# The plants of glossopterids : a reappraisal and review

Divya Darshan Pant

Pant DD 1997. The plants of glossopterids: a reappraisal and review. Palaeobotanist 46 (3): 105-110.

New information about the structural features of the plants of *Glossopteris* and related genera is reviewed in the light of advances made on the basis of permineralized fossils of the group mainly those which have been lately discovered in Antarctica. It is pointed out that the permineralized remains have merely confirmed, although far more vividly, the presence of anatomical features which had been inferred earlier by the study of impression and compression (incrustation) fossils of the glossopterids. The author concludes that the study of impression, compression (incrustation) fossils is as important as that of permineralized remains and many a time the former furnish details which are difficult to observe in permineralized remains.

Key-words — Glossopterids, Anatomy, Permineralized fossils, Impressions, Compressions (incrustations).

D.D. Pant, Department of Botany, University of Allahabad, Allahabad 211 002, India.

#### सारौँश

## ग्लॉसॉप्टेरिडी पौधे : एक पुनर्व्याख्या एवं समालोचना

#### दिव्य दर्शन पन्त

ग्लॉसॉप्टेरिडी तथा सम्बद्ध प्रजातियों के पौधों के संरचनात्मक लक्षणों के बारे में अभी हाल में अंटार्कटिका से एकत्रित इसी समूह के पारखनिजीकृत पादपाश्मों के अध्ययन से उपलब्ध नई जानकारी की समीक्षा की गई है। यह प्रदर्शित किया गया है कि पारखनिजीकृत अवशेषों से केवल शारीरीय लक्षणों की उपस्थिति की ही पुष्टी होती है जैसा कि पहले ग्लॉसॉप्टेरिडी पौधों की छापों एवं संपीडनाश्मों के आधार पर अनुमान लगाया गया था। समीक्षा के आधार पर यह निष्कर्ष निकाला गया है कि छापों एवं संपीडनाश्मों का अध्ययन भी उतना ही महत्वपूर्ण है जितना कि पारखनिजीकृत अवशेषों का बहुधा छापों एवं संपीडनाश्मों से ऐसी विस्तृत जानकारी मिल जाती है जो कि पारखनिजीकृत अवशेषों से बहुत ही मुश्किल से मिल पाती है।

NEARLY twenty years ago I published an account of "The plant of Glossopteris" (Pant, 1977) wherein I tried to present a reconstruction of the plant based on studies of impressions and compressions of the different fragments of its vegetative and reproductive organs. A recent article by Pigg and Trevitt (1994) has now triggered the necessary stimulus in me to review my earlier account of the plant which is duly cited by the above authors in their references but, unfortunately, without mentioning that my associates and I had arrived at practically the same conclusions much earlier about the structural features besides additional details of the various organs of the Glossopteris plant on the basis of our studies of its different organs in the compressed state. Unfortunately, two papers by Pant and Nautiyal (1965, 1984b) on the compressed seed bearing, fructifications whose permineralized remains are

mentioned as "megasporophylls" by Pigg and Trevitt (1994), seem to have been missed in being cited by them. However, their references to Pant (1982, 1987) imply that these authors may have been aware of the work.

## IMPRESSIONS AND COMPRESSIONS VERSUS PERMINERALISATIONS

At the outset it is important to say that careful studies of compressed fossils preserved as incrustations, based on observations of parts and counterparts, are often as informative as permineralizations (Whittington & Morris, 1985; Gould, 1991). Organs which became naturally macerated by the plant substance becoming preserved in various states of degradation, during fossilization, are often rendered more or less translucent and they show various details of internal structure under the microscope, particularly when these are pulled out in cellulose acetate and mounted in Canada balsam. When plant parts of sizeable thickness are compressed in rock matrix, e.g., bunches of sporangia which lie in slightly differing planes, above or below the plane of fracture of a hand specimen, they can be carefully excavated out of the matrix or they can be extracted out by carefully dissolving the rock piece in HF, if silicified, or HCl if calcified. Observations of compressions in oil can reveal the presence of hairs or other similarly protruding structures (Pant, 1958). Harris (1938) was able to show that the highly controversial fossils of *Natadita*, belonged to a bryophyte by studying them in oil.

In fact, sectional views of permineralized remains are often inadequate for a clear understanding of the form and, therefore, some crustaceans (Scourfield, 1926) and cyanobacteria (Croft & George, 1959) had to be observed directly in broken chips of rock by putting them in oil and observing them under an oil immersion objective but without sectioning as is usually the practice for observing permineralized remains. Compressed fossils have often yielded important information about the hidden face of incrustations of compressions by preparing transfers with Walton's transfer technique (Walton, 1923). This was actually done by Pant and Nautival (1984) in the case of Ottokaria, the female fertiliger of Glossopteris where they could observe attached seeds on the usually uneven and therefore firmly rock-attached concave faces of the fructifications.

It is important to mention that even impressions of fossils, when they are well preserved in finegrained rock matrix, can show features of epidermal cells, stomata, hairs and other superficial structures in the parts and counterparts under oblique lighting or in oil.

Compression or telescoping of an organ in different directions can yield information about its shape in different directions, e.g., the platyspermic and radiospermic character of seeds (Pant, 1958; Pant & Nautiyal, 1960) the form of sporangia and annulus (Pant & Khare, 1960) and about internal structures like presence of fibres and vascular strands and nucellar surface and tissues, pollen chambers, megaspore membranes, gametophytic tissues and archegonia and starch grains inside cells of glossopterid seeds have been described in detail by Pant (1958), Pant and Nautiyal (1960), Pant and Srivastava (1964) and Pant *et al.* (1985).

No doubt permineralized fossils can yield indubitable information about the details of internal structure of plant fossils but, as mentioned above, the details of surface and internal features inferred from compressions are in no way less significant. It is actually important to mention that compressions of fossils of several extinct groups of plants which have not been found preserved in permineralized condition have been vividly deciphered from such remains without having a single permineralized fossil. This is also true of many early vascular plants from the Late Silurian and Devonian, numerous Carboniferous, Permian, Triassic, Jurassic, Cretaceous and Cainozoic fossils like those of many Palaeozoic ferns, pteridosperms, the Caytoniales, Corystospermales, Peltaspermales, Pinophytes and Ginkgophytes. Last but even more important are the Cretaceous and Cainozoic flowers (Friis, 1983, 1985, 1990; Friis et al., 1987) which are not usually found permineralized.

Many of the above mentioned plants are known only in the form of impressions and compressions (incrustations) but their structural details are almost as well known as those of permineralized fossils. As is true for almost all fossils, there are many mute points about their growth habits and reconstructions like what is true about the glossopterids, e.g., the growth habit of one of the best known pteridosperms, Lyginopteris oldhamia- Sphenopteris hoeninghausii-Calymmatotheca-Lagenostoma, is largely a matter of conjecture. Indeed that is also true about some of the best known Mesozoic pteridosperms like the Caytoniales or Corystospermales. The stems of these two groups are almost unknown although I would like to think that their foliage and fructifications were borne on sizeable trees or climbing shrubs. At least their disaccate pollen grains would suggest that

*Caytonanthus* and *Pteruchus* microsporangia may have been held high for the wide scatter of such pollen grains through air currents. Pant (1949, 1987, 1992) has suggested the possibilities of pollen rains in forests of Glossopteris flora.

#### RELATIVE ADVANTAGES OF COMPRESSION FOSSILS OVER PERMINERALIZATIONS

In fact, compressions can many a time vividly indicate and confirm the unclear details of permineralized fossils which can be studied only in almost repetitive sections and thereafter reconstructed. Compressions reveal the entire external form of fossils which permineralized parts may fail to show. A classic example of such studies is furnished by the observations made by Surange (1952) and Chaloner (1958) on Bensonites fusiformis, the magasporangium of Stauropteris burntislandica. Surange observed Bensonites only in sections of permineralized material and could not ascertain the number and the form of the megaspores inside the megasporangia, whereas Chaloner could find the entire megasporangia in macerations of rock matrix and he could also extract them from their permineralized material. He could thus show that the megasporangium of Bensonites contained a tetrahedral tetrad of two large megaspores juxtaposed with two small ones and all of them were enclosed in a membrane which he called Didymosporites. It is, therefore, important, nay many a time essential for students of permineralized fossils not to overlook the earlier achievements of those who have studied impressions and compressions and found structural details which are confirmed by their studies of permineralized fossils.

Unfortunately, the article by Pigg and Trevitt (1994) while highlighting the details of internal structure revealed by permineralized fossils gives the impression that many of the structural features of glossopterid gymnosperms were discovered for the first time by studies of permineralized fossils. This is far from being true since earlier observations on impression and compression fossils had already revealed many structural details which have no doubt been confirmed vividly by studies of

permineralized fossils. I would particularly like to mention that the presence of epidermal hairs, sunken stomata, stomatal pits, subsidiary cells with overarching papillae, polar and lateral lignin lamellae of guard cells, presence of a hypodermis, palisade and spongy mesophyll cells, fibres in vein meshes and along veins, multiple veined midribs, upwardly curved or almost joined veins at the margins, vein and midrib bundle xylem showing scalariform and pitted elements had been observed by the author (Pant, 1958) and his group of workers (Pant & Gupta, 1971; Pant & Singh, 1971, and others).

It must also be mentioned that the difference between leaves of *Glossopterts* and other glossopterids like *Belemnopterts* (Feistmantel, 1976, 1981; Lacey *et al.*, 1974, 1975; Pant & Chowdhury, 1977). *Sagittop- byllum* (Pant *et al.*, 1984; Pant & Chauhan, 1996) and others would have been difficult to decipher if only permineralized fossils had been available to us.

Our studies of compressions have in fact helped us also in allaying our own doubts about certain features of glossopterid fossils. When Pant (1958) found seeds of Spermatites crystallinus showing crystal marks over the outer cuticle, a lurking doubt remained about the crystal marks coming from the rock matrix or belonging to the seed surface. However, when Pant and Nautiyal (1960) found impressions of seeds on the leaf cuticles of Glossopteris and these showed cell outlines and crystals only in the region of the impressions of seeds, it became at once clear that the crystals belonged to the seed surface. When leaf cuticle of Glossopterts also showed impressions of sporangia of Arbertella and also disaccate spores prevailingly shed by sporangia of Arberiella it became clear that these were shed over glossopterid leaves due to their being held above the leaves in the life of plants. Thus even though permineralized fossils have their strong points and advantages, over compression and impression fossils, there are also other aspects in which compression fossils are superior to permineralized ones.

#### ACHIEVEMENTS OF STUDIES ON PERMINERALIZED GLOSSOPTERID FOSSILS

In view of the above mentioned facts I am compelled to point out that an otherwise excellent summary of the achievements made by studies of permineralized fossils has unfortunately erred in making it appear that the structural features of the glossopterid gymnosperms were discovered for the first time by studies of permineralized fossils when many of them had been known already on the basis of earlier studies of compressions and impressions. The credit of the permineralized fossils lies mainly in vividly confirming structural features which had been inferred from impression and compression fossils and we must all admit that is the contribution of paramount importance made by studies of permineralized fossils.

#### **BLECHNOXYLON IS A GLOSSOPTERIS**

There are also some other points about the account of Pigg and Trevitt (1994) which need correction. These authors have, for example, mentioned that Blechnoxylon talbragarense (Etheridge, 1899) "was recognized as a seed plant by Seward (1910) particularly on the basis of its typically gymnospermous stem as cut in transverse section" but they did not mention that Seward (1910, p. 510) had instead unequivocally stated "Although the leaves of Blechnoxylon are much smaller than those of Glossopteris, I am now disposed to regard the genus as closely allied or even generically referable to Glossopteris. The crowded disposition of leaves is like that in Glossopteris ..... The absence of reticulum of anastomosing veins can no longer be considered a fatal objection to the suggestion that the Australian type may be a species of Glossopterts". Seward had nowhere suggested that *Blechnoxylon* was a seed plant and the above mentioned statements of Seward were supported by Pant and Singh (1974). Subsequently, Pant and Nautiyal (1984a) re-examined the type material and they supported Seward's ideas on the basis of their having seen a few cross connections between forks of adjacent veins particularly in Museum Slide no. AM 152 (Original No. 6309) and other resemblances between leaves of Glossopteris talbragarense and leaves of Glossopteris, like those of *G. hispida* (Pant, 1958) in the presence of multicellular hairs. It is necessary to point out that small leaves too are no bar to the reference of *G. talbragarense* to *Glossopterts* since even smaller leaves of that genus have been described by Zeiller (1896) and Pant and Nautiyal (1987).

#### INTERGRADATION OF PERMINERALIZED AND OTHER KINDS OF FOSSILS

In connection with this discussion on impression, compression (incrustation) and permineralized fossils it is important to point out that these various kinds of fossils intergrade, e.g., a permineralized fossil can be more or less compressed and partially decayed out during preservation. Likewise a compression (incrustation) fossil may also be partially permineralized and infiltrated with mineral matter. This was actually observed in the wood of *Burtadia* by Pant and Nautiyal (1967).

## VERTEBRARIA COULD BELONG TO A ROOT OR STEM

It must also be pointed out that attached leaves of Glossopteris and other glossopterids have been reported by various workers from time to time. Zeiller (1896), Oldham (1897), Dolianiti (1954) and Pant (1977) found them attached to axes which presented features of Vertebraria but others found them attached to axes which lacked typical rectangular areas of Vertebraria (Walton & Wilson, 1932). Vascular tissues of Vertebraria were first described by Walton and Wilson, (1932) and later by Pant (1956), Pant and Singh (1968) and others. Authors like Schopf (1965), described permineralized axes of Vertebraria and thought that their exarch protoxylem indicated that these were roots. But it was pointed out by Pant and Singh (1974) and Pant (1977) that primitive stems were quite like roots in having exarch protoxylem and Vertebraria could even be a stem. Indeed Pant (1977) thought that Vertebraria axes could represent roots as well as stems. Pant (1958b) also described young roots of Vertebraria where he could even see endogenous root primordia slightly behind root apices as they occur in roots. Some of these thin roots were

attached to *Vertebraria* axes. *Vertebraria* could indeed be a rhizomorph an organ like stigmarian axes which can neither be termed a root nor stem. These organs clearly suggest that Nature often defies strict definitions.

#### CONCLUSION

The present reappraisal and review of the work on glossopterids by various workers reminds me of J.G. Saxe's poem.

"It was six men of Indostan"

(or any other country)

"To learning much inclined

Who went to see the elephant

(Though all of them were blind).

.....

.....

And so these men of Indostan

Disputed loud and long

Each in his own opinion

Exceeding stiff and strong,

Though each was partly in the right,

All were in the wrong"

Like the six men different palaeobotanists either observe impressions, compressions (incrustations) or permineralizations of the fragmented plant bodies. They all obtain only partial views of the original plants, and therefore, it is necessary that they do not remain oblivious of the observations made on other kinds of fossils to correlate and consider their own observations with those made by others to obtain correct ideas about the fossil plants under their investigations.

#### REFERENCES

- Chaloner WG 1958. Isolated megaspore tetrads of *Stauropteris* burntislandica, Ann. Bot. (N.S.) 22: 197-204.
- Croft WN & George EA 1959. Blue green algae from the Middle Devonian of Rhynie, Aberdeenshire. *Bull. Brit. Mus. (Nat. Hist). Geol.* **3** (10): 339-353.
- Dolianiti E 1954. A flora do Gondwano inferior am Santa Catarina, 4. O Genero Vertebraria. Notas prelim. Estud. Div. Geol. Miner. Bras. 81: 1-5.

- Etheridge R 1899. On a fern (*Blechnoxylon talbragarense*) with secondary wood forming a new genus, from the Coal-Measures of the Talbragar District, New South Wales. *Rec. Austr. Mus.* **3**: 135-146.
- Feistmantel O 1876. On some fossil plants from the Damuda Series in the Raniganj Coalfield collected by Mr. J. Wood-Mason. J. Asiat. Soc. Bengal (2): 329-382.
- Feistmantel O 1881. The fossil flora of the Gondwana System. The flora of Damuda Panchet Divisions. *Mem. geol. Surv. India Palaeont. indica*. Ser. 12 (3): 78-149.
- Friis EM 1983. Upper Cretaceous (Senoniam) floral structures cf. juglandalean affinity containing Normapolles pollen. Rev. Palaeobot. Palynol. 39: 161-188.
- Friis EM 1985. Angiosperm fruits and seeds from the Middle Miocene of Jutland (Denmark). Kongl. Danske Vidensk. selskab, Selskab Biol. Skrifter 36: 1-35.
- Friis EM, Chaloner WG & Crane PR (Editors) 1987. The origin of angiosperms and their biological consequences. Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Gould SJ 1991. Wonderful life. Penguin Books, London.
- Harris TM 1938. *The British Rhaetic Flora*. British Museum (Nat. Hist), London.
- Lacey WS, Van Dijk DE & Gordon-Gray KD 1974. New Permian Glossopteris flora from Natal. S. Afr. J. Sci. **70** (5): 154-156.
- Lacey WS, Van Dijk DE & Gordon-Gray KD 1975. Fossil plants from the Upper Permian of Mooi River District of Natal, South Africa. Ann. Natal Mus. 22 (2): 349-420.
- Oldham RD 1887. On a plant of *Glossopteris* with part of the rhizome attached, and on the structure of *Vertebraria*. *Rec. geol. Surv. India* **30** (1): 45.
- Pant DD 1949. On the occurrence of *Pityosporites* Seward in a Lower Gondwana tillite from Australia and its possible relationship with *Glossopteris. Proc. Indian Sci. Congr., Allababad* : 10-11.
- Pant DD 1956. On two compressed Paleozoic axes: Stigmaria ficoides and Vertebraria indica. Ann. Bot. n.s. 20: 419-429.
- Pant DD 1958a. On the structure of some leaves and fructifications of the Glossopteris flora of Tanganyika. *Bull. Brit. Mus. (Nat. Hist.) Geol.* 3: 127- 175.
- Pant DD 1958b. Structure of some roots and spores from the Lower Gondwana (Permo-Carboniferous) of East Africa. *VijnanaParisbad Anusandhan Patrika* 1(4): 231-244.
- Pant DD 1977. The plant of Glossopteris. J. Indian bot. Soc. 56: 1-23.
- Pant DD 1982. The Lower Gondwana gymnosperms and their relationships. *Rev. Palaeobot. Palynol.* 37: 55-70.
- Pant DD 1987. Reproductive biology of Glossopterids and their affinities. Bull. Soc. fr. Actual Bot. **134** (2): 77-93.
- Pant DD 1992. Forests of India through the ages. J. Sen Memorial Lecture 1: 11-31. (Seventh lecture 1987). Calcutta University, Calcutta.
- Pant DD & Chauhan DK 1996. On Sagittophyllum and Laceyphyllum, two genera of glossopterid leaves from Lower Gondwanas. Dabar Festscrift. (in Press).
- Pant DD & Chowdhury A 1977. On the genus *Belemnopteris* Feistmantel. *Palaeontographica* **B164**: 153-166.
- Pant DD & Gupta KL 1968. Cuticular structure of some Indian Gondwana species of Glossopteris Bgt. Pt. I. Palaeontographica B124: 45-81.

- Pant DD & Gupta KL 1971. Cuticular structure of some Lower Gondwana species of *Glossopteris* Bgt. Part 2. *Palaeontographica* B132: 130-152.
- Pant DD & Khare PK 1974. Damudopteris gen. nov.— a new genus of ferns from the Lower Gondwanas of Raniganj Coalfield, India. Proc. R. Soc. London B186: 121-135.
- Pant DD & Nautiyal DD 1960. Some seeds and sporangia of Glossopteris flora from Raniganj Coalfield, India. *Palaeontographica* B107-41-61.
- Pant DD & Nautiyal DD 1965. Seed bearing Ottokaria-like fructifications from India. Nature 207: 623-624.
- Pant DD & Nautiyal DD 1967. On the structure of *Buriadia beterophylla* (Feistmantel) Seward & Sahni and its fructification. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. London* **B252** (774): 27-48.
- Pant DD & Nautiyal DD 1984a. Notes on *Glossopteris talbragarense* (Etheridge Jr.) comb. nov. and some other Australian glossopterids. *Phyta* 4, 5: 33-37 (1981-1982).
- Pant DD & Nautiyal DD 1984b. On the morphology and structure of Ottokaria zeilleri sp. nov., a female fructification of Glossopteris. Palaeontographica B195: 127-152.
- Pant DD & Nautiyal DD 1987. Diphyllopteris verticillata Srivastava, the probable seedling of Glossopteris from the Palaeozoic of India. Rev. Palaeobot. Palynol. 51: 31-36.
- Pant DD, Nautiyal DD & Chauhan DK 1984. Sagittophyllum gen. nov., a new glossopterid leaf. Developmental and comparative aspects of plant structure and function: 195-198.
- Pant DD, Nautiyal DD & Tiwari SP 1985. On some Indian Lower Gondwana compressions of seeds. *Palaeontographica* B196: 31-78.
- Pant DD & Singh KB 1971. Cuticular structure of some Indian Lower Gondwana species of *Glossopteris* Bgt. Part 3. *Palaeontographica* B135: 1-40.
- Pant DD & Singh RS 1968. The structure of Vertebraria indica Royle. Palaeontology 11: 643-653.

- Pant DD & Singh RS 1974. On the stem and attachment of *Gangamopteris* and *Glossopteris* leaves. Part II. Structural features. *Palaeontographica* **B147**:42-73.
- Pant DD & Srivastava GK 1968. On Walkomiellospermum indicum gen. et sp. nov. seed like bodies and alete megaspores from Talchir Coalfield, India. Proc. Natn. Inst. Sci. India B29(6): 575-584.
- Pigg KD & Trevitt ML 1994. Evolution of glossopterid gymnosperms from Permian Gondwana. J. Plant Res. **107**: 461-477.
- Schopf JM 1965. Anatomy of the axis of Vertebraria. In: Hadley JB (Editor)— Geology and Palaeontology of the Antarctic Res. Ser. 6 Amer. Geophys. Union of Nat. Acad. Sci., Nat. Res. Council Washington D.C.: 217-228.
- Schopf JM 1982. Forms and facies of Vertebraria in relation to Gondwana coal. Geology of the Central Transantarctic Mountains. Ant. Res. ser.36: 37-62.
- Scourfield DJ 1926. A new type of crustacean from the Old Red Sandstone (Rhynie Chert Bed, Aberdeenshire)- Lepidocaris rbyniensis gen. et sp. nov. Phil. Trans. R. Soc. London B214:133-187.
- Seward AC 1910. Fossil Plants, 2. Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Surange KR 1952. The morphology of *Stauropteris burntislandica* P. Bentrand and its megasporangium *Bensonites fusiformis* R. Scott. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. London* **B237**: 73-91.
- Walton J 1923. On a new method of investigation of fossil plant impressions or incrustations. Ann. Bot. 37: 379-390.
- Walton J & Wilson JAR 1932. On the structure of Vertebraria. Proc. R. Soc. Edinburgh 52(2): 200-207.
- Whittington HB & Morris SC 1985. Extraordinary fossil biotas: their ecological and evolutionary significance. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. London* B311: 1-192.
- Zeiller R 1896. E'tude sur quelques fossiles en particulier Vertebraria et Glossopteris des environs de Johannesburg (Transvaal). Bull. Soc. Geol. France, Paris ser. 3, 24: 349-378.