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Abstract Coccolith species belonging to the family Sphenolithaceae, in the genera *Sphenolithus* and *Furcatolithus*, are widespread and common throughout most of the Cenozoic. This study details their ultrastructure, emphasising the importance of recognising their major structural components. In *Sphenolithus*, these are: 1) the proximal element cycle; 2) the lower lateral element cycle; 3) the upper lateral element cycle; and 4) the apical structure. In *Furcatolithus*, these are: 1) the proximal element cycle; and 2) the bifid spine, which is derived from the upper lateral element cycle in *Sphenolithus*. The evolutionary transition from *Sphenolithus* to *Furcatolithus* involved loss of the lower lateral element cycle and the apical structure, and upward growth of the upper lateral element cycle into the bifid spine. Here, 65 species are recognised as valid within the Sphenolithaceae (48 in *Sphenolithus* and 17 in *Furcatolithus*) and are described in detail. Two new species—*Sphenolithus shamrockiae* n. sp. and *S. bergenii* n. sp.—are introduced. The family Sphenolithaceae, the genera *Sphenolithus* and *Furcatolithus* and the species *F. furcatolithoides* and *S. delphix* are emended. Sixteen species previously assigned to *Sphenolithus* are recombined into *Furcatolithus*—*F. akropodus*, *F. avis*, *F. bulbulus*, *F. celsus*, *F. ciperoensis*, *F. cuniculus*, *F. directus*, *F. intercalaris*, *F. obtusus*, *F. patifunditis*, *F. peartiae*, *F. predistentus*, *F. tawfikii*, *F. triangularis*, *F. tribulosus* and *F. umbrellus*.
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1. Introduction
The family Sphenolithaceae is a group of Cenozoic calcareous nannofossils that originated in the Late Paleocene (Late Danian) and flourished until the end of the Early Pliocene (Zanclean). They are one of the most important groups used in Cenozoic nannofossil biostratigraphy, but differentiating among species is often difficult because many species share the same basic structure, but with varying proportions of the major components. The two genera included in the Sphenolithaceae—*Sphenolithus* and *Furcatolithus*—are clearly related; however, there are major ultrastructural differences between them that have not been fully recognised in previous studies.

This study arose from the realisation that the upper and lower lateral element cycles present in *Sphenolithus* coccoliths have been conserved throughout the geological history of the genus, and hence are fundamentally important characteristics for discriminating between species. Previous studies have tended to consider the lateral element cycles in two fundamentally different ways: 1) as part of the base of the coccolith (e.g. the upper pair of the four basal quadrants of Young et al., 1997); or 2) as part of the upper part of the coccolith (e.g. the lower part of the calyptra of Aubry, 2014). In both instances, the resulting two-part ultrastructural division minimises the importance of the lateral element cycles.

Four distinct ultrastructural components of *Sphenolithus* species were distinguished in this study (Figures 1–4): 1) the proximal element cycle; 2) the lower lateral element cycle; 3) the upper lateral element cycle; and 4) the apical structure. The characterisation and subsequent recognition of *Sphenolithus* species requires that all four of these components are described fully. In this study, all previously described species of *Sphenolithus* were considered, as well as those ascribed to other genera considered to belong to the Sphenolithaceae. The taxonomy was rationalised, and all valid species were described using a common ultrastructural framework and terminology.

Once the importance of the lateral element cycles in *Sphenolithus* species was understood, it was further recognised that, in the lineage that arose with *Sphenolithus kempii*, the upper lateral element cycle underwent a series of modifications through time. The upper lateral element cycle in species of this lineage increased in height vertically over time, with the number of elements in the cycle being reduced, ultimately to two. Concurrently, the apical structure diminished and eventually disappeared.

The modified upper lateral element cycle became a vertically split, two-part spine, here termed the bifid spine (Figures 1H–K, 3B, 4), with a very different appearance to the upper lateral element cycle it was derived from. With subsequent loss of the lower lateral element cycle, the lin-
Figure 1: Schematic sketches showing the ultrastructural components of sphenolithid species and variations in their proportions. For each sketch, an example of a species showing the same characteristics is listed. Only elements with the long axes parallel to the plane of the slide are shown.
eage that resulted has clear structural differences from the *Sphenolithus* species it descended from. Species in this diverged lineage were recombined here into the emended genus *Furcatolithus*. In clear contrast to the four distinct ultrastructural components in *Sphenolithus*, species in *Furcatolithus* only have two.

2. Origin of the family
Species in the family Sphenolithaceae are considered here to be heterococcoliths in the order Discoasterales. They are constructed of vertically stacked cycles of radially oriented elements, with radial c-axes in each element. Aubry (2014) indicated that the earliest known species in the Sphenolithaceae descended from the Danian genus *Diantholitha* Aubry in Aubry et al. (2011), based on strong similarities in the proximal element cycles of *Diantholitha* and early specimens of *Sphenolithus primus*. Above the proximal cycle, *Diantholitha* has a single distal cycle of elements, in contrast to the multiple element cycles in *S. primus*.

The addition of extra cycles of elements above the distal cycle in *Diantholitha* is a plausible step in the transition between the two genera. Aubry (2014) considered *Diantholitha* to be descended from the Early Danian genus *Biantholithus*, which has well-documented occurrences of intact coccospheres (Mai, 2001), and is clearly a coccolithophorid. Speculation by Towe (1979, fig. 8) and Aubry (2014, text-fig. 27a, b) that *Sphenolithus* and *Furcatolithus* form coccospheres, with the concave (proximal) surface of the coccoliths being situated adjacent to the living cell, is certainly plausible, although there is little evidence to support the interpretation by Towe (1979, p. 569) that the coccoliths on these coccospheres were polymorphic.

3. Morphology and ultrastructure
Species in the Sphenolithaceae show a range of gross morphologies that are all roughly cylindrical, in contrast to most heterococcoliths, which are approximately disc-

Figure 2: Schematic sketches (based on holotype specimens) showing the major ultrastructural components of (A) *S. abies* and (B) *S. pseudoradians*. Only elements with the long axes parallel to the plane of the slide are shown.
shaped. Although, without preserved coccospheres, we cannot be sure of the original orientation of such cylindrical coccoliths, the generally broader, concave end is assumed to be the proximal end, with the opposite end assumed to be the distal end. The distal surface of coccoliths in the Sphenolithaceae may be rounded, flat or spinose, conical or flaring, and may bifurcate or be spinose. The basal surface is always concave, above which there is one or more stacked cycles of lath-shaped elements, arranged radially around the median axis of the coccolith. The basal cycle, termed the proximal cycle, is similar in all members of the Sphenolithaceae, reflecting their common origin (Figures 1–4). The upper central point of the proximal cycle, on the median axis, is termed the core (Young et al., 1997), and is the point from which all of the elements in the coccolith radiate (Figures 1–4).

Coccoliths belonging to the genus *Sphenolithus* are termed sphenoliths. Above the proximal cycle, species in this genus have two vertically stacked element cycles—the lower and upper lateral cycles (Figures 1A–G, 2, 3A, 4). Previously, this term has been used for all members of the family, but here it is strictly limited to species that have both lower and upper lateral element cycles and belong to the genus *Sphenolithus*.

Above the upper lateral element cycle in most sphenoliths, there is an apical structure, which may comprise a single vertical or sub-vertical element, termed a monocrylline apical structure (Figures 1E–G, 3A), or single or multiple cycles of elements, termed monocyclic (Figure 1D) or polycyclic (Figures 1A–C, 2A) composite apical structures, respectively. Some sphenoliths completely lack any apical structure (e.g. *S. labradorensis*, Plate 2, figs 7–10).

Species in the Sphenolithaceae that lack a lower lateral element cycle belong to the genus *Furcatolithus* (Figures 1J–L, 3B, 4). All species in this genus lack any apical structure. Coccoliths of these species are here referred to as furcatoliths. The presence or absence of the lower

---

*Figure 3*: Schematic sketches (based on holotype specimens) showing the major ultrastructural components of (A) *S. heteromorphus* and (B) *F. ciperoensis*. Only elements with the long axes parallel to the plane of the slide are shown.
lateral cycle is the major structural difference between *Sphenolithus* and *Furcatolithus*, and is used here as the primary criterion for separating them (Figure 4). In some sphenoliths and all furcatoliths (except the last furcatolith species, *F. umbrellus*, which usually lacks any structure above the proximal cycle), the upper lateral element cycle is present, but is reduced to two elements, and is greatly enlarged vertically, forming a bifurcated distal spine. This spine is here termed the bifid spine (Figures 1H–K, 3B, 4). The structural components of sphenoliths and furcatoliths are discussed in detail below.

### 3.1 Element shape and arrangement

In electron microscope (EM) images of well-preserved specimens of many sphenolith species, it is evident that the individual elements are elongated, triradiate laths, with three blades extending at varying angles to the long axis of the elements, resulting in a ‘Y’ shape in cross-section (Figure 5). The intersection of the blades is here termed the blade axis. The three blades of each element share a single c-axis orientation, suggesting that the blades are all part of a single crystal of calcite. Individual elements showing this triradiate morphology were termed triades by Aubry (2014). The fact that early *Sphenolithus* species (e.g. specimens of *Sphenolithus primus* in Bybell & Self-Trail, 1997, pl. 5, fig. 8) and one of the last surviving species (e.g. specimens of *S. abies* in Figure 5, and in Perch-Nielsen, 1972, pl. 17, fig. 6) both possess similar-shaped triradiate elements demonstrates that this ultrastructure has been conserved throughout the history of the genus, particularly in species belonging to the long-ranging *S. primus* group, from which all other groups of sphenoliths are here interpreted to have evolved.

In well-preserved sphenoliths with triradiate elements, their blades can be seen to form a honeycomb structure (see the scanning electron microscope [SEM] images in Figures 2A, 5). The blades of each element are adjoined to the blades of either adjacent elements, or the blades of elements in the cycle above or below. Where the blades from adjacent or higher/lower elements adjoin each other, the suture where the blades meet is here termed a blade junction (Figure 5). With diagenetic calcite overgrowth, the space between the blades in each element is filled in, and the elements assume an overall lath shape. Not all elements in sphenoliths are triradiate. For example, the apical structure in *S. heteromorphus* is a monocry stalline,
biconical spine (Figure 3A, Plate 3, figs 7, 8). There are no published photographs of furcatoliths with triradiate elements, which may indicate that they are more susceptible to diagenetic overgrowth than sphenoliths, or that bladed elements are not a primary feature of furcatoliths.

In all sphenoliths, there are a greater number of elements in the proximal cycle than in the uppermost distal cycle (i.e., the apical structure in most sphenoliths or the bifid spine in some sphenoliths). The lateral element cycles have intermediate numbers of elements. Where the element count between two adjacent cycles differs by an odd number, it is not possible for the blades in these cycles to be adjoined in a regular way, where two blades (one from the lower cycle and one from the upper cycle) meet.
to form a blade junction. The difference in the element count between adjacent cycles is accommodated by blade junctions where three, or even four (rather than the usual two), blades meet. The apparently irregular distribution of two-, three- and four-element blade junctions throughout these sphenoliths results in a pervasive asymmetry in the arrangement of elements in the sphenolith. Three- and four-element blade junctions have been observed in almost all SEM photomicrographs of well-preserved S. abies (Figure 5). It is assumed here that variable-element blade junctions, and the pervasive asymmetry that results from these, are a characteristic of most, if not all, Sphenolithus species.

### 3.2 Calcite c-axis orientation and birefringence patterns

In most sphenolithid species, the c-axis of the calcite crystal comprising each individual element is aligned with the long axis of the element. For elements in the horizontal plane (i.e. the plane of the microscope slide), the primary control on birefringence is the angle between the long axis of the element and the polarising axes. When the median axis of the sphenolithid is aligned with one of the polarising axes, the elements with long axes that are near vertical or horizontal will be dark under cross-polarised light. Elements with long axes that are near 45° to the polarising axes will be bright, and those with long axes between ~10 and 35° will be partially bright or dim.

In specimens where the blades of each element are well-preserved, the orientation of each individual blade affects the observed birefringence of the element. Blades that are at, or near, right angles to the plane of the microscope slide will have higher birefringence than the other two blades of the same element (when the element is brightest; i.e. when its long axis is at 45° to the polarising axes), as they present a greater thickness of calcite relative to the plane of the slide (i.e. the full width of the blade). This is best observed in large specimens that are very well preserved (e.g. the holotype of S. abies, Bown, 2005a, pl. 43, fig. 15), and that may give the appearance of there being more elements than are actually present. In most specimens, where some overgrowth is present, this blade effect is minimal compared to the overall orientation of the element relative to the polarising axes and the plane of the slide.

In sphenolithids that possess a bifid spine (Figure 6), the c-axes of the elements in the bifid spine may not be closely aligned with the long axis of each element, instead being at an angle of ~10–45° to the median axis of the coccolith. For angles between ~30 and 45° between the c-axes of the bifid spine elements and the median axis, the spine elements will be bright when the median axis is parallel to one of the polarising axes, and dark when the median axis is at 45° to the polarising axes (see S. shamrockiae n. sp., Plate 2, figs 3, 4). For angles between 15 and 30°, the spine elements will be dim (i.e. partially bright) at both parallel, and at 45°, to the polarising axes (see Furcatolithus akropodus n. comb., Plate 4, figs 15, 16). For angles of less than 15°, the spine elements will be dark when parallel to one of the polarising axes, and bright at 45° to the polarising axes (see F. ciperoensis n. comb., Plate 4, figs 23, 24).

Many published light-microscope (LM) photomicrographs of sphenolithids are over-exposed, including the images of many holotypes (e.g. the images of the holotype of S. belemnos in Bramlette & Wilcoxon, 1967 and S. capricornutus in Bukry & Percival, 1971). Because the elements of the four structural components in Sphenolithus (proximal cycle, lower lateral element cycle, upper lateral cycle and apical structure) have c-axes that radiate from the core, each of the elements is dark when parallel to one of the polarising axes, bright when at, or near, 45°, and neither fully bright nor dark when oriented obliquely to the polarising axes. Recognition of the upper and lower lateral cycles is generally easy in the LM, but can be very difficult in over-exposed photographs, hindering the assignment of specimens in the LM to published species.

### 3.3 Proximal cycle

All sphenolithids share a proximal cycle (Young et al., 1997) of adpressed elements that are arranged radially in plan view (Figures 2, 3), often with slight imbrication and suture kinking (see pl. 2, fig. 4 in Wilcoxon, 1970). In lateral view, the proximal cycle elements are approximately trapezoidal in outline. In well-preserved material, the proximal cycle elements are bladed, with two sub-horizontal blades and one vertical blade extending laterally from each element (see Figure 5C).

The elements of the proximal cycle vary in height and lateral extension of the base of the element relative to the top (termed the degree of flare) between species. Some species have minimal lateral extension of the base of the proximal cycle relative to the top (low degree of flare),
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPECIMENS ORIENTED WITH MEDIAN SUTURE VISIBLE (MEDIAN SUTURE AT RIGHT ANGLE TO PLANE OF SLIDE)</th>
<th>SPECIMENS ORIENTED WITH MEDIAN SUTURE NOT VISIBLE (MEDIAN SUTURE PARALLEL TO PLANE OF SLIDE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPECIES WITH LOW (0-15°) BIFID SPINE C-AXIS TO MEDIAN AXIS ANGLE:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![Image A]</td>
<td>![Image B]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>median axis</td>
<td>median axis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dark at 0°, part bright at 45°</td>
<td>dark at 0°, bright at 45°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F. peartiae</em></td>
<td><em>F. obtusus</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **SPECIES WITH MODERATE (15-30°) BIFID SPINE C-AXIS TO MEDIAN AXIS ANGLE:** |
|---|---|
| **C** | **D** |
| ![Image C] | ![Image D] |
| part bright at 0°, part bright at 45° | dark at 0°, bright at 45° |
| *F. akropodus* | *F. akropodus* |

| **SPECIES WITH HIGH (30-45°) BIFID SPINE C-AXIS TO MEDIAN AXIS ANGLE:** |
|---|---|
| **E** | **F** |
| ![Image E] | ![Image F] |
| bright at 0°, dark at 45° | dark at 0° bright at 45° |
| *F. cuniculus* | calcite c-axes of individual elements (projected to plane of slide) |
resulting in an approximately cylindrical proximal cycle with a sub-vertical lateral periphery (e.g. *S. dissimilis*, Plate 2, figs 23, 24). Others have strong lateral extension of the base (high degree of flare), resulting in a proximal cycle with a lateral periphery that is at a low angle to the vertical (e.g. *S. delphix*, Plate 3, figs 19–22). In lateral view, the basal surface of each element can be linear or curved, resulting in the basal surface of the proximal cycle being concave to a greater or lesser degree. The general form of the proximal cycle is similar among all sphenolithic species, reflecting their common origin. The proximal cycle has been termed the proximal shield or column by Roth et al. (1971) and Perch-Nielsen (1985), the column by Romein (1979) and Aubry (2014), and the basal feet by Bown & Dunkley Jones (2012).

### 3.4 Lateral element cycles

All sphenoliths have two lateral element cycles (Young et al., 1997)—the lower and upper lateral element cycles—which lie above the proximal cycle element, and below the apical structure, if one is present (Figures 1A–I, 2A, B, 3A, 4). In well-preserved material, it can be seen that the elements in the lateral cycles are bladed, with the blades of each element joined at blade junctions to the blades in adjacent element cycles. In most species, the long axes of the lower lateral cycle elements are sub-horizontal in lateral view, and those of the upper lateral cycle elements lie at approximately 45° to the median axis. Elements in each of the lateral element cycles are arranged radially in plan view. Other, similar cycles may exist above the two lateral cycles (see the discussion on the apical structure, below), but in all sphenoliths, there are always two lateral element cycles. The lateral element cycles vary between species in their thickness, height and degree of lateral extension. The lateral element cycles have been termed the basal cycles by Romein (1979), the lower calyptra by Aubry (2014) and the lateral elements by Roth et al. (1971) and Perch-Nielsen (1985).

Much confusion exists in the literature regarding the upper and lower lateral cycles and their distinction from each other, and from the proximal cycle, in cross-polarised light. Many workers have referred to the four bright elements seen in the base of a typical sphenolith under cross-polarised light as the upper and lower basal quadrants or ‘basal quads’ (Young et al., 1997; Bergen et al., 2017). The lower quadrants are the birefringent elements of the proximal cycle, while the upper quadrants are the birefringent elements of the two lateral element cycles. Many species descriptions refer to the size ratios between the upper and lower quadrants.

This is problematic because, when a sphenolith is rotated relative to the polariser, the lower and upper lateral element cycles alternate their birefringence relative to each other. Effectively, the bright upper quadrants are reflecting the birefringence of different elements as the sphenolith is rotated (the upper lateral element cycle is bright when the median axis is parallel to one of the polarising axes, and the lower lateral element cycle is bright when the median axis is at 45° to the polarising axes), making size ratios between the upper and lower quadrants an unreliable criterion for distinguishing between species, unless one is clear on which lateral cycle is bright when the size ratio is being observed.

### 3.5 Apical structure

In most sphenolith species, there are one or more element cycles above the upper lateral element cycle. The elements in these cycles are arranged in lateral (i.e. horizontal) to distal (i.e. vertical) orientations, radiating from the core (Figures 1A–H, 2A, B, 3A, 4, 5). These form the apical structure. The apical structure can comprise either a single element, termed a monocrystalline apical structure (Fig-
ures 1E–G, 3A), or multiple elements, termed a composite apical structure (Figures 1A–D, 2A, B). A composite apical structure may have a single cycle of elements, termed a monocyclic composite apical structure (Figures 1A–D, 2B, 4), or multiple cycles of elements, termed a polycyclic composite apical structure (Figures 1A–C, 2A, 4). Where there is a polycyclic composite apical structure (other than their position above the lateral element cycles), the elements in the apical cycles are usually minimally differentiated from the elements of the lateral element cycles (e.g. in species of the *S. primus* group). For all composite apical structures, it can be seen in well-preserved material that the elements in the apical structure are bladed, with blades from each element joining at blade junctions to the blades in adjacent element cycles (Figure 5). The apical structure has been referred to as the apical spine by Roth et al. (1971), the cone or centro-distal spine by Roine (1979), the apical spine or apical elements by Perch-Nielsen (1985) and the upper calytra by Aubry (2014).

The long-ranging *S. primus* group, from which all other sphenoliths are descended, has a polycyclic composite apical structure that is hemispherical in shape. The evolution of new species of *Sphenolithus* involves modification of this apical structure (and also changes in the shape of the proximal cycle). There seems to be a trend in which a lineage begins with a new species that evolves a monocyclic composite apical structure from a polycyclic ancestor in the *S. primus* group. Once a monocyclic composite apical structure has been established, the apical structure often becomes taller, turning into a monocrystalline apical structure in later species in the lineage. An example of this can be seen in the *S. radians* group, where *S. editus*, with a monocyclic composite apical structure, evolved from *S. moriformis* (Plate 1, figs 5, 6) or *S. apoxis* (Plate 1, figs 9, 10), with polycyclic composite apical structures. Later, *S. richteri*, with a monocrystalline apical structure, evolved from *S. spiniger* (Plate 1, figs 23, 24), with a monocyclic composite apical structure. Monocrystalline apical structures have evolved from monocyclic composite apical structures several times, so species with monocrystalline apical structures are clearly polyphylectic and cannot be grouped together.

Monocyclic composite apical structures with a conical shape can be distinguished from monocrystalline apical structures with a similar shape by their diffuse extinction when aligned with one of the major polarising axes (reflecting multiple elements radiating from the core, at slight angles to each other, e.g. *S. conicus*, Plate 2, figs 29, 30), in contrast to the total extinction of a monocrystalline apical structure (e.g. *S. heteromorphus*, Plate 3, figs 7, 8). In some species, there is a cycle of small, thin apical elements above the upper lateral element cycle, above which there is a tall monocrystalline apical structure (e.g. *S. pseudoheteromorphus*, Plate 3, figs 5, 6; also, see the holotype specimen in Fornaciari & Agnini, 2009, pl. 1, fig. 1).

### 3.6 Bifid spine

In later members of the *S. kempii* group, the apical structure is reduced in height. The upper lateral element cycle has grown vertically, and has a reduced element count, down to three or four elements in *S. kempii* (Figure 1G; Plate 1, figs 27, 28), and two in *S. shamrockiae* n. sp. (Figure 1H; Plate 2, figs 3–6), *S. furcatolithoides* (Plate 2, figs 1, 2) and *S. labradorensis* (Figure 1I; Plate 2, figs 7–10). With vertical growth of the upper lateral element cycle, the apical structure becomes relatively lower, eventually disappearing completely in *S. furcatolithoides* and *S. labradorensis*. Effectively, in *S. furcatolithoides and S. labradorensis*, with vertical growth of the upper lateral cycle, and reduction in the element count to two elements, the upper lateral cycle becomes the dominant apical element, at the expense of the apical structure, which has disappeared. This highly modified upper lateral element cycle is here termed the bifid spine and is a key characteristic of most species in the genus *Furcatolithus*, which is descended from the *S. kempii* group. The bifid spine becomes reduced in size in the *F. triangularis* group, becoming miniscule or disappearing completely in the transition between *F. avis* n. comb. (Plate 4, figs 27, 28) and *F. umbrellus* n. comb. (Figure 1J; Plate 4, figs 29, 30)—the last representative of the genus. The bifid spine has been referred to as a duocrystalline spine by Brown & Dunkley Jones (2012) and Bergen et al. (2017).

There is considerably more variation in the birefringence pattern in the bifid spine in the furcatoliths (and those sphenoliths in the *S. kempii* group that have a bifid spine) than there is variation in the birefringence of the apical structure among most sphenoliths. Morphologically similar species can have essentially opposite birefringence patterns in the bifid spine under cross-polarised light, based solely on differing c-axis orientations in the bifid spine (Figure 6). This is in contrast to most spheno-
liths (i.e. those that lack a bifid spine), where the c-axis orientations are always parallel to the long axis of each individual element, so the birefringence of an element is based largely on its position in the sphenolith structure and its thickness.

Because the bifid spine has two elements, separated by a median plane, the orientation of the spine relative to the plane of the microscope slide is critically important in determining the observed birefringence of the spine under cross-polarised light. When the specimen is oriented so that the median plane of the spine is horizontal (i.e. parallel to the slide), the bifid spine appears as a single element in the LM (Figure 6b, d, f). When the median axis of the specimen is aligned with one of the polarising axes, the bifid spine is dark, and when the specimen is aligned at 45° to the polarising axes, it is bright. In this orientation (with the median plane of the bifid spine being horizontal), the angle between the c-axes of the bifid spine elements and the median axis of the coccolith (typically between 10° and 45°) has no effect on the birefringence, so different species, with different c-axis angles in the bifid spine, will display similar birefringence.

In contrast, when the median plane of the bifid spine is vertical (i.e. at right angles to the plane of the slide), the median plane appears as a sharp suture down the middle of the bifid spine (Figure 6a, c, e). The two elements of the spine are clearly visible, and their birefringence depends on the orientation of their c-axes in the horizontal plane. The c-axes in the bifid spine elements are typically between 10 and 45° to the median axis of the coccolith, so, depending on the c-axis orientation, the birefringence when the median axis is parallel to one of the polarising axes could be bright (for specimens with the c-axis between 35 and 45°: Figure 6e), dark (for specimens with the c-axis at an angle between 10 and 15°: Figure 6a) or dim (angles between 15 and 35°: Figure 6c).

The best example of this is _S. labradorensis_ (Plate 2, figs 7–10; junior synonym _S. strigosus_), which was illustrated with a median suture clearly visible, and bifid spine elements that are brightly birefringent when parallel to the polarising axes and dark at 45° (Firth, 1989, pl. 2, figs 15, 16). The holotype of the otherwise similar _S. runus_ (Bown & Dunkley Jones, 2006, pl. 8, figs 18–20), which is similar in size and has a similar range, has the median suture of the bifid spine oriented obliquely to the plane of the slide. The median suture is visible near the left and right edges of the spine, and the spine is mostly dark when parallel to the polarising axes and bright at 45°, opposite to the birefringence observed in the bifid spine of _S. labradorensis_. The holotype of _S. runus_ is here interpreted as being a specimen of _S. labradorensis_ where the median plane of the bifid spine is slightly oblique to the horizontal, rather than vertical. Accordingly, _S. runus_ is considered here to be a junior synonym of _S. labradorensis_.

In photomicrographs of well-preserved specimens of sphenoliths with a bifid spine, many specimens show long, thin extensions of the two bifid spine elements that extend distally and laterally. These bifid spine extensions sometimes extend to several times the height of the specimen below the spine extensions (see pl. 11, figs 7, 9, 18, 19, 22, 23, 25–29, 40, 41 in Bown & Newsam, 2017 for excellent illustrations of numerous species with bifid spines that bear long extensions). In most specimens, these bifid spine extensions are missing, presumably because they have broken off or dissolved.

4. **Systematic palaeontology**

With a relatively simple ultrastructure that was mostly conserved during the history of the family, separating sphenolithid species into an approximation of phylogenetic lineages is difficult. Most of the variation among sphenolithid species is in the size and shape of components that are shared by most species. Previous studies that considered sphenolithid ultrastructure and taxonomy include Roth et al. (1971), Romein (1979), Perch-Nielsen (1985), Young et al. (1997), Aubry (2014) and Bergen et al. (2017). These studies classified sphenolithids into informal groups based on varying combinations of overall shape, ultrastructural units and optical features. None of these studies recognised the full range of sphenolithid ultrastructure, particularly that lateral element cycles are present in all sphenoliths, that the lower lateral element cycle is not present in any furcatoliths, and that the bifid spine present in some sphenolith species and most furcatoliths is derived from the upper lateral element cycle of sphenoliths.

Also unrecognised in previous studies is the importance of the number of cycles in the apical structure of sphenoliths (i.e. whether the composite apical structure is monocyclic or polycyclic). Without considering whether the apical structure is monocyclic or polycyclic, unrelated species with superficially similar gross morphologies have been placed in the same group. Examples of this are clas-
classification schemes that group the conical species Sphenolithus abies and S. radians together. These species are unrelated, but share a gross conical morphology. Sphenolithus abies has a polycyclic composite apical structure with a conical shape, and was derived from the polycyclic S. primus lineage during the Neogene, while S. radians has a monocyclic composite apical structure with a similar conical shape, and was derived from a similar, but lower, spine in S. editus, which in turn was derived from the polycyclic S. primus lineage during the Eocene. The entire S. radians lineage was extinct well before S. abies evolved from the S. primus group, so classifying S. radians and S. abies together because their disparate apical structures share a conical morphology obscures their differing phylogenies. Similar arguments apply to classification schemes that have grouped species with high proximal element cycles that have curved elements, as seen in S. orphankollensis, F. umbrellus n. comb. and S. milanetti, a characteristic that evolved separately in these unrelated species.

The approach taken here was to group Sphenolithus species primarily by the nature of their apical structures, and secondarily by the shape of the proximal cycle (Figure 7). Although necessarily speculative, this results in lineages that are plausibly phylogenetic. Species in the ancestral and long-lived S. primus lineage have a polycyclic composite apical structure, which varies in height and shape. From this basal lineage, lineages with monocyclic apical structures diverged several times. In these lineages, an initial monocyclic composite apical structure often gave rise to monocrystalline apical structures before the lineage went extinct (e.g. S. richteri, with a monocrystalline apical structure evolving from S. spiniger, which has a monocyclic composite apical structure). Species within lineages tend to have proximal cycles that are similar in height and degree of flare.

For species of Furcatolithus, which have much less ultrastructural variability than Sphenolithus species, the approach taken here was to group the species based on the angle between the median suture and the top of the proximal element cycle (Figure 1J, K), and also the height of the proximal cycle as a proportion of the total height.

The size terms used here follow Young et al. (1997); that is, <3 µm—small, 3–5 µm—medium, 5–8 µm—large, >8 µm—very large. These are used here to describe the height of the coccolith, from the base of the proximal element cycle to the top of the apical structure, which for most sphenolithids is the largest dimension. For most furcatolith species, the height does not include the thin distal and lateral extensions of the bifid spine, which can be as long as 30 µm, but which are often missing due to breakage or dissolution. A representative subset of each of the informal groups of sphenolithid species discussed here is illustrated on Plates 1–4.

Order DISCOASTERALES Hay, 1977 emend. Bown, 2010

Family SPHENOLITHACEAE Deflandre, 1952 emend.

Emended diagnosis: Domed, conical, cylindrical or bi-conical coccoliths with a proximal element cycle of radially and proximally oriented elements. Above the proximal element cycle, there is usually one or more cycles of radially to distally arranged elements. The calcite c-axes in each element are usually oriented parallel to the long axis of the element. All of the elements radiate from a point on the median axis, just above the proximal cycle.

Included genera: Sphenolithus, Furcatolithus. Range: Paleocene (Late Danian) to Pliocene (Zanclean). Discussion: The original description for the family by Deflandre (1952) is “Sphenoliths, or wedge-shaped bodies, with a distinctive ‘spherolithic’ structure, producing a black cross in cross polarised light, when positioned longitudinally” (translation from Aubry, 2014). This was understood here to mean that when sphenolithid specimens are viewed laterally, with the long axis of the specimen aligned with one of the polarising axes, that a black cross is visible on the specimen, with the axes of the cross being aligned with the polarising axes. While such a birefringence pattern is shown by many sphenolithid species, it is not shown by any furcatolith species, or by any sphenolith species that have a bifid spine (e.g. S. furcatolithoides). Accordingly, the family is emended here.

Genus Sphenolithus Deflandre, 1952 emend.

Emended diagnosis: Domed, conical, cylindrical or bi-
conical coccoliths with a proximal element cycle situated below two radially oriented, vertically superimposed element cycles—the lower and upper lateral element cycles. Above the upper lateral element cycle, an apical structure is usually present. The apical structure may comprise single or multiple cycles of vertically stacked, radially and distally oriented elements, or a single vertical to sub-vertical element, or may be entirely absent. **Type species:** Sphenolithus radians Deflandre, 1952. **Synonyms:** Nannoturrella Brönnimann & Stradner, 1960, the generotype of which is Nannoturrella moriformis Brönnimann & Stradner, 1960, a species that clearly belongs in Sphenolithus. Sphenaster Wilcoxon, 1970, the generotype of which, Sphenaster metala Wilcoxon, 1970, is an isolated proximal element cycle of a sphenolith, probably from the *S. primus* group. **Discussion:** In the sphenolith lineage (the *S. primus* group) that give rise to the genus Furcatolithus, the upper lateral element cycle increases in size vertically, with the number of elements reducing to two and becoming the bifid spine present in most species of *Furcatolithus*. The apical structure is completely absent in the last members of this lineage—*S. furcatolithoides* and *S. labradorensis*.

The origin of *S. primus* (and hence the genus *Sphenolithus* and the family Sphenolithaceae) is likely related to the genus Diantholitha (as noted by Aubry, 2014), which has a very similar proximal cycle to *S. primus*. Above the proximal cycle, Diantholitha species have a single radial cycle of upward- and outward-extending apical elements. As in *S. primus*, the calcite c-axes of the elements lie parallel to their long axes. The addition of extra cycles of elements distally to form both the lateral and apical element cycles of *Sphenolithus* seems a plausible mechanism for the evolution of *Sphenolithus* from Diantholitha. The generotype of Diantholitha, *D. mariposa* Rodriguez & Aubry in Aubry et al., 2011 is illustrated on Plate 1, figs 1, 2 for comparison.

The holotype of *S. elongatus* Perch-Nielsen, 1980 (pl. 2, figs 5, 6) does not appear to have an ultrastructure that belongs to either *Sphenolithus* or *Furcatolithus*. What superficially appears to be a proximal element cycle has elements that do not resemble those of any other sphenolithid. No lateral cycle elements appear to be present, and no median suture appears in the spine. Accordingly, this species was not considered to be a true sphenolithid and is not considered further.

The genus Ilselithina Stradner in Stradner & Adamiker, 1966 has small to medium biconical coccoliths that have been considered by Aubry (2014) and Bergen et al. (2017) to be possibly related to *Sphenolithus*, based largely on the similarity between their proximal element cycles. Young in Young et al. (2018) noted that the elements considered by previous studies to belong to separate proximal and distal cycles, are actually one piece, with the elements that appear to belong to the distal cycle actually being distal extensions of the proximal cycle elements. This construction is quite unlike any sphenolithid, so Ilselithina was not considered to be a member of the Sphenolithaceae, and is not considered here.

Forty-eight species in the genus *Sphenolithus* were recognised as valid in this study. These species have been divided into eight informal groups of species, based on shared morphology and likely phylogeny. These groups are listed in Table 1 and detailed below, with both groups and species approximately ordered by first stratigraphic appearance. A selection of species from each group is illustrated on Plates 1–3.

**Sphenolithus primus Group**

The species in this group all have simple domed morphologies and a polycyclic composite apical structure with multiple apical element cycles, which are minimally differentiated from the lower and upper lateral element cycles. This group is long-ranging, with representatives present throughout the history of the genus, forming a plexus of closely related species of varying sizes, and with varying apical structure heights. All other groups of sphenolithids evolved from this group.

The species in this group are discussed below in approximate order of first stratigraphic appearance: *S. primus*, *S. acervus*, *S. moriformis*, *S. apoxis*, *S. puniceus*, *S. neeobies*, *S. abies*, *S. verensis* and *S. grandis*. Range charts for this group are presented in Figures 8–10.

**Sphenolithus primus** Perch-Nielsen, 1971a

Pl. 1, figs 3, 4

1971a *Sphenolithus primus* Perch-Nielsen: p. 357, pl. 11, figs 3, 4
Ultrastructure and taxonomy of the Sphenolithaceae

Sphenolithus quadrispinatus Group
- Monocyclic composite apical structure with distal spines
- 9.2 μm HT SEM

Sphenolithus primus Group
- S. grandis
- S. verensis
- S. abies

Sphenolithus conicus Group
- S. hetroemorphous
- S. pseudoheteromorphous
- S. presaisi
- S. macrocarpitos
- S. conicus
- S. calyculus
- S. monopterus
- S. apoxis
- 8.6 μm HT LM

- Conical shape
- Tall monocyclic composite or monocryalline apical structure

- Low hemispherical to high rounded conical shape
- Polycyclic composite apical structure
Table 1: Species of Sphenolithus grouped into informal morphological groups, in approximate order of first stratigraphic appearance (see Figure 7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>MORPHOLOGICAL CRITERION</th>
<th>RANGE</th>
<th>SPECIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. primus</td>
<td>Simple domed shape</td>
<td>Early Paleocene–Early Pliocene (Danian–Zanclean)</td>
<td>S. primus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Polycyclic composite apical structure</td>
<td></td>
<td>S. acervus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. moniformis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. bergani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. apoxis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. punicus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. neobabies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. abies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. verenisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. grandis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. ananhopus</td>
<td>Conical shape</td>
<td>Late Paleocene–Early Eocene (Thanetian–Ypresian)</td>
<td>S. ananhopus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High, sharply pointed monocristalline apical structure</td>
<td></td>
<td>S. vilae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. radians</td>
<td>Conical shape</td>
<td>Early Eocene–Early Oligocene (Ypresian–Rupelian)</td>
<td>S. editus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monocyclic composite or monocristalline apical structure</td>
<td></td>
<td>S. arthuri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. radians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. orphankollensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. spiniger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. nihleri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. conspicicus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. kempi</td>
<td>Divergent upper lateral element cycle</td>
<td>Middle Eocene (Lutetian–Bartonian)</td>
<td>S. steilatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trend of increasing upper lateral element length, with reduction in element count</td>
<td></td>
<td>S. kempi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. perpendiculans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. shartockiae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. furcalitheoides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. dissimilis</td>
<td>Polycyclic composite apical structure with subparallel to divergent elements</td>
<td>Late Eocene–Early Miocene (Priabonian–Burdigalian)</td>
<td>S. insanti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. procenus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. capricornutus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. compactus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. diabelamos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. multispinatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. dissimilis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. cometa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. conicus</td>
<td>Conical shape</td>
<td>Early Oligocene–Middle Miocene (Rupelian–Serravallian)</td>
<td>S. conicus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium to high, sharply pointed to rounded monocrystalline or monocristalline apical structure</td>
<td></td>
<td>S. calyculus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. macroancthos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. pseudoheteromorphus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. heteromorphus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. preassi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. milanetti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. delphix</td>
<td>Strongly flared proximal element cycle</td>
<td>Early Oligocene–Early Miocene (Rupelian–Burdigalian)</td>
<td>S. speipels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monocyclic or monocristalline apical structure</td>
<td></td>
<td>S. spinula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. microdelphix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. delphix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. intinxthubulum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. ditremos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. quadrispinatus</td>
<td>Monocyclic apical structure with divergent elements with thin lateral and distal extensions</td>
<td>Late Miocene (Tortonian)</td>
<td>S. quadrispinatus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagnosis: A small sphenolith with a medium-height, slightly conical proximal element cycle, thin lower and upper lateral element cycles, and polycyclic composite apical element cycles forming a low apical dome. Remarks: This was the first sphenolithid species to evolve. Given that Diantholitha evolved in NP4 in the Danian, and was likely the ancestor of S. primus, it is clear that the first S. primus evolved in NP4. However, Diantholitha was not described (Aubry in Aubry et al., 2011) until well after S. primus had been described (Perch-Nielsen, 1971a) and, given the strong similarity between the side views of Diantholitha and S. primus, it is possible that some records in the literature of the earliest S. primus are actually records of Diantholitha. The simple morphology of S. primus is long-lived, persisting to the end of the Zanclean in S. moriformis, a larger, but otherwise similar, species.

Sphenolithus acervus Bown, 2005a

2005a Sphenolithus acervus Bown: pl. 43, figs 13–19.
**Diagnosis:** A large sphenolith with a medium-height, slightly conical proximal element cycle, thick lower and upper lateral element cycles, and polycyclic composite apical element cycles forming a medium-height apical dome. **Remarks:** Individual elements in this species appear very strongly triradiate, resulting in a relatively open structure in three dimensions. This explains why this large species only has moderate birefringence, rather than the high birefringence exhibited by similarly large species in this group, such as *S. puniceus*, which has coarser elements and high birefringence, with first-order red and blue colours under cross-polarised light.

*Sphenolithus moriformis* (Brönnimann & Stradner, 1960) Bramlette & Wilcoxon, 1967

Pl. 1, figs 5, 6

1960 *Nannoturbella moriformis* Brönnimann & Stradner: p. 368, figs 11–13, 16, non figs 14, 15.


**Diagnosis:** A medium-sized sphenolith with a low to medium-height proximal element cycle, thin lower and upper lateral element cycles, and polycyclic composite apical cycles forming a low domed apical structure. **Remarks:** Brönnimann & Stradner (1960) illustrated *Nannoturbella moriformis* with a series of line-drawings featuring two different morphotypes—a low-domed form (their figs 11–13, 16), which they clearly designated as the holotype, and a higher-domed form (their figs 14, 15), which was later described as *S. apoxis* by Bergen & de Kaenel in Bergen et al. (2017). The transition from *S. primus* to *S. moriformis* is unclear, as there is little difference between the two species, other than size (the holotype of *S. primus* is ~3.5 µm high, that of *S. moriformis* is ~5 µm high). Most authors, somewhat arbitrarily, have placed this transition around the base of the Eocene. *Sphenolithus moriformis* has the longest range of all sphenolithid species, from the basal Eocene to the mid-Pliocene.

*Sphenolithus bergenii* n. sp.

Pl. 1, figs 7, 8

non 1980 *Sphenolithus compactus* Backman: p. 59, pl. 3, fig. 20.

**Derivation of name:** Named in honour of Dr Jim Bergen, retired Amoco and BP nannofossil biostratigrapher and mentor. **Diagnosis:** A very small to small sphenolith with a low, moderately flared proximal element cycle, thin lower and upper lateral element cycles, and a low-domed apical structure. **Remarks:** Small sphenoliths with a low-domed apical structure have been placed in *S. compactus* by most workers, largely following Perch-Nielsen (1985, pp. 522, 523, fig. 71, based on sketches in Aubry, 1989). Perch-Nielsen (1985, fig. 71) provided three sketches of *S. compactus*—two showing its appearance in the LM, and one an interpretation of what the species would look like in the EM. The two sketches showing the appearance of *S. compactus* in the LM show a form with a low proximal cycle, while the figure illustrating its appearance in the EM shows a tall, cylindrical proximal cycle, much like the holotype of *S. compactus* and unlike the other two sketches. **Holotype:** Pl. 1, figs 7, 8. **Holotype height:** 2.7 µm. **Type locality:** DSDP Leg 12, Hole 116, Rockall Plateau, Atlantic Ocean. **Type level:** DSDP-12-116, 12-1, 80–81 cm; NN3 (of Martini, 1971), Burdigalian. **Occurrence:** The range of this species has not been fully established due to the taxonomic confusion with *S. compactus*. In the distribution data for a composite section through most of the Oligocene and Neogene in ODP Leg 154 holes, Bergen et al. (2019b) recorded this species as *S. compactus* (which they distinguished from *S. paratintinnabulum*, which, as discussed in this paper, is a junior synonym of *S. compactus*) throughout, from the base of their dataset at ~30.7 Ma, up to 3.607 Ma, just below the extinction of the genus.

*Sphenolithus apoxis* Bergen & de Kaenel in Bergen et al., 2017

Pl. 1, figs 9, 10

1960 *Nannoturbella moriformis* Brönnimann & Stradner: p. 368, figs 14, 15, non figs 11–13, 16.

Figure 9: Range chart for the *S. primus*, *S. anarrhopus*, *S. radians* and *S. kempii* groups. Ranges based on Bergen et al. (2017), Bowan & Dunkley-Jones (2012) and Aubry (2014). All measurements are based on the author’s measurements of the holotype or paratype images. All sketches were traced from the holotype or paratype images, either LM or EM.

**Diagnosis:** A medium-sized sphenolith with a medium-height, slightly flared proximal element cycle, thin lower and upper lateral element cycles, and a polycyclic composite apical structure forming a high apical dome. **Remarks:** This species is essentially a high-domed, rather than low-domed, form of *S. moriformis*. It forms a plexus with *S. moriformis* for its entire range, from the Ypresian to the Burdigalian.

*Sphenolithus puniceus* Bergen & de Kaenel in Bergen et al., 2017

Pl. 1, figs 11, 12


**Diagnosis:** A large sphenolith with a medium-height proximal element cycle, thick lower and upper lateral element cycles, and polycyclic composite apical element cycles forming a medium-height apical dome. All of the elements appear coarsely constructed, although this is probably a function of the large size of the sphenolith. **Remarks:** The large size and coarse elements of this species result in high birefringence relative to most other sphenolithids, with first-order orange, red and blue colours under cross-polarised light.

*Sphenolithus neoabies* Bukry & Bramlette, 1969

Pl. 1, figs 13, 14


**Diagnosis:** A small sphenolith with a low, strongly flared proximal element cycle, thin lower and upper lateral element cycles, and polycyclic composite apical element cycles forming a very low, pointed apical dome. **Remarks:** The strongly flared proximal cycle and small pointed apical structure of this species give it a distinctive triangular lateral outline.

*Sphenolithus abies* Deflandre in Deflandre & Fert, 1954

Pl. 1, figs 15, 16


**Diagnosis:** A medium to large sphenolith with a medium-height, moderately flared proximal element cycle. The lower and upper lateral element cycles are thin. The apical structure is composite and polycyclic, and has the form of a high, rounded cone. **Remarks:** Along with *S. moriformis*, this species is consistently common throughout the late Middle Miocene to Early Pliocene interval.

*Sphenolithus verensis* Backman, 1978

Pl. 1, figs 17, 18

1978 *Sphenolithus verensis* Backman: p. 111, pl. 2, figs 4–6, 11, 12.


**Diagnosis:** A large sphenolith with a medium-height, strongly flared proximal element cycle. The lower and upper lateral element cycles are thin. The apical structure is composite and polycyclic, and has the form of a high, rounded cone. **Remarks:** The strongly flared proximal element cycle is the only significant difference between this species and *S. abies*.

*Sphenolithus grandis* Haq & Berggren, 1978

1978 *Sphenolithus grandis* Haq & Berggren: figs 17, 18.


**Diagnosis:** A large sphenolith with a medium-height proximal element cycle, thick lower and upper lateral element cycles, and polycyclic composite apical element cycles forming a medium-height apical dome. **Remarks:** This large species is essentially a large form of *S. moriformis*. The birefringence of this species reaches first-order yellow and orange—higher than *S. moriformis*, as its elements are
Figure 10: Range chart for the *S. primus*, *S. dissimilis* and *S. delphix* groups. Ranges based on Bergen et al. (2017), Bown & Dunkley-Jones (2012) and Aubry (2014). All measurements are based on the author’s measurements of the holotype or paratype images. All sketches were traced from the holotype or paratype images, either LM or EM.
larger and thicker, but lower than the first-order red and blue birefringence exhibited by *S. puniceus*.

**Sphenolithus anarrhopus Group**

The species in this group are all conical, with a high, sharply pointed, monocrystalline or monocyclic composite apical structure. In most specimens, the apical structure is monocrystalline, but occasionally (e.g. *S. villae* in Bown, 2005a, pl. P9, figs 23, 24, 35, 36) it can be seen that the apical structure is composite and monocrystalline, comprising several elements, but with one larger element dominating the spine. This is the first group of sphenolithids to diverge from the simple-domed morphologies of the *S. primus* group. The species in this group are discussed below in approximate order of first stratigraphic appearance: *S. anarrhopus*, *S. villae* and *S. conspicuus*. A range chart for this group is presented in Figure 9.

**Sphenolithus anarrhopus** Bukry & Bramlette, 1969


**Diagnosis**: A large, conical sphenolith with a medium-height proximal element cycle, a thin lower lateral element cycle, a thick upper lateral element cycle, and a tall, sharply pointed, conical monocrystalline composite or monocrystalline apical structure.

**Remarks**: *Sphenolithus rioi* was described as having a straight spine that is generally longer than the spine of *S. anarrhopus*. The holotypes of the two species are very similar in size (6.8 µm for *S. rioi* and 7.0 µm for *S. anarrhopus*), with similarly sized spines. Whilst most specimens of *S. anarrhopus* have slightly asymmetric apical structures, it seems clear that even with an asymmetric spine, if the spine is pointing downwards or upwards relative to the plane of the slide, it would appear to be symmetrical in plan view. For these reasons, *S. rioi* is considered to be a junior synonym of *S. anarrhopus*.

**Sphenolithus villae** Bown, 2005a


**Diagnosis**: A very large, conical sphenolith with a high, slightly flaring proximal element cycle, a thin lower lateral element cycle, a thick upper lateral element cycle, and a very tall, pointed, conical monocrystalline composite or monocrystalline apical structure. **Remarks**: Distinguished from the otherwise similar *S. anarrhopus* and *S. conspicuus* by its symmetrical apical structure and larger size.

**Sphenolithus conspicuus** Martini, 1976


**Diagnosis**: A large conical sphenolith with a medium-height cylindrical proximal element cycle, a thin lower lateral element cycle, a slightly thickened upper lateral element cycle, and a tall conical apical structure. **Remarks**: *Sphenolithus conspicuus* has a symmetrical apical structure and is taller and narrower than *S. anarrhopus*, but is otherwise similar.

**Sphenolithus radians Group**

Species in this group all have a conical shape and a monocyclic composite or monocrystalline apical structure. They are clearly differentiated from species of the *S. primus* group, which all have polycyclic apical structures. The species in this group are discussed below in approximate order of first stratigraphic appearance: *S. editus*, *S. arthurii*, *S. radians*, *S. orphanknollensis*, *S. spiniger*, *S. richteri* and *S. pseudoradians*. A range chart for this group is presented in Figure 9.

**Sphenolithus editus** Perch-Nielsen in Perch-Nielsen et al., 1978


**Diagnosis:** A small, conical sphenolith with a medium-height, moderately flared proximal element cycle, thin lower and upper lateral element cycles, and a medium-height, pointed, conical monocyclic composite apical structure. **Remarks:** SEM photomicrographs of this small species by Bybell & Self-Trail (1997, pl. 5, figs 9, 12) clearly show that the apical structure is composite and monocyclic, with vertically oriented, blade-shaped elements. The apical structure is very similar in appearance to that of S. radians (see the SEM photomicrograph of Perch-Nielsen, 1977, pl. 31, fig. 8).

*Sphenolithus arthurii* Bown, 2005b

2005b *Sphenolithus arthurii* Bown: p. 9, pl. 9, figs 1–7.

**Diagnosis:** A large to very large, stoutly constructed, conical sphenolith, with a medium-height, slightly flaring proximal element cycle, thick lower and upper lateral element cycles, and a medium-height, pointed, conical monocyclic composite apical structure. **Remarks:** This species appears to be restricted to the Early Eocene. It is essentially a heavily constructed form of *S. radians*, but with a lower apical structure.

*Sphenolithus radians* Deflandre, 1952

1952 *Sphenolithus radians* Deflandre: p. 466, figs 363A–G.


**Diagnosis:** A medium to large, conical sphenolith, with a medium-height, slightly flared proximal element cycle, slightly thick lateral element cycles, and a high, conical, sharply pointed, monocyclic composite apical structure with vertically oriented, blade-shaped elements. **Remarks:** This long-ranging species is the generotype of *Sphenolithus*, and was the first *Sphenolithus* species described.

*Sphenolithus richteri* Bown & Dunkley Jones, 2012

2012 *Sphenolithus richteri* Bown & Dunkley Jones: p. 33,
Diagnosis: A small, conical sphenolith, with a medium-height, cylindrical proximal element cycle, thin lower lateral cycle elements, thick upper lateral cycle elements, and a narrow, sharply pointed, monocryrstalline apical structure. Remarks: This species has a monocryrstalline apical structure, and is clearly descended from S. spiniger, which has a monocyclic composite apical structure. No other Sphenolithus species with a monocryrstalline apical structure exist when S. richteri first occurs in the mid-Eocene. This indicates that S. richteri is not descended from the earlier S. anarrhopus lineage of sphenoliths with monocryrstalline apical structures, thus demonstrating that monocryrstalline apical structures are polyphyletic.

*Sphenolithus pseudoradians* Bramlette & Wilcoxon, 1967


Diagnosis: A very large, conical sphenolith, with a low to medium-height, slightly flared proximal element cycle, thick lateral element cycles, and a high, conical, sharply pointed monocyclic composite apical structure. Remarks: This species is essentially a larger and more robustly constructed variety of *S. radians*.

*Sphenolithus kempii* Group

The species in this group all have low to medium-height proximal element cycles, and a thin lower lateral element cycle. The apical structure is monocyclic and reduced in size, disappearing completely in *S. furcatolithoides* and younger species. With a reduction in element count in the upper lateral element cycle through time, ultimately to two elements in *S. perpendicularis*, the upper lateral cycle elements increase in length laterally and vertically through time, to become the bifid spine of *S. shamrockiae* n. sp. and younger species.

The species in this group are discussed below in approximate order from first stratigraphic appearance: *S. stellatus*, *S. kempii*, *S. perpendicularis*, *S. shamrockiae* n. sp., *S. furcatolithoides* and *S. labradorensis*. A range chart for this group is presented in Figure 9.

*Sphenolithus stellatus* Gartner, 1971

1971 *Sphenolithus stellatus* Gartner: p. 114, pl. 5, fig. 3a, b.


Diagnosis: The type illustrations in Gartner (1971, pl. 5, fig. 3a, b) are black and white photomicrographs of a single specimen in a single orientation (plan view), so the exact ultrastructure of this species is unclear. It appears to have an upper lateral element cycle comprising at least four, and probably six, elements. Other elements are present between these four elements, but these are slightly out of focus, suggesting they may be lower lateral cycle elements. Without images of lateral views of this species, it is difficult to fully characterise the proximal and lower lateral element cycles, or the apical structure. The type specimen is ~9.4 µm wide. Remarks: This species is interpreted here as an intermediate form between *S. spiniger* and *S. kempii*, or perhaps between *S. kempii* and *S. perpendicularis*. With at least four large, distally and laterally divergent spines in the upper lateral element cycle, this species is far less likely than most other sphenolith species to lie on its side on the microscope slide, being more likely to lie top-up or top-down, so it has only been figured in plan view and not lateral view. If there are only four divergent spines, it is possible that this species is a senior synonym of *S. kempii*. Until this species has been figured in side view, and its exact relationship to *S. kempii* and/or *S. perpendicularis* has been made clear, it was decided here to retain it as a separate species.

In his original description, Gartner (1971, p. 114) described the type level of *S. stellatus* (and separately in the figure caption for the holotype) as being a sample at 251 ft in JOIDES Core J-6B, offshore Florida. The summary range chart for the JOIDES cores studied by Gartner (1971, fig. 2) showed the sample from 251 ft in Core J-6B as belonging to his *Isthmolithus recurvus* Zone of Late Eocene age, but the nannofossil distribution chart for Core J-6B (Gartner, 1971, fig. 5) does not show any occurrence
of *S. stellatus*. Gartner (1971, p. 114) described the occurrence of *S. stellatus* as “the middle Eocene interval of the JOIDES Blake Plateau Core J-3”, with no further information given. The nanofossil distribution chart for Core J-3 (Gartner, 1971, fig. 4) showed *S. stellatus* occurring as rare to few in samples from 516–536 ft, an interval belonging to his *Chipfragma* *militatus* *quad* *ratus* and *Reticulofenestra umbilica* Zones, which he regarded as being of latest Early and Middle Eocene age. These two zones are shown as being equivalent to planktonic foraminiferal zones P10 and P11 (using the planktonic foraminiferal zonation of Blow, 1979), which are Middle Eocene in age (Wade et al., 2011).

The best guide we have to the actual age of this taxon, which has rarely been recorded since being described (suggesting it has a very short range), is the distribution data of Bralower & Mutterlose (1995), who record *S. stellatus* from ODP Holes 865B and 865C in the mid-Pacific. They recorded its occurrence from Section 8H-6 in Hole 865B and 9H-3 in Hole 865C, at the base of CP13a (of Okada & Bukry, 1980)/within NP15 (of Martini, 1971), to Section 7H-6 in Hole 865B and 8H-3 in Hole 865C, low in CP13b/within NP15. This species has also been recorded by Lupi & Wise (2006) from ODP Hole 1260A on the Demerara Rise. They recorded occurrences of *S. stellatus* from Section 21R-2, in the uppermost part of CP12a/NP14 to Section 18R-6 at the base of CP13b/within NP15. From these records, it seems that the range is essentially within CP13a/NP15, which closely matches the range from JOIDES Blake Plateau Core J-3 (Gartner, 1971, fig. 4), and also the range of *S. kempii* (Bown & Dunkley Jones, 2012, p. 33). It seems clear that *S. stellatus* is closely related to *S. kempii*, and has a similarly short range.

*Sphenolithus kempii* Bown & Dunkley Jones, 2012

Pl. 1, figs 27, 28

1990 *Sphenolithus* sp. 1 Okada: p. 154, pl. 2, figs 9–12.

**Diagnosis**: Medium-sized sphenolith with a medium-height, cylindrical proximal element cycle and a thin lower lateral element cycle. The upper lateral element cycle has a reduced element count, with three or four elements that are elongated vertically and laterally, forming distally divergent spines. The calcite c-axes in the upper lateral cycle elements are at an angle of ~45° to the median axis, so when the long axis of an element is parallel to the plane of the slide, and the median axis of the sphenolith is parallel to one of the polarising axes, the element is bright, and when the median axis is at 45°, it is dark. A small apical structure may be present, which appears to be monocyclic and monocrystalline. **Remarks**: This species, which appears to be descended from *S. spiniger*, marks the beginning of a lineage in which the upper lateral element cycle grows vertically and laterally, ultimately becoming the bifid spine that characterises most *Furcatolithus* species. It is possible that *S. stellatus* (Gartner, 1971, p. 114, pl. 5, fig. 3a, b) is a plan view of *S. kempii*, in which case, *S. kempii* would be a junior synonym of *S. stellatus*. Until this can be shown conclusively, the name *S. kempii* is retained here.

*Sphenolithus perpendicularis* Shamrock, 2010

Pl. 1, figs 29, 30

2010 *Sphenolithus perpendicularis* Shamrock: p. 8, pl. 1, figs 1-1, 1-2, 2-1, 2-2, 3-1, 3-2, 4-1, 4-2, 5-1, 5-2.
2012 *Sphenolithus perpendicularis* Shamrock, 2010 – Bown & Dunkley Jones: pl. 10, fig. 41.
2017 *Sphenolithus perpendicularis* Shamrock, 2010 – Bown & Newsam: pl. 11, figs 7–10, 13, *non* figs 11, 12.

**Diagnosis**: A large to very large sphenolith with a low to moderate-height, cylindrical proximal element cycle. The lower lateral cycle elements are thin. The upper lateral cycle elements are reduced in number to two, and are enlarged vertically and laterally to form two distally divergent spines, with an angle of ~90° between the spines. The calcite c-axes in the upper lateral cycle elements are at an angle of ~45° to the median axis, so they are brightly bi-refrangent in lateral view when the median axis is parallel to one of the polarising axes, and dark when the median axis is at 45°. A small apical structure is present, which appears to be monocyclic and monocrystalline. The top of the apical structure is level with the base of the inter-
spine area between the two upper lateral element spines, or projects slightly above it. **Remarks:** This is a very distinctive species with a very short range (within NP15, Middle Eocene), making it an excellent biostratigraphic marker. This is also the first species where the element count in the upper lateral element cycle is reduced to two elements—a critical step in the formation of the bifid spine characteristic of most species of *Furcatolithus*.

**Sphenolithus shamrockiae** n. sp.

Pl. 2, figs 1–4

2010 *Sphenolithus furcatolithoides* Locker, 1967 – Shamrock: pl. 1, figs 7-1, 7-2, 8-1, 8-2.


**Derivation of name:** In honour of Dr Jamie Shamrock, who figured the holotype of this species as *S. furcatolithoides* in Shamrock (2010). **Diagnosis:** A sphenolith with a low proximal element cycle, a thin lower lateral element cycle, and a high to very high, bifurcated upper lateral element cycle with two elements that form a bifid spine. A small, monocyclic apical structure is present, which does not extend above the base of the bifurcation of the bifid spine. **Remarks:** The presence of an apical structure (clearly visible when the specimen is oriented at 45° to the polarising axes as a small birefringent element above the birefringent elements of the lower lateral element cycle; see Shamrock, 2010, fig. 7-2) distinguishes this species from the otherwise similar *S. furcatolithoides*, the holotype of which completely lacks an apical structure. The apical structure is small, so it is unclear whether it is monocryalline or a monocyclic composite. This is the first sphenolithid species known to have a bifid spine. **Holotype:** Shamrock (2010, pl. 1, figs 7-1, 7-2). **Holotype height:** 7.5 µm. **Paratype:** Shamrock (2010, pl. 1, figs 8-1, 8-2). Sample ODP-122-762C-15-2, 125–126 cm. **Type locality:** ODP Leg 122, Hole 762C, Exmouth Plateau, offshore western Australia, southeastern Indian Ocean. **Type level:** ODP-122-762C-15X-1, 48–49 cm; NP15b (of Martini, 1971)/CP13b (of Okada & Bukry, 1980), Middle Eocene (Lutetian), according to Shamrock (2010). **Occurrence:** The range of this species has not been fully established because most previous studies have not distinguished it from the similar, and closely related, *S. furcatolithoides*. Agnini et al. (2014) separated *S. shamrockiae* (as *S. furcatolithoides* morphotype A) from *S. furcatolithoides* (as *S. furcatolithoides* morphotype B), finding it restricted to their zone CNE10 (= middle NP15).

**Sphenolithus furcatolithoides** Locker, 1967 emend.

Pl. 2, figs 5, 6

1967 *Sphenolithus furcatolithoides* Locker: p. 363, pl. 1, figs 14–16, text-figs 7, 8.


**Emended diagnosis:** A sphenolith with a low proximal element cycle, a thin lower lateral element cycle, and a high to very high upper lateral element cycle. The upper lateral element cycle has two vertically adjoined elements, which bifurcate distally, forming a bifid spine. The point at which the bifid spine bifurcates is approximately one-third from the base of the spine. Thin distal and lateral extensions of the two vertical elements of the bifid spine may or may not be present, but if present, can vary greatly in length. No apical structure is present. **Remarks:** The photomicrographs of the holotype (Locker, 1967, figs 14, 15) of *S. furcatolithoides* are over-exposed, making it difficult to determine whether a lower lateral element cycle is present, although Locker’s sketches of the holotype (figs 7, 8) strongly suggest that it is. Most subsequent illustrations of this species clearly show the presence of a lower lateral element cycle (e.g. Bown, 2005a, pl. 45, figs 1, 2). The holotype clearly lacks any apical structure. The high, bifurcated upper lateral element cycle in *S. furcatolithoides* and the closely related *S. shamrockiae* n. sp., formed from the high upper lateral element cycle of *S. perpendicularis*, and mark the evolution of the bifid spine, which is a key structural component of subsequent species in the genus *Furcatolithus*.

**Sphenolithus labradorensis** Firth, 1989 stat. nov.

Pl. 2, figs 7–10

2006 *Sphenolithus strigosus* Bown & Dunkley Jones: p. 23, pl. 8, figs 6–15.
2006 *Sphenolithus runus* Bown & Dunkley Jones: p. 23, pl. 8, figs 16–24.
2012 *Sphenolithus strigosus* Bown & Dunkley Jones, 2006 – Bown & Dunkley Jones: pl. 10, figs 44, 45.
2014 *Sphenolithus labradorensis* (Firth, 1989) Aubry: pp. 150, 282 (invalid, see remarks below).

**Basionym:** *Sphenolithus furcatolithoides* Locker, 1967 subsp. *labradorensis* Firth, 1989, p. 277, pl. 2, figs 15, 16; pl. 3, figs 1–4. Firth, J.V. 1989. Eocene and Oligocene calcareous nannofossils from the Labrador Sea, ODP Leg 105. *Proceedings of the ODP, Scientific Results*, 105: 263–286. **Diagnosis:** A sphenolith with a low proximal element cycle, a thin lower lateral element cycle, and a high upper lateral element cycle. The upper lateral element cycle is reduced to two vertical elements, which bifurcate distally. Thin distal extensions of these vertical elements may or may not be present. No apical structure is present. **Remarks:** The change in status by Aubry (2014) is invalid under ICN Art. 41.6 because, whilst the basionym was cited, as required under Art. 41.5, the page and figure numbers of the description of *S. furcatolithoides* subsp. *labradorensis* by Firth were entirely omitted, which is not permitted under ICN Art. 41.6. This species is likely the immediate ancestor to *Furcatolithus cuniculus* n. comb., with the main difference being the presence of a lower lateral element cycle in *S. labradorensis*, which is lost in the transition to *F. cuniculus*. The presence or absence of a lower lateral element cycle is the key structural difference between the two species and the two genera.

The holotype of *S. strigosus* is very similar to that of *S. labradorensis*, with both specimens clearly showing the presence of a lower lateral element cycle and a bifid spine, so *S. strigosus* is considered here to be a junior synonym of *S. labradorensis*. The holotype of *S. runus* is similar in size and overall appearance to the holotypes of both *S. labradorensis* and *S. strigosus*, with a clearly visible lower lateral element cycle, but no visible apical structure. The bifid spine of the holotype (Bown & Dunkley Jones, 2006, pl. 8, figs 18–20) is dark at 0° and bright at 45°, which is opposite to the extinction pattern for the bifid spine of the holotype specimen of *S. labradorensis*. A suture can be seen surrounding the periphery of the spine, which here is interpreted as the median suture of the bifid spine, at a low oblique angle to the plane of the slide. The other specimens of *S. runus* figured in Bown & Dunkley Jones (2006, pl. 8, figs 16, 17, 21–24) show a similar pattern, as do the specimens of *S. runus* figured by Bown & Newsam (2017, pl. 11, figs 30, 31, 34, 35). The specimen figured as *S. runus* by Bown & Newsam (2017, pl. 11, figs 32, 33) has a bifid spine that is partially bright in both the 0° and 45° orientations to the polarising axes, and has a clearly visible median suture (their pl. 11, fig. 32), where the specimen is oriented at 0° to the polariser, so this specimen is considered to be specimen of *S. labradorensis*, even by their criteria.

For these reasons, the holotype of *S. runus* is interpreted here as being a specimen of *S. labradorensis* oriented with the median suture of the bifid spine lying parallel, or slightly oblique, to the plane of the slide, rather than orthogonal to the plane of the slide, as in the holotype image of *S. labradorensis*, and in which orientation the median suture of the bifid spine is visible. Accordingly, *S. runus* is interpreted to be a junior synonym of *S. labradorensis*.

**Sphenolithus dissimilis Group**

The species in this group all have medium-high to high, cylindrical to slightly flaring proximal element cycles, thin lateral element cycles, and monocyclic composite apical structures with subparallel to divergent elements, resulting in a cylindrical or biconical overall shape in some species. In some species, the elements in the apical structure are all similar in height, giving the apical structure a cylindrical appearance with a flat distal surface, which is not seen in any other group of sphenoliths. The species in this group are discussed below in approximate order of first stratigraphic appearance: *S. truaxii*, *S. procerus*, *S. capricornatus*, *S. compactus*, *S. disbelemnos*, *S. multispinatus*, *S. dissimilis* and *S. cometa*. A range chart for this group is presented in Figure 10.

**Diagnosis**: A large sphenolith with a medium to tall cylindrical proximal element cycle. The elements of the lower and upper lateral cycles are thick and extend laterally slightly beyond the top of the proximal cycle, giving the lateral profile a slightly stepped appearance. The composite apical structure is monocyclic and cylindrical with a gently convex to flat distal surface. The apical structure is tall. **Remarks**: Under the LM, some specimens of this species present an unusual appearance where the proximal element cycle and the apical structure are approximately equal in size and shape. In specimens like this, the proximal cycle and the apical structure can be difficult to distinguish.

*Sphenolithus procerus* Maiorano & Monechi, 1997
Pl. 2, figs 13, 14

1997 *Sphenolithus procerus* Maiorano & Monechi: p. 103, pl. 1, figs 1–3.

**Diagnosis**: A medium-sized sphenolith with a medium-high, slightly flared proximal element cycle. The lower and upper lateral element cycles are slightly thickened. The composite apical structure is monocyclic and cylindrical, with a relatively flat distal surface. **Remarks**: This species resembles *S. truaxii* but differs in having a lower proximal element cycle.

*Sphenolithus capricornutus* Bukry & Percival, 1971
Pl. 2, figs 15, 16

1971 *Sphenolithus capricornutus* Bukry & Percival: p. 140, pl. 6, figs 4–6.

**Diagnosis**: A large to very large sphenolith with a medium-high to high, slightly to moderately flared proximal element cycle. The lower lateral cycle elements are thin, and the upper lateral cycle elements are thick. The high apical structure is monocyclic and composite, and comprises two prominent apical elements that diverge distally and laterally. **Remarks**: Such a pair of divergent apical elements is not found in any other post-Eocene sphenolith. Differentiation of the upper lateral cycle elements from the two apical elements is difficult in this species because the apical elements are at an angle of ~45° to the median axis, so the e-axis orientations of the elements in the spines are similar to the c-axis orientations of the elements in the upper lateral element cycle, and hence their birefringence is similar. Close examination of most published images of specimens where the median axis is parallel to one of the polarising axes (e.g. Denne, 2007, pl. 1, fig. 14; Bergen et al., 2017, pl. 7, figs 26, 28, 30; Gennari et al., 2017, fig. 9a) shows that the upper lateral cycle elements are slightly brighter than the two apical elements, and can be recognised as ultrastructurally distinct. **Differentiation**: This species is superficially similar to the Eocene *S. perpendicularis*, although it is phylogenetically and ultrastructurally unrelated, as the divergent spines in *S. perpendicularis* are elongated upper lateral cycle elements, and not elongated apical structure elements, as seen in *S. capricornutus*.

*Sphenolithus compactus* Backman, 1980
Pl. 2, figs 17, 18

1980 *Sphenolithus compactus* Backman: p. 59, pl. 3, fig. 20.

2017 *Sphenolithus paratintinnabulum* Bergen & de Kae ne in Bergen et al.: p. 88, pl. 3, figs 29, 30; pl. 4, figs 1–6.

**Diagnosis**: A very small to small sphenolith with a high, cylindrical proximal element cycle. The lateral element cycles are thin. The composite apical structure is domed and low. It is unclear whether the apical structure is monocyclic or polycyclic. **Remarks**: The holotype of *S. compactus* was described by Backman (1980) from NN3, in the Early Miocene, and falls within the range described by Bergen et al. (2017) for *S. paratintinnabulum*, the holotype of which was described from NN2, but which ranges up to the middle of NN3, to 18.612Ma (Bergen et al., 2017, 2019a). The holotypes of the two species are very similar, with relatively tall, cylindrical proximal element cycles and low apical structures, so *S. paratintinnabulum* is regarded here as a junior synonym of *S. compactus*. This species has been regarded by many workers as a small variety of *S. primus* or *S. moriformis* (e.g. Perch-Nielsen, 1985, pp. 522, 523), but its tall, cylindrical proximal cycle is quite unlike the much lower and slightly flaring proximal cycle
of S. moriformis.

**Sphenolithus disbelemnos** Fornaciari & Rio, 1996
Pl. 2, figs 19, 20

1996 *Sphenolithus disbelemnos* Fornaciari & Rio: pl. 2, figs 7–10; pl. 3, figs 19, 20; pl. 4, fig. 2.

1996 *Sphenolithus aubryae* de Kaenel & Villa: p. 128, pl. 11, figs 16–18.


**Diagnosis**: A small sphenolith with a tall, cylindrical proximal element cycle. The elements of the lower and upper lateral cycles are thick, and extend laterally slightly beyond the top of the proximal cycle, giving the lateral profile a slightly stepped appearance. The composite apical structure is monocyclic and cylindrical, with a relatively flat distal surface. The apical structure is low in height.

**Remarks**: The holotype of *S. aubryae* is very similar to that of *S. disbelemnos*, other than being slightly larger (the holotype of *S. disbelemnos* is 2.95 µm high, that of *S. aubryae* 4.1 µm high), so *S. aubryae* is considered to be a junior synonym of *S. disbelemnos*.

**Sphenolithus multispinatus** Maiorano & Monechi, 1997
Pl. 2, figs 21, 22

1997 *Sphenolithus multispinatus* Maiorano & Monechi: pl. 1, figs 14–16.


**Diagnosis**: A large sphenolith with a tall, slightly flaring to cylindrical proximal element cycle. The lower and upper lateral element cycles are thin. The apical structure is monocyclic, tall, and has distally diverging elements that give this species an overall biconical shape. The distal surface of the apical structure appears flat in lateral view.

**Remarks**: The divergent apical structure of this species is clearly different to the cylindrical apical structure of the otherwise similar *S. dissimilis*.

**Sphenolithus dissimilis** Bukry & Percival, 1971
Pl. 2, figs 23–26

1971 *Sphenolithus dissimilis* Bukry & Percival, pl. 6, figs 7, 9, non fig. 8.


**Diagnosis**: A large sphenolith with a tall, cylindrical proximal element cycle, slightly thickened lower and upper lateral element cycles, and a moderately tall, monocyclic composite apical structure that is cylindrical in shape. The distal surface of the apical structure appears flat in lateral view.

**Remarks**: This species has a similar range to *S. disbelemnos*, with which it appears to form a plexus in which the height of the apical structure is variable—low in *S. disbelemnos*, moderately high in *S. dissimilis*.

**Sphenolithus cometa** de Kaenel & Villa, 1996
Pl. 2, figs 27, 28

1996 *Sphenolithus cometa* de Kaenel & Villa: pl. 11, figs 22–24.


**Diagnosis**: A medium-sized sphenolith with a tall, slightly flaring to cylindrical proximal element cycle. The lower and upper lateral element cycles are thin. The apical structure is monocyclic, tall, and has distally diverging elements that give this species an overall biconical shape. The distal surface of the apical structure appears flat in lateral view.

**Remarks**: The degree of divergence of the elements in the apical structure is greater in *S. multispinatus* than in *S. cometa*, and the elements are coarser.

**Sphenolithus conicus** Group

The species in this group are all medium-high to high, conical, with a medium-high to high, sharply pointed to rounded, monocyclic apical structure. As with the *S. anarhopus* group, the apical structures in most specimens of species in this group are monocristalline, but occasionally (particularly in *S. conicus*), it can be seen that the apical structure is monocrystalline and composite, comprising several elements, but with one or two larger elements dominating the spine. The species in this group are discussed below.
in approximate order of first stratigraphic appearance: S. conicus, S. calyculus, S. macroacanthos, S. pseudoheteromorphus, S. heteromorphus, S. preasii and S. milanetti. A range chart for this group is presented in Figure 8.

*Sphenolithus conicus* Bukry, 1971a

Pl. 2, figs 29, 30

1971a *Sphenolithus conicus* Bukry: p. 320, pl. 5, figs 10–12.


2017 *Sphenolithus conicus* Bukry, 1971a – Bergen et al.: pl. 5, figs 7–18.

**Diagnosis:** A large sphenolith with a medium-high, moderately flaring proximal element cycle, thin lower and upper lateral element cycles, and a medium-high, rounded, conical, monocyclic composite apical structure, usually dominated by one or two large, sub-vertical elements. Some specimens have a fully monocrystalline apical structure. **Remarks:** The transition from a monocyclic composite spine to a monocrystalline spine occurs in this species. These two morphotypes could be split into different species. This is considered impractical here because it can be very difficult to distinguish between a composite apical structure with a few coarse elements and a monocrystalline apical structure. All subsequent species in this lineage have monocrystalline apical structures, although *S. pseudoheteromorphus* can have a cycle of small, thin apical elements at the base of the large monocrystalline spine, resulting in a composite apical structure.

*Sphenolithus calyculus* Bukry, 1985

Pl. 3, figs 1, 2

1985 *Sphenolithus calyculus* Bukry: p. 600, pl. 1, figs 13–19.

2017 *Sphenolithus calyculus* Bukry, 1985 – Bergen et al.: pl. 5, figs 1–4, non figs 5, 6.

**Diagnosis:** A medium-sized sphenolith with a medium-high proximal cycle, thin lower and upper lateral element cycles, and a tall, narrow, conical monocrystalline apical structure. **Remarks:** This species is transitional between *S. conicus* and *S. pseudoheteromorphus*. It is distinguished from both of these species by its taller and thinner apical structure, which is symmetrical, in contrast to the spine in *S. pseudoheteromorphus*.

*Sphenolithus macroacanthos* Aubry, 2014

Pl. 3, figs 3, 4

non 1980 *Sphenolithus elongatus* Perch-Nielsen: p. 2, pl. 1, figs 14, 15; pl. 2, figs 5–11 (not considered here to be a true sphenolithid).

1986 *Sphenolithus elongatus* Martini: p. 753, pl. 2, figs 7, 8 (homonym of *S. elongatus* Perch-Nielsen, 1980).


2017 *Sphenolithus calyculus* Bukry, 1985 – Bergen et al.: pl. 5, figs 5, 6, non figs 1–4.

**Diagnosis:** A large to very large sphenolith with a medium-high proximal cycle, thin lower and upper lateral element cycles, and a tall, narrow monocrystalline apical structure. **Remarks:** *Sphenolithus elongatus* Martini, 1986 is a homonym of *S. elongatus* Perch-Nielsen, 1980. Aubry (2014) erected the name *S. macroacanthos* as a nomen novum for *S. elongatus* Martini, 1986. *Sphenolithus elongatus* Perch-Nielsen, 1980 is not considered to be a true sphenolithid, as the holotype does not appear to have a sphenolithid proximal cycle, and hence does not belong to the family Sphenolithaceae. The holotype of *S. elongatus* Martini, 1986 is 9.6 µm high, while that of *S. calyculus* is 5.0 µm. Otherwise the two species are very similar.

*Sphenolithus pseudoheteromorphus* Fornaciari & Agnini, 2009

Pl. 3, figs 5, 6

2009 *Sphenolithus pseudoheteromorphus* Fornaciari & Agnini: p. 97, pl. 1, figs 1–16; pl. 2, figs 1–5, 9, 13.


**Diagnosis:** A very large sphenolith with a low, moderately flared proximal element cycle, thin lower and upper lateral element cycles, and a tall, pointed-conical monocrystalline apical structure that is usually at a slight angle to the median axis of the sphenolith. A cycle of small apical elements may be present around the base of the apical struc-
nature. **Remarks:** This species is generally taller and thinner overall than the closely related *S. heteromorphus*. The two species can be separated by the inclination of the apical structure in *S. pseudoheteromorphus*.

*Sphenolithus heteromorphus* Deflandre, 1953

1953 *Sphenolithus heteromorphus* Deflandre: p. 1786, pl. 1, figs 1–2.

2017 *Sphenolithus heteromorphus* Deflandre, 1953 – Bergen et al.: pl. 7, figs 6–11.

**Diagnosis:** A large to very large sphenolith with a low, moderately flared proximal element cycle, slightly thickened lower and upper lateral element cycles, and a tall, pointed monocrystalline apical structure. **Remarks:** *Sphenolithus heteromorphus* can be very common in CN3 (of Okada & Bukry, 1980)/NN4 (of Martini, 1971) in the Burdigalian, where it is an excellent marker species.

*Sphenolithus preasii* Bergen & de Kaenel in Bergen et al., 2017


**Diagnosis:** A very large sphenolith with a medium-high, moderately flared proximal element cycle, thickened lower and upper lateral element cycles, and a medium-high, pointed apical structure. **Remarks:** As noted by Bergen et al. (2017), *S. preasii* is transitional between *S. conicus* and *S. milanetti*, with the elements in the proximal cycle being slightly curved in lateral view. *Sphenolithus pospichalii* was described as having a taller apical structure than *S. milanetti*; however, the difference in the height of the apical structure between the two holotypes is minimal. As noted by Bergen et al. (2017), the two holotypes are both 8 µm in height, and both species were described from NN4, so they are here considered synonymous.

*Sphenolithus delphix* Group

The species in this group all have a flared proximal element cycle. The apical structure is monocyclic, composite in *S. bipedis* and monocrystalline in *S. spinula, S. microdelphix, S. delphix, S. tintinnabulum* and *S. belemnos*. Species in this group are discussed below in approximate order of first stratigraphic appearance: *S. bipedis, S. spinula, S. microdelphix, S. delphix, S. tintinnabulum* and *S. belemnos*. A range chart for this group is presented in Figure 10.

*Sphenolithus bipedis* Bergen & de Kaenel in Bergen et al., 2017

2017 *Sphenolithus bipedis* Bergen & de Kaenel in Bergen et al.: p. 83, pl. 1, figs 5–12.

**Diagnosis:** A small sphenolith with a medium-high, strongly flared proximal element cycle. The lateral element cycles are thin, and there is a low, conical mono-
cyclic composite apical structure. Remarks: This species resembles *S. neoabies* in having a strongly flared proximal element cycle and a low apical structure, but is older, and has a disjunct range (Bergen et al., 2017).

*Sphenolithus spinula* Bergen & de Kaenel in Bergen et al., 2017
Pl. 3, figs 15, 16

2017 *Sphenolithus spinula* Bergen & de Kaenel in Bergen et al.: p. 91, pl. 6, figs 1–8.

**Diagnosis:** A medium-sized sphenolith with a tall, strongly flared proximal element cycle. The lower and upper lateral element cycles are thin, and the monocrystalline apical structure is medium-high. Remarks: *Sphenolithus spinula* is distinguished from the otherwise similar *S. microdelphix* in having a taller, but equally strongly flared proximal element cycle.

*Sphenolithus microdelphix* Bergen & de Kaenel in Bergen et al., 2017
Pl. 3, figs 17, 18

2017 *Sphenolithus microdelphix* Bergen & de Kaenel in Bergen et al.: p. 91, pl. 6, figs 21–25.

**Diagnosis:** A medium-sized sphenolith with a medium-high, strongly flared proximal element cycle, a thin lower lateral element cycle, a slightly thickened upper lateral element cycle, and a tall, conical, monocrystalline apical structure. In well-preserved specimens, two horizontally opposite elements in the proximal cycle are proximally and laterally extended, to a variable degree. Remarks: Most descriptions of *S. delphix* emphasise the strongly flared proximal element cycle as characteristic of this species. Published images of this species show a wide range of variation in the degree of flare of the proximal cycle, with some images showing the length of the elements in the proximal cycle being approximately equal to the length of the apical structure. The type description by Bukry (1973) clearly mentioned that “The apical spine and two of the basal spines are slender and elongate, resulting in a triradiate outline”, and in the remarks, Bukry commented that “The structure of some specimens suggests that the two long basal spines are secondary elongations. Because of the regular position of these spines and the low abundance of *S. delphix* in populations of fossil coccoliths, however, these structures are probably biologic in origin”.

Close examination of the LM images of the holotype (Bukry, 1973, pl. 3, figs 19, 21, 22) show a difference in the lengths of the proximal cycle elements between his fig. 19 (a transmitted light image) and fig. 20 (a cross-polarised light image), which is interpreted here as evidence that the holotype specimen bears extended elements in the proximal cycle, which are about half the height of the apical structure in length. The specimen figured here in Plate 3, figs 21 and 22, shows an extended proximal cycle element on the right-hand side of the proximal cycle, which is similar in length to the apical structure. This extension of some of the proximal cycle elements is a structural innovation not shown by any sphenolithid other than the closely related *S. microdelphix*, which is smaller, with a
proportionally shorter apical structure, but is otherwise very similar.

It is clear from the SEM images of Müller (1974, pl. 4, figs 7, 8) and Knüttel (1986, pl. 4, figs 1, 2), and the LM images of Firth (1989, pl. 4, figs 7, 8) that these horizontally opposed proximal cycle elements can be extended in length, elongating into long spines, similar in length to the apical structure. This form was described, but not figured, as a “long triradiated” S. delphix by de Kaenel & Villa (1996, p. 99), who mentioned that “Moreover, a very short, characteristic interval contains abundant forms of large S. delphix. This ‘triradiated’ form possesses a very long apical spine and two extremely elongated proximal elements, and it occurs near the top of the range of S. delphix, together with frequent T. carinatus”.

*Sphenolithus tintinnabulum* Maiorano & Monechi, 1997

Pl. 3, figs 23, 24


2017 *Sphenolithus tintinnabulum* Bergen et al.: pl. 4, figs 7–18.

**Diagnosis**: A small sphenolith with a moderately high, moderately flared proximal element cycle, thin lower and upper lateral element cycles, and a low monocrystalline apical structure that is conical in shape. **Remarks**: See remarks for *S. belemnos*.

*Sphenolithus belemnos* Bramlette & Wilcoxon, 1967

Pl. 3, figs 25–28


**Diagnosis**: A large sphenolith with a moderately tall, slightly flaring proximal element cycle. Both the lower and upper lateral element cycles are thin. The monocrystalline apical structure is tall and conical. **Remarks**: The proximal element cycle of *S. belemnos* is taller than that of *S. tintinnabulum*, but is not as flared. It is similar in height to that of *S. disbelemnos*, but is more flared. The apical structure of *S. belemnos* is monocrystalline, like that of *S. tintinnabulum* (and unlike the monocryclic composite apical structure of *S. disbelemnos*), so, overall, *S. belemnos* is considered here to be likely descended from *S. tintinnabulum*, although it could also be descended from *S. disbelemnos*.

**Sphenolithus quadrispinatus Group**

The single species in this group has a low to medium-high, cylindrical proximal element cycle. The apical structure is monocryclic, with usually four elements bearing thin extensions that extend laterally and vertically. A range chart for the single species in this group is presented in Figure 8.

*Sphenolithus quadrispinatus* Perch-Nielsen, 1980


**Diagnosis**: A large to very large sphenolith with a low to medium-high, cylindrical proximal element cycle, thin lateral element cycles, and a monocryclic apical structure with usually four elements bearing thin extensions that extend laterally and vertically. **Remarks**: This species is a partial homeomorph of species in the *S. dissimilis* group—particularly *S. capricornutus* and *S. multispinatus*—with which it shares an apical structure with distally and laterally diverging elements. The EM images of this species in Perch-Nielsen (1980, pl. 2, figs 1–4) are of high quality and show multiple well-preserved specimens. It seems clear from these images that this species is distinct from species of the *S. dissimilis* group.

*Sphenolithus quadrispinatus* has a short range in the Tortonian, and has very rarely been recorded. The only record in the International Ocean Discovery Program SEDIS database of DSDP, ODP and IODP data is that of Quintero (1994) who recorded it from CN8 (of Okada & Bukry, 1980) in ODP Hole 841B, from the Tonga Trench in the Pacific Ocean, but did not present any images.

**Genus Furcatolithus** Martini, 1965 emend.

**Emended diagnosis**: Conical coccoliths with a proximal element cycle of radially arranged elements. Above the proximal element cycle, there is usually a vertically split bifid spine, composed of two vertical elements. The two elements of the bifid spine often bear thin extensions
that extend distally and laterally. No lower lateral element cycle, or apical structure (apical cycle or spine), as seen in species of the genus Sphenolithus, is ever present. **Type species:** Furcatolithus distentus Martini, 1965.

**Synonym:** Pseudozygrhabilithus Haq, 1971. **Discussion:** Martini (1965) described *F. distentus* as the generotype of *Furcatolithus*. The holotype (Martini, 1965, figs 8, 9) is an isolated bifid spine, with thin distal extensions. No proximal cycle is present; it is interpreted here as having broken off. The holotype was interpreted by Martini (1965) to be of Miocene age (*Catapsydrax dissimilis* planktonic foraminiferal zone). As *F. distentus* has been reported in subsequent works by many authors (e.g. Perch-Nielsen, 1985; Bown & Dunkley Jones, 2012) to be of mid-Oligocene age, the age interpretation of Martini (1965) is considered erroneous. Bramlette & Wilcoxon (1967) examined material from the same core that Martini (1965) described *F. distentus* from, and figured specimens (Bramlette & Wilcoxon, 1967, pl. 1, fig. 5; pl. 2, figs 4, 5) that clearly show the presence of a proximal element cycle (which they termed ‘short basal spines’), the absence of a lower lateral element cycle, and the absence of an apical element cycle or spine. They commented that “The apical spine is easily separated from the short basal spines, particularly in the poorly preserved specimens of some samples”, which seems to be a reference to the fact that Martini’s (1965) holotype has a missing proximal element cycle. They considered the core examined by Martini (1965) to belong to the upper *Globigerina ampliapertura* or lower *Globorotalia opima opima* planktonic foraminiferal zones, supporting a mid-Oligocene range for *F. distentus*.

Bramlette & Wilcoxon (1967) recombined *F. distentus* into the genus *Sphenolithus* Deflandre, 1952, presumably because of the overall similarity of the forms (i.e. conical gross morphology) between the generotype of *Sphenolithus* (*S. radians* Deflandre, 1952) and *F. distentus*. Curiously, Bramlette & Wilcoxon (1967) did not attempt to justify or discuss their recombination at all, instead confining their discussion to the ultrastructure of *F. distentus*, and its geographical and stratigraphical distribution. Their recombination has been followed by almost all nannofossil workers, having the effect of completely suppressing the genus *Furcatolithus*. This recombination is rejected here, due to the major structural differences between the generotypes of the two genera—the presence of a bifid spine and the absence of a lower lateral element cycle and any apical structure in *F. distentus*, and the presence of lower and upper lateral element cycles and an apical structure in *S. radians*, which lacks a bifid spine.

*Furcatolithus* is interpreted to have evolved from the *S. kempii* group during the Middle Eocene. The lineage from *S. kempii* to *S. perpendicularis* to *S. shamrockiae* to *F. furcatolithoides* to *S. labradorensis* shows a trend of increasing height and decreasing element count in the upper lateral element cycle—which became the two-part bifid spine in *Furcatolithus* species—along with a reduction in height of the apical structure. The eventual complete loss of the apical structure occurred in the transition from *F. furcatolithoides* to *S. labradorensis*, and was followed by loss of the lower lateral element cycle in the transition from *S. labradorensis* to *F. cuniculus*—the oldest species of *Furcatolithus*. The bifid spine is reduced in size in the *F. triangularis* group, and is ultimately lost completely in the last representative of the genus—*F. umbrellus*.

Seventeen *Furcatolithus* species are recognised as valid here. These species have been divided into three informal groups of species, based on shared morphology. These groups are listed in Table 2 and are detailed below, with both groups and species in approximate order of first stratigraphical appearance.

**Furcatolithus predistentus Group**

The species in this group all have high (>65°) median-axis/base bifid spine angles. Most species (e.g. *F. predistentus*) have low proximal cycles (~10–15% of the total height, excluding distal bifurcations), although some species (*F. obtusus*, *F. peartiae* and *F. tawfi kii*) have higher proximal cycles. The species in this group are discussed below in approximate order of first stratigraphical appearance: *F. cuniculus, F. predistentus, F. obtusus, F. celsus, F. intercalaris, F. akropodus, F. tribulosus, F. peartiae* and *F. tawfi kii*. A range chart for this group is presented in Figure 11. A selection of species from each group in the genus is presented on Plate 4.

**Furcatolithus cuniculus** (Bown, 2005a) n. comb.

Pl. 4, figs 1–4


**Basionym:** *Sphenolithus cuniculus* Bown, 2005a, p. 46.
pl. 45, figs 6–10. Bown, P.R. 2005a. Palaeogene calcareous nannofossils from the Kilwa and Lindi areas of coastal Tanzania (Tanzania Drilling Project 2003–4). Journal of Nannoplankton Research, 27(1): 21–95. Diagnosis: A medium to large furcatolith with a high, blocky bifid spine, and a low proximal element cycle. The tips of the bifid spine bifurcate 30% of the way down the spine. The angle between the median axis and the top of the proximal element cycle is approximately 90°. The base of the proximal element cycle is concave. Remarks: Bown (2005a) described this species as being similar to (and possibly a preservational variant of) S. furcatolithoides, but with shorter lower quadrants (i.e. a lower proximal element cycle) and broader upper quadrants (i.e. a broader bifid spine). Unlike S. furcatolithoides, which has a lower lateral element cycle (a key characteristic of Sphenolithus, as emended here), F. cuniculus completely lacks a lower lateral element cycle, and so belongs to Furcatolithus. Furcatolithus cuniculus has an unusually blocky bifid spine, with thick vertical bifurcations, so measurement of the total height is taken to the top of the bifurcations. For the holotype, this results in the proximal cycle being 15% of the total height. F. cuniculus is the first species of the genus to have evolved.

Furcatolithus predistentus (Bramlette & Wilcoxon, 1967) n. comb.  
Pl. 4, figs 5, 6

1967 Sphenolithus predistentus Bramlette & Wilcoxon: p. 126, pl. 1, fig. 6; pl. 2, figs 10, 11.  

Basionym: Sphenolithus predistentus Bramlette & Wilcoxon, 1967, p. 126, pl. 1, fig. 6; pl. 2, figs 10, 11. Bramlette M.N. & Wilcoxon J.A. 1967. Middle Tertiary calcareous nannoplankton of the Cipero section, Trinidad, W.I. Tulane Studies in Geology, 5(3): 93–131. Diagnosis: A very large furcatolith with a bifid spine and a very low proximal element cycle that is ~10% of the total height. The total height is >9 µm. The bifid spine narrows to become thin and parallel-sided at about one-third of the total height of the spine. The angle between the median axis and the top of the proximal element cycle is ~80–90°. The base of the proximal element cycle is concave. Thin distal extensions of the bifid spine may or may not be present, and if present, can vary greatly in length. Remarks: The precise relationships between the earliest forms of Furcatolithus are unclear. Either F. cuniculus or F. predistentus could be the ancestor of F. obtusus.

Furcatolithus obtusus (Bukry, 1971a) n. comb.  
Pl. 4, figs 7–12

1971a Sphenolithus obtusus Bukry: p. 321, pl. 6, figs 1–9.  

Basionym: Sphenolithus obtusus Bukry, 1971a, p. 321, pl. 6, figs 1–9. Bukry, D. 1971a. Cenozoic Calcareous Nannofossils from the Pacific Ocean. Transactions of the San Diego Society of Natural History, 16(14): 303–327. Diagnosis: A large furcatolith with a bifid spine, and a proximal element cycle that is ~25% of the total height. The angle between the median axis and the top of the proximal element cycle is ~50–60°. The base of the proximal element cycle is concave. Thin distal extensions of the bifid spine may or may not be present, and if present, can vary greatly in length. Remarks: The precise relationships between the earliest forms of Furcatolithus are unclear. Either F. cuniculus or F. predistentus could be the ancestor of F. obtusus.

Furcatolithus celsus (Haq, 1971) n. comb.  
1971 Sphenolithus celsus Haq: p. 121, pl. 1, figs 1–5; pl. 5, fig. 4.  

Basionym: Sphenolithus celsus Haq, 1971, p. 121, pl. 1, figs 1–5; pl. 5, fig. 4. Haq, B.U. 1971. Paleogene calcareous nannoflora. Parts I–IV. Stockholm Contributions in Geology, 25: 1–158. Diagnosis: A very large furcatolith with a bifid spine and a very low proximal element cycle that is ~10% of the total height. The total height is >9 µm. The bifid spine narrows to become thin and parallel-sided at about one-third of the total height of the spine. The angle between the median axis and the top of the proximal element cycle is ~80–90°. The base of the proximal element cycle is concave. Thin distal extensions of the bifid spine may or may not be present, and if present, can vary greatly in length. Remarks: The proximal element cycle and the
lower part of the bifid spine are very similar to those of *F. predistentus*, but the upper part of the bifid spine, where it narrows to become parallel-sided (clearly visible in the holotype specimen in Haq, 1971, pl. 5, fig. 4), is different, and provides a criterion for separating the two species.

**Furcatolithus intercalaris** (Martini, 1976) n. comb.
Pl. 4, figs 13, 14

1976 *Sphenolithus intercalaris* Martini: p. 395, pl. 6, fig. 9; pl. 13, figs 25, 26.

**Basionym:** *Sphenolithus intercalaris* Martini, 1976, p. 395, pl. 6, fig. 9; pl. 13, figs 25, 26. Martini, E. 1976. Cretaceous to Recent calcareous nannoplankton from the Central Pacific Ocean (DSDP Leg 33). *Initial Reports of the Deep Sea Drilling Project, 33*: 383–423. **Diagnosis:** A medium-sized furcatolith with a bifid spine and a proximal element cycle that is less than 5% of the total height. The proximal cycle is often missing. The angle between the median axis and the top of the proximal cycle is ~90°. The lateral profile of the bifid spine is outwardly convex. Thin distal extensions of the bifid spine may or may not be present, and if present, can vary greatly in length. **Remarks:** The holotype of *S. intercalaris* Martini, 1976 is an isolated bifid spine with the proximal cycle missing (much like the holotype of *F. distentus* Martini, 1965), which is interpreted here as being a broken specimen. The LM photograph by Fioroni et al. (2015, pl. 2, fig. 16) of *F. intercalaris* clearly shows very small proximal cycle elements below the bifid spine. This species seems to be very closely related to *S. predistentus*, as both species share a very low proximal element cycle with small elements, but clearly differs in the lateral profile of the bifid spine, which is strongly convex in *S. intercalaris*, and sub-linear in *S. predistentus*.

**Furcatolithus akropodus** (de Kaenel & Villa, 1996) n. comb.
Pl. 4, figs 15, 16

1990 *Sphenolithus* sp. 1 Fornaciari & Rio in Fornaciari et al.: p. 238, pl. 2, figs 1–3.
1996 *Sphenolithus akropodus* de Kaenel & Villa: p. 127, pl. 11, figs 1, 2, 4–11.

**Basionym:** *Sphenolithus obtusus* de Kaenel & Villa, 1996, p. 127, pl. 11, figs 1, 2, 4–11. de Kaenel, E. & Villa, G. 1996. Oligocene-Miocene calcareous nannofossil biostratigraphy and paleoecology from the Iberia Abyssal Plain. *Proceedings of the Ocean Drilling Program, Scientific Results, 149*: 79–145. **Diagnosis:** A large to very large furcatolith with a tall bifid spine and a proximal element cycle that is ~15% of the total height. The angle between the median axis and the top of the proximal element cycle is >70°. The base of the proximal element cycle is concave. The tops of the elements in the proximal cycle can extend slightly beyond the base of the bifid spine. Thin distal extensions of the bifid spine may or may not be present, and if present, can vary greatly in length. **Remarks:** The tall, linear-sided bifid spine of this species is diagnostic. The likely ancestor is *F. predistentus* or *F. celsus*.

**Furcatolithus tribulosus** (Roth, 1970) n. comb.
Pl. 4, figs 17, 18

1970 *Sphenolithus tribulosus* Roth: p. 870, pl. 14, figs 5, 7, 8.

**Basionym:** *Sphenolithus tribulosus* Roth, 1970, p. 870, pl. 14, figs 5, 7, 8. Roth P.H. 1970. Oligocene calcareous nannoplankton biostratigraphy. *Eclogae Geologicae Helvetiae, 63*(3): 799–881. **Diagnosis:** A large furcatolith with a bifid spine and a very low proximal element cycle that is <15% of the total height. The angle between the median axis and the top of the proximal element cycle is >80°. The base of the proximal element cycle is concave. Thin distal extensions of the bifid spine may or may not be present, and if present, can vary greatly in length. The base of the bifid spine is wider than in similar species (e.g. *S. predis-
such that the lateral profile of the spine is concave. The bifid spine bears small serrate ridges, which are not often visible under the L.M. Remarks: This species was very well illustrated by Bown & Dunkley Jones (2006, pl. 8, figs 1–5). It seems to be closely related to both S. intercalaris and S. predistentus, but differs from them in the concave lateral profile of the bifid spine.

**Furcatolithus peartiae** (Bown & Dunkley Jones, 2012 emend. Bergen & de Kaenel in Bergen et al., 2017) n. comb.  
Pl. 4, figs 19, 20

2012 *Sphenolithus peartiae* Bown & Dunkley Jones: p. 34, pl. 11, figs 39–44.  

**Basionym:** *Sphenolithus peartiae* Bown & Dunkley Jones, 2012, p. 34, pl. 11, figs 39–44. Bown, P.R. & Dunkley Jones, T. 2012. Calcareous nannofossils from the Paleogene equatorial Pacific (IODP Expedition 320 Sites U1331–1334). *Journal of Nannoplankton Research, 32*(2): 3–51. **Diagnosis:** A large furcatolith with a bifid spine and a proximal element cycle that is ~20–25% of the total height. The angle between the median axis and the top of the proximal element cycle is ~70°. The base of the proximal element cycle is linear at the periphery and steeply concave in the centre. Thin distal extensions of the bifid spine may or may not be present, and if present, can vary greatly in length. **Remarks:** This species has a taller proximal element cycle than any other species in the *F. predistentus* group, but, like the other members of the group, it has a high angle between the median axis and the top of the proximal cycle.

**Furcatolithus ciperoensis Group**  
Species in this group all have low (≤ 50°) median axis/base bifid spine angles. The proximal cycles are high, ~30–45% of the total height, excluding the distal bifurcations.

**Remarks:** This species is most similar to, and likely descended from, *F. akropodus*, but has a lower bifid spine.

**Furcatolithus tawfikii** (Bergen & de Kaenel in Bergen et al., 2017) n. comb.  
2017 *Sphenolithus tawfikii* Bergen & de Kaenel in Bergen et al.: p. 95, pl. 9, figs 17–20. **Basionym:** *Sphenolithus tawfikii* Bergen & de Kaenel in Bergen et al., 2017, p. 95, pl. 9, figs 17–20. Bergen, J., de Kaenel, E., Blair, S., Boesiger, T. & Browning, E. 2017. Oligocene–Pliocene taxonomy and stratigraphy of the genus *Sphenolithus* in the circum North Atlantic Basin: Gulf of Mexico and ODP Leg 154. *Journal of Nannoplankton Research, 37*(2–3): 77–112. **Diagnosis:** A large furcatolith with a bifid spine and a proximal element cycle that is ~35–40% of the total height. The angle between the median axis and the top of the proximal element cycle is ~80°. The base of the proximal element cycle is linear at the periphery and steeply concave in the centre. Thin distal extensions of the bifid spine may or may not be present, and if present, can vary greatly in length. **Remarks:** This species has a taller proximal element cycle than any other species in the *F. predistentus* group, but, like the other members of the group, it has a high angle between the median axis and the top of the proximal cycle.

**Table 2:** Species of *Furcatolithus* grouped into informal morphological groups, by approximate order of first stratigraphical appearance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>MORPHOLOGICAL CRITERION</th>
<th>RANGE</th>
<th>SPECIES</th>
<th>PROXIMAL CYCLE % OF TOTAL HEIGHT</th>
<th>BIFID SPINE HEIGHT</th>
<th>MEDIAN AXIS/TOP OF PROXIMAL CYCLE ANGLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>F. predistentus</em></td>
<td>High (&gt; 50°) median axis/base bifid spine angle</td>
<td>Middle Eocene–Late Oligocene (Lutetian–Chattian)</td>
<td><em>F. cuniculus</em></td>
<td>20–25%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>90–100°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>F. predistentus</em></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>80–90°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>F. obtusus</em></td>
<td>20–25%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>90–100°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>F. calicus</em></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>70–75°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>F. intercalaris</em></td>
<td>&lt;10%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>90°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>F. akropodus</em></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>65–70°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>F. tribulus</em></td>
<td>&lt;15%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>70–75°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>F. peartiae</em></td>
<td>20–25%</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>65–70°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>F. tawfikii</em></td>
<td>35–40%</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>90°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>F. bulbulus</em></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>45–50°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>F. distensus</em></td>
<td>30–35%</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>45°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>F. ciperoensis</em></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>40°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>F. patirundus</em></td>
<td>40–45%</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>30°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>F. rectus</em></td>
<td>30–35%</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>40°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F. ciperoensis</em></td>
<td>Low (≤ 50°) median axis/base bifid spine angle</td>
<td>Oligocene (Rupelian–Chattian)</td>
<td><em>F. bulbulus</em></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>45–50°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>F. distensus</em></td>
<td>30–35%</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>45°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>F. ciperoensis</em></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>40°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>F. patirundus</em></td>
<td>40–45%</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>30°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>F. rectus</em></td>
<td>30–35%</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>40°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. triangulans</strong></td>
<td>Very high proximal cycle, &gt; 90% of total height, excluding distal bifurcations</td>
<td>Early Oligocene–Early Miocene (Rupelian–Aquitanian)</td>
<td><em>F. triangulans</em></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>40–50°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>F. avis</em></td>
<td>&gt; 90%</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>F. umbrellus</em></td>
<td>&gt; 90%</td>
<td>Very low to absent</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Species in this group are discussed below in approximate order of first stratigraphic appearance: *F. bulbulus, F. distentus, F. ciperoensis, F. patifunditis* and *F. directus*. A range chart for this group is presented in Figure 11.

**Furcatolithus bulbulus** (Bergen & de Kaenel in Bergen et al., 2017) n. comb.

2017 *Sphenolithus bulbulus* Bergen & de Kaenel in Bergen et al.: p. 96, pl. 9, figs 25–30; pl. 10, figs 1–6.

_Basionym_: *Sphenolithus bulbulus* Bergen & de Kaenel in Bergen et al., 2017, p. 96, pl. 9, figs 25–30; pl. 10, figs 1–6. Bergen, J., de Kaenel, E., Blair, S., Boesiger, T. & Browning, E. 2017. Oligocene–Pliocene taxonomy and stratigraphy of the genus *Sphenolithus* in the circum North Atlantic Basin: Gulf of Mexico and ODP Leg 154. Journal of Nannoplankton Research, 37(2–3): 77–112. **Diagnosis**: A large furcatolith with a proximal element cycle that is ~35% of the total height. The angle between the median axis and the top of the proximal element cycle is ~45°. The base of the proximal element cycle is concave. The lateral periphery of the proximal cycle elements is convex. Thin distal extensions of the bifid spine may or may not be present, and if present, can vary greatly in length. **Remarks**: The indented lateral profile of the entire furcatolith, and the convex lateral periphery of the proximal cycle elements, distinguishes this species from the otherwise similar *F. ciperoensis* and *F. patifunditis*.

**Furcatolithus distentus** Martini, 1965

Pl. 4, figs 21, 22


1967 *Sphenolithus distentus* (Martini, 1965) Bramlette & Wilcoxon: pl. 1, fig. 5; pl. 2, figs 4, 5.

2017 *Sphenolithus distentus* (Martini, 1965) Bramlette & Wilcoxon – Bergen et al.: pl. 10, fig. 10.

**Diagnosis**: A large to very large furcatolith with a moderately high bifid spine, and a proximal element cycle that is ~25–30% of the total height. The angle between the median axis and the top of the proximal element cycle is approximately 45°. The base of the proximal element cycle is concave. Thin distal extensions of the bifid spine may or may not be present, and if present, can vary greatly in length. **Remarks**: See discussion for the genus.

**Furcatolithus ciperoensis** (Bramlette & Wilcoxon, 1967) n. comb.

Pl. 4, figs 23, 24

1967 *Sphenolithus ciperoensis* Bramlette & Wilcoxon: p. 120, pl. 2, figs 15–20.


_Basionym_: *Sphenolithus ciperoensis* Bramlette & Wilcoxon, 1967, p. 120, pl. 2, figs 15–20. Bramlette, M.N. & Wilcoxon, J.A. 1967. Middle Tertiary calcareous nannoplankton of the Cipero section, Trinidad, W. I. Tulane Studies in Geology, 5(3): 93–131. **Diagnosis**: A large furcatolith with a proximal element cycle that is ~40% of the total height and a moderately high bifid spine. The angle between the median axis and the top of the proximal element cycle is approximately 35–40°. The base of the proximal element cycle is concave. The lateral periphery is linear. Thin distal extensions of the bifid spine may or may not be present, and if present, can vary greatly in length. **Remarks**: This species is the most common furcatolith in Upper Oligocene assemblages. *Furcatolithus bulbulus, F. patifunditis* and *F. directus* are all similar to *F. ciperoensis*, and all have comparable ranges.

**Furcatolithus patifunditus** (Bergen & de Kaenel in Bergen et al., 2017) n. comb.

2017 *Sphenolithus patifunditus* Bergen & de Kaenel in Bergen et al.: p. 95, pl. 9, figs 9–16.

_Basionym_: *Sphenolithus patifunditus* Bergen & de Kaenel in Bergen et al., 2017, p. 95, pl. 9, figs 9–16. Bergen, J., de Kaenel, E., Blair, S., Boesiger, T. & Browning, E. 2017. Oligocene–Pliocene taxonomy and stratigraphy of the genus *Sphenolithus* in the circum North Atlantic Basin: Gulf of Mexico and ODP Leg 154. Journal of Nannoplankton Research, 37(2–3): 77–112. **Diagnosis**: A medium-sized furcatolith with a proximal element cycle that is ~40–45% of the total height, and a medium-height bifid spine. The angle between the median axis and the top of the proximal element cycle is approximately 30°. The base of the proximal...
Figure 11: Range chart for the *Furcatolithus predistentus*, *F. ciperoensis* and *F. triangularis* groups. Ranges based on Bergen et al. (2017), Bown & Dunkley-Jones (2012) and Aubry (2014). All measurements are based on the author’s measurements of the holotype or paratype images. All sketches have been traced from holotype or paratype LM or SEM images.

- *Furcatolithus predistentus Group*
  - Low proximal cycle (<35% total height)
  - High median axis/base bifid spine angle (>85°)

- *Furcatolithus ciperoensis Group*
  - High proximal cycle (>35% total height)
  - Low median axis/base bifid spine angle (<50°)

- *Furcatolithus triangularis Group*
  - Very high proximal cycle (>60% total height)
Furcatolithus directus (Bergen & de Kaenel in Bergen et al., 2017) n. comb.

2017 Sphenolithus directus Bergen & de Kaenel in Bergen et al.: pl. 9, figs 21–24.

Basionym: Sphenolithus directus Bergen & de Kaenel in Bergen et al., 2017, p. 96, pl. 9, figs 21–24. Bergen, J., de Kaenel, E., Blair, S., Boesiger, T. & Browning, E. 2017. Oligocene–Pliocene taxonomy and stratigraphy of the genus Sphenolithus in the circum North Atlantic Basin: Gulf of Mexico and ODP Leg 154. Journal of Nannoplankton Research, 37(2–3): 77–112. Diagnosis: A medium-sized furcatolith with a proximal element cycle that is ~35% of the total height, and a medium-height bifid spine. The angle between the median axis and the top of the proximal element cycle is 30–35°. Thin distal extensions of the bifid spine may or may not be present, and if present, can vary greatly in length. The lateral periphery is slightly concave. The proximal element cycle is less flared than similar species. Remarks: The main difference between this species and F. ciperoensis is that the proximal element cycle is less flared.

Furcatolithus triangularis Group

Species in this group all have very high proximal cycles, >60% of the total height, excluding the distal bifurcations. Species in this group are discussed below in approximate order of first stratigraphic appearance: F. triangularis, F. avis and F. umbrellus. A range chart for this group is presented in Figure 11.

Furcatolithus triangularis (Bergen & de Kaenel in Bergen et al., 2017) n. comb.

Pl. 4, figs 25, 26


Basionym: Sphenolithus triangularis Bergen & de Kaenel in Bergen et al., 2017, p. 97, pl. 10, figs 15–24. Bergen, J., de Kaenel, E., Blair, S., Boesiger, T. & Browning, E. 2017. Oligocene–Pliocene taxonomy and stratigraphy of the genus Sphenolithus in the circum North Atlantic Basin: Gulf of Mexico and ODP Leg 154. Journal of Nannoplankton Research, 37(2–3): 77–112. Diagnosis: A small furcatolith with a low bifid spine, and a proximal element cycle that is ~60% of the total height. The angle between the median axis and the top of the proximal element cycle is approximately 45°. The base of the proximal element cycle is strongly concave. Thin distal extensions of the bifid spine may or may not be present, and if present, can vary greatly in length. The total height and the basal width of the proximal cycle are approximately equal, such that the peripheral outline approximates an equilateral triangle. Remarks: This small species was probably overlooked in many earlier studies, where it may have been considered a small, low form of S. ciperoensis.

Furcatolithus avis (Aljahdali et al., 2015) n. comb.

Pl. 4, figs 27, 28


Basionym: Sphenolithus avis Aljahdali et al., 2015, p. 193, pl. 1, figs 1a–d, 2a–d, 3a–d, 4a–f, 5a, b. Aljahdali, M., Wise, S.W. Jr., Bergen, J. & Pospichal, J.J. 2015. A new biostratigraphically significant Late Oligocene Sphenolithus species from the equatorial region. Micropaleontology, 61(3): 193–197. Diagnosis: A small to medium-sized furcatolith with a very low bifid spine, and a proximal element cycle that is ~70% of the total height. The elements of the proximal cycle are curved in lateral view, such that the base of the proximal cycle is strongly concave. The angle between the median axis and the top of the proximal element cycle is approximately 40°. Thin distal extensions of the bifid spine may or may not be present, and if present, can vary greatly in length. The total height and basal width...
Plate 1

1, 2: *Diantholitha*; 3–18: *S. primus* Group; 19, 20: *S. anarrhopus* Group; 21–26: *S. radians* Group; 27–30: *S. kempii* Group
Plate 2

1–10: *S. kempii* Group; 11–28: *S. dissimilis* Group; 29, 30: *S. conicus* Group

Ultrastructure and taxonomy of the Sphenolithaceae
1–12: *S. conicus* Group; 13–28: *S. delphix* Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plate 3</th>
<th><img src="image" alt="Image" /></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ODP154-926B-33-5, 140-141cm, NN3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODP154-926B-33-5, 140-141cm, NN3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODP154-926B-33-5, 140-141cm, NN3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODP154-926B-33-5, 140-141cm, NN3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. conicus Group; 13–28: <em>S. delphix</em> Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODP154-925A-9-7, 55-56cm, NN4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODP154-929A-35-3, 125-126cm, NP26</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODP154-929A-35-3, 125-126cm, NP26</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undisclosed well, Gulf of Mexico, NN4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. macrocanthos</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. pseudoheremorphus</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. heteromorphus</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. preasii</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. calyculus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. macrocanthos</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. pseudoheremorphus</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. heteromorphus</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. preasii</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. calyculus</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODP154-926B-33-5, 140-141cm, NN3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODP154-926B-33-5, 140-141cm, NN3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODP154-926B-51-1, 105-106cm, NP26</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. milanettii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. bipedis</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. spinula</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. microdelphix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. delphix</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODP154-926B-51-1, 105-106cm, NP26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODP154-926B-51-1, 105-106cm, NP26</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf of Mexico Core 46B-2, 12.5-15.0, NN3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODP154-926B-52-2, 85-86cm, NP26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. delphix</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. tintinnabulum</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. belemnos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ultrastructure and taxonomy of the Sphenolithaceae

Plate 4
Remarks: This species is clearly intermediate between *F. triangularis* and *F. umbrellus*, having the small bifid spine of *F. triangularis*, and a high proximal cycle with curved elements, similar to that of *F. umbrellus*.

*Furcatolithus umbrellus* (Bukry, 1971b) n. comb.
Pl. 4, figs 29, 30

1986 *Sphenolithus umbrellus* (Bukry, 1971b) Aubry & Knüttel in Knüttel: p. 279, pl. 5, figs 1, 2, 5–10.

Basionym: *Catinaster? umbrellus* Bukry, 1971b, p. 50, pl. 3, figs 10–13. Bukry, D. 1971b. *Discoaster* evolutionary trends. *Micropaleontology*, 17(1): 43–52. Diagnosis: A large to very large furcatolith with a greatly reduced vestigial bifid spine, or no bifid spine. The proximal element cycle is >95% of the total height. The proximal cycle elements are curved, so that the base of the proximal element cycle is strongly concave. Remarks: This species is the last representative of the genus before its extinction in the Early Miocene. The SEM photographs of Knüttel (1986, pl. 5, figs 1, 2) show some specimens of *F. umbrellus* with tiny elements just above the top of the proximal cycle, which may be the vestigial elements of a bifid spine.

5. Conclusions
From their origin at ~62 Ma, the Sphenolithaceae flourished alongside other heterococcolith groups before becoming extinct at ~3.5 Ma, providing an ~59.5 Myr record of their evolution. Their ultrastructure has been shown here to be relatively simple, the major components being shared by most species, and with variability between species mostly accommodated by varying proportions of these major components. Characterisation of the proximal element cycle, the lower and upper lateral element cycles and the apical structure is necessary to reliably identify *Sphenolithus* species, while characterisation of the proximal element cycle and bifid spine is necessary to recognise *Furcatolithus* species. The upward growth of the upper lateral element cycle and its transition into a bifid spine, as well as recognition that the lower lateral element cycle is absent in some species, has been shown to be key to understanding the evolution of *Furcatolithus* from *Sphenolithus*. When examining species with a bifid spine under cross-polarised light, particular attention must be paid to the orientation of the median suture of the spine relative to the microscope slide because the birefringence of the spine changes greatly between orientations where the median suture is parallel or orthogonal to the slide.
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