UC Davis

UC Davis Previously Published Works

Title

Three-dimensional morphological variability of Recent rhynchonellide brachiopod crura

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/84q1q1tc>

Journal

Paleobiology, 40(4)

ISSN

0094-8373

Authors

Schreiber, HA
Roopnarine, PD
Carlson, SJ

Publication Date

2014

DOI

10.1666/13042

Peer reviewed

Three-dimensional morphological variability of Recent rhynchonellide brachiopod crura

Holly A. Schreiber, Peter D. Roopnarine, and Sandra J. Carlson

RRH: 3D VARIABILITY OF RHYNCHONELLIDE CRURA

LRH: HOLLY A. SCHREIBER ET AL.

24 *Abstract.*—

25 Crura, the calcareous support structures of the lophophore in rhynchonellide brachiopods, have
26 historically been used to justify higher-level rhynchonellide classification and reveal major
27 evolutionary lineages within rhynchonellides. Seventeen crural types have been described and
28 categorized into four groups based on variation in overall structure and cross-sectional shape, but
29 not evaluated in a quantitative or comprehensive manner. Heterochrony has been hypothesized to
30 play a role in the evolutionary transitions among some types, but the structural, developmental,
31 and phylogenetic context for testing these hypotheses has not yet been established. In this study,
32 we quantify morphological disparity among all six crural morphs in Recent adult rhynchonellides
33 using three-dimensional geometric morphometric techniques, with the goal of delineating more
34 objective criteria for identifying and comparing crural morphs, ultimately to test hypotheses
35 explaining morphological transformations in ontogeny and phylogeny. We imaged the crura of
36 seven Recent rhynchonellide species using X-ray computed microtomography. We used
37 landmarks and semi-landmarks to define the dimensions and curvature of the crura and the
38 surrounding hinge area. Procrustes-standardized landmark coordinates were analyzed using a
39 principal component analysis to test the discreteness of the individual crural morphs, groups of
40 morphs, and identify features that vary most among the crural configurations.

41

42 Our results demonstrate that microCT imaging techniques provide novel ways to investigate the
43 morphology of very small features that may be otherwise impossible to obtain using more
44 conventional imaging techniques. Although we predicted overlap among crural morphs in the 3D
45 shape space, the principal component analyses suggest that five of the six crural morphs differ
46 distinctly from one another. Some but not all previously designated crural groups appear to

exhibit morphological cohesion. This study establishes a quantitative morphological foundation necessary to begin an investigation of the phylogenetic significance of ontogenetic changes in crura, which will allow hypotheses of heterochrony to be tested.

Holly A. Schreiber and Sandra J. Carlson. Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences, University of California, Davis, One Shields Avenue, Davis, California 95616 U.S.A. E-mail: haschultz@ucdavis.edu; sjcarlson@ucdavis.edu.

Peter D. Roopnarine. Department of Invertebrate Zoology and Geology, California Academy of Sciences, 55 Music Concourse Drive, San Francisco, California 94118 U.S.A. E-mail: proopnarine@calacademy.org.

Introduction

Crura, the prong-like, calcareous structures that support the lophophore on either side of the mouth, are often the most conspicuous morphological features of the interior of rhynchonellide brachiopod dorsal valves (Fig. 1). The crura support and position the base of the lophophore, allowing the lophophore to filter water efficiently as it enters the mantle cavity along either side of the commissure and exits at the valve anterior (Ager 1965; Rudwick 1970; Williams et al. 1997). A broad range of crural morphological variability exists — 17 named types — even though all rhynchonellides are characterized by only one lophophore type, the helically-coiled spirolophore lophophore (Rudwick 1970; Williams et al. 1997; Savage et al. 2002). The morphological diversity among crura has historically been used to organize higher-level rhynchonellide classification (Manceñido 1998, 2000; Manceñido and Owens 2001; Savage et al.

2002; Manceñido et al. 2007), but it remains unclear how different named crural configurations are related morphologically, phylogenetically, or ontogenetically (Cooper 1959; Ager 1965; Rudwick 1970; Manceñido and Owens 2001; Savage et al. 2002; Manceñido 1998, 2000; Manceñido et al. 2007; Manceñido and Motchurova-Dekova 2010). A quantitative characterization of crural morphology would facilitate reproducibility in the naming of crural types (morphs) and in the identification of specimens with respect to crural type, and allow us to test proposed evolutionary patterns of crural transformation (Manceñido and Motchurova-Dekova 2010). It would also enable quantitative comparisons among adults, throughout ontogeny, and across phylogenetic hypotheses of relationship (Cohen and Bitner 2013; Schreiber et al. 2013). Using microCT technology, we obtained 3D images of all six named crural types expressed in Recent rhynchonellides, and statistically analyzed three-dimensional geometric morphometric measurements of crura in order to evaluate the relationship between size and shape of crura in rhynchonellides of different body (shell) size, taxonomic affiliation, and phylogenetic affinity.

Crura in Rhynchonellida

Rhynchonellida originated in the Ordovician and is the second most diverse extant brachiopod order (after Terebratulida), with over 500 fossil and extant genera (Williams et al. 2000a, 2000b; Carlson and Leighton 2001; Savage et al. 2002; Manceñido et al. 2007). Today, forty extant species are classified into nineteen genera. They are distributed globally, but are most abundant and diverse in extra-tropical regions, specifically Australia and New Zealand (Savage et al. 2002; Logan 2007; Savage 2007; Manceñido et al. 2007). Although rhynchonellide (Kuhn 1949) brachiopods are the geologically oldest and putatively the phylogenetically most basal of the extant rhynchonelliforms, they are somewhat inconspicuous in today's oceans with

94 many living in patchy distributions at bathyal depths. Their apparent rarity in modern faunas
 95 makes numerous species difficult to collect in abundance and consequently they are relatively
 96 understudied by neontologists and paleontologists. Rhynchonellide extant diversity —
 97 approximately 3% of their total Phanerozoic generic diversity — is severely diminished,
 98 however their apparently basal phylogenetic position provides, among crown clade articulate
 99 brachiopods, critically important comparative information about the evolution of more derived
 100 rhynchonelliform brachiopods (Cooper 1959; Ager 1965; Carlson 1995; Cohen and Gawthrop
 101 1997; Manceñido and Owens 2001; Cohen 2001a, 2001b, 2007; Carlson and Leighton 2001;
 102 Savage et al. 2002; Cohen and Weydmann 2005; Carlson 2007; Manceñido et al. 2007).

103 Extant rhynchonellides have a spirolophore lophophore (with the exception of
 104 *Tethyrhynchia*, which is trocholophous) in which the apices of the spires point dorsally, and are
 105 supported posteriorly by crura (Williams et al. 1997; Savage 1996; Manceñido and Owen 2001;
 106 Savage et al. 2002). Their distinctive, roughly triangular shell morphology is often characterized
 107 by a strongly biconvex and costate shell in extinct forms, usually with a dorsal fold and ventral
 108 sulcus (though many today are rectimarginate and lack shell ornamentation). Extant adult
 109 rhynchonellides range in shell length from approximately one millimeter (e.g., *Tethyrhynchia*
 110 *mediterranea*) to twenty millimeters (e.g., *Pemphixina pyxidata*); compared to terebratulides,
 111 they are relatively small as adults.

112 Crura (singular: crus) are short (typically no more than one or two millimeters long),
 113 paired, rod- or prong-like calcareous processes (Fig. 1). Crura extend antero-ventrally from the
 114 inner socket ridge of the dorsal valve into the mantle cavity on either side of the mouth of the
 115 brachiopod, from which the lophophore arms extend, and serve as attachment sites for the body
 116 wall (Rudwick 1970; Brunton et al. 1996; Williams et al. 1997; Savage et al. 2002). Each crus

supports the very proximal section of the lophophore directly adjacent to the mouth, while the remaining portion of the spirolophore is supported hydrostatically, lacking any additional mineralized support (Rudwick 1970; James et al. 1992). Due to their typically short length, the crura act primarily as positioning devices for the lophophore rather than extensive support structures, and consequently, their geometry may affect the three-dimensional flow of water through the mantle cavity (Ager 1965; Rudwick 1970; Williams et al. 1997). However, the specific details of the relationship between crural morphology, and lophophore geometry and water flow patterns, have yet to be studied (although see LaBarbera 1977, 1978, 1981; Emig 1992; Shiino et al. 2009; Shiino and Kuwazuru 2010). Crura vary morphologically in three primary ways: angle of projection into the mantle cavity, toward the ventral valve shell (curvature of the crus); shape of the distal tip of the crus (narrow or broad, digitate or not); and cross-sectional shape of the crus (straight or curved, and curved dorsally/ventrally). Crural morphs range from laterally to dorso-ventrally compressed and can either be relatively straight or highly curved or twisted medially in a gentle helix (Fig. 2).

The crura begin to develop in juvenile rhynchonellides shortly after larval settlement (Long and Stricker 1991; James et al. 1992; Williams et al. 1997). Sheathed in outer epithelium, they consist of secondary shell material (Rudwick 1970; Williams et al. 1997) and develop from the inner socket ridge, growing by simple accretion to the distal end. Rudwick (1970) claims that crura grow through ontogeny without resorption of shell material, but this is a hypothesis that has yet to be tested. The tips of the crura may be elongated into the primary lamellae of spire-bearing brachiopods (e.g., extinct atrypides, athyridides, and spiriferides) or the descending lamellae of loops in terebratulide brachiopods (Williams et al. 1997); all are groups that have evolved from within a paraphyletic Rhynchonellida or share close common ancestry with them (Carlson 2007).

Crura are thus an important component of the cardinalia of all crown clade articulated brachiopods (Neoarticulata; Carlson 2012; Carlson and Cohen, in press).

Over the past 150 years, seventeen crural configurations have been named and have recently been placed into four qualitative groups (raducal, septifal, ensimergal, arcual) according to differences in overall structure and cross-sectional shape (Fig. 2; Manceñido 1998, 2000; Savage et al. 2002; Manceñido et al. 2007; Manceñido and Motchurova-Dekova 2010). The depauperate Recent rhynchonellide fauna represents not only a small fraction of taxonomic diversity, but also a fraction of the morphological diversity of crura found in the geologic past (Manceñido and Owens 2001; Savage et al. 2002). Under the current classification, nine rhynchonellide superfamilies have the same crural type, while six superfamilies are characterized by multiple crural types including the four superfamilies with extant representatives (Cooper 1959; Ager 1965; Carlson and Leighton 2001; Manceñido and Owens 2001; Savage et al. 2002).

Do adult individuals within a single morph vary significantly in shape, or exhibit similar degrees of variability from morph to morph? After surveying rhynchonellide crural variation present in museum collections and literature sources (see complete list in Supplementary Table 1), we noted that slight qualitative shape variations in the crura, often found in only a few specimens, were used as the basis for naming new crural morphs; a fact that Cooper (1959) and Ager (1965) and others confirmed in their descriptions. A thorough comparative review of rhynchonellide crural morphs is called for because no consistent method has been used historically to identify, name, or group them, or to determine relationships among morphs or among groups of morphs. Arguably, the best way to achieve this revision is to use both qualitative and quantitative methods, as each can illuminate the other. Qualitative descriptions of individual crural morphs exist (see Rothpletz 1886; Wisniewska 1932; Cooper 1959; Ager 1962,

1965; Dagys 1968; Rudwick 1970; Baranov 1980; Savage et al. 2002; Manceñido and Motchurova-Dekova 2010) and include brief discussions of crural shape variability. However, these descriptions can vary from author to author depending on the particular specimens studied, revealing the need for quantitative analyses that can test hypotheses using measurable data in a more objective and repeatable manner.

Our study is the first to undertake a quantitative analysis of crura in an effort to identify and classify the range of variability present in extant rhynchonellides. We have chosen to characterize Recent crural morphs using computer generated three-dimensional surface models, which allow in-depth examination of very small crural features not easily seen with more conventional imaging and analytical methods. The three-dimensional surface models can be enlarged and manipulated fully in three dimensions to reveal multiple views of the crura from many perspectives (Fig. 3). We then use three-dimensional geometric morphometric and multivariate statistical analyses to quantify the morphological diversity within and among the six crural morphs present in Recent rhynchonellides. How distinct are each of these six morphs from one another and how are they related in size and shape? How does the raduliform morph, the stratigraphically oldest and most common crural (Savage et al. 2002) form vary among adults? Because several different names have been given to the morphologically simple crura lacking quantitative analysis, we predict that crural morphs have been over-split and may occupy overlapping regions in three-dimensional shape space.

Materials and Methods

We selected extant rhynchonellide species for this initial morphometric study because crura can be imaged more precisely in three-dimensions using X-ray computed microtomography when the mantle cavity is entirely free of sediment. By using only Recent

specimens, we also avoid complications from post-mortem distortion of the crura, a confounding problem that will be examined in future studies. A minimum of three individuals of each of the six extant crural morphs (raduliform, falciform, arcuiform, canaliform, spinuliform, maniculiform; Fig. 3), from seven species, were selected from museum and marine laboratory collections, for a total of twenty-three adult rhynchonellides (see Supplementary Table 1 for a complete list). Specimens were examined from the National Museum of Natural History (Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.), the California Academy of Sciences (San Francisco, CA), Portobello Marine Laboratory (Portobello, New Zealand), University of California, Davis, and Scripps Institution of Oceanography (San Diego, CA), and were either dried or preserved in 70% ethanol.

Images of the crura were obtained using X-ray computed microtomography (microCT). Using X-rays, microCT scanners generate a series of digital, contiguous two-dimensional cross-sectional slices of an object by detecting differences in the attenuation of the X-rays as they pass through the object. Materials will scatter or absorb X-rays in direct relation to their density. A more dense material will appear more opaque in a microCT image than a less dense material (Elliot and Dover 1982; Flannery et al. 1987; Ketcham and Carlson 2001; Monnet et al. 2009; Shiino et al. 2009; Peck et al. 2009; Angiolini et al. 2010; Motchurova-Dekova and Harper 2010; Pakhnevich 2010; van Dam et al. 2011; Abel et al. 2012; Görög et al. 2012). The microCT scanner produces a series of sequential, adjacent two-dimensional images which, when assembled using computer software such as 3D Slicer (<http://www.slicer.org>; Gering et al. 1999; Pieper et al. 2004; Pieper et al. 2006), create a three-dimensional model of the object (Ketcham and Carlson 2001). These three-dimensional representations can then be easily manipulated digitally, by rotation in three dimensions, for ease of measurement and visualization of features.

210 We imaged all specimens with the Scanco Medical microCT scanner located at the University of
211 California, Davis School of Veterinary Medicine. The scanner is a desktop cone-beam microCT
212 scanner with a nominal resolution of approximately five to ninety microns. Samples require no
213 preparation and can be scanned either dried or preserved in alcohol. With this initial set of
214 images of extant crura as a baseline, to establish proof of concept, we can then attempt to obtain
215 images of fossil crura, from individuals preserved in sediment matrix of a range of densities.
216 Individual image slices were assembled and surface models constructed using the software
217 platforms Amira v5.2 or 3D Slicer v3.4. The surface models were then edited and enhanced in
218 the program Raindrop GeoMagic Studio v10.0 to expose the crura and other internal features of
219 the shell such as the sockets, hinge plates, and socket ridges (Fig 1).

220 We used three-dimensional geometric morphometric techniques to quantify the disparity
221 among the six crural morphs found in extant rhynchonellides. Landmarks, along with semi-
222 landmarks, defined the dimensions of the crura, cardinalia, and the curvature of the crura (Fig.
223 4). A landmark is a discrete, geometrically homologous anatomical point that can be accurately
224 identified on all individuals, while a semi-landmark is a constructed point on a geometric feature,
225 often a curve or surface, defined by its relative position on that feature (Bookstein 1991; Zelditch
226 et al. 2004). We defined nine homologous landmarks (Types 1 and 2; Bookstein 1991). Three-
227 dimensional Cartesian coordinates were collected for all landmarks and semi-landmarks
228 (Mitteroecker and Gunz 2002; Zelditch et al. 2004) using the morphometric program Landmark
229 v3.6 (Wiley et al. 2007).

230 Crural curvature and the shape of the distal tip are important characteristics for defining
231 crural morphs; therefore we used semi-landmarks to delineate the curved areas of the crus (e.g.,
232 distal tip morphology; Bookstein 1997; Gunz 2001, 2005; Gunz et al. 2005; Mitteroecker and

Gunz 2009; see Table 1 for a complete description of all landmarks and semi-landmarks). Semi-landmarks allow information about the curvature of a feature to be incorporated into a geometric morphometric analysis (Zelditch et al. 2004). Each curve consists of three equally spaced semi-landmarks anchored by two landmarks. Bilateral symmetry allowed landmarks to be digitized on one crus per specimen, useful in cases in which one crus was damaged or broken off entirely.

Following data collection, we used the morphometric program Morphologika v2.5 (O'Higgins and Jones 1998), to perform a generalized Procrustes analysis (Gower 1975; Rohlf and Slice 1990), which removed any variation between sets of landmarks due to differences in scale, rotation, or translation. A generalized Procrustes analysis performs a Procrustes superimposition which minimizes the Procrustes distance among all landmark configurations in the dataset using centroid size (Gower 1975; Rohlf and Slice 1990; Zelditch et al. 2004). The Procrustes-fitted coordinates served as input variables for multivariate statistical analyses. We first examined shape distinct from size, and later added size back into the analysis by comparing shape with centroid size of landmark and semi-landmark data.

We used multivariate statistical analyses to explore the nature of morphological variation among crural morphs in order to locate the areas of the crura that vary most among Recent morphs and to test statistically the morphological distinctiveness and examine within-morph variability of the six Recent crural morphs. A principal component analysis (PCA) was used to locate and explore areas of the crura that exhibit the most variability and to study the variation of landmark positions between the Recent crural morphs, allowing shape parameters that vary among crural morphs to be identified. The PCA of the measured variables was completed in the program PAST v1.94b (Hammer et al. 2001) with the variance-covariance matrix of the unstandardized data (i.e., the variance of the data is not standardized), allowing the areas of

maximum shape variation to be identified. We also performed cluster analyses, both single linkage and neighbor-joining, based on the Euclidean distances between specimens, as measured using scores derived from the first three principal components of the PCA, in order to test whether individuals in the same crural type cluster together and whether different types cluster together.

We evaluated morphological variability within and among six crural morphs in adults of seven species (representing four superfamilies) of rhynchonellides, variability among the raduliform crura of adults of two species, and, to a more limited degree, variability within and among the arcual and raducal groups (Manceñido and Motchurova-Dekova 2010). Adult morphological variation of crural morphs was assessed using a PCA of all crura from adult rhynchonellides using a combination of landmark and semi-landmark data. Differences in crural shape have been deemed to be more important than absolute changes in size in naming crural morphs (Savage et al. 2002; Manceñido et al. 2007). Shape and orientation also appear to influence the way in which the crura contact and support the lophophore (Cooper 1959; Manceñido and Owen 2001; Savage et al. 2002; Manceñido et al. 2007). To assess within-morph variability, we performed a PCA on the Procrustes coordinates derived from specimens having raduliform crura (adult *Notosaria nigricans* and *Hemithiris psittacea*). Shape differences found among the crural groups designated by Manceñido and Motchurova-Dekova (2010) were investigated also using a PCA. Qualitative differences among the crural morphs, and the biological implications of those differences, were also evaluated.

Results

Adult Morphological Variation.—The principal component that accounts for the greatest amount of variation in this analysis, PC 1, is associated with landmarks and semi-landmarks that

280 describe the ventral position of the medial edge of the crus (Fig. 5). The first three PC axes
281 account for 64.83% of the total variance in the data: PC 1 accounts for 27.73%, PC 2 accounts
282 for 25.37%, and PC 3 accounts for 11.73% (complete PC scores are available from the authors
283 for all analyses). The morphological variation illustrated along PC 1 is associated with the width
284 and the medial twist of the distal end of the crus relative to the proximal end (Fig. 5A). Falciform
285 crura represent one morphological extreme with broad, medially convex crura. Arcuiform crura
286 represent the opposite extreme with narrower crura twisted medially. All other crural morphs are
287 concentrated around the origin, indicating that the width and twisting of the distal end of the
288 crura dominate variation along PC 1. The morphological variation illustrated along PC 2 is
289 associated with crus length and width and ventral curvature (Fig. 5A). Maniculiform crura
290 represent one end-member with narrow, straight and elongated crura. They are also the smallest
291 crura in absolute size (Fig. 3). Canaliform represent the opposite end-member morphology with
292 short, wide crura, and are among the largest crura which occur in the largest individuals. Crural
293 morphs are more or less equally distributed along PC 2 indicating slight variations in crural
294 width and length and ventral curvature from one end-member to the other. Morphological
295 variation along PC 3 is associated with crural curvature and medial twisting (Fig. 5B);
296 *Hemithiris* distal tips are horizontal; *Frieleia* are nearly vertical, and only slightly medially tilted.
297 Variation along PC 3 ranges from relatively straight and laterally compressed spinuliform crura
298 to dorso-ventrally compressed, medially twisted, and ventrally curved in raduliform crura. Crural
299 morphs are more or less equally distributed along PC 3 indicating slight variations in crural
300 curvature from one extreme to the other. Semi-landmarks along the medial edge of the crus have
301 a significant impact on the outcome of the analysis by capturing the variability of the medial
302 edge of the crus and subsequently outweighing the variability associated with crural length.

Without semi-landmarks, the variation of the medial edge among Recent crural morphs is not captured fully. This suggests that the shape and curvature of the medial edge, in all three dimensions, is particularly important for distinguishing Recent crural morphs. Delineating Recent crural morphs depends on the degree of medial twisting from proximal to distal ends of the crura, a transformation that is expressed ontogenetically.

Statistical analyses of landmark and semi-landmark coordinates for all adult individuals indicate that those with the same crural morph generally occupy a volume of morphospace that is restricted relative to the separation between groups of different crural morphologies. The canaliform crural morph is an exception (Fig. 5), in that it consistently groups with the raduliform crura, supporting the grouping of both these crural morphs into the raducal group. The Euclidean distance between *Notosaria* and *Hemithiris* (calculated from the first ten PC scores), both considered to have raduliform crura, are as different from one another as are most crural morphs from one another (Fig. 5). Canaliform crura only overlap with the raduliform crura of *Notosaria*, not those of *Hemithiris* (Fig. 5).

Major axes of shape variation are potentially related to size; therefore we performed a multivariate regression analysis to test the degree of association between crural centroid size and the first three principal components of the landmark and semi-landmark analysis. The analysis shows that there is no general dependence between size and shape ($R^2 = 0$; $p = x$), but crural size and PC 1 are significantly correlated. The linear dependence of PC 1 on size indicates that it describes allometric size-related variation (among adults) among the crural morphs ($R^2 = 0.20$; $p = 0.03$). The dependence, however, is not a uniform one among morphs, but instead is a function of the exceptional differences of the small-sized *Neorhynchia profunda* crura and the larger *Basiliola lucida* crura from an otherwise isometric similarity among the remaining taxa. Size is

not correlated significantly with PC 2 ($R^2 = 0.12$; $p = 0.11$) or PC 3 ($R^2 = 0.001$; $p = 0.87$).

Comparing a simple linear measure of crural length with overall shell length (Fig. 6A), it is clear that smaller individuals, in general, have shorter crura than larger individuals, as might be expected. And yet, the relationship between centroid size of the crural region and overall shell length among all species is not necessarily as clear; adults of species in some genera (e.g., *Pemphixina*) have a much different allometric relationship between crural region and shell length than closely-related adults of the same shell length in other genera (Fig. 6B).

Within-Morph Variability.—Previous authors (Rothpletz 1886; Muir-Wood 1934; Wisniewska 1932; Cooper 1959; Ager 1965; Savage et al. 2002; among others) have noted the variable morphology of the raduliform morph, including variation in size, distal end morphology, and angle of curvature. We performed a second PCA of the landmark and semi-landmark coordinates of the raduliform crura in adult *Notosaria nigricans* and *Hemithiris psittacea* specimens only, to investigate within morph variability among species (Fig. 7). PC 1 accounts for 64.93% of the total variance in the data. The crura of *Notosaria nigricans* are thicker and more robust than those in *Hemithiris psittacea*, even though they have the same curvature and distal tip morphology. This PCA, along with the Procrustes distance information, supports the results of the all-adult crural morph PCA (Fig. 5), which illustrates that the two raduliform species are as different from one another as are any two different morphs, as discussed earlier. It is unclear whether other morphs might exhibit comparable variability; additional species per morph are being investigated currently to test this possibility as are additional adults in other species with raduliform crura.

Crural “Cognate” Groups.—We used the results of the PCA of landmarks and semi-landmarks on adults to test the morphological integrity of the four crural groups proposed by

Manceñido et al. (2007) (Fig. 2, 5). PC 1 and PC2 (Fig. 5A) separate representatives of the four groups from one another; PC 1 and PC 3 separate the septifal and arcual groups from the others, but the ensimergal and some members of the raducal group overlap one another completely. Representatives of the arcual group (spinuliform and arcuiform crura) occupy two distinct areas of morphospace (Fig. 5). The raducal group (canaliform and raduliform crura) shows a similar pattern, with the greatest separation between the two raduliform species, as noted above. This suggests that these two groups are not necessarily morphologically cohesive and the variation between raduliform species is as great as, or greater than, that between two different morphs. However, the crural groups put forth by Manceñido et al. (2007) and Manceñido and Motchurova-Dekova (2010) appear to be grouped mainly according to hypothesized evolutionary transformations, not necessarily morphological cohesion, so it is perhaps not unexpected that the crural morphs placed in one group do not cluster in statistical space.

Cluster Analysis of Adults.—Single linkage and neighbor-joining cluster analyses of the Euclidean distances between adults in principal component space consistently generated four main clusters (Fig. 8). Individuals with the same crural morph cluster together, as expected from the distributions in Fig. 5, with one exception. *Pemphixina* (canaliform) clusters with *Notosaria* (raduliform), while *Hemithiris* (raduliform) clusters with *Basiliola* (falciform); these two clusters themselves cluster together more closely than do either of the other two clusters. *Frieleia* (spinuliform) and *Cryptopora* (maniculiform) form the third main cluster, and *Neorhynchia* (arcuiform) forms a cluster that is most dissimilar to all the others. The current landmark configuration was unable to capture the serrated distal end of the maniculiform crura, a feature that distinguishes them from all other crural types.

Summary of Results.—Crura vary in their morphology among adults within a single species, genus, or superfamily, among adults in different species assigned to the same crural morph, and among adults assigned to different crural morphs. Adult individuals in the same species, having the same crural morph, typically cluster together in the shape space defined here. Groups of morphs recognized previously (Manceñido and Motchurova-Dekova 2010) are often but not always distinct from one another in this morphospace. Data on more species representing the only six extant crural morphs are needed to test this conclusion more rigorously.

Discussion

Crura are a fundamentally important feature of all rhynchonellate brachiopods (sensu Williams et al. 1996; Williams and Carlson 2007) because they function to support the lophophore within the mantle cavity. Crura first appear, phylogenetically, in derived syntrophiidine pentamerides, the camerelloids and pentameridines, which share common ancestry with the Rhynchonellida (Carlson et al. 2002). Rhynchonellida is a large, ancient paraphyletic group from which the various spiralia-bearing and loop-bearing groups have evolved (Carlson 2007). Because crura form the structural base of both spiralia and loops, characterizing their morphological variability in ontogeny (and phylogeny) informs our understanding of the evolutionary history of Neoarticulata (Carlson and Cohen in press), the crown clade of articulated brachiopods. This study was designed as a preliminary test of the morphological integrity of named crura types (morphs) and the grouping of crural types into “cognate groups.” Our study provides a quantitative morphological foundation for more comprehensive tests of hypotheses of heterochrony (currently ongoing), which have been suggested to play a role in these evolutionary transformations (Manceñido and Motchurova-Dekova 2010).

Methodological Approach.—The small size and delicate structure of crura have hindered detailed study of their morphology for many years. MicroCT imaging techniques provide novel ways to investigate the morphology of such very small features. Three-dimensional computer models have been generated from CT-scanned images of extinct spire-bearing brachiopods, from which physical models were made to investigate water flow through the mantle cavity (Shiino et al. 2009; Shiino and Kuwazuru 2010); however, our study is the first to quantify morphological variability among crura using these techniques. The traditional method of serial sectioning (e.g., Ager 1965; Motchurova-Dekova et al. 2002; Savage et al. 2002; Manceñido and Motchurova-Dekova 2010) destroys shell material and thus informative morphological detail between each section, which makes it difficult to interpret the complex 3D geometries of very small crura. Scanning electron microscopy (SEM), a common imaging technique, yields highly resolved, but static, 2D views of crura. Furthermore, in order to capture an unrestricted SEM image of the cardinalia and crura, the valves must first be disarticulated, which can damage brachiopods like rhynchonellides with cyrtomatodont (interlocking) hinge structures (Jaanusson 1971; Carlson 1989). Three-dimensional surface models created from successive, closely-spaced CT scans allow the digital capture and dynamic manipulation of the entire hinge area of the brachiopod in three dimensions without the need for disarticulation, so that more detailed quantitative and qualitative analyses can be undertaken.

Morphologic, Taxonomic, and Phylogenetic Variation Among Adult Crura.—Morphologically, the crura of adult extant rhynchonellides vary mainly in five parameters: height, width, and length of each crus; degree of curvature of the entire crus, particularly along the dorso-medial edge; and the angle of divergence between the two crus' (Fig. 3). Even small variations in these parameters may significantly affect the position and orientation of the

spirolophe, and thus influence the three-dimensional geometry of water movement through the mantle cavity (see Ager 1965; Rudwick 1970; LaBarbera 1977; James et al. 1992; Williams et al. 1997). The particular functional significance of minor variations in position and orientation has not yet been investigated, and is not the focus of this study, but would yield interesting insights into patterns of water flow between the valves, and the effect of those differences on rhynchonellide feeding behavior among adults of different overall body size.

We studied multiple individuals per species, representing seven different species; individuals of the same crural morph (and species) clustered together, with six of the seven species clusters occupying a distinctly different region in the shape space constructed (Fig. 5). Taxonomically, this confirms the morphological integrity of six of the seven species with respect to crural morphology, as well as the morphological integrity of five of the six named extant crural morphs. This result suggests that our original prediction — that crural morphs had been oversplit — is not borne out among the six extant crural morphs. More individuals from additional extant (and extinct) species must be analyzed to test these preliminary conclusions, but most extant crural morphs appear to be quantitatively distinct from one another, and their relative position in morphospace is now established. The exceptions to this pattern: two raduliform species analyzed are as different from one another as any two other crural morphs, and canaliform individuals largely overlap one of the two raduliform species clusters.

With respect to higher taxonomic affiliation, three of the four superfamilies form distinct morphological clusters separate from the others (Fig. 5). Three species in the superfamily Hemithiridoidea cluster relatively closely together in the morphospace, but the two species in Norelloidea do not, which indicates that crural morphology varies among extant representatives per superfamily. Several extinct superfamilies have been characterized by the same crural morph

(raduliform), while others, particularly the four superfamilies with extant representatives, are characterized by multiple morphs, rarely including raduliform. These four superfamilies might have experienced a diversification in crural morphs from a raduliform ancestral state, which may have contributed to their evolutionary success. It is also possible that we are simply better able to image and study the diversity of these crural types because some are extant.

Phylogenetically, the raduliform crural morph (Fig. 3, 7) is the most basal (Schreiber et al. 2013) among all Rhynchonellida, extant and extinct; it is also the morph that appears to be the most variable morphologically among constituent species (given our limited sampling regime so far). It is the morph that first appears stratigraphically as well (Manceñido and Owen 2001; Savage et al. 2002). Very little is known about the nature of morphological variability (both within and among species) of the stratigraphically early raduliform crura — shape of the distal ends, angle of curvature, cross-sectional shape — due to poor preservation and the difficulties of imaging crura in fossils; it has been questioned whether these early crura should even be considered raduliform (Ager 1965; Savage 1996; Savage et al. 2002). However, the presence of raduliform-like crura in many well-preserved pentameride brachiopods supports the basal phylogenetic position of raduliform crura among all the rhynchonellides (Carlson 1993; Carlson et al. 2002).

Among crown clade (extant) Rhynchonellida only, the basal members of three of the four subclades recognized in morphological phylogenetic analyses possess spinuliform crura (Fig. 3F); the fourth, raduliform (Schreiber et al. 2013: Fig. 3C). Molecular analysis of 12 species of extant rhynchonellides discovered three subclades (Cohen and Bitner 2013); basal members of each of these three subclades have either spinuliform or arcuiform (Fig. 3E) crura. Phylogenetic analyses using either type of data support similar ancestral character state reconstruction of

crural types among the extant taxa: spinuliform appears to be the ancestral crural morph. Raduliform crura are clearly the stratigraphically oldest and most common morph, suggesting that the spinuliform type evolved as a shared derived feature of the crown clade Rhynchonellida. The nature of the evolutionary transition from raduliform to spinuliform crura has not yet been investigated morphologically or phylogenetically in detail, but is currently under investigation.

It is intriguing that the cluster analysis of adult crural morphology (Fig. 8) produces a branching pattern that is quite different from the current classification (Savage et al. 2002) and from both recent phylogenetic analyses (Cohen and Bitner 2013; Schreiber et al. 2013). The cluster analysis includes only features of crural morphology, however, while the classification and the phylogenetic analyses include essentially all morphological features or a large number of molecular characters simultaneously, so differences between them should perhaps be expected. Furthermore, the cluster analysis is purely distance-based, and takes no account of polarity determined from outgroups and the sequential acquisition of apomorphies that are suggested by a phylogenetic analysis.

Crural “Cognate” Groups.—Manceñido and Motchurova-Dekova (2010) organized 15 of the 17 named crural types into four groups (Fig. 2): raducal, arcual, septifal, and ensimergal. There are two components to these groups: the assignment of types to a particular group, based generally and qualitatively on crural morphology; and hypotheses of morphological, developmental, and/or phylogenetic transformations between types. With respect to the first component, our main focus in this study, we predicted that, based on the work of Manceñido and Motchurova-Dekova (2010), crural morphs in the same group would cluster together morphologically, and that crural groups would be separate from one another in the shape space constructed. Our results reveal that some morphs cluster together by group, but others do

not. Crural morphs in three of the four named crural groups do occupy distinctly different regions of shape space (Fig. 5), but more than one morph in each of only two groups were investigated, necessarily so since our study focused on extant species of which only six of the 17 types are represented. Raduliform and canaliform morphs cluster together as predicted (Fig. 8), but falciform morphs cluster with them as well, which is not consistent with our predictions. Spinuliform and arcuiform morphs do not cluster together, as we predicted that they would. Morphometric analyses of additional species representing each morph are clearly required to test the generality of these preliminary findings, but it appears that most (not all) crural groups are quantitatively distinct, supporting the morphological distinctions among these “cognate” crural groups.

As described by Manceñido and Motchurova-Dekova (2010), the configuration of crural groups provides a rich source of evolutionary hypotheses to test, many of which involve heterochrony, or the evolutionary consequences of changes in developmental rate or timing, leading to changes in size and shape from ancestor to descendant. Three distinct types of information are required in order to test hypotheses of heterochrony: qualitative and quantitative data on size and shape; data on the nature of and sequence of developmental transformations over ontogeny; and phylogenetic hypotheses that enable comparisons between putative ancestors and descendants (minimally, identification of sister group pairs). As noted previously, this study is focused primarily on establishing a foundation based on the first of these three types of data.

Conclusion

Crura are a fundamentally important feature of all crown clade articulated brachiopods because they function to support the lophophore within the mantle cavity. Crura form the structural base of both spiralia and loops and studying their morphological variation can give us

valuable insights in the evolutionary history of crown clade articulated brachiopods. Our study provides a quantitative morphological foundation for more comprehensive tests of possible mechanisms (e.g., heterochrony) generating the evolutionary changes we see.

MicroCT imaging techniques provide novel ways to investigate the morphology of very small “hidden” features, such as the crura. Three-dimensional surface models created from CT scans allow the digital capture and dynamic manipulation of the entire hinge area of the brachiopod in three dimensions, allowing more detailed quantitative and qualitative analyses to be undertaken.

Morphologically, the crura of adult extant rhynchonellides vary primarily in five parameters: height, width, and length of each crus; degree of curvature of the entire crus, particularly along the dorso-medial edge; and the angle of divergence between the two crus’. This study confirms the morphological integrity of six of the seven species with respect to crural morphology, as well as the morphological integrity of five of the six named extant crural morphs; extant crural morphs at least do not appear to have been oversplit. However, the two raduliform species analyzed are as different from one another as any two other crural morphs, and canaliform individuals largely overlap one of the two raduliform species clusters. Furthermore, three of the four superfamilies form distinct morphological clusters separate from the others. Stratigraphically and phylogenetically, the raduliform crural morph is the most basal among all Rhynchonellida, extant and extinct; it is also the morph that appears today to be the most variable morphologically among constituent species.

Crural morphs in three of the four named crural cognate groups occupy distinctly different regions of morphometric shape space, supporting the qualitative morphological

distinctions among them, but sampling of additional species in the morphs and groups must be increased to test these preliminary results.

Acknowledgments

We thank R. Motani for helpful discussions and advice throughout this project, which grew out of one portion of the first author's dissertation research. Anonymous reviewers provided helpful suggestions that improved the quality of the manuscript. We also thank Scripps Institution of Oceanography, California Academy of Sciences, and D. E. Lee (University of Otago, New Zealand) for access to specimens. We thank J. Thompson (National Museum of Natural History) for providing access to specimens, and other assistance during research visits. Finally, we thank Tanya Garcia-Nolan (J.D. Wheat Veterinary Orthopedic Research Laboratory at the University of California, Davis School of Veterinary Medicine) for all microCT scanning of specimens. We gratefully acknowledge support for this project provided by National Science Foundation grant EAR 1147537. Support for this research was also provided by Durrell funds from the Department of Geology, University of California, Davis, and a Geological Society of America Graduate Student Research Grant to the first author.

Literature Cited

Abel, R. L., C. R. Laurini, and M. Richter. 2012. A palaeobiologist's guide to "virtual" micro-CT preparation. *Palaeontologia Electronica* 15(2):palaeo-electronica.org/content/issue-2-2012-technical-articles/233-micro-ct-workflow.

554

555 Ager, D. V. 1962. A monograph of the British Liassic Rhynchonellidae. Part III.

556 Palaeontographical Society of London, Monograph 116(498):85–136.

557

558 ———. 1965. Mesozoic and Cenozoic Rhynchonellacea. Pp. H597–H625 in R. C. Moore, ed.

559 Treatise on invertebrate paleontology. Part H, Brachiopoda. Geological Society of

560 America and University of Kansas Press. Lawrence.

561

562 Alberch, P., S. J. Gould, G. F. Oster, and D. B. Wake. 1979. Size and shape in ontogeny and

563 phylogeny. *Paleobiology* 5:296–317.

564

565 Angiolini, L., V. Barberini, N. Fusi, and A. Villa. 2010. The internal morphology of fossil

566 brachiopods under x-ray computed tomography (CT). In Program & Abstracts, 6th

567 International Brachiopod Congress, Geological Society of Australia Abstracts 95:7.

568 Baranov, V. V. 1980. Morphology of crura and new rhynchonellid taxa. *Paleontologicheskii*

569 *Zhurnal* 4:75-90.

570

571 Bookstein, F. L. 1991. Morphometric tools for landmark data. Cambridge University Press,

572 Cambridge, U.K.

573

574 ———. 1997. Landmark methods for forms without landmarks: morphometrics of group

575 differences in outline shape. *Medical Image Analysis* 1(3):225–243.

576

- 577 Boucot, A. J. and R. A. Wilson. 1994. Origin and early radiation of terebratuloid brachiopods:
578 thoughts provoked by *Prorensselaeria* and *Nanothyris*. *Journal of Paleontology*
579 68(5):1002–1025.
580
- 581 Brunton, C. H. C., F. Alvarez, and D. I. MacKinnon. 1996. Morphological terms used to describe
582 the cardinalia of articulate brachiopods: homologies and recommendations. *Historical*
583 *Biology* 11:9–41.
584
- 585 Carlson, S. J. 1989. The articulate brachiopod hinge mechanism: morphological and functional
586 variation. *Paleobiology* 15(4):364–386.
587
- 588 ———. 1993. Phylogeny and evolution of ‘pentameride’ brachiopods. *Palaeontology* 36:807–
589 837.
590
- 591 ———. 1995. Phylogenetic relationships among extant brachiopods. *Cladistics* 11:131–197.
592
- 593 ———. 2007. Recent research on brachiopod evolution. Pp. H2878–H2900 *in* A. Williams et al.
594 *Brachiopoda 6* (revised), Supplement. Part H of P. A. Seldon, ed. *Treatise on invertebrate*
595 *paleontology*. Geological Society of America, Boulder and University of Kansas,
596 Lawrence.
597
- 598 ———. 2012. Are phylogenetic nomenclature and invertebrate paleontology friends or foes?
599 *Geological Society of America Annual Meeting, Abstracts with Programs* 44(7):34.

600

601 Carlson, S. J. and L. R. Leighton. 2001. The phylogeny and classification of

602 Rhynchonelliformea. The Paleontological Society Papers 7:27–51.

603

604 Carlson, S. J. and B. L. Cohen. In press 2013. *Neoarticulata*. in K. de Queiroz, P. D. Cantino,

605 and J. A. Gauthier, eds. Phylonyms: a companion to the PhyloCode. University of

606 California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.

607

608 Carlson, S. J., A. J. Boutcot, R. Jia-Yu, R. B. Blodgett. 2002. Pentamerida. Pp. H922–H1027 in

609 A. Williams et al. Brachiopoda 4 (revised), Rhynchonelliformea (part). Part H of R. L.

610 Kaesler, ed. Treatise on invertebrate paleontology. Geological Society of America,

611 Boulder and University of Kansas Press, Lawrence.

612

613 Cohen, B. L. 2001a. Brachiopod molecular phylogeny advances. In C. H. C. Brunton, L. R. M.

614 Cocks, and S. Long, eds. Brachiopods past and present. Proceedings of the Millennium

615 Brachiopod Congress, 2000. The Systematics Association Special Volume Series 63:121–

616 128. Taylor and Francis. London.

617

618 ———. 2001b. Genetics and molecular systematics of brachiopods. In S. J. Carlson and M. R.

619 Sandy, eds. Brachiopods ancient and modern. A Tribute to G. Arthur Cooper. 7:53–67.

620 Paleontological Society, Pittsburgh.

621

- 622 ———. 2007. The brachiopod genome. Pp. H2356–H2372 in A. Williams et al. *Brachiopoda* 6
623 (revised), Supplement. Part H of P. A. Seldon, ed. *Treatise on invertebrate paleontology*.
624 Geological Society of America, Boulder and University of Kansas, Lawrence.
625
- 626 Cohen, B. L. and M. A. Bitner. 2013. Molecular phylogeny of rhynchonellide articulate
627 brachiopods (Brachiopoda, Rhynchonellida). *Journal of Paleontology* 87(2):211–216.
628
- 629 Cohen, B. L. and A. B. Gawthrop. 1997. The brachiopod genome. Pp. H189–H211 in A.
630 Williams et al. *Brachiopoda* 1 (revised), Introduction. Part H of R. L. Kaesler, ed. *Treatise*
631 *on invertebrate paleontology*. Geological Society of America, Boulder and University of
632 Kansas, Lawrence.
633
- 634 Cohen, B. L. and A. Weydmann. 2005. Molecular evidence that phoronids are a subtaxon of
635 brachiopods (Brachiopoda: Phoronata) and that genetic divergence of metazoan phyla
636 began long before the Early Cambrian. *Organisms, Diversity and Evolution* 5(4):253–
637 273.
638
- 639 Cooper, G. A. 1959. Genera of Tertiary and recent rhynchonelloid brachiopods. *Smithsonian*
640 *Miscellaneous Collections* 139(5):1–90.
641
- 642 ———. 1972. Homeomorphy in Recent deep-sea brachiopods. *Smithsonian Contributions to*
643 *Paleobiology*, 11:1–15.
644

- 645 Dagys, A. S. 1968. Iurskie i rannemelovye brakhiopody severa Sibiri [Jurassic and Early
646 Cretaceous brachiopods from north Siberia]. Trudy Instituta Geologii I Geofiziki 41:1–
647 167.
- 648
- 649 Dall, W. H. 1895. Report on Mollusca and Brachiopoda dredged in deep water, chiefly near the
650 Hawaiian Islands, with illustrations of hitherto unfigured species from northwest
651 America. Proceedings of the United States National Museum 17(1032):675–733.
- 652
- 653 Davidson, T. 1880. Report on the Brachiopoda dredged by H. M. S. Challenger during the years
654 1873–1876. Report of scientific results of the Voyage H.M.S. Challenger (Zoology) 1:1–
655 67.
- 656
- 657 Elliott, J. C. and S. D. Dover. 1982. X-ray microtomography. Journal of Microscopy 126:211–
658 213.
- 659
- 660 Emig, C. C. 1992. Functional disposition of the lophophore in living Brachiopoda. Lethaia
661 25:291–302.
- 662
- 663 Flannery, B. P., H. W. Deckman, W. G. Roberge, and K. L. D'Amico. 1987. Three-dimensional x-
664 ray microtomography. Science 237:1439–1444.
- 665
- 666 Gering D, A. Nabavi, R. Kikinis, W. Grimson, N. Hata, P. Everett, F. Jolesz, and W. Wells. 1999.
667 An Integrated visualization system for surgical planning and guidance using image fusion

and interventional imaging. International Conference on Medical Image Computing and
Computer Assisted Intervention 2:809–819.

Gmelin, J. F. 1790. *Systema naturae*, editio decimal tertia aucta. Reformata I. Ps. VI. Vermes.
Lipsiae. Pp. 3021–4120.

Görög, Á., B. Szinger, E. Tóth, and J. Viskok. 2012. Methodology of the micro-computer
tomography on foraminifera. *Palaeontologia Electronica* 15(1). [palaeo-
electronica.org/content/issue-1-2012-technical-articles/121-methodology-of-ct-on-forams](http://palaeo-electronica.org/content/issue-1-2012-technical-articles/121-methodology-of-ct-on-forams)

Gould, A. A. 1862. Descriptions of shells and molluscs from 1839–1862 *Ostia conchologia*.
Boston, 256 p.

Gower, J. C. 1975. Generalized Procrustes analysis. *Psychometrika* 40:33–51.

Gunz, P. 2001. Using semi-landmarks in three dimensions to model human neurocranial shape
(Master Thesis, University of Vienna, Vienna, 2001).

———. 2005. Statistical and geometric reconstruction of hominid crania: reconstructing
australopithecine ontogeny (Ph.D. Thesis, University of Vienna, Vienna, 2005).

- 689 Gunz, P., P. Mitteroecker, and F. L. Bookstein. 2005. Semi-landmarks in three dimensions. Pp.
690 73–98 *in* D. E. Slice , ed. Modern morphometrics in physical anthropology. Kluwer
691 Academic/Plenum Publishers, New York.
- 692
- 693 Hammer, Ø. and D. A. T. Hammer and P. D. Ryan. 2001. PAST: paleontological statistics
694 software package for education and data analysis. *Palaeontologica Electronica* 4(1):9.
- 695
- 696 Holmer, L. E. and L. Y. Popov. 2000. Lingulata. Pp. H30–H146 *in* A. Williams et al.
697 Brachiopoda 2 (revised), Linguliformea, Craniiformea, and Rhynchonelliformea (part).
698 Part H of R. L. Kaesler, ed. Treatise on invertebrate paleontology. Geological Society of
699 America and University of Kansas Press, Lawrence.
- 700
- 701 Jaanusson, V. J. 1971. Evolution of the brachiopod hinge. *Smithsonian Contributions to*
702 *Paleobiology* 3:33–46.
- 703
- 704 James, M., A. D. Ansell, M. J. Collins, G. B. Curry, L. S. Peck, and M. C. Rhodes. 1992. Biology
705 of living brachiopods. *Advances in Marine Biology* 28:175–387.
- 706
- 707 Jeffreys, J. G. 1876. On some new and remarkable North-Atlantic Brachiopoda. *Annals and*
708 *Magazine of Natural History* (series 4) 18:250–253.
- 709

- 710 Ketcham R. A. and W. D. Carlson. 2001. Acquisition, optimization and interpretation of x-ray
711 computed tomographic imagery: applications to the geosciences. *Computers and*
712 *Geosciences* 27:381–400.
- 713
- 714 Kuhn, O. 1949. *Lehrbuch der Paläozoologie*. E. Schweizerbart'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
715 Stuttgart.
- 716
- 717 LaBarbera, M. 1977. Brachiopod orientation to water movement 1. theory, laboratory behavior,
718 and field orientations. *Paleobiology* 3(3):270–287.
- 719
- 720 ———. 1978. Brachiopod orientation to water movement, functional morphology. *Lethaia*
721 11(1):67–79.
- 722
- 723 ———. 1981. Water flow patterns in and around three species of articulate brachiopods. *Journal*
724 *of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 55:185–206.
- 725
- 726 Lee, D. E. and J. B. Wilson. 1979. Cenozoic and recent rhynchonellide brachiopods of New
727 Zealand—systematics and variation in the genus *Notosaria*. *Journal of the Royal Society*
728 *of New Zealand* 9(4):437–463.
- 729
- 730 Logan, A. 2007. Geographic distribution of extant articulated brachiopods. Pp. H3083–H3115 *in*
731 A. Williams et al. *Brachiopoda* 6 (revised), Supplement. Part H of P. A. Seldon, ed.

- 732 Treatise on invertebrate paleontology. Geological Society of America, Boulder and
733 University of Kansas, Lawrence.
- 734
- 735 Long, J. A. and S. A. Stricker. 1991. Brachiopoda. *In* A. Geise, J. S. Pearse, and V. B. Pearse,
736 eds. *Reproduction of Marine Invertebrates* 6:47–84.
- 737
- 738 Manceñido, M. O. 1998. Revaluación de los tipos de crura de los Rhynchonellida post-
739 paleozoicos (Brachiopoda). – VII Congreso Argentino de Paleontología y Biostratigrafía,
740 Resúmenes. Bahía Blanca, Argentina. p. 46.
- 741
- 742 ———. 2000. Crural types among Post-Paleozoic Rhynchonellida (Brachiopoda). The
743 Millenium Brachiopod Congress, 10-14 July 2000. London, Abstracts. The Natural
744 History Museum, London, p. 57.
- 745
- 746 Manceñido, M. O. and E. F. Owen. 2001. Post-Paleozoic Rhynchonellida (Brachiopoda):
747 classification and evolutionary background. Pp. 189–200 *in* L. R. M. Cocks, C. H. C.
748 Brunton, and S. L. Long, eds. *Brachiopods past and present*. Proceedings of the
749 Millennium Brachiopod Congress, 2000. The Systematics Association Special Volume
750 Series, Taylor and Francis, London.
- 751
- 752 Manceñido, M. O. and N. Motchurova-Dekova. 2010. A review of crural types, their
753 relationships to shell microstructure, and significance among post-Paleozoic

- 754 Rhynchonellida. Evolution and Development of the Brachiopod, Special Papers in
755 Palaeontology Series 84:203–204.
756
- 757 Manceñido, M. O., E. F. Owen, and D.-L. Sun. 2007. Post-Paleozoic Rhynchonellida. Pp.
758 H2727–2741 in A. Williams et al. Brachiopoda 6 (revised), Supplement. Part H of P. A.
759 Seldon, ed. Treatise on invertebrate paleontology. Geological Society of America,
760 Boulder and University of Kansas, Lawrence.
761
- 762 Mitteröcker P. and P. Gunz. 2002. Semi-landmarks on curves and surfaces in three dimensions.
763 American Journal of Physical Anthropology. Supplement 34:114–115.
764
- 765 ———. 2009. Advances in geometric morphometrics. Evolutionary Biology 36:235–247.
766
- 767 Monnet, C., C. Zollikofer, H. Bucher, and N. Goudemand. 2009. Three-dimensional
768 morphometric ontogeny of mollusc shells by micro-computed tomography and geometric
769 analysis. Palaeontologia Electronica 12(3).
770 http://palaeo-electronica.org/2009_3/183/index.html
771
- 772 Motchurova-Dekova, N., M. Saito, and K. Endo. 2002. The Recent rhynchonellide brachiopod
773 *Parasphenarina cavernicola* gen. et sp. nov. from the submarine caves of Okinawa,
774 Japan. Paleontological Research 6:299–319.
775

- 776 Muir-Wood, H. M. 1934. On the internal structure of some Mesozoic Brachiopoda. Philosophical
777 Transactions of the Royal Society of London (Series B) 223:511–567.
778
- 779 O’Higgins P. and N. Jones. 1998. Facial growth in *Cercocebus torquatus*: An application of
780 three dimensional geometric morphometric techniques to the study of
781 morphological variation. Journal of Anatomy 193:251–272.
782
- 783 Pakhnevich, A. V. 2010. Micro-CT investigations of Recent and fossil brachiopods. *In* Program
784 and Abstracts, 6th International Brachiopod Congress, 1-5 February 2010,
785 Melbourne, Australia; Geological Society of Australia Abstracts 95:85
786
- 787 Peck, R. L., J. B. Bailey, R. J. Heck, N. T. Scaiff. 2009. X-ray CT scan as an aid to identification
788 and description of a new bivalve species (Mollusca) from the Mississippian Bluefield
789 formation, southeastern West Virginia. Journal of Paleontology 83(6):954–961.
790
- 791 Pieper S., M. Halle, R. Kikinis. 2004. 3D SLICER. Proceedings of the 1st IEEE International
792 Symposium on Biomedical Imaging: From Nano to Macro 1:632–635.
793
- 794 Pieper S., B. Lorensen, W. Schroeder, R. Kikinis. 2006. The NA-MIC Kit: ITK, VTK,
795 pipelines, grids and 3D Slicer as an open platform for the medical image computing
796 community. Proceedings of the 3rd IEEE International Symposium on Biomedical
797 Imaging: From Nano to Macro 1:698–701.
798

- 799 Popov, L. Y., M. G. Bassett, and L. E. Holmer. 2000. Craniata. Pp. H158–H168 in A. Williams et
800 al. Brachiopoda 2 (revised), Linguliformea, Craniiformea, and Rhynchonelliformea
801 (part). Part H of R. L. Kaesler, ed. Treatise on invertebrate paleontology. Geological
802 Society of America, Boulder and University of Kansas Press, Lawrence.
- 803
- 804 Rohlf, F. J. and D. E. Slice. 1990. Extensions of the Procrustes method for the optimal
805 superimposition of landmarks. *Systematic Zoology* 39:40–59.
- 806
- 807 Rothpletz, A. 1886. Geologisch-palaeontologische monographie der bilser Alpen mit besonderer
808 Berucksichtigung der Brachiopoden-systematik. *Palaeontographica* 33:1–180.
- 809
- 810 Roopnarine, P. D. 2001. Testing the hypothesis of heterochrony in morphometric data: lessons
811 from a bivalved mollusk. Pp. 271–303 in M. Zelditch, ed. *Beyond heterochrony: the*
812 *evolution of development*. Wiley-Liss.
- 813
- 814 Rudwick, M. J. S. 1970. *Living and fossils brachiopods*. Hutchinson and Company, London.
- 815
- 816 Savage, N. M. 1996. Classification of Paleozoic rhynchonellide brachiopods. Pp. 249–260 in P.
817 Copper and J. Jin, eds. *Brachiopods. Proceedings of the third International brachiopod*
818 *congress, 1995*. A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam.
- 819
- 820 ———. 2007. Rhynchonellida (part). Pp. H2703–2716 in A. Williams et al. *Brachiopoda 6*
821 *(revised), Supplement*. Part H of P. A. Seldon, ed. *Treatise on invertebrate paleontology*.
822 Geological Society of America, Boulder and University of Kansas, Lawrence.

823

824 Savage, N. M., M. O. Manceñido, E. F. Owen, S. J. Carlson, R. E. Grant, A. S. Dagys, and S.

825 Dong-Li. 2002. Rhynchonellida. Pp. H1027–H1040 in A. Williams et al. Brachiopoda 4

826 (revised), Rhynchonelliformea (part). Part H of R. L. Kaesler, ed. Treatise on invertebrate

827 paleontology. Geological Society of America, Boulder and University of Kansas Press,

828 Lawrence.

829

830 Schreiber, H. A., M. A. Bitner, and S. J. Carlson. 2013. Morphological analysis of phylogenetic

831 relationships among extant rhynchonellide brachiopods. Journal of Paleontology

832 87(4):550–569.

833

834 Shiino, Y. and O. Kuwazuru. 2010. Functional adaptation of spiriferide brachiopod morphology.

835 Journal of Evolutionary Biology 23(7):1547–1557.

836

837 Shiino, Y., O. Kuwazur, and N. Yoshikawa. 2009. Computational fluid dynamics simulations on

838 a Devonian spiriferid *Paraspirifer bownockeri* (Brachiopoda): generating mechanism of

839 passive feeding flows. Journal of Theoretical Biology 259:132–141.

840

841 Sowerby, G. B. 1846. Descriptions of thirteen new species of brachiopods. Proceedings of the

842 Zoological Society of London 14:91–95.

843

- 844 van Dam, J. A., J. Fortuny, and L. J. van Ruijven. 2011. MicroCT-scans of fossil micromammal
845 teeth: re-defining hypsodonty and enamel proportion using true volume.
846 *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* 311:103–110.
847
- 848 Westbroek, P. 1968. Morphological observations with systematic implications on some Paleozoic
849 Rhynchonellida from Europe, with special emphasis on the Uncinulidae. *Leidse*
850 *Geologische Mededelingen* 41:1–82.
851
- 852 Wiley, D. F., N. Amenta, D. A. Alcantara, D. Ghosh, Y. J Kil, E. Delson, W. Harcourt-Smith, F.
853 J.Rohlf, K. St. John, B. Hamann. 2005 (2007 update). *Evolutionary Morphing in*
854 *Proceedings of IEEE Visualization* 2005.
855
- 856 Williams, A. and S. J. Carlson. 2007. Affinities of brachiopods and trends in their evolution. Pp.
857 H2823–H2877 *in* A. Williams et al. *Brachiopoda* 6 (revised), Supplement. Part H of P. A.
858 Seldon, ed. *Treatise on invertebrate paleontology*. Geological Society of America,
859 Boulder and University of Kansas, Lawrence.
860
- 861 Williams, A., S. J. Carlson, C. H. C. Brunton, L. E. Holmer, and L. E. Popov. 1996. A supra-
862 ordinal classification of the Brachiopoda. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*
863 *of London (series B)* 351:1171–1193.
864
- 865 Williams, A., C. H. C Brunton, and D. I. MacKinnon. 1997. Morphology Pp. H321–H440 *in* A.
866 Williams et al. *Brachiopoda* 1 (revised), Introduction. Part H of R. L. Kaesler, ed. *Treatise*

on invertebrate paleontology. Geological Society of America, Boulder and University of
Kansas, Lawrence.

Williams, A., S. J. Carlson, C. H. C. Brunton. 2000a. Brachiopod classification Pp. H1–H29 *in*
A. Williams et al. Brachiopoda 2 (revised), Linguliformea, Craniiformea, and
Rhynchonelliformea (part). Part H of R. L. Kaesler, ed. Treatise on invertebrate
paleontology. Geological Society of America, Boulder and University of Kansas Press,
Lawrence.

———. 2000b. Rhynchonelliformea Pp. H193 *in* A. Williams et al. Brachiopoda 2 (revised),
Linguliformea, Craniiformea, and Rhynchonelliformea (part). Part H of R. L. Kaesler, ed.
Treatise on invertebrate paleontology. Geological Society of America, Boulder and
University of Kansas Press, Lawrence.

Wisniewska, M. 1932. Les Rhynchonellides du Jurassique sup. de Pologne [Rhynchonellidae
Gornej Jury w Polsce]. *Palaeontologia Polonica* 2(1): viii + 1–71.

Zelditch, M. R., D. L. Swiderski, H. D. Sheets, and W. L. Fink, eds. 2004. Geometric
morphometrics for biologists: a primer. Elsevier Press, San Diego.

Figure Captions

Figure 1. A, Generalized rhynchonellide dorsal valve (interior of posterior portion) based on *Trigonirhynchia paretii*. Adapted from Westbroek (1968) and Savage et al. (2002). B, Interior of ventral valve; C, Interior of dorsal valve; and D, Posterior of dorsal valve interior of *Hemithiris psittacea*, showing crura. Modified from Savage et al. (2002).

Figure 2. The four named crural cognate groups (Manceñido and Motchurova-Dekova 2010) and their constituent crural morphs, with arrows indicating hypothesized evolutionary transformations between. The six crural morphs present in extant rhynchonellides are denoted by asterisks; all others are found in extinct rhynchonellides. The ciliform and maniculiform crural morphs have been designated as members of the ensimergal group, but are not included in any hypothesized evolutionary relationships (Manceñido and Motchurova-Dekova 2010). Each pair of drawings per crural type represents, on the left, a view looking into the posterior interior of the dorsal valve; on the right, a lateral view of articulated valve posterior, with the dorsal valve on the right. Crural figures are modified from Savage et al. (2002).

Figure 3. Three-dimensional surface models of posterior region of dorsal valve interiors of all extant crural morphs. Models include the truncated teeth sitting in the sockets of each specimen. A, maniculiform crura of *Cryptopora gnomon*; B, falciform crura of *Basiliola lucida*; C, raduliform crura of *Hemithiris psittacea*; D, canaliform crura of *Pemphixina pyxidata*; E, arcuiform crura of *Neorhynchia profunda*; F, spinuliform crura of *Frieleia halli*. Scale bars are 1 mm. See the 3D Brachiopod Images website

(<http://3dbrachiopodimages.ucdavis.edu/index.html>) for complete 3D models of the rhynchonellide crura.

Figure 4. A, Illustrations of the posterior region of the dorsal valve; B, lateral view of articulated valves; and C, mid-crura transverse cross-section of a raduliform morph with dorsal valve uppermost. Geometrically homologous landmarks (numbered black dots) and semi-landmarks (open dots) for three-dimensional morphometric analysis. Semi-landmarks are located in relation to landmarks; however, landmarks are not visible in Figure C because of the orientation of the figure. Figures modified after Savage et al. (2002).

Figure 5. Results of PCA of Procrustes-fitted landmark and semi-landmark coordinates of adult crural morphs. A, PC 1 versus PC 2. The morphological variation illustrated along PC 1 is associated with the width of the distal end of the crus and the medial twisting of the distal end of the crus. Falciform crura represent one morphological extreme with broad, medially convex crura. Arcuiform crura represent the opposite extreme with narrower, twisted crura. All other crural morphs plot near the origin, indicating that the width and twisting of the distal end of the remaining crural morphs are very similar. The morphological variation illustrated along PC 2 is associated with crus length and width. Maniculiform crura represent one end-member morphology with narrow, elongated crura. Canaliform represent the opposite end-member morphology with short, wide crura. Crural morphs are more or less equally distributed along PC 2 indicating slight variations in crural width and length among Recent crural morphs from one end-member to the other. B, PC 1 versus PC 3. Morphological variation along PC 3 is associated with crural curvature. Variation along PC 3 ranges from straight and laterally compressed in

spinuliform crura to dorso-ventrally compressed and ventrally curved in raduliform crura. Crural morphs are equally distributed along PC 3 indicating slight variations in crural curvature among Recent crural morphs from one extreme to the other. Members of the arcual group (arcuiform and spinuliform) do not cluster in statistical space. Members of the raducal group (raduliform and canaliform) do show overlap, but raduliform crura do not cluster tightly. Wireframe models illustrate three-dimensional end-member morphology in lateral view for each principal component. Numbered nodes on the wireframe models correspond to the measured landmarks illustrated in Figure 4. Individuals with the same crural morph are denoted with ellipses. Ellipses have no statistical meaning. A complete list of PC scores is available from the authors for all analyses.

Figure 6. A, Crura length versus shell length in juvenile and adult Recent rhynchonellides. Crura and shell length are averages estimated from at least two photographs per species in literature sources (Savage et al., 2002; Manceñido et al. 2007). Crura length is measured from base of crus to tip of crus. Shell length is the length of the ventral valve. Crura length and shell length are not significantly correlated ($r = 0.70$, $p = 0.07$). B, Centroid size versus shell length in juvenile and adult Recent rhynchonellides. Centroid size is the average centroid size of each species (the centroid size of each individual was previously calculated in this analysis). Centroid size and shell length are not significantly correlated ($r = -0.09$, $p = 0.85$) among all species.

Figure 7. PCA of raduliform crura of adult *Notosaria nigricans* and *Hemithiris psittacea*. Size has been standardized. *Notosaria* and *Hemithiris* form two distinct clusters within the raduliform

957 ellipse in Figure 4. Raduliform crura exhibit interspecific variability, as illustrated in this PCA.
958 However, the one *Notosaria* outlier greatly affects the distribution of the remaining specimens.
959 The outlier is much shorter and wider than the other specimens of *Notosaria*, indicating
960 intraspecific variability of the crura. Variation along PC1 is associated with crural length, width,
961 and divergence. PC 1 accounts for 64.93% of the total variance in data. The raduliform crura of
962 *Hemithiris* tend to be more elongate, while the raduliform crura of *Notosaria* are shorter and
963 wider. Wireframe models illustrate three-dimensional end-member morphology in lateral view
964 for PC 1. Numbered nodes on the wireframe models correspond to the measured landmarks
965 illustrated in Figure 4.

966

967 Figure 8. Single linkage cluster analysis of adult crura. Cluster analysis was performed using the
968 scores on the first three principal components together. The dissimilarity measure is a measure of
969 the Euclidean distances between specimens. Euclidean distance is a measure of the straight line
970 distance between two points in space. Crural types tend to cluster together, with the exception of
971 the raduliform and canaliform types. The specimens of each genus also cluster together with the
972 exception of *Notosaria*. The one *Notosaria* individual that clusters with *Pemphixina* is the outlier
973 in Figure 7. This *Notosaria* individual is shorter and wider than the remaining *Notosaria*.

Figure 1. A, Generalized rhynchonellide dorsal valve (interior of posterior portion) based on *Trigonirhynchia paretii*. Adapted from Westbroek (1968) and Savage et al. (2002). B, Interior of ventral valve; C, Interior of dorsal valve; and D, Posterior of dorsal valve interior of *Hemithiris psittacea*, showing crura. Modified from Savage et al. (2002).

985

986 Figure 2. The four named crural cognate groups (Manceñido and Motchurova-Dekova 2010) and
 987 their constituent crural morphs, with arrows indicating hypothesized evolutionary
 988 transformations between. The six crural morphs present in extant rhynchonellides are denoted by
 989 asterisks; all others are found in extinct rhynchonellides. The ciliform and maniculiform crural
 990 morphs have been designated as members of the ensimergal group, but are not included in any
 991 hypothesized evolutionary relationships (Manceñido and Motchurova-Dekova 2010). Each pair
 992 of drawings per crural type represents, on the left, a view looking into the posterior interior of the
 993 dorsal valve; on the right, a lateral view of articulated valve posterior, with the dorsal valve on
 994 the right. Crural figures are modified from Savage et al. (2002).

Figure 3. Three-dimensional surface models of posterior region of dorsal valve interiors of all extant crural morphs. Models include the truncated teeth sitting in the sockets of each specimen. A, maniculiform crura of *Cryptopora gnomon*; B, falciform crura of *Basiliola lucida*; C, raduliform crura of *Hemithiris psittacea*; D, canaliform crura of *Pemphixina pyxidata*; E, arcuiform crura of *Neorhynchia profunda*; F, spinuliform crura of *Frieleia halli*. Scale bars are 1 mm. See the 3D Brachiopod Images website (<http://3dbrachiopodimages.ucdavis.edu/index.html>) for complete 3D models of the rhynchonellide crura.

Figure 4. A, Illustrations of the posterior region of the dorsal valve; B, lateral view of articulated valves; and C, mid-crura transverse cross-section of a raduliform morph with dorsal valve uppermost. Geometrically homologous landmarks (numbered black dots) and semi-landmarks (open dots) for three-dimensional morphometric analysis. Semi-landmarks are located in relation to landmarks; however, landmarks are not visible in Figure C because of the orientation of the figure. Figures modified after Savage et al. (2002).

1026

1028

Figure 5. Results of PCA of Procrustes-fitted landmark and semi-landmark coordinates of adult crural morphs. A, PC 1 versus PC 2. The morphological variation illustrated along PC 1 is associated with the width of the distal end of the crus and the medial twisting of the distal end of the crus. Falciform crura represent one morphological extreme with broad, medially convex crura. Arcuiform crura represent the opposite extreme with narrower, twisted crura. All other crural morphs plot near the origin, indicating that the width and twisting of the distal end of the remaining crural morphs are very similar. The morphological variation illustrated along PC 2 is associated with crus length and width. Maniculiform crura represent one end-member morphology with narrow, elongated crura. Canaliform represent the opposite end-member morphology with short, wide crura. Crural morphs are more or less equally distributed along PC 2 indicating slight variations in crural width and length among Recent crural morphs from one end-member to the other. B, PC 1 versus PC 3. Morphological variation along PC 3 is associated with crural curvature. Variation along PC 3 ranges from straight and laterally compressed in spinuliform crura to dorso-ventrally compressed and ventrally curved in raduliform crura. Crural morphs are equally distributed along PC 3 indicating slight variations in crural curvature among Recent crural morphs from one extreme to the other. Members of the arcual group (arcuiform and spinuliform) do not cluster in statistical space. Members of the raducal group (raduliform and canaliform) do show overlap, but raduliform crura do not cluster tightly. Wireframe models illustrate three-dimensional end-member morphology in lateral view for each principal component. Numbered nodes on the wireframe models correspond to the measured landmarks illustrated in Figure 4. Individuals with the same crural morph are denoted with ellipses. Ellipses have no statistical meaning. A complete list of PC scores is available from the authors for all analyses.

Figure 6. A, Crura length versus shell length in juvenile and adult Recent rhynchonellides. Crura and shell length are averages estimated from at least two photographs per species in literature sources (Savage et al., 2002; Manceñido et al. 2007). Crura length is measured from base of crus to tip of crus. Shell length is the length of the ventral valve. Crura length and shell length are not significantly correlated ($r = 0.70$, $p = 0.07$). B, Centroid size versus shell length in juvenile and adult Recent rhynchonellides. Centroid size is the average centroid size of each species (the centroid size of each individual was previously calculated in this analysis). Centroid size and shell length are not significantly correlated ($r = -0.09$, $p = 0.85$) among all species.

Figure 7. PCA of raduliform crura of adult *Notosaria nigricans* and *Hemithiris psittacea*. Size has been standardized. *Notosaria* and *Hemithiris* form two distinct clusters within the raduliform ellipse in Figure 4. Raduliform crura exhibit interspecific variability, as illustrated in this PCA. However, the one *Notosaria* outlier greatly affects the distribution of the remaining specimens. The outlier is much shorter and wider than the other specimens of *Notosaria*, indicating intraspecific variability of the crura. Variation along PC1 is associated with crural length, width, and divergence. PC 1 accounts for 64.93% of the total variance in data. The raduliform crura of *Hemithiris* tend to be more elongate, while the raduliform crura of *Notosaria* are shorter and wider. Wireframe models illustrate end-member morphology in lateral view for PC 1. Numbered nodes on the wireframe models correspond to the measured landmarks illustrated in Figure 4.

Figure 8. Single linkage cluster analysis of adult crura. Cluster analysis was performed using the scores on the first three principal components together. The dissimilarity measure is a measure of the Euclidean distances between specimens. Euclidean distance is a measure of the straight line distance between two points in space. Crural types tend to cluster together, with the exception of the raduliform and canaliform types. The specimens of each genus also cluster together with the exception of *Notosaria*. The one *Notosaria* individual that clusters with *Pemphixina* is the outlier in Figure 7. This *Notosaria* individual is shorter and wider than the remaining *Notosaria*.