NEW SEASON TITLES

LOOKING AT VERTEBRATES

A Practical Guide To
Vertebrate Adaptations

Elizabeth Rogers

Cased Illustrated £9.95 net
ISBN 0 582 45086 1 March 1986

UNRAVELLING ANIMAL BEHAVIOUR

Marian Stamp Dawkins

Paper Illustrated £6.50 net
ISBN 0 582 44691 0 March 1986

EVOLUTION AND CLASSIFICATION

The Reformation Of Cladism
Mark Ridley

Paper Illustrated £6.95 net
ISBN 0 582 44497 7 April 1986

INORGANIC CHEMISTRY Second Edition

A G Sharpe

Paper & Cased Illustrated
£12.95 & £25.00 net
ISBN 0 582 44688 0 & 0 582 44689 9
April 1986

KAYE & LABY'S TABLES OF PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL CONSTANTS

Fifteenth Edition

Cased Illustrated
Probably £17.50 net
ISBN 0 582 46354 8 April 1986

OP PRESS... STOP PRESS... ST
COMING SOON
THE BLIND WATCHMAKER
Richard Dawkins
Cased Illustrated Probably
£12.95 net
ISBN 0 582 44694 5 Sept 1986

For full details of these and related titles,
please write to Clive Weatherley, Longman
Group Ltd., Longman House, Burnt Mill,
Harlow, Essex, CM20 2JE, UK.

Ordered thoughts on taxonomy

Michael T. Ghiselin

Evolution and Classification: The Reformation of Cladism. By Mark Ridley. Longman: 1986. Pp. 201. Pbk £6.95, \$16.95. From 1 May Longman science books will be distributed in the United States by John Wiley, New York.

BIOLOGY is a branch of strictly objective natural science — at least it ought to be. But in this book Mark Ridley argues at great length that the leading schools of taxonomy have failed to live up to this ideal standard, with the noteworthy exception of "cladism" as it was originally formulated by its founder, Willi Hennig. The others, namely numerical phenetics, the evolutionary systematics of Simpson and Mayr, and the "transformed" version of cladism, are sadly deficient in this respect.

The differences between the various schools are philosophical, and Ridley makes it clear that bad philosophy is the culprit for all that is wrong in taxonomical thinking. Most of the points he raises are by no means new, but the detailed examination of the issues provides a compelling argument for objectivity in classification. For a system to be objective it needs what Ridley calls a "principle of justification", such that we classify the objects themselves not the subjects ourselves (for example, a ranking of ink blots in the order of their obscenity obviously projects the properties of the subject into the system). Less obvious is the point that the concept of "similarity" is open to the same basic criticism; there is no way to decide which objects are "more similar" upon anything but a subjective basis. The failure of numerical pheneticists to come up with an objective criterion for what they called "overall similarity" indicates that their fundamental premise was in error.

The periodic table of the elements is justified as an objective system by the properties of atoms and the laws that govern them. Genealogical classification is justified by the fact that the taxonomic groups stand to each other as parts of a genealogical nexus. Ridley examines other possible principles of justification, such as Ideas in the Divine Intellect, and finds them unsatisfactory. Evolutionary systematics he considers imperfect, because it is tainted with the same kind of subjectivity that affects phenetics. This leaves cladism, but not the "transformed" version, which "has been greedily incorporated into that great media event, the crisis of Darwin" (p.10).

Ridley is not the first to advocate *strictly*

genealogical classification. Darwin did. Unfortunately, biologists have persisted with the traditional practice of obscuring relationships by removing modified organisms from the groups that gave rise to them. A mixture of genealogy and "amount of difference" does not provide the kind of arrangement which a scientist needs for doing research, because the two criteria lead to ambiguity. Consider, for example, our own genus, the closest relatives of which are chimpanzees and *Gorilla*. Putting *Homo* in one family and what might be called "the rest of us apes" in another, gives the false impression that our lineage branched off before the common ancestor of gibbons and chimpanzees. Those of us who do research on the history of life have not been unaware of this problem, and have used phylogenetic trees instead of formal classification systems wherever possible. A strictly genealogical system has certain disadvantages with respect to nomenclature, which Ridley perhaps should have discussed, but the price he has paid is not unreasonable. As a professional student of evolutionary mechanisms, he needs to know the facts about evolutionary history, not some taxonomist's evaluation of them.

Transformed cladism, which attempts to do without evolutionary justification, is Ridley's prime target. The transformed cladists' philosophy is a throwback to pre-Darwinian idealistic morphology, combined with a naive inductionism that rejects the modern hypothetico-deductive method out of hand. According to this ideal of science, we are supposed to wait until the "patterns" have been worked out before we begin to study "process", which is like saying that astronomers should have waited until the epicycles were known in exhaustive detail before investigating the laws that govern celestial bodies.

Ridley maintains that the transformed cladists have argued their case on the basis of sophistry, bad metaphysics and outright misrepresentation; indeed, so successful has been their conspiracy of silence with respect to the use of functional anatomy that Ridley himself seems unaware of the extensive literature on that topic, and of its routine application by the best workers for more than a century. The use of vestigial structures to indicate the direction of evolutionary change is but one obvious example — the teeth in the jaws of baleen whale embryos are obviously on the way out. It is not out of character that those who ignore legitimate scientific data when doing research go so far as to pretend that such data do not even exist when writing polemics. But this neglect is not characteristic of transformed cladists alone. Classifying on the basis of "pure morphology", which leaves out all consideration of function, is symptomatic of the pervasive

influence of typological thinking.

All the leading schools of taxonomy have taken it for granted that classification is somehow based upon putting similar things together on the basis of shared attributes, and nothing else. There is little hope for rectifying the situation until the falsehood of this premise is generally recognized. Classifications ought to be based upon a scientific evaluation of any data that happen to be germane; that is, upon scientific knowledge as a whole, drawing upon physics and chemistry, as well as the laws, principles and historical particulars of biology and geology. It means thinking like a historian, asking what has happened and why, and formulating hypotheses and gathering data to test them.

There are innumerable opportunities available for doing the job well. At the moment the study of large molecules apt to evolve divergently is beginning to yield very impressive results. Charles Sibley's monumental work on DNA $\times$ DNA hybridization in birds has at last provided us with a rigorous phylogeny of the group, this in spite of the fact that it does not

employ shared derived characters and has therefore been spurned by the cladists. It works instead because, as time passes, homologues cease to be identical, and the relevant parameters can be measured. Likewise Carl Woese's frontal attack on prokaryote ribosomal RNA has demolished the claims of pheneticists that bacterial phylogenetics is simply unknowable. Norman Pace has developed a technique whereby hundreds of nucleotides of this same material can be read off a single gel, and data on the phyla and classes of Metazoa are rapidly accumulating in his laboratory. Once the basic phylogenetic tree has been worked out, biologists will then find it much easier to place the whole range of their findings in an evolutionary context. When that happens, the value of genealogy will be so clear that its alternatives will no longer be taken seriously. Good science generally wins out over bad philosophy, but it takes a long time. $\square$

Michael T. Ghiselin is MacArthur Fellow in the Department of Invertebrate Zoology, California Academy of Sciences, Golden Gate Park, San Francisco, California 94118, USA.

Dancing in time

Leonard Krishtalka

The Great American Biotic Interchange. Edited by Francis G. Stehli and S. David Webb. Plenum: 1985. Pp. 532. \$75, £61.64.

FOR THE past 90 million years (Myr) North and South America have danced a biological and geological *pas de deux* — long periods of drifting in isolation punctuated by brief encounters, animal invasions and faunal interchange. Until quite recently, much of the palaeobiological ballet of the Americas was scattered throughout a vast literature. Not any more. *The Great American Biotic Interchange* is an outstanding reference work on 90 Myr of New World faunas, geochronology and palaeogeography, especially of South America. It is appropriately dedicated to George Gaylord Simpson and complements his more popular book on the subject, *Splendid Isolation: The Curious History of South American Mammals*, published by Yale University Press in 1980.

The volume opens in the late Cretaceous. By that time plate tectonics and a spreading Atlantic sea floor had torn the Americas from Europe and Africa and waltzed them into momentary contact across a Caribbean island arc. The fossil record hints that South American didelphid marsupials hopped into North America for the first time, while northern lizards, snakes, duckbilled dinosaurs and a primitive placental ungulate entered South America.

The Americas jeté apart for the next 87 million years, their faunas evolving in near isolation from one another. North America became dominated by placental mammals: primates (initially), insectivores, rodents, rabbits, perissodactyls, artiodactyls, mastodons and a legion of now extinct orders. South America hosted the explosive radiation of a horde of marsupials, edentates (sloths, anteaters, armadillos) and unusual, now extinct, placental ungulates (hoofed herbivores: didolodons, astrapotheres, litopterns, notoungulates and pyrotheres).

Three events pierced the calm of faunal isolation. The first, of least consequence, seemingly occurred in the mid-Palaeocene (58–61 Myr ago), when edentates and notoungulates appear to have island-hopped to North America from the south, left a few tantalizing bony remains and continued on to Asia. The second episode, during the mid- to late Oligocene (33–28 Myr ago), involved the sudden appearance in South America of platyrrhine primates and caviomorph rodents, immigrants on a flotilla of "Noah's Arks" — biotic rafts — from North America or Africa. The third event, during the late Miocene (7–9 Myr ago), was a portent of things to come: a filter bridge between the Americas allowed some racoons and rodents to pass south and two groups of sloths to move north.

Three million years ago the Panamanian land corridor surfaced and all pretence of faunal isolation ended; the Great American Interchange was underway. Among the first waves of northern mammals to invade South America were

canids, ursids, mustelids, felids, tapirs, equids, camelids, cervids and mastodons. In turn, rodents (porcupine, capybara), edentates (glyptodonts, ground sloths, armadillos), a llama, an opossum and a flightless bird dispersed into North America.

Peppering this history are palaeo-ecological questions: the convergent suites of morphological adaptations among mammalian ecological vicars in North and South America; the allegedly precocious evolution in South America of savannahs and grazing ungulates with high-crowned dentitions; the effects, if any, of the northern placental invaders on southern faunas; and the ancestors, provenance and date of arrival of the first South American primates and rodents.

Unlike the scattershot approach of most symposium volumes, the material in the book is organized in textbook fashion (19 chapters in five sections). Sections I and II examine Caribbean plate motions; plate evolution; evidence of inter-American mammals in the Palaeocene; herpetofaunas from the Cretaceous and the Cenozoic; and geochronology, mammalian biochronology and interchange events for the same periods. The last two (by R. Estes and A. Báez, and L.G. Marshall) are excellent and exhaustive treatments.

Section III covers the Tertiary evolution and dispersal of North American mammals; the origin and diversification of South American mammals, ungulates, and primates and rodents. Here nationalism seems to reign. Most American palaeontologists, including A.E. Wood who deals with primates and rodents, claim a New World mid-Tertiary origin for the South American platyrrhines and caviomorphs. Old World palaeobiologists favour an African origin.

The last two sections are the climax — close looks at the physical and biotic dynamics of the Great American Interchange over the past 3 Myr: Caribbean tectonics; the Central American land bridge, climate and sea level; the inter-American dispersal of invertebrates, plants and their bee pollinators, fish, amphibians and reptiles, birds, all mammals, and desert and grassland mammals.

Accompanying the integrated accounts of palaeobiology, biogeography, ecology, systematics and geology is a staggering amount of information, such as the detailed compendia of fossil vertebrate occurrences in South America. *The Great American Biotic Interchange* is a comprehensive, up-to-date and invaluable resource for any student interested in the past and present biotas of the Western hemisphere. $\square$

Leonard Krishtalka is Associate Curator in the Section of Vertebrate Fossils, Carnegie Museum of Natural History, 4400 Forbes Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213, USA.