

The origins of angiosperms are still debated, despite many years of work by scientists from differing disciplines. The progress made toward resolving the problem is reviewed in this book. The author suggests that the only fruitful method of study is the total integrated use of the fossil record, particularly dispersed palynomorphs. This includes the use of electron microscopy and refined data handling to record the occurrence of microscopic fossils, rather than the extensive use of morphology and cladistics. The methods advocated in this book could result in a rethink of the current classification of living plants. The ideas presented will initiate discussion between professionals and students of paleontology and plant science on the wider possibilities that may clarify the enigmatic origins of the dominant flowering plant groups.



Cambridge Paleobiology Series

1 The enigma of angiosperm origins



CAMBRIDGE PALEOBIOLOGY SERIES

Series Editors:

D. E. G. BRIGGS, University of Bristol

P. DODSON, University of Pennsylvania

B. J. MACFADDEN, University of Florida

J. J. SEPKOSKI, University of Chicago

R. A. SPICER, University of Oxford

Cambridge Paleobiology Series is a new collection of books in the multidisciplinary area of modern paleobiology. The series will provide accessible and readable reviews of the exciting and topical aspects of paleobiology. The books will be written to appeal to advanced students and to professional earth scientists, paleontologists and biologists who wish to learn more about the developments in the subject.



The enigma of angiosperm origins

NORMAN F. HUGHES

Department of Earth Sciences, University of Cambridge, and Queens' College, Cambridge





CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo

Cambridge University Press The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521411455

© Cambridge University Press 1994

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1994

This digitally printed first paperback version 2005

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

Hughes, Norman F. (Norman Francis)

The enigma of angiosperm origins / by Norman F. Hughes.

p. cm. – (Cambridge Paleobiology Series 1)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0 521 41145 9

1. Angiosperms, Fossil. 2. Paleobotany – Mesozoic. I. Title.

II. Series.

QE980.H79 1994 93-41393 CIP

561'.2 - dc20

 $ISBN-13\ 978-0-521-41145-5\ hardback$

ISBN-10 0-521-41145-9 hardback

ISBN-13 978-0-521-67554-3 paperback ISBN-10 0-521-67554-5 paperback



DEDICATED IN MEMORY OF

Hugh Hamshaw Thomas F.R.S. 1885-1962

of the Botany School, Cambridge, and of Downing College,
who essentially solved a significant part of
the problem in the context of knowledge
seventy years ago,
but who was ahead of his time



Contents

	Preface	page xi
	Illustration credits	xiii
Part I	The setting of the problem	1
1	Outline history of investigations	1
2	Current contributions on origin	6
3	Challenges to customary procedures	13
4	Working principles	21
5	Stratigraphic framework	27
6	General Mesozoic palynologic evidence	34
7	Integration of Mesozoic floras and faunas	43
Part II	The evidence for Cretaceous origin	55
8	Mesozoic megafossils	55
9	English Barremian monosulcate pollen	118
10	First convincing angiospermous fossils	197
11	Cretaceous angiosperm consolidation	215



x Contents

Part III	Consequences and conclusions	225
12	Cenozoic angiosperm radiation	225
13	Research unattained but possible	231
14	Principles, time and choice	234
15	General biological conclusions	246
	Glossary	255
	References	270
	Index	291



Preface

This book is intended as a sequel to my previous book published in 1976 (*Paleobiology of angiosperm origins*, CUP), but is not in any sense a second edition. The still unsolved problem of angiosperm origins has moved on in terms of interest and of general attention, but remains in some respects as wide open as ever. It is currently possible to publish serious papers proposing origins scattered over 150 million years of Triassic to Cretaceous time, a duration longer than the probable subsequent period of existence of this centrally important group of plants. Having studied Mesozoic fossils relevant to the problem over the last forty years, and having thus been personally involved along with many others in the failure to solve it, I sincerely believe that this failure is not due primarily to lack of application on the part of any one of us, and that consequently there is a significant error of method concealed somewhere.

The current divide appears to be between the relatively few who maintain that reliable evidence can only come from the fossil record, and perhaps the majority who feel that all the weight of scientific effort committed over many years to comparative morphology, to interpretation of chromosome numbers, to DNA or RNA signatures and the like should somehow prevail. To a believer in the ultimate efficacy, when properly employed, of the whole integrated fossil record, despite its shortcomings, the 'comparative morphology' method can offer only approximations with no time-sequence basis and thus no penetration beyond a fog of enthusiasm that is not meaningfully susceptible to statistical manipulation. Compromise has already been tried for perhaps two decades now without any noticeable success, and will doubtless persist, but the strong suspicion that the significant error of method is indeed to be found in this neontologic procedure suggests that compromise is not any longer of value here.

Unfortunately the issues very easily become emotionally charged. This is a measure of the great investment in the existing shored-up part-solution of the problem; the very central classification of extant angiosperms, leading on to good order in botanical science and even to public esteem, appears to hang on the maintenance of this uneasy position. Because the consequences of any change of approach in the direction proposed might reach into the understanding of evolution, into the classification of all land plants affected by concepts of primitive and advanced characters, into taxonomy and the nomenclature codes, and into recording methods in the whole of paleontology, there is great difficulty in avoiding the giving of unintended offence.



xii Preface

No unusual rectitude is claimed for the ideas presented here, and no rapid solutions are offered, but I hope that the challenge is serious enough to encourage exploration for new lines both of evidence and of argument.

Although I have trawled ideas both positive and negative from very many paleobotanical colleagues past and present throughout the world, most of whose names appear at some stage in the book, none of them should be held to account even by association for any disasters of mine. Particularly helpful have been some of the botanical brigade of free-thinkers of the unexpected such as Tom M. Harris, E. J. H. Corner, Jack Douglas, William G. Chaloner, Val A. Krassilov, A. D. J. Meeuse, James A. Doyle, John M. Anderson and others who have unknowingly quashed for me various wilder aberrations. Research students and associates who have suffered and thus helped, knowingly or otherwise, include the late R. Ashley Couper, Frank R. Gnauck, Kathleen I. M. Chesters, Margaret G. Mortimer, Geoffrey Playford, Mary E. Dettmann, Jenny K. Friend, Geoffrey Norris, Keith C. Allen, Judy C. Moody-Stuart, Elizabeth M. Truswell, David J. Batten, Catherine A. Croxton, David G. Smith, John F. Laing, Timothy C. B. Oldham, Gillian E. Drewry, the late Timothy H. Jefferson, Jenny L. Chapman, Babagide Salami, Hamish J. Campbell, Audrey G. McDougall, Ihsan I. Aslam, James H. J. Penny and Ian C. Harding. I have also been very grateful for long periods over the years for much technical assistance in the Department of Earth Sciences from the late Albert Barlow, Paul Hensher, Stan Curtis and David Newling, and from many others at particular times. In the last few months I have been specially appreciative of help from Robert A. Spicer, Alan G. Smith, Gillian E. Drewry, Catherine Flack and Sandi Irvine of CUP, Audrey McDougall, Christine Few, Jacqueline Hodkinson and Hilary Alberti.

Norman F. Hughes



Illustration credits

The author is grateful to the following publishers and journals for permission to reproduce illustrations. The full forms of the references are given at the end of the book.

American Journal of Botany: 8.56 (Taylor and Archangelsky 1985), 10.7 (Drinnan et al. 1991), 10.8 (Dilcher and Kovach 1986).

Cambridge University Press: 5.2 (Hughes 1989), 8.3A, 8.9E,F, 8.13B (Stewart 1983), 8.22, 8.24, 8.34, 8.41, 8.44, 8.46, 8.58 (Hughes 1976), 10.3 (Upchurch and Wolfe 1987), 10.5C (Friis *et al.* 1987).

Columbia University Press: 8.49A (Watson 1988).

Elsevier Science Publishers BV: 8.14A,C, 8.32, 8.49B-D (Alvin 1982), 8.19B,C (Pedersen *et al.* 1989), 10.4D,E (Krassilov *et al.* 1983), 10.9 (Krassilov and Pacltova 1989).

ETP Publications: 8.11 (Cornet 1989b).

Missouri Botanical Garden: 8.4B, 8.6B-F, 8.19A, 8.27, 8.29, 8.36 (Crane 1985), 10.5A,B (Dilcher and Crane 1984).

National Botanical Institute, Pretoria: 8.4A (Anderson and Anderson 1985), 8.6A (Anderson and Anderson 1989), 8.9A-D (Anderson and Anderson 1983).

Palaeontology: 8.20, 8.53 (Hughes 1961).

Scandinavian University Press: 10.4A-C (reprinted from Krassilov and Bugdaeva 1988*c*, by permission of Scandinavian University Press).

E. Schweitzerbart'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung: 8.3B-D (Pant and Nautiyal 1984), 8.14B, 8.15 (Jung 1968), 8.18 (Schweitzer 1977), 8.39 (Krassilov 1975), 10.6A-C (Retallack & Dilcher 1981*b*).

United States Department of the Interior, Geological Survey: 8.60 (Ash and Read 1976).

University of Chicago Press: 10.6D,E (Drinnan *et al.* 1990, © 1990 by University of Chicago. All rights reserved), 11.1 (Doyle 1973, © 1973 Stony Brook Foundation, Inc.).