Stenactis septentrionalis. A taxonomic elevation with a change of the generic name is proposed in *Elytrigia flaccidifolia*. Varieties are elevated to subspecies in *Galium glaucum* subsp. *hirsutum* and in two subspecies of *Negundo*. In the latter case a change of the generic name and classification into two species proved necessary. Reclassification of a species into a subspecies is proposed in *Tephroseris palustris* subsp. *congesta* only. The following changes of rank are based on morphological and geographical evidence: *Aremonia pouzarii*, *Dactylorhiza ochroleuca*, *Genistella undulata*, *Galium glaucum* subsp. *hirsutum*, subspecies of *Negundo*. Changes of taxonomic rank in *Avenochloa occidentalis*, *Erysimum cazorlense*, *Galium vivianum* and *Elytrigia flaccidifolia* are also supported by karyological differences. Individual nomenclatural combinations (with a change of the generic name) are proposed in *Acetosa* MILL. (*Rumex* L. p. p.), *Aconogonon* (MEISSN.) REICHENB. (*Polygonum* L. p. p.), *Avenochloa* HOLUB (*Helictotrichon* BESS. p. p.), *Bromopsis* FOURR. (*Bromus* L. p. p.), *Calathiana* DELARBRE (*Gentiana* L. p. p.), *Chamaecytisus* LINK (*Cytisus* L. p. p.), *Colymbada* HILL (*Centaurea* L. p. p.), *Dichodon* (BARTL.) REICHENB. (*Cerastium* L. p. p.), *Eremogone* FENZL (*Arenaria* L. p. p.) and in *Tithymalus* GAERTN. (*Euphorbia* L. p. p.). New nomenclatural combinations necessitated by purely nomenclatural reasons are proposed in *Fallopia* ADANS. (= *Bilderdykia* DUM.) and *Genistella* ORTEGA (= *Chamaespartium* auct.). A. "nomen novum" must be proposed for *Carduus glaucus* BAUMG. regarding its homonymic character. The majority of the changes (about 90 %) presented in this paper arise from taxonomic grounds and only the remainder are based on purely nomenclatural reasons.

Comments follow on the newly accepted genera and their names as well as observations on some taxa included.

DISCUSSION

Anemonidium (SPACH) HOLUB 1974

When classifying species of *Anemone* L. 1753 into several genera, the present author (HOLUB 1973a) abstained from any changes in *Anemone dichotoma* L. 1753. This species is, however, very isolated in *Anemone* and when *Anemonoides* MILL. 1754 and *Anemonastrum* HOLUB 1973 are excluded as separate genera, generic status is also required for *Anemone dichotoma*. The species is a representative of the monotypic section *Anemonidium* SPACH. The achenes are strongly compressed laterally, with distinct wings and without a woolly indumentum; the style is straight and as long as the achene, the rhizome is slender and horizontal. The isolated position of *A. dichotoma* in *Anemone* has recently been confirmed by ČUPOV (1973), who found this species to be quite distinct in the immunological respect. Because the species cannot be referred to any of the generic segregants of *Anemone* s. l. recognized at present, its classification as a separate monotypic genus based on *Anemone* L. sect. *Anemonidium* SPACH 1839 is here considered as the only possible solution.

Chamaepitys HILL 1756

The species of *Ajuga* L. 1753 with flowers usually bright yellow and tripartite leaves constitute a well circumscribed taxonomic group. Their partial inflorescences are

rather poor (with only 1—2 (4) flowers) and the ring of hairs inside the corolla is interrupted, very approached to the bases of stamens. Species of *Ajuga* L. proper are many-flowered (with 6 or more flowers in each partial inflorescence), the flowers are usually blue (never yellow), the ring of hairs inside the corolla is continuous, separated from the bases of stamens; leaves are not partite. KRČÍKOVÁ (1969, MS) demonstrated that there is also a difference in the structure of nectaries between the representatives of these two genera: only one projection is found in the nectaries of *Ajuga chamaepitys* (L.) SCHREB., while there are four projections in the species of *Ajuga* proper. There is also a difference in chromosome numbers. Species of *Ajuga* proper have $2n = 16, 32$ (with $x = 8$) but the only number known with certainty in *Chamaepitys* is $2n = 30$ (with $x = 15$). The number $2n = 28$ reported earlier for *Ajuga chamaepitys* requires revision[1]. By its habitus *Chamaepitys* approach some *Teucrium* species rather than *Ajuga*. Based on the grounds mentioned above, a separation of *Chamaepitys* from *Ajuga* seems to be justified. The generic name *Chamaepitys* was validly published by HILL in 1756 but had been used in the prae-Linnean period by TOURNEFOURT. In the later literature the taxon has usually been classified as a section of *Ajuga*. The delimitation accepted here corresponds to *Ajuga* sect. *Chamaepitys* subsect. *Ivae* BRIQ. in ENGLER et PRANTL Natürl. Pflanzenfam. 4/3: 209—210, 1897.

The infrageneric classification of *Chamaepitys*, especially of *Ajuga chamaepitys* agg., is very difficult. Some authors (BRIQUET 1913—1914, SMEJKAL 1961, BALL 1972) classified all taxa of the complex as subspecies, while BILIK (in RECHINGER 1960) preparing a monographic study of this group treated some of them as species. The latter classification is accepted here, also with regard to the fact that the majority of the taxa concerned were originally described as species. A more profound study is required, in the opinion of the present author, to subordinate one taxon to another. The genus has an evolutionary centre in the East Mediterranean, from where it reached the Pontic, Submediterranean and West Mediterranean regions.

The taxonomic relationships between *Ajuga chamaepitys* (L.) SCHREB. and *A. chia* SCHREB. are not very well understood. Plants intermediate in morphological respect have been named *A. pseudochia* ŠOST.-DESJAT. 1940 or, at the subspecific level, *A. chamaepitys* subsp. *ciliata* (BRIQ.) SMEJKAL 1961. The intermediate taxon (which is, however, morphologically closer to *A. chia* than to *A. chamaepitys*) occurs in regions where the distribution areas of *A. chamaepitys* and *A. chia* intergradate, from the southern part of European U.S.S.R. across the Balkan Peninsula to Sicily. The specific name of *Ajuga glabra* PRESL 1826, according to the short description provided, refers to *A. pseudochia* rather than to *A. chamaepitys*, the latter classification having been used by SMEJKAL (1961). The type was not designated by PRESL, but the material of *Teucrium chamaepitys glabra* (with a printed label) collected by SIEBER at Manfredonia in 1812 and deposited in PR seems to have been the original material on which the description of PRESL's species was based. This material belongs, in my opinion, to a glabrous variant of *A. pseudochia* ŠOST.-DESJAT.; *A. glabra* PRESL 1826 must therefore replace *A. pseudochia* ŠOST.-DESJAT. 1940. The epithet „*glabra*" is also earlier than „*trifida*" from the correct name of *Ajuga chamaepitys* in the genus *Chamaepitys* — *Ch. trifida* DUM. Florul. Belg., 42, 1827, but is later than „*chia*" published by SCHREBER in 1773. The taxonomic status of *Ajuga argyrea*, *A. comata*, *A. cuneatifolia* and *A. lycia* (all described by STAPF from Turkey in 1885) is uncertain: *A. comata* with very long corollas (31 mm) seems to be of particular interest. The taxonomic position of *A. vestita* BOISS. requires further study.

[1] Newly the number $2n = 28$ has been published for Bulgarian plants of *Ajuga chamaepitys* indicating rather the possibility of $x = 7$ (cf. Taxon, Utrecht, 23: 193, 1974).