# Multigene Phylogeny of Land Plants with Special Reference to Bryophytes and the Earliest Land Plants

Daniel L. Nickrent,\* Christopher L. Parkinson,<sup>†1</sup> Jeffrey D. Palmer,<sup>†</sup> and R. Joel Duff<sup>\*2</sup>

\*Department of Plant Biology and Center for Systematic Biology, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale; and †Department of Biology, Indiana University at Bloomington

A widely held view of land plant relationships places liverworts as the first branch of the land plant tree, whereas some molecular analyses and a cladistic study of morphological characters indicate that hornworts are the earliest land plants. To help resolve this conflict, we used parsimony and likelihood methods to analyze a 6,095-character data set composed of four genes (chloroplast *rbcL* and small-subunit rDNA from all three plant genomes) from all major land plant lineages. In all analyses, significant support was obtained for the monophyly of vascular plants, lycophytes, ferns (including *Psilotum* and *Equisetum*), seed plants, and angiosperms. Relationships among the three bryophyte lineages were unresolved in parsimony analyses in which all positions were included and weighted equally. However, in parsimony and likelihood analyses in which *rbcL* third-codon-position transitions were either excluded or downweighted (due to apparent saturation), hornworts were placed as sister to all other land plants, with mosses and liverworts jointly forming the second deepest lineage. Decay analyses and Kishino-Hasegawa tests of the third-position-excluded data set showed significant support for the hornwort-basal topology over several alternative topologies, including the commonly cited liverwort-basal topology. Among the four genes used, mito-chondrial small-subunit rDNA showed the lowest homoplasy and alone recovered essentially the same topology as the multigene tree. This molecular phylogeny presents new opportunities to assess paleontological evidence and morphological innovations that occurred during the early evolution of terrestrial plants.

# Introduction

Understanding the evolutionary history of bryophytes (mosses, liverworts, and hornworts) is compelling because they represent the first green plants to colonize the terrestrial environment, in the course of which they evolved numerous important adaptations, including alternation of gametophytic (haploid) and sporophytic (diploid) generations, elaborate gametophytes, specialized gametangia, and desiccation-resistant spore walls (Renzaglia et al. 2000). Spore microfossils of terrestrial (nonalgal) plants are known from the middle Ordovician (470 MYA) (Gray 1993); however, the earliest spore records identified as liverworts are from the lower Silurian (430 MYA) (Taylor 1995) and the earliest spore records for hornworts are from the upper Silurian (420 MYA) (Richardson 1985). Furthermore, unequivocal macrofossils of liverworts (Pallavicinites) and hornworts (Notothylacites) date to the upper Devonian (370 MYA) (Hueber 1961) and upper Cretaceous (70-90 MYA) (Nemejc and Pacltova 1974), respectively, i.e., long after their initial appearance. Determining which bryophyte group is the most ancient among extant land plants has proven difficult, and a myriad of phylogenetic hypotheses have been advanced with fundamentally different tree topologies. The long-standing concept of

<sup>1</sup> Present address: Department of Biology, University of Central Florida.

<sup>2</sup> Present address: Department of Biology, University of Akron.

Abbreviations: HBT, hornwort basal topology; LBT, liverwort basal topology.

Key words: land plant phylogeny, embryophyte, hornwort, liverwort, moss, *rbcL*, small-subunit ribosomal DNA.

Address for correspondence and reprints: Daniel L. Nickrent, Department of Plant Biology and Center for Systematic Biology, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois 62901-6509. E-mail: nickrent@plant.siu.edu.

Mol. Biol. Evol. 17(12):1885-1895. 2000

© 2000 by the Society for Molecular Biology and Evolution. ISSN: 0737-4038

bryophyte monophyly was first challenged by morphological cladistic analyses which placed liverworts as the sister to all other land plants (Mishler and Churchill 1984). Analyses combining morphological characters with rRNA sequences (Mishler et al. 1994) and analyses of the chloroplast gene *rbcL* (Lewis, Mishler, and Vilgalys 1997) have generally supported a "liverworts-basal" topology (LBT) and placed either mosses or hornworts as sister to vascular plants (tracheophytes). More recently, the LBT was deemed the most parsimonious explanation to account for the presence and absence of three mitochondrial introns (Qiu et al. 1998).

Despite its wide acceptance, the LBT has been challenged by data derived from spermatozoid ultrastructure and spermatogenesis (Renzaglia and Duckett 1991) and, more recently (Garbary and Renzaglia 1998), by an extensive cladistic analysis of morphological and ultrastructural data that yielded a monophyletic mossliverwort clade, with hornworts sister to all land plants. This "hornworts-basal" topology (HBT) was also obtained in analyses of nuclear small-subunit (nuSSU) rDNA (Hedderson, Chapman, and Rootes 1996), combined analysis of five chloroplast genes (Nishiyama and Kato 1999), and analyses of mitochondrial cox3 (Malek et al. 1996), nad5 (Beckert et al. 1999), and mitochondrial small-subunit (mtSSU) rDNA (Duff and Nickrent 1999). In an effort to distinguish between the LBT and the HBT and to provide an improved understanding of land plant phylogeny, we generated additional sequence data to allow the construction of a multigene data set representing all three plant genomes and the same suite of exemplar taxa.

# **Materials and Methods**

Ingroup and Outgroup Selection

Sequences were obtained from chloroplast SSU (cpSSU) rDNA, chloroplast *rbcL*, nuSSU rDNA, and

Table 1

GenBank Accession	n Numbers for	Taxa	Used in	Multigene	Analysis	of Land	Plant Phyloge	nv
								•

		rbcL	cpSSU rDNA	nuSSU rDNA	mtSSU rDNA
Nicotiana tabacum	Glycine max	Z95552	X06428	X02623	M16589
Zea maysX86563X86563U42796X00894Maganolia × soulangeanal/Magnolia acuminatal/Magnolia grandiflorumMS8393AF244557D29776AF161089normal contrallymphaea tuberosal/lymphaea tuberosal/lymphaea betweend erosal/lymphaea sphanea tuberosal/lymphaea sphanea tub montanumMT7034AF244550L24404AF161091fuenus gnemoni/Gnetun leyboldii/Gnetun gnemoni/Gne- tun montanumL12680AF244555U42416AB029358Ephedra antisyphitica strightima surginianal/uniperus chi- nensis/lumperus virginianal/uniperus chi- mensis/lumperus virginianal/uniperus chi- strightimasL12677U24584U42414AF244552Juniperus conferua/luniperus virginianal/uniperus chi- strobusD17510D17510D38245AF058659Cycas circinalis/Cycas revoluta/Cycas taitungensis/Cy- cas revoluta.L12674AF244551D85297AB029356Ginkgo bilobaD10733AF244554U18505AF058667Huperiza lucidulaMyrojakastrum digitatum/Di- phastiastrum digitatum/Di- ph	Nicotiana tabacum	Z00044	Z00044	AF161095	U82638
Magnolia × soulangeanal/M. × soulangeanal/Magnolia acuminata/Magnolia yandiforumMS839AF244557D29776AF161089Nymphaea odorata/Nymphaea tubereas/Nymphaea tuber erosal/Nymphaea Sp.M77034AF244550L24404AF161091Gnetum genenon/Gnetum leyboldii/Gnetum genenon/Gnetum montanama.L12680AF244555U42416AB029358Ephedra tweedianalEphedra trifurca/Ephedra torreyanalL12677U24584U42414AF244552Innjerus conferul/Juliperus virginiana/Juliperus chi- nensis/Iuniperus virginianaL12573U24586D38243AF058658Finus funbergril/Pinus elliotii/Pinus strobusD17510D38245AF058658D4829356Cycas circinalis/Cycas revoluta/Cycas taitungensis/Cy- cas revoluta/Cycas taitungensis/Cy- cas revoluta/Diphasiastrum digittatum/Diphasiastrum disectonL11054U24591X75517<	Zea mays	X86563	X86563	U42796	X00894
accuminate/Magnolia grandiflorumMS8393AF244557D29776AF161089Nymphaea objanta/Nymphaea tuberosa/Nymphaea tubM77034AF244560L24404AF161091erosa/Nymphaea sp.M77034AF244560L24404AF161091fune montanumL12680AF244555U42416AB029358Ephedra versigniana/Juniperus chi-L12677U24584U42414AF244552mensis/Intiperus virginianaL12677U24586D38243AF058658Pinus thunbergi/Pinus thunbergi/Pinus eliotii/PinusD17510D17510D38245AF058659Cycas circinalis/Cycas revoluta/Cycas taitungensis/Cy- cas revolutaL12674AF244551D85297AB029356Ginkgo biobaD10733AF244554D16448AB029355Jiphasiastrum digitatum/Diphasiastrum digitatum/Di- phasiastrum digitatum/Diphasiastrum digitatum/DiphasiastrumL1055U24587U18505AF058668Selaginella defeas/Selaginella apoda/Selaginella vogelliY07934AF244556U18505AF058663noneAF093253U24591X75517NoneIsoètes nelunopodal/soètes durieuïL1054U24581U18623AF058663Orrychim biernatum/Borychium dissectumL10474U24581U18623AF058663Orhoigolossum pediaum/Adianum radL1054U24589U18515AF058664dianum/Adianum/Adianum radL1055U24580U18519AF058664dianum/Adianum/Adianum radL1055U24580U18519AF058664dioristin defalomul/Adianu	Magnolia  imes soulangeana/ $M$ . $ imes$ soulangeana/ $M$ agnolia				
Nymphaea obcratal/Nymphaea tub- eroxal/Nymphaea sp.MT7034AF244560L24404AF161091Gnetum genom/Gnetum leyboldi/Gnetum gnemon/Gne- tum montanum.L12680AF244555U42416AB029358Ephedra tregelina leyboldi/Gnetum gnemon/Gne- tum montanum.L12677U24584U42414AF244552Juniperus conferia/Juniperus virginiana/Juniperus chi nemisis/Juniperus virginiana.L12573U24586D38243AF058658Finas thunbergil/Finus elitoti/Pinus strobusD17510D38245AF058659Cycas circinalis/Cycas revoluta/Cycas taitungensis/Cy- cas revolutaL12674AF244551D85297AB029356Corks circinalis/Cycas revoluta/Cycas taitungensis/Cy- cas revolutaD10733AF244554D185297AB029356Diphasiastrum digittatum/Diphasiastrum digittatum/Diphasiastrum digittatum/Diphasiastrum digittatum/Diphasiastrum digittatum/Diphasiastrum plasiastrum digittatum/Diphasiastrum digittatum tucidula/ tuperzia lucidula/ tuperzia selago/Huperzia lucidula/ tuperzia lucidula/ tuperzia	acuminata/Magnolia grandiflorum	M58393	AF244557	D29776	AF161089
ercsal/Nymphaca sp.M77034AF244560L.24404AF161091fonctum genenom/Gnetum leyboldil/Gnetum genenom/GnetL12680AF244555U42416AB029358Ephedra trongendena trifuccal/Ephedra torreyana/ Ephedra trongenas virginiana/Inniperus virginiana/Inniperus schi- nensis/Inniperus virginiana/Inniperus ethiliperusL12677U24584U42414AF244552Juniperus conferta/Inniperus virginiana/Inniperus ethiliperus virginiana/Inniperus ethiliperus ethilip	Nymphaea odorata/Nymphaea tuberosa/Nymphaea tub-				
Gnetum genenoul Gnetum genenoul Gnetum genenoul GnetumL12680AF244555U42416AB029358Ephedra trogenical phedra trifuccil Ephedra torreyanalL12677U24584U42414AF244552Juniperus confertal Juniperus virginiana/haniperus chiL12573U24586D38243AF058658Pinus thunbergil Pinus thunbergil Pinus ellotii PinusD17510D38245AF058659Cycas circinalis Cycas revolutal Cycas taitungensis Cy- cas revolutaL12674AF244551D1648AB029356Cycas circinalis Cycas revolutal Cycas taitungensis Cy- cas revolutaL12674AF244551D1648AB029355Diphasiastrum digittatum/Diphasiastrum digittatumL11055U24587U18511AF058667Huperzia selago Huperzia lucidulal Inperia lucidulalY07934AF244556U18505AF058668Selaguiella depedu/Selaginella vogeli/ lootes hystrixL11054U24587X18517NoneJoõtes melanopoda/Isoõtes melanopoda/Isoõtes durieui/ lootes hystrixL11054U24585X83521AF058669Equisetum arvense/Equisetum hyemaeL11053U24593X78890AF058666Botrychium biternatum/Botry- chium lunaria Botrychium dissectumL11053U24581U18623AF058666Ophioglossum engelmamii/Ophioglossum engelmamii/ Ophioglossum peiloatum/Adiantum rad dianum/Adiantum rad dianum/Adiantum rad dianum/Adiantum rad dianum/Adiantum rad dianum/Adiantum rad dianum/Adiantum rad dianum/Adiantum rad/Botrychiud bisectumL11052U24580D85301AF058670Polioglossum engelmamii/Ophioglossum	erosa/Nymphaea sp	M77034	AF244560	L24404	AF161091
tum montanum. L12680 AF244555 U42416 AB029358 Ephedra vareisellanelEphedra trifurca/Ephedra torreyana/ Ephedra vareisellanelEphedra trifurca/Ephedra torreyana/ Ephedra vareisellanelEphedra trifurca/Ephedra torreyana/ Ephedra vareisellanelEphedra trifurca/Ephedra torreyana/ Engineerus comperial/uniperus virginiana/Juniperus chi- mensis/Jmiperus virginiana strobus strobus strobus torus thunbergil/Pinus thunbergil/Pinus strobus strobus torus thunbergil/Pinus thunbergil/Pinus strobus torus thunbergil/Pinus thunbergil/Pinus strobus torus tristatopum/Diphesiastrum digittatum/Di- phasiastrum tristachyum/Diphesiastrum digittatum/Di- phasiastrum tristachyum/Diphesiastrum digittatum/Di- phasiastrum tristachyum/Diphesiastrum digittatum/Di- pheria lucidula/ Huperzia lucidula/ Huperzia lucidula/ Selaginella effext/Selaginella aopda/Selaginella vogeliti/ none Isoëtes melanopoda/Isoëtes melanopoda/Isoëtes durieui/ Isoëtes triste/Equisetum arvense/Equisetum fyema- L11054 U24585 X83521 AF058669 Equisetum arvense/Equisetum fyema- L11054 U24585 X83521 AF058669 Equisetum arvense/Equisetum fyema- L11053 U24593 X78890 AF058663 Botrychium biternatum/Botrychium biternatum/Botry- chium lunari/Botrychium phedaum/Adianum rad- Botrychium commune US765 AF04565 AF058674 U18521 AF058667 Af058677 AF244563 U18518 AF244565 AF058677 AF244564 AF058677 AF244563 V18499 AF058677 Capagea mue	Gnetum gnemon/Gnetum leyboldii/Gnetum gnemon/Gne-				
Epiedra tveediana/Ephedra trifurcal/Ephedra torreyana/ Ephedra antisyphitica	tum montanum	L12680	AF244555	U42416	AB029358
Ephedra antisyphilica.L12677U24584U42414AF244552numerus confertal/uniperus virginiana/Juniperus chi- nensis/Inniperus virginianaL12573U24586D38243AF058658Pinus thunbergil/Pinus thunbergil/Pinus elliotii/Pinus strobusD17510D17510D38245AF058659Cycas circinalis/Cycas revoluta/Cycas taitungensis/Cy- cas revoluta.L12674AF244551D85297AB029356Ginkgo bilobaD10733AF244554D16448AB029355Jiphasiastrum digittatum/Diphasiastrum digittatum/Di- phasiastrum tristachyum/Diphasiastrum digittatum/Di- phasiastrum tristachyum/Diphasiastrum digittatum/Di- phasiastrum tristachyum/Diphasiastrum digittatum/Di- phasiastrum tristachyum/Diphasiastrum digittatum/Di- phasiastrum tristachyum/Diphasiastrum digittatum/Di- phasiastrum digittatum/Di- phasiastrum tristachyum/Diphasiastrum digittatum/Di- phasiastrum tristachyum/Diphasiastrum digittatum/Di- phasiastrum tristachyum/Diphasiastrum digittatum/Di- phasiastrum tristachyum/Diphasiastrum digittatum/Di- phasiastrum apodal/Seleginella vogelii/ NoneNO7934AF244556U18505AF058668Selaginella apodal/Seleginella vogelii/ noneL11054U24585X83521AF058669Equisetum hymaleL11053U24593X78890AF058663Borychiam biternatum/Borychiam biternatum/Borychiam biternatum/Borychiam biternatum/Adiantum rad- dianum/Adiantum rad- dianum/Adiantum rad- dianum/Adiantum rad- dianum/Adiantum rad- dianum/Adiantum rad- dianum/Adiantum rad- L11052U24580U18621AF058660Argotsecaros enigmaticus/Megaceros enigmaticus/Megaceros eris oradicus/Megaceros enigm	Ephedra tweediana/Ephedra trifurca/Ephedra torreyana/				
Juniperus confertal/Juniperus virginianal/Juniperus chi- nensis/Juniperus virginiana L12573 U24586 D38243 AF058658 Pinus thunbergii/Pinus thunbergi/Pinus elliotii/Pinus strobus D17510 D17510 D38245 AF058659 Cycas circinalis/Cycas revoluta/Cycas taitungensis/Cy- cas revoluta	Ephedra antisyphitica	L12677	U24584	U42414	AF244552
nensis/Juniperus virginiana	Juniperus conferta/Juniperus virginiana/Juniperus chi-				
Pinus thunbergi/Pinus thunbergi/Pinus ellioti/Pinus strobus D17510 D17510 D38245 AF058659 Cycas revoluta	nensis/Juniperus virginiana	L12573	U24586	D38243	AF058658
strobus D17510 D17510 D17510 D38245 AF088659 Cycas circinalis/Cycas revoluta/Cycas taitungensis/Cy- cas revoluta	Pinus thunbergii/Pinus thunbergi/Pinus elliotii/Pinus				
Cycas circinalis/Cycas revoluta/ cas revoluta/ cas revoluta/ phasiastrum digittatum/Diphasiastrum digittatum/Diphasiastrum digittatum/Diphasiastrum digittatum/Diphasiastrum digittatum/Diphasiastrum digittatum/Liphasiastrum digittatum/Liphasiastrum/Liphasiastum/Liphasiastrum/Liphasiastrum	strobus	D17510	D17510	D38245	AF058659
ccss revolutaL126/4AF244551D5529/AB029356Ginkgo bilobaD10733AF244554D16448AB029355Diphasiastrum digittatum/Diphasiastrum digittatum/Di- phasiastrum tristachyum/Diphasiastrum digittatumD10733AF244554D16448AB029355Diphasiastrum tristachyum/Diphasiastrum digittatumL11055U24587U18511AF058667Huperzia lucidula/ Huperzia lucidula/ moneY07934AF244556U18505AF058668Selaginella deflexa/Selaginella apoda/Selaginella vogelii/ noneAF093253U24591X75517NoneIsoètes melanopoda/Isoètes durieui/ lsoètes melanopoda/Isoètes durieui/ lsoètes melanopoda/Isoètes durieui/ le/Equisetum nyemaleL11054U24585X83521AF058669Equisetum byemaleL11053U24593X78890AF058663Botrychium biternatum/Botry- chium lunaria/Botrychium dissectumL11058U24581U18623AF058664Adianum/Adiantum pedatum/Adiantum rad- dianum/Adiantum pedatum/Adiantum rad- dianum/Adiantum nadialumL11052U24580D85301AB029352Polytrichum communeL11059U24590U18519AF244566Sphaquan palustreL13485L13485U4592Y11370AF058679Valakai lepidozioidesAF024565AF058678U18526AF058673U18526AF058673Polytrichum communeU87087AF244563U18518AF244564Marchantia polymorphaL13481AF244563U18491AF058677Polytrichum communeU87065 <t< td=""><td>Cycas circinalis/Cycas revoluta/Cycas taitungensis/Cy-</td><td>T 10 (T 1</td><td></td><td>D.0.500</td><td></td></t<>	Cycas circinalis/Cycas revoluta/Cycas taitungensis/Cy-	T 10 (T 1		D.0.500	
Grinkgo bitobaD10733AF244554D16448AB029355Diphasiastrum digittatum/Diphasiastrum digittatum/Diphasiastrum tristachyum/Diphasiastrum digittatumL11055U24587U18511AF058667Huperzia kelago/Huperzia lucidulaY07934AF244556U18505AF058668Selaginella deflexa/Selaginella apoda/Selaginella vogelii/ noneY07934AF244556U18505AF058668Selaginella deflexa/Selaginella apoda/Selaginella vogelii/ noneAF093253U24591X75517NoneIsoëtes melanopoda/Isoëtes melanopoda/Isoëtes durieui/ Isoëtes hystrixL11054U24585X83521AF058669Equisetum nyemaleL11053U24593X78890AF058663Botrychium biternatum/Botrychium disectumL11053U24581U18623AF058661Ophioglossum engelmannii/ Ophioglossum engelmannii/ Ophioglossum engelmannii/ Ophioglossum engelmannii/ Ophioglossum engelmannii/ Ophioglossum valgareL11058U24589U18515AF058664Adiantum raddianum/Adiantum rad- dianum/Adiantum raddianum/Adiantum rad- dianum/Adiantum and- topteris lygodi-L11052U24580D85301AB029352Psiloun nudumL11059U24590U18519AF244566Sphagnum palustreL13476X75490U18526AF058674Megaceros enigmaticus/Megaceros enigmaticus/M	cas revoluta	L12674	AF244551	D85297	AB029356
Diphasiastrum digitatium/Diphasiastrum digitatium/Di- phasiastrum digitatium/Di- 	Ginkgo biloba	D10/33	AF244554	D16448	AB029355
phastastrum tristachyum/Diphastastrum digittatum.L11055U24587U18511AFU58667Huperzia elago/Huperzia lucidula/ Huperzia lucidula.Y07934AF244556U18505AF058668Selaginella deflexa/Selaginella apoda/Selaginella vogelii/ none.AF093253U24591X75517NoneIsoëtes hystrixAF058669L11054U24585X83521AF058669Isoëtes hystrixL11054U24585X83521AF058669e/Equisetum arvense/Equisetum arvense/Equisetum hyema- le/Equisetum forrychium biternatum/Botry- chum lunaria/Botrychium dissectumL11053U24593X78890AF058663Ophioglossum engelmannii/ Ophioglossum engelmannii// Ophioglossum engelmannii// Ophioglossum pedatum/Adiantum rad- dianum/Adiantum raddianum/Adiantum raddianum/Adiantum rad- tifolia/Angiopteris lygodii ifolia/Angiopteris lygodii folia/angiopteris lygodii folia/angiopteris lygodii ophiaziolisL11052U24580D85301AB029352Psiloum nudumL11052U24580D85301AB029352Psiloum nudumL11054U24592Y11370AF058670Takakia lepidozioidesAF244565AF058678U18516AF058672Polytrichum communeL1305U24590U18518AF244564Calypogeia muelleriana/Calypo- geia arguta/Calypogeia muelleri	Diphasiastrum digittatum/Diphasiastrum digittatum/Di-	1 1 1 0 5 5	1124505	110511	
Huperzia selago/Huperzia ucidulaY07934AF244556U18505AF058668Selaginella deflexa/Selaginella apoda/Selaginella vogelii/ noneAF093253U24591X75517NoneIsoëtes melanopodal/Soètes melanopodal/Soètes durieui/ Isoëtes hystrixL11054U24595X83521AF058669Equisetum nervense/Equisetum hyema- le/Equisetum biternatum/Botry- chium biternatum/Botry- chium biternatum/Botry- chium biternatum/Botry- chium biternatum/Dotioglossum engelmannii// Ophioglossum engelmannii// Ophioglossum petiolatum/Ophioglossum vulgareL11058U24593X78890AF058661Ophioglossum engelmannii// Ophioglossum petiolatum/Ophioglossum vulgareL11058U24589U18623AF058664Adiantum raddianum/Adiantum raddianumU05906AF244549U18621AF058660Angiopteris evecta/Angiopteris lygodii- ifolia/Angiopteris lygodifoliaL11052U24590U18519AF244566Sphagnum palustreL13485U24592Y11370AF058670AF244565AF058678U18526AF058672Polytrichum comuneW87087AF244565X78439AF058674W8929Calypogeia muelleriana/Calypo- geia arguta/Calypogeia muelleriana/Calypo- geia mugare/Calypogeia muelleriana/Calypo- geia mugare/Calypogeia muelleriana/Calypo- geia arguta/Calypogeia muelleriana/Calypo- geia ar	phasiastrum tristachyum/Diphasiastrum digittatum	L11055	024587	018511	AF05866/
Huperzia luciduidY0/934AF 244556U18505AF 058668Selaginella deflexal/Selaginella apoda/Isoëtes melanopoda/Isoëtes durieui/ Isoëtes melanopoda/Isoëtes durieui/ Isoëtes systrixAF093253U24591X75517NoneIsoëtes systrixL11054U24585X83521AF058669Equisetum arvense/Equisetum arvense/Equisetum hyema- le/Equisetum hyemaleL11053U24593X78890AF058663Botrychium biternatum/Botrychium biternatum/Botrychium biternatum/Botrychium dissectumL13474U24581U18623AF058664Ophioglossum engelmannii/ Ophioglossum engelmannii/ anum/Adiantum raddianum/Adiantum rad- dianum/Adiantum raddianum/Adiantum rad- dianum/Adiantum raddianumU05906AF244549U18621AF058660Angiopteris vectal/Angiopteris lygodii ifolia/Angiopteris lygodiifoliaL11052U24590U18519AF244566Psilotum nudumL11059U24590U18519AF244566AF058670ArgusterisL13485U24592Y11370AF058670Zalypogeia muelleriana/Calypo- geia arguta/Calypogeia muelleriana/Calypo- geia arguta/Calypogeia muelleriana.U87065AF244563U18518AF244564Calypogeia muelleriana.U87065AF244550X78439AF058674Calypogeia muelleriana.U87065AF244558AF244559AF058675Phaeoceros laguta/Calypogeia muelleriana.U87065AF244550X78439AF058675Phaeoceros tosanusL13481AF244558AF244559AF058677Chara connivens/Chara sp. 1/Chara connivens/Ch	Huperzia selago/Huperzia lucidula/Huperzia lucidula/	N07024		110505	1 5050660
Selaginelia deflexi/selaginelia vogeti/iAF093253U24591X75517NonenoneL11054U24585X83521AF058669Isoëtes melanopoda/Isoëtes melanopoda/Isoëtes durieui/L11054U24585X83521AF058669Equisetum nyemaleL11053U24593X78890AF058663Botrychium biternatum/Botrychium biternatum/Botry- chium lunaria/Botrychium dissectumL13474U24581U18623AF058661Ophioglossum engelmannii/Ophioglossum vulgareL13474U24589U18515AF058664Adiantum raddianum/Adiantum pedatum/Adiantum rad- dianum/Adiantum raddianumU05906AF244549U18621AF058660Angiopteris evecta/Angiopteris evecta/Angiopteris lygodi- ifolia/Angiopteris lygodifoliaL11052U24580D85301AB029352Psilotum nudumL11059U24590U18519AF244566Sphagnum palustreL13485U24592Y11370AF058670Takakia lepidozioidesAF244565AF058678U18518AF244564Marchantia polymorphaW0870AF244550X78439AF058674Megaceros enigmaticus/Megaceros enigmaticus/MegaL13476X75519U18493AF191800Spirogyra maxima/Spirogyra grevil- leano/Spirogyra grevilleanaL13476X75519U18493AF191800		10/934	AF 244550	018505	AF058668
NoneAF093253U2491X7517NoneIsoëtes melanopoda/Isoëtes durieui/ Isoëtes hystrixL11054U24585X83521AF058669Equisetum arvense/Equisetum arvense/Equisetum arvense/Equisetum arvense/Equisetum arvense/Equisetum arvense/Equisetum hyema- le/Equisetum hyemaleL11053U24593X78890AF058663Botrychium biternatum/Botrychium biternatum/Botry- chium lunaria/Botrychium dissectumL11053U24593X78890AF058663Ophioglossum velloglossum	Selaginella deflexa/Selaginella apoda/Selaginella vogelii/	1 5002252	1124501	N775517	NT
Isoeites melanopodalisoeites anelanopodalisoeites durieuli Isoeites Mystrix		AF093255	024591	X/331/	None
LinoseLinoseDefailsDefailsAccessionEquisetum arvense/Equisetum arvense/Equisetum hyemalL11053U24593X78890AF058663Botrychium biternatum/Botrychium biternatum/Botrychium dissectumL11053U24593X78890AF058663Ophioglossum engelmannii/ Ophioglossum petiolatum/Ophioglossum engelmannii/ Ophioglossum petiolatum/Adiantum rad- dianum/Adiantum raddianum/Adiantum rad- 	Isoetes melanopoaa/Isoetes melanopoaa/Isoetes aurieui/	I 11054	1124595	V02501	1 E059660
Equiserum arvense Equiserum arvense Equiserum hyemal- le/Equiserum hyemaleL11053U24593X78890AF058663Botrychium biternatum/Botrychium biternatum/Botry- chium lunaria/Botrychium dissectumL13474U24581U18623AF058661Ophioglossum engelmannii/Ophioglossum engelmannii/ Ophioglossum petiolatum/Ophioglossum vulgareL11058U24589U18515AF058664Adiantum raddianum/Adiantum pedatum/Adiantum rad- dianum/Adiantum raddianum.U05906AF244549U18621AF058660Angiopteris evecta/Angiopteris lygodi- ifolia/Angiopteris vecta/Angiopteris lygodi- ifolia/Angiopteris evecta/Angiopteris lygodi- ifolia/Angiopteris evecta/Angiopteris lygodi- tifolia/Angiopteris evecta/Angiopteris evec	Equipotent grant and a / Equipotent grant and a / Equipotent have a	L11034	024383	A65521	AF038009
Icitiquisedum nyemaleIcition (24393)ArosooArosooBotrychium biternatum/Botrychium biternatum/Botrychium dissectumL13474U24581U18623AF058661Ophioglossum engelmannii/ Ophioglossum petiolatum/Ophioglossum vulgareL11058U24589U18515AF058664Adiantum raddianum/Adiantum pedatum/Adiantum rad- dianum/Adiantum raddianumU05906AF244549U18621AF058660Angiopteris evecta/Angiopteris evecta/Angiopteris lygodi- ifolia/Angiopteris lygodifoliaL11052U24580D85301AB029352Psilotum nudumL11059U24590U18519AF244566Sphagnum palustreL13485U24592Y11370AF058670Takakia lepidozioidesAF244565AF058678U18526AF058672Polytrichum communeU87087AF244563U18518AF244564Marchantia polymorphaW87065AF244550X78439AF058674Megaceros enigmaticus/Megaceros enigmaticus/Megaceros enigmaticus/Megaceros enigmaticus/Megaceros enigmaticus/Megaceros enigmaticus/Megaceros enigmaticus/Megaceros enigmaticus/MegacerosL13481AF244562AF244561U18491AF058677Chara connivens/Chara sp. 1/Chara connivens/Chara spirogyra maxima/Spirogyra maxima/Spirogyra grevil- leanal/Spirogyra grevilleanaL1307U24596U18523AF191800	la/Equisetum hyomala	L 11052	1124502	V78800	A E059662
Both yor numerical and both yor and and both yorL13474U24581U18623AF058661Ophioglossum engelmannii/ Ophioglossum petiolatum/Ophioglossum engelmannii/ Ophioglossum petiolatum/Ophioglossum vulgareL11058U24589U18515AF058664Adiantum raddianum/Adiantum pedatum/Adiantum rad- dianum/Adiantum raddianum/Adiantum raddiantum/Adiantum raddianum/Adiantum raddianu	Retrychium hiternatum/Retrychium hiternatum/Retry	L11055	024393	A/0090	AF038003
Chain land bir (chain absorb) (chain absorb)ClassifierClassifierClassifierClassifierAftossofierOphioglossum engelmannii/Ophioglossum vulgareL11058U24589U18515AF058664Adiantum raddianum/Adiantum pedatum/Adiantum rad- dianum/Adiantum raddianum.U05906AF244549U18621AF058660Angiopteris evecta/Angiopteris lygodi- ifolia/Angiopteris lygodifoliaL11052U24580D85301AB029352Psilotum nudumL11059U24590U18519AF244566Sphagnum palustreL13485U24592Y11370AF058670Takakia lepidozioidesAF244565AF058678U18526AF058672Polytrichum communeU87087AF244563U18518AF244564Marchantia polymorphaX04465X04465X75521M68929Calypogeia muelleriana/Calypo- geia arguta/Calypogeia muellerianaU87065AF244550X78439AF058674Megaceros tosanus/Megaceros tosanusL13481AF244558AF244559AF058675Phaeoceros laevisAF244562AF244561U18491AF058677Chara connivens/Chara sp. 1/Chara connivens/Chara spirogyra maxima/Spirogyra grevil- leana/Spirogyra grevil- leana/Spirogyra grevil-L13476X75519U18493AF191800	chium lunaria/Botrychium dissoctum	I 13474	1124581	1118623	A E058661
Opinoglossum engelmanni opinoglossum engelmanni opinoglossum rengelmanni opinoglossum rengelmanni opinoglossum vulgareL11058U24589U18515AF058664Adiantum raddianum/Adiantum raddianum/Adiantum raddianum/Adiantum raddianum/Adiantum raddianum.U05906AF244549U18621AF058660Angiopteris evecta/Angiopteris evecta/Angiopteris lygodi- ifolia/Angiopteris lygodiifoliaL11052U24580D85301AB029352Psilotum nudumL11059U24590U18519AF244566Sphagnum palustreL11059U24590U18519AF058670Takakia lepidozioidesAF244565AF058678U18526AF058672Polytrichum communeU87087AF244563U18518AF244564Marchania polymorphaW87065AF244550X78439AF058674geia arguta/Calypogeia muelleriana/Calypo- geia arguta/Calypogeia muellerianaU87065AF244558AF244559AF058675Phaeoceros laevisL13481AF244562AF244561U18491AF058677Chara connivens/Chara sp. 1/Chara connivens/CharaL13476X75519U18493AF191800Spirogyra maxima/Spirogyra grevil- leana/Spirogyra grevilleanaL11057U24596U18523AF191801	Ophioglossum angelmannii/Ophioglossum angelmannii/	L134/4	024501	018025	AI/050001
Adiantum raddianum/Adiantum pedatum/Adiantum rad- dianum/Adiantum raddianum.U05906AF244549U18621AF058660Angiopteris evecta/Angiopteris evecta/Angiopteris lygodi- ifolia/Angiopteris lygodiifoliaL11052U24580D85301AB029352Psilotum nudumL11059U24590U18519AF244566Sphagnum palustreL11059U24592Y11370AF058670Takakia lepidozioidesAF244565AF058678U18526AF058672Polytrichum communeU87087AF244563U18518AF244564Marchantia polymorphaX04465X04465X75521M68929Calypogeia muelleriana/Calypogeia muelleriana/Calypogeia muellerianaU87065AF244558AF244559AF058675Phacoceros laevisL13481AF244562AF244561U18491AF058677Chara connivens/Chara sp. 2L13476X75519U18493AF191800Spirogyra maxima/Spirogyra grevil- leana/Spirogyra grevilleanaL11057U24596U18523AF191801	Ophioglossum engelmännin Ophioglossum engelmännin	I 11058	1124589	U18515	AF058664
Anticitum indicationDeclaminationU05906AF244549U18621AF058660Angiopteris evecta/Angiopteris evecta/Angiopteris lygodi- ifolia/Angiopteris evecta/Angiopteris lygodiifoliaL11052U24580D85301AB029352Psilotum nudumL11059U24590U18519AF244566Sphagnum palustreL13485U24592Y11370AF058670Takakia lepidozioidesAF244565AF058678U18526AF058672Polytrichum communeU87087AF244563U18518AF244564Marchantia polymorphaX04465X04465X75521M68929Calypogeia muelleriana/Calypogeia muelleriana/Calypo- geia arguta/Calypogeia muellerianaU87065AF244550X78439AF058675Phaeoceros laevisL13481AF244558AF244559AF058675Chara connivens/Chara sp. 1/Chara connivens/Chara sp. 2L13476X75519U18493AF191800Spirogyra maxima/Spirogyra grevill- leana/Spirogyra grevilleanaL11057U24596U18523AF191801	Adiantum raddianum/Adiantum pedatum/Adiantum rad-	LII050	02450)	010515	11 050004
Ansiopterisevecta/Angiopterislineevecta/Angiopterislineifolia/AngiopterislygodiifoliaL11052U24580D85301AB029352Psilotum nudumL11059U24590U18519AF244566Sphagnum palustreL13485U24592Y11370AF058670Takakia lepidozioidesAF244565AF058678U18526AF058672Polytrichum communeU87087AF244563U18518AF244564Marchantia polymorphaX04465X04465X75521M68929Calypogeia muelleriana/Calypogeia muelleriana/Calypo- geia arguta/Calypogeia muellerianaU87065AF244550X78439AF058674Megaceros enigmaticus/Megaceros tosanusL13481AF244561U18491AF058675Phaeoceros laevisL13476X75519U18493AF191800Spirogyra maxima/Spirogyra grevill- leana/Spirogyra grevilleanaL11057U24596U18523AF191801	dianum/Adiantum raddianum	U05906	AF244549	U18621	AF058660
Integration Support is observed in high providing in the style of	Angionteris evecta/Angionteris evecta/Angionteris lygodi-	005700		010021	111 050000
Spiningspress of generating of the strength of the strengt of the strength of the strength of the strength of t	ifolia/Angiopteris lygodiifolia	L11052	U24580	D85301	AB029352
Sphagnum palustreL13485U24592Y11370AF058670Takakia lepidozioidesAF244565AF058678U18526AF058672Polytrichum communeU87087AF244563U18518AF244564Marchantia polymorphaX04465X04465X75521M68929Calypogeia muelleriana/Calypogeia muelleriana/Calypo- geia arguta/Calypogeia muellerianaU87065AF244550X78439AF058674Megaceros enigmaticus/Megaceros enigmaticus/Mega- ceros tosanus/Megaceros tosanusL13481AF244558AF244559AF058675Phaeoceros laevisAF244562AF244561U18491AF058677Chara connivens/Chara sp. 1/Chara connivens/Chara sp. 2L13476X75519U18493AF191800Spirogyra maxima/Spirogyra maxima/Spirogyra grevil- leana/Spirogyra grevilleanaL11057U24596U18523AF191801	Psilotum nudum	L11059	U24590	U18519	AF244566
Jakakia lepidozioidesAF244565AF058678U18526AF058672Polytrichum communeU87087AF244563U18518AF244564Marchantia polymorphaX04465X04465X75521M68929Calypogeia muelleriana/Calypogeia muelleriana/Calypogeia muelleriana/Calypogeia muelleriana/Calypogeia muellerianaU87065AF244550X78439AF058674Megaceros enigmaticus/Megaceros enigmaticus/Megaceros enigmaticus/Megaceros enigmaticus/Megaceros tosanusL13481AF244558AF244559AF058675Phaeoceros laevisAF191800AF058677L13476X75519U18493AF191800Spirogyra maxima/Spirogyra maxima/Spirogyra grevilleanaL11057U24596U18523AF191801	Sphagnum palustre	L13485	U24592	Y11370	AF058670
Polytrichum communeU87087AF244563U18518AF244564Marchantia polymorphaX04465X04465X75521M68929Calypogeia muelleriana/Calypogeia muelleriana/Calypogeia muelleriana/Calypogeia muellerianaU87065AF244550X78439AF058674Megaceros enigmaticus/Megaceros enigmaticus/Megaceros enigmaticus/Megaceros tosanus/Megaceros tosanusL13481AF244558AF244559AF058675Phaeoceros laevisAF244562AF244561U18491AF058677Chara connivens/Chara sp. 1/Chara connivens/CharaL13476X75519U18493AF191800Spirogyra maxima/Spirogyra grevilleanaL11057U24596U18523AF191801	Takakia lepidozioides	AF244565	AF058678	U18526	AF058672
Marchantia polymorphaX04465X04465X75521M68929Calypogeia muelleriana/Calypogeia muelleriana/Calypogeia muelleriana/Calypogeia muelleriana/Calypogeia muellerianaU87065AF244550X78439AF058674Megaceros enigmaticus/Megaceros enigmaticus/Megaceros enigmaticus/Megaceros tosanus/Megaceros tosanusL13481AF244558AF244559AF058675Phaeoceros laevisAF244562AF244561U18491AF058677Chara connivens/Chara sp. 1/Chara connivens/CharaL13476X75519U18493AF191800Spirogyra maxima/Spirogyra grevilleanaL11057U24596U18523AF191801	Polytrichum commune	U87087	AF244563	U18518	AF244564
Calypogeia muelleriana/Calypogeia muelleriana/Calypogeia muelleriana/Calypogeia muelleriana/Calypogeia muellerianaU87065AF244550X78439AF058674Megaceros enigmaticus/Megaceros enigmaticus/Megaceros enigmaticus/Megaceros tosanusL13481AF244558AF244559AF058675Phaeoceros laevisAF244562AF244561U18491AF058677Chara connivens/Chara sp. 1/Chara connivens/CharaL13476X75519U18493AF191800Spirogyra maxima/Spirogyra grevilleanaL11057U24596U18523AF191801	Marchantia polymorpha	X04465	X04465	X75521	M68929
geia arguta/Calypogeia muellerianaU87065AF244550X78439AF058674Megaceros enigmaticus/Megaceros enigmaticus/Megaceros enigmaticus/Megaceros tosanusL13481AF244558AF244559AF058675Phaeoceros laevisAF244562AF244561U18491AF058677Chara connivens/Chara sp. 1/Chara connivens/CharaL13476X75519U18493AF191800Spirogyra maxima/Spirogyra grevilleL11057U24596U18523AF191801	Calypogeia muelleriana/Calypogeia muelleriana/Calypo-				
Megaceros enigmaticus/Megaceros enigmaticus/Mega- ceros tosanus/Megaceros tosanusL13481AF244558AF244559AF058675Phaeoceros laevisAF244562AF244561U18491AF058677Chara connivens/Chara sp. 1/Chara connivens/Chara sp. 2L13476X75519U18493AF191800Spirogyra maxima/Spirogyra grevil- leana/Spirogyra grevilleanaL11057U24596U18523AF191801	geia arguta/Calypogeia muelleriana	U87065	AF244550	X78439	AF058674
ceros tosanus/Megaceros tosanus       L13481       AF244558       AF244559       AF058675         Phaeoceros laevis       AF244562       AF244561       U18491       AF058677         Chara connivens/Chara sp. 1/Chara connivens/Chara       sp. 2       L13476       X75519       U18493       AF191800         Spirogyra maxima/Spirogyra grevilleana       L11057       U24596       U18523       AF191801	Megaceros enigmaticus/Megaceros enigmaticus/Mega-				
Phaeoceros laevisAF244562AF244561U18491AF058677Chara connivens/Chara sp. 1/Chara connivens/CharaL13476X75519U18493AF191800sp. 2L13476X75519U18493AF191800Spirogyra maxima/Spirogyra grevil- leana/Spirogyra grevilleanaL11057U24596U18523AF191801	ceros tosanus/Megaceros tosanus	L13481	AF244558	AF244559	AF058675
Chara connivens/Chara sp. 1/Chara connivens/Chara       L13476       X75519       U18493       AF191800         Spirogyra maxima/Spirogyra grevil- leana/Spirogyra grevilleana       L11057       U24596       U18523       AF191801	Phaeoceros laevis	AF244562	AF244561	U18491	AF058677
sp. 2       L13476       X75519       U18493       AF191800         Spirogyra maxima/Spirogyra grevil- leana/Spirogyra grevilleana       L11057       U24596       U18523       AF191801	Chara connivens/Chara sp. 1/Chara connivens/Chara				
Spirogyra maxima/Spirogyra grevil- leana/Spirogyra grevilleanaL11057U24596U18523AF191801	sp. 2	L13476	X75519	U18493	AF191800
<i>leana/Spirogyra grevilleana</i> L11057 U24596 U18523 AF191801	Spirogyra maxima/Spirogyra maxima/Spirogyra grevil-				
	leana/Spirogyra grevilleana	L11057	U24596	U18523	AF191801

NOTE.-Multiple placeholder species for a single terminal are indicated by a slash and the order listed follows the gene order. GenBank accession numbers in bold are new reports generated for this study.

mtSSU rDNA for representatives of all major extant land plant lineages. Sampling included two hornworts (*Phaeoceros* and *Megaceros*), two liverworts (*Marchantia* and *Calypogeia*), three mosses (*Takakia*, *Polytrichum*, and *Sphagnum*), four lycophytes (*Selaginella*, *Isoëtes*, *Huperzia*, and *Diphasiastrum*), six ferns (*Psilotum*, *Ophioglossum*, *Botrychium*, *Angiopteris*, *Equisetum*, and Adiantum), six gymnosperms (*Cycas*, *Ginkgo*, *Juniperus*, *Pinus*, *Gnetum*, and *Ephedra*), and five angiosperms (*Nymphaea*, *Magnolia*, *Zea*, *Nicotiana*, and *Glycine*). Chara and Spirogyra (green algae) were used as outgroups. Taxa were initially selected based on the presence of one or more of the four gene sequences in GenBank, as well as a desire to represent a wide range of taxonomic diversity. From this list, sequences from 30 genera were obtained from GenBank or generated for this study. For 10 of the 28 ingroup taxa, the same species was used for all four gene sequences (table 1). Placeholder species were used for the remaining 18 taxa: 8 cases with two species, 11 cases with three species, and for *Ephedra*, four different species were used. Of the 119 DNA sequences assembled, 27 were newly generated. As previously reported (Duff and Nickrent 1999), PCR amplifications of mtSSU rDNA from Co*leochaete* and *Selaginella* failed; hence, *Coleochaete* was not used as an outgroup, and *Selaginella* represented the only case of a missing ingroup sequence in this study. Complete voucher information for newly generated sequences, full scientific names, and GenBank numbers for sequences of all taxa are given in table 1.

# Molecular Methods

The protocols used here for extracting genomic DNA, PCR, cloning, and sequencing have previously been reported (Nickrent 1994; Qiu et al. 1998; Duff and Nickrent 1999; Chaw et al. 2000). The primers used to amplify and sequence the newly generated sequences were cited in the following: *rbcL* (Soltis and Soltis 1998), cpSSU rDNA (Nickrent, Duff, and Konings 1997), nuSSU rDNA (Nickrent and Starr 1994), and mtSSU rDNA (Duff and Nickrent 1999).

# Alignments

Separate gene and multigene alignments were conducted manually using SeqApp (Gilbert 1993). Alignment of *rbcL* and cpSSU rDNA sequences was trivial, given essentially no length variation, whereas for nuclear and mitochondrial SSU rDNA sequences, alignments were guided by reference to published higher-order structures (Nickrent and Soltis 1995; Duff and Nickrent 1999). Terminal priming regions were excluded from all sequences, as were regions where alignment was ambiguous or where extensive length variation occurred (e.g., introns in mtSSU rDNA; see Duff and Nickrent 1999). There were (with reference to Glycine sequences) 51 such sites for rbcL, 63 for cpSSU rDNA, 133 for nuSSU rDNA. and 633 for mtSSU rDNA. for a total of 909 sites excluded from the multigene data set. The key to excluded regions and the final alignment (6,095 positions: rbcL = 1,351, cpSSU rDNA = 1,480, nuSSU rDNA = 1,720, and mtSSU rDNA = 1,544) can be found at http://www.science.siu.edu/landplants/Alignments/Alignments.html.

# Parsimony and Likelihood Analyses

There currently exists conflicting information in the literature as to whether *rbcL* third codon positions are saturated, or, more specifically, whether the process of substitution has become so randomized as to preclude the use of this position for ascertaining deep phylogenetic relationships. Evidence that third-codon-position transitions are effectively saturated has been presented by Goremykin et al. (1996) and Chaw et al. (2000). Conversely, Lewis, Mishler, and Vilgalys (1997) showed that trees generated from only third positions are nearly identical to trees produced from all sites and that these trees agree with independent evidence. Hence, they concluded that, despite being highly variable, third positions retain phylogenetic signal across all land plants. A similar conclusion was reached by Källersjö et al. (1998). To test for saturation, we plotted uncorrected p-distances from first-, second-, and third-position transitions and transversions against corrected F84 distances (Felsenstein 1984).

Four versions of the multigene data set were constructed and analyzed with either maximum parsimony (MP) or maximum likelihood (ML). In the first version, all positions, including *rbcL* third codon positions, were included and were weighted equally. Analyses of this version were called MP+3Ti and ML-rates. The second version also included all positions, but differential weighting (ranging from 0.5 to 1.0) was applied to third codon positions. Analyses of this version were dubbed MP+weights. The third version excluded *rbcL* third-codon-position transitions, which was accomplished by recoding all third-position nucleotides as either R (A or G) or Y (C or T). Analyses of this version were called MP-3Ti and ML-3Ti. In the fourth version, all positions were included, and site-to-site rate variation was accounted for using the program DNArates (S. Pract, R. Overbeek, and G. Olsen, personal communication; available at the Ribosomal Database Project website). Analysis of this version was called ML+rates.

All MP analyses were conducted using PAUP\* (Swofford 1998). For these analyses, the separate and combined gene matrices were analyzed either with all characters equally weighted or with unequal weighting (see above). Heuristic search strategies with random tax-on addition (100 replicates), MULPARS on, and tree bisection-reconnection (TBR) branch swapping was employed. MP bootstrap (BS) support was assessed using PAUP\*, employing a heuristic search strategy with 100 replications (1,000 for the multigene data set).

ML analyses employed fastDNAml, version 1.06, rewritten to run in parallel, on 8-16 nodes of the STARRS/SP cluster (IBM RS/6000 computer platform, located at Indiana University). The F84 model (Felsenstein 1984) as implemented in PHYLIP (Felsenstein 1993) was used, with the initial transition/transversion (ti/tv) ratio estimated using PUZZLE, version 4.02, under the Tamura-Nei model of evolution with parameter estimation set to "approximate" (Strimmer and von Haeseler 1996). Ten initial ML trees were inferred for each individual and the combined data set by randomizing "input" order with jumble and using "global" swapping across all nodes (equivalent to subtree-pruning-regrafting of PAUP\*). The optimal tree (best log likelihood score) was then input into PAUP\* to reoptimize the ti/ty ratio using a model that incorporated variability in rates of change. We used the F84 evolutionary model assuming a discrete gamma distribution with four categories of site-to-site rate variability. The resulting ti/ tv ratio was used to infer a new tree as above, further optimizing branch lengths. This tree and the optimized ti/tv ratio were then used to estimate evolutionary rates of change for each sequence position by partitioning the sites into 35 "rate" categories using DNArates. A new ML tree, incorporating the rate categories and the reoptimized ti/tv ratio, was then inferred. This new optimal tree was then used for a second round of rate estimation and tree inference. This process was iterated until a stable topology was achieved.

ML bootstrapping with and without rates used SE-QBOOT (PHYLIP) to generate 100 pseudoreplicate data sets that were analyzed using fastDNAml, and the re-



FIG. 1.—Plots of uncorrected pairwise sequence divergence (p-distances) versus corrected distances (F84-distance) for first, second, and third codon positions in *rbcL*. Transitional (ti) and transversional (tv) substitutions are combined for first and second positions, whereas they are plotted separately for third positions. Deviation from the diagonal trend line, as is evident for third-codon-position transitions, indicates saturation. A total of 427 pairwise comparisons are represented in each panel. Eight ingroup-to-algal-outgroup comparisons for third-position transitions were excluded because the observed dissimilarity exceeded 0.75.

sulting bootstrap numbers were generated using CON-SENSE (PHYLIP). The individual trees from the 100 pseudoreplicates were analyzed as above using fast-DNAml, randomizing the input order, and allowing swapping across all nodes. Each initial "no-rates" topology was then used to infer rate categories incorporating the optimized ti/tv ratio. A second round of rate category generation and tree inference was performed, and the final 100 trees were imported into CONSENSE to generate bootstrap node values.

Alternative topologies, evaluated under ML and MP, were determined using the parametric K-H test (Kishino and Hasegawa 1989) and the nonparametric Templeton (1983) ranked-sums test as implemented in PAUP\*. Decay analyses (Bremer 1994) were performed with MP using PAUP\* and AUTODECAY (Eriksson 1998).

# Results

# Composition Bias and Saturation

Nucleotide compositions for the entire multigene data set varied little among taxa (A = 0.253, C = 0.228,

G = 0.292, T = 0.227), with an average A+T composition of 48%. A chi-square test of homogeneity of base frequencies across taxa gave 45.607 (df = 87, P= 0.9999); hence, nucleotide composition was homogeneous. Homogeneity was also seen for all of the separate gene partitions with the exception of *rbcL*. Chisquare tests of homogeneity showed that rbcL first and second codon positions were homogeneous, whereas third positions (with A+T averaging 72% and ranging from 46% in Selaginella to 85% in Marchantia) were significantly heterogeneous across taxa. These results agree with those reported for *rbcL* by Lewis, Mishler, and Vilgalys (1997) and Nishiyama and Kato (1999) and therefore require the use of sequence evolution models that do not assume compositional equality. In tests for saturation using distance plots (fig. 1), first- and secondposition transitions and transversions and third-position transversions were significantly linear, whereas third-position transitions were significantly nonlinear. This result parallels those of Goremykin et al. (1996) and Chaw et al. (2000) and, we believe, indicates third-position transitional saturation for *rbcL*.



FIG. 2.—Land plant relationships derived from an MP+3Ti analysis of the four-gene data set. A single tree (length = 7,074) was obtained with a consistency index (excluding uninformative sites) of 0.3900, a retention index of 0.4756, and a rescaled consistency index of 0.2332. Values above the branches are bootstrap percentages derived from 100 replications.

Phylogenetic Relationships Recovered Using All Analytical Methods

Of the 6,095 characters in the alignment, 1,037 (17%) were variable but parsimony-uninformative, and 1,219 (20%) were parsimony-informative. For the multigene data set, MP+3Ti analysis resulted in one tree of length 7,074 (fig. 2). MP-3Ti analysis yielded a single tree of length 5,252 (fig. 3). These two trees are highly congruent for relationships among tracheophytes but differed with regard to bryophyte relationships (see below).

As shown in figures 2 and 3 and table 2, MP+3Ti, MP-3Ti, ML-rates, and ML+rates analyses all yielded high BS values for the majority of land plant clades, including angiosperms, gymnosperms, seed plants, ferns (including Psilotum and Equisetum), lycophytes, tracheophytes, liverworts, and hornworts. When BS support >70% is considered significant (Hillis and Bull 1993), the following percentages of total nodes were supported as significant among the various analyses: MP+3Ti (70%), MP-3Ti (78%), ML-rates (74%), and ML+rates (81%). The MP and ML analyses gave strong support for a clade composed of all vascular plants (tracheophytes), although this was not the case among the nonmitochondrial genes analyzed individually. Moderate (MP) to high (ML) BS values were obtained for lycophyte monophyly. All methods gave high BS support for lycophytes as the sister to all other vascular plants, consistent with other molecular (Raubeson and Jansen 1992) and morphological (Kenrick and Crane 1997) analyses. The two heterosporous genera (Selaginella and Isoëtes) are sisters, as are the two homosporous genera (Huperzia and Diphasiastrum); these relationships generally follow current classifications (Kenrick and Crane 1997). The monophyly of ferns, here including the horsetail Equisetum and the whiskfern Psilotum, has high BS and decay analysis support. Within this clade, *Psilotum* is strongly supported as sister to the eusporangiate ferns Botrychium and Ophioglossum, a relationship now well documented (Manhart 1994; Pryer, Smith, and Skog 1995; Wolf 1997). Weak support exists for the placement of Angiopteris as sister to Equisetum and Adiantum, although this topology was also obtained in a combined analysis of *rbcL* and morphological characters (Pryer, Smith, and Skog 1995). Seed plants are clearly resolved as monophyletic, with moderate (MP) to strong (ML) support for a clade of extant gymnosperms. A clade of gnetophytes (Gnetum and Ephedra) and conifers (Pinus and Juniperus) is very strongly supported (98%-100% BS, decay value of 24 steps), in agreement with two recent multigene studies of seed plant phylogeny (Bowe, Coat, and dePamphilis 2000; Chaw et al. 2000). Angiosperms are strongly supported as monophyletic in all analyses and with all separate gene partitions (table 2).

# Phylogenetic Relationships that Differed Among the Various Analyses

Several differences can be seen when the MP+3Ti tree (fig. 2) and the MP-3Ti tree (fig. 3) are compared. Euphyllophytes (vascular plants exclusive of lycophytes; Kenrick and Crane 1997) are strongly supported using ML+rates and MP-3Ti. Different relationships



FIG. 3.—Land plant relationships derived from an MP–3Ti analysis of the four-gene data set. A single tree (length = 5,251) was obtained with a consistency index (excluding uninformative sites) of 0.4312, a retention index of 0.5275, and a rescaled consistency index of 0.2941. Branch lengths shown are derived from the ML+rates analysis (log likelihood = -37,923.99574, ti/tv = 2.25). Numbers at nodes (left to right): ML-rates BS values, MP–3Ti BS values, and decay index. Nodes not present are indicated by dashes.

 Table 2
 Bootstrapa
 Percentages for Selected Land Plant Clades

	Gene						
Clade	$rbcL^{b}$ (35 trees, HI = 0.679)	cpSSU (30 trees, HI = 0.524)	nuSSU (2 trees, HI = 0.578)	mtSSU (2 trees, HI = 0.435)	No mtSSU (1 tree, HI = 0.611)	No $rbcL$ (1 tree, HI = 0.524)	Multigene (1 tree, HI = 0.569)
Angiosperms	98/99/86	85/84/81	100/100/100	100/100/100	100	100/100/100	100/100/100
Gymnosperms	-/-60	_/_/_	-/22/33	51/71/-	78	-/60/51	87/89/66
Seed plants	99/100/99	99/100/92	99/91/100	99/99/100	100	100/100/100	100/100/100
Ferns <sup>c</sup>	40/63/47	_/_/_	30/_/_	100/100/100	80	100/100/99	100/100/100
Psilotum sister to							
eusporangiates <sup>d</sup>	70/92/50	53/-/65	59/65/52	74/73/75	97	100/100/100	99/100/99
Euphyllophytes <sup>e</sup>	_/_/_	_/_/_	45/58/28	98/98/87	55	94/96/88	76/91/85
Lycophytes	76/80/-	_/_/_	_/_/36	98/99/93	_	82/82/62	92/96/75
Tracheophytes	25/45/47	_/_/_	_/_/_	97/96/97	53	100/99/96	99/100/97
Liverworts	41/70/60	100/100/100	_/_/_	100/100/100	80	100/100/100	100/100/100
Mosses	_/_/_	_/_/_	_/_/_	92/93/90	_	97/99/90	81/91/96
Mosses sister to liverworts	_/_/_	_/_/23	_/_/_	78/78/78	_	94/94/84	61/83/87
Hornworts	98/96/77	100/100/100	86/83/96	100/100/100	100	100/100/100	100/100/100
Hornworts basal	_/_/_	48/37/57	_/_/_	74/56/74		97/96/96	62/78/95

NOTE.-HI = homoplasy index minus uninformative sites.

<sup>a</sup> Maximum likelihood (ML) without DNArates/ML with DNArates/maximum parsimony (MP); MP only for no mtSSU. 100 replications for all ML and MP analyses except MP Multigene, which used 1,000 replications. A dash indicates that a clade not present in ML or strict-consensus MP trees.

<sup>b</sup> Outgroups (Chara and Spirogyra) not monophyletic; third-position transversions only for MP.

° Including Equisetum and Psilotum.

<sup>d</sup> Here, the ferns *Botrychium* and *Ophioglossum*.

e Vascular plants exclusive of lycophytes.

among the five angiosperm taxa were obtained following analyses of the multigene data using MP and ML. For MP+3Ti analyses, Zea was sister to the rest, albeit with low BS support (fig. 2). The MP-3Ti, MP+weights, ML-rates, and ML+rates analyses all resolved Nymphaea as basalmost with higher BS support, a result consistent with recent global angiosperm analvses (Parkinson, Adams, and Palmer 1999; Oiu et al. 1999; P. S. Soltis, D. E. Soltis, and Chase 1999; Bowe, Coat, and dePamphilis 2000; Chaw et al. 2000; D. E. Soltis, P. S. Soltis, and Chase 2000). Both the MP+3Ti and the MP-3Ti analyses placed Juniperus as sister to the gnetophytes, although in both cases BS support for this relationship was low. In contrast, ML both with and without rates placed *Pinus* as sister to the gnetophytes, with Juniperus sister to that entire clade.

The most striking differences between the MP+3Ti and MP-3Ti analyses involved bryophyte relationships. The single shortest tree recovered from the multigene data set using MP+3Ti (fig. 2) showed the liverworts Marchantia and Calypogeia as sister to all other land plants (the LBT), with paraphyletic mosses and the hornworts Megaceros and Phaeoceros sister to the tracheophytes. None of these bryophyte relationships received BS support >50%. Mosses were not supported as monophyletic using any of the nonmitochondrial partitions separately (table 2), but only achieved monophyly in the multigene data sets in which rbcL third position transitions were excluded or downweighted (MP+weights). A similar result was obtained for the sister group relationship between mosses and liverworts. One topological difference occurred within the moss clade when using ML-rates as opposed to ML+rates and MP-3Ti. The former method placed Polytrichum as sister to a Takakia/ Sphagnum clade (tree not shown), whereas the latter methods placed Takakia as sister to Sphagnum/Polytrichum (fig. 3). For the MP+weights analysis, the HBT was obtained using all weights up to 0.93, whereas the LBT was retrieved with weights above this threshold.

In general, BS support for most clades was equivalent or higher for ML+rates than for ML-rates; this was true for the multigene data set and, to a lesser extent, for analyses of individual genes (table 2). Such an increase in BS support can be seen for the HBT, where the ML+rates and ML-rates BS values were 62% and 78%, respectively. Three clades in the multigene analysis showed marked differences in BS values between ML+rates and MP: gymnosperms, lycophytes, and HBT (table 2). For the HBT, the lower BS values obtained when using ML-rates (62%) or ML+rates (78%) as compared with MP (95%) may be attributed to the influence of the *rbcL* partition. Of the four partitions, only mtSSU and cpSSU rDNA analyzed separately retrieved the HBT (but with low to moderate BS support). Using ML and MP methods, combining the three SSU rDNA partitions gave BS values of 96%-97% for the HBT. That combined analyses can result in increased resolution and BS support for particular clades that were not well supported following individual analyses has been documented (Kluge 1989; Mishler et al. 1994; Soltis et al. 1998; Soltis, Soltis, and Chase 1999). Moreover,



FIG. 4.—Alternative topologies imposed on the multigene data set: *A* (Hedderson, Chapman, and Rootes 1996; Garbary and Renzaglia 1998; Duff and Nickrent 1999; Nishiyama and Kato 1999; present work), *B* (Mishler et al. 1992), *C* (Lewis, Mishler, and Vilgalys 1997), *D* (Mishler and Churchill 1984), *E* (Garbary, Renzaglia, and Duckett 1993), and *F* (Malek et al. 1996). Numbers below trees represent additional steps compared with the shortest MP tree (length = 5,251). Results from K-H ML tests: \* = statistically significantly different from best tree (*A*) at P < 0.05; — = not statistically significantly different. K-H MP and Templeton tests resulted in all alternate topologies being significantly different from tree *A* at P < 0.05. O = outgroup; H = hornworts; L = liverworts; M = mosses; Sp = Sphagnum; T = tracheophytes.

clades that were not present following analyses of individual genes can appear and gain significant BS support upon combined analyses. Examples here include the euphyllophyte, fern, and gymnosperm clades using *rbcL*, cpSSU, and nuSSU rDNA separately and in combination.

#### Decay Analyses and Hypothesis Testing

Decay analysis showed that 12 additional steps were required to collapse the hornworts-basal node (fig. 3). Five alternative topologies were tested with the multigene data set using the K-H test with ML and MP (fig. 4A-F). Two frequently cited LBTs depict either hornworts (fig. 4C) or mosses (fig. 4D) as sister to tracheophytes, but both were rejected as statistically worse (P < 0.05 level) than the ML tree. Similarly, the paraphyletic moss topology (fig. 4F) was significantly worse than the MP and ML trees. An alternative HBT (fig. 4B), in which liverworts and mosses were not sister taxa, added six steps to the most-parsimonious MP tree and could not be rejected relative to the ML tree. Finally, a monophyletic-bryophytes topology, although 14 steps longer than the MP tree, also could not be rejected relative to the ML tree. The K-H and Templeton tests conducted using MP as the criterion showed that all alternative trees (B-F) were significantly worse than tree  $A \ (P < 0.05).$ 

# Discussion

Outgroup Selection and Comparison Among the SSU Gene Partitions

This study is the first to sample among all major land plant lineages and across four genes representing the three plant subcellular genomes. Although sampling among tracheophytes was adequate, it is clear that additional bryophyte sequences are needed to place in context the results reported here. With the mtSSU rDNA data partition, the choice of outgroup is critical. In a previous analysis that utilized mtSSU rDNA (Duff and Nickrent 1999), basal land plant relationships were not unambiguously resolved with MP (although the HBT was retrieved with ML). This result was likely a consequence of using an algal outgroup (Prototheca) whose mtSSU sequence was much more distantly related to land plant sequences than the charophycean algal sequences used here. Pairwise comparisons of Kimura two-parameter distances using mtSSU rDNA gave the following results: Chara to Phaeoceros = 0.114, Chara to Glycine = 0.134, Glycine to Phaeoceros = 0.110, *Prototheca* to *Phaeoceros* = 0.342, *Prototheca* to *Gly*cine = 0.364, and *Prototheca* to *Chara* = 0.347. These distances show that *Chara* is patristically closer to land plants than Prototheca (and hence probably a more appropriate outgroup), and branch lengths from *Chara* to ingroup taxa were not disproportionately long so as to perturb phylogenetic relationships (Felsenstein 1978).

Lower homoplasy in mitochondrial genes may derive from generally lower mutation rates as compared with nuclear or chloroplast genes (Wolfe, Li, and Sharp 1987; Palmer 1990; Wolfe 1996) and further highlights their utility in addressing ancient land plant relationships. Chloroplast SSU rDNA had the second lowest amount of homoplasy. Although this gene alone contains insufficient phylogenetic signal to resolve many clades, it did recover the liverwort clade and the HBT, two relationships that were not obtained using the longer and more variable nuSSU rDNA alone (table 2). The poor overall performance of nuSSU rDNA in resolving land plant relationships cannot be attributed to insufficient taxon sampling in this study, as similarly poor results were obtained in a recent study that utilized 93 ingroup sequences (Soltis et al. 1999).

#### Influence of the *rbcL* Partition on Resulting Trees

Chloroplast *rbcL* alone recovered a number of land plant clades but contained the highest level of homoplasy among the four gene partitions (table 2). When *rbcL* was analyzed alone using MP with all positions equally weighted, three trees were obtained that supported the LBT (62% BS support; results not shown). Removal of all third positions resulted in extensive loss of resolution across the entire tree, in agreement with Lewis, Mishler, and Vilgalys (1997) and Källersjö et al. (1998). Removal of third-position transitions resulted in a tree with no BS support for any of the major land plant clades. These exercises demonstrated that most of the phylogenetic signal in *rbcL* resides in third codon positions, specifically, third-position transitions. When the *rbcL* partition was included in the multigene data set and third codon positions were weighted 0.94 or less, the HBT was obtained, thus demonstrating how these competing topologies are sensitive to the degree of influence imparted by third-position differences.

#### **Evolutionary Rates**

Oiu and Palmer (1999) list several factors that might potentially confound the problem of determining the basalmost land plant lineage: (1) a wide "evolutionary gap" (both with morphological and molecular characters) between charophyte outgroups and land plants that eliminates synapomorphies; (2) long-branch attraction problems between ingroup and outgroup; (3) ancient and rapid radiation of bryophyte lineages at the base of the land plant tree, leaving little phylogenetic signal; and (4) extinction. As discussed above, the sequence divergence between *Chara* and a hornwort is equivalent to that between a hornwort and a flowering plant, thus demonstrating that the "evolutionary gap" between ingroup and outgroup is not disproportionate, at least for slowly evolving genes such as mtSSU rDNA. As shown in figures 2 and 3, both the gnetophyte and the *Selaginella* clades have increased substitution rates, as indicated by their branch lengths, but in neither case can this be attributed to low taxon sampling. The fast evolutionary rate of gnetophytes has been well documented; however, we do not feel the position of the gnetophyte clade as sister to conifers is artifactual given that this result is in agreement with several recent molecular phylogenetic studies (Bowe, Coat, and de-Pamphilis 2000; Chaw et al. 2000; Sanderson et al. 2000). Similarly, despite the long branch leading to Selaginella, its position as sister to Isoëtes when ML+rates was employed is fully in line with molecular and morphological analyses. Long-branch effects can be demonstrated with the nuSSU rDNA partition when analyzed alone with MP. Here, Selaginella migrates to the base of the tree, near liverworts. Among bryophytes, there is some evidence of lineage-specific and gene-specific substitution rate heterogeneity. For example, transition rates in complex thalloid liverwort *rbcL* are about half those seen in leafy and simple thalloid liverworts (Lewis, Mishler, and Vilgalys 1997), whereas the opposite is true for nuSSU rDNA (Capesius and Bopp 1997). There is no indication in the present analysis, however, that relationships within and among hornworts, liverworts, and mosses are being influenced by longbranch attraction artifacts.

#### Mitochondrial Introns

The presence/absence of three mitochondrial introns (Qiu et al. 1998) has been interpreted as supporting the LBT, as all three introns "are present, with occasional losses, in mosses, hornworts and all major lineages of vascular plants, but are entirely absent from liverworts, green algae and all other eukaryotes." How can this result be reconciled with the findings reported here? If the HBT is correct, these introns must have been acquired in the common ancestor of all land plants and then lost in the common ancestor of liverworts. This scenario is more likely if liverworts are monophyletic, as supported by our analyses (fig. 1), than if they are paraphyletic, as suggested by some previous studies that sampled more broadly within liverworts (Capesius and Bopp 1997; Lewis, Mishler, and Vilgalys 1997). Postulating a single additional loss of each intron is not unreasonable given that all three introns are already known to have been lost in two different lineages (Isoëtes and Ephedra) and that two of the three introns have been lost many times in land plant evolution (Qiu et al. 1998; Qiu and Palmer, personal communication). Addition of the three intron characters to the multigene matrix does not change the MP-3Ti tree topology, and BS support for the HBT remains high (92%; data not shown).

# Reinterpretation of Morphological Features

Given the strong support for the HBT, reinterpretation of key morphological and anatomical innovations is now required. Several ultrastructural features shared between hornworts and charophycean algae (such as Coleochaete) support the concept that hornworts are the earliest land plant lineage. Unique among land plants, hornwort chloroplasts contain pyrenoids (localized groupings of RUBISCO) that are essentially identical to those in green algae (Vaughn et al. 1992) and also share with algae channel thylakoids. The HBT thus requires that these chloroplast structures have been lost in other land plants. Conversely, hornworts lack chloroplast granal end membranes and staggered spermatozoid flagella, which presumably evolved subsequent to the divergence of hornworts and other land plants (Garbary and Renzaglia 1998). If the HBT and the sister group status of liverworts and mosses are correct, the presence of stomates in some hornworts and mosses and all vascular plants may indicate that these structures are not homologous (Renzaglia et al. 2000). If moss and vascular plant stomates are homologous, then stomates were lost in the ancestor of liverworts. Similarly, a loss in liverworts is invoked for the perine layer in spores, a feature shared by mosses and vascular plants (Garbary and Renzaglia 1998).

As in most analyses to date, the paraphyly of bryophytes is demonstrated in this multigene analysis. The sister group relationship between mosses and liverworts has received support from data derived from spermatogenesis (Garbary, Renzaglia, and Duckett 1993), sperm ultrastructure (Maden et al. 1997), and overall morphology (Garbary and Renzaglia 1998), as well as molecular characters such as nuclear SSU rDNA (Hedderson, Chapman, and Cox 1998) and mitochondrial SSU rDNA (Duff and Nickrent 1999) and an analysis of five chloroplast genes (Nishiyama and Kato 1999). The morphological and ultrastructural synapomorphies that support a moss/liverwort clade are (1) the presence of gametophytic slime papillae, (2) superficial archegonia, (3) dimorphic basal bodies on spermatozoa, and (4) apertures associated with the spline on spermatozoa (Garbary and Renzaglia 1998). Takakia was first described

as a liverwort; however, substantial morphological (Renzaglia, McFarland, and Smith 1997) and molecular (Hedderson, Chapman, and Rootes 1996; Duff and Nickrent 1999) evidence now places the genus within the mosses, a result supported by this multigene analysis. Additional sequencing to allow inclusion of putatively basal liverworts such as *Haplomitrium* and *Monoclea* in future multigene analyses is required to test the robustness of the moss-liverwort clade.

# **Conclusions and Future Work**

Although both a thalloid and a leafy liverwort were included in this study, increased sampling of this group and other bryophytes is required to represent more adequately the overall taxonomic diversity of bryophytes; work is currently underway to remedy this situation (unpublished data). In addition to ingroup taxon density, inclusion of other green algal outgroup taxa is critical for future land plant phylogenetic studies. As mentioned in Materials and Methods. a mtSSU rDNA sequence for Coleochaete has yet to be obtained. When sequences from three genes from Coleochaete are included in the four-gene data set (with its mtSSU rDNA scored as missing), an MP+3Ti analysis yields the HBT (73% BS support) as opposed to the LBT, which is obtained without these *Coleochaete* sequences. As the taxonomic breadth of sequences increases, other genes, such as mitochondrial nad5 (Beckert et al. 1999), cox3 (Malek et al. 1996), and chloroplast photosystem genes (Nishiyama and Kato 1999), can be added to the present fourgene data set. A preliminary analysis in which nad5 was added to the four-gene matrix reported here (18 ingroup taxa, half of which were placeholders) gave a tree fully congruent with the one shown in figure 3, with the HBT receiving 90% BS support (unpublished data). The present study, and several recent ones on angiosperm and gymnosperm evolution, demonstrate the tremendous utility of mitochondrial genes. That these genes often give strong support for many noncontroversial relationships provides a compelling reason to consider seriously those relationships inferred from these genes that are not recovered using other data sets.

As stated in the Introduction, a goal of this study was to determine whether molecular and morphological data better support the LBT or the HBT. It appears that most support for the former hypothesis derives from the chloroplast gene *rbcL*, specifically, third-codon-position transitions of this gene. In contrast, the HBT is supported by the present study, as well as combined analyses of rbcL and other chloroplast genes (Nishiyama and Kato 1999), mitochondrial genes (Malek et al. 1996; Beckert et al. 1999; Duff and Nickrent 1999), nuclear SSU rDNA (Hedderson, Chapman, and Cox 1998), and morphology (Garbary and Renzaglia 1998). Decay analyses indicate that all the alternative topologies tested using MP result in longer trees, and K-H tests show that these alternatives. including the LBT, are statistically different from the HBT. Thus, we conclude that the HBT hypothesis is most consistent with all of the available evidence (morphological and molecular), is not in conflict with presence/absence data on mitochondrial introns, and therefore provides the best explanation of early land plant evolution. Further refinement and resolution of this tree will provide a firm phylogenetic foundation to help interpret the evolution of plant morphology, ultrastructure, development, and biochemistry.

# Acknowledgments

We acknowledge Y.-L. Qiu for several plant DNAs and Karen Renzaglia for insightful discussions and encouragement. This research was supported by grants from the NSF (MCB-9808752 to D.L.N.) and the NIH (GM-35087 to J.D.P.) and by an NIH fellowship (GM-19225 to C.L.P).

#### LITERATURE CITED

- BECKERT, S., S. STEINHAUSER, H. MUHLE, and V. KNOOP. 1999. A molecular phylogeny of bryophytes based on nucleotide sequences of the mitochondrial *nad5* gene. Plant Syst. Evol. **218**:179–192.
- BOWE, L. M., G. COAT, and C. W. DEPAMPHILIS. 2000. Phylogeny of seed plants based on all three plant genomic compartments: extant gymnosperms are monophyletic and Gnetales derived conifers. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 97:4092– 4097.
- BREMER, K. 1994. Branch support and tree stability. Cladistics 10:295–304.
- CAPESIUS, I., and M. BOPP. 1997. New classification of liverworts based on molecular and morphological data. Plant Syst. Evol. 207:87–97.
- CHAW, S.-M., C. L. PARKINSON, Y. CHENG, T. M. VINCENT, and J. D. PALMER. 2000. Seed plant phylogeny inferred from all three plant genomes: monophyly of extant gymnosperms and origin of Gnetales from conifers. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 97:4086–4091.
- DUFF, R. J., and D. L. NICKRENT. 1999. Phylogenetic relationships of land plants using mitochondrial small-subunit rDNA sequences. Am. J. Bot. **86**:372–386.
- ERIKSSON, T. 1998. AutoDecay, version 4.0. Bergius Foundation, Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, Stockholm.
- FELSENSTEIN, J. 1978. Cases in which parsimony or compatibility will be positively misleading. Syst. Zool. 27:401–410.
  ——. 1984. Distance methods for inferring phylogenies: a justification. Evolution 38:16–24.
- . 1993. PHYLIP (phylogeny inference package). Version 3.5. Distributed by the author, Department of Genetics, University of Washington, Seattle.
- GARBARY, D. J., and K. S. RENZAGLIA. 1998. Bryophyte phylogeny and the evolution of land plants: evidence from development and ultrastructure. Pp. 45–63 *in* J. W. BATES, N. W. ASHTON, and J. G. DUCKETT, eds. Bryology for the twenty-first century. Maney and the British Bryological Society, Leeds, England.
- GARBARY, D. J., K. S. RENZAGLIA, and J. G. DUCKETT. 1993. The phylogeny of land plants: a cladistic analysis based on male gametogenesis. Plant Syst. Evol. 188:237–269.
- GILBERT, D. G. 1993. SeqApp. Version 1.9a157. Biocomputing Office, Biology Department, Indiana University, Bloomington.
- GOREMYKIN, V., V. BOBROVA, J. PAHNKE, A. TROITSKY, A. ANTONOV, and W. MARTIN. 1996. Noncoding sequences from the slowly evolving chloroplast inverted repeat in addition to *rbcL* data do not support Gnetalean affinities of angiosperms. Mol. Biol. Evol. **13**:383–396.

- GRAY, J. 1993. Major Paleozoic land plant evolutionary bioevents. Palaeogeogr. Palaeoclimatol. Palaeoecol. 104:153– 169.
- HEDDERSON, T. A., R. CHAPMAN, and C. J. COX. 1998. Bryophytes and the origins and diversification of land plants: new evidence from molecules. Pp. 65–77 *in* J. W. BATES, N. W. ASHTON, and J. G. DUCKETT, eds, Bryology for the twenty-first century. Maney and the British Bryological Society, Leeds, England.
- HEDDERSON, T. A., R. L. CHAPMAN, and W. L. ROOTES. 1996. Phylogenetic relationships of bryophytes inferred from nuclear-encoded rRNA gene sequences. Plant Syst. Evol. 200: 213–224.
- HILLIS, D. M., and J. J. BULL. 1993. An empirical test of bootstrapping as a method for assessing confidence in phylogenetic analysis. Syst. Biol. 42:182–191.
- HUEBER, F. M. 1961. *Hepaticites devonicus*, a new fossil liverwort from the Devonian of New York. Ann. Mo. Bot. Gard. 48:125–132.
- KÄLLERSJÖ, M., J. S. FARRIS, M. W. CHASE, B. BREMER, M. F. FAY, C. J. HUMPHRIES, G. PETERSEN, O. SEBERG, and K. BREMER. 1998. Simultaneous parsimony jackknife analysis of 2538 rbcL DNA sequences reveals support for major clades of green plants, seed plants and flowering plants. Plant Syst. Evol. 213:259–287.
- KENRICK, P., and P. R. CRANE. 1997. The origin and early diversification of land plants: a cladistic study. Smithsonian Institute Press, Washington, D.C.
- KISHINO, H., and M. HASEGAWA. 1989. Evaluation of the maximum likelihood estimate of the evolutionary tree topologies from DNA sequence data, and the branching order of Hominoidea. J. Mol. Evol. 29:170–179.
- KLUGE, A. G. 1989. A concern for evidence and a phylogenetic hypothesis of relationships among *Epicrates* (Boidae, Serpentes). Syst. Zool. 38:7–25.
- LEWIS, L. A., B. D. MISHLER, and R. VILGALYS. 1997. Phylogenetic relationships of the liverworts (Hepaticae), a basal embryophyte lineage, inferred from nucleotide sequence data of the chloroplast gene *rbcL*. Mol. Phylogenet. Evol. 7:377–393.
- MADEN, A. R., D. P. WHITTIER, D. J. GARBARY, and K. S. RENZAGLIA. 1997. Ultrastructure of the spermatozoid of *Ly-copodiella lateralis* (Lycopodiaceae). Can. J. Bot. **75**:1728–1738.
- MALEK, O., K. LÄTTIG, R. HIESEL, A. BRENNICKE, and V. KNOOP. 1996. RNA editing in bryophytes and a molecular phylogeny of land plants. EMBO J. 15:1403–1411.
- MANHART, J. R. 1994. Phylogenetic analysis of green plant *rbcL* sequences. Mol. Phylogenet. Evol. **3**:114–127.
- MISHLER, B. D., and S. P. CHURCHILL. 1984. A cladistic approach to the phylogeny of the bryophytes. Brittonia **36**: 406–424.
- MISHLER, B. D., L. A. LEWIS, M. A. BUCHHEIM, K. S. REN-ZAGLIA, D. J. GARBARY, C. F. DELWICHE, F. W. ZECHMAN, T. S. KANTZ, and R. L. CHAPMAN. 1994. Phylogenetic relationships of the "green algae" and "bryophytes." Ann. Mo. Bot. Gard. 81:451–483.
- MISHLER, B. D., P. H. THRALL, J. S. J. HOPPLE, E. DE LUNA, and R. VILGALYS. 1992. A molecular approach to the phylogeny of bryophytes: cladistic analysis of chloroplast-encoded 16S and 23S ribosomal RNA genes. Bryologist 95: 172–180.
- NEMEJC, F., and B. PACLTOVA. 1974. Hepaticae in the Senonian of South Bohemia. Paleobotanist **21**:23–26.
- NICKRENT, D. L. 1994. From field to film: rapid sequencing methods for field collected plant species. BioTechniques 16: 470–475.

- NICKRENT, D. L., R. J. DUFF, and D. A. M. KONINGS. 1997. Structural analyses of plastid-derived 16S rRNAs in holoparasitic angiosperms. Plant Mol. Biol. 34:731–743.
- NICKRENT, D. L., and D. E. SOLTIS. 1995. A comparison of angiosperm phylogenies based upon complete 18S rDNA and *rbcL* sequences. Ann. Mo. Bot. Gard. **82**:208–234.
- NICKRENT, D. L., and E. M. STARR. 1994. High rates of nucleotide substitution in nuclear small-subunit (18S) rDNA from holoparasitic flowering plants. J. Mol. Evol. 39:62– 70.
- NISHIYAMA, T., and M. KATO. 1999. Molecular phylogenetic analysis among bryophytes and tracheophytes based on combined data of plastid coded genes and the 18S rRNA gene. Mol. Biol. Evol. **16**:1027–1036.
- PALMER, J. D. 1990. Contrasting modes and tempos of genome evolution in land plant organelles. Trends Genet. 6:115– 120.
- PARKINSON, C. L., K. L. ADAMS, and J. D. PALMER. 1999. Multigene analyses identify the three earliest lineages of extant flowering plants. Curr. Biol. 9:1485–1488.
- PRYER, K. M., A. R. SMITH, and J. E. SKOG. 1995. Phylogenetic relationships of extant ferns based on evidence from morphology and *rbcL* sequences. Am. Fern J. 85:205–282.
- QIU, Y., Y. LEE, F. BERNASCONI-QUADRONI, D. E. SOLTIS, P. S. SOLTIS, M. ZANIS, E. A. ZIMMER, Z. CHEN, V. SAVOLAINEN, and M. W. CHASE. 1999. The earliest angiosperms: evidence from mitochondrial, plastid and nuclear genomes. Nature 402:404–409.
- QIU, Y.-L., Y. CHO, J. C. COX, and J. D. PALMER. 1998. The gain of three mitochondrial introns identifies liverworts as the earliest land plants. Nature **394**:671–674.
- QIU, Y.-L., and J. D. PALMER. 1999. Phylogeny of early land plants: insights from genes and genomes. Trends Plant Sci. 4:26–30.
- RAUBESON, L. A., and R. K. JANSEN. 1992. Chloroplast DNA evidence on the ancient evolutionary split in vascular land plants. Science 255:1697–1699.
- RENZAGLIA, K. S., and J. G. DUCKETT. 1991. Towards an understanding of the differences between the blepharoplast of mosses and liverworts, comparisons with hornworts, biflagellated lycopods and charophytes: a numerical analysis. New Phytol. 117:187–208.
- RENZAGLIA, K. S., R. J. DUFF, D. L. NICKRENT, and D. J. GARBARY. 2000. Vegetative and reproductive innovations of early land plants: implications for a unified phylogeny. Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci. 355:769–793.
- RENZAGLIA, K. S., K. D. MCFARLAND, and D. K. SMITH. 1997. Anatomy and ultrastructure of the sporophyte of *Takakia ceratophylla* (Bryophyta). Am. J. Bot. **84**:1337–1350.
- RICHARDSON, J. B. 1985. Lower Palaeozoic sporomorphs: their stratigraphical distribution and possible affinities. Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci. 309:201–205.

- SANDERSON, M. J., M. F. WOJCIECHOWSKI, J.-M. HU, T. S. KHAN, and S. G. BRADY. 2000. Error, bias, and long-branch attraction in data for two chloroplast photosystem genes in seed plants. Mol. Biol. Evol. 17:782–797.
- SOLTIS, D. E., and P. S. SOLTIS. 1998. Choosing an approach and an appropriate gene for phylogenetic analysis. Pp. 1– 42 *in* D. E. SOLTIS, P. S. SOLTIS, and J. J. DOYLE, eds. Molecular systematics of plants II. DNA sequencing. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston.
- SOLTIS, D. E., P. S. SOLTIS, M. W. CHASE et al. (13 co-authors). 2000. Angiosperm phylogeny inferred from 18S rDNA, *rbcL*, and *atpB* sequences. Bot. J. Linn. Soc. **133**:381–461.
- SOLTIS, D. E., P. S. SOLTIS, M. E. MORT, M. W. CHASE, V. SAVOLAINEN, S. B. HOOT, and C. M. MORTON. 1998. Inferring complex phylogenies using parsimony: an empirical approach using three large DNA data sets for angiosperms. Syst. Biol. 47:32–42.
- SOLTIS, P. S., D. E. SOLTIS, and M. W. CHASE. 1999. Angiosperm phylogeny inferred from multiple genes as a tool for comparative biology. Nature 402:402–407.
- SOLTIS, P. S., D. E. SOLTIS, P. G. WOLF, D. L. NICKRENT, S.-M. CHAW, and R. L. CHAPMAN. 1999. The phylogeny of land plants inferred from 18S rDNA sequences: pushing the limits of rDNA signal? Mol. Biol. Evol. 16:1774–1784.
- STRIMMER, K., and A. VON HAESELER. 1996. Quartet puzzling: a quartet maximum-likelihood method for reconstructing tree topologies. Mol. Biol. Evol. **13**:964–969.
- SWOFFORD, D. L. 1998. PAUP\*: phylogenetic analysis using parsimony. Version 4.0 b2a. Sinauer, Sunderland, Mass.
- TAYLOR, W. A. 1995. Spores in earliest land plants. Nature **373**:393–392.
- TEMPLETON, A. R. 1983. Phylogenetic inference from restriction endonuclease cleavage site maps with particular reference to the evolution of humans and the apes. Evolution 37:221–244.
- VAUGHN, K. C., R. LIGRONE, H. A. OWENS, J. HASEGAWA, E. O. CAMPBELL, K. S. RENZAGLIA, and J. MONGE-NAJERA. 1992. The Anthocerote chloroplast: a review. New Phytol. 120:169–190.
- WOLF, P. G. 1997. Evaluation of *atpB* nucleotide sequences for phylogenetic studies of ferns and other pteridophytes. Am. J. Bot. 84:1429–1440.
- WOLFE, K., W.-H. LI, and P. SHARP. 1987. Rates of nucleotide substitution vary greatly among plant mitochondrial, chloroplast, and nuclear DNAs. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 84: 9054–9058.
- WOLFE, K. H. 1996. Molecular evolution of plants: more genomes, less generalities. Pp. 45–57 in B. ANDERSSON, A. H. SALTER, and J. BARBER, eds. Molecular genetics of photosynthesis. IRL Press, Oxford, England.

PAMELA SOLTIS, reviewing editor

Accepted August 23, 2000