Martin Brasier’s contribution to the palaeobiology of the Ediacaran–Cambrian transition
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Abstract

Martin Brasier’s work spanned almost the entire geological column, but the origin of animals and the nature of the Cambrian Explosion were areas of particular interest. Martin adopted a holistic approach to the study of these topics that considered the interplay between multiple geological and biological phenomena, and sought to interpret the fossil record within the broad context of geological, biogeochemical, and ecological changes in the Earth system. Here we summarize Martin’s main contributions in this area, and assess the impact of his findings on the development of this field.

“Karl Popper would have said that... palaeontology [is] not real science because you can’t go out and sample it. I think absolutely the opposite. I think this is actually where science is. It’s trying to guess what lies over the hill and map terra incognita. When people come in and colonize, that’s just technology.”

Martin Brasier, 2013

(Excerpted from a phone interview with Robert Moor, On Trails, 2016)
Martin’s path into the Ediacaran–Cambrian transition

Martin Brasier’s journey into study of the Cambrian Explosion of animal life is a story he frequently articulated. Drawing comparisons to Darwin and Lyell, Martin observed that his studies into the past also began by looking at the present – in his case, exploring Caribbean reefs and lagoons as a ship’s naturalist on-board HMS Fawn and HMS Fox during his doctoral work in 1970 (Brasier 2009). Much of his early palaeontological research focused on foraminifera (see Brasier 2012; Gooday, in review), but these interests broadened to encompass other groups and ever more ancient organisms. During his time at the University of Reading, Martin was shown macrofossil specimens from the Ediacaran of Australia by Roland Goldring, which Martin later quipped he didn’t study at the time because “[the Ediacara biota] had been solved, Glaessner had worked it all out”. Martin did however take an interest in Roland’s archaeocyathid sponges, which led him to Paris to work with François Debrenne on the Cambrian Explosion.

Martin became fascinated by the conundrum of Darwin’s Dilemma: the mystery of why animal fossils seemingly extended back in time only to the Cambrian Period when evolutionary theory predicted a much more ancient history for metazoan lineages. He saw the Cambrian Explosion as “probably one of the strangest things that’s ever happened to life on our planet”, and dedicated a significant part of his career to attempting to resolve this problem. An early contribution to this area involved helping Michael House to organize one of the first symposia on the Cambrian Explosion for the Systematics Association in 1978, while his work at the University of Hull explored the ecology and taphonomy of archaeocyatha and the “Tommotian” trace fossils and skeletal biota of Nuneaton: the Small Shelly Fossils, or “small smelly fossils” as he fondly referred to them (Brasier 1976, 1984, 1986; Brasier et al. 1978; Brasier & Hewitt 1979). Those studies later expanded to encompass the broader Cambrian Explosion, and particularly its global palaeoenvironmental context (Brasier 1982, 1985).

Following his move to the University of Oxford in 1988, Martin became focused on the interrelationship between the evolution of animal life, nutrient flux, and the global ocean-atmosphere system, as evidenced by authigenic minerals and stable isotopes (e.g. Brasier 1990, 1991, 1992; Brasier et al. 1990; Brasier et al. 1992). His interest in isotopes led to greater involvement in refining stable isotope stratigraphy across the Ediacaran–Cambrian boundary, culminating in his involvement in the International Subcommission on Cambrian
Stratigraphy and the definition of the basal Cambrian boundary (Brasier et al. 1994a; Landing & Geyer, this volume).

Between 1992 and 1995, Martin supervised his first student on the Ediacaran–Cambrian transition, Duncan McIlroy, and it was at this time that Martin was partly drawn away from the carbonate-rich Cambrian successions and towards the fossiliferous siliciclastic Ediacaran–Cambrian sections of Avalonia and Baltica (Brasier & McIlroy 1998; McIlroy et al. 1998). It was not until the early 2000s that Martin truly engaged with the Ediacaran during a visit to Mistaken Point with Guy Narbonne of Queens University in 2002. Following McIlroy’s move to Memorial University of Newfoundland, Martin became an adjunct professor at Memorial University, and from 2005 onwards he visited Newfoundland with graduate students for several weeks each year (Fig. 1) until his death. Many of these students, including Jonathan Antcliffe, Richard Callow, Alex Liu, Latha Menon, Jack Matthews and Renee Hoekzema, continue to explore aspects of Ediacaran geology and palaeobiology in Newfoundland and elsewhere. Although Martin continued to extend his research ever further back in time, “working on ever older and more puzzling rocks – as I myself grew more ancient and puzzled” (see Antcliffe et al. this volume), the question of animal origins, and the enigma of the Cambrian Explosion, remained a core area of his studies. Some of the highlights of his Ediacaran and Cambrian work, and the intellectual impact they have had on the field, are outlined below.

**Refining stratigraphic understanding**

Martin’s work, particularly in the 1980s and 1990s, had a strong focus on refining Ediacaran–Cambrian stratigraphy in order to develop a global framework upon which to pin geological and evolutionary events. He noted at his retirement event in 2014 that “although everybody is interested in the biology of the Cambrian Explosion, actually defining the terms and the nature of rocks across that time was a fundamental part of developing the language we needed…” As part of his formal Reply upon receiving the Lyell Medal of the Geological Society that same year, he noted: “It took twenty years (1973–1993) to help settle a definition of the Precambrian–Cambrian boundary, and another two decades to help characterize the new Ediacaran System”.

Martin’s involvement in this important work utilized several independent records, across multiple continents. Following early work on the Cambrian boundary sections in India (Brasier & Singh 1987), he proceeded to integrate geochemical and biostratigraphic records from places as far afield as Scotland, Iran, Oman, China, Mongolia, Spain and Australia (Brasier, et al. 1979; Brasier, et al. 1990; Brasier et al. 1996; Shields et al. 1997; Brasier & Shields 2000; Lindsay et al. 2005). These studies contributed to an increasingly robust understanding of temporal changes in geochemical records during the Ediacaran–Cambrian transition, and also include some of the first publications to recognise overlaps in the biostratigraphic ranges of key Cambrian biotas (e.g. Brasier et al. 1979). Although he was not a geochronologist, Martin became associated with several projects involved in dating significant Ediacaran and Cambrian sections worldwide, including studies of material from Oman (Brasier et al. 2000), and most recently efforts to date the fossiliferous Ediacaran localities in Newfoundland, Canada.

Martin became involved in global discussions regarding Cambrian stratigraphic correlation during the late 1980s and early 1990s, holding positions as Secretary of the Working Group on the Precambrian–Cambrian boundary, and leader of IGCP Project 303 on Precambrian–Cambrian event stratigraphy (Brasier et al, 1994b). Most notably, in his role as President of the International Subcommission on Cambrian Stratigraphy (1992–1996) Martin presided over the key decision regarding the placement of the Global Stratotype Section and Point for the base of the Cambrian System. This process required considerable diplomacy, with multiple nations competing for the GSSP (Brasier et al. 1994a; Brasier 2009). The eventual GSSP section, at Fortune Head in Newfoundland, Canada, was chosen partly on the basis of its possession of the first appearance datum of the *Treptichnus pedum* (formerly *Phycodes pedum*) trace fossil assemblage (summarized in Brasier et al. 1994a; McIlroy & Brasier, this volume). Although this decision has largely withstood the test of time, refinement of formal stratigraphy in both the Cambrian and the Neoproterozoic are ongoing (Narbonne et al. 2012; Shields-Zhou et al. 2012; Babcock et al. 2014; Geyer & Landing, this volume). Martin retained an active role in Subcommission activities, and was a Voting Member of the International Subcommission on Ediacaran Stratigraphy at the time of his death.

**Decoding the Ediacaran biota**
Martin worked on several different groups of Cambrian and Neoproterozoic organisms, but perhaps the most challenging (and ultimately rewarding) group were the Ediacaran macrobiota. To the uninitiated, study of the Ediacaran macrobiota appears a daunting task: many of the fossils bear little or no resemblance to any extinct or extant taxon, and their paucity of recognisable morphological characters has contributed to significant uncertainty regarding their position in the eukaryotic tree. Martin conducted fieldwork in locations including Canada, Oman, Namibia and Brazil to attempt to resolve the question of what the Ediacaran organisms were. The consensus opinion when he began this work was that many of the Ediacaran organisms were animals (cf. Glaessner 1984), but following Seilacher’s famous suggestion of an alternative Vendobiont hypothesis (Seilacher 1984, 1989) there has been considerable debate and uncertainty surrounding their phylogenetic position. Martin was keen to emphasize that the Precambrian world was different, and that the principle of uniformitarianism could not be extrapolated back into the Precambrian as reliably as it could in the Phanerozoic: “the world before the Cambrian was, arguably, more like a distant planet” (Brasier 2009). He also recognized that ‘shoehorning’ Ediacaran fossils into modern groups was unwise, since many characters diagnostic of extant crown groups were likely to have developed in response to extrinsic events or factors that had not yet come to pass in the Ediacaran. In particular, he was in recent years a vocal advocate of questioning hypotheses that suggested Ediacaran macro-organisms were metazoan, critically assessing the evidence, promoting consideration of the null hypothesis, and encouraging debate and discussion (e.g. Antcliffe et al. 2014).

Although he participated in field trips to Ediacaran localities from the 1970s onwards, it was from the early 2000s that Martin started to seriously examine Ediacaran macrofossils, with his first foray in this field being a Masters student project on Charnia masoni (completed by Jo Slack). This led to over a decade of research into the Ediacaran macrobiota, which coincided with a significant global invigoration of the field. Perhaps unsurprisingly, this work did also include occasional forays into descriptions of microfossils (e.g. Zhou et al. 2001).

**Consideration of growth and development**

Martin’s approach to investigating Ediacaran macro-organisms was to focus on a small number of iconic, representative taxa; to study these in detail; and to assess their growth and
development in order to attempt to constrain their phylogenetic position (an approach outlined in Brasier & Antcliffe 2004). Work undertaken with Jonathan Antcliffe on Charnia demonstrated how its mode of growth differed from that of extant sea pens, thus permitting a pennatulacean affinity for Charnia to be ruled out (Antcliffe & Brasier 2007a, 2008). Similar studies into Dickinsonia (Brasier & Antcliffe 2008; utilising specimens from the Goldring collection) and Palaeopascichnus (Antcliffe et al. 2011) provided further contributions to our knowledge of those taxa and their construction, and expanded the armoury of approaches used to study Ediacaran macrofossils. Martin played an important role in guiding these early studies, and their influence can be clearly seen in recent studies into the growth, development and morphogenesis of Ediacaran macrofossils (e.g. Hoyal Cuthill & Conway Morris, 2014; Gold et al. 2015). These studies benefitted from a technological innovation introduced into Ediacaran research by Martin’s group; the laser scanning of fossil-bearing surfaces (Fig. 2; Antcliffe & Brasier 2011). Laser scanning permitted fine-scale quantitative studies of morphology, and revealed morphological characters that cannot be easily observed in the field.

Consideration of other Ediacaran frondose taxa (e.g. Bradgatia and Charniodiscus) explored how those organisms might be related to one another (Brasier & Antcliffe 2004, 2009), how disparate their morphologies could be (Antcliffe & Brasier 2007b) and the details of their architecture and taxonomy, culminating in the development of a coherent system with which to describe and classify rangeomorph organisms (Brasier et al. 2012). That latter publication provided a testable framework in which to explore frondose taxa, and has stimulated ongoing research into the fundamental question of what constitutes ecophenotypic versus genotypic variability in Ediacaran populations (e.g. Wilby et al. 2015; Liu et al. 2016). Though he did not describe significant numbers of new Ediacaran macrofossil taxa, Martin was particularly proud of deciphering Beothukis mistakensis (Brasier & Antcliffe 2009), which he considered to be a ‘Rosetta Stone’ for the understanding of rangeomorphs. As with the other taxa he named from Newfoundland (e.g. Vinlandia, Brasier et al. 2012), Martin favoured names that celebrated the history of the indigenous populations of the island.

A focus on Avalonia

Martin’s work included descriptions of Ediacaran fossils from Australia (Brasier & Antcliffe 2008), Iran (Menon et al. In Prep), Brazil (Parry et al. In Prep) and Siberia (Liu et al. 2013),
but much of his Ediacaran research was undertaken on sites either in England, or in Newfoundland, Canada. The classic English localities of the Long Mynd and Charnwood Forest, along with the coastal sections of Newfoundland, all lay on the margins of the microcontinent of Avalonia during late Ediacaran times (Cocks et al. 1997). As such, they exhibit many similarities in age, facies and fossil assemblage (Wilby et al. 2011; Noble et al. 2015), and in the past decade Martin made a concerted effort to better understand these regions and their relationship to wider global patterns and processes.

Charnwood Forest

The Ediacaran–Cambrian inlier of Charnwood Forest in Leicestershire, central England, was for Martin a classic place to take new students due to its accessibility, its historical importance in Ediacaran palaeontology, and because it is not actually a very easy area to understand without geological mapping and careful fieldwork. The art of deciphering stratigraphy and palaeoenvironment is something that Martin always loved, be it mapping the location of Precambrian cherts (e.g. Wacey et al. 2010) or working out field relations between dated igneous rocks and Ediacaran successions to indirectly constrain the age of the Ediacaran biota (McIlroy et al. 1998).

The Charnian successions became a central focus of Martin’s research following his 2005 visit to Mistaken Point in Newfoundland, during which time his Oxford group first started to develop ideas pertaining to growth and morphology of the Ediacaran macro-organisms. The easy accessibility of type material of Charnia masoni and Bradgatia linfordensis allowed Martin to employ his skills as an artist to create sketches that were more informative than any photograph. Martin used a technique where he drew the same fossil multiple times using illumination from different directions to build up a picture of the specimen that was simultaneously lit from several directions (Fig. 3). Although he called it ‘camera lucida’, in truth it often involved him tracing over images directly on his computer monitor. While drawing the type material of Charniodiscus, Martin suggested that it might actually be composed of several fronds orientated at angles to one another and compressed into the same plane (unpublished work discussed widely at conferences; Fig. 3; contrast this with Brasier & Antcliffe 2009, fig. 12), which, if correct, potentially has implications for all the other currently valid species of Charniodiscus (C. arboreus, C. longus, C. oppositus, C. procerus, C. spinosus and C. yorgensis), which appear to only have one frond and as such
would have to be transferred to another genus. *Charniodiscus* is a particularly problematic taxon, and although progress is being made in understanding its morphology (e.g. Ivantsov 2016), it remains to be seen whether Martin’s interpretation is correct. Much of Martin’s work on rangeomorphs utilized material from Charnwood, and he also contributed to discussions regarding protection of the Charnwood localities in his role as a member of the *Charnia* Research Group.

*The Long Mynd, Shropshire*

The other main English Ediacaran sections are to be found in the Long Mynd of Shropshire. The purported macrofossils from this area were first described by John Salter (Salter 1856, 1857) who was a contemporary of Charles Darwin, and the material from the Long Mynd was posited by Darwin as a partial solution to the unexpectedly sudden appearance of fossils at the base of what we now call the Cambrian Explosion (Darwin 1859). Martin had been fond of relating the sad story of John Salter, who was from a relatively humble background and had worked his way up to be a palaeontologist for the British Geological Survey, only to be sacked just before reaching pensionable age. Struggling to support his family, and suffering from bouts of depression, he finally committed suicide (Callow *et al.* 2011). In the course of Martin’s revisiting of the Longmyndian fossils, the wonderful Darwin Correspondence Project (e.g. Burkhardt & Smith 1985) provided a more complete story of Salter’s last years, especially his awkward behaviour towards his peers, which lends support to the idea that he suffered from what we would now call bipolar disorder (Callow *et al.* 2011). Salter’s tragic story, especially the way that his work was overlooked and side-lined, touched Martin, who took delight in bringing Salter’s work to a modern audience within the context of historical geology.

The key scientific questions regarding the Longmyndian relate to what its dominantly discoidal fossil assemblage represents, and how the shallow-marine to fluvial depositional environments relate to the largely marine sections seen elsewhere in Avalonia. The various discoidal structures of the Long Mynd have been the subject of much discussion in the geological literature (summarized in Callow & Brasier 2009a; Callow *et al.* 2011). Debate had surrounded the biogenicity of the small, circular impressions from the Burway, Synalds and Lightspout formations, with interpretations ranging from gas escape structures or raindrops to body and trace fossils of Ediacaran macro-organisms (e.g. Cobbold 1900;
McIlroy et al. 2005; Toghill 2006). Martin’s own investigations in the Long Mynd led to expanded descriptions of microfossils (originally described by Timofeyev et al. 1980, and Peat 1984), and the recognition that they could be preserved in multiple taphonomic styles (Callow & Brasier 2009b). Follow-up work with Latha Menon investigated the problem of what the discoidal structures actually represent by utilising serial grinding techniques to digitally reconstruct their 3-dimensional morphology. This work revealed that the Longmyndian pits were formed by the interaction of escaping fluids within finely laminated, microbial-mat-bound sediments (Menon et al. 2016; Menon et al. this volume), finally resolving that they originate from a combination of abiogenic processes and the presence of microbial mats.

So from a position where Martin felt that the Longmyndian sections were key to understanding evolution in the latest Ediacaran (his Kotlin Crisis; Brasier 1995), gradually, taxon by taxon, detailed objective work (e.g. Menon et al. 2016) has reduced us to a position where there are no longer any authentic Ediacaran macrofossils reported from the Long Mynd (though that is not to say his Kotlin Crisis has been abandoned; see for example Kolesnikov et al. 2015). John Salter’s novel assertion that there was Precambrian animal life is correct (Salter 1856), but sadly not based on the material he knew. The critical reassessment of the discoidal forms of the Long Mynd owe much to Martin instilling into his students the importance of constant vigilance in interpreting ancient markings, and his emphasis on the importance of the null hypothesis. In this case, the influence of microbial mats on fluid-filled sediments, driving millimetre-scale fluid escape, and affecting their surface expression, was entirely sufficient to explain the range of discoidal markings found in the Burway Formation of the Long Mynd. This work also expanded the range of influence of microbial mats on Ediacaran sediments, and highlighted the need to recognize the key role of microbes when examining the fossil record - a subject close to Martin’s heart (e.g. Callow & Brasier 2009a; Brasier et al. 2010).

Meanwhile Martin’s interests in determining the origin of the Long Mynd’s other enigmatic surface impression, Arumberia (Bland 1984; McIlroy & Walter 1997; McIlroy et al. 2005; Kolesnikov et al. 2012), and in refining the geochronological record of the locality, are ongoing areas of research for his group. He passed away before embarking on the next phase of our Longmyndian investigations—an opportunity to compare the sections to thick non-marine Ediacaran successions in Newfoundland—but he would have been amused to note that, as in all known non-marine Ediacaran successions, there is currently no evidence
for the classic Ediacaran macrobiota. Had the Ediacara biota truly been composed of lichens (Retallack 1994), environments like this are surely amongst the most likely places where we would have expected to find them.

Newfoundland, Canada

In addition to the work on rangeomorphs mentioned previously, Martin supported the exploration of sites in Newfoundland by his students. Research into Ediacaran taphonomy, largely using data collected from Newfoundland, offered a comprehensive view of how taphonomic processes and styles changed across the Ediacaran–Cambrian boundary, and their impact on our interpretation of the fossil record (Callow & Brasier 2009a). Martin also contributed to the recognition that some impressions on Ediacaran fossil-bearing surfaces previously described as valid taxa (e.g. Ivesheadia, Shepsedia and Blackbrookia; Boynton & Ford 1995), instead reflect decayed carcasses of other Ediacaran organisms (Liu et al. 2011; though see Laflamme et al. 2011; Wilby, et al. 2011). The recognition that time averaging occurs on Ediacaran bedding planes was a revolutionary idea at the time, and has been built upon by several other studies recognising the presence of multiple successive communities preserved on individual Ediacaran bedding planes (e.g. Antcliffe et al. 2015; Wilby et al. 2015). It has also inspired studies into the potential ecological impact of the appearance (and post-mortem influence) of macroscopic soft-bodied organisms on both benthic communities and the late Ediacaran carbon cycle (e.g. Liu et al. 2015a; Budd & Jensen 2015; Dufour & McIlroy this volume).

Martin and his students have also made major contributions to the Ediacaran ichnofossil record. The description and interpretation of 565 Ma horizontal surface trails in the Mistaken Point Formation of Newfoundland (Liu et al. 2010a; Liu et al. 2014a) and of ~560 Ma vertical equilibration traces in the Fermeuse Formation (Menon et al. 2013), extend the record of metazoan movement considerably into the Ediacaran Period. Those discoveries also provided a search image for Ediacaran researchers that appears to have stimulated a considerable increase in the recognition of late Ediacaran trace fossils worldwide (e.g. Chen et al. 2013; Carbone & Narbonne 2014; Macdonald et al. 2014; see Liu & McIlroy 2015), providing some of the strongest existing evidence for the presence of motile metazoans among the largely sessile Ediacaran macro-organisms. However, Martin was wary of accepting all claims for complex metazoan movement or feeding, staying true to his belief
that the null hypothesis must first be rejected before considering more ground-breaking
claims (Brasier 2015). He was involved in questioning both ‘grazing’ traces of Dickinsonia-
like organisms (McIlroy et al. 2009), and claims for bioturbation in Siberian rocks (Brasier et
al. 2013a). These challenges were nevertheless constructive, and were intended to spur
debate that will ultimately resolve the nature of these important materials.

Martin oversaw the description of discoveries of communities of juvenile
rangeomorphs within the Mistaken Point Ecological Reserve (Liu et al. 2012), and personally
discovered the holotype of what would come to be known as Haootia quadriformis (Liu et al.
2014b) on the Bonavista Peninsula. This remarkable fossil caused a lot of head-scratching
and beard-stroking, but upon discovery of a second specimen in 2013, an interpretation of
Haootia as recording an organism with fibrous musculature was developed (Liu et al. 2014b,
2015b). Once again, Martin was keen to ensure that the null hypothesis was first rejected
before he would seriously consider options that implied the presence of metazoan
musculature, and even after publication he was careful to stress that this interpretation was a
“tentative reconstruction”, made on the basis of available evidence. His demand for high
standards continued throughout his Ediacaran research, for example in his questioning of the
terrestrial interpretation of the Ediacara biota (e.g. Retallack 2010, 2013). He considered such
interpretations to require special pleading to reinterpret sections that, on process-based
physical sedimentological evidence, have always been considered marine (e.g. Liu et al.
2010b; Callow et al. 2013).

Palaeoenvironmental and preservational context was central to Martin’s approach to
fieldwork, and he would encourage his students to visualize fossil assemblages in their
original depositional environments, expertly producing impromptu sketches of possible
scenarios in his notebook after meticulously recording his field observations (e.g. Fig. 4).
This broad consideration of palaeoenvironment and context formed an important counterpoint
to the detailed study of individual Ediacaran fossils. His work on both was driven by a
combination of detailed observation, imagination, and biological insight, guided and
tempered by his wide experience. An example of his rapid assimilation and interpretation of
new observations is given by the reinterpretation of the remarkable preservation of Ediacaran
rangeomorphs at Spaniard’s Bay (Brasier et al. 2013b). An observation by one of his students
that the basal discs of fronds preserved on this surface show a steep undercutting on one side
struck him immediately as of significance, and led to his proposing a hydraulic model, which
the group tested and confirmed with sedimentological and morphological evidence. This
reassessment of the context of preservation has important implications for the interpretation of morphological features in Ediacaran rangeomorphs (e.g. compare discussions in Brasier et al. 2013b with those in Narbonne et al. 2009). In addition to studying the fossils and their sedimentological context, Martin, along with Duncan McIlroy and Jonathan Antcliffe, had in recent years developed hypotheses regarding the role of geochemical cycling in Ediacaran ecosystems (Dufour & McIlroy, this volume). These hypotheses are currently being tested through the application of NanoSIMS to investigate sulfur cycling, in collaboration with David Wacey, using material from Newfoundland in particular. This line of research was in its infancy at the time of Martin’s death, but had begun to yield preliminary results by demonstrating the biogenic origin (via microbial sulfate reduction) of pyrite frambooids within mineralized veneers at macrofossil-bearing interfaces (Wacey et al. 2015; see also Liu 2016). Further sulfur isotope data will be published in the coming years as this avenue of research is explored in greater detail.

Martin’s work in Newfoundland led to his being invited along with Alex Liu to write the Global Comparative Analysis of Ediacaran Fossil Sites for the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador: a document that in 2015 was submitted to UNESCO as part of the Canadian nomination of Mistaken Point Ecological Reserve for World Heritage Site status (Liu & Brasier 2012). As well as comparing Ediacaran fossil sites worldwide against a number of palaeontological criteria, the report sets out a protocol for the assessment of the Outstanding Universal Value of Precambrian fossil sites, which Martin hoped would make a lasting contribution to society’s appreciation of important palaeontological localities worldwide.

**Considering the interplay between Earth and Life**

Core to Martin’s thinking when assessing Ediacaran and Cambrian evolutionary events was the possible interplay between evolution and the wider biosphere. He realized that the patterns revealed in the fossil record could only be deciphered through consideration of the contemporaneous geological and geochemical events that triggered, or were consequences of, evolutionary innovations. His deep musing on approaches to interpreting the fossil record, which he regarded as akin to playing a card game without knowing the rules (see Antcliffe et al., this volume), was reflected in his public lectures and nicely summed up in his popular science book on the subject, *Darwin’s Lost World* (Brasier 2009). In this book, intended to
inspire new generations of students as well as the general reader, he highlighted the dramatic impact of the evolutionary innovation of predation among early animals, driving an arms race of attack and defence mechanisms and culminating in the “circus of worms”—the sudden appearance of widespread and deep burrowing—that so strikingly characterizes the transition from the Ediacaran to Cambrian (Herringshaw et al., this volume; McIlroy & Brasier, this volume). His perspective was profoundly influenced by an Earth systems view, involving feedbacks, symbiotic associations, and the possibilities of catastrophic collapses of interconnected webs resulting from subtle internal as well as external factors. These ideas, many of which stem from observations made during his time as a ship’s naturalist, fed even more strongly into his second book, about the origins of complex life, Secret Chambers (Brasier 2012).

The forcing factors for animal evolution and the Cambrian Explosion

A particularly long-running strand of Martin’s research was his investigation of whether the Cambrian Explosion was a real event, and what may have triggered it. He certainly saw a role for taphonomy as a potential player in the event, noting several differences in the nature of fossil preservation between the Cambrian and Proterozoic (Callow & Brasier 2009a; Brasier et al. 2011). Some of his earliest work investigated the role of sea level change and facies variations in driving the Cambrian Explosion (Brasier 1982), and he later expanded this to consider factors such as climate change, eutrophication (Brasier 1991, 1992), and even supercontinent breakup (Brasier & Lindsay 2001), which has been explored in recent years as a tenable trigger for the Cambrian radiation (e.g. Peters & Gaines 2012). The occurrence of a broad belt of glauconite and phosphate-rich sedimentary facies in the Early Cambrian was a long-lasting source of inspiration and intrigue (Brasier 1980, 1992; Brasier & Callow, 2007), and Martin’s favourite question for speakers on Ediacaran–Cambrian topics at conferences was “but what about the phosphate?”, a question he argued could be asked with justification of any researcher of this interval. Martin’s observations of the apparent onset of phosphatization at shallow depths within the sediment profile led him to invoke nutrients such as phosphate as a potential trigger for the Cambrian Explosion and the advent of biomineralization (Brasier 1980, 1990, 1992). Whether phosphate was a cause or a consequence of the Cambrian radiation has yet to be resolved (Butterfield 2003), but phosphate continues to be a poorly understood phenomenon of the Early Cambrian.
Resolving the role of phosphate in fossilization (Brasier 1984, 1985) and oxygenation (Brasier & Callow 2007; Boyle et al. 2014) became another long-running theme of Martin’s research, and was used as a primary example of his hypothesis that the nature of the fossil record has changed through time. He recognised that soft-bodied forms are preserved by phosphate in exquisite detail from the Early Cambrian to the late Mesoproterozoic, and suggested that the quality of the fossil record (somewhat paradoxically) improves the further back in time we go (Brasier 2009). Finally, Martin made significant contributions to our understanding of palaeogeography during this interval, providing insights into the fossils and facies of several regions to assist in the assembly of widely cited Neoproterozoic to Palaeozoic continental reconstructions (McKerrow et al. 1992; Torsvik et al. 1996).

**Going forward**

At the time of his death, Martin’s research into the Ediacaran–Cambrian transition was far from over, and there remains much to do to understand evolutionary events and processes during this interval. We have touched upon several of the ways in which studies Martin was involved in are already being built upon (e.g. Dufour & McIlroy, this volume). However, Martin’s greatest legacies in this field are arguably his involvement in defining the Ediacaran–Cambrian boundary (and also the basal Ediacaran GSSP in his role as a voting member of the Ediacaran Subcommission; Geyer & Landing this volume), and his support and expansion of the Ediacaran scientific community, both through the guidance of members of his own group, and the encouragement he offered, both informally and in reviews, to many scientists around the world seeking to tackle Ediacaran problems.

In much the same way as his approach to palaeobiology in general, Martin’s Ediacaran–Cambrian work challenged existing paradigms, expanded knowledge via application of new techniques to known sections, and provided novel hypotheses for critical testing. His studies throughout his career were rigorous, vigorous, thought-provoking, and scholarly. They often combined strong fieldwork elements in order to provide essential context for palaeontological material with the development of theoretical frameworks through which to make sense of the unusual organisms and events. This approach is something that many of his former students are keen to uphold.
His work questioned several of the hypotheses that were ‘in vogue’ at the time, for example the severity of Neoproterozoic Snowball Earth events (Leather et al. 2002; Allen et al. 2004; Kilner et al. 2005). Importantly, in the best scientific tradition, he was not above questioning his own previous interpretations, for example revoking specimens he had earlier described as peristaltic burrowing (Brasier & McIlroy 1998; then see Brasier & Shields 2000) and the oldest sponge spicules (Brasier et al. 1997; then see Antcliffe et al. 2014). At its core, Martin’s Ediacaran–Cambrian work was focused on pushing the boundaries of knowledge: “trying to guess what lies over the hill and map terra incognita”, and ultimately understand the questions of how and why animals evolved. He may not have answered those questions completely, but he has certainly played a prominent role in steering the scientific community towards the solutions.
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**Figure captions**
Fig. 1 Martin Brasier in Newfoundland. (a) On the ‘E’ Surface at Mistaken Point, in his socks, 2005. (b) Sketching on the Bonavista Peninsula, 2008. Photo credit: Jack Matthews.
**Fig. 2** (a) Martin (inset) undertaking laser scanning in the field, Memorial Crags, Charnwood Forest, Leicestershire. (b) An example of a laser-generated digital image: the holotype of *Charnia masoni* (see Brasier & Antcliffe 2009).

**Fig. 3** Martin’s method of drawing Ediacaran fossils, as exemplified by his work on the holotype of *Charniodiscus concentricus*, from Charnwood Forest, Leicestershire. (a) Photograph of a cast of the holotype specimen in New Walk Museum, Leicester, image courtesy of the British Geological Survey. (b) Martin’s sketch of the key features of the specimen, developed via drawings made from photographs and laser scan data. (c) Martin’s novel interpretation of multiple fronds emanating from the stem of the organism.
Fig. 4 Excerpt from one of Martin’s (many) field notebooks, showing a log drawn through the fossil-bearing section at Spaniard’s Bay, Newfoundland (work that was eventually published in Brasier et al. 2013b).