This is a largely forgotten but overall good paper - mostly for its comparisons - on segnosaurids
http://gspauldino.com/Segnosaur.pdf

Note that Paul back in 1984 still considered Nanshiungosaurus a sauropod despite its pelvis was strongly diagnostic for segnosaurids (convergent with titanosaurs).

In illustrative comparisons segnosaurids should stand next to Massospondylus in order to show their close relationships especially on Fig 4 with an ankle which cladists consider crucial for a determination of dinosaur origin - that of Segnosaurus is a super-version of Massospondylus, also of note is the fact that an ankle overall especially the astragalus with its "ascending process" is not diagnostic for Theropoda as seen on comparisons of Massospondylus and Liliensternus (here "Halticosaurus") which many - though not me - consider a theropod.

Unfortunately, Paul does not compare the vertebral column which is also diagnostic for Sauropodomorpha in segnosaurids.

In comparisons of pelvic bones, Paul writes about the opisthopubic condition but the London Camarasaurus is almost "mesopubic"
http://www.flickr.com/photos/bellatrix6/3775879432/?q=camarasaurus%20british%20museum

several South American titanosaurs almost opisthopubic, and Camarasaurus also shows that "laterally flared anterior processes of ilia".

But I agree with his final conclusion - segnosaurids are NOT theropods, they are descendants of prosauropods paralleling titanosaurs (IF both groups are monophyletic which is not clear).

Peter Mihalda
Greetings,

as a part of his characteristic impertinence, arrogance and ignorance, Darren Naish also releases untrue informations on whereabouts of Mongolian fossils. Those were OUR expeditions (aka European, namely Polish and Russian) for OUR money, and Mongols ONLY joined them they did not find anything because you know they live in tents (aka yurts) and ride horses (and sometimes (Jenghiz Khan) they attack and smash us).

Correct informations are as follows:

the fighting Velociraptor found by Poles in 1971 ("living legend of raptors" Mark Norell good bye - we have better one)

Erlikosaurus found by Russians in 1972

Segnosaurus found by Russians in 1973

As for segnosaurs, prof Young back in 1946 based on his great sample of saurischian bones wrote that appendicular bones of theropods and prosauropods are difficult to be distinguished in lack of cranial material. This is largely true yet there is one way how to distinguish them - theropods have a separated "lesser trochanter" from a femoral bone. This is present in all ornithomims, Coelurus and Ornitholestes (Carpenter et al, 1995), compsognathids, Gigantoraptor and certainly an ancestor of velociraptors. Absent in all segnosaurs.

Adam Yates, an expert on prosauropods (he is little infamiliar with Chinese forms), says and publishes that the vertebral column of sauropodomorphs (=herbivorous rauisuchids, or "herbivorous herrerasaurs" if you show me one herrerasaur with a closed acetabulum) is possible to distinguish from theropods in 3 ways (unambiguous synapomorphies) - one lamina missing on posterior cervical, one lamina missing on posterior dorsals, dorsal spines long and not tall), later

http://paleodb.org/cgi-bin/bridge.pl?action=displayReference&reference_no=32744

he adds "posterior concavity of neural spine" (Fig 3)

so is a posterior dorsal of Falcarius (Fig 7C)


For a correct identification of segnosaurs as a group one only needs the big book of Huene, 1908, with humeri of plateosaurs containing "large paddle" (aka internal tuberosity, getting to extreme in Neimongosaurus) and "huge lateral hooks" (aka deltopectoral crest) but these are also present in megalosaurs, rauisuchids and
aetosaurs although absent in sauropods, so probably a dinosaur synapomorphy (Taf V, Huene 1908). For a characteristic prosauropod posterior dorsal, see an articulated column on Taf XII.

Despite Zanno et al write something about the pubic apron
http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/276/1672/3505.full.pdf+html
it is unbelievable how inaccurately they reconstruct pubes in anterior view
http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/3/3e/Nothronychus_(1).jpg
or
http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/f/fd/Gigantoraptor.jpg

when even pubes of Deinonychus are distally fused in anterior view (Fig 4)
http://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/page/3189704#page/57/mode/1up

There is another problem: I would like to ask them "are you SURE what you speak about?"
I cite dr Gauthier (here "birds" are "dinosaurs" as opposed to "crocodiles")
" "birds" are said to have erected metatarsals with a digitigrade posture"
So is Batrachotomus!!
http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/7/72/Batrachotomus_kupferzellensis.JPG

And Darren Naish, on another hand, wrote that a segnosaur foot was functionally tetradactyl, and sauropod feet were formed by metatarsals (we have tracks for that).

I-do-not-know-whether-they-are-sane....

best regards
Peter Mihalda
--- On Mon, 1/30/12, Heinrich Mallison <heinrich.mallison@googlemail.com> wrote:

From: Heinrich Mallison <heinrich.mallison@googlemail.com>
Subject: Re: aetosaurs=thyreophorans
To: "Peter Mihalda" <pmihalda@yahoo.ca>
Received: Monday, January 30, 2012, 7:56 AM

in short, you're nuts!

get real and have a nice life.

Dr. Heinrich Mallison
Abteilung Forschung
Museum für Naturkunde - Leibniz-Institut für Evolutions- und Biodiversitätsforschung an der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin
Invalidenstrasse 43
10115 Berlin
Office phone: +49 (0)30 2093 8764
Email: heinrich.mallison@gmail.com

Fere libenter homines id quod volunt credunt.
Gaius Julius Caesar

On Mon, Jan 30, 2012 at 10:46 AM, Peter Mihalda <pmihalda@yahoo.ca> wrote:

OK so now skulls of aetosaurs and ankylosaurs are that "major obstacle" why they cannot be these two lineages closely related?

Because on Fig 9 there is nothing in a postcranial skeleton which would prevent that

http://www.bioone.org/doi/pdf/10.1080/02724631003763524

When speaking about ankylosaurs most people imagine Euoplocephalus or Ankylosaurus, but forget them - those are "derived members of derived lineage (Ankylosauridae)". One must look at nodosaurs, and here "primitive members (of primitive lineage).
I do not need to name shared characters but I show a scientific reconstruction of

- nodosaur
  Fig 14
- aetosaur

They are so similar, especially in palatal view, that I would have a very hard time to say which is which if they were not labelled.

And everybody who claims that one is a "bird-line archosaur" and another "a crocodile-line archosaur" is an enemy of science.

Sure, they may claim that it is just "extreme converge" but then Feduccia may also claim that birds and some really bird-like theropods are also only "extremely convergent", and we are where we have been before.

Good luck

Peter Mihalda

--- On Thu, 1/26/12, Heinrich Mallison <heinrich.mallison@googlemail.com> wrote:

From: Heinrich Mallison <heinrich.mallison@googlemail.com>
Subject: Re: aetosaurs=thyreophorans
To: "Peter Mihalda" <pmihalda@yahoo.ca>
Received: Thursday, January 26, 2012, 10:29 AM

Why should I name characters? You made up a new hypothesis, you need to support it.
Also, you are incapable of counting: if Galton published before 2003 or in 2003, and Moser's paper appeared in 2003, how can Galton have known...
what was in Moser 2003 when he wrote his papers?

Dr. Heinrich Mallison
Abteilung Forschung
Museum für Naturkunde - Leibniz-Institut
für Evolutions- und Biodiversitätsforschung
an der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin
Invalidenstrasse 43
10115 Berlin
Office phone: +49 (0)30 2093 8764
Email: heinrich.mallison@gmail.com

Fere libenter homines id quod volunt credunt.
Gaius Julius Caesar

On Thu, Jan 26, 2012 at 11:14 AM, Peter Mihalda <pmihalda@yahoo.ca> wrote:

Oh, so many cranial characters different...so name them.

Two species of Ceratosaurus have so many different cranial characters, I count them for you 13 (including dental), read diagnosis of C. magnicornis

http://ugspub.nr.utah.gov/publications/misc_pubs/MP-00-2.pdf

that it can also turn one of them to be a "bird" and another a crocodile!

There are not so many characters different between aetosaurs and thyreophorans, especially making one crocodiles and other "birds", and even those who work upon them admit that, only they call it "convergence".

And of course Galton worked on the type of Plateosaurus!

ahem - if you delete all those things that make thyreophorans DIFFERENT from aetosaurs, and if you ignore the skulls, and then ignore some more characters..... well, this way you can turn a bird into a whale.

Get real!

OK, you seem to be not quite capable of using logic and reason. I gave you a chance, this chance is over now: quit wasting my time.

NOTICE: an further emails, of any sort and for any reason, are undesired, and will be posted to my blog.

Dr. Heinrich Mallison
Abteilung Forschung
Museum für Naturkunde - Leibniz-Institut für Evolutions- und Biodiversitätsforschung an der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin
Invalidenstrasse 43
10115 Berlin
Office phone: +49 (0)30 2093 8764
Email: heinrich.mallison@gmail.com

Fere libenter homines id quod volunt credunt.
Gaius Julius Caesar

On Wed, Jan 25, 2012 at 2:39 PM, Peter Mihalda <pmihalda@yahoo.ca> wrote:

http://www.bioone.org/doi/pdf/10.1080/02724631003763524

Deleting all supposed thyreophoran synapomorphies, with iliac blades facing dorsally (Fig 9D), and the astragalus of about the same
size as the calcaneum (Fig 7A) but otherwise totally unimportant for dinosaur evolution. Only 2 synapomorphies remain
- predentary bone
- backturned ischium

I would like to know how they will explain to someone sane that this animal is a "crocodylomorph" while the very very same eg Sauropelta is a "bird-line archosaur", sensu Sterling Nesbitt. Maybe on some bones there is sign "D" (dinosaur) and on others "C" (crocodile). Good fun.

Peter Mihalda

--- On Wed, 1/25/12, Heinrich Mallison <heinrich.mallison@googlemail.com> wrote:

From: Heinrich Mallison <heinrich.mallison@googlemail.com>
Subject: Re: Dinosauria
To: "Peter Mihalda" <pmihalda@yahoo.ca>
Received: Wednesday, January 25, 2012, 6:34 AM

WHAT???

OK, I see what you do: you make up any BS you like, then extrapolate based on it. What is the world is supposed to link Megalosaurus and rauisuchians? Hylaeosaurus and aetosaurs?

Dr. Heinrich Mallison
Abteilung Forschung
Museum für Naturkunde - Leibniz-Institut
für Evolutions- und Biodiversitätsforschung
an der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin
Invalidenstrasse 43
10115 Berlin
Office phone: +49 (0)30 2093 8764
Email: heinrich.mallison@gmail.com

Fere libenter homines id quod volunt credunt.
Gaius Julius Caesar

On Tue, Jan 24, 2012 at 11:44 AM, Peter Mihalda <pmihalda@yahoo.ca> wrote:

No, it is in fact very near to what Owen suggested - Megalosaurus + Iguanodon + Hylaeosaurus.
Megalosaurus is very near to rauisuchids and Hylaeosaurus is from aetosaurs.

Some authors misinform readers because of their ignorance. Pls read the first sentence in 1. Introduction, Ezcurra and Agnolin say that primitive sauropodomorphs are not present in geological rocks past Liassic


They ARE!


Peter Mihalda

--- On Mon, 1/23/12, Heinrich Mallison <heinrich.mallison@googlemail.com> wrote:

From: Heinrich Mallison <heinrich.mallison@googlemail.com>
Subject: Re: Dinosauria
To: "Peter Mihalda" <pmihalda@yahoo.ca>
Received: Monday, January 23, 2012, 6:58 AM

OK, so you make up a definition for Dinosauria that is totally novel and has no connection whatsoever to OWEN's original work?

Dr. Heinrich Mallison
Abteilung Forschung
Museum für Naturkunde - Leibniz-Institut für Evolutions- und Biodiversitätsforschung
an der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin
Invalidenstrasse 43
10115 Berlin
Office phone: +49 (0)30 2093 8764
Fere libenter homines id quod volunt credunt.
Gaius Julius Caesar

On Mon, Jan 23, 2012 at 11:25 AM, Peter Mihalda <pmihalda@yahoo.ca> wrote:

Rauisuchia+Aetosauria