PROBLEMATIC SIDE VIEWS OF EPROLITHUS: COMPARISON WITH MICULA DECUSSATA
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Abstract: The morphologies of Eprolithus floralis, Eprolithus octopetalus and Eprolithus eptapetalus have been studied by means of LM/SEM micrographs of the same specimens, as well as via biometric measurements. Interference figures of side-views of certain Eprolithus species, which make them appear similar to Micula decussata, are shown to be side-views of E. eptapetalus and E. octopetalus, in which the X represents four elements under the same plane of focus.

Introduction

In this work, we examine in detail the morphologic and structural features of some species belonging to the Family Polycyclolithaceae (Forchheimer, 1972 emend. Varol, 1992), in particular Eprolithus floralis, Eprolithus octopetalus, Eprolithus eptapetalus and Micula decussata. Herein, we do not use the name Micula staurophora because, as pointed out by Perch-Nielsen (1985), Dioacoaster staurophorus Gardet, 1955 was described from Miocene strata and the holotype was poorly illustrated. For this reason, it is here considered to be invalid for this Cretaceous form and M. decussata is used instead. In addition, we use E. eptapetalus instead of Eprolithus moratus because we believe they are different species. Our examination of the holotypes appears to reveal that the elements of moratus twist slightly, whilst they do not appear to in eptapetalus, and that the central area is narrower in moratus than in eptapetalus.

The stratigraphic ranges of the above-mentioned species are fairly well defined, and there is general agreement on their distribution (see Figure 1). Nevertheless, the M. decussata first occurrence datum (FO), which is generally placed in the Coniacian at the base of zone CC14 (Sissingh, 1977) or UC10 (Burnett, 1998) (Perch-Nielsen, 1985; Bralower, 1992; Burnett, 1998; Bralower & Bergen, 1998; Bergen & Sikora, 1999; Luciani & Cobianchi, 1999), has also been reported from the Early Turonian (Thierstein, 1976; Ghisletti & Erba in Premoli Silva & Sliter, 1995).

Thierstein (1976) considered ‘Tetralithus pyramidus’ Gardet, 1955 to be a synonym of M. staurophora (=M. decussata), consequently extending the range of the latter species down into the Early Turonian. Due to the poorly-detailed drawing of the holotype of ‘T. pyramidus’, Prins & Perch-Nielsen (in Manivit et al., 1977) renamed it Quadrum garnert, the FO of which is in the Early Turonian. Thus, the apparent discrepancy shown by Thierstein (1976) in the earliest occurrence of M. decussata is taxonomic, not biostratigraphic.

Apart from the confused synonymy of M. decussata, a morphological problem could be the cause of the apparent biostratigraphical discrepancy. In the light-microscope (LM), side-views of E. octopetalus and E. eptapetalus - a rectangular outline crossed by an X - are reminiscent of M. decussata, and this interference figure may have been erroneously interpreted as M. decussata. The side-view of E. floralis under the LM has an ‘H’-shape, as reported in the original description (Stradner, 1962), and cannot easily be confused with M. decussata.

The Polycyclolithaceae contain those taxa which possess two superimposed cycles of elements, visible in side-view. The number of elements in each cycle can vary from 3 to c.20. This is a fundamental taxonomic feature (for taxonomic remarks, see Appendix and Varol, 1992). In side-view, SEM images of E. floralis, E. octopetalus and E. eptapetalus show two cycles of elements, arranged one on top of another, to form a double ‘crown’ (Plate 1, Figure 7). In the LM, side-views of E. octopetalus and E. eptapetalus show an ‘X’ that is the result of viewing four elements under the same plane of focus, a similar interference figure to that of M. decussata.

M. decussata has a cubic shape, composed of eight equal-sized, pyramid-shaped blocks. In the LM, any face of the cube appears to have the same aspect - a square surmounted by a cross, in which the four ‘arms’ (sutures) are disposed along the diagonals of the square.

Here, we aim to elucidate the structural and morphological features responsible for the optical interference figures that make side-views of E. octopetalus and E. eptapetalus appear similar to M. decussata. This will help to clarify a taxonomic problem which could lead to misinterpretation of the biostratigraphy. This study has also allowed us to overcome such misinterpretation in the LM, during routine analyses, by illustrating that the two genera can be distinguished using the gypsum plate (1x).

Material and methods

Samples utilised for this work come, in part, from a section of the Basal Complex of the Helminthoid Flysch (Northern Apennines), which is represented by Cenomanian-Turonian turbidite sandstones (Cassolo section: Villa & Persico, 2002). The finding of forms very much like Micula decussata, but associated with older species such as Eprolithus eptapetalus and E. octopetalus, led us to focus on the morphology and structure of the two genera. Samples from ODP Leg 171, Hole 1050C, cores 20-21, in
which good nannofossil preservation allowed useful SEM analysis, were also studied.

*Eprolithus* was never abundant in this material, and so the samples were prepared using a concentration technique (de Kaenel & Villa, 1996). Parameters used to differentiate between *Eprolithus* species included number of wall elements, maximum diameter of the nannolith, and diameter of the central area.

To determine with more confidence if the 'X'-shaped side-view forms (XSVF) observed in the LM belonged to *E. eptapetalus* and *E. octopetalus* or to *M. decussata*, we observed the same fossil specimens both in LM and SEM, using the methodology described in Moshkovitz (1977). This technique confirmed that the postulated *M. decussata* were, in fact, side-views of *E. eptapetalus* and *E. octopetalus* (Plate 1, Figures 3-4). To support this simple observation, several biometric measurements were performed in the LM, in order to obtain the mean of the maximum diameter (D), the central-area diameter (d), and the length (L) (Figure 2) of about 30 randomly-chosen specimens.

For the biometric analyses, samples with good preservation were selected, recovered from different, known stratigraphic levels from the Cenomanian, Coniacian and Santonian. This excluded any overlapping of the biostratigraphic ranges of the two genera under examination and, thus, avoided taxonomical mistakes.

**Results**

The main results obtained from the biometric measurements can be summarised as follows:

1. The measurement of d and D in 30 specimens of *Eprolithus floralis*, *E. octopetalus* and *E. eptapetalus* in plan-view allowed the evaluation of the ratio D/d, in order to obtain an absolute value, independent from the size of each specimen, which indicated the size of the central area (Figure 3).

\[ d = D \]

**Figure 2:** Biometric parameters of measurements on *Eprolithus*. The maximum diameter (D) of *Eprolithus* in plan-view corresponds to the length (L) of *Eprolithus* in side-view.
2. In the Cenomanian sample (ODP 1050C-21R-3, 56cm) (Huber et al., 1999), only ‘H’-shaped side-view forms (HSVF) were observed, belonging to *E. floralis* (as described in Stradner’s (1962) original description). Biometric measurements of plan-views of 30 specimens of *E. floralis* revealed a maximum diameter (D) ranging from 4 to 8µm (mean 5.85µm) (Figure 4, top left). In another 30 specimens of HSVF, the length measurement (L) ranged from 4 to 7µm (mean 5.16µm) (Figure 4, top right). This good biometric correspondence confirms that L and D are the same parameter, and that all the measured forms belonged to the same species.

3. In the Turonian sample (ODP 1050C-21R-1, 59-60cm) (Huber et al., 1999), both HSVF and XSVF were observed: the three recorded species of *Eprolithus* are present. The maximum diameter (D) of 30 specimens of *E. octopetalus* and 30 of *E. eptapetalus* were measured, their mean values being 6.76 and 6.63µm, respectively (Figure 4, centre and bottom left). In the same sample, the lengths (L) of 30 XSVF were measured, and the resulting mean value (6.5µm) corresponds well with the above-mentioned mean value of D, confirming the equivalence of either *E. octopetalus* or *E. eptapetalus* with the XSVF (Figure 4, centre right).

4. *M. decussata* is the only representative of the Polycyclolithaceae in the examined Santonian sample (N.13, Cassolo section). The length (L) of the cube face of 30 specimens of *M. decussata* was measured (Figure 4, bottom right). The resulting mean is 5.06µm, which excludes a correspondence of *M. decussata* with the XSVF, which were larger.

Now that it can be demonstrated that SEM-illustrated distinctions between the taxa are supported by the LM-based biometric measurements, it is also useful to provide a tool for use in distinguishing the optical behaviour of the side-views of *E. eptapetalus* and *E. octopetalus* from views of *M. decussata*, which could be used during routine LM analysis, especially when dealing with samples that are not in stratigraphic order. With the gypsum plate, *M. decussata* assumes a typical colour alternation (blue-yellow: Moshkovitz & Osmond, 1989) of the four ‘arms’ of the ‘X’ on each face of the cube (Plate 2, Figures 10, 12). This pattern is not so evident in the *Eprolithus* side-views, in which the colours vanish from the centre toward the wall (Plate 2, Figures 6, 8). In addition, in the LM, when focusing on a side-view of *Eprolithus*, all the elements of the wall become gradually visible (Figure 5), an aspect that cannot be present in *M. decussata*, because its eight elements make up a cube.

**Conclusions**

The results allow us to conclude the following:

1. *Eprolithus floralis* has a relatively wider central-area than *E. eptapetalus* and *E. octopetalus*, both of which have central-areas of similar size (Figure 3). The shape of the side-view is strictly connected to the central-area size. In fact, large central-area specimens have an ‘H’-shaped aspect in side-view, as a result of the distance between the wall elements. Small central-area specimens assume, in side-view, the aspect of an ‘X’, as the elements are close to each other.

2. The ‘H’-shaped forms correspond to side-views of *E. floralis* specimens (Figure 4; Plate 2, Figures 13-16).

3. The ‘X’-shaped forms with an L mean value of 6.5µm correspond to specimens of *E. eptapetalus* and/or *E. octopetalus*, with a D mean value of 6.76µm and 6.63µm, respectively (Figure 4).

4. The good correspondence between the mean values of D (Figure 4, left column) of the three *Eprolithus* species with the L mean values of HSVF and XSVF (Figure 4, centre and top right) excludes a relationship between *Eprolithus* and *Micula*, the latter having a smaller L mean value.

Through this work, it has been clarified how forms, which in the LM could be confused with *M. decussata*, are actually side-views of *E. eptapetalus* and *E. octopetalus*.
Figure 4. Left: histograms showing the distribution of L4-measured diameter (D) of 30 specimens of *E. florisalis* and *E. octopetalus*. Right: histograms showing the distribution of L4-measured length (L) of 30 specimens with 'H'-shaped and 'X'-shaped side-views, compared with measurements of 30 specimens of *M. decussata*.
in which the ‘X’ is the result of viewing four elements in the same plane of focus. This has been demonstrated by LM/SEM photomicrographs of the same specimens, as well as by biometric measurements. It has also been suggested that these species can be easily distinguished in the LM, with the use of the gypsum plate to detect optical and structural differences. It is thus hoped that this study provides a key to avoiding erroneous classification which can lead to incorrect biochronostratigraphic attributions.
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### Appendix: Systematic palaeontology

**Genus: Micula Vekshina, 1959**

*Type species:* *Micula decussata* Vekshina, 1959

*Micula decussata* Vekshina, 1959

Plate 1, Figures 5, 8; Plate 2, Figures 9-12

1955 *Discoaster staurophorus* Gardet: 534, pl.10, fig.96.

1959 *Micula decussata* Vekshina: 71-72, pl.1, fig.6; pl.2, fig.11.

1963 *Micula staurophora* (Gardet) Stradner *partim.*: 174, pl.4, fig.12a, non pl.4, figs 12, 12b, 12c.


1976 *Micula staurophora* (Gardet) Stradner: Thierstein *partim.*: 352, pl.1, fig.9, pl.4, figs 34-35, non pl.1, fig.10.


1998 *Micula staurophora* (Gardet) Stradner: Burnett, 194, pl.6.13, fig.25.

### Remarks

A short taxonomic note on *M. decussata* is reported in the text, above. Essentially, Thierstein’s (1976, p.352) confusion of "*Tetraolithus pyramidius*" (= *Quadrum gartneri*) with *M. staurophora* meant that his FO for *M. staurophora* was erroneously low. *Micula* and *Quadrum* are quite distinct genera: *Micula* can be easily distinguished from *Quadrum* with the use of the gypsum plate, as *Micula* spp. (with the exception of *Micula murus*) assume the typical blue/yellow alternation pattern, opposite to that of *Quadrum* spp., which display the yellow/blue crystallographic direction (Moskhovitz & Osmond, 1989).

**Dimensions:** Holotype 3μm, studied samples 5μm.

**Range:** Early Coniacian - Late Maastrichtian.

*Genus Eprolithus Stover, 1966*

*Type species:* *Liithastrinus floris Stradner, 1962*

**Remarks:** *Eprolithus* differs from other polycycloliths by having petal-like elements making up the wall/rim. The wall/rim is composed of two cycles of elements, and the number of elements is a species-level taxonomical character.

*Eprolithus floralis* (Stradner) Stover, 1966

Plate 2, Figures 4, 13-16

1962 *Liithastrinus floralis* Stradner, *partim.*: 370, 372, pl.2 figs 7, 9-11; non pl.2, figs 6, 8.

1966 *Eprolithus floralis* (Stradner) Stover: 149, pl.7, figs 4-7, 9; pl.9, fig.21.

1998 *Eprolithus floralis* (Stradner) Burnett: 192, pl.6.13, figs 3a-b.

**Remarks:** A species of *Eprolithus* having nine petal-like elements in each cycle of the wall/rim. In side-view, it assumes an ‘H’ aspect. It is worth noting that also *Radiolithus* spp. in side-view show an ‘H’ aspect, however, in *Radiolithus* the ‘H’ appears stretched, with a wider ‘bridge’ (the diaphragm), and the wall/rim height is lower than that of *Eprolithus*.

**Dimensions:** Holotype 8-10μm; studied samples 5.8μm.

**Range:** Middle Aptian – Late Coniacian. Burnett (1998) reports a Middle Aptian-?Campanian range.

*Eprolithus eptapetalus* Varol, 1992

Plate 1, Figures 1, 7; Plate 2, Figures 1-2

1978 *Liithastrinus grillii* Stradner: Proto-Decima *et al.,* pl.16, figs 1a-e.

1992 *Eprolithus eptapetalus* Varol: 104, pl.1, figs 2-4; pl.6, figs 8-13.

1998 *Eprolithus moratus* (Stover) Burnett: 192, pl.6.13, figs 5a-6.

**Remarks:** An *Eprolithus* having seven petal-like elements, radially inclined, in each cycle of the wall.

**Dimensions:** Holotype 7-11μm; studied samples 6.63μm.

**Range:** Early Turonian – Early Coniacian.

*Eprolithus octopetalus* Varol, 1992

Plate 1, Figure 2; Plate 2, Figure 3

1992 *Eprolithus octopetalus* Varol: 104, pl.1, figs 5-10; pl.6, figs 14-15.

1998 *Eprolithus octopetalus* Burnett: 192, pl.6.13, figs 4a-b.

**Remarks:** *Eprolithus* with eight petal-like elements in each cycle. In side-view, it is indistinguishable from *E. moratus*.

**Dimensions:** Holotype maximum diameter 5.0μm; studied samples 6.76μm.

**Range:** Late Cenomanian – Middle Turonian.
Plate 1

All photomicrographs were taken with a digital camera, the files are stored on a CD in the Dept. of Earth Science, University of Parma

Fig. 1: *E. eptapetalus*, XPL and SEM (plan-view). ODP Hole 1050C-21R-1, 59-60cm.
Fig. 2: *E. octopetalus*, XPL and SEM (side-view). ODP Hole 1050C-21R-1, 59-60cm.
Fig. 3: *Eprolithus* sp., same specimen, XPL and SEM (side-view). ODP Hole 1050C-21R-1, 59-60cm.
Fig. 4: *Eprolithus* sp., same specimen, XPL and SEM (side-view). ODP Hole 1050C-21R-1, 59-60cm.
Fig. 5: *M. decussata*, XPL and SEM (plan-view). N.13 Cassolo section.
Fig. 6: *M. concava*, XPL and SEM (side-view). N.13 Cassolo section.
Fig. 7: *E. eptapetalus* line-drawings and SEM (side-view). ODP Hole 1050C-21R-1, 59-60cm.
Fig. 8: *M. decussata* line-drawings and SEM (side-view). ODP Hole 1050C-21R-1, 59-60cm.
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Plate 2

Figs 1-2: *Eprolithus eptapetalus*, XPL. ODP Hole 1050C-21R-1, 59-60cm.

Fig.3: *Eprolithus octopetalus*, XPL. ODP Hole 1050C-21R-1, 59-60cm.

Fig.4: *Eprolithus floralis*, XPL. ODP Hole 1050C-21R-1, 59-60cm.

Figs 5-6: *Eprolithus* sp. ('X' side-view), XPL, gypsum plate. ODP Hole 1050C-21R-1, 59-60cm.

Figs 7-8: *Eprolithus* sp. ('X' side-view), XPL, gypsum plate. ODP Hole 1050C-21R-1, 59-60cm.


Figs 11-12: *M. decussata*, XPL, gypsum plate. N.13 Cassolo section.

Figs 13-14: *E. floralis* ('H' side-view), XPL, gypsum plate. ODP Hole 1050C-21R-3, 56-59cm.

Figs 15-16: *E. floralis* ('H' side-view), XPL, gypsum plate. ODP Hole 1050C-21R-3, 56-59cm.
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