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Preface

The history of life is documented by fossils through the past 3.5 billion years. We need this long-term perspective for three reasons: ancient life and environments can inform us about how the world might change in the future; extinct plants and animals make up 99% of all species that ever lived, and so we need to know about them to understand the true scope of the tree of life; and extinct organisms did amazing things that no living plant or animal can do, and we need to explore their capabilities to assess the limits of form and function.

Every week, astonishing new fossil finds are announced – a 1 ton rat, a miniature species of human, the world’s largest sea scorpion, a dinosaur with feathers. You read about these in the newspapers, but where do these stray findings fit into the greater scheme of things? Studying fossils can reveal the most astonishing organisms, many of them more remarkable than the wildest dreams (or nightmares) of a science fiction writer. Indeed, paleontology reveals a seemingly endless catalog of alternative universes, landscapes and seascapes that look superficially familiar, but which contain plants that do not look quite right, animals that are very different from anything now living.

The last 40 years have seen an explosion of paleontological research, where fossil evidence is used to study larger questions, such as rates of evolution, mass extinctions, high-precision dating of sedimentary sequences, the paleobiology of dinosaurs and Cambrian arthropods, the structure of Carboniferous coal-swamp plant communities, ancient molecules, the search for oil and gas, the origin of humans, and many more. Paleontologists have benefited enormously from the growing interdisciplinary nature of their science, with major contributions from geologists, chemists, evolutionary biologists, physiologists and even geophysicists and astronomers. Many areas of study have also been helped by an increasingly quantitative approach.

There are many paleontology texts that describe the major fossil groups or give a guided tour of the history of life. Here we hope to give students a flavor of the excitement of modern paleontology. We try to present all aspects of paleontology, not just invertebrate fossils or dinosaurs, but fossil plants, trace fossils, macroevolution, paleobiogeography, biostratigraphy, mass extinctions, biodiversity through time and microfossils. Where possible, we show how paleontologists tackle controversial questions, and highlight what is known, and what is not known. This shows the activity and dynamism of modern paleobiological research. Many of these items are included in boxed features, some of them added at the last minute, to show new work in a number of categories, indicated by icons (see below for explanation).

The book is intended for first- and second-year geologists and biologists who are taking courses in paleontology or paleobiology. It should also be a clear introduction to the science for keen amateurs and others interested in current scientific evidence about the origin of life, the history of life, mass extinctions, human evolution and related topics.
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- **Hot topics/debates**
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- **Exceptional and new discoveries**
- **Quantitative methods**
- **Cladogram/classification**
Chapter 1

Paleontology as a science

Key points

- The key value of paleontology has been to show us the history of life through deep time – without fossils this would be largely hidden from us.
- Paleontology has strong relevance today in understanding our origins, other distant worlds, climate and biodiversity change, the shape and tempo of evolution, and dating rocks.
- Paleontology is a part of the natural sciences, and a key aim is to reconstruct ancient life.
- Reconstructions of ancient life have been rejected as pure speculation by some, but careful consideration shows that they too are testable hypotheses and can be as scientific as any other attempt to understand the world.
- Science consists of testing hypotheses, not in general by limiting itself to absolute certainties like mathematics.
- Classical and medieval views about fossils were often magical and mystical.
- Observations in the 16th and 17th centuries showed that fossils were the remains of ancient plants and animals.
- By 1800, many scientists accepted the idea of extinction.
- By 1830, most geologists accepted that the Earth was very old.
- By 1840, the major divisions of deep time, the stratigraphic record, had been established by the use of fossils.
- By 1840, it was seen that fossils showed direction in the history of life, and by 1860 this had been explained by evolution.
- Research in paleontology has many facets, including finding new fossils and using quantitative methods to answer questions about paleobiology, paleogeography, macroevolution, the tree of life and deep time.

All science is either physics or stamp collecting.

Sir Ernest Rutherford (1871–1937), Nobel prize-winner
Scientists argue about what is science and what is not. Ernest Rutherford famously had a very low opinion of anything that was not mathematics or physics, and so he regarded all of biology and geology (including paleontology) as “stamp collecting”, the mere recording of details and stories. But is this true?

Most criticism in paleontology is aimed at the reconstruction of ancient plants and animals. Surely no one will ever know what color dinosaurs were, what noises they made? How could a paleontologist work out how many eggs Tyrannosaurus laid, how long it took for the young to grow to adult size, the differences between males and females? How could anyone work out how an ancient animal hunted, how strong its bite force was, or even what kinds of prey it ate? Surely it is all speculation because we can never go back in time and see what was happening?

These are questions about paleobiology and, surprisingly, a great deal can be inferred from fossils. Fossils, the remains of any ancient organism, may look like random pieces of rock in the shape of bones, leaves or shells, but they can yield up their secrets to the properly trained scientist. Paleontology, the study of the life of the past, is like a crime scene investigation – there are clues here and there, and the paleontologist can use these to understand something about an ancient plant or animal, or a whole fauna or flora, the animals or plants that lived together in one place at one time.

In this chapter we will explore the methods of paleontology, starting with the debate about how dinosaurs are portrayed in films, and then look more widely at the other kinds of inferences that may be made from fossils. But first, just what is paleontology for? Why should anyone care about it?

PALEONTOLOGY IN THE MODERN WORLD

What is the use of paleontology? A few decades ago, the main purpose was to date rocks. Many paleontology textbooks justified the subject in terms of utility and its contribution to industry. Others simply said that fossils are beautiful and people love to look at them and collect them (Fig. 1.1). But there is more than that. We identify six reasons why people should care about paleontology:

1 Origins. People want to know where life came from, where humans came from, where the Earth and universe came from. These have been questions in philosophy, religion and science for thousands of years and paleontologists have a key role (see pp. 117–20). Despite the spectacular progress of paleontology, earth sciences and astronomy over the last two centuries, many people with fundamentalist religious beliefs deny all natural explanations of origins – these debates are clearly seen as hugely important.

2 Curiosity about different worlds. Science fiction and fantasy novels allow us to think about worlds that are different from what we see around us. Another way is to study paleontology – there were plants and animals in the past that were quite unlike
any modern organism (see Chapters 9–12). Just imagine land animals 10 times the size of elephants, a world with higher oxygen levels than today and dragonflies the size of seagulls, a world with only microbes, or a time when two or three different species of humans lived in Africa!

3 Climate and biodiversity change. Thinking people, and now even politicians, are concerned about climate change and the future of life on Earth. Much can be learned by studying the modern world, but key evidence about likely future changes over hundreds or thousands of years comes from studies of what has happened in the past (see Chapter 20). For example, 250 million years ago, the Earth went through a phase of substantial global warming, a drop in oxygen levels and acid rain, and 95% of species died out (see pp. 170–4); might this be relevant to current debates about the future?

4 The shape of evolution. The tree of life is a powerful and all-embracing concept (see pp. 128–35) – the idea that all species living and extinct are related to each other and their relationships may be represented by a great branching tree that links us all back to a single species somewhere deep in the Precambrian (see Chapter 8). Biologists want to know how many species there are on the Earth today, how life became so diverse, and the nature and rates of diversifications and extinctions (see pp. 169–80, 534–41). It is impossible to understand these great patterns of evolution from studies of living organisms alone.

5 Extinction. Fossils show us that extinction is a normal phenomenon: no species lasts forever. Without the fossil record, we might imagine that extinctions have been caused mainly by human interactions.

6 Dating rocks. Biostratigraphy, the use of fossils in dating rocks (see pp. 23–41), is a powerful tool for understanding deep time, and it is widely used in scientific studies, as well as by commercial geologists who seek oil and mineral deposits. Radiometric dating provides precise dates in millions of years for rock samples, but this technological approach only works with certain kinds of rocks. Fossils are very much at the core of modern stratigraphy, both for economic and industrial applications and as the basis of our understanding of Earth’s history at local and global scales.

PALEONTOLOGY AS A SCIENCE

What is science?

Imagine you are traveling by plane and your neighbor sees you are reading an article about the life of the ice ages in a recent issue of National Geographic. She asks you how anyone can know about those mammoths and sabertooths, and how they could make those color paintings; surely they are just pieces of art, and not science at all? How would you answer?

Science is supposed to be about reality, about hard facts, calculations and proof. It is obvious that you can not take a time machine back 20,000 years and see the mammoths and sabertooths for yourself; so how can we ever claim that there is a scientific method in paleontological reconstruction?

There are two ways to answer this; the first is obvious, but a bit of a detour, and the second gets to the core of the question. So, to justify those colorful paintings of extinct mammals, your first answer could be: “Well, we dig up all these amazing skeletons and other fossils that you see in museums around the world – surely it would be pretty sterile just to stop and not try to answer questions about the animal itself – how big was it, what were its nearest living relatives, when did it live?” From the earliest days, people have always asked questions about where we come from, about origins. They have also asked about the stars, about how babies are made, about what lies at the end of the rainbow. So, the first answer is to say that we are driven by our insatiable curiosity and our sense of wonder to try to find out about the world, even if we do not always have the best tools for the job.

The second answer is to consider the nature of science. Is science only about certainty, about proving things? In mathematics, and many areas of physics, this might be true. You can seek to measure the distance to the moon, to calculate the value of pi, or to derive a set of equations that explain the moon’s influence on the Earth’s tides. Generation by generation, these measurements and proofs are tested and improved. But this approach does not work for most of the natural sciences. Here,
there have been two main approaches: induction and deduction.

Sir Francis Bacon (1561–1626), a famous English lawyer, politician and scientist (Fig. 1.2a), established the methods of induction in science. He argued that it was only through the patient accumulation of accurate observations of natural phenomena that the explanation would emerge. The enquirer might hope to see common patterns among the observations, and these common patterns would point to an explanation, or law of nature. Bacon famously met his death perhaps as a result of his restless curiosity about everything; he was traveling in the winter of 1626, and was experimenting with the use of snow and ice to preserve meat. He bought a chicken, and got out of his coach to gather snow, which he stuffed inside the bird; he contracted pneumonia and died soon after. The chicken, on the other hand, was fresh to eat a week later, so proving his case.

The other approach to understanding the natural world is a form of deduction, where a series of observations point to an inevitable outcome. This is a part of classical logic dating back to Aristotle (384–322 BCE) and other ancient Greek philosophers. The standard logical form goes like this:

\[
\text{All men are mortal.} \\
\text{Socrates is a man.} \\
\text{Therefore Socrates is mortal.}
\]

Deduction is the core approach in mathematics and in detective work of course. How does it work in science?

Karl Popper (1902–1994) explained the way science works as the hypothetico-deductive method. Popper (Fig. 1.2b) argued that in most of the natural sciences, proof is impossible. What scientists do is to set up hypotheses, statements about what may or may not be the case. An example of a hypothesis might be “Smilodon, the sabertoothed cat, was exclusively a meat eater”. This can never be proved absolutely, but it could be refuted and therefore rejected. So what most natural scientists do is called hypothesis testing; they seek to refute, or disprove, hypotheses rather than to prove them. Paleontologists have made many observations about Smilodon that tend to confirm, or corroborate, the hypothesis: it had long sharp teeth, bones have been found with bite marks made by those teeth, fossilized Smilodon turds contain bones of other mammals, and so on. But it would take just one discovery of a Smilodon skeleton with leaves in its stomach area, or in its excrement,
to disprove the hypothesis that this animal fed exclusively on meat.

Science is of course much more complex than this. Scientists are human, and they are subject to all kinds of influences and prejudices, just like anyone else. Scientists follow trends, they are slow to accept new ideas; they may prefer one interpretation over another because of some political or sociological belief. Thomas Kuhn (1922–1996) argued that science shuttles between so-called times of normal science and times of scientific revolution. Scientific revolutions, or **paradigm shifts**, are when a whole new idea invades an area of science. At first people may be reluctant to accept the idea, and they fight against it. Then some supporters speak up and support it, and then everyone does. This is summarized in the old truism – when faced with a new idea most people at first reject it, then they begin to accept it, and then they say they knew it all along.

A good example of a paradigm shift in paleontology was triggered by the paper by Luis Alvarez and colleagues (1980) in which they presented the hypothesis that the Earth had been hit by a meteorite 65 million years ago, and this impact caused the extinction of the dinosaurs and other groups. It took 10 years or more for the idea to become widely accepted as the evidence built up (see pp. 174–7). As another example, current attempts by religious fundamentalists to force their view of “intelligent design” into science will likely fail because they do not test evidence rigorously, and paradigm shifts only happen when the weight of evidence for the new theory overwhelms the evidence for the previous view (see p. 120).

So science is curiosity about how the world works. It would be foolish to exclude any area of knowledge from science, or to say that one area of science is “more scientific” than another. There is mathematics and there is natural science. The key point is that there can be no proof in natural science, only hypothesis testing. But where do the hypotheses come from? Surely they are entirely speculative?

Speculation, hypotheses and testing

There are facts and speculations. “The fossil is 6 inches long” is a fact; “it is a leaf of an ancient fern” is a speculation. But perhaps the word “speculation” is the problem, because it sounds as if the paleontologist simply sits back with a glass of brandy and a cigar and lets his mind wander idly. But speculation is constrained within the hypothetico-deductive framework.

This brings us to the issue of **hypotheses** and where they come from. Surely there are unknown millions of hypotheses that could be presented about, say, the trilobites? Here are a few: “trilobites were made of cheese”, “trilobites ate early humans”, “trilobites still survive in Alabama”, “trilobites came from the moon”. These are not useful hypotheses, however, and would never be set down on paper. Some can be refuted without further consideration—humans and trilobites did not live at the same time, and no one in Alabama has ever seen a living trilobite. Admittedly, one discovery could refute both these hypotheses. Trilobites were almost certainly not made from cheese as their fossils show cuticles and other tissues and structures seen in living crabs and insects. “Trilobites came from the moon” is probably an untestable (as well as wild) hypothesis.

So, hypotheses are narrowed down quickly to those that fit the framework of current observations and that may be tested. A useful hypothesis about trilobites might be: “trilobites walked by making leg movements like modern millipedes”. This can be tested by studying ancient tracks made by trilobites, by examining the arrangement of their legs in fossils, and by studies of how their modern relatives walk. So, **hypotheses should be sensible and testable**. This still sounds like speculation, however. Are other natural sciences the same?

Of course they are. The natural sciences operate by means of hypothesis testing. Which geologist can put his finger on the atomic structure of a diamond, the core–mantle boundary or a magma chamber? Can we prove with 100% certainty that mammoths walked through Manhattan and London, that ice sheets once covered most of Canada and northern Europe, or that there was a meteorite impact on the Earth 65 million years ago? Likewise, can a chemist show us an electron, can an astronomer confirm the composition of stars that have been studied by spectroscopy, can a physicist show us a quantum of energy, and can a biochemist show us the double helix structure of DNA?

So, the word “speculation” can mislead; perhaps “**informed deduction**” would be a
better way of describing what most scientists do. Reconstructing the bodily appearance and behavior of an extinct animal is identical to any other normal activity in science, such as reconstructing the atmosphere of Saturn. The sequence of observations and conjectures that stand between the bones of Brachiosaurus lying in the ground and its reconstructed moving image in a movie is identical to the sequence of observations and conjectures that lie between biochemical and crystallographic observations on chromosomes and the creation of the model of the structure of DNA. Both hypotheses (the image of Brachiosaurus or the double helix) may be wrong, but in both cases the models reflect the best fit to the facts. The critic has to provide evidence to refute the hypothesis, and present a replacement hypothesis that fits the data better. Refutation and skepticism are the gatekeepers of science — ludicrous hypotheses are quickly weeded out, and the remaining hypotheses have survived criticism (so far).

Fact and fantasy – where to draw the line?

As in any science, there are levels of certainty in paleontology. The fossil skeletons show the shape and size of a dinosaur, the rocks show where and when it lived, and associated fossils show other plants and animals of the time. These can be termed facts. Should a paleontologist go further? It is possible to think about a sequence of procedures a paleontologist uses to go from bones in the ground to a walking, moving reconstruction of an ancient organism. And this sequence roughly matches a sequence of decreasing certainty, in three steps.

The first step is to reconstruct the skeleton, to put it back together. Most paleontologists would accept that this is a valid thing to do, and that there is very little guesswork in identifying the bones and putting them together in a realistic pose. The next step is to reconstruct the muscles. This might seem highly speculative, but then all living vertebrates – frogs, lizards, crocodiles, birds and mammals – have pretty much the same sorts of muscles, so it is likely dinosaurs did too. Also, muscles leave scars on the bones that show where they attached. So, the muscles go on to the skeleton – either on a model, with muscles made from modeling clay, or virtually, within a computer – and these provide the body shape.

Other soft tissues, such as the heart, liver, eyeballs, tongue and so on are rarely preserved (though surprisingly such tissues are sometimes exceptionally preserved; see pp. 60–5), but again their size and positions are predictable from modern relatives. Even the skin is not entirely guesswork: some mumified dinosaur specimens show the patterns of scales set in the skin.

The second step is to work out the basic biology of the ancient beast. The teeth hint at what the animal ate, and the jaw shape shows how it fed. The limb bones show how the dinosaurs moved. You can manipulate the joints and calculate the movements, stresses and strains of the limbs. With care, it is possible to work out the pattern of locomotion in great detail. All the images of walking, running, swimming and flying shown in documentaries such as Walking with Dinosaurs (see Box 1.2) are generally based on careful calculation and modeling, and comparison with living animals. The movements of the jaws and limbs have to obey the laws of physics (gravity, lever mechanics, and so on). So these broad-scale indications of paleobiology and biomechanics are defensible and realistic.

The third level of certainty includes the colors and patterns, the breeding habits, the noises. However, even these, although entirely unsupported by fossil data, are not fantasy. Paleontologists, like any people with common sense, base their speculations here on comparisons with living animals. What color was Diplodocus? It was a huge plant eater. Modern large plant eaters like elephants and rhinos have thick, gray, wrinkly skin. So we give Diplodocus thick, gray, wrinkly skin. There’s no evidence for the color in the fossils, but it makes biological sense. What about breeding habits? There are many examples of dinosaur nests with eggs, so paleontologists know how many eggs were laid and how they were arranged for some species. Some suggested that the parents cared for their young, while others said this was nonsense. But the modern relatives of dinosaurs – birds and crocodilians – show different levels of parental care. Then, in 1993, a specimen of the flesh-eating dinosaur Oviraptor was found in Mongolia sitting over a nest of Oviraptor eggs – perhaps this was a chance association, but it seems most likely that it really was a parent brooding its eggs (Box 1.1).
Box 1.1 Egg thief or good mother?

How dramatically some hypotheses can change! Back in the 1920s, when the first American Museum of Natural History (AMNH) expedition went to Mongolia, some of the most spectacular finds were nests containing dinosaur eggs. The nests were scooped in the sand, and each contained 20 or 30 sausage-shaped eggs, arranged in rough circles, and pointing in to the middle. Around the nests were skeletons of the plant-eating ceratopsian dinosaur Protoceratops (see p. 457) and a skinny, nearly 2-meter long, flesh-eating dinosaur. This flesh eater had a long neck, a narrow skull and jaws with no teeth, and strong arms with long bony fingers. Henry Fairfield Osborn (1857–1935), the famed paleontologist and autocratic director of the AMNH, named this theropod Oviraptor, which means “egg thief”. A diorama was constructed at the AMNH, and photographs and dioramas of the scene were seen in books and magazines worldwide: Oviraptor was the mean egg thief who menaced innocent little Protoceratops as she tried to protect her nests and babies.

Then, in 1993, the AMNH sent another expedition to Mongolia, and the whole story turned on its head. More nests were found, and the researchers collected some eggs. Amazingly, they also found a whole skeleton of an Oviraptor apparently sitting on top of a nest (Fig. 1.3). It was crouching down, and had its arms extended in a broad circle, as if covering or protecting the whole nest. The researchers X-rayed the eggs back in the lab, and found one contained an unhatched embryo. They painstakingly dissected the eggshell and sediment away to expose the tiny incomplete bones inside the egg – a Protoceratops baby? No! The embryo belonged to Oviraptor, and the adult over the nest was either incubating the eggs or, more likely, protecting them from the sandstorm that buried her and her nest.

As strong confirmation, an independent team of Canadian and Chinese scientists found another Oviraptor on her nest just across the border in northern China.

Read more about these discoveries in Norell et al. (1994, 1995) and Dong and Currie (1996), and at http://www.blackwellpublishing.com/paleobiology/.
INTRODUCTION TO PALEOBIOLOGY AND THE FOSSIL RECORD

So, when you see a walking, grunting dinosaur, or a leggy trilobite, trotting across your TV screen, or featured in magazine artwork, is it just fantasy and guesswork? Perhaps you can now tell your traveling companion that it is a reasonable interpretation, probably based on a great deal of background work. The body shape is probably reasonably correct, the movements of jaws and limbs are as realistic as they can be, and the colors, noises and behaviors may have more evidence behind them than you would imagine at first.

Paleontology and the history of images

Debates about science and testing in paleontology have had a long history. This can be seen in the history of images of ancient life: at first, paleontologists just drew the fossils as they saw them. Then they tried to show what the perfect fossil looked like, repairing cracks and damage to fossil shells, or showing a skeleton in a natural pose. For many in the 1820s, this was enough; anything more would not be scientific.

However, some paleontologists dared to show the life of the past as they thought it looked. After all, this is surely one of the aims of paleontology? And if paleontologists do not direct the artistic renditions, who will? The first line drawings of reconstructed extinct animals and plants appeared in the 1820s (Fig. 1.4). By 1850, some paleontologists were working with artists to produce life-like paintings of scenes of the past, and even three-dimensional models for museums. The growth of museums, and improvements in printing processes, meant that by 1900 it was com-

Figure 1.4 Some of the earliest reconstructions of fossil mammals. These outline sketches were drawn by C. L. Laurillard in the 1820s and 1830s, under the direction of Georges Cuvier. The image shows two species each of *Anoplotherium* and *Palaeotherium*, based on specimens Cuvier had reconstructed from the Tertiary deposits of the Paris Basin. (Modified from Cuvier 1834–1836.)
monplace to see color paintings of scenes from ancient times, rendered by skilful artists and supervised by reputable paleontologists. Moving dinosaurs, of course, have had a long history in Hollywood movies through the 20th century, but paleontologists waited until the technology allowed more realistic computer-generated renditions in the 1990s, first in *Jurassic Park* (1993), and then in *Walking with Dinosaurs* (1999), and now in hundreds of films and documentaries each year (Box 1.2). Despite the complaints from some paleontologists about the mixing of fact and speculation in films and TV documentaries, their own museums often use the same technologies in their displays!

The slow evolution of reconstructions of ancient life over the centuries reflects the growth of paleontology as a discipline. How did the first scientists understand fossils?

**Box 1.2 Bringing the sabertooths to life**

Everyone’s image of dinosaurs and ancient life changed in 1993. Steven Spielberg’s film *Jurassic Park* was the first to use the new techniques of computer-generated imagery (CGI) to produce realistic animations. Older dinosaur films had used clay models or lizards with cardboard crests stuck on their backs. These looked pretty terrible and could never be taken seriously by paleontologists. Up to 1993, dinosaurs had been reconstructed seriously only as two-dimensional paintings and three-dimensional museum models. CGI made those superlative color images move.

Following the huge success of *Jurassic Park*, Tim Haines at the BBC in London decided to try to use the new CGI techniques to produce a documentary series about dinosaurs. Year by year, desktop computers were becoming more powerful, and the CGI software was becoming more sophisticated. What had once cost millions of dollars now cost only thousands. This resulted in the series *Walking with Dinosaurs*, first shown in 1999 and 2000.

Following the success of that series, Haines and the team moved into production of the follow-up, *Walking with Beasts*, shown first in 2001. There were six programs, each with six or seven key beasts. Each of these animals was studied in depth by consultant paleontologists and artists, and a carefully measured clay model (maquette) was made. This was the basis for the animation. The maquette was laser scanned, and turned into a virtual “stick model” that could be moved in the computer to simulate running, walking, jumping and other actions.

While the models were being developed, BBC film crews went round the world to film the background scenery. Places were chosen that had the right topography, climatic feel and plants. Where ancient mammals splashed through water, or grabbed a branch, the action (splashing, movement of the branch) had to be filmed. Then the animated beasts were married with the scenery in the studios of Framestore, the CGI company. This is hard to do, because shadowing and reflections had to be added, so the animals interacted with the backgrounds. If they run through a forest, they have to disappear behind trees and bushes, and their muscles have to move beneath their skin (Fig. 1.5); all this can be semiautomated through the CGI software.

**Continued**
provided evidence for earlier positions of the oceans. Other classical and medieval authors, however, had a different view.

Fossils as magical stones

In Roman and medieval times, fossils were often interpreted as mystical or magical objects. Fossil sharks’ teeth were known as *glossopetrae* (“tongue stones”), in reference to their supposed resemblance to tongues, and many people believed they were the petrified tongues of snakes. This interpretation led to the belief that the glossopetrae could be used as protection against snakebites and other poisons. The teeth were worn as amulets to ward off danger, and they were even dipped into drinks in order to neutralize any poison that might have been placed there.

Most fossils were recognized as *looking like* the remains of plants or animals, but they were said to have been produced by a “plastic force” (*vis plastica*) that operated within the Earth. Numerous authors in the 16th and 17th centuries wrote books presenting this interpretation. For example, the Englishman Robert Plot (1640–1696) argued that ammonites (see pp. 344–51) were formed “by two salts shooting different ways, which by thwarting one another make a helical figure”. These interpretations seem ridiculous now, but there was a serious problem in explaining how such specimens came to lie far from the sea, why they were often different from living animals,
and why they were made of unusual minerals.

The idea of plastic forces had been largely overthrown by the 1720s, but some extraordinary events in Wurzburg in Germany at that time must have dealt the final blow. Johann Beringer (1667–1740), a professor at the university, began to describe and illustrate “fossil” specimens brought to him by collectors from the surrounding area. But it turned out that the collectors had been paid by an academic rival to manufacture “fossils” by carving the soft limestone into the outlines of shells, flowers, butterflies and birds (Fig. 1.6). There was even a slab with a pair of mating frogs, and others with astrologic symbols and Hebrew letters. Beringer resisted evidence that the specimens were forgeries, and wrote as much in his book, the *Lithographiae Wirceburgensis* (1726), but realized the awful truth soon after publication.

Fossils as fossils

The debate about plastic forces was terminated abruptly by the debacle of Beringer’s figured stones, but it had really been resolved rather earlier. Leonardo da Vinci (1452–1519), a brilliant scientist and inventor (as well as a great artist), used his observations of modern plants and animals, and of modern rivers and seas, to explain the fossil sea shells found high in the Italian mountains. He interpreted them as the remains of ancient shells, and he argued that the sea had once covered these areas.

Later, Nicolaus Steno (or Niels Stensen) (1638–1686) demonstrated the true nature of glossopetrae simply by dissecting the head of a huge modern shark, and showing that its teeth were identical to the fossils (Fig. 1.7). Robert Hooke (1625–1703), a contemporary of Steno’s, also gave detailed descriptions of fossils, using a crude microscope to compare the cellular structure of modern and fossil wood, and the crystalline layers in the shell of a modern and a fossil mollusk. This simple descriptive work showed that magical explanations of fossils were without foundation.
The idea of extinction

Robert Hooke was one of the first to hint at the idea of **extinction**, a subject that was hotly debated during the 18th century. The debate fizzed quietly until the 1750s and 1760s when accounts of fossil mastodon remains from North America began to appear. Explorers sent large teeth and bones back to Paris and London for study by the anatomic experts of the day (normal practice at the time, because the serious pursuit of science as a profession had not yet begun in North America). William Hunter noted in 1768 that the “American incognitum” was quite different from modern elephants and from mammoths, and was clearly an extinct animal, and a meat-eating one at that. “And if this animal was indeed carnivorous, which I believe cannot be doubted, though we may as philosophers regret it,” he wrote, “as men we cannot but thank Heaven that its whole generation is probably extinct.”

The reality of extinction was demonstrated by the great French natural scientist Georges Cuvier (1769–1832). He showed that the mammoth from Siberia and the mastodon from North America were unique species, and different from the modern African and Indian elephants (Fig. 1.8). Cuvier extended his studies to the rich Eocene mammal deposits of the Paris Basin, describing skeletons of horse-like animals (see Fig. 1.4), an opossum, carnivores, birds and reptiles, all of which differed markedly from living forms. He also wrote accounts of Mesozoic crocodilians, pterosaurs and the giant mosasaur of Maastricht.

Cuvier is sometimes called the father of **comparative anatomy**; he realized that all organisms share common structures. For example, he showed that elephants, whether living or fossil, all share certain anatomic features. His public demonstrations became famous: he claimed to be able to identify and reconstruct an animal from just one tooth or bone, and he was usually successful. After 1800, Cuvier had established the reality of extinction.

The vastness of geological time

Many paleontologists realized that the sedimentary rocks and their contained fossils documented the history of long spans of time. Until the late 18th century, scientists accepted calculations from the Bible that the Earth was only 6000–8000 years old. This view was challenged, and most thinkers accepted an unknown, but vast, age for the Earth by the 1830s (see p. 23).

The geological periods and eras were named through the 1820s and 1830s, and geologists realized they could use fossils to recognize all major sedimentary rock units, and that these rock units ran in a predictable sequence everywhere in the world. These were the key steps in the foundations of **stratigraphy**, an understanding of geologic time (see p. 24).

FOSSILS AND EVOLUTION

Progressionism and evolution

Knowledge of the fossil record in the 1820s and 1830s was patchy, and paleontologists
debated whether there was a **progression** from simple organisms in the most ancient rocks to more complex forms later. The leading British geologist, Charles Lyell (1797–1875), was an antiprogressionist. He believed that the fossil record showed no evidence of long-term, one-way change, but rather cycles of change. He would not have been surprised to find evidence of human fossils in the Silurian, or for dinosaurs to come back at some time in the future if the conditions were right.

**Progressionism** was linked to the idea of **evolution**. The first serious considerations of evolution took place in 18th century France, in the work of naturalists such as the Comte de Buffon (1707–1788) and Jean-Baptiste Lamarck (1744–1829). Lamarck explained the phenomenon of progressionism by a large-scale evolutionary model termed the “Great Chain of Being” or the Scala naturae. He believed that all organisms, plants and animals, living and extinct, were linked in time by a unidirectional ladder leading from simplest at the bottom to most complex at the top, indeed, running from rocks to angels. Lamarck argued that the Scala was more of a moving escalator than a ladder; that in time present-day apes would rise to become humans, and that present-day humans were destined to move up to the level of angels.

**Darwinian evolution**

Charles Darwin (1809–1882) developed the theory of evolution by **natural selection** in the 1830s by abandoning the usual belief that species were fixed and unchanging. Darwin realized that individuals within species showed considerable variation, and that there was not a fixed central “type” that represented the essence of each species. He also emphasized the idea of evolution by common descent, namely that all species today had evolved from other species in the past. The problem he had to resolve was to explain how the variation within species could be harnessed to produce evolutionary change.

Darwin found the solution in a book published in 1798 by Thomas Malthus (1766–1834), who demonstrated that human populations tend to increase more rapidly than the supplies of food. Hence, only the stronger can survive. Darwin realized that such a principle applied to all animals, that the surviving individuals would be those that were best fitted to obtain food and to produce healthy young, and that their particular **adaptations** would be inherited. This was Darwin’s theory of evolution by natural selection, the core of modern evolutionary thought.

The theory was published 21 years after Darwin first formulated the idea, in his book *On the Origin of Species* (1859). The delay was a result of Darwin’s fear of offending established opinion, and of his desire to bolster his remarkable insight with so many supporting facts that no one could deny it. Indeed, most scientists accepted the idea of evolution by common descent in 1859, or soon after, but very few accepted (or understood) natural selection. It was only after the beginning of modern genetics early in the 20th century, and its amalgamation with “natural history” (systematics, ecology, paleontology) in the 1930s and 1940s, in a movement termed the “Modern synthesis”, that Darwinian evolution by natural selection became fully established.

**Paleontology today**

**Dinosaurs and fossil humans**

Much of 19th century paleontology was dominated by remarkable new discoveries. Collectors fanned out all over the world, and knowledge of ancient life on Earth increased enormously. The public was keenly interested then, as now, in spectacular new discoveries of dinosaurs. The first isolated dinosaur bones were described from England and Germany in the 1820s and 1830s, and tentative reconstructions were made (Fig. 1.9). However, it was only with the discovery of complete skeletons in Europe and North America in the 1870s that a true picture of these astonishing beasts could be presented. The first specimen of *Archaeopteryx*, the oldest bird, came to light in 1861: here was a true “missing link”, predicted by Darwin only 2 years before.

Darwin hoped that paleontology would provide key evidence for evolution; he expected that, as more finds were made, the fossils would line up in long sequences showing the precise pattern of common descent. *Archaeopteryx* was a spectacular
start. Rich finds of fossil mammals in the North American Tertiary were further evidence. Othniel Marsh (1831–1899) and Edward Cope (1840–1897), arch-rivals in the search for new dinosaurs, also found vast numbers of mammals, including numerous horse skeletons, leading from the small four-toed *Hyracotherium* of 50 million years ago to modern, large, one-toed forms. Their work laid the basis for one of the classic examples of a long-term evolutionary trend (see pp. 541–3).

Human fossils began to come to light around this time: incomplete remains of Neandertal man in 1856, and fossils of *Homo erectus* in 1895. The revolution in our understanding of human evolution began in 1924, with the announcement of the first specimen of the “southern ape” *Australopithecus* from Africa, an early human ancestor (see pp. 473–5).

Evidence of earliest life

At the other end of the evolutionary scale, paleontologists have made extraordinary progress in understanding the earliest stages in the evolution of life. Cambrian fossils had been known since the 1830s, but the spectacular discovery of the Burgess Shale in Canada in 1909 showed the extraordinary diversity of soft-bodied animals that had otherwise been unknown (see p. 249). Similar but slightly older faunas from Sirius Passett in north Greenland and Chengjiang in south China have confirmed that the Cambrian was truly a remarkable time in the history of life.

Even older fossils from the Precambrian had been avidly sought for years, but the breakthroughs only happened around 1950. In 1947, the first soft-bodied Ediacaran fossils were found in Australia, and have since been identified in many parts of the world. Older,
simpler, forms of life were recognized after 1960 by the use of advanced microscopic techniques, and some aspects of the first 3000 million years of the history of life are now understood (see Chapter 8).

**Macroevolution**

Collecting fossils is still a key aspect of modern paleontology, and remarkable new discoveries are announced all the time. In addition, paleontologists have made dramatic contributions to our understanding of large-scale evolution, **macroevolution**, a field that includes studies of rates of evolution, the nature of speciation, the timing and extent of mass extinctions, the diversification of life, and other topics that involve long time scales (see Chapters 6 and 7).

Studies of macroevolution demand excellent knowledge of time scales and excellent knowledge of the fossil species (see pp. 70–7). These two key aspects of the **fossil record**, our knowledge of ancient life, are rarely perfect: in any study area, the fossils may not be dated more accurately than to the nearest 10,000 or 100,000 years. Further, our knowledge of the fossil species may be uncertain because the fossils are not complete. Paleontologists would love to determine whether we know 1%, 50% or 90% of the species of fossil plants and animals; the eminent American paleontologist Arthur J. Boucot considered, based on his wide experience, that 15% was a reasonable figure. Even that is a generalization of course – knowledge probably varies group by group: some are probably much better known than others.

All fields of paleontological research, but especially studies of macroevolution, require quantitative approaches. It is not enough to look at one or two examples, and leap to a conclusion, or to try to guess how some fossil species changed through time. There are many quantitative approaches in analyzing paleontological data (see Hammer and Harper (2006) for a good cross-section of these). At the very least, all paleontologists must learn simple **statistics** so they can describe a sample of fossils in a reasonable way (Box 1.3) and start to test, statistically, some simple hypotheses.

**Paleontological research**

Most paleontological research today is done by paid **professionals** in scientific institutions, such as universities and museums, equipped with powerful computers, scanning electron microscopes, geochemical analytic equipment, and well-stocked libraries, and, ideally, staffed by lab technicians, photographers and artists. However, important work is done by **amateurs**, enthusiasts who are not paid to work as paleontologists, but frequently discover new sites and specimens, and many of whom develop expertise in a chosen group of fossils.

A classic example of a paleontological research project shows how a mixture of luck and hard work is crucial, as well as the

---

**Box 1.3  Paleobiostatistics**

Modern paleobiology relies on quantitative approaches. With the wide availability of microcomputers, a large battery of statistical and graphic techniques is now available (Hammer & Harper 2006). Two simple examples demonstrate some of the techniques widely used in taxonomic studies, firstly to summarize and communicate precise data, and secondly to test hypotheses.

The smooth terebratulide brachiopod *Dielasma* is common in dolomites and limestones associated with Permian reef deposits in the north of England. Do the samples approximate to living populations, and do they all belong to one or several species? Two measurements (Fig. 1.10a) were made on specimens from a single site, and these were plotted as a frequency polygon (Fig. 1.10a) to show the population structure. This plot can test the hypothesis that there is in fact only one species and that the specimens approximate to a typical single population. If there are two species, there should be two separate, but similar, peaks that illustrate the growth cycles of the two species.
Figure 1.10  Statistical study of the Permian brachiopod *Dielasma*. Two measurements, sagittal length (L) and maximum width (W) were made on all specimens. The size–frequency distributions (a, b) indicate an enormous number of small shells, and far fewer large ones, thus suggesting high juvenile mortality. When the two shape measurements are compared (c), the plot shows a straight line ($y = 0.819x + 0.262$); on a previous logarithmic plot, the slope ($\alpha$) did not differ significantly from unity, so an isometric relationship is assumed, and the raw data have been replotted.
The graph suggests that there is in fact a single species, but that the population has an imbalance (is skewed) towards smaller size classes, and hence that there was a high rate of juvenile mortality. This is confirmed when the frequency of occurrence of size classes is summed to produce a cumulative frequency polygon (Fig. 1.10b). It is possible to test ways in which this population diverges from a normal distribution (i.e. a symmetric “bell” curve with a single peak corresponding to the mean, and a width indicated by the standard deviation about the mean).

It is also interesting to consider growth patterns of *Dielasma*: did the shell grow in a uniform fashion, or did it grow more rapidly in one dimension than the other? The hypothesis is that the shell grew uniformly in all directions, and when the two measurements are compared on logarithmic scales (Fig. 1.10c), the slope of the line equals one. Thus, both features grew at the same rate.

In a second study, a collection of thousands of *microvertebrates* (teeth, scales and small bones) was made by sieving sediment from a Middle Jurassic locality in England. A random sample of 500 of these specimens was taken, and the teeth and bones were sorted into taxonomic groups: the results are shown as a pie chart (Fig. 1.11a). It is also possible to sort these 500 specimens into other kinds of categories, such as types of bones and teeth or taphonomic classes (Fig. 1.11b, c). A further analysis was made of the relatively abundant theropod (carnivorous dinosaur) teeth, to test whether they represented a single population of young and old animals, or whether they came from several species. Tooth lengths and widths were measured, and frequency polygons (Fig. 1.11d) show that there are two populations within the sample, probably representing two species.
cooperation of many people. The spectacular Burgess Shale fauna (Gould 1989; Briggs et al. 1994) was found by the geologist Charles Walcott in 1909. The discovery was partly by chance; the story is told of how Walcott and his wife were riding through the Canadian Rockies, and her horse supposedly stumbled on a slab of shale bearing beautifully preserved examples of *Marrella splendens*, the “lace crab”. During five subsequent field seasons, Walcott collected over 60,000 specimens, now housed in the National Museum of Natural History, Washington, DC. The extensive researches of Walcott, together with those of many workers since, have documented a previously unknown assemblage of remarkable soft-bodied animals. The success of the work depended on new technology in the form of high-resolution microscopes, scanning electron microscopes, X-ray photography and computers to enable three-dimensional reconstructions of flattened fossils. In addition, the work was only possible because of the input of thousands of hours of time in skilled preparation of the delicate fossils, and in the production of detailed drawings and descriptions. In total, a variety of government and private funding sources must have contributed hundreds of thousands of dollars to the continuing work of collecting, describing and interpreting the extraordinary Burgess Shale animals.

The Burgess Shale is a dramatic and unusual example. Most paleontological research is more mundane: researchers and students may spend endless hours splitting slabs, excavating trenches and picking over sediment from deep-sea cores under the microscope in order to recover the fossils of interest. Laboratory preparation may also be tedious and long-winded. Successful researchers in paleontology, as in any other discipline, need endless patience and stamina.

Modern paleontological expeditions go all over the world, and require careful negotiation, planning and fund-raising. A typical expedition might cost anything from US$20,000 to $100,000, and field paleontologists have to spend a great deal of time planning how to raise that funding from government science programs, private agencies such as the National Geographic Society and the Jurassic Foundation, or from alumni and other sponsors. A typical high-profile example has been

---

**Box 1.4 Giant dinosaurs from Madagascar**

How do you go about finding a new fossil species, and then telling the world about it? As an example, we choose a recent dinosaur discovery from the Late Cretaceous of Madagascar, and tell the story step by step. Isolated dinosaur fossils had been collected by British and French expeditions in the 1880s, but a major collecting effort was needed to see what was really there. Since 1993, a team, led by David Krause of SUNY-Stony Brook, has traveled to Madagascar for nine field seasons with funding from the US National Science Foundation and the National Geographic Society. Their work has brought to light some remarkable new finds of birds, mammals, crocodiles and dinosaurs from the Upper Cretaceous.

One of the major discoveries on the 1998 expedition was a nearly complete skeleton of a titanosaurian sauropod. These giant plant-eating dinosaurs were known particularly from South America and India, though they have a global distribution, and isolated bones had been reported from Madagascar in 1896. The new fossil was found on a hillside in rocks of the Maevareno Formation, dated at about 70 million years old, in the Mahajanga Basin. The landscape is rough and exposed, and the bones were excavated under a burning sun. The first hint of discovery was a series of articulated tail vertebrae, but as the team reported, “The more we dug into the hillside, the more bones we found”. Almost every bone in the skeleton was preserved, from the tip of the nose, to the tip of the tail. The bones were excavated and carefully wrapped in plaster jackets for transport back to the United States.

Back in the laboratory, the bones were cleaned up and laid out (Fig. 1.12). Kristi Curry Rogers worked on the giant bones for her PhD dissertation that she completed at SUNY-Stony Brook in 2001. Kristi, and her colleague Cathy Forster, named the new sauropod *Rapetosaurus krausei* in