



Modern avian radiation across the Cretaceous-Paleogene boundary

Authors: Dyke, Gareth J., Nudds, Robert L., and Benton, Michael J.

Source: The Auk, 124(1) : 339-341

Published By: American Ornithological Society

URL: [https://doi.org/10.1642/0004-8038\(2007\)124\[339:MARATC\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1642/0004-8038(2007)124[339:MARATC]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.



The Auk 124(4):339, 2007
 © The American Ornithologists' Union, 2007.
 Printed in USA.

Use of skin from the feet of museum specimens as a source of DNA.—Mundy et al. (1997:126) stated that “because the sole of the foot has not to our knowledge been used as a taxonomic character in birds, the damage done to the specimens for future research is negligible.” Although not commonly used, foot soles can provide systematically important morphological characters.

Characters on the plantar surface of the feet of birds have been used with success in recent studies. Lennerstedt (1973, 1974, 1975a, b, c) described such characters, their interspecific and individual variation, and their variation at different seasons, and also carried out a functional study. Mann et al. (1978) used such characters, among others, to erect a new genus of babbler (Timaliidae), viz. *Kakamega*. Characters on the plantar surface of the foot were intensively examined by Mann (1979, 1988) in taxonomic studies of passerine birds.

I would urge researchers who wish to use such tissue to remove small pieces from either the large pad on the hind digit or from the central pad, avoiding the edges and any folds or furrows. In this way, sufficient tissue can be made available for DNA studies without destroying the basic morphology.

Acknowledgments.—I thank R. Prŷs-Jones for drawing my attention to Mundy et al. (1997) and encouraging me to write this piece.—CLIVE F. MANN, 53 Sutton Lane South, London W4 3JR, United Kingdom. E-mail: clivemann@gmail.com

LITERATURE CITED

- LENNERSTEDT, I. 1973. Pads, furrows and papillae in the foot of birds. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Lund, Sweden.
- LENNERSTEDT, I. 1974. Pads and papillae in the feet of nine passerine species. *Ornis Scandinavica* 5: 103–111.
- LENNERSTEDT, I. 1975a. Pattern of pads and folds in the foot of European Oscines (Aves, Passeriformes). *Zoologica Scripta* 4:101–109.
- LENNERSTEDT, I. 1975b. Seasonal variation in the foot papillae of wood pigeon, pheasant and House Sparrow. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology A* 51:511–520.
- LENNERSTEDT, I. 1975c. A functional study of papillae and pads in the foot of passerines, parrots and owls. *Zoologica Scripta* 4:111–123.
- MANN, C. F. 1979. The use of the plantar surface of the foot in the taxonomy of the Timaliinae (Aves, Passeriformes, Muscicapidae). M.Sc. thesis, Polytechnic of Central London—City of London Polytechnic, United Kingdom.
- MANN, C. F. 1988. A taxonomic reappraisal of the Passeriformes (Aves) based on the morphology of the plantar surface of the foot. Ph.D. dissertation, City of London Polytechnic, United Kingdom.
- MANN, C. F., P. J. K. BURTON, AND I. LENNERSTEDT. 1978. A reappraisal of the systematic position of *Trichastoma poliothorax* (Timaliinae, Muscicapidae). *Bulletin of the British Ornithologists' Club* 98: 131–140.
- MUNDY, N. I., P. UNITT, AND D. S. WOODRUFF. 1997. Skin from feet of museum specimens as a non-destructive source of DNA for avian genotyping. *Auk* 114:126–129.

Received 7 July 2006, accepted 19 September 2006

The Auk 124(4):339–341, 2007

Modern avian radiation across the Cretaceous–Paleogene boundary.

—The pattern of modern avian radiation across the Cretaceous–Paleogene (K-P) boundary has been debated for more than a decade (e.g., Feduccia 1995, Cooper and Penny 1997, Dyke and van Tuinen 2004, Clarke et al. 2005) and was discussed in a recent review in *The Auk* by James (2005). Here we show, using a comprehensive compendium of temporal, phylogenetic, and geological data (Fountaine et al. 2005; full data set available on request from the authors), that the bulk of sediments yielding fossil birds from the earliest Paleogene (65–49 mya) are aquatic: marginal marine or lacustrine. This does not reflect preservation potential; older birds from the Mesozoic (146–65 mya), where there are lower volumes of aquatic rocks, are known from all sedimentological environments (Fountaine et al. 2005). Because global sea level is known to have fallen from the Cretaceous to the Paleogene (Fara 2002), leading to an increase in terrestrial rock volume with respect to marine, the presence of more birds in aquatic environments is likely independent of preservation potential. This suggests that either taphonomic effects bias the interpretation of avian evolution across the K-P boundary or that more “waterbirds” were actually present in the early Paleogene. Thus, our geological and paleontological data set supports a “shorebird” or “waterbird” transition in prevailing environments of preservation in the aftermath of the K-P extinction,

albeit in the absence of clear phylogenetic control. Previous proposals for avian “survivorship” across the K-P boundary have explicitly defined a “shorebird or waterbird morphotype” for modern avian ancestry (Feduccia 1995); our data do not address this, having bearing only on environments of preservation.

We compiled a database of fossil bird records for the Mesozoic ($n = 117$) and collated a comprehensive sample of named taxa from the early Paleogene (Paleocene–Eocene; $n = 132$) (Mlikovsky 2002, Fountaine et al. 2005). Whereas Mesozoic birds appear in equal numbers in aquatic and terrestrial sediments, our Paleogene data set is strongly aquatic, from nonmarine sediments. Only 7% of named birds from the early stages of the Paleogene are from terrestrial sediments (Fig. 1); almost all (>90% of records) named taxa of Paleogene birds are from lacustrine or marginal marine sediments, independent of their preservation potential (Fountaine et al. 2005).

In the Cretaceous, the rarity of modern birds may reflect actual contemporary abundance: the paucity of known fossils ($n = 27$) does not necessarily imply patchy preservation (Fountaine et al. 2005). Indeed, all but two modern bird fossil records are from aquatic

environments and just two are represented by partial skeletons. By contrast, >30 species from nonmodern clades of Cretaceous age are known from complete skeletons (Fountaine et al. 2005). This dramatic difference in relative preservation could be an artifact of a smaller sample size, or it could be real.

Why not a biological explanation for these data? There is no *prima facie* reason to expect a difference in the relative preservation potential of modern and nonmodern avian clades: data show that specimens within each broad subdivision span similar size ranges (Fountaine et al. 2005). Comparing our data with similar compilations of other Cretaceous vertebrate groups (Fara and Benton 2000) further demonstrates that preservation likelihood is independent of body size. Instead, the clear taphonomic bias evident in these data may suggest that modern birds were simply more prevalent in aquatic environments before and after the K-P boundary.

Fossil representatives of several of the modern avian clades are now known from the late stages of the Cretaceous (Clarke et al. 2005; see also Dyke and van Tuinen 2004); indeed, this period boasts some of the best-preserved avian records from the entire Mesozoic,




Fig. 1. Numbers of (A) fossil specimens, (B) fossil species, and (C) fossil genera found in aquatic and terrestrial (terr) sediments in the Mesozoic and Paleogene. Mesozoic and Paleogene differ significantly from aquatic and terrestrial environments in incidences of fossil specimens ($\chi^2 = 54.17$, $df = 1$, $P < 0.001$), fossil species ($\chi^2 = 59.02$, $df = 1$, $P < 0.001$), and fossil genera ($\chi^2 = 54.66$, $df = 1$, $P < 0.001$); there is a distinct bias toward aquatic sediments in the Paleogene. Only 7% of fossil specimens (9 vs. 123) and genera (6 vs. 91) are found in terrestrial sediments in the Paleogene, whereas numbers of aquatic and terrestrial specimens (61 and 56, respectively) and genera (35 and 46, respectively) are similar in the Mesozoic. Note that the analyses of species and genera do not include species that occur in both habitats.

from a wide range of sedimentary environments (Fountaine et al. 2005). Because other extinct clades of similarly sized taxa (e.g., Enantiornithes, Ichthyornithiformes) have been recovered globally from the Cretaceous, we consider it unlikely that modern birds were present but were “morphologically cryptic” (i.e., hard to identify on the basis of morphology alone). Our data set strongly supports the contention that the fossil record of birds across the K-P boundary is well enough understood to extract biological patterns—aquatic environments of preservation dominate the early Palaeogene avian fossil record, because these were the habitats in which more modern birds lived at the time of the transition.

Acknowledgments.—Our work is supported by University College Dublin (G.J.D.) and a Leverhulme Early Career Research Fellowship (R.L.N.); we thank H. James, L. Martin, and D. Steadman for helpful comments on the manuscript.—GARETH J. DYKE, *School of Biology and Environmental Science, University College Dublin, Belfield Dublin 4, Ireland (e-mail: gareth.dyke@ucd.ie)*; ROBERT L. NUDDS, *Institute of Integrative and Comparative Biology, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, United Kingdom*; and MICHAEL J. BENTON, *Department of Earth Sciences, University of Bristol, Queens Road, Bristol BS8 1RJ, United Kingdom*.

LITERATURE CITED

- CLARKE, J. A., C. P. TAMBUSI, J. I. NORIEGA, G. M. ERICKSON, AND R. A. KETCHAM. 2005. Definitive fossil evidence for the extant avian radiation in the Cretaceous. *Nature* 433:305–308.
- COOPER, A., AND D. PENNY. 1997. Mass survival of birds across the Cretaceous–Tertiary boundary: Molecular evidence. *Science* 275:1109–1113.
- DYKE, G. J., AND M. VAN TUINEN. 2004. The evolutionary radiation of modern birds (Neornithes): Reconciling molecules, morphology and the fossil record. *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* 141:153–177.
- FARA, E. 2002. Sea-level variations and the quality of the continental fossil record. *Journal of the Geological Society* 159:489–491.
- FARA, E., AND M. J. BENTON. 2000. The fossil record of Cretaceous tetrapods. *Palaos* 15:161–165.
- FEDUCIA, A. 1995. Explosive evolution in Tertiary birds and mammals. *Science* 267:637–638.
- FOUNTAIN, T. M. R., M. J. BENTON, G. J. DYKE, AND R. L. NUDDS. 2005. The quality of the fossil record of Mesozoic birds. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, Series B* 272:289–294.
- JAMES, H. F. 2005. Paleogene fossils and the radiation of modern birds. *Auk* 122:1049–1054.
- MLIKOVSKY, J. 2002. *Cenozoic Birds of the World, part 1: Europe*. Ninox Press, Prague, Czech Republic.
- Received 21 April 2006, accepted 18 September 2006