

Response to Mayr and Peters

Authors: Feduccia, Alan, Martin, Larry D., and Tarsitano, Sam

Source: The Auk, 124(4) : 1452

Published By: American Ornithological Society

URL: [https://doi.org/10.1642/0004-8038\(2007\)124\[1452:RTMAP\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1642/0004-8038(2007)124[1452:RTMAP]2.0.CO;2)

BioOne Complete (complete.BioOne.org) is a full-text database of 200 subscribed and open-access titles in the biological, ecological, and environmental sciences published by nonprofit societies, associations, museums, institutions, and presses.

Your use of this PDF, the BioOne Complete website, and all posted and associated content indicates your acceptance of BioOne's Terms of Use, available at www.bioone.org/terms-of-use.

Usage of BioOne Complete content is strictly limited to personal, educational, and non - commercial use. Commercial inquiries or rights and permissions requests should be directed to the individual publisher as copyright holder.

BioOne sees sustainable scholarly publishing as an inherently collaborative enterprise connecting authors, nonprofit publishers, academic institutions, research libraries, and research funders in the common goal of maximizing access to critical research.

- XING, X., AND F.-C. ZHANG. 2005. A new maniraptoran dinosaur from China with long feathers on the metatarsus. *Naturwissenschaften* 92:173–177.
- ZHOU, Z.-H., AND F.-C. ZHANG. 2006. Mesozoic birds of China—A synoptic review. *Vertebrata Palasiatica* 44:74–98.

Received 1 June 2007, accepted 23 July 2007

The Auk 124(4):1452, 2007

Response to Mayr and Peters.—We welcome the reply by Mayr and Peters (2007) to our article on the relationships and morphology of early birds (Feduccia et al. 2007), because such discussion may lead to a better understanding of avian evolution. We believe that the figures in their original papers adequately illustrate the points we discussed, but we look forward to actually examining the specimen when it becomes available for study. It now appears that they did not intend their description of the new *Archaeopteryx* to indicate that *Archaeopteryx* had a terrestrial lifestyle and was unable to perch in trees. If they also believe that the hallux of their specimen was only inclined medially (but not at a nearly right angle), their description corresponds to the reflexed hallux of most other birds and we would not disagree with it. However, if that was their intention, they should have used a term such as “postero-medial” to describe its position.

The expansion of the hallux unguis in *Archaeopteryx* is not a character of birds adapted to an aquatic or terrestrial habit, but is characteristic of arboreal birds. Other *pes* characters that they use include a supposed expansion of phalangeal condyles that is not clearly evident in *Archaeopteryx*, and a proper understanding would necessitate comparison of scaled measurements between theropod dinosaurs, birds, and other archosaurian taxa that are not provided. Mayr and Peters (2007) agree with us that *Archaeopteryx* does not have the special morphology characteristic of deinonychosaurs on *pes* digit two and did not code these features as a synapomorphy with *Archaeopteryx*, although they did claim that this is a morphology “uniting archaeopterygids and deinonychosaurs.”

The presence or absence of serrations on the teeth varies widely among related groups, but the avian character of maniraptorian teeth is demonstrated by the waisted crown and expanded root seen in at least some examples. We are sure that there is still significant disagreement between our interpretations and those of Mayr and Peters, but the explanations they now offer seem to greatly diminish those differences. Perhaps these discussions will lead to a better exchange of ideas among students of avian evolution with contrary views, and contribute toward new and better hypotheses concerning the ancestry or sister-group relationships of birds.

Our phylogeny is only slightly modified from that of Nick Longrich, as we noted (Feduccia et al. 2007), by moving *Archaeopteryx* to a basal position with respect to microraptors and other Mesozoic birds, a position that conforms to its temporal occurrence. This view of superficially theropod-like Mesozoic birds being derivatives of the early avian radiation is not new to us, but was suggested in some form or other as early as 1911 by O. Abel, and most recently by Gregory Paul, George Olshevsky, Stephen Czerkas, A.F., L.M., and others. By our interpretation of the current evidence, birds are monophyletic and are nicely defined by their unique possession of feathers.—ALAN FEDUCCIA, *Department of Biology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27599, USA (e-mail: feduccia@bio.unc.edu)*; LARRY D. MARTIN, *Museum of Natural History, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66045, USA*; and SAM TARSITANO, *Biology Department, Worcester State College, Worcester, Massachusetts 01602, USA*.

LITERATURE CITED

- FEDUCCIA, A., L. D. MARTIN, AND S. TARSITANO. 2007. *Archaeopteryx* 2007: *Quo vadis?* *Auk* 124:373–380.
- MAYR, G., AND D. S. PETERS. 2007. The foot of *Archaeopteryx*: Response to Feduccia et al. (2007). *Auk* 124:1450–1452.

Received 15 August 2007, accepted 29 August 2007