска, БИХ)  
Д-р Марјан Никетиќ (Белград, Србија)  
Д-р Рената Ќуштеревска (Скопје, Македонија)  
Д-р Сеад Војниковиќ (Сараево, БИХ)  
Д-р Бојан Симовски (Скопје, Македонија)  
Д-р Јасница Медак (Загреб, Хрватска)  
Д-р Митко Костадиновски (Скопје, Македонија)

**Scientific and reviewers board**

Vlado Matevski Acad. (Skopje, Macedonia)  
Andraž Čarni PhD (Ljubljana, Slovenia)  
Dmytro Iakushenko PhD (Zielona Góra, Poland)  
Marijana Novaković-Vuković PhD (Belgrade, Serbia)  
Jane Acevski PhD (Skopje, Macedonia)  
Jugoslav Brujić PhD (Banja Luka, R. Srpska, BiH)  
Marjan Niketić PhD (Belgrade, Serbia)  
Renata Ćušterevska PhD (Skopje, Macedonia)  
Sead Vojniković PhD (Sarajevo, BiH)  
Bojan Simovski PhD (Skopje, Macedonia)  
Jasnica Medak PhD (Zagreb, Croatia)  
Mitko Kostadinovski PhD (Skopje, Macedonia)

**Интернет-страница**

[www.sf.ukim.edu.mk/sumarski\\_pregled.htm](http://www.sf.ukim.edu.mk/sumarski_pregled.htm)

**Web page (on-line)**

[www.sf.ukim.edu.mk/sumarski\\_pregled.htm](http://www.sf.ukim.edu.mk/sumarski_pregled.htm)

**Адреса на издавачот**

УКИМ-Шумарски факултет во Скопје  
Редакција на Шумарски преглед  
Ул. „16 Македонска бригада“ бр. 1  
(П. факс 235)  
1 000 Скопје  
Република Македонија  
Е-пошта: [sumpregled@sf.ukim.edu.mk](mailto:sumpregled@sf.ukim.edu.mk)  
[www.sf.ukim.edu.mk](http://www.sf.ukim.edu.mk)

**Publisher's address**

UKiM Faculty of Forestry in Skopje  
Editorial Board of the Forest Review  
Ul. 16 Makedonska brigada br. 1  
(P.O. box 235)  
MK-1000 Skopje  
Republic of Macedonia  
E-mail: [sumpregled@sf.ukim.edu.mk](mailto:sumpregled@sf.ukim.edu.mk)  
[www.sf.ukim.edu.mk](http://www.sf.ukim.edu.mk)

## CONTENTS

### *Preface*

---

### ***Bibliography (monograph articles):***

---

- Mandžukovski D.  
**THE LIFE AND WORK OF PROF. DR. RADOŠLAV RIZOVSKI (16.IX 1935 – 20.VII 2008)  
80 YEARS SINCE THE BIRTH OF AND OVER 40 YEARS OF EDUCATIONAL AND SCIENTIFIC  
ACTIVITY** 1
- 

### ***Original Scientific Articles:***

---

- Baričević D., Vukelić J., Puača M., Šapić I.  
**A PHYTOCOENOLOGICAL STUDY OF FORESTS OF HUNGARIAN OAK AND TURKEY OAK  
(QUERCETUM FRINETTO-CERRIDIS /RUDSKI 1949/ TRINAJSTIĆ ET AL. 1996) ON THE  
NORTHWEST BORDER OF ARRIVAL (NATURE PARK PAPUK, CROATIA)** 7
- Dimitrov M., Natcheva R., Ganeva A., Gyurova D.  
**PLANT BIODIVERSITY OF SPHAGNUM-DOMINATED MIRES IN VITOSHA NATURE PARK** 15
- Kutnar L., Eler K.  
**PLANT SPECIES DIVERSITY AND INVASIBILITY OF (PERI-)URBAN FORESTS OF  
LJUBLJANA, SLOVENIA** 30
- Melovski Lj., Hristovski S.  
**FIRST RECORDS FOR SEVEN SPECIES AND ONE HYBRID FOR THE FLORA OF THE  
REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA** 36
- Nikolov I., Dimitrov M.  
**BOREO-MONTANE FOREST PHYTOCOENOSES IN CENTRAL STARA PLANINA MTS.** 43
- Novaković-Vuković M., Milošević R.  
**ANALYSIS OF FLORISTIC COMPOSITION OF MOUNTAIN BEECH FOREST ON LIMESTONE  
AND SERPENTINE IN SERBIA** 55
- Pedashenko H., Vassilev K., Bancheva S., Delcheva M., Vladimirov V.  
**FLORISTIC AND VEGETATION DIVERSITY IN KONGURA RESERVE (SOUTH-WEST  
BULGARIA)** 59
- Teofilovski A., Nikolov Z., Mandžukovski D.  
**JUNCUS FILIFORMIS L. (JUNCACEAE), A NEW SPECIES IN THE FLORA OF MACEDONIA** 71
- Vassilev K., Gavrilova A.  
**FLORA, HABITATS AND VEGETATION OF CHAMDZHA MANAGED RESERVE, CENTRAL  
BALKAN RANGE** 74
- Vukelić J., Šapić I., Baričević D.  
**FLORISTIC-VEGETATIONAL VARIABILITY OF THE ASSOCIATION EPIMEDIO-  
CARPINETUM BETULI (HORVAT 1938) BORHIDI 1963 IN THE NORTH OF CROATIA** 88
- 

### *Instructions to Authors*

---

## FLORISTIC-VEGETATIONAL VARIABILITY OF THE ASSOCIATION *EPIMEDIO-CARPINETUM BETULI* (HORVAT 1938) BORHIDI 1963 IN THE NORTH OF CROATIA

VUKELIĆ J., ŠAPIĆ I., BARIČEVIĆ D.

University of Zagreb, Faculty of Forestry, Zagreb, Croatia

Corresponding author e-mail address: dario.baricevic@zg.htnet.hr

**ABSTRACT:** The paper analyzes 246 phytocoenological relevés of the association *Epimedio-Carpinetum betuli* (I. Horvat 1938) Borhidi 1963 in northern Croatia using the standard principles of the Central European Phytocoenological School [5] and applying recent statistical methods [10, 6, 30]. The association is divided into six subassociations with sociologically closely affiliated differential species. The first part of the research implies formalized classification to analyze and correct the selection of diagnostic and differential species in traditional subassociations formed on the basis of previous studies. The second part uses a statistical method to form three clusters, determine their differential species and compare them with the earlier classification of the association. The results of the analysis have revealed a relatively low floristic variability, whereas structural classification has confirmed a smaller number of the described associations. In addition to providing an objective classification of the community *Epimedio-Carpinetum*, the study will also contribute to future analyses of Illyrian oak-hornbeam forests in their distribution range, as well as to the synthesis of the *Carpinetum* communities of Europe.

**Keywords:** *Epimedio-Carpinetum betuli*, northern Croatia, statistical analysis, differential species.

### 1 INTRODUCTION

The forests of sessile oak and common hornbeam in the north of Croatia belong to the earliest descriptions of forest communities of south-eastern Europe [11]. The most distinctive features of the association *Quercus-Carpinetum croaticum* I. Horvat 1938 are its wealth of flora and diagnostic value of the species of the Illyrian floristic element. On these bases Horvat [12] establishes a separate alliance of oak-hornbeam forests of the Illyrian region (*Carpinion betuli illyrico-podolicum* Horvat 1958), thus delineating them from the Central European forests. His attitude provoked a number of discussions [3, 4, 8, 14, 34], but phytocoenologists of south-eastern Europe retained this alliance in their later works. They pointed out the absence of their characteristic species, but attributed diagnostic importance to the present species from the Illyrian beech forests of the alliance *Fagion illyricum* (= *Aremonio-Fagion* /Horvat 1938/ Borhidi in Török, Podani et Borhidi 1989). Particularly active in the study of the *Carpinion* communities of south-eastern Europe were Slavic phytocoenologists, so Marinček [in 33], in line with the then valid code of phytocoenological nomenclature, named the alliance *Carpinion illyrico-podolicum* as *Erythronio-Carpinion betuli* (Horvat 1938) Marinček 1993 in Wallnöfer et al. 1993; however, this alliance was soon afterwards divided into three sub-alliances [16, 17]. The alliance *Erythronio-Carpinion* is currently recognized in the majority of the surveys of forest vegetation of Europe [25, 1 et al.].

Following research by Horvat, the Illyrian oak-hornbeam forests were nomenclaturally defined by Borhidi [3], who named the association *Epimedio-Carpinetum betuli*. Research into this association has continued in Croatia, resulting in about five hundred relevés to date [23, 24, 29, 15, 27, 21, 31, 2, 18, 28, 26 et al.]. In addition to the association *Epimedio-Carpinetum betuli*, the relevés also describe the association *Festuco drymeiae-Carpinetum betuli*, but it is not analyzed in this paper.


In the cited works, the association *Epimedio-Carpinetum betuli* is divided into six subassociations: *erythronietosum* Horvat 1938, on moderately acidophilic podzolic soils of north-western Croatia, *staphyletosum* Horvat 1938, on neutrophil-alkaline carbonate soils of the

same area, the typical and most common subassociation *caricetosum pilosae* Horvat 1963, mesophilic *asperuletosum* Wraber 1961 and two acidophilic *castanetosum* Wraber 1958 and *luzuletosum albidae* Wraber 1961 with a more pronounced anthropogenic impact. A comparative analysis of the differences and justifiability of the subassociations was not made, while the criteria used to describe them frequently relied on a small number of differential species determined by the first authors of the subassociations I. Horvat and M. Wraber. Since such research activities are supported by new statistical techniques, the goal of our paper was to, with the help of these techniques, analyze the variability and distribution of the association *Epimedio-Carpinetum* in northern Croatia. The results should critically question the justifiability of the traditional classification from previous studies (1), assess the value of diagnostic species (2), possibly define a new statistically justified classification (3), but also answer other important questions concerning the composition and structure of this well known association. A statistical analysis of the overall phytocoenological material of a larger area has an advantage, since it eliminates the narrowly distributed local syntaxa which were developed under the impact of some local factors. On the other hand, it provides a more comprehensive picture of the impact of the macro-climate, other regional factors and naturally, the biogeographic area. Finally, the present European classifications, Natura 2000 in the first place, are based on such regional types.

### 2 RESEARCH AREA

The association *Epimedio-Carpinetum betuli* is a zonal association of the colline belt of a larger part of continental Croatia. The most important areas are located in the mountains between the rivers Sava and Drava in Croatia, then on the northern boundary part of the Dinaric mountain range south of Karlovac, and on the slopes of karst fields in the Dinaric region. It occurs between 150 and 450 m above sea level, most frequently on slope pseudogley, eutric cambisol and luvisol above different parent bedrock. The average annual temperature in the eastern part of the distribution range is 10.5 °C, in the central part it is 10.3 °C, and in the southern part it

amounts to 10.0°C. Precipitation also ranges in the same direction from 700 mm annually, to 1,100 mm (central part), to 1,500 mm at Ogulin. Generally, the climate is moderately warm and humid, while in the eastern part of the distribution range it is semi-humid. Precipitation distribution is favourable (over 50 % in the vegetation period), making the climate conducive to the development of forest vegetation. Apart from climate, there are other ecological factors that are suitable for the life of man, and therefore sessile oak - hornbeam forests were massively cut down very early in history. In northern Croatia (Fig. 1) they inhabit the lower slopes of higher mountains in Pannonia and surround them in a ring-like fashion. In the lower hills (up to 350 m), they occupy comprehensive complexes which are interrupted by colline-submontane beech forests on the northern sides.



**Figure 1:** Map of the research area

### 3 MATERIAL AND METHODS

A phytocoenological analysis of the association *Epimedio-Carpinetum betuli* is based on the principles of the Zurich-Montpellier or the standard Central European School [5]. All the cited research was conducted in accordance with the mentioned School. The most important feature is the unique methodology of field phytocoenological sampling as a prerequisite for comparison and analysis of the results. Two basic analyses were conducted in the project: the first analyzes and evaluates the past (traditional) phytocoenological classification of the association *Epimedio-Carpinetum betuli*, and the second divides the same relevés into clusters formed by means of statistical classification.

A total of 246 phytocoenological relevés were used to analyze previous phytocoenological classification. In all the original papers they were classified into the association *Epimedio-Carpinetum betuli*, or into some of its subassociations:

- *erythronietosum* – 33 relevés, [11, 23, 15, 31]
- *staphyletosum* – 41 relevés, [11, 23, 29, 15, 31]
- *caricetosum pilosae* – 107 relevés, [23, 15, 31, 2, 28]
- *asperuletosum* – 23 relevés, [27, 28]
- *castanetosum sativae* – 25 relevés, [18]
- *luzuletosum albidae* – 17 relevés, [29, 27, 15]

Vegetation relevés were entered into TURBOVEG database [10]. Cluster analysis was performed in PRIMER 6 software [6], with Euclidian distance as a measure of similarity. Diagnostic species were

determined by means of JUICE 7.0 software package [30] on the basis of the analysis of Fidelity measure. The plant covers that occur in more layers were combined. Each plant species was considered with total cover, regardless of the number of structural layers in which it occurred in a particular relevé. Mosses were not evidenced in the majority of studies and were therefore not taken into consideration.

In the first analysis the relevés were classified into six groups (Table I) according to the original subassociations described by the previous authors of research. Species participating with over 30% and fidelity index above 30 were taken as their differential species.

The second analysis was performed on the basis of statistical classification of the same relevés using cluster analysis, which resulted in their grouping within 3 clusters.

Research results (Tables I and II) show only differential, constant, dominant and Illyrian floral element species. Constant species were defined as those with a frequency  $\geq 50\%$  inside the vegetation unit (cluster), whereas dominant species were those with a cover value  $> 25\%$  in at least 20% of the relevés belonging to a particular vegetation unit. Differential species were listed separately. The analysis of ecological conditions using Ellenberg's ecoindicator coefficients [7] was performed in JUICE 7.0 programme [30]. The plant nomenclature was adjusted to the *Flora Croatica* database [19]. The nomenclature of plant communities was adjusted to the survey of forest vegetation of Croatia [32] and subassociation as determined by Croatian phytosociologies in the cited papers [11, 13, 18, 27, 28].

### 4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A total of 276 species of higher plants were recorded in 246 relevés of the association *Epimedio-Carpinetum betuli*. The most important species of the Illyrian floral element distributed in all the six subassociations include *Lonicera caprifolium*, *Epimedium alpinum*, *Ruscus hypoglossum*, *Cyclamen purpurascens*, *Aposeris foetida*, *Knautia drymeia* ssp. *drymeia* and *Primula vulgaris*. A major part of the subassociations also contain *Lamium orvala*, *Erythronium dens-canis*, *Aremonia agrimonoides* and *Vicia oroboides*. The species *Omphalodes verna*, *Cardamine trifolia*, *Helleborus purpurascens* and *Crocus vernus* ssp. *vernus* occur in only one subassociation. In two subassociations in the eastern part of the study area there is an abundance of the species *Helleborus odorus*. It is the presence of these species in oak-hornbeam forests of the Illyrian floral province that constitutes the main reason for the establishment of the alliance *Erythronio-Carpinion betuli*.

From a relatively large number of the species, 55 species were observed in all the subassociations. Constant species of the association are *Carpinus betulus*, *Quercus petraea*, *Prunus avium*, *Fagus sylvatica*, *Crataegus monogyna*, *Corylus avellana*, *Ligustrum vulgare*, *Cornus sanguinea*, *Acer campestre*, *Fraxinus ornus*, *Viola reichenbachiana*, *Pulmonaria officinalis*, *Galium odoratum*, *Asarum europaeum*, *Stellaria holostea*, *Hedera helix*, *Carex sylvatica*, *Rubus hirtus*, *Epimedium alpinum* and *Galium sylvaticum*. They are generally not differential for particular subassociations. The dominant species are *Carpinus betulus* and *Quercus petraea*.

VUKELIĆ J., ŠAPIĆ I., BARIČEVIĆ D.  
 FLORISTIC-VEGETATIONAL VARIABILITY OF THE ASSOCIATION *EPIMEDIO-CARPINETUM BETULI* (HORVAT 1938)  
 BORHIDI 1963 IN THE NORTH OF CROATIA

**Table I:** Shortened synoptic table with percentage frequency and modified fidelity phi coefficient based on the traditional division of associations *Epimedio-Carpinetum betuli*

Group No.	1	2	3	4	5	6
No. of relevés	107	23	33	25	17	41
Subassociations	caric	aspe	eryt	casta	luzu	staph
<b>Differential species</b>						
<i>Tilia tomentosa</i>	28 <sup>49.5</sup>	. ---	. ---	. ---	. ---	. ---
<i>Melica uniflora</i>	52 <sup>45.5</sup>	13 ---	6 ---	. ---	12 ---	10 ---
<i>Carex pilosa</i>	60 <sup>40.1</sup>	13 ---	9 ---	32 <sup>10.3</sup>	6 ---	15 ---
<i>Viola hirta</i>	41 <sup>37.4</sup>	26 <sup>17.4</sup>	. ---	. ---	6 ---	5 ---
<i>Glechoma hirsuta</i>	44 <sup>36.6</sup>	22 <sup>8.7</sup>	3 ---	12 ---	6 ---	2 ---
<i>Acer tataricum</i>	45 <sup>40.9</sup>	30 <sup>22.0</sup>	6 ---	. ---	. ---	. ---
<i>Helleborus odorus</i>	37 <sup>39.0</sup>	26 <sup>22.6</sup>	. ---	. ---	. ---	. ---
<i>Galeobdolon luteum</i>	42 <sup>17.3</sup>	65 <sup>41.1</sup>	12 ---	12 ---	18 ---	2 ---
<i>Prunella vulgaris</i>	5 ---	35 <sup>35.6</sup>	3 ---	. ---	18 <sup>10.6</sup>	2 ---
<i>Galium odoratum</i>	65 <sup>6.9</sup>	91 <sup>30.3</sup>	61 <sup>2.5</sup>	44 ---	29 ---	56 ---
<i>Asarum europaeum</i>	41 ---	96 <sup>30.1</sup>	67 <sup>3.2</sup>	48 ---	47 ---	80 <sup>16.1</sup>
<i>Sanicula europaea</i>	30 ---	87 <sup>29.8</sup>	52 ---	60 <sup>5.6</sup>	35 ---	59 <sup>4.3</sup>
<i>Erythronium dens-canis</i>	2 ---	. ---	64 <sup>60.2</sup>	20 <sup>5.9</sup>	6 ---	. ---
<i>Crocus vernus agg.</i>	3 ---	. ---	58 <sup>50.8</sup>	16 ---	. ---	20 <sup>4.3</sup>
<i>Anemone nemorosa</i>	24 ---	. ---	82 <sup>41.1</sup>	56 <sup>17.2</sup>	6 ---	56 <sup>17.3</sup>
<i>Milium effusum</i>	11 ---	35 <sup>7.3</sup>	58 <sup>30.1</sup>	. ---	18 ---	44 <sup>16.4</sup>
<i>Doronicum austriacum</i>	3 ---	. ---	52 <sup>41.8</sup>	36 <sup>23.2</sup>	. ---	10 ---
<i>Convallaria majalis</i>	12 ---	. ---	64 <sup>37.9</sup>	48 <sup>22.0</sup>	. ---	34 <sup>7.9</sup>
<i>Luzula pilosa</i>	4 ---	. ---	58 <sup>34.7</sup>	52 <sup>28.9</sup>	18 ---	15 ---
<i>Fragaria vesca</i>	20 ---	30 ---	82 <sup>33.7</sup>	20 ---	41 ---	73 <sup>25.9</sup>
<i>Frangula alnus</i>	1 ---	. ---	33 <sup>29.7</sup>	8 ---	12 ---	17 <sup>7.2</sup>
<i>Cephalanthera longifolia</i>	11 ---	. ---	. ---	60 <sup>66.6</sup>	. ---	. ---
<i>Castanea sativa</i>	10 ---	9 ---	24 ---	100 <sup>55.2</sup>	53 <sup>12.2</sup>	41 <sup>1.7</sup>
<i>Melampyrum pratense</i>	10 ---	22 ---	33 ---	88 <sup>50.9</sup>	41 <sup>6.7</sup>	10 ---
<i>Euonymus latifolius</i>	1 ---	. ---	. ---	32 <sup>47.3</sup>	. ---	5 ---
<i>Prenanthes purpurea</i>	2 ---	. ---	9 <sup>1.4</sup>	36 <sup>45.2</sup>	. ---	2 ---
<i>Potentilla micrantha</i>	47 <sup>19.3</sup>	26 ---	6 ---	68 <sup>40.6</sup>	6 ---	12 ---
<i>Lamium orvala</i>	6 ---	. ---	42 <sup>12.8</sup>	68 <sup>37.9</sup>	12 ---	49 <sup>19.0</sup>
<i>Fraxinus ornus</i>	64 <sup>19.1</sup>	9 ---	21 ---	80 <sup>34.0</sup>	18 ---	63 <sup>19.0</sup>
<i>Hedera helix</i>	46 ---	48 ---	52 ---	96 <sup>31.4</sup>	47 ---	83 <sup>19.4</sup>
<i>Acer platanoides</i>	7 ---	4 ---	6 ---	36 <sup>30.1</sup>	6 ---	20 <sup>8.3</sup>
<i>Gentiana asclepiadea</i>	6 ---	9 ---	61 <sup>22.6</sup>	76 <sup>36.9</sup>	35 ---	32 ---
<i>Hieracium murorum</i>	9 ---	. ---	33 <sup>22.4</sup>	36 <sup>25.7</sup>	6 ---	7 ---
<i>Luzula luzuloides</i>	11 ---	. ---	48 <sup>8.8</sup>	64 <sup>23.0</sup>	100 <sup>56.0</sup>	10 ---
<i>Hieracium racemosum</i>	19 ---	13 ---	15 ---	40 <sup>16.8</sup>	47 <sup>24.2</sup>	10 ---
<i>Staphylea pinnata</i>	3 ---	. ---	. ---	. ---	. ---	66 <sup>76.4</sup>
<i>Hacquetia epipactis</i>	. ---	. ---	9 ---	28 <sup>13.5</sup>	. ---	63 <sup>55.9</sup>
<i>Scilla bifolia agg.</i>	. ---	. ---	6 ---	. ---	. ---	34 <sup>49.1</sup>
<i>Helleborus atrorubens</i>	4 ---	. ---	9 ---	. ---	6 ---	44 <sup>49.0</sup>
<i>Melampyrum nemorosum</i>	9 ---	. ---	21 <sup>5.8</sup>	. ---	12 ---	56 <sup>47.9</sup>
<i>Campanula trachelium</i>	3 ---	4 ---	24 <sup>8.8</sup>	8 ---	6 ---	56 <sup>46.8</sup>
<i>Vicia oroboides</i>	12 <sup>4.9</sup>	. ---	3 ---	. ---	. ---	39 <sup>46.8</sup>
<i>Tamus communis</i>	36 <sup>10.6</sup>	. ---	21 ---	28 <sup>2.0</sup>	. ---	71 <sup>45.5</sup>
<i>Solidago virgaurea</i>	6 ---	9 ---	15 ---	. ---	12 ---	49 <sup>42.3</sup>
<i>Mercurialis perennis</i>	7 ---	. ---	9 <sup>1.0</sup>	. ---	. ---	34 <sup>41.3</sup>
<i>Salvia glutinosa</i>	7 ---	13 ---	. ---	24 <sup>10.4</sup>	. ---	49 <sup>41.0</sup>
<i>Viburnum lantana</i>	20 <sup>5.3</sup>	. ---	6 ---	20 <sup>5.8</sup>	. ---	46 <sup>38.5</sup>
<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	19 ---	9 ---	52 <sup>10.9</sup>	56 <sup>15.0</sup>	29 ---	73 <sup>30.7</sup>
<i>Senecio nemorensis agg.</i>	2 ---	. ---	9 ---	40 <sup>31.3</sup>	. ---	39 <sup>30.1</sup>
<b>Dominant species</b>						
<i>Carpinus betulus</i>	100 <sup>6.4</sup>	100 <sup>6.4</sup>	100 <sup>6.4</sup>	88 ---	100 <sup>6.4</sup>	100 <sup>6.4</sup>
<i>Quercus petraea</i>	100 <sup>14.6</sup>	83 ---	100 <sup>14.6</sup>	68 ---	94 <sup>5.7</sup>	98 <sup>10.9</sup>
<b>Constant species</b>						
<i>Fagus sylvatica</i>	90 <sup>5.6</sup>	87 <sup>2.1</sup>	70 ---	92 <sup>8.5</sup>	100 <sup>18.6</sup>	73 ---
<i>Corylus avellana</i>	48 ---	83 ---	91 <sup>10.1</sup>	88 <sup>6.7</sup>	94 <sup>13.9</sup>	90 <sup>9.3</sup>
<i>Carex sylvatica</i>	65 ---	91 <sup>18.5</sup>	70 ---	52 ---	76 <sup>3.5</sup>	83 <sup>10.0</sup>
<i>Prunus avium</i>	79 <sup>8.4</sup>	65 ---	82 <sup>11.6</sup>	72 <sup>2.1</sup>	41 ---	80 <sup>10.4</sup>



<i>Pulmonaria officinalis</i>	55	---	65	2.7	79	15.2	68	5.3	24	---	83	19.1
<i>Ligustrum vulgare</i>	50	---	48	---	58	4.7	44	---	41	---	73	18.6
<i>Crataegus monogyna</i>	54	---	48	---	61	1.8	64	4.9	47	---	78	17.6
<i>Viola reichenbachiana</i>	58	6.0	43	---	73	19.2	32	---	35	---	66	13.1
<i>Acer campestre</i>	79	16.4	74	12.2	55	---	72	10.5	24	---	61	---
<i>Epimedium alpinum</i>	66	14.1	65	13.0	61	8.9	28	---	47	---	37	---
<i>Cornus sanguinea</i>	62	2.9	57	---	55	---	72	12.2	24	---	83	22.1
<i>Rubus hirtus s.lat.</i>	86	35.4	30	---	24	---	64	15.7	35	---	39	---
<i>Stellaria holostea</i>	60	---	74	13.5	88	26.2	24	---	53	---	56	---
<i>Galium sylvaticum</i>	40	---	13	---	82	26.5	60	7.0	35	---	83	27.5
<b>Illirian floral element</b>												
<i>Lonicera caprifolium</i>	14	---	65	13.8	61	9.7	52	2.0	53	2.9	54	3.5
<i>Ruscus hypoglossum</i>	14	---	22	4.2	3	---	20	2.2	35	19.9	15	---
<i>Primula vulgaris</i>	22	---	39	---	73	29.5	28	---	24	---	56	14.4
<i>Aposeris foetida</i>	11	---	52	---	91	27.5	76	13.9	47	---	88	24.7
<i>Knautia drymeia</i>	24	---	43	6.5	42	5.5	16	---	29	---	63	25.0
<i>Cyclamen purpurascens</i>	10	---	17	---	33	---	48	14.3	35	2.2	54	19.7

Differential species of the subassociations are decisive for the classification of the association. According to the studies of the cited authors, the differential species of the compared subassociations are:

- *erythronietosum*: *Erythronium dens-canis*, *Lathyrus montanus*;
- *staphyletosum*: *Staphylea pinnata*, *Hacquetia epipactis*, *Craex digitata*, *Salvia glutinosa*, *Vicia oroboides*, *Aconitum vulparia*, *Rhamnus cathartica*;
- *caricetosum pilosae*: *Carex pilosa*, *Potentilla micrantha*, *Hepatica nobilis*;
- *asperuletosum*: *Galium odoratum*, *Asarum europaeum*, *Sanicula europaea*;
- *castanetosum*: *Castanea sativa*, *Melampyrum pratense*, *Gentiana asclepiadea*, *Pteridium aquilinum*, *Luzula luzuloides*, *Serratula tinctoria*;
- *luzuletosum*: *Luzula luzuloides*.

In the first statistical analysis the subassociations were distributed into six groups (subassociations), according to the standpoints of the phytocoenologists in the cited works. The goal of our analysis was to re-examine their standpoints and use a statistical method to determine differential species. Our subjective criterion guiding the selection was the following: participation in more than 30% of the relevés of a particular subassociation and the fidelity index above 30. The results of the analysis are given in Table I. Of 21 differential species determined by the original researchers, our analysis confirmed 14 and grouped as many as 37 new ones. Since the majority of the species had broader distribution, the previous phytocoenologists did not consider them sociologically significant for discriminating the subassociations. These are, for example, *Tilia tomentosa*, *Melica uniflora*, *Viola hirta*, *Hedera helix*, *Prenanthes purpurea*, *Fraxinus ornus*, *Senetio ovatus*, *Convallaria majalis* etc. On the other hand, a differential status was not confirmed for a smaller number of species (e.g. *Lathyrus montanus*, *Carex digitata*, *Hepatica nobilis*, *Serratula tinctoria*). In the primary research, these species had received this status on the basis of their higher participation, but in a small number of relevés.

In the second analysis we wanted to highlight some new possibilities of classifying the association *Epimedio-Carpinetum betuli* on the basis of the same phytocoenological relevés. Cluster analysis was employed to group the relevés into three clusters, which

were then used for further analysis.

Cluster I: comprises 36 relevés formed for the most part of the former groups 3 and 6, i.e. of the subassociations *erythronietosum* (13 relevés) and *staphyletosum* (21 relevés). The differential species of the new cluster include all the differential species of the former subassociation *staphyletosum* and the majority of the differential species of the former subassociations *erythronietosum* and *asperuletosum*. This cluster is the richest in the species of the Illyrian floral geoelement. A total of 11 species occur with over 30% in all the relevés in the cluster.

Cluster II: comprises 99 relevés, of which 90% belonged to the subassociation *caricetosum pilosae* in the previous analysis, and the rest mainly to the subassociation *asperuletosum*. The subassociation *caricetosum pilosae* had 7 differential species and they all regained their differential status. Along with these, the following species were also determined as differential: *Quercus cerris*, *Euphorbia amygdaloides*, *Lathyrus vernus*, *Lamium galeobdolon* and *Potentilla micrantha*. In the previous analysis, the first three did not prove to be differential species, *Potentilla micrantha* was found in the subassociation *castanetosum*, while *Lamium galeobdolon* was found in the subassociation *asperuletosum*.

Cluster III: comprises 111 phytocoenological relevés grouped from all the subassociations. This heterogeneous cluster contains all the relevés of the subassociations *castanetosum* and *luzuletosum*, while of other subassociations, the relevés lacking differential species determined in the two remaining clusters. It was also found that relevés with acidothermophilic species were more fully present, where *Castanea sativa* and *Luzula luzuloides* feature as differential species. Acidophytes *Melampyrum pratense*, *Hieracium racemosum*, *Hieracium murorum*, *Gentiana asclepiadea*, *Aposeris foetida* and other species have distinctly high participation. The backbone of this cluster is formed by the subassociations *castanetosum* and *luzuletosum*, and six species of the Illyrian floral geoelement are present in more than 30% of all the relevés.

According to the results of the analysis, the former subassociations *caricetosum pilosae* in Cluster II and *castanetosum* and *luzuletosum* in Cluster III manifest the highest degree of homogeneity.

The differential species of the subassociation *asperuletosum* are widely distributed and had a lower fi -

VUKELIĆ J., ŠAPIĆ I., BARIČEVIĆ D.  
 FLORISTIC-VEGETATIONAL VARIABILITY OF THE ASSOCIATION *EPIMEDIO-CARPINETUM BETULI* (HORVAT 1938)  
 BORHIDI 1963 IN THE NORTH OF CROATIA

**Table II:** Shortened synoptic table with percentage frequency and modified fidelity phi coefficient identified by cluster analysis

Group No.	1	2	3
No. of relevés	36	99	111
<b>Differential species</b>			
<i>Heraclium sphondylium</i>	81 <sup>65.1</sup>	12 ---	16 ---
<i>Ranunculus lanuginosus</i>	67 <sup>64.4</sup>	1 ---	12 ---
<i>Euonymus europaeus</i>	83 <sup>60.7</sup>	27 ---	13 ---
<i>Milium effusum</i>	75 <sup>58.5</sup>	14 ---	17 ---
<i>Crocus vernus</i> agg.	58 <sup>58.4</sup>	1 ---	11 ---
<i>Campanula trachelium</i>	61 <sup>58.4</sup>	2 ---	13 ---
<i>Lamium orvala</i>	72 <sup>57.0</sup>	1 ---	29 ---
<i>Aegopodium podagraria</i>	61 <sup>55.5</sup>	3 ---	15 ---
<i>Melampyrum nemorosum</i>	58 <sup>52.4</sup>	3 ---	16 ---
<i>Staphylea pinnata</i>	50 <sup>52.1</sup>	2 ---	9 ---
<i>Scilla bifolia</i> agg.	39 <sup>52.0</sup>	2 ---	. ---
<i>Hacquetia epipactis</i>	53 <sup>50.8</sup>	. ---	15 ---
<i>Daphne mezereum</i>	64 <sup>49.2</sup>	1 ---	30 ---
<i>Helleborus atrorubens</i>	44 <sup>48.4</sup>	8 ---	2 ---
<i>Galanthus nivalis</i>	31 <sup>46.3</sup>	. ---	1 ---
<i>Ranunculus ficaria</i>	44 <sup>44.0</sup>	10 ---	5 ---
<i>Frangula alnus</i>	36 <sup>41.5</sup>	2 ---	7 ---
<i>Arum maculatum</i>	39 <sup>41.4</sup>	10 ---	2 ---
<i>Convallaria majalis</i>	58 <sup>41.1</sup>	6 ---	30 ---
<i>Paris quadrifolia</i>	31 <sup>39.9</sup>	4 ---	2 ---
<i>Glechoma hederacea</i>	36 <sup>37.3</sup>	8 ---	5 ---
<i>Malus sylvestris</i>	39 <sup>37.1</sup>	4 ---	13 ---
<i>Carex digitata</i>	36 <sup>36.7</sup>	5 ---	9 ---
<i>Mercurialis perennis</i>	33 <sup>35.8</sup>	4 ---	8 ---
<i>Ulmus glabra</i>	39 <sup>35.7</sup>	3 ---	15 ---
<i>Vicia oroboides</i>	36 <sup>35.0</sup>	6 ---	10 ---
<i>Prunus spinosa</i>	31 <sup>34.5</sup>	7 ---	4 ---
<i>Scrophularia nodosa</i>	44 <sup>33.5</sup>	9 ---	19 ---
<i>Moehringia trinervia</i>	33 <sup>33.5</sup>	10 ---	5 ---
<i>Geranium phaeum</i>	33 <sup>32.9</sup>	8 ---	7 ---
<i>Serratula tinctoria</i>	39 <sup>30.2</sup>	. ---	25 <sup>6.6</sup>
<i>Helleborus odoratus</i>	. ---	45 <sup>58.7</sup>	1 ---
<i>Rubus hirtus</i> s.lat.	6 ---	87 <sup>55.1</sup>	51 <sup>4.8</sup>
<i>Acer tataricum</i>	6 ---	52 <sup>55.1</sup>	4 ---
<i>Melica uniflora</i>	. ---	53 <sup>52.1</sup>	14 ---
<i>Viola hirta</i>	3 ---	46 <sup>51.8</sup>	5 ---
<i>Glechoma hirsuta</i>	3 ---	46 <sup>47.5</sup>	10 ---
<i>Carex pilosa</i>	17 ---	56 <sup>37.0</sup>	22 ---
<i>Quercus cerris</i>	6 ---	38 <sup>36.1</sup>	12 ---
<i>Tilia tomentosa</i>	3 ---	26 <sup>36.0</sup>	3 ---
<i>Galeobdolon luteum</i>	11 ---	47 <sup>35.6</sup>	18 ---
<i>Potentilla micrantha</i>	8 ---	49 <sup>33.9</sup>	26 ---
<i>Euphorbia amygdaloides</i>	. ---	30 <sup>30.6</sup>	14 ---
<i>Lathyrus vernus</i>	22 ---	60 <sup>30.4</sup>	34 ---
<i>Castanea sativa</i>	19 ---	2 ---	57 <sup>49.4</sup>
<i>Luzula luzuloides</i>	25 ---	6 ---	45 <sup>32.0</sup>
<i>Sanicula europaea</i>	47 <sup>2.2</sup>	23 ---	67 <sup>29.8</sup>
<b>Dominant species</b>			
<i>Carpinus betulus</i>	100 <sup>6.7</sup>	100 <sup>6.7</sup>	97 ---
<i>Quercus petraea</i>	100 <sup>15.1</sup>	96 <sup>1.1</sup>	91 ---
<b>Constant species</b>			
<i>Fagus sylvatica</i>	58 ---	89 <sup>17.0</sup>	90 <sup>19.1</sup>
<i>Galium odoratum</i>	58 ---	69 <sup>11.6</sup>	55 ---
<i>Carex sylvatica</i>	83 <sup>15.7</sup>	70 ---	68 ---
<i>Prunus avium</i>	94 <sup>26.3</sup>	79 ---	65 ---
<i>Hedera helix</i>	78 <sup>23.0</sup>	41 ---	67 <sup>6.9</sup>
<i>Asarum europaeum</i>	100 <sup>50.3</sup>	42 ---	57 ---
<i>Pulmonaria officinalis</i>	100 <sup>45.1</sup>	57 ---	57 ---
<i>Ligustrum vulgare</i>	92 <sup>42.8</sup>	57 ---	39 ---

<i>Galium sylvaticum</i>	89	41.9	37	---	53	---
<i>Corylus avellana</i>	100	39.0	43	---	86	16.5
<i>Cornus sanguinea</i>	94	38.3	64	---	50	---
<i>Acer campestre</i>	97	36.9	76	2.1	50	---
<i>Stellaria holostea</i>	89	33.2	64	---	48	---
<i>Crataegus monogyna</i>	86	31.3	57	---	52	---
<i>Viola reichenbachiana</i>	83	31.1	58	---	45	---
<b>Illyrian floral elemente</b>						
<i>Ruscus hypoglossum</i>	3	---	17	9.6	18	11.4
<i>Erythronium dens-canis</i>	14	4.0	6	---	16	9.0
<i>Epimedium alpinum</i>	50	---	71	22.8	43	---
<i>Knautia drymeia</i>	58	27.6	16	---	43	5.8
<i>Lonicera caprifolium</i>	86	54.0	9	---	49	1.0
<i>Cyclamen purpurascens</i>	56	34.6	8	---	34	2.4
<i>Primula vulgaris</i>	81	48.8	18	---	40	---
<i>Aposeris foetida</i>	100	60.4	4	---	69	16.6

delity index than all the differential species of other subassociations. As it turned out, this subassociation does not show individuality in northern Croatia. It was primarily established because the sampled plots lacked the favoured differential Illyrian species from other subassociations (*staphyletosum* and *erythronietosum* in the first place), while species of beech forests listed in Table I dominated. It should be mentioned that the association *Asperulo-Carpinetum* Wraber 1969 was described in Slovenia.

The subassociation *luzuletosum* follows a similar pattern. In the first analysis it had only two differential species (*Luzula luzuloides* and *Hieracium racemosum*) which occur in the new Cluster III with a high percentage of participation. Since chestnut was singled out as the differential species, the subassociation *castanetosum* should be given priority.

In relation to the previous insights, what is most surprising is the absence of the subassociation *erythronietosum*. Its 33 relevés were for the most part grouped into Cluster I and III. Of its differential species, *Erythronium dens-canis* and *Luzula pilosa* do not have diagnostic importance, whereas all the other species have differential importance for Cluster I, i.e. for the subassociation *staphyletosum*. Evidently, the diagnostic species from the previous studies could not accentuate the identity of the subassociation *erythronietosum* clearly enough to form its own cluster. However, it may have local importance, because the difference between the subassociations *staphyletosum* and *erythronietosum* was also confirmed by pedological research [9]. Undoubtedly, in the process of merging the majority of the relevés of these two subassociations into Cluster I, an important role was played by the biogeographic position of the sampled forest stands. Namely, the study area in the north-western Croatia is the richest in the species of the Illyrian floral geoelement, and so these relevés were grouped into Cluster I.

The former subassociation *staphyletosum* is represented by 41 relevés. Of this, 21 relevés was placed in Cluster I, which gathered all the differential species of the subassociation, including *Staphylea pinnata*. The remaining relevés were grouped into Cluster III. These relevés are characterized by a poorer floristic composition, lessened participation of Illyrian species, absence of diagnostic species of the subassociation *staphyletosum* and higher participation of the species *Castanea sativa*, *Solidago virgaurea*, *Sanicula europaea* and others. This can well be illustrated with a concrete

example of the percentage ratio of some particular species of the former subassociation *staphyletosum* after it was grouped into two clusters. The participation ratio of the species *Staphylea pinnata* in Cluster I in relation to Cluster III is 86:45 %, that of the species *Heracleum sphondylium* is 90:25 %, of *Ranunculus lanuginosus* it is 81:20 %, of *Hacquetia epipactis* it is 90:35 %, etc. All the relevés from the Samobor Mountains were grouped into Cluster III [29].

The subassociation *caricetosum pilosae* underwent the least changes in relation to the traditional standpoints. All the differential species remained the same in the new analysis as well, but some new ones were also added. The number of Illyrian species decreases from the west towards east, while some, such as *Lamium orvala* and *Hacquetia epipactis*, are completely absent. However, it is in this subassociation that important Illyrian species *Epimedium alpinum* and *Helleborus odoratus* are the best represented, despite being the only ones that occur in more than 30% of the relevés in Cluster II. Important differential species in the central and eastern distribution range of the community are *Tilia tomentosa*, *Heleborus odoratus*, *Acer tataricum* and *Quercus cerris*. It will be interesting to compare the relationship of these 99 relevés towards the related associations *Festuco drymeiae-Carpinetum* Vukelić ex Marinček 1994, and *Carici pilosae-Carpinetum betuli* Neuhäusl et Neuhäuslova-Novotna 1964. They are characterized by the smaller number and cover of Illyrian species and high participation of the species *Carex pilosa* and *Festuca drymeia*.

The analysis of ecological conditions conducted with Ellenberg's ecoinicator coefficients [7] did not show significant differences between individual clusters. According to these conditions, the association *Epimedio-Carpinetum betuli* occurs in semi-light (4.58 to 4.81), moderately warm (5.54 to 5.73) and fresh (4.81 to 5.04) habitats. They are moderately acidophilic to moderately basophilic (6.41 to 6.80) and moderately rich in nutrients (4.88 to 5.21).

By summarizing the problem of differential species in this manner, it is evident that they were determined primarily by means of numerical methods. In these methods all the species are put on the same level, regardless of their sociological affiliation. In this sense, it is possible to combine research methodologies for the purpose of achieving the best possible results. By analyzing as many relevés or syntaxa as possible, the fidelity value of more widely distributed ("common")

species is lessened, while the sociologically more closely affiliated species gain increasing importance. Moreover, an unbalanced number of relevés of a particular taxon may give a distorted image, which is also the problem of this analysis. This is the reason that we recommend our results primarily as guidelines for future research.

## 5 CONCLUSIONS

Based on the analysis of 246 relevés and participation of 276 species of higher plants of the association *Epimedio-Carpinetum betuli*, we re-examined its classification into traditional subassociations and proposed a possible new classification. The analysis is based first and foremost on differential species, for which of decisive importance was their participation and fidelity index in a particular syntaxon, i.e. cluster. A small number of differential species which were sociologically closely affiliated to a particular subassociation was frequently the reason for describing a larger number of subassociations, but this often did not correspond to the real field condition. In our study, the fund of differential species in traditionally formed subassociations was significantly increased, which facilitates field research and mapping.

In the second statistical analysis all the relevés were grouped into three clusters. In these clusters, the subassociations *caricetosum pilosae* and *staphyletosum* retained their basic identity, regardless of the fact that a part of the relevés was grouped into other clusters. The subassociation *asperuletosum* does not have distinct differential species and does not show an independent character. Its species are relatively abundantly present in other subassociations. The subassociation *luzuletosum* coincides with the subassociation *castanetosum* in terms of differential species and character, but the latter should be given priority. The relevés of the subassociation *erythronietosum* on deeper, more humid and shadier soils can be added to the subassociation *staphyletosum*, while those on steeper, drier and moderately acidophilic to neutrophilic soils with the species *Erythronium dens-canis* require more detailed study and analysis within the stands grouped in Cluster III.

The results of research suggest the need for further studies and a new syntaxonomic classification of the association *Epimedio-Carpinetum betuli* on the northern boundary of the Illyrian floral province. The results will also be useful for future research into the Illyrian oak-hornbeam forests in their overall distribution range, but also the *Carpinetum* communities in a wider European space.

## 6 REFERENCES

- [1] D. Aeschmann, K. Lauber, D. M. Moser, J. P. Theurillat, *Flora Alpina*, Bd 1. 2. 3. (2004), Haupt Verlag, Bern, Stuttgart, Wien.
- [2] D. Baričević, *Sinekološko-fitocenološke značajke šumske vegetacije Požeške i Babjegore*, Disertacija, Šumarski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu (2002), pag. 175, Zagreb.
- [3] A. Borhidi, *Die Zönologie des Verbandes Fagion illyricum*. 1. Allg. Teil. *Acta Bot. Acad. Sci. Hung.* 9 (1963), pag. 259–297.
- [4] A. Borhidi, *Die geobotanischen Verhältnisse der Eichen- und Hainbuchenwälder Südosteuropas*, Feddes Rep. 78/1-3 (1968), pag. 109–130.
- [5] J. Braun-Blanquet, *Pflanzensoziologie, Grundzüge der Vegetationskunde* (1964), pag. 865, Springer, Wien – New York.
- [6] K. Clarke, R. N. Gorley, *PRIMER v5. User manual/Tutorial*, Primer-E Ltd, (2001), Plymouth.
- [7] H. Ellenberg, C. Leuschner, *Vegetation Mitteleuropas mit den Alpen - Zeigerwerte der Pflanzen Mitteleuropas*, (2010), pag. 109, Eugen Ulmer, Stuttgart.
- [8] V. Glavač, *Über Eichen-Hainbuchenwälder Kroatiens*, Feddes Rep. 79/1-2 (1968), pag. 115–138.
- [9] M. Gračanin, *Tipovi šumskih tala Hrvatske*, Glas. šum. pokuse 9 (1948), pag. 95-119.
- [10] S. M. Hennekens, J. H. J. Schaminée, *TURBOVEG, a comprehensive data base management system for vegetation data*. *J. Veg. Sci.*, 12 (2001) pag. 589–591.
- [11] I. Horvat, *Biljnoscijološka istraživanja šuma u Hrvatskoj*. Glas. šum. pokuse 6 (1938), pag. 127-279.
- [12] I. Horvat, *Laubwerfende Eichenzonen Südosteuropas in pflanzensoziologischer, klimatischer und bodenkundlicher Betrachtung*, *Angew. Pflanzensoziologie* 15 (1958), pag. 50-62.
- [13] I. Horvat, *Šumske zajednice Jugoslavije*. Šumarska enciklopedija, I. izdanje, 2 (1963), pag. 560–590.
- [14] I. Horvat, V. Glavač, H. Ellenberg, *Vegetations Südosteuropas*. G. Fischer Verlag (1974), pag. 768, Stuttgart.
- [15] K. Hruška-Dell'Uomo, *Biljni pokrov Moslavačke gore*. Disertacija, Prirodoslovno- matematički fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu (1974), pag. 312, Zagreb.
- [16] L. Marinček, *Zur Nomenklatur der Hainbuchenwälder des Erythronio-Carpinion*. Zbornik simpozija „Pevalek“, Flora i vegetacija Hrvatske, Šumarski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu i JP „Hrvatske šume“ (1994), pag. 57-62, Koprivnica – Zagreb.
- [17] L. Marinček, A. Čarni, *Die Unterverbände der Hainbuchenwälder des Verbandes Erythronio-Carpinion betuli* (Horvat 1938) Marinček in Walnöfner, Mucina et Grass 1993, *Scopolia* 45 (2000), pag. 1–20.
- [18] J. Medak, *Fitocenološke značajke šuma pitomoga kestena u sjeverozapadnoj Hrvatskoj*, Magistarski rad, Šumarski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu (2004), pag. 126, Zagreb.
- [19] T. Nikolić, (ur.), *Flora Croatica, baza podataka*. On-line (<http://hirc.botanic.hr/fcd>). Botanički zavod, Prirodoslovno- matematički fakultet, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Accessed december, 2015.
- [20] J. Podani, *SYN-TAX 2000. Computer Programs for Data Analysis in Ecology and Systematics, User s Manual* (2001), pag. 53, Budapest.
- [21] Đ. Rauš, N. Šegulja, J. Topić, *Vegetacija sjeveroistočne Hrvatske*, Glas. šum. pokuse 23 (1985), pag. 225–355.
- [22] Lj. Regula-Bevilacqua, *Biljni pokrov Strahinščice u Hrvatskom zagorju*, Disertacija, Prirodoslovno- matematički Sveučilišta u Zagrebu (1978), pag. 261, Zagreb.
- [23] R. Rizovski, *Cenoze hrasta kitnjaka s običnim grabom i hrasta kitnjaka u centralnoj Makedoniji i centralnoj Hrvatskoj*, Magistarski rad, Šumarski



- fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu (1969), pag. 102, Zagreb.
- [24] R. Rizovski, Sporeduvanje na gorun-gaberovi šumi od severna Hrvatska i SR Makedonija, Šumarskiot fakultet na Univerzitet vo Skopje, Godišen zbornik na zemjodelsko 23 (1970), pag. 55–63, Skopje.
- [25] J. S. Rodwell, H. J. Schamine, L. Mucina, S. Pignatti, J. Dring, D. Moss, The Diversity of Europaen Vegetation. An overview of phytosociological alliances and their relationships to EUNIS habitats, National Reference Centre for Agriculture, Nature and Fisheries, Wageningen, (2002), pag. 163, The Netherlands.
- [26] I. Šapić, I., 2012: Šumska vegetacija Zrinske gore, Disertacija, Šumarski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu (2012), pag. 214, Zagreb.
- [27] N. Šegulja, Biljni pokrov Vukomeričkih gorica. Disertacija, Prirodoslovno-matematički fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu (2004), pag. 232, Zagreb.
- [28] Ž. Škvorc, Florističke i vegetacijske značajke Dilja. Disertacija, Šumarski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu (2006), pag. 221, Zagreb.
- [29] I. Šugar, Biljni svijet Samoborskog gorja. Disertacija, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, (2012), pag. 179, Zagreb.
- [30] L. Tichý, JUICE, software for vegetation classification, Journal of Vegetation Science 13 (2002), pag. 451–453.
- [31] J. Vukelić, Šumska staništa i zajednice hrasta kitnjaka (*Quercus petraea* Liebl.) u gorju sjeverozapadne Hrvatske, Glas. šum. pokuse 27 (1991), pag. 1–82.
- [32] J. Vukelić, Šumska vegetacija Hrvatske, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Šumarski fakultet, Državni zavod za zaštitu prirode (2012), pag. 403, Zagreb.
- [33] S. Wallnöfer, L. Mucina, G. Grabherr, Die Pflanzengesellschaften Österreichs. Teil III, (1993), Gustav Fischer Verlag, pag. 85-236, Jena.
- [34] M. Wraber, Über die Verbreitung, Ökologie und Systematische Gliederung der Eichen-Hainbuchenwäder Slowenien, Feddes Rep. 79/6, (1969), pag. 373–389.



### ШУМАРСКИ ПРЕГЛЕД

Меѓународно научно списание  
Год. 46 / Стр. 1-95  
Скопје, 2015

### FOREST REVIEW

International Scientific Journal  
Vol. 46 / Pag. 1-95  
Skopje, 2015

Online ISSN 1857-9507

УДК 630

УДК 635.9

УДК 674

Online ISSN 1857-9507

UDC 630

UDC 635.9

UDC 674

#### Издавач

Универзитет „Св. Кирил и Методиј“ во Скопје  
Шумарски факултет во Скопје  
Декан  
Д-р Јане Ацевски

#### Publisher

Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje  
Faculty of Forestry in Skopje  
Dean  
Jane Acevski PhD

#### Главен и одговорен уредник

Д-р Бојан Симовски

#### Editor-in-chief

Bojan Simovski PhD

#### Уредувачки одбор

Д-р Љупчо Несторовски (Скопје, Македонија)  
Д-р Марилена Ицојтиќ (Загреб, Хрватска)  
Д-р Милосав Ангелиќ (Подгорица, Црна Гора)  
Д-р Милорад Даниловиќ (Белград, Србија)  
Д-р Ирена Папазова-Анакиева (Скопје, Македонија)  
Д-р Роберт Брус (Љубљана, Словенија)  
Д-р Чиприан Палагиану (Сучава, Романија)  
Д-р Влатко Андоновски (Скопје, Македонија)  
Д-р Саша Орловиќ (Нови Сад, Србија)  
Д-р Маргарита Георгиева (Софија, Бугарија)  
Д-р Зоран Говедар (Бања Лука, Р. Српска, БИХ)  
Д-р Јасминка Ризовска Атанасовска (Скопје, Македонија)  
Д-р Мариус Димитров (Софија, Бугарија)  
М-р Дејан Манџуковски (Скопје, Македонија)

#### Editorial board

Ljupčo Nestorovski PhD (Skopje, Macedonia)  
Marilena Idžojtić PhD (Zagreb, Croatia)  
Milosav Anđelić PhD (Podgorica, Montenegro)  
Milorad Danilović PhD (Belgrade, Serbia)  
Irena Papazova-Anakieva PhD (Skopje, Macedonia)  
Robert Brus PhD (Ljubljana, Slovenia)  
Ciprian Palaghianu PhD (Suceava, Romania)  
Vlatko Andonovski PhD (Skopje, Macedonia)  
Saša Orlović (Novi Sad, Serbia)  
Margarita Georgieva PhD (Sofia, Bulgaria)  
Zoran Govedar PhD (Banja Luka, R. Srpska, BiH)  
Jasminka Rizovska Atanasovska PhD (Skopje, Macedonia)  
Marius Dimitrov PhD (Sofia, Bulgaria)  
Dejan Mandžukovski MSc (Skopje, Macedonia)

#### Технички уредник

М-р Дејан Манџуковски

#### Technical editor

Dejan Mandžukovski MSc

#### Корица и насловна фотографија

Д-р Бојан Симовски, *Ramonda nathaliae*

#### Cover page and photography

Bojan Simovski PhD, *Ramonda nathaliae*

Излегува еднаш годишно

Published once a year

#### Интернет-страница

[www.sf.ukim.edu.mk/sumarski\\_pregled.htm](http://www.sf.ukim.edu.mk/sumarski_pregled.htm)

#### Web page (on-line)

[www.sf.ukim.edu.mk/sumarski\\_pregled.htm](http://www.sf.ukim.edu.mk/sumarski_pregled.htm)

#### Адреса на издавачот

УКИМ-Шумарски факултет во Скопје  
Редакција на Шумарски преглед  
Ул. „16 Македонска бригада“ бр. 1  
(П. факс 235)  
1 000 Скопје  
Република Македонија  
Е-пошта: [sumpregled@sf.ukim.edu.mk](mailto:sumpregled@sf.ukim.edu.mk)  
[www.sf.ukim.edu.mk](http://www.sf.ukim.edu.mk)

#### Publisher's address

UKIM Faculty of Forestry in Skopje  
Editorial Board of the Forest Review  
Ul. 16 Makedonska brigada br. 1  
(P.O. box 235)  
MK-1000 Skopje  
Republic of Macedonia  
E-mail: [sumpregled@sf.ukim.edu.mk](mailto:sumpregled@sf.ukim.edu.mk)  
[www.sf.ukim.edu.mk](http://www.sf.ukim.edu.mk)

Шум. преглед (Šum. pregled)  
For. review

Год. 46  
Vol. 46

Стр. 1-95  
Pag. 1-95

Скопје, 2015  
Skopje, 2015

