



Preface

About This Book

Invertebrate zoology is a fascinating but enormous field. More than 98% of all known animal species are invertebrates, and that proportion is increasing with time as more species are described. Invertebrates are distributed among at least 30 phyla and a mind-boggling number of classes, subclasses, orders, and families. The degree of morphological and functional diversity found within some groups, even within single orders, can overwhelm the beginning student. The enormous size of the field and the great range of potential approaches to the subject make invertebrate biology challenging both to teach and to learn. In preparing the seventh edition of this book, I have endeavored to make the tasks of both teaching and learning easier, and even enjoyable, while nevertheless presenting the latest thinking in the field.

Too many people think of invertebrate zoology as an exercise in memorizing terms and, perhaps, interesting but trivial stories about interesting but irrelevant animals. Too many people think of invertebrate zoology as outdated, and a field in which everything is already known. I hope that this book alters those perceptions by presenting invertebrate zoology as a lively area of ongoing and worthwhile modern biological inquiry.

Like previous editions, the seventh is designed as a nonintimidating, readable introduction to the biology of each group, emphasizing those characteristics that set each group apart from all others. The book is intended to serve as the foundation for further learning—in lecture, laboratory, field, and library—a foundation that is largely manageable by students. Instructors are then free to embellish and expand on that foundation to suit any desired focus: taxonomy and phylogeny, behavior, conservation, environmental biology, diversity of form and function, physiology, ecology, or current research in any of those areas. The book whets the student's appetite and provides the required background, buying instructors the time to discuss more fully whatever they feel are the most interesting and important aspects of the field. This is the guiding principle in my decisions about the

level of detail to provide: I generalize wherever possible to build a firm foundation without intimidation or confusion. Given a chance, the animals themselves soon win most students over.

The most difficult part of writing this book has been deciding what to leave out. My decisions have been reached largely by reading many dozens of research articles on the biology of each group and determining the specific terminology and level of background information that students will need to read those papers. Although all phyla are covered, I have aimed for conciseness, not exhaustiveness, and have emphasized unifying principles rather than the diversity found within each group. Students are best prepared to encounter the diversity of form and function in lecture, laboratory, and field, once they have mastered basic concepts and terminology. I provide a sense of the ecological diversity encountered within each group in a "Taxonomic Detail" section at the end of most chapters, a section that also adds to the value of the book for reference.

The text remains somewhat biased toward functional morphology, bringing animals to life for students and preparing them to make careful observations of living animals in the laboratory and in the field. Most chapters contain a section entitled "Topics for Further Discussion and Investigation," highlighting many of the major research questions that have been and are being addressed for the animals covered in each chapter. For each topic, I have selected references from the primary literature that should be intellectually accessible to any interested, beginning student once he or she has read the relevant textbook chapter. I have had to exclude many excellent papers because they were too advanced, were published in less widely distributed journals, or were review papers rather than primary journal articles. The topics I have chosen, along with the accompanying references, could be used as a basis for lectures, class discussion, term papers, research proposals, or other writing assignments, or simply as a convenient way of easing students into the original literature by having them investigate topics that excite their curiosity. Students gain little by reading and

memorizing predigested summaries of the primary literature; they gain much by reading and discussing that literature. Similarly, I have again decided against adding "end-of-chapter summaries," arguing that students will learn far more of lasting value by writing and discussing their own summaries than by memorizing mine.

The excitement of invertebrate biology is found in the primary research literature, and a major goal of this book is to motivate and prepare students to read that literature—both the recent literature and that of past decades, before the words "synapomorphy" and "Lophotrochozoa" were common in the literature, and when most workers still thought that Echiura was a phylum and that myxozoans were members of the Protozoa. The *Research Focus Boxes* scattered throughout the book are based on individual papers drawn from the primary literature to illustrate the range of questions that biologists have been asking about invertebrates and the variety of approaches that have been used to address those questions. My goal here is to prepare students to read the primary literature by focusing on how questions are formulated, how data are collected and interpreted, and how each study typically leads to further questions. Students interested in the topic of a particular Research Focus Box might wish to read the original paper on which that Focus Box was based and then use that Focus Box as a model for summarizing other papers on related topics. For Focus Boxes based on older research articles, interested students may wish to follow the topic forward in time, using an indexing service such as the Web of Science. Many instructors now ask their students to write Research Focus Boxes modeled on the ones in this book; such assignments can teach students much of lasting value, particularly if they include guided revision—not an onerous chore for either student or instructor since each Focus Box is only a few pages long. This assignment allows students to put their growing vocabulary to immediate use, and it doesn't seem to hurt, either, that students feel that they're learning useful skills in the process.

As further incentive for both instructors and students, Bob Podolski at the College of Charleston has created a Research Focus Box (RFB) posting area on the Society for Integrative and Comparative Biology website (Division of Invertebrate Zoology): <http://www.sicb.org/dl/rfb.php>. Now students can write for a real audience, not just for their instructors. Instructors are encouraged to post their students' best RFB's on the website for others to read.

As with previous editions, chapters are self-contained and can be assigned in whatever order best suits the organization of any particular course, once the introductory chapters have been covered. In my own course, I cover some introductory material (particularly chapters 1 and 5) and then begin with annelids and other protostomes. Within each chapter, the material has been arranged in manageable, readable units for the convenience of both student and instructor. For example, a section entitled "Introduction and General Characteristics" might be assigned prior to a lecture on a particular group of organisms, while a section called "Feeding and Digestion" might best be assigned prior to the accompanying laboratory

session; it is always easier to assign additional sections of a text than to tell students what *not* to read within a larger section. I find that periodic scheduled quizzes, designed to reward students for doing the assigned reading, provide excellent motivation. The final chapter (Chapter 24) brings together all of the major phyla by considering general principles of invertebrate reproduction and development, providing students an opportunity to reminisce about all the animals that they have encountered during the term and to begin moving beyond phylum-by-phylum compartmentalization toward synthesis.

This edition has a somewhat greater phylogenetic orientation than its predecessors, but it still avoids prolonged phylogenetic discussion. There is still no consensus concerning many invertebrate interrelationships: Developmental studies, molecular techniques, and cladistic analyses continue to revolutionize our thinking about evolutionary relationships, or at least to challenge many treasured assumptions. Annelids and arthropods may or may not be closely related, segmentation may be a derived rather than an ancestral character in molluscs, the ancestral mollusc may have more closely resembled a bivalve than a gastropod, nematodes are probably closely related to arthropods than to rotifers, insects may have evolved from crustacean ancestors, leeches and earthworms may be derived polychaetes, and phoronids may be modified brachiopods. Similarly, nemertine worms, long considered acoelomates, actually may be unusual coelomates with no direct flatworm affinities. Acoels may be primitive but may not belong in the phylum Platyhelminthes.

For some workers, even the definition of what it means to be a protostome has shifted substantially over the past few years and now relies less on anatomical and developmental criteria. Indeed, the usefulness of morphology and ultrastructure in inferring phylogenetic relationships has been seriously challenged in recent years. "Lophophorates," for example, appear to be deuterostomes based on morphological and developmental criteria, but group unambiguously with protostomes in most molecular analyses. Similarly, molecular data now align chaetognaths with protostomes, despite their many deuterostome developmental characteristics. The relationships between cephalochordates, chordates, and echinoderms are also uncertain: Some recent molecular data suggest that cephalochordates are more closely related to echinoderms than to other chordates, implying that some key chordate features were present in the ancestral deuterostome and later lost in the evolution of echinoderms and hemichordates. And molecular analyses, often in concert with careful ultrastructural studies, have mostly destroyed the idea that pseudopodia and flagella inform us about protozoan relationships.

Clearly, invertebrate systematics is a work in progress. Although the phylogenetic atmosphere is charged with excitement, beginning students typically view textbook discussion of such controversies as simply another set of facts to be memorized. For this reason, such issues are best treated in lecture, where they can be used to animate

class discussion. Indeed, the controversies surrounding phylogenetic speculation are what make phylogeny interesting, and can be used to make the animals themselves interesting. Chapter 2 introduces students to the range of approaches used in reconstructing phylogenies, and includes substantial discussion of cladistic analysis and the promise and potential pitfalls associated with the incorporation of molecular data. The book provides the foundation upon which instructors and students can build.

Whenever possible, I provide "Defining Characteristics" as each new animal group is introduced, to help students keep track of features separating each group of animals from other groups at the same taxonomic level. In essence, these defining characteristics are synapomorphies. For some groups there are no clear defining characteristics, or characteristics that have been proposed are too controversial to be included at the present time.

Most chapters conclude with a section entitled "Search the Web," guiding students to particularly good websites associated with the group under discussion. I have listed only those sites that speak with verifiable authority and that are likely to be around and updated for a number of years.

Changes for the Seventh Edition

When I finished the second edition of this book in 1984, I thought that it might need to be revised perhaps once or twice in my lifetime. A series of careful developmental studies in concert with the increasing acceptance and use of cladistic methodology and molecular data in phylogenetic analyses have made the past 30 years far more exciting than I had imagined they would be, and the changes to this edition are substantial, despite the passage of only 4 years since I completed the previous edition.

Most chapters have been revised to reflect new discoveries and expanding research areas, including research of commercial importance and environmental relevance.

Remarkably, all of the rather dramatic organizational changes that I made for the previous editions have held up, and indeed have generally been bolstered by additional evidence. The pogonophorans, echiurans, and sipunculans, for example, for many years treated as 3 separate phyla, are all now widely accepted as modified annelids based upon morphological, developmental, and molecular data. Support has also generally increased for separating protostomes into at least two great groups—the Ecdysozoa and the Lophotrochozoa—although there is not yet complete agreement about exactly which animals each group contains or how the animals within each group are related to each other.

This edition contains some impressive new changes. For example, I now discuss the increasingly likely possibility that insects have evolved directly from crustacean ancestors, and that acoel and nemertodermatid flatworms may belong in a separate phylum, the Acoelomorpha, which may have little relationship with other flatworms. I have also updated phylogenetic relationships

for some other animals, including the tardigrades; indications of an association with nematodes seems to have resulted from a long-branch attraction problem which, once resolved, restores the tardigrades to the neighborhood of arthropods and onychophorans. In addition, the sponges now include 4 classes rather than 3—the Homoscleromorpha have been moved out of the Demospongiae to form a class of their own—*Velella* and *Porpita* are no longer in separate hydrozoan orders, and the Class Polychaeta may no longer be a valid taxonomic category. The gnathostomulids have come to settle comfortably as close relatives of rotifers and acanthocephalans within the new clade Gnathifera, and the xenoturbellids seem to be deuterostomes, bringing the total number of extant deuterostome phyla to four.

Several chapters have been largely rewritten. In particular, I have reorganized the material on body cavities in Chapter 2 to better emphasize the protostome-deuterostome distinction. I also have updated the section "Inferring Evolutionary Relationships" in that chapter to incorporate more of the modern molecular approaches. In addition, I have updated the biological information about many of the animal groups discussed in this book. For example, I now discuss recent information about the role of sexual reproduction in the life cycle of cellular slime molds in Chapter 3. Moreover, it seems clear that the definitive host in the myxozoan life cycle is usually an invertebrate, with vertebrates usually serving as intermediate hosts—the opposite of what occurs in the trematode life cycle. In Chapter 6, I now draw more attention to the Staurozoa, given their possible basal position within the Medusozoa. Throughout the book, I have updated the General References sections and references listed in the "Topics for Further Discussion and Investigation" sections, and have added new topics to several chapters. I also have updated material in the "Taxonomic Detail" sections of many chapters. For example, students now can learn about a remarkable crustacean parasite that destroys the tongue of its fish host and then takes the tongue's place with its own body.

The current edition deals somewhat more conspicuously with biomedical relevance, biological invasions, habitat degradation, and other contemporary issues. I have written several new Research Focus Boxes, added new "Topics for Further Discussion and Investigation" sections to some chapters, and included many new references to the recent primary literature, including many published as recently as 2013. I also have added some wonderful new websites to the Search the Web sections that close each chapter, and have written one new invertebrate riddle. In addition, since learning about invertebrates requires students to acquire a substantial new vocabulary, I have added a new online resource to give students some ideas for including that new vocabulary in their everyday conversation: Talking about Invertebrates (See left side of web page: <http://ase.tufts.edu/biology/labs/pechenik/publications/>); send your entries to me and I'll post them for all to see.

The paradigm shifts that have occurred over the past 25 years or so have been truly remarkable, and there is no end in sight. If insects really evolved from crustacean ancestors, for example, as recent molecular and morphological studies indicate, that will require a substantial redefinition of what it means to be a crustacean. Similarly, there is now substantial molecular evidence that oligochaetes and leeches evolved from polychaete ancestors, which would essentially make the Polychaeta the equivalent of the Annelida, and a study in 2007 using expressed sequence tags has supported the inclusion of Ectoprocta and Entoprocta within a single phylum, the Bryozoa, bringing us back to a classification established over 100 years ago. Finally, although recent molecular studies using individual molecules continue to add support for the Ecdysozoa-Lophotrochozoa dichotomy, as noted earlier, a recently reported whole-genome study of nine eukaryotic species does not support that arrangement, but favors instead the older Articulata hypothesis in which arthropods are more closely related to annelids than to nematodes.

As more molecular data from more species and more genes from each species are collected, we should see increasing stability in the accepted arrangements. There is good reason to hope.

As always, I welcome constructive criticism from all readers, both instructors and students.

Jan.Pechenik@tufts.edu

Acknowledgments

It is a great pleasure to thank the reviewers who have helped to make this a better text.

Douglas Lipka
William Carey University

John Lugthart
Dalton State University

Joshua Mackie
San Jose State University

Brian Steinmiller
Waynesburg University

Janice Voltzow
University of Scranton

William Woods
Tufts University

I am also grateful to Gordon Hendler, for detailed advice on all things echinoderm; Tom Cavalier-Smith and Laura Katz, for suggestions about how to best arrange the protozoans in Chapter 3; Sally Leys, for detailed comments on my revision of Chapter 4; Beth Okamura, for her patience in answering all of my questions about myxozoans; Gary Rosenberg, for updates on gastropod species numbers; Christer Erséus and Thorten Struck, for updates on annelid systematics and species numbers; William (Randy)

Miller, for updates on tardigrade species numbers; and Jens Høeg and Gonzalo Giribet, for their helpful comments on the arthropod material.

I would also like to thank the many people who contributed their expertise to previous editions of the text:

Frank E. Anderson, Southern Illinois University; **Christopher J. Bayne**, Oregon State University; **John F. Belshe**, Central Missouri State University; **Yehuda Benayahu**, Tel Aviv University; **Bill Biggers**, Wilkes University; **Robert Bieri**, Antioch University; **Chip Biernbaum**, College of Charleston; **Brian L. Bingham**, Western Washington University; **Susan Bornstein-Forst**, Marian College; **Kenneth J. Boss**, Harvard University; **Barbara C. Boyer**, Union College; **Robert H. Brewer**, Trinity College; **Maria Byrne**, University of Sydney

C. Bradford Calloway, Harvard University; **Ron Campbell**, University of Massachusetts at Dartmouth; **John C. Clamp**, North Carolina Central University; **Clayton B. Cook**, Bermuda Biological Station for Research; **John O. Corliss**, University of Maryland; **Bruce Coull**, University of South Carolina

Ferenc A. deSzalay, Kent State University; **Don Diebei**, Memorial University of Newfoundland; **Ronald V. Dimock, Jr.**, Wake Forest University; **William G. Dyer**, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale

David A. Evans, Kalamazoo College

Daphne G. Fautin, University of Kansas; **Paul Fell**, Connecticut College; **Ben Foote**, Kent State University; **Bernard Fried**, Lafayette College; **Peter Funch**, University of Århus

Audrey Gabel, Black Hills State University; **James R. Garey**, University of South Florida; **Ann Grens**, Indiana University, South Bend

Kenneth M. Halanych, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution; **G. Richard Harbison**, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution; **Norman Hecht**, Tufts University; **Gordon Hendler**, Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County; **Anson H. Hines**, Smithsonian Environmental Research Center; **Edward S. Hodgson**, Tufts University; **Alan R. Holyoak**, Manchester College; **Duane Hope**, Smithsonian Institution; **William D. Hummon**, Ohio University, Athens

William W. Kirby-Smith, Duke University; **Robert E. Knowlton**, George Washington University

John Lawrence, University of South Florida; **William Layton**, Dartmouth Medical School; **Herbert W. Levi**, Harvard University; **Gail M. Lima**, Illinois Wesleyan University; **B. Staffan Lindgren**, University of Northern British Columbia

Robert Knowlton, Western Illinois University; **James McClintock**, University of Alabama at Birmingham; **Rachel Ann Merz**, Swarthmore College; **Nancy Milburn**, Tufts University

Diane R. Nelson, East Tennessee State University; **Claus Nielsen**, University of Copenhagen; **Michele Nishiguchi**, New Mexico University - Las Cruces; **Jon Norenburg**, Smithsonian Institution

Steve Palumbi, *University of Hawaii*; **Lloyd Peck**, *British Antarctic Survey*; **John F. Pilger**, *Agnes State College*; **William J. Pohley**, *Franklin College of Indiana*; **Gary Polis**, *Vanderbilt University*; **Rudolph Prins**, *Western Kentucky University*

Mary Rice, *Smithsonian Institute*; **Robert Robertson**, *The Academy of Natural Sciences*; **Pamela Roe**, *California State University, Stanislaus*; **Frank Romano**, *Jacksonville State University*

Amelia H. Scheltema, *Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution*; **J. Malcolm Shick**, *University of Maine*; **Owen D. V. Sholes**, *Assumption College*; **Terry Snell**, *University of Tampa*; **Eve C. Southward**, *Plymouth Marine Laboratory (U.K.)*

John Tibbs, *University of Montana, Missoula*

Steve Vogel, *Duke University*

J. Evan Ward, *Salisbury State University*; **Daniel Wickham**, *University of California-Bodega Marine Laboratory*; **Edward O. Wilson**, *Harvard University*;

Jon D. Witman, *Marine Science Institute-Northeastern University*; **William Woods**, *Tufts University*; **Robert Woollacott**, *Harvard University*

Russel L. Zimmer, *University of Southern California*

I am also indebted to many other colleagues around the world who cheerfully provided their stunning photographs for this and previous editions, answered specific queries in person or by telephone and e-mail, or commented on drafts of new Research Focus Boxes that I based on their original research papers.

I am grateful to all of these people: their devotion to, enthusiasm for, and knowledge about invertebrate biology is both inspiring and humbling.

Finally, I am happy to thank Steve Wainwright for getting me off to a good start. Chapters 1 and 24 of this book are based on papers I wrote as an undergraduate for his Animal Diversity course at Duke University. Students: never throw your schoolwork out; you just never know!