



# Morphology should not be forgotten in the era of genomics—a phylogenetic perspective

## Citation

Giribet, Gonzalo. 2015. "Morphology Should Not Be Forgotten in the Era of Genomics—a Phylogenetic Perspective." *Zoologischer Anzeiger - A Journal of Comparative Zoology* (January). doi:10.1016/j.jcz.2015.01.003.

## Published Version

doi:10.1016/j.jcz.2015.01.003

## Permanent link

<http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:34609598>

## Terms of Use

This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Open Access Policy Articles, as set forth at <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#OAP>

## Share Your Story

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.  
Please share how this access benefits you. [Submit a story](#).

[Accessibility](#)

1 Morphology should not be forgotten in the era of  
2 genomics—a phylogenetic perspective

3

4 Gonzalo Giribet

5

6 *Museum of Comparative Zoology, Department of Organismic and Evolutionary Biology, Harvard*

7 *University, 26 Oxford Street, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA*

8

9 ABSTRACT

10 Morphology has traditionally played a pivotal role in animal phylogeny since the first  
11 evolutionary biologists began to decipher the animal tree of life. In recent times, however,  
12 morphological characters have lost prominence in inferring deep relationships among  
13 animals due to fundamental issues with homology statements and the choice of higher taxa  
14 as terminals, but most importantly, due to declining costs of generating molecular data. As  
15 genomes and transcriptomes become widely available, the burden of evidence for  
16 morphology in overcoming molecular tree topologies has become ever heavier. In addition,  
17 collection and coding of morphological characters must accelerate and become less  
18 subjective. These needs have led to developments in the field of ontology, the use of a  
19 controlled and formalized morphological vocabulary. Finally, the role of fossils for dating  
20 molecular phylogenies is discussed. While molecules seem to have displaced morphology  
21 for phylogenetic inference, the need to incorporate fossils as explicit terminals, including  
22 dating of molecular-driven trees, together with new methods for high-throughput  
23 morphological data acquisition and annotation, may rescue morphology to become again an  
24 important player in phylogenetics. The reasons for maintaining a research program in  
25 morphology are thus countless, as ultimately, a zoologist's interest is to understand form  
26 and function, ecology and evolution, as well as all other aspects that may explain how our  
27 favorite organisms live, behave and evolve.

28

29 *Keywords: phylogenetics, phylogenomics, tip dating, node dating, total evidence dating*

30

## 31 **1. The historical role of morphology in systematics**

32

33           Since the beginnings of systematics as the science for inferring organismal  
34 relationships, morphology has played a prominent role in elucidating the tree of life (e.g.,  
35 Haeckel, 1866). With the advent of cladistics (phylogenetic systematics) (Hennig, 1950,  
36 1966) and numerical methodologies (mostly parsimony-based methods), the prevalence of  
37 explicit morphological data sets exploded in the 1980s and 1990s with the aim of testing  
38 animal classification systems at various taxonomic levels. With respect to the  
39 interrelationships of the animal phyla, several morphological data matrices were assembled  
40 (e.g., Brusca and Brusca, 2003; Eernisse et al., 1992; Jenner, 2004; Jenner and Scholtz, 2005;  
41 Meglitsch and Schram, 1991; Nielsen et al., 1996; Schram, 1991; Sørensen et al., 2000;  
42 Zrzavý et al., 1998), some becoming the basis for subsequent combined analyses of  
43 morphological and molecular data (e.g., Giribet et al., 2000; Glenner et al., 2004; Peterson  
44 and Eernisse, 2001; Zrzavý et al., 1998).

45           The development of these matrices was however hampered by two methodological  
46 impediments and few advances have been made since the early to mid-2000s. First, these  
47 matrices often used higher taxa as terminals, a practice eloquently critiqued by Prendini  
48 (2001), among other things by not allowing such higher taxa to be non-monophyletic. For  
49 example, it is now broadly accepted that Acanthocephala nests within Rotifera (e.g., Garey  
50 et al., 1996; Sørensen and Giribet, 2006; Wey-Fabrizius et al., 2014), something that could  
51 never be discovered by coding Rotifera and Acanthocephala as terminals of their own—at  
52 most one could place them as sister taxa. Second, many characters coded as absent/present  
53 assumed homology of non-comparable conditions (this is independent from other issues  
54 with applying a/p coding; see for example Pleijel, 1995), as critiqued by Jenner (2002). For

55 example a character state such as presence of spiral cleavage bears a homology statement  
56 (Hejnol, 2010), but its absence coding assumes that all other types of cleavage are  
57 homologous—something that obviously is not the case. Many other issues with coding  
58 characters and recycling data sets have also been exposed (e.g., Jenner, 2001).

59 While the use of species as terminals is a logical, albeit time consuming, solution to  
60 the first problem—and may require coding multiple species with disparate morphologies  
61 per phylum—resolving issues of homology can be complicated in many cases, especially  
62 when dealing with complex characters such as egg cleavage patterns or segmentation  
63 (Scholtz, 2002). Large morphological data matrices based on the exemplar approach  
64 advocated by Prendini (2001) are occasionally assembled for many animal groups (e.g.,  
65 Bieler et al., 2014; Lee et al., 2013). However, the exemplar approach has yet to be applied  
66 to broad metazoan relationships, and few efforts seem to be currently directed that way.

67

68

## 69 **2. Molecular systematics in the era of genomics**

70

71 While morphological data sets played a pioneering role in elucidating the animal  
72 phylogenetic tree, molecules entered the game relatively early (Field et al., 1988), and  
73 included data from nearly all the animal phyla just a decade later (e.g., Giribet et al., 2000;  
74 Zrzavý et al., 1998). But these phylogenies relied mostly on sequences from one or a few  
75 genes obtained through Sanger sequencing of PCR (polymerase chain reaction)-amplified  
76 fragments, even after the first invertebrate genomes were rapidly being sequenced and  
77 assembled (Adams et al., 2000; Consortium, 1998). Sanger-based sequencing approaches  
78 were however limited in the number of genes that could be amplified and they often lacked  
79 signal in many deep nodes. Soon, with the availability of the first animal genomes, several

80 data sets used information from 100 (Blair et al., 2002) to 3,000 gene sequences (Dopazo et  
81 al., 2004). These data sets, severely limited in taxonomic scope, questioned what had  
82 become recent “dogmas” of molecular phylogenetics, such as the clade Ecdysozoa (Philip et  
83 al., 2005; Wolf et al., 2004). These studies however omitted most of the diversity of  
84 invertebrates, save for a few model organisms for which genomes were available.

85         While these few genomes were available for a handful of model organisms,  
86 generating whole genome data remained unreachable to the average systematist. The first  
87 attempts to analyze large data sets using broad animal sampling efforts thus combined the  
88 previous genomic data with a rapidly evolving set of multigene data sets derived from  
89 expressed sequence tags (ESTs) (Delsuc et al., 2006; Delsuc et al., 2005; Lartillot and  
90 Philippe, 2008; Philippe et al., 2007; Philippe et al., 2005; Philippe and Telford, 2006). Still,  
91 these studies mostly relied on publicly available data until Dunn et al. (2008) published the  
92 first comprehensive analysis of animal relationships using transcriptomics, soon expanded  
93 to include a few additional missing species and key lineages like acoelomorphs and  
94 placozoans (Hejnol et al., 2009). Many other analyses followed, especially re-evaluating the  
95 base of the animal tree (e.g., Lartillot and Philippe, 2008; Moroz et al., 2014; Philippe et al.,  
96 2009; Pick et al., 2010; Ryan et al., 2013), or some of its largest clades (e.g., Andrade et al.,  
97 2014; Dordel et al., 2010; González et al., 2015; Kocot et al., 2011; Lemer et al., 2015;  
98 Meusemann et al., 2010; Nesnidal et al., 2013; Philippe et al., 2011; Rehm et al., 2011; Rehm  
99 et al., 2014; Sharma et al., 2014; Smith et al., 2011; Struck et al., 2014; von Reumont et al.,  
100 2012; Weigert et al., 2014; Zapata et al., 2014). The newer analyses transitioned from small  
101 and sparsely populated EST data matrices, generated by Sanger sequencing, to more  
102 complete ones using genomes or transcriptomes obtained by 454 pyrosequencing, or  
103 Illumina sequencing, among other techniques. These high-throughput sequencing  
104 techniques have exploded, with an associated decrease in sequencing costs, shifting the

105 paradigm of nucleic acid sequencing, and resulting in a low cost per base and a throughput  
106 on the gigabase order of magnitude. Some phylogenetic studies therefore now include  
107 thousands of genes—mostly protein-coding genes are used in phylogenomic studies—and  
108 dozens of taxa, and larger data sets will soon be available (see several global initiatives in  
109 Kumar et al., 2012; Lopez et al., 2014; Robinson et al., 2011). One such data set recently  
110 explored the phylogeny of insects with an unprecedented amount of data (Misof et al.,  
111 2014). The first multi-genome phylogeny of an animal group appeared more than half a  
112 decade ago (Clark et al., 2007), and dozens of genomes can now be obtained for non-model  
113 invertebrate species, as recently shown by the 101 genomes of the monarch butterfly  
114 *Danaus plexippus* (Zhan et al., 2014). It is thus unavoidable that rapidly decreasing costs of  
115 sequencing genomes coupled with analytical developments will result in sufficient data to  
116 thoroughly examine many key nodes in the animal tree.

117         Whereas the available amounts of molecular data scale up faster than requisite  
118 technological developments (i.e., computation power, algorithmic efficiency), the gradual  
119 expansion of morphological data is far from paralleling the growth of molecular data  
120 acquisition, in spite of more efficient data collection. This has led some to question whether  
121 one should collect morphological data at all for the purpose of inferring phylogenies  
122 (Scotland et al., 2003).

123

124

### 125 **3. Why is it important to maintain a research program in morphology?**

126

127         The reasons for maintaining a research program in morphology are countless, as  
128 ultimately, a zoologist's interest is to understand form and function, ecology and evolution,  
129 as well as all other aspects that may explain how our favorite organisms live, behave and

130 evolve (see Richter and Wirkner, 2014). Put plainly, one’s interest in animal phylogeny is  
131 not the phylogeny per se, but to understand how the organisms evolve and adapt to their  
132 environment, and how this reflects upon their morphology, ecology and behavior. And of  
133 course, morphology will always be required for recognizing new taxa representing novel  
134 body plans (e.g., Funch and Kristensen, 1995; Just et al., 2014; Kristensen, 1983; Kristensen  
135 and Funch, 2000), “testing” molecular hypotheses, and to understand the evolution of body  
136 plans (*evo-devo*). Therefore, rephrasing the title of this section, we may ask, “*Why is it*  
137 *important to maintain a research program in morphology for estimating phylogenies?*”,  
138 especially when entire genomes can now be collected for hundreds of species. It is thus  
139 unquestionable that large molecular data sets derived from next-generation sequencing  
140 techniques are becoming available and the preferred way to infer the relationships of many  
141 animal groups, including most phyla. It is also evident that cladistic matrices to infer deep  
142 metazoan relationships are comparatively stagnant, given the amount of effort and  
143 expertise required to code properly a matrix using an exemplar approach and produce  
144 sound hypotheses of homology for animals that share few macroscopic features, such as  
145 between for example the two “*C. elegans*”, *Crella*, the sponge, and *Caenorhabditis*, the  
146 nematode. There are obviously some sound alternatives to the exemplar approach  
147 advocated here, such as combining actual observations from different exemplars for  
148 analytical purposes, especially to minimize amounts of missing data, but still this strategy  
149 does not seem to scale up with molecular data. Nevertheless, molecular hypotheses face the  
150 insurmountable limitation of necessarily omitting vast amounts of biodiversity—those that  
151 are extinct but still provide sound explanations of a group’s phylogeny (Edgecombe, 2010).

152 Fossils constitute a key element for understanding the phylogenies of many animal  
153 groups (Donoghue et al., 1989; Edgecombe, 2010; Wiens, 2004), from placental mammals  
154 (O’Leary et al., 2013) to early panarthropods (Legg et al., 2013). In some cases, fossils in fact



155 increase congruence between morphological and molecular phylogenies. The role of  
156 morphology in coding fossil taxa for phylogenetic inference is thus undeniable and such  
157 practice becomes a strong advocate (one of many) for maintaining a healthy program in  
158 morphology. However, the proportion of phylogenies produced using fossils as terminals is  
159 just a tiny fraction of the total number of phylogenies generated every year, as they require  
160 expertise in more complex data than molecular phylogenies, and access to material often  
161 not broadly available for study.

162 Another aspect worth exploring, but seldom touched upon in the literature, is the  
163 information content of morphology and molecules, or even in some cases, that of the  
164 different character systems. Some early studies compared measures such as the consistency  
165 index of molecular and morphological data (Sanderson and Donoghue, 1989), but to my  
166 knowledge, few invertebrate studies have focused on discerning the information content of  
167 different systems. A seminal study by Harper et al. (2000) analyzed 43 anatomical and shell  
168 characters in anomalodesmatan bivalves, and then re-analyzed 18 characters which could  
169 be scored from shell characters alone—as many of these could also be scored for fossils.  
170 They then showed conflict between the shell-based tree and the cladistic hypothesis based  
171 on all the evidence (Harper et al., 2000). More recently, Bieler et al. (2014) analyzed  
172 broader bivalve relationships using a combined approach with multiple molecular markers  
173 and a specimen-based morphological approach of 210 characters (for a total of 22,680 cells  
174 with 16.6% of missing data), and then assessed the phylogenetic signal of multiple  
175 character systems. From the 210 characters, 99 had significant phylogenetic signal (when  
176 compared to the molecular and total evidence results), but a few character systems,  
177 including sperm ultrastructure and shell gross morphology and microstructure contained  
178 above average signal, while other character systems, such as alimentary and gill characters,  
179 are less informative than the average. Studies such as these can direct morphological

180 research or even assess whether fossils would contribute with significant signal—as in this  
181 case, two of the best character systems are available in the fossils. Analyses of phylogenetic  
182 signal in morphological characters are however scarce, or in some cases, limited to just a  
183 few characters to assess their possible value for inferring phylogenies (e.g., Gainett et al.,  
184 2014). Further and rigorous assessment of the phylogenetic signal in morphological data is  
185 certainly needed (see Wiens, 2004).

186         Another aspect to consider when relying on morphological data for inferring  
187 phylogenetic relationships is the time of data collection and interpretation, an aspect that  
188 has been properly outlined by just a few authors (e.g., Ramírez et al., 2007). Discussion has  
189 emerged in the community about “high throughput morphology”, and novel terms such as  
190 “next-generation histology”, or “phenomics”, have appeared, often trailing on the newest  
191 tendencies in molecular data generation. The use of automated methods for generating the  
192 raw data that will be transformed into the comparative morphological data is becoming  
193 more widespread, at least for technologies such as micro-computed tomography and  
194 magnetic resonance imaging (e.g., Ziegler et al., 2011), leading to accelerated acquisition of  
195 anatomical data (Ziegler, 2012; Ziegler et al., 2008; Ziegler and Menze, 2013). A major  
196 impediment to the phylogenetic analysis of such data is the so-called linguistic problem of  
197 morphology, or the translation of the anatomical raw data into anatomical descriptions, and  
198 these into morphological data matrices (Vogt et al., 2010). A solution to this problem can be  
199 provided by the development of ontologies—the use of a controlled and formalized  
200 morphological vocabulary (e.g., Ramírez et al., 2007; Richter et al., 2010; Vogt et al., 2010;  
201 Vogt et al., 2012; Vogt et al., 2013), but the practice and application of ontologies to  
202 distantly related groups is difficult. Modernizing data collection, storage, display and  
203 annotation are, together with the training of morphological experts who can interpret the  
204 characters, key aspects for returning morphological data to a more prominent position in

205 inferring phylogenetic patterns. However, there will always be a limiting step, character  
206 conceptualization, that will require expert assessment and that will limit automated  
207 procedures.

208

209

#### 210 **4. Morphology, fossils, dating, and phylogenomics**

211

212         Dating trees has become common in systematics (Donoghue and Benton, 2007), as a  
213 time-tree allows not only discussing patterns, but also tempo, of evolution, and thus allows  
214 for testing specific hypotheses. The hypotheses often pertain to biogeography, and  
215 increasingly to comparative methods evaluating diversification rates and alternative  
216 models for evolutionary dynamics through time. Comparative methods are thus on the rise  
217 (Harmon et al., 2008; Rabosky and Alfaro, 2010) and require both precise dating for testing  
218 key innovations (Slater et al., 2012), where morphological or behavioral innovations cause  
219 differential diversification rates (e.g., Dimitrov et al., 2012) and allow testing for adaptive  
220 radiations, where niches are defined on the basis of morphology (e.g., Gillespie, 2004; Losos  
221 and Ricklefs, 2009). It is thus ironic that fossils have become formidable allies of molecules  
222 wherever inference of divergence times is required, while molecules have relegated  
223 morphological characters of living organisms to an almost marginal role in phylogenetics.

224         For the most part, researchers use fossils to calibrate molecular trees, providing  
225 information to constrain certain nodes (Donoghue and Benton, 2007). Some even explore  
226 issues of uncertainty of calibrations and multiple models (e.g., Mao et al., 2012; Warnock et  
227 al., 2012), but often assume that the taxonomy reflects the correct phylogenetic position of  
228 the fossils, something difficult to justify without proper phylogenetic assessment. It is for  
229 the latter reason that a minority of workers has opted to treat fossils as actual terminals

230 (the so-called “tip dating” or “total evidence dating” approach), using morphological data to  
231 infer fossil placement—as commonly done by paleontologists—while the molecular data  
232 guides the dating (Murienne et al., 2010; Pyron, 2011; Sharma and Giribet, 2014; Wood et  
233 al., 2013). Tip dating addresses on the one side the aspect of phylogenetic uncertainty of  
234 fossils (see also Parham et al., 2012), but also the concern that the date estimates are more  
235 accurate when fossils appear in a specific phylogenetic position, and not just as  
236 approximate constraints to nodes (Pyron, 2011), especially when taxon sampling is limited.  
237 This has been illustrated in a large arachnid data set with an exemplar fossil record (Sharma  
238 and Giribet, 2014), and has now been tested with ancient DNA from fossil humans (Rieux et  
239 al., 2014). The latter study, using a comprehensive data set of 350 ancient and modern  
240 human complete mitochondrial DNA genomes, shows that for the same data set, estimates  
241 based on individual dated tips are far more consistent with each other than those based on  
242 node calibration, and should thus be considered as more reliable. This result thus provides  
243 the scientific justification for preferring tip dating (using fossils as terminals) over node  
244 dating (using fossils to constrain nodes), encouraging the use of tip dating whenever  
245 possible—which may not always be possible.

246         There may also be other reasons for preferring tip versus node dating, these having  
247 to do with the idiosyncrasies of the fossil record. Some groups (e.g., molluscs, arthropods,  
248 brachiopods) fossilize well, while others (e.g., platyhelminths, nemertean, rotifers) do not.  
249 In addition, some geological periods have more rock available to us or more favorable  
250 conditions for fossilization, so in some cases, a group that has missed a fossilization window  
251 (e.g., in the Carboniferous) may not appear again until many millions of years later. To  
252 provide an empirical example, the fossil record of Opiliones (harvestman arachnids) is  
253 exceptional in many respects, with the first Devonian fossils (Dunlop et al., 2003) probably  
254 close to the first appearance of this ancient arachnid order, with multiple lineages

255 preserved as three-dimensional fossils in the Carboniferous (Garwood et al., 2011; Garwood  
256 et al., 2014), and several other lineages known from the Mesozoic (see Dunlop, 2010 for a  
257 recent review). The phylogeny of Opiliones is well understood (e.g., Giribet et al., 2002;  
258 Giribet et al., 2010; Hedin et al., 2012a; Sharma et al., 2014; Shultz, 1998; Shultz and Regier,  
259 2001), and while stem-group Eupnoi and Dyspnoi are known from the Paleozoic (Garwood  
260 et al., 2011), the first fossil Cyphophthalmi is only from Cretaceous amber (Poinar, 2008),  
261 between 45 and more than 300 million years after the diversification of the group  
262 (following Sharma and Giribet, 2014), and its exact phylogenetic position is unclear. In the  
263 case of Laniatores—the largest Opiliones suborder, which separated from its sister group  
264 around the Devonian—the oldest known fossil is from Eocene Baltic amber (Ubick and  
265 Dunlop, 2005). Therefore, while for some clades the first fossil occurs near their time of  
266 origin and thus may provide good estimates of the age of a clade, in other cases the first  
267 fossil occurrences may be closer to the tip than to the base of a clade. If the latter are used  
268 for dating a clade, the excessively young fossil may produce a “push towards the present”  
269 effect for the whole clade, and thus grossly underestimate the age of the clade in question  
270 (Fig. 1).

271           It is clear that this may oversimplify the way node dating is done, as this fossil would  
272 generally be treated as some sort of minimum age, but still, in the absence of much older  
273 fossils in nearby clades, this effect should be noticeable. However, if the fossil were included  
274 as a morphological terminal in a phylogeny instead of used for constraining a clade, its  
275 position within the phylogeny should reflect its more derived position, and thus engender a  
276 more precise dating of the whole clade. Of course one could argue that a more precise node  
277 than “Cyphophthalmi” or “Laniatores” should be chosen when using those groups, but the  
278 Burmese cyphophthalmid fossil was described in the wrong family and the phylogenetic  
279 position of the Baltic fossils is difficult to ascertain without a comprehensive phylogenetic

280 analysis of Laniatores, which was entirely lacking at the time of its description. One could  
281 also argue that the taxonomy should be fixed first, but in the real world, molecular  
282 systematists tend to follow the taxonomy from the taxonomists describing the fossils and  
283 such fossils may often not be precisely positioned.

284 Another common problem of using fossils to date nodes is that sometimes such  
285 nodes are misrepresented, because most authors “recycling” fossil papers for their analyses  
286 without critical phylogenetic assessment tend to take conservative approaches. For  
287 example, Hedin et al. (2012b) used the age estimate of two members of closely related  
288 families of Eupnoi as the age for the entire suborder (see Sharma and Giribet, 2014),  
289 resulting again in a *push towards the present* effect, but in this case for a different reason.  
290 Had they coded the fossils as terminals, the two species represented molecularly would  
291 have not been placed with the fossil they used for dating the node. A clear demonstration of  
292 these was recently provided in two analyses of fossil Opiliones (Garwood et al., 2014;  
293 Sharma and Giribet, 2014).

294 Tip dating however requires on the one hand morphological expertise, and also  
295 algorithmic developments, as currently no software allows analyzing simultaneously  
296 complex genomic-scale data (i.e., thousands of loci) and morphological data in a  
297 probabilistic framework. To my knowledge, no software additionally enables efficient  
298 dating using morphological and phylogenomic data matrices (see Sharma and Giribet,  
299 2014). Due to the complexity of nucleotide and/or amino acid transition matrices, assigning  
300 accurate models to simultaneous analyses of morphological and molecular sequence data is  
301 inherently difficult, and recapitulates an older problem of how different data classes should  
302 be weighted in total evidence analyses (Bull et al., 1993; Giribet, 2010; Kluge, 1989).

303

304

305 **5. Final Remarks**

306

307 Morphological data have traditionally played a key role in inferring animal  
308 phylogeny but recently have been replaced by molecular data due to multiple factors,  
309 perhaps most prominently due to the efficiency and low cost of sequence data acquisition  
310 and the development of analytical methods to deal with a vast amount of characters with a  
311 small number of states. This is unfortunately leading to a large asymmetry in the amount of  
312 studies using either type of data, while morphological data can still provide an important  
313 framework to assess molecular trees—congruence between the two data sources generate  
314 confidence in the results, while incongruence often leads to interesting aspects of body plan  
315 evolution, including convergence. Several developments, including high throughput  
316 morphological data collection and the establishment of clear ontologies are now required to  
317 restore the place of morphology as a main player in elucidating phylogenetic relationships.  
318 These will also aid in ameliorating previous problems with higher taxa as terminals and  
319 poorly formulated homology statements. But most important is the need of using fossils to  
320 improve phylogenetic inference and to help generate time-trees. In the latter arena, it is  
321 beginning to become evident that tip dating (total evidence dating) may be philosophically  
322 preferable to other forms of dating using fossils to calibrate accepted nodes. As refined  
323 bioinformatic tools become available, it should be possible to analyze genomic and  
324 morphological data in conjunction and to use these analyses for providing the most  
325 accurate estimate of the timed phylogenies of a group. Molecular data may easily provide  
326 the skeleton of the animal tree of life; morphology will still be required to test such skeleton,  
327 to place key fossils, and to provide a sound temporal framework for such animal tree.

328

329 **Acknowledgments**

330

331           This invited paper derived from the Presidential Lecture at III International  
332 Congress on Invertebrate Morphology, and I am indebted to the organizers and the editors  
333 of this volume for their invitation, especially to Gerhard Scholtz, Thomas Stach and Carsten  
334 Lüter. Some of the ideas outlined here derive from many discussions and conversations  
335 about total evidence, morphology, dating and genomics, I have had with many close  
336 colleagues through the years, especially with Greg Edgecombe, Rosa Fernández, Gustavo  
337 Hormiga, Prashant Sharma, Lars Vogt, and Ward Wheeler. Prashant Sharma, Rosa  
338 Fernández, Stefan Richter and an anonymous reviewer provided comments and criticism  
339 that helped to considerably improve this review.



340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367

368

369

370

371

372

## References

- Adams, M.D., Celniker, S.E., Holt, R.A., Evans, C.A., Gocayne, J.D., Amanatides, P.G., Scherer, S.E., Li, P.W., Hoskins, R.A., Galle, R.F., George, R.A., Lewis, S.E., Richards, S., Ashburner, M., Henderson, S.N., Sutton, G.G., Wortman, J.R., Yandell, M.D., Zhang, Q., Chen, L.X., Brandon, R.C., Rogers, Y.H.C., Blazej, R.G., Champe, M., Pfeiffer, B.D., Wan, K.H., Doyle, C., Baxter, E.G., Helt, G., Nelson, C.R., Miklos, G.L.G., Abril, J.F., Agbayani, A., An, H.J., Andrews-Pfannkoch, C., Baldwin, D., Ballew, R.M., Basu, A., Baxendale, J., Bayraktaroglu, L., Beasley, E.M., Beeson, K.Y., Benos, P.V., Berman, B.P., Bhandari, D., Bolshakov, S., Borkova, D., Botchan, M.R., Bouck, J., Brokstein, P., Brottier, P., Burtis, K.C., Busam, D.A., Butler, H., Cadieu, E., Center, A., Chandra, I., Cherry, J.M., Cawley, S., Dahlke, C., Davenport, L.B., Davies, A., de Pablos, B., Delcher, A., Deng, Z.M., Mays, A.D., Dew, I., Dietz, S.M., Dodson, K., Doup, L.E., Downes, M., Dugan-Rocha, S., Dunkov, B.C., Dunn, P., Durbin, K.J., Evangelista, C.C., Ferraz, C., Ferriera, S., Fleischmann, W., Fosler, C., Gabrielian, A.E., Garg, N.S., Gelbart, W.M., Glasser, K., Glodek, A., Gong, F.C., Gorrell, J.H., Gu, Z.P., Guan, P., Harris, M., Harris, N.L., Harvey, D., Heiman, T.J., Hernandez, J.R., Houck, J., Hostin, D., Houston, D.A., Howland, T.J., Wei, M.H., Ibegwam, C., Jalali, M., Kalush, F., Karpen, G.H., Ke, Z.X., Kennison, J.A., Ketchum, K.A., Kimmel, B.E., Kodira, C.D., Kraft, C., Kravitz, S., Kulp, D., Lai, Z.W., Lasko, P., Lei, Y.D., Levitsky, A.A., Li, J.Y., Li, Z.Y., Liang, Y., Lin, X.Y., Liu, X.J., Mattei, B., McIntosh, T.C., McLeod, M.P., McPherson, D., Merkulov, G., Milshina, N.V., Mobarry, C., Morris, J., Moshrefi, A., Mount, S.M., Moy, M., Murphy, B., Murphy, L., Muzny, D.M., Nelson, D.L., Nelson, D.R., Nelson, K.A., Nixon, K., Nusskern, D.R., Pacleb, J.M., Palazzolo, M., Pittman, G.S., Pan, S., Pollard, J., Puri, V., Reese, M.G., Reinert, K., Remington, K., Saunders, R.D.C., Scheeler, F., Shen, H., Shue, B.C., Siden-Kiamos, I., Simpson, M., Skupski, M.P., Smith, T., Spier, E., Spradling, A.C., Stapleton, M., Strong, R., Sun, E., Svirskas, R., Tector, C., Turner, R., Venter, E., Wang, A.H.H., Wang, X., Wang, Z.Y., Wassarman, D.A., Weinstock, G.M., Weissenbach, J., Williams, S.M., Woodage, T., Worley, K.C., Wu, D., Yang, S., Yao, Q.A., Ye, J., Yeh, R.F., Zaveri, J.S., Zhan, M., Zhang, G.G., Zhao, Q., Zheng, L.S., Zheng, X.Q.H., Zhong, F.N., Zhong, W.Y., Zhou, X.J., Zhu, S.P., Zhu, X.H., Smith, H.O., Gibbs, R.A., Myers, E.W., Rubin, G.M., Venter, J.C., 2000. The genome sequence of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Science* 287, 2185-2195.

373 Andrade, S.C.S., Montenegro, H., Strand, M., Schwartz, M., Kajihara, H., Norenburg, J.L.,  
 374 Turbeville, J.M., Sundberg, P., Giribet, G., 2014. A transcriptomic approach to ribbon  
 375 worm systematics (Nemertea): resolving the Pilidiophora problem. *Mol. Biol. Evol.*  
 376 *31*, 3206-3215.

377 Bieler, R., Mikkelsen, P.M., Collins, T.M., Glover, E.A., González, V.L., Graf, D.L., Harper, E.M.,  
 378 Healy, J.M., Kawauchi, G.Y., Sharma, P.P., Staubach, S., Strong, E.E., Taylor, J.D.,  
 379 Tëmkin, I., Zardus, J.D., Clark, S., Guzmán, A., McIntyre, E., Sharp, P., Giribet, G., 2014.  
 380 Investigating the Bivalve Tree of Life – an exemplar-based approach combining  
 381 molecular and novel morphological characters. *Invertebr. Syst.* *28*, 32-115.

382 Blair, J.E., Ikeo, K., Gojobori, T., Hedges, S.B., 2002. The evolutionary position of nematodes.  
 383 *BMC Evol. Biol.* *2*, 1-7.

384 Brusca, R.C., Brusca, G.J., 2003. *Invertebrates*. 2nd Edition, 2nd ed. Sinauer Associates,  
 385 Sunderland.

386 Bull, J.J., Huelsenbeck, J.P., Cunningham, C.W., Swofford, D.L., Waddell, P.J., 1993. Partitioning  
 387 and combining data in phylogenetic analysis. *Syst. Biol.* *42*, 384-397.

388 Clark, A.G., Eisen, M.B., Smith, D.R., Bergman, C.M., Oliver, B., Markow, T.A., Kaufman, T.C.,  
 389 Kellis, M., Gelbart, W., Iyer, V.N., Pollard, D.A., Sackton, T.B., Larracuenta, A.M., Singh,  
 390 N.D., Abad, J.P., Abt, D.N., Adryan, B., Aguade, M., Akashi, H., Anderson, W.W.,  
 391 Aquadro, C.F., Ardell, D.H., Arguello, R., Artieri, C.G., Barbash, D.A., Barker, D.,  
 392 Barsanti, P., Batterham, P., Batzoglou, S., Begun, D., Bhutkar, A., Blanco, E., Bosak,  
 393 S.A., Bradley, R.K., Brand, A.D., Brent, M.R., Brooks, A.N., Brown, R.H., Butlin, R.K.,  
 394 Caggese, C., Calvi, B.R., Bernardo de Carvalho, A., Caspi, A., Castrezana, S., Celniker,  
 395 S.E., Chang, J.L., Chapple, C., Chatterji, S., Chinwalla, A., Civetta, A., Clifton, S.W.,  
 396 Comeron, J.M., Costello, J.C., Coyne, J.A., Daub, J., David, R.G., Delcher, A.L.,  
 397 Delehaunty, K., Do, C.B., Ebling, H., Edwards, K., Eickbush, T., Evans, J.D., Filipowski, A.,  
 398 Findeiss, S., Freyhult, E., Fulton, L., Fulton, R., Garcia, A.C., Gardiner, A., Garfield, D.A.,  
 399 Garvin, B.E., Gibson, G., Gilbert, D., Gnerre, S., Godfrey, J., Good, R., Gotea, V., Gravely,  
 400 B., Greenberg, A.J., Griffiths-Jones, S., Gross, S., Guigo, R., Gustafson, E.A., Haerty, W.,  
 401 Hahn, M.W., Halligan, D.L., Halpern, A.L., Halter, G.M., Han, M.V., Heger, A., Hillier, L.,  
 402 Hinrichs, A.S., Holmes, I., Hoskins, R.A., Hubisz, M.J., Hultmark, D., Huntley, M.A., Jaffe,  
 403 D.B., Jagadeeshan, S., Jeck, W.R., Johnson, J., Jones, C.D., Jordan, W.C., Karpen, G.H.,  
 404 Kataoka, E., Keightley, P.D., Kheradpour, P., Kirkness, E.F., Koerich, L.B., Kristiansen,  
 405 K., Kudrna, D., Kulathinal, R.J., Kumar, S., Kwok, R., Lander, E., Langley, C.H., Lapoint,

406 R., Lazzaro, B.P., Lee, S.J., Levesque, L., Li, R., Lin, C.F., Lin, M.F., Lindblad-Toh, K.,  
407 Llopart, A., Long, M., Low, L., Lozovsky, E., Lu, J., Luo, M., Machado, C.A., Makalowski,  
408 W., Marzo, M., Matsuda, M., Matzkin, L., McAllister, B., McBride, C.S., McKernan, B.,  
409 McKernan, K., Mendez-Lago, M., Minx, P., Mollenhauer, M.U., Montooth, K., Mount,  
410 S.M., Mu, X., Myers, E., Negre, B., Newfeld, S., Nielsen, R., Noor, M.A., O'Grady, P.,  
411 Pachter, L., Papaceit, M., Parisi, M.J., Parisi, M., Parts, L., Pedersen, J.S., Pesole, G.,  
412 Phillippy, A.M., Ponting, C.P., Pop, M., Porcelli, D., Powell, J.R., Prohaska, S., Pruitt, K.,  
413 Puig, M., Quesneville, H., Ravi Ram, K., Rand, D., Rasmussen, M.D., Reed, L.K., Reenan,  
414 R., Reily, A., Remington, K.A., Rieger, T.T., Ritchie, M.G., Robin, C., Rogers, Y.H., Rohde,  
415 C., Rozas, J., Rubenfield, M.J., Ruiz, A., Russo, S., Salzberg, S.L., Sanchez-Gracia, A.,  
416 Saranga, D.J., Sato, H., Schaeffer, S.W., Schatz, M.C., Schlenke, T., Schwartz, R., Segarra,  
417 C., Singh, R.S., Sirot, L., Sirota, M., Sisneros, N.B., Smith, C.D., Smith, T.F., Spieth, J.,  
418 Stage, D.E., Stark, A., Stephan, W., Strausberg, R.L., Strempel, S., Sturgill, D., Sutton, G.,  
419 Sutton, G.G., Tao, W., Teichmann, S., Tobari, Y.N., Tomimura, Y., Tsolas, J.M., Valente,  
420 V.L., Venter, E., Craig Venter, J., Vicario, S., Vieira, F.G., Vilella, A.J., Villasante, A.,  
421 Walenz, B., Wang, J., Wasserman, M., Watts, T., Wilson, D., Wilson, R.K., Wing, R.A.,  
422 Wolfner, M.F., Wong, A., Ka-Shu Wong, G., Wu, C.I., Wu, G., Yamamoto, D., Yang, H.P.,  
423 Yang, S.P., Yorke, J.A., Yoshida, K., Zdobnov, E., Zhang, P., Zhang, Y., Zimin, A.V.,  
424 Baldwin, J., Abdouelleil, A., Abdulkadir, J., Abebe, A., Abera, B., Abreu, J., Christophe  
425 Acer, S., Aftuck, L., Alexander, A., An, P., Anderson, E., Anderson, S., Arachi, H., Azer,  
426 M., Bachantsang, P., Barry, A., Bayul, T., Berlin, A., Bessette, D., Bloom, T., Blye, J.,  
427 Boguslavskiy, L., Bonnet, C., Boukhgalter, B., Bourzgui, I., Brown, A., Cahill, P.,  
428 Channer, S., Cheshatsang, Y., Chuda, L., Citroen, M., Collymore, A., Cooke, P., Costello,  
429 M., D'Aco, K., Daza, R., De Haan, G., Degray, S., Demaso, C., Dhargay, N., Dooley, K.,  
430 Dooley, E., Doricent, M., Dorje, P., Dorjee, K., Dupes, A., Elong, R., Falk, J., Farina, A.,  
431 Faro, S., Ferguson, D., Fisher, S., Foley, C.D., Franke, A., Friedrich, D., Gadbois, L.,  
432 Gearin, G., Gearin, C.R., Giannoukos, G., Goode, T., Graham, J., Grandbois, E., Grewal,  
433 S., Gyaltzen, K., Hafez, N., Hagos, B., Hall, J., Henson, C., Hollinger, A., Honan, T., Huard,  
434 M.D., Hughes, L., Hurhula, B., Erii Husby, M., Kamat, A., Kanga, B., Kashin, S.,  
435 Khazanovich, D., Kisner, P., Lance, K., Lara, M., Lee, W., Lennon, N., Letendre, F.,  
436 Levine, R., Lipovsky, A., Liu, X., Liu, J., Liu, S., Lokyitsang, T., Lokyitsang, Y., Lubonja,  
437 R., Lui, A., Macdonald, P., Magnisalis, V., Maru, K., Matthews, C., McCusker, W.,  
438 McDonough, S., Mehta, T., Meldrim, J., Meneus, L., Mihai, O., Mihalev, A., Mihova, T.,

439 Mittelman, R., Mlenga, V., Montmayeur, A., Mulrain, L., Navidi, A., Naylor, J., Negash,  
440 T., Nguyen, T., Nguyen, N., Nicol, R., Norbu, C., Norbu, N., Novod, N., O'Neill, B.,  
441 Osman, S., Markiewicz, E., Oyono, O.L., Patti, C., Phunkhang, P., Pierre, F., Priest, M.,  
442 Raghuraman, S., Rege, F., Reyes, R., Rise, C., Rogov, P., Ross, K., Ryan, E., Settipalli, S.,  
443 Shea, T., Sherpa, N., Shi, L., Shih, D., Sparrow, T., Spaulding, J., Stalker, J., Stange-  
444 Thomann, N., Stavropoulos, S., Stone, C., Strader, C., Tesfaye, S., Thomson, T.,  
445 Thoulutsang, Y., Thoulutsang, D., Topham, K., Topping, I., Tsamla, T., Vassiliev, H., Vo,  
446 A., Wangchuk, T., Wangdi, T., Weiland, M., Wilkinson, J., Wilson, A., Yadav, S., Young,  
447 G., Yu, Q., Zembek, L., Zhong, D., Zimmer, A., Zwirko, Z., Jaffe, D.B., Alvarez, P.,  
448 Brockman, W., Butler, J., Chin, C., Gnerre, S., Grabherr, M., Kleber, M., Mauceli, E.,  
449 Maccallum, I., 2007. Evolution of genes and genomes on the *Drosophila* phylogeny.  
450 Nature 450, 203-218.

451 Consortium, T.C.e.S., 1998. Genome sequence of the nematode *C. elegans*: A platform for  
452 investigating biology. Science 282, 2012-2018.

453 Delsuc, F., Brinkmann, H., Chourrout, D., Philippe, H., 2006. Tunicates and not  
454 cephalochordates are the closest living relatives of vertebrates. Nature 439, 965-  
455 968.

456 Delsuc, F., Brinkmann, H., Philippe, H., 2005. Phylogenomics and the reconstruction of the  
457 tree of life. Nat. Rev. Genet. 6, 361-375.

458 Dimitrov, D., Lopardo, L., Giribet, G., Arnedo, M.A., Álvarez-Padilla, F., Hormiga, G., 2012.  
459 Tangled in a sparse spider web: single origin of orb weavers and their spinning  
460 work unravelled by denser taxonomic sampling. P. Roy. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 279, 1341-  
461 1350.

462 Donoghue, M.J., Doyle, J.J., Gauthier, J., Kluge, A.G., Rowe, T., 1989. The importance of fossils  
463 in phylogeny reconstruction. Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst. 20, 431-460.

464 Donoghue, P.C., Benton, M.J., 2007. Rocks and clocks: calibrating the Tree of Life using  
465 fossils and molecules. Trends Ecol. Evol. 22, 424-431.

466 Dopazo, H., Santoyo, J., Dopazo, J., 2004. Phylogenomics and the number of characters  
467 required for obtaining an accurate phylogeny of eukaryote model species.  
468 Bioinformatics 20 Suppl 1, I116-I121.

469 Dordel, J., Fisse, F., Purschke, G., Struck, T.H., 2010. Phylogenetic position of Sipuncula  
470 derived from multi-gene and phylogenomic data and its implication for the  
471 evolution of segmentation. J. Zool. Syst. Evol. Res. 48, 197-207.

472 Dunlop, J.A., 2010. Geological history and phylogeny of Chelicerata. *Arthropod Struct. Dev.*  
473 39, 124-142.

474 Dunlop, J.A., Anderson, L.I., Kerp, H., Hass, H., 2003. Preserved organs of Devonian  
475 harvestmen. *Nature* 425, 916.

476 Dunn, C.W., Hejnol, A., Matus, D.Q., Pang, K., Browne, W.E., Smith, S.A., Seaver, E.C., Rouse,  
477 G.W., Obst, M., Edgecombe, G.D., Sørensen, M.V., Haddock, S.H.D., Schmidt-Rhaesa, A.,  
478 Okusu, A., Kristensen, R.M., Wheeler, W.C., Martindale, M.Q., Giribet, G., 2008. Broad  
479 phylogenomic sampling improves resolution of the animal tree of life. *Nature* 452,  
480 745-749.

481 Edgecombe, G.D., 2010. Palaeomorphology: fossils and the inference of cladistic  
482 relationships. *Acta Zool.* 92, 72-80.

483 Eernisse, D.J., Albert, J.S., Anderson, F.E., 1992. Annelida and Arthropoda are not sister taxa:  
484 A phylogenetic analysis of spiralian metazoan morphology. *Syst. Biol.* 41, 305-330.

485 Field, K.G., Olsen, G.J., Lane, D.J., Giovannoni, S.J., Ghiselin, M.T., Raff, E.C., Pace, N.R., Raff, R.A.,  
486 1988. Molecular phylogeny of the animal kingdom. *Science* 239, 748-753.

487 Funch, P., Kristensen, R.M., 1995. Cyclophora is a new phylum with affinities to Entoprocta  
488 and Ectoprocta. *Nature* 378, 711-714.

489 Gainett, G., Sharma, P.P., Pinto-da-Rocha, R., Giribet, G., Willemart, R.H., 2014. Walk it off:  
490 Predictive power of appendicular characters toward inference of higher-level  
491 relationships in Laniatores (Arachnida: Opiliones). *Cladistics* 30, 120-138.

492 Garey, J.R., Near, T.J., Nonnemacher, M.R., Nadler, S.A., 1996. Molecular evidence for  
493 Acanthocephala as a subtaxon of Rotifera. *J. Mol. Evol.* 43, 287-292.

494 Garwood, R.J., Dunlop, J.A., Giribet, G., Sutton, M.D., 2011. Anatomically modern  
495 Carboniferous harvestmen demonstrate early cladogenesis and stasis in opiliones.  
496 *Nature Comm.* 2, 444.

497 Garwood, R.J., Sharma, P.P., Dunlop, J.A., Giribet, G., 2014. A new stem-group Palaeozoic  
498 harvestman revealed through integration of phylogenetics and development. *Curr.*  
499 *Biol.* 24, 1-7.

500 Gillespie, R., 2004. Community assembly through adaptive radiation in Hawaiian spiders.  
501 *Science* 303, 356-359.

502 Giribet, G., 2010. A new dimension in combining data? The use of morphology and  
503 phylogenomic data in metazoan systematics. *Acta Zool.* 91, 11-19.

504 Giribet, G., Distel, D.L., Polz, M., Sterrer, W., Wheeler, W.C., 2000. Triploblastic relationships  
505 with emphasis on the acoelomates and the position of Gnathostomulida,  
506 Cycliophora, Plathelminthes, and Chaetognatha: A combined approach of 18S rDNA  
507 sequences and morphology. *Syst. Biol.* 49, 539-562.

508 Giribet, G., Edgecombe, G.D., Wheeler, W.C., Babbitt, C., 2002. Phylogeny and systematic  
509 position of Opiliones: a combined analysis of chelicerate relationships using  
510 morphological and molecular data. *Cladistics* 18, 5-70.

511 Giribet, G., Vogt, L., Pérez González, A., Sharma, P., Kury, A.B., 2010. A multilocus approach to  
512 harvestman (Arachnida: Opiliones) phylogeny with emphasis on biogeography and  
513 the systematics of Laniatores. *Cladistics* 26, 408-437.

514 Glenner, H., Hansen, A.J., Sørensen, M.V., Ronquist, F., Huelsenbeck, J.P., Willerslev, E., 2004.  
515 Bayesian inference of the metazoan phylogeny; a combined molecular and  
516 morphological approach. *Curr. Biol.* 14, 1644-1649.

517 González, V.L., Andrade, S.C.S., Bieler, R., Collins, T.M., Dunn, C.W., Mikkelsen, P.M., Taylor,  
518 J.D., Giribet, G., 2015. A phylogenetic backbone for Bivalvia: an RNA-seq approach. *P.*  
519 *Roy. Soc. B Biol. Sci.*

520 Haeckel, E., 1866. *Generelle Morphologie der Organismen. Allgemeine Grundzüge der*  
521 *Organischen formen-wissenschaft, mechanisch begründet durch die von Charles*  
522 *Darwin reformirte descendenztheorie*, 2 vols. Georg Reimer, Berlin.

523 Harmon, L.J., Weir, J.T., Brock, C.D., Glor, R.E., Challenger, W., 2008. GEIGER: investigating  
524 evolutionary radiations. *Bioinformatics* 24, 129-131.

525 Harper, E.M., Hide, E.A., Morton, B., 2000. Relationships between the extant  
526 Anomalodesmata: a cladistic test, in: Harper, E.M., Taylor, J.D., Crame, J.A. (Eds.), *The*  
527 *Evolutionary Biology of the Bivalvia*. The Geological Society of London, London, pp.  
528 129-143.

529 Hedin, M., Starrett, J., Akhter, S., Schönhofer, A.L., Shultz, J.W., 2012a. Phylogenomic  
530 resolution of Paleozoic divergences in harvestmen (Arachnida, Opiliones) via  
531 analysis of next-generation transcriptome data. *PLoS ONE* 7, e428888.

532 Hedin, M., Tsurusaki, N., Macías-Ordóñez, R., Shultz, J.W., 2012b. Molecular systematics of  
533 sclerosomatid harvestmen (Opiliones, Phalangioidea, Sclerosomatidae): Geography  
534 is better than taxonomy in predicting phylogeny. *Mol. Phylogenet. Evol.* 62, 224-236.

535 Hejnal, A., 2010. A twist in time—The evolution of spiral cleavage in the light of animal  
536 phylogeny. *Integr. Comp. Biol.* 50, 695-706.

537 Hejnal, A., Obst, M., Stamatakis, A., M., O., Rouse, G.W., Edgecombe, G.D., Martinez, P., Baguñà,  
538 J., Bailly, X., Jondelius, U., Wiens, M., Müller, W.E.G., Seaver, E., Wheeler, W.C.,  
539 Martindale, M.Q., Giribet, G., Dunn, C.W., 2009. Assessing the root of bilaterian  
540 animals with scalable phylogenomic methods. *P. Roy. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 276, 4261-  
541 4270.

542 Hennig, W., 1950. *Grundzüge einer Theorie der phylogenetischen Systematik*. Deutsche  
543 Zentralverlag, Berlin.

544 Hennig, W., 1966. *Phylogenetic Systematics*, 1st ed. University of Illinois Press, Urbana.

545 Jenner, R.A., 2001. Bilaterian phylogeny and uncritical recycling of morphological data sets.  
546 *Syst. Biol.* 50, 730-742.

547 Jenner, R.A., 2002. Boolean logic and character state identity: pitfalls of character coding in  
548 metazoan cladistics. *Contrib. Zool.* 71, 67-91.

549 Jenner, R.A., 2004. Towards a phylogeny of the Metazoa: evaluating alternative phylogenetic  
550 positions of Platyhelminthes, Nemertea, and Gnathostomulida, with a critical  
551 reappraisal of cladistic characters. *Contrib. Zool.* 73, 3-163.

552 Jenner, R.A., Scholtz, G., 2005. Playing another round of metazoan phylogenetics: Historical  
553 epistemology, sensitivity analysis, and the position of Arthropoda within Metazoa  
554 on the basis of morphology, in: Koenemann, S., Jenner, R.A. (Eds.), *Crustacean Issues*  
555 16: Crustacea and Arthropod Relationships. *Festschrift for Frederick R. Schram*.  
556 Taylor & Francis, Boca Raton, pp. 355-385.

557 Just, J., Kristensen, R.M., Olesen, J., 2014. *Dendrogramma*, new genus, with two new non-  
558 bilaterian species from the marine bathyal of southeastern Australia (Animalia,  
559 Metazoa incertae sedis) – with similarities to some medusoids from the  
560 Precambrian Ediacara. *PLoS ONE* 9, e102976.

561 Kluge, A.G., 1989. A concern for evidence and a phylogenetic hypothesis of relationships  
562 among *Epicrates* (Boidae, Serpentes). *Syst. Zool.* 38, 7-25.

563 Kocot, K.M., Cannon, J.T., Todt, C., Citarella, M.R., Kohn, A.B., Meyer, A., Santos, S.R., Schander,  
564 C., Moroz, L.L., Lieb, B., Halanych, K.M., 2011. Phylogenomics reveals deep molluscan  
565 relationships. *Nature* 447, 452-456.

566 Kristensen, R.M., 1983. Loricifera, a new phylum with Aschelminthes characters from  
567 meiobenthos. *Zeitschrift für zoologische Systematik und Evolutionsforschung* 21,  
568 163-180.

569 Kristensen, R.M., Funch, P., 2000. Micrognathozoa: A new class with complicated jaws like  
570 those of Rotifera and Gnathostomulida. *J. Morphol.* 246, 1-49.

571 Kumar, S., Koutsovoulos, G., Kaur, G., Blaxter, M., 2012. Toward 959 nematode genomes.  
572 *Worm* 1, 42-50.

573 Lartillot, N., Philippe, H., 2008. Improvement of molecular phylogenetic inference and the  
574 phylogeny of Bilateria. *Philos. T. R. Soc. Lon. B* 363, 1463-1472.

575 Lee, M.S.Y., Soubrier, J., Edgecombe, G.D., 2013. Rates of phenotypic and genomic evolution  
576 during the Cambrian Explosion. *Curr. Biol.* 23, 1-7.

577 Legg, D.A., Sutton, M.D., Edgecombe, G.D., 2013. Arthropod fossil data increase congruence  
578 of morphological and molecular phylogenies. *Nature Comm.* 4, 2485.

579 Lemer, S., Kawauchi, G.Y., Andrade, S.C.S., González, V.L., Boyle, M.J., Giribet, G., 2015. Re-  
580 evaluating the phylogeny of Sipuncula through transcriptomics. *Mol. Phylogenet.*  
581 *Evol.* 83, 174-183.

582 Lopez, J.V., Bracken-Grissom, H., Collins, A.G., Collins, T., Crandall, K., Distel, D., Dunn, C.,  
583 Giribet, G., Haddock, S., Knowlton, N., Martindale, M., Medina, M., Messing, C.,  
584 O'Brien, S.J., Paulay, G., Putnam, N., Ravasi, T., Rouse, G.W., Ryan, J.F., Schulze, A.,  
585 Wörheide, G., Adamska, M., Bailly, X., Breinholt, J., Browne, W.E., Diaz, M.C., Evans, N.,  
586 Flot, J.-F., Fogarty, N., Johnston, M., Kamel, B., Kawahara, A.Y., Laberge, T., Lavrov, D.,  
587 Michonneau, F., Moroz, L.L., Oakley, T., Osborne, K., Pomponi, S.A., Rhodes, A.,  
588 Rodriguez-Lanetty, M., Santos, S.R., Satoh, N., Thacker, R.W., Peer, Y.V.d., Voolstra,  
589 C.R., Welch, D.M., Winston, J., Zhou, X., 2014. The Global Invertebrate Genomics  
590 Alliance (GIGA): Developing community resources to study diverse invertebrate  
591 genomes. *J. Hered.* 105, 1-18.

592 Losos, J.B., Ricklefs, R.E., 2009. Adaptation and diversification on islands. *Nature* 457, 830-  
593 836.

594 Mao, K., Milne, R.I., Zhang, L., Peng, Y., Liu, J., Thomas, P., Mill, R.R., Renner, S.S., 2012.  
595 Distribution of living Cupressaceae reflects the breakup of Pangea. *P. Natl. Acad. Sci.*  
596 *USA* 109, 7793-7798.

597 Meglitsch, P.A., Schram, F.R., 1991. *Invertebrate Zoology*, 3 ed. Oxford University Press,  
598 Oxford.

599 Meusemann, K., von Reumont, B.M., Simon, S., Roeding, F., Strauss, S., Kück, P., Ebersberger,  
600 I., Walz, M., Pass, G., Breuers, S., Achter, V., von Haeseler, A., Burmester, T., Hadrys,



601 H., Wägele, J.W., Misof, B., 2010. A phylogenomic approach to resolve the arthropod  
602 tree of life. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 27, 2451-2464.

603 Misof, B., Liu, S., Meusemann, K., Peters, R.S., Donath, A., Mayer, C., Frandsen, P.B., Ware, J.,  
604 Flouri, T., Beutel, R.G., Niehuis, O., Petersen, M., Izquierdo-Carrasco, F., Wappler, T.,  
605 Rust, J., Aberer, A.J., Aspöck, U., Aspöck, H., Bartel, D., Blanke, A., Berger, S., Böhm, A.,  
606 Buckley, T.R., Calcott, B., Chen, J., Friedrich, F., Fukui, M., Fujita, M., Greve, C., Grobe,  
607 P., Gu, S., Huang, Y., Jermiin, L.S., Kawahara, A.Y., Krogmann, L., Kubiak, M., Lanfear,  
608 R., Letsch, H., Li, Y., Li, Z., Li, J., Lu, H., Machida, R., Mashimo, Y., Kapli, P., McKenna,  
609 D.D., Meng, G., Nakagaki, Y., Navarrete-Heredia, J.L., Ott, M., Ou, Y., Pass, G.,  
610 Podsiadlowski, L., Pohl, H., von Reumont, B.M., Schütte, K., Sekiya, K., Shimizu, S.,  
611 Slipinski, A., Stamatakis, A., Song, W., Su, X., Szucsich, N.U., Tan, M., Tan, X., Tang, M.,  
612 Tang, J., Timelthaler, G., Tomizuka, S., Trautwein, M., Tong, X., Uchifune, T., Walz,  
613 M.G., Wiegmann, B.M., Wilbrandt, J., Wipfler, B., Wong, T.K.F., Wu, Q., Wu, G., Xie, Y.,  
614 Yang, S., Yang, Q., Yeates, D.K., Yoshizawa, K., Zhang, Q., Zhang, R., Zhang, W., Zhang,  
615 Y., Zhao, J., Zhou, C., Zhou, L., Ziesmann, T., Zou, S., Li, Y., Xu, X., Zhang, Y., Yang, H.,  
616 Wang, J., Wang, J., Kjer, K.M., Zhou, X., 2014. Phylogenomics resolves the timing and  
617 pattern of insect evolution. *Science* 346, 763-767.

618 Moroz, L.L., Kocot, K.M., Citarella, M.R., Dosung, S., Norekian, T.P., Povolotskaya, I.S.,  
619 Grigorenko, A.P., Dailey, C., Berezikov, E., Buckley, K.M., Ptitsyn, A., Reshetov, D.,  
620 Mukherjee, K., Moroz, T.P., Bobkova, Y., Yu, F., Kapitonov, V.V., Jurka, J., Bobkov, Y.V.,  
621 Swore, J.J., Girardo, D.O., Fodor, A., Gusev, F., Sanford, R., Bruders, R., Kittler, E., Mills,  
622 C.E., Rast, J.P., Derelle, R., Solovyev, V.V., Kondrashov, F.A., Swalla, B.J., Sweedler, J.V.,  
623 Rogaev, E.I., Halanych, K.M., Kohn, A.B., 2014. The ctenophore genome and the  
624 evolutionary origins of neural systems. *Nature* 510, 109-114.

625 Muriene, J., Edgecombe, G.D., Giribet, G., 2010. Including secondary structure, fossils and  
626 molecular dating in the centipede tree of life. *Mol. Phylogenet. Evol.* 57, 301-313.

627 Nesnidal, M.P., Helmkampf, M., Meyer, A., Witek, A., Bruchhaus, I., Ebersberger, I., Hankeln,  
628 T., Lieb, B., Struck, T.H., Hausdorf, B., 2013. New phylogenomic data support the  
629 monophyly of Lophophorata and an Ectoproct-Phoronid clade and indicate that  
630 Polyzoa and Kryptrochozoa are caused by systematic bias. *BMC Evol. Biol.* 13, 253.

631 Nielsen, C., Scharff, N., Eibye-Jacobsen, D., 1996. Cladistic analyses of the animal kingdom.  
632 *Biol. J. Linn. Soc.* 57, 385-410.

633 O'Leary, M.A., Bloch, J.I., Flynn, J.J., Gaudin, T.J., Giallombardo, A., Giannini, N.P., Goldberg,  
634 S.L., Kraatz, B.P., Luo, Z.X., Meng, J., Ni, X., Novacek, M.J., Perini, F.A., Randall, Z.S.,  
635 Rougier, G.W., Sargis, E.J., Silcox, M.T., Simmons, N.B., Spaulding, M., Velazco, P.M.,  
636 Weksler, M., Wible, J.R., Cirranello, A.L., 2013. The placental mammal ancestor and  
637 the post-K-Pg radiation of placentals. *Science* 339, 662-667.

638 Parham, J.F., Donoghue, P.C.J., Bell, C.J., Calway, T.D., Head, J.J., Holroyd, P.A., Inoue, J.G., Irmis,  
639 R.B., Joyce, W.G., Ksepka, D.T., Patane, J.S.L., Smith, N.D., Tarver, J.E., van Tuinen, M.,  
640 Yang, Z.H., Angielczyk, K.D., Greenwood, J.M., Hipsley, C.A., Jacobs, L., Makovicky, P.J.,  
641 Muller, J., Smith, K.T., Theodor, J.M., Warnock, R.C.M., Benton, M.J., 2012. Best  
642 practices for justifying fossil calibrations. *Syst. Biol.* 61, 346-359.

643 Peterson, K.J., Eernisse, D.J., 2001. Animal phylogeny and the ancestry of bilaterians:  
644 inferences from morphology and 18S rDNA gene sequences. *Evol. Dev.* 3, 170-205.

645 Philip, G.K., Creevey, C.J., McInerney, J.O., 2005. The Opisthokonta and the Ecdysozoa may  
646 not be clades: stronger support for the grouping of plant and animal than for animal  
647 and fungi and stronger support for the Coelomata than Ecdysozoa. *Mol. Biol. Evol.*  
648 22, 1175-1184.

649 Philippe, H., Brinkmann, H., Copley, R.R., Moroz, L.L., Nakano, H., Poustka, A.J., Wallberg, A.,  
650 Peterson, K.J., Telford, M.J., 2011. Acoelomorph flatworms are deuterostomes  
651 related to *Xenoturbella*. *Nature* 470, 255-258.

652 Philippe, H., Brinkmann, H., Martinez, P., Riutort, M., Bagaña, J., 2007. Acoel flatworms are  
653 not Platyhelminthes: evidence from phylogenomics. *PLoS ONE* 2, e717.

654 Philippe, H., Derelle, R., Lopez, P., Pick, K., Borchiellini, C., Boury-Esnault, N., Vacelet, J.,  
655 Renard, E., Houliston, E., Quéinnec, E., Da Silva, C., Wincker, P., Le Guyader, H., Leys,  
656 S., Jackson, D.J., Schreiber, F., Erpenbeck, D., Morgenstern, B., Wörheide, G., Manuel,  
657 M., 2009. Phylogenomics revives traditional views on deep animal relationships.  
658 *Curr. Biol.* 19, 1-17.

659 Philippe, H., Lartillot, N., Brinkmann, H., 2005. Multigene analyses of bilaterian animals  
660 corroborate the monophyly of Ecdysozoa, Lophotrochozoa and Protostomia. *Mol.*  
661 *Biol. Evol.* 22, 1246-1253.

662 Philippe, H., Telford, M.J., 2006. Large-scale sequencing and the new animal phylogeny.  
663 *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 21, 614-620.

664 Pick, K.S., Philippe, H., Schreiber, F., Erpenbeck, D., Jackson, D.J., Wrede, P., Wiens, M., Alie, A.,  
665 Morgenstern, B., Manuel, M., Wörheide, G., 2010. Improved phylogenomic taxon

666 sampling noticeably affects nonbilaterian relationships. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 27, 1983-  
667 1987.

668 Pleijel, F., 1995. On character coding for phylogeny reconstruction. *Cladistics* 11, 309-315.

669 Poinar, G., 2008. *Palaeosiro burmanicum* n. gen., n. sp., a fossil Cyphophthalmi (Arachnida:  
670 Opiliones: Sironidae) in Early Cretaceous Burmese amber, in: Makarov, S.E.,  
671 Dimitrijevic, R.N. (Eds.), *Advances in Arachnology and Developmental Biology. Papers dedicated to Prof. Dr. Bozidar Curcic.* Faculty of Life Sciences, University of  
672 Vienna, and Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Vienna, Belgrade, Sofia, pp. 267-  
673 274.

675 Prendini, L., 2001. Species or supraspecific taxa as terminals in cladistic analysis?  
676 Groundplans versus exemplars revisited. *Syst. Biol.* 50, 290-300.

677 Pyron, R.A., 2011. Divergence time estimation using fossils as terminal taxa and the origins  
678 of Lissamphibia. *Syst. Biol.* 60, 466-481.

679 Rabosky, D.L., Alfaro, M.E., 2010. Evolutionary bangs and whimpers: methodological  
680 advances and conceptual frameworks for studying exceptional diversification. *Syst.*  
681 *Biol.* 59, 615-618.

682 Ramírez, M.J., Coddington, J.A., Maddison, W.P., Midford, P.E., Prendini, L., Miller, J., Griswold,  
683 C.E., Hormiga, G., Sierwald, P., Scharff, N., Benjamin, S.P., Wheeler, W.C., 2007.  
684 Linking of digital images to phylogenetic data matrices using a morphological  
685 ontology. *Syst. Biol.* 56, 283-294.

686 Rehm, P., Borner, J., Meusemann, K., von Reumont, B.M., Simon, S., Hadrys, H., Misof, B.,  
687 Burmester, T., 2011. Dating the arthropod tree based on large-scale transcriptome  
688 data. *Mol. Phylogenet. Evol.* 61, 880-887.

689 Rehm, P., Meusemann, K., Borner, J., Misof, B., Burmester, T., 2014. Phylogenetic position of  
690 Myriapoda revealed by 454 transcriptome sequencing. *Mol. Phylogenet. Evol.* 77C,  
691 25-33.

692 Richter, S., Loesel, R., Purschke, G., Schmidt-Rhaesa, A., Scholtz, G., Stach, T., Vogt, L.,  
693 Wanninger, A., Brenneis, G., Doring, C., Faller, S., Fritsch, M., Grobe, P., Heuer, C.M.,  
694 Kaul, S., Møller, O.S., Müller, C.H.G., Rieger, V., Rothe, B.H., Stegner, M.E.J., Harzsch, S.,  
695 2010. Invertebrate neurophylogeny: suggested terms and definitions for a  
696 neuroanatomical glossary. *Front. Zool.* 7, 29.

697 Richter, S., Wirkner, C.S., 2014. A research program for Evolutionary Morphology. *J. Zool.*  
698 *Syst. Evol. Res.* 52, 338-350.

699 Rieux, A., Eriksson, A., Li, M., Sobkowiak, B., Weinert, L.A., Warmuth, V., Ruiz-Linares, A.,  
700 Manica, A., Balloux, F., 2014. Improved calibration of the human mitochondrial clock  
701 using ancient genomes. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 31, 2780-2792.

702 Robinson, G.E., Hackett, K.J., Purcell-Miramontes, M., Brown, S.J., Evans, J.D., Goldsmith, M.R.,  
703 Lawson, D., Okamuro, J., Robertson, H.M., Schneider, D.J., 2011. Creating a buzz about  
704 insect genomes. *Science* 331, 1386.

705 Ryan, J.F., Pang, K., Schnitzler, C.E., Nguyen, A.D., Moreland, R.T., Simmons, D.K., Koch, B.J.,  
706 Francis, W.R., Havlak, P., Smith, S.A., Putnam, N.H., Haddock, S.H.D., Dunn, C.W.,  
707 Wolfsberg, T.G., Mullikin, J.C., Martindale, M.Q., Baxevanis, A.D., 2013. The genome of  
708 the ctenophore *Mnemiopsis leidyi* and its implications for cell type evolution. *Science*  
709 342, 1242592.

710 Sanderson, M.J., Donoghue, M.J., 1989. Patterns of variation in levels of homoplasy.  
711 *Evolution* 43, 1781-1795.

712 Scholtz, G., 2002. The Articulata hypothesis - or what is a segment? *Org. Divers. Evol.* 2, 197-  
713 215.

714 Schram, F.R., 1991. Cladistic analysis of metazoan phyla and the placement of fossil  
715 problematica, in: Simonetta, A.M., Conway Morris, S. (Eds.), *The early evolution of*  
716 *Metazoa and the significance of problematic taxa*, 1 ed. Cambridge University Press,  
717 Cambridge, pp. 35-46.

718 Scotland, R.W., Olmstead, R.G., Bennett, J.R., 2003. Phylogeny reconstruction: the role of  
719 morphology. *Syst. Biol.* 52, 539-548.

720 Sharma, P.P., Giribet, G., 2014. A revised dated phylogeny of the arachnid order Opiliones.  
721 *Front. Genet.* 5, 255.

722 Sharma, P.P., Kaluziak, S., Pérez-Porro, A.R., González, V.L., Hormiga, G., Wheeler, W.C.,  
723 Giribet, G., 2014. Phylogenomic interrogation of Arachnida reveals systemic conflicts  
724 in phylogenetic signal. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 31, 2963-2984.

725 Shultz, J.W., 1998. Phylogeny of Opiliones (Arachnida): an assessment of the  
726 "Cyphopalpatores" concept. *J. Arachnol.* 26, 257-272.

727 Shultz, J.W., Regier, J.C., 2001. Phylogenetic analysis of Phalangida (Arachnida, Opiliones)  
728 using two nuclear protein-encoding genes supports monophyly of Palpatores. *J.*  
729 *Arachnol.* 29, 189-200.

730 Slater, G.J., Harmon, L.J., Alfaro, M.E., 2012. Integrating fossils with molecular phylogenies  
731 improves inference of trait evolution. *Evolution* 66, 3931-3944.

732 Smith, S., Wilson, N.G., Goetz, F., Feehery, C., Andrade, S.C.S., Rouse, G.W., Giribet, G., Dunn,  
733 C.W., 2011. Resolving the evolutionary relationships of molluscs with phylogenomic  
734 tools. *Nature* 480, 364-367.

735 Sørensen, M.V., Funch, P., Willerslev, E., Hansen, A.J., Olesen, J., 2000. On the phylogeny of  
736 Metazoa in the light of Cycliophora and Micrognathozoa. *Zool. Anz.* 239, 297-318.

737 Sørensen, M.V., Giribet, G., 2006. A modern approach to rotiferan phylogeny: Combining  
738 morphological and molecular data. *Mol. Phylogenet. Evol.* 40, 585-608.

739 Struck, T.H., Wey-Fabrizius, A.R., Golombek, A., Hering, L., Weigert, A., Bleidorn, C., Klebow,  
740 S., Iakovenko, N., Hausdorf, B., Petersen, M., Kück, P., Herlyn, H., Hankeln, T., 2014.  
741 Platyzoan paraphyly based on phylogenomic data supports a non-coelomate  
742 ancestry of Spiralia. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 31, 1833-1849.

743 Ubick, D., Dunlop, J.A., 2005. On the placement of the Baltic amber harvestman *Gonyleptes*  
744 *nemastomoides* Koch & Berendt, 1854, with notes on the phylogeny of  
745 Cladonychiidae (Opiliones, Laniatores, Travunioidea). *Mitt. Mus. Nat.kd. Berl.,*  
746 *Geowiss. Reihe* 8, 75-82.

747 Vogt, L., Bartolomaeus, T., Giribet, G., 2010. The linguistic problem of morphology: Structure  
748 versus homology and the standardization of morphological data. *Cladistics* 26, 301-  
749 325.

750 Vogt, L., Grobe, P., Quast, B., Bartolomaeus, T., 2012. Accommodating ontologies to biological  
751 reality—top- level categories of cumulative-constitutively organized material  
752 entities. *PLoS ONE* 7, e30004.

753 Vogt, L., Nickel, M., Jenner, R.A., Deans, A.R., 2013. The need for data standards in  
754 zoomorphology. *J. Morphol.* 274, 793-808.

755 von Reumont, B.M., Jenner, R.A., Wills, M.A., Dell'Ampio, E., Pass, G., Ebersberger, I., Meyer,  
756 B., Koenemann, S., Iliffe, T.M., Stamatakis, A., Niehuis, O., Meusemann, K., Misof, B.,  
757 2012. Pancrustacean phylogeny in the light of new phylogenomic data: support for  
758 Remipedia as the possible sister group of Hexapoda. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 29, 1031-1045.

759 Warnock, R.C., Yang, Z., Donoghue, P.C., 2012. Exploring uncertainty in the calibration of the  
760 molecular clock. *Biol Lett* 8, 156-159.

761 Weigert, A., Helm, C., Meyer, M., Nickel, B., Arendt, D., Hausdorf, B., Santos, S.R., Halanych,  
762 K.M., Purschke, G., Bleidorn, C., Struck, T.H., 2014. Illuminating the base of the  
763 annelid tree using transcriptomics. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 31, 1391-1401.

764 Wey-Fabrizius, A.R., Herlyn, H., Rieger, B., Rosenkranz, D., Witek, A., Mark Welch, D.B.,  
765 Ebersberger, I., Hankeln, T., 2014. Transcriptome data reveal syndermatan  
766 relationships and suggest the evolution of endoparasitism in Acanthocephala via an  
767 epizoic stage. *PLoS One* 9, e88618.

768 Wiens, J.J., 2004. The role of morphological data in phylogeny reconstruction. *Syst. Biol.* 53,  
769 653-661.

770 Wolf, Y.I., Rogozin, I.B., Koonin, E.V., 2004. Coelomata and not Ecdysozoa: evidence from  
771 genome-wide phylogenetic analysis. *Genome Res.* 14, 29-36.

772 Wood, H.M., Matzke, N.J., Gillespie, R.G., Griswold, C.E., 2013. Treating fossils as terminal  
773 taxa in divergence time estimation reveals ancient vicariance patterns in the  
774 palpimanoid spiders. *Syst. Biol.* 62, 264-284.

775 Zapata, F., Wilson, N.G., Howison, M., Andrade, S.C.S., Jörger, K.M., Schrödl, M., Goetz, F.E.,  
776 Giribet, G., Dunn, C.W., 2014. Phylogenomic analyses of deep gastropod  
777 relationships reject Orthogastropoda. *P. Roy. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 281, 20141739.

778 Zhan, S., Zhang, W., Niitepõld, K., Hsu, J., Fernández Haeger, J., Zalucki, M.P., Altizer, S., de  
779 Roode, J.C., Reppert, S.M., Kronforst, M.R., 2014. The genetics of monarch butterfly  
780 migration and warning colouration. *Nature* 514, 317-321.

781 Ziegler, A., 2012. Broad application of non-invasive imaging techniques to echinoids and  
782 other echinoderm taxa. *Zoosymposia* 7, 53-70.

783 Ziegler, A., Faber, C., Mueller, S., Bartolomaeus, T., 2008. Systematic comparison and  
784 reconstruction of sea urchin (Echinoidea) internal anatomy: a novel approach using  
785 magnetic resonance imaging. *BMC Biol.* 6, 33.

786 Ziegler, A., Kunth, M., Mueller, S., Bock, C., Pohmann, R., Schröder, L., Faber, C., Giribet, G.,  
787 2011. Application of magnetic resonance imaging in zoology. *Zoomorphology* 130,  
788 227-254.

789 Ziegler, A., Menze, B.H., 2013. Accelerated acquisition, visualization, and analysis of zoo-  
790 anatomical data, in: Zander, J., Mosterman, P.J. (Eds.), *Computation for Humanity. Information Technology to Advance Society*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, pp. 233-260.

791 Zrzavý, J., Mihulka, S., Kepka, P., Bezdek, A., Tietz, D., 1998. Phylogeny of the Metazoa based  
792 on morphological and 18S ribosomal DNA evidence. *Cladistics* 14, 249-285.

793  
794

794

795 **Fig. 1.** Effect of a young fossil on the phylogeny of an old lineage, represented in this case by  
796 an amber fossil for a clade with an old history (A). Supposing that the fossil could be  
797 assigned to the red clade, based on morphology, it could be used for tip dating (B) or for  
798 constraining a node (C). In tip dating, the clade could accommodate for extensive  
799 cladogenesis occurring prior to the fossil, if the fossil were positioned in a derived position  
800 in the phylogeny of the group. In node dating, the fossil may cause a “push towards the  
801 present” effect. See text for discussion.