Evolutionary significance of the blastozoan Eumorphocystis and its pseudo-arms

Thomas Guensburg, James Sprinkle, Rich Mooi, Bertrand Lefebvre

► To cite this version:

Thomas Guensburg, James Sprinkle, Rich Mooi, Bertrand Lefebvre. Evolutionary significance of the blastozoan Eumorphocystis and its pseudo-arms. *Journal of Paleontology*, 2021, 95 (2), pp.327-343. 10.1017/jpa.2020.84 . hal-03004489

HAL Id: hal-03004489

<https://hal.science/hal-03004489>

Submitted on 13 Nov 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 **Evolutionary significance of the blastozoan *Eumorphocystis* and its** 2 **pseudo-arms**

3
4 Thomas E. Guensburg¹, James Sprinkle², Rich Mooi³, and Bertrand Lefebvre⁴

5
6 ¹IRC, Field Museum, 1400 South Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, IL 60605 (tguensburg@fieldmuseum.org)

7
8 ²Department of Geological Sciences, Jackson School of Geosciences, University of Texas, 1 University
9 Station C1100, Austin, TX 78712-0254 (echino@jsg.utexas.edu)

10
11 ³Department of Invertebrate Zoology, California Academy of Sciences, 55 Music Concourse Drive, San
12 Francisco, CA 94118 (rmooi@calacademy.org)

13
14 ⁴ Univ Lyon, Univ Lyon 1, ENSL, CNRS, LGL-TPE , F69622, Villeurbanne, France
15 (bertrand.lefebvre@univ-lyon1.fr)

16
17 **Running header:** *Eumorphocystis*, pseudo-arms, homoplasy with crinoids

18
19 **Abstract.**—Twelve *Eumorphocystis* specimens provide the basis for new findings and a more
20 informed assessment of whether this blastozoan (eocrinoids, blastoids, diploporites,
21 rhombiferans) constitutes the sister taxon to crinoids, as has been recently proposed. Both
22 *Eumorphocystis* and earliest-known crinoid feeding appendages express large longitudinal
23 canals, a demonstrable homology exclusive to these taxa. However, the specimen series studied
24 here shows that *Eumorphocystis* canals constrict proximally and travel within ambulacrals above

the thecal cavity. This relationship is congruent with a documented blastozoan pattern but very unlike earliest crinoid topology. Earliest crinoid arm cavities lie fully beneath floor plates; these expand and merge directly with the main thecal coelomic cavity at thecal shoulders. Other associated anatomical features echo this contrasting comparison. Feeding appendages of *Eumorphocystis* lack two-tiered cover plates, podial basins/pores, and lateral arm plating, all features of earliest crinoid "true arms". *Eumorphocystis* feeding appendages are buttressed by solid block-like plates added during ontogeny at a generative zone below floor plates, a pattern with no known parallel among crinoids. *Eumorphocystis* feeding appendages express brachioles, erect extensions of floor plates, also unknown among crinoids. These several distinctions point to non-homology of most feeding appendage anatomy, removing *Eumorphocystis* and other blastozoans from exclusive relationship with crinoids. *Eumorphocystis* further differs from crinoids in that thecal plates express diplopores, respiratory structures not present among crinoids, but ubiquitous among certain groups of blastozoans. Phylogenetic analysis places *Eumorphocystis* as a crownward blastozoan, far removed from crinoids.

Introduction

It was suggested long ago that blastozoans (eocrinoids, blastoids, diploporites, rhombiferans) and crinoids comprise a monophyletic assemblage, the so-called *Pelmatozoa* (Leuckart, 1846), largely on the basis of common possession of a superficially similar attachment stalk. In spite of doubts about this interpretation that arose during the mid-20th century (Ubaghs, 1953, 1968; Sprinkle, 1973), this canon was perpetuated in major reference

works such as the *Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology* and persists in many publications to the present day. Works seeking to separate blastozoans and crinoids as only distantly related pentaradiate forms or reject the pelmatozoan hypotheses that crinoids and blastozoans share exclusive common ancestry, have met with considerable resistance (Clausen et al., 2009; Zamora and Smith, 2011; Kammer et al., 2013; Sumrall, 2017; Sheffield and Sumrall, 2019a, 2019b; inter alia).

However, even detractors of the idea that crinoids and blastozoans are only superficially similar and do not form an exclusive clade seem to have accepted the importance of the crucial suite of feeding appendage features cited by those who question the validity of Pelmatozoa, or at least argue that any resemblances are superficial (Mooi and David, 1998, 2000; David and Mooi, 1999; Guensburg and Sprinkle, 2007; Guensburg et al., 2020, inter alia). For example, proponents for blastozoan ancestry of crinoids claimed an unnamed Middle Cambrian blastozoan represented only by disarticulated plates provided evidence that somatocoelar extensions from the main body cavity continued into the arms (Clausen, 2009). However, it is also clear these supposed blastozoan arms lacked any extraxial elements. The purported coelomic canals pass through floor plates toward the peristome, not through the thecal shoulder, which is an anatomy unlike crinoids. The diminutive nature of these blastozoan canals is also problematic. Other workers cited this and other evidence to reject the idea that any canals within the appendages of blastozoans represented spaces for somatocoelar extensions (Guensburg et al., 2010). In spite of attempts to clarify the issue through precise anatomical descriptions, the debate continues. Here, we shed new light on another purported “missing link” between crinoids and blastozoans.

Recently, a proposal that *Eumorphocystis multiporata* Branson and Peck, 1940, (hereafter, *Eumorphocystis*, as all specimens are conspecific topotypes), a diplopore-bearing

blastozoan, represents the nearest-known sister group to crinoids has been published (Sheffield and Sumrall, 2019). Evidence central to this suggestion, largely derived from a single specimen, is the description of a longitudinal canal within each of this taxon's feeding appendages. These canals are stated to pierce the theca and connect with the thecal coelomic cavity in a manner similar to that known for crinoids (Sheffield and Sumrall, 2019).

Two ancillary putative homologies follow: "arm" construction consisting of triserial (here referred to as tripartite, because an aboral series is not in strict one-to-one sequence with the other two) axial and extraxial elements, and the presence of "radial" plates from which an aboral uniserial set of "brachial" extraxial elements extends distally out these appendages. We reconsider and test this proposal using new and existing observations from 12 *Eumorphocystis* specimens. These data are then compared with an expanded update of early crinoid arm morphology recently made available through examination of earliest crinoids. These data have only recently been more fully explicated in the context of crinoid origins (Guensburg et al., 2020).

A full understanding of the feeding appendages of *Eumorphocystis* has been a long-term process, and even now some details, such as their full length, remain unknown (Fig. 1). The original description of *Eumorphocystis* (Branson and Peck, 1940) was based on the holotype alone, in which the appendages are broken off close to the theca. This led to the initial conclusion that exothecal feeding appendages were lacking in this taxon. More complete *Eumorphocystis* specimens provided the first evidence of "arms" (Parsley, 1982). Initially, these were considered of blastozoan origin and only homoplastic on crinoid arms (Parsley, 1982). Recently, the discovery that early crinoids express what could also be considered a tripartite pattern (Guensburg and Sprinkle, 2009) formed the basis for a reinterpretation that

Eumorphocystis “arm” anatomy is homologous to that of early crinoids (Sheffield and Sumrall, 2019a). In this paper, however, we add descriptive data and imagery that enhance our understanding of, and provide a basis for, interpretation of *Eumorphocystis* “arms” that is in agreement with the original suggestion that *Eumorphocystis* is of strictly blastozoan affinity (Parsley, 1982). The present data confirm most of the basic “arm” construction details, but reveal significant points of departure, particularly at the juncture of arms to theca (Sheffield and Sumrall, 2019a). This new information forms the core of our reappraisal of the evolutionary significance of *Eumorphocystis*.

Repositories, Material, Stratigraphic Occurrence, and Methods

Specimens used for this study were selected to provide data concerning feeding appendage and associated thecal anatomy. Virtually no additional preparation beyond that already accomplished was needed. Specimens were photographed using a Leica dms 300 digital camera fitted with stacking capability.

Repositories and institutional abbreviations.— *Eumorphocystis* specimens used in this study are housed in the collections of the Sam Noble Museum (OU), University of Oklahoma, Norman, and the Non-vertebrate Paleontology Lab (---TX--, NPL) at the University of Texas, Austin. These twelve topotypes are: OU 9047, OU 9048, OU 9049, OU 238156, OU 238157, OU 238158, OU 238159, 1107TX2, 1279TX126, 1279TX339, 1404TX6, and NPL 93144 ([Table 1](#)). We also examined a plaster cast of the holotype, OU 3123. Codings for other taxa used in the phylogenetic analysis were primarily obtained from published sources and checked with

specimens in the collections of the Field Museum, Chicago, and the Non-vertebrate Paleontology Laboratory at the University of Texas, Austin.

All *Eumorphocystis* specimens were collected from the Lower Echinoderm Zone, Mountain Lake Member, Bromide Formation, Arbuckle Mountains, Oklahoma. Detailed locality data are available from respective repositories. The Bromide Formation is Sandbian, early Late Ordovician, in age.

Preservation and Taphonomy

Most *Eumorphocystis* specimens were surface collected and largely free from enclosing calcareous shale, but a few are preserved on carbonate grainstone surfaces. Specimens are usually three dimensional or nearly so, with negligible crushing. No specimen preserved with complete feeding appendages or stems is known. Instead, available material consists of thecae with arms broken off at varying distances from the theca. The different breakage patterns are important for tracing features such as those involved in the transition from theca to appendage. Only a few specimens preserve proximal portions of the stem, the longest-known segment with 31 “columnals”. Specimens show variable amounts of grainy calcite overgrowths and spar infilling of stereom, presumably the result of rapid post-mortem cementation. This is not a serious impediment for observing anatomy such as thecal plate sutures, but it can obscure details of microscopic structures germane to assessing the features crucial to determining the evolutionary significance of *Eumorphocystis*. In some cases, there are no apparent canals in the thecal or near-thecal portions of the ambulacra. In a few cases, specimens corroded by differential dissolution weathering, presumably resulting from more soluble low magnesium

cement versus high-magnesium echinoderm stereom, reveal tiny canals. These are continuations of larger feeding appendage canals. In addition, the twelve specimens available furnish data on intraspecific variation. These findings are incorporated into the subsequent analysis.

Character analysis

Here we provide new information in the form of a character analysis for features of an admittedly contentious fossil, *Eumorphocystis*. The focus is primarily on feeding appendages but includes observations from adjacent skeletal anatomy as well. This analysis is based on examination of specimens hitherto unexamined by those who have suggested a sister group relationship to crinoids for this taxon (Sheffield and Sumrall, 2019a; Deline et al., 2020). Accompanying reasoning that strongly supports a position for *Eumorphocystis* contrary to this earlier work is presented with this analysis. The cases for or against hypotheses of homology, here and in the opposing viewpoint, both depend upon congruency and accepted ontogenetic, morphological, and positional criteria for homology (Patterson, 1988; Freudenstein, 2005).

Past criticisms of our conclusions regarding the origins of crinoids (most recently Sheffield and Sumrall, 2019a) cited reliance on what were perceived to be a priori assumptions. It was claimed that our work presupposed reasoning or knowledge proceeding from theoretical deduction. However, accepted theories such as the Extraxial-Axial Theory were developed from empirical observations and theoretical induction, not the other way around (Mooi and David, 1997). Our aforementioned methodology is brought to bear on hypotheses of homology in a detailed explication, without coding based solely on superficial resemblances of individual features that do not fully consider information gleaned from other sources, including but not

restricted to the overall relationships of these features one to another. Our approach has, and continues to be, utilization of these explications to code features, and to test these hypotheses of homology in a full phylogenetic analysis. This approach is integral to the uncovering of phylogenetic signal.

The same authors criticizing our approach rely on analyses that do not provide detailed delineation of character state parameters, full probing of superficial similarity, or support for why a given transformation series should be a part of a given character or carry phylogenetic signal (Kammer et al., 2013; Sumrall, 2017; Wright, et al., 2017; Deline, et al. 2020; inter alia). Approaches that differ from ours (e.g. Deline et al. 2020) leave uncited available data, or findings that undermine codings they favor (David et al., 2000; Guensburg et al., 2010; Guensburg et al., 2016; Lefebvre et al., 2019; inter alia). We prefer a different way of dealing with echinoderm phylogeny, particularly when working with fossils open to more than one interpretation. As stated in Mooi and David (1997: 306), "The issue of subjectivity versus objectivity is often raised in reference to character analysis, usually with the implication that it is not objective to try to assess the degree to which we can trust phylogenetic signal from certain features. As cladists interested in quality of data as well as quantity, we are resisting the implication that the more we know about our characters, the less objective the study will be."

A criticism of our methodology centered on reliance upon differences rather than similarities in our analyses (Wright et al., 2017, p. 831). This oversimplifies our approach and does not fully recognize the strengths of the phylogenetic method itself. Similarities and differences are nested concepts and provide the basis for evaluation of critical issues concerning homoplasy or homology. Commonality at one level of universality will be a difference at another, and our application of the data we have gathered recognize this explicitly. Moreover,

our insistence that certain features should not be considered even comparable or coded under the same character system is not founded on a search for differences. We are attempting to address the more profound problem that past nomenclature has reified concepts of similarity that are either inapplicable or violate the central principle that such analyses should capture phylogenetic signal. Our approach employs nuanced and detailed observations drawn from several sources but does not overtly rely on differences. Our evaluations continue to be founded among long established criteria: conjunction, congruence and similarity, and an intimate knowledge of the material at hand (Patterson, 1988; Freudenstein, 2005).

We base our characters and codings on analytical data from combined observations accumulated over a period of decades within the framework of established phylogenetic practice (Guensburg, 2012; Guensburg, et al., 2020), and on empirical observations informed by ontogenetic and anatomical information from a wide variety of sources (partially summarized in Mooi and David, 1998; Mooi et al., 2005; inter alia), including from extant specimens whose anatomy is frequently ignored in the context of what is plausible among fossil forms. Recent workers have appropriately applied new or previously little used methodology to the issue of crinoid phylogeny (Ausich, 2015b; Wright et al., 2017), but such approaches should incorporate information from other well-founded methodologies including those utilized here and in other works (e.g. Guensburg et al., 2016; Guensburg, et al., 2020).

Here, we start with observations benefiting from anatomical details furnished by the large *Eumorphocystis* sample size, improved understanding of earliest crinoid morphology and data from origins of specific body wall regions (Mooi and David, 1997, 2008; David et al., 2000; Guensburg and Sprinkle, 2007, 2009; Guensburg, 2012; Guensburg et al., 2016; Guensburg et al., 2020; inter alia). We begin with the three homologies proposed to link *Eumorphocystis* to

crinoids (Sheffield and Sumrall, 2019a) and continue with expanded comparative data from feeding appendages and beyond. These ultimately test the number and specific kinds of transformations in a series of hypothetical evolutionary events required to support an exclusive link between *Eumorphocystis* and the common ancestor of Crinoidea.

Coeloms.—The central issue and a principal point of departure of the concept that crinoids are sister to *Eumorphocystis* (Sheffield and Sumrall, 2019a) in this restudy concerns the interpretation of canals associated with feeding appendages. Adding uncertainty to this matter is the scarcity of comparative information for brachiolar and floor plate canals of blastozoans in general (see Sprinkle, 1973; Clausen et al., 2009, for examples). Among early crinoids, these data have only recently been extensively analyzed in a phylogenetic context, although the nature of these canals has long been understood from an anatomical standpoint (Heinzeller and Welsch, 1994; and summarized in Guensburg et al., 2020).

Present evidence shows that longitudinal feeding appendage canals, otherwise termed median canals (Sprinkle, 1973), exist in a diversity of blastozoans (gogiids, rhipidocystids, rhombiferans, blastoids) (Fay, 1960; Sprinkle, 1973; 1975; Clausen, et al., 2009; Sumrall and Sheffield, 2019a) (Figs 2-4, 6.1-6.4, 6.6, 6.8, 6.9). However, the generally small scales of available material, and the tendency for diagenesis to obscure details with calcitic infilling or eliminate them through moldic preservation that show only plate exteriors, combine to contribute to the scarcity of data. Further, material with attached feeding appendages remains unavailable for many blastozoans, and even ambulacra on thecae are not commonly broken through in such a way that might reveal internal canals. Not surprisingly, no comprehensive study of blastozoan median canals is available, and none is documented for most taxa. Blastozoan median canals

pass through floor plates and their extensions, the brachiolars, presumably to their tips. They are housed within floor plates, and in nearly all known cases, pass between opposing floor plate elements along the appendage mid-line. In one case, canals are encased in uniserial floor plates extending from arms to the theca (Clausen, et al., 2009). Position of canals and the fact that these seem to extend to the oral region suggest they housed nerve branches extending from the circumoral ring. This latter anatomical configuration can be observed among living echinoderms.

Previously reported blastozoan canals are circular openings, on the order of 0.1 mm^2 (using $A = \pi r^2$, the area for a circle) or smaller in section. These are housed within floor plates or, in the case of brachiole-bearing blastozoans, brachiolars. The roughly elliptical appendage cavities seen in *Eumorphocystis* are larger than those of other blastozoans, being approximately 1.3 mm^2 in section (using $A = \pi ab$, the area for an ellipse) (Fig. 2.2, but see Fig. 3.6 for much smaller canal). These transition proximally to much smaller, more circular, canals, approximately 0.14 mm^2 in section (Figs. 3.2, 3.4-3.6, 4.2, 4.6), on a scale similar to those of other blastozoans. These small proximal canals are often obscured by spar-filling similar in color to adjacent spar-filled plates (Figs. 2.3, 3.4, 4.1). This narrowing occurs at the second to fourth ambulacrals distal to the orals, except in the C-ray where differentiated floor plates skirt the periproct region. In both cases, though, this change takes place not far beyond the thecal wall. Topology in the proximal regions agrees with the most common blastozoan pattern in that canals run along the perradial sutures (ambulacral midline) that form contacts between opposing floor plates. On the theca itself, canals proceed within floor plates just above, but not through, the thecal wall (Figs. 4.2, 4.3). These narrow canals were observed to reach the orals (Fig. 3.5). Opposing floor plate walls each form a hemi-canal or “half-pipe” (Fig. 3.2, 3.5). Larger than

usual more distal canals could have accommodated expanded innervation of appendages supplying the dense array of brachioles.

The situation among early crinoids (see Guensburg et al., 2010; Guensburg et al., 2020, for detailed analysis) (Figs. 5, 6.5, 6.7) is not comparable to that of *Eumorphocystis* or any other blastozoan (see Guensburg et al., 2020, for detailed analysis) (Figs. 6.5, 6.7). Unlike blastozoans, crinoid canals expand into the main body mass at thecal shoulders away from the peristome (Figs. 5.1-5.3). In addition, arms themselves express secondary longitudinal grooves within the adoral brachial canals that extend out the arms. Subsequent evolutionary events led to the submergence of this secondary groove into brachials, thereby transforming what initiated as grooves into intraplate canals. Instances of the enclosed canal condition are known from as early as the Late Ordovician (e.g. *Columbicrinus*) (Guensburg et al., 2020, Fig. 7) and occur among all living crinoids. These canals house the brachial (also known as the aboral) nerve, part of the subepithelial system sensu Heinzeller and Welsh (1994). Ontogeny of living crinoids recapitulates this change in position of the nerve canal, which was originally only partly submerged into brachials.

It is important to note that the derived brachial canal condition in modern crinoids and certain fossils superficially resembles the situation found among blastozoans. In both cases, a canal perforates the primary skeletal support elements of feeding appendages. However, comparative study of the nature and origin of the plate bearing canals using earliest crinoid as well as modern crinoid anatomy reveals fundamentally different housing elements: extraxial brachials in crinoids, axial floor plate and brachiolar canals in blastozoans (Fig. 6). Accordingly, proposed homology of *Eumorphocystis* feeding structures with those of crinoids becomes more conjectural, since there remains no plausible evidence for somatocoels. The polarity of the

changes above does not rely on a priori reasoning, but on reciprocal illumination of direct observation of conditions that have nothing to do with the nerve canals themselves, and that are congruent with the topology of the same tree that makes sense of these canal character transitions.

Tripartite pseudo-arms.— See *Summary of character analysis findings* below for definition of "pseudo-arm". A finding for homologous tripartite feeding appendages assumes this condition arose through the blastozoan *Eumorphocystis* to be inherited by earliest crinoids. Recently revealed evidence from earliest crinoids does not support such a series of events because the tripartite pattern is not the earliest condition for crinoid arms (Guensburg et al., 2020). Instead, it simply represents an additional state observed among more crownward crinoids, a state not found among the common ancestor of that group. Earliest crinoid arms (*Apektocrinus*, *Titanocrinus*, *Glenocrinus*) are not tripartite because they express lateral fields of platelets extending from the cup along the arms between brachials and floor plates, in one case, all the way to the arm tips (e.g. *Titanocrinus*) (Guensburg et al., 2020, Figs. 10.5, 10.6).

Radials.—Differentiated thecal plates lying at the base of the extraxial feeding appendage series in *Eumorphocystis* have been interpreted to be homologous with similarly positioned crinoid radials (Sheffield and Sumrall, 2019a). These, like those of crinoids lie at the base of a uniserial, radially positioned plate column, occur at the juncture with the thecal wall, and express a distinct facet articulating with a more distal extraxial plate. The comparison of proposed *Eumorphocystis* radials fails when a more nuanced attempt to homologize this pattern with that of Early Ordovician crinoids is implemented. In early camerates (Guensburg and Sprinkle,

2003), fixed brachials continue upward from radials in a uniserial series within the body wall. However, in the case of *Eumorphocystis*, no uniserial body wall plates continue above putative radials (*Eumorphocystis backing series* below). If the comparison is with cladids, the radial facets should express notches accommodating the passage of coeloms extending outward from the thecal shoulder, yet they do not. There is no opening leading distally into the feeding appendages from the “radials” of *Eumorphocystis*. Plates extending distally from the proposed *Eumorphocystis* “radial” confirm this anatomy. The first aboral plate beyond the “radial” of *Eumorphocystis* lacks an adoral groove. Stated another way, the proposed coelomic canal (above) does not bound either the putative radials or in the first two or three subsequent putative brachials. Furthermore, diplopores are evident in the so-called radials in *Eumorphocystis* (Fig. 2.6), features unlike crinoid respiratory structures.

Ambulacral grooves.—Ambulacral grooves of *Eumorphocystis* are narrow and shallow, approximately only a quarter of the entire arm width. Those of early crinoids are wide and deep, set down within the adoral grooves of brachials, spanning the entire floor plate and arm's width. It is not until more crownward taxa within the Crinoidea that narrower ambulacral grooves are encountered. It is unparsimonious to hypothesize that *Eumorphocystis* represents the plesiomorphic morphology of the common ancestor of crinoids and blastozoans when the earliest crinoids express dissimilar groove morphology, only to see something similar reappear in crownward crinoids, particularly when an alternative more parsimonious placement of *Eumorphocystis* exists.

Floor plates.—Like blastozoans in general, *Eumorphocystis* floor plates are massive, blocky elements lacking podial pores. They have large exposed surfaces, both on the theca, and along pseudo-arms, where they form the exposed tops and sides of arms. In nearly all blastozoans, pseudo-arms do not include extraxial elements and form the entire aboral appendage surface. Each *Eumorphocystis* floor plate bears a facet that facilitated infolding of an attached brachiole toward the peristome (Figs. 2.1, 2.4). The initial floor plate just beyond the orals is distinctly elongate. By contrast, early crinoid floor plates are delicate, largely internal, slat-like elements, with shared podial pores between sequential elements (Guensburg and Sprinkle, 2001, 2009; Guensburg et al., 2020). Arm support in this case is provided by brachials, the extraxial elements that form the aboral surface of the arm (Fig. 5). Although one could envision that thin crinoid floor plates were highly modified from the block-like versions seen in *Eumorphocystis*, the lack of podial pores makes this an unparsimonious proposition given the frequency of pores in other echinoderms (e.g. edrioasteroid-like forms, certain edrioasteroids) that have hitherto not at all been at all associated with blastozoans. In other words, extensive convergent evolution of podial pores would have to be proposed in the face of strong similarities among them, as well as broadly accepted phylogenetic evidence supporting blastozoan monophyly to the exclusion of all other major echinoderm clades (Guensburg et al., 2016; Guensburg et al., 2020).

Pinnules and brachioles.—First, it should be recognized that blastozoan brachioles and crinoid pinnules, although superficially similar, are only partly homologous structures in which respective nonhomologous portions indicate significantly different soft tissue anatomies. Both crinoids and blastozoans express cover plates, axial constructs over the ambulacra. However, primary supporting skeletal structures are non-homologous. Blastozoan brachiolaria are axial

extensions from ambulacral floor plates, crinoid pinnulars are extraxial extensions from the thecal body wall beyond the ambulacra (Mooi and David, 1997, 1998). Brachioles were a diagnostic blastozoan apomorphy from the onset of their origination during the Early Cambrian (Sprinkle, 1973). On the other hand, all known earliest crinoids were apinnulate (Guensburg, 2012; Guensburg et al., 2020). It is widely agreed among crinoid workers that pinnules evolved independently at different times among camerate, cladid, and disparid crinoids (Ausich, 1988; Sheffield and Sumrall, 2019a). Modern crinoid anatomy shows the same basic anatomy in arms and pinnules including the presence of left and right somatocoel extensions (Mooi and David, 1997, 1998). There is no evidence that would support a different conclusion in the various fossil crinoids.

Thecal and feeding appendage floor plates of *Eumorphocystis* each bear a uniserial brachiole (Fig. 2.1). These formed a dense filtration fan superficially much like pinnulate crinoid arms (Parsley, 1982) (Fig. 1). The suggestion that a *Eumorphocystis*-like ancestor first lost brachioles, then later evolved pinnules, after crinoids themselves had evolved (Sheffield and Sumrall, 2019a), requires loss of brachioles in a pre-crinoid phase, followed by development of pinnules after the origination of crinoids. The added complexity for this posited sequence of events undermines supposed homology between the feeding appendages of *Eumorphocystis* and the arms of any of the pinnulate crinoids, whether pinnules evolved more than once or not.

Cover plates.—Arm cover plates of earliest crinoid are arranged in a two-tiered pattern (Guensburg et al., 2020). *Eumorphocystis* appendage cover plates are arranged in a single-tiered alternating biseries, each with a transverse keel running laterally or orthogonal to the longitudinal axis of the appendage (Fig. 2.1). This biseries pattern occurs consistently among early blastozoan

brachioles (e.g. the Cambrian imbricates such as lepidocystids, and gogiids) (Sprinkle, 1973). Ambulacral and oral surface cover plating can be more complex, an irregular multi-series, usually a biseries, within a single tier. Derivation of a two-tiered early crinoid-type cover plate pattern from this single blastozoan biseries necessitates novel development of additional plates in stories. Accordingly, this option is not parsimonious given that complex cover plate configurations from which an incipient two-tiered early crinoid pattern potentially originated were available among Cambrian edrioasteroid-like (Smith and Jell, 1990, Fig. 4a; Zhao et al., 2010, Fig. 6.7, for instance) and Early Ordovician edrioasterid edrioasteroid (Sprinkle and Sumrall, 2015; Zamora et al., 2015, et al.) echinoderms (see Guensburg et al, 2020).

Eumorphocystis backing series.—Exterior views of the uniserial backing plates of *Eumorphocystis* appear crinoid-like. However, their interiors (oral surfaces) do not. The adoral groove of early crinoids is much larger and deeper than the groove forming the bottom of the pseudo-arm canal in *Eumorphocystis* and in crinoids, it bears a secondary groove (Figs. 6.4, 6.5 and 6.7).

Pseudo-arm buttressing.—*Eumorphocystis* pseudo-arms are buttressed by a solid wedge of plates underlying floor plates. Additions to this plate wedge are inserted below floor plates during ontogeny. Crinoid arms expand approaching the theca and this expanded region is hollow, the expanding space bounded aborally by brachials and thin lateral plate fields that lie just aborally to the floor plates (Figs. 5, 6.5, 6.7). No known intermediaries link these disparate morphologies.

Summary of character analysis findings.—Detailed anatomical analysis does not support somatocoelar, radial, or brachial homologies linking *Eumorphocystis* with crinoids. To signify these essential differences between the feeding appendages in blastozoans, and the “true arms” of crinoids, we refer to those seen in *Eumorphocystis* and other blastozoans with similar configurations as “pseudo-arms” (referred to as exothecal ambulacra by Sprinkle, et al., 2011). Thecal plate and respiratory systems, and stem/stalk morphology concur with these findings (Guensburg and Sprinkle, 2007; Guensburg et al., 2010; Guensburg et al., 2016).

Testing the claim of crinoid sister-group status for *Eumorphocystis*

The finding for a sister group relationship of *Eumorphocystis*, a blastozoan, and crinoids was accompanied by a phylogenetic analysis (Sheffield and Sumrall, 2019a). A more recent study that used *Eumorphocystis* and other taxa from this study, recovered different results – that crinoids arose independently from pentaradiate echinoderms apart from blastozoans (Guensburg et al., 2020). The present analysis builds upon this latter study, with a primary goal to elucidate further the phylogenetic position of blastozoans, and in particular *Eumorphocystis* within this context. The total taxon list from Guensburg et al. (2020) is expanded from 21 to 25 ([Table 2](#)), and the character list increased from 34 to 39. Essentially the entire range of taxa used to support a *Eumorphocystis* sister-group status with crinoids was implemented (Sheffield and Sumrall, 2019a). Added taxa include a Middle Ordovician hemicosmitid, a Silurian coronoid blastozoan, and a diplobathrid crinoid. Furthermore, we included the Early Ordovician rhodocrinitid *Proxenocrinus*, among the earliest-known pinnulate crinoids. However, Cambrian and Early

Ordovician taxa continue to remain in the overall taxon list in order to code for characters found in the earliest members of the clades to which they belong.

1. *Left and right somatocoels*: left and right somatocoels underlie ambulacra along their entire length (0); somatocoels restricted to thecal interior (1). State (0) includes those arm-bearing taxa with cavities extending uninterrupted from thecal shoulders. This trait, from a practical standpoint, highlights a key difference in feeding appendage construction. State (1) includes cases where cavities do not extend uninterrupted from the theca, such as *Eumorphocystis*. Here, this relationship is considered similar to that of paracrinoids where such a cavity has been referred to as a lumen (Parsley and Mintz, 1975).
2. *Podial pores or basins*: present (0); absent (1). Determining the existence of podial pores or podial basins is crucial to assessing relationships among early crinoids, as well as with other early echinoderm groups. The fossils can be difficult to interpret where weathering and diagenesis obscure plate boundaries such as in the fossils treated here (see *Taphonomy and Preparation* above). The best supported interpretation, obtained by coated, submersed, and dry images, is that there are at least podial basins if not actual pores in basins that extend to water vascular elements inside the coelom, internal to the floor plates. Although not documented in later Paleozoic crinoids, these structures can be seen in *Aethocrinus*, *Athenocrinus*, *Apektocrinus*, *Titanocrinus*, and possibly *Glenocrinus* (Guensburg et al., 2020, Figs. 4.4, 4.6, 10.3, 10.4).
3. *Floor plates on the theca*: floor plates short, relatively wide (0); long, relatively narrow (1). This trait does not code for appendage morphology.

4. *Floor plates in appendages*: plates thin, slat-like, not providing primary appendage supports (0); thick, blocky, forming primary appendage skeletal supports (1).
5. *Ambulacral cover plates*: arranged in lateral and medial tiers (0); in a single biseries of lateral plates (medial tier not expressed) (1). Medial and lateral tiers were previously referred to as primary and secondary cover plates (Paul and Smith, 1984). Single cover plate tiers can be arranged in an alternating double or other multiple series, but essentially forming one level. This differs from the two-tiered pattern where cover plates form two distinct levels (Guensburg et al., 2020). Patterns can be difficult to interpret in plesiomorphic Cambrian forms where plates are more irregular, but an incipient two-tiered pattern can be discerned (Smith and Jell, 1990; Zhao et al., 2010).
6. *Medial cover plates*: overlapping elements diminishing in size as they arch over the perradial suture (0); an alternating double biseries (1). This character requires medial cover plates and is scored as inapplicable for those taxa lacking medial cover plates.
7. *Hinging of thecal (non-appendage) cover plates*: hinged, capable of opening and closing (0); fixed, forming closed ambulacral tunnels (1).
8. *Axial orals*: absent (0); expressed as differentiated interradian elements surrounding the peristome in all interrays and forming junctions of ambulacra (1). Axial orals are not regarded as homologous with similarly positioned, extraxial, oral-like plates such as those of modern crinoids or of *Hybocrinus nitidus* and *Carabocrinus treadwelli* (see Guensburg et al, 2016, for supporting argumentation). Further, earliest hybocrinids lack orals entirely, suggesting acquisition independent from (and therefore not homologous with) the orals seen in blastozoans such as *Eumorphocystis* (Guensburg and Sprinkle, 2017). The plating of the oral region of *Stromatocystites pentangularis* includes oral-

like plating in AB and EA interrays. This latter state is autapomorphic among the taxa studied and is omitted from the analysis.

9. *Brachioles*: absent (0); present (1). Brachioles are entirely axial in construction whether uniserial or biserial, their primary support structures always arising from (axial) floor plates, or representing extensions of those floor plates beyond the perforate extraxial region.
10. *Fixed rays*: contacted entirely by non-standardized plating (0); contacted by standardized circlet(s) in part or entirely (1). Fixed rays are the uniserial series in continuity with the primary appendage support plate series. This character is inapplicable for those taxa lacking true arms sensu David and Mooi (1999:2) and David et al. (2000: 354)
11. *Respiratory pores*: epispires (0); absent (1); diplopores (2). State (1) includes taxa with thin, often corrugated, stereom at plate corners.
12. *Thecal base circlet*: absent (0); several irregular plates (1); five infrabasal plates (2); four plates (3); single fused element (4); three plates (5). State (1) consists of a ring of larger thecal plates above a narrower, pinched, pedunculate zone.
13. *Dorsal cup*: conical (0); bowl-shaped (1). The term “dorsal cup” requires left and right somatocoels extending from the thecal shoulders (character 1 above). This character is inapplicable for those taxa lacking true arms according to David and Mooi (1999: 92) and David et al. (2000: 354) (see character 19).
14. *CD interradius elevation*: not expressed except for periproct or anal cone (0); long cylindrical sac (1).
15. *CD interradiial gap plate*: present (0); absent (1). This character requires the presence of true arms. State (0) requires extension of the CD interray gap to the stem/stalk, that is,

they interrupt the cup base circlet. Gap plates are relatively small and are inserted between an otherwise more or less regular thecal base circlet (character 12).

16. *True basals*: absent (0); expressed as a differentiated mid-cup circlet between infrabasals, if present, and true radials (1). State (1) requires the presence of true arms and is therefore marked as not applicable in cases when true arms are absent (see character 19).

17. *Secondary median groove*: absent (0); expressed in feeding appendages (1). State (1) refers to a subsidiary channel along the interior aboral surface of the presumed coelomic channels in feeding appendages and extending from the theca. This groove could have housed the brachial nerve.

18. *True radials*: absent (0), present (1). A true radial represents the proximalmost extraxial plate of a true arm ray series. These support free arms at least early in ontogeny. This character requires the presence of true arms and is therefore marked inapplicable in cases where true arms are absent. *Eumorphocystis* expresses extraxial elements superficially similar to true radials of the type seen in derived crinoids where radials form the cup top. Unlike crinoids, the *Eumorphocystis* plates are not located at the cup top (see Sheffield and Sumrall, 2019a) and facets have no coelomic notches or other evidence of any communication to the thecal interior.

19. *Left and right somatocoels extended off the theca in feeding appendages, thus forming true arms*: absent (0), present (1)

20. *True arm branching pattern*: true arms atomous, non-branching (0); isotomously branching (1); endotomously branching (2). This character is scored inapplicable for taxa lacking true arms and refers to distalmost branching pattern.

21. *Brachials*: absent (0); brachials present (1). Brachials, when expressed, constitute primary skeletal supports for the feeding appendages. This character requires true arms and is scored inapplicable for taxa lacking true arms. *Eumorphocystis* expresses uniserial backing plates superficially resembling brachials, but these do not form primary appendage supports and do not contain a through-going coelomic canal.
22. *Extraxial laterals*: present, accompanying extended thecal wall out arms (0); absent. Extraxial laterals, when present, occupy aboral arm surfaces aside from brachials. State (0) requires true arms and is scored inapplicable for taxa lacking true arms.
23. *Platelet webs at branchings*: present (0); absent (1). These plate fields are most parsimoniously regarded as extensions of extraxial lateral plating (see character 22). This character requires true arms and is scored inapplicable for taxa lacking true arms.
24. *Fixed brachials*: present (0); absent (1). Fixed brachials are ray plates that extend aborally from true radials and are embedded in the cup; they articulate laterally with interradial plates. This character requires true arms and is scored inapplicable for taxa lacking true arms.
25. *Cup-like fixed brachials*: three or more in all rays (0); none to two in all rays (1); cup-like fixed brachials in C or E rays only (2). Cuplike indicates plates embedded in the cup with margins flush with adjacent cup plates, much like radials. This character requires true arms and is therefore scored inapplicable for taxa lacking true arms. Polarity is established by the known crinoid record.
26. *One or more brachial pairs in lateral union above branchings*: present (0); absent, not paired above branchings (1). This character requires true arms and is therefore scored inapplicable for taxa lacking true arms.

27. *Interradial plate fields separating multiple fixed primibrachials*: much wider than fixed rays (0); interradian fields not as wide as fixed rays or absent (1); interradian plate fields absent (2). Width is assessed across the widest portion of the field and compared with the widest fixed brachial. This character requires true arms and is therefore scored inapplicable for taxa lacking true arms.
28. *CD interradius*: CD interradius extending downward to the base of the thecal cavity (0); ending at true radials (1). State (0) indicates the radial circlet is interrupted across the CD interradius, and state (1) indicates radials are contiguous below the CD interradius. This character requires true arms and is therefore scored inapplicable for taxa lacking true arms.
29. *Radial(s) and anal X plates*: absent (0); present (1). State (1) consists of differentiated plates occupying the space below and to the left of a “raised” C radial. The radial can be absent in later more derived taxa, but not those treated here. States (0) and (1) require presence of true arms and are therefore scored as not applicable for those forms lacking them.
30. *Anibrachial plate*: absent (0), or present (1). This character requires true arms and is therefore scored inapplicable for those taxa lacking true arms.
31. *Peduncle, stem, or stalk*: absent or only slightly developed as attachment structure (0); anisotropic, imbricate, plated peduncle (1); irregularly tessellated peduncle with pinched demarcation at base of theca (2); monomeric (holomeric) stem (3); pentameric stalk (4). *Carabocrinus treadwelli* and *Hybocrinus nitidus* pentameres are inconspicuous (see Sprinkle, 1982a, Figs. 45D, 46H). Note: The presence of a stem has traditionally been used as a key feature linking blastozoans and crinoids, together these

comprising the pelmatozoans. Stems are now known among edrioasteroids as well as blastozoans and crinoids (Guensburg and Sprinkle, 2007; Guensburg et al., 2010). Therefore, it is not unparsimonious to assume that stems/stalks evolved more than once. Here we identify types of stems where, at least among treated taxa, a pattern emerges whereby blastozoan and earliest crinoid stems are distinguishable. This approach does not apply to later, more crownward taxa where homoplasy presumably results in more similar constructs.

32. *Stalk/stem lumen*: absent (0); round or irregular trilobate in cross section (1); pentalobate in cross section (2). This character requires a stalk or a stem and scored as not applicable for those forms lacking a meric stalk/stem.

33. *Ray length on theca*: long, approaching the perforate/imperforate boundary in extraxial body wall (0); short, restricted to the region around peristome and not approaching boundary between perforate and imperforate extraxial body wall (1).

34. *Extraxial “orals”*: absent (0); present (1). The interradianal circlet bordering the peristome of *Hybocrinus nitidus* and *Carabocrinus treadwelli* is considered extraxial and homologous among these and a few other cyathocrinine crinoids (*Porocrinus*, *Palaeocrinus*, inter alia); these are all characterized by flat tegmens of few plates and with a hydropore within a single posterior “oral”.

35. *Gonopore*: undifferentiated from hydropore (0), a slit-like pore apart from hydropore (1). State (1) requires an opening in the CD interray separate from the hydropore.

36. *Hydropore or combined hydropore-gonopore*: an interplate pore bordered by small platelets (0); a slit shared across two plates separate from hydropore (1); an intraplate pore (2), subcircular pore shared across two plates (3).

37. *Pinnules*: absent (0), present (1). This character requires true arms. Pinnules are supported by extraxial elements, and are constructed nearly identically to true arms, including containment of coeloms characteristic of arms. Pinnules are not homologous with brachioles, which can nonetheless superficially resemble pinnules.

38. *Ray branching in dorsal cup*: no branching in dorsal cup (0); branching from fixed brachial on the theca (1).

39. *Uniserial posterior plate column*: absent (0); present (1).

These 39 characters were assembled for scoring using Mesquite Version 3.2 (build 801), and the nexus file run on PAUP 4.0a (build 167) for Macintosh. All characters were unordered and unweighted; one character was parsimony uninformative (Table 3). The analysis employed the branch and bound algorithm, consensus trees were computed, and a bootstrap analysis of 10,000 replicates was run using a fast heuristic search.

Results of the phylogenetic analysis

We are acutely aware that merely piling up evidence that crinoids are different from blastozoans is insufficient to falsify the idea that crinoids are derived from within the blastozoan clade, let alone the diploporites, which appear to be non-monophyletic in any case (Sheffield and Sumrall, 2019b). However, unlike previous analyses, we allow for the strong likelihood that morphologies in feeding and other structures are merely superficially similar in blastozoans and crinoids, and lack phylogenetic signal due to homoplasy. For us, the key to uncovering this homoplasy is detailed study of the fossils themselves, details, in addition to broader comparisons with early taxa of both crinoid and blastozoan clades in which these features have very different

expressions from those in more crownward forms. Even if it could be shown that *Eumorphocystis* was a sister to crinoids, this is insufficient to place Crinoidea within any more inclusive blastozoan taxon, without trying to explain why crinoids lack so many of the apomorphies of blastozoans, as also discussed in Guensburg et al. (2020).

Nevertheless, our study of material adequate to close data gaps evident in the Sheffield and Sumrall (2019) analysis are not consistent with the suggestion that *Eumorphocystis* is relevant to the question of crinoid relationship with blastozoans. The latter is a monophyletic assemblage exclusive of the Crinoidea. No blastozoans, let alone the highly derived *Eumorphocystis*, are more closely related to crinoids than they are to other blastozoans (see Sheffield and Sumrall, 2019b, for a recent treatment of diploporites, in which *Eumorphocystis* has traditionally been included).

Results generally mirror those of Guensburg et al., 2020, and even with additional taxa, and are not surprising given the disparate morphological interpretations relative to those of the opposing view (Sheffield and Sumrall, 2019a). This phylogenetic analysis recovered 660 most parsimonious trees of length 75, consistency index (CI) of 0.675, retention index (RI) of 0.845, rescaled consistency index (RC) of 0.594, and homoplasy index (HI) of 0.307. Strict 50% and majority rule consensus trees are shown in Figure 7, along with the results of the bootstrap analysis. *Eumorphocystis* branches high in the blastozoan lineage, distantly related to crinoids, which are placed closer to the earliest pentaradiate echinoderm branch. Blastozoan history begins during the Early Cambrian, separate from crinoids.

Crinoids are first recognized during the Early Ordovician (Guensburg and Sprinkle, 2003, 2009, inter alia). Arm morphology in both modern and fossil crinoids indicates an origin from non-blastozoan pentaradiate echinoderms (David and Mooi, 1999; Mooi et al., 2000;

Guensburg and Sprinkle, 2007; Guensburg et al., 2010; Guensburg et al., 2012; Guensburg et al., 2016; Guensburg et al., 2020). Incorporation of the camerate crinoid taxa *Proxenocrinus* and *Gaurocrinus* in the expanded dataset here (characters 35-39) produced a different overall crinoid topology from an earlier iteration (Guensburg et al., 2020) with disparid and traditional camerate clades as sister taxa. This result contrasts with recent findings (Ausich et al., 2015a; Ausich et al., 2015b; Ausich et al., 2020; and Ausich et al., 2020) but is essentially that suggested by another author (Gahn, 2015). The inclusion of pinnulation, character 37, is interesting because it appears to provide phylogenetic signal only early in crinoid history. This character eventually occurs in disparids and cladids as well as camerates, but the current record indicates this feature evolved first among camerates, during the Late Floian. Pinnules are not known not among cladids and disparids until the Late Ordovician.

Acknowledgements

David Quednau ably assisted in the preparation of figures. We gratefully acknowledge the loan of *Eumorphocystis* material from the Sam Noble Museum, University of Oklahoma. C. Paul and an anonymous reviewer provided thoughtful and constructive reviews.

References

- Ausich, W.I., 1986, The crinoids of the Al Rose Formation (Early Ordovician, Inyo County, California, U.S.A.): *Alcheringa*, v. 10, p. 217-224.
- Ausich, W.I., 1988, Evolutionary convergence and parallelism in crinoid calyx design: *Journal of Paleontology*, v. 62, p. 906-916.

- 640 Ausich, W.I., 2018, Morphological paradox of disparid crinoids (Echinodermata): phylogenetic
641 analysis of a Paleozoic clade: *Swiss Journal of Palaeontology*, v. 137, p. 159–176.
642 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13358-0180147-z>
- 643 Ausich, W.I., Kammer, T.W., Wright, D., Cole, S., Peters, M., and Rhenberg, E., 2015a, Toward
644 a phylogenetic classification of the Crinoidea (Echinodermata): pages 29-32, *In* Zamora,
645 S., and Romano, I. (eds.). *Progress in Echinoderm Paleobiology*. Instituto Geológico y
646 Minero de España Cuaderno del Museo Geominero, 19, p. 29–32.
- 647 Ausich, W.I., Kammer, T.W., Rhenberg, E.C., and Wright, D.F., 2015b, Early phylogeny of
648 crinoids within the pelmatozoan clade: *Palaeontology*, v. 58, p. 937–952.
- 649 Ausich, W.I., Wright, D.F., Cole, S.R., and Sevastopulo, G.D., 2020, Homology of posterior
650 interrays in crinoids: a review and new perspectives from phylogenetics, the fossil record,
651 and development: *Palaeontology*, v. 2020, p. 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pala.12475>.
- 652 Blakey, D. Deep Time Maps--maps of ancient Earth: <https://deeptimemaps.com/>. Accessed
653 September 10, 2018.
- 654 Branson, E.B. and Peck, R.E., 1940, A new cystoid from the Ordovician of Oklahoma: *Journal*
655 *of Paleontology*, v. 14, p. 89–92.
- 656 Breimer, A., 1978, General morphology, Recent crinoids: *in* Moore, R.C. and Teichert, C. (eds.)
657 *Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology*, Part T, Echinodermata 2(1). Geological Society of
658 America Boulder and University of Kansas Press, Lawrence, p. T9–T50.
- 659 Callaway, C., 1877, On a new area of Upper Cambrian rocks in South Shropshire, with a
660 description of new fauna: *Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society of London*, v. 33,
661 p. 652–672.

- 662 Cole, S.R., 2017, Phylogeny and morphologic evolution of the Ordovician Camerata (Class
663 Crinoidea, Phylum Echinodermata): Journal of Paleontology, v. 91, special Issue 4, p.
664 815–828.
- 665 Clausen, S., Jell, P.A., Legrain, X., and Smith, A.B., 2009: Pelmatozoan arms from the Middle
666 Cambrian of Australia: Bridging the gaps between brachioles and brachials: Lethaia, v.
667 43, 432-440.
- 668 Conrad, T.A., 1842, Descriptions of new species of organic remains belonging to the Silurian
669 Devonian, and Carboniferous Systems of the U.S.: Philadelphia Academy of Natural
670 Sciences, Journal (old series), v. 8, p. 235-280.
- 671 David, B., and Mooi, R., 1999, Comprendre les échinodermes: la contribution du modèle
672 extraxial-axial: Bulletin de la Société Géologique de France, v. 170, p. 91–101.
- 673 David, B., Lefebvre, B., Mooi, R., and Parsley, R., 2000, Are homalozoans echinoderms? An
674 answer from the extraxial-axial theory: Paleobiology, v. 26, p. 529–555.
- 675 Deline, B., Thompson, J.R., Smith, N.S., Zamora, S., Rahman, I.A., Sheffield, S., Ausich, W.I.,
676 Kammer, T.W., and Sumrall, C.D., 2020, Evolution and development at the origin of a
677 phylum: Current Biology, doi:10.1016/j.cub.2020.02.054.
- 678 Derstler, K., Guensburg, T.E., Blake, D.B., and Sprinkle, J., 2018, Arms in *Camptostroma*, an
679 archaic pentaradiate echinoderm: Geological Society of America Abstracts with
680 Programs, v. 50: doi: 10.1130/abs/2018AM-324634.
- 681 Durham, J.W., 1966, *Camptostroma*, an Early Cambrian supposed scyphozoan referable to
682 Echinodermata: Journal of Paleontology, v. 40, p. 1216–1220.

- 683 Durham, J.W., 1967, Camptostromatoids: *in* Moore, R.C. (ed.) Treatise on
684 Invertebrate Paleontology, Part S Echinodermata 1(2). Geological Society of America
685 and the University of Kansas Press, Lawrence, p. S627–S631.
- 686 Fay, R.O. The type species of *Globoblastus* Hambach: Oklahoma Geology Notes, v. 21. P. 247-
687 248.
- 688 Foerste, A.F., 1938, Echinodermata: *in* Resser, C.E and Howell, B.F. (eds.), Lower Cambrian
689 *Olenellus* Zone of the Appalachians: Geological Society of America Bulletin, v. 49, p.
690 212–213.
- 691 Freudenstein, J.V., 2005, Characters, states, and homology: Systematic Biology, v. 54, p. 965-
692 973.
- 693 Geissman, J.W., Bowring, S.A., and Babcock, L.E., compilers, 2018, Geological Time Scale, v.
694 5.0: Geological Society of America, <https://doi.org/10.1130/2018>. Accessed in January
695 17, 2019.
- 696 Guensburg, T.E., 2012, Phylogenetic implications of the oldest crinoids: Journal of
697 Paleontology, v. 86, p. 455–461.
- 698 Guensburg, T.E., Blake, D.B., Sprinkle, J., and Mooi, R., 2016, Crinoid ancestry without
699 blastozoans: Acta Palaeontologica Polonica, v. 61, p. 253–266.
- 700 Guensburg, T.E., Mooi, R., Sprinkle, J., David, B., and Lefebvre, B., 2010, Pelmatozoan arms
701 from the mid-Cambrian of Australia: bridging the gap between brachioles and arms?
702 Comment: there is no bridge: Lethaia, v. 43, p. 432–440.
- 703 Guensburg, T.E. and Sprinkle, J. 2001. Earliest crinoids: new evidence for the origin of the
704 dominant Paleozoic echinoderms: Geology, v. 29, p. 131-134.

- 705 Guensburg, T.E. and Sprinkle, J., 2003, The oldest known crinoids (Early Ordovician, Utah), and
706 a new crinoid plate homology system: *Bulletins of American Paleontology*, 364: p. 1–
707 43.
- 708 Guensburg, T.E. and Sprinkle, J., 2007, Phylogenetic implications of the Protocrinoidea:
709 Blastozoans are not ancestral to crinoids: *Annales de Paléontologie*, v. 93, p. 277–290.
- 710 Guensburg, T.E., and Sprinkle, J., 2009, Solving the mystery of crinoid ancestry: New fossil
711 evidence of arm origin and development: *Journal of Paleontology*, v. 83, p. 350–364.
- 712 Guensburg, T.E., and Sprinkle, J., 2017, New evidence of early hybocrinid tegmens;
713 Phylogenetic implications: *Geological Society of America Abstracts with Programs*,
714 Paper number 49–2.
- 715 Guensburg, T.E., Sprinkle, J., Mooi, R., David, B., Lefebvre, B., and Derstler, K. 2020.
716 *Athenacrinus* n. gen. and other early echinoderm taxa inform crinoid origin and arm
717 evolution: *Journal of Paleontology*, v. 94, p. 311–333.
- 718 Hall, J., 1866, Descriptions of new species of Crinoidea and other fossils from the lower
719 Silurian strata principally of the Hudson-River Group (a note on it only): New York
720 State Cabinet, Natural History, 20th Annual Report, p. 304.
- 721 Heinzeller, T. and Welsch, U., 1994, Crinoidea: in Harrison, F.W. and Chia, F-S. (eds.),
722 *Microscopic Anatomy of the Invertebrates*, Vol. 14, Echinodermata. Wiley-Liss Inc.,
723 New York, p. 9–148.
- 724 Hyman, L., 1955, *The Invertebrates*, Volume 4, Echinodermata: McGraw-Hill, New York, p. 1–
725 761.
- 726 Jaekel, O., 1899, *Stemmesgeschichte der Pelmatozoen*, 1 Thecoidea und Cystoidea: P. 1–442,
727 Julius Springer, Berlin.

- 728 Jaekel, O., 1901, Über Carpoideen, eine neue Klasse von Pelmatozoen: Zeitschrift der Deutschen
729 Geologischen Gesellschaft, v. 52, p. 661–677.
- 730 Kammer, T.W., Sumrall, C.D., Zamora, S., Ausich, W.I., and Deline, B., 2013, Oral region
731 homologies in Paleozoic crinoids and other plesiomorphic pentaradial echinoderms:
732 PLoS ONE, vol. 8, p. 1–16. (doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0077989)
- 733 Kolata, D.R., 1982, Camerates: *in* Sprinkle, J. (ed.) Echinoderm faunas from the Bromide
734 Formation (Middle Ordovician) of Oklahoma: The University of Kansas Paleontological
735 Contributions, Monographs v. 1, p. 170–205.
- 736 Mooi, R., and David, B., 1997, Skeletal homologies of echinoderms: The Paleontological Society
737 Papers, v. 3, p. 305–335.
- 738 Mooi, R., and David, B., 1998, Evolution within a bizarre phylum: homologies of the first
739 echinoderms: American Zoologist, v. 38, p. 965–974.
- 740 Mooi, R. and David, B., 2000, What a new model of skeletal homologies tells us about asteroid
741 evolution: American Zoologist, v. 40, p. 326–339.
- 742 Mooi, R., David, B., and Wray, G., 2005, Arrays in rays: terminal addition in echinoderms and
743 its correlation with gene expression: Evolution and Development, v. 7, p. 542–555.
- 744 Parsley, R.D., 1982, *Eumorphocystis*: *in* Sprinkle, J. (ed.) Echinoderm Faunas from the Bromide
745 Formation (Middle Ordovician) of Oklahoma: University of Kansas Paleontological
746 Contributions, Monograph 1, p. 180–188.
- 747 Paul, C.R.C., 1968, *Macrocystella* Callaway, the earliest glyptocystitid cystoid: Palaeontology,
748 v.11, p. 580–600.
- 749 Patterson, C., 1988, Homology in classical and molecular biology: Molecular Biology and
750 Evolution, v. 5, p. 603–625.

- 751 Paul, C.R.C. and Smith, A.B., 1984, The early radiation and phylogeny of echinoderms:
752 Biological Reviews, v. 59, p. 443–481.
- 753 Pompeckj, J.F., 1896, Die Fauna des Cambrium von Tejrovic und Skrej in Böhmen: Jahrbuch
754 der kaiserlich-königlichen geologischen Reichsanstalt, v. 45, p. 495–614.
- 755 Robinson, R.A., 1965, Middle Cambrian eocrinoids from western North America: Journal of
756 Paleontology, v. 39, p. 355-364.
- 757 Roux, M., and Lambert, P., 2011, Two new species of stalked crinoids from the northeastern
758 Pacific in the genera *Gephyrocrinus* and *Ptilocrinus* (Echinodermata, Crinoidea,
759 Hyocrinoidae). Effects of ontogeny and variability on hyocrinid taxonomy: Zootaxa, v.
760 2825, p. 1-54.
- 761 Ruedemann, R., 1933, *Camptostroma*, a Lower Cambrian floating hydrozoan: Proceedings of the
762 United States National Museum, v. 82, p. 1–13.
- 763 Sheffield, S.L., and Sumrall, C.D., 2019a, A re-interpretation of the ambulacral system of
764 *Eumorphocystis* (Blastozoa, Echinodermata) and its bearing on the evolution of early
765 crinoids: Palaeontology, v. 62, p. 1–11 doi: 10.1111/pala.12396.
- 766 Sheffield, S.L. and Sumrall, C.D., 2019b, The phylogeny of the Diploporita: a polyphyletic
767 assemblage of blastozoan echinoderms: Journal of Paleontology, online,
768 <https://doi.org/10.1017/jpa.2019.2>, 13 pages.
- 769 Sinclair, G.W., 1945, Some Ordovician echinoderms from Oklahoma: American Midland
770 Naturalist, v. 34, p. 707–716.
- 771 Smith, A.B. and Jell, P.A., 1990, Cambrian edrioasteroids from Australia and the origin of
772 starfishes: Memoirs of the Queensland Museum, v. 28, p. 715-778.

- 773 Sprinkle, J., 1973, Morphology and evolution of blastozoan echinoderms: Special Publications,
774 Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard University, Cambridge, p. 1–283.
- 775 Sprinkle, J., 1982a, *Hybocrinus*: in Sprinkle, J. (ed.) Echinoderm Faunas from the Bromide
776 Formation (Middle Ordovician) of Oklahoma: The University of Kansas Paleontological
777 Contributions, Monograph 1, p. 119–128.
- 778 Sprinkle, J., 1982b, Large-calyx cladid inadunates: in Sprinkle, J. (ed.), Echinoderm Faunas from
779 the Bromide Formation (Middle Ordovician) of Oklahoma: University of Kansas
780 Paleontological Contributions, Monographs v. 1, p. 145–169.
- 781 Sprinkle, J., 1985, New edrioasteroid from the Middle Cambrian of western Utah: The
782 University of Kansas Paleontological Contributions, Paper 116, p. 1–4.
- 783 Sprinkle, J., Parsley, R.L., Zhao, Y., and Peng, J. 2011, Revision of lyracystid eocrinoids from
784 the Middle Cambrian of South China and western Laurentia: Journal of Paleontology, v.
785 85, p. 250-255.
- 786 Sprinkle, J. and Sumrall, C.D., 2015, New edrioasterine and asterocystitid (Echinodermata:
787 Edrioasteroidea) from the Ninemile Shale, central Nevada: Journal of Paleontology, v.89,
788 p. 1–7.
- 789 Strimple, H.L. and McGinnis, M.R., 1972, A new camerate crinoid from the Al Rose
790 Formation, Lower Ordovician of California: Journal of Paleontology, v. 46, p. 72-74.
- 791 Sumrall, C.D. and Waters, J., 2012, Universal elemental homology in glyptocystitoids,
792 hemicosmitoids, coronoids, and blastoids: steps toward phylogenetic reconstruction in
793 derived Blastozoa: Journal of Paleontology, v. 86, p. 956–972.
- 794 Sumrall, C.D. 2017, New insights concerning homology of the oral region and ambulacral
795 system plating of pentaradial echinoderms: Journal of Paleontology, v. 91, p. 604-617.

- 796 Swofford, D.L., 2003, PAUP*, Phylogenetic Analysis Using Parsimony (*and Other Methods),
797 Version 4: Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, Massachusetts.
- 798 Wright, D.F., Ausich, W.I., Cole, S.R., Peter, M.E., and Rhenberg, E.C., 2017, Phylogenetic
799 taxonomy and classification of the Crinoidea (Echinodermata): Journal of Paleontology,
800 v. 91, p. 829-846.
- 801 Ubaghs, G., 1963, *Rhopalocystis destombesi* n. g., n. sp., éocrinoïde de l'Ordovicien inférieur
802 (Trémadocien supérieur) du Sud marocain: Notes et Mémoires du Service géologique du
803 Maroc, v. 172, p. 25–45.
- 804 Ubaghs, G., 1967a, Eocrinoidea: in Moore, R.C. (ed.), Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology
805 1(2). Geological Society of America, Boulder, and University of Kansas Press, Lawrence,
806 p. S455–S495.
- 807 Ubaghs, G., 1967b, Le genre *Ceratocystis* Jaekel (Echinodermata, Stylophora): University of
808 Kansas Paleontological Contributions, Paper 22, p. 1–16.
- 809 Ubaghs, G., 1969, *Aethocrinus moorei* Ubaghs, n. gen. n. sp, le plus ancien crinoïde dicyclique
810 connu: University of Kansas Paleontological Contributions, Paper 38, p. 1–25.
- 811 Ubaghs, G., 1978, Skeletal morphology of fossils crinoids: in Moore, R.C. and Teichert, C. (eds.)
812 Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology, Part T, Echinodermata 2(1). Geological Society of
813 America, Boulder, and University of Kansas Press, Lawrence, p. T58–T216.
- 814 Zamora, S., Lefebvre, B., Hosgör, I., Franzen, C., Nardin, E., Fatka, O., and Alvaro, J.J., 2015,
815 The Cambrian edrioasteroid *Stromatocystites*; systematics, palaeogeography, and
816 palaeobiology: Geobios, v. 48, p. 417–426.

- 817 Zhao, Y., Sumrall, C.D., Parsley, R.D., and Peng, J., 2010, *Kailidiscus*, a new plesiomorphic
818 edrioasteroid from the Kaili biota of Guizhou Province, China: Journal of Paleontology,
819 v. 84, p. 668–680.

820

821 **Table 1.** *Eumorphocystis* specimens studied, with sizes of specimens, and comments on image
 822 orientations used in this study.

823

Specimen number	Thecal height (mm)	Images used
OU holotype cast 3123	50	not illustrated
OU 9047	9.5	A ray 2 nd broken floor plate left, 1 st on right
OU 9048	20	E ray, 1 st floor plate left, 2 nd on right
OU 9049	21	oral surface, C ray hemi-canal
OU 238156	11	not illustrated
OU 238157	29	A ray weathered, 3rd floor plate, stem facet
OU 238158	34	not illustrated
OU 238159	14	not illustrated
1107TX2	-	? ray, 4 th floor plate from oral
1279TX126	28	oral surface, AB oral, B ray hemi-canal
1279TX339	7.5	not illustrated
1404TX6	22	C, weathered, 3 rd floor plate
NPL 93144	-	thecal wall and two pseudo-arm stubs

824

825 **Table 2.** List of taxa used in the phylogenetic analysis (expanded from Guensburg et al., 2020):

826

827 Basal pentaradiate echinoderm

828 *Stromatocystites pentangularis* Pompeckj, 1896

829 *Kailidiscus chinensis* Zhao, Sumrall, Parsley and Peng, 2010

830 *Camptostroma rodgyi* Ruedemann, 1933

831 *'Totiglobus' lloydi* Sprinkle, 1985

832 *Pseudedriophus guensburgi* Sprinkle and Sumrall, 2015

833

834 Blastozoans

835 *Kinzercystis durhami* Sprinkle, 1973

836 *Lepidocystis wanneri* Foerste, 1938

837 *Eumorphocystis multiporata* Branson and Peck, 1940

838 *Gogia kitchnerensis* Sprinkle, 1973

839 *Hemicosmites pocillum* Jaekel, 1899

840 *Macrocystella mariae* Callaway, 1877

841 *Rhopalocystis destombesi* Ubaghs, 1963

842 *Stephanocrinus gemmiformis* Conrad, 1842

843

844 Stylophorans

845 *Ceratocystis perneri* Jaekel, 1901

846

847 Crinoids

- 848 *Aethocrinus moorei* Ubaghs, 1969
- 849 *Alphacrinus mansfieldi* Guensburg, 2012
- 850 *Apektocrinus ubaghsi* Guensburg and Sprinkle, 2009
- 851 *Athenacrinus broweri* Guensburg et al., 2020
- 852 *Carabocrinus treadwelli* Sinclair, 1945
- 853 *Eknomocrinus wahwahensis* Guensburg and Sprinkle, 2003
- 854 *Gaurocrinus nealli* (Hall, 1866)
- 855 *Glenocrinus globularis* Guensburg and Sprinkle, 2003
- 856 *Hybocrinus nitidus* Sinclair, 1945
- 857 *Proxenocrinus inyoensis* Strimple and McGinnis, 1972
- 858 *Titanocrinus sumralli* Guensburg and Sprinkle, 2003
- 859

Table 3. Matrix used in phylogenetic analysis. - = character state gap; ? = missing data.

861									
862	Taxon	Character Number							
863		1	11111	11111	22222	22222	33333	3333	
864		12345	67890	12345	67890	12345	67890	12345	6789
865									
866	<i>Stromatocystites pentangularis</i>	00000	0000-	00-0-	-0-0-	-----	-----	0-000	0---
867	<i>Kailidiscus chinensis</i>	000-0	0000-	10-0-	-0-0-	-----	-----	0-0?	0---
868	<i>Camptostroma rodgyi</i>	00000	00000	00-0-	---10	00---	-----	0-0-0	0---
869	<i>"Totiglobus" lloydi</i>	00000	0010-	10-0-	---0-	-----	-----	0-000	0---
870	<i>Pseudedriophus guensburgi</i>	00000	0010-	11-0-	-0-0-	-----	-----	2-00?	?---
871	<i>Kinzercystis durhami</i>	11111	-001-	00-0-	-0-0-	-----	-----	1-000	0---
872	<i>Lepidocystis wanneri</i>	11111	-001-	00-0-	-0-0-	-----	-----	1-00?	?---
873	<i>Gogia kitchnerensis</i>	11111	-001-	00-0-	-0-0-	-----	-----	2-10?	?---
874	<i>Rhopalocystis destombesi</i>	11111	-011-	04-00	-0-0-	-----	-----	3110?	?---
875	<i>Macrocystella mariae</i>	1111?	-011-	13--0	-0-0-	-----	-----	3110?	1---
876	<i>Hemicosmites pocillum</i>	1111?	-01?-	33--0	-0-0-	-----	-----	31101	1---
877	<i>Stephanocrinus gemmiformis</i>	1111?	-011-	15--0	-0-0-	-----	-----	31100	1---
878	<i>Eumorphocystis multiporata</i>	11111	-011-	23-00	-0-0-	-----	-----	31100	0---
879	<i>Ceratocystis perneri</i>	00--1	0000-	00---	-1010	10100	---00	0-00-	----
880	<i>Aethocrinus moorei</i>	00?00	10001	12001	11111	10000	01110	420?-	-000
881	<i>Alphacrinus mansfieldi</i>	00?00	10001	12011	0?112	11002	11101	4200-	-001
882	<i>Apektocrinus ubaghzi</i>	00000	10001	12000	11110	10000	-0010	4201-	-000
883	<i>Athenacrinus broweri</i>	00000	10001	12011	01112	11002	11101	4200-	-001
884	<i>Carabocrinus treadwelli</i>	00?-0	10001	12001	10111	10111	12110	4201-	-000
885	<i>Gaurocrinus nealli</i>	0-0?1	-1001	12101	11111	11100	10100	320?-	-111
886	<i>Hybocrinus nitidus</i>	00000	10001	10001	11110	11111	12110	42010	2000
887	<i>Eknomocrinus wahwahensi</i>	00??0	10001	12100	1?111	10000	00000	420?-	-000
888	<i>Proxenocrinus inyoensis</i>	00001	??001	12101	11111	11-00	10101	4?0?-	-111
889	<i>Glenocrinus globularis</i>	00??0	11000	1?100	1?111	10100	00000	420?-	-000
890	<i>Titanocrinus sumralli</i>	00?00	11000	02000	01111	10100	00000	4200-	-000
891									

Figure Captions

Figure 1. *Eumorphocystis multiporata* Branson and Peck, 1940, partial reconstruction, from Parsley, 1982, included for orientation of subsequent images; by permission from The Paleontological Institute, The University of Kansas, Lawrence.

Figure 2. *Eumorphocystis multiporata* Branson and Peck, 1940, 1279TX338 (NPL 93144), large partial theca with two adjacent pseudo-arm stubs, one longer, one shorter. **(1)** Coated oral view showing long arm stub (left), pseudo-arm cover plates and brachial facet (just above and to right and above scale), sharp keeled brachioles folded orally, one brachial nearly complete to tip, proximal-most brachiolar short, wide, distal brachiolar with spinose processes and tiny biserial cover plates, tapering to sharp termination, nearby thecal plates bearing dense diplopores; **(2)** Coated end-on view of pseudo-arm in **(1)**, broken at 7th floor plate beyond orals, tripartite arrangement, backing plate below, small ambulacral groove and cover plates above, larger ovate canal below; **(3)** Immersed short pseudo-arm stub and nearby theca, broken at distal margin of ?third floor plate from oral, showing (from bottom to top), anchoring thecal plate with diplopores, first backing plate, two sets of two blocky buttress plates forming a solid construct, floor plates surrounding small dark pore (above), and brachial stubs (see Fig. 5.3); **(4)** lateral view of pseudo-arm stub in **(1)** with backing plates (below), buttress plates filling wedge at thecal contact, large block-like, tumid, floor plates, and brachioles folded orally.

Figure 3. *Eumorphocystis multiporata* Branson and Peck, 1940, specimens showing pseudo-arm canal and adjacent morphology. **(1, 2)** OU 9049, **(1)** oral view of theca, plates partly obscured by calcitic overgrowths, theca broken through C ambulacrum, arrow points to view of enlargement

in 2 (2); (2) magnified view showing exposed suture surface with normally concealed small hemi-canal running down ambulacral mid-line just above thecal interior (arrow); (3, 5) TX1279.126, (3) oral view of well-preserved theca, thecal shoulder broken through B ambulacrum (arrow) (5); (5) magnified view, AB oral showing long interrarial suture at center-right with vertical “half diplopores”, short suture, BC oral, on left showing hemi-canal, concealed in articulated examples, along mid-line of B ambulacrum (arrow); (4) OU 238157, deeply etched theca, E ray showing apparent small weathered pore (arrow); (6) 1107TX2, AB interrarial view, face of pseudo-arm broken at fourth floor plate, small canal almost entirely within floor plates.

Figure 4. *Eumorphocystis multiporata* Branson and Peck, 1940, showing pseudo-arms and stem facet. (1-3), three specimens showing small canals near thecal juncture; (1) OU 9048, E ray, canal small, assumed to be spar-filled, (2) OU 238159, small individual lacking buttress plates (see Fig. 5.1), (3) 1404TX6 C ray, from intermediate-sized individual with large buttress plates below and small wedge-shaped elements intercalating above, these are missing splinters, otherwise plates are visible in crevasses (unseen in image) (see Fig. 5.2); (4) OU 238157 stem facet with inset peg and groove crenularium.

Figure 5. Arm to calyx transition of early crinoids for comparison with *Eumorphocystis* morphology. (1, 2) *Apektocrinus ubaghsi* Guensburg and Sprinkle, 2009, 1983TX1, D ray arm trunk to calyx transition, (1) original image, (2) color overlay interpretation, color coding (used in Fig. 5 as well) for specific body wall regions as follows: *Axial*— orange = floor plates, light orange = brachioles (floor plate extensions), blue = lateral cover plates, purple = medial cover

940 plates; *perforate extraxial*— dark green = anchoring and backing plates, light green = buttress
 941 plate; *imperforate extraxial*— dark grey = brachials, light grey = laterals; (3) *Aethocrinus moorei*
 942 Ubaghs, 1969, uncertain orientation, lateral plate field collapsed indicating expanding arm
 943 coelomic cavity merging with main thecal cavity, floor and cover plates visible above, brachials
 944 below.

945
 946 **Figure 6.** Color-coded *Eumorphocystis multiporata* Branson and Peck, 1940, blastozoan feeding
 947 appendage constructs shown with restorations of early crinoid arms. (1-3) *E. multiporata*
 948 ontogenetic series (see Table 1), OU 238159, 1404TX6, and NPL 93144, respectively, pseudo-
 949 arms broken off at theca-arm juncture, the second floor plate distal to the orals, small circular
 950 canals within floor plates (for images, see Figs. 3.2, 3.3 and 1.3, respectively); (4) *E.*
 951 *multiporata*, pseudo-arm broken seven floor plates distal to the orals, large ovate canal; (5, 7)
 952 proximal arm cross sections of *Titanocrinus* and *Apektocrinus*, respectively; (6, 8, 9) Three
 953 blastozoan brachioles/arms with small canals, in cross section: rhipidocystid and *Gogia spiralis*
 954 Robinson, 1965, brachioles (from Sprinkle, 1973), and uniserial Cambrian blastozoan arm (from
 955 Clausen et al., 2009), respectively. Color coding: *axial*— orange = floor plates, light orange =
 956 brachioles (floor plate extensions), blue = lateral cover plates, purple = medial cover plates;
 957 *perforate extraxial*—dark green = radials and first backing plates, light green = buttress plates;
 958 *imperforate extraxial*— dark grey = brachials, light grey = laterals.

959
 960 **Figure 7.** Strict and 50% majority rule consensus trees for parsimony analysis of data matrix in
 961 Table 3. All node frequencies occur in 100% of trees except where indicated, and bootstrap

962 values are indicated by numbers in parentheses. See *Summary of character analysis findings*

963 below for definition of "pseudo-arm".

964

965