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 in 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 by limiting itself to absolute certainties like mathematics.
- Classical and medieval views about fossils were often magical and mystical.
- Observations in the sixteenth and seventeenth 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 geological fieldwork and the use of fossils.
- By 1840, it was understood that fossils changed through time, 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.

COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL

Introduction to Paleobiology and the Fossil Record, Second Edition. Michael J. Benton and David A. T. Harper.
© 2020 John Wiley & Sons Ltd. Published 2020 by John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
Companion website: http://www.wiley.com/paleobiology

INTRODUCTION

Paleontology has had a long history, and yet astonishing new discoveries are made all the time. There is a mix of old and new in paleontology; it is a subject with a history of accumulating knowledge over 200 years coupled with the application of modern technology to exploring some of the most fundamental questions about Earth and life. We think of the new discoveries, dinosaur and bird fossils from China, human remains from Africa, and new Precambrian and Cambrian fossils that tell us something about the origin of life and the origin of animals. But new methods are probably more important in advancing our understanding of questions about origins, about extremes in plant and animal life, and about the coupled history of Earth and life through many changes in climate and physical conditions.

In paleontology, difficult questions are often asked about the reconstruction of ancient plants and animals. Surely no one will ever truly 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, or the differences between males and females? How could anyone discover how an ancient animal hunted, how strong was its bite force, 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 all questions about paleobiology and, surprisingly, a great deal can be inferred about these questions. **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 reveal 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 clues 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. We will also consider how you could construct a career for yourself as a paleontologist. But first, just what is paleontology for? Where does it sit in the ranks of modern science?

PALEONTOLOGY IN THE MODERN WORLD

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

1. *Origins*. People want to know about origins – where life came from, where humans came from, and where the Earth



(a)



(b)

Figure 1.1 People love to collect fossils. Many professional paleontologists go into the field because of the buzz of finding something beautiful that comes from a plant or animal that died millions of years ago. Fossils such as these tiny fishes from the Eocene of Wyoming (a), may amaze us by their abundance, or like the lacewing fly in amber (b), by the exquisite detail of their preservation. Source: Courtesy of Sten Lennart Jakobsen.

and universe came from. These have been questions in philosophy, religion, and science for thousands of years and paleontologists play a key role in revealing their answers. Despite the spectacular progress in paleontology, the earth sciences, and astronomy over the last two centuries, many people with fundamentalist religious beliefs deny all natural explanations of origins – these debates are hugely important, and paleontologists contribute vital information to the discussion.

2 *Curiosity about different worlds*. Science fiction and fantasy novels challenge and excite us with worlds that are different from our own. Another way to explore alien worlds is to study paleontology – the plants and animals that existed in the past were quite unlike any modern organism (see Chapters 10–19). Just imagine a world with 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 side by side 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 8). For example, 252 million years ago, the Earth went through a phase of substantial global warming, acid rain, and declining oxygen levels, which resulted in 95% of species dying out (see Chapter 8); 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 Chapter 7). This is 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 9). 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 Chapter 8; Sections "The Diversification of Life" and "The "Big Five" Mass Extinction Events"). 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 interventions, and we would have no concept of mass extinctions, times when vast numbers of species die out (see Chapter 8; Section "Mass Extinctions").

6 *Dating rocks*. **Biostratigraphy**, the use of fossils in dating rocks (see Chapter 2), 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. Radioisotopic dating provides precise dates in millions of years for rock samples (radiocarbon dating is used by archaeologists because it spans back only thousands of years), 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.

Paleontologists can come to the subject early, as children, or later through courses in geology or biology at university. Many students ask how they might find a career as a paleontologist, and the best way to weigh your options may be to look at some young people who have done just that (see Box 1.1).

PALEONTOLOGY AS A SCIENCE

What is science?

Imagine you are traveling by plane and your neighbor sees you 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 sabertooth cats, and how they could make those color paintings; surely they are just pieces of art, and not science at all? How would you answer?

Box 1.1 Careers in paleontology

Here are four people who have made careers in paleontology. The usual route is to first obtain a Bachelor's degree in Geology, Earth sciences, or Biology, after which pursuing a specialist Master's program in Paleontology, Museum studies, Micropaleontology, or some other specialism, and often a PhD (doctorate). Research posts in universities, colleges, and museums usually require a PhD, and the same is often true for jobs in industry, but paleontologists in the oil industry may have a Bachelor's degree and a specialist Master's, focusing especially on the use of microfossils in stratigraphy.

Dr. Erin Saupe (Figure 1.2a), Assistant Professor of Palaeobiology at the University of Oxford and former postdoc at the Yale Institute for Biospheric Studies, works on the ecological and evolutionary controls on species' environmental tolerances, the causes and consequences of both background and mass extinction, and the mechanisms and drivers responsible for diversification (see also Box 8.6). Here, she explains how she fell in love with paleontology and gives her advice for undergraduates pursuing a career in the field: "I fell head over heels for paleontology after taking a historical geology class as an undergraduate student. Although I had always been enamored with dinosaurs, entirely new creatures and ancient settings were revealed to me during this course, and I began to understand science as a process. I love that paleobiologists are similar to detectives: they work to piece together the history of life on Earth and the processes dictating that history. I care very deeply about sustaining life on Earth, and I use what happened to species in the past as a way to better understand and predict what might happen to them under present-day and future environmental changes. If you're interested in paleontology as an undergraduate, I would take as many courses in biology and geology as possible. Paleobiology is becoming increasingly quantitative, and future success in the field will be predicated – in part – on mathematical skills. For example, take as many modeling, programming, statistics, and calculus courses as you can stand (statistics being especially important). Seek out opportunities for independent research (e.g. with faculty at universities, museum settings, or national parks): the more experience you have with research early on, the more successful you will be in the future. Graduate school is increasingly competitive, and having research experience gives you an important leg up in the applicant pool."

Dr. Melanie Hopkins (Figure 1.2b), Associate Curator of Invertebrate Paleontology at the American Museum of Natural History, New York, works on the evolution of body shapes in trilobites (see also Box 6.3) and other arthropods. Here she comments on what paleontology means to her and recommends interested undergraduates to become fluent in as many scientific disciplines as possible: "I collected rocks and shells and sand as a child, and I loved learning about photosynthesis in high school. However, my first influential exposure to geology was not until college when I took some introductory courses on a whim, notably a course on coastal processes. And it was later still, when working at the U.S. Geological Survey, that I started reading about the early evolution of animals and thinking seriously about the coevolution of the Earth and life. The awesome and humbling time scales that had captivated me as a geology student were relevant for evolutionary biology! But studying paleobiology has also informed my everyday life, my opinions on current events, public policy, conservation, and my thinking about what life is and what it means to be human. Paleobiology is an integrative field of study, and this makes it a more demanding pursuit than commonly perceived. To be a professional, it is not enough to be able to identify fossils. The aspiring paleobiologist must gain some expertise in biology (such as evolutionary theory, quantitative genetics, systematics, phylogenetics, evo-devo, biochemistry, biogeography, ecology), geology (such as sedimentology, stratigraphy, Earth history, isotope analysis, geochemistry, taphonomy), statistics and various applied mathematics (such as linear algebra, time series analysis, model selection), and/or computer science (or at least an ability to code in something like R, C++, or Python)."

Dr. Maria McNamara (Figure 1.2c), Senior Lecturer at the University of Cork, Ireland, and formerly a postdoc at Yale and Bristol, UK, works on taphonomy of fossils, especially the chemistry



Figure 1.2 Paleontologists who are beginning their professional careers: (a) Dr. Erin Saupe discovers a fossil; (b) Dr. Melanie Hopkins collects trilobites bed-by-bed; (c) Dr. Maria McNamara takes notes as she logs a sedimentary section; and (d) Dr. Phoebe Cohen is happy to have found a near-perfect Precambrian stromatolite. Source: Images courtesy of their subjects.

of exceptional preservation of color in fossil insects and vertebrates (see also Box 5.1). She describes her sense of wonder and excitement in thinking about the life of the past: "The natural world has been my passion for as long as I can remember. As a child I pored over books about natural history. My real inspiration was my grandmother, and she sent us out into the fields with instructions to find different types of grasshopper or snail or some such. I still remember the satisfaction of identifying our precious finds using her wonderful library of reference books. My grandmother also brought us hunting for fossils in the local slate quarries, and this made me determined to pursue geology as a career. To me palaeobiology is one of the most exciting scientific fields today because it's a melting pot of evolutionary biology, classical palaeontology, sedimentology, geochemistry, geology, and more. My research is driven by a couple of fundamental questions: How are fossils preserved? How can fossils help us understand evolutionary trends and processes through deep

Continued

time? To younger students considering palaeontology as a career, my advice would be to study hard, gain relevant experience in a research group or museum, and read widely – this will broaden your knowledge base and understanding, and will help you identify what excites you most. Being a paleontologist often involves long hours in the lab, in the field, or writing papers, but when you're passionate about the subject, the hours fly by. It's hard sometimes to strike a balance between work and family life, but having young children has had a very definite positive impact on my work – I'm more focused and efficient now."

Dr. Phoebe Cohen (Figure 1.2d), Associate Professor of Geosciences at Williams College, Williamstown, Massachusetts, works on microscopic fossils from the Precambrian, exploring early life on Earth, and contributing to astrobiology as well as paleobiology. She describes why she finds the origin and early history of life so awesome: "I was inspired by going to the Harvard Museum of Natural History with my parents as a child, my 7th-grade Earth science teaching, and reading lots of National Geographic magazines. My driving inspiration is a desire to understand how the world got to be the way it is today, and what events have shaped life on earth through time. I love paleobiology because it's interdisciplinary and I am constantly learning and pushing myself as a scientist. I feel very fortunate that my profession lets me incorporate different ways of thinking about the world around me. I'm interested in understanding how earth and life have co-evolved through time. This is a big question, so I focus mainly on one time period, the Neoproterozoic, which is the time period leading up to the radiation of animals in the Cambrian Period. I'm really interested in how eukaryotes evolved in the Neoproterozoic (see also Box 9.3), what that can tell us more broadly about how life responds to environmental change, and how environments are themselves influenced by life over time. I find these questions endlessly interesting, which means I picked a good area to study! To me, the three keys to success are enthusiasm, curiosity, and persistence. If you don't truly feel enthusiasm for what you do, have curiosity about what you are working on, and persist at your work, it's hard to make it through the tough, boring, stressful times (and there will be plenty of those!)."

Science is supposed to be about reality, about hard facts, calculations, and proof. It is obvious that you cannot 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 attempt 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 (Figure 1.3a), established the methods of **induction** in science. He argued that it was only through the patient accumulation of accurate observations of natural phenomena that a problem could be solved. The enquirer might hope to see common patterns among the observations, and these common patterns would point to an explanation, or law



(a) (b)

Figure 1.3 Important figures in the history of science: (a) Sir Francis Bacon (1561–1626), who established the methods of induction in science; and (b) Karl Popper (1902–1994), who explained that scientists adopt the hypothetico-deductive method.

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:

All men are mortal.
Socrates is a man.
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) described the way that science works as the **hypothetico-deductive method**. Popper (Figure 1.3b) 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 saber-toothed 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, and 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 new idea, and they fight against it. Then some scientists speak up and support it, and then everyone does. This is summarized by 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 of Luis Alvarez et al. (1980) in which they presented the hypothesis that the Earth had been hit by a meteorite 66 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 Chapter 8; Section "The Cretaceous-Paleogene event"). 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 Chapter 7; Section "Evolution and the Fossil Record").

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 centimeters 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 or her 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 of 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, by studies of how their modern relatives walk, and by constructing functional digital computer models. 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 66 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 or the structure of DNA. 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 of the data to the facts. The critic has to provide evidence to refute the hypothesis, and, most importantly, 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 might be useful to think about a sequence of deductive steps used by a paleontologist 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 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 step 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 clay, or on a digital model 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 Chapter 5; Section "Exceptional preservation"), but again their size and positions are predictable from modern relatives. Even the skin is not entirely guesswork: some mummified 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 TV documentaries 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 usually unsupported by fossil data, are not fantasy. Paleontologists, like any people with common sense, base their speculations here on comparisons with living animals. How did dinosaurs reproduce? 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. But what about color? Surely there can never be any evidence about the original color of a dinosaur, or any extinct plant or animal for that matter? Well, a discovery in 2010 showed concrete evidence of dinosaur color, and electrified the world of paleontology (see Box 1.2).

So, when you see a walking, grunting dinosaur, or a leggy trilobite, trotting across

Box 1.2 Telling the color of a dinosaur

How quickly can viewpoints change! In discussing paleobiology, some things about ancient life might seem impossible to reconstruct. However, in 2010 two teams independently claimed to have reconstructed the original color and color patterns of a dinosaur in papers published in the world's leading scientific journals, first in *Nature* and then in *Science*. In the first paper, the small theropod dinosaur *Sinosauropteryx* was shown to have been all-over ginger in color, and with a ginger and white striped tail. In the second paper, the small theropod dinosaur *Anchiornis* was shown to have carried black and white stripes over its body, and to have had a reddish crest and speckled red and

Figure 1.4 The colors of dinosaur feathers: (a, b) scanning electron microscope photographs of sausage-shaped eumelanosomes, indicating black, gray, or brown original colors (a), and of spherical phaeomelanosomes, indicating ginger colors (b); (c) reconstruction of *Sinosauropteryx*, showing the ginger and white striped tail; (d) reconstruction of *Anchiornis*, showing black, gray, ginger, and white color stripes and patches. See Color plate 9.1. Source: (a, b) Zhang et al. (2010). Reproduced with permission from Nature Publishing Group. (c) J. Robins (artist), Bath, UK. Reproduced with permission. (d) M. DiGiorgio, Madison, CT, USA. Reproduced with permission.

gray cheeks. Many paleontologists doubted these results, and some still deny them, but the evidence was clear.

The story began in 2008, when Yale graduate student Jakob Vinther looked again at what had been identified as bacteria within a fossil feather from Brazil. At high magnification under the scanning electron microscope, the tiny, sausage-shaped structures looked just like coccoid bacteria, but Vinther noticed they were only seen in dark-colored stripes in the feather, not in the pale-colored stripes. He made a lateral jump and realized these were not bacteria but rather melanosomes, crowded within originally black bands and absent in originally white bands. The fossil feather showed only dark and light colors, and these could well have been any color in life. However, if the minute organelles were melanosomes, then he had direct evidence of original color.

Melanosomes are abundant in the feathers of birds and the hair of mammals. Melanosomes contain the pigment molecule melanin, which occurs in two variants. Eumelanin, the common variant, gives gray, brown, and black colors, while less frequent phaeomelanin gives ginger colors. These two organic pigments provide all the colors of mammalian, including human, hair, whereas birds use melanin commonly for feather color, but add some dietary pigments such as carotenes and porphyrins, for yellows, red, purples, and greens. Eumelanosomes are generally sausage-shaped organelles about 1 μm (= 1 millionth of a meter) in length (Figure 1.4a), phaeomelanosomes are generally spherical and half that size (Figure 1.4b).

So, in the 2010 papers, the team working on *Sinosauropteryx* identified only phaeomelanosomes in its fossilized feathers, and clear evidence for presence-absence in stripes along the tail (Figure 1.4c), and the team working on *Anchiornis* found both melanosome types in feathers from different regions of its body (Figure 1.4d).

These papers showed two things: that color in dinosaurs could be determined (only in feathered dinosaurs), and that display might have been important in these early forms, just as in birds today, and that perhaps scientists should never say something is impossible – as Peter Medawar, renowned medical researcher, said in the 1950s, "science is the art of the possible."

Read more about these discoveries in Zhang et al. (2010) and Li et al. (2010), and at https://dinocolour.blogs.bristol.ac.uk. The latest is that pterosaurs, the flying reptiles, also had melanosomes in their fluff, and indeed it seems likely that their "fluff" is the same as bird-dinosaur feathers, meaning feathers and feather color originated much earlier than anyone had thought before (Yang et al. 2019).

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 should be reasonably correct, the movements of jaws and limbs are based on structural experiments with the fossil skeletons and 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 (Figure 1.5). 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 commonplace to see color paintings of scenes from ancient times, rendered by skillful artists and supervised by reputable paleontologists. Moving dino-



Figure 1.5 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. Source: Modified from Cuvier 1834–1836.

saurs, of course, have had a long history in Hollywood movies through the twentieth century, but the world had to wait until the technology allowed more realistic computer-generated renditions in the 1990s, first in *Jurassic Park* (1993), and then in *Walking with Dinosaurs* (1999), *Jurassic World* (2015), and hundreds of films and documentaries each year (Box 1.3). Paleontologists often complain about the Hollywood dinosaurs, but often they are worried about details, and in fact their websites and museums may very well use the same digital technologies to produce physical models and computer-generated images that breathe life into fossil organisms.

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?

STEPS TO UNDERSTANDING

Earliest fossil finds

Fossils are very common in certain kinds of rocks, and they are often attractive and beautiful objects. It is probable that people picked up fossils long ago, and perhaps even wondered why shells of sea creatures are now found high in the mountains, or how a perfectly preserved fish specimen came to lie buried deep within layers of rock. Prehistoric peoples picked up fossils and used them as ornaments, presumably with little understanding of their meaning.

Some early speculations about fossils by classical authors seem now very sensible to modern observers. Early Greeks such as Xenophanes (576–480 BCE) and Herodotus (484–426 BCE) recognized that some fossils were marine organisms, and that these provided evidence for earlier positions of the

Box 1.3 Bringing dinosaurs 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 technique 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, a classic BBC production that is still a benchmark of collaboration between paleontologists, computer modelers, and filmmakers.

The documentary producers chose six or seven key beasts per episode. 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, climate, 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 by 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 (Figure 1.6); all this can be semiautomated through the CGI software.

In a recent production, *Attenborough and the Giant Dinosaur* (BBC, 2015–2016), the whole process, from bones in the ground to a fully skin-covered and animated titanosaur, was shown. David Attenborough walked round the reconstructed skeleton of one of the largest ever dinosaurs,

Figure 1.6 The world's largest dinosaur, a titanosaur from Argentina, as portrayed in "David Attenborough and the Giant Dinosaur," a film aired in 2015 and 2016.
Source: Courtesy of Robin Cox, BBC Natural History Unit.

Continued

built in an aircraft hangar, and the CGI team used high-resolution 3D scans of the fossil bones to create a virtual skeleton, which was articulated correctly with the help of paleontologists and comparative anatomists. This model was then used to place the internal organs, such as the heart and lungs, with the help of a comparative anatomist. The bones were then clothed with muscle and covered with skin, helping to create a moving "live" dinosaur. Such details and effects are key to the success of dinosaur movies and documentaries, but would be nothing without the close collaboration between the documentary producers, CGI experts and anatomists, and paleontologists.

CGI effects are commonplace now in films, advertising, and educational applications. From a start in about 1990, the industry now employs thousands of people, and many of them work full-time on making paleontological reconstructions for leading TV companies and museums.

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 sixteenth and seventeenth centuries wrote books presenting this interpretation. For example, the Englishman Robert Plot (1640–1696) argued that ammonites (see Chapter 14) 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 and embedded deep within solid rock.

The idea of plastic forces had been overthrown largely by the 1720s, but some extraordinary events in Wurzburg, Germany, contributed to its downfall at the time. 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. These collectors, however, had been paid by an academic rival to manufacture "fossils" by carving the soft limestone into the outlines of shells, flowers, butterflies, and birds (Figure 1.7). 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). He only 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

Figure 1.7 Lying stones: two of the remarkable "fossils" described by Professor Beringer of Wurzburg in 1726: he believed these specimens represented real animals of ancient times that had crystallized into the rocks by the action of sunlight.

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 (Figure 1.8). 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.



Figure 1.8 Nicolaus Steno's (1667) classic demonstration that fossils represent the remains of ancient animals. He showed the head of a dissected shark together with two fossil teeth, previously called *glossopetrae*, or tongue stones. The fossils are exactly like the modern shark's teeth. The Latin text at the top reads "head of sea fish," and at the bottom, "and its teeth."

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 eighteenth 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 anatomical 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 modern African and Indian elephants (Figure 1.9). Cuvier extended his studies to the rich Eocene mammal deposits of the Paris Basin, describing skeletons of horse-like animals (see Figure 1.5), 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 doc-



Figure 1.9 Proof of extinction: Cuvier's comparison of (a) the lower jaw of a mammoth and (b) a modern Indian elephant. Source: Courtesy of Eric Buffetaut.

umented the history of long spans of time. Until the late eighteenth 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 Chapter 2; Section "Astrochronology and cyclostratigraphy: looking up to find the rhythm"). It was only in the 1920s, that it became possible to assign absolute ages to rocks and to discover the true age of the Earth and of particular rock units (see Chapter 2; Section "Planets: remote but on the radar").

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 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 Chapter 2).

FOSSILS AND EVOLUTION

Progressionism and evolution

Knowledge of the fossil record in the 1820s and 1830s was patchy, and paleontologists debated whether **progression** occurred 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.

Most other geologists and paleontologists at the time, however, saw evidence for progressionism, and this was eventually linked to the idea of **evolution**. The first serious discussions of evolution happened in eighteenth-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 ("scale of nature"). 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 the Scala was more of a moving escalator than a ladder; that in time present-day apes would rise to become humans, and 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 strong 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 thereafter, but very few accepted (or understood) natural selection. This was because there was no adequate model of inheritance.

Darwin, and most scientists of his day, thought that you acquired characters equally from your mother and father and they blended. Over time, any particular feature would be progressively diluted under such a model of blending inheritance. The answer was already there, in the work of Gregor Mendel (1822–1884), who had discovered particulate inheritance – he understood that characteristics generally did not blend or dilute, but were particulate. We now refer to these coding particles as **genes**. You inherit your characteristics from your parents, but the characters remain fully expressed – if your mother has blond hair and your father has black hair, you inherit either the blond or black hair color. Under blending inheritance your hair should be gray.

Mendel published his work in 1866, but in such an obscure journal that few scientists of his day were aware of it. The work was rediscovered only about 1900, after Darwin had died, and its significance was then understood. It was then only after the beginning of modern genetics early in the twentieth 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 nineteenth-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 (Figure 1.10). 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 two 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), archrivals 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 Chapter 7; Section "Trends and progress").

Human fossils began to come to light around this time: incomplete remains of Neanderthal 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*

Figure 1.10 The first dinosaur craze in England in the 1850s was fueled by new discoveries and dramatic new reconstructions of the ancient inhabitants of that country. This picture, inspired by Sir Richard Owen, is based on his view that dinosaurs were almost mammal-like. Source: Courtesy of Eric Buffetaut.

from Africa, an early human ancestor (see Chapter 18; Section "Human evolution").

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 Chapter 11; Section "Great Ordovician Biodiversification Event"). Similar but slightly older faunas from Sirius Passet 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 9).

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 7 and 8).

Studies of macroevolution demand excellent knowledge of geologic time scales and fossil species (see Chapter 7; Section "Evolution and the Fossil Record"). 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 almost certainly varies from group to 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 (2005) 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 1.4) 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, computed tomography (CT) X-ray scanners, geochemical analytic equipment, 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 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

Box 1.4 Paleobiostatistics

Modern paleobiology relies on quantitative approaches. With the wide availability of microcomputers, a large battery of statistical and graphical techniques is now available (Hammer and Harper 2005). 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, length and width, were made on specimens from a single site, and these were plotted as a frequency polygon (Figure 1.11a) 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.

The graph suggests that there is in fact a single species, but that the population has an imbalance (is skewed) toward 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 (Figure 1.11b). It is possible to test ways in which this population diverges

Continued

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 (Figure 1.11c), the slope of the line equals one. Thus, both features grew at the same rate.



Figure 1.11 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 (α) did not differ significantly from unity, so an isometric relationship is assumed, and the raw data have been replotted.

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 (Figure 1.12a). It is also possible to sort these 500 specimens into other kinds of categories, such as types of bones and teeth or taphonomic classes (Figure 1.12b,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 (Figure 1.12d) show that there are two populations within the sample, probably representing two species.



Figure 1.12 Composition of a Middle Jurassic vertebrate fauna from England. The proportions of the major groups of vertebrates in the fauna are shown as a pie chart (a). The sample can be divided into categories of bone types (b) and taphonomic classes (c), which reflect the amount of transport. Dimensions of theropod dinosaur teeth show two frequency polygons (d) that are statistically significantly different (*t*-test), and hence indicate two separate forms.

specimens, now housed in the National Museum of Natural History, Washington, DC. The extensive research of Walcott, together with that of many workers since, have documented a previously unknown assemblage of remarkable soft-bodied animals. The success of the more recent work depended on new technology in the form of high-resolution microscopes, scanning electron microscopes, X-ray photography, and CT scanning to enable three-dimensional reconstructions of the 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 longwinded. 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 fundraising. A typical expedition might cost anything from US$20000 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 a long-running program of study of dinosaurs and other fossil groups from the Cretaceous of Madagascar (Box 1.5).

Field expeditions attract wide attention, but most paleontological research is done in the laboratory. Paleontologists may be motivated to study fossils for all kinds of reasons, and their techniques are as broad as in any science. Paleontologists work with chemists to understand how fossils are preserved and to use fossils to interpret ancient climates and atmospheres. Paleontologists work with engineers and physicists to understand how ancient animals moved, and with biologists to understand how ancient organisms lived and how they are related to each other. Paleontologists work with mathematicians to understand all aspects of evolution and events, and the biomechanics and distribution of ancient organisms. Paleontologists, of course, work with geologists to understand the sequence and dating of rocks, and their associated ancient environments and climates.

Box 1.5 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 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 to Madagascar in the 1880s, but a major collecting effort was needed to see what was really there. Starting in 1993, a team, led by David Krause of SUNY-Stony Brook, traveled to Madagascar for more than 10 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 Maevarano 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 (Figure 1.13). 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 2001. The specimen turned out to be different from titanosaurians already named from other parts of the world, and the specimen was unique in being nearly complete and in preserving the skull, which was described in detail by Curry Rogers and Forster in 2004. Its name refers to "rapeto," a legendary giant in Madagascan folklore. To date, *R. krausei* is the most complete and best-preserved titanosaur ever discovered.

Kristi Curry Rogers is now Associate Professor at Macalester College, St Paul, Minnesota, where she continues her work on the anatomy and relationships of sauropod dinosaurs, and on dinosaur bone histology. At the 2015 fall meeting of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology, she announced a new study on the eggs and embryology of *Rapetosaurus*. You can find out more about *Rapetosaurus* in Curry Rogers and Forster (2001, 2004).

Figure 1.13 Finding the most complete titanosaur, *Rapetosaurus*, in Madagascar: (a) Kristi Curry Rogers (front right) with colleagues excavating the giant skeleton; (b) after preparation in the lab, one of the huge thigh bones can be examined – this is a juvenile sauropod, so not as large as some of its relatives. Source: Courtesy of Kristi Curry Rogers.

But it seems that, despite centuries of study, paleobiologists have so much to learn. We don't have a complete tree of life; we don't know how fast diversifications can happen and why some groups exploded onto the scene and became successful and others did not; we don't know the rules of extinction and mass extinction; we don't know how life arose from non-living matter; we don't know why so many animal groups acquired skeletons 500 million years ago; we don't know why life moved on to land 450 million years ago; we don't know exactly what dinosaurs did; we don't know what the common ancestor of chimps and humans looked like and why the human lineage split off and evolved so fast to dominate the world. These are exciting times indeed for new generations to be entering this dynamic field of study!

Review Questions

1. What kinds of evidence might you look for to determine the speed and mode of locomotion of an ancient beetle? Assume you have fossils of the whole body, including limbs, of the beetle and its fossilized tracks.
2. Which of these statements is in the form of a scientific hypothesis that may be tested and could be rejected, and which are non-scientific statements? Note, scientific hypotheses need not always be correct; equally, non-scientific statements might well be correct, but cannot be tested:
   - The plant *Lepidodendron* is known only from the Carboniferous Period.
   - The sabertoothed cat *Smilodon* ate plant leaves.
   - *Tyrannosaurus rex* was huge.
   - There were two species of *Archaeopteryx*, one larger than the other.
   - Evolution did not happen.
   - Birds and dinosaurs are close relatives that share a common ancestor.
3. Do you think scientists should be cautious and be sure they can never be contradicted, or should they make statements they believe to be correct, but that can be rejected on the basis of new evidence?
4. Does paleontology advance by the discovery of new fossils, or by the proposal and testing of new ideas about evolution and ancient environments?
5. Should governments invest tax dollars in paleontological research?

Further reading

Benton, M.J. (2019). *The Dinosaur Rediscovered: How a Scientific Revolution Is Rewriting History*. London, New York: Thames & Hudson.

Benton, M.J. et al. (2020). *Cowen's History of Life*, 6e. New York: Wiley.

Briggs, D.E.G. and Crowther, P.R. (2001). *Palaeobiology II*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Bryson, B. (2003). *A Short History of Nearly Everything*. New York: Broadway Books.

Buffetaut, E. (1987). *A Short History of Vertebrate Palaeontology*. London: Croom Helm.

Eldredge, N. (2013). *Extinction and Evolution: What Fossils Reveal about the History of Life*. New York: Firefly Books.

Foote, M. and Miller, A.I. (2006). *Principles of Paleontology*. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman.

Prothero, D.R. (2018). *The Story of Life in 25 Fossils*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Rudwick, M.J.S. (1976). *The Meaning of Fossils: Episodes in the History of Paleontology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rudwick, M.J.S. (1992). *Scenes from Deep Time: Early Pictorial Representations of the Prehistoric World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sepkoski, D. (2015). *Rereading the Fossil Record: The Growth of Paleobiology as an Evolutionary Discipline*. University of Chicago Press.

Taylor, P.D. and O'Dea, A. (2014). *A History of Life in 100 Fossils*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Books.

References

Alvarez, L.W., Alvarez, W., Asaro, F., and Michel, H.V. (1980). Extraterrestrial causes for the Cretaceous-Tertiary extinction. Science 208: 1095–1108.

Beringer, J.A.B. (1726). *Lithographiae Wirceburgensis, Ducentis Lapidum Figuratorum, a Potiori Insectiformium, Prodigiosis Imaginibus Exornatae Specimen Primum, Quod in Dissertatione Inaugurali Physicohistorica, Cum Annexis Corollariis Medicis*, 116. Wurzburg: Fuggart.

Briggs, D.E.G., Erwin, D.H., and Collier, F.J. (1994). *The Fossils of the Burgess Shale*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Curry Rogers, K. and Forster, C.A. (2001). The last of the dinosaur titans: a new sauropod from Madagascar. Nature 412: 530–534.

Curry Rogers, K. and Forster, C.A. (2004). The skull of *Rapetosaurus krausei* (Sauropoda: Titanosauria) from the Late Cretaceous of Madagascar. Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology 24: 121–144.

Cuvier, G. (1834–1836). *Recherches sur les Ossemens Fossiles: où l'on Rétablit les Caractères de plusieurs Animaux dont les Révolutions du Globe ont Détruit les Espèces*. Paris: E. d'Ocagne.

Darwin, C.R. (1859). *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*, 502. London: John Murray.

Gould, S.J. (1989). *Wonderful Life. The Burgess Shale and the Nature of History*. New York: Norton.

Hammer, Ø. and Harper, D.A.T. (2005). *Paleontological Data Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hunter, W. (1768). Observations on the bones commonly supposed to be elephant's bones, which have been found near the river Ohio, in America. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society 58: 34–45.

Li, Q., Gao, K.-q., Vinther, J. et al. (2010). Plumage color patterns of an extinct dinosaur. Science 327: 1369–1372.

Yang, Z.X., Jiang, B.Y., McNamara, M.E. et al. (2019). Pterosaur integumentary structures with complex feather-like branching. Nature Ecology and Evolution 3: 24–30.

Zhang, F., Kearns, S.L., Orr, P.J. et al. (2010). Fossilized melanosomes and the colour of Cretaceous dinosaurs and birds. Nature 463: 1075–1078.