

1 **120 years of untangling the divaricate habit: a review**

2 Kévin J. L. Maurin^{a*} & Christopher H. Lusk^b

3 *^aSchool of Science, The University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand; ^bEnvironmental*
4 *Research Institute, The University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand*

5 **The University of Waikato – School of Science, Private Bag 3105, Hamilton 3240, New*
6 *Zealand, kjlm1@students.waikato.ac.nz*

120 years of untangling the divaricate habit: a review

The evolution of divaricate plants in New Zealand has been the subject of long-running debate among botanists and ecologists. Hypotheses about this remarkable case of convergent evolution have focused mainly on two different types of selective pressures: the Pliocene advent of cool, dry climates, or browsing by now-extinct moa. Here, we review the scientific literature relating to the New Zealand divaricates, and present a list of 81 taxa whose architectures fall on the divaricate habit spectrum. We recommend a series of standardised terms to facilitate clear communication about these species. We identify potentially informative areas of research yet to be explored, such as the genetics underlying the establishment and control of this habit. We also review work about similar plants overseas, proposing a list of 47 such species as a first step towards more comprehensive inventories; these may motivate further studies of the ecology, morphology and evolutionary history of these overseas plants which could help shed light on the evolution of their New Zealand counterparts. Finally, we compile published divergence dates between divaricate species and their non-divaricate relatives, which suggest that the divaricate habit is fairly recent (< 10 My) in most cases.

Keywords: convergent evolution; divaricating shrubs; heteroblasty; moa; New Zealand; structural plant defences

Introduction

The earliest mention we have found of what we call today the “divaricating plants” or the “divaricates” was made in 1896 by German botanist Ludwig Diels. He described them as “systematically distant descendants of the New Zealand forest flora that converged towards a xerophytic structure” (Diels 1896, pp. 246-247, translated from German). These plants are a collection of shrubs and early growth stages of heteroblastic trees bearing small leaves on tangled branches diverging at wide angles. He expresses surprise at seeing apparently drought-adapted species in climates that are generally more humid than in his native Central Europe, where plants do not show similar architectures.

Such a case of convergent evolution naturally attracted much attention from local and overseas botanists and ecologists. The centre of this attention was to identify putative selective forces that may have driven the evolution of the divaricates. Diels (1896) initially proposed drought as the main selective factor, and McGlone & Webb (1981) considered that frost and wind might also have been important. The climatic hypothesis remained largely unchallenged until

Greenwood & Atkinson (1977) developed the moa-browsing hypothesis that several authors had previously hinted at (e.g. Denny 1964; Carlquist 1974; Taylor 1975), igniting a passionate debate that is still ongoing today. Concurrently, a non-selective evolution process was proposed by Went (1971): the horizontal transfer of “divaricate” genes; it however received strong criticism on theoretical grounds (Tucker 1974; Greenwood & Atkinson 1977) and has not been empirically investigated so far.

Rationale for and content of this review

Although about 120 years have passed since the first publications on the topic, the real debate around the evolution of the divaricates only started in the late 1970s. Yet, no recent literature review (e.g. Wilson & Lee 2012) offers an exhaustive account of all the scientific material published about these plants. The aim of this review is to provide a comprehensive resource for anyone with an interest in divaricate plants.

First, we review past attempts at defining the divaricate habit and describing its variability in New Zealand. We propose a series of terms to try to standardise the vocabulary to be used when discussing these species (in bold in the text). We also report and discuss observations of divaricate-like species overseas, compiling a list of such occurrences.

We then review the published hypotheses that have been formulated to explain how such a diversity of architectures was selected in the New Zealand flora. We also report a recent new hypothesis that attempts to unify the ideas of the two main hypotheses that have been put forward: the combined effects of past climates and moa browsing.

Finally, we examine the handful of studies that, rather than focusing on the evolution of these species, have looked at developmental aspects of these peculiar architectures. We conclude our review by pointing out new areas of research that might enhance our understanding of divaricate plants.

Characterising the diversity of divaricating habits: variations of a New Zealand theme

Past attempts at defining the divaricate “syndrome” in New Zealand

“Divaricate” comes from a Latin root meaning “stretched apart”, which in botany refers to the usually wide angle at which branches of these species grow from the stem on which they originate. Indeed, the branching angle of divaricating species is on average more than 70°, sometimes over 90° (Bulmer 1958; Greenwood & Atkinson 1977), whereas their broadleaved relatives branch on

average at $< 55^\circ$ (Kelly 1994). However, simplifying the definition of a divaricate species by its branching angle is misleading: Pott & McLoughlin (2014) and Pott et al. (2015) discussed the evolutionary adaptations of shrub or low-growing tree species of the extinct gymnosperm family Williamsoniaceae by making a parallel between them and New Zealand divaricates, claiming that they share similar architectures. Although the species they described undeniably branched at wide angles, they did not look anything like what New Zealand researchers call “divaricates”: they bore much larger leaves (4-25 cm long, cf. < 2 cm in most New Zealand divaricates), and their branches were not interlaced. Likewise, many examples of extant species can be cited as having wide branching angles while not satisfying the definition of a divaricate, e.g. *Araucaria heterophylla* (Salisb.) Franco or *Piper excelsum* (G.Forst.). Indeed, the divaricate syndrome in New Zealand is also defined by a collection of other traits, including: small leaves (leptophyll and nanophyll classes of Raunkiær 1934); relatively long internodes compared to the size of their leaves (Kelly 1994 and references therein, Maurin & Lusk in review, although some species show “short-shoot development” (Tomlinson 1978), i.e. clusters of leaves resulting from a mass of very short internodes); interlaced and abundant branching. The exact set of features used to define the habit however varies among authors (Kelly 1994; Grierson 2014; see Appendix 1 for a list of traits used by past authors). Finally, New Zealand divaricates are notably lacking in spines, except for *Discaria toumatou* Raoul which has spinescent congeners in Australia and South America. Some divaricating species, such as *Melicytus alpinus* (Kirk) Garn.-Jones and *Aristotelia fruticosa* Hook.f., have been considered spinescent by some authors (e.g. Greenwood & Atkinson 1977; Burns 2016), but we argue that their pointed branchlets are not sharp enough to pierce the skin and therefore probably did not have the same adaptive value as actual wounding spines or thorns.

Because the divaricate habit has evolved independently multiple times in the New Zealand flora, this syndrome appears under different structural forms that were tentatively grouped by various authors to form classifications. Bell (2008) recognised four branching pattern types in divaricate species: branching at wide angles (e.g. *Aristotelia fruticosa*), zig-zagging by sympodial (e.g. juvenile form of *Elaeocarpus hookerianus* Raoul) or monopodial (e.g. *Muehlenbeckia astonii* Petrie) growth, and “fastigate”. The use of “fastigate” (meaning narrow branching angles) to categorise divaricate plants may seem paradoxical, but Bell's (2008) example, *Melicytus alpinus*, sometimes does show a fastigate habit in shaded habitats. In our experience, however, in sunny environments *M. alpinus* has wider branching angles and is compactly interlaced. Tomlinson (1978) tried to assign divaricate species to Hallé et al.'s (1978) architectural models, without

success. Halloy (1990) defined five groups based on branching patterns and assigned one species per group as examples, but his proposal has been largely ignored.

These variations around the features which characterise the divaricate habit led Wardle & McGlone (1988) to propose the word “filiramulate” to describe lianes and shrubs with reduced apical buds that have some (but not all) of the traits usually regarded as integral to the divaricate habit. These reduced buds exert a weakened apical dominance (Wardle & McGlone 1988), and thus do not prevent the outgrowth of lateral branches. Hence, this term emphasises the wiry branches that may be flexuose to truly divaricating. Divaricate plants are therefore seen as a subset of filiramulate species, and some species that appear clearly divaricate in open areas tend to adopt a more lax habit when growing in the shade, (Philipson 1963; Christian et al. 2006; pers. obs.) best described as “filiramulate” (Wardle 1991).

The lack of a consensus word-based definition of the divaricate habit led to two attempts to find a mathematical quantification of divaricateness. Atkinson (1992) focused on branch density (number of lateral branches subtended per cm of main branch) and branching angle; Kelly (1994) also focused on branching angle, and included leaf size and density (relative width of leaves to the size of the internodes that bear them). Although these two indices emphasise different features of the divaricate habit, they correlate well for New Zealand species (Kelly 1994; Grierson 2014). In spite of these indices, which are rarely used in the literature, consensus definitions of the divaricate habit and its variations are still lacking.

The peculiar case of heteroblastic divaricate species

Although most of the species showing the divaricate habit keep it their whole life, some heteroblastic species produce a divaricating form early in life, then later switch to a non-divaricating form (Cockayne 1958). Very few quantitative data exist regarding the age before the non-divaricating form appears (Table 1), which may depend on the degree of exposure to sunlight in many cases (Cockayne 1958), or even on latitude at least in *Sophora microphylla* Aiton (Godley 1979). We propose referring to them as **heteroblastic divaricate** species; the term “habit-heteroblastic” used by Philipson (1963) for such species is inadequate as it does not mention “divaricate”, and the juvenile and adults forms of some heteroblastic divaricate species do not only differ in habit but also in leaf shape (e.g. *Pennantia corymbosa* J.R.Forst. & G.Forst.). Both forms often coexist on the same individual at least for some time, and the transition can be abrupt (“metamorphic” species (Ray 1990), such as in *Pennantia corymbosa*; see Figure 1 in Supplementary Material), or gradual with transitional forms between the divaricating bottom and

133 the non-divaricating top of the plant (“allomorphic” species (Ray 1990), such as in *Hoheria*
134 *sexstylosa* Colenso). Day et al. (1997), studying the transition of the heteroblastic divaricate
135 *Elaeocarpus hookerianus* from its juvenile form to its adult form, described a distinctive
136 transitional form characterised by a less plastic growth pattern than the juvenile form, while not
137 showing the morphological attributes that identify the adult form.

Species	Duration of the juvenile form	Reference
<i>Elaeocarpus hookerianus</i> Raoul	At least 60 years, depends on light conditions (based on field observations and/or review of evidence?)	Cockayne (1958)
<i>Prumnopitys taxifolia</i> (D.Don) de Laub.	(1) Up to 60 years (based on field observations and/or review of evidence?) (2) At least 47 years (based on ring counts)	(1) Dawson & Lucas (2012) (2) Lusk (1989)
<i>Sophora microphylla</i> Aiton	(1) ca. 15 years (based on field observations and/or review of evidence?) (2) variable according to location: from absence of juvenile form in some parts of the North Island, to ca. 3.5 years in the Auckland region and at least 23 years in the south-east of the South Island (based on field observations and a common garden experiment)	(1) Cockayne (1958) (2) Godley (1979)

138 Table 1: Published quantitative measurements and estimations of the age reached by
139 heteroblastic divaricate species before their adult form appears.

140 The ubiquitous use in the literature of the adjectives “juvenile” and “adult” (sometimes
141 “mature”) to name, respectively, the early divaricating form and the ultimate non-divaricating form
142 of heteroblastic divaricate species, is potentially misleading. Jones (1999) criticised the use of
143 “juvenile” to describe early forms of heteroblastic species because it better characterises a phase
144 of plant development that is incapable of sexual reproduction. She therefore suggested that
145 “juvenile” should be restricted to non-flowering stages of heteroblastic species. Yet, it was
146 observed in New Zealand that the early form of some heteroblastic divaricate species are capable
147 of flowering, such as those of *Pennantia corymbosa* (Beddie 1958; Cockayne 1958) or *Plagianthus*
148 *regius* (Poit.) Hochr. subsp. *regius* (Cockayne 1958): they should therefore not be termed
149 “juvenile”. However, alternative terms such as “young” and “old” carry ambiguities of their own,
150 so it is not obvious to us how to improve upon “juvenile” and “adult”, which have become deeply
151 anchored in the literature. We however recommend the use of **juvenile/adult form** instead of the
152 more commonly used juvenile/adult “stage” or “phase” to avoid the confusion between growth
153 habit and reproductive state that Jones (1999) pointed out.

Two hypotheses have been proposed to try to explain the origin of heteroblastic divaricate species:

(1) Hybridisation between a divaricate species and a non-divaricate relative

It is well known that some divaricate species hybridise with broadleaved congeners (e.g. Dansereau 1964; see lists of known (and potential) hybrids compiled by Cockayne 1923, Cockayne & Allan 1934 and Greenwood & Atkinson 1977). These hybridisation events were hence proposed as a source for the origin of heteroblastic divaricate species (Godley 1979; Godley 1985). Carrodus (2009) addressed the question of whether *Pittosporum turneri* Petrie, a heteroblastic divaricate small tree, is a hybrid between *Pittosporum divaricatum* Cockayne, a divaricating shrub, and *Pittosporum colensoi* Hook.f., a broadleaved tree. The study used plastid and nuclear DNA markers as well as a morphological analysis and found evidence supportive of such an event, e.g. that *P. turneri* shows an ISSR band and morphological traits (for example in leaves, flowers and fruits) that combine those of the putative parents. They however suggested more investigation: their cross-pollination experiments between *P. divaricatum* and *P. colensoi* did not produce progeny, and given the limitations of the ISSR technique they recommend using more nuclear markers in more individuals. Shepherd et al. (2017) and Heenan et al. (2018) used chloroplast DNA and microsatellite markers respectively to study hybridisation and introgression events in New Zealand *Sophora* L.: even though their findings showed that these species hybridise readily, they reported little support for the hypothesis that the heteroblastic divaricate species *Sophora microphylla* arose through hybridisation between the divaricate species *Sophora prostrata* Buchanan and the non-divaricate species *Sophora tetraptera* J.F.Mill.

However, as Godley (1985) makes explicit, his hypothesis allows for multiple generations after an initial hybridisation and for selection of the heteroblastic divaricate form from a variable population of hybrid derivatives (such as a hybrid swarm). Therefore, genetic signal of a hybrid origin might be weak and difficult to detect in studies employing only modest numbers of genetic markers.

(2) Neotenous loss of a putative adult non-divaricate form

A mirror image of the previous hypothesis, this hypothesis states that divaricate species arose from heteroblastic divaricate ancestors which later lost their forest-adapted adult form in response to new selective pressures in more open environments. It was first suggested by Cockayne

(1911, p. 25–26; 1958, p. 141) and further developed by Day (1998a). It is difficult to see how to test such a hypothesis, which may explain why it has not been the subject of published research so far.

The divaricate habit in New Zealand and overseas

Variations of the divaricate habit are found in ca. 81 taxa in New Zealand (Appendix 2), including heteroblastic divaricate taxa. 80 are Eudicots, one is a Gymnosperm, and they represent 20 families. According to statistics about the New Zealand vascular flora produced by De Lange et al. (2006), this number represents almost 13% of indigenous woody spermatophytes. We refer to all these species as **divaricates**, a term that encompasses architectures that fall on a spectrum with two extremes. On one end, there are the **true divaricates** (or **truly divaricating** species), i.e. species with the most characteristic traits of the syndrome (such as tightly interlaced tough branches with relatively long internodes compared to leaf size, and leaves < 2 cm in length); typically shrubs that are common in open environments such as forest margins. On the other end of the spectrum are the **filiramulates**, a term first coined by Wardle & McGlone (1988), and later adapted by Wardle (1991); these are species with traits that are not as typical as the traits of the true divaricates, such as slender branches in a more open architecture, and larger leaves. Sometimes “semi-divaricate” is found in the literature to describe filiramulate species (e.g. Cockayne 1958; Dawson 1988), but we find the word filiramulate *sensu* Wardle (1991) more appropriate. Furthermore, we use the term **divaricate habit** to refer to the syndrome as a phenomenon, which manifests itself through a variety of architectures that we will refer to as **divaricating habits**.

Although divaricates are present in a wide range of environments throughout New Zealand, several environmental patterns in their abundance have been noted. They can be found in most forest types and successional shrublands (Wardle 1991), from the coast to alpine environments (Greenwood & Atkinson 1977). Divaricates have been reported as especially common in open environments such as forest margins (McGlone & Webb 1981), though relevant quantitative data are lacking. The percentage of divaricate species in woody assemblages increases from north to south (McGlone et al. 2010). Quantitative analyses have shown strong associations with frosty (and to some extent, droughty) climates such as are typical of the eastern South Island (Lusk et al. 2016; Garrity & Lusk 2017) where notably divaricate species often comprise the majority of arborescent assemblages (Lusk et al. 2016). It has been stated that divaricates are commonest on fertile young soils, such as those derived from recent alluviums or volcanic ashes (Greenwood &

Atkinson 1977; McGlone et al. 2004). Consistent with this proposal, the largest known concentrations of divaricate species occur on alluvial terraces derived from mudstone in the Rangitikei and Gisborne areas (Clarkson & Clarkson 1994). However, an analysis of > 1,000 plots by Lusk et al. (2016) did not detect a significant association with terraces, or with any other topographic position.

Even though broadly similar plants occur in many other regions of the world, few of them show the full range of traits that are typical of New Zealand divaricates. Species showing aspects of the divaricate habit were reported for example in Madagascar (Grubb 2003; “wire plants” of Bond & Silander 2007), Patagonia (Wardle & McGlone 1988; McQueen 2000) or South America in general (Böcher 1977), Australia and Tasmania (Bulmer 1958; Mitchell et al. 2009; Thompson 2010; Stajsic et al. 2015), Arizona and California in the USA (Carlquist 1974; Tucker 1974) and New Guinea (Lloyd 1985). If some of the reported species and their close relatives may show a branching pattern similar to what is seen in New Zealand divaricates, they often present rather large leaves. This is for example the case with the North American *Quercus dunni* Kellogg ex Curran, reported by Tucker (1974), and the South African shrub species with dense, cage-like architectures studied by Charles-Dominique et al. (2017). Most overseas divaricate-like plants also differ notably from most New Zealand divaricates by the presence of wounding spines. A striking example is the African boxthorn (*Lycium ferocissimum* Miers; see Figure 2 in Supplementary Material), a South African species naturalised in New Zealand, which has tough interlaced branches similar to those of some New Zealand divaricates but bears sharp spines. However, this spinescence can sometimes be rather weak, for example in Australian species of *Coprosma* J.R.Forst. & G.Forst. (Thompson 2010) and *Melicytus* J.R.Forst. & G.Forst. (Stajsic et al. 2015). There are however some overseas divaricate look-alikes that show the same traits as New Zealand divaricates, for example *Tetracoccus hallii* Brandege (Picrodendraceae), a non-spiny shrub with seemingly tough, interlaced branches, branching at wide angles and bearing small leaves (descriptions and pictures from SEINet Portal Network 2020 and Calflora 2020) from south-west USA (distribution data from GBIF 2020 and Calscape 2020).

We propose a list of the species that the studies cited above claim as “divaricate” and that we agree do resemble the architectural models we see in New Zealand divaricates (Appendix 3). We suggest the name **divaricate-like** to describe these species in order to emphasise their resemblance with New Zealand divaricates, yet stressing the fact that they often present distinguishing features (discussed above) and that they evolved in environmental conditions that

were somewhat different from those experienced by the ancestors of New Zealand divaricates (reviewed below).

A review of the theories around the evolution of the New Zealand divaricates

The climatic hypothesis

A history of New Zealand's climate and its putative effect on the evolution of the divaricates

The origins of the New Zealand archipelago have been dated to about 82 Mya (Wallis & Trewick 2009), when the mostly submerged continent of Zealandia separated from the supercontinent Gondwana; it however became an isolated archipelago only ca. 65 Mya (Wallis & Trewick 2009). Since the break with Gondwana, New Zealand climates have undergone wide-ranging changes. There is some debate as to the climate of the Upper Cretaceous: some argue this period was probably warmer than today (e.g. Fleming 1975), others that it was similar to present-day climates (e.g. Mildenhall 1980; Kennedy 2003). Hornibrook's (1992) review of marine fossil evidence indicates mostly subtropical climates during the Paleogene, although a sudden cooling event may have occurred around the Eocene-Oligocene boundary; temperatures then warmed to a local peak around 16 Mya, during the Miocene; the climate remained subtropical until a Late Miocene cooling, with further cooling from the Pliocene. The combined effects of this global cooling and of the rapid uplift of the Southern Alps during the Kaikoura Orogeny (Batt et al. 2000) created local frosty and droughty environments, especially in the eastern South Island. These new climates are likely to have reduced plant growth on many sites (Lusk et al. 2016), as shown by comparisons of juvenile annual height growth rates on modern sites that differ in growing season length (Bussell 1968; Anton et al. 2015).

Besides these climatic variations, a progressive submergence greatly reduced the extent of the New Zealand landmass from the Upper Cretaceous to the Early Miocene (85–22 Mya; Landis et al. 2008), reaching a peak around 25–23 Mya known as the Oligocene marine transgression (Cooper 1989). Landis et al. (2008) argued that, at that time, New Zealand might have been completely submerged. A complete submergence would imply that the current terrestrial flora must be descended from plants that re-colonised from no earlier than 22 Mya, which is the time when terrestrial habitats would have reappeared (Landis et al. 2008), and thus would be originated solely from long-distance dispersal from neighbouring landmasses (e.g. Pole 1994). However, geological and paleobiological evidence seem to argue against a complete drowning of New

Zealand during the Late Oligocene (reviewed by Mildenhall et al. 2014); it has been estimated that the surface of the New Zealand mainland was about 18% of its present-day surface area (Cooper & Cooper 1995). Moreover, recent evidence based on molecular dating of the age of New Zealand lineages strongly suggest that some extant terrestrial plant and animal groups are most likely originated from a Gondwanan vicariance, further contradicting the hypothesis of complete submergence of New Zealand (Wallis & Jorge 2018; Heenan & McGlone 2019).

Diels (1896) was the first to hypothesise an important role of Pleistocene climate in shaping the modern New Zealand flora, and as far as we are aware his work is the first attempt to explain the evolution of the divaricate habit. He proposed that, by reducing transpiration, the divaricate habit helped plants cope with droughty climates created in the eastern South Island by the uplift of the Southern Alps. Cockayne (1911) proposed that the divaricate form was a response to past windy and droughty Pleistocene steppe climates, especially in the South Island. Similarly, Rattenbury (1962) hypothesised that the divaricate habit was an adaptation to dry or cool Pleistocene climates, and suggested an effect of the cage-like architecture as a windbreak, reducing transpiration. Wardle (1963) suggested that the divaricate habit continues to be adaptive in the present-day drier forest and shrub environments of eastern New Zealand.

McGlone & Webb (1981) further developed the climatic hypothesis, joining the debate started by Greenwood and Atkinson with the moa-browsing hypothesis (Greenwood & Atkinson 1977; see next section). They suggested that the divaricate habit represents the response of the “largely subtropical” Tertiary flora of the isolated New Zealand archipelago to the near-treeless glacial periods of the Pleistocene; this habit may have protected growing points and leaves from wind abrasion, desiccation and frost damage, which occurred unpredictably in the weakly seasonal New Zealand climates of the Quaternary. McGlone & Webb (1981) also argued that the cage-like architecture of the divaricate habit also provides a milder microclimate within the plant which promotes higher rates of photosynthesis. The transition from the juvenile form to the adult form in heteroblastic divaricate species occurs above the height of the most damaging frosts during temperature inversions on clear nights, and the absence of the habit on offshore and outlying islands can be explained by their more oceanic, hence milder and less frosty, climates. Burns & Dawson (2009) however noted that the heteroblastic divaricate species *Plagianthus regius* from the mainland has a heteroblastic divaricate subspecies (*P. regius* subsp. *chathamicus* (Cockayne) de Lange) on the historically avian-browser-free Chatham Islands: they propose that, because *P. regius* is a recent immigrant on the Chatham Islands, its juvenile form has not been counter-selected yet.

The climatic factors suggested as selective forces are certainly not peculiar to New Zealand, whereas divaricate-like forms are much less common in other regions with similar climates (Dawson 1963). McGlone & Webb (1981) argued that what made New Zealand unique in the evolution of its subtropical flora in response to the cold, dry and windswept environments that appeared during the Quaternary is that its isolation from sources of steppe-adapted floras might have provided plants with more conventional physio-morphological responses to such climates. Nonetheless, if wind was one of the drivers of the evolution of the divaricate habit, it is strange that few divaricate species are found in some very windy parts of New Zealand (Greenwood & Atkinson 1977): although they are often prominent in the vegetation of windswept areas such as Cook Strait (Wardle 1985), they present a low species richness there (Gillham 1960).

The photoprotection variant of the climatic hypothesis

Howell et al. (2002, see also Howell 1999), proposed that the shading of inner leaves by the cage-like divaricate architecture protects them from high irradiance on cold mornings after frosts, thus minimising photoinhibition and photodamage. It is a derivative of the climatic hypothesis that includes the effect of solar radiation as a selective pressure under stressfully cold climatic conditions. Howell et al. (2002) tested this hypothesis with an experiment involving the pruning of the outer branches of three divaricate species, which resulted in a reduced photosynthetic capacity of the inner leaves of these shrubs for at least 3 months. This experiment was criticised by Lusk (2002), who pointed out that the failure to include non-divaricate species as a control undermined the authors' conclusions: without further research, we cannot know if non-divaricate plants would respond in a similar way to pruning of their outer branches.

Empirical appraisal of the climatic hypothesis

Experimental tests have produced little support for the climatic hypothesis. Although past climatic conditions cannot be reliably reproduced in a controlled experiment, it is possible to estimate the differential response of divaricate and non-divaricate species when they are subjected to present-day climatic conditions similar to those hypothesised to have selected the divaricate habit during the Pleistocene.

Kelly & Ogle (1990) were the first to publish a test of the response of divaricating architectures to climatic conditions. They studied the effect of air temperature, humidity, frost and wind on internal and external leaves of a divaricate species and both juvenile and adult forms of a heteroblastic divaricate species. While they did not show a significant difference in leaf

temperature and air humidity between the inside and the outside of the divaricate architecture, they did show that the habit provides some protection against frost.

Keey & Lind (1997) used four species showing various divaricating habits to test the effect of different branching architectures on the surrounding airflow patterns. Although they did not compare these species to non-divaricate species, they showed that dense branching patterns produce calmer zones, which may imply that they create a more favourable growing environment for leaves and other fragile organs by reducing wind damages.

Darrow and colleagues compared the frost resistance (2001) and water loss (2002) of isolated leaves and short pieces of shoots of juvenile and adult forms of heteroblastic species, most of them divaricate at a juvenile stage. However, their 2001 experiment did not provide an actual test of the hypothesis they studied (i.e. that the divaricate habit provides a resistance against frost) because they only recorded the frost tolerance of leaf tissues; neither did their 2002 experiment, as they studied water loss of fully rehydrated short portions of shoots which hence did not represent the response of the complete divaricate architecture to drought. In a similar vein to Darrow et al. (2001), Bannister et al. (1995) studied the evolution of frost resistance of detached leaves of some divaricate and non-divaricate *Pittosporum* Banks & Sol. ex Gaertn. species over the course of autumn and winter. For the same reason as Darrow et al. (2001) this study does not provide a test of the adaptive advantage of the divaricate habit to frost.

A test of the photoprotection hypothesis was provided by Christian et al. (2006), who compared carbon gain versus structural costs of three congeneric pairs of divaricate and non-divaricate species under different intensities of light exposure. They showed that the costs of the divaricate architecture may be too high to be compensated by the photoprotection it provides, although they did not subject their samples to especially stressfully cold temperatures. In parallel, Schneiderheinze (2006) studied photoinhibition in divaricate and non-divaricate species under high light loads and other stressful conditions, such as drought. She found plants of both habits showed similar levels of photoinhibition under high irradiance, whether the plants were water-stressed or not. Here again, the hypothesis as formulated by Howell et al. (2002; i.e. protection from photoinhibition under cold conditions) was not tested, but the study still provided a valuable insight into the absence of significant photoprotection in divaricate species compared to their non-divaricate relatives.

Recently, an observational approach was taken by Lusk et al. (2016), who examined the environmental correlates of the proportion of divaricate species in arborescent assemblages throughout the main islands of New Zealand. They concluded that divaricate species are generally

more diverse and prominent at frosty and droughty sites. Garrity & Lusk (2017) also used an observational approach by correlating climatic data with the distribution of 12 congeneric pairs of divaricate and larger-leaved species of the main islands of New Zealand. They found that divaricate species were significantly favoured by colder mean annual temperatures, and especially by colder minimum July temperature, but there was little evidence of an association with droughtier environments. Their results also showed little support for the photoprotection hypothesis, as the divaricate species tended to predominate in cold environments irrespective of winter solar radiation levels. These two different observational approaches concur in showing that short frost-free periods and cold climates in general favour the abundance and diversity of divaricate species, but do not quite agree on the effect of drought. Given the limited number of species encompassed by Garrity & Lusk (2017), as well as evidence that the largest concentrations of divaricate species occur on middle North Island sites subject to significant water deficits (Clarkson & Clarkson 1994), the balance of the evidence indicates that both frost and drought favour divaricate species.

Finally, a key component of the divaricate habit is small leaf size, which is known to be advantageous under harsh climates. A study by Lusk et al. (2018) compared leaf temperature during clear winter nights in relation to leaf size for 15 native New Zealand species, including four congeneric pairs of divaricate and non-divaricate species. They observed that small leaves chilled significantly less than large leaves. Their conclusions provide experimental support to leaf energy balance theory, which predicts that large leaves should be more vulnerable to frost because they cool below air temperatures on frosty nights whereas the smallest leaves stay close to air temperature (Parkhurst & Loucks 1972; Wright et al. 2017). Although this effect does not explain the three-dimensional structure of the divaricate habit, it suggests that the characteristically small leaves of divaricates may have provided an adaptive value in open habitats with short annual frost-free periods (see also Lusk & Clearwater 2015, a similar but less conclusive study on a smaller scale). Additionally, a study of the relationship between leaf dimensions and environmental variables in South African species of Proteaceae concluded that small leaves promotes convective heat dissipation under dry conditions and limited wind, enabling them to avoid overheating when water shortage forces stomatal closure (Yates et al. 2010). This effect was confirmed on Australian Proteaceae by Leigh et al. (2017). The small size of the leaves of most divaricates may therefore enable them to cope with drought better than large-leaved competitors.

406 *The moa-browsing hypothesis*

407 *The moa of New Zealand and their putative effect on the evolution of the divaricates*

408 “Moa” is the Māori name for a group of now-extinct large (1-3 m and 10-250 kg; Atkinson &
 409 Greenwood 1989; Worthy & Holdaway 2002) flightless birds (“ratites”) of the endemic order
 410 Dinornithiformes. Nine species are currently recognised, belonging to six genera and three families
 411 (Worthy & Scofield 2012). There are several hypotheses about how the ancestors of moa reached
 412 New Zealand (Allentoft & Rawlence 2012): they may have inhabited the New Zealand landmass
 413 from the time it started to separate from Gondwana about 80 Mya (the “Moa’s Ark” of Brewster
 414 1987); alternatively their ancestors might have reached New Zealand either by walking before
 415 60 Mya, when the New Zealand landmass was still connected to a disintegrating Gondwana, or by
 416 flying after the complete separation. This last possibility is consistent with recent molecular
 417 evidence that the closest living relatives of moa appear to be tinamous (Phillips et al. 2010;
 418 Mitchell et al. 2014), a group of volant birds. If the earliest ancestors of moa to inhabit Zealandia
 419 were volant, fossil evidence suggest that their descendants have been large flightless birds since at
 420 least 16-19 My ago (Tennyson et al. 2010). All moa species were extinct by about the mid-15th
 421 century CE (Perry et al. 2014), apparently because of hunting (Allentoft et al. 2014).

422 Moa subfossil remains are more common on the South Island than on the North Island
 423 (Anderson 1989); moreover, they are more concentrated in the east of the South Island (Anderson
 424 1989). However, this does not necessarily mean that moa were more abundant in the eastern South
 425 Island than elsewhere in the country, since the subfossil record is probably influenced by
 426 preservation biases: natural moa bone deposits are mainly in alkaline swamps and limestone caves,
 427 which are near-ideal preservation environments (Atkinson & Greenwood 1989) that happen to be
 428 more common in the eastern South Island than in most other parts of the country (Anderson 1989).
 429 Furthermore, an estimation of population size and distribution of the different moa species based
 430 on mitochondrial DNA and fossil record of *Dinornis* spp. suggests, in contrast, that moa
 431 populations were more numerous on the North Island than on the South Island (Gemmell et al.
 432 2004). Therefore, it seems difficult at present to draw clear conclusions about geographic variation
 433 in moa densities.

434 Although the potential influence of moa browsing on the evolution of the divaricate habit
 435 had been suggested by previous authors (e.g. Denny 1964; Carlquist 1974; Taylor 1975),
 436 Greenwood & Atkinson (1977) were the first to fully develop and argue this idea. First postulating
 437 that moa fed by clamping and pulling vegetation in the same manner as present-day ratites, they

hypothesised that the tough and highly tensile branches of many divaricate species are difficult to tear off, while the interlaced structure kept leaves and growing tips out of easy reach. Hence, browsing on these plants would be less energetically rewarding than browsing on broadleaved species. Greenwood & Atkinson (1977) did not completely exclude a cutting ability of moa beaks, later acknowledging that the feeding behaviour of moa could not be confidently inferred because fossil skulls do not retain all the relevant tissues (Atkinson & Greenwood 1989). A recent study simulating the force of moa jaw muscles however concluded that different moa species fed in various different ways, including cutting (Attard et al. 2016). This appears to confirm the findings of studies of moa gizzard contents, which concluded that that divaricate twigs consumed by moa had been sheared rather than broken off (Burrows 1980, 1989; Burrows et al. 1981). These findings were later corroborated by a study of coprolites (Wood et al. 2008), yielding the same conclusion that divaricate species were by no means exempt from moa browsing (reviewed by Wood et al. 2020).

Moreover, Greenwood & Atkinson (1977) used evidence from the distribution of divaricate plants to support their hypothesis. On the one hand, they pointed out that divaricate plants often grow on lowland river terraces and swamps, which offer high nutrient levels and hence high plant productivity and nutrient content. They explained that divaricate species should be more subjected to moa browsing in such places, a sensible claim given that at least some study show a positive correlation between herbivore abundance and soil fertility (e.g. Kanowski et al. 2001). Even if divaricate species have been reported from low fertility soils, such as the acidic soils of Stewart Island (McGlone & Clarkson 1993), the largest known concentrations have been reported from fertile terraces derived from mudstone (Clarkson & Clarkson 1994). . On the other hand, Greenwood & Atkinson (1977) noted that divaricates are largely absent from areas where moa did not live, such as offshore islands, or where moa could not reach them, such as growing on cliffs or as epiphytes. Although *Myrsine divaricata* A.Cunn. is abundant on some of the subantarctic islands of New Zealand (McGlone & Clarkson 1993; Meurk et al. 1994), which are unlikely to have harboured moa, Greenwood & Atkinson (1977) attributed such occurrences to recent colonisation from the mainland. Kavanagh (2015) lent support to this interpretation by comparing some traits used to describe the divaricate habit between related species of New Zealand mainland and Chatham Island (historically moa-free, with a flora largely derived from the mainland): he concluded that the absence of moa may have relaxed the selection for traits that deterred moa browsing on the main islands of New Zealand.

Greenwood & Atkinson (1977) also examined the bearing of the height of transition between the juvenile in adult forms in heteroblastic divaricate species on their hypothesis. They claimed that, in such species, the shift from the juvenile divaricate form to the adult non-divaricate form happens around 3-4 m high; this height corresponds to the approximate height of the tallest moa, implying that the adult form in these species only appears at heights where it is safe from browsing. Burns & Dawson (2006) brought support to this claim from New Caledonia: they mentioned that heteroblastic species there (which do not have a divaricating juvenile form) seem to shift form at about the estimated height of the flightless birds which once lived there, although they called for quantitative support for this observation. There are however multiple counter-examples to Greenwood & Atkinson's (1977) claim. Field observations sometimes reveal that the shift can happen significantly lower; for example, Cockayne (1911) reported that the shift in *Sophora microphylla* can happen as low as 1.4 m, and we observed a shift in *Pennantia corymbosa* happening at about 2 m high (Figure 1 in Supplementary Material). Conversely, some homoblastic divaricate species can reach heights significantly above the size of the tallest moa without showing any relaxation of their divaricating habit; McGlone & Clarkson (1993) report such instances with individuals of *Coprosma crassifolia* Colenso, *Melicope simplex* A.Cunn. and *Myrsine divaricata* more than 5 m high; individuals of the latter species exceeding this height were also recorded by Veblen & Stewart (1980).

Finally, a crucial point of Greenwood & Atkinson's (1977) argument is the fact that the New Zealand flora is unique in having co-evolved with ratites but without browsing mammals. This phenomenon did not occur in areas where divaricate-like species co-evolved with ratites: in Madagascar, now-extinct elephant birds shared the island with giant tortoises and giant lemurs (Bond & Silander 2007); in Patagonia, Darwin's rhea grazed side-by-side with diverse mammals, such as equiids, camelids and giant ground sloths (McQueen 2000); in Australia, emus coexisted with many different herbivorous mammals, mostly marsupials (Roberts et al. 2001). Although these regions have all undergone megafaunal extinctions, they still host browsing mammals, and with the exception of Madagascar they have retained their ratites as well. No ratites or ratite fossils are known from North America; they are known only from former Gondwanan lands (Briggs 2003).

The first theoretical critique of this hypothesis was formulated by Lowry (1980). He suggested that, rather than being a protective "armour" against moa browsing, the divaricate habit's main effect is to help the plant survive browsing by spacing and multiplying palatable growing tips, with a side-effect of making the browsing less energetically rewarding. This idea

that the divaricate habit enables plants to survive rather than to prevent browsing led Atkinson and Greenwood to reconsider their 1977 hypothesis by acknowledging Lowry's view (Atkinson & Greenwood 1980). Consequently, this view raises the question of why the divaricate habit, if it is not a specialised moa-detering adaptation, is much scarcer in other regions where non-ratite browsers existed (McGlone & Webb 1981).

Indirect support for the moa-browsing hypothesis came from a fossil of a small-leaved woody species with wide-angle opposite branching that was discovered by Campbell et al. (2000). It was estimated to date from 20-16 Mya, which corresponds to the Early Miocene, whereas the climatic conditions usually put forward as the drivers of the evolution of the divaricate habit did not occur before the Pliocene (i.e. not before 5.333 Mya, Cohen et al. 2013, updated). Despite the absence of information about the three-dimensional structure of the plant when alive, 12 out of 15 experts they consulted agreed it was most likely a divaricate species (potentially extinct), and had rather varied ideas about what genus it could belong to. They noted the presence of “small acute broken processes protrud[ing] from the branchlets at irregular intervals”, which look like spines even though they are not opposite. Even though the processes might have been defensive spines that would be of little use against moa beaks, this discovery appears consistent with the moa-browsing hypothesis reviewed in the next section.

According to the moa browsing hypothesis, the divaricate habit could be nowadays seen as an anachronism (Greenwood & Atkinson 1977). As such, it was hypothesised that divaricate species may not be adapted to the current browsing pressure of introduced mammals because their costly ratite-resistant architecture was thought to be useless against mammals (Bond et al. 2004). Diamond (1990) imported the concept of “ghost” from overseas cases of anachronisms (later reviewed by Barlow 2000) when defending the hypothesis that divaricates are adapted to a now-extinct fauna. However, the conclusions of Pollock et al. (2007) about the preferences of ungulates for New Zealand woody plants, as well as a study by Lusk (2014) on the regeneration of divaricate and non-divaricate species in a forest remnant that had been subject to ungulate browsing for decades, indicate that the divaricate habit may also be effective in deterring mammal browsing. Ungulates indeed tend to avoid some (though not all) divaricate species until more attractive foods are depleted (Forsyth et al. 2002; Lusk 2014).

Experimental appraisal of the moa-browsing hypothesis

The moa browsing hypothesis was first tested experimentally by Bond et al. (2004), who fed juvenile and adult form foliage of two heteroblastic divaricate species to present-day ratites (emus

and ostriches). They found that the high tensile strength of divaricate branches reduces breakage, that the high branching angles make the twigs difficult to swallow because birds cannot use their tongue to properly orient the twigs, and that small and widely spaced leaves increase the time and the energy required to consume leaf biomass. These results brought support to the hypothesis that the divaricate habit represents an adaptation to deter moa browsing. However, whether the feeding behaviour of the present-day ratites reliably reflect the feeding behaviour of extinct moa is a matter of debate (reviewed above).

A more elaborate cafeteria experiment was conducted a few years later by Pollock et al. (2007), comparing the offtake of deer, goats and ostriches from five divaricate species compared to five congeneric non-divaricate species. Their general finding is that features of the divaricate habit, such as small leaves and stem toughness, deter ungulates as well as ratites.

The moa-climate synthetic hypothesis

The idea that selection for the divaricate habit may have been driven by both past climatic conditions and the effect of moa browsing has been suggested several times since the debate started (Wardle 1985; Wardle 1991; Cooper et al. 1993; Bond & Silander 2007). Lusk et al. (2016) proposed a synthetic hypothesis with a specific mechanism integrating browsing and climatic factors. Although the ancestors of moa may have reached the New Zealand landmass as early as 80-60 Mya (reviewed by Allentoft & Rawlence 2012), the divaricate habit may not have become advantageous as an anti-browsing defence until Plio-Pleistocene climatic constraints on plant growth resulted in juvenile trees being exposed for longer to ground-dwelling browsers. During this period the combination of global cooling (Hornibrook 1992) and rapid uplift of the Southern Alps (Batt et al. 2000) created widespread frosty, droughty environments in the eastern South Island. The relatively fertile alluvial soils of these environments may have attracted high levels of browsing, but frost and drought would have reduced the ability of juvenile trees to grow rapidly out of the browsing zone, even in well-lit microenvironments such as treefall gaps. Evidence for a much earlier origin of divaricate plants, for example in the more benign climates of the Miocene or Oligocene, would refute both this hypothesis and the original climate hypothesis, and would point to moa browsing as the sole driver of divaricate evolution if no other factor can be identified.

The light trap hypothesis and its appraisal

The light trap hypothesis, formulated by Kelly (1994), relies on the conclusions of Horn (1971) that a multi-layered leaf distribution (i.e. leaves distantly scattered among multiple layers in the

canopy) is more efficient at capturing a higher proportion of sunlight than mono-layered architectures (i.e. leaves distributed in a dense layer, the umbra of the outermost leaves completely obscuring the innermost leaves). Photosynthesis of most plants is indeed saturated well below full sunlight, saturation point varying with for example species' successional status (e.g. Bazzaz & Pickett 1980); the scattered distribution of the leaves of divaricates over multiple branch layers therefore allows inner leaves to be in the penumbra of the outer leaves, thus better distributing light harvest throughout the canopy. The light trap hypothesis appears consistent with a modelling study of the impact of penumbral effects on shoot-level net carbon gain of conifers (Stenberg 1995) which, like New Zealand divaricates, have small effective leaf diameters that result in short shadows; this modelling however does not explain the potential advantage of the architectural structure of divaricating habits. Moreover, even though penumbral effects are likely to result in higher carbon gain per unit area of foliage in small-leaved species growing in high light, Christian et al.'s (2006) data suggest that this advantage will be outweighed by the much higher (ca. threefold) leaf area ratio of congeneric broadleaved species, resulting in higher net carbon gain per unit of biomass in the latter. In divaricate species, this effect might be at least partially compensated by photosynthesis in stems, brought to light in one instance so far: the juvenile form of the heteroblastic divaricate *Prumnopitys taxifolia* (Banks & Sol. ex D. Don) de Laub. (Mitchell et al. 2019); more divaricate species will need to be investigated to determine how widespread stem photosynthesis is among divaricates. However, why would divaricating habits be scarce or absent in most other regions of the world if sunlight were the main driver of the evolution of these peculiar architectures in New Zealand, where solar irradiance levels are similar to those of other regions at comparable latitudes (Solargis s.r.o., 2020)? The light trap hypothesis does not appear to offer a satisfying explanation of the evolution of the New Zealand divaricates.

Insights into the developmental sequence of divaricate branching patterns

If the debate surrounding divaricate plants has mainly focused on how the divaricate habit has evolved, a handful of studies looked into describing the range of growth patterns that give rise to the spectrum of divaricating habits, and how such patterns translate into adaptations to local environments.

Tomlinson (1978) examined bifurcation ratios of 18 New Zealand divaricates, including two heteroblastic divaricate species. He concluded that the interlaced structure of most divaricates is a consequence of a sequential branching which may be supplemented by reiterative branching. Moreover, he suggested that this sequential branching is characterised by a lack of organisational

control that translates into a dimorphism between orthotropic and plagiotropic branches. He recommended the study of the changes in the branching sequence of many divaricate species over their lifetime, as he believed this could be the only way to understand how the diversity of divaricating habits was produced under a possibly single selective pressure, and to draw general conclusions about their development.

Subsequently, the development patterns of a few divaricates were studied in the 1990s. The species were: *Muehlenbeckia astonii* (Lovell et al. 1991); the juvenile form of *Elaeocarpus hookerianus* (Day & Gould 1997; Day et al. 1998; Day 1998a), *Carpodetus serratus* J.R.Forst. & G.Forst. (Day 1998a;b) and *Pennantia corymbosa* (Day 1998c); *Sophora prostrata* and the juvenile form of *Sophora microphylla* (Carswell & Gould 1998). Overall, these studies concluded that such a growth pattern, with many growing points scattered across the plant's crown, offers a plastic structure that can more easily accommodate for changes in environmental conditions (e.g. forest canopy gap versus closed canopy or seasonal changes in environmental conditions). These case studies also agreed that the lack of apical dominance plays a key role in the establishment of the divaricating habits they observed.

In parallel to the study of developmental patterns, a handful of studies looked into the hormonal control of the divaricate habit. Horrell et al. (1990) showed that a gibberellic acid treatment on cuttings of the adult form of *Pennantia corymbosa* and *Carpodetus serratus* tends to revert them to their juvenile form. This phenomenon did not occur in *Elaeocarpus hookerianus*, a result later confirmed by Day et al. (1998) with treatments of adult cuttings with gibberellic acid and other growth factors, including a cytokinin. Day et al. (1998) also showed that the adult form is not precociously triggered in *E. hookerianus* seedlings by these treatments. In *Sophora*, a treatment with 6-benzylaminopurine (a cytokinin) reinforces the divaricateness of the juvenile form of *Sophora microphylla* (Carswell et al. 1996). Qualitative and quantitative measurements in *E. hookerianus* showed that the leaves of the divaricating juvenile form contain more active cytokinins than the non-divaricating adult form or transitional form leaves (Day et al. 1995, reviewed by Jameson & Clemens 2015). A similar yet more questionable conclusion was drawn from a comparison of the ratio of active to storage forms of cytokinin between divaricate and non-divaricate forms in *Sophora* species (Carswell et al. 1996). In contrast with the heteroblastic divaricate species studied, the levels of cytokinins are relatively low in the divaricate species *Sophora prostrata*, suggesting that they might not play a role in the establishment of the divaricate form itself (Carswell et al. 1996). There are however too few studies about these growth regulators

to formulate general conclusions about their potential effects in controlling the expression of the divaricate habit.

Conclusions

We have attempted to standardise terminology used to describe these plants. The terms **divaricate** or **divaricating** have been variously applied to around 80 New Zealand species that we regard as occupying a spectrum from **truly divaricate** (small and widely-spaced leaves; wide-angle branching; tough, wiry, tightly interlaced stems) to **filiramulate** (plants that present some but not all of these traits). This spectrum of architectural forms, which we call **divaricating habits**, is the expression of a phenomenon called the **divaricating habit**. **Heteroblastic divaricate** species have a divaricate (or filiramulate) **juvenile form** and a non-divaricate **adult form**, in contrast to the generally smaller (< 8 m) homoblastic divaricates that retain the divaricate form throughout their entire lives. Finally, we coin the term **divaricate-like** to describe overseas instances of the divaricate habit phenomenon, which acknowledges their resemblances with New Zealand divaricates while stressing their peculiarities. We hope that adoption of these terms will help reduce ambiguities in future research and facilitate clear communication. Our recommendations nevertheless do not resolve the blurry boundary between true divaricates and filiramulates, like any categorisation involving a degree of subjectivity.

In spite of rather extensive experimental and observational evidence, no hypothesis about the evolution of divaricates in New Zealand has been decisively favoured over another. Among the most plausible hypotheses however, the moa-browsing hypothesis seems more supported than the climatic hypothesis, although neither are fully satisfying on their own. The newer synthetic moa-climate hypothesis has not been much discussed or tested in publications so far, but given the evidence of both the moa-browsing hypothesis and the climate hypothesis individually, it appears to be an ideal candidate for a definitive answer to the divaricate question.

However, neo-ecological studies alone are unlikely to entirely resolve the origin of divaricate plants. One way still left to explore was suggested by Cooper et al. (1993): using molecular phylogenetics to date the divergences between divaricates and their closest non-divaricate relatives. Past studies estimating the age of New Zealand plant lineages (e.g. reviewed by Wallis & Jorge 2018; Heenan & McGlone 2019) have not focused on dating such divergences. Such studies, and studies on overseas groups that include New Zealand representative, can still offer isolated dates even though they might not have sampled the closest non-divaricate relative to the divaricate species they included (Appendix 4). The divergence dates between congeneric

divaricate and non-divaricate species give us a first hint that the divaricate habit may have appeared less than 10 Mya in most cases. Table 2 provides the theoretical divergence dates one might expect from a study specifically dating splits between divaricate and non-divaricate species under the different hypotheses in play; the dates of the divergences in Appendix 4 appear to favour the moa-browsing hypothesis, although a dating approach using a consistent method for all dates would be needed to confirm this result.

Hypothesis	Implied theoretical divergence period
Climatic (including photoprotection)	Not older than ca. 5.3 Mya.
Moa-browsing	Much older than 5.3 Mya
Moa-climate synthesis	Not older than ca. 5.3 Mya.
Light trap	Unpredictable, as past sun radiation levels cannot be estimated (or with difficulty and questionable reliability).

Table 2: Theoretical divergence periods between New Zealand divaricates and their closest non-divaricate relatives under the different hypotheses that try to explain their emergence. 5.3 Mya represents the lower bound of the Pliocene, the period when the climatic factors that would have favoured the evolution of the divaricate habit appeared.

There is still much to be done on developmental aspects of the divaricate form. First, our understanding of how the diversity of divaricating habits is produced needs more work despite having been the subject of numerous studies in the late 1990s. Second, the genes or gene networks that produce the diversity of divaricating forms have not been identified; such knowledge would help assessing Went's (1971) horizontal transfer hypothesis beyond theoretical arguments. These directions might even bring a new theory about the emergence of these species, or give birth to a new classification of the divaricating habits. However, we believe that such a new classification could only become consensual if it is based on quantitative measurements of the architectural features of all these species, that would be analysed by way of multivariate analyses. The main issue with such an endeavour is that each individual species will need to be measured in the wild, including several individuals in shaded and open habitats. Herbarium specimens cannot be used because the three-dimensional structure of the original individual is lost during pressing and, and only a small fraction of the architectural structure is usually represented. Such a classification may help significantly in clarifying the boundary between true divaricates and filiramulates, by identifying and discriminating architectural types within the spectrum of the divaricate habit.

Moreover, combined with the molecular phylogeny suggested by Cooper et al. (1993), it will be essential to try to answer the following pending questions:

- Did similar architectures arise in closely related species? I.e. do different divaricating habits reflect different inherited pre-existing traits of the corresponding lineages (as suggested for example in Brown & Lawton 1991)?
- Did similar architectures arise in response to similar environmental selective pressures? I.e. what features of those architectures (e.g. branching angle, degree of interlacement, degree of branch toughness, etc.) were selected by climatic factors, moa browsing or another selective pressure yet to be identified? For example, do species typically found in open habitats present more interlaced and tougher branches than species of shaded environments, as field observations seem to suggest?

Finally, our understanding of the evolution of divaricate species in New Zealand might be aided by more extensive study of the ecology, morphology and evolutionary history of divaricate-like species in other regions of the world, which would lead to identifying the putative selective pressures under which they may have evolved. Generating a thorough inventory of divaricate-like species could be a useful first step that motivates further work on them.

Acknowledgements

We thank the Royal Society of New Zealand for support through Marsden contract 16-UOW-029. We thank Rob D. Smissen, Matt McGlone and two anonymous reviewers for insightful comments on the manuscript. KJLM thanks the researchers of the Institut de Recherche pour le Développement of Nouméa (New Caledonia), especially Sandrine Isnard and David Bruy, for fruitful conversations that provided new elements of thoughts about the divaricates.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest is reported by the authors.

Funding

This research is supported by the Royal Society of New Zealand – Te Apārangi under a Marsden fund (number 16-UOW-029); the Faculty of Science and Engineering of the University of Waikato under the FSEN Student Trust Fund (number P102218 SoS/PG Support).

715 **ORCID**

716 Kévin J. L. Maurin <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2231-3668>

717 Christopher H. Lusk <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9037-7957>

718 **Appendix**

719 Appendix 1: List of the morphological traits used by past authors to describe New Zealand
720 divaricates, ordered by decreasing popularity. Y = character always present; \pm = character not
721 always associated with the divaricate habit; * = translated from German.

722

723 *[This appendix is provided as a supplementary file to the online version of the review]*

Morphological feature	Diels (1896)*	Cockayne (1911)	Bulmer (1958)	Rattenbury (1962)	Dawson (1963)	Philipson (1963)	Denny (1964)	Went (1971)	Carlquist (1974)	Greenwood & Atkinson (1977)	Tomlinson (1978)	McGlone & Webb (1981)	Lee & Johnson (1984)	Wardle & McGlone (1988)	Dawson (1988)	Atkinson & Greenwood (1989)	Diamond (1990)	Kelly & Ogle (1990)	Brown & Lawton (1991)	Lovell et al. (1991)	Wardle (1991)	Wilson (1991)	Atkinson (1992)	McGlone & Clarkson (1993)	Cooper et al. (1993)	Wilson & Galloway (1993)	Kelly (1994)	Day et al. (1997)	Keey & Lind (1997)	Day (1998) abc	Carswell & Gould (1998)	Campbell et al. (2000)	McQueen (2000)	Darrow et al. (2001)	Lord & Marshall (2001)	Howell et al. (2002)	Grubb (2003)	Bond et al. (2004)	McGlone et al (2004)	Christian et al. (2006)	Bond & Silander (2007)	Bell (2008)	Wilson & Lee (2012)	Kavanagh (2015)	Lusk & Clearwater (2015)	Lusk et al. (2016)	Garrity & Lusk (2017)		
Small leaves			Y	Y	Y			Y	±	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y		±	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			±	±			Y	Y	±	Y	Y		±	±	Y	±	Y	Y			
Interlaced/tangled branching		±	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y			±	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	±	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	±	Y	Y	±	Y	±			±	±		±	±	±	±		
Wide branch angles	Y	±			±		Y			Y	±	Y	Y		±			Y		Y	±		Y	±		±	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	±	±	Y	±	Y	Y					
Slender/thin/wiry stems		±	±		Y	±	Y			±	±			Y	Y			Y		Y						±					Y						±	Y	±			Y	Y	±	Y	Y			
Much/densely branched		Y	±	Y	Y	±		Y				±		±	Y			Y								Y	Y			Y	Y		±	Y							Y								
Stiff/tough/stout/rigid stems	Y	±				±			±	±						Y	Y		±						Y	Y	±						±				±				Y	±				Y			
Fewer (even no) leaves on outer branches										±		Y	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y				±		Y								±		±		Y												
Well-separated/sparse/widely-spaced leaves					±							Y									Y				Y	Y		Y						Y					±	Y	Y			Y					
Reduced apical dominance/bud/growth								Y	Y	Y				Y	±					Y			Y				±				Y			±								±							
Smaller leaves at branch tip/on outer branches																	Y						±		Y		Y				Y										±	±							
Branch angles ≥ 90°			Y		±		±	Y		±	±				±								±							±					±						±								
Continuous growth of lateral/high order branches										Y					±								Y				Y			Y				±								Y							
Springy/high-tensiled branches												Y			±	Y			±		Y																					Y				Y			
Long internodes								Y		±				Y								±																				±			±	Y	Y		
Spineless			±							Y	±			±				Y								±												±						±	±				
Zig-zag branching					±					±	±										±									Y				±							±	±							
Short-shoot development											±			±				Y			Y					±															±								
Crooked/recurved/tortuous branches								±		Y												±				Y																							
Multi-layered leaf distribution																												Y													Y								
Lateral flowering											±							Y																							±								
Entire leaves											±							Y																															
Interlocking branching												Y											±																										
Fastigate branching											±																								±						±								
Multiple growing points																Y																																	
Small and simple inflorescences													Y																																				
Small buds													Y																																				
Flexible branching			±																								±																						
Sympodial branching										±																																		±					
Leaves simple (not compound)											±																															±							
Accessory buds												±																														±							
Die-back of axes											±																																						
Lost apical dominance										±																																							
Monopodial growth																																										±							
Occasional branching			±																																														
Orbicular leaves								±																																									
Short-lived leaves																					±																												
Thin leaves																					±																												
Branch angles ± 90°									±																																								

Appendix 2: Complete list of 81 New Zealand taxa falling on the divaricate habit spectrum (e.g. from truly divaricate to filiramate sensu Wardle 1991). This list is based on a compilation of published work amended by field observations. * = also found in Australia; # = heteroblastic divaricate.

Family	Taxon
Araliaceae	<i>Raukawa anomalus</i> (Hook.) A.D.Mitch., Frodin & Heads
Argophyllaceae	<i>Corokia cotoneaster</i> Raoul
Compositae	<i>Helichrysum lanceolatum</i> (Buchanan) Kirk
	<i>Olearia bullata</i> H.D.Wilson & Garn.-Jones
	<i>Olearia hectorii</i> Hook.f.
	<i>Olearia laxiflora</i> Kirk
	<i>Olearia lineata</i> (Kirk) Cockayne
	<i>Olearia odorata</i> Petrie
	<i>Olearia polita</i> H.D.Wilson & Garn.-Jones
	<i>Olearia quinquevulnera</i> Heenan
	<i>Olearia solandri</i> (Hook.f.) Hook.f.
	<i>Olearia virgata</i> (Hook.f.) Hook.f.
Elaeocarpaceae	<i>Aristotelia fruticosa</i> Hook.f.
	# <i>Elaeocarpus hookerianus</i> Raoul
Gesneriaceae	<i>Rhabdothamnus solandri</i> A.Cunn.
Lamiaceae	<i>Teucrium parvifolium</i> (Hook.f.) Kattari et Salmaki
Leguminosae	# <i>Sophora microphylla</i> Aiton
	<i>Sophora prostrata</i> Buchanan
Malvaceae	# <i>Hoheria angustifolia</i> Raoul
	# <i>Hoheria sexsylosa</i> Colenso
	<i>Plagianthus divaricatus</i> J.R.Forst. & G.Forst.
	# <i>Plagianthus regius</i> (Poit.) Hochr. subsp. <i>regius</i>
Moraceae	# <i>Streblus heterophyllus</i> (Blume) Corner
Myrtaceae	<i>Lophomyrtus obcordata</i> (Raoul) Burret
	<i>Neomyrtus pedunculata</i> (Hook.f.) Allan
Pennantiaceae	# <i>Pennantia corymbosa</i> J.R.Forst. & G.Forst.
Pittosporaceae	<i>Pittosporum anomalum</i> Laing & Gourlay
	<i>Pittosporum crassicaule</i> Laing & Gourlay
	<i>Pittosporum divaricatum</i> Cockayne
	<i>Pittosporum lineare</i> Laing & Gourlay
	<i>Pittosporum obcordatum</i> Raoul
	<i>Pittosporum rigidum</i> Hook.f.
	# <i>Pittosporum turneri</i> Petrie
Podocarpaceae	# <i>Prumnopitys taxifolia</i> (Sol. ex D.Don) de Laub.
Polygonaceae	<i>Muehlenbeckia astonii</i> Petrie
	* <i>Muehlenbeckia axillaris</i> (Hook.f.) Endl.
	* <i>Muehlenbeckia complexa</i> (A.Cunn.) Meisn.

Primulaceae	<i>Myrsine divaricata</i> A.Cunn.
Rhamnaceae	<i>Discaria toumatou</i> Raoul
Rousseaceae	# <i>Carpodetus serratus</i> J.R.Forst. & G.Forst.
Rubiaceae	<i>Coprosma acerosa</i> A.Cunn.
	# <i>Coprosma arborea</i> Kirk
	<i>Coprosma areolata</i> Cheeseman
	<i>Coprosma brunnea</i> (Kirk) Cockayne ex Cheeseman
	<i>Coprosma cheesemanii</i> W.R.B.Oliv.
	<i>Coprosma ciliata</i> Hook.f.
	<i>Coprosma crassifolia</i> Colenso
	<i>Coprosma cuneata</i> Hook.f.
	<i>Coprosma decurva</i> Heads
	<i>Coprosma depressa</i> Colenso ex Hook.f.
	<i>Coprosma distantia</i> (de Lange & R.O.Gardner) de Lange
	<i>Coprosma dumosa</i> (Cheeseman) G.T.Jane
	<i>Coprosma elatirioides</i> de Lange & A.S.Markey
	<i>Coprosma fowerakeri</i> D.A.Norton & de Lange
	<i>Coprosma intertexta</i> G.Simpson
	<i>Coprosma linariifolia</i> Hook.f.
	<i>Coprosma microcarpa</i> Hook.f.
	<i>Coprosma neglecta</i> Cheeseman
	<i>Coprosma obconica</i> Kirk
	<i>Coprosma parviflora</i> Hook.f.
	<i>Coprosma pedicellata</i> Molloy, de Lange & B.D.Clarkson
	<i>Coprosma polymorpha</i> W.R.B.Oliv.
	<i>Coprosma propinqua</i> A.Cunn.
	<i>Coprosma pseudociliata</i> G.T.Jane
	<i>Coprosma pseudocuneata</i> W.R.B.Oliv. ex Garn.-Jones & Elder
	<i>Coprosma rhamnoides</i> A.Cunn.
	<i>Coprosma rigida</i> Cheeseman
	<i>Coprosma rotundifolia</i> A.Cunn.
	<i>Coprosma rubra</i> Petrie
	<i>Coprosma rugosa</i> Cheeseman
	<i>Coprosma spathulata</i> A.Cunn.
	<i>Coprosma tenuicaulis</i> Hook.f.
	<i>Coprosma virescens</i> Petrie
	<i>Coprosma wallii</i> Petrie in Cheeseman
Rutaceae	<i>Melicope simplex</i> A.Cunn.
Violaceae	<i>Melicytus alpinus</i> (Kirk) Garn.-Jones
	<i>Melicytus crassifolius</i> (Hook.f.) Garn.-Jones
	<i>Melicytus drucei</i> Molloy & B.D.Clarkson
	<i>Melicytus flexuosus</i> Molloy & A.P.Druce
	<i>Melicytus micranthus</i> (Hook.f.) Hook.f.
	<i>Melicytus obovatus</i> (Kirk) Garn.-Jones

730 Appendix 3: List of 47 divaricate-like taxa outside New Zealand, compiled from published work and personal observations. This list is not
731 exhaustive.

Family	Taxon	Distribution	Source
Anacardiaceae	<i>Schinus fasciculatus</i> (Griseb.) I.M.Johnst.	Patagonia	McQueen (2000)
	<i>Schinus johnstonii</i> F.A.Barkley	Patagonia	McQueen (2000)
Bignoniaceae	<i>Rhigozum madagascariense</i> Drake	Madagascar/Africa	Bond & Silander (2007)
Burseraceae	<i>Commiphora brevicalyx</i> H. Perrier	Madagascar/Africa	Bond & Silander (2007)
Caesalpinaceae	<i>Senna meridionalis</i> (R. Vig.) Du Puy	Madagascar/Africa	Bond & Silander (2007)
Cannabaceae	<i>Celtis pallida</i> Torr.	Southern USA	Tucker (1974)
Combretaceae	<i>Terminalia seyrigii</i> (H. Perrier) Capuron	Madagascar	Bond & Silander (2007)
Compositae	<i>Amphipappus fremontii</i> Torr. & A. Gray	South-western USA	Tucker (1974)
	<i>Tetradymia axillaris</i> A. Nels.	South-western USA	Tucker (1974)
Ebenaceae	<i>Diospyros humbertiana</i> H. Perrier	Madagascar/Africa	Bond & Silander (2007)
Krameriaceae	<i>Krameria grayi</i> Rose & Painter	South-western USA	Tucker (1974)
Leguminosae	<i>Adesmia campestris</i> (Rendle) Rowlee	Patagonia	McQueen (2000)
	<i>Adesmia echinus</i> C.Presl	Chile	Pers. obs.
	<i>Chadsia grevei</i> Drake	Madagascar	Bond & Silander (2007)
	<i>Pickeringia montana</i> Nutt.	California	Tucker (1974)
	<i>Psorothamnus emoryi</i> (A.Gray) Rydb.	Southern USA/Northern Mexico	Tucker (1974)
	<i>Psorothamnus polydenius</i> (Torr.) Rydb.	South-western USA	Tucker (1974)
Nyctaginaceae	<i>Bougainvillea spinosa</i> (Cav.) Heimerl	Patagonia	McQueen (2000)

Olacaceae	<i>Ximenia perrieri</i> Cavaco & Keraudren	Madagascar/Africa	Bond & Silander (2007)
Oleaceae	<i>Menodora spinescens</i> A.Gray	South-western USA	Tucker (1974)
	<i>Olea oleaster</i> Hoffmanns. & Link	Europe	Pers. obs.
Picrodendraceae	<i>Tetracoccus hallii</i> Brandegees	South-western USA/Northern Mexico	Tucker (1974)
Pittosporaceae	<i>Pittosporum multiflorum</i> (A.Cunn. ex Loudon) L.Cayzer, Crisp & I.Telford	Australia	Relative to a pers. obs.
	<i>Pittosporum spinescens</i> (F.Muell.) L.Cayzer, Crisp & I.Telford	Australia	Pers. obs.
	<i>Pittosporum viscidum</i> L.Cayzer, Crisp & I.Telford	Australia	Relative to a pers. obs.
Rhamnaceae	<i>Adolphia californica</i> S. Watson	California/Northern Mexico	Tucker (1974)
	<i>Ceanothus ferrisiae</i> McMinn	California	Tucker (1974)
	<i>Ceanothus jepsonii</i> Greene	California	Tucker (1974)
	<i>Condalia globosa</i> I.M.Johnst.	South-western USA/Northern Mexico	Tucker (1974)
	<i>Condalia microphylla</i> Cav.	Patagonia	McQueen (2000)
Rosaceae	<i>Cercocarpus intricatus</i> S.Watson	South-western USA	Carlquist (1974)
	<i>Coleogyne ramosissima</i> Torr.	South-western USA	Tucker (1974)
	<i>Prunus fasciculata</i> (Torr.) A.Gray	South-western USA	Tucker (1974)
	<i>Prunus spinosa</i> L.	Europe/Western Asia/North Africa	Pers. obs.
Rubiaceae	<i>Coprosma nitida</i> Hook.f.	Australia/Tasmania	Thompson (2010)
	<i>Coprosma quadrifida</i> (Labill.) B.L.Rob.	Australia/Tasmania	Thompson (2010)
Solanaceae	<i>Lycium ameghinoi</i> Speg.	Patagonia	McQueen (2000)
	<i>Lycium andersonii</i> A. Gray	South-western USA/Northern Mexico	Tucker (1974)
	<i>Lycium brevipes</i> Benth.	California/Northern Mexico	Tucker (1974)
	<i>Lycium californicum</i> Nutt. ex Gray	California/Northern Mexico	Tucker (1974)

	<i>Lycium chilense</i> Miers ex Bertero	Patagonia	McQueen (2000)
	<i>Lycium ferocissimum</i> Miers	South Africa	Pers. obs.
	<i>Lycium fremontii</i> A.Gray	South-western USA/Northern Mexico	Tucker (1974)
	<i>Lycium gilliesianum</i> Miers	Patagonia	McQueen (2000)
	<i>Lycium parishii</i> A. Gray	South-western USA/Northern Mexico	Tucker (1974)
Violaceae	<i>Melicytus angustifolius</i> (DC.) Garn.-Jones subsp. <i>divaricatus</i>	Australia	Stajsic et al. (2015)
	<i>Melicytus dentatus</i> (DC.) Molloy & Mabb.	Australia	Stajsic et al. (2015)

732

733 Appendix 4: Published divergence dates between New Zealand divaricate species and their closest sampled non-divaricate relatives. “+” = clade
734 of species; “ca.” = when no table with the date was available, it was estimated visually from the dated phylogeny; “or” = when different methods
735 were used and gave different results.

736

Divaricate species	Sister non-divaricate species in the phylogeny	Estimated date of divergence (confidence interval if given)	Source
<i>Aristotelia fruticosa</i> Hook.f.	<i>Aristotelia serrata</i> (J.R.Forst. & G.Forst.) Oliv.	3 Mya (standard deviation: 0 My)	Crayn et al. (2006)
<i>Coprosma</i> , 31 taxa	<i>Coprosma</i> , 73 taxa (including the 2 Australian divaricate-like species listed in Table 2)	Between about 11 Mya (95% HPD: ca. 15-7 Mya) and 2.5 Mya (95% HPD: ca. 3-0.5 Mya)	Cantley et al. (2016)
<i>Discaria toumatou</i> Raoul	<i>Discaria chacaye</i> (G.Don) Tortosa	10.2 Mya (standard deviation: 3.7 My)	Wardle et al. (2001)

<i>Elaeocarpus hookerianus</i> Raoul	<i>Elaeocarpus bancroftii</i> F.Muell. & F.M.Bailey + <i>Elaeocarpus arnhemicus</i> F.Muell.	4 Mya (standard deviation: 1 Mya)	Crayn et al. (2006)
<i>Elaeocarpus hookerianus</i> Raoul	<i>Elaeocarpus dentatus</i> (J.R.Forst. & G.Forst.) Vahl	13.13 Mya (95% HPD: 21.90-5.25 Mya)	(Phoon (2015)
<i>Lophomyrtus obcordata</i> (Raoul) Burret + <i>Neomyrtus pedunculata</i> (Hook.f.) Allan	<i>Lophomyrtus bullata</i> Burret	ca. 4 Mya (95% HPD: ca. 9-1 Mya)	Thornhill et al. (2015)
<i>Melicytus</i> , 5 taxa and 3 affine samples	<i>Melicytus</i> , 10 taxa (including the 2 Australian divaricate-like species listed in Table 2) and 5 affine samples	From 6.41 Mya	Mitchell et al. (2009)
<i>Muehlenbeckia</i> (the 3 species listed in Table 2)	<i>Muehlenbeckia</i> , 16 taxa	From 20.5 Mya (95% HPD: 30.4-14.2 Mya), or from 22.3 Mya (95% HPD: 33.5-14.4 Mya)	Schuster et al. (2013)
<i>Olearia solandri</i> (Hook.f.) Hook.f.	<i>Olearia traversiorum</i> (F.Muell.) Hook.f.	ca. 1.8 Mya (95% HPD: ca. 3-1 Mya)	Wagstaff et al. (2011)
<i>Pennantia corymbosa</i> J.R.Forst. & G.Forst.	<i>Pennantia cunninghamii</i> Miers	6.6236 Mya	Nicolas & Plunkett (2014)
<i>Plagianthus divaricatus</i> J.R.Forst. & G.Forst.	<i>Plagianthus regius</i> (Poit.) Hochr.	3.9 Mya (95% HPD: 8.2-1.9 Mya), or 5.4 Mya (standard deviation: 2.2 My)	Wagstaff & Tate (2011)
<i>Prumnopitys taxifolia</i> (Sol. ex D.Don) de Laub.	<i>Prumnopitys andina</i> (Poepp. ex Endl.) de Laub.	ca. 14 Mya (95% HPD: ca. 29-7 Mya)	Leslie et al. (2012)
<i>Raukaua anomalus</i> (Hook.) A.D.Mitch., Frodin & Heads	<i>Raukaua simplex</i> (G.Forst.) A.D.Mitch., Frodin & Heads	0.88097 Mya	Nicolas & Plunkett (2014)
<i>Rhabdothamnus solandri</i> A.Cunn.	<i>Coronanthera clarkeana</i> Schltr.	22.0 Mya (95% HPD: 29.5-18.0), or 17.9 Mya	Woo et al. (2011)

Appendix 5: List of complementary readings about divaricate species. These scientific publications were not cited in the body of the review because they do not bring more significant elements about the evolution or the development of the divaricates than the studies already cited. However, we aim to offer a list of the scientific publications relating to the divaricates that is as exhaustive as possible, because these readings might provide ideas of future research to the reader. We do not include floras and other descriptive work that only list divaricate species.

- Christian (2003): review of the climatic and moa-browsing hypotheses, and advertises ongoing research on the photoprotection hypothesis.
- Fadzly & Burns (2010): study crypsis of both the juvenile divaricate juvenile and the non-divaricate adult forms of *Elaeocarpus hookerianus*.
- Forsyth et al. (2010): study the impact of introduced deer on the ecosystems of New Zealand, showing that divaricates are part of deer diet. Also review the evidence about moa diet, comparing it to their results for deer.
- Gamage & Jesson (2007) and Gamage (2011): compare shade tolerance of four congeneric pairs of homoblastic and heteroblastic species. Among the heteroblastic species, one is a heteroblastic divaricate species with a quasi-divaricate juvenile, two are divaricate species that are heteroblastic by their leaf shape, not architecture, and the last one is non-divaricate its whole life. All the homoblastic species are non-divaricate. They showed that the juvenile forms do not seem to be an adaptation to shaded environments, but it is difficult to isolate the effect of the divaricate habit itself from their statistical results because they tested homoblastic versus heteroblastic, not non-divaricate versus divaricate.
- Lee & Johnson (1984): compare the nutrient content of divaricate and non-divaricate *Coprosma* species. They show significant differences but argue that their experiment cannot tell us about the potential importance of these differences in regards to herbivory.
- Pole & Moore (2011): report fossil leaves that have similar shape and size to those of extant *Myrsine divaricata* A.Cunn. from a deposit dated 6-6.5 Myo (late Miocene), but because no branching architecture was preserved it cannot be reliably inferred that this species (*Myrsine waihiensis* sp. nov.) was similarly divaricate.
- Turnbull et al. (2002): reply to the criticism of Lusk (2002) on the conclusions of Howell et al. (2002).
- Whitaker (1987), Lord & Marshall (2001) and Wotton et al. (2016): develop the idea that native lizards (geckos and skinks) are seeds dispersers for divaricate species. Lord & Marshall (2001) formulated the hypothesis that the cage architecture, once it appeared,

771 provided a diurnal refuge for lizards, which would consume the fruits hidden in the cage
772 and subsequently disperse the seeds. Lord & Marshall (2001) and Wotton et al. (2016)
773 suggested that seed dispersal by lizards may have favoured the selection of white/blue/pale
774 fruits in divaricates.

- 775 • Wilson (1991): distribution maps of some New Zealand divaricate and heteroblastic
776 divaricate species in Canterbury and Westland.
777

778 **Supplementary Material**

779 Figure 1: Example of an abrupt shift from a divaricate juvenile form to a non-divaricate adult form
780 in a metamorphic heteroblastic divaricate species, *Pennantia corymbosa* J.R.Forst. & G.Forst.
781 (Pennantiaceae; Halswell Quarry Park, Christchurch, Canterbury, New Zealand). In this photo, the
782 shift happens around 1.80 m high (photo: KJLM, September 2014).



783

784 Figure 2: African boxthorn (*Lycium ferocissimum* Miers; Solanaceae), growing on a low cliff in
785 Stoddart Point Recreation Reserve (Diamond Harbour, Canterbury, New Zealand). A species with
786 interlaced wide-angle branching closely resembling some New Zealand divaricates, except for
787 very stiff spines and relatively large leaves (photo: KJLM, November 2017).



788

References

- Allentoft ME, Heller R, Oskam CL, Lorenzen ED, Hale ML, Gilbert MTP, Jacomb C, Holdaway RN, Bunce M. 2014. Extinct New Zealand megafauna were not in decline before human colonization. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*. 111(13):4922–4927.
- Allentoft ME, Rawlence NJ. 2012. Moa's Ark or volant ghosts of Gondwana? Insights from nineteen years of ancient DNA research on the extinct moa (Aves: Dinornithiformes) of New Zealand. *Ann Anat - Anat Anz*. 194(1):36–51.
- Anderson A. 1989. *Prodigious birds: moas and moa-hunting in New Zealand*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Anton V, Hartley S, Wittmer HU. 2015. Survival and growth of planted seedlings of three native tree species in urban forest restoration in Wellington, New Zealand. *N Z J Ecol*. 39(2):170–178.
- Atkinson I. 1992. A method for measuring branch divergence and interlacing in woody plants. Taita: DSIR Land Resources, Department of Scientific and Industrial Research.
- Atkinson I, Greenwood R. 1980. Divaricating plants and moa browsing: a reply. *N Z J Bot*. 3:165–167.
- Atkinson I, Greenwood R. 1989. Relationships between moas and plants. *N Z J Ecol*. 12:67–96.
- Attard MR, Wilson LA, Worthy TH, Scofield P, Johnston P, Parr WC, Wroe S. 2016. Moa diet fits the bill: virtual reconstruction incorporating mummified remains and prediction of biomechanical performance in avian giants. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci*. 283:20152043.
- Bannister P, Colhoun CM, Jameson PE. 1995. The winter hardening and foliar frost resistance of some New Zealand species of *Pittosporum*. *N Z J Bot*. 33(3):409–414.
- Barlow C. 2000. *The ghosts of evolution: nonsensical fruit, missing partners, and other ecological anachronisms*. New York: Basic Books.
- Batt GE, Braun J, Kohn BP, McDougall I. 2000. Thermochronological analysis of the dynamics of the Southern Alps, New Zealand. *Geol Soc Am Bull*. 112(2):250–266.
- Bazzaz F, Pickett S. 1980. Physiological ecology of tropical succession: a comparative review. *Annu Rev Ecol Syst*. 11(1):287–310.
- Beddie A. 1958. Precocious fruiting in *Pennantia corymbosa*. *Wellingt Bot Soc Bull*. 30:12–14.
- Bell AD. 2008. *Plant form: an illustrated guide to flowering plant morphology*. Portland: Timber Press.
- Böcher T. 1977. Convergence as an evolutionary process. *Bot J Linn Soc*. 75(1):1–19.
- Bond WJ, Lee WG, Craine JM. 2004. Plant structural defences against browsing birds: a legacy of New Zealand's extinct moas. *Oikos*. 104(3):500–508.
- Bond WJ, Silander JA. 2007. Springs and wire plants: anachronistic defences against Madagascar's extinct elephant birds. *Proc R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*. 274(1621):1985–1992.

- 824 Brewster B. 1987. Te Moa: the life and death of New Zealand's unique bird. Nelson, N.Z.: Nikau
825 Press.
- 826 Briggs JC. 2003. Fishes and birds: Gondwana life rafts reconsidered. *Syst Biol.* 52(4):548–553.
- 827 Brown V, Lawton J. 1991. Herbivory and the evolution of leaf size and shape. *Philos Trans Biol*
828 *Sci.* 333(1267):265–272.
- 829 Bulmer GM. 1958. A key to the divaricating shrubs of New Zealand. *Tuatara.* 7:48–61.
- 830 Burns K. 2016. Spinescence in the New Zealand flora: parallels with Australia. *N Z J Bot.*
831 54(2):273–289.
- 832 Burns K, Dawson JW. 2006. A morphological comparison of leaf heteroblasty between New
833 Caledonia and New Zealand. *N Z J Bot.* 44(4):387–396.
- 834 Burns K, Dawson JW. 2009. Heteroblasty on Chatham Island: a comparison with New Zealand
835 and New Caledonia. *N Z J Ecol.* 33(2):156–163.
- 836 Burrows CJ. 1980. Some empirical information concerning the diet of moas. *N Z J Ecol.*:125–130.
- 837 Burrows CJ. 1989. Moa browsing: evidence from the Pyramid Valley mire. *N Z J Ecol.*
838 12(Suppl.):51–56.
- 839 Burrows CJ, McCulloch B, Trotter MM. 1981. The diet of moas based on gizzard contents samples
840 from Pyramid Valley, North Canterbury, and Scaifes Lagoon, Lake Wanaka, Otago. *Rec Canterb*
841 *Mus.* 9(6):309–336.
- 842 Bussell W. 1968. The growth of some New Zealand trees: 1. Growth in natural conditions. *N Z J*
843 *Bot.* 6(1):63–75.
- 844 Campbell J, Lee D, Lee W. 2000. A woody shrub from the Miocene Nevis Oil Shale, Otago, New
845 Zealand-a possible fossil divaricate? *J R Soc N Z.* 30(2):147–153.
- 846 Cantley JT, Markey AS, Swenson NG, Keeley SC. 2016. Biogeography and evolutionary
847 diversification in one of the most widely distributed and species rich genera of the Pacific. *AoB*
848 *Plants.* 8.
- 849 Carlquist S. 1974. Island biology. New York & London: Columbia University Press.
- 850 Carrodus SK. 2009. Identification and the role of hybridisation in *Pittosporum* [Masters thesis].
851 Hamilton: University of Waikato.
- 852 Carswell FE, Day JS, Gould KS, Jameson PE. 1996. Cytokinins and the regulation of plant form
853 in three species of *Sophora*. *N Z J Bot.* 34(1):123–130.
- 854 Carswell FE, Gould KS. 1998. Comparative vegetative development of divaricating and
855 arborescent *Sophora* species (Fabaceae). *N Z J Bot.* 36(2):295–301.
- 856 Charles-Dominique T, Barczy J, Le Roux E, Chamaillé-Jammes S. 2017. The architectural design
857 of trees protects them against large herbivores. *Funct Ecol.* 31(9):1710–1717.

- 858 Christian R. 2003. New Zealand's divaricating shrubs: Did the moa do it? *Australas Sci.* 24(5):27–
859 29.
- 860 Christian R, Kelly D, Turnbull MH. 2006. The architecture of New Zealand's divaricate shrubs in
861 relation to light adaptation. *N Z J Bot.* 44(2):171–186.
- 862 Clarkson BD, Clarkson BR. 1994. Ecology of an elusive endemic shrub, *Pittosporum obcordatum*
863 Raoul. *N Z J Bot.* 32(2):155–168.
- 864 Cockayne L. 1911. Observations concerning evolution, derived from ecological studies in New
865 Zealand. In: *Trans N Z Inst.* Vol. 44. New Zealand; p. 1–50.
- 866 Cockayne L. 1923. Hybridism in the New Zealand flora. *New Phytol.* 22(3):105–127.
- 867 Cockayne L. 1958. The vegetation of New Zealand [Internet]. 3rd edition. Weinheim / Bergstr.
868 (Germany): H. R. Engelmann (J. Cramer). [http://nzetc.victoria.ac.nz/tm/scholarly/name-](http://nzetc.victoria.ac.nz/tm/scholarly/name-400919.html)
869 400919.html
- 870 Cockayne L, Allan H. 1934. An annotated list of groups of wild hybrids in the New Zealand flora.
871 *Ann Bot.* 48(189):1–55.
- 872 Cohen K, Finney S, Gibbard P, Fan J-X. 2013. The ICS international chronostratigraphic chart.
873 *Episodes.* 36(3):199–204.
- 874 Cooper A, Atkinson I, Lee WG, Worthy T. 1993. Evolution of the moa and their effect on the New
875 Zealand flora. *Trends Ecol Evol.* 8(12):433–437.
- 876 Cooper A, Cooper RA. 1995. The Oligocene bottleneck and New Zealand biota: genetic record of
877 a past environmental crisis. *Proc R Soc Lond B Biol Sci.* 261(1362):293–302.
- 878 Cooper R. 1989. New Zealand tectonostratigraphic terranes and panbiogeography. *N Z J Zool.*
879 16(4):699–712.
- 880 Crayn DM, Rossetto M, Maynard DJ. 2006. Molecular phylogeny and dating reveals an Oligo-
881 Miocene radiation of dry-adapted shrubs (former Tremandraceae) from rainforest tree progenitors
882 (Elaeocarpaceae) in Australia. *Am J Bot.* 93(9):1328–1342.
- 883 Dansereau P. 1964. Six Problems in New Zealand Vegetation. *Bull Torrey Bot Club.* 91(2):114–
884 140.
- 885 Darrow HE, Bannister P, Burritt DJ, Jameson PE. 2001. The frost resistance of juvenile and adult
886 forms of some heteroblastic New Zealand plants. *N Z J Bot.* 39(2):355–363.
- 887 Darrow HE, Bannister P, Burritt DJ, Jameson PE. 2002. Are juvenile forms of New Zealand
888 heteroblastic trees more resistant to water loss than their mature counterparts? *N Z J Bot.*
889 40(2):313–325.
- 890 Dawson J. 1963. A comment on divaricating shrubs. *Tuatara.* 11:193–4.
- 891 Dawson J. 1988. Forest vines to snow tussocks. Wellington: Victoria University Press.

- 892 Dawson J, Lucas R. 2012. Field Guide to New Zealand's Native Trees. [place unknown]: Craig
893 Potton.
- 894 Day JS. 1998a. Light conditions and the evolution of heteroblasty (and the divaricate form) in New
895 Zealand. N Z J Ecol. 22(1):43–54.
- 896 Day JS. 1998b. Growth and architecture of juvenile *Carpodetus serratus* in closed forest canopy
897 and canopy gap environments. N Z J Bot. 36(3):485–493.
- 898 Day JS. 1998c. Architecture of juvenile *Pennantia corymbosa*, a divaricate shrub from New
899 Zealand. N Z J Bot. 36(1):141–148.
- 900 Day JS, Gould KS. 1997. Vegetative architecture of *Elaeocarpus hookerianus*. Periodic growth
901 patterns in divaricating juveniles. Ann Bot. 79(6):607–616.
- 902 Day JS, Gould KS, Jameson PE. 1997. Vegetative architecture of *Elaeocarpus hookerianus*.
903 Transition from juvenile to adult. Ann Bot. 79(6):617–624.
- 904 Day JS, Gould KS, Jameson PE. 1998. Adventitious root initiation, plasticity, and response to plant
905 growth regulator treatments of seedling, juvenile, and adult *Elaeocarpus hookerianus* plants. N Z
906 J Bot. 36(3):477–484.
- 907 Day JS, Jameson P, Gould K. 1995. Cytokinins associated with metamorphic vegetative growth in
908 *Elaeocarpus hookerianus*. Funct Plant Biol. 22(1):67–73.
- 909 Denny GA. 1964. Habit heteroblastism of *Sophora microphylla* Ait. [Masters thesis].
910 Christchurch: University of Canterbury.
- 911 Diamond JM. 1990. Biological effects of ghosts. Nature. 345(6278):769–770.
- 912 Diels L. 1896. Vegetations-Biologie von Neu-Seeland. Leipzig: Wilhelm Engelmann.
- 913 Fadzly N, Burns K. 2010. Hiding from the ghost of herbivory past: evidence for crypsis in an
914 insular tree species. Int J Plant Sci. 171(8):828–833.
- 915 Fleming CA. 1975. The geological history of New Zealand and its biota. In: Biogeogr Ecol N Z.
916 Kuschel, G. (Ed.). The Netherlands: Springer; p. 1–86.
- 917 Forsyth DM, Coomes D, Nugent G, Hall G. 2002. Diet and diet preferences of introduced
918 ungulates (Order: Artiodactyla) in New Zealand. N Z J Zool. 29(4):323–343.
- 919 Forsyth DM, Wilmschurst JM, Allen RB, Coomes DA. 2010. Impacts of introduced deer and extinct
920 moa on New Zealand ecosystems. N Z J Ecol. 34(1):48.
- 921 Gamage HK. 2011. Phenotypic variation in heteroblastic woody species does not contribute to
922 shade survival. AoB Plants. 2011.
- 923 Gamage HK, Jesson L. 2007. Leaf heteroblasty is not an adaptation to shade: seedling anatomical
924 and physiological responses to light. N Z J Ecol. 31(2):245–254.
- 925 Garrity FD, Lusk CH. 2017. Independent contrasts reveal climatic relationships of divaricate plants
926 in New Zealand. N Z J Bot. 55(3):225–240.

- 927 GBIF - *Tetracoccus hallii* Brandegee. [accessed 2020 Jan 14].
 928 <https://www.gbif.org/species/5380903>
- 929 Gemmell NJ, Schwartz MK, Robertson BC. 2004. Moa were many. Proc R Soc Lond B Biol Sci.
 930 271(Suppl 6):S430–S432.
- 931 Gillham ME. 1960. Vegetation of Little Brother Island, Cook Strait, in relation to spray-bearing
 932 winds, soil salinity, and pH. Trans R Soc N Z. 88:405–424.
- 933 Godley E. 1985. Paths to maturity. N Z J Bot. 23(4):687–706.
- 934 Godley EJ. 1979. Leonard Cockayne and evolution. N Z J Bot. 17(2):197–215.
- 935 Greenwood R, Atkinson I. 1977. Evolution of divaricating plants in New Zealand in relation to
 936 moa browsing. In: Vol. 24. [place unknown]; p. 21–33.
- 937 Grierson E. 2014. The Development and Genetic Variation of *Sophora prostrata* – A New Zealand
 938 Divaricating Shrub [Masters thesis]. Hamilton: University of Waikato.
- 939 Grubb PJ. 2003. Interpreting some outstanding features of the flora and vegetation of Madagascar.
 940 Perspect Plant Ecol Evol Syst. 6(1–2):125–146.
- 941 Hallé F, Oldeman R, Tomlinson PB. 1978. Tropical Trees and Forests: An Architectural Analysis.
 942 Berlin, Heidelberg and New York: Springer-Verlag.
- 943 Halloy S. 1990. A morphological classification of plants, with special reference to the New
 944 Zealand alpine flora. J Veg Sci. 1(3):291–304.
- 945 Hall's *Tetracoccus*, *Tetracoccus hallii*. [accessed 2020 Jan 14]. [https://calscape.org/Tetracoccus-](https://calscape.org/Tetracoccus-hallii-())
 946 [hallii-\(\)](https://calscape.org/Tetracoccus-hallii-())
- 947 Heenan P, Mitchell C, Houliston G. 2018. Genetic variation and hybridisation among eight species
 948 of kōwhai (*Sophora*: Fabaceae) from New Zealand revealed by microsatellite markers. Genes.
 949 9(2):111.
- 950 Heenan PB, McGlone MS. 2019. Cenozoic formation and colonisation history of the New Zealand
 951 vascular flora based on molecular clock dating of the plastid *rbcL* gene. N Z J Bot [Internet].
 952 <https://doi.org/10.1080/0028825X.2019.1632356>
- 953 Horn HS. 1971. The adaptive geometry of trees. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- 954 Hornibrook N de B. 1992. New Zealand Cenozoic marine paleoclimates: a review based on the
 955 distribution of some shallow water and terrestrial biota. In: Pac Neogene Environ Evol Events.
 956 Ryuichi Tsuchi and James C. Ingle Jr. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press; p. 83–106.
- 957 Horrell BA, Jameson PE, Bannister P. 1990. Growth regulation and phase change in some New
 958 Zealand heteroblastic plants. N Z J Bot. 28(2):187–193.
- 959 Howell CJ. 1999. Shedding New Light on Old Moa Myths: Cold-induced Photoinhibition and the
 960 Divaricate Plant Form [Masters thesis]. Christchurch: University of Canterbury.

- 961 Howell CJ, Kelly D, Turnbull MH. 2002. Moa ghosts exorcised? New Zealand's divaricate shrubs
962 avoid photoinhibition. *Funct Ecol.* 16(2):232–240.
- 963 Jameson PE, Clemens J. 2015. Phase change and flowering in woody plants of the New Zealand
964 flora. *J Exp Bot.* 70(21):e6488–e6495.
- 965 Jones CS. 1999. An essay on juvenility, phase change, and heteroblasty in seed plants. *Int J Plant*
966 *Sci.* 160(6):S105–S111.
- 967 Kanowski J, Hopkins MS, Marsh H, Winter J. 2001. Ecological correlates of folivore abundance
968 in north Queensland rainforests. *Wildl Res.* 28(1):1–8.
- 969 Kavanagh PH. 2015. Herbivory and the evolution of divaricate plants: structural defences lost on
970 an offshore island. *Austral Ecol.* 40(2):206–211.
- 971 Keey RB, Lind D. 1997. Airflow around some New Zealand divaricating plants. *N Z Nat Sci.*
972 23:19–29.
- 973 Kelly D. 1994. Towards a numerical definition for divaricate (interlaced small-leaved) shrubs. *N*
974 *Z J Bot.* 32(4):509–518.
- 975 Kelly D, Ogle MR. 1990. A test of the climate hypothesis for divaricate plants. *N Z J Ecol.* 13:51–
976 61.
- 977 Kennedy EM. 2003. Late Cretaceous and Paleocene terrestrial climates of New Zealand: leaf fossil
978 evidence from South Island assemblages. *N Z J Geol Geophys.* 46(2):295–306.
- 979 Landis C, Campbell H, Begg J, Mildenhall D, Paterson AM, Trewick S. 2008. The Waipounamu
980 Erosion Surface: questioning the antiquity of the New Zealand land surface and terrestrial fauna
981 and flora. *Geol Mag.* 145(2):173–197.
- 982 de Lange PJ, Sawyer JWD, Rolfe JR. 2006. New Zealand indigenous vascular plant checklist.
983 Wellington, N.Z.: New Zealand Plant Conservation Network.
- 984 Lee WG, Johnson PN. 1984. Mineral element concentrations in foliage of divaricate and non-
985 divaricate *Coprosma* species. *N Z J Ecol.* 7:169–173.
- 986 Leigh A, Sevanto S, Close J, Nicotra A. 2017. The influence of leaf size and shape on leaf thermal
987 dynamics: does theory hold up under natural conditions? *Plant Cell Environ.* 40(2):237–248.
- 988 Leslie AB, Beaulieu JM, Rai HS, Crane PR, Donoghue MJ, Mathews S. 2012. Hemisphere-scale
989 differences in conifer evolutionary dynamics. *Proc Natl Acad Sci.* 109(40):16217–16221.
- 990 Lloyd DG. 1985. Progress in understanding the natural history of New Zealand plants. *N Z J Bot.*
991 23(4):707–722.
- 992 Lord JM, Marshall J. 2001. Correlations between growth form, habitat, and fruit colour in the New
993 Zealand flora, with reference to frugivory by lizards. *N Z J Bot.* 39(4):567–576.
- 994 Lovell P, Uka D, White J. 1991. Architecture of a clonal population of *Muehlenbeckia astonii*
995 Petrie (Polygonaceae), a divaricating shrub endemic to New Zealand. *N Z J Bot.* 29(1):63–70.

- 996 Lowry J. 1980. Evolution of divaricating plants in New Zealand in relation to moa browsing. N Z
997 J Ecol. 3:165–165.
- 998 Lusk CH. 1989. Age structure and dynamics of podocarp/broadleaved forest in Tongariro National
999 Park [PhD thesis]. Auckland: University of Auckland.
- 1000 Lusk CH. 2002. Does photoinhibition avoidance explain divarication in the New Zealand flora?
1001 Funct Ecol. 16(6):858–860.
- 1002 Lusk CH. 2014. Divaricate plants resist ungulate browsing in a forest remnant on the North Island
1003 of New Zealand. N Z Nat Sci. 39:1–9.
- 1004 Lusk CH, Clearwater MJ. 2015. Leaf temperatures of divaricate and broadleaved tree species
1005 during a frost in a North Island lowland forest remnant, New Zealand. N Z J Bot. 53(4):202–209.
- 1006 Lusk CH, Clearwater MJ, Laughlin DC, Harrison SP, Prentice IC, Nordenstahl M, Smith B. 2018.
1007 Frost and leaf-size gradients in forests: global patterns and experimental evidence. New Phytol.
1008 219(2):565–573.
- 1009 Lusk CH, McGlone MS, Overton JM. 2016. Climate predicts the proportion of divaricate plant
1010 species in New Zealand arborescent assemblages. J Biogeogr. 43(9):1881–1892.
- 1011 Maurin KJL, Lusk CH. in review. Do the New Zealand divaricates defy Corner's rules? Submitted
1012 to N Z Nat Sci.
- 1013 McGlone MS, Clarkson BD. 1993. Ghost stories: moa, plant defences and evolution in New
1014 Zealand. Tuatara. 32:1–21.
- 1015 McGlone MS, Dungan RJ, Hall GM, Allen RB. 2004. Winter leaf loss in the New Zealand woody
1016 flora. N Z J Bot. 42(1):1–19.
- 1017 McGlone MS, Richardson SJ, Jordan GJ. 2010. Comparative biogeography of New Zealand trees:
1018 species richness, height, leaf traits and range sizes. N Z J Ecol. 34(1):137–151.
- 1019 McGlone MS, Webb CJ. 1981. Selective forces influencing the evolution of divaricating plants. N
1020 Z J Ecol. 4:20–28.
- 1021 McQueen D. 2000. Divaricating shrubs in Patagonia and New Zealand. N Z J Ecol.:69–80.
- 1022 Meurk CD, Foggo M, Wilson JB. 1994. The vegetation of subantarctic Campbell Island. N Z J
1023 Ecol. 18(2):123–168.
- 1024 Mildenhall DC. 1980. New Zealand Late Cretaceous and Cenozoic plant biogeography: a
1025 contribution. Palaeogeogr Palaeoclimatol Palaeoecol. 31:197–233.
- 1026 Mildenhall DC, Mortimer N, Bassett K, Kennedy E. 2014. Oligocene paleogeography of New
1027 Zealand: maximum marine transgression. N Z J Geol Geophys. 57(2):107–109.
- 1028 Mitchell A, Heenan PB, Murray B, Molloy B, de Lange P. 2009. Evolution of the south-western
1029 Pacific genus *Melicytus* (Violaceae): evidence from DNA sequence data, cytology and sex
1030 expression. Aust Syst Bot. 22(3):143–157.

- 1031 Mitchell AE, Logan BA, Reblin JS, Burns KC, Gould KS. 2019. Photosynthetic properties of
1032 juvenile *Prumnopitys taxifolia* (Podocarpaceae), a divaricate and heteroblastic conifer. N Z J
1033 Bot.:1–11.
- 1034 Mitchell KJ, Llamas B, Soubrier J, Rawlence NJ, Worthy TH, Wood J, Lee MS, Cooper A. 2014.
1035 Ancient DNA reveals elephant birds and kiwi are sister taxa and clarifies ratite bird evolution.
1036 Science. 344(6186):898–900.
- 1037 Nicolas AN, Plunkett GM. 2014. Diversification times and biogeographic patterns in Apiales. Bot
1038 Rev. 80(1):30–58.
- 1039 Parkhurst DF, Loucks O. 1972. Optimal leaf size in relation to environment. J Ecol. 60(2):505–
1040 537.
- 1041 Perry GL, Wheeler AB, Wood JR, Wilmshurst JM. 2014. A high-precision chronology for the
1042 rapid extinction of New Zealand moa (Aves, Dinornithiformes). Quat Sci Rev. 105:126–135.
- 1043 Philipson WR. 1963. Habit in relation to age in New Zealand trees. J Indian Bot Soc. 42A:167–
1044 179.
- 1045 Phillips MJ, Gibb GC, Crimp EA, Penny D. 2010. Tinamous and moa flock together:
1046 mitochondrial genome sequence analysis reveals independent losses of flight among ratites. Syst
1047 Biol. 59(1):90–107.
- 1048 Phoon S-N. 2015. Systematics and biogeography of *Elaeocarpus* (Elaeocarpaceae) [PhD thesis].
1049 [place unknown]: James Cook University.
- 1050 Pole M. 1994. The New Zealand flora-entirely long-distance dispersal? J Biogeogr. 21(6):625–
1051 635.
- 1052 Pole M, Moore PR. 2011. A late Miocene leaf assemblage from Coromandel Peninsula, New
1053 Zealand, and its climatic implications. Alcheringa. 35(1):103–121.
- 1054 Pollock ML, Lee WG, Walker S, Forrester G. 2007. Ratite and ungulate preferences for woody
1055 New Zealand plants: influence of chemical and physical traits. N Z J Ecol. 31(1):68–78.
- 1056 Pott C, McLoughlin S. 2014. Divaricate growth habit in Williamsoniaceae (Bennettitales):
1057 unravelling the ecology of a key Mesozoic plant group. Palaeobiodiversity Palaeoenvironments.
1058 94(2):307–325.
- 1059 Pott C, Wang X, Zheng X. 2015. *Wielandiella villosa* comb. nov. from the Middle Jurassic of
1060 Daohugou, China: more evidence for divaricate plant architecture in Williamsoniaceae. Bot
1061 Pacifica. 4(2):137–148.
- 1062 Rattenbury J. 1962. Cyclic Hybridization as a Survival Mechanism in the New Zealand Forest
1063 Flora. Evolution. 16(3):348–363.
- 1064 Raunkiær C. 1934. The life forms of plants and statistical plant geography. Oxford, G.B.:
1065 Clarendon Press.
- 1066 Ray TS. 1990. Metamorphosis in the Araceae. Am J Bot. 77(12):1599–1609.

- 1067 Roberts RG, Flannery TF, Ayliffe LK, Yoshida H, Olley JM, Prideaux GJ, Laslett GM, Baynes A,
 1068 Smith MA, Jones R. 2001. New ages for the last Australian megafauna: continent-wide extinction
 1069 about 46,000 years ago. *Science*. 292(5523):1888–1892.
- 1070 Schneiderheinze J. 2006. Photoinhibition under Drought and High Light Loads in New Zealand's
 1071 Divaricate Shrubs [PhD thesis]. Christchurch: University of Canterbury.
- 1072 Schuster TM, Setaro SD, Kron KA. 2013. Age estimates for the buckwheat family Polygonaceae
 1073 based on sequence data calibrated by fossils and with a focus on the Amphi-Pacific
 1074 *Muehlenbeckia*. *PLoS ONE*. 8(4):e61261.
- 1075 SEINet Portal Network - *Tetracoccus hallii*. [accessed 2020 Jan 14].
 1076 <http://swbiodiversity.org/seinet/taxa/index.php?taxon=Tetracoccus+hallii>
- 1077 Shepherd LD, de Lange PJ, Perrie LR, Heenan PB. 2017. Chloroplast phylogeography of New
 1078 Zealand *Sophora* trees (Fabaceae): extensive hybridization and widespread Last Glacial Maximum
 1079 survival. *J Biogeogr*. 44:1640–1651.
- 1080 Solargis s.r.o. Direct normal irradiation map, Global Solar Atlas 2.0 [Internet]. [accessed 2020 Jan
 1081 15]. <https://globalsolaratlas.info/map>
- 1082 Stajsic V, Walsh N, Douglas R, Messina A, Molloy B. 2015. A revision of *Melicytus* (Violaceae)
 1083 in mainland Australia and Tasmania. *Aust Syst Bot*. 27(4):305–323.
- 1084 Stenberg P. 1995. Penumbra in within-shoot and between-shoot shading in conifers and its
 1085 significance for photosynthesis. *Ecol Model*. 77(2–3):215–231.
- 1086 Taylor GM. 1975. Divaricating shrubs. *Nat Herit*. 6:2118–27.
- 1087 Tennyson AJ, WorTHy TH, Jones CM, Scofield RP, Hand SJ. 2010. Moa's Ark: Miocene fossils
 1088 reveal the great antiquity of moa (Aves: Dinornithiformes) in Zealandia. *Rec Aust Mus*.
 1089 62(1):105–114.
- 1090 *Tetracoccus hallii* Calflora. 2020. [accessed 2020 Jan 14]. [https://www.calflora.org/cgi-](https://www.calflora.org/cgi-bin/species_query.cgi?where-calrecnum=7933)
 1091 [bin/species_query.cgi?where-calrecnum=7933](https://www.calflora.org/cgi-bin/species_query.cgi?where-calrecnum=7933)
- 1092 Thompson IR. 2010. A new species of *Leptostigma* (Rubiaceae: Coprosminae) and notes on the
 1093 Coprosminae in Australia. *Muelleria*. 28(1):29–39.
- 1094 Thornhill AH, Ho SY, Külheim C, Crisp MD. 2015. Interpreting the modern distribution of
 1095 Myrtaceae using a dated molecular phylogeny. *Mol Phylogenet Evol*. 93:29–43.
- 1096 Tomlinson PB. 1978. Some qualitative and quantitative aspects of New Zealand divaricating
 1097 shrubs. *N Z J Bot*. 16(3):299–310.
- 1098 Tucker JM. 1974. Patterns of parallel evolution of leaf form in new world oaks. *Taxon*:129–154.
- 1099 Turnbull MH, Howell CJ, Christian R, Kelly D. 2002. Photoinhibition, acclimation and New
 1100 Zealand's divarication plants: a reply to Lusk. *Funct Ecol*. 16(6):860–862.
- 1101 Veblen TT, Stewart GH. 1980. Comparison of forest structure and regeneration on Bench and
 1102 Stewart Islands, New Zealand. *N Z J Ecol*. 3:50–68.

- 1103 Wagstaff SJ, Breitwieser I, Ito M. 2011. Evolution and biogeography of *Pleurophyllum* (Astereae,
1104 Asteraceae), a small genus of megaherbs endemic to the subantarctic islands. *Am J Bot.* 98(1):62–
1105 75.
- 1106 Wagstaff SJ, Tate JA. 2011. Phylogeny and character evolution in the New Zealand endemic genus
1107 *Plagianthus* (Malveae, Malvaceae). *Syst Bot.* 36(2):405–418.
- 1108 Wallis GP, Jorge F. 2018. Going under down under? Lineage ages argue for extensive survival of
1109 the Oligocene marine transgression on Zealandia. *Mol Ecol.* 27:4368–4396.
- 1110 Wallis GP, Trewick SA. 2009. New Zealand phylogeography: evolution on a small continent. *Mol*
1111 *Ecol.* 18(17):3548–3580.
- 1112 Wardle P. 1963. Evolution and distribution of the New Zealand flora, as affected by Quaternary
1113 climates. *N Z J Bot.* 1(1):3–17.
- 1114 Wardle P. 1985. Environmental influences on the vegetation of New Zealand. *N Z J Bot.*
1115 23(4):773–788.
- 1116 Wardle P. 1991. *Vegetation of New Zealand*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1117 Wardle P, Ezcurra C, Ramírez C, Wagstaff S. 2001. Comparison of the flora and vegetation of the
1118 southern Andes and New Zealand. *N Z J Bot.* 39(1):69–108.
- 1119 Wardle P, McGlone MS. 1988. Towards a more appropriate term for our divaricating shrubs and
1120 juvenile trees. *N Z Bot Soc Newsl.* 11:16–18.
- 1121 Went F. 1971. Parallel evolution. *Taxon.* 20(2/3):197–226.
- 1122 Whitaker A. 1987. The roles of lizards in New Zealand plant reproductive strategies. *N Z J Bot.*
1123 25(2):315–328.
- 1124 Wilson HD. 1991. Distribution maps of small-leaved shrubs in Canterbury and Westland. *Canterb*
1125 *Bot Soc J.* 25:3–81.
- 1126 Wilson JB, Lee WG. 2012. Is New Zealand vegetation really ‘problematic’? Dansereau’s puzzles
1127 revisited. *Biol Rev.* 87(2):367–389.
- 1128 Woo VL, Funke MM, Smith JF, Lockhart PJ, Garnock-Jones PJ. 2011. New World origins of
1129 southwest Pacific Gesneriaceae: multiple movements across and within the South Pacific. *Int J*
1130 *Plant Sci.* 172(3):434–457.
- 1131 Wood JR, Rawlence NJ, Rogers GM, Austin JJ, Worthy TH, Cooper A. 2008. Coprolite deposits
1132 reveal the diet and ecology of the extinct New Zealand megaherbivore moa (Aves,
1133 *Dinornithiformes*). *Quat Sci Rev.* 27(27):2593–2602.
- 1134 Wood JR, Richardson SJ, McGlone MS, Wilmshurst JM. 2020. The diets of moa (Aves:
1135 *Dinornithiformes*). *N Z J Ecol.* 44(1):1–21.
- 1136 Worthy TH, Holdaway RN. 2002. *The lost world of the moa: prehistoric life of New Zealand*.
1137 Christchurch, N.Z.: Indiana University Press.

- 1138 Worthy TH, Scofield RP. 2012. Twenty-first century advances in knowledge of the biology of moa
1139 (Aves: Dinornithiformes): a new morphological analysis and moa diagnoses revised. *N Z J Zool.*
1140 39(2):87–153.
- 1141 Wotton DM, Drake DR, Powlesland RG, Ladley JJ. 2016. The role of lizards as seed dispersers in
1142 New Zealand. *J R Soc N Z.* 46(1):40–65.
- 1143 Wright IJ, Dong N, Maire V, Prentice IC, Westoby M, Díaz S, Gallagher RV, Jacobs BF, Kooyman
1144 R, Law EA. 2017. Global climatic drivers of leaf size. *Science.* 357(6354):917–921.
- 1145 Yates MJ, Verboom GA, Rebelo AG, Cramer MD. 2010. Ecophysiological significance of leaf
1146 size variation in Proteaceae from the Cape Floristic Region. *Funct Ecol.* 24(3):485–492.
- 1147