Phylogenetics and biogeography of the parasitic genus *Thesium* L. (Santalaceae), with an emphasis on the Cape of South Africa
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*Thesium* is a large genus of parasitic shrubs belonging to tribe Thesieae of Santalaceae. It has a principally Old World distribution, with the greatest diversity being found in southern Africa. Little is known about the relationships within *Thesium* or its relationships with its closest relatives. In this article, we present a first estimate of species-level phylogenetic relationships in *Thesium* based on internal transcribed spacer (ITS) and *trnL–trnF* sequence data, and use this to explore the biogeographical history of the group. One hundred and four samples representing 72 *Thesium* spp. were included in a phylogenetic analysis. Plastid and combined data resolve *Thesium* as paraphyletic relative to *Thesidium* and *Austroamericium* with high posterior probability and bootstrap support. ITS sequence data place *Thesidium* as sister to a large *Thesium* clade, but with weak support. Ancestral range reconstruction and dating analysis suggest a southern African origin for the group, with a crown age of 39.1 ± 11.9 Mya, followed by dispersal into Europe and South America. A large clade of Cape species split in the Miocene from a clade comprising tropical species (25.5 ± 7.3 Mya) with the diversification of extant species beginning at 16.7 ± 6.3 Mya. © 2010 The Linnean Society of London, *Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society*, 2010, 162, 435–452.


INTRODUCTION

*Thesium* L. is a large genus of predominantly perennial root-parasitic shrubs (sometimes referred to as hemiparasites as they possess chlorophyll) belonging to tribe Thesieae Reichenb. of Santalaceae. *Thesium* spp. obtain some of their nutritional needs from other plants. Species in the genus are often unattractive, having a yellowish colour and lacking leaves. The flowers are frequently small and creamy-white, and most species are probably pollinated by small bees and flies (Hendrych, 1972).

*Thesium* has a principally Old World distribution, with the greatest diversity being found in southern Africa. Of the c. 300 species of *Thesium* (Mabberley, 2008), approximately 150 are native to southern Africa, a further 60 species occur in tropical and northern Africa, and the rest of the genus is primarily distributed in Europe and Asia. Only three species occur in South America, with two species centred in Brazil and a third native to Venezuela. *Thesium* is widely distributed in South Africa, with high densities of species in the Cape (or Cape Floristic Region; Manning & Goldblatt, 2000). With 81 currently recognized species native to the Cape, including 35 endemics, *Thesium* is one of the largest genera in the region (Goldblatt & Manning, 2002). Despite its species' richness, *Thesium* has received little explicit systematic attention, either locally or globally. Such systematic understanding is important for the understanding of the evolution of biotic communities. An increasing grasp of the phylogenetic relationships of Cape taxa and their non-Cape relatives has been vital.
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for furthering our understanding of the patterns and processes that have driven the evolution of the Cape region as a whole (Linder, 2003; Galley & Linder, 2006; Verboom et al., 2009).

For decades, the origin and evolution of the Cape flora has been the subject of some debate (see Levyns, 1964; Axelrod & Raven, 1978; Galley & Linder, 2006; Galley, Linder & Zimmermann, 2009). Levyns (1964) hypothesized a tropical African origin for many Cape lineages, with subsequent migration southwards into the Cape. Other authors have suggested a vicariance scenario, in which the Cape flora represents a relic of a previously widespread African flora (Wild, 1968; King, 1978). Recently, Galley et al. (2007) have shown that there is a general trend for unidirectional migration from the Cape into the Drakensberg (in the eastern part of South Africa) and thence northwards into tropical Africa. With strong affinities to other floras. Hendrych (1972) hypothesized that Thesium originated in southern Africa, subsequently migrating north into the rest of Africa and further into Europe and Asia. This hypothesis has not yet been evaluated in a phylogenetic context against the alternatives that: (1) Thesium biogeography is the result of vicariance, following isolation caused by climatic fluctuations, or (2) Thesium originated in the north, migrating south with subsequent diversification in southern Africa.

Most systematic work on the genus has been based primarily on the morphological and geographical attributes of the species (Fig. 1). Originally described by Linnaeus (1753), Thesium received limited attention until the 1800s, early treatments being hampered by poor species’ sampling and often focusing on particular geographical regions (Hendrych, 1972). Throughout the first half of the 19th century, three infrageneric groups were recognized at sectional level, namely Frisea Endl., Thesiosyris Endl. and Thesium R.Br. (= Euthesium Benth.). These sections were broadly distinguished by floral morphology, especially flower shape and perianth structure, and geographical distribution, with Thesium being predominantly European and Frisea and Thesiosyris predominantly occurring in southern Africa.

The first comprehensive treatment of the genus was conducted by De Candolle (1857a, b). He based his subgeneric classifications on more material than had been examined by previous authors, examining all 112 species known at the time. Within a single year, De Candolle produced two treatments, first (1857a) dividing Thesium into five sections, but soon modifying this scheme and splitting the genus into six sections (Table 1). In his second scheme, De Candolle accepted the separation of the genus Thesidium from Thesium, as proposed by Sonder (1857). Thesidium is a small genus (approximately eight species) of parasitic shrubs endemic to the southern part of Africa, where its range overlaps completely with that of Thesium. It differs from Thesium in being monoecious and having unisexual, tetramerous flowers. Recent molecular work (Der & Nickrent, 2008) has identified Thesidium as sister to Thesium, but limited sampling hampered the ability of these authors to evaluate the monophyly of the two genera.

In his treatment of the genus, Hill (1915) created four new sections (Table 1, see also Fig. 1). His treatment, however, was based on a limited geographical

### Table 1. Broad level infragenERIC classifications of Thesium, and geographical locality of each major grouping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section <em>Frisea</em></td>
<td>Section <em>Annullata</em></td>
<td>Section <em>Frisea</em></td>
<td>Subgenus <em>Frisea</em>†</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section <em>Euthesium</em></td>
<td>Section <em>Penicillata</em></td>
<td>Section <em>Euthesium</em></td>
<td>Subgenus <em>Thesium</em></td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section <em>Discothesium</em></td>
<td>Section <em>Barbata</em></td>
<td>Section <em>Discothesium</em></td>
<td>Subgenus <em>Thesium</em></td>
<td>Africa/Eurasia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section <em>Aetheothesium</em></td>
<td>Section <em>Imberbia</em></td>
<td>Section <em>Aetheothesium</em></td>
<td>Subgenus <em>Thesium</em></td>
<td>Africa/Eurasia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section <em>Chrysothesium</em></td>
<td>Subsection <em>Fimbriata</em></td>
<td>Section <em>Chrysothesium</em></td>
<td>Subgenus <em>Chrysothesium</em></td>
<td>Africa/Eurasia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section <em>Psilothesium</em></td>
<td>Subsection <em>Subglabra</em></td>
<td>Section <em>Psilothesium</em></td>
<td>Genus <em>Austroamericanum</em></td>
<td>South America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genus <em>Thesidium</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Genus <em>Thesidium</em></td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Hill’s sections *Annullata*, *Penicillata*, *Barbata* retained as series of Pilger’s section *Frisea*.
†Hill’s sections *Annullata*, *Penicillata*, *Barbata* retained as sections of Hendrych’s subgenus *Frisea*. 

sample, as he focused on species from South Africa, paying little attention to species found outside southern Africa. As a result of this sampling bias, Hill's treatment was not readily reconcilable with that of De Candolle. It was Pilger (1935) who first attempted to address the mismatch between these two treatments by examining a large number of Thesium spp. from across the distribution of the genus. In his treatment, Thesium was split into four sections (Table 1) which broadly agree with De Candolle's and earlier authors' works, but incorporate the groupings that Hill had devised for the South African Thesium spp. The majority of species surveyed by Hill fall into Pilger's section Frisea, whereas some (from section Imberbia) fit into Thesium [as Euthesium] (Table 1).

The most recent comprehensive study of the genus is that of Hendrych (1972), who attempted to provide a broad outline of the group and revise the existing subgeneric Northern Hemisphere classifications. His study was, however, limited because of its focus on Northern Hemisphere species, paying little attention to southern African species. He offered little insight into the origin and evolution of the Cape members of Thesium or into the phylogenetic relationships within the genus. In addition, Hendrych focused

**Figure 1.** Species representing three of Hill's (1915) infrageneric groupings. Species shown are as follows: A, *Thesium carinatum* (section Barbata); B, *T. euphrasioides* (section Barbata); C, D, *T. spicatum* (section Annulata); E; *T. euphorbioideus* (section Imberbia); F, *T. spinulosum* (section Imberbia). All scale bars, 1 cm. All photographs taken at Baardskeerdersbos, Western Cape, South Africa by GAV.
solely on morphology and geography, not taking molecular data into account. Hendrych's treatment included three subgenera within *Thesium*: *Frisea*, *Thesium* and *Chrysothesium* DC. (Table 1). Hendrych (1963, 1972) also removed the three South American species from *Thesium* to a new genus, *Austroamericum*. This was based on their disjunct distribution relative to the rest of *Thesium* and their divergent morphological attributes, particularly fruit and floral morphology.

Phylogenetic data have gained increasing importance in both the delimitation of higher taxa (Schrire & Lewis, 1996; De Queiroz, 2007) and in tracing the evolutionary histories of lineages, including their biogeographical origins (Avise, 1994). In order to enhance the utility and predictive power of higher taxa, taxonomists set out to reclassify taxa that are found to be paraphyletic into monophyletic groupings (Backlund & Bremer, 1998). Phylogenetic studies of *Thesium* are few, and those that exist generally focus at a higher taxonomic level (e.g. Der & Nickrent, 2008), and sample a limited number of *Thesium* spp. As a result, relationships amongst *Thesium* spp. remain poorly understood (Hendrych, 1972), as does the relationship between *Thesium* and its closest relatives.

In this article, we present a first estimate of species-level phylogenetic relationships in *Thesium* using plastid and nuclear molecular data with a particular focus on Cape species, and use this to explore the taxonomy and biogeographical history of the group, employing Bayesian- and parsimony-based phylogenetic analyses. Specifically, we aim to: (1) evaluate the relationships between *Thesium* and its segregate genera *Thesidium* and *Austroamericum* (sensu Hendrych, 1963); (2) assess relationships among *Thesium* spp., especially in relation to existing infrageneric classifications; and (3) evaluate, from a molecular phylogenetic perspective, Hendrych's southern origin hypothesis for the genus *Thesium*.

**MATERIAL AND METHODS**

**TAXON SAMPLING**

One hundred and four accessions (Appendix, Table 2), representing 72 *Thesium* spp., were sampled for the phylogenetic analysis. Fifty-seven of the sampled species were from South Africa, with a further 14 species sampled from tropical Africa, Europe and Asia. Nine *Thesium* (seven Eurasian, two tropical African) and two *Austroamericum* species were sampled from herbarium specimens housed at the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew (K; see Appendix). Three *Thesidium* spp. were also sampled. *Buckleya lanceolata* (Thesiae), *Exocarpus spartens* (Anthoboleae) and *Leptomeria cunninghamii* (Osyrideae) were sampled as outgroup taxa.

**DNA ISOLATION, AMPLIFICATION AND SEQUENCING**

Total DNA was extracted from silica-dried, field-collected samples or herbarium material using a modified version of the cetyltrimethylammonium bromide (CTAB) extraction protocol outlined in Doyle & Doyle (1987). Samples were ground using a small amount of fine silica in mortars preheated to 65 °C to facilitate grinding. DNA was precipitated in ethanol (for silica-dried samples) or isopropanol (for herbarium samples) at −20 °C for up to 10 days. Additional purification was performed using a caesium chloride/ethidium bromide gradient (Csiba & Powell, 2006) and a dialysis procedure. All DNA samples were stored in the DNA bank at the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew (http://data.kew.org/dnabank/homepage.html).

One plastid region and one nuclear region were selected. The trnL–trnF region of the plastid genome (spacer and intron) was amplified in one reaction using the primers c and f designed by Taberlet et al. (1991). In some cases, amplification also required the use of the internal primers d and e. Polymerase chain reactions (PCRs) were performed in 25 μL volumes, containing 22.5 μL of ReddyMix PCR Master Mix (containing 2.5 mM MgCl₂; ABgene, Epsom, Surrey, UK), 0.5 μL of bovine serum albumin (BSA; 0.04%), 0.5 μL of each primer and 1 μL of DNA template. The ribosomal internal transcribed spacer (ITS) from the nuclear genome was generally amplified using primers 17SE and 26SE of Sun et al. (1994), but, when these reactions failed, the ITS region was amplified using the ITS4 and ITS5 primers (White et al., 1990). Each 25 μL reaction contained 21.5 μL of ReddyMix PCR Master Mix (containing 1.5 mM MgCl₂), 1 μL of dimethyl sulphoxide (DMSO), 0.5 μL of BSA, 0.5 μL of each primer and 1 μL of DNA template. Amplification of both regions employed the same thermal profile: an initial denaturation at 94 °C for 2 min, followed by 30 cycles of 94 °C for 40 s, 54 °C for 40 s and 72 °C for 40 s, and completed with a final

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number of species</th>
<th>Species sampled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropical Africa</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Africa and Madagascar</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Number of species sampled according to region

extension of 72 °C for 4 min. PCR products were then purified on columns (Nucleospin® Extract II minicolumn kit; Macherey-Nagel, Düren, Germany). Cycle sequencing was performed using the BigDye Terminator Cycle Sequencing kit (version 3.1; Applied Biosystems, Warrington, Cheshire, UK) following the manufacturer’s protocol, and the same primers as used for amplification. Products from the cycle sequencing reactions were cleaned on a Biomek NXS8 automated workstation (Beckman Coulter, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire, UK) and visualized on a 3730 DNA Analyser (Applied Biosystems).

Complementary sequences were assembled and edited using Seqman (DNASTar Inc., Madison, WI, USA) and aligned in MegAlign (DNASTar Inc.) using the CLUSTALW (Thompson, Higgins and Gibson, 1994) alignment algorithm. Automatically aligned sequences were then exported in BioEdit v7.0 (Hall, 1999) and the alignments were checked and edited by eye. Simple gap coding was implemented in GapCoder (Young & Healy, 2003) to incorporate any insertion/deletion (indel) information present. Indels for which homology could not be confidently inferred (especially indels adjacent to homopolymers), and stretches of DNA sequence that could not be confidently aligned, were excluded from subsequent phylogenetic analyses. Stretches of sequence for which outgroup taxa could not be aligned to ingroup taxa with any confidence were treated as unknown for the outgroup taxa. All sequences generated as part of this study have been submitted to GenBank (Appendix), and aligned matrices to TreeBase (www.treebase.org; matrix number SN4795-25231).

**Phylogenetic analyses and molecular dating**

Phylogenetic relationships were inferred using both parsimony and Bayesian inference. Prior to combined analysis of the plastid and nuclear gene regions, separate parsimony analyses, comprising only terminals for which both regions were available, were conducted to allow for an evaluation of incongruence. These separate analyses included only those accesses for which both plastid and nuclear sequences were available (72 species). Combined analyses, however, included all available accessions. The incongruence length difference (ILD) test (Farris et al., 1994), as implemented in PAUP 4.0b10 (Swofford, 2002), was conducted to test for incongruence. Owing to the propensity of the ILD test to type I error (Cunningham, 1997), conflict was considered to be significant if the P value was below $\alpha = 0.01$. Separate trees for each locus were also visually compared, with conflict considered to be supported when both conflicting nodes had bootstrap (BS; Felsenstein, 1985) support greater than 75%. Parsimony searches were conducted heuristically in PAUP 4.0b10 (Swofford, 2002), with 10 000 random addition replicates, tree bisection–reconnection (TBR) branch swapping and MULTREES in effect. BS values were calculated on the basis of 500 replicates, each involving a heuristic search set-up as follows: simple addition sequence, TBR branch swapping and MASTREES set to 500. Bayesian searches were conducted in MrBayes v3.1.2 (Huelsenbeck & Ronquist, 2001), with different DNA substitution models implemented for the different data partitions (i.e. ITS, trnL–trnF and indels). A GTR + I + $\Gamma$ model (Yang, 1994) was selected using ModelTest 3.7 (Posada & Crandall, 1998) applied to both sequence partitions, and a Markov-$k$ model (Lewis, 2001) was applied to the coded indel data. The analyses were performed using two independent MCMC runs, each comprising four chains (one cold and three heated), and a random starting tree. Each chain was run for $10^8$ generations, sampling every 100th generation, giving a total of 10 000 samples per run. Plots of the log-likelihood scores against generation time were generated in Tracer v1.3 (Rambaut & Drummond, 2005) to determine when stationarity was achieved, and thus to estimate the ‘burn-in’ period. At the same time, the effective sample size (ESS) for each parameter of the models used was also employed to confirm sampling adequacy. Trees from the ‘burn-in’ were discarded prior to the calculation of posterior probabilities (PPs).

Molecular dating was conducted in BEAST v1.4.2 (Drummond & Rambaut, 2007), using a log-normal relaxed clock.Dating was conducted on both nuclear and plastid data and on the combined data (see Pfeil, 2009). Because the dataset comprised two loci, a mixed model was used, with separate models applied to nuclear and plastid datasets (GTR + I + $\Gamma$). Molecular evolution model parameters were assigned flat priors, whereas tree priors were modelled according to a Yule speciation process. The analysis was calibrated by setting a single age prior estimated for the divergence between *Leptomeira + Exocarpus* and *Buckleya + Thesium*. A normal calibration prior with a mean of 73.65 and standard deviation of 7.00 was used, based on a separate dating of a higher level phylogenetic analysis (Der & Nickrent, 2008). Calibration for that analysis was based on fossil evidence for the divergence between Santalaceae and Misodendraceae + Loranthaceae (see Vidal-Russell & Nickrent, 2008). Again, log-likelihood scores were plotted against generation time, together with ESS values, and visualized in Tracer, with ‘burn-in’ trees discarded prior to generating the consensus tree.

Distributions of South African *Thesium* species were scored using Jordaan (2003), whereas non-South African species were characterized for broad geo-
Table 3. Tree statistics for internal transcribed spacer (ITS), \textit{trnL–trnF} and the combined dataset. Consistency indices (CI) were measured excluding parsimony-uninformative characters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>Number of sites</th>
<th>Potentially parsimony informative</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>RI</th>
<th>Tree length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>295 (31.5%)</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{trnL–trnF}</td>
<td>1272</td>
<td>353 (21.8%)</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>2209</td>
<td>624 (28.3%)</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RI, retention index.

geographical distribution (Steyermark, 1951; Hendrych, 1964; Polhill, 2005). Ancestral character state reconstruction was conducted in Mesquite v2.5 (Maddison & Maddison, 2008), using likelihood optimizations according to Galley \textit{et al.} (2009). Reconstruction was conducted on the tree with maximum PP obtained from the BEAST search. Nodes were reconstructed for a given area, if they were significantly present for that area and significantly absent for all other areas. Nodes that were significantly absent from all areas were treated as equivocal.

RESULTS

Aligned matrices of ITS and \textit{trnL–trnF} were 937 and 1272 bases long, respectively (Table 3). Separate analyses consisted of 72 ITS and \textit{trnL–trnF} sequences, and combined analyses consisted of 91 ITS and 86 \textit{trnL–trnF} sequences. ITS had higher ingroup sequence divergence (0–17.5% vs. 0–9.0%) and a higher percentage of potentially parsimony-informative characters (31.5% vs. 21.8%) than \textit{trnL–trnF}. The \textit{trnL–trnF} region, however, displayed the greatest variation in length and, consequently, had more indels (158 vs. 64). A summary of the tree statistics is shown in Table 3.

SEPARATE ANALYSES

The trees derived from the separate plastid and ITS analyses are presented in Figure 2. The plastid data resolve \textit{Thesium} as paraphyletic relative to \textit{Thesidium} and \textit{Austroamericum} with high PP and BS support (PP = 1.00; BS = 100). In contrast, ITS sequence data place \textit{Thesium} as sister to a large clade consisting of all \textit{Thesium} spp. sampled, but with weak support (PP = 0.53; BS < 50) for the monophyly of the latter. In general, the ITS tree is better supported, especially at deeper nodes, than the plastid tree, which is consistent with its higher proportion of potentially informative characters (Table 3). Results of the ILD test suggest that nuclear and plastid data are not significantly discordant ($P > 0.01$), although supported conflict (BS > 75) occurs in two areas.

Firstly, the plastid data place \textit{Thesium ericaefolium} A.D.C. in a clade of species mostly drawn from Hill's section \textit{Annulata} (BS = 88), whereas ITS places it as sister to a second accession of \textit{T. ericaefolium} (BS = 96), both of these being resolved as sister to \textit{T. glomeruliflorum} Sond. (BS = 97). Secondly, within a Cape-dominated clade which is, in general, poorly resolved, the plastid data place \textit{T. hispidulum} Lam. as sister to \textit{T. polycephalrum} Schlrtr. (BS = 79), \textit{T. paniculatum} L. as sister to one sample of \textit{T. capituliflorum} Sond. (BS = 79) and \textit{T. carinatum} A.D.C. as sister to another sample of \textit{T. capituliflorum} (BS = 99). In contrast, ITS places \textit{T. hispidulum} as sister to \textit{T. carinatum} (BS = 100) and \textit{T. capituliflorum} as sister to \textit{T. capituliflorum} (BS = 97). We consider this incongruence as minor and, as only terminal branches are involved, a plastid/nuclear combined analysis was conducted.

COMBINED ANALYSES

Combining ITS and plastid data generally strengthened nodal support values (Fig. 3). As in the separate plastid analysis, both \textit{Thesium} and \textit{Austroamericum} are nested within \textit{Thesium}, the monophyly of each being strongly supported (Fig. 3: PP = 1.00, BS = 100). Within \textit{Thesium}, two principal clades are resolved with varying degrees of support (Fig. 3). Clade 1 (PP = 1.00, BS = 100) comprises two well-supported clades: a Eurasian clade (PP = 1.00, BS = 100) and the \textit{Thesium} clade (PP = 1.00, BS = 100). Clade 2, with high posterior and low BS support (PP = 1.00, BS < 75), is dominated by two principal clades: a Cape clade (PP = 1.00, BS < 75) and a strongly supported Tropical clade (PP = 1.00, BS = 100), including the two sampled South American species of \textit{Austroamericum}. Completing Clade 2 is a South African-centred grade comprising \textit{T. pungens} + \textit{T. spinulosum} (PP = 1.00, BS < 50) and \textit{T. triflorum} + \textit{T. squarrosum} (PP = 1.00, BS < 50). Deep relationships within the Cape clade are poorly resolved and unsupported, possibly reflecting rapid diversification. Some assemblages are, however, resolved, although support is weak to moderate.
Figure 2. Consensus trees resulting from the separate Bayesian analyses of internal transcribed spacer (ITS) and trnL–trnF datasets. Only taxa with both plastid and ITS data available were included in these separate analyses. Posterior probabilities above 0.90 and bootstrap values above 75 are shown above and below the branches, respectively. Open circles indicate incongruent clades discussed in the text.
Figure 3. Consensus tree of the combined internal transcribed spacer (ITS) and trnL–trnF Bayesian analysis. Posterior probabilities above 0.90 and bootstrap values above 75 are indicated above and below the branches, respectively. Clades referred to in the text are labelled. Symbols next to South African species’ names indicate the subgeneric classification based on Hill (1915) and are coded as follows: ●, section Barbata; ▲, section Imberbia; ○, section Penicillata; ◆, section Annulata.
Table 4. Results of separate dating analyses. Numbers in parentheses below regions indicate the number of taxa used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>ITS (72)</th>
<th>trnL–trnF (72)</th>
<th>Combined (72)</th>
<th>Combined (104)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Origin</td>
<td>42.7 ± 13.8</td>
<td>37.2 ± 14.2</td>
<td>35.9 ± 11.5</td>
<td>39.1 ± 11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Divergence between Eurasian species and Thesium spp.</td>
<td>36.6 ± 12.6</td>
<td>24.1 ± 12.1</td>
<td>28.5 ± 9.9</td>
<td>29.8 ± 10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cape origin (maximum age)</td>
<td>25.6 ± 9.9</td>
<td>30.1 ± 13.1</td>
<td>22.2 ± 18.6</td>
<td>25.5 ± 7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>South American divergence</td>
<td>10.1 ± 4.4</td>
<td>8.9 ± 7.7</td>
<td>9.6 ± 4.9</td>
<td>13.4 ± 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Diversification within Cape clade</td>
<td>17.2 ± 6.9</td>
<td>22.9 ± 11.4</td>
<td>13.9 ± 4.9</td>
<td>16.7 ± 6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These include a clade (PP = 0.78, BS = 0.90) of species from Hill's section Annulata and a clade of 'leafy' Thesium species, essentially representing Hill's section Barbata (PP = 0.79, BS < 50). Where species were represented by multiple accessions, these generally grouped together in the same major clade, but often failed to form sister relationships with conspecific accessions (Fig. 3).

**BIOGEOGRAPHY AND DATING**

In general, dates were consistent across analyses based on separate gene regions, and those based on the combined data with full and reduced taxon sampling (Table 4). Broad-scale ancestral range reconstruction (Fig. 4) suggests a southern African origin for the group, with subsequent dispersal into the rest of Africa and single dispersal events to South America and Europe. The age of the crown node of Thesium (Fig. 4: Node 1) is dated to the late Eocene (39.1 ± 11.9 Ma). Within Thesium, the divergence of the Eurasian clade from Thesidium dates to the Oligocene, 29.8 ± 10.7 Ma (Fig. 4: Node 2), and the origin of the Cape clade to the Miocene (25.5 ± 7.3 Ma; Fig. 4: Node 3). The crown age for the group is 21.3 ± 8.0 Ma. The latter is succeeded by a relatively recent diversification event, beginning at 16.7 ± 6.3 Ma (Fig. 4: Node 5). The South American clade appears to have diverged from its tropical African sister around 13.4 ± 6.0 Ma (Fig. 4: Node 4).

**DISCUSSION**

In combination, ITS and trnL–trnF yielded a well-resolved and, in places, strongly supported phylogenetic hypothesis for the genus Thesium. The reciprocal monophyly of Thesium, Thesidium and Austroamericanum is contradicted, suggesting a need for generic realignment, although the formalization of this lies outside the scope of this study. Finally, ancestral area reconstruction supports the notion of a southern African origin for the group, with subsequent dispersal out of Africa, and rapid speciation in the Cape.

**TAXONOMY**

Both plastid and combined data reject the reciprocal monophyly of Thesium and Thesidium (Figs 2, 3), suggesting, instead, that Thesium is embedded within Thesidium, being sister to the Eurasian Thesium clade. Although ITS identifies Thesidium as sister to a larger Thesium clade, this relationship is unsupported statistically (Fig. 2). Backlund & Bremer (1998) proposed that the primary principle in determining the taxonomic ranking for a set of organisms is monophyly. In order to ensure generic monophyly, two options are available: (1) to sink Thesidium into Thesium, retaining it as a section in the genus (Hag-
Figure 4. Ancestral area reconstruction (maximum likelihood) on the chronogram produced using a relaxed, log-normal clock (implemented in BEAST; see text for details). Selected clades are numbered for reference. Grey lines correspond to equivocal branches. Open circles indicate nodes with posterior probability (PP) > 0.95.

nothesium sensu De Candolle, 1857a), or (2) to elevate Eurasian Thesium species to the genus level.

There is strong morphological support for the maintenance of Thesidium as a separate genus. Specifically, Thesidium species are dioecious plants, with tetramerous flowers, traits not seen among Thesium spp. Such morphological differences between the two genera support the principle of maximizing diagnosability (Backlund & Bremer, 1998). All of the Eurasian species sampled in this study come from Hendrych's subgenus Thesium, which is characterized by campanulate perigonia, glabrous perianth margins and a pencil of hairs attaching anthers to the perianth lobes (Hendrych, 1972). These morphological characters are not unique to this group, however, with similar floral morphologies being found in South African Thesium spp. (in Hill's section Imberbia). Given the lack of morphological exclusivity between Eurasian and southern African taxa, coupled with the strength of the support for Thesidium being nested within Thesium, we feel, on current evidence, that they would be best maintained within Thesium. This suggests that Thesidium should be reduced to a subgenus within Thesium. However, a lack of full sampling of species from the Eurasian subgenus and the absence of a comprehensive comparative morphological study make any final judgement on this potential change premature.

Hendrych (1963) segregated the South American Thesium spp. as a new genus, Austroamericum, based on their apparent morphological distinctiveness and their geographical disjunction from the rest of the genus (all Old World). Molecular evidence presented here contradicts Hendrych's view, however, suggesting that Austroamericum is strongly (PP = 1.00, BS = 100) nested within a predominantly tropical African Thesium clade. Hendrych (1972) cited floral structure as a key diagnostic feature of Austroamericum, with these species having, among other features, funnel-shaped perianth tubes, with the anthers close to the free lobes of the perigonium. He also suggested that pear-shaped fruits that retain the dried lobes of the perigonium after they have formed and have raised ribs connected by reticulated veins were unique to these South American species. In addition, he cited an annual life history, in conjunction with scale-shaped leaves, as supporting their exclusion from the rest of Thesium. Many of the characters identified as characteristic of Austroamericum by Hendrych are, however, seen in tropical African Thesium spp. For example, many tropical African species are annual, with scale-like leaves, and some species also have ribbed fruit, with vein reticulation (e.g. Group 4, in Polhill, 2005). Although a more thorough morphological investigation is required, such superficial morphological similarity between South American and tropical African Thesium taxa, combined with the molecular evidence outlined here, supports the re-inclusion of these species in Thesium.

Relationships among South African species generally do not correspond with Hill's (1915) infrageneric groupings, although some patterns are noticeable. Section Imberbia forms a paraphyletic grade, which suggests that its morphological characteristics may represent plesiomorphic states. These species have glabrous or fringed perianth margins and hairs attaching the anthers to the perianth segments. Hill's section Barbata is represented by two clades within the larger Cape clade. One clade (PP = 0.79, BS < 50) comprises a group of leafy species (Fig. 3: Leafy clade), and the second is sister to a clade (PP = 0.90, BS < 50) of Imberbia species. The Cape section Annulata receives moderate support (PP = 0.78, BS = 90, Fig. 3) and is distinguished morphologically by having anthers free from the perianth lobes (i.e. without attaching hairs) and a characteristic ring of hairs at the throat of the perianth tube (Hill, 1915). The inclusion of T. densiflorum in the Annulata clade is exceptional, this species being assigned to section Barbata by Hill. Both sections Barbata and Annulata have a dense apical beard on their perianth lobes, but differ in the presence of attaching hairs behind the anthers in section Barbata species. As well as sharing its range with many species from section Annulata, some individuals of T. densiflorum have been noted to lack attaching hairs behind their anthers (T. Moore, pers. observ.). This species also shares a similar floral arrangement to many species from section Annulata, with flowers arranged in 'dense rounded heads at the ends of branches' (Levyns, 1950). The only South African representative of the section Penicillata arises as sister to a clade comprising section Imberbia species.

Overall, the lack of support for the monophyly of Hill's infrageneric groupings suggests that a new system is required. Increased genetic and taxonomic sampling is required to shed further light on the relationships within Thesium (cf. Albach & Chase, 2004).

HISTORICAL BIOGEOGRAPHY

Ancestral area reconstruction (Fig. 4) supports Hendrych's (1972) hypothesis of a southern African origin for the genus. The results presented here mirror a biogeographical pattern shown by several other groups (Galley et al., 2007), which exhibit a clear northward dispersal trend out of southern Africa. Based on our limited sampling of the Eurasian species, the occurrence of the genus in Eurasia is apparently the result of a single dispersal event from Africa to Europe and thence to Asia (Fig. 4). Limited

taxon sampling may potentially have a major effect on ancestral reconstruction (Salisbury & Kim, 2001), and here the limited number of Eurasian species sampled (see Table 2) may impact on the reconstruction of the basal node.

The divergence times obtained from the separate dating of each data partition did not differ greatly from those obtained from the combined analysis (cf. Hardy & Linder, 2005; Table 4). South American *Thesium* spp. split from their African relatives approximately 13.4 Mya (Fig. 4). The exact location of the common ancestor is unclear from likelihood optimizations (Node 4: Fig. 4), although a tropical African distribution seems intuitive. Moreover, parsimony optimization suggests a tropical African reconstruction for this node (data not shown). This date is far too recent to be the result of vicariance associated with the break-up of Gondwana (approximately 90 Mya; Sanmartín & Ronquist, 2004), as suggested by Hendrych (1972), but instead indicates the more likely involvement of long-distance dispersal. A large number of plant and animal genera display trans-Atlantic disjunctions (Thorne, 1973) and, in a review of plants displaying trans-Atlantic distributions, Renner (2004) found that, of the 11 genera studied, seven were best explained as recent (< 10 Mya) dispersal events across the Atlantic. She suggested that strong oceanic currents, rather than dispersal by wind or birds, may effectively transport ‘rafts’ of plant material across the Atlantic. The strongly supported monophyly of the South American *Thesium* spp., nested within a tropical African clade, suggests a single, relatively recent dispersal event from tropical Africa to South America.

High *Thesium* diversity in the Cape is the result of recent diversification within a single lineage (Fig. 4). The relative antiquity of this Cape clade matches that of several other Cape groups, for example Rhamnaceae (Richardson et al., 2001), Irideae (Goldblatt et al., 2002), Ehrhartia (Verboom, Linder & Stock, 2003), African Restionaceae (Linder, Eldenäs & Briggs, 2003), Pelargonium (Bakker et al., 2005) and Muralitia (Forest et al., 2007). The radiation of the group, however, only occurred subsequently in the Miocene (16.7 ± 6.7 Mya). A similar pattern was observed in the South African Pelargonium (Bakker et al., 2005), which shows recent diversification events in the Miocene and Pliocene. Climate has been recognized as a key driver in the recent radiations of many Cape lineages (Richardson et al., 2001; Verboom et al., 2003; Bakker et al., 2005; McKenzie & Barker, 2008; Verboom et al., 2009) and, in particular, the large climatic fluctuations experienced during the early–late Miocene are suggested to have stimulated speciation in the Cape winter rainfall region at that time (Verboom et al., 2003).

Parasitic plants may be affected by changes in climate, both directly through impacts on their own physiology and indirectly through impacts on their host (Phoenix & Press, 2005). Thus, range expansions and contractions of both parasites and/or its hosts during periods of climatic fluctuation may have promoted speciation in parasitic lineages. Miocene climatic changes were accompanied by major geomorphic events which significantly altered the substrates available for plant colonization, providing novel habitats (Cowling, Proches & Partridge, 2009). Many studies have shown the effect of nutrient availability on parasite success and fecundity, with parasitic plants grown under high nutrient conditions generally being larger and having higher reproductive outputs (Salonen & Puustinen, 1996). Thus, the exposure of novel, relatively nutrient-rich substrates (Cowling et al., 2009) may have provided opportunities for both *Thesium* spp. and their hosts to diversify into novel, unexploited niches. Some Cape species, particularly from section *Annulata* (e.g. *T. funale* L. and *T. patulum* A.W.Hill) are found almost exclusively on lowland clay-rich soils that were exposed relatively recently during the mid to late Miocene (Cowling et al., 2009). Such large-scale changes in climate and geology may have played an influential role in the evolution of *Thesium*, but little is known about the roles climate and geology play in the evolution of a parasitic lifestyle in plants. This study serves as a preliminary framework for future research, not only on the phylogenetics and biogeography of the genus *Thesium*, but also for the understanding of the evolution of the species-rich Cape region as a whole.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>trnL–trnF</th>
<th>ITS</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th>Voucher</th>
<th>Collection locality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GU294680</td>
<td></td>
<td>Austroamericiam brasiliense Hendrych</td>
<td>South America</td>
<td>Ganev 708, K</td>
<td>Bahia, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294639</td>
<td>GU256824</td>
<td>Austroamericiam tepuiense Hendrych</td>
<td>South America</td>
<td>Santos et al. 236, K</td>
<td>Parana, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294669</td>
<td>GU256863</td>
<td>Buckleya lanceolata Mig.</td>
<td>Asia/America</td>
<td>SADO 200, K</td>
<td>Sado-Ga-Sima Niigata Prefecture, Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294670</td>
<td>GU256864</td>
<td>Exocarpus spartens R.Br.</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Verboom 1273, BOL</td>
<td>Western Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294671</td>
<td>GU256865</td>
<td>Leptomeria cunninghamii Mig.</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Verboom 1274, BOL</td>
<td>Western Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294606</td>
<td>GU256783</td>
<td>Thesidium fragile 1 Sond.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Verboom 912, BOL</td>
<td>Kamannassieberg, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294681</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thesidium fragile 2 Sond.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Verboom 1305, BOL</td>
<td>Betty's Bay, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294607</td>
<td>GU256784</td>
<td>Thesidium leptostachyum Sond.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Forest 1, NBG</td>
<td>WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294609</td>
<td>GU256786</td>
<td>Thesidium micorcarpum 1 A.D.C.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Verboom 1150, BOL</td>
<td>Kamannassieberg, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294608</td>
<td>GU256785</td>
<td>Thesidium micorcarpum 2 A.D.C.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Verboom 1149, BOL</td>
<td>Kamannassieberg, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU256845</td>
<td>GU256846</td>
<td>Thesidium acuminatum A.W.Hill</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Moore 149, BOL</td>
<td>Red Hill, Cape Town, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294646</td>
<td>GU256832</td>
<td>Thesidium aggregatum 1 A.W.Hill</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Forest 694, NBG</td>
<td>De Hoop, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294659</td>
<td>GU256852</td>
<td>Thesidium aggregatum 2 A.W.Hill</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Louw 12062, BOL</td>
<td>Capricorn Park, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294649</td>
<td>GU256836</td>
<td>Thesidium aggregatum 3 A.W.Hill</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Britton 1904/085, BOL</td>
<td>Jonkershoek, Cape Town, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294625</td>
<td>GU256825</td>
<td>Thesidium aggregatum 4 A.W.Hill</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Forest 669, NBG</td>
<td>Table Mountain, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294599</td>
<td>GU256777</td>
<td>Thesidium alpinum L.</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>BK 80311, K</td>
<td>Vitosa Mt., Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294664</td>
<td>GU256857</td>
<td>Thesidium asterias A.W.Hill</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Trinder-Smith 432, BOL</td>
<td>Oribi Gorge, KZN, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294654</td>
<td>GU256847</td>
<td>Thesidium bathyshcistum Schltr.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Moore 87, BOL</td>
<td>Heuningberg NR, Bredasdorp, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294600</td>
<td>GU256778</td>
<td>Thesidium bergeri Zucc.</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Brummit&amp;Powell18740</td>
<td>Sterea Ellas Div., Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294634</td>
<td>GU256819</td>
<td>Thesidium brachygyne Schltr.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Louw 11371, BOL</td>
<td>WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU256796</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thesidium capitatum L.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Moore 111, BOL</td>
<td>Jonkershoek, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294650</td>
<td>GU256840</td>
<td>Thesidium capitiflorum 1 Sond.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Verboom 1297, BOL</td>
<td>Betty's Bay, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU256843</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thesidium capitiflorum 2 Sond.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Moore 169, BOL</td>
<td>Grootwinterhoek Mts, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294655</td>
<td>GU256848</td>
<td>Thesidium capitiflorum 3 Sond.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Moore 165, BOL</td>
<td>Grootwinterhoek Mts, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294652</td>
<td>GU256844</td>
<td>Thesidium capitiflorum 4 Sond.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Muasya&amp;Striton 4083, BOL</td>
<td>WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU256794</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thesidium carinatum 1 A.D.C.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Forest 594, NBG</td>
<td>Cederberg, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294618</td>
<td>GU256798</td>
<td>Thesidium carinatum 2 A.D.C.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Moore 167, BOL</td>
<td>Grootwinterhoek Mts, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294637</td>
<td>GU256822</td>
<td>Thesidium carinatum 3 A.D.C.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Verboom 1311, BOL</td>
<td>Betty's Bay, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294661</td>
<td>GU256854</td>
<td>Thesidium cf. angulosum DC.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Verboom 1025, BOL</td>
<td>Garden Castle NR, KZN, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294663</td>
<td>GU256856</td>
<td>Thesidium cf. impeditum A.W.Hill</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Verboom 1043, BOL</td>
<td>Wakkestroom, MPA, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trnL-trnF</td>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>Voucher</td>
<td>Collection locality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294603 GU256781</td>
<td>Thesium chine 1 Turcz.</td>
<td>Asia/Australia</td>
<td>Copeland 3482, K</td>
<td>Lake Inverell, NSW, Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294673</td>
<td>Thesium chine 2 Turcz.</td>
<td>Asia/Australia</td>
<td>Kharkevich&amp;Buch s.n., K</td>
<td>Nedzhdensky Dist., eastern Russia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294683</td>
<td>Thesium commutatum Sond.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Forest 716, NBG</td>
<td>De Hoop, WC, South Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294647 GU256833</td>
<td>Thesium corngereum A.W.Hill</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Forest 952, NBG</td>
<td>Landroskop, WC, South Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294662 GU256855</td>
<td>Thesium costatum A.W.Hill</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Verboom 1037, BOL</td>
<td>Garden Castle NR, KZN, South Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294666 GU256859</td>
<td>Thesium cupressoides A.W.Hill</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Verboom 1026, BOL</td>
<td>Garden Castle NR, KZN, South Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294679</td>
<td>Thesium densiflorum A.DC.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Moore 152, BOL</td>
<td>Camps Bay, Cape Town, South Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294631 GU256816</td>
<td>Thesium ericafolium 1 A.DC.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Verboom 1296, BOL</td>
<td>Betty's Bay, WC, South Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294623 GU256803</td>
<td>Thesium ericafolium 2 A.DC.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Moore 89, BOL</td>
<td>Potberg, WC, South Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294614 GU256791</td>
<td>Thesium euphorbioides L.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Forest 953, NBG</td>
<td>Landroskop, WC, South Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294630 GU256815</td>
<td>Thesium flexuosum A.DC.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Verboom 1156, BOL</td>
<td>Kamannassieberg, WC, South Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294619 GU256799</td>
<td>Thesium foliosum A.DC.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Moore 41, BOL</td>
<td>Thumb Peak, WC, South Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294678</td>
<td>Thesium frisea 1 L.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Louw WV14, BOL</td>
<td>WC, South Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294640 GU256826</td>
<td>Thesium frisea 2 L.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Forest CP 3, NBG</td>
<td>Cape Peninsula, WC, South Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294626 GU256809</td>
<td>Thesium frisea 3 L.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>NGB 1616, BOL</td>
<td>Drakensberg, KZN, South Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU256866</td>
<td>Thesium funale L.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Forest 732, NBG</td>
<td>Salmonsadam, WC, South Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294615 GU256792</td>
<td>Thesium galioides A.DC.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Moore 50, BOL</td>
<td>Prince Alberts Pass, WC, South Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294621 GU256801</td>
<td>Thesium glomerulifolium Sond.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Moore 46, BOL</td>
<td>Prince Alberts Pass, WC, South Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294667 GU256860</td>
<td>Thesium gracile 1 A.W.Hill</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Verboom 1054a, BOL</td>
<td>Barberton, MPA, South Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294661 GU256861</td>
<td>Thesium gracile 2 A.W.Hill</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Verboom 1054b, BOL</td>
<td>Barberton, MPA, South Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294685 GU256858</td>
<td>Thesium gracile 3 A.W.Hill</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Trinder-Smith 424, BOL</td>
<td>Drakensberg, KZN, South Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294668 GU256862</td>
<td>Thesium gracile 4 A.W.Hill</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Nowell s.n., BOL</td>
<td>Sani Pass, KZN, South Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294635 GU256820</td>
<td>Thesium hispidulum Lam.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Louw 9440, BOL</td>
<td>Tulbagh Valley, WC, South Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294604</td>
<td>Thesium humifusum 1 DC.</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Fay s.n., K</td>
<td>Sierra Nevada, Spain (Kew DNA bank 3687)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294602 GU256780</td>
<td>Thesium humifusum 2 DC.</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Chase 1881, K</td>
<td>Sierra Nevada, Spain (Kew DNA bank 1881)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294674</td>
<td>Thesium humile Vahl</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Abd el Ghani sn, K</td>
<td>No locality (Kew DNA bank 1858)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU256810</td>
<td>Thesium imbricatum Thunb.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Trinder-Smith 423, BOL</td>
<td>Drakensberg, KZN, South Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294598 GU256776</td>
<td>Thesium impressum Steud. ex A.DC.</td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Davis 23148, K</td>
<td>Van Dist., Turkey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU256834</td>
<td>Thesium juncifolium 1 DC.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Musaya&amp;Striton 4081, BOL</td>
<td>WC, South Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294653 GU256846</td>
<td>Thesium juncifolium 2 DC.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Moore 62, BOL</td>
<td>Grootvadersbos, WC, South Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## APPENDIX Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>trnL-trnF</th>
<th>ITS</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th>Voucher</th>
<th>Collection locality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GU294675</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thesium juncifolium 3</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Moore 54, BOL</td>
<td>Grootvadersbos, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294624</td>
<td>GU256804</td>
<td>Thesium leptocaule</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Forest 768, NBG</td>
<td>Baviaanskloof, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294638</td>
<td>GU256823</td>
<td>Thesium lopollense</td>
<td>Tropical Africa</td>
<td>ANGOLA 1959, BOL</td>
<td>Southern Angola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU206839</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thesium macrostachyum 1 A.DC.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Moore 140, BOL</td>
<td>Baardskeerdersbosch, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294656</td>
<td>GU256849</td>
<td>Thesium macrostachyum 2 A.DC.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Moore 166, BOL</td>
<td>Grootwinterhoek Mts, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294657</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thesium macrostachyum 3 A.DC.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Moore 168, BOL</td>
<td>Grootwinterhoek Mts, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294612</td>
<td>GU256789</td>
<td>Thesium nanaquense</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Forest 896, NBG</td>
<td>Spektakel Pass, NC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294643</td>
<td>GU256829</td>
<td>Thesium nigrumontaneum</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Forest 702, NBG</td>
<td>Potberg, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294633</td>
<td>GU256818</td>
<td>Thesium nudicaule</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Louw 12249, BOL</td>
<td>WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294636</td>
<td>GU256821</td>
<td>Thesium paniculatum L. A.W.Hill</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Moore 23, BOL</td>
<td>Pilaarkop, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294641</td>
<td>GU256827</td>
<td>Thesium patulum A.W.Hill</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Evans 25/11/08/1, BOL</td>
<td>Stellenbosch, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294629</td>
<td>GU256814</td>
<td>Thesium penicillatum</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Verboom 1140, BOL</td>
<td>Hottentots Hollands NR, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294620</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thesium pinifolium A.DC.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Moore 43, BOL</td>
<td>Thumb Peak, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294651</td>
<td>GU256842</td>
<td>Thesium polycephalum 1 Schltr.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Verboom 1142, BOL</td>
<td>Springbok, NC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294613</td>
<td>GU256790</td>
<td>Thesium polycephalum 2 Schltr.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Forest 911, NBG</td>
<td>Spektakel Pass, NC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294672</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thesium procumbens C.A.Mey.</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Watson et al. 1644, K</td>
<td>Erzurum, Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294648</td>
<td>GU256835</td>
<td>Thesium pseudoavirgatum</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Britton 1904/084, BOL</td>
<td>Jonkershoek, Cape Town, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294682</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thesium pubescens DC.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Forest CP 4, NBG</td>
<td>Cape Peninsula, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294628</td>
<td>GU256812</td>
<td>Thesium pungens A.W.Hill</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Verboom 1340, BOL</td>
<td>Namaqualand, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294617</td>
<td>GU256797</td>
<td>Thesium pycananthum</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Britton 1904/082, BOL</td>
<td>Jonkershoek, Cape Town, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294601</td>
<td>GU256779</td>
<td>Thesium radicans Hohen. ex A.DC.</td>
<td>Tropical Africa</td>
<td>Collenette 8173, K</td>
<td>Jabal Qahar, Saudi Arabia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294684</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thesium rariflorum Sond.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Moore 100, BOL</td>
<td>Houwshoek, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294608</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thesium scabrum L.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Moore 155, BOL</td>
<td>Camps Bay, Cape Town, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294605</td>
<td>GU256782</td>
<td>Thesium schweinfurthii Engl.</td>
<td>Tropical Africa</td>
<td>Malaisse 13645, K</td>
<td>Kasungami, Zaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294607</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thesium sedifolium A.DC.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Moore 146, BOL</td>
<td>Baardskeerdersbosch, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294676</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thesium sertulariastum A.W.Hill</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Moore 45, BOL</td>
<td>Prince Alberts Pass, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294645</td>
<td>GU256831</td>
<td>Thesium sp 1</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Moore 16, BOL</td>
<td>Sir Lowry’s Pass, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294658</td>
<td>GU256851</td>
<td>Thesium sp 2</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Verboom 1290, BOL</td>
<td>Du Toits Kloof Mountains, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294642</td>
<td>GU256828</td>
<td>Thesium spicum 1 L.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Forest 950, NBG</td>
<td>Landrooskop, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294644</td>
<td>GU256830</td>
<td>Thesium spicum 2 L.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Forest 850, NBG</td>
<td>Prince Albert’s Pass, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX  Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>trnL-trnF</th>
<th>ITS</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th>Voucher</th>
<th>Collection locality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GU294660</td>
<td>GU256853</td>
<td><em>Thesium spicatum</em> 3 L.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Verboom 1300, BOL</td>
<td>Betty's Bay, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU256805</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Thesium spinosum</em> L.f.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Moore 114, BOL</td>
<td>De Hoop NR, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294627</td>
<td>GU256811</td>
<td><em>Thesium spinulosum</em> A.DC.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Moore 148, BOL</td>
<td>Baardskeerdersbosch, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294610</td>
<td>GU256787</td>
<td><em>Thesium squarrosum</em> L.f.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Forest 851, NBG</td>
<td>Uniondale, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU256813</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Thesium strictum</em> 1 P.J.Bergius</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Forest 668, NBG</td>
<td>Table Mountain, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294622</td>
<td>GU256802</td>
<td><em>Thesium strictum</em> 2 P.J.Bergius</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Moore 48, BOL</td>
<td>Prince Alberts Pass, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294677</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Thesium strictum</em> 3 P.J.Bergius</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Verboom 1295, BOL</td>
<td>Betty's Bay, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294622</td>
<td>GU256817</td>
<td><em>Thesium subnudum</em> 1 Sond.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Louw 9563, BOL</td>
<td>Tulbagh Valley, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU256837</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Thesium subnudum</em> 2 Sond.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Moore 96, BOL</td>
<td>Kogelberg, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU256795</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Thesium translucens</em> Sond.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Britton 1904/083, BOL</td>
<td>Jonkershoek, Cape Town, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294611</td>
<td>GU256788</td>
<td><em>Thesium triflorum</em> Thunb. ex L.f.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Moore 128, BOL</td>
<td>Graaf Reinet, EC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU256838</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Thesium virgatum</em> 1 Lam.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Moore 14, BOL</td>
<td>Harold Porter BG, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294625</td>
<td>GU256806</td>
<td><em>Thesium virgatum</em> 2 Lam.</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Verboom 1153, BOL</td>
<td>Ramannasieberg, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU294616</td>
<td>GU256793</td>
<td><em>Thesium viridifolium</em> Levyns</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Forest 680, NBG</td>
<td>Cape Peninsula, WC, South Africa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ITS, internal transcribed spacer.*