



Jumping through the hoops: the challenges of daffodil (Narcissus) classification

Article

Accepted Version

Könyves, K., David, J. and Culham, A. (2019) Jumping through the hoops: the challenges of daffodil (Narcissus) classification. *Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society*, 190 (4). pp. 389-404. ISSN 0024-4074 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/botlinnean/boz032> Available at <http://centaur.reading.ac.uk/85267/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

To link to this article DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/botlinnean/boz032>

Publisher: Oxford University Press

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

Jumping through the hoops: the challenges of daffodil classification

1 Kálmán Könyves^{1,2*}, John David¹, Alastair Culham²

2 ¹Royal Horticultural Society Garden Wisley, Woking, Surrey, GU23 6QB, United Kingdom

3 ²University of Reading Herbarium, Harborne Building, School of Biological Sciences,

4 University of Reading, Whiteknights, Reading, RG6 6AS, United Kingdom

5 * Correspondence:

6 Kálmán Könyves

7 kalmankonyves@rhs.org.uk

8

9 Running title: Hoop-petticoat daffodils

10

11 ABSTRACT

12

13 Hoop-petticoat daffodils are a morphologically congruent group that has two distinct lineages
14 in the molecular phylogeny of *Narcissus*. It is possible that the morphological similarity is a
15 product of both historic and current low-level gene flow between these lineages. For the first
16 time we report population sampling from across the entire range of distribution covering both
17 the Iberian Peninsula and Morocco. In total 455 samples were collected from 59 populations.
18 Plastid DNA sequences of *matK* and *ndhF* were generated alongside 11 microsatellite loci to
19 permit comparison between plastid and nuclear lineage history. The plastid DNA phylogeny
20 was highly congruent with previous molecular studies and supported the recognition of these
21 two lineages of hoop-petticoat daffodils as separate sections. Assignment of samples to
22 sections sometimes differed between plastid DNA and (nuclear) microsatellite data. In these
23 cases, the taxa had previously been the focus of dissent in taxonomic placement based on
24 morphology. These discrepancies could be explained by hybridisation and introgression
25 among the two lineages during the evolution of hoop-petticoat daffodils and shows that
26 placement of species in sections is dependent on the source of data used. This study
27 underlines the complex evolutionary history of *Narcissus* and highlights the discrepancies
28 between floral morphology and phylogeny, which provides a continuing challenge for the
29 systematics of *Narcissus*.

30

31 KEYWORDS: *Narcissus*, *matK*, microsatellites, DAPC, *N. obesus*, *N. luteolentus*

32

33 INTRODUCTION

34

35 Daffodils, the genus *Narcissus* L., are one of the most iconic spring flowers, yet the taxonomy of
36 the genus, which underpins their conservation and breeding, remains in flux. The last
37 comprehensive monographic revision of the genus, at species level, was by Baker in 1875
38 (Burbidge & Baker, 1875), although the system of subgenera and sections proposed by Fernandes
39 (1968, 1975) has been largely followed in subsequent publications on the genus. The genus is
40 split into two subgenera: *Narcissus* and *Hermione* (Haw.) Spach and 10-14 sections (Figure
41 1) (Fernandes, 1968; Aedo, 2013; Marques *et al.*, 2017). Recent changes in the delimitation
42 of sections mean that the established approach of using morphology to allocate species to
43 sections is no longer reliable. Some sections are best defined on DNA evidence.

44

45 *Narcissus* section *Bulbocodii* DC. has traditionally been distinguished from the rest of
46 *Narcissus* by the large funnel-shaped corona relative to the narrow tepals, a right angled
47 attachment of the anther to the filament, and the declinate stamens and stigma which gives
48 rise to a zygomorphic flower (Fernandes, 1968; Blanchard, 1990). This distinctive corona
49 shape has given rise to the English common name “hoop-petticoat daffodil”. The recognition
50 of these daffodils dates to the late 16th and the early 17th century (David & Könyves, 2013).
51 The integrity of this group had not been questioned by morphological studies. This distinctive
52 group has been recognised at different taxonomic ranks, ranging from genus (*Corbularia*;
53 Salisbury, 1812), or subgenus (*N. subgenus Corbularia* Pax, 1888), to section (*N. section*
54 *Bulbocodii*, De Candolle, 1815) and even as a single species (Baker in Burbidge & Baker,
55 1875). The recognition of hoop-petticoat daffodils as a distinct genus has never been
56 accepted widely, but a number of authors have treated it at subgeneric level (Ascherson &
57 Graebner, 1907; Maire, 1959; Mathew, 2002). However the most common treatment of hoop-

58 petticoat daffodils, supported by morphological and cytological evidence, is as section
59 *Bulbocodii* (Fernandes, 1934; Webb, 1978; Zonneveld, 2008; Aedo, 2013; Fennane, 2015).
60
61 Hoop-petticoat daffodils are distributed from southwest France through the Iberian Peninsula,
62 to Morocco and northwest Algeria. Natural populations of hoop-petticoat daffodils show a
63 great range of morphological variation (Figure 2), that has resulted in disagreement in the
64 number of taxa and the level at which they have been recognised (Fernandes, 1963; Webb,
65 1978; Barra & López González, 1982; Fernández Casas, 1986a, 1996; Barra Lázaro, 2002;
66 Vázquez Pardo, 2013). In addition to the morphological diversity within the basic hoop-
67 petticoat ground plan, along with a propensity for hybridisation between species (Blanchard,
68 1990; Aedo, 2013), a wide range of chromosome numbers have been reported (Fernandes,
69 1934, 1963; Zonneveld, 2008). All of these factors have led to an unstable classification
70 indicated by the number of recognised taxa at species level or below ranging from 4-35
71 (Könyves, 2014).
72
73 Recent molecular evidence has indicated that the evolutionary history and taxonomy of
74 section *Bulbocodii* is more complex than first thought. The first molecular study of *Narcissus*
75 (Graham & Barrett, 2004) used plastid DNA data and identified two separate clades
76 comprising the section *Bulbocodii sensu* DC. making the section polyphyletic. Later studies
77 with wider taxonomic sampling across *Narcissus* showed the same polyphyletic pattern in
78 section *Bulbocodii* (Marques, 2010; Santos-Gally, Vargas, & Arroyo, 2012; Fonseca *et al.*,
79 2016). Moreover, other sections also show polyphyly: section *Tazettae* DC. (Santos-Gally *et*
80 *al.*, 2012), section *Jonquillae* DC. and section *Pseudonarcissi* DC. (Marques, 2010). These
81 results suggest that extensive hybridisation and subsequent gene flow may have contributed
82 to the complex genetic history of *Narcissus*. The most comprehensive study of the genus to

83 date, Marques *et al.* (2017), using markers from three genomes (plastid, mitochondrial, and
84 nuclear ribosomal), found hoop-petticoat daffodils to be polyphyletic in both organellar and
85 nuclear datasets. This led to the formal split of section *Bulbocodii* and the recognition of
86 section *Meridionalis* I.Marques, Fuertes, Martins-Loução, Moharrek & Nieto Fel. to include
87 some species previously in *N.* section *Bulbocodii*. These two sections are distinguished on
88 molecular evidence and there are, as yet, no clear morphological characters to separate them.
89
90 *Narcissus* is most diverse in the Iberian Peninsula and Northern Africa, and current
91 treatments of this genus in these areas are synthetic accounts. The accounts vary in their
92 scope, breadth of new knowledge added, and the chosen breadth of species concept used to
93 encompass morphological diversity. The most recent account of taxa occurring in the Iberian
94 Peninsula is the treatment in *Flora iberica* (Aedo, 2013). This treatment is a detailed revision
95 and employs broadly defined species and recognises only a few infraspecific taxa. In contrast,
96 the treatment in *Flore Pratique du Maroc* (Fennane, 2015) is a compilation of current
97 knowledge with a narrower species concept applied. This leads to problems in comparing
98 different treatments of hoop-petticoat daffodils as there is only partial overlap of the taxa
99 between the Iberian Peninsula and Morocco and the species circumscriptions, even under the
100 same name, differ. For example, *Narcissus bulbocodium* L. is accepted in both accounts,
101 however Aedo (2013) treats *N. bulbocodium* as a variable species including *N. obesus* Salisb.
102 as a synonym, in contrast to the view of Webb for *Flora Europaea* (1978) who treats it as
103 subsp. *obesus* (Salisb.) Maire, or Zonneveld (2008) who treats it as a species: *N. obesus*. A
104 further issue is the treatment of *N. obesus* in Morocco. Maire (1959) treats it as *N.*
105 *bulbocodium* var. *obesus* (Salisb.) Baker. Fernandes (1968) also notes its presence in
106 Morocco, as *N. obesus*. However, Fennane (2015) treats the Moroccan *N. obesus* as a
107 synonym of *N. tingitanus* Fern.Casas, which has now been sunk into *N. albicans* (Haw.)

108 Spreng. (Fernández Casas, 2016). There is strong molecular evidence for the acceptance of
109 *obesus* as a distinct taxon (Fonseca *et al.*, 2016; Marques *et al.*, 2017) at species or
110 subspecies level, based on predominantly Iberian material. *Narcissus cantabricus* DC. is also
111 treated differently in the two accounts: Fennane (2015) recognises two subspecies in his
112 account of Moroccan *Narcissus*, while Aedo (2013) does not for his account of species of the
113 Iberian Peninsula, even though one of the subspecies in Morocco has also been reported from
114 SE Spain (Fernandes, 1968).

115

116 A particularly controversial taxon is the entity originally described as *N. cantabricus* subsp.
117 *luteolentus* Barra & G.López (Barra & López González, 1982), that has been treated as a
118 species, *N. blancoi* Barra & G.López (Barra Lázaro & López González, 1992) or included in
119 *N. albicans* (Fernández Casas, 2016) or as a possible synonym of *N. hedraeanthus* (Webb &
120 Heldr.) Colmeiro (Fernández Casas, 1984). The taxon was transferred to *N. hedraeanthus*
121 subsp. *luteolentus* (Barra & G.López) Aedo by Aedo (2013) based on morphology. However,
122 Fonseca *et al.* (2016) supported its assignment to *N. cantabricus* based on plastid DNA
123 evidence.

124

125 For the remainder of the section Fennane (2015) accepts three species, all endemic to
126 Morocco. *Narcissus romieuxii* Braun-Blanq. & Maire is treated as an ancient allopolyploid
127 hybrid of *N. bulbocodium* and *N. cantabricus* (Fernandes, 1959). The other two species, *N.*
128 *peroccidentalis* Fern.Casas and *N. tingitanus* were described by Fernández Casas (1996),
129 however he has since reduced these to synonymy with *N. albicans*. This is a confused name
130 applied to two different entities, a hoop-petticoat daffodil and a trumpet daffodil (Kington,
131 2008). Fernández Casas (2016) typified the name *N. albicans* on the hoop-petticoat daffodil.
132 Furthermore, two species from southern Morocco, *N. jacquemoudii* Fern.Casas and *N.*

133 *jeanmonodii* Fern.Casas, have been accepted by some (Mathew, 2002; Rankou *et al.*, 2015;
134 Marques *et al.*, 2017), but are treated as synonyms of *N. romieuxii* by Fennane (2015).

135

136 To confound matters further, there are natural hybrids with other sections (Kington, 2008;
137 Aedo, 2013). Our study includes hybrids between a number of hoop-petticoat daffodils and
138 *N. triandrus* L. (sect. *Ganymedes* (Haw.) Schult.f.). Furthermore, there are crosses with other
139 sections with limited geographic range mostly occurring in the Iberian Peninsula (Fernández
140 Casas, 1986b, 1993).

141

142 The understanding of daffodil dispersal and the establishment of hybrid populations is based
143 on a very small number of studies. In a study of *N. longispathus* (subsection *Pseudonarcissi*)
144 Barrett, Cole, & Herrera (2004) reported limited pollen flow and seed dispersal. However, in
145 a study of *N. cavanillesii* hybrids (section *Braxireon*) F1 progeny were found to have a
146 fitness advantage in establishment and later vegetative propagation (Marques *et al.*, 2011),
147 that allows the long-term perennation of these populations in the wild. No such studies are
148 yet published for *N. section Bulbocodii sensu* Marques and *N. section Meridionalis*.

149

150 The various treatments of the hoop-petticoat daffodils both within the Iberian Peninsula, and
151 for Iberia and North Africa together, illustrate clearly the challenges to finding a consistent
152 taxonomy of the group. Interpretation of findings of previous molecular studies have been
153 constrained by limited geographic and within-species sampling. There is a need for
154 population level sampling across the entire range of these species. Here we use novel
155 microsatellite and plastid DNA data to examine populations of sections *Bulbocodii* and
156 *Meridionalis* throughout most of their distribution at a level of detail not previously
157 attempted.

158

159 MATERIALS AND METHODS

160

161 PLANT MATERIALS

162

163 Material was collected in the form of either silica dried leaf material or as living plants across
164 the natural distribution of *Narcissus* sections *Bulbocodii sensu* Marques and *Meridionalis*.
165 Herbarium vouchers were collected for each sampled population. Collecting permits were
166 obtained from the local authorities (Universities in Morocco; National Parks and Regional
167 Governments in Spain and Portugal). In total 455 samples were collected from 59
168 populations (Table S1). Populations were sampled according to accessibility or by haphazard
169 sampling (Lowe, Harris, & Ashton, 2004) ensuring at least 5 metres between samples to limit
170 sampling of ramets. To maximise genetic variation, a minimum of 10 individuals were
171 collected per population where possible. The sampling strategy was designed to sample
172 genetic variation without endangering small populations. A combination of descriptions from
173 Blanchard (1990) and Aedo (2013) was used for identification of samples.

174

175 To help elucidate the relationship of hoop-petticoat daffodils, 78 additional samples
176 representing 24 taxa from other sections were also collected following the same procedures
177 or purchased (suppliers listed in Table S2). Sequences for one additional daffodil, *N. tazetta*
178 L., and three *Sternbergia* Waldst. & Kit. species for outgroups, were downloaded from
179 GenBank (*N. tazetta*: HM011047 & HM011012; *S. greuteriana* Kamari & R.Artelari:
180 HM011031 & HM010997; *S. lutea* (L.) Ker Gawl. ex Spreng.: HM011025 & HM010992; *S.*
181 *sicula* Tineo ex Guss.: HM011014 & HM010984, *matK* and *ndhF* respectively), voucher
182 specimens given in Gage *et al.* (2011).

183

184 MICROSATELLITE METHODS

185

186 Total genomic DNA was extracted using a modified CTAB protocol (Doyle & Doyle, 1987).

187 Eleven of the 15 hoop-petticoat daffodil microsatellite markers reported in Könyves *et al.*

188 (2016) were amplified following their protocol. The allele dosage of polyploids cannot

189 readily be established, therefore traditional population genetic techniques which rely on

190 correct allele frequencies (e.g. STRUCTURE, Pritchard *et al.*, 2000) cannot be applied. We

191 used a presence-absence scoring of peaks to estimate polymorphism, similar to a dominant

192 marker (e.g., amplified fragment length polymorphism [AFLP]) data set and used

193 discriminant analysis of principal components to identify clusters within the microsatellite

194 dataset (DAPC, Jombart *et al.*, 2010). To characterise the variability of the selected markers

195 the total number of alleles per marker, the number of alleles per individual, the mean number

196 of alleles per individual and the observed heterozygosity (H_o) were calculated. To assess the

197 variation between markers and within samples, and therefore the preliminary identification

198 power of the markers, an allelic diversity was calculated as the complement of Simpson's

199 diversity ($D=1 - \sum\{p_i(p_i - 1)/N(N - 1)\}$), where p_i is the frequency with which the i th

200 allele was detected). As some of the markers exhibited no alleles in some samples (null

201 genotypes) the proportion of null genotypes was also calculated. The presence of null

202 genotypes was confirmed by repeated PCR amplifications using both a labelled and

203 unlabelled forward primer, to rule out user error or possible adverse effect of the dye

204 labelling. The presence of null genotypes was expected due to incomplete transferability of

205 these markers in hoop-petticoat daffodils. Five samples (two samples from population *Hue*,

206 one sample each from populations *Ald*, *JTiz*, and *Sdf*; Table S1), that had failed fragment

207 analysis after successful PCR of one or more loci, were removed. In total 450 hoop-petticoat

208 samples were included in the analysis. DAPC was conducted using the package *adegenet* ver.
209 1.3–9.2 (Jombart & Ahmed, 2011) in the statistical program *R* ver. 3.0.2 (R Development
210 Core Team, 2013).

211

212 The optimal number of clusters in the dataset was determined using the guidelines of Jombart
213 (2013). The model was run for 10^6 iterations to search for convergence, retaining principal
214 components that explained 95% of the variance. All eigenvalues were retained, as the number
215 of the clusters was small. The clustering analysis identified four clusters. The two most
216 populous ones, Clusters 1 and 3, were further analysed using DAPC to elucidate any
217 additional genetic structure.

218

219 PLASTID DNA METHODS

220

221 A section of the *matK* region was amplified with primers *matK* 2.1 and *matK* 5 or, in the case
222 of weak amplification, with primers *matK* X and *matK* 5 (Ford *et al.*, 2009). PCR reactions
223 were performed in 30 μ l volumes containing final concentrations of 1 \times Bioline Biomix
224 (Bioline Reagents Ltd., London, UK), 0.35 μ M of each primer, 0.13mg/ml BSA (bovine
225 serum albumin), 2.67% v/v DMSO (dimethyl sulfoxide) and 15ng DNA template. A few
226 samples failed to amplify with any of the *matK* primer combinations. For these *trnK* was
227 amplified, using primers *trnK* 570F and *trnK* 1710R (Samuel *et al.*, 2005), as these flank the
228 entire *matK* region. The PCR protocol for *trnK* was 1 \times Bioline Biomix, 0.35 μ M of each
229 primer, 0.2 g/ml BSA, 4% v/v DMSO and 15ng DNA template in 50 μ l total volume. The 3'
230 end of *ndhF* was amplified with primers *ndhF* 745F and *ndhF* 2110R (Terry, Brown, &
231 Olmstead, 1997) for 45 samples representing all recovered *matK* haplotypes. PCR reactions
232 were each performed in 50 μ l volumes containing final concentrations of 1 \times Bioline Biomix,

233 0.35 μ M of each primer, 0.2 mg/ml BSA (bovine serum albumin), and 15ng of DNA template.
234 PCR cycling conditions for all amplified regions are listed in Table 1.

235

236 The PCR products were separated on 1% agarose gels in 1 \times TAE buffer stained with 0.3
237 μ gml⁻¹ ethidium bromide. Gels were illuminated with UV light and photographs were taken
238 to record the presence of PCR amplicons. Approximate size and concentration of the PCR
239 amplicons was determined using HyperLadder™ 1kb (Biolone Reagents Ltd, London, UK).
240 Direct sequencing of PCR products was carried out by Beckman Coulter (UK) Ltd, High
241 Wycombe, UK; Source BioScience, Nottingham, UK; and Macrogen Europe, Amsterdam,
242 Netherlands in both forward and reverse direction. Sequence trace files were assembled and
243 edited using Seqman II (DNASTar, Inc., Madison, WI, USA). Sequences were aligned with
244 the MUSCLE algorithm using the default parameters (Edgar, 2004) implemented in ebioX
245 1.6 (Martínez Barrio *et al.*, 2009). The ends of the alignments were trimmed to the point
246 where all sequences were present and base calls were unambiguous.

247

248 To explore the relationships between the sampled populations and other sampled *Narcissus* a
249 statistical parsimony network was constructed from the *matK* dataset using TCS ver. 1.21
250 (Clement, Posada, & Crandall, 2000) under the 95% statistical parsimony criterion.

251 Phylogenetic trees were constructed through Bayesian inference (BI) in MrBayes ver. 3.2
252 (Ronquist *et al.*, 2012) according to the best-fit model of evolution identified by MrModeltest
253 ver. 2.3 (Nylander, 2004). To avoid overfitting of the model, BI analysis of the *matK* dataset
254 was performed using only the haplotypes identified by TCS. BI analysis of the combined
255 dataset including the *matK* haplotypes and the corresponding *ndhF* sequences was used to
256 improve the resolution of the *matK* phylogenetic tree. The incongruence of the *matK* and
257 *ndhF* datasets was assessed with the incongruence length difference (ILD) test in PAUP*

258 4.0b 10 (Swofford, 2003). All BI analyses were conducted with two separate runs, each of
259 four chains. The analyses for the *matK* and the combined datasets were run for 2,500,000 and
260 5,000,000 generations respectively, sampling every 1000 generations. Autocorrelation of the
261 sampled generations was tested in Microsoft Excel 2011 by checking the correlation between
262 subsequent generations. Burn-in was identified by assessing convergence with Tracer ver. 1.5
263 (Rambaut & Drummond, 2009). Trees from the first 25% of the sampled generations were
264 discarded.

265

266 GENETIC DIVERSITY ESTIMATORS

267

268 For each taxon, the number of haplotypes, the total number of different alleles across all loci
269 (A), the number of private alleles across all loci (A_p) and the genotypic richness ($R=G-1/N-1$;
270 where G is the number of multilocus genotypes and N is the number of genotyped samples,
271 Dorken & Eckert 2011) were calculated. Multilocus genotypes for each sample were
272 identified using the *R*-library *polysat* ver. 1.3-2 (Clark & Jasieniuk, 2011). Samples with zero
273 distance were considered to belong to the same multilocus genotype.

274

275 RESULTS

276

277 MICROSATELLITE VARIATION

278

279 A summary of the variability within microsatellite markers is given in Table 2. The number
280 of alleles per locus ranged from five to 25, while the observed heterozygosity (H_o) was
281 between 0.138 and 0.424. Most of the samples appeared homozygous with the mean number
282 of alleles per individual ranging from 1.099 to 1.532. The allelic diversity of the amplified

283 markers was between 0.353 and 0.832, while the frequency of null genotypes ranged from
284 0.4% to 30%.

285

286 The DAPC of 450 individuals revealed a separation of the microsatellite dataset into four
287 main clusters (Figure 3 A). *Narcissus bulbocodium* populations were assigned to clusters 1, 2
288 and 3. *Narcissus cantabricus* and *N. romieuxii* were in Cluster 3. The two subspecies of *N.*
289 *hedraeanthus* formed Cluster 4. *Narcissus obesus* was indistinguishable from *N.*
290 *bulbocodium* samples included in Cluster 1. The hybrid individuals were assigned to clusters
291 including the hoop-petticoat daffodil parent (apart from one individual of *N. × fosteri* Lynch,
292 a hybrid of *N. bulbocodium* and *N. triandrus*, and one individual of *N. × cazorlanus*
293 Fern.Casas, hybrid of *N. hedraeanthus* and *N. triandrus*, which were assigned to Cluster 3
294 with *N. cantabricus* and *N. romieuxii*). A further DAPC conducted on Cluster 1 detected two
295 sub-clusters (Figure 3 B). These represented the *N. bulbocodium* *N. × fosteri* (Sub-cluster 1.1)
296 and *N. obesus* populations (Sub-cluster 1.2). The further DAPC conducted on Cluster 3
297 detected three sub-clusters (Figure 3 C). The three sub-clusters do not appear to correlate
298 with established taxonomic groups.

299

300 PLASTID DNA VARIATION

301

302 The total aligned and analysed length of the *matK* dataset was 836bp including a 6bp
303 insertion. TCS identified 46 different haplotypes (GenBank accession numbers: XXXXXX -
304 XXXXXX) and created two unconnected networks, corresponding to subgenus *Hermione*
305 (h43-h46) and subgenus *Narcissus* (Figure 4 A).

306

307 The hoop-petticoat daffodil sequences were grouped into 22 haplotypes, the remaining 20
308 haplotypes belonged to other daffodil samples in subgenus *Narcissus*. *Narcissus* section
309 *Bulbocodii sensu* Marques and section *Meridionalis* appeared as two distantly related groups,
310 separated by a minimum of 22bp differences. The *matK* (Figure S1), and the combined *matK*
311 and *ndhF* BI analyses (Figure 5) recovered a topology congruent with Marques *et al.* (2017).
312 The correspondence of the DAPC and plastid DNA results is shown in Figure 5. The
313 correspondence of floral morphology and sectional classification is shown in Figure 4.
314
315 The DAPC results (Figure 3 A, B) showed *N. obesus* to be grouped with *N. bulbocodium* in
316 section *Bulbocodii sensu* Marques, however, the plastid DNA analyses placed it in section
317 *Meridionalis*. *Narcissus hedraeanthus* subsp. *luteolentus* was placed in the same cluster as *N.*
318 *hedraeanthus* subsp. *hedraeanthus* by DAPC, but it was indistinguishable from *N.*
319 *cantabricus* and *N. romieuxii* in the plastid DNA analysis. The plastid DNA analyses and
320 DAPC differ in the placement of some samples carrying haplotypes H29, H32 and H34: the
321 former placing them in section *Bulbocodii*, the latter in section *Meridionalis* (Figure 4). Three
322 of these populations occur in southern Morocco and two in central Spain. The geographic
323 distribution of the plastid DNA haplotypes and the DAPC clusters is shown in Figure 6.

324

325 DIVERSITY ESTIMATORS

326

327 *Narcissus* section *Bulbocodii sensu* Marques, comprising purely *N. bulbocodium* samples in
328 our analysis, contained 13 different plastid DNA haplotypes, and 34 private microsatellite
329 alleles. In comparison section *Meridionalis*, comprising five taxa, also had 13 haplotypes, but
330 only 15 private alleles. Genotypic richness (*R*) was 1 in all cases except *N. cantabricus*,
331 which was 0.95 (Table 3).

332

333 DISCUSSION

334

335 The DAPC and plastid DNA analyses, presented here, each recovered two separate hoop-
336 petticoat daffodil groups. These two groups correspond with the two hoop-petticoat daffodil
337 sections recognised by Marques *et al.* (2017). Our results support the recognition of these
338 sections by recovering the divergent groups through analysis of microsatellite markers, which
339 have broader coverage of the nuclear genome than ITS used by Marques *et al.* (2017). The
340 recognition of the two sections is strongly supported by molecular evidence, but the putative
341 morphological markers for these sections are not definitive. The two distinct lineages (Figure
342 5) have an apparently identical range of floral morphology (Figure 2 A-H section
343 *Meridionalis*, Figure 2 I-L as section *Bulbocodii sensu* Marques). This emphasis on floral
344 morphology to distinguish taxa has led to other characters being overlooked that may
345 distinguish these sections. A parallel can be drawn with the relationships within *Scilla* L. *s.l.*
346 where taxonomy based on floral characters is inconsistent with the taxa recognised using
347 non-floral characters (Speta 1998a; Speta 1998b), the latter appearing to be supported by
348 molecular data (Ali *et al.*, 2012).

349

350 The sampling employed by Fonseca *et al.* (2016) and Marques *et al.* (2017) focused mostly
351 on Iberian hoop-petticoat daffodils. Our study includes much wider sampling in Morocco and
352 in section *Meridionalis* than these earlier studies, which gives a more comprehensive picture
353 of the species relationships among hoop-petticoat daffodils. As the two widely sampled
354 species, *N. cantabricus* and *N. romieuxii*, could not be separated with plastid DNA analyses,
355 there were no grounds, based on these data, to evaluate their infraspecific taxa. *Narcissus*
356 *romieuxii* is endemic to Morocco and is an ancient allotetraploid hybrid of *N. bulbocodium*
357 and *N. cantabricus* (Fernandes, 1959). Its flower colour appears intermediate, ranging from

358 white to whitish-yellow (Fernandes, 1959). The results of the microsatellite analyses show
359 the same pattern, a cluster including *N. cantabricus* and *N. romieuxii* (Cluster 3), without
360 clear separation between them. The plastid DNA results indicate that *N. cantabricus* was the
361 seed parent of *N. romieuxii*, while the microsatellite results indicate introgression of *N.*
362 *romieuxii* and *N. cantabricus*. Due to the limited information provided in the original
363 descriptions of *N. peroccidentalis* and *N. tingitanus*, it is uncertain whether samples
364 attributable to these species were collected and analysed for this study. From their brief
365 descriptions, and the more recent synonymy with *N. albicans*, as circumscribed by Fernández
366 Casas (2016), they would likely be part of section *Meridionalis*.

367

368 Thirteen taxa have been described below species level in *N. bulbocodium*, more than in any
369 other species of hoop-petticoat daffodil and this variation seems to be reflected in the genetic
370 diversity measured by plastid DNA. This species had the highest haplotype diversity,
371 carrying 13 different haplotypes, but the DAPC showed more uniform genetic structure, with
372 most samples assigned to sub-cluster 1.1. However, two *N. bulbocodium* populations (*Ald,*
373 *Ede*) in central Spain were assigned to Cluster 2. These plants also carried *matK* haplotypes
374 exclusive to them, but they appeared morphologically similar to the rest of the *N.*
375 *bulbocodium* samples. So far, no corresponding morphological discontinuity has been
376 identified to explain this variation. Apart from the treatment of *N. obesus* (discussed later), *N.*
377 *bulbocodium* is widely treated as a single variable species (Webb, 1978; Aedo, 2013;
378 Fennane, 2015; Fonseca *et al.*, 2016; Marques *et al.*, 2017). However, recently Fernández
379 Casas (2017a,b) delineated two species that broadly belong to *N. bulbocodium*: one, *N.*
380 *saltuum* Fern.Casas, was new to science and reported to occur in Northern Spain; the other,
381 *N. tenuifolius* Salisb., although originally described by Salisbury (1796) and long regarded as
382 a synonym of *N. bulbocodium*, is applied by Fernández Casas to plants from the southern tip

383 of Andalusia. Neither of these species overlap geographically with the populations in Cluster
384 2 or any other sampled populations. Moreover, Fonseca *et al.* (2016) treats localized but
385 unresolved plastid DNA variation as evidence for infraspecific taxa in *N. bulbocodium*,
386 recognizing four subspecies and five varieties.

387

388 Three populations in Southern Morocco further highlighted the complex genetic variation
389 found in *N. bulbocodium*. Two of these, *Our* and *Tafr*, were identified as *N. bulbocodium* in
390 the field and this was confirmed with plastid DNA evidence, however DAPC of the
391 microsatellites places these same populations in section *Meridionalis* with *N. cantabricus* and
392 *N. romieuxii*. In contrast, the third population, *Tig*, was field-collected as *N. cantabricus*
393 (Figure 2 I), but identified as *N. bulbocodium* with plastid DNA, however DAPC supported
394 the field identification. This pattern is congruent with a hybrid origin for these populations
395 with either *N. bulbocodium* and *N. cantabricus* (or *N. romieuxii*) as the seed parent, and
396 shows more recent hybridisation. This pattern could also explain the differing treatments of
397 *N. jacquemoudii* and *N. jeanmonodii* both by Marques *et al.* (2017) and Fennane (2015). In
398 the former these are recognized species belonging to section *Bulbocodii sensu* Marques, but
399 treated as synonyms of *N. romieuxii* by the latter author, and therefore part of section
400 *Meridionalis*. Future sampling in the High Atlas, the type locality of both species, may help
401 to resolve this.

402

403 A population in Spain (*JD11-8*), from which two plants were sampled, included one
404 morphologically typical of *N. bulbocodium* and one typical of *N. cantabricus*, and while each
405 sample grouped in its respective cluster in DAPC, both carried the same *N. bulbocodium*
406 *matK* haplotype. This is most easily explained by gene flow through introgression. The two
407 species rarely occur together on the Iberian Peninsula (Barra, Blanco, & Grijalbo, 2011). It is

408 possible that the rarity of hybrids between the two in the Iberian Peninsula is due to their
409 differences in geographical range and possibly ecological preferences. However, this shows
410 that patterns similar to that in southern Morocco can be found in the Iberian Peninsula and
411 highlights the need to conduct studies across the whole of the natural distribution.

412

413 The evidence to accept *N. obesus* as a species (Fonseca *et al.*, 2016; Marques *et al.*, 2017),
414 rather than a subspecies of *N. bulbocodium* (Aedo, 2013), is further supported by our results.
415 Sub-cluster 1.2 of the DAPC corresponds to *N. obesus*, and its placement in the plastid DNA
416 analysis is the same as that shown by Fonseca *et al.* (2016) using *matK* and *trnL-F* sequences.
417 However, the assignment of *N. obesus* to section *Bulbocodii sensu* Marques in the DAPC, but
418 to section *Meridionalis* in the plastid DNA analysis raises the question whether this species
419 has also arisen through hybridisation between the two hoop-petticoat daffodil sections. The
420 base chromosome number of *N. obesus* is $x=13$, while the rest of the hoop-petticoat daffodils
421 have $x=7$ (Fernandes, 1934; Zonneveld, 2008). This could be congruent with allotetraploid origin
422 and subsequent chromosome losses/fusions (De Storme & Mason, 2014). Whichever of the two
423 sections this species is correctly placed in, it is clear that it should be recognised as a species,
424 based on chromosome number and DNA sequence, however this species cannot be reliably
425 differentiated using morphological characters. It is pertinent to note that *N. obesus* and *N.*
426 *bulbocodium* occur together in some locations, including population *Joa*.

427

428 *Narcissus hedraeanthus* is endemic to Spain, and limited to a small area between Albacete,
429 Ciudad Real, Jaen and Granada (Barra & López González, 1986; Aedo, 2013). While
430 morphologically distinct, the stem is at an angle of 45 degrees or less to the ground opposed
431 to the upright stem found in all other species (Blanchard, 1990), its taxonomic position has
432 been often debated. It was previously treated as a subspecies or variety of *N. bulbocodium*
433 (Baker, 1888; Richter, 1890), a species (Fernandes, 1963), or a subspecies of *N. cantabricus*

434 (Fernández Casas, 1982). Fonseca *et al.* (2016) and Marques *et al.* (2017) have shown that *N.*
435 *hedraeanthus* is closely related to *N. cantabricus* and belongs to section *Meridionalis* and this
436 is confirmed by our findings.

437

438 At subspecies rank the taxon *luteolentus* has been placed in either *N. hedraeanthus* (Aedo,
439 2013) or *N. cantabricus* (Barra & López González, 1982); but also at species rank as *N.*
440 *blancoi* (Barra Lázaro & López González, 1992). Based on plastid DNA data, Fonseca *et al.*
441 (2016) accepts *N. cantabricus* subsp. *luteolentus*. We collected fifteen samples from four
442 populations. Of these, three populations were identified as subsp. *luteolentus* (*Hue*; *JD11-14*;
443 *JD11-17*, N=14), while the remaining population (*JD12-8*, N=1) was identified as subsp.
444 *hedraeanthus* based on morphology. The DAPC assigned all *N. hedraeanthus* samples to
445 Cluster 4, together with a sample of *N. × cazorlanus*, a known hybrid of *N. hedraeanthus* and
446 *N. triandrus*. The plastid DNA haplotype of subsp. *hedraeanthus* was unique (H8), however,
447 the samples from the subsp. *luteolentus* populations shared haplotype H1 with *N. cantabricus*
448 and *N. romieuxii*. The possibility of *N. hedraeanthus* subsp. *luteolentus* being a unique form
449 of *N. cantabricus* was debated by Fernández Casas (1984), and Barra & López González
450 (1986). Our data support treatment of *luteolentus* as a potential hybrid between *N.*
451 *hedraeanthus* and *N. cantabricus* (which would be indicated as the nothospecies *N. ×*
452 *blancoi*).

453

454 CONCLUSION

455

456 Combining microsatellite data with plastid DNA data has highlighted incongruence between
457 patterns of relationship recovered from nuclear and organellar genomes that is indicative of
458 hybridisation at many levels within *Narcissus* evolution. There remains a clear signal that

459 there are two lineages of hoop-petticoat daffodils, consistent with those recently identified by
460 Marques *et al.* (2017) using ITS and organellar DNA. However, there is also evidence of
461 ongoing hybridisation between these two sections. The haplotype diversity recovered in these
462 two sections is similar, and this is congruent with evidence of evolutionary age, *N.* section
463 *Bulbocodii sensu* Marques was estimated at 3.43 Myr and *N.* section *Meridionalis* excluding
464 *N. obesus* (which has distinct haplotypes), 3.37 Myr (Marques *et al.*, 2017). There remains
465 the conundrum of taxa that can be recognised morphologically such as *N. cantabricus* and *N.*
466 *romieuxii*, but are genetically indistinguishable and, in contrast, taxa which have been
467 synonymised based on morphology but have distinct genetic profiles, such as *N. obesus*, and
468 subspecies *luteolentus*. Here we advise extreme caution in using plastid genome data alone to
469 name new *Narcissus* taxa and argue strongly for a multi-evidence approach.

470

471 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

472

473 The authors would like to thank Rafea Shkwa, Gábor Sramkó, Anna Trias Blasi, and Brian
474 Duncan for assisting K.K. with collecting plant material. The authors would like to thank
475 Chris Yesson for constructive comments on a draft of the manuscript and two anonymous
476 reviewers for their feedback. The authors would also like to thank the Royal Horticultural
477 Society for funding this project, and the Alpine Garden Society for its contribution to funding
478 the development of the microsatellite markers.

479

480 REFERENCES

481

482 **Aedo C. 2013.** *Narcissus* L. In: Talavera S, Andrés C, Arista M, *et al.*, eds. *Flora iberica.*

483 *Plantas vasculares de la Península Ibérica e Islas Baleares. Vol. XX, Liliaceae-Agavaceae.*

484 Madrid: Real Jardín Botánico, CSIC, 340–397.

485 **Ali SS, Yu Y, Pfosser M, Wetschnig W. 2012.** Inferences of biogeographical histories

486 within subfamily Hyacinthoideae using S-DIVA and Bayesian binary MCMC analysis

487 implemented in RASP (Reconstruct Ancestral State in Phylogenies). *Annals of Botany* **109**:

488 95–107.

489 **Ascherson P, Graebner P. 1907.** *Synopsis der Mitteleuropäischen Flora* 3. Leipzig:

490 Wilhelm Engelmann.

491 **Baker JG. 1888.** *Handbook of the Amaryllideae, including the Alstroemerieae and Agaveae.*

492 London: Bell.

493 **Barra A, Blanco E, Grijalbo J. 2011.** Narcisos ibéricos: junquillos, campanillas, capirotos o

494 trompones. *Quercus* **301**: 40–52.

495 **Barra Lázaro A. 2002.** Notas sobre *Narcissus* L. (Amaryllidaceae), III. *Anales del Jardín*

496 *Botánico de Madrid* **60**: 222–224.

497 **Barra Lázaro A, López González G. 1992.** Notas sobre el género *Narcissus* L. (III). *Anales*

498 *del Jardín Botánico de Madrid* **50**: 123.

499 **Barra A, López González G. 1982.** Notas sueltas sobre el género *Narcissus* en España.

500 *Anales del Jardín Botánico de Madrid* **39**: 67–68.

501 **Barra A, López González G. 1986.** Diferencias entre *Narcissus cantabricus* DC. subsp.

502 *luteolentus* Barra & G. López y *Narcissus hedraeanthus* (Webb & Heldr.) Colmeiro. *Anales*

503 *del Jardín Botánico de Madrid* **43**: 185–187.

504 **Barrett SCH, Cole WW, Herrera CM. 2004.** Mating patterns and genetic diversity in the

505 wild Daffodil *Narcissus longispathus* (Amaryllidaceae). *Heredity* **92**: 459–465.

506 **Blanchard JW. 1990.** *Narcissus: a guide to wild daffodils*. Woking: Alpine Garden Society.

507 **Burbidge FW, Baker JG. 1875.** *The Narcissus: its History and culture*. London: L. Reeve &

508 Co.

509 **De Candolle AP. 1815.** *Flore française*. Paris: Desray.

510 **Clark L V., Jasieniuk M. 2011.** POLYSAT: An R package for polyploid microsatellite

511 analysis. *Molecular Ecology Resources* **11**: 562–566.

512 **Clement M, Posada D, Crandall KA. 2000.** TCS: A computer program to estimate gene

513 genealogies. *Molecular Ecology* **9**: 1657–1659.

514 **David J, Könyves K. 2013.** The earliest published report of *Narcissus bulbocodium* in

515 cultivation. *Daffodil, Snowdrop and Tulip Yearbook*: 36–38.

516 **Dorken ME, Eckert CG. 2011.** Severely reduced sexual reproduction in northern

517 populations of a clonal plant, *Decodon verticillatus* (Lythraceae). *Journal of Ecology* **89**:

518 339–350.

519 **Doyle JJ, Doyle JL. 1987.** A rapid DNA isolation procedure for small quantities of fresh leaf

520 tissue. *Phytochemical Bulletin* **19**: 11–16.

521 **Edgar RC. 2004.** MUSCLE: multiple sequence alignment with high accuracy and high

522 throughput. *Nucleic Acid Research* **32**: 1792–1797.

523 **Fennane M. 2015.** *Narcissus*. In: Fennane M, Ibn Tattou M, El Oualidi J, eds. *Flore pratique*

524 *du Maroc, Volume 3*. Rabat: Institut Scientifique, Université Mohammed V de Rabat.

525 **Fernandes A. 1934.** *Nouvelles études caryologiques sur le genre Narcissus L.* Coimbra:

526 Imprensa da Universidade.

527 **Fernandes A. 1959.** On the origin of *Narcissus romieuxii* Br.-Bl. & Maire. *Boletim da*

528 *Sociedade Broteriana II*. **33**: 103–117.

529 **Fernandes A. 1963.** Sobre a evolução no subgénero *Corbularia* do género *Narcissus* L.

530 *Memórias da Academia das ciências de Lisboa, classe de ciências* **8**: 1–21.

531 **Fernandes A. 1968.** Keys to the Identification of Native and Naturalised Taxa of the Genus
532 *Narcissus* L. *R.H.S. Daffodil and Tulip Year Book*: 37–66.

533 **Fernandes A. 1975.** L'Evolution chez le genre *Narcissus* L. *Anales del Instituto Botánico A.*
534 *J. Cavanilles* **32**: 843–872.

535 **Fernández Casas FJ. 1982.** De Flora Occidentale. *Fontqueria* **1**: 9–12.

536 **Fernández Casas FJ. 1984.** Remiendos y enmiendas en el género *Narcissus* L. *Fontqueria*
537 **6**: 35–50.

538 **Fernández Casas FJ. 1986a.** Cuatro novedades en *Narcissus* L. *Fontqueria* **10**: 9–11.

539 **Fernández Casas FJ. 1986b.** Acerca de unos cuantos Narcisos norteños. *Fontqueria* **11**: 15–
540 23.

541 **Fernández Casas FJ. 1993.** Narcissorum notulæ. *Fontqueria* **36**: 271–272.

542 **Fernández Casas FJ. 1996.** Narcissorum notulæ, II. *Fontqueria* **44**: 253–262.

543 **Fernández Casas FJ. 2016.** Narcissorum notulæ, XLV–XLVII. *Fontqueria* **56**: 467–480.

544 **Fernández Casas FJ. 2017a.** Narcissorum notulæ, XLIX. *Fontqueria* **56**: 555–556.

545 **Fernández Casas FJ. 2017b.** Narcissorum notulæ, L. *Fontqueria* **56**: 557–558.

546 **Fonseca JP, Levy A, Henriques R, Costa JC, Neto C, Robalo J. 2016.** Phylogenetic
547 approach of the section *Bulbocodii* D.C. of *Narcissus* based on cpDNA. A case of taxonomic
548 inflation? *Plant Biosystems* **150**: 787–798.

549 **Ford CS, Ayres KL, Toomey N, Haider N, Van Alphen Stahl J, Kelly LJ, Wikström N,**
550 **Hollingsworth PM, Duff RJ, Hoot SB, Cowan RS, Chase MW, Wilkinson MJ. 2009.**
551 Selection of candidate coding DNA barcoding regions for use on land plants. *Botanical*
552 *Journal of the Linnean Society* **159**: 1–11.

553 **Gage E, Wilkin P, Chase MW, Hawkins J. 2011.** Phylogenetic systematics of *Sternbergia*
554 (Amaryllidaceae) based on plastid and ITS sequence data. *Botanical Journal of the Linnean*

555 *Society*.

556 **Graham SW, Barrett SCH. 2004.** Phylogenetic reconstruction of the evolution of stilar
557 polymorphisms in *Narcissus* (Amaryllidaceae). *American Journal of Botany* **91**: 1007–1021.

558 **Jombart T. 2013.** A tutorial for Discriminant Analysis of Principal Components (DAPC)
559 using adegenet 1.4-0. R vignette.

560 **Jombart T, Ahmed I. 2011.** adegenet 1.3-1: new tools for the analysis of genome-wide SNP
561 data. *Bioinformatics* **27**: 3070–3071.

562 **Jombart T, Devillard S, Balloux F. 2010.** Discriminant analysis of principal components: a
563 new method for the analysis of genetically structured populations. *BMC Genetics* **11**: 1–15.

564 **Kington S. 2008.** *The International Daffodil Register and Classified List 2008*. London: The
565 Royal Horticultural Society.

566 **Könyves K. 2014.** Taxonomy to underpin cultivar identification in hoop-petticoat daffodils.
567 Ph.D. Thesis. University of Reading.

568 **Könyves K, David JC, Culham A. 2016.** Microsatellite Markers for Hoop-Petticoat
569 Daffodils (*Narcissus* sect. *Bulbocodii*; Amaryllidaceae). *Applications in Plant Sciences* **4**:
570 1500127.

571 **Lowe A, Harris S, Ashton P. 2004.** *Ecological Genetics: Design, Analysis, and Application*.
572 Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

573 **Maire R. 1959.** *Flore de l'Afrique du Nord*. Paris: Paul Lechevalier.

574 **Marques I. 2010.** Evolutionary outcomes of natural hybridization in *Narcissus*
575 (*Amaryllidaceae*): the case of *N. × perezlarae* s.l. Ph.D. Thesis. Universidade De Lisboa.

576 **Marques I, Aguilar JF, Martins-Louçao MA, Moharrek F, Feliner GN. 2017.** A three-
577 genome five-gene comprehensive phylogeny of the bulbous genus *Narcissus*
578 (*Amaryllidaceae*) challenges current classifications and reveals multiple hybridization events.
579 *Taxon* **66**: 832–854.

580 **Marques I, Nieto Feliner G, Martins-Loução MA, Fuertes Aguilar J. 2011.** Fitness in
581 *Narcissus* hybrids: low fertility is overcome by early hybrid vigour, absence of exogenous
582 selection and high bulb propagation. *Journal of Ecology* **99**: 1508–1519.

583 **Martínez Barrio Á, Lagercrantz E, Sperber GO, Blomberg J, Bongcam-Rudloff E.**
584 **2009.** Annotation and visualization of endogenous retroviral sequences using the Distributed
585 Annotation System (DAS) and eBioX. In: *BMC Bioinformatics.*, S18.

586 **Mathew B. 2002.** Classification of the genus *Narcissus*. In: Hanks GR, ed. *Narcissus and*
587 *Daffodil: The genus Narcissus*. London: Taylor & Francis, 30–52.

588 **Nylander JAA. 2004.** MrModeltest v2. *Program distributed by the author. Evolutionary*
589 *Biology Centre, Uppsala University.*

590 **Pax F. 1888.** Amaryllidaceae. In: Engler A, Prantl K, eds. *Die Natürlichen Pflanzenfamilien.*
591 Leipzig: Verlag von Wilhelm Engelmann, 97–124.

592 **Pritchard JK, Stephens M, Donnelly P. 2000.** Inference of population structure using
593 multilocus genotype data. *Genetics* **155**: 945–959.

594 **Rambaut A, Drummond AJ. 2009.** Tracer version 1.5. Available at
595 <http://tree.bio.ed.ac.uk/software/tracer/>.

596 **Rankou H, Culham A, Sghir Taleb M, Ouhammou A, Martin G, Jury SL. 2015.**
597 Conservation assessments and red listing of the endemic moroccan flora (monocotyledons).
598 *Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society* **177**: 504–575.

599 **Richter K. 1890.** *Plantae Europaeae. Enumeratio systematica et synonymica plantarum*
600 *phaenerogamicarum in Europa sponte crescentium vel mere inquilinarum.* Leipzig: Verlag
601 von Wilhelm Engelmann.

602 **Ronquist F, Teslenko M, Van Der Mark P, Ayres DL, Darling A, Höhna S, Larget B,**
603 **Liu L, Suchard MA, Huelsenbeck JP. 2012.** MrBayes 3.2: Efficient bayesian phylogenetic
604 inference and model choice across a large model space. *Systematic Biology* **61**: 539–542.

605 **Salisbury RA. 1796.** *Prodromus stirpium in horto ad Chapel Allerton vigentium*. London.

606 **Salisbury RA. 1812.** On the cultivation of Rare Plants, especially such as have been
607 introduced since the Death of Mr. Philip Miller. *Transactions of the Horticultural Society of*
608 *London* **1**: 261–366.

609 **Samuel R, Kathriarachchi H, Hoffmann P, Barfuss MHJ, Wurdack KJ, Davis CC,**
610 **Chase MW. 2005.** Molecular phylogenetics of Phyllanthaceae: evidence from plastid *matK*
611 and nuclear *PHYC* sequences. *American Journal of Botany* **92**: 132–141.

612 **Santos-Gally R, Vargas P, Arroyo J. 2012.** Insights into Neogene Mediterranean
613 biogeography based on phylogenetic relationships of mountain and lowland lineages of
614 *Narcissus* (Amaryllidaceae). *Journal of Biogeography* **39**: 782–798.

615 **Speta F. 1998a.** Systematische Analyse der Gattung *Scilla* L. s.l. (Hyacinthaceae). *Phyton*
616 (*Horn*) **38**: 1–224.

617 **Speta F. 1998b.** Hyacinthaceae. In: Kubitzki K, ed. *The Families and Genera of Vascular*
618 *Plants III. Monocotyledons – Lilianae (except Orchidaceae)*. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer
619 Verlag, 261–285.

620 **De Storme N, Mason A. 2014.** Plant speciation through chromosome instability and ploidy
621 change: Cellular mechanisms, molecular factors and evolutionary relevance. *Current Plant*
622 *Biology* **1**: 10–33.

623 **Swofford DL. 2003.** PAUP*. Phylogenetic Analysis Using Parsimony (*and Other
624 Methods). Version 4.0b 10.

625 **Terry RG, Brown GK, Olmstead RG. 1997.** Examination of Subfamilial Phylogeny in
626 Bromeliaceae Using Comparative Sequencing of the Plastid Locus *ndhF*. *American Journal*
627 *of Botany* **84**: 664–670.

628 **Vázquez Pardo FM. 2013.** Anotaciones a la diversidad de *Narcissus bulbocodium* L.,
629 (Amaryllidaceae) en Extremadura (España). *Folia Botanica Extremadurensis* **7**: 13–21.

- 630 **Webb D. 1978.** Taxonomic notes on *Narcissus* L. *Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society*
631 **76:** 298–307.
- 632 **Zonneveld BJM. 2008.** The systematic value of nuclear DNA content for all species of
633 *Narcissus* L. (Amaryllidaceae). *Plant Systematics and Evolution* **275:** 109–132.
- 634

635 Figure Legends

636

637 **Figure 1.** Examples of floral variation within and between *Narcissus* sections and
638 subsections *sensu* Marques *et al.* (2017). *Narcissus* subsection *Pseudonarcissi*: A) *N. nobilis*,
639 B) *N. cyclamineus*, C) *N. moschatus*, D) *N. bujei*; *Ganymedes*: E) *N. triandrus*; *Nevadensis*:
640 F) *N. segurenensis*; *Juncifolii*: G) *N. assoanus*; *Braxireon*: H) *N. cavanillesii*; *Meridionalis*: I)
641 *N. cantabricus*; *Apodanthi*: J) *N. rupicola*; *Bulbocodii sensu* Marques: K) *N. bulbocodium*;
642 *Jonquillae*: L) *N. jonquilla*, M) *N. viridiflorus*; *Dubii*: N) *N. tortifolius*; *Angustifolii*: O) *N.*
643 *elegans*; *Tazettae*: P) *N. tazetta*, Q) *N. papyraceus*; *Aurelia*: R) *N. broussonetti*; *Narcissus*
644 subsection *Narcissus*: S) *N. poeticus*; *Serotini*: T) *N. serotinus* Scale bar = 5 cm. Copyright
645 the authors except for B (J. Bilborrow) and O (T. Sanders).

646 **Figure 2.** Examples of morphological variation of hoop-petticoat daffodils: A, B) *N.*
647 *romieuxii*; C) *N. hedraeanthus* subsp. *hedraeanthus*; D) *N. hedraeanthus* subsp. *luteolentus*;
648 E, F) *N. obesus*; G, H, I) *N. cantabricus*; J, K, L) *N. bulbocodium*. Scale bar = 5 cm.

649 **Figure 3.** Results of the DAPC. A) Individual membership probabilities of each of four
650 genetic clusters ($k=4$) of 450 individuals; B) Results of DAPC of Cluster 1 samples, showing
651 membership probabilities of either of two genetic clusters ($k=2$); C) Results of DAPC of
652 Cluster 3 samples, showing membership probabilities of each of three genetic clusters ($k=3$).
653 Population order follows the natural distribution from north to south (top to bottom).

654 **Figure 4.** Haplotype network of *matK* sequences. A) Coloured circles represent the observed
655 haplotypes. B) **Error! Reference source not found.** Recoloured according to the DAPC
656 cluster and sub-cluster assignments. Labels show identifications made in the field or *ex situ*.
657 Species names in black represent hoop-petticoat taxa, grey labels represent other taxa. All
658 section *Bulbocodii sensu* Marques haplotypes refer to *N. bulbocodium*, apart from the ones
659 with labels. The size of the circle is proportional to the haplotype frequency. Open circles

660 indicate inferred haplotypes, dashes indicate indel positions. The length of connecting lines
661 does not have meaning.

662 **Figure 5.** Bayesian inference majority rule consensus tree of the combined *matK* and *ndhF*
663 dataset. Posterior probabilities are shown at nodes. Scale bar shows the number of
664 substitutions per site. *N. c.* = *N. cantabricus*, *N. r.* = *N. romieuxii*. Haplotype colours and
665 names correspond to Figure 4 A. Labels correspond to Figure 1 and Figure 2.

666 **Figure 6.** Geographic distribution of A) the hoop-petticoat daffodil *matK* haplotypes
667 [numbers and colours correspond to Figure 4 A] and B) distribution of the DAPC clusters
668 [colours correspond to Figure 3, labels show population codes]. Areas within the dotted lines
669 indicate regions in which these species are found but from which we did not have opportunity
670 to sample.

671 **Figure S1.** Bayesian inference tree of the *matK* dataset. Posterior probabilities are shown at
672 nodes. Scale bar shows the number of substitutions per site. Haplotype colours and names
673 correspond to Figure 4 A. *N. c.* = *N. cantabricus*, *N. r.* = *N. romieuxii*.
674

675 Table captions

676

677 **Table 1.** Details of the PCR cycling conditions for the plastid DNA markers.

678

679 **Table 2.** Summary statistics of the 11 amplified microsatellites based on 450–455 hoop-
680 petticoat daffodil samples. H_o = observed heterozygosity; s.e. = standard error. N indicates
681 number of samples across the table.

682

683 **Table 3.** Genetic diversity estimators for each taxon. N_H = the number of different haplotypes
684 N_C = the number of different clusters, A = the total number of different alleles across all loci;
685 A_p = the number of private alleles across all loci; R = the genotypic richness. N without
686 subscript indicates number of samples across the table.

687

688 **Table S1.** Geographic location and voucher information of hoop-petticoat daffodil samples.

689 N = number of sampled individuals included in the plastid DNA (cpDNA) and microsatellite
690 (SSRs) analyses.

691

692 **Table S2.** Geographic location or source, and voucher information of *Narcissus* samples. N =
693 number of individuals included in the chloroplast DNA analysis; N/K = not known; N/A =
694 not applicable.