

Termites (Isoptera): Their Phylogeny, Classification, and Rise to Ecological Dominance

Authors: Engel, Michael S., Grimaldi, David A., and Krishna, Kumar

Source: American Museum Novitates, 2009(3650) : 1-27

Published By: American Museum of Natural History

URL: <https://doi.org/10.1206/651.1>

The BioOne Digital Library (<https://bioone.org/>) provides worldwide distribution for more than 580 journals and eBooks from BioOne's community of over 150 nonprofit societies, research institutions, and university presses in the biological, ecological, and environmental sciences. The BioOne Digital Library encompasses the flagship aggregation BioOne Complete (<https://bioone.org/subscribe>), the BioOne Complete Archive (<https://bioone.org/archive>), and the BioOne eBooks program offerings ESA eBook Collection (<https://bioone.org/esa-ebooks>) and CSIRO Publishing BioSelect Collection (<https://bioone.org/csiro-ebooks>).

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

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

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

AMERICAN MUSEUM *Novitates*

PUBLISHED BY THE AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY
CENTRAL PARK WEST AT 79TH STREET, NEW YORK, NY 10024

Number 3650, 27 pp., 5 figures, 3 tables

June 25, 2009

Termites (Isoptera): Their Phylogeny, Classification, and Rise to Ecological Dominance

MICHAEL S. ENGEL,¹ DAVID A. GRIMALDI,² AND KUMAR KRISHNA³

ABSTRACT

Like ants, termites are entirely eusocial and have profound ecological significance in the tropics. Following upon recent studies reporting more than a quarter of all known fossil termites, we present the first phylogeny of termite lineages using exemplar Cretaceous, Tertiary, and Recent taxa. Relationships among Recent families were largely unaffected by the addition of extinct taxa, but the analysis revealed extensive grades of stem-group taxa and the divergence of some modern families in the Cretaceous. Rhinotermitidae, Serritermitidae, and the “higher” termites (family Termitidae), which comprise 84% of the world termite species, diverged and radiated entirely in the Tertiary, corresponding to a significant increase in termite individuals in the fossil record. Radiation of the higher termites may have affected the formation of terrestrial carbon reserves like oil and coal. The higher classification of Isoptera is slightly revised based on the phylogenetic results. The following new taxa are proposed: **Cratomastotermitidae**, new family; **Euisoptera**, new clade; **Archotermopsidae**, new family; and **Neoisoptera**, new clade. In addition, the families Stolotermitidae, Stylotermitidae, and Archeorhinotermitidae are newly recognized or resurrected, and the families Termopsidae and Hodotermitidae are significantly restricted in composition.

INTRODUCTION

“Success” of a species or group of species is typically either ecological or evolutionary. Insects, in particular, are evolutionarily very successful because of their early origins in the

Devonian and subsequent radiation into millions of species. It is only certain insects, however, that account for the remarkable overall ecological dominance of insects in terrestrial ecosystems, in terms of biomass and impact on biological communities, and

¹ Division of Invertebrate Zoology (Entomology), American Museum of Natural History; Division of Entomology (Paleoentomology), Natural History Museum, and Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, 1501 Crestline Drive – Suite 140, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66049-2811 (msengel@ku.edu).

² Division of Invertebrate Zoology (Entomology), American Museum of Natural History (grimaldi@amnh.org).

³ Division of Invertebrate Zoology (Entomology), American Museum of Natural History (krishn@amnh.org).

chief among them are the social insects. This report is a phylogenetic synthesis of many recent discoveries of fossil termites, which is then used to consider the origins of termite ecological success.

Advanced sociality, or eusociality, involves overlapping generations of siblings that generally share a durable domicile in which groups of individuals specialize in tasks (i.e., castes), especially reproduction, foraging, and commonly defense and brood care (Wilson, 1971). A colony's efficiency in mobilizing its foragers and soldiers fosters the superior competitive ability of major eusocial groups like ants, vespid wasps, honeybees, and termites. For example, there are approximately 19,340 modern species of bees (Apoidea: Anthophila), but it is the large, complex colonies of honey bees (genus *Apis*) that easily outcompete the native social species, even leading to the latter's localized extirpation (e.g., Roubik et al., 1986; Sugden et al., 1996). Unlike bees, all of the 12,516 living species of ants and 2,958 living species of termites are eusocial (termite species numbers valid as of 11 March 2009: Krishna et al., in press). Basal lineages of both these groups generally live in small colonies of several dozen to several hundred individuals with less caste differentiation, and the most recently derived lineages (like army ants, leaf cutter ants, and mound-building termites) form massive colonies of over one million individuals with extreme caste differentiation. Termites in tropical and subtropical ecosystems are the major consumers of the most abundant biomolecule on land, cellulose, and its more inert form, lignocellulose. It is estimated, for example, that termites ingest 50%–100% of the dead plant biomass in tropical ecosystems (Bignell and Eggleton, 2000). Their abundance, like that of ants, frequently exceeds 1,000 individuals/m² or 2,000 mg/m², and it is estimated that gas excretion from termites and their nests contributes 2%–5% of the world's atmospheric methane (Sugimoto et al., 2000). The ecological impact of termites, even apart from the commercial damage they cause, is prodigious.

There has been intensive study of the relationships and fossil record of bees (Engel, 2001, 2004; Danforth et al., 2006; Michener, 2007; Ohl and Engel, 2007) and ants (Grimaldi

et al., 1997; Grimaldi and Agosti, 2001; Dlussky and Rasnitsyn, 2002; Engel and Grimaldi, 2005; Moreau et al., 2006; Brady et al., 2006). Both of these groups appear to have originated in the late Early Cretaceous, ca. 100–120 Ma, with some modern subfamilies diverging in the Late Cretaceous. Though their evolutionary history has been studied less, it is now acknowledged that termites are highly modified, eusocial roaches (Cleveland et al., 1934; McKittrick, 1964; Lo et al., 2000; Deitz et al., 2003; Grimaldi and Engel, 2005; Klass and Meier, 2006), whose earliest fossils predate those of ants and bees by approximately 35 million years (Thorne et al., 2000; Engel et al., 2007a). Recent phylogenetic work on termites involves molecular and some morphologically based analyses of living species only (e.g., Kambhampati et al., 1996; Donovan et al., 2000; Thompson et al., 2000; Bitsch and Noirot, 2002; Klass and Meier, 2006; Inward et al., 2007a, 2007b; Legendre et al., 2008). Unique for any insect order, all early fossil termites have been classified into living families, particularly the Hodotermitidae, despite the fact that such fossils may be stem groups since they lack many derived features of living families.

Here we present the first analysis of relationships among fossil and living termite lineages, along with estimates of divergence times and ecological patterns of the major lineages. Recent studies have reported 18 new termites from the Cretaceous (Krishna and Grimaldi, 2000, 2003; Engel et al., 2007a; Grimaldi et al., 2008) and 38 species from the Tertiary (Nel and Bourguet, 2006; Wappler and Engel, 2006; Engel and Krishna, 2007a, 2007b; Engel et al., 2007b; Engel, 2008; Krishna and Grimaldi, 2009), comprising about one-quarter of all described fossil species. Nearly 80% of these species are preserved in amber, from the Early Cretaceous of Lebanon, the mid-Cretaceous of Myanmar and New Jersey, the Eocene of the Baltic Region and France, and the Miocene of Mexico and the Dominican Republic (deposits are reviewed in Rasnitsyn and Quicke, 2002; Grimaldi and Engel, 2005). The microscopic fidelity of preservation in amber allows uniquely detailed comparisons with living species, greatly facilitating phylo-

genetic analysis of extinct taxa. Insects in 110 Ma limestone from the Crato Formation of Brazil also have exceptional preservation, as mineralized replicas with cuticular microstructure and even some internal organs. As a result, Crato species preserved as series of specimens can be largely reconstructed (Grimaldi et al., 2008). Thus, now is an opportune time for deciphering nearly 140 million years of termite evolution.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Termite specimens belonging to 38 exemplar living species of 36 genera, representing all seven traditionally recognized families and four subfamilies of the “higher” termites (family Termitidae), were dissected and directly examined; 38 extinct species in 25 genera were studied and compared to living taxa. The fossils ranged in age from Early Cretaceous (Berriasian, ca. 135 Ma, of Baissa, Siberia) to the Miocene (in amber from the Dominican Republic, ca. 17 Ma) (table 2). Species preserved as compressions or mineralized replicas were also included where bodies were preserved, not just isolated wings (we have omitted from the analysis taxa known only or largely from wings, such as *Ulmeriella* Meunier).

There were 108 morphological and biological attributes scored from imago, soldier, and worker castes where available (table 1 and appendix); outgroup taxa were other Dictyoptera, specifically the most basal mantis (*Chaeteessa* sp. Burmeister), the roaches *Periplaneta* Burmeister and *Panchlora* Burmeister, and the relict wood roaches (*Cryptocercus* spp. Scudder), the latter being the living sister group to termites. Within the matrix of 8,748 cells, 21% of the cells were coded as unknown (feature not observed in the fossils), and a further 9% as inapplicable (e.g., soldier characters in genera that lack this caste). Phylogenetic analysis employed NONA (Goloboff, 1997), using 500 replicates of the data set with random taxon addition and branch swapping on all shortest topologies. This yielded 2,088 equally most-parsimonious trees of 302 steps (C.I. 44, R.I. 86), the strict consensus of which resulted in 323 steps (unambiguous character changes mapped in figs. 1, 2, 4, 5). The relative abundance of

termites through time was plotted as proportions (%) of the number of termite specimens to all insect specimens per fossil deposit (table 2); only deposits that yielded at least one termite specimen were plotted, in order to ensure the appropriate taphonomic conditions for termite preservation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

PHYLOGENY

Analysis of the paleontological data resulted in a remarkably resolved topology for Isoptera (fig. 3). Structure of the consensus tree generally agrees with that from prior morphological and molecular studies (Kambhampati et al., 1996; Donovan et al., 2000; Thompson et al., 2000; Bitsch and Noirot, 2002; Inward et al., 2007a, 2007b), but depart in some respects from the recent molecular study of Legendre et al. (2008) (e.g., the relatively basal placement of Kalotermitidae). Legendre et al. (2008) had a dramatically reduced taxon sampling relative to other, more comprehensive treatments (e.g., Inward et al., 2007a).

In our analysis unequivocal relationships include *Cryptocercus* as the living sister group to the termites and *Mastotermes* Froggatt as the living sister group to all other termites—the lineage we are designating here as **Euisoptera**. *Mastotermes darwiniensis* Froggatt, from northern Australia and southern New Guinea, is the sole survivor of the formerly global Mastotermitidae (Thorne et al., 2000; Wappler and Engel, 2006), and it retains striking plesiomorphic features with roaches, such as laying its eggs in a vestigial pod or ootheca. Interestingly, the Mastotermitidae as it has historically been classified was recovered as monophyletic, despite opinion to the contrary (e.g., Jarzembowski, 1981). *Cratomastotermes* Bechly, from the Early Cretaceous Crato Formation of Brazil, was formerly placed in the Mastotermitidae (Bechly, 2007); in our analysis it is the most basal species of termite since it retains even more plesiomorphic features than Mastotermitidae (Grimaldi et al., 2008). This genus is accordingly placed in a new, extinct family, **Cratomastotermitidae**, new family (see Classification). Cretaceous fossils traditionally classified as Hodo-




Fig. 1. Strict consensus cladogram with unambiguous character-state changes mapped. Character numbers appear above the branch, with the corresponding state beneath the branch. Branch “A” continued in figs. 2, 4, and 5. *Chaeteessa* (Mantodea), *Panchlora* (Blattaria), *Periplaneta* (Blattaria), and *Cryptocercus* (Blattaria) are the outgroup taxa.

TABLE 1
Character and Character-State Descriptions

The following list enumerates those characters and character states used in the analysis of relationships within Isoptera (refer to appendix 1 for codings). All characters were considered nonadditive and of equal weights

1. Number of alate/imago antennomeres: 50 or more antennomeres = 0; 30–40 antennomeres = 1; 23–28 antennomeres = 2; 11–22 antennomeres = 3.
2. Structure of imago flagellum: flagellomeres filiform = 0; flagellomeres moniliform = 1.
3. Apex of imago flagellum: distal 7–8 articles tapered = 0; distal 7–8 articles not tapered = 1.
4. Ocelli of alates: three present (homologous with other orders) = 0; absent = 1.
5. Ocelli of soldiers: present = 0; absent or vestigial = 1.
6. Pigmentation of soldier compound eyes: present = 0; absent = 1.
7. Soldier compound eyes: rudimentary = 0; absent = 1.
8. Frontal gland developed into distinct fontanelle: absent = 0; present = 1.
9. Position of alate head: hypo-/orthognathous = 0; prognathous = 1.
10. Ventral cervical sclerite of alate: present = 0; absent = 1.
11. Marginal teeth of left mandible of alate: greater than or equal to three = 0; two teeth = 1.
12. Subsidiary tooth of right mandible of alate: absent = 0; present = 1.
13. Lacinial teeth of maxilla: both teeth apical = 0; one tooth subapical = 1.
14. Postclypeal furrow (workers and alates): absent = 0; present as shallow longitudinal furrow = 1.
15. Clypeus (workers only) in profile: not keeled = 0; with keel = 1.
16. Shape of occipital foramen in imagos: rounded = 0; trapezoidal = 1.
17. Y-shaped coronal ecdysial cleavage line in imago: present = 0; absent or highly vestigial = 1.
18. Pair of ocelluslike structures (= ocelloids) near inner margin of compound eye: present as circular tympanalike areas = 0; vestigial as areas of weakened or pale cuticle = 1; absent = 2; present and nearly lenslike (superficially resembling ocelli and historically termed ocelli by isopterists) = 3.
19. Occipital sulcus: present = 0; absent or highly vestigial = 1.
20. Compound eye: lenticular = 0; circular = 1.
21. Notch between first and third marginal teeth: present = 0; absent = 1.
22. Mandibular excavation between apical and first marginal teeth: absent = 0; present = 1.
23. Soldier mandible: marginal teeth: distributed along length, with 1–4 teeth along middle of margin = 0; lost except small teeth/serrations at base = 1.
24. Soldier mandible: short to moderate in length, length ca 2 or less \times basal width = 0; greatly elongate and narrow, length ca. 3 or more \times basal width = 1; vestigial = 2.
25. Soldier mandibles: symmetrical, not clicking = 0; asymmetrical, clicking = 1.
26. Soldier head capsule: rectangular in dorsal aspect = 0; phragmotic, plug shaped = 1; nasutiform = 2.
27. Diagonal grooves between fontanelle and postclypeus: absent = 0; present = 1.
28. Pronotal posterolateral corners of imago: broadly arched = 0; acutely rounded, nearly orthogonal = 1.
29. Pronotal posterior margin of imago: straight or slightly indented = 0; rounded = 1.
30. Pronotal lateral margins of imago: subparallel = 0; converging = 1.
31. Pronotal size of imago: covering head dorsally = 0; not covering head but with width greater than or equal to head = 1; width significantly less than head width = 2.
32. Pronotal anterior margin of imago: concave = 0; relatively straight = 1; convex, with anterolateral corners developed = 2.
33. Tibial macrosetae and spurs: heavily serrate = 0; slightly pimplate = 1; smooth = 2.
34. Tibial macrosetae and spurs: asymmetrical, with one side flattened = 0; symmetrical = 1.
35. Tarsomeres: pentamerous, fully developed = 0; pentamerous, second tarsal article reduced = 1; tetramerous (second tarsal article lost) = 2; trimerous = 3.
36. Metabasitarsomere length: less than twice the width = 0; more than 3 \times the width = 1.
37. Pretarsal arolium: present = 0; absent = 1.
38. Plantular pads: present = 0; absent = 1.
39. Procoxal ventral keel of alate: present = 0; absent = 1.
40. Protibial spines along length: present and extensive = 0; absent, reduced to apical spines/spurs = 1.
41. First Rs fork: in basal half = 0; near midlength or beyond = 1.
42. Length of R1: short, extending in quarter of wing length = 0; median, extending in third of wing length = 1; long, extending to or past wing midlength = 2.
43. Forewing Rs: branched basally in scale with 2–3 branches = 0; simple in scale = 1.
44. Forewing CuA: shorter, to around wing midlength = 0; long, to point within apical third of wing = 1; elongate and extensively developed, extending to apex or subapex, posteriorly along one-half wing, with 6 or more branches = 2.

TABLE 1
(Continued)

-
-
45. Multiple branches of R1: present = 0; absent = 1.
 46. Forewing tegmenization: developed as tegmina = 0; not developed as complete tegmina = 1.
 47. Wings: present = 0; absent = 1.
 48. Forewing vein M: present = 0; absent = 1.
 49. Forewing scale relative to hind wing scale: apical margin of forewing scale meeting or overlapping hind scale = 0; scales well separated = 1.
 50. Wing membrane setae: absent = 0; present, microsetulose = 1.
 51. Fore- and hind wings: not dehiscent = 0; dehiscent = 1.
 52. Forewing basal cleavage suture: absent = 0; present = 1.
 53. Hind wing basal cleavage suture: absent = 0; present but rudimentary = 1; completely developed = 2.
 54. Cross veins connecting longitudinal veins: present = 0; absent = 1.
 55. Sclerotization of veins: all uniformly sclerotized = 0; Sc, R, and M thick and sclerotized relative to CuA = 1; Sc and R sclerotized relative to M and CuA = 2.
 56. Anal lobe of hind wing: present = 0; absent (wing homonomous) = 1.
 57. Hind wing vein A1: present = 0; absent = 1.
 58. Wing membrane reticulations: present, not pigmented = 0; present, pigmented = 1; absent = 2.
 59. Wing membrane surface: smooth = 0; nodulose or pimplate = 1.
 60. Radial fracture of forewing scale: present = 0; absent = 1.
 61. Reticulations between CuA and CuP on forewing scale: veins = 0; reticulations = 1; reticulations only anterior to CuP = 2; absent = 3.
 62. Distal margin of forewing scale: evenly convex = 0; straight to slightly convex = 1; straight and diagonal = 2.
 63. CuP in forewing scale: convex = 0; straight or concave = 1.
 64. Humeral margin of forewing scale: flat = 0; swollen beyond level of costal margin = 1.
 65. Forewing CuP: terminates prior to posterior tip of basal suture = 0; terminates in basal suture = 1.
 66. Position of forewing vein M: close to Rs = 0; midway between Rs and CuA or closer to latter = 1.
 67. Costalization of forewing: not costalized = 0; C+Sc+R and Rs extremely close and simple and parallel = 1.
 68. Branches of Rs: with dorsal and ventral branches, inferiors irregular (acute go tip) = 0; with dorsal and ventral branches, inferiors angled & parallel = 1; with short dorsal branches only or simple = 2.
 69. Branches of vein M: with two or more branches = 0; with one apical branch = 1; simple (unbranched) = 2.
 70. Radial field: encompassing apex or terminating at apex = 0; terminating anterior to apex = 1.
 71. Development of CuP: extensive, developed as claval furrow = 0; reduced, confined to short, simple vein near wing base = 1.
 72. Dichotomous branching of R and M: extensive = 0; reduced = 1.
 73. Number of superior branches of Rs: none = 0; one = 1; two = 2; three = 3; four = 4; five = 5; six = 6; seven or more = 7.
 74. Female styli: present = 0; absent = 1.
 75. Imago cercus segmentation: four or higher = 0; three = 1; one or two = 2.
 76. Castes: absent = 0; present, with workers = 1; present, without workers = 2.
 77. Ootheca: present = 0; absent = 1.
 78. Presence of *Blattabacterium* in fat body: present = 0; absent = 1.
 79. Presence of flagellates and ciliates: present = 0; absent = 1.
 80. Wood feeding: absent = 0; present = 1.
 81. Social organization: absent = 0; extended parental care = 1; eusocial = 2.
 82. Living in structures/nests: absent = 0; present = 1.
 83. Soldiers: present = 0; lost = 1.
 84. Soldier nasus: short = 0; very long, length several times width = 1.
 85. Nasute fontanelle: rimmed or slitlike = 0; minute, not rimmed or slitlike = 1.
 86. First proctodeal segment: expanded = 0; tubular, not dilated = 1.
 87. Soldier labral apex: sclerotized = 0; hyaline = 1.
 88. Soldier heads: normal = 0; flattened = 1.
 89. Soldier labrum: well developed = 0; vestigial = 1.
 90. Soldier pronotum: flat = 0; saddle shaped = 1.
 91. Malpighian tubule number: eight or more = 0; four or fewer = 1.
 92. Imago/worker fontanelle: small and round = 0; slit-, drop-, or Y-shaped = 1.
 93. Anterior margin of worker/alate postclypeus: flat or concave = 0; convex = 1.
 94. Imago compound eye: protruding well beyond lateral margin of head = 0; small, not protruding beyond lateral margin of head in frontal view = 1.
-

TABLE 1
(Continued)

95.	Imago ocelloid: large, ca. 7–8x diameter of compound eye facet = 0; small, ca. 2–3x diameter of compound eye facet = 1.
96.	Soldier fontanelle: normal, dorsal-facing = 0; enlarged and facing anteriad = 1.
97.	Nasute head capsule: not constricted = 0; slightly constricted = 1.
98.	Proventricular teeth: present = 0; highly reduced or lost = 1.
99.	Protibial apical spur number: three or more = 0; two = 1.
100.	Mesotibial apical spurs: four or five = 0; three = 1; two = 2.
101.	Metatibial apical spurs: four = 0; three = 1; two = 2.
102.	Sternal gland on third sternum: present = 0; absent = 1.
103.	Sternal gland on fourth sternum: present = 0; absent = 1.
104.	Sternal gland on fifth sternum: present = 0; absent = 1.
105.	Soldier labral brush: absent = 0; present = 1.
106.	Setulae surrounding fontanelle (directed toward fontanelle): absent = 0; present = 1.
107.	Hind wing vein M: present = 0; absent = 1.
108.	Soldier frontal groove: absent = 0; present (ridges anterior from fontanelle with width of fontanelle) = 1.

termitidae, such as the extinct “genus”
Meiatermes Lacasa-Ruiz and Martínez-Delclòs, actually comprise a grade of stem-group species that fall basal to the divergence of Termopsidae, true Hodotermitidae, and

all other termites. Termopsidae stat. n. (see Classification) should be restricted to the Baltic amber species of *Termopsis* Heer (Engel et al., 2007b). What we are designating as the true Hodotermitidae (see Classification)

TABLE 2
Termite Abundance (% of all insect specimens) in Major Insect Deposits throughout the Cretaceous and Cenozoic

Deposit	Age	% termites	References
CRETACEOUS			
Baissa, Siberia	137 Ma	0.1%	Rasnitsyn, 2008
Montsec, Llerida, Spain	129 Ma	0.2%	Lacasa-Ruiz and Martínez-Delclòs, 1986
Weald clay, UK	127 Ma	0.1%	Jarzembowski, 1977, 1984, 1991
Lebanese amber	120 Ma	0.2%	Azar, 2000
Crato Formation, Brazil	110 Ma	1.0%	Bechly, 2007; Grimaldi, unpubl. data
Burmese amber	100 Ma	0.2%	Grimaldi, unpubl. data
French amber (Archingeay)	100 Ma	0.03%	Perrichot et al., 2007
New Jersey amber	90 Ma	0.4%	Grimaldi et al., 2000
CENOZOIC			
Baltic amber	45 Ma	0.2%	Sontag, 2003
Baltic amber	45 Ma	0.2%	Perkovsky et al., 2007
Baltic amber	45 Ma	0.3%	Krzemińska et al., 1992
Eckfeld Maar, Germany	45 Ma	0.5%	Wappler, 2003
Küclín, Czech Rep.	40 Ma	6%	Prokop, 2003
Bembridge Marls, UK	34 Ma	2.5%	Jarzembowski, 1980
Seifhennersdorf, Germany	30 Ma	6%	Prokop, 2003
Krottensee, Bohemia	18 Ma	5%	Prokop, 2003
Dominican amber	18 Ma	5.6%	Grimaldi, unpubl. data
Dominican amber	18 Ma	2.8%	Poinar and Poinar, 1999
Andance, France	15 Ma	10%	Prokop, 2003
Oeningen, Germany	15 Ma	2%	Prokop, 2003
Radoboj, Croatia	15 Ma	2%	Prokop, 2003
Zanzibar copal	1000 y.	8%	Grimaldi, unpubl. data
Colombian copal	300 y.	10%	Grimaldi, unpubl. data




Fig. 2. Continuation of figure 1 focusing on Hodotermitidae s.s., “Termopsidae” s.s., Archotermopsidae, n. fam., Stolotermitidae, stat. n., and various stem-group lineages. Branch “B” (Kalotermitidae + Neoisoptera) is depicted in fig. 4.

is a group of three genera of the “harvesters”—*Anacanthotermes* Jacobson, *Hodotermes* Hagen, *Microhodotermes* Sjöstedt—that feed on grasses in savanna and steppe biomes of Africa and Eurasia; monophyly of this group is confirmed by other analyses (Inward et al., 2007a, 2007b; Legendre et al., 2008). Three genera of highly disjunct wood feeders that are traditionally placed in the Termopsidae s.l.—*Archotermopsis* Desneux, *Zootermopsis* Emerson, and *Hodotermopsis* Holmgren—were not found to be monophyletic, contrary to other studies. Inclusion or exclusion of the fossils made no difference to the definition of “Termopsidae s.l.” except that *Archotermopsis* was sometimes found to be monophyletic. As such, the traditional concept of Termopsidae s.l. could not be supported and these genera are accordingly classified in the new family **Archotermopsidae**, new family (see Classification).

The austral disjuncts, *Stolotermes* Hagen and *Porotermes* Hagen, are sometimes placed within Termopsidae s.l. (e.g., Donovan et al., 2000; Thorne et al., 2000; Legendre et al., 2008) but should clearly be the separate family Stolotermitidae, stat. n. (= Stolotermitinae + Porotermitinae; see Classification), since they are the living sister group to Kalotermitidae plus higher termites in this study and in some molecular analyses (Inward et al., 2007a, 2007b). The divergence between Stolotermitidae and Kalotermitidae + higher termites was certainly in the Early Cretaceous, since there are three intermediate genera from the Early and mid-Cretaceous. The family Kalotermitidae, or dry-wood termites, is a cosmopolitan group of 457 living species, which has two known Cretaceous and three Tertiary stem-group taxa (only two of the latter were included in our study), with living species comprising a monophyletic group of probably Tertiary origin. Interestingly, a kalotermitid-like nest exists from the Late Cretaceous Javelina Formation of Texas (Rohr et al., 1986). Kalotermitidae is the sister group to an unequivocally monophyletic group we are calling the **Neoisoptera**, which is defined in part by the distinctive opening of the frontal gland called the fontanelle. The Neoisoptera is comprised of the Rhinotermitidae (13 living genera, 380 living species,

all of which are wood feeders), the monotypic family Serritermitidae from Brazil, and the largest family, Termitidae. It also includes *Archeorhinotermes rossi* Krishna and Grimaldi in 100 Ma Burmese amber, the most derived termite from the Cretaceous, formerly placed in the Rhinotermitidae (Krishna and Grimaldi, 2003), but actually an extinct stem group to the rest of the Neoisoptera and here considered as the sole member of Archeorhinotermitidae, stat. n. (see Classification). *Parastylotermes* Snyder and Emerson and *Stylotermes* Holmgren and Holmgren (neither genus studied in prior analyses [Donovan et al., 2000; Inward et al., 2007a, 2007b; Legendre et al., 2008]) should be separated from Rhinotermitidae s. str., the latter doubtfully monophyletic (Donovan et al., 2000; Inward et al., 2007a, 2007b; Legendre et al., 2008) but clearly closely related to the Termitidae. These genera have been at times considered a separate family, as Stylotermitidae, stat. rev. (see Classification), and this status should be reinstated. The earliest rhinotermitids are *Reticulitermes antiquus* (Germar) and *Heterotermes eocenicus* Engel in Baltic amber (Engel et al., 2007b; Engel, 2008); the divergence of both families probably occurred in the Early Tertiary.

CLASSIFICATION

Several taxonomic changes are required in order to have the classification of termite families reflect our cladistic results. The revised, higher-level classification of Isoptera is outlined in table 3 (modified from Engel and Krishna, 2004a, 2004b, 2007c). The classification is that which is employed for (and will be further elaborated in) the forthcoming world catalog of Isoptera (Krishna et al., in press).

CRATOMASTOTERMITIDAE, new family

TYPE GENUS: *Cratomastotermes* Bechly.

DIAGNOSIS: Diagnosed by primitive retention of distinct cross veins, archedictyon between veins, arched humeral margin of forewing scale, large rectangular pronotum, pentamerous tarsi, and absence of ocelloids and fontanelle (refer also to Grimaldi et al., 2008).

TABLE 3
Synonymical Hierarchical Classification of Isoptera
(modified and updated from Engel and Krishna, 2004a, 2004b, 2007c)

Order ISOPTERA Brullé

Family †Cratomastotermitidae Engel, Grimaldi, and Krishna, **new family**

Family Mastotermitidae Desneux

= †*Pliotermitinae* Pongrácz

= †*Miotermitinae* Pongrácz

EUIISOPTERA Engel, Grimaldi, and Krishna, **new clade**

Family Incertae Sedis

(a grade of primitive termites whose relationships are not yet resolved)

= †*Cretatermitinae* Emerson

= †*Lutetitermitinae* Schlüter

= †*Carinatermitinae* Krishna and Grimaldi

= †*Caatingatermitinae* Martins-Neto et al.

Family †Termopsidae Holmgren, sensu stricto

Family Hodotermitidae Desneux, sensu stricto

Family Archotermopsidae Engel, Grimaldi, and Krishna, **new family**

Family Stolotermitidae Holmgren, status novus

Subfamily Stolotermitinae Holmgren

Subfamily Porotermitinae Emerson

Family Kalotermitidae Froggatt

= *Glyptotermitinae* Froggatt

= †*Electrotermitinae* Emerson

NEOISOPTERA Engel, Grimaldi, and Krishna, **new clade**

Family †Archeorhinotermitidae Krishna and Grimaldi, status novus

Family Stylotermitidae Holmgren and Holmgren, status revivisco

Family Rhinotermitidae Froggatt

Subfamily Coptotermitinae Holmgren

= *Arrhinotermitinae* Sjöstedt

Subfamily Heterotermitinae Froggatt

= *Leucotermitinae* Holmgren

Subfamily Prorhinotermitinae Quennedey and Deligne

Subfamily Psammotermitinae Holmgren

Subfamily Termitogetoninae Holmgren

Subfamily Rhinotermitinae Froggatt

Family Serritermitidae Holmgren

= *Glossotermitinae* Cancelli and DeSouza, **new synonymy**

Family Termitidae Latreille

Subfamily Sphaerotermitinae Engel and Krishna

Subfamily Macrotermitinae Kemner

= *Acanthotermitinae* Sjöstedt

= *Odontotermitini* Weidner

Subfamily Foraminitermitinae Holmgren

= *Pseudomicrotermitinae* Holmgren, **new synonymy**

Subfamily Syntermitinae Engel and Krishna

Subfamily Nasutitermitinae Hare

Subfamily Apicotermitinae Grassé and Noirot

= *Indotermitidae* Roonwal and Sen Sarma

Subfamily Cubitermitinae Weidner, status revivisco et novus

Subfamily Termitinae Latreille

= *Microcerotermitinae* Holmgren

= *Amitermitinae* Kemner

= *Mirocapritermitinae* Kemner

= *Mirotermitini* Weidner

= *Capritermitini* Weidner

Incertain Sedes †Eutermitinae Holmgren

INCLUDED GENERA: The family presently comprises a single genus, *Cratomastotermes*.

Family TERMOPSIDAE Holmgren, sensu novum

Termopsinae Holmgren, 1911: 35. Type genus: *Termopsis* Heer, 1849.

COMMENTS: Since the time of Hagen (1858), the fossil *Termopsis breinii* Heer (1849) has been intricately linked to a group of otherwise plesiomorphic modern species. Over the intervening 150 years a few additional genera and several living species have been added to the group that became known as the Termopsinae and eventually Termopsidae (e.g., Emerson, 1933). Unfortunately, no singular, specialized (i.e., apomorphic) feature has truly united these taxa and the monophyly of the group has been suspect. Our analysis reveals that those fossils of the Tertiary genus *Termopsis* are, in fact, not related to the modern members otherwise classified in the family (namely *Archotermopsis*, *Zootermopsis*, and *Hodotermopsis*, below classified into a new family). In addition, those other fossil and living genera also traditionally classified in the family (e.g., *Stolotermes* and *Porotermes* of the Stolotermitinae and Porotermitinae, respectively) were similarly found to be unrelated to *Termopsis*, as well as unrelated to the aforementioned genera of Termopsinae. Accordingly, Termopsidae is here significantly restricted and considered to comprise only the genus *Termopsis*.

ARCHOTERMOPSIDAE, new family

TYPE GENUS: *Archotermopsis* Desneux.

DIAGNOSIS: The new family can be characterized by the following combination of attributes: absence of ocelloids and fontanelle, antennae with 22–27 articles, pronotum distinctly narrower than head, tarsi pentamerous (sometimes cryptically), fourth sternite with sole sternal gland, forewing scale overlapping hind-wing scale, humeral margin of scale flat, imago-worker mandibles with three marginal teeth (left side) and subsidiary tooth between apical and first marginal teeth (right side).

INCLUDED GENERA: *Archotermopsis*, *Zootermopsis*, *Hodotermopsis*, and tentatively †*Parotermes* Scudder. The Late Miocene genus

†*Gyatermes* Engel and Gross (2009) may belong herein but must await more completely preserved material.

Family HODOTERMITIDAE Desneux, sensu novum

Hodotermitini Desneux, 1904: 284. Type genus: *Hodotermes* Hagen, 1853.

COMMENTS: Numerous genera of plesiomorphic fossil termites have been historically assigned to Hodotermitidae, leaving the impression that this group was once diverse in the past but has experienced significant extinction and that the modern taxa are relicts of this former diversity. In fact, our study demonstrates that none of the fossils assigned to Hodotermitidae can be considered actual hodotermitids. Instead, this assemblage represents a grade between several families and lineages of Isoptera. Hodotermitidae was recovered as a monophyletic group but strictly for the modern genera. We have accordingly restricted the sense of Hodotermitidae to those genera (listed below) and consider the remaining groups such as Cretotermitinae, Carinatermitinae, Lutetiatерmitinae, and Caaingatermitinae (the latter two ill defined on teratologies and misinterpreted characters, respectively), among numerous other genera (e.g., *Meiatermes*; *Melqartitermes* Engel, Grimaldi, and Krishna; *Mylacrotermes* Engel, Grimaldi, and Krishna; *Mariconitermes* Fontes and Vulcano; *Cratokalotermes* Bechly) as incertae sedis among basal Euisoptera (fig. 3).

INCLUDED GENERA: *Hodotermes*, *Anacanthotermes*, and *Microhodotermes*.

Family STOLOTERMITIDAE Holmgren, status novus

Stolotermitinae Holmgren, 1910: 285. Type genus: *Stolotermes* Hagen, 1858.

COMMENTS: The Stolotermitidae is here recognized to encompass the former subfamilies Stolotermitinae and Porotermitinae of Termopsidae s.l. For the moment the two subfamilies are retained despite each being monogeneric.

INCLUDED GENERA: *Stolotermes* (in Stolotermitinae) and *Porotermes* (in Porotermitinae).

Family ARCHEORHINOTERMITIDAE
Krishna and Grimaldi, status novus

Archeorhinotermitinae Krishna and Grimaldi, 2003: 2.
Type genus: *Archeorhinotermes* Krishna and Grimaldi, 2003.

COMMENTS: Although previously classified as a primitive lineage in the Rhinotermitidae, affinities with this group are entirely plesiomorphic. As our analysis reveals, *Archeorhinotermes* is actually a stem group, basal to all Euisoptera. Accordingly we have removed the genus from Rhinotermitidae and elevated Archeorhinotermitinae to familial rank.

INCLUDED GENERA: The family includes only *Archeorhinotermes* at present.

Family STYLOTERMITIDAE Holmgren and
Holmgren, status revivisco

Stylotermitinae Holmgren and Holmgren, 1917: 141. Type genus: *Stylotermes* Holmgren and Holmgren, 1917.

COMMENTS: *Stylotermes* and the Tertiary genus *Parastylotermes* have historically been classified in the Rhinotermitidae. These genera are particularly distinctive in their possession of trimerous tarsi, a feature otherwise known only in *Indotermes* of the Termitidae. The significance of this tarsal reduction was used by some authors in the past to accord Stylotermitinae familial rank, in the same fashion that *Indotermes* was placed in a monogeneric family of its own (e.g., Roonwal, 1958). Herein we resurrect the familial status of the former. Although the trimerous condition of the tarsi is truly a distinctive synapomorphy for the group, the classificatory alteration is based on the fact that Stylotermitinae comprises a grade, along with Archeorhinotermitinae leading to Rhinotermitidae + Serritermitidae + Termitidae (fig. 3). As such, its inclusion within Rhinotermitidae renders the assemblage demonstrably paraphyletic.

INCLUDED GENERA: *Stylotermes* and *Parastylotermes*.

ECOLOGY AND EVOLUTION

The circumtropical family Termitidae, or “higher termites,” comprises approximately 70% of all termite species and appears to be

one of the most recent radiations of all insect groups that are ecologically significant. Monophyly of the Termitidae is well established; the family includes such familiar groups as the Macrotermitinae and Nasutitermitinae, some of which build huge mounds in grassland and scrub biomes; other nasute taxa build large arboreal nests of cartonlike, fecal material in tropical forests. The diets of Termitidae are extremely diverse, primitively being sound and rotting wood but also including humus, leaf litter, soil, grass, herbivore dung, and even the mycelia of a symbiotic fungus, *Termitomyces* R. Heim, that they cultivate in the nest like attine ants (e.g., Sands, 1969). The huge colonies and diverse diets of the Termitidae account for the overwhelming biomass of termites in tropical and subtropical environments. The earliest apparent termitid is an incomplete compression of an imago from the Oligocene of Brazil, ca. 30 Ma (Martins-Neto and Pesenti, 2006; a putative termitid from the Bembridge Marls [Jarzembowski, 1980] is probably a rhinotermitid). The first diverse paleofaunas of Termitidae—more than 30 species—are in Miocene amber from the Dominican Republic (Krishna and Grimaldi, 2009) and Mexico, which are very similar to modern Neotropical faunas. This dramatic appearance is probably due to the fact that these ambers are the only major fossil insect deposits from the Neogene that were formed in the tropics. Were Termitidae abundant during the Eocene they should have been preserved in Baltic amber (Lutetian: ca. 45 Ma), since this deposit has yielded thus far most other living termite families (Engel et al., 2007b; Engel, 2008), as well as species belonging to a diversity of other tropical insect groups (Grimaldi and Engel, 2005). We estimate that Termitidae diverged from Rhinotermitidae sometime in the Early Paleogene (perhaps Late Paleocene or Early Eocene) and subsequently began its diversification in the latest Eocene (Priabonian-Bartonian: ca. 40 Ma) to Early Oligocene, continuing to radiate throughout the remainder of the Neogene and Quaternary.

Though Jurassic remains of Isoptera have not been found, Isoptera appear to have diverged from cryptocercid roaches in the

Late Jurassic. This would make termites the oldest group of eusocial animals, predating the origins of ants by some 35 million years. Major geological and biotic events in the Cretaceous probably had little effect on termites, since basal divergences appear to have preceded the drift of Gondwanan continents and the angiosperm radiations. Unfortunately, the stratigraphic sampling is too poor in the Late Cretaceous and Paleocene to determine any effects of the end-Cretaceous extinctions. The Tertiary thermal maximum of the late Paleocene and Eocene, however, probably had a profound effect on termites, specifically on the global spread of *Mastotermes* and the radiations of living Kalotermitidae and Neoisoptera. The rapid spread of C4 grasslands in the Miocene (Jacobs et al., 1999) doubtless promoted a minor diversification of the harvesters and the explosive diversification of many Termitidae, such as the Macrotermitinae. A macrotermite nest, in fact, is known from the Miocene of Chad (Düringer et al., 2006).


Throughout the Cretaceous and early Tertiary, including the mid-Eocene, termites represented less than 1% of all insect specimens in all fossil deposits (fig. 3). Their abundance rises in the late Eocene to approximately 2%, and then spikes from 5%–10% during the Miocene as both amber and compression fossils, to the present day (in copals, or subfossil resins) (table 2, fig. 3). This spike in abundance is due to the diversification of the Termitidae. The abundance of ants rises dramatically in the Eocene (Grimaldi and Agosti, 2001; Dlussky and Rasnitsyn, 2002), and ants are generally much more abundant in Tertiary insect deposits than are termites, probably because termites feed within the wood where they nest or they travel through tunnels from nest to food sources, so foragers are rarely exposed and imagoes are exposed only during brief nuptial flights. Interestingly, many termitids will forage in the open and these are concomitantly the most abundant termites in Dominican amber and copal.

Our analysis indicates the importance of including fossils in cladistic analyses rather than mapping their putative ages onto molecular-based trees for purposes of dating. The

identity of stem groups is obscured in the latter method, resulting in overestimates for divergence times. In our analyses this overestimation is highlighted by the traditional taxonomic placement of *Termopsis* and most Cretaceous fossils as Termopsidae s.l. and Hodotermitidae, respectively (fig. 3). These taxa in fact represent either a grade to more nested termite lineages or stem groups to some modern families (fig. 3). Using such fossils to calibrate the basal nodes for Hodotermitidae or Termopsidae would result in significant overestimates of the ages of these groups. A failure to distinguish stem groups in an analysis probably explains prior overestimates of the age of other insect lineages (e.g., Moreau et al., 2006; Hunt et al., 2007).

Patterns in termite diversification are very similar to those of the ants (Grimaldi and Agosti, 2001): throughout the Cretaceous both groups were rare and consisted of basal lineages. The diversity and abundance of termites and ants spiked in the Tertiary when speciose groups that form large colonies with highly specialized castes (for ants, the subfamilies Dolichoderinae, Formicinae, and Myrmecinae) eclipsed the smaller colonies of more basal taxa—the concept of “dynastic succession” (Wilson and Hölldobler, 2005). For ants, approximately 70 million years passed from origin to ecological dominance; in termites, this period was 100 million years. Thus, eusociality per se does not result in ecological success, but living in very large colonies with extreme division of labor does. Why, then, did it take so long for large colonies to evolve? We suggest that social evolution is like any other highly adaptive feature, such as the evolution of flight in feathered theropods, and thus may take tens of millions of years to refine.

Similarly, the symbiosis of termites with intestinal protozoa or bacteria which aid their break down of lignocellulose does not alone explain their ecological success as basal termite lineages exhibit the same mutualistic relationship. While their critical role as carbon recyclers is made possible by this symbiosis, this association existed for tens of millions of years before their rise in abundance and diversity (fig. 3).






Fig. 3. Strict consensus cladogram of all termite species studied superimposed on geological time scale, with graph of termite abundance.





Fig. 4. Continuation of figs. 1–2 focusing on Kalotermitidae. Branch “C” (Neoisoptera) in fig. 5.

One question remains: how was wood decomposed in Mesozoic forests with few or no termites? Patterns of coal and oil deposition suggest that lignocellulose did not rapidly decompose prior to termites and the actions of fungi or other organisms at the time must have been either slow or negligible. Coal is formed from ombrotrophic, or waterlogged, peat (Scott, 1987). While there are some tropical peatlands, such as the coastal “moor” forests of western Borneo and southern Sumatra,

these are dwarfed in area compared to the boreal peatlands of sphagnum and heaths that comprise some 3% of earth’s land surface. Tropical ecosystems produce more biomass, but much greater plant detritus accumulates in boreal forests and peatlands, which is traditionally explained by lower boreal evapotranspiration and because seasonality limits decomposition (Scott, 1987). Indeed, boreal peatlands lay hundreds of miles north of the most northern termites in the genus *Reticulitermes*



Holmgren (Rhinotermitidae). Maximum termite diversity is equatorial, and half of that diversity falls between 18° N and 30° S latitudes; by 48° N and S it is 1%–4% that of the diversity at the Equator (Eggleton, 2000). Tropical ecosystems where termites are most abundant and diverse have notoriously thin humus layers (Richards, 1996). This may explain why coals that were formed prior to the appearance of termites in the Paleozoic and Early Mesozoic, and in largely the same regions and habitats, decomposed less (i.e., contained significantly more vitrain) than Tertiary and modern peats (Shearer et al., 1995; Raymond et al., 2000), as well as the formation of some vast reservoirs of petroleum, like those in the Early Cretaceous Nubian sandstones of present-day Africa and the Middle East. While some Miocene coal formations are astonishingly thick (Shearer et al., 1995), these were formed in palaeoclimates that today would have very few or no termites.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to V. Krishna, K.K. Magill, I.A. Hinojosa-Díaz, M. Knight, and S. Thurston for assistance during the various stages of this work, and to R. Scheffrahn and an anonymous reviewer for their constructive comments on the manuscript. Support was provided by NSF grants DEB-0542909 (to M.S. Engel), DEB-0542726 (to D.A. Grimaldi), DEB-9870097 (to K. Krishna and D.A. Grimaldi), and a Guggenheim Fellowship from the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation (to M.S. Engel). This is a contribution of the Division of Entomology, University of Kansas Natural History Museum.

REFERENCES

- Azar, D. 2000. Les ambres mésozoïques du Liban. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Paris, Orsay, 202 pp.
- Bechly, G. 2007. Isoptera: termites. In D.M. Martill, G. Bechly and R.F. Loveridge (editors), *The Crato fossil beds of Brazil: window into an ancient world*: 249–262. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, xvi+625 pp.
- Bignell, D.E., and P. Eggleton. 2000. Termites in ecosystems. In T. Abe, D.E. Bignell and M. Higashi (editors), *Termites: evolution, sociality, symbioses, ecology*: 363–387. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, xxii+466 pp.
- Bitsch, C., and C. Noirot. 2002. Gut characters and phylogeny of the higher termites (Isoptera: Termitidae): a cladistic analysis. *Annales de la Société Entomologique de France* 38(3): 201–210.
- Brady, S.G., T.R. Schultz, B.L. Fisher, and P.S. Ward. 2006. Evaluating alternative hypotheses for the early evolution and diversification of ants. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 103(48): 18172–18177.
- Cleveland, L.R., S.K. Hall, E.P. Sanders, and J. Collier. 1934. The wood-feeding roach *Cryptocercus*, its protozoa, and the symbiosis between protozoa and roach. *Memoirs of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 17: 185–342.
- Danforth, B.N., S. Sipes, J. Fang, and S.G. Brady. 2006. The history of early bee diversification based on five genes plus morphology. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 103(41): 15118–15123.
- Deitz, L.L., C. Nalepa, and K.-D. Klass. 2003. Phylogeny of the Dictyoptera re-examined (Insecta). *Entomologische Abhandlungen* 61(1): 69–91.
- Desneux, J. 1904. A propos de la phylogénie des Termitides. *Annales de la Société Entomologique de Belgique* 48(8): 278–286.
- Blusky, G.M., and A.P. Rasnitsyn. 2002. Ants (Hymenoptera, Formicidae) of Formation Green River and some other middle Eocene deposits of North America. *Russian Entomological Journal* 11(4): 411–436.
- Donovan, S.E., D.T. Jones, W.A. Sands, and P. Eggleton. 2000. Morphological phylogenetics of termites (Isoptera). *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* 70(3): 467–513.
- Duringer, P., M. Schuster, J.F. Genise, A. Likius, H.T. Mackaye, P. Vignaud, and M. Brunet. 2006. The first fossil fungus gardens of Isoptera: oldest evidence of symbiotic termite fungiculture (Miocene, Chad basin). *Naturwissenschaften* 93(12): 610–615.
- Eggleton, P. 2000. Global patterns of termite diversity. In T. Abe, D.E. Bignell and M. Higashi (editors), *Termites: evolution, sociality, symbioses, ecology*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 25–51, xxii+466.
- Emerson, A.E. 1933. A revision of the genera of fossil and Recent Termopsinae (Isoptera). University of California Publications in Entomology 6(6): 165–196.

- Engel, M.S. 2001. A monograph of the Baltic amber bees and evolution of the Apoidea (Hymenoptera). *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History* 259: 1–192.
- Engel, M.S. 2004. Geological history of the bees (Hymenoptera: Apoidea). *Revista de Tecnologia e Ambiente* 10(2): 9–33.
- Engel, M.S. 2008. Two new termites in Baltic amber (Isoptera). *Journal of the Kansas Entomological Society* 81(3): 194–203.
- Engel, M.S., and D.A. Grimaldi. 2005. Primitive new ants in Cretaceous amber from Myanmar, New Jersey, and Canada (Hymenoptera: Formicidae). *American Museum Novitates* 3485: 1–23.
- Engel, M.S., D.A. Grimaldi, and K. Krishna. 2007a. Primitive termites from the Early Cretaceous of Asia (Isoptera). *Stuttgarter Beiträge zur Naturkunde Serie B (Geologie und Paläontologie)* 371: 1–32.
- Engel, M.S., D.A. Grimaldi, and K. Krishna. 2007b. A synopsis of Baltic amber termites (Isoptera). *Stuttgarter Beiträge zur Naturkunde Serie B (Geologie und Paläontologie)* 372: 1–20.
- Engel, M.S., and M. Gross. 2009. A giant termite from the Late Miocene of Styria, Austria (Isoptera). *Naturwissenschaften* 96(2): 289–295.
- Engel, M.S., and K. Krishna. 2004a. Family-group names for termites (Isoptera). *American Museum Novitates* 3432: 1–9.
- Engel, M.S., and K. Krishna. 2004b. An overlooked family-group name for termites (Isoptera). *Entomological News* 115(3): 168.
- Engel, M.S., and K. Krishna. 2007a. Drywood termites in Dominican amber (Isoptera: Kalotermitidae). *Beiträge zur Entomologie* 57(2): 263–275.
- Engel, M.S., and K. Krishna. 2007b. New *Dolichorhinotermes* from Ecuador and in Mexican amber (Isoptera: Rhinotermitidae). *American Museum Novitates* 3592: 1–8.
- Engel, M.S., and K. Krishna. 2007c. Two overlooked family-group names for fossil termites (Isoptera: Mastotermitidae). *Entomological News* 118(1): 105–106.
- Goloboff, P.A. 1997. NoName (NONA), version 2.0. Program and documentation. Tucumán: Fundación y Instituto Miguel Lillo.
- Grimaldi, D., and D. Agosti. 2001. A formicine in New Jersey Cretaceous amber (Hymenoptera: Formicidae) and early evolution of the ants. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 97(25): 13678–13683.
- Grimaldi, D., D. Agosti, and J.M. Carpenter. 1997. New and rediscovered primitive ants (Hymenoptera: Formicidae) in Cretaceous amber from New Jersey, and their phylogenetic relationships. *American Museum Novitates* 3208: 1–43.
- Grimaldi, D., and M.S. Engel. 2005. *Evolution of the insects*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, xv+755 pp.
- Grimaldi, D.A., M.S. Engel, and K. Krishna. 2008. The species of Isoptera (Insecta) from the Early Cretaceous Crato Formation: a revision. *American Museum Novitates* 3626: 1–30.
- Grimaldi, D., A. Shedrinsky, and T.P. Wampler. 2000. A remarkable deposit of fossiliferous amber from the Upper Cretaceous (Turonian) of New Jersey. In D. Grimaldi (editor), *Studies on fossils in amber, with particular reference to the Cretaceous of New Jersey*. Leiden: Backhuys, 1–76, viii+498.
- Hagen, H.A. 1853. Hr. Peters Berichtete über die von ihm gesammelten und von Hrn. Dr. Hermann Hagen bearbeiten Neuropteren aus Mosambique. Bericht über die zur Bekanntmachung geeigneten. *Verhandlungen der Königlichen Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* zu Berlin 18: 479–484.
- Hagen, H.A. 1858. Monographie der Termiten. *Linnaea Entomologica* 12: 1–342.
- Heer, O. 1849. Die Insektenfauna der Tertiärgebilde von Oeningen und von Radoboj in Croatien. Zweiter Theil: Heuschrecken, Florfliegen, Aderflügler, Schmetterlinge und Fliegen. Leipzig: Engelmann, iv+264 pp.
- Holmgren, K., and N. Holmgren. 1917. Report on a collection of termites from India. *Memoirs of the Department of Agriculture of India* 5: 137–171.
- Holmgren, N. 1910. Das System der Termiten. *Zoologischer Anzeiger* 35(9–10): 284–286.
- Holmgren, N. 1911. Termitenstudien: 2. Systematik der Termiten. Die Familien Mastotermitidae, Protermitidae und Mesotermitidae. *Kungliga Svenska Vetenskapsakademiens Handlingar* 46(6): 1–86.
- Hunt, T., J. Bergsten, Z. Levkanicova, A. Papadopoulou, and O.S.t. John, et al. (2007). A comprehensive phylogeny of beetles reveals the evolutionary origins of a superradiation. *Science* 318(5858): 1913–1916.
- Inward, D.J.G., G. Beccaloni, and P. Eggleton. 2007a. Death of an order: a comprehensive molecular phylogenetic study confirms that termites are eusocial cockroaches. *Biology Letters* 3(3): 331–335, [Lo et al. (2007) provide a concise rebuttal to the synonymy of Isoptera proposed by these authors]
- Inward, D.J.G., A.P. Vogler, and P. Eggleton. 2007b. A comprehensive phylogenetic analysis of termites (Isoptera) illuminates key aspects of

- their evolutionary biology. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 44(3): 953–967.
- Jacobs, B.F., J.D. Kingston, and L.L. Jacobs. 1999. The origin of grass-dominated ecosystems. *Annals of the Missouri Botanical Garden* 86: 590–643.
- Jarzembowski, E.A. 1977. Insect fossils from the wealden of the Weald. *Proceedings of the Geologist's Association* 87: 443–447.
- Jarzembowski, E.A. 1980. Fossil insects from the Bembridge Marls, Palaeogene of the Isle of Wight, southern England. *Bulletin of the British Museum (Natural History) Geology* 33(4): 237–293.
- Jarzembowski, E.A. 1981. An early Cretaceous termite from southern England (Isoptera: Hodotermitidae). *Systematic Entomology* 6(1): 91–96.
- Jarzembowski, E.A. 1984. Early Cretaceous insects from southern England. *Modern Geology* 9(1): 71–93.
- Jarzembowski, E.A. 1991. The weald clay of the Weald: report of 1988/89 field meetings. *Proceedings of the Geologist's Association* 102(2): 83–92.
- Kambhampati, S., K.M. Kjer, and B.L. Thorne. 1996. Phylogenetic relationships among termite families based on DNA sequence of mitochondrial 16S ribosomal RNA gene. *Insect Molecular Biology* 5(4): 229–238.
- Klass, K.-D., and R. Meier. 2006. A phylogenetic analysis of Dictyoptera (Insecta) based on morphological characters. *Entomologische Abhandlungen* 63(1–2): 3–50.
- Krishna, K., M.S. Engel, and D.A. Grimaldi. In press. *Termites of the world (Isoptera)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Krishna, K., and D. Grimaldi. 2000. A new subfamily, genus, and species of termite (Isoptera) from New Jersey Cretaceous amber. *In* D. Grimaldi (editor), *Studies on fossils in Amber, with particular reference to the Cretaceous of New Jersey*: 133–140. Leiden: Backhuys, viii+498 pp.
- Krishna, K., and D. Grimaldi. 2003. The first Cretaceous Rhinotermitidae (Isoptera): a new species, genus, and subfamily in Burmese amber. *American Museum Novitates* 3390: 1–10.
- Krishna, K., and D. Grimaldi. 2009. Diverse Rhinotermitidae and Termitidae (Insecta: Isoptera) in Dominican amber. *American Museum Novitates* 3640: 1–48.
- Krzemińska, E., W. Krzemiński, J.-P. Haenni, and C. Dufour. 1992. Les fantômes de l'ambre: insectes fossiles dans l'ambre de la Baltique. *Neuchâtel: Musée d'Histoire Naturelle de Neuchâtel*, 142 pp.
- Lacasa-Ruiz, A., and X. Martínez-Delclòs. 1986. *Meiatermes*: nuevo género fósil de insecto isóptero (Hodotermitidae) de las calizas Necomienses del Montsec (Provincia de Lérida, España). *Lleida: Institut d'Estudis Ilerdencs*, 65 pp.
- Legendre, F., M.F. Whiting, C. Bordereau, E.M. Cancellor, T.A. Evans, and P. Grandcolas. 2008. The phylogeny of termites (Dictyoptera: Isoptera) based on mitochondrial and nuclear markers: implications for the evolution of the worker and pseudergate castes, and foraging behaviors. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 48(2): 615–627.
- Lo, N., M.S. Engel, S. Cameron, C.A. Nalepa, and G. Tokuda, et al. (2007). Save Isoptera: a comment on Inward et al. *Biology Letters* 3(5): 562–563.
- Lo, N., G. Tokuda, H. Watanabe, H. Rose, and M. Slaytor, et al. (2000). Evidence from multiple gene sequences indicates that termites evolved from wood-feeding cockroaches. *Current Biology* 10(13): 801–804.
- Martins-Neto, R.G., and M. Pesenti. 2006. The first fossil Termitidae (Isoptera) from the Oligocene of South America: the Entre-Córregos Formation of the Aiuruoca Basin, Minas Gerais, Brazil. *Journal of the Entomological Research Society* 8(3): 63–68.
- McKittrick, F.A. 1964. *Evolutionary studies of cockroaches*. Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station Memoir 389: 1–197.
- Michener, C.D. 2007. *The bees of the world*. [2nd ed.]. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, xvi+[i]+953 pp.
- Moreau, C.S., C.D. Bell, R. Vila, S.B. Archibald, and N.E. Pierce. 2006. Phylogeny of the ants: diversification in the age of angiosperms. *Science* 312(5770): 101–104.
- Nel, A., and E. Bourguet. 2006. Termite [sic] of the Early Eocene amber of France (Isoptera: Mastotermitidae, Kalotermitidae). *Neues Jahrbuch für Geologie und Paläontologie Monatshefte* 2006(2): 101–115.
- Ohl, M., and M.S. Engel. 2007. Die Fossilgeschichte der Bienen und ihrer nächsten Verwandten (Hymenoptera: Apoidea). *Denisia* 20: 687–700.
- Perkovsky, E.E., A.P. Rasnitsyn, A.P. Vlaskin, and M.V. Taraschuk. 2007. A comparative analysis of the Baltic and Rovno amber arthropod faunas: representative samples. *African Invertebrates* 48(1): 229–245.
- Perrichot, V., D. Néraudeau, A. Nel, and G. de Ploëg. 2007. A reassessment of the Cretaceous amber deposits from France and their palaeontological significance. *African Invertebrates* 48(1): 213–227.

- Poinar, G., and R. Poinar. 1999. The amber forest: a reconstruction of a vanished world. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, xviii+239 pp.
- Prokop, J. 2003. Remarks on the palaeoenvironmental changes based on reviewed Tertiary insect associations from the Krušné hory piedmont basins and the České středohoří Mts in northwestern Bohemia (Czech Republic). *Acta Zoologica Cracoviensia Supplement* 46: 329–344.
- Rasnitsyn, A.P. 2008. Palaeontological Institute, Russian Academy of Sciences, Baissa Collections (<http://www.palaeoentomolog.ru/Collections/baissa.html>). [accessed 28 August 2008]
- Rasnitsyn, A.P., and D.L.J. Quicke (editors). 2002. History of insects. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, xii+517 pp.
- Raymond, A., P. Cutlip, and M. Sweet. 2000. Rates and processes of terrestrial nutrient cycling in the Paleozoic: the world before beetles, termites and flies. In W. Allmon and D.J. Bottjer (editors), *Evolutionary paleoecology: the ecological context of macroevolutionary change*. New York: Columbia University Press, 235–283, xi+357.
- Richards, P.W. 1996. The tropical rain forest: an ecological study. [2nd ed.]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, xxiii+575 pp.
- Rohr, D.M., A.J. Boucot, J. Miller, and M. Abbott. 1986. Oldest termite nest from the Upper Cretaceous of west Texas. *Geology* 14(1): 87–88.
- Roonwal, M.L. 1958. Recent work on termite research in India (1947–57). *Transactions of the Bose Research Institute* 22: 77–100.
- Roubik, D.W., J.E. Moreno, C. Vergara, and D. Wittmann. 1986. Sporadic food competition with the African honey bee: projected impact on neotropical social bees. *Journal of Tropical Ecology* 2: 97–111.
- Sands, W.A. 1969. The association of termites and fungi. In K. Krishna and F.M. Weesner (editors), *Biology of termites* [Vol. 1]: 495–524. New York: Academic Press, xiii+598 pp.
- Scott, A.C. 1987. Coal and coal-bearing strata: recent advances. Oxford: Blackwell Science Publishing, vii+332 pp.
- Shearer, J.C., T.A. Moore, and T.D. Demchuk. 1995. Delineation of the distinctive nature of Tertiary coal beds. *International Journal of Coal Geology* 28(2–4): 71–98.
- Sontag, E. 2003. Animal inclusions in a sample of unselected Baltic amber. *Acta Zoologica Cracoviensia Supplement* 46: 431–440.
- Sugden, E.A., R.W. Thorp, and S.L. Buchmann. 1996. Honey bee-native bee competition in Australia: focal point for environmental change and apicultural response. *Bee World* 77: 26–44.
- Sugimoto, A., D.E. Bignell, and J.A. MacDonald. 2000. Global impact of termites on the carbon cycle and atmospheric trace gases. In T. Abe, D.E. Bignell and M. Higashi (editors), *Termites: evolution, sociality, symbioses, ecology*: 409–435. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, xxii+466 pp.
- Thompson, G.J., O. Kitade, N. Lo, and R.H. Crozier. 2000. Phylogenetic evidence for a single, ancestral origin of a ‘true’ worker caste in termites. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* 13(6): 869–881.
- Thorne, B.L., D. Grimaldi, and K. Krishna. 2000. Early fossil history of the termites. In T. Abe, D.E. Bignell and M. Higashi (editors), *Termites: evolution, sociality, symbioses, ecology*: 77–93. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, xxii+466 pp.
- Wappler, T. 2003. Systematik, Phylogenie, Taphonomie und Paläoökologie der Insekten aus dem Mittel-Eozän des Eckfelder Maars, Vulkaneifel. *Clausthaler Geowissenschaften* 2: 1–241.
- Wappler, T., and M.S. Engel. 2006. A new record of *Mastotermes* from the Eocene of Germany (Isoptera: Mastotermitidae). *Journal of Paleontology* 80(2): 380–385.
- Wilson, E.O. 1971. The insect societies. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, x+584 pp.
- Wilson, E.O., and B. Hölldobler. 2005. Eusociality: origin and consequences. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 102(38): 13367–13371.

APPENDIX
(Continued)

Taxon	Character																																			
	1								2								3								4											
	123456789	0123456789	0123456789	0123456789	0123456789	0123456789	0123456789	0123456789	0123456789	0123456789	0123456789	0123456789	0123456789	0123456789	0123456789	0123456789	0123456789	0123456789	0123456789	0123456789	0123456789	0123456789	0123456789	0123456789	0123456789	0123456789	0123456789	0123456789	0123456789	0123456789	0123456789	0123456789	0123456789	0123456789		
<i>Meiatermes</i> sp.	??????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????
<i>Proelectrotermes swinhoei</i>	3111????01	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????
<i>Proelectrotermes holmgreni</i>	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????	???????????
<i>Archeorhinotermes rossi</i>	?1?1???11	?01?0???13?	100????000	?21212011-	1--12																															
<i>Mylacrotermes cordatus</i>	?111????01	0???????120	1???????-01	110010011?	1??1?																															
<i>Dharmatermes avernalis</i>	?1?1????01	?0?0????2?	100????-00	01101?0?1?	10010																															
<i>Tanytermes anawrahtai</i>	3111????01	?0?0???12?	101????-10	021012001?	10111																															
<i>Carinatermes nascimbenei</i>	?111????01	??????????20	1???????-10	0100000010	10210																															
<i>Garmitermes succineus</i>	2101????00	?????????030	1???????-00	1100000000	1??0?																															
<i>Termopsis breinii</i>	2111????01	?????????121	1???????-10	0110100011	10010																															
<i>Termopsis ukapirmasi</i>	2111????01	1???????121	1???????-10	0110100011	10010																															
<i>Archotermopsis tornquisti</i>	3111????01	?????????021	0???????-00	122--10011	10110																															
<i>Proelectrotermes berendtii</i>	3111????01	?????????03?	1???????-00	0101120011	11211																															
<i>Electrotermes affinis</i>	3111????01	1???????031	1???????-00	010--20011	10012																															
<i>Reticulitermes antiquus</i>	3111????11	1???1??131	1???????000	121--20111	1--12																															
<i>Parastylotermes robustus</i>	3111????11	1???1??131	1???????000	021--30111	1--12																															
<i>Mastotermes electromexicus</i>	2111????01	1???????130	1???????-00	010--00010	10100																															
<i>Mastotermes electrodominicanus</i>	21111??01	1???00?030	1???????-00	010--00010	10100																															
<i>Mastotermes minutus</i>	3101????01	?????????03?	1???????-00	010??00010	10100																															
<i>Stylotermes fletcheri</i>	311111011	10101-1131	100--00000	0212130111	1--12																															
<i>Constrictotermes</i>																																				
<i>electroconstrictus</i>	311???????	???????????	1?????02???	???????????	1?????																															
<i>Nasutitermes electronasutus</i>	311???????	???????????	1?????02???	???????????	1?????																															
<i>Dolichorhinotermes apopnus</i>	3111????11	1???????1?	1???????100	1212120111	1--12																															
<i>Cryptotermes yamini</i>	3111??101	1???????131	1???????-00	0102120011	11212																															
<i>Cryptotermes glaesarius</i>	3111??101	1???????131	1???????-00	0102120011	11212																															
<i>Glyptotermes paleolibertatus</i>	3111??101	1???????131	1???????-00	0102120011	11012																															
<i>Coptotermes priscus</i>	31111-111	1?????11?131	1001???-00	1212120011	1--12																															
<i>Anoplotermes</i> sp. fossil	3111????11	11?????131	1???????000	1212120111	1--12																															
<i>Anoplotermes</i> sp. living	3111--111	1100101131	11?---000	1212120111	1--12																															
<i>Microcerotermes</i> sp. fossil	3111????11	110?????131	11?????000	1212120111	1--12																															

Taxon	Character																																											
	4				5				6				7				8																											
	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9									
<i>Hodotermopsis sjostedti</i>	-	1	0	0	-	0	1	1	-	1	2	1	0	1	0	1	3	0	-	0	-	1	0	-	0	0	1	1	-	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	2	1	0	-	-	0	0	0
<i>Zootermopsis angusticollis</i>	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	-	0	0	1	1	7	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	2	1	0	-	-	0	0	0
<i>Porotermes adamsoni</i>	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	1	1	5	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	2	1	0	-	-	0	0	0	
<i>Porotermes planiceps</i>	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	1	1	7	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	2	1	0	-	-	0	0	0		
<i>Stolotermes brunneicornis</i>	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	1	1	5	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	2	1	0	-	-	0	0	0	
<i>Kalotermes flavicollis</i>	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	3	0	1	1	1	0	0	2	0	1	1	5	1	2	2	1	1	0	1	2	1	0	-	-	0	0	0		
<i>Cryptotermes brevis</i>	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	3	0	1	1	1	0	0	2	2	1	1	1	3	1	2	2	1	1	0	1	2	1	0	-	-	0	0	0	
<i>Cryptotermes cavifrons</i>	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	3	0	1	1	1	0	0	2	2	1	1	1	3	1	2	2	1	1	0	1	2	1	0	-	-	0	0	0	
<i>Neotermes castaneus</i>	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	3	0	1	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	1	1	4	1	2	2	1	1	0	1	2	1	0	-	-	0	0	0	
<i>Incisitermes schwarzi</i>	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	3	0	1	1	1	0	0	2	2	1	1	1	3	1	2	2	1	1	0	1	2	1	0	-	-	0	0	0	
<i>Pterotermes occidentis</i>	1	1	0	0	-	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	3	0	1	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	5	1	2	2	1	1	0	1	2	1	0	-	-	0	0	0	
<i>Glyptotermes tuberculatus</i>	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	0	1	2	1	0	-	-	0	0	0	
<i>Serritermes serrifer</i>	1	1	0	-	-	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	1	3	1	1	-	0	1	1	2	-	1	1	1	0	1	2	1	1	1	0	1	2	1	0	-	-	?00		
<i>Coptotermes curvignathus</i>	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	0	1	2	1	1	1	0	1	2								

APPENDIX
(Continued)

Taxon	Character																													
	4				5				6				7				8													
	56789	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
<i>Reticulitermes antiquus</i>	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	--	???	
<i>Parastylotermes robustus</i>	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	1	1	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	--	???	
<i>Mastotermes electromexicus</i>	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	--	???		
<i>Mastotermes electrodominicanus</i>	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	--	?00		
<i>Mastotermes minutus</i>	0	1	0	0	?	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	--	???		
<i>Stylotermes fletcheri</i>	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	-	1	1	0	1	2	1	1	1	0	1	2	1
<i>Constrictotermes</i>																														
<i>electroconstrictus</i>	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
<i>Nasutitermes electronasutus</i>	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
<i>Dolichorhinotermes apopnus</i>	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	-	1	1	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	--	???		
<i>Cryptotermes yamini</i>	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	3	0	1	1	0	0	2	-	1	1	6	?	?	?	?	?	?
<i>Cryptotermes glaesarius</i>	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	3	0	1	1	0	0	2	-	1	1	6	?	?	?	?	?	?
<i>Glyptotermes paleoliberatus</i>	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	3	0	1	1	0	0	2	-	1	1	1	?	?	?	?	?	?
<i>Coptotermes priscus</i>	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	-	1	1	0	1	2	1	?	?	?	?	?	?
<i>Anoplotermes</i> sp. fossil	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	1	3	2	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	1	1	0	?	?	?	?
<i>Anoplotermes</i> sp. living	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	1	3	2	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1
<i>Microcerotermes</i> sp. fossil	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	1	3	2	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
<i>Microcerotermes</i> sp. living	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	1	3	2	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
<i>Nasutitermes</i> sp. fossil	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	1	3	2	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
<i>Constrictotermes</i> sp.	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	1	3	2	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
<i>Subulitermes</i> sp. fossil	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
<i>Subulitermes</i> sp.	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	1	3	2	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

Taxon	Character																											
	1																											
	0																											
	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8							
<i>Chaeteessa</i> sp.	-	-	0	-	0	0	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-							
<i>Periplaneta</i> sp.	-	-	0	-	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-							
<i>Panchlora</i> sp.	-	-	0	-	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-							
<i>Cryptocercus</i> sp.1	-	-	0	-	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-							
<i>Cryptocercus</i> sp.2	-	-	0	-	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-							
<i>Mastotermes darwiniensis</i>	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0								
<i>Anacanthotermes viarum</i>	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	-								
<i>Microhodotermes viator</i>	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	-								
<i>Hodotermes mossambicus</i>	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	-								
<i>Archotermopsis wroughtoni</i>	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	1	0	-	-								
<i>Hodotermopsis sjostedti</i>	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	-								
<i>Zootermopsis angusticollis</i>	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	-								
<i>Porotermes adamsoni</i>	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	-	-								
<i>Porotermes planiceps</i>	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	-	-								
<i>Stolotermes brunneicornis</i>	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	1	0	1	0	-								
<i>Kalotermes flavicollis</i>	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	-	-	-								
<i>Cryptotermes brevis</i>	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	-	-	-								
<i>Cryptotermes cavifrons</i>	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	-	-	-								
<i>Neotermes castaneus</i>	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	-	-	-								
<i>Incisitermes schwarzi</i>	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	-	-	-								
<i>Pterotermes occidentis</i>	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	-	-	-								
<i>Glyptotermes tuberculatus</i>	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	-	-	-								
<i>Serritermes serrifer</i>	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	-	0	1	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0								

APPENDIX
(Continued)

Taxon	Character																	
	1																	0
	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Coptotermes curvignathus</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	-	0	0	2	2	1	1	0	0
<i>Heterotermes platycephalus</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	-	0	0	2	2	1	1	0	0
<i>Prorhinotermes flavus</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	2	2	1	1	0	0
<i>Rhinotermes</i> sp.	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	-	0	1	2	2	1	1	0	1	0
<i>Psammotermes allocerus</i>	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	-	0	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	0
<i>Schedorhinotermes</i> sp.	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	-	0	1	2	2	1	1	0	1	0
<i>Reticulitermes flavipes</i>	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	-	0	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	0
<i>Termitogeton umblicautus</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	1	2	2	1	1	0	0	0
<i>Foraminitermes tubifrons</i>	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	-	1	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0
<i>Macrotermes</i> sp.	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0
<i>Syntermes</i> sp.	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	-	1	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0
<i>Procornitermes</i> sp.	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	-	?0	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Nasutitermes</i> sp.	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0
<i>Dicuspiditermes</i> sp.	0	1	1	\$	0	0	0	-	0	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0
<i>Capritermes</i> sp.	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	-	?0	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Baissatermes lapideus</i>	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	-	0	-	0	-
<i>Valditermes brennenae</i>	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	-	?	-	0	-
<i>Melqartitermes myrrheus</i>	?	?	?	0	-	?	?	0	0	0	?	?	0	-	0	-	0	-
<i>Meiatermes bertrani</i>	?	?	0	-	0	-	?	?	0	0	?	?	0	-	0	-	0	-
<i>Meiatermes araripena</i>	?	?	0	-	0	-	?	?	0	0	?	?	0	-	0	-	0	-
<i>Mariconitermes talicei</i>	?	?	0	-	0	-	?	?	0	0	?	?	0	-	?	-	0	-
<i>Cratomastotermes wolfschwendneri</i>	?	?	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	0	-	?	-	0	-
<i>Cratokalotermes santanensis</i>	?	?	0	-	0	-	?	?	0	0	?	?	0	-	?	-	0	-
<i>Meiatermes</i> sp.	?	?	0	-	0	-	?	?	0	0	?	?	0	-	?	-	0	-
<i>Proelectrotermes swinhoei</i>	?	?	0	-	0	-	?	?	0	0	?	?	0	-	?	-	0	-
<i>Proelectrotermes holmgreni</i>	?	?	0	-	0	-	?	?	0	0	?	1	2	2	1	1	0	-
<i>Archeorhinotermes rossi</i>	?	?	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	1	1	0	0
<i>Mylacrotermes cordatus</i>	?	0	-	0	-	0	0	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	-
<i>Dharmatermes avernalis</i>	?	0	-	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
<i>Tanytermes anawrahtai</i>	?	0	-	0	-	0	0	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	-
<i>Carinatermes nascimbenei</i>	?	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	-
<i>Garmitermes succineus</i>	?	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
<i>Termopsis breinii</i>	?	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	1	2	-
<i>Termopsis ukapirmasi</i>	?	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	1	-
<i>Archotermopsis tornquisti</i>	?	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	1	-
<i>Proelectrotermes berendtii</i>	?	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	1	2	-
<i>Electrotermes affinis</i>	?	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	1	2	-
<i>Reticulitermes antiquus</i>	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	0
<i>Parastylotermes robustus</i>	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	2	2	0	0
<i>Mastotermes electromexicus</i>	?	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
<i>Mastotermes electrodominicanus</i>	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
<i>Mastotermes minutus</i>	?	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
<i>Stylotermes fletcheri</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	0
<i>Constrictotermes electroconstrictus</i>	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	0	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	0	0	-
<i>Nasutitermes electronasutus</i>	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	2	0	0	-
<i>Dolichorhinotermes apopnus</i>	?	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	2	2	0	0
<i>Cryptotermes yamini</i>	?	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	-
<i>Cryptotermes glaesarius</i>	?	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	-
<i>Glyptotermes paleoliberatus</i>	?	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	-
<i>Coptotermes priscus</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	2	2	2	2	2	0	1	0

APPENDIX
(Continued)

Taxon	Character																			
	1										0									
	8	9									0									
	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
<i>Anoplotermes</i> sp. fossil	?	?	?	?	1	0	0	1	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
<i>Anoplotermes</i> sp. living	-	-	1	1	0	0	-	-	1	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Microcerotermes</i> sp. fossil	?	?	?	?	1	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
<i>Microcerotermes</i> sp. living	0	1	1	\$	0	0	0	0	-	?	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Nasutitermes</i> sp. fossil	?	?	?	?	1	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
<i>Constrictotermes</i> sp.	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	?	1	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Subulitermes</i> sp. fossil	1	1	?	1	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
<i>Subulitermes</i> sp.	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0

Complete lists of all issues of the *Novitates* and the *Bulletin* are available at World Wide Web site <http://library.amnh.org/pubs>. Inquire about ordering printed copies via e-mail from scipubs@amnh.org or via standard mail from: American Museum of Natural History, Library—Scientific Publications, Central Park West at 79th St., New York, NY 10024. TEL: (212) 769-5545. FAX: (212) 769-5009.

Ⓒ This paper meets the requirements of ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (Permanence of Paper).