

Title: The macroevolutionary singularity of snakes

Pascal O. Title^{1†}, Sonal Singhal^{2†}, Michael C. Grundler³, Gabriel C. Costa⁴, R. Alexander
Pyron^{5,6}, Timothy J. Colston^{6,7}, Maggie R. Grundler^{8,9}, Ivan Prates³, Natasha Stepanova³, Marc
E.H. Jones^{10,11,12}, Lucas B. Q. Cavalcanti¹³, Guarino R. Colli¹⁴, Nicolas Di-Poi¹⁵, Stephen C.
Donnellan¹⁶, Craig Moritz¹⁷, Daniel O. Mesquita¹³, Eric R. Pianka^{18‡}, Stephen A. Smith¹⁹,
Laurie J. Vitt²⁰, Daniel L. Rabosky^{3*†}

†equal contributions

‡deceased (September 12, 2022)

Affiliations:

¹Department of Ecology & Evolution, Stony Brook University; Stony Brook, New York, USA.

²Department of Biology, California State University – Dominguez Hills; Carson, California, USA.

³Museum of Zoology & Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Michigan; Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA.

⁴Department of Biology and Environmental Sciences, Auburn University at Montgomery; Montgomery, Alabama 36117, USA.

⁵Department of Biological Sciences, The George Washington University; Washington, DC, USA.

⁶Department of Vertebrate Zoology, National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution; Washington, DC, USA.

⁷Biology Department, University of Puerto Rico at Mayagüez; Mayagüez, Puerto Rico.

⁸Department of Environmental Science, Policy, and Management, University of California, Berkeley; Berkeley, California, USA.

⁹Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, University of California, Berkeley; Berkeley, California, USA.

¹⁰Science Group: Fossil Reptiles, Amphibians and Birds Section, Natural History Museum; London, SW7 5BD, United Kingdom.

¹¹Research Department of Cell and Developmental Biology, University College London; WC1E 6BT, United Kingdom.

¹²Biological Sciences, University of Adelaide; Adelaide, South Australia 5005, Australia.

¹³Departamento de Sistemática e Ecologia, Universidade Federal da Paraíba; João Pessoa, Paraíba, Brazil.

¹⁴Departamento de Zoologia, Universidade de Brasília; Brasília, Distrito Federal, Brazil.

¹⁵Institute of Biotechnology, Helsinki Institute of Life Science, University of Helsinki; Helsinki, Finland.

¹⁶South Australian Museum; North Terrace, Adelaide, South Australia 5000, Australia.

¹⁷Research School of Biology, The Australian National University; Canberra, ACT, Australia.

¹⁸Department of Integrative Biology, University of Texas, Austin; Austin, Texas, USA.

¹⁹Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Michigan; Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA.

²⁰Sam Noble Museum & Department of Biology, University of Oklahoma; Norman, Oklahoma, USA.

* Corresponding author: drabosky@umich.edu

Abstract: Snakes and lizards (Squamata) represent a third of terrestrial vertebrates and exhibit spectacular innovations in locomotion, feeding, and sensory processing. However, the evolutionary drivers of this radiation remain poorly known. We infer potential causes and ultimate consequences of squamate macroevolution by combining individual-based natural history observations (>60,000 animals) with a comprehensive time-calibrated phylogeny that we anchored with genomic data (5,400 loci) from 1,018 species. Due to shifts in the dynamics of speciation and phenotypic evolution, snakes have transformed the trophic structure of animal communities through the recurrent origin and diversification of specialized predatory strategies. Squamate biodiversity reflects a legacy of singular events that occurred during the early history of snakes and reveals the impact of historical contingency on vertebrate biodiversity.

One-sentence summary: A burst of innovation in form and function during the evolution of snakes reshaped vertebrate biodiversity

Main text:

From a phylogenetic perspective, snakes are indisputably nested within lizards (1, 2) and are simply one example of a particularly species-rich and cosmopolitan group of “scaled reptiles” (Squamata). Yet – unlike lizards – snakes engage with human emotions in a visceral manner unmatched by almost any other group of organisms and for this reason have played important cultural roles in human societies (3). Most readily known for their lack of limbs and unique prey capture strategies, snakes exhibit an incredible degree of ecomorphological diversity and specialization. The ~4,000 extant snake species include shovel-snouted burrowers that hunt desert scorpions, slender arboreal predators that prey on tree snails, and paddle-tailed marine forms that probe reef crevices for fish eggs and eels. However, more than 25 clades of lizards have independently evolved limblessness (4), and other lineages also evolved dietary specialization, venom, highly mobile skulls, and / or advanced chemoreception (5–7) – all attributes typically associated with snakes. This convergence raises fundamental questions about how and why particular traits have influenced squamate diversification more generally.

Viewed across multiple traits, snakes nonetheless appear distinct from lizards with respect to ecology, morphology, and biogeography (8–10). These observations suggest that evolutionary dynamics in snakes are qualitatively different from those in lizards. If so, the origin of snakes is potentially consistent with a Simpsonian view of macroevolution (11, 12), whereby major biodiversity expansions occur via qualitative phase shifts into new adaptive zones. These phase shifts can be conceptualized as macroevolutionary “singularities”: patterns of rapid change across multiple organismic and ecological axes that, when viewed retrospectively through the prism of geological time, are sufficiently clustered together as to seem virtually instantaneous. The term “singular” also refers to the fact that these transformations typically appear unpredictable from prior character states and phylogenetic position alone; such transitions have been documented within birds (13, 14), mammals (15), and other taxa (16). Here, we characterize the tempo and mode of ecological and morphological innovation across squamate reptiles to address the role of macroevolutionary singularities in generating large-scale patterns of lizard and snake biodiversity. In particular, we test the extent to which phenotypic shifts have predictable consequences for evolutionary diversification across squamates.

Approach

We constructed a genomic backbone phylogeny for 1,018 species of squamates, sequencing an average of 4.4 Mb across 4,945 loci per taxon (fig. S1, fig. S2, Data S1). This phylogeny was then used as a scaffold upon which we added additional species from GenBank, yielding a species-level, dated phylogeny containing 6,885 of the 10,759 squamate taxa (fig. S3, Data S2). We then time-calibrated a phylogenomic tree subsampled to 134 tips that spanned 31 fossil calibrations (fig. S4, S5, Data S1) and used the resulting node dates as secondary calibrations for our full tree (fig. S6).

With this tree, we quantified macroevolutionary dynamics across a range of ecological, morphological, and environmental traits. Traits were collated from a variety of sources and augmented with primary natural history data from our field- and museum-based research programs (17), including a dietary dataset (n = 68,547 records) from preserved stomach contents and field observations that spanned 1,314 species of snakes and lizards. For each species, we then computed a simple statistical index of net innovation, Ψ , defined as the absolute difference

in phenotype between the focal species and the inferred ancestral state for all extant squamates (17). We calculated indices for net trophic innovation (Ψ_{diet}), morphological innovation in skull shape (Ψ_{skull}), presacral vertebral count (Ψ_{vert}), body elongation (Ψ_{elong}) and chemosensory processing (Ψ_{chem}). For the same traits, we also computed an index of absolute, branch-specific change along individual branches (fig. S7).

To estimate evolutionary rates, we developed a novel tip rate metric for univariate and multivariate phenotypic data that is similar to the widely used DR statistic for speciation rate (18); we refer to this metric as the “TR” statistic (17). We then used a variance-partitioning analysis to identify nodes that best account for species-level phenotypic variation (canonical phylogenetic ordination; CPO; (19)). We also characterized heterogeneity in phenotypic macroevolution using multiprocess evolutionary models that allowed for shifts in both (trait) state and evolutionary rates, where “state shifts” are defined as large jumps in phenotype on individual branches (17).

Results

Phenotypic innovation across snakes and lizards

Snakes have undergone large transformations along multiple phenotypic axes (Fig. 1, Fig. 2, fig. S7-10) relative to other squamates. These shifts distinguish them both quantitatively and qualitatively from the ancestral squamate phenotype and from their closest living (non-snake) relatives. Estimates of net innovation range from 1.6-fold to three-fold higher in snakes relative to lizards (Fig. 1, fig. S8). These results suggest that the origin or early diversification of snakes was associated with massive shifts in traits associated with feeding, locomotion, and sensory processing.

Rates for morphological and ecological traits generally increased early in the evolutionary history of snakes (Fig. 1). Snakes occupy distinct morphological space and exhibit elevated rates of morphological evolution relative to lizards, as evidenced by their greater body elongation (mean snake elongation index and rate >6x and >24x that of lizards; fig. S11), higher vertebral counts (mean count and rate for snakes >5x and >80x that of lizards; fig. S11-12), highly distinctive skull shape (mean snake rate >3x that of lizards; fig. S11; (9)), and greater rate of body mass evolution (snake rate > 12x that of lizards; fig. S13). Patterns of morphological evolution are mirrored by ecological trait evolution – the rate of trophic niche evolution was 3.2-fold faster in snakes compared to lizards, and snake diets have diverged much more from the ancestral squamate diet relative to lizards (Fig. 1).

Across a range of traits and rates, both CPO and multiprocess models reveal that much of the phenotypic variation across snakes and lizards can be explained by a single event that occurred early in the evolutionary history of snakes (Fig. 2, fig. S14, S15). Multiprocess phenotypic models generally recovered a phase shift in both rate and state associated with the ancestor of extant snakes or an associated early divergence within snakes (Fig. 2, fig. S16, S17), implying both decoupled rate dynamics in snakes relative to other squamates and also a major shift (jump) in phenotypic state. These findings are consistent with those of several recent studies that demonstrated phase shifts in the tempo and mode of cranial evolution associated with the origin and early radiation of snakes (8, 20).

Trophic structure of squamate biodiversity

Snakes occupy much greater dietary space relative to lizards (Fig. 3A), and their diets are generally non-overlapping owing to the disproportionate consumption of vertebrate prey by snakes (Fig. 3B, fig. S18, S19). Snakes also use an aquatic and semi-aquatic prey base that is largely untouched by lizards (separation along diet PC 2, Fig. 3A, Fig. 3B, fig. S18). While snakes as a whole use a greater diversity of food resources than lizards, the diets of individual snake species are consistently narrower than those of lizards (Fig. 3D). Snakes have evolved a range of novel phenotypes to specialize on viscous prey (worms, slugs), slippery prey (eggs, eels, caecilians), noxious and dangerous prey (e.g., venomous snakes, mammals, centipedes, scorpions), as well as snails and other “armored” resources (Fig. 3A & B).

A small number of lizards (e.g., some monitor lizards, *Heloderma*, *Lialis*) feed heavily on vertebrates, mainly exploiting prey already used by snakes. In contrast, finer partitioning of dietary categories among arthropod-feeding squamates (Fig. 3C) reveals that snakes and lizards consume largely non-overlapping resources, with blindsnakes feeding almost exclusively on insect brood – larval/pupal ants and termites in particular – and with several other snake lineages specializing on spiders, centipedes, and scorpions. Conversely, arthropod-feeding lizards consume far more adult insects spanning multiple taxonomic categories, and lizard niche breadths are broader than those of arthropod-feeding snakes (Fig. 3C).

Previous analyses of trophic macroevolution across lizards (7) have formulated the “deep history” hypothesis of squamate diets, in which resource use is deeply conserved, in contrast to dynamic patterns of trophic niche evolution observed in some vertebrate radiations (21–23). Our diet analyses recovered elements of this hypothesis (7, 24) (fig. S20), but this legacy effect is dwarfed by the trophic shifts and expansions that have occurred in snakes throughout the Cenozoic (25). The origin of Alethinophidian snakes (all snakes but blindsnakes; 88% of snake species; Fig. 1) accounts for nearly 40% of the variance in species-level diet state across squamates (fig. S14G). This shift, accompanied by an overall acceleration in the rate of trophic niche evolution in colubriiform snakes (Fig. 1, TR_{diet}), led to a dramatic expansion of the squamate trophic universe. Overall, our results highlight the power of primary natural history data, obtained from museum specimens and field observations, to reveal major shifts in the ecological structure of the biota.

Climate and life-history evolution

Climatic niche and life history traits do not appear to be evolving along distinct evolutionary trajectories in snakes relative to lizards, thus departing from patterns observed for morphology and diet (Fig. 2). We find high lability of a key life-history trait (parity mode), and in climatic niche parameters (Fig. S8, S9). Despite some phylogenetic signal in climatic niche parameters (fig. S14, S15), there is little evidence that such conservatism persists across large phylogenetic scales (fig. S21, S22). Variation in climatic niche across squamates thus cannot be explained by deep divergences in their evolutionary past (Fig. 2, fig. S14L, S15R).

Speciation rates in lizards and snakes

We quantified speciation rates across squamates, using phylogenetic imputation to infer placements for the 3,872 squamate species for which genetic data were not available (fig. S23, (17)). Snakes show substantially elevated rates of speciation relative to lizards (mean lizard λ $\lambda_{\text{CLaDS}} = 0.08$, $\lambda_{\text{BAMM}} = 0.09$; snake $\lambda_{\text{CLaDS}} = 0.18$, $\lambda_{\text{BAMM}} = 0.21$; Fig. 4, fig. S24, S25D), including other well-studied lizard clades thought to be the result of rapid radiation (e.g., *Anolis*;

sphenomorphine skinks; Fig. 4C, 4D). Approximately 45% of the variance in tip-level speciation rates across squamates is explained by the node spanning colubriform snakes ($\lambda_{\text{CLaDS}} = 0.20$; $\lambda_{\text{BAMM}} = 0.23$; fig. S14; fig. S26). Outside of snakes, the most important rate shift involved the ancestor of the species-rich *Liolaemus* lizard clade from montane and arid South America (~260 species), which accounts for ~11% of the variance in tip-level rates. For higher taxa, speciation rate is correlated with species richness ($n = 119$ subfamilies; Spearman $r = 0.63$; Fig. 4C), but this positive correlation is driven by the presence of very small clades with low speciation rates. For clades with at least 50 species – collectively accounting for 96% of global squamate diversity – there is effectively no relationship between richness and rate ($n = 42$, $r = 0.03$). Similar decoupling between speciation rates and diversity patterns – both for taxonomic groups and geographic regions – has now been observed in a wide range of taxa (18, 26, 27).

We then tested whether previously proposed key innovations predict speciation rates across squamates more generally. We found that individual traits had minimal ability to explain speciation rate variation (Figs. 4F, fig. S25E), even for those traits that have evolved multiple times across squamates (maximum $R^2 = 0.01$). To the extent that these traits contributed to snake diversification, their influence is statistically confounded with a macroevolutionary singularity associated with the origin of snakes (Fig. 4E, fig. S27; (28)). We also considered several biogeographic predictors of speciation rate, finding no evidence for associations with latitude (fig. S28) or biogeographic region (fig. S29). Similar to other vertebrate clades (18, 26), the latitudinal gradient in squamate diversity appears largely decoupled from speciation rates, and geographic variability in speciation rate is largely a function of the relative fraction of snakes versus lizards in the biota.

Conclusions

Global squamate biodiversity has been heavily shaped by a singularity in macroevolutionary dynamics that occurred in association with the origin of snakes and with their most successful constituent clade (Colubriformes; 3,800 species; Fig. 1), a radiation which shows no sign of slowing towards the present (25). Numerous hypotheses have been proposed to account for the dramatic evolutionary radiation of snakes, including shifts in feeding mechanisms, extreme cranial kinesis, body elongation, limb reduction, and venom (8, 25, 29, 30). Furthermore, snakes show several genomic attributes such as transposable element proliferation (31) and metabolic protein redesign (32) that might contribute to evolutionary versatility of the general snake body plan (20). However, our results highlight the challenge of linking specific innovations to the overall "success" of the snake phenotype. Replicated innovations in our dataset – including chemosensory innovation, limb loss, and body elongation – show no predictable effects on speciation rate (Fig. 4). Moreover, counterfactual experiments have occurred throughout squamate evolutionary history that support a decoupling between innovation *per se* and macroevolutionary regime shifts. For example, lizard (non-snake) lineages that have evolved potent venom (*Heloderma*) have scarcely diversified, and perhaps the most extreme instance of cranial kinesis in a non-snake squamate occurs in a species-poor group of legless geckos (33). Conversely, one lineage of snakes – the splitjaw snakes (Bolyeridae) – has further increased the flexibility of the Alethinophidian trophic apparatus through dramatic skeletal innovations not seen in any other vertebrates (34). Yet this innovation was unaccompanied by any significant ecological or species diversification, and the lineage is currently represented by a tiny clade of endangered or recently extinct island endemics (*Casarea dussumieri*, *Bolyeria multocarinata*).

Snakes thus appear to represent an ongoing adaptive radiation characterized by sustained ecological and species diversification that was triggered ultimately by one or more unknown and perhaps unknowable singular events. The principal challenge in resolving the causal basis of such singularities involves a lack of phylogenetic replication. By focusing on traits specific to squamates (e.g., cranial kinesis; venom), evolutionary biologists are necessarily limited to a small number of statistically independent data points or contrasts (28). However, some hypotheses – particularly those associated with genomic change or molecular evolutionary rates (20) – could be tested across vastly greater phylogenetic scales (e.g., all vertebrates or metazoans). Likewise, the development of taxon-independent ontologies to describe key processes (e.g., sexual selection and trophic flexibility) might facilitate comparison of putative causal processes or agents across diverse branches of the Tree of Life. Nonetheless, the action of these and other innovations may be highly contingent on geographic and other circumstances peculiar to individual clades (35, 36).

The view of phenotypic evolution emerging from squamates and other taxa (15, 20, 37) is that many of the most spectacular changes in the history of life have involved macroevolutionary singularities: rare, transformative events that are unpredictable from evolutionary time, phylogenetic position, and other factors. Here, the recurrent evolution of snake-like traits in other groups of non-snake lizards has failed to generate comparable evolutionary outcomes, suggesting that replicated patterns of adaptive radiation observed in many groups of organisms (35, 38) may be superseded at deeper phylogenetic scales by systemic shifts that ultimately give rise to higher taxa (11). The extent to which such shifts are qualitatively distinct from those associated with young radiations is likely to remain a challenging problem. Perhaps most importantly, the pruning effect of extinction – through the selective elimination of ecologically and phenotypically intermediate clades – may exacerbate the distinctiveness of clades that comprise the “survivors” we observe in the present day (39). Thus, transformation of the biota through time may be partly attributable to phenotypic changes that confer increased survivorship at the species or clade level (40, 41). Determining why snakes and other groups – from bats to beetles, angiosperms to acanthomorph fishes – have experienced such dramatic shifts in evolutionary tempo and mode is, as Darwin put it, an “abominable mystery”. Yet the major features of biological diversity may owe more to these revolutionary events than to the causal structures we infer by extrapolating contemporary microevolution through geological time.

References and Notes:

1. C. L. Camp, Classification of the Lizards. *Bull. Am. Mus. Nat. Hist.* **48**, 289–480 (1923).
2. T. Townsend, A. Larson, E. Louis, J. R. Macey, Molecular phylogenetics of Squamata: the position of snakes, amphisbaenians, and dibamids, and the root of the squamate tree. *Syst. Biol.* **53**, 735–757 (2004).
3. H. W. Greene, *Snakes: The Evolution of Mystery in Nature* (University of California Press, 1997).
4. J. J. Wiens, M. C. Brandley, T. W. Reeder, Why does a trait evolve multiple times within a clade? Repeated evolution of snakeline body form in squamate reptiles. *Evolution.* **60**, 123–141 (2006).
5. K. Schwenk, The evolution of chemoreception in squamate reptiles: a phylogenetic approach. *Brain Behav. Evol.* **41**, 124–137 (1993).
6. K. Metzger, "Cranial kinesis in lepidosaurs: skulls in motion" in *Topics in Functional and Ecological Vertebrate Morphology*, A. Van Damme R Aerts P D'aout K Herrel, Ed. (Shaker Publishing, Düren and Maastricht, 2002), pp. 15–46.
7. L. J. Vitt, E. R. Pianka, Deep history impacts present-day ecology and biodiversity. *PNAS.* **102**, 7877–7881 (2005).
8. A. Watanabe *et al.*, Ecomorphological diversification in squamates from conserved pattern of cranial integration. *PNAS.* **116**, 14688–14697 (2019).
9. F. O. Da Silva *et al.*, The ecological origins of snakes as revealed by skull evolution. *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 376 (2018).
10. U. Roll *et al.*, The global distribution of tetrapods reveals a need for targeted reptile conservation. *Nat Ecol Evol.* **1**, 1677–1682 (2017).
11. G. G. Simpson, *Tempo and mode in evolution* (Columbia University Press, New York, NY, 1944), vol. 8.
12. M. J. Landis, J. G. Schraiber, Pulsed evolution shaped modern vertebrate body sizes. *PNAS.* **114**, 13224–13229 (2017).
13. C. R. Cooney *et al.*, Mega-evolutionary dynamics of the adaptive radiation of birds. *Nature.* **542**, 344–347 (2017).
14. G. Navalón, A. Bjarnason, E. Griffiths, R. B. J. Benson, Environmental signal in the evolutionary diversification of bird skeletons. *Nature.* **611**, 306–311 (2022).
15. A. Goswami *et al.*, Attenuated evolution of mammals through the Cenozoic. *Science.* **378**, 377–383 (2022).

16. J. W. Valentine, D. Jablonski, D. H. Erwin, Fossils, molecules and embryos: new perspectives on the Cambrian explosion. *Development*. **126**, 851–859 (1999).
17. Title PO, Singhal S, Grundler MC, Costa G, Pyron A, Colston TJ, Grunder MR, Prates I, Stepanova N, Jones M, Cavalcanti LBQ, Colli G, Di-Poi N, Donnellan S, Kraus F, Moritz C, Mesquita DO, Pianka ER, Smith SA, Vitt L, Rabosky DL, Supplementary information for “The macroevolutionary singularity of snakes.”
18. W. Jetz, G. H. Thomas, J. B. Joy, K. Hartmann, A. O. Mooers, The global diversity of birds in space and time. *Nature*. **491**, 444–448 (2012).
19. N. P. Giannini, Canonical phylogenetic ordination. *Syst. Biol.* **52**, 684–695 (2003).
20. T. R. Simões, O. Vernygora, M. W. Caldwell, S. E. Pierce, Megaevolutionary dynamics and the timing of evolutionary innovation in reptiles. *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 3322 (2020).
21. O. Seehausen, C. E. Wagner, Speciation in freshwater fishes. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* **45**, 621–651 (2014).
22. D. Schluter, *The Ecology of Adaptive Radiation* (OUP Oxford, 2000).
23. T. Price, *Speciation in birds* (W. H. Freeman, New York, NY, 2008).
24. T. J. Colston, G. C. Costa, L. J. Vitt, Snake diets and the deep history hypothesis. *Biol. J. Linn. Soc. Lond.* **101**, 476–486 (2010).
25. M. C. Grundler, D. L. Rabosky, Rapid increase in snake dietary diversity and complexity following the end-Cretaceous mass extinction. *PLoS Biol.* **19**, e3001414 (2021).
26. D. L. Rabosky *et al.*, An inverse latitudinal gradient in speciation rate for marine fishes. *Nature*. **559**, 392–395 (2018).
27. L. F. Henao Diaz, L. J. Harmon, M. T. C. Sugawara, E. T. Miller, M. W. Pennell, Macroevolutionary diversification rates show time dependency. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **116**, 7403–7408 (2019).
28. J. C. Uyeda, R. Zenil-Ferguson, M. W. Pennell, Rethinking phylogenetic comparative methods. *Syst. Biol.* **67**, 1091–1109 (2018).
29. B. G. Fry *et al.*, Evolution of an arsenal: structural and functional diversification of the venom system in the advanced snakes (Caenophidia). *Mol. Cell. Proteomics*. **7**, 215–246 (2008).
30. H. W. Greene, Dietary Correlates of the Origin and Radiation of Snakes¹. *Integr. Comp. Biol.* **23**, 431–441 (2015).
31. G. I. M. Pasquesi *et al.*, Squamate reptiles challenge paradigms of genomic repeat element evolution set by birds and mammals. *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 2774 (2018).
32. T. A. Castoe *et al.* The Burmese python genome reveals the molecular basis for extreme

adaptation in snakes. *PNAS*. **110**, 20645–20650 (2013).

33. F. C. Patchell, R. Shine, Feeding Mechanisms in Pygopodid Lizards: How Can Lialis Swallow Such Large Prey? *J. Herpetol.* **20**, 59–64 (1986).
34. T. H. Frazzetta, From Hopeful Monsters to Bolyerine Snakes? *Am. Nat.* **104**, 55–72 (1970).
35. C. E. Wagner, L. J. Harmon, O. Seehausen, Ecological opportunity and sexual selection together predict adaptive radiation. *Nature*. **487**, 366–369 (2012).
36. A. de Queiroz, Contingent predictability in evolution: key traits and diversification. *Syst. Biol.* **51**, 917–929 (2002).
37. C. Venditti, A. Meade, M. Pagel, Multiple routes to mammalian diversity. *Nature*. **479**, 393–396 (2011).
38. D. L. Mahler, T. Ingram, L. J. Revell, J. B. Losos, Exceptional convergence on the macroevolutionary landscape in island lizard radiations. *Science*. **341**, 292–295 (2013).
39. D. N. Reznick, R. E. Ricklefs, Darwin’s bridge between microevolution and macroevolution. *Nature*. **457**, 837–842 (2009).
40. D. Jablonski, Background and mass extinctions: the alternation of macroevolutionary regimes. *Science*. **231**, 129–133 (1986).
41. G. C. Williams, *Natural Selection: Domains, Levels, and Challenges* (Oxford University Press, 1992).
42. Data for: P. O. Title, S. Singhal, M. C. Grundler, G. C. Costa, R. A. Pyron, T. J. Colston, M. R. Grundler, I. Prates, N. Stepanova, M. E. H. Jones, L. B. Q. Cavalcanti, G. R. Colli, N. Di-Poi, S. C. Donnellan, C. Moritz, D. O. Mesquita, E. R. Pianka, S. A. Smith, L. J. Vitt, D. L. Rabosky, The macroevolutionary singularity of snakes, Dryad (2023); <https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.p5hqbzkbv>.
43. Code for: P. O. Title, S. Singhal, M. C. Grundler, G. C. Costa, R. A. Pyron, T. J. Colston, M. R. Grundler, I. Prates, N. Stepanova, M. E. H. Jones, L. B. Q. Cavalcanti, G. R. Colli, N. Di-Poi, S. C. Donnellan, C. Moritz, D. O. Mesquita, E. R. Pianka, S. A. Smith, L. J. Vitt, D. L. Rabosky, The macroevolutionary singularity of snakes, Zenodo (2023); <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8250112>.
44. V. A. Funk, R. Edwards, S. Keeley, The problem with(out) vouchers. *Taxon*. **67**, 3–5 (2018).
45. J. C. Buckner, R. C. Sanders, B. C. Faircloth, P. Chakrabarty, The critical importance of vouchers in genomics. *Elife*. **10** (2021), doi:10.7554/eLife.68264.
46. C. W. Thompson, K. L. Phelps, M. W. Allard, J. A. Cook, J. L. Dunnum, A. W. Ferguson, M. Gelang, F. A. A. Khan, D. L. Paul, D. M. Reeder, N. B. Simmons, M. P. M. Vanhove, P. W. Webala, M. Weksler, C. W. Kilpatrick, Preserve a Voucher Specimen! The Critical

Need for Integrating Natural History Collections in Infectious Disease Studies. *MBio*. **12** (2021), doi:10.1128/mBio.02698-20.

- 390 47. K. R. Johnson, I. F. P. Owens, Global Collection Group, A global approach for natural history museum collections. *Science*. **379**, 1192–1194 (2023).
48. M. R. Grundler, S. Singhal, M. A. Cowan, D. L. Rabosky, Is genomic diversity a useful proxy for census population size? Evidence from a species-rich community of desert lizards. *Mol. Ecol.* **28**, 1664–1674 (2019).
- 395 49. S. Singhal, G. R. Colli, M. R. Grundler, G. C. Costa, I. Prates, D. L. Rabosky, No link between population isolation and speciation rate in squamate reptiles. *PNAS*. **119** (2022), doi:10.1073/pnas.2113388119.
50. S. Singhal, T. J. Colston, M. R. Grundler, S. A. Smith, G. C. Costa, G. R. Colli, C. Moritz, R. A. Pyron, D. L. Rabosky, Congruence and conflict in the higher-level phylogenetics of squamate reptiles: an expanded phylogenomic perspective. *Syst. Biol.* **70**, 542–557 (2021).
- 400 51. S. Singhal, M. Grundler, G. Colli, D. L. Rabosky, Squamate Conserved Loci (SqCL): A unified set of conserved loci for phylogenomics and population genetics of squamate reptiles. *Mol. Ecol. Resour.* **17**, e12–e24 (2017).
52. A. R. Lemmon, S. A. Emme, E. M. Lemmon, Anchored hybrid enrichment for massively high-throughput phylogenomics. *Syst. Biol.* **61**, 727–744 (2012).
- 405 53. B. C. Faircloth, J. E. McCormack, N. G. Crawford, M. G. Harvey, R. T. Brumfield, T. C. Glenn, Ultraconserved elements anchor thousands of genetic markers spanning multiple evolutionary timescales. *Syst. Biol.* **61**, 717–726 (2012).
54. J. J. Wiens, C. R. Hutter, D. G. Mulcahy, B. P. Noonan, T. M. Townsend, J. W. Sites Jr, T. W. Reeder, Resolving the phylogeny of lizards and snakes (Squamata) with extensive sampling of genes and species. *Biol. Lett.* **8**, 1043–1046 (2012).
- 410 55. S. M. Aljanabi, I. Martinez, Universal and rapid salt-extraction of high quality genomic DNA for PCR-based techniques. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **25**, 4692–4693 (1997).
56. K. Bi, D. Vanderpool, S. Singhal, T. Linderroth, C. Moritz, J. M. Good, Transcriptome-based exon capture enables highly cost-effective comparative genomic data collection at moderate evolutionary scales. *BMC Genomics*. **13**, 403 (2012).
- 415 57. D. M. Portik, L. L. Smith, K. Bi, An evaluation of transcriptome-based exon capture for frog phylogenomics across multiple scales of divergence (Class: Amphibia, Order: Anura). *Mol. Ecol. Resour.* **16**, 1069–1083 (2016).
- 420 58. W. J. Kent, BLAT—The BLAST-Like Alignment Tool. *Genome Res.* **12**, 656–664 (2002).
59. H. Li, B. Handsaker, A. Wysoker, T. Fennell, J. Ruan, N. Homer, G. Marth, G. Abecasis, R. Durbin, 1000 Genome Project Data Processing Subgroup, The Sequence Alignment/Map format and SAMtools. *Bioinformatics*. **25**, 2078–2079 (2009).

60. A. M. Bolger, M. Lohse, B. Usadel, Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina sequence data. *Bioinformatics*. **30**, 2114–2120 (2014).
61. J. Zhang, K. Kobert, T. Flouri, A. Stamatakis, PEAR: a fast and accurate Illumina Paired-End reAd mergeR. *Bioinformatics*. **30**, 614–620 (2014).
62. M. G. Grabherr, B. J. Haas, M. Yassour, J. Z. Levin, D. A. Thompson, I. Amit, X. Adiconis, L. Fan, R. Raychowdhury, Q. Zeng, Z. Chen, E. Mauceli, N. Hacohen, A. Gnirke, N. Rhind, F. di Palma, B. W. Birren, C. Nusbaum, K. Lindblad-Toh, N. Friedman, A. Regev, Full-length transcriptome assembly from RNA-Seq data without a reference genome. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **29**, 644–652 (2011).
63. H. Li, Aligning sequence reads, clone sequences and assembly contigs with BWA-MEM. *arXiv [q-bio.GN]* (2013), (available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1303.3997>).
64. K. Katoh, G. Asimenos, H. Toh, Multiple alignment of DNA sequences with MAFFT. *Methods Mol. Biol.* **537**, 39–64 (2009).
65. M. G. Harvey, G. A. Bravo, S. Claramunt, A. M. Cuervo, G. E. Derryberry, J. Battilana, G. F. Seeholzer, J. S. McKay, B. C. O'Meara, B. C. Faircloth, S. V. Edwards, J. Pérez-Emán, R. G. Moyle, F. H. Sheldon, A. Aleixo, B. T. Smith, R. T. Chesser, L. F. Silveira, J. Cracraft, R. T. Brumfield, E. P. Derryberry, The evolution of a tropical biodiversity hotspot. *Science*. **370**, 1343–1348 (2020).
66. A. Stamatakis, RAxML version 8: a tool for phylogenetic analysis and post-analysis of large phylogenies. *Bioinformatics*. **30**, 1312–1313 (2014).
67. S. Guindon, J.-F. Dufayard, V. Lefort, M. Anisimova, W. Hordijk, O. Gascuel, New algorithms and methods to estimate maximum-likelihood phylogenies: assessing the performance of PhyML 3.0. *Syst. Biol.* **59**, 307–321 (2010).
68. C. Zhang, M. Rabiee, E. Sayyari, S. Mirarab, ASTRAL-III: polynomial time species tree reconstruction from partially resolved gene trees. *BMC Bioinformatics*. **19**, 153 (2018).
69. D. M. Portik, J. J. Wiens, Do Alignment and Trimming Methods Matter for Phylogenomic (UCE) Analyses? *Syst. Biol.* **70**, 440–462 (2021).
70. J. H. Degnan, N. A. Rosenberg, Gene tree discordance, phylogenetic inference and the multispecies coalescent. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **24**, 332–340 (2009).
71. F. T. Burbrink, F. G. Grazziotin, R. A. Pyron, D. Cundall, S. Donnellan, F. Irish, J. S. Keogh, F. Kraus, R. W. Murphy, B. Noonan, C. J. Raxworthy, S. Ruane, A. R. Lemmon, E. M. Lemmon, H. Zaher, Interrogating Genomic-Scale Data for Squamata (Lizards, Snakes, and Amphisbaenians) Shows no Support for Key Traditional Morphological Relationships. *Syst. Biol.* **69**, 502–520 (2020).
72. A. M. Kozlov, A. J. Aberer, A. Stamatakis, ExaML version 3: a tool for phylogenomic analyses on supercomputers. *Bioinformatics*. **31**, 2577–2579 (2015).

- 460 73. X.-X. Shen, C. T. Hittinger, A. Rokas, Contentious relationships in phylogenomic studies can be driven by a handful of genes. *Nat Ecol Evol.* **1**, 126 (2017).
74. Aberer, Krompaß, Stamatakis, RogueNaRok: An efficient and exact algorithm for rogue taxon identification. *Heidelberg Institute for Theoretical Studies* (2011) (available at <http://sco.h-its.org/exelixis/pubs/Exelixis-RRDR-2011-10.pdf>).
- 465 75. B. Q. Minh, H. A. Schmidt, O. Chernomor, D. Schrempf, M. D. Woodhams, A. von Haeseler, R. Lanfear, IQ-TREE 2: New Models and Efficient Methods for Phylogenetic Inference in the Genomic Era. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **37**, 1530–1534 (2020).
76. O. Jeffroy, H. Brinkmann, F. Delsuc, H. Philippe, Phylogenomics: the beginning of incongruence? *Trends Genet.* **22**, 225–231 (2006).
- 470 77. S. A. Smith, M. J. Moore, J. W. Brown, Y. Yang, Analysis of phylogenomic datasets reveals conflict, concordance, and gene duplications with examples from animals and plants. *BMC Evol. Biol.* **15**, 150 (2015).
78. S. A. Smith, J. F. Walker, PyPHLAWD : A Python tool for phylogenetic dataset construction. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **10**, 104–108 (2019).
- 475 79. G. S. C. Slater, E. Birney, Automated generation of heuristics for biological sequence comparison. *BMC Bioinformatics.* **6**, 31 (2005).
80. T. Rognes, T. Flouri, B. Nichols, C. Quince, F. Mahé, VSEARCH: a versatile open source tool for metagenomics. *PeerJ.* **4**, e2584 (2016).
81. C. Hahn, L. Bachmann, B. Chevreux, Reconstructing mitochondrial genomes directly from genomic next-generation sequencing reads—a baiting and iterative mapping approach. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **41**, e129–e129 (2013).
- 480 82. P. Uetz, P. Freed, R. Aguilar, J. Hošek, The Reptile Database. *The Reptile Database* (2021), (available at <http://www.reptile-database.org>).
83. J. F. R. Tonini, K. H. Beard, R. B. Ferreira, W. Jetz, R. A. Pyron, Fully-sampled phylogenies of squamates reveal evolutionary patterns in threat status. *Biol. Conserv.* **204**, 23–31 (2016).
- 485 84. H. Zaher, R. W. Murphy, J. C. Arredondo, R. Graboski, P. R. Machado-Filho, K. Mahlow, G. G. Montingelli, A. B. Quadros, N. L. Orlov, M. Wilkinson, Y.-P. Zhang, F. G. Grazziotin, Large-scale molecular phylogeny, morphology, divergence-time estimation, and the fossil record of advanced caenophidian snakes (Squamata: Serpentes). *PLoS One.* **14**, e0216148 (2019).
- 490 85. D. M. Portik, J. J. Wiens, SuperCRUNCH: A bioinformatics toolkit for creating and manipulating supermatrices and other large phylogenetic datasets. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **11**, 763–772 (2020).
- 495 86. V. Ranwez, E. J. P. Douzery, C. Cambon, N. Chantret, F. Delsuc, MACSE v2: Toolkit for

the Alignment of Coding Sequences Accounting for Frameshifts and Stop Codons. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **35**, 2582–2584 (2018).

87. A. Gudyś, S. Deorowicz, QuickProbs 2: Towards rapid construction of high-quality alignments of large protein families. *Sci. Rep.* **7**, 41553 (2017).

88. J. W. Brown, J. F. Walker, S. A. Smith, Phyx: phylogenetic tools for unix. *Bioinformatics.* **33**, 1886–1888 (2017).

89. J. B. Pease, J. W. Brown, J. F. Walker, C. E. Hinchliff, S. A. Smith, Quartet Sampling distinguishes lack of support from conflicting support in the green plant tree of life. *Am. J. Bot.* **105**, 385–403 (2018).

90. M. E. H. Jones, C. L. Anderson, C. A. Hipsley, J. Müller, S. E. Evans, R. R. Schoch, Integration of molecules and new fossils supports a Triassic origin for Lepidosauria (lizards, snakes, and tuatara). *BMC Evol. Biol.* **13**, 208 (2013).

91. R. L. Nydam, A new taxon of helodermatid-like lizard from the Albian–Cenomanian of Utah. *J. Vert. Paleontol.* **20**, 285–294 (2000).

92. J. L. Conrad, Phylogeny and systematics of Squamata (Reptilia) based on morphology. *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History.* **2008**, 1–182 (2008).

93. T. W. Reeder, T. M. Townsend, D. G. Mulcahy, B. P. Noonan, P. L. Wood Jr, J. W. Sites Jr, J. J. Wiens, Integrated analyses resolve conflicts over squamate reptile phylogeny and reveal unexpected placements for fossil taxa. *PLoS One.* **10**, e0118199 (2015).

94. R. L. Cifelli, J. I. Kirkland, A. Weil, A. L. Deino, B. J. Kowallis, High-precision $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$ geochronology and the advent of North America's Late Cretaceous terrestrial fauna. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **94**, 11163–11167 (1997).

95. J. L. Conrad, O. Rieppel, L. Grande, A Green River (Eocene) polychrotid (Squamata: Reptilia) and a re-examination of iguanian systematics. *J. Paleontol.* **81**, 1365–1373 (2007).

96. M. Elliot Smith, K. R. Chamberlain, B. S. Singer, A. R. Carroll, Eocene clocks agree: Coeval $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$, U-Pb, and astronomical ages from the Green River Formation. *Geology.* **38**, 527–530 (2010).

97. R. L. Nydam, A. L. Titus, M. A. Loewen, Lizards and snakes from the Cenomanian through Campanian of southern Utah: filling the gap in the fossil record of Squamata from the Late Cretaceous of the Western Interior of North America. *At the Top of the Grand Staircase: the Late Cretaceous of Southern Utah.* Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 370–423 (2013).

98. E. M. Roberts, S. D. Sampson, A. L. Deino, S. A. Bowring, R. Buchwaldt, "The Kaiparowits Formation: a remarkable record of late Cretaceous terrestrial environments, ecosystems, and evolution in western North America" in *At the Top of the Grand Staircase: the late Cretaceous of Southern Utah*, A. L. Titus, M. A. Loewen, Eds. (Indiana University Press, Bloomington, IN, USA, 2013), p. 22.

99. M. W. Caldwell, R. L. Nydam, A. Palci, S. Apesteguía, The oldest known snakes from the Middle Jurassic-Lower Cretaceous provide insights on snake evolution. *Nat. Commun.* **6**, 5996 (2015).
100. A. R. H. LeBlanc, A. Palci, N. Anthwal, A. S. Tucker, R. Araújo, M. F. C. Pereira, M. W. Caldwell, A conserved tooth resorption mechanism in modern and fossil snakes. *Nat. Commun.* **14**, 742 (2023).
101. J. Head, R. Benson, S. E. Evans, "Running with the devils: postcranial osteology of the enigmatic Jurassic parviraptorid squamates, and their implications for the evolution of the snake body form" in *SVP Program and Abstracts Book* (Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology, 2023), p. 176.
102. S. E. Evans, "The origin and early diversification of squamates" in *The Origin and Early Evolutionary History of Snakes*, D. J. Gower, H. Zaher, Eds. (Cambridge University Press, 2022), *The Systematics Association*, pp. 7–12.
103. V.-H. Reynoso, G. Callison, A new scincomorph lizard from the Early Cretaceous of Puebla, Mexico. *Zool. J. Linn. Soc.* **130**, 183–212 (2000).
104. A. Bolet, E. L. Stanley, J. D. Daza, J. S. Arias, A. Čerňanský, M. Vidal-García, A. M. Bauer, J. J. Bevitt, A. Peretti, S. E. Evans, Unusual morphology in the mid-Cretaceous lizard *Oculudentavis*. *Curr. Biol.* **31**, 3303–3314.e3 (2021).
105. C. D. Brownstein, D. L. Meyer, M. Fabbri, B.-A. S. Bhullar, J. A. Gauthier, Evolutionary origins of the prolonged extant squamate radiation. *Nat. Commun.* **13**, 7087 (2022).
106. M. Tałanda, V. Fernandez, E. Panciroli, S. E. Evans, R. J. Benson, Synchrotron tomography of a stem lizard elucidates early squamate anatomy. *Nature*. **611**, 99–104 (2022).
107. A. Čerňanský, E. L. Stanley, J. D. Daza, A. Bolet, J. S. Arias, A. M. Bauer, M. Vidal-García, J. J. Bevitt, A. M. Peretti, N. N. Aung, S. E. Evans, A new Early Cretaceous lizard in Myanmar amber with exceptionally preserved integument. *Sci. Rep.* **12**, 1660 (2022).
108. T. R. Simões, M. W. Caldwell, M. Tałanda, M. Bernardi, A. Palci, O. Vernygora, F. Bernardini, L. Mancini, R. L. Nydam, The origin of squamates revealed by a Middle Triassic lizard from the Italian Alps. *Nature*. **557**, 706–709 (2018).
109. Z. Yang, PAML 4: phylogenetic analysis by maximum likelihood. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **24**, 1586–1591 (2007).
110. S. A. Smith, J. W. Brown, J. F. Walker, So many genes, so little time: A practical approach to divergence-time estimation in the genomic era. *PLoS One*. **13**, e0197433 (2018).
111. Q. Tao, K. Tamura, F. U Battistuzzi, S. Kumar, A machine learning method for detecting autocorrelation of evolutionary rates in large phylogenies. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **36**, 811–824 (2019).
112. Q. Tao, J. Barba-Montoya, S. Kumar, Data-driven speciation tree prior for better species

divergence times in calibration-poor molecular phylogenies. *Bioinformatics*. **37**, i102–i110 (2021).

113. S. A. Smith, B. C. O’Meara, treePL: divergence time estimation using penalized likelihood for large phylogenies. *Bioinformatics*. **28**, 2689–2690 (2012).

114. D. L. Rabosky, No substitute for real data: A cautionary note on the use of phylogenies from birth-death polytomy resolvers for downstream comparative analyses. *Evolution*. **69**, 3207–3216 (2015).

115. J. Chang, D. L. Rabosky, M. E. Alfaro, Estimating diversification rates on incompletely sampled phylogenies: theoretical concerns and practical solutions. *Syst. Biol.* **69**, 602–611 (2020).

116. S. Nee, R. M. May, P. H. Harvey, The reconstructed evolutionary process. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* **344**, 305–311 (1994).

117. N. Cusimano, T. Stadler, S. S. Renner, A new method for handling missing species in diversification analysis applicable to randomly or nonrandomly sampled phylogenies. *Syst. Biol.* **61**, 785–792 (2012).

118. R. A. Pyron, F. T. Burbrink, J. J. Wiens, A phylogeny and revised classification of Squamata, including 4161 species of lizards and snakes. *BMC Evol. Biol.* **13**, 93 (2013).

119. D. L. Rabosky, S. C. Donnellan, M. Grundler, I. J. Lovette, Analysis and visualization of complex macroevolutionary dynamics: an example from Australian scincid lizards. *Syst. Biol.* **63**, 610–627 (2014).

120. A. Skinner, A. F. Hugall, M. N. Hutchinson, Lygosomine phylogeny and the origins of Australian scincid lizards. *J. Biogeogr.* **38**, 1044–1058 (2011).

121. T. W. Reeder, A phylogeny of the Australian *Sphenomorphus* group (Scincidae: Squamata) and the phylogenetic placement of the crocodile skinks (*Tribolonotus*): Bayesian approaches to assessing congruence and obtaining confidence in maximum likelihood inferred relationships. *Mol. Phylogenet. Evol.* **27**, 384–397 (2003).

122. T. Stadler, Simulating trees with a fixed number of extant species. *Syst. Biol.* **60**, 676–684 (2011).

123. Y. Zheng, J. J. Wiens, Combining phylogenomic and supermatrix approaches, and a time-calibrated phylogeny for squamate reptiles (lizards and snakes) based on 52 genes and 4162 species. *Mol. Phylogenet. Evol.* **94**, 537–547 (2016).

124. J. W. Streicher, J. J. Wiens, Phylogenomic analyses of more than 4000 nuclear loci resolve the origin of snakes among lizard families. *Biol. Lett.* **13**, 20170393 (2017).

125. N. Vidal, S. B. Hedges, The phylogeny of squamate reptiles (lizards, snakes, and amphisbaenians) inferred from nine nuclear protein-coding genes. *C. R. Biol.* **328**, 1000–1008 (2005).

126. D. G. Mulcahy, B. P. Noonan, T. Moss, T. M. Townsend, T. W. Reeder, J. W. Sites Jr, J. J. Wiens, Estimating divergence dates and evaluating dating methods using phylogenomic and mitochondrial data in squamate reptiles. *Mol. Phylogenet. Evol.* **65**, 974–991 (2012).
127. I. Irisarri, D. Baurain, H. Brinkmann, F. Delsuc, J.-Y. Sire, A. Kupfer, J. Petersen, M. Jarek, A. Meyer, M. Vences, H. Philippe, Phylotranscriptomic consolidation of the jawed
vertebrate timetree. *Nat Ecol Evol.* **1**, 1370–1378 (2017).
128. R. A. Pyron, A likelihood method for assessing molecular divergence time estimates and the placement of fossil calibrations. *Syst. Biol.* **59**, 185–194 (2010).
129. X.-X. Shen, D. Liang, J.-Z. Wen, P. Zhang, Multiple genome alignments facilitate development of NPCL markers: a case study of tetrapod phylogeny focusing on the position
of turtles. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **28**, 3237–3252 (2011).
130. T. R. Simões, R. A. Pyron, The squamate tree of life. *Bulletin of the Museum of Comparative Zoology*,. **163**, 47–95 (2021).
131. D. I. Whiteside, S. A. V. Chambi-Trowell, M. J. Benton, A Triassic crown squamate. *Sci Adv.* **8**, eabq8274 (2022).
132. R. Vullo, S. Bailon, Y. Dauphin, H. Monchot, R. Allain, A reappraisal of Jeddaherdan aleadonta (Squamata: Acrodonta), the purported oldest iguanian lizard from Africa. *Cretaceous Res.* **143**, 105412 (2023).
133. S. E. Evans, J. Barbadillo, Early Cretaceous lizards from Las Hoyas, Spain. *Zool. J. Linn. Soc.* **119**, 23–49 (2008).
134. S. E. Evans, M. E. H. Jones, R. Matsumoto, A new lizard skull from the Purbeck Limestone Group (Lower Cretaceous) of England. *Bulletin de la Société Géologique de France.* **183**, 517–524 (2012).
135. S. A. Magallón, Dating Lineages: Molecular and Paleontological Approaches to the Temporal Framework of Clades. *Int. J. Plant Sci.* **165**, S7–S21 (2004).
136. G. P. Wagner, L. Altenberg, Perspective: complex adaptations and the evolution of evolvability. *Evolution.* **50**, 967–976 (1996).
137. A. Feldman, N. Sabath, R. A. Pyron, I. Mayrose, S. Meiri, Body sizes and diversification rates of lizards, snakes, amphisbaenians and the tuatara. *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.* **25**, 187–197 (2016).
138. S. Meiri, Traits of lizards of the world: Variation around a successful evolutionary design. *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.* **27**, 1168–1172 (2018).
139. C. M. Sheehy III, J. S. Albert, H. B. Lillywhite, The evolution of tail length in snakes associated with different gravitational environments. *Funct. Ecol.* **30**, 244–254 (2016).
140. R. B. King, Sexual dimorphism in snake tail length: sexual selection, natural selection, or

morphological constraint? *Biol. J. Linn. Soc. Lond.* **38**, 133–154 (1989).

141. A. M. Lawing, J. J. Head, P. D. Polly, "The Ecology of Morphology: The Econometrics of Locomotion and Macroenvironment in North American Snakes" in *Paleontology in Ecology and Conservation*, J. Louys, Ed. (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2012), pp. 117–146.
142. A. Feldman, S. Meiri, Length–mass allometry in snakes. *Biol. J. Linn. Soc. Lond.* **108**, 161–172 (2012).
143. E. W. Goolsby, J. Bruggeman, Rphylopars: fast multivariate phylogenetic comparative methods for missing data and within-species variation. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **8**, 22–27 (2017).
144. E. N. Arnold, Relationships of the Palaearctic lizards assigned to the genera *Lacerta*, *Algyroides* and *Psammotromus* (Reptilia: Lacertidae). *Bulletin of the British Museum (Natural History) Zoology*. **25**, 291–366 (1973).
145. A. M. Bauer, A. P. Russell, G. L. Powell, The evolution of locomotor morphology in *Rhoptropus* (Squamata: Gekkonidae): Functional and phylogenetic considerations. *Afr. J. Herpetol.* **45**, 8–30 (1996).
146. P. D. Polly, J. J. Head, M. J. Cohn, Testing modularity and dissociation: the evolution of regional proportions in snakes. *Beyond heterochrony: the evolution of development*, 307–335 (2001).
147. R. Van Damme, B. Vanhooydonck, Speed versus manoeuvrability: association between vertebral number and habitat structure in lacertid lizards. *J. Zool.* **258**, 327–334 (2002).
148. A. M. Bauer, Descriptions of seven new *Cyrtodactylus* (Squamata: Gekkonidae) with a key to the species of Myanmar (Burma). *Proceedings of the California Academy of Sciences*. **54**, 463–498 (2003).
149. I. Das, N. Yaakob, A new species of *Dibamus* (Squamata: Dibamidae) from Peninsular Malaysia. *Raffles Bulletin of Zoology*. **51**, 143–148 (2003).
150. A. Miralles, G. Rivas, W. E. Schargel, A new species of *Mabuya* (Squamata, Scincidae) from the Venezuelan Andes. *Zootaxa*. **895**, 1–11 (2005).
151. R. A. Sadler, A. M. Bauer, S. A. Smith, A new species of *Nannoscincus* Gunther (Squamata: Scincidae) from high elevation forest in southern New Caledonia. *Records of the Australian Museum*. **58**, 29–36 (2006).
152. R. A. Sadler, S. A. Smith, A. M. Bauer, A. H. Whitaker, Three new species of skink in the genus *Marmorosphax* Sadler (Squamata: Scincidae) from New Caledonia. *Zoologia Neocaledonica*. **7**, 373–390 (2009).
153. K. Ljubisavljević, O. Arribas, G. Džukić, S. Carranza, Genetic and morphological differentiation of Mosor rock lizards, *Dinarolacerta mosorensis* (Kolombatović, 1886), with

the description of a new species from the Prokletije Mountain Massif (Montenegro) (Squamata: Lacertidae). *Zootaxa*. **1613**, 1–22 (2007).

154. M. Carretero, G. Llorente, A. Kaliontzopoulou, Interspecific and intersexual variation in presacral vertebrae number in *Podarcis bocagei* and *P. carbonelli*. *Amphibia-reptilia*. **29**, 288–292 (2008).
155. P. M. Hampton, Ventral and sub-caudal scale counts are associated with macrohabitat use and tail specialization in viperid snakes. *Evol. Ecol.* **25**, 531–546 (2011).
156. P. J. Bergmann, D. J. Irschick, Vertebral evolution and the diversification of squamate reptiles. *Evolution*. **66**, 1044–1058 (2012).
157. A. Miralles, M. Anjeriniaina, C. A. Hipsley, J. Müller, F. Glaw, Variations on a bauplan: description of a new Malagasy “mermaid skink” with flipper-like forelimbs only (Scincidae, *Sirenoscincus* Sakata & Hikida, 2003). *Zoosystema*. **34**, 701–719 (2012).
158. T. Tsuihiji, M. Kearney, O. Rieppel, Finding the neck-trunk boundary in snakes: anteroposterior dissociation of myological characteristics in snakes and its implications for their neck and trunk body regionalization. *J. Morphol.* **273**, 992–1009 (2012).
159. M. Camaiti, A. R. Evans, C. A. Hipsley, M. N. Hutchinson, S. Meiri, R. O. Anderson, A. Slavenko, D. G. Chapple, A database of the morphology, ecology and literature of the world’s limb-reduced skinks. *J. Biogeogr.* **49**, 1397–1406 (2022).
160. M. Camaiti, A. Villa, L. C. M. Wencker, A. M. Bauer, E. L. Stanley, M. Delfino, Descriptive osteology and patterns of limb loss of the European limbless skink *Ophiomorus punctatissimus* (Squamata, Scincidae). *J. Anat.* **235**, 313–345 (2019).
161. P. J. Bergmann, G. Morinaga, The convergent evolution of snake-like forms by divergent evolutionary pathways in squamate reptiles. *Evolution*. **73**, 481–496 (2019).
162. L. Kratochvíl, L. Kubička, M. Vohralík, Z. Starostová, Variability in vertebral numbers does not contribute to sexual size dimorphism, interspecific variability, or phenotypic plasticity in body size in geckos (Squamata: Gekkota: *Paroedura*). *J Exp Zool A Ecol Integr Physiol.* **329**, 185–190 (2018).
163. A. A. Alexander, C. Gans, The pattern of dermal-vertebral correlation in snakes and amphisbaenians. *Zool. Meded.* **41**, 171–190 (1966).
164. L. E. Lindell, The evolution of vertebral number and body size in snakes. *Funct. Ecol.* **8**, 708 (1994).
165. M. C. Grundler, SquamataBase: a natural history database and R package for comparative biology of snake feeding habits. *Biodivers Data J.* **8**, e49943 (2020).
166. M. Grundler, D. L. Rabosky, Complex ecological phenotypes on phylogenetic trees: a Markov Process model for comparative analysis of multivariate count data. *Syst. Biol.* **69**, 1200–1211 (2020).

167. K. A. Heller, Z. Ghahramani, "Bayesian hierarchical clustering" in *Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on Machine learning* (Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2005), *ICML '05*, pp. 297–304.
- 715 168. D. N. Karger, O. Conrad, J. Böhner, T. Kawohl, H. Kreft, R. W. Soria-Auza, N. E. Zimmermann, H. P. Linder, M. Kessler, Climatologies at high resolution for the earth's land surface areas. *Sci Data*. **4**, 170122 (2017).
169. P. Brun, N. E. Zimmermann, C. Hari, L. Pellissier, D. N. Karger, Global climate-related
720 predictors at kilometre resolution for the past and future. *Earth System Science Data Discussions*, 1–44 (2022).
170. P. O. Title, J. B. Bemmels, ENVIREM: an expanded set of bioclimatic and topographic variables increases flexibility and improves performance of ecological niche modeling. *Ecography*. **41**, 291–307 (2018).
171. E. H. Taylor, *Ceylonese lizards of the family Scincidae* (University of Kansas, 1950).
- 725 172. G. Nilson, C. Andrén, C. Andren, A New Species of *Ophiomorus* (Sauria: Scincidae) from Kavir Desert, Iran. *Copeia*. **1978**, 559 (1978).
173. T. Kohlsdorf, G. P. Wagner, Evidence for the reversibility of digit loss: a phylogenetic study of limb evolution in *Bachia* (Gymnophthalmidae: Squamata). *Evolution*. **60**, 1896–1912 (2006).
- 730 174. M. C. Brandley, J. P. Huelsenbeck, J. J. Wiens, Rates and patterns in the evolution of snake-like body form in squamate reptiles: evidence for repeated re-evolution of lost digits and long-term persistence of intermediate body forms. *Evolution*. **62**, 2042–2064 (2008).
175. S. Carranza, E. N. Arnold, P. Geniez, J. Roca, J. A. Mateo, Radiation, multiple dispersal and parallelism in the skinks, *Chalcides* and *Sphenops* (Squamata: Scincidae), with
735 comments on *Scincus* and *Scincopus* and the age of the Sahara Desert. *Mol. Phylogenet. Evol.* **46**, 1071–1094 (2008).
176. A. Skinner, M. S. Y. Lee, M. N. Hutchinson, Rapid and repeated limb loss in a clade of scincid lizards. *BMC Evol. Biol.* **8**, 310 (2008).
- 740 177. J. G. Roscito, K. Sameith, B. M. Kirilenko, N. Hecker, S. Winkler, A. Dahl, M. T. Rodrigues, M. Hiller, Convergent and lineage-specific genomic differences in limb regulatory elements in limbless reptile lineages. *Cell Rep.* **38**, 110280 (2022).
178. C. Gans, The Feeding Mechanism of Snakes and Its Possible Evolution. *Am. Zool.* **1**, 217–227 (1961).
- 745 179. V. Deolindo, C. Koch, M. Joshi, A. Martins, To move or not to move? Skull and lower jaw morphology of the blindsnake *Afrotyphlops punctatus* (Leach, 1819) (Serpentes, Typhlopoidea, Typhlopidae) with comments on its previously advocated cranial kinesis. *Anat. Rec.* **304**, 2279–2291 (2021).

180. S. J. Beaupre, C. E. Montgomery, The meaning and consequences of foraging mode in snakes. *Lizard ecology* (2007).
- 750 181. R. Shine, Ecology of the Australian death adder *Acanthophis antarcticus* (Elapidae): evidence for convergence with the Viperidae. *Herpetologica*. **36**, 281–289 (1980).
182. E. R. Pianka, L. J. Vitt, *Lizards: Windows to the Evolution of Diversity* (University of California Press, 2003).
- 755 183. J. H. Carothers, "Correlates of foraging modes in lizards: a review" in *Archivos de biología y medicina experimentales* (SOC BIOL CHILE CASILLA 14164 CORREO, SANTIAGO 9, CHILE, 1985), vol. 18, pp. R90–R91.
184. W. E. Cooper, L. J. Vitt, J. P. Caldwell, S. F. Fox, Foraging modes of some American lizards: relationships among measurement variables and discreteness of modes. *Herpetologica*. **57**, 65–76 (2001).
- 760 185. W. E. Cooper, M. J. Whiting, J. H. Van Wyk, Foraging modes of cordyliform lizards. *Afr. Zool.* **32**, 9–13 (1997).
186. W. E. Cooper, M. J. Whiting, Foraging modes in lacertid lizards from southern Africa. *Amphib-reptil.* **20**, 299–311 (1999).
- 765 187. W. E. Cooper, Foraging mode, prey chemical discrimination, and phylogeny in lizards. *Anim. Behav.* **50**, 973–985 (1995).
188. A. du Toit, P. le F. N. Mouton, H. Geertsema, A. F. Flemming, Foraging mode of serpentiform, grass-living cordylid lizards: a case study of *Cordylus anguina*. *Afr. Zool.* **37**, 141–149 (2002).
- 770 189. J. M. Greeff, M. J. Whiting, Foraging-Mode Plasticity in the Lizard *Platysaurus broadleyi*. *Herpetologica*. **56**, 402–407 (2000).
190. D. O. Mesquita, G. C. Costa, G. R. Colli, T. B. Costa, D. B. Shepard, L. J. Vitt, E. R. Pianka, Life-History patterns of lizards of the world. *Am. Nat.* **187**, 689–705 (2016).
191. D. O. Mesquita, G. R. Colli, G. C. Costa, T. B. Costa, D. B. Shepard, L. J. Vitt, E. R. Pianka, Life history data of lizards of the world. *Ecology*. **96**, 594–594 (2015).
- 775 192. G. Perry, The evolution of search modes: ecological versus phylogenetic perspectives. *Am. Nat.* **153**, 98–109 (1999).
193. R. A. Pyron, F. T. Burbrink, Early origin of viviparity and multiple reversions to oviparity in squamate reptiles. *Ecol. Lett.* **17**, 13–21 (2014).
- 780 194. P. O. Title, D. L. Rabosky, Tip rates, phylogenies and diversification: What are we estimating, and how good are the estimates? *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **10**, 821–834 (2019).
195. D. L. Rabosky, Extinction rates should not be estimated from molecular phylogenies.

Evolution. **64**, 1816–1824 (2010).

196. S. Louca, M. W. Pennell, Extant timetrees are consistent with a myriad of diversification histories. *Nature*. **580**, 502–505 (2020).

785 197. O. Maliet, F. Hartig, H. Morlon, A model with many small shifts for estimating species-specific diversification rates. *Nat Ecol Evol*. **3**, 1086–1092 (2019).

198. O. Maliet, H. Morlon, Fast and accurate estimation of species-specific diversification rates using data augmentation. *Syst. Biol.* **71**, 353–366 (2022).

790 199. D. L. Rabosky, Automatic detection of key innovations, rate shifts, and diversity-dependence on phylogenetic trees. *PLoS One*. **9**, e89543 (2014).

200. T. Vasconcelos, B. C. O’Meara, J. M. Beaulieu, A flexible method for estimating tip diversification rates across a range of speciation and extinction scenarios. *Evolution*. **76**, 1420–1433 (2022).

795 201. D. W. Redding, A. Ø. Mooers, Incorporating evolutionary measures into conservation prioritization. *Conserv. Biol.* **20**, 1670–1678 (2006).

202. Gelman, A, Carlin, JB, Stern, HS, Dunson, DB, Vehtari, A, Rubin, DB, *Bayesian data analysis* (CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 2014).

203. D. L. Rabosky, M. Grundler, C. Anderson, BAMM tools: an R package for the analysis of evolutionary dynamics on phylogenetic trees. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **5**, 701–707 (2014).

800 204. J. Felsenstein, Maximum-likelihood estimation of evolutionary trees from continuous characters. *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* **25**, 471–492 (1973).

205. E. A. Stone, Why the phylogenetic regression appears robust to tree misspecification. *Syst. Biol.* **60**, 245–260 (2011).

805 206. L. J. Harmon, J. B. Losos, T. Jonathan Davies, R. G. Gillespie, J. L. Gittleman, W. Bryan Jennings, K. H. Kozak, M. A. McPeck, F. Moreno-Roark, T. J. Near, A. Purvis, R. E. Ricklefs, D. Schluter, J. A. Schulte II, O. Seehausen, B. L. Sidlauskas, O. Torres-Carvajal, J. T. Weir, A. Ø. Mooers, Early bursts of body size and shape evolution are rare in comparative data. *Evolution*. **64**, 2385–2396 (2010).

810 207. C. Venditti, A. Meade, M. Pagel, Phylogenies reveal new interpretation of speciation and the Red Queen. *Nature*. **463** (2010), pp. 349–352.

208. B. C. O’Meara, C. Ané, M. J. Sanderson, P. C. Wainwright, Testing for different rates of continuous trait evolution using likelihood. *Evolution*. **60**, 922–933 (2006).

815 209. J. M. Eastman, M. E. Alfaro, P. Joyce, A. L. Hipp, L. J. Harmon, A novel comparative method for identifying shifts in the rate of character evolution on trees. *Evolution*. **65**, 3578–3589 (2011).

210. D. M. Olson, E. Dinerstein, E. D. Wikramanayake, N. D. Burgess, G. V. N. Powell, E. C. Underwood, J. A. D'amico, I. Itoua, H. E. Strand, J. C. Morrison, C. J. Loucks, T. F. Allnutt, T. H. Ricketts, Y. Kura, J. F. Lamoreux, W. W. Wettengel, P. Hedao, K. R. Kassem, Terrestrial Ecoregions of the World: A New Map of Life on Earth: A new global map of terrestrial ecoregions provides an innovative tool for conserving biodiversity. *Bioscience*. **51**, 933–938 (2001).
211. S. J. Arnold, Species Densities of Predators and Their Prey. *Am. Nat.* **106**, 220–236 (1972).
212. A. G. Fischer, Latitudinal Variations in Organic Diversity. *Evolution*. **14**, 64–81 (1960).
213. D. P. Ford, R. B. J. Benson, The phylogeny of early amniotes and the affinities of Parareptilia and Varanopidae. *Nat Ecol Evol*. **4**, 57–65 (2020).
214. M. D. Ezcurra, T. M. Scheyer, R. J. Butler, The origin and early evolution of Sauria: reassessing the permian Saurian fossil record and the timing of the crocodile-lizard divergence. *PLoS One*. **9**, e89165 (2014).
215. J. F. Parham, P. C. J. Donoghue, C. J. Bell, T. D. Calway, J. J. Head, P. A. Holroyd, J. G. Inoue, R. B. Irmis, W. G. Joyce, D. T. Ksepka, J. S. L. Patané, N. D. Smith, J. E. Tarver, M. van Tuinen, Z. Yang, K. D. Angielczyk, J. M. Greenwood, C. A. Hipsley, L. Jacobs, P. J. Makovicky, J. Müller, K. T. Smith, J. M. Theodor, R. C. M. Warnock, M. J. Benton, Best practices for justifying fossil calibrations. *Syst. Biol.* **61**, 346–359 (2012).
216. S. E. Evans, D. C. Chure, Paramacellodid lizard skulls from the Jurassic Morrison Formation at Dinosaur National Monument, Utah. *J. Vert. Paleontol.* **18**, 99–114 (1998).
217. R. Hoffstetter, Les serpents du Néogène du Pakistan (couches des Siwaliks). *Bulletin de la Société géologique de France*. **7**, 467–474 (1964).
218. R. Estes, Sauria terrestria, amphisbaenia. Encyclopedia of paleoherpetology, Part 10a (1983).
219. S. E. Evans, D. J. Chure, Upper Jurassic lizards from the Morrison Formation of Dinosaur National Monument, Utah. *Vertebrate paleontology in Utah*. **99**, 151 (1999).
220. J. L. Conrad, J. C. Ast, S. Montanari, M. A. Norell, A combined evidence phylogenetic analysis of Anguimorpha (Reptilia: Squamata). *Cladistics*. **27**, 230–277 (2011).
221. J. L. Conrad, M. A. Norell, A complete Late Cretaceous iguanian (Squamata, Reptilia) from the Gobi and identification of a new iguanian clade. *American Museum Novitates*. **2007**, 1–47 (2007).
222. J. D. Daza, E. L. Stanley, P. Wagner, A. M. Bauer, D. A. Grimaldi, Mid-Cretaceous amber fossils illuminate the past diversity of tropical lizards. *Sci Adv*. **2**, e1501080 (2016).
223. E. N. Arnold, G. Poinar, A 100 million year old gecko with sophisticated adhesive toe pads, preserved in amber from Myanmar. *Zootaxa*. **1847**, 62 (2008).

224. R. L. Nydam, R. L. Cifelli, Lizards from the Lower Cretaceous (Aptian–Albian) Antlers and Cloverly Formations. *J. Vert. Paleontol.* **22**, 286–298 (2002).
225. T. S. Fachini, S. Onary, A. Palci, M. S. Y. Lee, M. Bronzati, A. S. Hsiou, Erratum: Cretaceous blind snake from Brazil fills major gap in snake evolution. *iScience*. **24**, 102180 (2021).
226. M. Elliot Smith, A. R. Carroll, B. S. Singer, Synoptic reconstruction of a major ancient lake system: Eocene Green River Formation, western United States. *GSA Bulletin*. **120**, 54–84 (2008).
227. R. L. Nydam, T. B. Rowe, R. L. Cifelli, Lizards and snakes of the Terlingua Local Fauna (late Campanian), Aguja Formation, Texas, with comments on the distribution of paracontemporaneous squamates throughout the Western Interior of North America. *J. Vert. Paleontol.* **33**, 1081–1099 (2013).
228. J. J. Head, Fossil calibration dates for molecular phylogenetic analysis of snakes 1: Serpentes, Alethinophidia, Boidae, Pythonidae. *Palaeontol. Electronica*. **18**, 1–17 (2015).
229. J. J. Head, K. Mahlow, J. Müller, Fossil calibration dates for molecular phylogenetic analysis of snakes 2: Caenophidia, Colubroidea, Elapoidea, Colubridae. *Palaeontol. Electronica*. **19** (2016), doi:10.26879/625.
230. H. Zaher, K. T. Smith, Pythons in the Eocene of Europe reveal a much older divergence of the group in sympatry with boas. *Biol. Lett.* **16**, 20200735 (2020).
231. K. T. Smith, B.-A. S. Bhullar, G. Köhler, J. Habersetzer, The only known jawed vertebrate with four eyes and the bauplan of the pineal complex. *Curr. Biol.* **28**, 1101–1107.e2 (2018).
232. K. T. Smith, Eocene Lizards of the Clade *Geiseltaliellus* from Messel and Geiseltal, Germany, and the Early Radiation of Iguanidae (Reptilia: Squamata). *Bulletin of the Peabody Museum of Natural History*. **50**, 219–306 (2009).
233. K. T. Smith, The squamation of the Eocene stem-basilisk *Geiseltaliellus maarius* (Squamata: Iguanidae: Corytophaninae) from Messel, Germany. *Salamandra*. **53**, 519–530 (2017).
234. K. M. Thorn, M. N. Hutchinson, M. Archer, M. S. Y. Lee, A new scincid lizard from the Miocene of northern Australia, and the evolutionary history of social skinks (Scincidae: Egerniinae). *J. Vert. Paleontol.* **39**, e1577873 (2019).
235. J. C. Rage, Z. Szyndlar, *Natrix longivertebrata* from the European Neogene, a snake with one of the longest known stratigraphic ranges. *Neues Jahrbuch für Geologie und Paläontologie*. **1986**, 56–64 (1986).
236. M. Ivanov, The first European pit viper from the Miocene of Ukraine. *Acta Palaeontol. Pol.* **44**, 327–334 (1999).
237. J. W. Streicher, J. J. Wiens, Phylogenomic analyses reveal novel relationships among snake

families. *Mol. Phylogenet. Evol.* **100**, 160–169 (2016).

238. J. W. Streicher, J. A. Schulte 2nd, J. J. Wiens, How should genes and taxa be sampled for phylogenomic analyses with missing data? an empirical study in Iguanian lizards. *Syst. Biol.* **65**, 128–145 (2016).

239. J. L. Grismer, J. A. Schulte 2nd, A. Alexander, P. Wagner, S. L. Travers, M. D. Buehler, L. J. Welton, R. M. Brown, The Eurasian invasion: phylogenomic data reveal multiple Southeast Asian origins for Indian Dragon Lizards. *BMC Evol. Biol.* **16**, 43 (2016).

240. A. D. Leaché, C. W. Linkem, Phylogenomics of Horned Lizards (Genus: *Phrynosoma*) using targeted sequence capture data. *Copeia*. **103**, 586–594 (2015).

241. A. D. Leaché, A. S. Chavez, L. N. Jones, J. A. Grummer, A. D. Gottscho, C. W. Linkem, Phylogenomics of phrynosomatid lizards: conflicting signals from sequence capture versus restriction site associated DNA sequencing. *Genome Biol. Evol.* **7**, 706–719 (2015).

242. R. A. Pyron, C. R. Hendry, V. M. Chou, E. M. Lemmon, A. R. Lemmon, F. T. Burbrink, Effectiveness of phylogenomic data and coalescent species-tree methods for resolving difficult nodes in the phylogeny of advanced snakes (Serpentes: Caenophidia). *Mol. Phylogenet. Evol.* **81**, 221–231 (2014).

243. X. Chen, A. R. Lemmon, E. M. Lemmon, R. A. Pyron, F. T. Burbrink, Using phylogenomics to understand the link between biogeographic origins and regional diversification in ratsnakes. *Mol. Phylogenet. Evol.* **111**, 206–218 (2017).

244. D. B. Tucker, G. R. Colli, L. G. Giugliano, S. B. Hedges, C. R. Hendry, E. M. Lemmon, A. R. Lemmon, J. W. Sites Jr, R. A. Pyron, Methodological congruence in phylogenomic analyses with morphological support for teiid lizards (Sauria: Teiidae). *Mol. Phylogenet. Evol.* **103**, 75–84 (2016).

245. R. W. Bryson Jr, C. W. Linkem, C. J. Pavón-Vázquez, A. Nieto-Montes de Oca, J. Klicka, J. E. McCormack, A phylogenomic perspective on the biogeography of skinks in the *Plestiodon brevirostris* group inferred from target enrichment of ultraconserved elements. *J. Biogeogr.* **44**, 2033–2044 (2017).

246. N. G. Crawford, B. C. Faircloth, J. E. McCormack, R. T. Brumfield, K. Winker, T. C. Glenn, More than 1000 ultraconserved elements provide evidence that turtles are the sister group of archosaurs. *Biol. Lett.* **8**, 783–786 (2012).

247. S. Ruane, C. J. Raxworthy, A. R. Lemmon, E. M. Lemmon, F. T. Burbrink, Comparing species tree estimation with large anchored phylogenomic and small Sanger-sequenced molecular datasets: an empirical study on Malagasy pseudoxyrhopiine snakes. *BMC Evol. Biol.* **15**, 221 (2015).

248. C. W. Linkem, V. N. Minin, A. D. Leaché, Detecting the Anomaly Zone in Species Trees and Evidence for a Misleading Signal in Higher-Level Skink Phylogeny (Squamata: Scincidae). *Syst. Biol.* **65**, 465–477 (2016).

249. R. A. Pyron, F. W. Hsieh, A. R. Lemmon, E. M. Lemmon, C. R. Hendry, Integrating
phylogenomic and morphological data to assess candidate species-delimitation models in
brown and red-bellied snakes (*Storeria*). *Zool. J. Linn. Soc.* **177**, 937–949 (2016).

Acknowledgements:

We thank G. Schneider and F. Kraus for sample access, P. Skipwith and S. Potter for logistical support, and A. Devault, J. Enk, M.R. Marchan-Rivadeneira and the team at UMich ARC for technical support. We also thank A. Davis Rabosky, members of the Rabosky Lab, and two anonymous reviewers for comments and suggestions that substantially improved this manuscript. Approximately 80% of the dietary records in our dataset came from preserved voucher specimens and we thank the curatorial staff of the many natural history collections worldwide that made this research possible. For photographs, we thank T. Schramer, R. Recoder, M.T. Rodrigues, J. Grummer, J. Farquhar, J. Crowe-Riddell, and A. Davis Rabosky. Pictures by R. Brown and B. Trapp were modified to compose manuscript figures.

Funding:

National Science Foundation, Division of Environmental Biology #1754398 (DLR, SS)
Packard Fellowship for Science and Engineering (DLR)
Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior (GRC)
National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (GRC)
FAPDF (GRC)
California State University, Dominguez Hills RSCA (SS)
National Science Foundation, Division of Environmental Biology #1754425 (GCC)
National Science Foundation, Division of Biological Infrastructure #0905765 (RAP)
National Science Foundation, Division of Environmental Biology #1441719 (RAP)
J. William Fulbright Fellowship (TJC)
National Science Foundation, Division of Environmental Biology #1501711 (TJC)
Australian Research Council (CM)
Australian Research Council #DE130101567 (MEHJ)
National Council for Scientific and Technological Development #304715/2021-2 (DOM)
Fundação de Apoio à Pesquisa do Estado da Paraíba-PB (DOM)
Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior-PRINT UFPB (AUXPE
88881.312082/2018-01; DOM)
National Science Foundation, Division of Environmental Biology #0415430 (LJV)
National Science Foundation, Division of Environmental Biology #9200779 (LJV)
National Science Foundation, Division of Environmental Biology #9505518 (LJV)

Author Contributions:

Project conceptualization and planning: DLR, POT, SS, MCG, GCC
Data collection: SS, TJC, MRG, GCC, LBQC, GRC, NS, MEHJ, POT, DLR, MCG, LJV
Funding acquisition: DLR, RAP, GCC, GRC, SS
Resources: DLR, RAP, GCC, LBQC, GRC, NDP, SCD, CM, DOM, ERP, SAS, LJV
Method development: MCG, DLR, POT
Data analysis: POT, SS, MCG, DLR, GCC
Data visualization: POT, SS, MCG, IP, DLR
Writing of primary draft: DLR, POT, SS

Editing, commenting and approving final draft: all authors but ERP (deceased).

Competing Interests: Authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Data Availability: Accession numbers (NCBI) for genomic data are available in Supplemental Data S1. Data and scripts used in data processing, analysis, and visualization are available on Dryad (42), Zenodo (43), and GitHub <https://github.com/macroevolution/squamata>.

Supplementary Materials

Materials and Methods

980 Figs. S1 to S44

Tables S1 to S5

Data S1 to S3

MDAR Reproducibility Checklist

985

Figure legends

Figure 1. Phenotypic innovation and evolutionary rates across squamates. Net innovation (Ψ) and evolutionary rate (TR) are shown across 246 squamate clades (bottom), subsampled from our full time-calibrated phylogeny of 6,885 species (fig. S3). Snakes show greater phenotypic innovation and faster rates of evolution for innovation in skull shape (Ψ_{skull}), elongation (Ψ_{elong}), and diet composition (Ψ_{diet}); these results are even more striking for colubriiform snakes (node *L*). Tip values are residuals from tree-wide median value; additional traits shown in fig. S8.

Figure 2. Phase shifts associated with the early evolution of snakes explain trait variation across extant squamates. Top row: Multiprocess models generally find strong support for major phase shifts in both trait state and rates associated with all snakes (red) or Alethinophidian snakes (orange; 88% of snake diversity). Bottom row: Cumulative trait variance across extant squamates explained by discrete phase shifts on single branches, as inferred from two distinct unsupervised learning methods. Total variance explained by five largest shift nodes (top row) are shown as triangles; results from stepwise canonical phylogenetic ordination are shown as squares. Individual node effects account for much less variance in climate (right) relative to other traits.

Figure 3. Fundamental ecological differences between snakes and lizards. (A) Multidimensional trophic niche as inferred from 68,547 individual squamates (stomach contents, field observations). Individual points correspond to species ($n = 1,314$); point size denotes dietary niche breadth. **(B)** Similarity path through diet space as inferred by principal graph analysis, illustrating taxonomic structure of resource differences between snakes and lizards. Nodes (circles) are groupings of species that consume similar resources; colors represent fractional resource use of each inferred node, and node sizes are proportional to the number of species assigned to the group. **(C)** Apparent dietary overlap between some snakes and lizards (panel A) masks differences in the ways that these groups utilize invertebrate prey. Arthropod-feeding snakes tend to eat spiders, centipedes, and scorpions (e.g., *Sonora semiannulata* and *Tantilla nigriceps*) or soft-bodied larval insects (e.g., *Amerotyphlops reticulatus*), and also consume far fewer adult insects relative to lizards. **(D)** Dietary niche breadths are much greater for lizards than for snakes, even after accounting for intraspecific sampling variability.

Figure 4: Speciation rates in snakes are consistently elevated relative to lizards. (A) Subsampled phylogeny of 246 clades (as in Fig. 1) illustrating **(B)** speciation rates (CLaDS) relative to tree-wide median rate. Rates for each tip represent the mean rate for all species assigned to each terminal clade. **(C)** Species richness and tip-averaged speciation rate for major clades within squamates (subfamily level). **(D)** Median and interquartile range for tip speciation rates across all snakes and lizards and for several key groups. **(E)** Speciation rates for individual species as a function of body elongation. Snakes are elongate and have fast rates of speciation **(D)** but elongate and/or limb-reduced lizards show no trends towards faster rates. Phylogenetic distribution of limb reduction is indicated by blue branches in the phylogeny shown in **(A)**. **(F)**

Phylogenetic regression analysis reveals minimal effect of any phenotypic traits on speciation rates ($R^2 < 0.01$).

1035

Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4

