

Springer Geology

Xin Wang

The Dawn Angiosperms

Uncovering the Origin of Flowering
Plants

Second Edition

 Springer

Springer Geology

被子植物的曙光

贈王鑫博士 謹

Calligraphy of Chinese Version of “The Dawn Angiosperms,” by Mr. Jinglian Cai.

More information about this series at <http://www.springer.com/series/10172>

Xin Wang

The Dawn Angiosperms

Uncovering the Origin of Flowering Plants

Second Edition

 Springer

Xin Wang
Nanjing Institute of Geology and Palaeontology
Nanjing, Jiangsu
China

ISSN 2197-9545 ISSN 2197-9553 (electronic)
Springer Geology
ISBN 978-3-319-58324-2 ISBN 978-3-319-58325-9 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-58325-9

Library of Congress Control Number: 2017945088

© Springer International Publishing AG 2010, 2018

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Printed on acid-free paper

This Springer imprint is published by Springer Nature
The registered company is Springer International Publishing AG
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

*Dedicated to
the 120th Anniversary of
Peking University*



Preface

Angiosperms are the most diversified plant group in the world, being represented by *ca* 300,000 species in about 400 families. Like all of Life, including ourselves, they have had their own history and undergone many evolutionary stages before they arrive at their current forms. The origin of Angiosperms (flowering plants) has been the subject of much dispute because this is a key event in the history of life and has a far-reaching influence on our understanding of relationships among seed plants as a whole as well as within the angiosperms. Despite all efforts and investigations on pre-Cretaceous fossil plants, most of palaeobotanists accepted angiosperms only from the Cretaceous and younger strata. This not only contradicts the results of molecular analyses but also makes angiosperms as if out of nowhere.

I have been working on Mesozoic fossil plants in the past two decades, during which time I have studied a number of fossil plants. Some of these fossil plants have been published as Jurassic angiosperms, and, unsurprisingly, many questions and doubts have been raised about them. These questions need to be addressed seriously and journal papers do not provide sufficient space to compare and relate these early angiosperms. In this book, these pioneer angiosperms are documented in detail, sometimes with new specimens not studied before. Also, I propose a criterion to identify angiosperms that could be adopted in palaeobotany. My aim is to improve clarity and objectivity of judgment about what constitutes an angiosperm before studying. The evolution of angiosperms is evaluated in the background of seed plants or even in whole land plants. The general patterns of plant evolution are elaborated.

In Chap. 1, a brief introductory overview of angiosperms is given. In Chap. 2, some of the already suggested ancestors of angiosperms are noted. Chapter 3 discusses the various features scientists have used to define angiosperms, and an index character for fossil angiosperms is selected. Chapter 4 gives a brief summary of the geological and biological backgrounds of fossil plants to be elaborated upon in later chapters. Chapters 5 through 7 document in detail several angiosperms or possible angiosperms found in the Early Cretaceous and Jurassic of northeast China and south Germany, and these chapters form the core of the book. For those

interested in fossil evidence, these chapters may be your favorite. Chapter 8, based on current knowledge, raises a new hypothesis on flower formation and discusses possible origin and evolutionary history of angiosperms and land plants. For those interested in general evolution patterns of plants, especially reproductive organs, this may be your favorite chapter. Chapter 9 summarizes the results as a whole and provides suggestions for future study in related fields.

There are 671 pictures and drawings in 166 figures. These pictures represent the fossil plants in a way more direct and objective than words; the latter more or less reflects my personal inclination in interpretation as well as wording. In total, 642 references are cited. The readers can refer to these references for further information.

It is expected that this book, like many others, will have certain controversial aspects. The publishing of this book can only serve as a starting rather than a concluding point for works on these fossils as well as the origin of angiosperms. Everything in this book, including criteria, definitions, interpretations, and conclusions, is open to discussion. Readers are always welcome to interpret the data in this book from their own perspectives. I hope the readers can feel free to send me their opinions. I believe the future study of early angiosperms will benefit from such feedback and interaction.

Nanjing
March 2017

Xin Wang

Acknowledgements

My studies of the plant fossils described in this book can be dated back to the early 1990s, and some of the fossil collecting was done even before that time. During this long period, I have benefited from the constant support from my advisors, Drs. Shuying Duan, Ye Chen, David L. Dilcher, and Zhiyan Zhou. Many colleagues, including Drs. Shaolin Zheng, Jinzhong Cui, Shijun Wang, Baoyin Geng, Zhong-Jian Liu, Limi Mao, Frédéric Jacques, Gang Han, Yong Yang, and my advisors have coauthored papers with me. Many other colleagues and friends have offered valuable support and constructive suggestions from various aspects, including Drs. Wu Zhang, Zhaoliang Xu, Jingeng Sha, Shuangxing Guo, Qiang Ji, Jun Wang, Yi Wang, Deming Wang, Yaosong Xue, Chuanming Zhou, Dong Ren, Yuan Wang, Shunqin Wu, Fang Zheng, Shuren Zhang, Weiming Wang, Jianguo Li, Cuiling He, Chunzhao Wang, Erjun Zhuo, Xiting Cheng, Kaihe Du, Yinhou Xiao, Min Feng, Jie Wen, Zhi Du, Xuejian Yang, Zhaoyi Meng, Xin Xu, Song Ge, Liangqian Li, Hongzhi Kong, Qiang Zhang, Gang Li, Haichun Zhang, Qin Leng, Yibo Luo, Hongxia Liu, Yan Liang, Gongle Shi, Yan Fang, Hongtao Cai, Shikuan Liang, Yan Chen, Peter Stevens, Dennis W. Stevenson, Michael Frohlich, Walter Judd, Kevin Nixon, James Doyle, Peter Crane, Michael Krings, Stefan Schmeißner, Günter Dutsch, Martin Kirchner, Johanna H.A. van Konijnenburg-van Cittert, Steve McLoughlin, Thomas N. Taylor, Nora Dotzler, Larry Hufford, Meizhen Cao, Zhenyu Li, Jianan Zhu, Catarina Rydin, Steven Manchester, Ian Glasswool, José B. Diez Ferrer, Michael Heads, Douglas McKinnon, Williams Rose, and many unnamed here. Margaret Joyner have helped with English in the first edition of this book. Dr. Christopher Hill has gone through the first edition and given constructive and detailed suggestions. Finally, and most importantly, my family, especially my wife Huijun Ma, have been supportive for my research. I wish to extend my cordial thanks to all of them.

The research is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (41688103, 91514302, 91114201), Strategic Priority Research Program (B) of Chinese Academy of Sciences (Grant No. XDPB05, XDB18000000), the State Key Laboratory of Systematic and Evolutionary Botany at the Institute of Botany,

Chinese Academy of Sciences, the Scientific Research Foundation for Returned Overseas Chinese Scholars, State Education Ministry, State Key Laboratory of Palaeobiology and Stratigraphy (Nanjing Institute of Geology and Palaeontology, CAS, No. 053103), and Deep Time RCN. This work is a contribution to IGCP 632.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
	References	4
2	Suggested Angiosperm Ancestors	9
2.1	Gnetales	10
2.2	Gigantopteriales	11
2.3	Glossopteridales	12
2.4	<i>Sanmiguelia</i>	14
2.5	<i>Leptostrobus</i>	14
2.6	<i>Caytonia</i>	15
2.7	Bennettitales	17
2.8	<i>Umkomasia</i>	18
2.9	<i>Problematospermum</i>	19
2.10	Dirhopalostachyaceae	19
2.11	<i>Ktalenia</i>	20
2.12	Pentoxylales	21
2.13	<i>Irania</i>	22
2.14	Summary	22
	References	22
3	Angiosperms: Characters and Criteria	29
3.1	Messy Definitions of Angiosperms	29
3.2	Angiospermous Characters	30
3.2.1	Leaf Venation	31
3.2.2	Vessel Elements in the Xylem	32
3.2.3	Closed Carpel, or Enclosed Seed	32
3.2.4	Bitegmic Ovule	33
3.2.5	Double Fertilization	34
3.2.6	Tetrasporangiate Anther	34
3.2.7	Pollen Tube	35
3.2.8	Tectate-Columellate Pollen Grains	36

3.2.9	Developmental Pattern	36
3.2.10	Chemical Species	37
3.3	Criterion for Criteria	38
3.4	Criterion for Fossil Angiosperms	38
	References	41
4	Background for the Plant Fossils	47
4.1	Stratigraphy	47
4.2	Faunas	52
4.2.1	The Jiulongshan Fauna	52
4.2.2	The Yixian Fauna	53
4.3	Floras	54
4.3.1	The Jiulongshan Flora	54
4.3.2	The Yixian Flora	54
	References	54
5	Flowers from the Early Cretaceous	61
5.1	<i>Chaoyangia</i>	62
5.1.1	Previous Studies	62
5.1.2	Misunderstanding and Clarification	63
5.1.3	New Information	66
5.1.4	Emended Diagnosis	79
5.1.5	Description	79
5.1.6	Development	81
5.1.7	Pollination	82
5.1.8	Additional Points	82
5.1.9	Affinity	83
5.1.10	Problems Unsolved	90
5.2	<i>Archaeofructus</i>	91
5.2.1	<i>Archaeofructus</i> , a Great Discovery	91
5.2.2	Controversies over <i>Archaeofructus</i>	94
5.2.3	Diagnosis After Emendation	97
5.2.4	Ecology of <i>Archaeofructus</i>	97
5.2.5	The Discovery of <i>Archaeofructus</i>	98
5.3	<i>Sinocarpus</i>	99
5.4	<i>Callianthus</i>	101
5.4.1	Previous Studies	101
5.4.2	Misunderstanding and Clarification	101
5.4.3	New Information	101
5.4.4	Diagnosis	107
5.4.5	Description	107
5.4.6	Development	116
5.4.7	Pollination and Dispersal	118
5.4.8	Affinity	118
5.5	<i>Liaoningfructus</i>	122
5.5.1	General Background	122

5.5.2	Generic Diagnosis	122
5.5.3	<i>Liaoningfructus ascidiatus</i>	122
5.5.4	Discussions	124
5.6	<i>Baicarpus</i>	125
5.6.1	Diagnosis	127
5.6.2	<i>Baicarpus huangbanjigouensis</i>	127
5.6.3	<i>Baicarpus gracilis</i>	129
5.6.4	<i>Baicarpus robusta</i>	130
5.6.5	General Remarks	131
5.6.6	Affinity	132
5.6.7	Comparisons	133
5.6.8	Implications on Style Evolution	134
5.7	<i>Nothodichocarpum</i>	135
5.7.1	Generic Diagnosis	135
5.7.2	<i>Nothodichocarpum lingyuanensis</i>	135
5.7.3	Remarks	138
5.7.4	Affinity and Comparison	138
5.7.5	Implications on Flower Forming	141
5.7.6	Development	142
5.7.7	Summary	143
	References	143
6	Flower-Related Fossils from the Jurassic	151
6.1	<i>Schmeissneria</i>	151
6.1.1	Previous Studies	151
6.1.2	Misunderstandings and Clarifications	154
6.1.3	New Information	157
6.1.4	Emended Diagnosis	163
6.1.5	Description	164
6.1.6	Development	179
6.1.7	Pollination	181
6.1.8	Fruit Dispersal	181
6.1.9	Affinity	182
6.1.10	Ecology and Environment	184
6.1.11	Comparison with Other Relatives	184
6.1.12	Summary	184
6.2	<i>Xingxueanthus</i>	185
6.2.1	Background	185
6.2.2	Features of the Plant	185
6.2.3	Description	196
6.2.4	Affinity	198
6.2.5	Evolutionary Implications	200
6.2.6	Problems Unsolved	201
6.2.7	Summary	201

6.3	<i>Solaranthus</i>	202
6.3.1	Possibly Related Previous Studies	202
6.3.2	New Information and Implications	203
6.3.3	Diagnosis and Description	206
6.3.4	Affinity	212
6.3.5	Implications for the Origin of Angiosperms	217
6.4	<i>Euanthus</i>	221
6.4.1	Generic Diagnosis	221
6.4.2	<i>Euanthus panii</i>	221
6.4.3	Discussions	227
6.5	<i>Yuhania</i>	230
6.5.1	Generic Diagnosis	230
6.5.2	<i>Yuhania daohugouensis</i>	231
6.5.3	Remarks	235
6.5.4	Consistent Criterion for Angiosperm Recognition	235
6.5.5	Female Parts and Implications	235
6.5.6	Position of Ovule	236
6.5.7	Jurassic Monocot?	236
6.5.8	Leaf Structure and Habitat	238
6.5.9	Origin of Angiosperms	238
6.5.10	Conclusion	239
6.6	<i>Juraherba</i>	239
6.6.1	Description	240
6.6.2	Discussions	245
6.7	General Summary	249
	References	250
7	Fossil Plants Possibly Related to Angiosperms	259
7.1	Taxon A	259
7.1.1	Diagnosis	259
7.2	<i>Pseudoephedra</i>	262
7.2.1	<i>Pseudoephedra</i>	263
7.2.2	<i>Pseudoephedra paradoxa</i>	263
7.2.3	Discussions	267
7.2.4	Conclusions	270
7.3	<i>Problematospermum</i>	270
7.3.1	<i>Problematospermum</i>	271
7.3.2	<i>Problematospermum ovale</i>	271
7.3.3	Nomenclature and Structure	276
7.3.4	Developmental Series	277
7.3.5	Phylogenetic Relationships	277
7.4	<i>Nubilora</i>	279
7.4.1	Introduction	279
7.4.2	Geological Background	279
7.4.3	<i>Nubilora</i>	280

7.4.4	<i>Nubilora triassica</i> gen. et sp. nov.	281
7.4.5	Discussions	284
	References	288
8	The Making of Flowers	293
8.1	Major Events in the History of Plants	293
8.1.1	Before the Landing	293
8.1.2	The Landing	294
8.1.3	After Landing	295
8.1.4	Sexual Reproductive Cycle (SRC)	295
8.1.5	Generation Alternation	297
8.1.6	Sexual Modes	297
8.1.7	Tissue Differentiation	298
8.1.8	Organ Differentiation	298
8.1.9	Leaf	300
8.1.10	Heterospory	300
8.1.11	Endospory	301
8.1.12	Ovule	301
8.1.13	Diverted Development	302
8.1.14	Outer Integument	302
8.1.15	Angio-Ovuly	303
8.1.16	Vivipary	304
8.1.17	Angio-Carpy	304
8.1.18	Differentiation of Flowers in Inflorescence	304
8.1.19	Stamens	306
8.2	Basic Units of Reproductive Organs in Land Plants	306
8.2.1	Early Land Plants	307
8.2.2	Sphenopsida	307
8.2.3	Lycophytales	308
8.2.4	Ferns	310
8.2.5	Archaeopteridales and Aneurophytales	311
8.2.6	Cycadales	311
8.2.7	Ginkgoales	314
8.2.8	Cordaitales	316
8.2.9	Coniferales	318
8.2.10	<i>Palissya</i>	320
8.2.11	Gnetales	321
8.2.12	Caytoniales	321
8.2.13	Peltaspermales	322
8.2.14	Glossopteridales	322
8.2.15	Bennettitales	322
8.2.16	Pentoxylales	323
8.2.17	Vojnovskales	323
8.2.18	Caryophyllales	324
8.2.19	Myrtaceae	324
8.2.20	Actinidiaceae	325
8.2.21	<i>Amborella</i>	325

8.2.22	Magnoliaceae	325
8.2.23	Brassicaceae	325
8.2.24	Solanaceae	326
8.2.25	Basellaceae	327
8.3	Definition of a Carpel	328
8.3.1	Defining a Carpel	328
8.3.2	Converging on a New Definition	329
8.3.3	Derivation of the Carpel	333
8.4	Placenta	336
8.4.1	Isolation of Placenta from Carpel Wall	336
8.5	Origin of Placenta	338
8.6	Spatial Relationship Between Ovule and Adjacent Parts in Gymnosperms	342
8.7	Enclosing Ovules	343
8.7.1	Spatial Relationship and Ways of Ovule-Enclosing in Angiosperms	343
8.7.2	Parts Involving in Ovule-Enclosing	346
8.8	Flower	347
8.9	Favoring Evidence	348
8.9.1	Extant Plants	348
8.9.2	Fossil Plants	349
8.10	Angiosperm Prototype and Its Relationship to Other Seed Plants	350
8.11	Merits of the Unifying Theory	353
8.11.1	Simplicity and Directness	353
8.11.2	Support from Various Fields	353
8.11.3	Difficulties Negotiated	354
8.11.4	Wide Applicable Range	357
8.11.5	Settling Controversies	357
8.11.6	Goal to Reach	357
8.12	General Regularities in Seed Plant Evolution	358
8.12.1	Enclosure and Aggregation	358
8.12.2	Differentiation, Overgrowth and Reduction	359
8.12.3	Sterilization and Neofunctionalization	359
8.12.4	Connation and Adnation	359
8.12.5	Diverted Development	359
8.12.6	Better Conditioning the Growth of Offsprings	360
8.13	Problems Unsolved	360
8.13.1	From Unisexual to Bisexual	360
8.13.2	Boundary Between Gymnosperms and Angiospermae	361
8.13.3	Prediction and Test	361
8.14	Implications for Seed Plant Phylogeny	361
8.15	Evolutionary Roadmap of Plants	362
8.16	Disadvantages of the Classical Theories	362
	References	366

- 9 General Conclusions 375**
 - 9.1 Origins and Ancestors of Angiosperms 375
 - 9.1.1 Time of Origin 375
 - 9.1.2 Location and Habitat of Early Angiosperms 376
 - 9.1.3 Ancestors 377
 - 9.2 Monophyly or Polyphyly 378
 - 9.3 Animals and Plants 378
 - 9.4 Road to Success 379
 - 9.5 The Idiosyncrasy of Angiospermae or a Grade of Evolution? 380
 - 9.6 Digging Deeper 380
 - References 381

- 10 Appendix 385**
 - 10.1 List of Morphological Characters Used for Cladistic Analysis 385
 - 10.2 Morphological Matrix 390
 - 10.3 List of Fauna Elements 393
 - 10.3.1 The Jiulongshan Fauna 393
 - 10.3.2 The Yixian Fauna 395
 - 10.4 List of Flora Elements 398
 - 10.4.1 The Jiulongshan Flora 398
 - 10.4.2 The Yixian Flora 399
 - 10.5 Morphological Matrix for Seed Plant Cladistics 400
 - References 401

- Index 405**

Acronyms

AGS	Acta Geologica Sinica (English edition)
APG	Angiosperm Phylogeny Group
BSPG	Bayerische Staatssammlung für Paläontologie und Geologie, München, Deutschland
CNU	Capital Normal University, Beijing, China
GDPC	Günter Dutsch personal collection
IBCAS	Institute of Botany, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China
LHFM	Lingyuan Hongtao Fossil Museum, Liaoning, China
LM	Light microscope
NIGPAS	Nanjing Institute of Geology and Palaeontology, Academia Sinica, Nanjing, China
NOCC	National Orchid Conservation Center of China
IVPP	Institute of Vertebrate Palaeontology and Palaeoanthropology, Academia Sinica, Beijing, China
SEM	Scanning electron microscope
SFLBG	Shenzhen Fairy Lake Botanical Garden
SSPC	Stefan Schmeißner personal collection
STMN	Shandong Tianyu Museum of Nature, Pingyi, Shandong, China
TEM	Transmission electron microscope

List of Figures

Fig. 2.1	Approximate temporal distribution of the taxa discussed	10
Fig. 2.2	Leaf morphology, venation, and vessel elements of Gigantopterids	12
Fig. 2.3	Leaf and reproductive organ of Glossopterids	13
Fig. 2.4	Palm-like pleated leaf of <i>Sanmiguelia</i>	14
Fig. 2.5	Reproductive organ of Czekanowskiales	15
Fig. 2.6	<i>Paracaytonia</i> and <i>Sagenopteris</i>	16
Fig. 2.7	<i>Umkomasia</i> and its details	19
Fig. 2.8	Seeds of <i>Problematospermum ovale</i>	20
Fig. 2.9	Reconstructed <i>Ktalenia</i>	21
Fig 3.1	A possible scenario for the acquisition of characters typical of angiosperms in the geological history	40
Fig. 4.1	Geographical distribution of the Jurassic strata (including Early Cretaceous Yixian Formation) in China	48
Fig. 4.2	The stratigraphic column of the Jurassic and Cretaceous strata in western Liaoning and adjacent regions	49
Fig. 4.3	Geographical locations of Sanjiaochengcun and Huangbanjigou in western Liaoning Province	50
Fig. 4.4	The geographical position of Daohugou Village in Inner Mongolia, China	50
Fig. 4.5	The Jiulongshan Formation	51
Fig. 4.6	Outcrop of the Yixian Formation near Huangbanjigou in Beipiao, Liaoning, China	51
Fig. 5.1	Dr. Shuying Duan, the author of the first paper describing <i>Chaoyangia</i> , and Mr. Shikuan Liang, the collector of <i>Chaoyangia</i>	62
Fig. 5.2	The holotype of <i>Chaoyangia</i>	63
Fig. 5.3	Details of the styles, flowers/fructifications	64
Fig. 5.4	Details of connected floral parts	65

Fig. 5.5	Female flower A in Fig. 5.2b	67
Fig. 5.6	Male flowers and its connection to female flower	69
Fig. 5.7	Connected female flower and male flower	70
Fig. 5.8	In situ monocolpate pollen grains	71
Fig. 5.9	Details of the female flower shown in Fig. 5.7b	72
Fig. 5.10	Branches and leaves	73
Fig. 5.11	Isolated fructifications and those connected by branches	74
Fig. 5.12	Details within the fructifications	75
Fig. 5.13	Fructification and in situ seed	76
Fig. 5.14	Idealized diagrams of male flower, fructification, and inflorescence	77
Fig. 5.15	Possible phylogenetic relationship among <i>Chaoyangia</i> , <i>Archaeofructus</i> , and other seed plants, inferred based on morphological data	89
Fig. 5.16	<i>Archaeofructus liaoningensis</i>	92
Fig. 5.17	Reconstruction of <i>Archaeofructus eoflora</i>	93
Fig. 5.18	Fructification of <i>Sinocarpus</i>	100
Fig. 5.19	Two facing parts of the same flower of <i>Callianthus</i>	103
Fig. 5.20	Styles and arrangement of floral parts	104
Fig. 5.21	Stamen, tepal, and gap between carpels	109
Fig. 5.22	Whole tepals and stamen	110
Fig. 5.23	In situ pollen grains	111
Fig. 5.24	Details of <i>Callianthus</i> pollen grains	112
Fig. 5.25	In situ pollen grains seen on replicas	113
Fig. 5.26	Details of bristles, stomata, fructification surface, and tepal veins	114
Fig. 5.27	Fructifications and their details	115
Fig. 5.28	<i>Callianthus</i> fructifications and details	116
Fig. 5.29	Details of the fructification	117
Fig. 5.30	Sketch of the flower	121
Fig. 5.31	General morphology and details of <i>Liaoningfructus ascidiatus</i> ..	123
Fig. 5.32	Details of <i>Baicarpus huangbanjigouensis</i>	126
Fig. 5.33	Details of the fructification in Fig. 5.32a	128
Fig. 5.34	Further details of <i>Baicarpus</i>	130
Fig. 5.35	Idealized rendering of <i>Baicarpus</i>	134
Fig. 5.36	Holotype of <i>Nothodichocarpum</i> and its details	137
Fig. 5.37	Sketches of <i>Nothodichocarpum</i>	139
Fig. 5.38	Details of flowers under SEM	140
Fig. 5.39	Reconstruction of <i>Nothodichocarpum</i> flower/fruit in its flowering and fruiting stages	141
Fig. 6.1	<i>Schmeissneria microstachys</i> was once thought to be a male organ of <i>Baiera</i> in its early development	154
Fig. 6.2	Mr. Stefan Schmeißner and the stratum yielding <i>Schmeissneria microstachys</i> at Pechgraben, Kulmbach, Bayer, Germany	155

Fig. 6.3	A specimen of <i>S. microstachys</i> showing physically connected short shoot, leaves, and female inflorescences in various developmental stages	156
Fig. 6.4	Inflorescences	159
Fig. 6.5	Tufts of leaves attached to the apices of short shoots of <i>S. microstachys</i>	164
Fig. 6.6	Branches and leaves attached to short shoot of <i>S. microstachys</i>	165
Fig. 6.7	Female inflorescences of <i>S. microstachys</i>	166
Fig. 6.8	Inflorescences of <i>S. microstachys</i> in anthesis	167
Fig. 6.9	Three inflorescences of <i>S. microstachys</i> in anthesis	168
Fig. 6.10	Four female inflorescences of <i>S. microstachys</i>	169
Fig. 6.11	Infructescences, fruits and in situ seeds of <i>S. microstachys</i>	170
Fig. 6.12	Inflorescences of <i>S. sinensis</i> , and their details	171
Fig. 6.13	Young flowers of <i>S. sinensis</i> showing closed ovary tip	172
Fig. 6.14	Blooming flowers in a <i>S. microstachys</i> inflorescence, shown in Fig. 6.8b, and their hairs	173
Fig. 6.15	Blooming flowers of <i>S. microstachys</i> and their hairs	174
Fig. 6.16	Infructescence axis and tepals in the flowers of <i>S. microstachys</i>	175
Fig. 6.17	Fruits and in situ seeds of <i>S. microstachys</i>	176
Fig. 6.18	Details of in situ seeds within fruits of <i>S. microstachys</i>	177
Fig. 6.19	Reconstruction of <i>S. microstachys</i>	178
Fig. 6.20	Sketches of the flowers in various stages and perspectives	180
Fig. 6.21	The inflorescence of <i>Xingxueanthus sinensis</i>	186
Fig. 6.22	The inflorescence of <i>Xingxueanthus sinensis</i>	187
Fig. 6.23	A flower in axil of a bract and its details	188
Fig. 6.24	A flower covered by a bract and its details	189
Fig. 6.25	SEM of the placenta in Flower 5 in Fig. 6.22	190
Fig. 6.26	SEM of placenta in flowers	191
Fig. 6.27	Some details of flowers	192
Fig. 6.28	Some details of ovules in flowers	193
Fig. 6.29	Some details of flower placenta	194
Fig. 6.30	Reconstructions and sketches of the flowers	197
Fig. 6.31	Two facing parts of the same “inflorescence” with more than 13 “flowers”	207
Fig. 6.32	Two facing parts of the same “inflorescence” with up to 27 “flowers”	208
Fig. 6.33	A general view of two to three “inflorescences” on the same slab	209
Fig. 6.34	Two facing parts of another “inflorescence”	210
Fig. 6.35	Another “inflorescence” with clustered hexagonal/pentagonal “flowers”	210
Fig. 6.36	Details of the “flowers”	211
Fig. 6.37	Details of the “flowers”	212

Fig. 6.38	Details of the “tepals” and “stamens”	213
Fig. 6.39	Details of the “tepals” and “stamens”	215
Fig. 6.40	Details of the “gynoecium”	216
Fig. 6.41	Details of the ovulate structures and an ovule-like structure	217
Fig. 6.42	An inflorescence in its early development	218
Fig. 6.43	A young inflorescence in its early development	218
Fig. 6.44	Inflorescences with bracts or tepals	219
Fig. 6.45	The longitudinal sketch of a “flower”	220
Fig. 6.46	<i>Euanthus panii</i> and its details	223
Fig. 6.47	Details of <i>Euanthus panii</i>	224
Fig. 6.48	Gynoecium of <i>Euanthus panii</i>	225
Fig. 6.49	Stamens of <i>Euanthus panii</i>	226
Fig. 6.50	Sketch and reconstruction of <i>Euanthus panii</i>	227
Fig. 6.51	<i>Yuhania daohugouensis</i> and its details	232
Fig. 6.52	Leaves and their details	233
Fig. 6.53	Flower and aggregate fruits of <i>Yuhania</i>	234
Fig. 6.54	Reconstruction of <i>Yuhania</i>	237
Fig. 6.55	General morphology and details of <i>Juraherba</i>	241
Fig. 6.56	Details of <i>Juraherba</i> ’s leaves and root	242
Fig. 6.57	Details of <i>Juraherba</i> ’s fructifications	243
Fig. 6.58	Fluorescent micrographs of leaf, pedicel, and surrounding foliar parts on the fructification	244
Fig. 6.59	Reconstruction of whole plant, fructification, and leaf of <i>Juraherba</i>	246
Fig. 6.60	A scenario of diversification of angiosperms in the Mesozoic	249
Fig. 7.1	Two facing parts of Taxon A	260
Fig. 7.2	Details of Taxon A	260
Fig. 7.3	Details of Taxon A	261
Fig. 7.4	<i>Pseudoephedra paradoxa</i> and its details	264
Fig. 7.5	Details of <i>P. paradoxa</i>	266
Fig. 7.6	Sketches of <i>P. paradoxa</i> , showing details of female parts	267
Fig. 7.7	<i>Problematospermum ovale</i> . Nine seeds preserved in various stages	273
Fig. 7.8	<i>Problematospermum ovale</i> seeds	274
Fig. 7.9	<i>Problematospermum ovale</i> . Details of seeds and detached filamentous appendage	275
Fig. 7.10	<i>Nubilora triassica</i> and its details	282
Fig. 7.11	Details of lateral units and ovules/seeds of <i>Nubilora</i> <i>triassica</i>	283
Fig. 7.12	Details of lateral units and ovules/seeds of <i>Nubilora triassica</i>	284
Fig. 7.13	Sketches of lateral units and ovules/seeds of <i>Nubilora</i> <i>triassica</i>	285
Fig. 8.1	Life histories of plants	296
Fig. 8.2	Three sexual modes, isogamy, anisogamy, and oogamy	298

Fig. 8.3	Differentiation of tissue in an about 600 Ma old fossil recovered from China	299
Fig. 8.4	Differentiation of organs in <i>Laminaria</i>	299
Fig. 8.5	Outer integument derivation	303
Fig. 8.6	Vivipary of mangrove plant	305
Fig. 8.7	Sporangia on the termini of branches in earliest land plants	307
Fig. 8.8	Peltate sporangiophore bearing sporgania on its adaxial side in Sphenopsids	308
Fig. 8.9	Four different lateral appendages bearing sporangia in Lycophytes	309
Fig. 8.10	Sporangium of <i>Miadesmia membranacea</i> protected by layers of tissues	309
Fig. 8.11	Fern pinnae with sporangia attached to the abaxial side	310
Fig. 8.12	Reproductive organs of <i>Archaeopteris</i> , showing sporangia borne on the adaxial of the axis	311
Fig. 8.13	Living and fossil reproductive female parts of cycads	312
Fig. 8.14	Teratological “megasporophyll” of <i>Zamia furfuracea</i>	313
Fig. 8.15	Female part of <i>Bernattia</i> with ovules on the basal adaxial	314
Fig. 8.16	Three dimensionally deployed ovules/seeds of living and fossil Ginkgoaceae	315
Fig. 8.17	Several ovules clustered on the terminals of <i>Ginkgo</i> female organs	316
Fig. 8.18	Reproductive organs of Cordaitales	317
Fig. 8.19	Cross views of ovule pedicel and sterile scales Bar = 0.1 mm ...	318
Fig. 8.20	Female parts of Coniferales	319
Fig. 8.21	Longitudinal section of female cone of Pentoxylales	323
Fig. 8.22	Reproductive organ of <i>Vojnovskya paradoxa</i>	323
Fig. 8.23	Free central placentation in which the ovules are attached to the extended floral axis	324
Fig. 8.24	Longitudinal section of a carpel of <i>Amborella</i>	326
Fig. 8.25	Weird fruits	327
Fig. 8.26	Enclosing ovules fulfilled by floral apex and carpel wall together in Gyrostemonaceae and Phytolacceae	328
Fig. 8.27	Diagrams of Cordaitales and their derivatives	329
Fig. 8.28	Flowers of the Portulacaceae and Cactaceae	330
Fig. 8.29	Possible relationship among different placentations	331
Fig. 8.30	Derivation of basal placentation from free central placentation ...	335
Fig. 8.31	Fossil evidence from the Permian and Jurassic	335
Fig. 8.32	Floral diagrams of <i>Pyrola elliptica</i> (Pyrolaceae)	337
Fig. 8.33	Inferred steps from a gymnospermous ancestor to the carpel of <i>Amborella</i>	345

Fig. 8.34 A Palaeozoic *Sphenopteris* with possible seed/ovule/
megasporangium on the terminal of the branched 349

Fig. 8.35 A lateral appendage of *Shougangia bella* showing proximal
pinnae and distal cluster of sporangia 350

Fig. 8.36 Possible relationships among Cordaitales, Coniferales,
Gnetales, and Angiospermae 352

Fig. 8.37 Major evolutionary relationships among various placentations ... 353

Fig. 8.38 Different structures of various gynoecia in angiosperms 358

Fig. 8.39 Possible relationship among seed plants, based on
morphological data 363

Fig. 8.40 Arrangement of sporangia (including ovules) in various taxa
of land plants 365

List of Tables

Table 5.1	Comparison among <i>Chaoyangia</i> and other seed plants	85
Table 5.2	DNA sequence accession numbers for the taxa used in the cladistic analysis	88
Table 6.1	Comparison of terms used in previous descriptions and this book of <i>Schmeissneria</i>	157
Table 8.1	The correlation between organs in Cordaitales and possibly related groups	339

Chapter 1

Introduction

The origin of angiosperm has been a contentious topic in botany, especially in palaeobotany. Before the 1960s there were for a long time and remains today a number of reports of angiosperms from strata older than the Cretaceous. However, mainstream palaeobotanists discount them now. Instead, palaeobotanists since 1970s have increasingly favored a rapid origin of angiosperms in the Early Cretaceous, although these conclusions have been frequently challenged by enigmatic fossil plant discoveries. The present conflicting situation, in my view, reflects a result of multiple criteria used for angiosperm definition and recognition in palaeobotany. I propose a new open criterion for fossil angiosperms as a solution for the problem. This chapter briefly summarizes the historic background of the current study.

The botanical term “Angiosperm” (Greek: *αγγειον*, receptacle, and *σπερμα*, seed) was coined in the form *Angiospermae* by Paul Hermann in 1690, as the name of one of the primary divisions of the plant kingdom. It included flowering plants possessing seeds enclosed in capsules, in contradistinction to his *Gymnospermae* (Harper 2001). As early as 1827, Brown demonstrated that the *Angiospermae* are indeed distinguished from gymnosperms, i.e. all other seed plants, by their enclosed ovules (Arber and Parkin 1908). This apparently subtle difference had a great impact on scientific thinking in the systematics of plants. Angiosperms today are by far the most diverse group in the plant kingdom. They dominate the terrestrial biota with more than 300,000 species, about 89.4% of the total species in the embryophytes (Crepet 2000). They are major sources of our fibres, food, drugs, and housing materials. They are also the predominant species of tropical rain forests and provide structural definition for most terrestrial ecosystems (Crepet 2000). An understanding of evolution and of precise relationships within the angiosperms allows a better understanding of their specific diversity, temporal and spatial distributions, and ecological implications. This in turn facilitates more efficient searching for natural resources, provides a precise framework to evaluate the plants for various applications, and helps informed decision-making regarding biodiversity conservation (Crepet 2000). The origin, evolution and sustainable

development of ourselves, human beings, would be unimaginable without angiosperms. Because of their importance for the Earth's ecosystem and for our own survival, it is not surprising that people are curious about all aspects of angiosperms, especially their origin and evolution.

The origin of angiosperms has indeed been a riveting topic in botany for more than a century. During the time of Charles Darwin, people were already talking about the rapid diversification of flowering plants in the mid-Cretaceous, and Darwin's "abominable mystery" is related to this apparently abrupt historic phenomenon (Friedman 2009). John Ball (1818–1889) published a paper hypothesizing that atmospheric carbon dioxide concentrations had been the key factor restricting the development of angiosperms, and those angiosperms had stayed in alpine regions and had little chance to be fossilized. He believed they did not enter the fossil record until the concentration of atmospheric carbon dioxide dropped. Both Joseph D. Hooker (1817–1911) and Charles Darwin (1809–1882) were skeptical of this hypothesis (Friedman 2009), but the abrupt appearance of flowering plants in the mid-Cretaceous was a problem for Darwin because it strongly contradicted his concept of gradualism (Friedman 2009). Darwin conjectured that at one time there had been a remote continent in the southern hemisphere, where angiosperms evolved until they spread to other continents (Friedman 2009). At this time such a birthplace continent has not been identified by geologists. Gaston de Saporta (1823–1895), also perplexed by the rapid diversification of angiosperms in the mid-Cretaceous, came up with an alternate interpretation: the rapid diversification of angiosperms was due to the co-evolution of angiosperms and insects. This idea was favored and promoted by Darwin, and is still favored by many biologists (Ren 1998; Friedman 2009; Ren et al. 2009). However, according to Hughes (1994), there were no corresponding changes in insects during this period.

Since the death of Charles Darwin in 1882, there has been much progress in terms of theories and findings of earlier fossil angiosperms. Hugh H. Thomas (1885–1962) discovered a new plant, *Caytonia*, from the Middle Jurassic and related this plant to angiosperms (Thomas 1925). Despite the fact that Thomas M. Harris (1903–1983) found that the pollination in *Caytonia* was gymnospermous rather than angiospermous, this plant remains one of the most attractive candidates for angiosperm ancestry (Doyle 2006, 2008; Rothwell et al. 2009). *Corytospermum* was recognized by Thomas as another potential candidate for angiosperm ancestry (Doyle 2006, 2008; Rothwell et al. 2009). Scott (1906) and Arber and Parkin (1907) proposed a possible relationship between Bennettitales and angiosperms, which became the foundation for the so-called anthophyte theory that persists today (Crane 1985, 1986) although some details are now open to debate (Rothwell et al. 2009). In addition, Sahni related *Pentoxylon* from the Mesozoic of the Gondwana to angiosperms (Hughes 1994). Retallack and Dilcher (1981) related Glossopteridales and angiosperms, while Taylor and Hickey (1996) pointed out possible relationship between Gnetales and Angiosperms. Meyen (1988) proposed the gamoheterotopy theory, and Frohlich and Parker (2000) proposed the mostly male theory for the origin of angiosperm flowers. Asama (1982) related Gigantopterids to angiosperms based on foliar features, and Taylor et al. (2006) did so based on biogeochemistry. However, none of these fossil plants have a

confirmed relationship to angiosperms, and a status intermediate between angiosperms and these groups is still hard to conceive. There appears to be insurmountable difference between these plants and angiosperms.

Before 1960s many pre-Cretaceous fossils were claimed to be directly related to modern angiosperms (Wieland 1926; Eames 1961; Hill and Crane 1982); subsequently, their angiospermous affinities have been largely rejected (Scott et al. 1960). Since that time, however, several newly-found interesting fossil plants have been found in the Early Cretaceous or even earlier that appear to be more or less related to angiosperms, although their actual significance is still open to debate. These discoveries have enhanced our understanding of the diversity of ancient seed plants and repeatedly stimulated discussion. These discoveries include *Sanmiguelia*, *Schmeissneria*, *Xingxueanthus*, *Euanthus*, *Yuhania*, *Juraherba*, *Chaoyangia*, *Archaeofructus*, *Sinocarpus*, *Callianthus*, *Baicarpus*, *Liaoningcarpus*, *Nothodichocarpum* (among many others) and various angiosperm-like pollen grains from the Triassic and Jurassic (Cornet 1986, 1989a, b, 1993; Li et al. 1989; Martin 1989a, b; Cornet and Habib 1992; Hill 1996; Duan 1998; Sun et al. 1998, 2001, 2002; Leng and Friis 2003, 2006; Hochuli and Feist-Burkhardt 2004, 2013; Wang et al. 2007a, b; Wang and Zheng 2009; Wang 2010; Wang and Wang 2010; Liu and Wang 2016, 2017; Han et al. 2013, 2016, 2017). Mesofossils described by Friis, Crane and their colleagues have by far contributed the most to our knowledge of the diversity of angiosperms in the Early Cretaceous (Friis et al. 2003, 2005, 2006, 2009, 2011) although the fragmentary nature of such fossil remains restricts us from understanding the plants as a whole (Friis et al. 2003, 2005, 2006, 2009, 2011; Rothwell et al. 2009). Macroscopically, the radiation of fossil angiosperms from the Early to Middle Cretaceous has been well documented (Doyle and Hickey 1976; Archangelsky et al. 2009). At present it is commonly believed by many botanists that the origin of angiosperms cannot be pre-Cretaceous (Cronquist 1988; Friis et al. 2005, 2006, 2011).

Some frequently overlooked information on the topic includes that tricolpate pollen grains, thought to be more derived, occurred in the Barremian, and that the angiosperms from the Yixian Formation (the Barremian-Aptian), the oldest well-accepted megafossils of angiosperms, demonstrate unexpectedly greater diversity. These facts suggest that angiosperms must have had a much earlier origin, favoring the hypotheses based on *Schmeissneria* and other older fossils (Cornet 1986, 1989a, b, 1993; Cornet and Habib 1992; Hill 1996; Duan 1998; Sun et al. 1998, 2001, 2002; Leng and Friis 2003, 2006; Hochuli and Feist-Burkhardt 2004, 2013; Wang et al. 2007a, b; Wang and Zheng 2009; Wang and Wang 2010; Wang 2010; Liu and Wang 2016, 2017; Han et al. 2013, 2016, 2017).

It is true that there is no strict consensus on these Early Cretaceous angiosperms. For example, *Archaeofructus* and *Sinocarpus* have been foci of debates in the past years (Sun et al. 1998, 2002; Friis et al. 2003; Leng and Friis 2003, 2006; Dilcher et al. 2007). Other fossils have also been contentious. A layman might well ask: "Why can't you palaeobotanists reach an agreement on these fossils?" This is a question worthy thinking about. Ideally, the authors of all publications should be honest, intelligent, and logical. They should offer detailed description and figures of

their fossils, interpret them using correct botanical terms, and follow the same rules. If this were the case, there would be no controversy in palaeobotany at all. Then where did the controversies come from? Controversies arise from different criteria applied in the descriptions, discussions, and arguments. Following the above idealistic thinking, there would be a universally accorded criterion identifying fossil angiosperms. In reality, different workers have different criteria, some emphasizing one feature, others emphasizing other features. This means there cannot be a consensus on early angiosperms unless an open, applicable definition of fossil angiosperm is found. So finding an applicable definition for fossil angiosperms therefore becomes a key point in the study of early angiosperms.

In this book, I approach the origin of angiosperms from this view point, trying to construct an acceptable and applicable definition for early fossil angiosperms. Then I document several fossil plants from the Jurassic and Early Cretaceous in north-eastern China and Germany, and apply this definition to justify their angiospermous identity. Based on this fossil evidence, I discuss the origin of angiosperms and related topics.

It is my expectation that many points of view in this book may not agree with existing ones, and many colleagues may feel more or less offended in one way or another. The literature cited in this book is not exhaustive, so many important, but marginal in this context, works may not be listed. This does not mean that I intend to ignore them, but simply that space does not allow me to do all the things in this book alone. The definition of an angiosperm might be the focus of the debate. However, since we are doing science, open discussion among people with different opinions is inevitable and ultimately beneficial to science. I welcome those with different opinions to stand up and offer their theories and evidence to solve the common problems we face. I would seek to incorporate any solution that is better than mine. As soon as we can reach a consensus on a definition of what constitutes an angiosperm, I think we are beginning to see the light at the end of the tunnel. Were we palaeobotanists to reach a consensus, we could end the current rather chaotic state of palaeobotany, where authority, rather than consensus, prevails.

References

- Arber EAN, Parkin J (1907) On the origin of angiosperms. *J Linn Soc Lond Bot* 38:29–80
- Arber EAN, Parkin J (1908) Studies on the evolution of the angiosperms: the relationship of the angiosperms to the Gnetales. *Ann Bot* 22:489–515
- Archangel'sky S, Barreda V, Passalia MG, Gandolfo M, Pramparo M, Romero E, Cuneo R, Zamuner A, Iglesias A, Llorens M et al (2009) Early angiosperm diversification: evidence from southern South America. *Cretac Res* 30:1073–1082
- Asama K (1982) Evolution and phylogeny of vascular plants based on the principles of growth retardation. Part 5. Origin of angiosperms inferred from the evolution of leaf form. *Bull Natl Sci Mus Tokyo Ser C* 8:43–58
- Cornet B (1986) The leaf venation and reproductive structures of a late Triassic angiosperm, *Sanmiguelia lewisii*. *Evol Theory* 7:231–308

- Cornet B (1989a) Late Triassic angiosperm-like pollen from the Richmond rift basin of Virginia, USA. *Paläontographica* B 213:37–87
- Cornet B (1989b) The reproductive morphology and biology of *Sanmiguelia lewisii*, and its bearing on angiosperm evolution in the late Triassic. *Evol Trends Plants* 3:25–51
- Cornet B (1993) Dicot-like leaf and flowers from the Late Triassic tropical Newark Supergroup rift zone, U.S.A. *Mod Biol* 19:81–99
- Cornet B, Habib D (1992) Angiosperm-like pollen from the ammonite-dated Oxfordian (Upper Jurassic) of France. *Rev Palaeobot Palynol* 71:269–294
- Crane PR (1985) Phylogenetic analysis of seed plants and the origin of angiosperms. *Ann Mo Bot Gard* 72:716–793
- Crane PR (1986) The morphology and relationships of the Bennettitales. In: Spicer RA, Thomas BA (eds) *Systematic and taxonomic approaches in palaeobotany*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, pp 163–175
- Crepet WL (2000) Progress in understanding angiosperm history, success, and relationships: Darwin’s “abominably” perplexing phenomenon. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 97:12939–12941
- Cronquist A (1988) *The evolution and classification of flowering plants*. New York Botanical Garden, Bronx
- Dilcher DL, Sun G, Ji Q, Li H (2007) An early infructescence *Hyracantha decussata* (comb. nov.) from the Yixian Formation in northeastern China. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 104:9370–9374
- Doyle JA (2006) Seed ferns and the origin of angiosperms. *J Torrey Bot Soc* 133:169–209
- Doyle JA (2008) Integrating molecular phylogenetic and paleobotanical evidence on origin of the flower. *Int J Plant Sci* 169:816–843
- Doyle JA, Hickey LJ (1976) Pollen and leaves from the Mid-Cretaceous Potomac Group and their bearing on early angiosperm evolution. In: Beck CB (ed) *Origin and early evolution of angiosperms*. Columbia University Press, New York, pp 139–206
- Duan S (1998) The oldest angiosperm—a tricarpaceous female reproductive fossil from western Liaoning Province, NE China. *Sci China Ser D Earth Sci* 41:14–20
- Eames AJ (1961) *Morphology of the angiosperms*. McGraw-Hill, New York
- Friedman WE (2009) The meaning of Darwin’s “abominable mystery”. *Am J Bot* 96:5–21
- Friis EM, Doyle JA, Endress PK, Leng Q (2003) *Archaeofructus*—angiosperm precursor or specialized early angiosperm? *Trends Plant Sci* 8:S369–S373
- Friis EM, Pedersen KR, Crane PR (2005) When earth started blooming: insights from the fossil record. *Curr Opin Plant Biol* 8:5–12
- Friis EM, Pedersen KR, Crane PR (2006) Cretaceous angiosperm flowers: innovation and evolution in plant reproduction. *Palaeogeogr Palaeoclimatol Palaeoecol* 232:251–293
- Friis EM, Pedersen KR, von Balthazar M, Grimm GW, Crane PR (2009) *Monetianthus mirus* gen. et sp. nov., a nymphaealean flower from the early Cretaceous of Portugal. *Int J Plant Sci* 170:1086–1101
- Friis EM, Crane PR, Pedersen KR (2011) *The early flowers and angiosperm evolution*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Frohlich MW, Parker DS (2000) The mostly male theory of flower evolutionary origins: from genes to fossils. *Syst Bot* 25:155–170
- Han G, Fu X, Liu Z-J, Wang X (2013) A new angiosperm genus from the lower Cretaceous Yixian Formation, Western Liaoning, China. *Acta Geol Sin* 87:916–925
- Han G, Liu Z-J, Liu X, Mao L, Jacques FMB, Wang X (2016) A whole plant herbaceous angiosperm from the Middle Jurassic of China. *Acta Geol Sin* 90:19–29
- Han G, Liu Z, Wang X (2017) A *Dichocarpum*-like angiosperm from the early Cretaceous of China. *Acta Geol Sin* 90:1–8
- Harper D (2001) Online etymology dictionary.
- Hill CR (1996) A plant with flower-like organs from the Wealden of the Weald (Lower Cretaceous), southern England. *Cretac Res* 17:27–38