

**MOLECULAR BIOLOGY
INTELLIGENCE
UNIT**

Cell-Cell Channels

Frantisek Baluska, Ph.D.

Institute of Cellular and Molecular Botany
Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms University of Bonn
Bonn, Germany

Dieter Volkmann, Ph.D.

Institute of Cellular and Molecular Botany
Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms University of Bonn
Bonn, Germany

Peter W. Barlow, Ph.D.

School of Biological Sciences
University of Bristol
Bristol, U.K.

LANDES BIOSCIENCE / EUREKAH.COM
GEORGETOWN, TEXAS
U.S.A.

SPRINGER SCIENCE+BUSINESS MEDIA
NEW YORK, NEW YORK
U.S.A.

CELL-CELL CHANNELS

Molecular Biology Intelligence Unit

Landes Bioscience / Eurekah.com
Springer Science+Business Media, LLC

ISBN: 0-387-36058-1

Printed on acid-free paper.

Copyright ©2006 Landes Bioscience and Springer Science+Business Media, LLC

All rights reserved. This work may not be translated or copied in whole or in part without the written permission of the publisher, except for brief excerpts in connection with reviews or scholarly analysis. Use in connection with any form of information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed is forbidden.

The use in the publication of trade names, trademarks, service marks and similar terms even if they are not identified as such, is not to be taken as an expression of opinion as to whether or not they are subject to proprietary rights.

While the authors, editors and publisher believe that drug selection and dosage and the specifications and usage of equipment and devices, as set forth in this book, are in accord with current recommendations and practice at the time of publication, they make no warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to material described in this book. In view of the ongoing research, equipment development, changes in governmental regulations and the rapid accumulation of information relating to the biomedical sciences, the reader is urged to carefully review and evaluate the information provided herein.

Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, 233 Spring Street, New York, New York 10013, U.S.A.
<http://www.springer.com>

Please address all inquiries to the Publishers:
Landes Bioscience / Eurekah.com, 810 South Church Street, Georgetown, Texas 78626, U.S.A.
Phone: 512/ 863 7762; FAX: 512/ 863 0081
<http://www.eurekah.com>
<http://www.landesbioscience.com>

Printed in the United States of America.

9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Cell-cell channels / [edited by] Frantisek Baluska, Dieter Volkmann, Peter W. Barlow.

p. ; cm. -- (Molecular biology intelligence unit)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-387-36058-1 (alk. paper)

1. Cell junctions. 2. Cell interaction. 3. Cells--Permeability. 4. Cell membranes. I. Baluška, F. II. Volkmann, Dieter. III. Barlow, Peter W. IV. Series: Molecular biology intelligence unit (Unnumbered)

[DNLM: 1. Cell Communication. 2. Intercellular Junctions. QU 350 C393 2006]
QH603.C4.C45 2006

571.6--dc22

2006018962

About the Editors...



FRANTISEK BALUSKA is lecturer and researcher in the Institute of Cellular and Molecular Botany at the University of Bonn, Germany. His main interest is in cell biology of plants, especially as related to the cytoskeleton, endocytosis, vesicle trafficking, and polarity. He has investigated root apices for more than 20 years now and made original contributions to the understanding of the root apex organization by the discovery of a transition zone interpolated between the apical meristem and rapid cell elongation region. Frantisek Baluska is also interested in response of roots to environmental factors such as gravity as well as in emerging neurobiological aspects of plants. Finally, he is interested in conceptual analysis of the cell theory. He obtained his first degree from the Comenius University in Bratislava and his Ph.D. from the Slovak Academy of Sciences in Bratislava, Slovakia.



DIETER VOLKMANN is apl. Professor at the Institute of Cellular and Molecular Botany, Division of Plant Cell Biology, at the University of Bonn, Germany. His main research interest is in the field of plant responses to environmental factors, in particular responses related to gravity and microgravity at the cellular level. He made contributions to knowledge of the gravity controlled signal transduction chain as well as to the process of cell-cell-communication. He received a Ph.D. in botany at the University of Bonn and is member of the Faculty of Science at this university.



PETER BARLOW is Senior Research Fellow in the School of Biological Sciences at the University of Bristol, Bristol, U.K. His present research interests lie in the field of theoretical systems that contribute to biology, especially those which specify cellular patterns and differentiation, as well as in their possible cytological counterparts. He has also made contributions in the fields of plant cytology, human cytogenetics and mammalian embryology, and has also worked in a consultative capacity for the European Space Agency. Peter Barlow received a Bachelor of Science degree in botany from the University of St. Andrews, Scotland, from which he later received the degree of D.Sc. He also was awarded a D. Phil. degree from Oxford University, U.K.

CONTENTS

Preface	xvii
---------------	------

1. Cell-Cell Channels and Their Implications for Cell Theory	1
<i>Frantisek Baluska, Dieter Volkmann and Peter W. Barlow</i>	
The Permanent Crisis Surrounding Cell Theory	2
More Problems with Cell Theory: What Is a Cell?	3
Julius Sachs: Energide as the Basic Unit of Eukaryotic Life	
Endowed with Vital Energy	4
Energide versus Cell Periphery	5
Adaptability versus Complexity in Cellular Evolution	6
Duality of Eukaryotic Cells	7
Cell-Cell Channels: Supracellularity Is Found at All Levels	
of Cellular Organization	7
Cell-Cell Channels in Filamentous Fungi, Plants and Animals	9
Cell-Cell Channels and the Energide: Implications for Cell Theory	10

Section I: Prokaryotic Cells

2. Mating Cell-Cell Channels in Conjugating Bacteria	21
<i>Elisabeth Grohmann</i>	
Conjugative DNA Transfer in Gram-Negative Bacteria	22
Pheromone-Responsive Conjugative Plasmids in <i>E. faecalis</i>	27
Nonpheromone-Responsive Plasmids in G+ Bacteria	28

Section II: Ciliate Cells

3. The <i>Tetrahymena</i> Conjugation Junction	39
<i>Eric S. Cole</i>	
Developmental Biology	41
Biochemical Studies	55
Genetic Studies	57

Section III: Algal Cells

4. Cytoplasmic Bridges in <i>Volvox</i> and Its Relatives	65
<i>Harold J. Hoops, Ichiro Nishii and David L. Kirk</i>	
A Brief Overview of <i>Volvox carteri</i> Development	66
The Formation of a Cytoplasmic-Bridge System	
in <i>Volvox carteri</i> Embryos	68
Structural Features of the <i>V. carteri</i> Cytoplasmic-Bridge System	70
The Function of the Cytoplasmic-Bridge System	
in Cleaving Embryos	71
The Function of the Cytoplasmic-Bridge System	
in Inverting Embryos	71
An Inversion Motor in the Cytoplasmic Bridges	72

The Evolutionary Origins of Cytoplasmic Bridges that Persist in the Adult	74
Structure and Formation of Persistent Cytoplasmic Bridges in <i>Volvox</i> , Section Euvolvox	76
What Is the Relationship between Embryonic and Adult Cytoplasmic Bridges?	81
The Functions of Persistent Cytoplasmic Bridges	81

Section IV: Fungal Cells

5. Vegetative Hyphal Fusion in Filamentous Fungi	87
<i>Nick D. Read and M. Gabriela Roca</i>	
Fusion between Spores and Spore Germlings	88
Fusion between Hyphae in the Mature Colony	91
CAT Fusion as a Model for Studying Vegetative Hyphal Fusion	91
Functions of Vegetative Hyphal Fusion	94
Features of Hyphal Fusion in Common with Yeast Cell Mating and Appressorium Formation	94
Vegetative Hyphal Fusion and Heterokaryon Incompatibility	95

Section V: Plant Cells

6. Plasmodesmata: Cell-Cell Channels in Plants	101
<i>Yoselin Benitez Alfonso, Laurence Cantrill and David Jackson</i>	
Structure of Plasmodesmata	102
Mechanisms of Protein and RNA Transport through PDs	104
Plasmodesmata as a Route for Trafficking of Developmental Signals	106
Developmental and Environmental Regulation of PD SEL	106
7. Sieve-Pore Plugging Mechanisms	113
<i>Aart J.E. van Bel</i>	
Cell Biology of the Sieve Element/Companion Cell Complex	113
Mass Flow and Phloem-Specific Proteins	114
Sieve-Plate Plugging by Phloem-Specific Proteins	114
Mechanisms of Sieve-Plate Sealing	115
Dispersion and Contraction of Forisomes	115
Physiological Triggers of the Sieve-Plate Plugging	115
8. Actin and Myosin VIII in Plant Cell-Cell Channels	119
<i>Jozef Samaj, Nigel Chaffey, Uday Tirlapur, Jan Jasik, Andrej Hlavacka, Zhan Feng Cui, Dieter Volkmann, Diedrik Menzel and Frantisek Baluska</i>	
How Are Proteins and Other Molecules Targeted to PD?	120
How Are Molecules Transported through PD?	120

Actin and Myosin VIII in PD of Algae and Herbaceous Plants	121
Root Cap Statocytes Are Symplasmically Isolated and Depleted in Myosin VIII	122
PD and Nuclear Pores: Common Structural and Functional Aspects	124
PD and Cell Plates: Endocytic Connections?	125
Cytoskeleton, Endocytosis and PD	127
Actin and Myosin VIII in PD of Woody Tissues in Trees	128
Conclusions and Outlook: From the Actomyosin-Based PD in Plants to the Actomyosin-Based Cell-Cell Channels in Animals	130
9. Cell-Cell Communication in Wood	135
<i>John R. Barnett</i>	
Xylem Parenchyma	137
Origin and Function of Rays	141
Distribution of Plasmodesmata in Nonparenchymatous Wood Cells	142
Plasmodesmata in Differentiating Xylem	144
Formation of Plasmodesmata in Cambium and Developing Wood Cells	145
10. TMV Movement Protein Targets Cell-Cell Channels in Plants and Prokaryotes: Possible Roles of Tubulin- and FtsZ-Based Cytoskeletons	148
<i>Manfred Heinlein</i>	
Plasmodesmata and Intercellular Communication in Plants	148
The Movement Protein of TMV Interacts with the Plant Cytoskeleton and Plasmodesmata to Facilitate Intercellular Spread of the Virus	149
The Movement Protein of TMV Targets and Modifies Cell-Cell Junctions in <i>Anabaena</i>	152
11. Viral Movement Proteins Induce Tubule Formation in Plant and Insect Cells	160
<i>Jan W.M. van Lent and Corinne Schmitt-Keichinger</i>	
Viruses, Transport Tubules and Plasmodesmata	161
Requirements for the Assembly of the Transport Tubules	165
The MPs That Form Tubules	165
Interactions between Tubules and Capsids for Cell-to-Cell Movement	166
Host Factors Involved in Targeting and Assembly of the Tubules	167
Interaction between MP and Plasma Membrane: Anchoring	169
A Model for Tubule-Mediated Cell-to-Cell Movement	169

12. Cell-Cell Movements of Transcription Factors in Plants	176
<i>Alexis Maizel</i>	
Noncell Autonomous Action of Transcription Factors	
by Direct Protein Transfer in Plants	176
Common Mechanistic Trends in Plant Transcription	
Factors Movement?	179
Biological Significance of Transcription Factor	
Movement in Plants?	180

Section VI: Animal Cells

13. Gap Junctions: Cell-Cell Channels in Animals	185
<i>Fabio Mammano</i>	
Connexins	185
Connexin-Related Pathologies	191
Pannexins	195
14. Tunneling Nanotubes: Membranous Channels	
between Animal Cells	200
<i>Hans-Hermann Gerdes and Amin Rustom</i>	
Structure	201
Formation	203
Function(s)	204
Implications and Outlook	206
15. Cytoplasmic Bridges as Cell-Cell Channels of Germ Cells	208
<i>Sami Ventelä</i>	
Cytoplasmic Bridges during Gametogenesis	208
The Cytoplasmic Bridges in Action	209
Mechanisms Needed for Cytoplasmic Material	
Transportation between the Germ Cells	212
16. Fusome as a Cell-Cell Communication Channel	
of <i>Drosophila</i> Ovarian Cyst	217
<i>Jean-René Huynh</i>	
Formation of the Fusome	218
Fusome Functions in the Formation and Differentiation	
of the Germline Cyst	227
17. Cytonemes as Cell-Cell Channels in Human Blood Cells	236
<i>Svetlana Ivanovna Galkina, Anatoly Georgievich Bogdanov,</i>	
<i>Georgy Natanovich Davidovich and Galina Fedorovna Sud'ina</i>	
Cytonemes of Embryonic Cells	237
Cytonemes of Human Blood Cells	237
Formation and Properties of Cytonemes Connecting Blood Cells	240
Origin and Degradation of Cytonemes	242

18. Paracellular Pores in Endothelial Barriers	245
<i>Luca Manzi and Gianfranco Bazzoni</i>	
Endothelial Permeability	245
Tight Junctions and Paracellular Permeability	245
The Role of Claudins in Paracellular Permeability	247
Open Issues	248
19. Channels across Endothelial Cells	251
<i>Radu V. Stan</i>	
Vascular Permeability—Pathways of Transendothelial Exchange	252
Pores across Endothelium	257
20. Molecular Transfers through Transient Lymphoid Cell-Cell Channels	267
<i>Mary Poupot, Julie Gertner and Jean-Jacques Fournié</i>	
Introduction: Transient Cell-Cell Contacts Take Place at the Immunological Synapse between Lymphoid Cells	267
Two Different Ways for Cell-Cell Transfer between Lymphoid Cells	269
A Mechanistic Model of Trogocytosis	272
Methods and Techniques for the Monitoring of in Vitro Trogocytosis	273
Intercellular Transfer in Activated Lymphoid Cells	275
Spontaneous Homotypic Intercellular Transfer in Lymphoid Cancer Cells	276
Physiological Consequences of Intercellular Transfer by T Lymphocytes	276
Physiological Consequences of Intercellular Transfer by NK Cells: Protective Role of Acquired HLA Class I Alleles, Cytokine Receptor and Deleterious Role of Acquired Viral Receptors	277
Technological Consequences of Trogocytosis	277
Trogotypes for Immuno-Monitoring the Lymphoid Cell Reactivity to Cancer	278
Transynaptic Acquisition of Functional Markers in Oncology	279
21. Cell-Cell Transport of Homeoproteins: With or Without Channels?	283
<i>Alain Joliot and Alain Prochiantz</i>	
Intercellular Transfer of Homeoproteins in Animals	283
Phylogenesis of Homeoprotein Intercellular Transfer	284
Function of Intercellular Transfer	285

22. Virological Synapse for Cell-Cell Spread of Viruses	288
<i>Eduardo Garcia and Vincent Piguet</i>	
Neural, Immunological and Virological Synapse	288
Virological Synapse during Retroviral Infection	289
Virological Synapses during HIV Infection	289
Virological Synapse for HTLV-1 Replication	291
Emerging Role for a Plant Virological Synapse	292
23. Cell-Cell Fusion: Transient Channels Leading	
 to Plasma Membrane Merger	298
<i>William A. Mohler</i>	
Fertilization (Mouse)	300
Fertilization (Nematode)	300
Myoblasts (Mouse)	300
Myoblasts (Fruit Fly)	302
Placental Syncytiotrophoblast Cells (Human and Mouse)	303
Lens Fiber Cells (Mouse and Other Vertebrates)	305
Macrophages/Osteoclasts (Mouse)	305
Implanted Stem Cells (Mouse and Human)	306
Epithelia (Nematode)	306
Primary Mesenchyme (Sea Urchin)	308
Embryonic Blastomeres (Leech)	309
Haploid Mating (Yeast)	309
Fungal Hyphae	309
Summary of Molecules Driving Cell Fusion:	
Obstacles to Their Discovery	309
Structural Origins of Cell Fusion Channels?	310
Evolution and Cell Fusion	311
Index	317

EDITORS

Frantisek Baluska

Institute of Cellular and Molecular Botany
Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms University of Bonn
Bonn, Germany
Email: baluska@uni-bonn.de

Chapters 1, 8

Dieter Volkmann

Institute of Cellular and Molecular Botany
Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms University of Bonn
Bonn, Germany
Email: unb110@uni-bonn.de

Chapters 1, 8

Peter W. Barlow

School of Biological Sciences
University of Bristol
Bristol, U.K.
Email: P.W.Barlow@bristol.ac.uk

Chapter 1

CONTRIBUTORS

Yoselin Benitez Alfonso
Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory
Cold Spring Harbor, New York, U.S.A.
Chapter 6

John R. Barnett
School of Plant Sciences
University of Reading
Whiteknights, Reading, U.K.
Email: j.r.barnett@reading.ac.uk
Chapter 9

Gianfranco Bazzoni
Department of Biochemistry
and Molecular Pharmacology
Istituto di Ricerche Farmacologiche
Mario Negri
Milano, Italy
Email: bazzoni@marionegri.it
Chapter 18

Anatoly Georgievich Bogdanov
A.N. Belozersky Institute
of Physico-Chemical Biology
and
Biological Department
Moscow State University
Moscow, Russia
Chapter 17

Laurence Cantrill
School of Biological Sciences
University of Sydney
Sydney, NSW, Australia
Chapter 6

Nigel Chaffey
Department of Biology
Bath Spa University
Newton St. Loe, U.K.
Chapter 8

Eric S. Cole
Biology Department
St. Olaf College
Northfield, Minnesota, U.S.A.
Email: colee@stolaf.edu
Chapter 3

Zhan Feng Cui
Department of Engineering Science
University of Oxford
Oxford, U.K.
Chapter 8

Georgy Natanovich Davidovich
A.N. Belozersky Institute
of Physico-Chemical Biology
and
Biological Department
Moscow State University
Moscow, Russia
Chapter 17

Jean-Jacques Fournié
Groupe d'Etude des Antigènes
Non-Conventionnels
Département Oncogénèse
and Signalisation dans les Cellules
Hématopoïétiques
INSERM Unité 563
Centre de Physiopathologie
de Toulouse Purpan
Toulouse, France
Email: fournier@toulouse.inserm.fr
Chapter 20

Svetlana Ivanovna Galkina
A.N. Belozersky Institute
of Physico-Chemical Biology
and
Biological Department
Moscow State University
Moscow, Russia
Email: galkina@genebee.msu.ru
Chapter 17

Eduardo Garcia
Department of Dermatology
and Venereology
University Hospital of Geneva
Geneva, Switzerland
Chapter 22

Hans-Hermann Gerdes
Institute for Biochemistry
and Molecular Biology
University of Bergen
Bergen, Norway
and
Interdisciplinary Center of Neuroscience
Institute of Neurobiology
University of Heidelberg
Heidelberg, Germany
Email:
Hans-hermann-gerdes@biomed.nib.no
Chapter 14

Julie Gertner
Groupe d'Etude des Antigènes
Non-Conventionnels
Département Oncogénèse
and Signalisation dans les Cellules
Hématopoïétiques
INSERM Unité 563
Centre de Physiopathologie
de Toulouse Purpan
Toulouse, France
Chapter 20

Elisabeth Grohmann
Department of Environmental
Microbiology
University of Technology Berlin
Berlin, Germany
Email: Elisabeth.grohmann@tu-berlin.de
Chapter 2

Manfred Heinlein
Institut Biologie Moléculaire des Plantes
CNRS UPR 2357
Strasbourg, France
Email:
manfred.heinlein@ibmp-ulp.u-strasbg.fr
Chapter 10

Andrej Hlavacka
Institute of Cellular
and Molecular Botany
University of Bonn
Bonn, Germany
Chapter 8

Harold J. Hoops
Department of Biology
State University of New York at Geneseo
Geneseo, New York, U.S.A.
Chapter 4

Jean-René Huynh
Institut Jacques-Monod, CNRS
Universités Paris
Paris, France
Email: huynh@ijm.jussieu.fr
Chapter 16

David Jackson
Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory
Cold Spring Harbor, New York, U.S.A.
Email: jacksond@cshl.edu
Chapter 6

Jan Jasik
Max Planck Institute for Plant
Breeding Research
Cologne, Germany
Chapter 8

Alain Joliot
Homeoprotein Cell Biology
CNRS UMR8542
Ecole Normale Supérieure
Paris, France
Email: joliot@biologie.ens.fr
Chapter 21

David L. Kirk
Department of Biology
Washington University
St. Louis, Missouri, U.S.A.
Email: kirk@biology.wustl.edu
Chapter 4

Alexis Maizel
Department of Molecular Biology
Max Planck Institute
of Developmental Biology
Tübingen, Germany
Email: maizel@tuebingen.mpg.de
Chapter 12

Fabio Mammano
Venetian Institute
of Molecular Medicine
University of Padova
Padua, Italy
Email: fabio.mammano@unipd.it
Chapter 13

Luca Manzi
Department of Biochemistry
and Molecular Pharmacology
Istituto di Ricerche Farmacologiche
Mario Negri
Milano, Italy
Chapter 18

Diedrik Menzel
Institute of Cellular
and Molecular Botany
University of Bonn
Bonn, Germany
Chapter 12

William A. Mohler
Department of Genetics
and Developmental Biology
University of Connecticut Health Center
Farmington, Connecticut, U.S.A.
Email: wmohler@neuron.uchc.edu
Chapter 23

Ichiro Nishii
Department of Biology
Washington University in St. Louis
St. Louis, Missouri, U.S.A.
and
Nishii Initiative Research Unit
RIKEN Institute
Saitama, Japan
Chapter 4

Vincent Piguet
Department of Dermatology
and Venereology
University Hospital of Geneva
Geneva, Switzerland
Email:
vincent.piguet@medecine.unige.ch
Chapter 22

Mary Poupot
Groupe d'Etude des Antigènes
Non-Conventionnels
Département Oncogénèse
et Signalisation dans les Cellules
Hématopoïétiques
INSERM Unité 563
Centre de Physiopathologie
de Toulouse Purpan
Toulouse, France
Chapter 20

Alain Prochiantz
Development and Neuropharmacology
Group
CNRS UMR8542
Ecole Normale Supérieure
Paris, France
Email: prochian@biologie.ens.fr
Chapter 21

Nick D. Read
Fungal Cell Biology Group
Institute of Cell Biology
University of Edinburgh
Edinburgh, U.K.
Email: Nick@fungalcell.org
Chapter 5

M. Gabriela Roca
Fungal Cell Biology Group
Institute of Cell Biology
University of Edinburgh
Edinburgh, U.K.
Chapter 5

Amin Rustom
Interdisciplinary Center of Neuroscience
Institute of Neurobiology
University of Heidelberg
Heidelberg, Germany
Chapter 14

Jozef Samaj
Institute of Cellular
and Molecular Botany
University of Bonn
Bonn, Germany
and
Institute of Plant Genetics
and Biotechnology
Slovak Academy of Sciences
Nitra, Slovak Republic
Email: jozef.samaj@uni-bonn.de
Chapter 8

Corinne Schmitt-Keichinger
Institut Biologie Moléculaire des Plantes
CNRS UPR 2357
Strasbourg, France
Email:
corinne.keichinger@ibmp-ulp.u-strasbg.fr
Chapter 11

Radu V. Stan
Dartmouth Medical School
Angiogenesis Research Center
Department of Pathology
Hanover, New Hampshire, U.S.A.
Email: Radu.V.Stan@Dartmouth.edu
Chapter 19

Galina Fedorovna Sud'ina
A.N. Belozersky Institute
of Physico-Chemical Biology
and
Biological Department
Moscow State University
Moscow, Russia
Chapter 17

Uday Tirlapur
Department of Engineering Science
University of Oxford
Oxford, U.K.
Chapter 8

Aart J.E. van Bel
Plant Cell Biology Group
Institute of General Botany
Justus-Liebig-University
Giessen, Germany
Email: aart.v.bel@bot1.bio.uni-giessen.de
Chapter 7

Jan W.M. van Lent
Laboratory of Virology
Department of Plant Sciences
Wageningen University
Wageningen, The Netherlands
Email: jan.vanlent@wur.nl
Chapter 11

Sami Ventelä
Departments of Otorhinolaryngology,
Head and Neck Surgery,
and Physiology and Pediatrics
University of Turku
Turku, Finland
Email: satuve@utu.fi
Chapter 15

PREFACE

The biological sciences are dominated by the idea that cells are the functionally autonomous, physically separated, discrete units of life. This concept was propounded in the 19th century by discoveries of the cellular structuring of both plants and animals. Moreover, the apparent autonomy of unicellular eukaryotes, as well as the cellular basis of the mammalian brain (an organ whose anatomy for a long while defied attempts to validate the idea of the cellular nature of its neurons), seemed to provide the final conclusive evidence for the completeness of 'cell theory', a theory which has persisted in an almost dogmatic form up to the present day. However, it is very obvious that there are numerous observations which indicate that it is not the cells which serve as the basic units of biological life but that this property falls to some other, subcellular assemblage. To deal with this intricate problem concerning the fundamental unit of living matter, we proposed the so-called *Cell Body* concept which, in fact, develops an exceedingly original idea proposed by Julius Sachs at the end of the 19th century.

In the case of eukaryotic cells, DNA-enriched nuclei are intimately associated with a microtubular cytoskeleton. In this configuration—as a *Cell Body*—these two items comprise the fundamental functional and structural unit of eukaryotic living matter. The *Cell Body* seems to be inherent to all cells in all organisms. In effect, the cell is an elaboration of the *Cell Body*: the cell's periphery is a result of a *Cell-Body*-organized secretion which can also produce an extracellular matrix within which cells are embedded to form tissues. From an evolutionary perspective, it is proposed that the nuclear component of the *Cell Body* is descended from the first endosymbionts which were the invaders of an ancient host structure, and which later became specialized for the storage and distribution of DNA molecules to daughter nuclei after a binary nuclear division. It follows that the eukaryotic nucleus corresponds to the entire cell of a prokaryote. Although prokaryotes have a different organization, these organisms can also be accommodated within our present version of *Cell Body* theory. This is because, in prokaryotic cells, just as in eukaryotes, both the organization and the partitioning of DNA molecules are dependent upon a physical linkage between DNA and cytoskeletal elements.

Contemporary prokaryotes and eukaryotes have an inherent property of being joined together via temporary or stable cell-cell channels. Sometimes these channels even lead to the complete fusion of cells. In bacteria, these channels serve for conjugative transfer of DNA while in ciliates they permit the conjugative transfer of whole nuclei. Similarly, whole nuclei can pass through cell-cell channels in fungal cells. In the case of plants,

cells are linked via permanent or semi-permanent channels known as plasmodesmata. These sometimes enlarge into pores which can then transfer whole nuclei from cell to cell. Also, animal cells can be linked with membraneous cell-cell channels which can allow the intercellular passage of whole organelles. Intriguingly, plasmodesmata of plant cells are similar in many respects to nuclear pores, suggesting that nuclear pores are representatives of a prototypic cell-cell channels that already existed, in their primordial form, between the original guest and host cells which merged together in the early formation of the eukaryotic cell. All these considerations call for an update of the traditional 'cell theory'.

This book covers the topic of cell-cell channels at all levels of biological organization, starting with bacteria and unicellular ciliates, via algal, fungal and plant cells, up to and including the diverse cell types of animals. We hope that this book will help update the traditional cell theory and will also stimulate new discussions concerning the basic units of life.

Frantisek Baluska

Dieter Volkmann

Peter W. Barlow

Bonn – Bristol, 6 April 2006

CHAPTER 1

Cell-Cell Channels and Their Implications for Cell Theory

Frantisek Baluska,* Dieter Volkmann and Peter W. Barlow

Abstract

Cells show diverse appearances and sizes, ranging from some 30 nanometers up to several meters in length. Besides the classical prokaryotic and eukaryotic cells, there are also very bizarre cells such as the highly reduced symbiotic mitosomes which lack DNA. Other examples of extremely small cells in the nanometre range are the mycosomes and nanobacteria. On the other hand, there are huge eukaryotic cells, the size of which can reach up to several meters. Most of these are multinucleate (coenocytic) due to mitotic divisions not having been followed by cytokinesis. Moreover, cells at all levels of cellular complexity show an inherent tendency to form cell-cell channels. The most conspicuous example is the plant 'supercell' where all the cells of the plant body are permanently connected via plasmodesmata. In the last year, the first reports of similar cell-cell channels between animal cells have been published. Moreover, fungal cells fuse together into supracellular mycelia, even exchanging their motile nuclei. This phenomenon is also known for plant cells. Intriguingly, transcellularly moving fungal nuclei communicate with their mating partners via pheromone-like signaling mechanisms.

Already in 1892 Julius Sachs was aware of most of the problems associated with the Cell Theory, which in fact survive until the present. Sachs proposed the Energide concept, postulating that it is the nucleus and its protoplasm which represent the vital unit of living matter within a supracellular construction, while the cell periphery is only a secondary structure generated by the active Energide for its shelter and protection. Recently, we elaborated the Cell Body concept which explains how and why the nucleus and the microtubular cytoskeleton have become merged together to build a coherent and universal unit of eukaryotic life which is autonomous and can synthesize the rest of the cell. However, there are several problems with the term Cell Body as it is sometimes used in other meanings. Here we show that the Energide concept of Sachs can be united with the Cell Body concept. Moreover, we agree with Julius Sachs that the term Energide better invokes the unique properties of this universal unit of supracellular living matter endowed with the vital energy.

Introduction

Current biological thinking is dominated by cells. All living things are defined as either being composed of cells or are cells themselves—membraneous compartments filled with organic molecules in a way that allows them to be autonomous self-replicating units of life. The cell concept originates from Robert Hooke's seminal observations of plant tissue in 1665 when he saw small chambers (in fact, dead and empty cells of cork tissue) which he called 'cells'.¹ These were later, during the next 200 years (when living cells were being examined), shown to contain a nucleus and

*Corresponding Author: Frantisek Baluska—Institute of Cellular and Molecular Botany, Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms University of Bonn, Kirschallee 1, D 53115 Bonn, Germany.
Email: baluska@uni-bonn.de

all the other now familiar organelles. In 1838, Matthias Schleiden and Theodor Schwann proposed that both plants and animals are built of cells; Rudolf Virchow announced his famous dictum '*omnis cellula e cellula*' in 1858.² Virchow also wrote that: '*every animal appears as the sum of vital units, each of which bears in itself the complete characteristics of life*'.³ After the cellular nature of brain tissue was confirmed,⁴ cells became synonymous with life. Cell Theory has been ever since the most influential dogma of contemporary biology.²⁻⁷

The Permanent Crisis Surrounding Cell Theory

There are fundamental problems with the Cell Theory. In fact, many of these problems started to be apparent soon after Schleiden and Schwann proposed the cellular basis of plants and animals.^{8,9} First of all, multinuclear cells were found. Next, prokaryotic cells were discovered which lacked organelles, and their simple architecture was taken as evidence for their ancient or archaic nature. Nowadays, however, several genome-based data have emerged which suggest just the opposite—that the contemporary prokaryotic cells are not so ancient and primitive after all.^{10,11} More importantly, the eukaryotic cell is defined as a structurally coherent and physically autonomous entity being completely separated from its surroundings by a plasma membrane. However, there are numerous examples, listed in the next sections of this chapter as well as in other chapters of this volume, of cells which are interlinked via cell-cell channels (Fig. 1), cells which contain many nuclei either due to nuclear divisions not followed by cell divisions, or which are generated by fusions between cells.

Permanent cell-cell channels are typical of plant tissues. Similar supracellular constructions which allow the exchange of organelles occur also in the animals kingdom (see other chapters in this volume).^{12,13} Furthermore, classical cell organelles such as mitochondria and plastids have finally been demasked, after many years of discussion, as being cells too. They are highly reduced descendants of once free-living cells. Besides these smaller organelles, nuclei can also be considered to




Figure 1. Cell-cell channels in viruses (A), bacteria, organelles, eukaryotic cells (B). In eukaryotic cells, whole Energides (C) can move from cell-to-cell via microtubule-based motility.



Figure 2. 61 years old Julius Sachs, taken one year after the publishing of his Energide concept and four years before his death.

Box 1. Energide (Cell Body) at a glance

An Energide consists of a nucleus, centrosome, microtubules, endoplasmic reticulum (ER), Golgi apparatus (GA), GA-based secretory vesicles, and ribosomes. It gains control over the original cell periphery-based structures, such as the actin cytoskeleton and endosomes. This provides the Energide with the tools necessary to regulate its own motility, the distribution of organelles and the reproduction of its enclosing cell. The Energide can form a new cell periphery from endosomes filled with cell wall molecules and enclosed by membranes derived from the plasma membrane. Thus, the Energide rapidly generates a new cell surface in the case of accidental damages to the cell periphery.

The Energide produces the rest of the cell by means of its synthetic activities. It resides in a space derived from the ancient host cell, now known as cytoplasmic space, which provides the Energide with a unique environmental niche. Some autonomy is still maintained by other guest cells, mitochondria and plastids. The cell periphery consists of the plasma membrane, cell wall, and actin cytoskeleton. All host DNA has been transferred into the nucleus. Nevertheless, the cell periphery still maintains some structural independence as it is essential for sheltering the Energide, providing it with information about the environment outside the cell, and generating the endosomes, lysosomes, as well as vacuoles in order to provide the Energide with nutrition and to store nutritive and energy-rich compounds. Also, this system is responsible for detoxification of toxic compounds entering cells. Early in cellular evolution, this endosomal system was adjusted for rapid repair of damaged cell periphery and for final events in cytokinesis. Later in the evolution of multicellular organisms, this endosomal and recycling machinery was used for synaptic cell-to-cell communication, the formation of immunity, cell/organism individuality (self, nonself recognition), the brain and consciousness. Importantly, the inherent feature of cells at all levels of cellular complexity is the formation of cell-cell channels. If these are sufficiently large, even the whole of an Energide can move from its original cell into an adjacent cell. Intriguingly, transcellularly moving fungal nuclei communicate with their mating partners via pheromone-like signaling mechanisms. This is the ultimate evidence that the Energide is an autonomous organism representing the universally valid unit of supracellular eukaryotic life.

represent vestiges of ancient endosymbionts.^{12,14-20} In fact, the nucleus emerges as the first endosymbiont to have invaded the ancient host cell.¹⁵ Recently, we have reviewed numerous data in favour of the Cell Body concept which considers not the cell but rather the nucleus with its associated microtubules, the so-called Cell Body, to represent the smallest unit of life in the construction of multicellular or, more exactly, supracellular, organisms.^{12,21} However, by 1892, Julius Sachs (Fig. 2) had already discussed these problems from the perspective of giant cells, such as multinucleate coenocytes and syncytia, which did not obviously conform with the Cell Theory. In order to resolve this problem, he proposed the 'Energide' concept.^{6,22,23}

Below, we discuss the Energide concept of Sachs in relation to our Cell Body concept and we conclude that both concepts can easily be combined, resulting in an ultimate concept that explains the smallest autonomous unit of supracellular eukaryotic life (summarized in Box 1 and Fig. 3). As the Cell Body is not as suitable term, from now on we will use 'Energide' instead of 'Cell Body' for this universal unit of eukaryotic life.

More Problems with Cell Theory: What Is a Cell?

Obviously, the definition of a cell is very vague. If the cell should be the smallest unit of life showing all the attributes of living matter, how can Cell Theory accommodate the fact that cellular organelles are, or have been, cells also? Even recently evolved eukaryotic cells have been internalized and enslaved by a recent endosymbiotic event and now act as chloroplasts.^{24,25} There are other obvious examples of 'cells within cells' such as bacterial and yeast spores, as well as pollen tubes and embryo sacs in plants.^{9,21} Moreover, as Sachs noted more than a hundred years ago, the structural organization of multinucleate cells of coenocytic algae, for instance, those of *Ventricaria ventricosa*,²⁶ cannot be explained by the Cell Theory.^{9,21-23}

Cell-merging is one of the most important factors shaping the evolution of more complex eukaryotic cells.¹⁵ Not only are these fusions examples of secondary endosymbiotic events, but the enslaved cells accomplish dramatic reductions which do not permit their recognition as cells any more.⁹ Hydrogenosomes are endosymbiotic organelles related to mitochondria, and some of them, like those of *Trichomonas* and *Neocallimastix*, lack any DNA.²⁷ Moreover, another type of mitochondria-derived relict organelles of human pathogen, *Entamoeba histolytica*, the so-called mitosomes, have sizes below 500 nm and lack any DNA.²⁸ Nevertheless, these mini-cells can reproduce themselves as their numbers are maintained at about 250 for one host cell.²⁹ Both mitosomes and hydrogenosomes provide us with convincing evidences that DNA can be completely removed from one partner cell during an endosymbiotic partnership. Further examples of exotic cellular organisms are mycosomes (0.1–1.0 µm in diameter) isolated from plant plastids and which can give rise to yeast-like cells.³⁰ Even smaller are nanobacteria which are about 30–100 nm in diameter. These tiny spheres are predicted to cause several human diseases.³¹ The bacterium *Spiroplasma* is one of the smallest of cells, comparable in size to the diameter of a bacterial flagellar bundle. Despite its extremely small size, it is equipped with a quite complex cytoskeleton.³² On the other hand, there are some viruses which are larger than the smallest bacteria.³³ Even more, there are large eukaryotic cells which are visible to the naked eye. Avian egg cells are the largest cells by volume organized by a single nucleus. Plant pollen cells grow several centimeters in length to deliver sperm cells to ovules deeply buried within flower tissues, and multinucleate laticifers may extend the whole length of a *Euphorbia* plant. The marine algae, *Caulerpa* and *Acetabularia*, are single cells which can attain up to several meters in length (in the case of *Caulerpa*). They are filled with numerous nuclei, each organizing its own microtubular array and cytoplasmic domain. One of the most dramatic examples of huge cells is the mammalian placental syncytiotrophoblast whose surface area can reach up to ten square meters.³⁴

In the classical cell concept, the limiting membrane plays the dominant role whereas the internal parts are not as important and vary from having no DNA, such as in the above-mentioned mitosomes and some hydrogenosomes, to having just a few DNA molecules encoding several proteins within highly reduced organelles, up to the extremely complex cellular interiors encompassing hundreds of nuclei and enormous numbers of other organelles (also cells) with a cytoplasm. In contrast to this diffuse and vague situation with cells, the structure and morphology of the Energide (Cell Body) units are essentially the same throughout the eukaryotic superkingdom (see below), implying that they are much more useful for defining the basic vital units of supracellular eukaryotic life. As we discuss below, cell-cell channels are inherent for all these cell types, starting with the prokaryotic cells and symbiotic cellular organelles, up to eukaryotic cells covering all kingdoms including fungi, plants and animals. If we really need a basic unit of supracellular eukaryotic life, then we must define a new one.

Julius Sachs: Energide as the Basic Unit of Eukaryotic Life Endowed with Vital Energy

Julius Sachs was well aware of all these problems of Cell Theory 110 years ago. He proposed the Energide concept in which it was not the cell, but rather the nucleus with a surrounding sphere of protoplasmic influence ('Wirkungssphäre') that defined the autonomous vital unit bearing all the attributes of life.^{22,23} Energide does not encompass the plasma membrane ('Zellhaut') and cell wall which, in contemporary cells, are postulated to be of a secondary nature produced by the active Energide to protect itself from the hostile environment.²³ Importantly, while the Energide contains the 'vital energy' ('Lebenskraft') and divides by a template-based duplication followed by fission, the cell periphery cannot multiply in this way and grows rather via fusion of vesicles generated by the secretory activities of the Energide ('...von ihm selbst erzeugten Gehäuse'). For Julius Sachs, the cell is only a chamber ('Zellstoffkammer') which can harbour one, several, or many Energides. Recently, we discussed numerous modern data confirming most of the predictions made by Julius Sachs more than 100 years ago.^{9,21} In order to convey his line of arguments to contemporary cell biologists as well as to a broader community of scientists, we translate from German into English the most important parts of his text.

Julius Sachs, Flora 1892; 75:57-67.

Pages 57, 59:

'Unter einer Energide denke ich mir einen einzelnen Zellkern mit dem von ihm beherrschten Protoplasma, so zwar, dass ein Kern und das ihn umgebende Protoplasma als ein Ganzes zu denken sind und dieses Ganze ist eine Organische Einheit, sowohl im morphologischen wie im physiologischen Sinne. Den Namen Energide wähle ich, um damit die Haupteigenschaft dieses Gebildes zu bezeichnen: dass es nämlich innere Thatkraft, oder wenn man will: Lebenskraft besitzt. ... die einzelne Energide für sich frei leben kann, ohne von einer Zellhaut oder Zelle umgeben zu sein...' 'Zum Begriff der Energide gehört also die Zellhaut nicht; die Sache liegt vielmehr so, dass jede einzelne Energide sich mit einer Zellhaut umgeben kann, oder aber mehrere Energiden zusammen bilden eine Zellhaut ...'

'Energide is represented by a nucleus associated with its protoplasm in such a way that the nucleus and surrounding protoplasm form an organic unit, both from the morphological and physiological perspectives. The name Energide is chosen to stress the major property of this structure: endowment with the inner power for action or, if one wants: endowment with a vital power.' '...an individual Energide is capable of living freely, without being enclosed within the cell skin or cell chamber. ...' 'The term Energide does not encompass the cell skin; the case is more that each individual Energide is able to enclose itself by a cell skin, or that several Energides together can enclose themselves with one single cell skin ...'

Page 60:

"...dagegen beginnt die Wissenschaft von den lebendigen Dingen mit einem Wort, welches vor mehr als 200 Jahren infolge eines Irrthums entstanden und dann beibehalten worden ist: dem Wort Zelle.

Bekantlich ist das Wort Zelle als Terminus technicus der Botanik nur historisch zu verstehen, insofern Robert Hooke 1667 die innere Configuration des Korkes und der Holzkohle eine zellige, im Sinn einer Bienenwabe, nannte. Auch die Zootomie hat später dieses unglückliches Wort aufgegriffen und für die Elementartheile des thierischen Organismus verwendet, obgleich es dort noch weniger Sinn hatte, als bei denn Pflanzen. – In der 40er Jahren erkannten die Botaniker, dass das Wesentliche der Pflanzenzelle nich ihr Gehäuse, sondern ihr Inhalt, wie wir jetzt sagen, das Protoplasma mit dem Kern ist, und so unterschied man Zelle und Zellinhalt."

'...the science which deals with living matter commenced with a controversial word, originating as a mistake more than 200 years ago, and then maintained up to the present day: it is the word Cell.'

'It is well-known that the word Cell should be understood only from a historical perspective as Robert Hooke referred to the inner structures of cork as being cellular because they closely resembled hexagonal wax cells of honeycomb. Later, zoology also accepted this unfortunate term, despite this word being even more controversial when applied to animals. In the forties [i.e., 1840s], botanists realized that the true living matter is not the shell, but that it resides inside the Cell, and is called protoplasm and nucleus. One should therefore be careful in distinguishing the Cell's interior from its external boundary.'

Energide versus Cell Periphery

Julius Sachs stressed that although the Energide can undergo autonomous template-based growth followed by binary fission, its boundary structures ('Gehäuse' or 'Zellstoffkammer') can divide only after the accomplishment of Energide-based growth and Energide-instructed division. Importantly, Energide division does not need to be followed by cell periphery division, and this results in the formation of coenocytes. Even more importantly, the opposite situation, that cell division could occur without a preceding mitosis, was never recorded. Moreover, 'cells' lacking their Energides, so-called cytoblasts, cannot divide. On the other hand, Energides can be released from ruptured coenocytic algae, whereupon each Energide regenerates both its plasma membrane and cell wall to form a new complete cell.⁹ The Energide is the primary unit of supracellular life as it can escape

from its cellular boundaries and, later, it can autonomously regenerate these boundary structures. Cell periphery structures can not undergo sustained growth and binary fission without being supported by an Energide.

Recently, we have discovered that cytokinesis in plant cells is driven by the fusion of endosomes which are enclosed by the plasma membrane-derived membrane and enriched with cell wall pectins.^{35,36} These endosomes are recruited to the division site by the Energide (Cell Body) microtubules.³⁶ In animal cells, too, Energide microtubules specify cytokinesis both spatially and temporally.³⁷ Similarly, sporulating yeast cells generate their plasma membrane *de novo* from early endosomes enriched with PI(3)P.³⁸ Also, in this situation, the Energide and its microtubules play the essential role of enclosing the cell with a plasma membrane.³⁹ Last, but not least, *de novo* formation of the plasma membrane was demonstrated during the fragmentation of coenocytic algae, releasing 'naked' Energides which then enveloped themselves with boundary structures, thus regenerating new cells.⁹ All these examples, from throughout the eukaryotic superkingdom, convincingly document the secondary nature of the boundary structures, including the plasma membrane and cell wall/extracellular matrix. This is evident also from the mode of their growth and division. In contrast to the Energide, cell periphery grows and divides by fusion of vesicles.

Adaptability versus Complexity in Cellular Evolution

The formation of eukaryotic cells represented a great leap forward in cellular complexity.⁴⁰ The Darwinian selection-based evolution towards increased fitness, which acted even on ancient proto-cells early in the development of life,^{41,42} cannot explain the dramatic increase in cellular complexity.⁴⁰ In fact, both viruses and prokaryotic cells are far better adapted to harsh environments, and this is the reason why they have been so successful up to the present time. They have been selected by their environment to be efficient mutators and replicators. In several aspects, these simple cells are not primitive at all, and they clearly dominate the biosphere of the Earth. Darwinian evolution is strong in explaining how their adaptability comes about, driven by variation, competition, and selection. However, Darwinian *adaptive* evolution is weak in explaining satisfactorily why cells should proceed from the less complex towards the more complex forms of cellular organization. It may be a question of selection creating the most efficient combinations of molecular modules at the subcellular level,⁴³ whereas at the cellular level evolution is a question of finding the best combination of symbiotic associations.

In fact, we know several examples where complex cells undergo 'regressive' evolution towards a less complex type of cell if they are enslaved by other cells or exposed to extremely challenging environments. Recent advances in the study of symbiogenesis and its role in cellular evolution allowed a breakthrough in our understanding of this paradigm. It was primarily Lynn Margulis^{15,45-48} who revived this old concept, after more than 70 years of oblivion.⁴⁴ It appears that the most powerful source of innovation with regard to cellular complexity is the merging of individual cells.¹⁵ Of course, this cellular merging is a by-product of cellular competition. But this time it is not the *adaptive* competition in the sense of Darwinian *adaptive* evolution, but it rather is *predative* competition⁹ in the sense of Margulisian *symbiotic* evolution which is based on serial endosymbiosis.^{15,48} In other words, *adaptive* evolution towards increased fitness is driven by the conflict of organisms within a harsh selectionist environment, whereas *predative* evolution that drives towards increased cellular complexity is powered by nutritive conflicts between heterotrophic unicellular organisms entertaining a predator/prey based life style. Sometimes, a balance of 'forces' is reached between predator and prey cells allowing the development of stable symbiotic relationships between the host and its guest. This ultimately leads to the generation of more complex cells.^{15,48}

Recent analysis of genomes and their genes have revealed that the last universal common ancestor of eukaryotic cells was formed by cell-cell fusion.^{14,49} This universal ancestor enslaved endosymbiotic cells (organelles) via predatory phagocytosis.^{9,15-20,45-48,50-52} Thus there are two processes which pave the way towards more complex eukaryotic cells and which disobey Darwinian evolution: lateral gene transfer and endosymbiosis.^{14,49} Both these processes played a crucial role in evolution of complex eukaryotic cells endowed with nuclei and Energides.^{9,15}

Recently, even viruses have come into consideration as having invented the first nucleus in ancient protocells. Viruses have the inherent ability to invade cells and there are several intriguing similarities between nuclei and viruses.⁵² Nuclei and viruses lack the protein synthesis machinery and lipid-producing pathways; both transcribe DNA but do not translate RNA, and they contain linear chromosomes equipped with primitive telomeres rather than the circular chromosomes found in bacteria, mitochondria, and plastids.⁵² Furthermore, viruses are well-known for their ability to induce cell-cell fusion,⁵³ a phenomenon which was essential for the early events required for the formation of ancient eukaryotic cells.¹⁴

Duality of Eukaryotic Cells

Eukaryotic cells are characterized by a distinct duality at the structural level (Energetics and cell periphery), at the level of genome organization (eubacterial and archaeobacterial features), cytoskeleton (actin and tubulin), membrane flow (exocytosis and endocytosis), and cell division (mitosis and cytokinesis).⁹ These features strongly suggest that the most ancient eukaryotic cell was generated from at least two cellular organisms fusing together and generating the ancient nucleus by transformation of the host cell via recruitment of all the host DNA.⁹ Recent analysis of diverse genomes has revealed that the eukaryotic genome was, in fact, generated from a fusion of at least two prokaryotic-like genomes, an event which massively speeded-up horizontal gene transfer.^{14,49} Due to this, all host DNA was transferred into the guest cell which was then transformed into a eukaryotic nucleus.^{9,15} Moreover, some mitochondria-related hydrogenosomes have also lost all of their DNA.²⁷ This new twist in the evolutionary origin of the contemporary eukaryotic cell is in accordance with the symbiotic origin of eukaryotic nuclei,^{9,14-20} and it can also explain the absence of DNA from the plasma membrane. Very convincing examples of the complete loss of DNA from endosymbiotic cells are mitosomes.²⁸ In fact, any DNA introduced into a eukaryotic cell is transported into the nucleus and integrated into the genome, allowing for the easy transformability of eukaryotic cells.

As mentioned above, endosymbiosis and lateral gene transfer are not only the most important processes shaping evolution of complex eukaryotic cells, but also these are phenomena which disobey Darwinian evolution.⁴⁹ Thus, the mechanisms shaping the evolution of eukaryotic cells are extremely important for understanding biological evolution in a much broader perspective. Evolution of complex eukaryotic cells provides us with an important paradigm for the elusive nature of living matter and why it should evolve from low to high complexity. The next big issue to be solved by cell biology is the topic of this book—cells at all levels of complexity are characterized by cell-cell channels. Why and what for? This feature must be very ancient and of extreme importance because it is evident in all contemporary cellular organisms, at all levels of cellular complexity. It seems that both RNA and DNA molecules could be relevant in this respect. Importantly, viewing nuclear pores as cell-cell channels not only supports the endosymbiotic origin of nuclei but also explains the perplexing similarity between nuclear pores and plasmodesmata.⁵⁴

Cell-Cell Channels: Supracellularity Is Found at All Levels of Cellular Organization

As is apparent throughout this book, cells which have been created by division also seem to have an inherent tendency to fuse into supracellular assemblies. The first breakthrough in this respect was the early discovery of plasmodesmata by Eduard Tangl in 1867.⁵⁵ It is perhaps typical of biology that this discovery was not fully accepted until some 100 years later when electron microscopy allowed the submicroscopic resolution of these cell-cell channels.⁵⁵ Much more recently, cell-cell channels of animal cells have been discovered.^{13,56-58} Hopefully it will not take a further 100 years to have this discovery accepted (or definitely rejected) by mainstream biology.

Cell-Cell Channels in Viruses, Prokaryotes and in Eukaryotic Organelles: Something Special about Cellular End-Poles

Cell-cell channels can be found at all levels of cellular complexity, suggesting that this feature is inherent to cellular organization. Bacterial viruses inject phage DNA into host cells via a channel

which is still not characterized in detail (Fig. 1A).⁵⁹ This ability of viruses suggests that they should be considered as highly reduced cells specialized for a unique form of cellular parasitism. Bacteria also develop a wide spectrum of transcellular injection machines for cell-cell delivery of their virulence factors into host cells (Fig. 1B).⁶⁰ Interestingly, the nongrowing cellular end-poles assemble these injection organelles which export DNA to other prokaryotic or eukaryotic cells.⁶¹⁻⁶³ In *Streptomyces* colonies, pore-like structures assemble at end-poles for the conjugative spread of plasmids throughout the colony.⁶⁴ These cells interacting via their end-poles are also equipped with pores secreting slime and motile hair-like filaments known as pili.⁶⁵⁻⁶⁸ Could this polarisation of cell-cell interactions at the end-poles have implications for the siting of plant plasmodesmata?

Dynamic pili protruding from the bacterial end-poles can rapidly extend and then retract, exerting pulling and pushing forces.⁶⁶ These might contribute to the alignment of cells into filamentous rows^{65,67} resembling the cell files of plant tissues.⁶⁹ In the cyanobacteria, *Phormidium* and *Anabaena*, junctional pore complexes are similarly formed at the end-poles of cells which are also arranged into cell files.⁷⁰ These end-poles are traversed by cell-cell channels which allow direct transport of metabolites as well as communication between heterocysts specialized for nitrogen fixation and other cells accomplishing photosynthesis.⁶ Similarly, end-poles/cross-walls of plant cells are abundantly traversed by plasmodesmata.⁶⁹ Intriguingly, prokaryotic cell-cell channels can be targeted by movement proteins of plant viruses which then modify these prokaryotic cell-cell channels in a manner known from virus-affected plant plasmodesmata.⁷¹ This finding strongly suggest that prokaryotic and eukaryotic cell-cell channels are evolutionarily related. Intriguingly in this respect, nongrowing end-poles traversed by cell-cell channels, play a central role in polarity of both bacteria and plant cells.⁶⁹ Furthermore, viruses are well-known to induce cell-cell channels and cell-cell fusions in eukaryotic cells.⁵³

In conformity with free-living bacteria, bacteria-like descendent organelles of eukaryotic cells, such as plastids, mitochondria, and peroxisomes, are all known to fuse together, an event which necessitates the existence of fusion channels. Plastids generate stroma-filled long tubules, so-called stromules. These are highly dynamic structures interconnecting adjacent plastids and allowing an exchange of molecules as large 560 kDa.⁷²⁻⁷⁸ Mitochondria are also well-known to undergo fusion and fission processes.⁷⁹⁻⁸² The fusion machinery for plastids are not known yet, but there are data accumulating on the fusion machineries of mitochondria⁸³ and peroxisomes.⁸⁴ It is obvious that these 'cell-cell' fusion mechanisms differ from those which drive membrane fusion in exocytic and endocytic pathways.⁸⁵

The outer leaflet of the nuclear envelope extrudes endoplasmic reticulum (ER) whereas the inner leaflet is anchored via the nuclear lamina, to the chromatin complex. ER pervades the whole cytoplasmic space, budding as a Golgi Apparatus (GA) and secretory vesicles (Fig. 3), as well as interacting with other organelles.⁸⁶⁻⁸⁸ In plants, ER elements extend from cell-to-cell across the plasmodesmata,⁵⁴⁻⁵⁵ but this is likely to be a secondary event following from the primary contact and fusion of adjacent cell peripheries. Microinjection of 3 kDa dye into the lumen of ER enables visualization of dye movement into adjacent cells where it first appears within the nuclei.⁸⁹ Obviously, *Energides* from adjacent plant cells are now able to interact via the physical continuity of their ER membranes.

Nuclear Pores as Prototypic Cell-Cell Channels

If the endosymbiotic origin of nuclei can be definitely confirmed, then nuclear pores also can be viewed as specialized cell-cell channels resembling plant plasmodesmatal cell-cell channels.⁵⁴ These are optimized for effective cell-cell transport of proteins, as well as RNA and DNA molecules. Intriguingly, nuclear pores are highly selective with respect to the macromolecules which they transport. Particles as large as ribosomes can pass through nuclear pores whereas much smaller molecules may be actively excluded.^{90,91} Similarly, plant plasmodesmata support transport of certain large proteins whereas the small auxin molecule, for example, is excluded from direct cell-cell transport.⁹² Recently, both plasmodesmata⁹³⁻⁹⁵ and nuclear pores^{96,97} were revealed to be closely associated with molecules driving endocytosis. Viruses, RNA and DNA molecules all are internalized




Figure 3. Energide (Cell Body), shown in continuous lines, settled within a highly reduced guest cell, shown in dotted lines, which serves predominantly as a shelter. ER: endoplasmic reticulum, GA: Golgi apparatus, SV: secretory vesicles, EV: endocytic vesicles.

into endosomes which then deliver them into either the ER or the nuclear pores.^{98,99} Many cell periphery and endocytic proteins use this endosomal route for their transport into and out of the nucleus.¹⁰⁰⁻¹⁰² Interestingly in this respect, endosomes are the only type of organelle which invades and travels through cell-cell channels of animal cells.¹³ Furthermore, the acrosomal compartment which drives the cell-cell fusion between sperm cells and oocytes, has endosomal features; and it is also enriched with synaptic molecules which recycle via secretory endosomes.¹⁰³⁻¹⁰⁴

Cell-Cell Channels in Filamentous Fungi, Plants and Animals

Cell-cell channels are found in all multicellular organisms, including filamentous fungi, plants and animals. As their presence, structure, and functions are extensively discussed in several chapters of this volume, we limit ourselves to just some basic information. Fungal hyphae are tip-growing tubules which inherently fuse together. As a result, complex mycelial networks are formed to allow the exchange of large masses of protoplasm, organelles and, importantly, the highly motile Energides.¹⁰⁵⁻¹⁰⁹ All cells of plant bodies are well-known to be interconnected via plasmodesmata,^{55,71,87} and if they are not formed as an accompaniment of cytokinesis, they can form later as so-called secondary plasmodesmata. But plant tissues also form much larger cell-cell channels, known as cytoplasmic channels or intercellular bridges.^{110,111} These macro-channels allow transfer not only of large organelles but also of nuclei (Energides). This spectacular process was documented both *in situ*^{110,112} and *in vivo*.¹¹³ In addition, plasmodesmata can be transformed into the massive pores of sieve plates, thus allowing the mass flow of metabolites along phloem elements.¹¹⁴

There are numerous examples of cell-cell channels in animals. Well studied are fusomes and intercellular bridges of germinal cells of numerous taxa. They form as a result of incomplete cytokinesis.¹¹⁵⁻¹¹⁸ Fusomes develop from spherical vesicular compartments into large cell-cell channels which not only nurse developing oocytes but also determine their polarity due to the anchoring of the Energide microtubules.¹¹⁹ Similar to plasmodesmata of plant cells, fusomes provide direct

Energide-Energide connectivity via ER elements.¹²⁰ Recently, exciting observations have revealed thin (50-200 nm) nanotubules between cultured PC12 rat neural cells and kidney cells.¹³ These actin-based cell-cell channels allow transcellular transport of myosin-associated endosomes. Similar nanotubules were found also at immunological synapses where exchange of GPI-anchored proteins and class I MHC protein was noted.^{56,57} Even larger (100 nm-5 μ m in width, and up to 100 μ m in length) cell-cell tubules were reported between DU 145 human prostate cancer cells. These are positive for alpha-tubulin and transport very large membrane vesicles (up to 3 μ m in diameter).⁵⁸

Cell-Cell Channels and the Energide: Implications for Cell Theory

Microtubules radiating from the Energide/Cell Body represent an ideal instrument by which to delimit the cytoplasmic, cellular boundary. Moreover, this limit is somehow controlled by the DNA mass, or amount, stored within the nucleus.⁹ The dynamic instability of microtubules allows the Energide to measure continuously the size and shape of its 'sphere of influence' (cell). Also, the microtubules collectively serve as a highly effective tool for Energide motility within the confines of its cell.^{9,122} But it is mysterious how DNA, irrespective its coding information, can determine both the size of the nucleus (Energide) and the size of its cell. Concerning the DNA amount/size of the nucleus correlation, the skeletal DNA hypothesis has been proposed¹²¹ while the Energide/Cell Body concept can explain the tight correlation between DNA amount and cell size.^{9,123}

Energide/Cell Body Microtubules Act as a Tool to Prevent Their Fusion, to Obtain Information Which Is Acquired and Processed at the Plasma Membrane, to Explore the Cellular Space and to Invade Adjacent Cells, as Well as to Repair Old and Generate New Cell Periphery

What features are so special about the Energide (Cell Body) that confer upon it properties which have allowed the Energide to act as the vital unit of supracellular eukaryotic organisation involving constructions composed of millions of Energides? We argue that this feature is due to the unique association between the DNA-based nuclei and the tubulin-based microtubular cytoskeleton.⁹ Julius Sachs obviously could not incorporate microtubules into his Energide concept. So, by merging the Energide concept with the Cell Body concept,^{9,21} we should be able to unravel the full scope of the unique properties of the Sachsian Energide.

First of all, whereas cells show an extremely wide range of sizes and structural organizations, Energides are basically constant structures, always consisting of nucleus sheathed within perinuclear radiating microtubules. These are instrumental for numerous properties of a vital Energide. Energide microtubules are essential for preventing accidental nuclear fusions which would easily happen either during cytokinesis or after cell-cell fusions.⁹ In fact, depolymerization of Energide microtubules during mitosis results in the immediate fusion of daughter Energides and the subsequent formation of a polyploid nucleus.¹²⁴ This inherent tendency of adjoining nuclei to fuse together, if they are not ensheathed with microtubules or cell periphery boundaries, is a very strong argument for cellular nature and endosymbiotic origin of nuclei. Energide-Energide fusions can be observed in some ephemeral plant tissues like endosperm.^{21,123-125} This is because radiating microtubules from adjacent Energides, which interact via plus ends of their microtubules so that they usually keep their distance from each other, under some circumstances can fail to be effective organizers of their cytoplasmic 'spheres' of influence.^{9,21}

Next, Energides of syncytial and coenocytic cells are regularly distributed in their cytoplasmic space. This is also due to the physical interactions between plus ends of microtubules from the adjacent Energides.^{9,21} The claim upon protoplasmic space, the volume of which is directly related to the amount of DNA stored within a given nucleus, leads to the phenomenon known as the nucleo-cytoplasmic ratio.^{9,123} However, also important is the way in which DNA is packed within the nuclei: highly condensed generative nuclei of pollen grains form small Energides whereas decondensed large vegetative nuclei form large Energides, despite the fact that the DNA amount in both these nuclei can be the same.¹²³ The mechanisms behind these phenomena include both nucleus-stored molecules having MTOC properties¹²³ and the Energide's ability to generate longer

microtubules when more MTOC molecules are available.^{9,21} Microtubules initiated at the nuclear surface, and having their dynamic plus ends interacting with the plasma membrane, are ideally suited for the transfer towards the Energide nucleus of information acquired and processed at the cell periphery and plasma membrane. Importantly, Energide-associated dynamic microtubules can act as vehicles allowing the movement of whole Energides/Cell Bodies through cellular space.¹²²

Finally, these microtubules can gain control over the distribution of cell periphery-derived endosomes filled with internalized cell wall material and enclosed by a membrane, which are ideally suited for cell periphery repair or for rapid generation of a new cell periphery.^{35,36,39} In plants, Energides are actively recruited to cell periphery sites which have been compromised by pathogen attack or which accomplish rapid and highly polarized cell growth via tip-growth.^{126,127} Similar tipward localization of Energides is typical also of filamentous fungi.^{109,128,129}

Energide/Cell Body Can Use Cell-Cell Channels to Travel across Cellular Boundaries

As briefly mentioned above, Energides (Cell Bodies) not only explore the confines of their own cells¹²² but can also move to an adjacent cell if the connecting channels are sufficiently large. This phenomenon, which is clearly incompatible with the current version of Cell Theory, is the final proof for the autonomous primary nature of the Energide. In plants, there are numerous ultrastructural observations of this process, known also as cytomixis.^{110,112} However, these findings have been criticized as representing nothing more than aberrant cytokinesis where daughter nuclei have been squeezed through a maturing cell plate. But in vivo studies provided the final proof for a genuine cytomixic cell-cell movement of nuclei (Energides).^{105,106,109,113} Moreover, other well studied examples of nuclear transfer involve a structure called the conjusome, a cell-cell channel specialized for conjugation in *Tetrahymena*.^{130,131}

A rather exotic cell-cell transfer of nuclei occurs between the parasitic alga, *Choreocolax*, and cells of its red-alga host, *Polysiphonia*.¹³² This resembles the situation in fusing fungal hyphae in which genetically different Energides co-exist and are exchanged.^{107,108,133,134} Intriguingly, the fungal Energides can recognize their respective mating Energide partners.¹³⁵ This mysterious process is accomplished via a pheromone/receptor system operating at the level of Energides (Cell Bodies) of the opposite mating types.^{136,137} This pheromone-like communication between individual Energides is a further very strong argument for the cellular and endosymbiotic nature of nuclei. When a spindle pole body is inserted into the nuclear envelope, it acts as an MTOC and interacts with the DNA. This DNA-spindle pole body complex was proposed to be responsible for the recognition of self and nonself at the level of individual Energides.¹³⁸

Energide microtubules are extremely sensitive to mechanical treatments. Thus, it is not surprising to find an extremely low (typically between 0-4%) success rate in experiments of animal cloning which have involved nuclear transfer.¹³⁹⁻¹⁴¹ We can safely envision that if more care were taken over the intactness of the whole Energide during this process, the success rate (as judged by the frequency of developing embryos) would increase considerably and would help optimize the cloning process. To achieve this, one needs to be aware that the whole intact Energide (Cell Body), including its ensheathing microtubules, must be transferred into the recipient cell, not just the nucleus alone.

Impacts of Cell-Cell Channels on a Hypothetical Scenario of Eukaryotic Cell Evolution

From the currently available data, two major phases in the evolution of complex eukaryotic cells can be envisioned. An initial 'communal' phase^{142,143} dominated by repeated fusion events between proto-cells allowed the early cells to increase their amounts of DNA. As a vestige of this primordial phase, the cell periphery of contemporary cells still shows an inherent tendency to fuse together thereby forming cell-cell channels. Some ancient proto-cells were more effective in this fusion process than others, which resulted in their larger cell size. These large cells suffered from osmotic imbalance resulting in the rupture of the early plasma membrane.^{144,145} The frequent bursting of these proto-cells forced them to develop a means of rapid repair of the cell periphery as well as an

ability to assemble more robust peripheries by enveloping the plasma membrane with a cell wall. These events heralded the second 'predatory' phase which, in fact, continues up to the present time. A convincing example of this is, the mutual enslavement of eukaryotic algae thereby generating eukaryote-eukaryote chimaeras.^{24,25}

The onset of the 'predatory' phase was preceded by the generation of the most ancient eukaryotic cell. Now it is clear that this last common ancestor of eukaryotic cells was a complete cells equipped with nucleus, cytoskeleton, mitochondria, endoplasmic reticulum, Golgi apparatus, and vesicle trafficking.^{146,147} Merging of cells was accomplished presumably with the invasion of a large and soft-periphery host cell, still suffering from the frequent bursting events, by a more advanced smaller guest cell already equipped with a more rigid-periphery.⁹ These ancient nucleated proto-cells then went on to 'invent' actin-based phagocytosis which allowed them not only to initiate an active predatory lifestyle but also to accomplish a very efficient cell periphery repair process using recycling secretory endosomes filled with extracellular matrix components and enclosed by a plasma membrane-derived membrane.^{35,36} Similarly, a phagocytosis-like process is known to be accomplished in the bacterium *Bacillus subtilis* during the formation of spores.^{148,149} The cellular prey internalized by these proto-cells active in phagocytosis, and perhaps not fully equipped with all the enzymes needed to digest prey, often survived and developed into organelles such as peroxisomes, mitochondria, and plastids which are now features of eukaryotic cells.⁹ During evolution, lateral gene transfer resulted in loss of DNA from developing organelles (DNA-losing ancient guest cells) and their accumulation within nuclei (DNA-gaining ancient guest cells). In some situations, all DNA can be lost: for example, mitosomes are remnants of mitochondrion-related organelles that lack any detectable DNA.²⁸ Furthermore, some hydrogenosomes also lost all of their DNA. Similarly, all DNA from the host cell (the cell contributing the plasma membrane) was transferred into the guest cell (the cell which became the nucleus), and it might well be that peroxisomes and centrosomes also represent highly reduced guest cells, having lost all DNA via lateral gene transfer.¹⁵⁰ For instance, the cell wall of plant cells appears to be descended from endosymbiotic cyanobacteria which, during their evolutionary transformation into plastids, have donated their cell wall genes to the guest cell.¹⁵¹

Conclusions and Outlook

The most important message of this chapter (and the whole book) is that cell-cell channels are an inherent feature of cells at all levels of complexity, from relatively simple bacteria up to large and complex plant and animal cells. In fact, plants are supracellular organisms because most of their cells (Energides) are interconnected by plasmodesmatal channels.^{55,87} This might turn out to be true for animals. Conclusive evidence would be if the sensitive and apparently short-lived nanotubes^{13,56-58} were found in intact tissues. There are some intriguing generalities with respect to cell-cell channels. First, viruses and molecules of RNA and DNA seem to have the ability to induce cell-cell channels. Both viruses and bacteria—and here for plant cells, consider *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*¹⁵²—can induce cell-cell channels, enabling them to invade host cells and then to pirate the nuclear pores and thereby gain access to the DNA replication machinery within the host nuclei. After their replication, they escape from the nucleus and return to the cytoplasm; they then either kill the cell to gain access to other cells (animals) thereby inducing new cell-cell channels, or they gate the existing channels to allow cell-cell spread of virus or bacterium throughout the whole organism (plants). Besides viruses and bacteria, small RNA molecules also can spread from cell-to-cell, and this ability is used for transcellular and global silencing of specific genes. This transfer of small RNAs across cell boundaries is an ancient feature, allowing application of the RNA interference (RNAi) technology for both animals and plants.¹⁵³⁻¹⁵⁵ The original discovery of RNAi was in *C. elegans*¹⁵⁶ where the transport of RNAs across cellular borders is dependent on the transmembrane protein SID1.¹⁵⁷

Darwinian *adaptive* evolution that tends towards increased fitness is still the major force with respect to the adaptation of cells and other more complex units of life, like multicellular organisms, to the ever-changing ambient environment. However, it operates in parallel with the Margulisian *symbiotic* evolution which generates an increased complexity of evolving systems such as eukaryotic cells and their vital units of supracellular life, which are here called Energides. This is true both for

the evolution of complex eukaryotic cells, as well as for their assembly into multi-cellular or, better, supra-cellular, organisms. Cell-cell fusion emerges as important factor determining animal cell behavior.¹⁵⁸ Cell-cell channels are inherent not only to plants⁸⁷ but also to animals.^{13,56-58} Both unicellular¹⁵ as well as supra-cellular organisms⁸⁷ should be considered as complex ecosystems composed of numerous modified cellular micro-organisms.¹⁷⁵ Finally, in contrast to cells which are widely heterogeneous in their size (ranging from 30 nanometres up to several metres), architecture, and mechanism of their divisions; Energides are extremely conservative in all these respects. This makes the Energide an ideal candidate for the universal unit of supracellular eukaryotic life. Appreciation of Energides as vital units endowed with all attributes of life is critical for our understanding of still enigmatic processes and phenomena of contemporary cell biology,^{158,159} such as transformation, plasticity, and cloning of eukaryotic cells.

References

1. Hooke R. Of the schematisme or texture of cork, and of the cells and pores of some other such frothy bodies. *Micrographia*, Observation 18. London: 1665:112-116.
2. Harris H. *The Birth of the Cell*. New Haven: Yale University Press 1999.
3. Lodish H, Baltimore D, Berk A et al. *Molecular Cell Biology*, 3rd ed. New York: W.H. Freeman and Company, 1995.
4. Mazzarello P. A unifying concept: the history of cell theory. *Nat Cell Biol* 1999; 1:E13-E15.
5. Alberts B, Bray D, Hopkin K et al. *Essential Cell Biology*. 2nd ed. New York: Taylor & Francis Group: Garland Science, 2004.
6. Kleinig H, Sirte P. *Zellbiologie*. Stuttgart, New York: Gustav Fischer Verlag, 1984.
7. Pollard TD, Earnshaw WC. *Cell Biology*. Philadelphia, London, New York, St. Louis, Sydney, Toronto: Saunders, Elsevier Science, 2002.
8. Richmond ML. T.H. Huxley's criticism of German Cell Theory: an epigenetic and physiological interpretation of cell structure. *J Hist Biol* 2000; 33:247-289.
9. Baluska F, Volkmann D, Barlow PW. Eukaryotic cells and their Cell Bodies: Cell Theory revisited. *Ann Bot* 2004; 94:9-32.
10. Forterre P, Philippe H. Where is the root of the universal tree of life. *BioEssays* 1999; 21:871-879.
11. Poole A, Jeffares D, Penny D. Early evolution: prokaryotes, the new kids on the block. *BioEssays* 1999; 21:880-889.
12. Baluska F, Hlavacka A, Volkmann D et al. Getting connected: actin-based cell-to-cell channel in plants and animals. *Trends Cell Biol* 2004; 14:404-408.
13. Rustom A, Saffrich R, Markovic I et al. Nanotubular highways for intercellular organelle transport. *Science* 2004; 303:1007-1110.
14. Rivera MC, Lake JA. The ring of life provides evidence for a genome fusion origin of eukaryotes. *Nature* 2004; 431:152-155.
15. Margulis L. Serial endosymbiotic theory (SET) and composite individuality. Transition from bacterial to eukaryotic genomes. *Microbiol Today* 2004; 31:172-174.
16. Margulis L, Dolan MF, Guerrero R. The chimeric eukaryote: origin of the nucleus from karyomastigont in amitochondriate protist. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2000; 97:6954-6999.
17. Horiike T, Hamada K, Kanaya S et al. Origin of eukaryotic cell nuclei by symbiosis of Archaea in Bacteria is revealed by homology-hit analysis. *Nat Cell Biol* 2001; 3:210-214.
18. Horiike T, Hamada K, Shinozawa T. Origin of eukaryotic cell nuclei by symbiosis of Archaea in Bacteria supported by the newly clarified origin of functional genes. *Genes Genet Syst* 2002; 77:369-376.
19. Dolan MF, Melnitsky H, Margulis L et al. Motility proteins and the origin of the nucleus. *Anat Rec* 2002; 268:290-301.
20. Hartman H, Fedorov A. The origin of the eukaryotic cell: a genomic investigation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2002; 99:1420-1425.
21. Baluska F, Volkmann D, Barlow PW. Cell bodies in a cage. *Nature* 2004; 428:371.
22. Sachs J. Beiträge zur Zellentheorie. Energiden und Zellen. *Flora* 1892; 75:57-67.
23. Sachs J. Weitere Betrachtungen über Energiden und Zellen. *Flora* 1892; 81:405-434.
24. Cavalier-Smith T. Genomic reduction and evolution of novel genetic membranes and protein-targeting machinery in eukaryote-eukaryote chimaeras (meta-algae). *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* 2003; 358:109-133.
25. Keeling PJ. Diversity and evolutionary history of plastids and their hosts. *Am J Bot* 2004; 91:1481-1493.

26. Shepherd VA, Beilby MJ, Bisson MA. When is a cell not a cell? A theory relating coenocytic structure to the unusual electrophysiology of *Ventricaria ventricosa* (*Valonia ventricosa*). *Protoplasma* 2004; 223:79-91.
27. Embley TM, van der Giezen M, Horner DS et al. Hydrogenosomes, mitochondria and early eukaryotic evolution. *IUBMB Life* 2003; 55:387-395.
28. Leon-Avila G, Tovar J. Mitosomes of *Entamoeba histolytica* are abundant mitochondrion-related remnant organelles that lack a detectable organellar genome. *Microbiology* 2004; 150:1245-1250.
29. Tovar J, Leon-Avila G, Sanchez LB et al. Mitochondrial remnant organelles of *Giardia* function in iron-sulphur protein maturation. *Nature* 2003; 426:172-176.
30. Atsatt PR. Fungus propagules in plastids: the mycosome hypothesis. *Int Microbiol* 2003; 6:17-26.
31. Maniloff J, Nealon KH, Psennner R et al. Nanobacteria: size limits and evidence. *Science* 1997; 276:1773-1776.
32. Kürner J, Frangakis AS, Baumeister W. Cryo-electron tomography reveals the cytoskeletal structure of *Spiroplasma melliferum*. *Science* 2005; 307:436-438.
33. Raoult D, Audic S, Robert C et al. The 1.2-megabase genome sequence of *Mimivirus*. *Science* 2004; 306:1344-1350.
34. Benirschke K. Remarkable placenta. *Clin Anat* 1997; 11:194-205.
35. Baluska F, Lingers F, Hlavacka A et al. Cell wall pectins and xyloglucans are internalized into dividing root cells and accumulate within cell plates during cytokinesis. *Protoplasma* 2005; In press.
36. Dhonuksche P. Visualizing microtubule dynamics and membrane trafficking in live and dividing plant cells. Ph.D. Thesis. University of Amsterdam, 2005.
37. Burgess DR, Chang F. Site selection for the cleavage furrow at cytokinesis. *Trends Cell Biol* 2005; 15:156-165.
38. Onishi M, Koga T, Morita R et al. Role of phosphatidylinositol 3-phosphate in formation of forespore membrane in *Schizosaccharomyces pombe*. *Yeast* 2003; 20:193-206.
39. Shimoda C. Forespore membrane assembly in yeast: coordinating SPBs and membrane trafficking. *J Cell Sci* 2004; 117:389-396.
40. de Duve C. The birth of complex cells. *Scient Amer* 1996; 274(4):38-45.
41. de Duve C. The onset of selection. *Nature* 2005; 433:581-582.
42. Ingber DE. The origin of cellular life. *BioEssays* 2002; 22:1160-1170.
43. Hartwell LH, Hopfield JJ, Leibler S et al. From molecular to modular cell biology. *Nature* 1999; 402(suppl):C47-C52.
44. Altman R. *Die Elementarorganismen und Ihre Beziehungen zur den Zellen*. Leipzig: Verlag von Veit, 1890.
45. Margulis L. *Origin of Eukaryotic Cells*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970.
46. Margulis L. *Symbiosis in Cell Evolution. Life and Its Environment on the Early Earth*. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1981.
47. Margulis L. *Symbiosis in Cell Evolution*. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1993.
48. Margulis L, Sagan D. *Acquiring Genomes: a Theory of the Origin of Species*. New York: Basic Books, 2002.
49. Martin W, Embley TM. Early evolution comes full circle. *Science* 2004; 431:134-137.
50. López-García P, Moreira D. Metabolic symbiosis at the origin of eukaryotes. *Trends Biochem Sci* 1999; 24:88-93.
51. Moreira D, López-García P. Symbiosis between methanogenic Archaea and Proteobacteria as the origin of eukaryotes: the syntrophic hypothesis. *J Mol Evol* 1998; 47:517-530.
52. Pennisi E. The birth of the nucleus. *Science* 2004; 305:766-768.
53. Hernandez LD, Hoffman LR, Wolfsberg TG et al. Virus-cell and cell-cell fusion. *Annu Rev Dev Biol* 1996; 12:627-661.
54. Lee J-Y, Yoo B-C, Lucas WJ. Parallels between nuclear-pore and plasmodesmal trafficking of information molecules. *Planta* 2000; 210:177-187.
55. Carr DJ. Historical perspectives on plasmodesmata. In: Gunning BES, Robards AW, eds. *Intercellular Communication in Plants: Studies on Plasmodesmata*. Berlin, Heidelberg, New York: Springer Verlag, 1976:291-295.
56. Önfelt B, Nedvetzki S, Yanagi K et al. Membrane nanotubes connect immune cells. *J Immunol* 2004; 173:1511-1513.
57. Önfelt B, Davis DM. Can membrane nanotubes facilitate communication between immune cells? *Biochem Soc Trans* 2004; 32:676-678.
58. Vidulescu C, Clejan S, O'Connor KC. Vesicle traffic through intercellular bridges in DU 145 human prostate cancer cells. *J Cell Mol Med* 2004; 8:388-396.
59. Errington J, Bath J, Wu LJ. DNA transport in bacteria. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol* 2001; 2:538-544.