

Leaf morphology and anatomy of *Camellia* section *Camellia* (Theaceae)

PI ERXU¹, PENG QIUFA¹, LU HONGFEI^{1*}, SHEN JINGBO¹, DU YUEQIANG², HUANG FEILAI² and HU HUI²

¹College of Chemistry and Life Science, Zhejiang Normal University, Jinhua, 321004, China

²Jinhua Forestry Bureau of Zhejiang Province, Jinhua, 321004, China

Received 2 January 2008; accepted for publication 16 December 2008

The delimitations of species in *Camellia* section *Camellia* have been disputed for many years, resulting from uncertain relationships among species. Leaf morphological and anatomical characters for 54 species and three varieties in this section were investigated to reveal the relationships. Principal component analysis and cluster analysis were conducted using the transformed data for quantitative and qualitative characters from leaf morphology and anatomy. Combining the results of statistical analysis with comparative leaf characters of morphology and anatomy, we discussed the taxonomic treatment of section *Camellia* by Chang compared with that of Ming and we conclude that section *Camellia* consists of *c.* 50 species. © 2009 The Linnean Society of London, *Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society*, 2009, 159, 456–476.

ADDITIONAL KEYWORDS: cluster analysis – epidermis – leaf anatomy – principal component analysis – taxonomy.

INTRODUCTION

Camellia section *Camellia* (L.) Dyer (Theaceae) is the largest section in the genus with about 60 species, subspecies and varieties (Chang, 1998), most of which are native to China. Some are cultivated as ornamental trees and are thus spread all over the world (Gao, Parks & Du, 2005). This section is characterized by large, usually red flowers and basal fusion of stamens (Gao *et al.*, 2005). Frequently, bracts and sepals are indistinguishable. The seeds of all species contain edible oils. There are three well-known taxonomic treatments of *Camellia* that have discussed the classification of species of this section in detail: Sealy (1958), Chang (1998) and Ming (2000). Sealy (1958) considered that this section contained eight distinct species. Chang (1998) suggested that it included 57 species and Ming (2000) revised it back to 12 species. There are many uncertainties about the relationships

among species in this section and much disagreement among taxonomic treatments and further taxonomic research on this section is necessary.

Several works based on genetic information (Chen, Wang & Nelson, 2005; Yang *et al.*, 2006) have been conducted to clarify the interspecific relationships within genus *Camellia*, but these studies were not able to answer all the taxonomic questions.

On the one hand, leaf morphology and anatomy have always played an important role in plant taxonomy, particularly for identifying taxa in which variation in floral structures is uninformative or in which flowering specimens are infrequent owing to, for example, a limited flowering season (Meade & Parnell, 2003). On the other hand, leaf features have been largely unexploited in taxonomic studies, resulting from a belief that they respond in a plastic manner to environmental forces. In this study, all materials were taken from the International *Camellia* Species Garden in Jinhua city, making it possible to compare species growing under the same environmental conditions.

*Corresponding author. E-mail: luhongfei63@yahoo.com.cn
The first and second authors contributed equally to this work.

In section *Camellia*, leaf morphology has been described in several publications (Chang, 1998; Ming, 2000; Gao *et al.*, 2005). However, a simple definition of leaf shape is difficult because of the extreme diversity observed. For example, the leaf shape of *Camellia hongkongensis* was described as oblong by Chang (1998), whereas Ming (2000) recorded it as oblong-elliptic, oblong or oblong-lanceolate and Gao *et al.* (2005) described it as oblong-elliptic. These differences in descriptions cause confusion and reduce the taxonomic value of leaf morphology. In contrast, a morphometrical analysis of leaf morphology is a useful and rapid method for identification of species. Recently, morphometric studies on *Taxus*, a taxonomically complex genus, with many sterile specimens like *Camellia*, showed that leaf characters are powerful in separating and identifying species in this morphologically labile plant group (Möller *et al.*, 2007; Shah *et al.*, 2008).

Epidermal characters have been considered to be of great use in studying relationships between taxa (Kong, 2001; Yang & Qi, 2005). In section *Camellia*, there are a few descriptions of leaf epidermal micromorphology (Ao, Chen & Chang, 2002; Ao, Ye & Zhang, 2007), but only a limited number of species were included. Thus, a more comprehensive investigation of leaf epidermal micromorphology in this section is necessary. The multiple epidermis (when present) and the presence or absence of stone cells provides useful information for taxonomy (Baranova, 1972). Additionally, the mesophyll usually offers some useful features, including the presence of crystals (Heintzelman & Howard, 1948). Nevertheless, in section *Camellia*, data for leaf characters in transverse sections are unavailable.

How to treat and make best use of morphological data in taxonomy is still a problem. A great many methods have been reported (Briggs & Walters, 1984; Kirchoff *et al.*, 2004; Plotze *et al.*, 2005; Kirchoff, Richter & Remington, 2007) and there are two main types of numerical techniques to represent taxonomic structure: clustering analysis and principal component analysis (PCA). The two techniques have been shown by Rhodes *et al.* (1971) to be complementary.

In summary, section *Camellia* is retained in the taxonomic treatments of genus *Camellia* by Chang (1998) and Ming (2000), but both the number and the delimitations of species in this section are controversial. This study aims to provide a basis for further investigations of systematic classification using the data of leaf morphology and anatomy.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Leaf samples from 285 plants representing 54 species and three varieties in this section (according to

Chang's taxonomic treatment) were collected from the International *Camellia* Species Garden in Jinhua city. Voucher specimens were deposited in Zhejiang Normal University (ZJNU) herbarium (Table 1). Five fully expanded sun-exposed leaves were sampled for each species.

Leaf epidermal scrapings were macerated in 40% sodium hypochlorite (NaClO) solution for 10 min at 35 °C. After removal of mesophyll tissues, pieces of epidermis were obtained and then dehydrated in an alcohol series and stained with safranin and fast green (Lü & Hu, 2001). Finally, they were mounted in neutral resin (Shanghai Shenhua Holdings Co., China) and examined with an Olympus BX50 light microscope (Olympus Co., Tokyo, Japan).

Shortly after being collected, leaves for transverse sections were cut into pieces and fixed in formaldehyde-acetic acid-alcohol (FAA) solution (Stern & Judd, 2002). Materials were dehydrated in a graded ethanol series, embedded in paraffin (Shanghai Shenhua Holdings Co.), sectioned with a KD-2508 Rotary Microtome (Zhejiang Jinhua Kedi Instrumental Equipment Co., China), treated with a safranin and fast-green stain procedure and mounted in neutral resin. The thicknesses of palisade tissues and spongy tissues were measured using the Dn-3 Micro-Image program (Ningbo Yongxin Optics Co., China). The terminology was based on the classification proposed by Metcalfe & Chalk (1979).

Ten leaves were sampled for each species and were scanned and estimated using the WinFOLIA system (Regent Instruments Inc., Canada). Measurements of area, perimeter, width, length, aspect ratio (width/length) and leaf form coefficient were averaged. All the average values for principal component analysis (PCA) were transformed using formula 1:

$$D_i = \frac{n\bar{X}_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{X}_i} \quad (1)$$

where D_i is the transformed value, \bar{X}_i is the average value of one character of the i the species and n is the number of species examined. D_i is similar with Pearson's coefficient of variation (Briggs & Walters, 1984), making it possible to compare these data calculated in different units. Then a PCA was made using the PAST procedure (version 1.20) based on the transformed values (D_i). We chose the 'correlation (normalized var-covar)' option because the variables were measured in different units, necessitating normalization of all variables by division by their standard deviations. A scatter plot using the two most important components, component 1 (PC1) and component 2 (PC2) as the axes, was constructed.

Table 1. Vouchers of studied specimens, following the system of Chang (1998)

Taxa	Names of collectors and reference numbers	Date of collection
<i>Camellia jinshajiangica</i> Chang & S. L. Lee	Peng Q. F. 200603601	March 2006
<i>Camellia omeiensis</i> Chang	Peng Q. F. 200603611	March 2006
<i>Camellia polyodonta</i> How ex Hu	Peng Q. F. 200603621	March 2006
<i>Camellia lanosituba</i> Chang	Peng Q. F. 200603631	March 2006
<i>Camellia longigyna</i> Chang	Peng Q. F. 200603641	March 2006
<i>Camellia lapidea</i> Wu	Peng Q. F. 200603651	March 2006
<i>Camellia phelloderma</i> Chang, Liu & Zhang	Peng Q. F. 200603661	March 2006
<i>Camellia mairei</i> (Lévl.) Melch.	Peng Q. F. 200603671	March 2006
<i>Camellia villosa</i> Chang & S. Y. Liang	Peng Q. F. 200603681	March 2006
<i>Camellia trichosperma</i> Chang	Peng Q. F. & Lin X. Y. 200604691	April 2006
<i>Camellia semiserrata</i> Chi	Peng Q. F. & Lin X. Y. 200604701	April 2006
<i>Camellia semiserrata</i> var. <i>albiflora</i> Chang	Peng Q. F. & Lin X. Y. 200604721	April 2006
<i>Camellia brevipetiolata</i> Chang	Peng Q. F. 200603731	March 2006
<i>Camellia phellocapsa</i> Chang & B. K. Lee	Peng Q. F. 200603742	March 2006
<i>Camellia compressa</i> Chang & Wen ex Chang	Peng Q. F. 200603751	March 2006
<i>Camellia magniflora</i> Chang	Peng Q. F. 200603761	March 2006
<i>Camellia lungshenensis</i> Chang	Peng Q. F. & Jiang B. 200610771	October 2006
<i>Camellia reticulata</i> Lindl.	Peng Q. F. 200603711	March 2006
<i>Camellia brevicolumna</i> Chang, Liu & Zhang	Peng Q. F. 200603781	March 2006
<i>Camellia pitardii</i> Coh. St.	Peng Q. F. & Jiang B. 200610801	October 2006
<i>Camellia pitardii</i> var. <i>alba</i> Chang	Peng Q. F. 200603811	March 2006
<i>Camellia pitardii</i> var. <i>yunnaica</i> Sealy	Peng Q. F. 200603821	March 2006
<i>Camellia xifongensis</i> Y.K.Li ex X. C. Chen & F. Z. Zheng	Peng Q. F. 200603831	March 2006
<i>Camellia hongkongensis</i> Seem.	Peng Q. F. 200603841	March 2006
<i>Camellia cryptoneura</i> Chang	Peng Q. F. 200603851	March 2006
<i>Camellia oviformis</i> Chang	Peng Q. F. 200603861	March 2006
<i>Camellia brachygyna</i> Chang	Peng Q. F. 200603871	March 2006
<i>Camellia tunganica</i> Chang & B. K. Lee	Peng Q. F. 200603881	March 2006
<i>Camellia bambusifolia</i> Chang, Liu & Zhang	Peng Q. F. 200603891	March 2006
<i>Camellia saluenensis</i> Stapf ex Been	Peng Q. F. & Jiang B. 200610901	October 2006
<i>Camellia albo-sericea</i> Chang	Peng Q. F. 200603911	March 2006
<i>Camellia bailinshanica</i> Chang, Liu & Xiong	Peng Q. F. 200603921	March 2006
<i>Camellia oligophlebia</i> Chang	Peng Q. F. 200603931	March 2006
<i>Camellia uraku</i> (Mak.) Kitamura	Peng Q. F. 200603941	March 2006
<i>Camellia edithae</i> Hance	Peng Q. F. & Jiang B. 200610961	October 2006
<i>Camellia paucipetala</i> Chang	Peng Q. F. 200603971	March 2006
<i>Camellia tenuivalvis</i> Chang	Peng Q. F. 200603981	March 2006
<i>Camellia boreali-yunnanica</i> Chang	Peng Q. F. 200603991	March 2006
<i>Camellia hibisciflora</i> Chang	Peng Q. F. 2006031001	March 2006
<i>Camellia concina</i> Chang	Peng Q. F. & Jiang B. 2006101011	October 2006
<i>Camellia glabsipetala</i> Chang	Peng Q. F. 2006031021	March 2006
<i>Camellia delicata</i> Y. K. Li	Peng Q. F. 2006031041	March 2006
<i>Camellia hunanica</i> Chang & L. L. Qi ex Chang	Peng Q. F. & Jiang B. 2006101051	October 2006
<i>Camellia glabriperulata</i> Chang	Peng Q. F. 2006031061	March 2006
<i>Camellia magnocarpa</i> (Hu & Huang) Chang	Peng Q. F. & Lin X. Y. 2006041081	April 2006
<i>Camellia liberistamina</i> Chang & Chiu	Peng Q. F. & Lin X. Y. 2006041091	April 2006
<i>Camellia lucidissima</i> Chang	Peng Q. F. 2006031101	March 2006
<i>Camellia chekiangoleosa</i> Hu	Peng Q. F. & Jiang B. 2006101111	October 2006
<i>Camellia mongshanica</i> Chang & Ye	Peng Q. F. 2006031121	March 2006
<i>Camellia japonica</i> L.	Peng Q. F. & Jiang B. 2006101131	October 2006
<i>Camellia rusticana</i> (Honda) Kitamura	Peng Q. F. & Jiang B. 2006101141	October 2006
<i>Camellia changii</i> Ye	Peng Q. F. & Jiang B. 2006101151	October 2006
<i>Camellia subintegra</i> Huang ex Chang	Peng Q. F. & Lin X. Y. 2006041161	April 2006
<i>Camellia lienshanensis</i> Chang	Peng Q. F. & Lin X. Y. 2006041171	April 2006
<i>Camellia crassissima</i> Chang & Shi	Peng Q. F. & Lin X. Y. 2006041181	April 2006
<i>Camellia apolyodonta</i> Chang & Q. M. Chen	Peng Q. F. & Lin X. Y. 2006041191	April 2006
<i>Camellia longicaudata</i> Chang & Liang ex Chang	Peng Q. F. & Jiang B. 2006102001	October 2006

Table 2. Qualitative characters and character states

Pattern of anticlinal walls of adaxial epidermal cells	Straight–curved (1), repand (2), sinuous (3)
Pattern of anticlinal walls of abaxial epidermal cells	Straight–curved (1), repand (2), sinuous (3)
Hairs	Present (0), absent (1)
Cork wart	Present (1), absent (0)
Stomatal cluster	Present (1), absent (0)
Centre stomata	Present (1), absent (0)
Veins	Invisible (1), visible (2), raised (3)
Multiple epidermis	Present (1), absent (0)
Stone cells in mesophyll	Present (0), absent (1)

For the cluster analysis, all the measurements of quantitative characters (including leaf area, perimeter, width, length, aspect ratio, form coefficient, thickness of the upper and lower epidermis, thickness of palisade tissue and thickness of spongy tissue) were averaged and then transformed using formula 1. All the qualitative characters were given values (Table 2). A cluster analysis was conducted by PAST procedure (version 1.20) based on the data for quantitative characters and qualitative characters.

RESULTS

CHARACTERS OF THE EPIDERMIS

The characters of the leaf epidermis are listed in Table 3.

Epidermal cells

As seen under the light microscope (LM), the anticlinal walls of the epidermal cells appear straight–curved (Fig. 1), undulate (repand) (Fig. 2) or sinuous (Fig. 3). The patterns may vary between species or between the adaxial and abaxial epidermis of the same species (Table 3). Adaxial epidermal cells vary in size and (or) form even within the same specimen for 44 species (Figs 4–8). The adaxial epidermal cells of some species can be classified in more than one category. The abaxial epidermal cells usually share the same patterns within species. Sinuous anticlinal walls of the abaxial epidermal cells are found in 27 species (Fig. 9) and repand anticlinal walls of the abaxial epidermal cells are seen in 29 species (Fig. 10). Only one species has straight to curved anticlinal walls of the abaxial epidermal cells. Epidermal cells with walls are scarcely seen on the abaxial epidermis.

Stomatal apparatus

All species studied here are hypostomatic (i.e. with stomata only on the lower epidermis). Forty-three species have anisocytic stoma (Fig. 11, arrowhead),

whereas the other species have one of two distinct types of stomatal apparatus (Figs 12–15). One is larger in size, infrequently distributed and surrounded by four or more subsidiary cells (Figs 13–15, arrow), defined as cyclocytic stomata by Metcalfe & Chalk (1979). The other is smaller and surrounded by three subsidiary cells which are variable in size, namely anisocytic stomata (Metcalfe & Chalk, 1979). Frequently, a few anisocytic stomata surround the larger, cyclocytic stomata in the form of a circle (Figs 13–15). Therefore, we define this cyclocytic stoma as the ‘centre stoma’ for its situation and significantly larger size (Table 4).

Stomatal clusters

In section *Camellia*, non-clustered stomata are found in nine species (Figs 16, 17). Stomatal clusters, in which two or more stomata are arranged adjacently with common subsidiary cells, have been documented in previous studies (Yang & Sack, 1995; Geisler, Yang & Sack, 1998; Tang *et al.*, 2002). In this study, 48 species have stomatal clusters, frequently involving 2–4 stomata (Figs 18, 19).

Hairs

A few species have hairs on the abaxial surface (Table 3). *Camellia edithae* has strikingly dense hairs and is thus distinguishable from other species. All of the hairs examined under LM are long, simple and unicellular. Their basal cells are usually stained red with safranin (Fig. 19).

Cork warts

Cork warts are of great diagnostic value (Sealy, 1958; Parks & Griffiths, 1963; Gao *et al.*, 2005). Only six species have cork warts and thus can be easily distinguished from other species (Fig. 20). These species are *C. lanosituba*, *C. compressa*, *C. magniflora*, *C. hibisciflora*, *C. japonica* and *C. rusticana* (Table 3). Cork warts are only present in the abaxial epidermis and their size is variable among species. On the fresh leaf surface, the cork warts look like brown spots. When examined under LM, they look like black pits surrounded by small fibrous epidermal cells, which are frequently stained red and thus easily distinguished from common epidermal cells.

CHARACTERS IN TRANSVERSE SECTION


The characters in transverse section are shown in Table 5. (Detailed data of significance tests are listed in Supplementary Material, Appendix S1.)

Mesophyll

All species examined have bifacial leaves. The number of layers of palisade cells varies from species

Table 3. The characters of leaf epidermis

Taxa	Adaxial epidermis		Abaxial epidermis				
	VEC	POAWOEC	POAWOEC	Hairs	Cork warts	Stomatal clusters	Centre stomata
<i>C. jinshajiangica</i>	–	Repand	Sinuuous	+	–	+	–
<i>C. omeiensis</i>	+	Repand	Sinuuous	–	–	+	–
<i>C. polyodonta</i>	+	Repand	Sinuuous	–	–	+	–
<i>C. lanosituba</i>	+	Repand	Sinuuous	–	+	+	–
<i>C. longigyua</i>	+	Repand	Sinuuous	–	–	+	–
<i>C. lapidea</i>	+	Repand	Repand	+	–	+	–
<i>C. phelloderma</i>	+	Repand	Repand	–	–	+	–
<i>C. mairei</i>	+	Repand	Sinuuous	–	–	+	–
<i>C. villosa</i>	–	Repand	Sinuuous	+	–	–	–
<i>C. trichosperma</i>	+	Str-cur	Repand	–	–	+	+
<i>C. semiserrata</i>	+	Str-cur	Repand	–	–	+	+
<i>C. reticulata</i>	+	Str-cur	Repand	–	–	+	–
<i>C. semiserrata</i> var. <i>albiflora</i>	+	Str-cur	Repand	–	–	+	+
<i>C. brevipetiolata</i>	+	Str-cur	Sinuuous	–	–	+	+
<i>C. phellocapsa</i>	+	Str-cur	Sinuuous	–	–	+	–
<i>C. compressa</i>	+	Sinuuous	Repand	–	+	–	–
<i>C. magniflora</i>	+	Str-cur	Repand	–	+	–	–
<i>C. lungshenensis</i>	+	Str-cur	Sinuuous	–	–	+	+
<i>C. brevicolumna</i>	–	Repand	Repand	–	–	–	–
<i>C. pitardi</i>	+	Repand	Repand	–	–	+	–
<i>C. pitardii</i> var. <i>alba</i>	+	Repand	Sinuuous	–	–	+	–
<i>C. pitardii</i> var. <i>yunnanica</i>	+	Repand	Sinuuous	–	–	+	–
<i>C. xifongensis</i>	+	str-cur	Sinuuous	–	–	–	–
<i>C. hongkongensis</i>	+	str-cur	Sinuuous	–	–	–	–
<i>C. cryptoneura</i>	+	Repand	Repand	–	–	+	+
<i>C. oviformis</i>	+	Sinuuous	Sinuuous	–	–	+	–
<i>C. brachygyna</i>	–	Sinuuous	Sinuuous	+	–	–	–
<i>C. tunganica</i>	+	str-cur	Sinuuous	–	–	+	–
<i>C. bambusifolia</i>	–	str-cur	Repand	+	–	+	–
<i>C. saluenensis</i>	–	str-cur	Repand	+	–	+	–
<i>C. albo-sericea</i>	–	Repand	Sinuuous	+	–	+	–
<i>C. bailinshanica</i>	–	Repand	Sinuuous	+	–	+	–
<i>C. oligophlebia</i>	+	Sinuuous	Sinuuous	–	–	+	–
<i>C. uraku</i>	+	str-cur	str-cur	–	–	+	–
<i>C. edithae</i>	+	str-cur	Repand	+	–	+	–
<i>C. paucipetala</i>	+	Sinuuous	Repand	–	–	+	–
<i>C. tenuivalvis</i>	–	Repand	Repand	–	–	+	–
<i>C. boreali-yunnanica</i>	–	Sinuuous	Repand	–	–	+	–
<i>C. hibisciflora</i>	–	Repand	Repand	–	+	–	–
<i>C. concina</i>	–	Repand	Sinuuous	–	–	–	–
<i>C. glabsipetala</i>	+	Sinuuous	Sinuuous	–	–	–	+
<i>C. delicata</i>	+	Sinuuous	Sinuuous	+	–	+	+
<i>C. hunanica</i>	+	Sinuuous	Sinuuous	–	–	+	–
<i>C. glabriperulata</i>	+	Sinuuous	Sinuuous	–	–	+	–
<i>C. magnocarpa</i>	+	str-cur	Repand	–	–	+	+
<i>C. liberistamina</i>	+	str-cur	Repand	–	–	+	+
<i>C. lucidissima</i>	+	str-cur	Repand	–	–	+	–
<i>C. chekiangoleosa</i>	+	str-cur	Repand	–	–	+	–
<i>C. mongshanica</i>	+	str-cur	Repand	–	–	+	+
<i>C. japonica</i> var. <i>japonica</i>	+	str-cur	Repand	–	+	+	–
<i>C. japonica</i> subsp. <i>rusticana</i>	+	str-cur	Repand	–	+	+	–
<i>C. changii</i>	–	str-cur	Repand	–	–	+	–
<i>C. subintegra</i>	+	str-cur	Repand	–	–	+	+
<i>C. lienshanensis</i>	+	str-cur	Repand	–	–	+	–
<i>C. crassissima</i>	+	str-cur	Repand	–	–	+	–
<i>C. apolyodonta</i>	+	str-cur	Sinuuous	–	–	+	–
<i>C. longicaudata</i>	+	Sinuuous	Sinuuous	–	–	+	–



Figures 1–8. The characters of the adaxial epidermis under the light microscope. Figures 1–3. Showing the anticlinal walls of adaxial epidermal cells. Fig. 1. *C. changii*: straight-arched. Fig. 2. *C. tenuivalvis*: undulate (repand). Fig. 3. *C. paucipetala*: sinuous. Figures 4–8. Adaxial epidermal cells varying in size or form within the same species. Fig. 4. *C. villosa*. Fig. 5. *C. chekiangoleosa*. Fig. 6. *C. edithae*. Fig. 7. *C. glabsipetala*. Fig. 8. *C. glabriperulata*. Scale bar, 50 μm .

to species (Figs 21–24). In some species, it is difficult to differentiate palisade tissue from spongy tissue.

Apart from *C. changii*, all species have stone cells (Fig. 25). Frequently, these are present in palisade tissue and some of them penetrate into spongy tissue. Cluster crystals are present in all species.

Epidermis


With the exception of those species with a single-layered epidermis, 44 species have a multiple epidermis (Table 5). Of these, only *C. japonica* has a multiple epidermis in which hypodermal cells are arranged adjacently without intercellular spaces (Fig. 26) and therefore it can be readily distinguished. Forty-three species have a discontinuous multiple

epidermis (Fig. 27, arrow). Especially large epidermal cells, with few contents, are seen in some species (Fig. 28, arrow).

The transverse view reveals that the guard cells are not surrounded but slightly elevated by subsidiary cells (Fig. 29, arrow). In a few species, guard cells lie on two superposed subsidiary cells rather than a single subsidiary cell (Fig. 30, arrow). Both the basal cells of hairs (Fig. 31) and the cells in cork warts (Fig. 32) seem to be suberized.

Veins

Some diagnostic characters are found in veins. *Camellia japonica* has cork warts on the veins (Fig. 33) and is therefore different from other species.




Figures 9–14. The characters of the abaxial epidermis under the light microscope. Figures 9, 10. The anticlinal walls of abaxial epidermal cells. Fig. 9. *C. lanosita*: sinuous. Fig. 10. *C. trichosperma*: repand. Figures 11–14. Showing two distinct types of stomatal apparatus within the same species. One is centre stomata (arrows). The other is anisocytic stomata. Fig. 11. *C. brevipetiolata*. Fig. 12. *C. lungshenensis*. Fig. 13. *C. cryptoneura*. Fig. 14. *C. brevicolumna*. Scale bar, 50 μm .

Table 4. The area, perimeter, length and width of the guard cell of centre stomata and common stomata in two species

Taxa	Stoma types	Area (μm^2)	Perimeter (μm)	Length (μm)	Width (μm)
<i>C. lungshenensis</i>	Centre stomata (cyclocytic)	556.26 \pm 55.48 [†]	63.74 \pm 3.58 [†]	31.48 \pm 2.97 [†]	15.56 \pm 2.39 [†]
	Common stomata (anisocytic)	387.48 \pm 28.03 [‡]	53.46 \pm 2.47 [‡]	28.36 \pm 1.74 [‡]	13.90 \pm 0.84 [‡]
<i>C. cryptoneura</i>	Centre stomata (cyclocytic)	666.34 \pm 95.75 [†]	72.78 \pm 4.10 [†]	36.08 \pm 2.69 [†]	15.54 \pm 1.34 [†]
	Common stomata (anisocytic)	431.30 \pm 18.74 [‡]	59.86 \pm 2.86 [‡]	28.40 \pm 2.41 [‡]	13.08 \pm 0.96 [‡]

Note: Duncan's Multiple Range Test is made by the SAS program (version 9.0).

[†], [‡]Means with the same symbol are not significantly different ($P = 0.05$).



Figures 15–20. The characters of the abaxial epidermis under the light microscope. Fig. 15. *C. xifongensis*: non-clustered stomata and abortive stomata (arrow). Fig. 16. *C. brachygyna*: single-distributed stomata. Figs 17, 18. Showing stomatal clusters: 2–4 stomata arranged adjacently. Fig. 17. *C. bambusifolia*: stomatal clusters with two stomata arranged adjacently. Fig. 18. *C. delicate*: showing stomatal clusters (arrow) and hairs. Fig. 19. *C. phellocapsa*: showing anisocytic stomata (arrowhead) and stomatal cluster (arrow). Fig. 20. *C. compressa*: showing cork wart (arrow). Scale bar, 50 μm .

Stone cells (Fig. 34) and crystals are randomly present in the veins of all species examined.

PCA BASED ON MEASUREMENTS OF LEAF MORPHOLOGY

The average values of lamina vertical length, horizontal width, ratio of width and length (W/L), area and leaf veins (Table 6, Supplementary, Appendix S1) were transformed before they were used for PCA. The PCA results (Fig. 35) indicate that component 1 and component 2 account for 63.2 and 20.6% of the total variance, respectively. Thus, the sum of the two components accounts for most of the total variance. In Figure 35, to compare readily the treatments of Chang

(1998) and Ming (2000), we use the number codes (Table 3) to represent species or varieties in Chang's treatment and tag them with corresponding symbols indicating their taxonomic status in Ming's treatment. The scatter diagram (Fig. 35) shows that *C. trichosperma*, *C. semiserrata*, *C. semiserrata* var. *albiflora* and *C. magnocarpa* cluster together. It also indicates that *C. compressa*, *C. paucipetala*, *C. changii*, *C. crassissima* and *C. apolyodonta* have particular leaf morphology and are thus distinct from other species.

CLUSTER ANALYSIS


In the cluster analysis, section *Camellia* was divided into two main clusters: cluster 1 (C1) consisting of

Table 5. Characters in transverse section

Taxa	Upper epidermis		Lower epidermis		Mesophyll		
	Thickness (µm)*	Multiple epidermis	Thickness (µm)*	Palisade tissue		Spongy tissue Thickness (µm)*	
				Stone cells	Thickness (µm)*		Layers
<i>C. jinshajiangica</i>	26.37 ± 4.22	Absent	25.98 ± 3.13	Present	128.8 ± 7.01	2	247.1 ± 18.30
<i>C. ometensis</i>	37.33 ± 3.06	Absent	19.18 ± 1.74	Present	161.3 ± 4.81	2	207.5 ± 8.24
<i>C. polyodonita</i>	12.62 ± 0.71	Discontinuous	13.39 ± 1.87	Present	92.57 ± 4.39	2	167.8 ± 4.28
<i>C. lanosituba</i>	15.95 ± 2.80	Absent	15.84 ± 1.23	Present	91.04 ± 4.00	2	170.8 ± 6.29
<i>C. longigyna</i>	22.22 ± 3.83	Absent	14.35 ± 2.75	Present	50.08 ± 4.55	1	119 ± 8.35
<i>C. lapidea</i>	24.04 ± 2.14	Discontinuous	15.48 ± 0.93	Present	114 ± 4.97	2	186.2 ± 3.79
<i>C. phelloderma</i>	26.96 ± 2.96	Discontinuous	15.12 ± 1.85	Present	100.7 ± 7.07	2	184.6 ± 13.90
<i>C. mairei</i>	19.53 ± 1.58	Discontinuous	16.13 ± 2.84	Present	174.3 ± 7.50	3	189.1 ± 3.27
<i>C. villosa</i>	26.61 ± 3.29	Discontinuous	15.93 ± 1.93	Present	126.1 ± 6.47	1	133.7 ± 6.45
<i>C. trichosperma</i>	42.34 ± 3.04	Discontinuous	18.96 ± 2.28	Present	95.79 ± 3.00	2	127.9 ± 4.44
<i>C. semiserrata</i>	46.8 ± 1.13	Discontinuous	23.53 ± 1.67	Present	62.35 ± 3.52	2	172.4 ± 2.71
<i>C. reticulata</i>	24.17 ± 1.83	Absent	20.48 ± 1.76	Present	141.2 ± 22.05	2	174 ± 6.80
<i>C. semiserrata</i> var. <i>albiflora</i>	30.78 ± 2.55	Absent	19.41 ± 2.25	Present	128.3 ± 5.86	2	157.1 ± 18.01
<i>C. brevipetiolata</i>	18.39 ± 2.29	Absent	19.29 ± 2.23	Present	159.2 ± 9.73	2	224.4 ± 5.70
<i>C. phellocapsa</i>	18.63 ± 1.68	Absent	13.01 ± 1.36	Present	88.83 ± 6.43	1	95.05 ± 8.35
<i>C. compressa</i>	39.88 ± 4.86	Discontinuous	20.24 ± 2.52	Present	185.6 ± 6.30	2	285.2 ± 7.52
<i>C. magniflora</i>	24.98 ± 1.96	Absent	19.9 ± 2.23	Present	144.5 ± 11.89	2	210.1 ± 8.29
<i>C. lungshenensis</i>	20.72 ± 2.13	Discontinuous	15.3 ± 1.19	Present	137 ± 9.57	2	227.9 ± 14.48
<i>C. brevicolumna</i>	23.04 ± 1.92	Absent	20.17 ± 2.18	Present	131.1 ± 2.73	2	217.8 ± 5.08
<i>C. pitardii</i>	16.26 ± 3.09	Absent	11.92 ± 1.15	Present	106.4 ± 3.67	2	175.5 ± 3.27
<i>C. pitardii</i> var. <i>alba</i>	19.62 ± 2.04	Discontinuous	12.15 ± 1.64	Present	145.4 ± 6.20	2	188.2 ± 7.04
<i>C. pitardii</i> var. <i>yunnanica</i>	30.14 ± 3.46	Discontinuous	15.8 ± 1.66	Present	155.3 ± 14.58	2	198.7 ± 8.58
<i>C. xifongensis</i>	28.88 ± 2.19	Absent	16.55 ± 1.49	Present	132.1 ± 6.56	2	223.7 ± 16.08
<i>C. hongkongensis</i>	14.98 ± 1.40	Discontinuous	14.94 ± 1.56	Present	84.17 ± 6.35	2	158.6 ± 8.66
<i>C. cryptoneura</i>	15.22 ± 1.46	Absent	20.74 ± 1.85	Present	191.1 ± 6.77	2	208.2 ± 4.25
<i>C. oviformis</i>	18.99 ± 1.89	Absent	20.73 ± 2.34	Present	169.2 ± 4.41	2	184.5 ± 6.74
<i>C. brachygyna</i>	24.36 ± 2.21	Absent	21.81 ± 1.99	Present	148.6 ± 9.72	2	194.1 ± 8.03
<i>C. tunganica</i>	22.03 ± 1.22	Discontinuous	14.18 ± 1.86	Present	159.9 ± 10.62	2	169 ± 10.82
<i>C. bambusifolia</i>	32.56 ± 2.17	Discontinuous	26.17 ± 2.42	Present	84.16 ± 4.99	1	140.1 ± 7.44
<i>C. saluenensis</i>	31.42 ± 3.76	Absent	15.39 ± 2.82	Present	129.3 ± 4.81	3	167.7 ± 7.93

<i>C. albo-sericea</i>	17.92 ± 1.68	Absent	16.31 ± 1.16	Present	132.1 ± 7.12	2	252.1 ± 33.95
<i>C. bailinshanica</i>	8.57 ± 1.75	Absent	7.99 ± 2.36	Present	86.54 ± 3.06	4	151.6 ± 6.95
<i>C. oligophlebia</i>	27.54 ± 1.91	Discontinuous	12.62 ± 2.02	Present	164 ± 13.30	2	212.7 ± 4.96
<i>C. uraku</i>	14.35 ± 1.73	Discontinuous	15.83 ± 1.29	Present	146.9 ± 6.84	3	228.3 ± 5.29
<i>C. edithee</i>	18.89 ± 1.40	Absent	13.33 ± 0.95	Present	113.2 ± 8.14	2	200 ± 16.16
<i>C. paucipetala</i>	25.78 ± 2.10	Discontinuous	13.68 ± 2.04	Present	161.3 ± 6.78	2	184.5 ± 8.45
<i>C. tenuivalvis</i>	17.98 ± 1.54	Absent	14.64 ± 1.58	Present	99.07 ± 6.16	2	165.7 ± 3.46
<i>C. boreali-yunnanica</i>	28.61 ± 1.43	Absent	20.19 ± 1.81	Present	169.2 ± 16.77	2	182 ± 11.47
<i>C. huiciflora</i>	24.72 ± 2.35	Discontinuous	18.69 ± 0.69	Present	120.9 ± 5.42	2	150.5 ± 9.60
<i>C. concina</i>	21.79 ± 1.69	Absent	18.28 ± 1.61	Present	153 ± 4.60	3	133.1 ± 5.04
<i>C. glabripetala</i>	24.47 ± 2.42	Absent	18.63 ± 1.21	Present	150.8 ± 4.88	2	223.4 ± 4.03
<i>C. delicata</i>	18.04 ± 0.98	Discontinuous	18.66 ± 2.52	Present	72.64 ± 5.29	1	184.3 ± 18.04
<i>C. hunanica</i>	21.02 ± 3.45	Discontinuous	14.47 ± 1.35	Present	131.3 ± 14.52	2	178 ± 4.76
<i>C. glabriperulata</i>	19.41 ± 2.05	Absent	19.29 ± 2.14	Present	112.9 ± 5.64	2	164 ± 8.40
<i>C. magnocarpa</i>	26.33 ± 3.47	Discontinuous	16.37 ± 1.67	Present	50.9 ± 3.07	2	165.3 ± 8.17
<i>C. liberistamina</i>	35.32 ± 2.75	Discontinuous	23.17 ± 1.39	Present	184.4 ± 17.31	2	260.2 ± 6.51
<i>C. lucidissima</i>	33.5 ± 2.82	Absent	19.68 ± 1.88	Present	149.5 ± 14.80	2	241.8 ± 7.22
<i>C. chekiangoleosa</i>	24.55 ± 1.90	Absent	18.6 ± 1.99	Present	183.7 ± 8.84	3	352.1 ± 10.94
<i>C. mongshanica</i>	35.26 ± 4.63	Discontinuous	16.59 ± 1.45	Present	107 ± 2.69	2	200.6 ± 5.67
<i>C. japonica</i> var. <i>japonica</i>	20.4 ± 3.55	Discontinuous	13.1 ± 1.43	Present	93.41 ± 5.45	2	275.6 ± 4.71
<i>C. japonica</i> subsp. <i>rusticana</i>	26.51 ± 2.22	Continuous	13.73 ± 1.11	Present	75.39 ± 2.64	2	176.7 ± 5.92
<i>C. azalea</i>	32.58 ± 1.82	Discontinuous	25.21 ± 3.01	Absent	70.72 ± 3.58	1	222.3 ± 6.08
<i>C. subintegra</i>	22.99 ± 3.09	Discontinuous	15.36 ± 1.77	Present	166.7 ± 4.85	3	227.7 ± 6.39
<i>C. tienshanensis</i>	39.84 ± 2.07	Absent	22.39 ± 1.58	Present	120.2 ± 4.91	2	214 ± 8.89
<i>C. crassissima</i>	37.23 ± 3.16	Absent	22.33 ± 4.01	Present	174.9 ± 17.06	3	264.4 ± 12.59
<i>C. apolyodonta</i>	18.42 ± 1.48	Discontinuous	13.63 ± 2.29	Present	97.16 ± 6.22	2	125.2 ± 7.34
<i>C. longicaudata</i>	25.67 ± 2.69	Absent	22.23 ± 2.24	Present	157.6 ± 7.47	2	298.1 ± 9.19

*Thickness (±SD) is the average value of 10 measurements.



Figures 21–24. Showing the number of layers of palisade cells. Fig. 21. *C. longigynga*: one layer of palisade cells. Fig. 22. *C. hongkongensis*: two layers of palisade cells. Fig. 23. *C. crassissima*: three layers of palisade cells. Fig. 24. *C. bailinshanica*: four layers of palisade cells. Scale bar, 50 μm .

only one species, *C. edithae*; and cluster 2 (C2) including the remaining species (Fig. 36). On closer inspection, C2 can be seen to contain two subclusters: subcluster 1 (SC1) comprising the 12 species and one variety with centre stomata; subcluster 2 (SC2) containing the remaining 39 species, one subspecies and three varieties. Six groups have similarity values greater than 0.96. These groups are: (1) *C. japonica* and *C. rusticana*; (2) *C. pitardii*, *C. pitardii* var. *yunnanica* and *C. pitardii* var. *alba*; (3) *C. trichosperma*, *C. semiserrata*, *C. semiserrata* var. *albiflora* and *C. magnocarpa*; (4) *C. tunganica* and *C. hunanica*; (5) *C. crassissima* and *C. mongshanica*; and (6) *C. albo-sericea* and *C. bailinshanica*.


DISCUSSION

STOMATA OF SECTION *CAMELLIA*

Of the epidermal features, stomatal characters are the most important in taxonomy and classification because they are not only easily observed but also constant within the same taxon. Previous works (Solereeder, 1908; Keng, 1962; Ao *et al.*, 2002; Yang *et al.*, 2003) have described stomatal patterns in the genus

Camellia, subfamily Theoideae and family Theaceae. However, their studies are not consistent with our investigations of section *Camellia* in the genus *Camellia*.

Solereeder (1908) first studied the patterns of stomatal apparatus of three species of Theaceae, proposing that there are two types of stomatal apparatus in this family. In one type, the guard cells (GCs) are surrounded by the subsidiary cells that are not distinguishable from the common epidermal cells. In the other type, the guard cells are usually surrounded by three (rarely two or four) narrow but distinguishable subsidiary cells. Keng (1962) defined the latter as the gordoniceous type and suggested that this type was transitional between the anomocytic type (no distinguishable subsidiary cells surrounding guard cells) and the paracytic type (with two subsidiary cells surrounding and parallel to the guard cells). Having observed the stomata of Theaceae, he reported that all species in subfamily Theoideae share the gordoniceous type, with the exception of the genus *Pyrenaria*. However, Yang *et al.* (2003) reported that all genera, including *Pyrenaria*, share the gordoniceous type. He considered that the intermediate type between the



Figures 25–28. Characters of transverse view. Fig. 25. *C. polyodonta*: showing stone cells (arrow). Fig. 26. *C. japonica* and *C. rusticana*: showing continuous multiple eidermis in the adaxial epidermis. Fig. 27. *C. magnocarpa*: showing discontinuous multiple eidermis (arrow). Fig. 28. *C. boreali-yunnanica*: large epidermal cells (arrow), containing few contents. Scale bar, 50 μ m.

anomocytic type and paracytic types more exactly matched the anisocytic type. Ao *et al.* (2002, 2007) pointed out that all of *Camellia* spp. share the cyclocytic type.

Our investigations reveal that, in section *Camellia*, some species have two distinct types of stomata (one strikingly large, surrounded by four or more subsidiary cells, and the other smaller, surrounded by three subsidiary cells that are more frequently variable in size), whereas most of species share one type. Some species have particularly large cyclocytic stomata that are situated at the centre of a few markedly smaller anisocytic stomata arranged in the form of ring. We define the large cyclocytic stoma as the centre stomata for its position. Large cyclocytic stomata and centre stomata are significant for classification and identification.


Stomatal clusters (Yang & Sack, 1995; Geisler *et al.*, 1998; Tang *et al.*, 2002) or stomata in groups (Metcalf & Chalk, 1979) have only rarely been reported in *Camellia*. Our examinations show that stomatal clusters are composed of 2–4 adjacent stomata with common subsidiary cells. Most species

examined have stomatal clusters which are readily discriminated under LM and are useful in taxonomy.


In the transverse section, the guard cell pairs can be seem to lie on, rather than be parallel to, the subsidiary cells. Therefore, in the surface view, most subsidiary cells are covered by guard cells and the subsidiary cells frequently appear narrow or even invisible. This may be the reason that Solereder (1908) noted that one type of stomatal apparatus lacked subsidiary cells and the other type had narrow ones.

RECONSIDERATION OF TAXONOMIC TREATMENTS IN SECTION *CAMELLIA*

At present, Chang's and Ming's taxonomic treatments are the two well-known taxonomic treatments of *Camellia*, but there are many differences between them. Chang's treatment, revised three times (Chang, 1981; Chang & Bartholomew, 1984; Chang, 1998), suggested that *Camellia* consisted of four subgenera, 22 sections and *c.* 280 species. Ming following Sealy (1958), proposed that *Camellia* included two subgen-



Figures 29–32. Characters of transverse section view. Fig. 29. *C. boreali-yunnanica*: showing common stomata in transverse view. Guard cells lying on a single subsidiary cell (white arrow). Fig. 30. *C. brevipetiolata*: Showing especial stomata with guard cells lying on two superposed subsidiary cells. Fig. 31. *C. villosa*: showing hairs' transection view. Fig. 32. *C. oligophlebia*: showing cork wart's transverse section view. Scale bar, 50 μm .



Figures 33–34. Characters of veins in the transverse view. Fig. 33. *C. japonica* and *C. rusticana*: showing cork wart (arrow) on the veins. Scale bar, 100 μm . Fig. 34. *C. hongkongensis*: showing stone cells in the veins (arrow). Scale bar, 250 μm .

era, 14 sections and 119 species. Chang (1998) suggested that section *Camellia* contained *c.* 60 species, whereas Ming (1998) treated many species as subspecies or synonyms and reduced it to 12 species and six varieties. These differences are shown in Figure 37.

With the exception of *C. hongkongensis*, *C. changii* and *C. edithae*, all the species in section *Camellia* were more or less merged by Ming (2000) (Fig. 37). Additionally, *C. uraku* was treated as a hybrid of *C. japonica* in Ming's treatment. Results show that

Table 6. The mean values of leaf area (cm²), perimeter (cm), vertical length (cm), horizontal width (cm), the ratio of width and length (W/L) and form coefficient, with values representing character states of leaf veins (1, not raised; 2, slightly raised; 3, raised)

No.	Taxa	Area	Perimeter	Vertical length	Horizontal width	W/L	Form coefficient	Veins
1	<i>C. jinshajiangica</i>	27.93 ± 2.31	24.66 ± 2.72	8.36 ± 0.56	4.92 ± 0.23	0.59 ± 0.03	0.59 ± 0.09	1
2	<i>C. omeiensis</i>	29.25 ± 1.91	28.30 ± 1.10	10.90 ± 0.84	4.30 ± 0.23	0.40 ± 0.05	0.46 ± 0.01	3
3	<i>C. polyodonta</i>	44.45 ± 1.52	30.39 ± 4.84	11.32 ± 0.30	5.66 ± 0.22	0.50 ± 0.01	0.62 ± 0.18	3
4	<i>C. lanosituba</i>	27.58 ± 2.99	25.81 ± 1.69	10.22 ± 0.85	4.18 ± 0.20	0.41 ± 0.02	0.52 ± 0.02	1
5	<i>C. longigyna</i>	21.30 ± 0.57	27.50 ± 0.56	10.34 ± 0.27	3.20 ± 0.08	0.31 ± 0.00	0.35 ± 0.01	3
6	<i>C. lapidea</i>	18.46 ± 0.81	23.66 ± 1.16	7.88 ± 0.46	3.50 ± 0.11	0.44 ± 0.02	0.42 ± 0.02	3
7	<i>C. phelloderma</i>	21.33 ± 2.58	25.98 ± 1.17	8.95 ± 0.41	3.77 ± 0.22	0.42 ± 0.02	0.40 ± 0.03	2
8	<i>C. mairei</i>	25.06 ± 2.19	26.46 ± 1.45	10.39 ± 0.62	3.74 ± 0.22	0.36 ± 0.02	0.45 ± 0.01	3
9	<i>C. villosa</i>	20.65 ± 2.55	26.41 ± 1.46	8.96 ± 0.59	3.61 ± 0.25	0.40 ± 0.02	0.37 ± 0.03	3
10	<i>C. trichosperma</i>	69.57 ± 3.72	34.32 ± 0.36	11.45 ± 0.02	7.96 ± 0.22	0.70 ± 0.02	0.74 ± 0.02	1
11	<i>C. semiserrata</i>	69.56 ± 2.63	34.32 ± 0.26	11.45 ± 0.02	7.96 ± 0.15	0.70 ± 0.01	0.74 ± 0.02	1
12	<i>C. reticulata</i>	29.90 ± 5.19	25.61 ± 2.29	9.82 ± 0.64	4.29 ± 0.47	0.44 ± 0.03	0.57 ± 0.04	2
13	<i>C. semiserrata</i> var. <i>albiflora</i>	69.57 ± 2.63	34.32 ± 0.26	11.45 ± 0.02	7.96 ± 0.15	0.70 ± 0.01	0.74 ± 0.02	1
14	<i>C. brevipetiolata</i>	32.63 ± 1.71	29.42 ± 1.35	10.07 ± 0.30	4.67 ± 0.25	0.46 ± 0.03	0.47 ± 0.02	1
15	<i>C. phellocapsa</i>	25.79 ± 2.00	24.29 ± 1.21	9.13 ± 0.47	4.12 ± 0.23	0.45 ± 0.03	0.55 ± 0.02	3
16	<i>C. compressa</i>	58.77 ± 4.55	42.30 ± 2.19	15.41 ± 0.55	5.72 ± 0.31	0.37 ± 0.01	0.41 ± 0.02	2
17	<i>C. magniflora</i>	46.42 ± 6.24	33.85 ± 1.98	11.62 ± 0.67	5.81 ± 0.46	0.50 ± 0.02	0.51 ± 0.04	1
18	<i>C. lungshenensis</i>	42.06 ± 4.91	32.09 ± 1.06	11.07 ± 0.48	5.52 ± 0.45	0.50 ± 0.02	0.51 ± 0.03	2
19	<i>C. brevicolumna</i>	26.72 ± 1.18	30.38 ± 1.10	9.20 ± 0.36	4.54 ± 0.15	0.49 ± 0.03	0.36 ± 0.01	1
20	<i>C. pitardii</i>	16.28 ± 1.29	23.42 ± 0.72	8.39 ± 0.36	3.02 ± 0.15	0.36 ± 0.02	0.37 ± 0.03	2
21	<i>C. pitardii</i> var. <i>alba</i>	13.46 ± 0.86	19.64 ± 0.96	7.19 ± 0.36	2.93 ± 0.14	0.41 ± 0.02	0.44 ± 0.03	2
22	<i>C. pitardii</i> var. <i>yunnanica</i>	17.40 ± 0.71	23.94 ± 0.59	8.23 ± 0.28	3.26 ± 0.15	0.40 ± 0.02	0.38 ± 0.02	2
23	<i>C. xifongensis</i>	26.93 ± 2.32	31.99 ± 2.08	11.02 ± 0.56	3.84 ± 0.24	0.35 ± 0.02	0.33 ± 0.02	2
24	<i>C. hongkongensis</i>	23.00 ± 2.41	30.49 ± 2.68	9.96 ± 0.75	3.69 ± 0.12	0.37 ± 0.02	0.31 ± 0.02	2
25	<i>C. cryptoneura</i>	36.14 ± 2.07	31.33 ± 0.79	11.14 ± 0.38	4.91 ± 0.15	0.44 ± 0.03	0.46 ± 0.04	2
26	<i>C. oviformis</i>	33.01 ± 3.01	26.70 ± 0.78	9.18 ± 0.56	5.31 ± 0.22	0.58 ± 0.05	0.58 ± 0.04	2
27	<i>C. brachygyna</i>	24.65 ± 1.63	25.35 ± 0.98	9.92 ± 0.37	3.93 ± 0.23	0.40 ± 0.03	0.48 ± 0.02	2
28	<i>C. tunganica</i>	22.13 ± 1.01	23.32 ± 0.82	8.61 ± 0.30	3.71 ± 0.09	0.43 ± 0.02	0.51 ± 0.03	2
29	<i>C. bambusifolia</i>	10.25 ± 1.56	17.46 ± 0.89	6.65 ± 0.55	2.28 ± 0.16	0.34 ± 0.01	0.42 ± 0.02	2

Table 6. Continued

No.	Taxa	Area	Perimeter	Vertical length	Horizontal width	W/L	Form coefficient	Veins
30	<i>C. saluenensis</i>	8.25 ± 1.73	15.85 ± 1.65	5.92 ± 0.61	2.05 ± 0.23	0.35 ± 0.00	0.41 ± 0.01	2
31	<i>C. albo-sericea</i>	21.86 ± 1.66	23.62 ± 0.61	9.04 ± 0.32	3.75 ± 0.18	0.41 ± 0.01	0.49 ± 0.03	2
32	<i>C. baimshanic</i>	20.30 ± 1.10	26.19 ± 0.74	9.44 ± 0.23	3.37 ± 0.21	0.36 ± 0.02	0.37 ± 0.02	2
33	<i>C. oligophlebia</i>	22.69 ± 2.12	22.89 ± 1.32	8.57 ± 0.38	4.13 ± 0.20	0.48 ± 0.01	0.54 ± 0.02	2
34	<i>C. uraku</i>	24.59 ± 1.71	27.41 ± 0.99	9.17 ± 0.43	4.09 ± 0.04	0.45 ± 0.02	0.56 ± 0.01	2
35	<i>C. edithae</i>	34.15 ± 5.29	27.09 ± 1.74	9.72 ± 0.29	5.03 ± 0.65	0.52 ± 0.05	0.58 ± 0.02	3
36	<i>C. paucipetala</i>	8.42 ± 1.03	14.19 ± 1.25	4.68 ± 0.30	2.58 ± 0.14	0.55 ± 0.02	0.53 ± 0.04	1
37	<i>C. tenuivalvis</i>	12.24 ± 1.90	16.58 ± 1.36	6.53 ± 0.47	2.77 ± 0.28	0.42 ± 0.02	0.56 ± 0.01	2
38	<i>C. boreali-yunnanica</i>	27.70 ± 4.93	27.36 ± 2.80	10.74 ± 1.62	3.92 ± 0.15	0.37 ± 0.04	0.46 ± 0.02	2
39	<i>C. hilisciflora</i>	22.59 ± 1.68	27.36 ± 1.04	9.73 ± 0.34	3.76 ± 0.14	0.39 ± 0.01	0.38 ± 0.03	1
40	<i>C. concina</i>	7.72 ± 1.13	16.53 ± 1.08	6.03 ± 0.32	2.06 ± 0.23	0.34 ± 0.02	0.35 ± 0.01	2
41	<i>C. glabripetala</i>	9.78 ± 0.78	16.18 ± 0.67	6.31 ± 0.21	2.30 ± 0.14	0.36 ± 0.02	0.47 ± 0.01	2
42	<i>C. delicata</i>	13.67 ± 1.67	20.50 ± 1.29	7.30 ± 0.32	3.01 ± 0.24	0.41 ± 0.02	0.41 ± 0.03	3
43	<i>C. hunanica</i>	17.44 ± 0.95	20.57 ± 0.78	7.09 ± 0.25	3.58 ± 0.12	0.51 ± 0.01	0.52 ± 0.03	2
44	<i>C. glabripetala</i>	10.69 ± 1.03	15.45 ± 0.87	6.18 ± 0.36	2.48 ± 0.15	0.40 ± 0.03	0.56 ± 0.03	2
45	<i>C. magnocarpa</i>	68.55 ± 2.96	34.17 ± 0.36	11.43 ± 0.04	7.87 ± 0.22	0.69 ± 0.02	0.74 ± 0.02	1
46	<i>C. liberistamina</i>	31.64 ± 4.99	30.41 ± 2.59	10.78 ± 1.38	4.61 ± 0.46	0.43 ± 0.01	0.43 ± 0.01	1
47	<i>C. lucidissima</i>	43.21 ± 0.30	30.99 ± 2.11	11.43 ± 0.62	5.95 ± 0.24	0.52 ± 0.05	0.57 ± 0.07	2
48	<i>C. chekiangoleosa</i>	28.27 ± 6.33	25.11 ± 3.55	9.28 ± 1.19	4.55 ± 0.65	0.49 ± 0.04	0.56 ± 0.03	1
49	<i>C. mongshanica</i>	31.84 ± 5.09	27.53 ± 3.09	10.03 ± 0.69	4.96 ± 0.72	0.49 ± 0.04	0.53 ± 0.04	2
50	<i>C. japonica</i>	17.59 ± 1.22	18.88 ± 0.64	7.13 ± 0.26	3.83 ± 0.24	0.54 ± 0.04	0.65 ± 0.03	2
51	<i>C. rusticana</i>	20.08 ± 2.21	20.94 ± 0.62	7.55 ± 0.17	4.05 ± 0.36	0.54 ± 0.04	0.57 ± 0.03	2
52	<i>C. azalea</i>	5.62 ± 0.52	11.04 ± 0.65	4.68 ± 0.34	1.70 ± 0.09	0.36 ± 0.03	0.58 ± 0.03	1
53	<i>C. subintegra</i>	17.04 ± 3.19	21.80 ± 1.82	9.31 ± 0.89	2.87 ± 0.31	0.31 ± 0.02	0.45 ± 0.02	1
54	<i>C. lienshanensis</i>	20.58 ± 1.46	22.11 ± 1.42	8.28 ± 0.58	3.97 ± 0.15	0.48 ± 0.03	0.53 ± 0.05	1
55	<i>C. crassissima</i>	1.46 ± 1.46	1.37 ± 1.37	0.95 ± 0.95	0.04 ± 0.04	0.04 ± 0.04	0.03 ± 0.03	2
56	<i>C. apolyodonta</i>	37.05 ± 2.43	38.63 ± 0.64	12.17 ± 0.49	4.75 ± 0.15	0.39 ± 0.02	0.31 ± 0.01	3
57	<i>C. longicaudata</i>	22.76 ± 1.32	21.82 ± 1.46	10.02 ± 0.43	3.42 ± 0.09	0.34 ± 0.02	0.61 ± 0.11	3




Figure 35. Comparing the taxonomic treatment by Chang (1998) with the treatment by Ming (2000) in *Camellia* section *Camellia*.

C. changii is characterized by its particular leaf shape and the absence of stone cells. *Camellia edithae* differs from the other species by its extremely dense and long hairs. These support the treatment of both Chang (1998) and Ming (2000) of *C. changii* and *C. edithae* as distinctive species, respectively.

Camellia semiserrata, *C. trichosperma*, *C. semiserrata* var. *albiflora* and *C. magnocarpa* share common features, such as centre stomata, straight to curved anticlinal walls of upper epidermal cells, repand anticlinal walls of lower epidermal cells and discontinuous multiple epidermis. Additionally, Figure 36 shows that the leaf morphology of *C. magnocarpa* is similar to that of *C. semiserrata*, *C. trichosperma* and *C. semiserrata* var. *albiflora*. Cluster analysis shows that

the similarity value among *C. semiserrata*, *C. trichosperma*, *C. semiserrata* var. *albiflora* and *C. magnocarpa* is larger than 0.96 (Fig. 36). These support the views of Ming (2000) that *C. magnocarpa* is a variety of *C. semiserrata*.

The leaf features of *C. phellocapsa*, including sinuous anticlinal walls of the upper epidermal cells, relatively smaller leaf area and form coefficient, do not agree with the proposal of Ming (2000) to merge *C. phellocapsa* with *C. semiserrata*. This opinion is consistent with that of Gao *et al.* (2005), who claimed that both flower size and foliar serration patterns of *C. phellocapsa* are different from those of *C. semiserrata*. Hence, the taxonomic status of *C. phellocapsa* needs to be reconsidered.




Figure 36. Scatter diagram of principle component analysis (PCA). Axes represent principle components 1 and 2. Each number code (see Table 6) represents a species or variety according to Chang (1998), while corresponding species (displayed in the top left corner) in Ming's (2000) treatment are shown by symbols. The results of PCA are shown in the top right corner.

Chang (1998) noted that all the features of *C. mongshanica* are similar to *C. crassissima*, except that *C. crassissima* had smaller capsules and tomentose seeds. Similar features of leaf morphology and anatomy of *C. mongshanica* and *C. crassissima* seem to support the views of Ming (2000) that *C. mongs-*

hanica should be treated as a variety of *C. semiserrata*. Figure 36 indicates that *C. mongshanica* is a close relative of *C. semiserrata*.

There are few differences between *C. japonica* and *C. rusticana*, except the continuous multiple epidermis in *C. japonica* and the discontinuous multiple




Figure 37. Cluster analysis based on quantitative and qualitative characters.

epidermis in *C. rusticana*. Figure 36 indicates that the leaf morphology of *C. japonica* is similar to that of *C. rusticana*. Our study supports Ming's (2000) treatment of *C. rusticana* as a variety of *C. japonica*.

In the light of Ming's taxonomic treatment, *C. pitardii*, *C. pitardii* var. *alba*, *C. hunanica*, *C. tungannica*, *C. cryptoneura*, *C. lungshenensis*, *C. compressa* and *C. magniflora* are merged into *C. pitardii* and treated as *C. pitardii* var. *pitardii*, *C. pitardii* form. *alba* and *C. pitardii* var. *cryptoneura* (Fig. 37).

It seems unnatural to treat *C. hunanica* and *C. tungannica* as forms of *C. pitardii*. Ming (2000) claimed that *C. hunanica* and *C. tungannica* only differ from *C. pitardii* in white flowers. However, our study reveals that *C. pitardii* differs from *C. hunanica* and *C. tungannica* as follows: (1) both *C. hunanica* and *C. tungannica* have white, fragrant flowers, but *C. pitardii* has red, non-fragrant flowers; (2) both *C. hunanica* and *C. tungannica* have relatively broader leaves, whereas *C. pitardii* has narrow leaves; (3) our cluster analysis demonstrates that the similarity value among *C. pitardii*, *C. hunanica* and *C. tungannica* is rather less than 0.96.

The presence of centre stomata in *C. cryptoneura* and its larger leaf size make it distinct from *C. pitardii*. The chromosome number ($2n = 90$) of *C. cryptoneura* is threefold higher than that of *C. pitardii* ($2n = 30$). The results of PCA (Fig. 35) show that *C. cryptoneura* also differs from *C. pitardii* in leaf morphology. Therefore, we consider there is not enough evidence to merge *C. cryptoneura* into *C. pitardii*. When reconsidering Ming's (2000) merging of *C. compressa* and *C. magniflora* into *C. pitardii*, we also find this unnatural. Examination of anticlinal walls of upper epidermis cells shows that the straight-curved pattern is present in *C. magniflora* and the sinuous pattern in *C. compressa*, whereas *C. pitardii* has the repand pattern. Cork warts are found in *C. compressa* and *C. magniflora*, but not in *C. pitardii*. Ming (2000) noted 'compared to *C. pitardii*, *C. compressa* and *C. magniflora* are distinct due to broader and larger leaf, tip acuminate, serrate (not thinly and sharply serrate), larger flowers and capsules and chromosome number $2n = 90$ or $2n = 120$ (not $2n = 30$).' All these facts indicate that the combination of *C. compressa*, *C. magniflora* and *C. pitardii* needs more evidence. Gao *et al.* (2005) noted 'however, there are significant morphological differences between *C. magniflora* and *C. pitardii*.' We feel the decision to combine these two species should be examined further.

The most extensive combination is that Ming (2000) merged 11 species into *C. reticulata*. We find that *C. albo-sericea* and *C. bailinshanica* share common characters as follows: repand pattern of anticlinal walls of upper epidermal cells, sinuous pattern of anticlinal

walls of lower epidermal cells, presence of hairs, centre stomata, presence of stomatal clusters and absence of cork warts. Additionally, their anatomical features are similar: absence of multiple epidermis and presence of stone cells. These pieces of evidence indicate that *C. albo-sericea* is a close relative of *C. bailinshanica*. Figure 36 shows that the similarity value between *C. albo-sericea* and *C. bailinshanica* is larger than 0.96. However, *C. reticulata* is obviously distinct from *C. albo-sericea* and *C. bailinshanica* by varied epidermal cells, straight-curved anticlinal walls of the upper epidermal cells, repand anticlinal walls of the lower epidermal cells and absence of hairs. The comparisons of characters from reproductive organs of *C. albo-sericea*, *C. bailinshanica* and *C. reticulata* are listed as follows (Gao *et al.*, 2005):

1. *C. albo-sericea*: flowers are light red to red, 5–6 cm in diameter, borne at the tip of the shoot and in leaf axils; sepals 8–9, outside surface white-silky pubescent; petals 6–7, 3.0–3.5 cm long, obovate, white-silky pubescent on back, fused with the staminal column from the base up to 5–6 mm; androecium glabrous, c. 2 cm, outer layer of stamens fused from the base into a cup to 10 cm long; gynoecium 1.5–2.0 cm long, three styles slightly cleft at the tip, ovary tomentose; capsules globose, 3 locules, pericarp wall 8 mm thick.
2. *C. bailinshanica*: flowers are light red to red, 4–6 cm in diameter, borne at the tip of the shoot and in leaf axils; sepals 7–9, slightly pubescent; petals 6–7, 3.0–4.0 cm long, obovate, white-silky pubescent on back, fused with the staminal column from the base up to 5–6 mm; androecium glabrous, about 2.0–2.5 cm, outer layer of stamens fused from the base into a cup to 5–7 mm long; gynoecium 2.5 cm long, three styles slightly cleft at the tip, ovary tomentose; capsules globose, 3 locules, pericarp wall 1.0 cm thick.
3. *C. reticulata*: flowers are rose-pink, 6.6–10.5 cm in diameter, borne at the tip of the shoot and in leaf axils; perules 7–10, partially persistent, pubescent on both surface; petals 6–9, 5.1–6.8 cm long, obovate or obcordate in shape, cleft at the tip from 4–10 mm, fused with the staminal column from the base up to 15 mm; androecium glabrous, 3.5–3.8 cm long, outer layer of stamens fused from the base into a cup to 2 cm long, approximately 130 stamens; gynoecium 3.7–4.1 cm long, 3–5 mostly glabrous styles, more than one-half fused from the base, ovary tomentose; capsules oblate and indented at the tip, surface rough and scaling, 3–5 locules, pericarp wall 4–8 mm thick.

Therefore, merging *C. albo-sericea* and *C. bailinshanica* into *C. reticulata* should be reconsidered. The

combination of *C. albo-sericea* and *C. bailinshanica* is, however, probably justified.

In summary, section *Camellia* probably contains about 50 species. Although a large volume of data of leaf macromorphology and micromorphology has been obtained in our study, there is still a great deal of work to do because plants have many characters, including those based on morphology, anatomy, chemistry and floral biology. It is not usually considered natural to determine their taxonomic status based on only one or two characters. Our study provides data for leaf anatomical and morphological features that lay the basis for further research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks are due to Clifford R. Parks (University of North Carolina, USA), David B. Hannaway (Department of Crop and Soil Science, Oregon State University, USA) and Michael Möller (Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh, UK) for valuable discussions and comments on this study, and the reviewers for revision of this manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Ao CQ, Chen GX, Chang HT. 2002.** Leaf epidermis morphology of *Camellia* and its taxonomic significance. *Acta Botanica Yunnanica* **24**: 68–74 (in Chinese, with English abstract).
- Ao CQ, Ye CX, Zhang HD. 2007.** A systematic investigation of leaf epidermis in *Camellia* using light microscopy. *Biologia* **62**: 157–162.
- Baranova M. 1972.** Systematic anatomy of the leaf epidermis in the Magnoliaceae and some related families. *Taxon* **21**: 447–469.
- Briggs D, Walters SM. 1984.** *Plant variation and evolution*, 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 42–43.
- Chang HT. 1981.** A taxonomy of the genus *Camellia*. *Acta Scientiarum Naturalium Universitatis, Sunyatseni* **1**: 1–180 (in Chinese).
- Chang HT. 1998.** Genus *Camellia*. In: Chang HT, Ren S-X, eds. *Theaceae, Flora Republicae Popularis sinicae*, Vol. 49 (3). Beijing: Science Press, 6–194 (in Chinese).
- Chang HT, Bartholomew B. 1984.** *Camellias*. Portland: Timber Press.
- Chen LH, Wang SZ, Nelson M. 2005.** Genetic diversities within *Camellia* species confirmed by random amplified polymorphic DNA (RAPD) markers. *Journal of the American Society for Horticultural Science* **40**: 993–1147.
- Gao JY, Parks CR, Du YQ. 2005.** *Collected species of the genus Camellia, an illustrated outline*. Hangzhou: Zhejiang Technology and Science Press (in Chinese and English).
- Geisler M, Yang M, Sack FD. 1998.** Divergent regulation of stomatal initiation and patterning in organ and suborgan regions of the *Arabidopsis* mutants *too many mouths* and *four lips*. *Planta* **205**: 522–533.
- Heintzelman CE, Howard RA. 1948.** The comparative morphology of the Icacinaceae. *American Journal of Botany* **35**: 42–52.
- Keng H. 1962.** Comparative morphological studies of Theaceae. *University of California Publications in Botany* **33**: 269–384.
- Kirchoff BK, Richter SJ, Remington DL. 2007.** Characters as groups: a new approach to morphological characters in phylogenetic analysis. *Taxon* **56**: 479–492.
- Kirchoff BK, Richter SJ, Remington DL, Wisniewski E. 2004.** Complex data produce better characters. *Systematic Biology* **53**: 1–17.
- Kong HZ. 2001.** Comparative morphology of leaf epidermis in the Chloranthaceae. *Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society* **136**: 279–294.
- Lü HF, Hu ZH. 2001.** Comparative anatomy of secretory structures of leaves in *Hypericum* L. *Acta Phytotaxonomica Sinica* **39**: 393–404 (in Chinese, with English abstract).
- Meade C, Parnell J. 2003.** Multivariate analysis of leaf shape patterns in Asian species of the *Uvaria* group (Annonaceae). *Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society* **143**: 231–242.
- Metcalfe CR, Chalk L. 1979.** *Anatomy of the dicotyledons*, 2nd edn. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ming TL. 1998.** The classification, differentiation and distribution of the genus *Camellia* sect. *Camellia*. *Acta Botanica Yunnanica* **20**: 127–148 (in Chinese, with English abstract).
- Ming TL. 2000.** *Monograph of the genus Camellia*. Kunming: Yunnan Science and Technology Press (in Chinese).
- Möller M, Gao LM, Mill RR, Li DZ, Hollingsworth ML, Gibby M. 2007.** Morphometric analysis of the *Taxus wallichiana* complex (Taxaceae) based on herbarium material. *Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society* **155**: 307–335.
- Parks CR, Griffiths A. 1963.** The *saluenensis-pitardii-reticulata* complex. *Camellia Review* **25**: 12–29.
- Plotz RDO, Falvo M, Pádua JG, Berbacci LC, Vieira MLC, Oliveira GCX, Bruno OM. 2005.** Leaf shape analysis using the multiscale Minkowski fractal dimension, a new morphometric method: a study with *Passiflora* (Passifloraceae). *Canadian Journal of Botany* **83**: 287–301.
- Rhodes AM, Malo SE, Campbell CW, Carmer SG. 1971.** A numerical taxonomic study of the avocado (*Persea americana* Mill.). *Journal of the American Society for Horticultural Science* **96**: 391–395.
- Sealy JR. 1958.** *A revision of the genus Camellia*. London: Royal Horticultural Society.
- Shah A, Li DZ, Möller M, Gao LM, Hollingsworth ML, Gibby M. 2008.** Delimitation of *Taxus fuana* Nan Li & R.R. Mill (Taxaceae) based on morphological and molecular data. *Taxon* **57**: 211–222.
- Solereder H. 1908.** *Systematic anatomy of the dicotyledons*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Stern WL, Judd WS. 2002.** Systematic and comparative anatomy of Cymbidieae (Orchidaceae). *Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society* **139**: 1–27.
- Tang M, Hu YX, Lin JX, Jin XB. 2002.** Developmental mechanism and distribution pattern of stomatal clusters in *Begonia peltatifolia*. *Acta Botanica Sinica* **44**: 384–389.

Yang JB, Li HT, Yang SX, Li DZ, Yang YY. 2006. The application of four DNA sequences to studying molecular phylogeny of *Camellia* (Theaceae). *Acta Botanica Yunnanica* **28**: 108–114 (in Chinese, with English abstract).

Yang M, Sack FD. 1995. The *too many mouths* and *four lips* mutations affect stomatal production in *Arabidopsis*. *Plant Cell* **7**: 2227–2239.

Yang SX, Liu AZ, Peng H, Wu ZY. 2003. Stomatal apparatus of *Pyrenaria* (Theaceae) and its systematic significance. *Guihaia* **23**: 250–252.

Yang ZR, Qi L. 2005. Comparative morphology of the leaf epidermis in *Schisandra* (Schisandraceae). *Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society* **148**: 39–56.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article:

Appendix S1. Significance test for leaf morphological and anatomical characters.

Please note: Wiley-Blackwell are not responsible for the content or functionality of any supporting materials supplied by the authors. Any queries (other than missing material) should be directed to the corresponding author for the article.