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#### Abstract

Detailed pollen morphology has been studied in eight $F_{1}$ interspecific hybrids, two induced autotetraploids and one desynaptic mutant. The pollen grains are prolate-spheroidal to subprolate, tricolporate to tetracolporate and psilate. The size of the grains showed variation at different ploidy levels. The variation in size and shape, apocolpial diameter, and mesocolpial diameter is higher in induced autotetraploids and desynaptic mutant, but intermediate in $\mathrm{F}_{1}$ hybrids. Finally, the significance of pollen morphology in unravelling the evolutionary status of the above taxa vis-a-vis their parents has also been discussed.


## Introduction

The importance of pollen morphology as an expression of the geographical distribution, genomal constitution, taxonomy and evolution of plants has been demonstrated in recent years. Palynology of species and varieties of the genus Capsicum has been studied and the interrelationships among them were deduced in part I. Information on the pollen morphology of species hybrids, induced polyploids and desynaptic mutants in angiospermic taxa is rather meagre. There are, however, a few reports on the pollen morphology of interspecific hybrids, viz., Sonneratia (Muller, 1969), Hibiscus (Nair, 1961), Amaranthus (see Nair, 1970; Pal \& Khoshoo, 1966) and Physalis (Lydia Prasad et al., 1984). Similarly a few reports on pollen morphology of polyploids, viz., Rice (Sampath \& Ramanathan 1951; Maurizio, 1956; Rangaswamy \& Raman, 1973) and Physalis (Lydia Prasad et al., 1984) have been made. Also the pollen morphology in induced mutants has been investigated in Pimpinella (Joshi \& Raghuvanshi, 1967) and Capsicum (Raghuvanshi, 1976). Still there is no information available on the palynology of the interspecific hybrids, induced polyploids and desynaptic mutants in the genus Capsicum. The present study documents for the first time the pollen morphology of species hybrids, induced polyploids and mutants of Capsicum and its significance in our understanding of the interrelationships of these taxa.

## Materials and Methods

The eight interspecific $F_{1}$ hybrids, viz., $G$. annuum var. $G 3 \times C$. frutescens, $C$. annuum var. cerasiformis $\times C$. chinense var. mishme, $C$. annuum var. cerasiformis $\times C$. pendulum, $C$. frutescens var. tabasco $\times G$. annuum var. cerasiformis, $G$. chinense $\times G$. frutescens, $G$. chacoense $\times C$. annuum var. $B O B, C$. chacoense $\times C$. chinense var. mishme were obtained through artificial hybridization. Autotetraploids were obtained in two cultivars of $C$. annuum through colchicine administered to the seedlings by the following methods: (i) 10 day old seedlings of $C$.
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annuum var. cerasiformis were treated with aqueous solution of $0.3 \%$ colchicine by applying the chemical to the apical growing buls using a small cotton plug to keep the bud, continuously wet for two days, (ii) the growing tips of three-week old seedlings of C.annuum var. TNK in the field at eight leaves stage were cut and $0.3 \%$ aquequs solution of colchicine in cotton swabs was applied to the cut end continuously for six hours. A induced desynaptic mutant was obtained through the seed treatment of $0.2 \%$ aqueous colchicine solution for 48 hours.

The fresh polliniferous mate, ial of interspecific hybrids, tetraploids and the desynaptic matants ware collected from the adult plants. Pollen preparations were made by revised acetolysis method of Erdtman (1969). Observations have been recorded with the help of light microscopy (Carl Zeiss binocular). The measurements are based on an average of fifty non-chlorinated grains randomly selected but excluding the deviating or abortive pollen. The terminology used is that of Faegri and Iverson (1964) and Murry and Eshbaugh (1971) and the descriptions of pollen are in accordance with Erdtman (1952, 1969).

## Description of Pollen Grains

## I. Interspecific hybrids:

1. C. annuum var. $G 3 \times C$. frutescens var. tabasco: Shape: prolate-spheroidal to subprolate, semi-angular in polar view, Size: $23.73 \pm 1.46 \mu(\mathrm{P}) \times 20.44 \pm 0.11 \mu$ (E) PEI $=$ $109.25 \pm 0.53 \mu$ and $\mathrm{PAI}=15.33_{ \pm 0.43 \mu \text { size varied from very small to larger pollen }}$ grains. Structure: Exine tectate $1.24 \pm 0.01 \mu$ thick, ektexine thicker than endexine. A general thickening noticeable near the apertures. In polar view equatorial diameter $20.57 \pm 0.9 \mu$, mesocolpial diameter $12.56 \pm 0.14 \mu$ and apocolpial diameter $3.13 \pm 0.09$ $\mu$ in equatorial view. Aprrtures: Tricolporate, angulaperturate, inaperturate grains also observed rarely. Margos distinct, os lalongate, constricted, extends half the width of the grain. Sometimes the apertures irregularly or obliquely placed, surface psilate (Pl. 1, Figs. 1-3; Table 1).
2. C. annuum var. cerasiformis $\pm$ C. chinense var. mishme: Shape: prolate-spheroidal, subtriangular in polar view, Size: $24.87 \pm 0.29 \mu(\mathrm{P}) \pm 22.48 \pm 0.29 \mu(\mathrm{E})$, PEI $=110.96$ $\pm 1.27 \mu$ and $\mathrm{PAI}=17.09 \pm 0.74 \mu$. Size also varies from very small to large, aborted grains very irregular. Structure: Exine tectate $1.16 \pm 0.01 \mu$ thick, ektexine and endexine neariy of same thickness. In polar view equatorial diameter $20.57 \pm 0.33 \mu$, mesocolpial diameter $12.44 \pm 0.28 \mu$ and apocolpial diameter $3.83 \pm 0.17 \mu$ in equatorial view. Apertures: mostly tricolporate, either irregular or obliquely placed, angulaperturate, os lalongate, constricted os extends half the width of the grain, outer ends tapering to slightly rounded. Surface psilate (Pl. 1, Figs. 4-6; Table 1).
3. C. annuum var. cerasiformis $\times$ C. pendulum: Shape: prolate-spheroidal, subtriangular in polar view. Size: $25.53 \pm 0.25 \mu(\mathrm{P}) \times 22.68 \pm 0.18 \mu(\mathrm{E}), \mathrm{PEI}=112.64 \pm 0.98 \mu$ and $\mathrm{PAI}=18.38 \pm 0.67 \mu$, aborted grains irregular in sizes. Structure: Exine tectate $1.20 \pm 0.02$ $\mu$, thick, ek texine and endexine nearly equal in thickness. In polar view the equatorial dianeter $22.36 \pm 0.21 \mu$, mesocolpial diameter $13.36 \pm 0.24 \mu$ and apocolpial diameter $4.12 \pm 0.14 \mu$ in equatorial view. Apertures: mostly tricolporate racely tetracolporate, angulaperturate, in equatorial view furrows bordered by distinct margos, os lalongate, unconstricted, extends half the width of the grain, outer ends tapering. Surface psilate (Pl. 1, Figs. 7-9; Table 1).
Table 1-Mean frequency of pollen parameters of the hybrids, induced autotetraploids and desynaptic mutant of Capsicum and their chromosome number

| Taxa | 2 n | Polar diameter <br> (P) | Equatorial diameter (E) (equatorial view) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Polar } \\ & \text { equatorial } \\ & \text { index } \\ & \text { P/E X } 100 \end{aligned}$ | Equatorial diameter (polar view) | Apocolpial <br> diameter | Mesocolpial diameter | Polar area index A/E N 100 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C. annuum var. G3 X <br> C. frutescens | 24 | $\begin{array}{r} 23.73 \pm 1.46 \\ (20.01-26.72) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 20.44 \pm 0.11 \\ (18.32-24.34) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 109.25 \pm \quad 0.53 \\ (91.20-123.63) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 20.57 \pm 0.09 \\ (17.79-26.02) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.13 \pm 0.09 \\ (2.83 .6 .90) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12.56 \pm 0.14 \\ (10.62-2.44) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15.33 \perp 0.43 \\ (11.72-29.06) \end{array}$ |
| C. annuum var. cerasiformis $\times$ C. chinense var. mishme | 24 | $\begin{gathered} 24.87 \pm 0.29 \\ (21.06-28.47) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22.48 \pm 0.29 \\ (17.35-26.46) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 110.96 \pm 1.27 \\ (94.44-137.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 20.57 \pm 0.33 \\ (16.55-24.51) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.83 \pm 0.17 \\ (0.00-5.34) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.44 \pm 0.28 \\ & (9.03-15.84) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 17.09 \pm 0.74 \\ (11.95-24.60) \end{array}$ |
| C. annuum var. cerasiformis $\times C$. pendulum | 24 | $\begin{array}{r} 25.53 \pm 0.25 \\ (20.44-28.76) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 22.68 \pm 0.18 \\ (19.56-26.55) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 113.64 士 0.98 \\ (94.67-130.67) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 22.36 \pm 0.21 \\ (18.58-25.75) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.12 \pm 0.14 \\ (2.57-6.90) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.36 \pm 0.24 \\ & (9.73-16.72) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 18.38 \pm 0.67 \\ (10.34-29.77) \end{array}$ |
| C. frutescens var. tabasco $\times$ <br> C. annuum var. cerasiformis | 24 | $\begin{array}{r} 23.50 \pm 0.30 \\ (19.20-26.64) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21.85 \pm 0.32 \\ (17.70-26.81) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 108.80 \pm 1.55 \\ (88.34-124.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 20.55 \pm 0.33 \\ (15.13-23.45) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3.85 \pm 0.14 \\ (2.48-5.49) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12.39+0.27 \\ (8.58-18.58) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 18.36+0.66 \\ (12.03-38.41) \end{array}$ |
| C. chinense var. mishme <br> C. frutescens var. tabasco |  | $\begin{gathered} 22.73 \pm 0.20 \\ (20.88-28.41) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 20.96 \pm 0.15 \\ (18.85-24.16) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 108.62+0.81 \\ (96.33-124.78) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 20.58 \pm 0.25 \\ (13.72-27.88) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.09+0.11 \\ (1.77-5.04) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13.43 \pm 0.23 \\ (8.78-16.46) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14.76 \pm 0.51 \\ (8.77-23.73) \end{gathered}$ |
| C. chacoense $\times$ <br> C. annuиm var. $B O B$ | 24 | $\begin{array}{r} 2.24 \pm 0.26 \\ (17.79-25.66) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7.18+0.27 \\ (15.66-24.07) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 105.44 \pm 1.23 \\ (91.53-120.72) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18.67 \pm 0.34 \\ (10.53-24.78) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2.89 \pm 0.09 \\ (1.06-4.51) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.55 \pm 0.30 \\ (8.32-19.38) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13.81 \pm 0.51 \\ (8.47-23.38) \end{gathered}$ |
| C. chacoense <br> C. frutescens var. tabasco | 24 | $\begin{gathered} 27.93 \pm 0.19 \\ (24.69-29.91) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 25.35 \pm 0.20 \\ (22.12-27.43) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 110.34 \pm 0.86 \\ (98.72-125.62) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 26.09 \pm 0.16 \\ (24.34-29.20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4.58 \pm 0.11 \\ (3.09-6.28) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 19.34 \pm 0.45 \\ (13.09-23.98) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 18.03 \pm 0.46 \\ (11.72-24.21) \end{array}$ |
| C. chcoense $\times$ <br> C. chinense var. mishme | 24 | $\begin{array}{r} 22.37 \pm 0.16 \\ (19.38-23.98) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19.5 \pm 0.12 \\ (17.70-12.33) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 114.27 \pm 0.71 \\ (104.57-125.99) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19.55 \pm 0.17 \\ (15.84-21.33) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.97 \pm 0.07 \\ (1.86-3.81) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 12.70 \pm 0.15 \\ (10.62-15.33) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15.26 \pm 0.40 \\ (10.01-22.99) \end{array}$ |
| C. annuum var. cerasiformis | 48 | $\begin{gathered} 36.91 \pm 0.21 \\ (34.07-39.39) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 31.89 \pm 0.26 \\ (26.28-35.40) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 116.03 \pm 0.99 \\ (98.41-134.02) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 33.02 \pm 0.16 \\ (30.80-35.13) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5.22 \pm 0.14 \\ (2.74-6.99) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 23.65 \pm 0.20 \\ (18.58-25.75) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16.43 \pm 0.44 \\ (8.10-25.18) \end{gathered}$ |
| C. annuum var. TNK | 48 | $\begin{array}{r} 38.19 \pm 0.31 \\ (31.50-42.57) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 31.67 \pm 0.21 \\ (28.14-33.72) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 121.35 \pm \quad 1.15 \\ & (94.68-134.89) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 32.94 \pm 0.32 \\ (26.99-39.82) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5.60 \pm 0.11 \\ (4.78-7.61) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 22.46 \pm 0.24 \\ (18.58-25.75) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 19.01 \pm 0.34 \\ (14.92-25.13) \end{array}$ |
| C. annuum var cerasiformis desynaptic mutant | 24 | $\begin{gathered} 23.42 \pm 0.22 \\ (18.14-26.37) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20.00 \pm 0.21 \\ (15.75-22.30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 117.57 \pm 1.34 \\ (103.91-136.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4 \\ (16.72 \pm 0.24 \\ (16.89) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2.17 \pm 0.19 \\ (0.00-4.34) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 13.61 \perp 0.14 \\ (11.41-15.13) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.83 \pm 0.97 \\ (0.00-17.34) \end{gathered}$ |

4. C. frutescens var. tabasco $\times$ C. annuum var. cerasiformis: Shape: Prolate-spheroidal, subtriangular in polar view. Size: $23.50 \pm 0.30 \mu(\mathrm{P}) \times 21.85 \pm 0.32 \mu, \mathrm{PEI}=108.80 \pm$ $1.55 \mu$ and $\mathrm{PAI}=18.36 \pm 0.66 \mu$. Structure: Exine tectate $1.13 \pm 0.03 \mu$ thick, ektexine thicker than endexine. A general thickening present near the apertures. In polar view the equatorial diameter $20.55 \pm 0.33 \mu$, mesocolpial diameter $12.39 \pm 0.27 \mu$ and apocolpial diameter $3.85 \pm 0.14 \mu$ in equatorial view. Apertures: Tricolporate, angulaperturate, syncolporate, colpae bordered by distinct margos, os lalongate, deeply constricted extends more than half the width of the grain, outer ends slightly rounded. Surface psilate (Pl. 1, Figs. 10-12; Table 1).
5. C. chinense var. mishme $\times$ C. frutescens var. tabasco: Shape: Prolate-spheroidal to subprolate, semiangular in polar view. Size: $22.73 \pm 0.20 \mu(P) \times 20.96 \pm 0.15 \mu(E)$ $\mathrm{PEI}=108.62 \pm 0.81 \mu$ and $\mathrm{PAI}=14.76 \pm 0.51 \mu$. Structure: Exine tectate $1.24 \pm 0.01 \mu$ thick, ektexine thicker than endexine. A general thickening present near the apertures. In polar view the equatorial diameter $20.38 \pm 0.25 \mu$, mesocolpial diameter $13.43 \pm 0.23 \mu$ and apocolpial diameter $3.09 \pm 0.11 \mu$ in equatorial view. Apertures: Mostly tricolporate occasionally tetracolporate, angulaperturate, inaperturate grains also observed. Margos distinct, os lalongate, constricted, extends half the width of the grain, outer ends slightly tapering to rounded. Rarely syncolporate condition was also observed. Surface psilate (Pl. 2, Figs. 13-15; Table 1).
6. C. chacoense $\times$. annuum var. $B O B$ : Shape: Prolate spheroidal to subprolate, semiangular in polar view. Size: $22.24 \pm 0.26 \mu(\mathrm{P}) \times 21.18 \pm 0.27 \mu(\mathrm{E}), \mathrm{PEI}=105.44 \pm$ $1.23 \mu$ and $\mathrm{PAI}=13.81 \pm 0.51 \mu$. Structure: Exine tectate $1.26 \pm 0.03 \mu$ thick, ektexine and endexine nearly equal in thickness. A general thickening noticeable near the apertures. In polar view the equatorial diameter $18.67 \pm 0.34 \mu$, mesocolpial diameter $11.55 \pm 0.30$ $\mu$, and apocolpial diameter $2.89 \pm 0.09 \mu$ in equatorial view. Apertures: Tricolporate, occasionally tetracolporate, angulaperturate, rarely fossaperturate, occasionally inaperturate grains also observed. Os lalongate, deeply constricted, extends half the width of the grain, outer ends pointed to slightly rounded. Surface psilate (Pl. 2, Figs. 16-18; Table 1).
7. C. chacoense $\times$ C. frutescens var. tabasco: Shape: Prolate-spheroidal to subprolate, semiangular in polar view. Size: $27.93 \pm 0.19 \mu(\mathrm{P}) \times 25.35 \pm 0.20 \mu(\mathrm{E}) \mathrm{PEI}=110.34 \pm$ $0.86 \mu$ and $\mathrm{PAI}=18.03 \pm 0.46 \mu$. Structure $:$ Exine tectate $1.43 \pm 0.09 \mu$ thick, ektexine thicker than endexine. A general thickening noticeable near the apertures. In polar view the equatorial diameter $26.09 \pm 0.16$, mesocolpial diameter $19.34 \pm 0.45 \mu$ and apocolpial diameter $4.58 \pm 0.11 \mu$ in equatorial view. Apertures: Mostly tricolporate, occasionally tetracolporate, angulaperturate or fossaperturate, rarely syncolporate, margos indistinct, os lalongate, deeply constricted to non-constricted, extends three fourth width of the grain, outer ends pointed to slightly rounded. Surface psilate (Pl.2, Figs. 19-21; Table 1).
8. C. chacoense $\times$. chinense var. mishme: Shape: Prolate-spheroidal to subprolate, angular to semiangular in polar view. Size: $22.37 \pm 0.16 \mu(\mathrm{P}) \times 19.55 \pm 0.12 \mu(\mathrm{E})$, $\mathrm{PEI}=114.27 \pm 0.71 \mu$ and $\mathrm{PAI}=15.26 \pm 0.40 \mu$. Structure: Exine tectate $1.08 \pm 0.03 \mu$ thick, ektexine and endexine nearly equal in thickness. A general thickening present near the apertures. In polar view, equatorial diameter $19.55 \pm 0.17 \mu \mathrm{~m}$, mesocolpial diameter $12.70 \pm 0.15 \mu$, and apocolpial diameter $2.97 \pm 0.07 \mu$ in equatorial view. Apertures: Mostly tricolporate rarely tetracolporate, angulaperturate or fossaperturate, less frequently inaperurate grains also noticed. Margos distinct to indistinct, os lalongate, deeply constricted, extends half the width of the grain, outer ends pointed to slightly rounded. Surface psilate (Pl. 2, Figs. 22-24; Table 1).
II. Colchicine induced variants of $C$. annuum :
(a) Autotetraploids:
9. var. TNK: Shape: Subprolate, tri or quadrilobed, subtriangular in polar view. Size: $38.19 \pm 0.31 \mu(\mathrm{P}) \times 31.67 \pm 0.21 \mu(\mathrm{E}), \mathrm{PEI}=121.35 \pm 1.15 \mu$ and $\mathrm{PAI}=19.01 \pm$ $0.34 \mu$. Structure: Exine tectate $1.140 \pm 0.02 \mu$ thick, ektexine and endexine equal in thickness. In polar view equatorial diameter $32.94 \pm 0.16 \mu$, mesocolpial diameter $22.46 \pm 0.24$ $\mu$ and apocolpial diameter $5.60 \pm 0.11 \mu$ in equatorial view. Apertures: Tricolporate to tetracolporate, angulaperturate, colpae bordered by distinct margos, os lalongate constricted to non-cozstricted, extends half the width of the grain, outer ends slightly rounded. Surface psilate (Pl. 3, Figs. 25-30; Table 1).
10. var. cerasiformis: Shupe: Subprolate, tri or quadrilobed or hexalobed, semiangular in polar view. Size: $36.91 \pm 0.21 \mu(\mathrm{P}) \times 31.89 \pm 0.26 \mu(\mathrm{E}) \mathrm{PEI}=116.03 \pm 0.99$ $\mu$ and $\mathrm{PAI}=16.43 \pm 0.44 \mu$. Structure: Exine tectate $1.32 \pm 0.02 \mu$ thick, ektexine thicker than endexine. A general thickening noticeable near the opertures. In polar view the equatorial diameter $33.02 \pm 0.16 \mu$, mesocolpial diameter $23.65 \pm 0.20 \mu$ and apocolpial diameter $5.22 \pm 0.14 \mu$ in equatorial view. Apertures: Tricolporate or tetracolporate, angulaperturate or fossaperturate, colpae bordered by distinct margos, os lalongate non-constrictel, outer ends pointed, extends half the width of the grain. Surface psilate (Pl. 3, Figs. 31-33; Table 1).
(b) Desynaptic mutant of $C$. annuum var. cerasiformis: Shape: Subprolate, semiangular in polar view. Size: $23.42 \pm 0.22 \mu(P) \times 20.00 \pm 0.21 \mu(E), \quad P E I=$ $117.57 \pm 1.34 \mu$ and $\mathrm{PAI}=10.83 \pm 0.97 \mu$. Structure: Exine tectate $1.30 \pm 0.02 \mu$ thick, ektexine thicker than endexine. A general thickening present near the apertures. In polar view the equatorial diameter $20.08 \pm 0.24 \mu \mathrm{~m}$, mesocolpial cliameter $13.61 \pm 0.14 \mu$ and apocolpial diameter $2.17 \pm 0.19 \mu$. Apertures: Mostly tricolporate, occasionally tetracolporate, angulaperturate or fossaperturate, inaperturate grains also observed. Margos indistinct, os lalongate, deeply constricted, extends half the width of the grain, outer ends pointed to slightly rounded. Surface psilate (Pl. 3, Figs. 34-36; Table 1).

## Discussion

The pollen morphology of the species and varieties of Capsicum which were involved in the hybridization programme is rather fairly homogeneous. Generally the pollen of Capsicum is subprolate or prolate-spheroidal in shape (Erdtman, 1952; Murry \& Eshbaugh, 1971; Basak, 1967; Nair \& Kapoor, 1974; Raghvanshi, 1976). The shape of pollen grains in specics and varieties currently involved in the hybridization work was found to be subprolate to prolate-spheroidal and oblate spheroidal (Aniel Kumar, 1984). In polar view the shape markedly varies with species and ploidy and is considered to be valuable as was observed by Muller (1969) in Sonneratia species and hybrids and also in interspecific hybrids of Physalis (Lydia Prasad et al., 1984). The pollen grains in the eight interspecific $F_{1}$ hybrids of the present study showed irregular shapes due to reduced pollen fertility. Triangular and occasionally tetralobed grains were found in all the $F_{1}$ hybrids except in C. annuum va". cerasiformis $\times C$. chinense var. mishme hybrid. Shrunken, aberrant and inaperturate condition was found in two $\mathrm{F}_{1}$ hybrids ( $C$. annuum var. cerasiformis $\times C$. chinense var. mishme and $C$. chacoense $\times C$. chinense var. mishme). The shape of the pollen grains in the $\mathrm{F}_{1}$ hyorids of $C$. annuum var. cerasiformis $\times$. chinense var. mishme, $C$. chinense $\times C$. frutescens was found to be intermediate between the respective parents, while
in the remaining six $\mathrm{F}_{1}$ hybrids (C. annuum var. $G 3 \times C$. frutescens var. tabasco, C. annuum var. cerasiformis $\times$ C. pendulum, ('. frutescens var. tabasco $\times C$. annuum var. cerasiformis, $C$. chacoense $\times C$. frutescens var. tabasco and $C$. chacoense $\times C$. chinense var. mishme) they were generally prolate-spheroidal. In contrast, Muller (1969) has recorded the shape of the pollen grains in the $\mathrm{F}_{1}$ hybrids of Sonneratia alba $\times S$. ouata and $S$. alba $\times S$. cascolaris as either dominant or recessive but never intermediate. He suggested that the shape subprolate is dominant over prolate-spheroidal type. Lydia Prasad et al. (1984) also encountered variation in pollen grains shape in the interspecific hybrids of Physalis.

Raw colchiloids $C$. annuum var. cerasiformis and $C$. annuum var. $T \mathcal{N} K$ generally suffer from low pollen production and reduced fertility compared to the corresponding diploid genotypes. Both tricolporate $(30.00 \%)$ and tetracolporate $(70.00 \%)$ grains were encountered in the two tetraploids. The shape of the pollen grains in them is subprolate, having a mean PEI of $121.35 \pm 1.15 \mu$ and $116.30 \pm 0.99 \mu$ respectively. Similar variation in pollen shapes was recorded in Sisymbrium irio complex (Nair \& Sharma, 1966-67). Shrunken and aberrant grains not uncommon in newly synthesized polyploids were encountered in the two tetraploids of the present study and also in the induced autotetraploid Physalis pubescens (Lydia Prasad et al., 1984).

Pollen grains of the desynaptic mutant were by and large subprolate; however, pro-late-spheroidal and oblate-spheroidal grains were also recorded though in a low frequency thus exhibiting variation in pollen shapes. The occurrence of shrunken and aberrant grains in the interspecific hybrids, raw colchiploids and desynaptic mutant of the present study was attributed to the irregular meiosis and polyadformation. Similar variation in pollen shape was attributed to higher pollen sterility. Such variation in pollen shapes was reported in the induced mutants of Pimpinella (Joshi \& Raghuvanshi, 1967) and Capsicuno (Raghuvanshi, 1976).

Pollen size seems to be an important character in Capsicum. The size variation was more evident in all the eight $\mathrm{F}_{1}$ hybrids of the present study showing micro and macro pollen grain formation. Similar micro and macro pollen grains were reported in the $F_{1}$ hybrid of Amaranthus dubius $\times A$. spinosus ( $\mathrm{Pal} \& \mathrm{Khoshoo} ,\mathrm{1966} \mathrm{)}$, the sizes of the pollen has been attributed to the presence of lagging univalents resulting in fewer chromosomes or more chromosones in the microspores. The variation encountered in pollen sizes of interspecific hybrids and mutants of the present investigation may be attributed to the occurrence of univalents and irregular meiosis in them.

Larger size of the pollen grains often provides a reliable index for the detection of autotetraploids in the experimental populations. In the present study the pollen grains in induced autotetraploids of $C$. annuum var. cerasiformis and $C$. annuum var. TNK were found to be larger than those of the diploid progenitors. A test for significance revealed that they were highly significantly different from each other (Table 2). Though there was no overall correlation between the chromosome number and pollen size it is presumed that the plants with lower chromosome number have smaller pollen and increase in the chromosome number of the same taxa is generally accompanied by larger pollen and with more defectives, more apertural numbers, and changes in aperture disposition etc. Such variations in the pollen size that accompanied an increase in chromosome number was also recorded in Oryzu (Sampath \& Ramanathan, 1951; Rangaswamy \& Raman, 1973), Plantago (Basset \& Crompton, 1968) and in Physalis pubescens (Lydia Prasay et al., 1984). Variation in pollen size raiging from small to large was encountered in the desynaptic mutant of the present study and this is attributed to irregularities pre-

Table 2-Comparison of various pollen characters in the diploids and their corresponding tetraploids of Capsicum L. ('t' values)

| Paired comparison | Polar <br> diameter | Equatorial <br> diameter | Polar <br> equatorial <br> index | Apocolpial <br> diameter | Polar area <br> index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C. annvum var. <br> cerasiformis (diploid) and <br> C. annuum var. <br> cerasiformis (tetraploid) | 44.30 | 28.21 | 4.28 | 4.68 | 4.95 |
| C. annuum var. TNK (diploid) and <br> C. annumm var. TNK (tetraploid) | 36.98 | 19.66 | 11.39 | 6.19 | $0.87^{*}$ |

$*=$ Not Significant at $\mathrm{p}=0.05$.
vailing in the genome. Similar variation in the pollen sizes were also reported in taxa treated with chemicals and physical mutagens such as in Pimpinella (Joshi \& Raghuvanshi, 1967) and Capsicum (Raghuvanshi, 1976) respectively. Therefore, the variation in the pollen sizes observed in interspecific hyorids, tetraploids and the desynaptic mutant of Capsicums is attributed to the unstable nature of the newly synthesized plants.

The pollen size was measured along the polar axis. Based upon sizes the pollen grains may be placed either in small (10-25 $\mu$ ) or in medium (25-50 $\mu$ ) classes (Erdtman, 1952; Murry \& Eshbaugh, 1971). Accordingly six out of the eight $\mathrm{F}_{1}$ hybrids fit into the small class whose mean ranges from 22.24 to $24.80 \mu$. The remaining two $F_{1}$ hybrids ( $C$. annuum var. cerasifornois $\times C$. pendulum and $C$. chacoense $\times C$. frutescens var. tabasco) and the two tetraploids of C. annuum varieties cerasiformis and $T N K$ and one desynaptic mutant come under medium class with mean ranges of 25.53 to $38.19 \mu$.

The relative size of the polar area based on polar area index (PAI) has been suggested by Faegri and Iverson (19j1) ant Murry and Eshbaugh (1971) as a quantitative character of diaynostic value. On the basis of the polar area index the following two classes are sugorested pertaining to the taxa of the present study.
(1) smaller polar arez index (PAI) between 10-15 $\mu$, eg: desynaptic mutant, $C$. chacoonse $\mathrm{x} C$. annuum var. BOB and $C$. chinense $\mathrm{x} C$. frutescens.
(2) Medium size polar area index (PAI) between 15-20 $\mu$, eg: two induced autotetraploids of $C$. annuum varieties of cerasiformis and TNK and six interspecific hybrids, viz., $C$. anzuum var. $\mathrm{G} 3 \times C$. frutescens, $C$. annuum var. cerasiformis x C. pendulunt and C. chinense var. mishne, C. frutescens var. tobasco x $C$. annuum var. cerasiformis, $C$. chacoense $\times C$. frutescens var. tobasco and $C$. chacoense $\times C$. chinense var. mishnue.
In all the interspecific hybrids, two induced autotetraploids and one desynaptic mutant, the PAI was less than that of the corresponding parents due to syncolporate condition. Sinilar results were reported in the induced autotetraploid, interspecific hybrids and the mutants of Physalis (Lydia Prasad et al., 1984). Smaller PAI due to syncolporate condition was also observed in some species of Capsicum (Murry \& Eshbaugh, 1971) and in the induced mutants of C. annuum (Raghuvanshi, 1976).

The higher number of apertures and the occasional inaperturate condition observed in the induced autotetraploids, desynaptic mutant and interspecific hybrids could be attri-
buted to the meiotic irregularities in the newly synthesized genome. The multiaperturate and occasional inaperturate condition was also reported in the interspecific hybrids, induced polyploids, and polyhaploid of Physalis (Lydia Prasad et al., 1984) and polyhaploids of Horajeum (Rajendra et al., 1978), Solanum species (Erdtman, 1952; Anderson \& Gensel, 1976) and induced mutants of Capsicum annuum (Raghuvanshi, 1976). Injecting colchicine to the flower buds Dover (1972) was able to induce multiaperturate condition in Triticum aestivum containing alien addition chromosomes in the genomes.

The endoaperture (os) was found to be lalongate, deeply constricted to non-constricted nature and extending half to three fourths of the width in all the eight $F_{1}$ hybrids, two autotetraploids and the desynaptic mutant. Irregular os with tapering ends was recorded in $4 \mathrm{~F}_{1}$ hybrids of the present study (C. annuum var. G3×C. frutescens, C. annuum var. cerasiformis $\times C$. pendulum, $C$. chacoense $\times C$. frutescens var. tabasco and $C$. chacoense $\times C$. chinense var. mishme). Irregular os with outer ends rounded was observed in the $\mathrm{F}_{1}$ hybrids of $C$. annuum var. cerasiformis $\times$ C chinense var. mishme, two autotetraploids of $C$. annuum and the desynaptic mutant. Circular os was observed in C. frutescens var. tabasco x C. annuum var. cerasiformis hybrid and bifurcated os was observed in $C$. chinense $\mathrm{x} C$. frutescens and $C$. chacoense x C. annuum var. $B O B$ hybrids. Irregular os formation could be attributed to the meiotic irregularities and higher pollen sterility present in the genome. Similar irregular os was also reported in interspecific hybrids and induced polyploids of Physalis (Lydia Prasad et al., 1984), species hybrids of Sonneratia (Muller, 1969), induced mutants of C. annuum (Raghuvanshi, 1976) and in some species of Solanum (Sharma, 1974).

Analysis of variance was also employed in the eight $F_{1}$ hybrids for quantitative meassurements utilising parameters such as polar diameter $(\mathrm{P})(\mathrm{F}=79.93 \mathrm{P}>0.01)$, equatorial diameter $(\mathrm{E})(\mathrm{F}=65.23, \mathrm{P}>0.01)$, polar equatorial index $(\mathrm{PEI})(\mathrm{F}=6.70, \mathrm{P}>0.01)$, apocolpial diameter (A) $(\mathrm{F}=27.48, \mathrm{P}>0.01)$, and polar area index ( PAI ) $(\mathrm{F}=10.30$, $\mathrm{P}>0.01$ ). The ' F ' values indicated highly significant differences among them.

## Inter-relationships

The inter-relationships between the five species of Capsicum have been explored through the crossability relationships and a cytogenetic analysis of the eight $F_{1}$ interspecific hybrids. Hybrids were obtained easily in the following combinations, viz., C. frutescens var. tabasco x $C$. annuum var. cerasifarmis, $C$. annuum var. cerasiformis $\times C$. pendulum, C. annuum var. cerasiformis $\times C$. chinense var. mishme, C. chucoense $\times C$. annuum var. $B O B$ and $C$. chinense x $C$. frutescens. Cytogenetic studies revealed that the hybrids differ from each other at least in one or two translocations in their genomes. They are partly pollen fertile indicating that there are considerable homologies or homologies among the genomes of the respective parents and hence they are probably closely related to each other. The pollen morphological evidence deduced through the application of the two paranieters (PEI and PAI) also supports the cytogenetical evidence.

## Evolutionary significance

In general the plant morphologists agree that similarity in a large number of characters of different taxa indicate close relationships, whereas diversity among the characters shows distant relationship. In recent years a few palynologists like Erdtman (1952, 1961), Saad (1961), Nair (1965), Punt (1971), Sharma (1969) and Muller (1969) have attempted to trace the evolutionary significance of some pollen morphological characters. In the genus Capsicum it is difficult to express any definite opinion about the evolutionary sig- nificance of pollen morphological characters. However, the present study highlights that some pollen characters showed evolutionary significance in species hybrids, induced autotetraploids and desynaptic mutant than in the respective parents.
(1) Shape: Prolate-spheroidal grains are considered to be advanced over the subprolate, eg: All the eight $F_{1}$ interspecific hybrids.
(2) Multiaperturate condition is an advanced character over tricolporate eg: induced autotetraploids of
C. annuum, desynaptic mutant and $\mathrm{F}_{1}$ hybrids of
C. annuum var. cerasifornis $\times C$. pendulum,
C. chinense x C. frutescens, C. chacoense x
C. annuum var. $B O B$.
(3) Circular os is considered to be an advanced feature cver bifurcated and tapering outer ends of the os, eg: $\mathrm{F}_{1}$ hybrid of $C$. frutescens var. tobasco x
C. annuum var. cerasiformis.
(4) Bifurcated os is advanced than tapering outer ends of the os, eg: $\mathrm{F}_{1}$ hybrids of C. chinense $\mathrm{x} C$. frutescens and Chacoense x C. annuum var. $B O B$.

The utilization of the above pollen morphological characters for the purpose of interpreting the relative advancement and the primitiveness of the taxa revealed that the interspecific hybrids, induced autoretraploids and desynaptic mutant showed advanced features over the corresponding parental species and varieties.
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## Explanation of Plates

(For all figures, magnification bar represents $10 \mu$ )

## PLATE 1

1-3. Pollen grains of $C$. annuum var. $G 3 \times$ C. frutescens var. iabasco

1. Equatorial view showing well separated colpae and mesocolpium.
2. Equatorial view showing ill-defined Os.
3. Polar view showing margos.

4-6. Pollen grains of $C$. annuum var. cerasiformis $\times$ C. chinense var. mishme
4 Equatorial view showing colpae.
5. Equatorial view showing irregular, constricted Os.
6. Polar view showing well developed margos.

7-9. Pollen grains of $C$. annuum var. cerasiformis $\times C$. pendulum
7. Equatorial view showing colpae.
8. Equatorial view showing nonconstricted Os.
9. Polar view showing margos.

10-12. Pollen grains of C. frutescens var. tabasco
C. annum var. cerasiformis
10. Equatorial view showing colpae.
11. Equatorial view showing deeply constricted circular Os.
12. Polar view showing syncolporate condition.




## PLATE 2

13-15. Pollen grains $C$. chinense var. mishme $\times$ C. frutescens var. tabasio
13. Equatorial view showing well separated colpae.
14. Equatorial view showing irregular, bifurcated Os.
15. Polar view showing tetracolporate condition.
16.18. Pollen grains of $C$. chacoense $\times C$. annuum var. $B O B$
16. Equatorial view showing well separated colpae.
17. Equatorial view showing irregular, constricted Os.
18. Polar view showing syncolporate condition.

19-2 1. Pollen grains of $C$. chacoense $\times C$. frutescens var. tabasco
19. Equatorial view showing colpae.
20. Equatorial view showing constricted Os.
21. Polar view showing margos.

22-24. Pollen grains of $C$. chacoense $\times C$. chinense var. mishme
22. Equatorial view showing colpae.
23. Equatorial view showing long narrow irregular Os.
24. Polar view showing syncolporate condition.

## PLATE 3

25-30. Pollen grains of induced autotetraploid of $C$. annuum var. $T \mathcal{N K}$
25. Equatorial view showing enlarged colpae.
26. Equatorial view showing irregular constricted Os.
27. Polar view showing distinct margos.
28. Polar view showing pores situated between the angles.
29. Polar view showing irregular shape.
30. Polar view showing tetracolporate condition.

31-33. Pollen grains of induced autotetraploid of C. annuum var. cerasiformis
31. Equatorial view showing colpae
32. Polar view showing pores situated between the angles.
33. Polar view showing well developed margos.

34-36. Pollen grains of induced desynaptic mutant of $C$. annuum var. cerasiformis
34. Equatorial view showing colpae.
35. Equatorial view showing irrgular deeply constricted Os.
36. Polar view showing margos.

