# STUDY ON POLLEN MORPHOLOGY OF GENUS ZIZIPHUS

### R.B. GUPTA, SUNEEL SHARMA and S.C. GOYAL

Department of Horticulture, CCS Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar - 125004, India. Department of Botany & Plant Physiology, CCS Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar - 125004, India.

Pollen morphology of seven cultivated varieties and four wild forms belonging to the genus Ziziphus was studied using the acetolysis technique. The pollen grains were similar in aperture. They were 3-colporate having either psilate or faintly reticulate exine ornamentation. Further the pollens were prolate, subprolate or prolate spheriodal in shape. The thickness of the exine ranged between 1.18 to  $1.72 \mu$ . Differences were observed in the size of the pollen grain and it was maximum in Desi- (29.52 x 27.48  $\mu$ ) and minimum in Kathaphal (19.32 x 18.42  $\mu$ ). Thus, the genus almost showed homogeneity in the morphology of the pollen grain except the size of pollen grain.

Keywords : Ber, Pollen morphology; Ziziphus. Introduction

Pollen morphology has been shown to be of great use in cultivar taxonomy of horticultural plants. Pollen morphology and surface topography have been widely accepted to identify plants of divergent and closely related taxa<sup>1</sup>. The earliest reported work on pollen grains of Ziziphus was by Wodehouse<sup>2</sup>. Subsequently, Erdtman<sup>3</sup> reported that Rhamnaceae was a stenopalynous family having pollen grain usually tricolporate with plainly reticulate exine. Nair<sup>4</sup> reported that pollen grain of Ziziphus jujuba Lam. were with psilate exine and circular endocolpium. Rao and Shukla<sup>5</sup> found that different species of Ziziphus could be differentiated based on size, shape and pore structure of the pollen grains. Varietal differences in shape and size of the pollen grains were also reported by Singh and Mishra<sup>6</sup>, Nehra et al.<sup>7</sup> and Hegde and Sharma<sup>8</sup>. An attempt has been made to differentiate the cultivated varieties and wild forms of Ziziphus on the basis of pollen morphology.

## **Materials and Method**

The polleniferous material used for pollen morphological studies was collected from selected cultivars and species of ber (Table 1) located at the Horticultural orchard of CCS Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar during the year 1999-2000 and 2000-2001. The flowers were collected directly from field in vials containing 70 percent ethanol between 6.30 to 7.30 AM in the peak month of flowering i.e. September for Jharber and October for other cultivars/forms. The pollen preparation was made by the acetolysis as described by Nair<sup>9</sup>. The terminology adopted for the description of pollen morphology was also the same as that used by Nair<sup>9</sup>.

## **Results and Discussion**

The Ziziphus species and cultivars investigated exhibit little diversity in shape, size and exine characteristics and complete uniformity in aperture characteristics (Table 1 & Plate 1). It is clear from the table that the pollen grains were similar in aperture. The pollen grains were 3-colporate. The shape of the pollen grains was subprolate in all the cultivated cultivars except Illaichi, where it was prolate. But in the case of all the four wild forms, the shape was prolate spheriodal.

The size of the pollen grains varied in different wild and cultivated species of ber. Two varieties could be identified on the basis of the size of pollen grain. The size of pollen grain ranged between  $19.32 \times 18.42\mu$ to  $29.52 \times 27.48\mu$  of different varieties/ forms. The exine ornamentation was faintly reticulate in all the cultivated varieties except Illaichi and Kathaphal where it was psilate type resembling to wild forms. So it can be said that the genus showed homogeneity in the morphology of pollen grain and variations were observed in size of pollen. Moti *et al.*<sup>10</sup> did not observe any differences in the morphology of pollen of

(Sound tour mont of a sugar		a could and to cuttor is th					
Name of cultivars/	Aperture	Shape		Size	P/E	Exine	Exine
forms/species				(n)	ratio	thickness	ornamentation
			Polar	Equitorial		(μ)	
Cultivated cultivars							i Si Si Si Si Si Si Si
Ziziphus mauritina							
Umran	3-Colporate	Subprolate	26.80	25.67	1.04	1.61	Faintly reticulate
Illaichi	3-Colporate	Prolate	21.14	19.93	1.06	1.27	Psilate
Kathaphal	3-Colporate	Subprolate	19.32	18.42	1.05	1.18	Psilate
Gola Gurgaon No. 3	3-Colporate	Subprolate	23.02	20.83	1.11	1.36	Faintly reticulate
Bahadurgarhia Gola	3-Colporate	Subprolate	27.25	24.68	1.10	1.47	Faintly reticulate
Dandan Gola	3-Colporate	Subprolate	24.53	22.12	1.11	1.40	Faintly reticulate
Kakrola Gola	3-Colporate	Subprolate	21.82	19.63	1.11	1:37	Faintly reticulate
Wild forms Ziziphus spp.							
Desi-1	3-Colporate	Prolate spheriodal	29.52	27.48	1.07	1.71	Psilate
Desi-2	3-Colporate	Prolate spheriodal	29.14	28.20	1.04	1.72	Psilate
Desi-3	3-Colporate	Prolate spheriodal	29.44	26.35	1.12	1.68	Psilate
Ziziphus nummularia							
Jharber	3-Colporate	Prolate spheriodal	27.62	25.92	1.06	1.40	Psilate

Table 1. Pollen morphology in various cultivars/forms of Ziziphus ssp

218

P/E-Polar/ Equitorial



Fig. 1. Pollen grains of various cultivars and forms of *Ziziphus* spp.
A. Umran; B. Illaichi; C. Kathaphal; D. Gola Gurgaon No. 3; E. Bahadurgarhia;
F. Dandan Gola; G. Kakrola Gola, H. Desi-1; I. Desi-2; J. Desi-3, K. Jharber.

5.

101 mango varieties but differences were found in the size of pollen grains. The reports of pollen morphology of guava by Nair *et al.*<sup>11</sup>, Moti and Singh<sup>12</sup> in grapes, and Nehra *et al.*<sup>7</sup> and Hegde and Sharma<sup>8</sup> in ber also revealed that the general characters were the same in all the cultivars and the differences were restricted to the size of pollen grain only.

## References

- 1. Mass JL 1977, J. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci. 102 560
- 2. Wodehouse R P 1932, Bull. Torrey Bot. Club 59

3. Erdtman G 1952, Almquist and wicksells,

- Uppsala stockholm Swsden.
- 4. Nair P K K 1965, Asia Publishing House. New

#### Delhi, India.

- Rao A R and Shukla P 1975, Today and Tomorrow's Printers and Publishers, New Delhi, India.
- 6. Singh P D and Misra O P 1979, Plant Sci. 11 88
- 7. Nehra N S, Chitkara S D and Singh K 1984, Puniab Hort. J. 24 49
- 8. Hegde, Diwakar and Sharma V P 1986, New Botanist XXIII 145
- 9. Nair P K K 1970, Scholar Publication House, Lucknow, India.
- 10. Moti Singh, U R and Singh A P 1973, Punjab Hort. J. 13 237
- 11. Nair P K K, Khan H P and Balasubramenyam Y R 1964, Indian J. Hort. 21 79
- 12. Moti Singh U R and Singh S N 1970, Punjab Hort. J. 10 227