TREATISE ONLINE

Number 20

Part E, Revised, Volume 4, Chapter 2A:

Introduction to the Fossil Hypercalcified Chaetetid-Type Porifera (Demospongiae)

Ronald R. West

2011

KU PALEONTOLOGICAL INSTITUTE
The University of Kansas

Lawrence, Kansas, USA
ISSN 2153-4012 (online)
paleo.ku.edu/treatiseonline

PART E, REVISED, VOLUME 4, CHAPTER 2A: INTRODUCTION TO THE FOSSIL HYPERCALCIFIED CHAETETID-TYPE PORIFERA (DEMOSPONGIAE)

RONALD R. WEST

[1014 Houston Street, Manhattan, Kansas, USA, e-mail: rrwest@ksu.edu]

In this introduction to chaetetid hypercalcified demosponges, it is pertinent to review briefly the history of relevant extant and fossil species, and key features used to recognize the fossil representatives.

DÖDERLEIN (1892, 1897) described *Petrostroma schulzei*, an extant sponge from Japan with a massive calcareous skeleton composed in part of fused spicules. This appears to be the first report of a living sponge with a hypercalcified basal skeleton. LISTER (1900) described *Astrosclera willeyana;* then, in 1911, HICKSON described *Ceratopora nicholsoni* (now *Ceratoporella nicholsoni*), and KIRKPATRICK (1912) described *Merlia normani*, all three extant taxa with a calcareous skeleton. KIRKPATRICK (1912) noted that *Merlia normani*, was allied to the Paleozoic fossil "*Monticulipora*." At that time, *Monticulipora* was considered to be a bryozoan by GRABAU and SHIMER (1909, p. 127) and ZITTEL (1913, p. 331). Earlier, NICHOLSON (1874, p. 500) stated that *Chaetetes* and *Monticulipora* were identical and considered *Monticulipora* to be a tabulate coral (NICHOLSON, 1879, p. 201). Still earlier, DUNCAN (1872) regarded *Chaetetes*, along with *Monticulipora* and other genera, as alcyonarians. This is important because (1) the skeleton of *Merlia* is similar to *Chaetetes;* and (2) NICHOLSON (1879, p. 201) included *Chaetetes* with *Monticulipora* as a tabulate coral. Although *Chaetetes* was not included in GRABAU and SHIMER (1909), it was grouped with tabulate corals by ZITTEL (1913, p. 117). Though most workers (e.g., HILL, 1981) accepted *Chaetetes* as a tabulate coral, others still considered it to be a bryozoan (PETERHANS, 1929).

In addition to extant species, fossil species of *Astrosclera* are known from the Triassic, and REITNER (1992), WÖRHEIDE (1998), and REITNER and others (2001) considered the calcareous skeleton as being similar to that of fossil stromatoporoids. The calcareous skeleton of both *Merlia* and *Ceratoporella* is similar to that in fossil chaetetids (HARTMAN & GOREAU, 1972; VACELET, 1990; REITNER, 1992) but the microstructure of these two extant taxa is different (CUIF & GAUTRET, 1993). However, there is a similarity in the microstructure of *Merlia normani* and the fossils *Chaetetes cylindricus* (FISCHER VON WALDHEIM, 1837) and *Blastochaetetes bathonicus* (CUIF & GAUTRET, 1993). The different microstructure in extant *Ceratoporella* and *Astrosclera* is reported in fossil chaetetids from the Permian and Mesozoic (WENDT, 1984; GAUTRET & RAZGALLAH, 1987; CUIF & GAUTRET, 1991, 1993).

Although KIRKPATRICK (1912) suggested that chaetetids and other taxa, including stromatoporoids, were siliceous sponges with a supplementary calcareous skeleton, it was not until after HARTMAN and GOREAU (1966, 1970, 1972, 1975, 1976) rediscovered living sponges with a calcareous skeleton in reefal environments of the Caribbean and Indo-Pacific regions during the late 1960s and early 1970s that there was some acceptance of this view. CUIF and others (1973) described astrorhizae from Mesozoic (Triassic of Turkey and Cretaceous of Spain) chaetetids. GRAY (1980)

West, R. R. 2011. Part E, Revised, Volume 4, Chapter 2A: Introduction to the fossil hypercalcified chaetetid-type Porifera (Demospongiae). Treatise Online 20:1–79, 52 fig.



FIG. 1. Rigid aspicular skeletons in chaetetid sponges; *1,* SEM of a longitudinal fracture of *Merlia lipoclavidisca*, an extant form, from La Catedral cave at a water depth of 12 m, Balearic Islands, Mediterranean Sea, ×70 (adapted from Vacelet & Uriz, 1991, p. 172, fig. 2a, with kind permission of Springer Science+Business Media); *2,* SEM of a longitudinal fracture of *Acanthochaetetes wellsi,* an extant form, locality not given, probably a cave at Anae *(Continued on facing page.)*

documented spicule pseudomorphs in Carboniferous chaetetids from the United Kingdom, and WEST and CLARK (1983, 1984) illustrated astrorhizae in Pennsylvanian (upper Carboniferous) chaetetids from Kansas. NEWELL (1935) reported the Paleozoic stromatoporoid *Parallelopora* with spicules from the same succession, and GALLOWAY (1957, p. 450) recognized it as a sponge, thus excluding it from this stromatoporoid genus, as did FLÜGEL and FLÜGEL-KAHLER (1968, p. 270), who recognized the presence of spicules. A reexamination of NEWELL's (1935) specimens confirmed their occurrence (WOOD, REITNER, & WEST, 1989).

Other extant sponges with a calcareous skeleton were recognized, and of particular importance was the description of an extant species of the Mesozoic genus of *Acanthochaetetes* as *A. wellsi* by HARTMAN and GOREAU (1975) from cryptic reefal habitats in the Pacific. There are now at least three extant sponge taxa with a calcareous skeleton that resemble the fossil chaetetids. Also, comparing the extant *Ceratoporella nicholsoni* with the calcareous skeleton of fossil chaetetids led HARTMAN and GOREAU (1972) to place the chaetetids in the phylum Porifera and suggested to them that ceratoporellids, with a range back into the Permian, were their descendants. Although a taxonomic home for fossil chaetetids was now better established, there were still problems. Sponges are differentiated taxonomically on the basis of the composition and morphology of their spicules, and spicules are virtually absent in fossil chaetetids. Additionally, the spicules in the extant genera





FIG. 2. Rigid aspicular skeletons in chaetetid sponges (continued); *1,* SEM of a longitudinal fracture of *Chaetetes radians*, probably Moscovian, upper Carboniferous, Moscow Basin, Russia, ×15 (new); *2,* longitudinal thin section of a chaetetid skeleton, Pennsylvanian, upper Carboniferous, Amoret Limestone Member, Altamont Limestone, Montgomery County, Kansas, ×14 (new).

FIG. 1. *Continued from facing page.*

Island, Guam, ×40 (adapted from Hartman & Goreau, 1975, fig. 6; courtesy of Yale Peabody Museum of Natural History); *3,* longitudinal section (SEM) of *Acanthochaetetes* sp., an extant form, collected live in October 2005 off the Komesu coast, southern Okinawa, at a water depth of 15 m, ×50 (new); *4,* longitudinal thin section of *Acanthochaetetes seunesi,* Cretaceous, Cenomanian form, locality not given, probably from the Pyrenees, magnification not given, probably ×10 (adapted from Wood, 1990, p. 230, fig. 7); *5,* SEM of a longitudinal fracture of a chaetetid skeleton, Pennsylvanian, upper Carboniferous, Amoret Limestone Member, Altamont Limestone, Montgomery County, Kansas, ×30 (new).



FIG. 3. Rigid spicular skeletons in chaetetid sponges; *1,* SEM of an oblique view of the upper surface of *Ceratoporella nicholsoni,* an extant form, locality not given, probably from the Caribbean, ×70 (adapted from Hartman & Goreau, 1972, fig. 8; courtesy of *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*); *2,* longitudinal section of *Ceratoporella nicholsoni,* an extant form (note megascleres, dark lines within skeleton), locality not given, probably from the Caribbean, magnification not given, probably ×10 (adapted from Wood, 1990, p. 228, fig. 5); *3,* SEM of an oblique fracture of *Stromatospongia micronesica*, an extant ceratoporellid sponge, showing siliceous spicules overgrown by the aragonitic skeleton, western Pacific, probably Micronesia, ×370 (adapted from Hartman & Goreau, 1976, p. 347, fig. 14).

placed those genera in different poriferan subclasses. WOOD (1990) summarized the resulting confusion and ultimate solution, namely that the chaetetid skeleton is a grade of organization with no high systematic value, and it belongs in the Tetractinomorpha and Ceractinomorpha, two of the three subclasses of the Demospongiae. Both of these subclasses extend back into the Paleozoic, and, to better understand hypercalcified demosponges with a chaetetid skeleton, it is necessary to consider,



FIG. 4. Rigid spicular skeletons in chaetetid sponges (continued); *1,* longitudinal thin section of *Calcisuberites stromatoporoides,* showing spicules incorporated into high Mg calcite skeleton, Turonian–Coniacian, Upper Cretaceous, near Oberwossen, Bavaria, ×65 (adapted from Reitner, 1992, pl. 23,*3;* courtesy of *Berliner Geowissenschaftliche Abhandlungen,* Free University, Berlin); *2,* SEM of pyritized spicules, pseudomorphs, within basal calcareous skeleton of *Meandripetra zardinii*, Carnian, Upper Triassic, San Cassiano beds near Cortina d'Ampezzo, Italy, ×700 (adapted from Dieci & others, 1977, pl. 2,*3a;* courtesy of *Bollettino della Societa Paleontologica, Italiana*); *3,* same as view *2,* but another area of *Meandripetra zardinii*, ×700 (adapted from Dieci & others, 1977, pl. 2,*3b;* courtesy of *Bollettino della Societa Paleontologica, Italiana*).

in some detail, their living descendants. However, recent studies (BORCHIELLINI & others, 2004; BOURY-ESNAULT, 2006) have shown that these two subclasses are polyphyletic and their use should be abandoned. Additionally, the form genus *Chaetetes* and the species assigned to it require further study.

EXTERNAL MORPHOLOGY

The skeleton of hypercalcified demosponges is a rigid aspicular skeleton (Fig.



FIG. 5. Basal calcareous skeleton of chaetetid sponges; *1a–c,* basic shapes of chaetetid skeletons; *a,* laminar, *b,* ragged, low domical, *c,* columnar (West & Clark, 1984, p. 339, fig. 3; courtesy of Paleontological Research Institution, Ithaca, New York); *2,* laminar (multiserial, single layer) chaetetids, Pennsylvanian, upper Carboniferous, southeastern Kansas, ×0.5 (new); *3,* domical (multiserial, multilayered) chaetetid, Pennsylvanian, upper Carboniferous, Amoret Limestone Member, Altamont Limestone, Montgomery County, Kansas, ×0.35 (new); *4,* columnar (multiserial, multilayered) chaetetid, Pennsylvanian, upper Carboniferous, Amoret Limestone Member, Altamont Limestone, Montgomery County, Kansas, ×0.65 (new); *5,* extant *Merlia normani,* a single (multiserial) layer encrusting a volcanic rock, ×0.6 (adapted from Kirkpatrick, 1911, pl. 32,*4*).

1



2



3

FIG. 6. Basal calcareous skeleton of chaetetid sponges (continued); *1,* extant *Acanthochaetetes* sp., a small domical (multiserial, multilayered) pedunculate specimen, collected live in October 2005 off the Komesu coast, southern Okinawa, at a water depth of 15 m, ×1.7 (new); *2,* extant *Ceratoporella nicholsoni*, a small domical (multiserial, multilayered) specimen from Pear Tree Bottom, Runaway Bay, Jamaica, in a tunnel at a depth of 85 feet, ×0.65 (new); *3,* a small domical, pedunculate specimen of *Atrochaetetes lagaaiji*, Triassic, Cassian Formation, northern Italy, ×3.3 (adapted from Engeser & Taylor, 1989, p. 51, fig. 8A; courtesy of the Natural History Museum, London).



FIG. 7. External features of chaetetid skeletons: astrorhizae and mamelons; *1, Acanthochaetetes wellsi,* with mamelons and astrorhizae from underwater cave, Anae Island, Guam at 7.5 to 9 m, paratype, YPM No. 9078, ×1.45 (adapted from Hartman & Goreau, 1975, fig. 1; courtesy of Yale Peabody Museum of Natural History); *2, Acanthochaetetes wellsi,* with astrorhizae on mamelon from Augulpelu Reef, Palau Island, southwestern wall of a cave at a depth of 12.2 m, ×4 (new); *3,* fossil chaetetid with eroded astrorhiza on mamelon, Pennsylvanian, upper Carboniferous, Amoret Limestone Member, Altamont Limestone, Montgomery County, Kansas, ×3 (new); *4, Ceratoporella nicholsoni,* with mamelons and astrorhizae from subreef tunnel off Runaway Bay, Jamaica, at a depth of 30 m, ×1.5 (adapted from Hartman & Goreau, 1970, p. 211, fig. 6).



FIG. 8. External features of chaetetid skeletons: astrorhizae and mamelons (continued); *1,* fossil chaetetid with astrorhizae, Pennsylvanian, upper Carboniferous, Amoret Limestone Member, Altamont Limestone, Labette County, Kansas, ×2 (new); *2, Cassianochaetetes* sp., with astrorhizae, Triassic, Cassian Formation, northern Italy, ×6.5 (adapted from Engeser & Taylor, 1989, p. 49, fig. 7C; courtesy of the Natural History Museum, London); *3, Atrochaetetes lagaaiji,* with astrorhizae, Triassic, Cassian Formation, northern Italy, ×3.3 (adapted from Engeser & Taylor, 1989, p. 51, fig. 8B; courtesy of the Natural History Museum, London); *4,* upper surface of laminar chaetetid with mamelons, Pennsylvanian, upper Carboniferous, Laberdie Limestone Member, Pawnee Limestone, Bourbon County, Kansas, ×0.5 (new).



FIG. 9. *(For explanation, see facing page).*

1–2), a rigid spicular skeleton (Fig. 3–4), or a combination of both. Morphological features of the exterior of this skeleton are the following: (1) general shape of the calcareous skeleton (Fig. 5–6); (2) surface features such as astrorhizae, mamelons, chimneys, and tubercules (Fig. 7–9); and (3) the numerous, vertically partitioned tubes, or tubules (Fig. 10–11) that compose the calcareous skeleton.

What becomes the rigid calcareous chaetetid skeleton is the result, initially, of sexual reproduction; however, the details of fertilization and larval development in extant taxa are still largely unknown (*Treatise Online,* Part E, Revised, Volume 4, Chapter 1, Vacelet, Willenz, & Hartman, 2010, Living Hypercalcified Sponges, p. 10). This sexually produced individual increases asexually (i.e., by cloning; see West & others, 2010) and the resulting clone may become differentiated into functional units, a form of modularity (Wood, Zhuravlev, & Debrenne, 1992). The degree of the structural relationship between the resulting modules may suggest interdependence expressed as low, medium, or high skeletal integration (Wood, Zhuravlev, & Debrenne, 1992, p. 133). Wood, Zhuravlev, and Debrenne (1992, p. 138, fig. 4) illustrated eight different modular-type skeletons recognized in hypercalcified sponges. Chaetetid skeletons are considered to be highly integrated and multiserial, and there are both horizontal and erect multiserial skeletons (Wood, 1999, p. 223, table 6.4). Most chaetetid skeletons are either highly integrated, multiserial, single layered (encrusting), horizontal sheets, or highly integrated, multiserial, multilayered, horizontal (massive) forms (Wood, 1999, p. 223, table 6.4). Wood, Zhuravlev, and Debrenne (1992, p. 135) described some extant hypercalcified sponges "... with multiserial massive (e.g., *Ceratoporella*), encrusting (e.g., *Merlia normani*, *Stromatopospongia vermicola*) or pedunculate, saucer-shaped morphologies (*Goreauella auriculata*)." Certainly, the skeleton of *Acanthochaetetes wellsi* should also be considered multiserial and single layered; see *Treatise Online,* Part E, Revised, Volume 4, Chapter 9B, External

Fig. 9. External features of chaetetid skeletons: tubercules and chimneys; *1,* SEM of the surface of *Merlia lipoclavidisca,* an extant form, note tubercules, from La Catedral cave at a water depth of 12 m, Balearic Islands, Mediterranean Sea, ×100 (adapted from Vacelet & Uriz, 1991, p. 172, fig. 2c, with kind permission of Springer Science+Business Media); *2,* SEM of the surface of a fossil chaetetid, note tubercules, Pennsylvanian, upper Carboniferous, Amoret Limestone Member, Altamont Limestone, Montgomery County, Kansas, ×40 (new); *3,* surface of fossil chaetetid with tubercules, Pennsylvanian, upper Carboniferous, Amoret Limestone Member, Altamont Limestone, Montgomery County, Kansas, ×15 (adapted from West & Clark, 1984, p. 341, pl. 1,*C;* courtesy of Paleontological Research Institution, Ithaca, New York); *4,* surface of fossil chaetetid with chimneys, Pennsylvanian, upper Carboniferous, Homer School Limestone Member, Holdenville Formation, Seminole County, Oklahoma, ×1 (new); *5,* longitudinal section of chimney in chaetetid, Pennsylvanian, upper Carboniferous, Homer School Limestone Member, Holdenville Formation, Seminole County, Oklahoma, ×1.3 (new).



FIG. 10. *(For explanation, see facing page).*

Morphology of the Paleozoic Stromatoporoidea: Shapes and Growth Habits, for a discussion of an appropriate use of encrust and encrusting. Less common are highly integrated, multiserial, erect chaetetid skeletons (Wood, 1999, p. 223, table 6.4).

The shape, or gross morphology, of chaetetids is like that of other hypercalcified demosponges, namely: nodular, branching, columnar, laminar, or domical, and may be referred to as the growth form. The relationship between growth morphology and growth form is given in the Glossary (see *Treatise Online,* Part E, Revised, Volume 4, Chapter 8, Glossary, Webby, 2010). As pointed out by West and Kershaw (1991), there are essentially three basic growth forms in chaetetids: laminar, domical, and columnar. These are synonymous, respectively, with what Stanton, Connolly, and Lambert (1994) termed tabular, hemispherical, and columnar. In terms of skeletal integration, a multiserial, encrusting growth would produce a laminar form, and the other two growth forms would be the result of a multiserial, massive growth. Domical, multiserial massive skeletons would be roughly equidimensional, and in columnar skeletons, the height would exceed the width. The basic building block of most chaetetids is a thin laminar sheet, and thus one might consider that there is a single growth form: laminar (Fig. 5–6; Fig. 12). As shown in Figure 12, laminar growth can result in domical and columnar masses, as well as in forms with more complex geometries. Such complex geometries are probably the result of environmental perturbations and



Fig. 11. Internal features of chaetetid skeletons: walls and tubules (continued); *1,* surface expression of tubules in a fossil chaetetid, Pennsylvanian, upper Carboniferous, Higginsville Limestone Member, Fort Scott Limestone, Bourbon County, Kansas, ×5 (adapted from Brosius, 2006, p. 42, fig. 58B; courtesy of Kansas Geological Survey, Lawrence); *2,* longitudinal thin section of tubules in *Atrochaetetes alakirensis*, Carnian, Upper Triassic, southwestern Turkey, ×20 (adapted from Cremer, 1995, pl. 25,*2;* courtesy of *Geobios,* Université Lyon).

Fig. 10. Internal features of chaetetid skeletons: walls and tubules; *1,* longitudinal section (SEM) of tubules in *Acanthochaetetes wellsi,* Guam, western Pacific, ×13 (adapted from Reitner, 1991, p. 196, fig. 11a, with kind permission of Springer Science+Business Media); *2,* longitudinal section of tubules in *Merlia normani,* ×130 (adapted from Kirkpatrick, 1911, pl. 35,*17*); *3,* transverse section of tubules in *Merlia normani,* ×130 (adapted from Kirkpatrick, 1911, pl. 35,*16*); *4,* longitudinal thin section of tubules in a fossil chaetetid, Pennsylvanian, upper Carboniferous, Amoret Limestone Member, Altamont Limestone, Montgomery County, Kansas, ×75 (adapted from West & Clark, 1984, p. 341, pl. 1,*B;* courtesy of Paleontological Research Institution, Ithaca, New York); *5,* transverse thin section of tubules in a fossil chaetetid, Pennsylvanian, upper Carboniferous, Amoret Limestone Member, Altamont Limestone, Montgomery County, Kansas, ×70 (adapted from West & Clark, 1984, p. 341, pl. 1*A;* courtesy of Paleontological Research Institution, Ithaca, New York); *6,* longitudinal thin section of tubules in a fossil chaetetid, Pennsylvanian, upper Carboniferous, Akiyoshi Limestone, Akiyoshi-dai, Japan, ×12 (new).



FIG. 12. Possible environmental controls on growth of the chaetetid skeleton, with the basic building block being a laminar accretionary unit; *1,* laminar accretionary unit; *2,* growth on a soft substrate; *3,* turbulence during growth; *4,* periodic sedimentation during growth; *5,* inferred growth to sea level; *6,* no sedimentation during growth; *7–9,* different inferred results of growth in areas of very slow, continuous sedimentation (adapted from Kershaw & West, 1991, p. 342, fig. 7).

may be referred to as digitate, branching, anastomosing, or other terms, but essentially they are the result of one or more of the three basic growth forms (Fig. 13–17). Although the calcareous skeleton of chaetetids is composed of tubules, the resulting shapes and growth habits are similar to that observed in stromatoporoids. WEBBY and KERSHAW (see *Treatise Online,* Part E, Revised, Volume 4, Chapter 9B) discuss in detail the external morphology of Paleozoic stromatoporoids in terms of their shapes and growth habits. In large part, this discussion also applies to chaetetids. STANTON, CONNOLLY, and LAMBERT (1994, fig. 1) illustrated what they considered axial growth and suggested that it might be taxonomically important. Specimens that appear to demonstrate axial growth are often poorly preserved, either partially or completely silicified (STANTON, CONNOLLY, & LAMBERT, 1994), or completely recrystallized. Such diagenetic changes, and others, significantly alter skeletal features. Axial growth in chaetetids may occur, but further study is needed for it to be clearly demonstrated and its possible taxonomic value assessed.

The ancestral part, i.e., initiation, of the calcareous skeleton of extant and fossil chaetetid skeletons is unknown. Thus, it can only be inferred that the entire basal area of any particular chaetetid growth form began at the same time from a thin layer or sheet of soft tissue. Although upward growth of all the tubules from the base appears to be simultaneous, there are differences. Based on studies of thin sections, polished surfaces, and acetate peels, KERSHAW and WEST (1991) reported five different styles of initial growth of the



Fig. 13. Laminar chaetetid growth forms, Pennsylvanian, upper Carboniferous; *1,* laminar growth of a chaetetid skeleton on an irregular substrate, Amoret Limestone Member, Altamont Limestone, Montgomery County, Kansas, ×0.85 (new); *2,* laminar growth of a chaetetid skeleton on an oncoid, Amoret Limestone Member, Altamont Limestone, Montgomery County, Kansas, ×0.85 (new); *3,* laminar growth of a chaetetid skeleton on an irregular surface that resulted in a bimodal, low domical form, Amoret Limestone Member, Altamont Limestone, Montgomery County, Kansas, ×0.5 (new); *4,* laminar to ragged domical chaetetids in a carbonate mudstone, Blackjack Creek Limestone Member, Fort Scott Limestone, Crawford County, Kansas, ×0.1 (new); *5,* closely stacked laminar chaetetid skeletons in an argillaceous carbonate mudstone, Myrick Station Limestone Member, Pawnee Limestone, Bourbon County, Kansas, ×0.45 (adapted from Miller & West, 1996, p. 293, fig. 4A); *6,* bowl-shaped laminar chaetetid skeletons surrounded by argillaceous carbonate mudstone, Myrick Station Limestone Member, Pawnee Limestone, Bourbon County, Kansas, ×0.35 (adapted from Miller & West, 1996, p. 293, fig. 4B).



FIG. 14. Domical chaetetid growth forms, Pennsylvanian, upper Carboniferous; *1,* low domical chaetetid produced by laminar chaetetid encrusting an oncoid that formed around a productid brachiopod valve, Amoret Limestone Member, Altamont Limestone, Montgomery County, Kansas, ×0.55 (new); *2,* upper surface of domical chaetetids, Higginsville Limestone Member, Fort Scott limestone, Crawford County, Kansas, ×0.075 (new); *3,* laminar to ragged, high domical chaetetids, Amoret Limestone Member, Altamont Limestone, Labette County, Kansas, ×0.075 (new); *4,* modified interpretive sketch of area shown in view *3,* ×0.09 (new).



FIG. 15. Domical chaetetid growth forms (continued), Pennsylvanian, upper Carboniferous; *1,* high domical, ragged chaetetid, Amoret Limestone Member, Altamont Limestone, Labette County, Kansas, ×0.2 (new); *2,* ragged, domical chaetetid in a fusulinid packstone, Higginsville Limestone Member, Fort Scott Limestone, Crawford County, Kansas, ×0.45 (new); *3,* low and high domical chaetetids, Amoret Limestone Member, Altamont Limestone, Montgomery County, Kansas, ×0.06 (new).



FIG. 16. Columnar chaetetid growth forms, Pennsylvanian, upper Carboniferous, Amoret Limestone Member, Altamont Limestone, Labette County, Kansas; *1,* smooth columnar chaetetid, ×0.25 (adapted from Miller & West, 1996, p. 293, fig. 4E); *2,* mass of columnar chaetetids, ×0.06 (new); *3,* smooth to slightly ragged columnar chaetetids, ×0.1 (new); *4,* smooth columnar chaetetid, ×0.045 (new).



FIG. 17. Columnar chaetetid growth forms (continued), Pennsylvanian, upper Carboniferous; *1,* largely silicified ragged columnar chaetetid, Horquilla Limestone, Whetstone Mountains, Arizona, ×0.1 (new); *2,* largely silicified smooth columnar chaetetid, Horquilla Limestone, Whetstone Mountains, Arizona, ×0.05 (new); *3,* largely silicified high domical to columnar chaetetids in an inferred so-called biostrome, Middle Magdalena Group, Hueco Mountains, Texas, ×0.16 (new); *4,* largely silicified vase-shaped chaetetid associated with an inferred biostrome, Middle Magdalena Group, Hueco Mountains, Texas, ×0.3 (new).

calcareous skeleton in chaetetids. These are shown in Figure 18. Some of these differences appear to be influenced by the substrate (Fig. 18.5; Fig. 19–20), but causes of the other observed differences are currently unknown (Fig. 18.1–18.4). As noted by West and Kershaw (1991, p. 446), vertical, uniform growth would produce a laminar form (Fig. 18.1), and vertical, non-uniform growth would produce a domical or columnar form (Fig. 18.2). Growth of some of the initial tubules may be oblique to the substrate and returns to a more vertical position as growth continues (Fig. 18.3). Tubule growth may also proceed from what appears to be two or more growth centers, producing an arrangement of tubules that is complex (Fig. 18.4; Fig. 21).



Fig. 18. Styles of initial growth in chaetetids; *1,* uniform tubule growth more or less normal to substrate; an uncommon style, ×3.25; *2,* greater tubule growth in the center; a common style and one that often is the template for continued growth, ×1.2; *3,* upward tubule growth is normal to oblique relative to the substrate, eventually all tubules grow, more or less, normal to the substrate; a common style, ×3; *4,* tubules spread upward and laterally from more than one center of growth, eventually compromised growth occurs at the margins of the different centers of growth; a common style, ×3; *5,* tubule growth associated with positive topographic features, tubules fan out from the positive area; a common style, ×3 (adapted from Kershaw & West, 1991, p. 336, fig. 2A).

The amount and rate of sedimentation also plays a role in the gross morphology of chaetetids. Lack of, or very slow, continuous sedimentation results in domical or columnar growth forms with a smooth outer surface (Fig. 12). Episodic sedimentation, which is often recorded as interruptions in the growth of tubules, produces chaetetids with ragged margins, as seen in Figures 22–23. These are not the only two factors that influence the growth form of chaetetids, but these are particularly important. For a fuller discussion, see Kershaw and West (1991), West and Kershaw (1991), and *Treatise Online,* Part E, Revised, Volume 4, Chapter 2E and Chapter 9B.

Surface features on chaetetids, such as astrorhizae, chimneys, mamelons, basal layer (basal layer is favored over epitheca, theca, or peritheca to avoid confusion with corals and bryozoans), and tubercules are seldom observed, probably, in part, because of postmortem abrasion, dissolution, or both. All of these, except the basal layer, occur on the upper exterior surface of chaetetids, and even when they are preserved in fossil specimens, they are often broken or muted. Unlike some fossil stromatoporoids and some extant hypercalcified sponges in which astrorhizae can be traced downward into the calcareous skeleton, astrorhizae in chaetetids are confined to the exterior surface (Fig. 13). Serial sectioning of a chaetetid specimen with surface astrorhizae revealed no evidence of these features within the calcareous skeleton. However, Cuif and others (1973, pl. 1,*2*) illustrated a longitudinal section of astrorhizae in *Blastoporella*, but this genus is not currently considered valid because neither spicules nor spicule pseudomorphs have been found.

Although present, the basal layer is rarely seen in fossil forms, but it does occur (Fig. 24) in some very small specimens and on the undersides of laminar forms that have been colonized to some extent by epibionts. Preservation of this feature occurs in specimens collected from mudrocks and has not been observed in any specimens collected from carbonates. The basal layer in fossil chaetetids appears similar to that described from extant forms, with fine concentric growth lines on both (Fig. 24.1–24.4). The basal layer in a section through a specimen of *Acanthochaetetes wellsi* is easily recognized in SEM images, because the microstructure is different from that of the rigid calcareous skeleton (Fig. 24.6). However, the basal layer is not everywhere present in extant forms, no doubt the result of abrasion, dissolution, and/or bioerosion during life. In a fossil specimen, where it could be observed in cross section, it is a very thin (about 0.1 mm or less in thickness), single layer of dark calcite, and the SEM images reveal that it is slightly different from the calcareous skeleton (Fig. 24.5). Although the difference between the basal layer and calcareous skeleton is not as clear in the fossil because of diagenesis, it can be recognized (Fig. 24.7). It is important to note that in both extant and fossil specimens, the outer layer of the skeleton, i.e., the basal layer, is rich in organics. In that a basal layer, like the periostracum in bivalves and brachiopods, functioned, in part at least, as a protection of the more calcareous skeleton (Clark, 1976), an organic-rich, outer layer is not surprising.

INTERNAL MORPHOLOGY

Irrespective of the growth form, the calcareous skeletons are composed internally of numerous thin-walled tubes that



FIG. 19. Influence of substrate irregularities on chaetetid growth, Pennsylvanian, upper Carboniferous; *1,* oncoid with a productoid brachiopod nucleus, colonized by a laminar chaetetid, followed by a microbial mat; because of this substrate irregularity, a low domical chaetetid skeleton was produced, Amoret Limestone Member, Altamont Limestone, Montgomery County, Kansas, ×0.5 (new); *2,* chaetetid colonization of two oncoids, producing a complex laminar to smooth, low domical skeleton, Amoret Limestone Member, Altamont Limestone, Montgomery County, Kansas, ×0.35 (see West & Kershaw, 1991, p. 449, fig. 2E for interpretive sketch, with kind permission of Springer Science+Business Media); *3,* smooth to slightly ragged, low, domical chaetetid as a result of a substrate irregularity produced by oncoids, skeletal debris, and matrix (carbonate mudstone), Amoret Limestone Member, Altamont Limestone, Montgomery County, Kansas, ×0.3 (new); *4,* high domical chaetetid with ragged margins that colonized and grew on an oncoid, substrate is inclined about 30° in a clockwise direction, Amoret Limestone Member, Altamont Limestone, Montgomery County, Kansas, ×0.45 (new); *5,* interpretive sketch of specimen in view *4,* with the substrate oriented horizontally, depicted by a row of slash marks on either side of large rounded oncoids displayed with a dark stippling, ×0.45 (see also West & Kershaw, 1991, p. 452, fig. 4E, with kind permission of Springer Science+Business Media); *6,* low domical chaetetid that began by colonizing a large crinoid columnal, southeastern Kansas, ×0.6 (West & Kershaw, 1991, p. 449, fig. 2D, with kind permission of Springer Science+Business Media).



FIG. 20. Influence of substrate irregularities on chaetetid growth (continued); *1,* laminar to slightly domical chaetetid produced by growth over two oncoids, one of which has a valve of the brachiopod *Neospirifera* as the nucleus, Pennsylvanian, upper Carboniferous, Amoret Limestone Member, Altamont Limestone, Montgomery County, Kansas, ×0.5 (new); *2,* laminar to slightly domical chaetetid produced by growth over a solitary rugose coral, Higginsville Limestone Member, Fort Scott Limestone, Crawford County, Kansas, ×1.9 (new; see West & Kershaw, 1991, p. 449, fig. 2A, for interpretive sketch); *3,* domical chaetetid produced by growth over an oncoid with an articulated *Neospirifera* nucleus, Pennsylvanian, upper Carboniferous, Amoret Limestone Member, Altamont Limestone, Montgomery County, Kansas, ×0.5 (new).

are polygonal (regular to irregular) to meandroid (Fig. 25–26) in transverse or tangential section. These tubes are referred to as tubules, and their walls are tightly joined or shared in common. Pores connecting tubules, referred to as mural pores in tabulate corals, have been documented in one possible chaetetid genus, *Blastoporella* (CUIF & EZZOUBAIR, 1991). Longitudinal sections of the calcareous skeleton reveal that the most conspicuous internal morphological features are the tabulae (Fig. 27–28). These are random, irregularly spaced, subhorizontal partitions within tubules that may or may not be aligned between adjacent tubules and are easily observed in polished and thin sections and acetate peels. Generally, the tabulae are thinner than the walls of the tubules, but taphonomic processes can produce thickening or thinning of both (see Fig. 49.2). Because of these taphonomic processes, all measurements, especially those used for taxonomic differentiation, i.e., tubule size, wall thickness, and spacing of tabulae, are of little value (WEST, 1994). A foramen (Fig. 29) may be present as a circular opening in the tabulae, allowing interconnection between tubular spaces immediately above and below the tabulae. In fossil taxa, the foramen is rarely observed, either because it has been sealed off during later growth or subsequently infilled by taphonomic processes. Spines that have been recognized in such extant forms as *Acanthochaetetes*, if present in fossil taxa, are usually indistinguishable from incomplete tabulae or pseudosepta.

Laminae do not appear to be related to the occurrence of tabulae, but may be associated with closely spaced tabulae. The term as used in chaetetids does not refer to the same features as laminae in stromatoporoids; rather, it is more like what are referred to as latilaminae in stromatoporoids (see *Treatise Online,* Part E, Revised, Volume 4, Chapter 8, Glossary, Webby, 2010). Laminae (Fig. 30) in chaetetids are bounded, above and below, by interruptions in the growth of the calcareous skeleton as a result of some disturbance. Thus, the thickness of the lamina will vary depending on the frequency of interruptions, and may thin and thicken laterally. Miller and West (1996) recognized five different types of growth interruption surfaces in chaetetids, all of which may define laminae in the calcareous skeleton (Fig. 31). Tubules may be continuous or discontinuous across some interruptions from one lamina to the next (Fig. 31.1–31.2). Sedimentation, biological encrustation, and/or erosion may also separate laminae (Fig. 31.3–31.6). Erosion process may be biological, physical, chemical, or a combination of all three. Several types of interruption surfaces may occur in a single skeleton, and the type of interruption surface may change across the skeleton (Fig. 31.1–31.2).

Growth of tubules upward and addition of tubules by longitudinal fission, intertubular increase, peripheral expansion, or combinations of all three increase the size of the calcareous skeleton (Fig. 32–33). Lateral growth of the calcareous skeleton occurs when new tubules are formed on the adjacent basal layer or inorganic substrate and are connected to existing tubules, i.e., peripheral expansion (Fig. 32.2). Longitudinal fission and intertubular increase occur within the existing calcareous skeleton. In the former, one pseudoseptum or more (pseudosepta) join to form a new tubule (Fig. 33.2). In intertubular growth, the latter tubule walls separate, and rapid upward growth produces a full-sized tubule (Fig. 32.3; Fig. 33.1).

Particularly conspicuous in transverse and tangential sections is the pseudoseptum (Fig. 34–35). Pseudosepta project into individual tubules from the tubule walls and begin as tiny pustules that might be interpreted as incipient spines. However, serial sections reveal that these pustules expand upward, bladelike, into the tubule as upward growth continues, producing a pseudoseptum and ultimately a new tubule, as noted above. This process of division is called longitudinal fission and, in longitudinal section, might be confused with intertubular increase (see Fig. 32.3). Pseudosepta are most reliably identified from surfaces perpendicular to the long dimension of the tubules, i.e., transverse sections of the calcareous skeleton.

Spicules, siliceous megascleres, and microscleres, are known from extant and fossil forms. However, not all extant or fossil sponges have spicules; Vacelet and Uriz (1991, p. 176) stated: "Interestingly, siliceous spicules are somewhat inconstant features in existing calcified demosponges." Most megascleres in chaetetids are tylostyles (Fig. 36–37) with or without spines, and the microscleres are some type of euaster (Fig. 38). Only megascleres are known in *Astrosclera willeyana;* they vary in abundance from high to low, and their morphology varies across different geographic regions (Wörheide, Reitner, & Gautret, 1997; Wörheide, 1998). Spicules are absent in Central Pacific populations of *Astrosclera willeyana*



FIG. 21. Tubule complexity in chaetetids; *1,* polished longitudinal section, showing the complexity of tubule interaction in a laminar chaetetid, Pennsylvanian, upper Carboniferous, Homer School Limestone Member, Holdenville Formation, Seminole County, Oklahoma, ×0.6 (new); *2,* interpretive sketch of view *1,* ×0.94 (Kershaw & West, 1991, p. 336, fig. 2B).

(Vacelet & Uriz, 1991, p. 176). Megascleres in extant forms range in length from 47 µm in some specimens of *Astrosclera* (acanthostyles; Fig. 39) to nearly 600 µm in *Willardia* (tylostyles). Microscleres in extant forms range from 5 µm in *Acanthochaetetes* (amphiasters, diplasters, and spirasters; Fig. 40.1–40.5) to 45 µm in *Merlia* (clavidiscs; Fig. 40.6).

Environmental factors can have a significant effect on spicule formation in some extant demosponges. Uriz and others (2003, p. 288), referring to the formation of siliceous spicules in sponges, stated that,



FIG. 22. Inferred development of laminar, domical, and columnar chaetetid skeletons with a ragged margin, Pennsylvanian, upper Carboniferous, Amoret Limestone Member, Altamont Limestone, Labette County, Kansas; *1,* inferred growth sequence of a ragged columnar chaetetid, based on specimens, ×0.09 (Kershaw & West, 1991, p. 338, fig. 3B); *2,* example of a ragged columnar chaetetid for comparison to view *1,* ×0.1 (new); *3,* ragged domical chaetetid illustrating multiple disturbances after initiation on an oncoid, ×0.45 (Miller & West, 1996, p. 293, fig. 4F); *4,* inferred sequence of growth events leading to the domical chaetetid shown in view *3,* ×0.19 (Miller & West, 1996, p. 297, fig. 9).

"Si uptake in sponges has been measured in laboratory experiments (Frohlich & Barthel, 1997; Reincke & Barthel, 1997; Maldonado, & others, 1999) and may vary according to Si concentration in the water, temperature, and other environmental factors that affect sponge physiology and metabolism." Experimental studies have shown that spicules are lacking in sponges grown in water low in silicic acid (Yourassowsky & Rasmont, 1983). Additionally, some extant sponges that lack one or more spicule types in one area but have a full complement of spicules in other areas, is the result, in part, of the silicon concentration in the seawater (Uriz, Turon, & Becerro, 2003, p. 187). Thus, spicule types, absent in natural populations living in waters with a low concentration of silicon, can be produced by artificially increasing the silicic acid concentration (Maldonado & others, 1999). Maldonado and others (1999) suggested that reef-building sponges during the Mesozoic were limited by the availability of silicon. In addition to silicon, experimental studies suggest that iron is necessary for the polymerization of silica to form spicules in demosponges (Müller & others, 2003; Uriz, Turon, & Becerro, 2003). Although megascleres and microscleres are expected in extant forms, environmental factors may preclude their presence. Variation in the spicules of the hypercalcified demosponge *Astrosclera willeyana,* as noted above, may be due to such environmental factors.

Spicules, both megascleres and microscleres, are much less common in fossil hypercalcified demosponges than in



Fig. 23. Inferred development of laminar, domical, and columnar chaetetid skeletons with a ragged margin (continued); *1,* inferred sequence of growth events of some cup-shaped laminar chaetetids, based on specimens, Pennsylvanian, upper Carboniferous, Myrick Station Limestone Member, Pawnee Limestone, Bourbon County, Kansas (Miller & West, 1996, p. 295, fig. 6); *2,* example of cup-shaped laminar chaetetids for comparison to view *1,* ×0.3 (adapted from Miller & West, 1996, p. 293, fig. 4B).



FIG. 24. *(For explanation, see facing page).*

extant forms. In addition to the environmental factors noted above, there may be several other explanations; two have been suggested. Most spicules are contained in the soft tissue of extant taxa and are not always incorporated into the calcareous skeleton (Kirkpatrick, 1911; Hartman & Goreau, 1975). Silica is unstable in the presence of calcium carbonate, and siliceous spicules are commonly corroded away in older parts of the calcareous skeleton of still-living taxa (Hartman & Goreau, 1970, 1972). Thus, it should not be surprising that spicules are rarely seen in fossil forms.

Given the ease with which silica spicules are corroded from the older parts of the skeleton, any evidence of spicules in fossil forms might be expected to be as pseudomorphs. Spicule pseudomorphs of calcite, pyrite, and iron oxide are known from Mesozoic chaetetids (see Gray, 1980, for summary). The first clear evidence of the poriferan affinities of Paleozoic chaetetids were the spicule pseudomorphs of calcite, pyrite, and silica described by Gray (1980) in chaetetids from the lower Carboniferous (Mississippian) of England (Fig. 36.6–36.9). Subsequently, Reitner (1991) documented spicule pseudomorphs, mostly calcite, in both Mesozoic and Paleozoic chaetetids (Fig. 37.1–37.3). Based on what he interpreted as pyrite pseudomorphs of spicules, Kaźmierczak (1984, 1989) suggested a poriferan affinity for some tabulate corals, but Oekentorp (1985) thought that these were the result of boring organisms. These features are similar to what Twitchell (1929) considered spicules in *Stromatopora,* but which Finks (1986) interpreted as pyrite-filled endolithic borings. Wood, Copper, and Reitner (1990) and Copper and Plusquellec (1993) reached similar conclusions for these features described by Kaźmierczak in tabulate corals. Kaźmierczak (1991) presented three cases of what appear to be spicule pseudomorphs in three different favositid tabulate genera. In 1994, Kaźmierczak illustrated well-ordered vertical and subhorizontal tracts of what he interpreted as calcite pseudomorphs of monaxonic sclerites in a Silurian favositid tabulate from Gotland. However, Scrutton (1997, p. 189) regarded these structures as diagenetically altered cores of the trabeculae of the corallite walls. What have been interpreted as calcite spicules have been described from Silurian tabulate corals (Chatterton & others, 2008) but support an affinity with the Octocorallia. Although the morphology of these spicules is not typical of sponges, the growth form and the external and internal morphological features of some tabulates, such as favositids, are similar to chaetetids, and perhaps there is some connection between them as suggested by the pores in the tubule walls of *Blastoporella,* a possible chaetetid genus.

Fig. 24. Basal layer in extant and fossil chaetetids; *1,* underside of extant *Acanthochaetetes wellsi,* showing concentric lines of the basal layer, Chandelier cave near Malakal, Palau, West Carolina Islands, ×1.5 (new); *2,* concentric bands of the basal layer on the underside of a fossil chaetetid, Pennsylvanian, upper Carboniferous, Higginsville Limestone Member, Fort Scott Limestone, Crawford County, Kansas, ×2 (new); *3,* closer view of part of the basal layer of extant *Acanthochaetetes wellsi* shown in view *1,* ×4 (new); *4,* closer view of part of the basal layer of the fossil chaetetid shown in view *2,* ×8 (new); *5,* SEM of the basal layer of the fossil chaetetid shown in view *2,* the thin area along the base of the tubules in the lower part of the image is the inferred basal layer, ×70 (new); *6,* SEM of the basal layer in extant *Acanthochaetetes wellsi* shown in view *1,* basal layer is the area on the left side of the image and the area below the faint light line on the right of the image, ×500 (new); *7,* SEM of part of the image shown in view *5,* the inferred basal layer is the lower layer that extends from the middle left of the image to the lower part of the right side of the image, ×300 (new).



FIG. 25. *(For explanation, see facing page).*



FIG. 26. Shape variation in chaetetid tubules (continued); *1,* transverse thin section of tubules in *Blastochaetetes dolomiticus*, Norian, Upper Triassic, southwestern Turkey, ×17 (adapted from Cremer, 1995, pl. 26,*3*; courtesy of *Geobios,* Université Lyon); *2,* transverse thin section of tubules in ?*Bauneia* sp., Norian, Upper Triassic, southwestern Turkey, ×26 (adapted from Cremer, 1995, pl. 27,*5*; courtesy of *Geobios,* Université Lyon); *3,* view of the surface, showing meandroid shape of tubules in *Meandrioptera zardinii*, Carnian, Upper Triassic, Cassiano beds near Cortina d'Ampezo, Italy, ×2.4 (adapted from Dieci & others, 1977, pl. 1,*2a;* courtesy of *Bollettino della Societa Paleontologica, Italiana*).

FIG. 25. Shape variation in chaetetid tubules; *1,* SEM of transverse view of tubules in *Chaetetes radians,* Carboniferous limestone, Miatschkovo, near Moscow, Russia, ×15 (new); *2,* transverse thin section of tubules in *Atrochaetetes alakirensis*, Norian, Upper Triassic, southwestern Turkey, ×21 (adapted from Cremer, 1995, pl. 25,*1*); *3,* SEM of transverse view of tubules in a ceratoporillid chaetetid, Permian, Tunisia, ×30 (new); *4,* transverse thin section of tubules in *Chaetetopsis favrei*, Barremian, Lower Cretaceous, Crimea, ×11.5 (adapted from Kazmierczak, 1979, p. 103, fig. 2B; courtesy of E. Schweizerbartsche Verlags, Naegele U Obermiller Science Publishers, Stuttgart, Germany); *5,* transverse thin section of tubules in *Leiospongia polymorpha,* Upper Triassic, Cassian Formation, northern Italy, ×21 (adapted from Engeser & Taylor, 1989, p. 43, fig. 2B; courtesy of the Natural History Museum, London); *6,* transverse thin section of *Chaetetes (Boswellia) mortoni,* lower Asbian, lower Carboniferous, northern Wales, ×14 (adapted from Gray, 1980, pl. 102,*3*).



Fig. 27. Walls and tabulae in fossil chaetetids; *1,* SEM of transverse to oblique fracture of a chaetetid, Permian, Tunisia, showing tubule walls and tabulae, ×20 (new); *2,* SEM of longitudinal fracture of chaetetid, Pennsylvanian, upper Carboniferous, Buckhorn Asphalt, Murray County, Oklahoma, ×15 (new); *3,* longitudinal thin section of chaetetid, upper Carboniferous, Akiyoshi Limestone, Akiyoshi-dai, Japan, ×36 (new); *4,* SEM of longitudinal fracture of a chaetetid, Moscovian, upper Carboniferous, near Podolsk, Russia, ×15 (new); *5,* longitudinal thin section of *Chaetetopsis crinata*, Upper Jurassic, Portlandian, Japan, ×15 (adapted from Fischer, 1970, pl. E,*8;* courtesy of *Annales de Paléontologie (Invertébrés),* Elsevier Masson SAS); *6,* longitudinal thin section of *Blastochaetetes capilliformis,* Oxfordian, Upper Jurassic, France, ×15 (adapted from Fischer, 1970, pl. A, fig. 8; courtesy of *Annales de Paléontologie (Invertébrés),* Elsevier Masson SAS).



FIG. 28. Walls and tabulae in fossil chaetetids (continued); *1,* longitudinal thin section of *Blastochaetetes bathonicus,* Bathonian, Middle Jurassic, France, ×15 (adapted from Fischer, 1970, pl. B,*4*); *2,* longitudinal thin section of *Ptychochaetetes globosus,* Oxfordian, Upper Jurassic, France, ×15 (adapted from Fischer, 1970, pl. D,*6;* both views courtesy of *Annales de Paléontologie (Invertébrés),* Elsevier Masson SAS).

BIOMINERALIZATION AND MICROSTRUCTURE

Skeletal components of hypercalcified sponges comprise the spicules and the calcareous skeleton. Spicules composed of silica may or may not occur, and even if they are present in extant forms, they are, as noted above, commonly lacking because of taphonomic processes. The calcareous skeleton in extant forms is composed of aragonite or high magnesium calcite (REITNER & WÖRHEIDE, 2002). Calcareous chaetetid skeletons composed of aragonite have been reported from the Mesozoic (CUIF, 1974; DIECI, RUSSO, & RUSSO, 1974; WENDT, 1974, 1984). SQUIRES (1973) reported at least 5 mol% magnesium carbonate in the walls of chaetetids preserved in the Buckhorn Asphalt, a Pennsylvanian (upper Carboniferous) unit in Oklahoma. The magnesium carbonate of extant chaetetid sponges is between 14 and 20 mol% (WENDT, 1984, p. 327). SQUIRES (1973, p. 98) suggested that the value he obtained could have been higher, in that a thin layer of dolomite rims the walls of the tubules (see his pl. 15, p. 97). Thus, some of the magnesium from the chaetetid skeleton could have been incorporated into the dolomite during diagenesis. Dolomite rims also occur in some of the Pennsylvanian (upper Carboniferous) chaetetids from Kansas (Fig. 41). In most fossil forms, these unstable mineral phases, aragonite and high magnesium calcite, have converted to low magnesium calcite. Because of this recrystallization, the original microstructure of the calcareous skeleton in fossil forms is muted or completely destroyed.

Biomineralization of the spicules and the calcareous skeleton in some extant forms has been well documented (KIRKPATRICK, 1911; VACELET & GARRONE, 1985; WILLENZ & HARTMAN, 1989, 1999; CUIF &



FIG. 29. Foramen in tabulae in extant and fossil chaetetids; *1,* SEM of a possible foramen in a tabula of an extant specimen of *Merlia normani*, Mediterranean Sea, ×350 (adapted from Gautret, Vacelet, & Cuif, 1991, pl. II,*1;* courtesy of *Publications Scientifiques du Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, Paris*); *2,* SEM of a possible foramen in a tabula of an extant specimen of *Merlia lipoclavidisca* VACELET & URIZ, 1991, La Catedral cave, at a water depth of 12 m, Balearic Islands, Mediterranean Sea, ×300 (adapted from Vacelet & Uriz, 1991, p. 172, fig. 2b, with kind permission of Springer Science+Business Media); 3, SEM of a possible foramen in a tabula of *Chaetetes radians*, Moscovian, upper Carboniferous, Moscow Basin, Russia, ×103 (new); *4,* SEM of a possible foramen in a tabula of *Chaetetes radians*, Moscovian, upper Carboniferous, near Podolsk, south of Moscow, Russia, ×60 (new).

FIG. 30. Laminae in fossil chaetetids, upper Carboniferous; *1,* interlayered chaetetid laminae with algal-microbal mats, Akiyoshi Limestone, Akiyoshi-dai, Japan, ×0.3 (new); *2,* polished longitudinal section of a ragged columnar chaetetid, showing laminae, Pennsylvanian, Amoret Limestone Member, Altamont Limestone, Montgomery County, Kansas, ×0.65 (new); *3,* differentially weathered longitudinal (vertical) surface of a ragged, high domical chaetetid, showing laminae, Pennsylvanian, Amoret Limestone Member, Altamont Limestone, Labette County, Kansas, ×0.4 (new); *4,* laminae of laminar chaetetids accentuated by weathering, Pennsylvanian, Myrick Station Limestone Member, Pawnee Limestone, Bourbon County, Kansas, ×0.25 (new); *5,* laminar to low domical chaetetids, showing individual laminae in a fusulinid grainstone, Pennsylvanian, Higginsville Limestone Member, Fort Scott Limestone, Crawford County, Kansas, ×0.16 (new).



FIG. 30. *(For explanation, see facing page).*



FIG. 31. Five types of growth interruptions observed in chaetetid skeletons, Pennsylvanian, upper Carboniferous, Higginsville Limestone Member, Fort Scott Limestone, Crawford County, Kansas; all figures are ×6; *1,* continuity of tubules across the interruption, type 1 (*arrows*) grades laterally into discontinuity of tubules across the interruption, type 2 (*arrows*); *2,* discontinuity of tubules across the interruption, type 2 (*arrow*), that grades laterally into a thin layer of matrix or matrix filled tubules, type 3 (*arrow*); note that a type 1 interruption (*upper arrow*) occurred after subsequent growth; *3,* thin layer of matrix separating chaetetid laminae, with some tubules below filled with matrix; *4,* chaetetid surface overgrown by fistuliporoid bryozoan (*b*) either coincident with or subsequent to renewed chaetetid growth (type 4 interruption); *5,* chaetetid surface covered by matrix and encrusted by the tabulate coral *Multithecopora* either coincident with or subsequent to renewed chaetetid growth (type 4 interruption); *6,* chaetetid surface locally corroded with evidence of skeletal destruction prior to renewed chaetetid growth (type 5) (adapted from Miller & West, 1996, p. 292, fig. 3A–F).

Gautret, 1991; Reitner, 1992; Gautret, Reitner, & Marin, 1996; Reitner & Gautret, 1996; Wörheide, Reitner, & Gautret, 1996, 1997; Reitner & others, 1997; Wörheide & others, 1997; Wörheide, 1998). However, because of taphonomic processes, little is known of the biomineralization of fossil forms, although it is assumed to be similar, if not identical, to that in extant taxa. Both *Merlia normani* and *Acanthochaetetes wellsi* have a calcareous skeleton similar to that seen in some fossil chaetetids. Kirkpatrick (1911) produced a very careful and detailed study of *Merlia normani*. Using modern techniques, Vacelet (1980); Gautret, Vacelet, and Cuif (1991); and Cuif and Gautret (1993) described the spicules of *Merlia normani* and compared the microstructure of its calcareous skeleton with that of fossil chaetetids. Because it bears on the occurrence of spicules, it is important to note the differences between the species of *Merlia* (Table 1). Currently four species of *Merlia* are recognized: *normani, lipoclavidisca, deficiens*, and *tenuis* (Vacelet & Uriz, 1991). *M. normani* and *M. lipoclavidisca* have a calcareous skeleton and contain spicules; *M. deficiens* and *M. tenuis* lack a calcareous skeleton but have spicules that place them within the family Merliidae. The megascleres of all four are small tylostyles. The microscleres in *M. normani*, *M. deficiens*, and *M. tenuis* are the very distinctive clavidiscs, but there are no microscleres in *M. lipoclavidisca*. Thus, all extant forms of *Merlia* have tylostyles, but may or may not have a calcareous skeleton and microscleres. Uriz and others (2003, p. 290) suggested that the absence of clavidiscs in *M. lipoclavidisca* is because of the silica-poor water where they live, and that they are present in *M. normani* because it inhabits silica-rich waters. Here again we have evidence relative to the occurrence of spicules in hypercalcified demosponges that is important to the studies of fossils with a chaetetid skeleton.

Table 1. Comparison of the skeletal components of the four species of *Merlia*.

Taxon	Megascleres	Microscleres	Calcareous skeleton
M. normani	tylostyles	clavidiscs	present
M. lipoclavidisca	tylostyles	none	present
M. deficiens	tylostyles	clavidiscs	absent
M. tenuis	tylostyles	clavidiscs	absent

Studies by Hartman and Goreau (1975); Reitner and Engeser (1987); Cuif and Gautret (1991); Reitner (1991, 1992); Wood (1991); Gautret, Reitner, and Marin (1996); Reitner and Gautret (1996); Wörheide, Reitner, and Gautret (1996, 1997); Reitner and others (1997); Lange and others (2001); and Reitner and others (2001) using more sophisticated techniques, have examined in some detail the microstructure of *Acanthochaetetes wellsi*. To provide some insight into the possible biomineralization in fossil chaetetids, a brief summary of biomineralization in *A. wellsi* and other hypercalcified demosponges follows (see also *Treatise Online,* Part E, Revised, Volume 4, Chapter 1, Vacelet, Willenz, & Hartman, 2010, Living Hypercalcified Sponges).

Spicules are formed by sclerocyte cells contained within the soft tissue (mesohyl) of the sponge. Studies of *Acanthochaetetes wellsi* show that this soft tissue is only 0.5 to 1 mm thick and contains siliceous tylostyle megascleres, amphiaster-like, and spiraster-like microscleres; some of the microscleres appear to become incorporated into the calcareous skeleton (Rützler & Vacelet, 2002, p. 277). Reitner and others (2001) divided the soft tissue and calcareous skeleton of *Acanthochaetetes wellsi* into six major zones.



FIG. 32. Skeletal increase in chaetetids; *1,* schematic diagram of chaetetid on a stippled substrate illustrating the methods of skeletal increase and associated morphological features: *a* = area of peripheral expansion; *b* = tubule; *c* = tubule increase by intertubule budding; *d* = pseudosepta and tubule increase by longitudinal fission; *e* = tabulae (adapted from West & Clark, 1983, p. 131, fig. 1; courtesy of Paleontological Research Institution, Ithaca, New York); *2,* peripheral expansion of the skeleton in an extant specimen of *Merlia normani, a* = area of peripheral expansion, ×75 (adapted from Kirkpatrick, 1911, pl. 38,*5*); *3,* SEM of longitudinal fracture of *Chaetetes radians,* showing intertubular budding (*white X*), Moscovian, upper Carboniferous, near Podolsk, Russia, ×5 (new).



FIG. 33. Skeletal increase in chaetetids (continued); *1,* longitudinal thin section, showing skeleton increase by intertubular budding (*black X*), Carboniferous, Akiyoshi Limestone, Akiyoshi-dai, Japan, ×10 (new); *2,* SEM of transverse fracture of *Chaetetes radians*, Moscovian, upper Carboniferous, near Podolsk, Russia, note the joined pseudosepta just above the *white X,* ×30 (new).

These are, from the exterior inward: (1) the dermal area; (2) the internal dermal area; (3) the central part of tubules; (4) the tabulae within the tubules; (5) the space(s) between tabulae; and (6) the nonliving calcareous skeleton. REITNER and others (2001, p. 230), in referring to zone 1, reported that, "The uppermost portion is formed by a thick crust of spiraster microscleres (dermal area, zone 1) and tylostyle megascleres arranged in clearly plumose bundles…"

Some spicules may be entrapped in the calcareous skeleton, resulting in what would be termed a rigid aspicular skeleton (Fig. 1–2). If the spaces within a framework produced by fused or linked spicules are filled by aspicular cement, the skeleton would be referred to as a rigid spicular skeleton (Fig. 3–4). Such a distinction is rarely possible in fossil forms because of taphonomic processes.

WENDT (1984) recognized three different microstructures in the calcareous skeletons of chaetetids: irregular, spherulitic, and clinogonal. Present usage recognizes three basic types of microstructure in the calcareous skeleton of chaetetids: microlamellar, fascicular fibrous, and spherulitic. Three different fascicular fibrous types are recognized: water-jet, penicillate, and trabecular (CUIF & GAUTRET, 1993), but only the former two are found in chaetetids. What WENDT (1984) referred to as irregular is the same as microlamellar, and his clinogonal is the same as fascicular fibrous. WENDT considered water-jet, penicillate, and trabecular



FIG. 34. Pseudosepta in fossil chaetetids; *1,* transverse thin section of chaetetid skeleton, showing tubules with conspicuous pseudosepta, Pennsylvanian, upper Carboniferous, Bird Springs Formation, near Mountain Springs, Nevada, ×100 (new); *2,* transverse thin section of chaetetid skeleton, showing tubules and pseudosepta, Pennsylvanian, upper Carboniferous, Amoret Limestone Member, Altamont Limestone, Montgomery County, Kansas, ×40 (new); *3,* SEM of transverse view of chaetetid skeleton, showing tubules and pseudosepta, Moscovian, upper Carboniferous, Moscow Basin, Russia, note prominent pseudoseptum in the tubule in the upper center and the two pseudosepta approaching each other in the tubule in the left center, ×25 (new); *4,* SEM of transverse view of *Chaetetes radians,* showing tubules with pseudosepta, Moscovian, upper Carboniferous, near Moscow, Russia; note the prominent pseudoseptum in the triangular tubule in the right center and the tubule in the left center with two pseudosepta approaching each other, ×30 (new).

as synonyms of clinogonal, and Boury-Esnault and Rützler (1997) considered them to be synonyms of fasciculate fibrous. Thus, the microstructure of the calcareous skeleton of chaetetids may be: microlamellar, spherulitic, water-jet, or penicillate; the last two being two of the three subdivisions of clinogonal and fasciculate fibrous. Cuif and Gautret (1991) pointed out the potential taxonomic value of the microstructure of the calcareous skeleton of fossil and recent sponges, in both Calcispongiae and Demospongiae.

Mineralization of the calcareous skeleton in *Acanthochaetetes wellsi* occurs in three different areas: (1) associated with the thin cover of Mg-rich calcite on collagenous fibers at the top of the walls of the tubules; (2) where the tabulae are being formed; and (3) within older parts of the calcareous skeleton between tabulae where decaying soft sponge tissue produces ammonia (Reitner & Gautret, 1996). Details of the biomineralization in these three areas was described by Reitner and Gautret (1996) and summarized in Reitner and others (2001, p. 230–232). A microlamellar microstructure (Cuif & others, 1979; Wendt, 1979; Reitner & Engeser, 1987) composed of an irregular arrangement of loosely packed crystals, generally with a random orientation, but sometimes arranged such that a lamellar structure is indicated (Wendt, 1984, p. 328), is produced by these processes in *Acanthochaetetes* (Fig. 42). Wendt (1984) referred to this microstructure as irregular.

The calcareous skeleton of the extant genus *Astrosclera*, and some fossil chaetetids from the Permian of Tunisia and the Triassic of Turkey, have a spherulitic microstructure (Wörheide, 1998; Fig. 43). Wörheide (1998) detailed the biocalcification process that produces the calcareous skeleton of



Fig. 35. Pseudosepta in fossil chaetetids (continued); *1,* transverse thin section of *Acanthochaetetes seunesi,* showing tubules and pseudosepta, Cenomanian, Upper Cretaceous, Pyrennees, ×7.5 (adapted from Fischer, 1970, pl. F,*3*); *2,* transverse thin section of *Blastochaetetes capilliformis,* showing tubules and pseudosepta, Oxfordian, Upper Jurassic, France, ×18.7 (adapted from Fischer, 1970, pl. A,*7;* both views courtesy of *Annales de Paléontologie (Invertébrés),* Elsevier Masson SAS).

TABLE 2. Comparison of the microstructures and skeletal mineralogy of extant and fossil hypercalcified demosponges with either a chaetetid or stromatoporoid calcareous skeleton (numerals with lower-case letters and author abbreviations refer to sources provided in the explanation; see below and facing page; new).

	Merlia	*Acanthochaetetes*	*Astrosclera*	*Ceratoporella*	Chaetetids	Stromatoporoids
Aragonite						
Penicillate				1a (F/R), 4a (C/G)	1a (F/R), 4b*(C/G)	
Spherulitic			1a (F/R), 2a (H/S), 6 (Wt)		1a (F/R), 6 (Wt)	1a (F/R)
Irregular						1a (F/R), 6 (Wt)
Spherulitic compound			5a (Wd)			
Spherulitic elongate				5a (Wd)		
Clinogonal				2a (H/S), 6 (Wt)	6 (Wt)	6 (Wt)
Orthogonal						6 (Wt)
Fibrous centers			7a (Cet)			
Asymmetical				7a (Cet.)		
Mg Calcite						
Penicillate	1b (F/R)				1b (F/R)	
Lamellar		1b (F/R), 2b (H/S), 7b (Cet.)			1b (F/R)	
Water-jet	2b (H/S), 4b (C/G)				4b (C/G)	
Fascicular fibrous	5b (Wd)					
Irregular		5b (Wd), 6 (Wt)			6 (Wt)	
Clinogonal	6 (Wt)				6 (Wt)	6 (Wt)
Spherulitic						6 (Wt)
Orthogonal						6 (Wt)
Trabecular	7b (Cet.)					
Mineralogy not recorded						
Fascicular fibrous	3 (B-E/R)			3 (B-E/R)		
Microlamellar		3 (B-E/R)				
Spherulitic			3 (B-E/R)			

*, some Mesozoic to Recent taxa, but all Paleozoic and some Mesozoic–Recent chaetetids have a water-jet calcite skeleton.

TABLE 2. Explanation.

1. (F/R)

Finks, Robert M., & J. Keith Rigby. 2004. Hypercalcified sponges. *In* R. L. Kaesler, ed., Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology, Part E, Porifera (Revised), vol. 3. The Geological Society of America, Inc. and The University of Kansas. Boulder, Colorado and Lawrence, Kansas. p. 586–587.

1a. Aragonite

Spherulitic: compound spherulitic, *Astrosclera* and relatives of stromatoporoid morphology, Permo-Triassic genera of inozoans, sphinctozoans, and chaetetids.

Penicillate: clionogonal aragonite, elongate spherulitic, water-jet *Ceratoporella* of chaetetids and inozoans of the Middle Triassic.

Irregular: microgranular aragonite, *Vaceletia* and Triassic sphinctozoans, inozoans, and stromatoporoids.

1b. Mg Calcite

Homogeneous-granular: microgranular Mg calcite, no extant examples, Triassic sphinctozoans and inozoans, best known in *Cassianothalamina* (not included in table).

Lamellar: *Acanthochaetetes,* in Cretaceous to Recent genera with a chaetetid morphology, and the Cretaceous *Calcichondrilla*, an encrusting form with a nonchaetetid morphology.

Penicillate: clinogonal calcite, fascicular fibrous calcite, *Merlia,* and Paleozoic and Mesozoic genera with a chaetetid morphology, such as *Stromatoaxinella*.

(Continued on facing page).

TABLE 2. Explanation *(continued from facing page)*.

Spherulitic: no extant examples, Cretaceous *Euzkadiella*.

Fibrous: orthogonal Mg calcite, examples in the Calcarea.

2. (H/S)

Hooper, J. N. A., & R. W. M. van Soest, eds. 2002. Systema Porifera, vol. 1. Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers. New York, Boston, Dordrecht, London, and Moscow. xlviii + 1101 p.

2a. Aragonite

Spherulitic: *Astrosclera*.

Clinogonal: *Ceratoporella*.

2b. Mg Calcite

Water-jet: *Merlia,* probably the same as penicillate calcite of 1.

Lamellar: *Acanthochaetetes.*

3. (B-E/R)

Boury-Esnault, Nicole, & Klaus Rützler. 1997. Thesaurus of Sponge Morphology. Smithsonian Contributions to Zoology, Number 596:55 p. [Mineralogy not recorded; also here the authors did not recognize separate aragonite and Mg calcite fields].

Fasciculate fibrous: water-jet, penicillate, and trabecular *Merlia;* water-jet, mineralogy not reported; *Ceratoporella,* penicillate.

Microlamellar: *Acanthochaetetes.*

Spherulitic: *Astrosclera*.

4. (C/G)

Cuif, Jean-Pierre, & Pascale Gautret. 1993. Microstructural features of fibrous tissue in the skeletons of some chaetetid sponges. *In* P. Oekentorp-Küster, ed., Proceedings of the VI International Symposium on Fossil Cnidaria and Porifera, Munster Cnidarian Symposium, vol. 1. Courier Forschungsinstitut Senckenberg 164:309–315.

4a. Aragonite

Penicillate: *Ceratoporella*.

4b. Mg Calcite

Water-jet: *Merlia*.

Trabecular: scleractinian corals (not included in table)

5. (Wd)

Wood, Rachel A. 1991. Non-spicular biomineralization in calcified demosponges. *In* J. Reitner & H. Keupp, eds., Fossil and Recent Sponges. Springer-Verlag. Berlin and Heidelberg. p. 322–340.

5a. Aragonite

Compound spherulitic: *Astrosclera,* probably the same as spherulitic aragonite of 1.

Elongate spherulitic: *Ceratoporella,* probably the same as penicillate aragonite of 1.

5b. Mg Calcite

Fascicular fibrous: *Merlia*, probably penicillate calcite of 1.

Irregular: *Acanthochaetetes,* crystals aligned in one plane, probably lamellar calcite of 1.

6. (Wt)

Wendt, Jobst. 1979. Development of skeletal formation, microstructure, and mineralogy of rigid calcareous sponges from the Late Palaeozoic to Recent. *In* C. Levi & N. Boury-Esnault, eds., Biologie des Spongiaires. Colloques Internationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique 291:449–457.

Wendt, Jobst. 1984. Skeletal and spicular mineralogy, microstructure and diagenesis of coralline calcareous sponges. Palaeontographica Americana 54:326–336. [Note: the latter reference is an update of the former.]

Mg Calcite or Aragonite

Irregular: aragonite in stromatoporoids and Mg calcite in Cretaceous and Recent "sclerosponges," *Acanthochaetetes*.

Spherulitic: probably aragonite in Carboniferous sclerosponges and in the extant genus *Astrosclera*; probably calcite in a Cretaceous stromatoporoid.

Clinogonal (synonyms = water-jet, trabecular, penicillate): aragonite or calcite in Mesozoic and possibly Paleozoic chaetetids and stromatoporoids; calcitic in *Merlia* and aragonite in *Ceratoporella* and stromatoporoids.

Orthogonal (synonym, fibro-normal): aragonite and calcite in stromatoporoids.

7. (Cet.)

Cuif, Jean-Pierre, Françoise Debrenne, J. G. Lafuste, & Jean Vacelet. 1979. Comparaison de la microstructure du squelette carbonate nonspiculaire d'éponges actuelles et fossiles. *In* C. Levi & N. Boury-Esnault, eds., Biologie des Spongiaires. Colloques Internationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique 291:459–465.

7a. Aragonite

Spherolites fibreux centres [fibrous spherulitic centers]: *Astrosclera*.

Spherolites asymetriques [asymmetrical spherulites]: *Ceratoporella*.

7b. Mg Calcite

Lamelles presque plates [nearly flat lamellae]: *Acanthochaetetes.*

Trabecules verticals [vertical trabeculae]: *Merlia.*



FIG. 36. *(For explanation, see facing page).*



FIG. 37. Pseudomorphs of megasclere tylostyles in fossil chaetetids; *1,* tangential thin section of *Calcistella tabulata,* showing spicule pseudomorphs within tubule walls (white dots within dark areas) from a Cretaceous, possibly Aptian, boulder in an Eocene conglomerate in Greece, ×9 (adapted from Reitner, 1991, p. 190, fig. 7a); *2,* SEM of a tylostyle from *Acanthochaetetes dendroformis,* Cretaceous, northern Spain, ×145 (adapted from Reitner, 1991, p. 200, fig. 13c); *3,* longitudinal thin section of a pyritized tylostyle, *Chaetetopsis favrei*, Cretaceous, possibly Aptian, boulder in an Eocene conglomerate, Greece, ×210 (adapted from Reitner, 1991, p. 185, fig. 5c, all views with kind permission of Springer Science+Business Media).

FIG. 36. Megascleres in chaetetids: tylostyles in extant forms, pseudomorphs in fossil forms; *1,* SEM of surface of *Acanthochaetetes* sp., showing spicules (tylostyles and spirasters) associated with the growing surface; from an extant specimen collected live in October 2005 off the Komesu coast, southern Okinawa, at a water depth of 15 m, ×100 (new); *2,* SEM of the tubule on the left side of view *1,* showing the tylostyles, ×500 (new); *3,* SEM of the surface of *Ceratoporella nicholsoni,* showing tylostyles of an extant specimen, Jamaica, ×100 (adapted from Hartman & Goreau, 1972, fig. 1; courtesy of *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*); *4,* SEM of tylostyles of *Ceratoporella nicholsoni,* an extant species, probably Caribbean, ×230 (adapted from Reitner, 1992, pl. 36,*3;* courtesy of *Berliner Geowissenschaftliche Abhandlungen,* Free University, Berlin); *5,* SEM of a tylostyle from *Merlia deficiens,* an extant species, Mediterranean, ×4500 (adapted from Gautret, Vacelet, & Cuif, 1991, pl. 1,*2;* courtesy of *Publications Scientifiques du Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, Paris*); *6,* longitudinal thin section of *Chaetetes (Boswellia) mortoni,* showing spicule pseudomorphs (thin dark lines within tubule walls), lower Asbian, lower Carboniferous, northern Wales, ×30 (adapted from Gray, 1980, pl. 103,*1*); *7,* enlargement of part of view *6,* showing pyritic spicule pseudomorphs, ×87 (adapted from Gray, 1980, pl. 103,*2*); *8,* SEM of longitudinal section of *Chaetetes (Boswellia) mortoni,* showing preferential etching of siliceous spicule pseudomorphs, ×821 (adapted from Gray, 1980, p. 814, fig. 4a); *9,* SEM of longitudinal section of *Chaetetes (Boswellia) mortoni,* showing pyritized spicule pseudomorph, ×667 (adapted from Gray, 1980, p. 814, fig. 4c).



FIG. 38. *(For explanation, see facing page).*

Astrosclera willeyana, and this process is summarized in Reitner and others (2001). Spherulites are produced within the soft tissue of the sponge. When they are about 15 microns in size, they are transported to the growing tips of the walls and fused together by epitaxial growth, and in some cases, spicules are incorporated, producing a rigid spicular skeleton.

Cuif and others (1979) referred to the microstructure of *Merlia normani* as trabecular and Wendt (1979, 1984) as clinogonal. Boury-Esnault and Rützler (1997) used the term fascicular fibrous, rather than clinogonal, and considered water-jet, trabecular, and penicillate as synonyms of fascicular fibrous. However, Cuif and Gautret (1993) clearly differentiated between the different types of fascicular fibrous microstructures, namely trabecular, penicillate, and water-jet. In taxa with a trabecular microstructure, the orientation of the crystal fibers in the axial part of the trabecula is strongly oblique to the growth direction of the trabecula and does not occur in sponges (Cuif & Gautret, 1993, p. 312). The main difference between the water-jet and penicillate microstructure is



Fig. 39. Variation in acanthostyles in *Astrosclera willeyana; 1,* SEM of an astrosclerid acanthostyle spicule in an extant specimen, Marigondon Cave, Philippines, ×1100 (adapted from Wörheide & others, 1997, pl. III,*2;* courtesy of Real Sociedad Española de Historia Natural, Seccion Geologica, Madrid, Spain); *2,* SEM photos of verticillately spined styles: *a–b,* Indonesia (×400); *c,* Palau (×482); *d,* Philippines (×364); and *e,* Glorieuses Islands (×615) (adapted from Wörheide, 1998, p. 49, pl. 20, with kind permission of Springer Science+Business Media).

Fig. 38. Microcleres in chaetetids: euasters in extant forms; pseudomorphs in fossil forms; *1,* SEM of a siliceous spicule, tylostyle from an extant specimen of *Acanthochaetetes wellsi,* Great Barrier Reef, ×650 (new; courtesy of Jean Vacelet); *2,* thin section of an asterose microsclere pseudomorph in the tubule wall of *Chaetetes radians,* upper Carboniferous, Russia; Reitner (1991) referred to this specimen as *Chaetetes radians* and renamed it *Chrondrochaetetes longitubus,* ×150 (adapted from Reitner, 1991, p. 187, fig. 6d); *3,* thin section of asterose microsclere pseudomorphs with pyrite centers (dark areas within lighter circular spicules) in the tubule wall (*white arrow* in lower left points to inferred relict star rays of the microsclere) of *Chaetetes radians,* upper Carboniferous, Russia; Reitner (1991) referred to this specimen as *Chaetetes radians* and renamed it *Chrondrochaetetes longitubus*, ×147 (adapted from Reitner, 1991, p. 187, fig. 6d); *4,* longitudinal thin section, showing clusters of euasters in the tubule wall of the extant species *Chondrilla grandistellata*, geographic locality not provided, ×29 (adapted from Reitner, 1991, p. 195, fig. 10a); *5,* enlarged view of the euasters in view *4,* ×200 (adapted from Reitner, 1991, p. 195, fig. 10b); *6,* longitudinal thin section, showing inferred euaster pseudomorphs in the tubule wall of *Calcichondrilla crustans,* Albian, Cretaceous, northern Spain, ×36.2 (adapted from Reitner, 1991, p. 192, fig. 8b); *7,* enlarged view of polycrystalline calcite pseudomorphs of inferred euasters in view *6,* ×135 (adapted from Reitner, 1991, p. 192, fig. 8c); *8,* SEM of euasters in tubule wall of the extant species *Chondrilla grandistellata,* geographic locality not provided, diameter of euasters approximately ×200 (adapted from Reitner, 1991, p. 190, fig. 7e); *9,* thin section of calcite-filled microscleres, pseudomorphs of inferred euasters, in *Calcistella tabulata* from a Cretaceous (Aptian) boulder in an Eocene conglomerate in Greece, ×220 (adapted from Reitner, 1991, p. 190, fig. 7d); *10,* SEM of an etched euaster microsclere from the tubule wall of *Acanthochaetetes dendroformis,* Cretaceous, northern Spain, ×2000 (adapted from Reitner, 1991, p. 200, fig. 13d; views *2–10* with kind permission of Springer Science+Business Media).



FIG. 40. Microscleres from *Acanthochaetetes* and *Merlia; 1,* SEM of masses of microscleres and a few megascleres (tylostyles) from the growing surface of *Acanthochaetetes* sp., an extant specimen collected live in October 2005 off the Komesu coast, southern Okinawa at a water depth of 15 m, ×1000 (new); *2,* enlargement of part of view *1,* showing details of the spirasters, ×4500 (new); *3,* SEM of spiraster microscleres from the growing surface of *Acanthochaetetes* sp., an extant specimen collected live in October 2005 off the Komesu coast, southern Okinawa, at a water depth of 15 m, ×1000 (new); *4,* SEM of diplaster from an extant specimen of *Acanthochaetetes wellsi,* Great Barrier Reef, ×1320 (new; courtesy of Jean Vacelet); *5,* SEM of several siliceous microscleres from an extant specimen of *Acanthochaetetes wellsi,* Great Barrier Reef, ×1200 (new; courtesy of Jean Vacelet); *6,* SEM of a clavidisc, a meniscoid microsclere from an extant specimen of *Merlia normani,* Great Barrier Reef, ×1760 (new; courtesy of Jean Vacelet).



Fig. 41. Dolomite crystals associated with tubule walls and tabulae in a chaetetid, Pennsylvanian, lower Carboniferous, Amoret Limestone Member, Altamont Limestone; *1,* SEM of tubule walls and tabulae replaced in part by dolomite, Labette County, Kansas, ×120 (new); *2,* enlarged SEM view of tubule wall (horizontal) and tabulae (vertical) replaced in part by dolomite, Labette County, Kansas, ×250 (new); *3,* SEM of dolomite rhombs replacing tubule wall, Montgomery County, Kansas, ×1800 (new).

in the degree of divergence in the crystal fibers upward in the direction of growth (Cuif & Gautret, 1993). In longitudinal sections, the fibers in a water-jet microstructure fan out upward, and in a penicillate microstructure, the fibers diverge at a very low angle and may appear almost parallel in some views.

Referring to the microstructure of *Merlia normani*, Cuif and Gautret (1993, p. 311) stated, "In longitudinal sections, the fibers are vertical in the axial part of the unit…" and bend progressively toward the external part. They comment that this is a typical water-jet (Fig. 44) disposition and noted a similar microstructure in some Carboniferous and Mesozoic (Jurassic and Cretaceous) chaetetids. As noted above, taphonomic processes often obliterate or mute the microstructure in fossil chaetetids, but in some specimens, there is evidence of the original microstructure, and it is fascicular fibrous, water-jet (Fig. 45–46).

The calcareous skeleton of other chaetetids is penicillate, also a type of fascicular

1



2



3

4

5

FIG. 42. *(For explanation, see facing page).*

fibrous microstructure. The penicillate microstructure is easily seen in the extant genus *Ceratoporella* and is also known from fossil chaetetids from the Permian, Triassic, Jurassic, and Cretaceous (Fig. 47; WENDT, 1984; CUIF & GAUTRET, 1993). Although the term penicillate is used in the *Thesaurus of Sponge Morphology* (BOURY-ESNAULT & RÜTZLER, 1997), REITNER and others (2001) and VACELET (2002) referred to the microstructure in *Ceratoporella* as clinogonal. HARTMAN and GOREAU (1970, 1972), WILLENZ and HARTMAN (1989), and REITNER and others (2001) described biomineralization in *Ceratoporella*. The calcareous skeleton of *Ceratoporella* is a rigid spicular skeleton in which the crystalline units diverge at a very low angle (HARTMAN & GOREAU, 1970, fig. 17; WENDT, 1984, fig. 1, pl. 2; WOOD, 1991, fig. 5). In spite of taphonomic processes, this microstructure is well preserved in some chaetetids with an original aragonitic skeleton, but less so in those with a calcitic skeleton (WENDT, 1984).

The most recent information on the microstructure and mineralogy of the calcareous skeleton of hypercalcified demosponges is given in FINKS and RIGBY (2004). They based their eight different categories on the studies of WOOD (1990), CUIF AND GAUTRET (1991), and MASTANDREA and RUSSO (1995): spherulitic aragonite, penicillate aragonite, irregular aragonite, homogeneous-granular Mg calcite, lamellar Mg calcite, penicillate Mg calcite, spherulitic Mg calcite, and fibrous Mg calcite. How their categories compare with those recognized by others is shown in Table 2, to aid in better understanding and comparing the literature on the different microstructures and skeletal mineralogies of extant and fossil hypercalcified demosponges with either a chaetetid or stromatoporoid calcareous skeleton.

TAPHONOMY (BIOSTRATINOMY AND DIAGENESIS)

Biostratinomic processes (changes between death and final burial) and diagenetic processes (changes after burial) are important in modifying the spicules and the calcareous skeleton of chaetetids. Taphonomic processes identified by RODRIGUEZ (2004) in corals are also important in chaetetids. The 12 taphonomic processes he identified (p. 151), with some modifications and additions, are listed below.

1. Colonization and encrustation by cyanobacteria, algae, bryozoans, foraminifera, corals, sponges, worms, and arthropods, i.e., borings by acrothoracian barnacles (see *Treatise Online,* Part E, Revised, vol. 4, Chapter 2E, Fig. 40.3; WEST & CLARK, 1984).

FIG. 42. Microlamellar microstructure in *Acanthochaetetes; 1,* section showing high Mg calcite microstructure and growing tip of a tubule wall, where the mineralization occurs in an extant specimen of *Acanthochaetetes wellsi*, Lizard Island Bonnie Bay reef cave, Great Barrier Reef, Australia, ×95 (adapted from Reitner & others, 1997, pl. *3,2;* courtesy of E. Schweizerbart Science Publishers); *2,* SEM of part of the zone of initial mineralization that produces the microlamelllar microstructure in *Acanthochaetetes wellsi*, an extant species collected from the Lizard Island Bonnie Bay reef cave, Great Barrier Reef, Australia, ×165 (adapted from Reitner & others, 1997, pl. *3,3;* courtesy of E. Schweizerbart Science Publishers); *3,* SEM of calcite microstructure in *Acanthochaetetes seunesi,* Albian, Cretaceous, northern Spain, ×8000 (adapted from Wendt, 1984, p. 331, pl. *1,4;* courtesy of Paleontological Research Institution, Ithaca, New York); *4,* ultrapolished thin section of an extant specimen of *Acanthochaetetes* sp., showing microlamellar microstructure of tubule walls, geographic locality not listed, ×650 (adapted from Cuif & others, 1979, pl. II,*9;* courtesy of CNRS, Paris); *5,* SEM of an extant specimen of *Acanthochaetetes* sp., showing microlamellar microstructure of tubule walls, geographic locality not listed, ×1250 (adapted from Cuif & others, 1979, pl. II,*10;* courtesy of CNRS, Paris).



FIG. 43. Spherulitic microstructure in extant and fossil astrosclerid chaetetids; *1,* aragonite spherulites (lighter gray irregular areas that appear brecciated) in a longitudinal section through the living part of an extant specimen of *Astrosclera willeyana,* collected at a depth of 25 m, Ribbon Reef No. 10, Lizard Island, Great Barrier Reef, Australia, ×2.4 (adapted from Reitner & others, 1997, pl. *2,2;* courtesy of E. Schweizerbart Science Publishers); *2,* SEM of smooth walls composed of aragonite spherulites in the skeleton of a Recent specimen of *Astrosclera willeyana,* collected from a reef crest cave of Osprey Reef, Great Barrier Reef, Australia, ×175 (adapted from Wörheide, 1998, pl. 28,*3*); *3,* SEM of aragonite fibers composing the skeleton of a Recent specimen of *Astrosclera willeyana,* collected at a depth of 270 m from the forereef slope of Osprey Reef, Great Barrier Reef, Australia, ×130 (adapted from Wörheide, 1998, pl. 28,*4*); *4,* thin section of spherulitic skeleton (darker areas) of *Astrosclera cuifi,* Norian, Upper Triassic, Turkey, ×50 (adapted from Wörheide,1998, pl. 30,*1*); *5,* thin section of sub-acanthostyles (*arrows*) in the skeleton of *Astrosclera cuifi*, Norian, Upper Triassic, Turkey, ×220 (adapted from Wörheide, 1998, pl. 30,*6*); *6,* thin section of the spherulitic skeleton with a single sub-acanthostyle between several spherulites in *Astrosclera cuifi,* Norian, Upper Triassic, Turkey, ×467 (adapted from Wörheide, 1998, pl. 30,*8;* views *2–6* with kind permission of Springer Science+Business Media).

2. Bioerosion represented by micro-, meso-, and macroborings, including borings by acrothoracian barnacles (see *Treatise Online,* Part E, Revised, vol. 4, Chapter 2E, Fig. 40.3; West & Clark, 1984).

3. Transportation as indicated by abraded surfaces and fragmentation.

4. Infilling of skeletal cavities by sediment and/or cement.

5. Recrystallization (coalescence, euhedralization, micritization).

6. Compression, which produces diagenetic fragmentation.

7. Cementation (micro-dogtooth spar and mosaic calcite).

8. Stylolitization.

9. Silicification.

10. Cleavage.

11. Dissolution.

12. Ferruginization, e.g., pyritization.

Rodriguez (2004, p. 151) pointed out that some of these processes began even before the death of the coral polyps. The same is also true for extant chaetetids in that alteration of the skeleton begins before the death of the organism, as noted by Reitner and Gautret (1996); and it is safe to assume that the same was true for fossil chaetetids.

As noted previously, not all extant hypercalcified demosponges contain spicules during life. Silica-poor water and other environmental factors may preclude the formation of spicules in some extant taxa. When spicules are present, most of them are contained in the soft tissue of extant taxa and are not always incorporated into the calcareous skeleton (Kirkpatrick, 1911; Hartman & Goreau, 1975). Additionally, silica is unstable in the presence of calcium carbonate and siliceous spicules are commonly corroded away in older parts of the calcareous skeleton of still-living taxa (Hartman & Goreau, 1970, 1972). Perhaps, as growth continues, it is more economical to recycle the silica in old spicules than extract it from seawater, given that the silica content in the world ocean may have been low. Ocean water today is undersaturated in silica (Broecker, 1974, p. 33) and averages 2 ppm (Armstrong, 1965, cited in Kennish, 1989, p. 60). Broecker (1974, p. 33) further indicated that hydrous silica dioxide, opal, would readily dissolve in seawater unless protected by some insoluble substance, such as an organic covering. Given the environmental factors that affect spicule formation in living taxa, and taphonomic processes that remove any that do occur, it is not surprising that spicules are relatively rare in fossil forms, and that when they are present, they occur as pseudomorphs (Fig. 36–38). This is unfortunate because spicule composition and morphology are the primary skeletal features upon which sponge systematics is based (Fig. 48.1). Thus, in most fossil specimens of hypercalcified demosponges with a chaetetid skeleton, only the calcareous skeleton is left, and the features it exhibits are less useful for systematic studies. These less useful features are, in order of importance: (1) original mineralogy and microstructure of the calcareous skeleton; and (2) skeletal features such as (a) the size, shape, and arrangement of tubules in transverse section; (b) thickness of walls and tabulae; and (c) spacing of tabulae (Fig. 48.1). Taphonomic processes that alter these features can have a significant negative impact on systematic studies.

Hypercalcified demosponges with a chaetetid skeleton are composed of aragonite or Mg calcite with different microstructures (Table 2) and are thus highly susceptible to diagenetic processes such as recrystallization and replacement (Fig. 41; and see Fig. 49). These diagenetic processes can alter the original mineralogy and microstructure of the skeleton, thus reducing, or eliminating, their systematic usefulness. Although the basic



FIG. 44. *(For explanation, see facing page).*

microstructure may remain unchanged in Mesozoic and some upper Paleozoic forms (Fig. 43–47), the size and chemical composition of the crystals forming that structure may change (Cuif & Gautret, 1987; Gautret & Razgallah, 1987; Gautret, Vacelet, & Cuif, 1991; Mastandrea & Russo, 1995; Dauphin, Gautret, & Cuif, 1996). However, even the microstructure of these more recent (Mesozoic) forms can be muted or destroyed (Veizer & Wendt, 1976). Additionally, a diagenetically altered microstructure may mimic the original microstructure in other taxa. For example, micritization can produce a granular microstructure in some taxa, when it was not the original microstructure of the skeleton. Thus, it becomes difficult to separate such diagenetically produced skeletons with a granular microstructure from those in which the original microstructure was/is granular. Gautret (1987) addressed this issue in some extant and Triassic hypercalcified demosponges, and he differentiated between diagenetically produced and original granular microstructural skeletons, using the chemical composition of the skeletons. Along with studies of the major-element composition of chaetetid skeletons (Gautret, 1987), more recent studies have focused on the minor-element and amino acid content of these skeletons (Gautret & Marin, 1993; Marin & Gautret, 1993) as a way of evaluating the effects of diagenesis.

Diagenesis has almost completely destroyed the original microstructure of lower and middle Paleozoic hypercalcified demosponges with a chaetetid skeleton. When careful and detailed studies of the microstructure of chaetetid skeletons is accomplished, the results will probably be much like those reported by Stearn (1966) and Riding (1974) for stromatoporoids. Only future studies will determine how useful elemental and amino acid compositions of the calcareous skeletons of Paleozoic hypercalcified demosponges will be in learning more about their original composition and microstructure.

With spicules absent or rarely preserved as pseudomorphs, and lacking information on the original composition and microstructure of the calcareous skeleton, the taphonomic impact on the readily visible skeletal features such as tubules, walls, and

Fig. 44. Fascicular fibrous water-jet microstructure in *Merlia normani*; *1,* microstructure and junction between walls (*white arrow*) in a polished and etched transverse surface of the extant species *M. normani,* Madeira, ×350 (adapted from Gautret, Vacelet, & Cuif, 1991, pl. II,*4;* courtesy of *Publications Scientifiques du Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, Paris*); *2,* water-jet microstructure in a polished and etched longitudinal surface of the extant species *M. normani,* Madeira, ×1167 (adapted from Gautret, Vacelet, & Cuif, 1991, pl. I,*4;* courtesy of *Publications Scientifiques du Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, Paris*); *3,* interpretive sketch of a transverse section across a tubule of *M. normani; arrows* indicate junction between walls (possibly junction of pseudosepta), compare with *white arrow* in view *1; line A–B* is the plane of the microstructural unit shown in view *4* (adapted from Cuif & Gautret, 1993, p. 310, fig. 1.1; courtesy of E. Schweizerbartsche Verlags, Naegele U Obermiller Science Publishers); *4,* interpretive sketch of the typical water-jet microstructure in a longitudinal section (*A–B* in view *3*) through a structural unit of *M. normani* (adapted from Cuif & Gautret, 1993, p. 310, fig. 1.2; courtesy of E. Schweizerbart Science Publishers).



FIG. 45. Fascicular fibrous water-jet microstructure, Pennsylvanian, lower Carboniferous; *1,* SEM of a tangentially fractured chaetetid skeleton, Moscovian, Moscow Basin, Russia, ×50 (new); *2,* enlarged view as seen in an SEM of a longitudinally fractured chaetetid skeleton, Moscovian, Moscow Basin, Russia, ×60 (new); *3,* longitudinal thin section of a chaetetid skeleton, Amoret Limestone Member, Altamont Limestone, Montgomery County, Kansas, ×65 (adapted from Mathewson, 1977, pl. *7,1;* courtesy of Kansas State University).



FIG. 46. Fascicular fibrous water-jet microstructure, Pennsylvanian, lower Carboniferous (continued); *1,* polished and etched longitudinal section of *Chaetetes cylindraceus,* Carboniferous, near Moscow, Russia, ×200 (adapted from Gautret, Vacelet, & Cuif, 1991, pl. III,*1*); *2,* polished and etched transverse section of *Chaetetes cylindraceus*, Carboniferous, near Moscow, Russia; note the junction of two microstructural units along a diagonal from the upper right to the lower left, ×200 (adapted from Gautret, Vacelet, & Cuif, 1991, pl. III,*2*); *3,* interpretive sketch of the microstructure of *Chaetetes cylindraceus,* Carboniferous, near Moscow, Russia; *a,* longitudinal section, *b,* transverse section; compare *a* to views *1* and *2,* ×80 (adapted from Gautret, Vacelet, & Cuif, 1991, p. 297, fig. 1; all views courtesy of *Publications Scientifiques du Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, Paris*).



FIG. 47. Fascicular fibrous penicillate microstructure (clinogonal) in extant and fossil ceratoporellid chaetetids; *1,* SEM of the fascicular fibrous penicillate microstructure (clinogonal) in a fractured surface near the growing tip of a tubule in an extant specimen of *Ceratoporella nicholsoni,* West Indian Caribbean, ×300 (adapted from Hartman & Goreau, 1972, fig. 4; courtesy of *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*); *2,* SEM of the aragonitic epitaxial backfill that results in the fascicular fibrous penicillate microstructure in a fractured surface of an extant specimen of *Ceratoporella nicholsoni,* Jamaica, ×135 (adapted from Wood, 1991, p. 329, fig. 5a, with kind permission of Springer Science+Business Media); *3,* SEM of the aragonitic fascicular fibrous penicillate microstructure (clinogonal) in a fractured surface of *Atrochaetetes medius,* Upper Triassic, Italy, ×375 (adapted from Wendt, 1984, p. 331, pl. *1,6;* courtesy of Paleontological Research Institution, Ithaca, New York).



Fig. 48. Categories of skeletal features and potential results of diagenetic processes; *1,* three categories of skeletal features used in systematic studies of chaetetid sponges: *P,* primary, the composition and morphology of mega- and microscleres; *S,* secondary and includes the original mineralogy and microstructure; and *T,* tertiary and includes size, shape and arrangement of tubules in transverse section, thickness of walls and tabulae, and spacing of tabulae (adapted from Wood, 1987, p. 52, fig. 21); *2–5,* diagrams illustrating the potential diagenetic affects on the skeletons of chaetetid sponges; *2,* the original, as depicted, may be affected by the addition and/or subtraction of minerals via interstitial fluids associated with recrystallization, replacement or both (new); *3,* results to the original if the walls and tabulae are thickened and intertubular space reduced by deposition of additional inorganic minerals from interstitial fluids (new); *4,* results to the original if the spicules are dissolved, the walls and tabulae reduced in thickness, and the intertubular space increased through dissolution via interstitial fluids (new); *5,* results if the spicules are dissolved, and the original mineralogy and microstructure is muted or destroyed by recrystallization and/or replacement (new).


1


2


3


4


5

FIG. 49. *(For explanation, see facing page).*

tabulae must now be examined. Although taphonomic processes rarely modify these features of the calcareous skeleton beyond recognition, they can make it difficult, if not impossible, to separate the mineral component of the original skeleton from that produced taphonomically. There are three areas of mineralization in the calcareous skeleton of *Acanthochaetetes wellsi* (see above, p. 37), a species that is a reasonable analogue for chaetetid skeletons. One of these, the older parts of the calcareous skeleton between tabulae, is especially important relative to skeletal features. Necrotic (before death) change occurs within this area, because decaying soft sponge tissue produces ammonia (Reitner & Gautret, 1996), creating an environment for the precipitation of calcium carbonate. Such mineralization can increase skeletal features such as wall and tabulae thicknesses, alter the cross-sectional shape of the tubules, and ultimately fill the space completely with precipitated calcium carbonate. Furthermore, it is reasonable to suggest that other processes might produce an acidic environment that could lead to the dissolution of tubule walls and tabulae. Such dissolution would decrease the thickness of the walls and tabulae, and it could even remove tabulae, consequently affecting the distance between tabulae, as well as altering the cross-sectional shape of the tubules. Thus, the size, shape, and arrangement of the tubules and the thicknesses of the walls and tabulae can be altered during life. After death, and during and after final burial, diagenetic processes (physical, chemical, and biological) continue to modify and/or destroy chaetetid skeletons through dissolution and/or chemical precipitation (Fig. 48.2–48.4; West, 1994, p. 401). For example, partial or complete recrystallization and/or silicification of chaetetid skeletons is commonly observed in some Carboniferous specimens (Fig. 49–50).

As noted above, systematic studies require primary features (spicules, which are commonly absent) and secondary features (the mineralogical composition and microstructure of the calcareous skeleton). These secondary features are, in numerous cases,

---

Fig. 49. Examples of diagenetically altered chaetetid skeletons, Pennsylvanian, lower Carboniferous; *1,* tangential to transverse thin section, showing chert replacing tubule walls and filling the tubules (white areas in upper right and left corners of image) in a chaetetid skeleton, Amoret Limestone Member, Altamont Limestone, Montgomery County, Kansas, ×20 (new); *2,* longitudinal thin section, showing calcite spar coating tubule walls and tabulae in a chaetetid skeleton, Amoret Limestone Member, Altamont Limestone, Mongomery County, Kansas; note the difference in the thickness of, and space between, tabulae because of the differential coating of tabulae, ×100 (new); *3,* SEM of a longitudinal fracture surface, showing the extensive coating, replacement, and filling of the pore spaces in a chaetetid skeleton, Amoret Limestone Member, Altamont Limestone, Montgomery County, Kansas, ×60 (new); *4,* transverse thin section, showing the differences in the wall thicknesses of tubules in a chaetetid skeleton, Bird Springs Formation, Kyle Canyon near Grapevine Spring, Nevada, note that tubule walls in the center are conspicuously thinner than those on either side, ×30 (new); *5,* transverse thin section, showing calcite spar coating tubule walls and filling some tubules and obscuring the walls in a chaetetid skeleton, Bird Springs Formation, near Mountain Springs, Nevada, ×30 (new).



Fig. 50. Examples of diagenetically altered chaetetid skeletons (continued); *1,* SEM of a transverse surface, showing the increase in tubule wall thickness by the addition of mineral deposits in *Chaetetes radians,* Moscovian, upper Carboniferous, near Moscow, Russia, ×30 (new); *2,* SEM of the upper right corner of view *1,* note how this diagenetic process affects the cross-section shape of the tubules, ×60 (new).

Fig. 51. Similarities and differences between the cross-sectional areas of the tubules from some Carboniferous species of chaetetids; *1,* SEM of transverse surface, showing cross-sectional area (cross-sectional area of a single tubule is illustrated by the white area near center of the left margin, *white arrow*) of tubules in *Chaetetes radians* Fischer von Waldheim, 1830, Moscovian, near Podolsk, south of Moscow, Russia, ×20 (new); *2,* matrix showing the results of grouped T-tests of the cross-sectional areas of the tubules in eight different Carboniferous species (designated by *): (a) groups 8 and 9 are from two different thin sections from the same stratigraphic and geographic locality of *Chaetetes milleporaceous** Milne-Edwards & Haime, 1851; (b) groups 21 and 22 are two different areas from the same thin section of the holotype of *Chaetetes schucherti** Morgan, 1924; (c) group 28 is from a thin section of the holotype of *Chaetetes eximius** Moore & Jeffords, 1945; (d) group 40 is from a thin section of a paratype of *Chaetetes subtilis** Moore & Jeffords, 1945; (e) group 41 is from a thin section of the holotype of *Chaetetes favosus** Moore & Jeffords, 1945; (f) group 14 is from a thin section of a chaetetid, Chesterian, lower Carboniferous, Kentucky; (g) groups 16 and 20 are of two different thin sections of *Chaetetes radians* Fischer von Waldheim, 1830, presumably from the same stratigraphic and geographic locality; and (h) groups 17 and 18 are two different areas on the same thin section of *Chaetetes depressus** (Fleming, 1828); *D,* the groups are different; *ND,* there is no difference between the groups; D^1*,* the same species are different from themselves, although the expected results are that there would be no difference. Significant results are that there are: (1) no differences between: (a) *C. milleporaceous** (group 9) and *C. schucherti** (group 21); (b) *C. eximius** (group 28) and *C. schucherti** (group 22); (c) *C. favosus** (group 41) and *C. schucherti** (group 22); (d) *C. milleporaceous** (group 8) and the lower Carboniferous chaetetid (group 14); (e) *C. milleporaceous** (group 9) and *C. radians* (group 16); (f) *C. radians* (group 20) and *C. schucherti** (group 22), *C. eximius** (group 28) and *C. favosus** (group 41); (g) *C. depressus** (group 17) and the lower Carboniferous chaetetid (group 14); and (h) *C. depressus** (group 18) and *C. schucherti** (group 22), *C. eximius** (group 28), and *C. radians* (group 20); and (2) that there are differences (D^1) between groups 8 and 9*,* both *C. milleporaceous**; groups 21 and 22, both *C. schucherti**; and groups 17 and 18, both *C. depressus** (adapted from West, 1994, p. 405, fig. 4; courtesy of E. Schweizerbart Science Publishers).



1

Groups													
8													
9	D^{1}	*C. milleporaceous*											
21	D	ND											
22	D	D	D^{1}	*C. schucherti* holotype									
28	D	D	D	ND	*C. eximus* holotype								
40	D	D	D	D	D	*C. subtilis* paratype							
41	D	D	D	ND	D	D	*C. favosus* holotype						
14	ND	D	D	D	D	D	D	*C.* sp. Chesterian					
16	D	ND	D	D	D	D	D	D					
20	D	D	D	ND	ND	D	ND	D	D^{1}	*C. radians*			
17	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	ND	D	D			
18	D	D	D	ND	ND	D	D	D	D	ND	D^{1}	*C. depressus*	
	8	9	21	22	28	40	41	14	16	20	17	18	Groups

2

FIG. 51. *(For explanation, see facing page).*



	310/6	310/5	310/4	310/3	310/2	310/1
310/6						
310/5	D					
310/4	ND	D				
310/3	D	ND	ND			
310/2	ND	D	ND	D		
310/1	ND	D	ND	ND	ND	

FIG. 52. Similarities and differences between the cross-sectional areas of the tubules from a single laminar chaetetid, Pennsylvanian, lower Carboniferous, Amoret Limestone Member, Altamont Limestone, Montgomery County, Kansas; *1,* upper surface (transverse section) of polished and etched surface of laminar chaetetid, ×0.4 (new); *2,* outline of polished and etched surface of specimen in view *1,* with superimposed polar coordinates from 270° to 360° (10 rays 10° apart) and 6 arcs, each 13 mm apart; *3,* print of a transverse acetate peel print of the area at point 310-5, an example of the 100 tubules for which the cross-sectional area was obtained at each ray-arc intersection, ×30; *4,* sample sites along ray 310 with the one at arc 5 indicated by a *black arrow; 5,* matrix of T-tests comparing the 6 sample sites along ray 310, *ND,* no difference between sites; *D,* there is a difference between sites; expected results are that there would be no differences between any of the sites (new).

extensively modified and, along with absent spicules, are of little value systematically. Therefore, one is left examining the skeletal features of chaetetid skeletons, and these are unreliable because such skeletons are polyphyletic (WEST, 1994). For example, hypercalcified sponges with a chaetetid skeleton occur in at least three orders of the Demospongiae (Hadromerida, Poecilosclerida, and Agelasida) and possibly more. Additionally, taphonomic processes further complicate systematic studies, because they modify such skeletal features as the cross-sectional area of tubules, to the extent that they have little significance (WEST, 1994, 1995; Fig. 51–52).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Over the years, numerous individuals from many parts of the world have contributed to my efforts to learn more about chaetetid sponges, and I sincerely thank all of them. Authors and publishers who have permitted use of copyrighted illustrations are listed below, and their cooperation is greatly appreciated: N. Boury-Esnault; E. Brosius; J.-P. Cuif; G. Dieci; J.-C. Fischer; P. Gautret; W. Hartman; J. Kaźmierczak; S. Kershaw; R. Kirkpatrick; J. Mathewson; K. Miller; J. Reitner; P. Taylor; M.-J. Uriz; J. Vacelet; J. Wendt; R. Wood; G. Wörheide; and *Annales de Paléontologie (Invertébrés),* Elsevier Masson SAS; *Berliner Geowissenshaftliche Abhandlungen,* Free University, Berlin; *Bollettino della Società Paleontologica, Italiana;* CNRS, Paris; E. Schweizerbartsche Verlags, Naegele U Obermiller Science Publishers; *Géobios,* Université Lyon; Kansas Geological Survey; Kansas State University; *Lethaia;* Natural History Museum, London; Paleontological Association; Paleontological Research Institution, Ithaca, New York; *Publications Scientifiques du Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, Paris;* Real Sociedad Española de Historia Natural, Seccion Geologica, Madrid, Spain; Springer Science+Business Media; *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences;* and Yale Peabody Museum of Natural History. I am particularly indebted to the Coordinating Author of this volume, Barry Webby, for his sage advice, continuous support, and careful attention to detail. Unless otherwise noted, the many SEM images are due to the technical expertise and photographic skills of George R. Clark II. I am greatly indebted to the excellent and timely assistance of the staff of the Interlibrary Loan Department of Hale Library at Kansas State University. Financial assistance from the Petroleum Research Fund of the American Chemical Society, the National Science Foundation, the Kansas Geological Survey, and the Bureau of General Research at Kansas State University are gratefully acknowledged. I am especially grateful for the financial support for research in Japan and China, which was provided by the Japanese Society for the Promotion of Science and the Nanjing Institute of Geology and Paleontology, respectively.

REFERENCES

Ager, D. V. 1963. Principles of Paleoecology. McGraw-Hill. New York. 371 p.

Almazán, Emilio, Blanca Buitrón, Catalina Gómez-Espinosa, & Daniel Vachard. 2007. Moscovian chaetetid (boundstone) mounds in Sonora, Mexico. *In* E. Vennin, M. Aretz, F. Boulvain, & A. Munnecke, eds., Facies from Palaeozoic reefs and bioaccumulations. Mémoires du Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle 195:269–271.

Andri, Eugenio, & Franco Rossi. 1980. *Leiochaetetes furlensis* n. gen. n. sp. un nuovo chetetide del Passo del Furlo (Pesaro, Marche). Bollettino della Società Paleontologica Italiana 19(2):274–280.

Aretz, Markus. 2001. The upper Viséan coral horizons of Royseux—Development of an unusual facies in the Belgium Early Carboniferous. *In* Yoichi Ezaki, Kei Mori, Tetsuo Sugiyama, & James E. Sorauf, eds., Proceedings of the 8th International Symposium of Fossil Cnidaria and Porifera, Bulletin of Tohoku University Museum 1:86–95, 7 fig.

Aretz, Markus, & Hans-Georg Herbig. 2003a. Coral-rich bioconstructions in the Visean (Late Mississippian) of southern Wales (Gower Peninsula, UK). Facies 49:221–242.

Aretz, Markus, & Hans-Georg Herbig. 2003b. Contribution of rugose corals to late Viséan and Serpukhovian bioconstructions in the Montagne Noire (southern France). *In* W. M. Ah, P. M. Harris, W. A. Morgan, & I. D. Somerville, eds., Permo-Carboniferous Carbonate Platforms and Reefs. SEPM Special Publication No. 78 and AAPG Memoir No. 83:119–132.

Aretz, Markus, & John Nudds. 2007. Palaeoecology of the late Visean (Dinantian) coral-chaetetid biostrome at Little Asby Scar (Cumbria, Great Britain). *In* B. Hubmann & W. E. Piller, eds., Fossil Corals and Sponges. Proceedings of the 9th International Symposium on Fossil Cnidaria and Porifera. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften Schriftenreihe Erdwissenschaftlichen Kommissionen 17:365–381, 5 fig., 2 pl.

Armstrong, F. A. J. 1965. Silicon. *In* J. P. Riley & G. Skirrow, eds., Chemical Oceanography, vol. 1. Academic Press. London. p. 409–432.

Bakus, G. J. 1968. Sedimentation and benthic invertebrates of Fanning Island, Central Pacific. Marine Geology 6:45–51.

Barrier, Pascel, Helmut Zibrowius, Pierre Lozouet, Christian Montenat, Philippe Ott d'Estevou, Francisco Serrano, & Henri-Jean Soudet. 1991. Une faune de fond dur du bathyal supérieur dans le Miocène terminal des cordillères bétiques (Carboneras, SE Espagne). Mésogée 51:3–13, 4 fig.

Bassler, Ray S. 1906. A study of the James types of Ordovician and Silurian Bryozoa. U. S. National Museum, Proceedings 30:1–66.

Bassler, Ray S. 1950. Faunal lists and descriptions of Paleozoic corals. Geological Society of America Memoir 44:315.

Benavides, L. M., & E. R. M. Druffel. 1986. Sclerosponge growth rate as determined by ^{210}Pb and ^{14}C chronologies. Coral Reefs 4:221–224.

Bergquist, Patricia R. 1978. Sponges. Hutchinson & Co. London. 268 p.

Bernecker, M., & O. Weidlich. 1994. Attempted reconstruction of Permian and Triassic skeletonization from reefbuilders (Oman, Turkey): Quantitative assessment with digital image analysis. *In* B. Senowbari-Daryan & A. Dauer, eds., Festschrift on the 60th Birthday of Erik Flügel. Abhandlungen der Geologischen Bundesanstalt 50:31–56.

Bertrand, M., M. Coen-Aubert, V. Dumoulin, A. Préat, & F. Tourneur. 1993. Sedimentology and palaeoecology of upper Emsian and lower Eifelian strata in the Couvin and Villers-la-Tour areas (southern margin of Dinant Synclinorium, Belgium). Neues Jahrbuch für Geologie und Paläontologie, Abhandlungen 188:177–211.

Bizzarini, Fabrizio, & Giampietro Braga. 1978. Upper Triassic new genera and species of fair and questionable Bryozoa and Chaetetida from the S. Cassiano Formation of the Dolomites (Eastern Alps). Bollettino della Società Paleontologica Italiana 17(1):28–48.

Bizzarini, Fabrizio, & Giampietro Braga. 1988. Osservazioni su alcuni Chaetetidi delle Prealpi Veneto-Trentine. Annali dei Musei civici di Rovereto Sezione. Archeologia, Storia Scienze Naturali 42:137–158.

Blomeier, Dierk, Christian Scheibner, & Holger Forke. 2009. Facies arrangement and cyclostratigraphic architecture of a shallow-marine, warm-water carbonate platform: the Late Carboniferous Ny Friesland Platform in eastern Spitsbergen (Pyefjellet Beds, Wordiekammen Formation, Gipsdalen Group). Facies 55:291–324.

Boiko, E. V. 1979. Pozdnetriasovie Hydrozoa Yugo-Vostocnogo Pamira [Late Triassic Hydrozoa from the Pamira Region of Yugoslavia]. Akademiya Nauk Zadzhikskoi SSSR, Institut Geologii. Dushanbe. 113 p.

Borchiellini, Carole, Catherine Chombard, Michael Manuel, Eliane Alivon, Jean Vacelet, & Nicole Boury-Esnault. 2004. Molecular phylogeny of Demospongiae: Implications for Classification and Scenarios of Character Evolution. Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution 32:823–837.

Boury-Esnault, Nicole. 2006. Systematics and evolution of Demospongiae. Canadian Journal of Zoology 84(2):205–224.

Boury-Esnault, Nicole, & Klaus Rützler. 1997. Thesaurus of Sponge Morphology. Smithsonian Contributions to Zoology, Number 596:55 p.

Boyajian, George E., & Michael LaBarbera. 1987. Biomechanical analysis of passive flow of stromatoporoids—Morphologic, paleontologic, and systematic implications. Lethaia 20:223–229.

Broadhead, Thomas W. 1975. Biostratigraphy and paleoecology of the Floyd Shale, Upper Mississippian, northwest Georgia. Unpublished Master's Thesis. University of Texas at Austin. 250 p.

Broecker, Wallace. S. 1974. Chemical Oceanography. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc. New York. 214 p.

Bromley, Richard G., & Claus Heinberg. 2006. Attachment Strategies of Organisms on Hard Substrates: A Palaeontological View. Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology 232:429–453.

Brosius, Elizabeth. 2006. Windows to the Past—A Guidebook to Common Invertebrate Fossils of Kansas. Kansas Geological Survey Educational Series 16:56 p.

Burton, M. 1949. Notes on the ecology of sponges. British Science News 2:83–85.

Candelas, G. C., & G. A. Candelas. 1963. Notes on the seasonal distribution of the sponge *Hymeniacidon heliophila* at Beaufort, North Carolina. Ecology 44:595–597.

Chatterton, Brian D. E., Paul Copper, Owen A. Dixon, & Stacey Gibbs. 2008. Spicules in Silurian tabulate corals from Canada and implications for their affinities. Palaeontology 51:173–198.

Chombard, Catherine, Nicole Boury-Esnault, Annie Tillier, & Jean Vacelet. 1997. Polyphyly of "Sclerosponges" (Porifera, Demospongiae) supported by 28S Ribosomal Sequences. Biological Bulletin 193:359–367.

Clark II, G. R. 1976. Shell growth in the marine environment: Approaches to the problem of marginal calcification. American Zoologist 16:617–626.

Connolly, W. M., L. L. Lambert, & R. J. Stanton, Jr. 1989. Paleoecology of Lower and Middle Pennsylvanian (Middle Carboniferous) *Chaetetes* in North America. Facies 20:139–168.

Connolly, W. M., & R. J. Stanton, Jr. 1983. Sedimentation and paleoenvironment of Morrowan strata in the Hueco Mountains, West Texas. *In* S. J. Meader-Roberts, ed., Geology of the Sierra Diablo and southern Hueco Mountains. Society of Economic Paleontologists and Mineralogists Permian Basin. Midland, Texas. p. 36–64.

Connolly, W. M., & R. J. Stanton, Jr. 1986. Lower Pennsylvanian (Morrowan) sedimentation in the Orogrande Basin. *In* J. L. Ahlen & M. E. Hansen, eds., Southwest section of American Association of Petroleum Geologists, Transactions and Guidebook of 1986 Convention, Ruidoso, New Mexico. New Mexico Bureau of Mines and Mineral Resources. Socorro, New Mexico. p. 129–142.

Copper, P. 2002. Silurian and Devonian reefs: 80 million years of global greenhouse between two ice ages. *In* W. Kiessling, E. Flügel, & J. Golonka, eds., Phanerozoic Reef Patterns. SEPM (Society of Sedimentary Geology) Publication 72:181–238.

Copper, Paul, & Y. Plusquellec. 1993. Ultrastructure of the walls, tabulae and "polyps" in Early Silurian *Favosites* from Anticosti Island, Canada. Courier Forschungsinstitut Senckenberg 164:301–308.

Corriero, G., L. S. Liaci, D. Ruggiero, & M. Pansini. 2000. The sponge community of a semi-submerged Mediterranean cave. Marine Ecology 21(1):85–96.

Cremer, Holger. 1995. Spicule pseudomorphs in Upper Triassic (Norian) chaetetid sponges from the western Taurids (Antalya-Region, SW Turkey). Geobios 28:163–174.

Cuif, Jean-Pierre. 1974. Rôle des Sclerosponges dans la faune récifale du Trias des Dolomites (Italie du Nord). Geobios 7(2):139–153.

Cuif, Jean-Pierre, Françoise Debrenne, J. G. Lafuste, & Jean Vacelet. 1979. Comparaison de la microstructure du squelette carbonate nonspiculaire d'éponges actuelles et fossiles. *In* C. Levi & N. Boury-Esnault, eds., Biologie des Spongiaires. Colloques Internationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique 291:459–465.

Cuif, Jean-Pierre, & F. Ezzoubair. 1991. Diversité des Cératoporellides Triasiques. Geobios 24(3):257–266.

Cuif, Jean-Pierre, Pierre Feuillée, Jean-Claude Fischer, & André Pascal. 1973. Présence d'astrorhizes chez les Chaetetida mésozoïques. Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences, Paris (series D) 277:2473–2476.

Cuif, Jean-Pierre, & Jean-Claude Fischer. 1974. Étude systematique sur les Chaetetida du Trias de Turquie. Annales de Paléontologie (Invertébrés) 60(1):3–14.

Cuif, Jean-Pierre, & Pascale Gautret. 1987. Comparaison des modalités de diagenèse du squelette de spongiaires carbonatés dans le Trias de Turquie et le Permien de Tunisie. Geobios 20(6):757–773.

Cuif, Jean-Pierre, & Pascale Gautret. 1991. Taxonomic value of microstructural features in calcified tissue from Recent and fossil Demospongiae and Calcarea. *In* J. Reitner & H. Keupp, eds., Fossil and Recent Sponges. Springer-Verlag. Berlin and Heidelberg. p. 159–169.

Cuif, Jean-Pierre, & Pascale Gautret. 1993. Microstructural features of fibrous tissue in the skeletons of some chaetetid sponges. *In* P. Oekentorp-Küster, ed., Proceedings of the VI International Symposium on Fossil Cnidaria and Porifera, Munster Cnidarian Symposium, vol. 1. Courier Forschungsinstitut Senckenberg 164:309–315.

Cumings, Edgar Roscoe. 1912. Development and systematic position of the monticuliporoids. Geological Society of America Bulletin 23:357–370.

Dassow, M. von. 2006. Influences of flow and feeding on colony organization in a bryozoan. Integrative and Comparative Biology 45(60):1090.

Dauphin, Yannicke, Pascale Gautret, & Jean-Pierre Cuif. 1996. Diagenetic changes in the chemical composition of Triassic biogenic aragonites in sponges, corals and cephalopods from the lower Norian of Lycian Tarus (Turkey). Bulletin de la Société Géologique de France 167(2):247–256.

Dean, M. T., A. W. Owen, & C. J. Dooris. 2008. Palaeoecology of the *Chaetetes*-Band: A numerical approach. The Palaeontological Association Newsletter 69:50–51.

De Goeij, J. M., H. van den Berg, M. M. van Oostveen, E. H. G. Epping, & F. C. van Duyl. 2008. Major bulk dissolved organic carbon (DOC) removal by encrusting coral reef cavity sponges. Marine Ecology Progress Series 357:139–151.

Deng Zhan-Qui. 1982. Mesozoic Chaetetida from Xizang (Tibet). Palaeontology of Xizang, part 4. Science Press. Beijing. p. 195–202. In Chinese with English abstract.

DeVries, D. A. 1955. Paleoecology and paleontology of a *Chaetetes* biostrome in Madison County, Iowa. PhD dissertation. University of Wisconsin. Madison. 69 p.

Dieci, G., A. Russo, & F. Russo. 1974. Nota preliminare sulla microstruttura di spugne aragonitiche del Trias medio-superiore. Bollettino della Società Paleontologica Italiana 13(1–2):99–107.

Dieci, Giovanni, Antinio Russo, Franco Russo, & Maria S. Marchi. 1977. Occurrence of spicules in Triassic chaetetids and ceratoporellids. Bollettino della Società Paleontologica Italiana 16(2):229–238.

Dietrich, W. O. 1919. Über sogen, Tabulaten des Jura und der Kreide, insbesondere die Gattung Acantharia Qu. Centralblatt für Mineralogie, Geologie und Paläontologie 1919:208–218.

Döderlein, L. 1892. Über *Petrostoma schulzei* n. g., n. sp., der Kalkschwamme [Description of *Petrostoma schulzei* of Calcarea, representing a new order of Lithones]. Verhandlungen Deutsche Zoologische Gesellschaft 2:143–145.

Döderlein, L. 1897. Über die Lithonina, eine neue Gruppe von Kalkschwammen. Zoologisches Jahrbucher, Abteilung fur Systematik, Geographie und Biologie der Thiere 10(1):15–32, pl. 2–6.

Dullo, Wolf-Christian. 2005. Coral growth and reef growth: A brief review. Facies 51:33–48.

Duncan, Helen M. 1965. Mississippian chaetetid from Kentucky. *In* Geological Survey Research 1965. United States Geological Survey Professional Paper 525A:A122.

Duncan, Helen M. 1966. Mississippian occurrence of *Chaetetes*. *In* Geological Survey Research 1966. United States Geological Survey Professional Paper 550A:A112.

Duncan, P. M. 1872. Third Report on the British Fossil Corals. Report of 41st Meeting of British Association for the Advancement of Science, Edinburgh 1871:116–137.

Dustan, P., & W. K. Sacco. 1982. The sclerosponge of Chalet Caribe Reef. Discovery 16:13–17.

Dybowski, W. N. 1877. Die Chaetitiden der ostbaltischen Silur-Formation. Russisch-Kaiserliche Mineralogische Gesellschaft zu St. Petersburg Verhandlungen (series 2) 14(1878):1–134.

Eichwald, C. E. von. 1829. Zoologia specialis quam expositis animalibus tum vivis, tum fossilibus potissimum Rossiae in universum, et Poloniae, in specie, in usum, lectionum, vol. 1. J. Zawalski. Vilna. vi + 314 p., 5 pl.

Engeser, Theo S., & Paul D. Taylor. 1989. Supposed Triassic bryozoans in the Klipstein Collection from the Italian Dolomites redescribed as calcified demosponges. Bulletin of the British Museum Natural History (Geology) 45(1):39–55.

Erwin, P. M., & R. W. Thacker. 2006. Incidence and importance of photosynthetic symbionts in shallow-water sponge communities. Integrative and Comparative Biology 45(6):992.

Etheridge Jr., Robert. 1899. On the corals of the Tamworth District, chiefly from the Moore Creek and Woolomol Limestones. Records of the Geological Survey of New South Wales 6:151–182.

Fabre, Cécile, & Bernard Lathuiliere. 2007. Relationships between growth-bands and paleoenvironmental proxies Sr/Ca and Mg/Ca in hypercalcified sponge: A micro-laser induced breakdown spectroscopy approach. Spectrochimica Acta (part B) 62:1537–1545.

Fagerstrom, J. A. 1984. The ecology and paleoecology of the Sclerospongiae and Sphinctozoa (*sensu stricto*): A review. Palaeontographica Americana 54:370–381.

Fagerstrom, J. A. 1987. The Evolution of Reef Communities. John Wiley and Sons. New York. 600 p.

Fagerstrom, J. A., & R. R. West. 2010. Roles of clone-clone interactions in building reef frameworks: Principles and examples. Facies, 20 p., doi: 10.1007/s10347-010-0251-z.

Fagerstrom, J. A., R. R. West, S. Kershaw, & P. J. Cossey. 2000. Spatial competition among clonal organisms in extant and selected Paleozoic reef communities. Facies 42:1–24.

Faul, Henry. 1943. Growth-rate of a Devonian reef coral (*Prismatophyllum*). American Journal of Science 241:579–582.

Finks, Robert M. 1970. The evolution and ecologic history of sponges during Palaeozoic times. *In* W. G. Fry, ed., The Biology of the Porifera. Symposia of the Zoological Society of London 25:3–22.

Finks, Robert M. 1986. “Spicules” in *Thamnopora*. Fossil Cnidaria 15(1.2):22.

Finks, Robert M. 2003a. Functional morphology and adaptation. *In* R. L. Kaesler, ed., Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology, Part E, Porifera (Revised), vol. 2. The Geological Society of America, Inc. and The University of Kansas. Boulder, Colorado and Lawrence, Kansas. p. 211–222.

Finks, Robert M. 2003b. Evolution and ecologic history of sponges during Paleozoic times. *In* R. L. Kaesler, ed., Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology, Part E, Porifera (Revised), vol. 2. Geological Society of America, Inc. and The University of Kansas. Boulder, Colorado and Lawrence, Kansas. p. 261–274.

Finks, Robert M., & J. Keith Rigby. 2004. Hypercalcified sponges. *In* R. L. Kaesler, ed., Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology, Part E, Porifera (Revised), vol. 3. The Geological Society of America, Inc. and The University of Kansas. Boulder, Colorado and Lawrence, Kansas. p. 585–594.

Fischer, Jean-Claude. 1970. Revision et essai de classification des Chaetetida (Cnidaria) post-Paleozoïques. Annales de Paléontologie (Invertébrés) 56(2):151–220.

Fischer, Rudolf, Carlos Galli Oliver, & Joachim Reitner. 1989. Skeletal structure, growth, and paleoecology of the patch reef-building ploychaete worm *Diplochaetetes mexicanus* Wilson, 1986 from the Oligocene of Baja California (Mexico). Geobios 22(5):761–775, 2 fig., 4 pl.

Fischer von Waldheim [de Waldheim], G. F. 1830. Oryctographie du Gouvernement de Moscou, 1st ed. A. Semen. Moscow. ix + 28 p., pl. A–G, i–xliv, i–xvi.

Fischer von Waldheim [de Waldheim], G. F. 1837. Oryctographie du Gouvernement de Moscou, 2nd ed. A. Semen. Moscow. v + 202 p., xv–xvii, pl. A–G, i–lvii.

Fleming, John. 1828. A Study of British Animals. Bell & Bradfute. Edinburgh. xxiii + 565 p.

Flügel, Erik. 1961. Bryozoen aus den Zlambach-Schichten (Rhat) des Salzkammergutes, Osterreich. Österreich Akademie der Wissenschaften, Mathematisch-Naturwissenschaftlische Klasse, Abhandlungen 170:265–272.

Flügel, Erik, & E. Flügel-Kahler. 1968. Stromatoporoidea (Hydrozoa palaeozoica), Fossilium Catalogus, I: Animalia, vol. 115–116. W. Junk. s’Gravenhage. 681 p.

Flügel, Erik, & Wolfgang Kiessling. 2002. Patterns of Phanerozoic reef crisis. *In* W. Kiessling, E. Flügel, & J. Golonka, eds., Phanerozoic Reef Patterns. SEPM (Society of Sedimentary Geology) Publication 72:691–733, 13 fig.

Flügel, Erik, & Joachim Reinhardt. 1989. Uppermost Permian reefs in Skyros (Greece) and Sichuan (China): Implications for the Late Permian extinction event. PALAIOS 4:502–518.

Fosså, J. H., P. B. Mortensen, & D. M. Furevik. 2002. The deep-water coral *Lophelia pertusa* in Norwegian waters: Distribution and fishery impacts. Hydrobiologia 471:1–12.

Frohlich, H., & D. Barthel. 1997. Silica uptake of the marine sponge *Halichondria panicea* in Keil Bight. Marine Biology 128:115–125.

Fromentel, M. E. de. 1860. Introduction à l’étude des éponges fossiles. Mémoires de la Société Linnéenne de Normandie 11:1–50, pl. 1–4.

Fromentel, M. E. de. 1861. Introduction à l’étude des polypiers fossiles. F. Savy. Paris. 357 p.

Fuchtbauer, H., & Lawrence A. Hardie. 1976. Experimentally determined homogeneous distribution coefficients for precipitated magnesian calcites: Application to marine carbonate cements. Geological Society of America Abstracts with Program 8:877.

Fuchtbauer, H., & Lawrence A. Hardie. 1980. Comparison of experimental and natural magnesian calcites. International Society of Sedimentologists Meeting Abstracts. Bochum. p. 167–169.

Fürsich, F. T., & J. Wendt. 1977. Biostratinomy and palaeoecology of the Cassian Formation (Triassic) of the Southern Alps. Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology 22:257–323.

Galloway, J. J. 1957. Structure and classification of the Stromatoporoidea. Bulletin of American Paleontology 37(164):345–480.

García-Bellido, Diego C., & Sergio Rodríguez. 2005. Palaeobiogeographical relationships of poriferan and coral assemblages during the late Carboniferous and the closure of the western Palaeotethys Sea–Panthalassan Ocean connection. Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology 219:321–331, 2 fig., 4 tables, doi: 10.1016/j.palaeo.2005.01.004.

Gautret, Pascale. 1987. Diagenetic and original nonfibrous microstructures within Recent and Triassic hypercalcified sponges. Revue de Paleobiologie 6(1):81–88.

Gautret, Pascale, & Frederic Marin. 1993. Diagenetic tendencies in aragonitic fibrous structures of corals and calcified demosponges from the Triassic of Turkey. Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences, Paris (series 2) 316(9):1319–1325.

Gautret, Pascale, & Saloua Razgallah. 1987. Architecture et microstructure des Chaetétides du Permien du Jebel Tebaga (Sud-Tunisie). Annals de Paléontologie 73(2):59–82.

Gautret, Pascale, Joachim Reitner, & Frederic Marin. 1996. Mineralization events during growth of the coralline sponges *Acanthochaetetes* and *Vaceletia*. Bulletin de l'Institut Oceanographique Monaco 14:325–334.

Gautret, Pascale, Jean Vacelet, & Jean-Pierre Cuif. 1991. Caractéristiques des spicules et du squelette carbonaté des espèces actuelles du genre *Merlia* (démosponge, Merliida), et comparaison avec des chaetétides fossiles. Bulletin du Muséum Nationale de l'Histoire Naturelles de Paris (section A) 13:289–307.

Giattini, G. B. 1902. Fossili del Lovcen nel Montenegro. Rivista Italiana di Paleontologia 8:62–66.

Gillette, Tracy. 1947. The Clinton of western and central New York. New York State Museum Bulletin Number 341:191 p., 20 fig., 4 tables.

Ginn, B. K., A. Logan, & M. L. H. Thomas. 2000. Sponge ecology on sublittoral hard substrates in a high current velocity area. Estuarine, Coastal, and Shelf Science 50:403–414.

Girty, George H. 1913. A Report on Upper Paleozoic fossils collected in China in 1903–1904. *In* Bailey Willis, Eliot Blackwelder, Rufus H. Sargent, Friedrich Hirth, Charles D. Walcott, S. Weller, & George H. Girty, eds., Research in China, vol. 3. Carnegie Institute of Washington, Publication 54:297–334.

Glaessner, Martin F. 1962. Precambrian fossils. Biological Review 37:467–494.

Gómez-Herguedas, Alberto, & Serigo Rodríguez. 2009. Palaeoenvironmental analysis based on rugose corals and microfacies: A case study at La Cornuda section (early Serpukhovian, Guadiato Area, SW Spain). Lethaia 42:39–54.

Grabau, Amadeus W., & Hervey W. Shimer. 1909. North American Index Fossils, vol. 1. A. G. Seiler Co. New York. 853 p.

Gray, David I. 1980. Spicule pseudomorphs in a Palaeozic chaetetid and its sclerosponge affinities. Palaeontology 23(4):803–820.

Gundrum, L. 1979. Demosponges as substrates: An example from the Pennsylvanian of North America. Lethaia 12:105–119.

Gutschick, Raymond C. 1965. *Pterotocrinus* from the Kinkaid Limestone (Chester, Mississippian) of Illinois and Kentucky. Journal of Paleontology 39(4):636–646, 6 fig., 2 pl.

Hajdu, Eduardo, & Rob W. M. van Soest. 2002. Family Merliidae Kirkpatrick, 1908. *In* J. N. A. Hooper & R. W. M. van Soest, eds., Systema Porifera, vol. 1. Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers. New York, Boston, Dordrecht, London, and Moscow. p. 691–693.

Hardie, Lawrence A. 1996. Secular variation in seawater chemistry: An explanation for the coupled secular variation in the mineralogies of marine limestones and potash evaporates over the last 600 m.y. Geology 24:279–283.

Hartman, Willard D. 1980. Systematics of the Porifera. *In* Willard D. Hartman, Jobst W. Wendt, & Felix Wiedenmayer, eds., Living and Fossil Sponges; Notes for a Short Course, Sedimenta VIII. Comparative Sedimentology Laboratory, Division of Marine Geology and Geophysics, Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science. University of Miami. Miami. p. 24–51.

Hartman, Willard D. 1984. Astrorhizae, mamelons and symbionts of Recent sclerosponges. Palaeontographica Americana 54:305–314.

Hartman, Willard D., & Thomas F. Goreau. 1966. *Ceratoporella*, a living sponge with stromatoporoid affinities. American Zoologist 6(4):262.

Hartman, Willard D., & Thomas F. Goreau. 1970. Jamaican Coralline Sponges: Their Morphology, Ecology, and Fossil Relatives. *In* W. G. Fry, ed., The Biology of the Porifera, Symposia of the Zoological Society of London 25. Academic Press. London. p. 205–243.

Hartman, Willard D., & Thomas F. Goreau. 1972. *Ceratoporella* (Porifera: Sclerospongiae) and the chaetetid 'corals.' Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences 44:133–148.

Hartman, Willard D., & Thomas F. Goreau. 1975. A Pacific tabulate sponge, living representative of a new order of sclerosponges. Postilla 167:21 p.

Hartman, Willard D., & Thomas F. Goreau. 1976. A new ceratoporellid sponge (Porifera: Sclerospongiae) from the Pacific. *In* F. W. Harrison, & R. R. Cowden, eds., Aspects of Sponge Biology. Academic Press. New York and London. p. 329–347.

Heckel, P. H. 1974. Carbonate buildups in the geologic record: A review. *In* L. Laporte, ed., Reefs in Time and Space. Society of Economic Paleontologists and Mineralogists Special Publication 18:90–154.

Helm, C., & I. Schuelke. 2006. Patch reef development in the Florigemma-Bank Member (Oxfordian) from the Deister Mts (NW Germany): A type example for Late Jurassic coral thrombolite thickets. Facies 52(3):441–467.

Hickson, S. J. 1911. On *Ceratopora*, the type of a new family of Alcyonaria. Proceedings of the Royal Society (series B) 84:195–200.

Hill, Dorothy. 1981. Rugosa and Tabulata. *In* C. Teichert, ed., Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology, Part F, Coelenterata, Supplement 1, vol. 2. The Geological Society of America and The University of Kansas. Boulder, Colorado, and Lawrence, Kansas. p. 379–762.

Hill, Dorothy, & E. C. Stumm. 1956. Tabulata. *In* R. C. Moore, ed., Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology, Part F, Coelenterata. The Geological Society of America and The University of Kansas. New York and Lawrence. p. 444–477.

Hill, Dorothy, & J. W. Wells. 1956. Hydroida and Spongiomorphida. *In* R. C. Moore, ed., Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology, Part F, Coelenterata. The Geological Society of America and The University of Kansas. New York and Lawrence. p. 81–89.

Hill, M., A. Hill, N. Lopez, & O. Harriott. 2006. The Caribbean sponge *Chondrilla nucula* harbors diverse and sponge-specific bacterial symbionts. Integrative and Comparative Biology 45(6):1145.

Hooper, J. N. A., & R. W. M. van Soest, eds. 2002a. Systema Porifera, vol. 1. Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers. New York, Boston, Dordrecht, London, and Moscow. xlviii + 1101 p.

Hooper, J. N. A., & R. W. M. van Soest. 2002b. Class Demospongiae Sollas, 1885. *In* John N. A. Hooper, & Rob W. M. van Soest, eds., Systema Porifera, vol. 1. Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers. New York, Boston, Dordrecht, London, and Moscow. p. 15–19.

Hubert B. L. M., M. K. Zapalski, J.-P. Nicollin, B. Mistiaen, & D. Brice. 2007. Selected benthic faunas from the Devonian of the Ardennes: An estimation of palaeobiodiversity. Acta Geologica Polonica 57(2):187–204.

Jackson, J. B. C., & L. W. Buss. 1975. Allelopathy and spatial competition among coral reef invertebrates. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA 72:5160–5163.

Jackson, J. B. C., T. F. Goreau, & W. D. Hartman. 1971. Recent brachiopod-coralline sponge communities and their paleoecological significance. Science 173:623–625.

James, U. P. 1881. On the monticuliporoid corals of the Cincinnati Group, with a critical revision of the species. The Paleontologist 5:33–44.

Jameson, Jeremy. 1980. Depositional environments in the Petershill Formation, Bathgate, West Lothian, vol. 1. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Edinburgh. Ediburgh. 545 p.

Jameson, Jeremy. 1987. Carbonate sedimentation on a mid-basin high: The Perteshill Formation, Midland Valley of Scotland. *In* John Miller, A. E. Adams, & V. P. Wright, eds., European Dinantian environments. John Wiley & Sons. New York. p. 309–327, 10 fig.

Jones, Adam C., James E. Blum, & Joseph R. Pawlik. 2005. Testing for defensive synergy in Caribbean sponges: Bad taste or glass spicules? Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology 322:67–81.

Kaandorp, Jaap A., & Janet E. Kubler. 2001. The Algorithmic Beauty of Seaweeds, Sponges, and Corals. Springer-Verlag. Berlin, Heidelberg, and New York. 193 p.

Kauffman, Erle C., & J. A. Fagerstrom. 1993. The Phanerozoic Evolution of Reef Diversity. *In* Robert E. Ricklefs & Dolph Schluter, eds., Species diversity in ecological communities. University of Chicago Press. Chicago. p. 315–329.

Kaźmierczak, Józef. 1979. Sclerosponge nature of chaetetids evidenced by speculated *Chaetetopsis favrei* (Deninger, 1906) from the Barremian of Crimea. Neues Jahrbuch für Geologie und Paläontologie, Monatshefte 2:97–108.

Kaźmierczak, Józef. 1984. Favositid tabulates: Evidence for poriferan affinity. Science 225:835–837.

Kaźmierczak, Józef. 1989. Halysitid tabulates: Sponges in corals' clothing. Lethaia 22:195–205.

Kaźmierczak, Józef. 1991. Further evidence for poriferan affinities of favositids. *In* J. Reitner & H. Keupp, eds., Fossil and Recent Sponges. Springer-Verlag. Berlin and Heidelberg. p. 212–223.

Kaźmierczak, Józef. 1994. Confirmation of the poriferan status of favositid tabulates. Acta Palaeontologica Polonica 39(3):233–245.

Kennish, M. J. 1989. Practical Handbook of Marine Science. CRC Press, Inc. Boca Raton, Florida. 710 p.

Kershaw, Stephen. 1981. Stromatoporoid growth form and taxonomy in a Silurian biostrome. Journal of Paleontology 55:1284–1295.

Kershaw, S. 1998. The applications of stromatoporoid palaeobiology in palaeoenvironmental analysis. Palaeontology 41:509–544.

Kershaw, Stephen, & Ronald R. West. 1991. Chaetetid growth form and its controlling factors. Lethaia 24:333–346.

Kershaw, S., R. A. Wood, & L. Guo. 2006. Stromatoporoid response to muddy substrates in Silurian limestones. Geologiska Föreningens i Stockholm Förhandlingar 128:131–138.

Kiessling, W., E. Flügel, & J. Golonka. 2002. Phanerozoic Reef Patterns. SEPM (Society of Sedimentary Geology) Publication 72:775 p.

Kirkpatrick, R. 1908. On two new genera of Recent pharetronid sponges. Annals and Magazine of Natural History (series 8) 2(12):503–514.

Kirkpatrick, R. 1911. On *Merlia normani*, a sponge with a siliceous and calcareous skeleton. Quarterly Journal of Microscopical Science 56(40):657–702, pl. 32–38.

Kirkpatrick, R. 1912. *Merlia normani* and its relation to certain Palaeozoic fossils. Nature 89:502–503.

Knott, N. A., A. J. Underwood, M. G. Chapman, & T. M. Glasby. 2006. Growth of the encrusting sponge *Tedania anhelans* (Lieberkuhn) on vertical and on horizontal surfaces of temperate subtidal reefs. Marine and Freshwater Research 57(1):95–104.

Kobluk, D. R., & R. W. M. van Soest. 1989. Cavity-dwelling sponges in a southern Caribbean coral reef and their paleontological implications. Bulletin of Marine Science 44:1207–1235.

Koechlin, Eduard. 1947. Chaetetiden aus dem Malm des Berner Jura. Schweizerische Palaeontologische Abhandlungen 65:1–16.

Koehl, M. A. R. 1982. Mechanical design of spicule-reinforced connective tissue: Stiffness. Journal of Experimental Biology 98:239–267.

Kötter, I., & J. Pernthaler. 2002. In situ feeding rates of obligate and facultative coelobite (cavity-dwelling) sponges in a Caribbean coral reef 1. Proceedings of the 9th International Coral Reef Symposium 1:347–350.

Krempf, A. 1934. Enregistrement du cycle marégraphique de 18 ans 2/3 par le polypier en voie de croissance de quelques corallaires. Annales des Sciences Naturelles, Zoologie et Biologie Animale (series 10) 18:135–143.

Lafuste, Jean, & Jean-Claude Fischer. 1971. Sur la présence de fibres à bosselures chez les Chaetetida (cnidaires) du Paléozoïque et du Mésozoïque. Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences, Paris D272:1488–1490.

Lang, J. C., W. D. Hartman, & L. S. Land. 1975. Sclerosponges: Primary framework constructors on the Jamaican deep-fore reef. Journal of Marine Research 33:223–231.

Lange, Robert, Matthias Bergbauer, Ulrich Szewzyk, & Joachim Reitner. 2001. Soluble proteins control growth of skeleton crystals in three coralline demosponges. Facies 45:195–202.

Larroux, C., B. Fahey, B. D. Liubicich, V. F. Hinman, M. Gauthier, M. Gongora, Gert Wörheide, S. P. Leys, & B. M. Degnan. 2006. Developmental gene expression in a sponge: Insights into the last common ancestor of all metazoans. Evolution and Development 8(2):150–173.

Laubenfels, M. W. 1947. Ecology of sponges of a brackish water environment at Beaufort, North Carolina. Ecological Monograph 17:31–46.

Laubenfels, M. W. 1950. An ecological discussion of the sponges of Bermuda. Transactions of the Zoological Society of London 27:155–201.

Lazareth, Claire E., Philippe Willenz, Jacques Navez, Eddy Keppens, Frank Dehairs, & Luc Andre. 2000. Sclerosponges as a new potential recorder of environmental changes: Lead in *Ceratoporella nicholsoni*. Geology 28:515–518.

Lecompte, Marius. 1939. Les Tabules du Devonien moyen et superieur du Bord sud du Bassin de Dinant. Musée Royal d'Histoire Naturelle de Belgique, Mémoirs 90:229 p.

Lecompte, Marius. 1952. Madreporaires Paléozoïques. *In* Jean Piveteau, ed., Traité de Paleontologie, vol. 1, Généralités, Protistes, Spongiaires, Coelentères, Bryozoaires. Masson et Cie, Éditeurs. Paris. p. 419–538.

Lehnert, H., & Joachim Reitner. 1997. Lebensdaur und regeneration bei *Ceratoporella nicholsoni* (Hickson, 1911) und *Spirastrella (Acanthochaetetes) wellsi* (Hartman & Goreau, 1975). Geologische Blätter für Nordost-Bayern und angrenzende Gebeite 47:265–272.

Leinfelder, R., F. Schlagintwelt, W. Werner, O. Erbli, M. Nose, D. U. Schmid, & G. W. Hughes. 2005. Significance of stromatoporoids in Jurassic reefs and carbonate platforms—Concepts and implications. Facies 51:287–325.

Leinfelder, Reinhold R., Dieter U. Schmid, Martin Nose, & Winfried Werner. 2002. Jurassic reef patterns—The expression of a changing globe. *In* W. Kiessling, E. Flügel, & J. Golonka, eds., Phanerozoic Reef Patterns. SEPM (Society of Sedimentary Geology) Publication 72:465–520, 18 fig.

Lin Baoyu, Tchi Yongyi, Jin Chuntai, Li Yaoxi, & Yan Youyin. 1988. Monograph of Palaeozoic Corals—Tabulatomorphic Corals, 2 vol. Geological Publishing House. Beijing. Vol. 1, 467 p.; vol. 2, 491 p.

Lindström, G. 1873. Nagra anteckningar om Anthozoa Tabulata. Öfversigt af Kongliga Vetenskaps-akademiens Förhandlingar, Stockholm 30(4):3–20.

Lister, J. J. 1900. *Astrosclera willeyana*, the type of a new family of sponges. *In* Arthur Willey, ed., Willey's Zoological Results. Part 4. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge. p. 459–482.

Lord, E., & S. E. Walker. 2009. The paleoecology of a Mississippian reef from northwestern Georgia. Geological Society of America Abstracts with Programs 41(7):102.

Ma Ting Ying. H. 1933. On the seasonal change in growth of some Palaeozoic corals. Proceedings of the Imperial Academy of Japan 9:407–409.

Ma Ting Ying. H. 1934. On the growth rate of reef corals and the sea water temperature in the Japanese Islands during the latest geological times, Science Report Tohoku Imperial University (2nd series, Geology) 16(3):165–187.

Ma Ting Ying. H. 1937a. On the seasonal growth in Palaeozoic tetracorals and the climate during the Devonian period. Palaeontologia Sinica (series B) 2(3):50 p.

Ma Ting Ying. H. 1937b. On the growth rate of reef corals and its relation to sea water temperature. Palaeontologia Sinica (series B) 16(1):226 p.

Ma Ting Ying. H. 1943a. The climate and the relative positions of Eurasia and North America during the Ordovician period as determined by the growth rate of corals, Research on the Past Climate and Continental Drift, vol. 1. Published by the author. Yungan, Fukien, China. 34 p.

Ma Ting Ying. H. 1943b. The climate and the relative positions of continents during the Silurian period as determined by the growth rate of corals, research on the past climate and continental drift, vol. 2. Published by the author. Yungan, Fukien, China. 88 p.

Ma Ting Ying. H. 1943c. The climate and the relative positions of continents during the Devonian period, research on the past climate and continental drift, vol. 3. Published by the author. Yungan, Fukien, China. 92 p.

Maldonado, Manuel, M. Carmen Carmona, Maria J. Uriz, & Antonio Cruzado. 1999. Decline in Mesozoic reef-building sponges explained by silicon limitation. Nature 401:785–788.

Marin, Frederic, & Pascale Gautret. 1993. Acidic amino acid contents in soluble organic matrices of sponges and coral calcareous skeletons: A possible implication in their diagenetic change. Bulletin de la Société Géologique de France 165(1):77–84.

Mastandrea, Adelaide, & Franco Russo. 1995. Microstructure and diagenesis of calcified demosponges from the Upper Triassic of the northeastern Dolomites (Italy). Journal of Paleontology 69(3):416–431.

Mathewson, J. E. 1977. Chaetetids and their paleoenvironments in the Amoret Limestone Member (Desmoinesian) of Labette County, Kansas. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Kansas State University. Manhattan. 148 p.

May, Andreas. 1993. Korallen aus dem höheren Eifelium und unteren Givetium (Devon) des nordwestlichen Sauerlandes (Rheinisches Schiefergebirge). Teil II: Rugose Korallen, Chaetetiden und spezielle Themen. Palaeontographica (Abt. A) 228:1–103.

May, Andreas. 2008. Corals (Anthozoa, Tabulata and Rugosa) and chaetetids (Porifera) from the Devonian of the Semara area (Morocco) at the Museo Geominero (Madrid, Spain), and their biogeographic significance. Bulletin de l'Institut Scientifique, Rabat, Section Sciences de la Terre 30:1–12.

McKinney, Frank K., & Jeremy B. C. Jackson. 1989. Bryozoan Evolution. University of Chicago Press. Chicago. 238 p.

Méndez-Bedia, Isabel, Francisco Soto, & Esperanza Fernández-Martinez. 1994. Devonian reef types in the Cantabrian Mountains (NW Spain) and their faunal composition. *In* P. Oekentorp-Küster, ed., Proceedings of the VI International Symposium on Fossil Cnidaria and Porifera, Munster Cnidarian Symposium volume 2. Courier Forschungsinstitut Senckenberg 172:161–183, 10 fig.

Meroz-Fine, E., S. Shefer, & M. Ilan. 2005. Changes in morphology and physiology of an East Mediterranean sponge in different habitats. Marine Biology 147:243–250.

Mickleborough, J., & A. G. Wetherby. 1878. A Classified List of Lower Silurian Fossils, Cincinnati Group. James Barclay. Cincinnati. 26 p.

Miller, Keith B., & Ronald R. West. 1996. Growth-interruption surfaces within chaetetid skeletons: Records of physical disturbance and depositional dynamics. Lethaia 29:289–299.

Miller, S. A. 1877. American Paleozoic fossils: A Catalogue of the Genera and Species. Published by the author. Cincinnati, Ohio. 253 p.

Miller, S. A. 1889. North American Geology and Palaeontology for the use of ameteurs, students, and scientists. Press of Western Methodist Book Concern. Cincinnati, Ohio. 718 p.

Millet, J., & W. Kiessling. 2009. First record of coralline demosponges in the Pleistocene: Implications for reef ecology. Coral Reefs 28:867–870.

Milne-Edwards, Henri, & Jules Haime. 1849. Mémoire sur les polypiers appartenant aux groupes naturels des Zoanthaires perforés et des Zoanthaires tabulés. Académie des Sciences de Paris, Comptes Rendus 29:257–263.

Milne-Edwards, Henri, & Jules Haime. 1850. A Monograph of the British Fossil Corals. Palaeontographical Society Monograph. London. p. i–ixxxv, 1–71, pl. 1–11.

Milne-Edwards, Henri, & Jules Haime. 1851. Monographie des polypiers fossiles des terrains paléozoïque. Archives du Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris. Paris. 502 p., 20 pl.

Minwegen, E. 2001. Die biokonstruktionen im Pennsylvanium des Kantabrischen Gebirges (Nordspanien). Kölner Forum für Geologie und Paläontologie 9:139 p.

Minwegen, E. 2007. Moscovian beresellid algal-chaetetid sponge buildups, Northern Spain. *In* E. Vennin, M. Aretz, F. Boulvain, & A. Munnecke, eds., Facies from Palaeozoic reefs and bioaccumulations. Mémoires du Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle 195:261–263.

Montanez, Isabel P. 2002. Biological skeletal carbonate records changes in major-ion chemistry of paleo-oceans. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 99(25):15,852–15,854.

Montenat, Christian, Pascel Barrier, & Philippe Ott D'Estevou. 2002. The Vigny limestones: A record of Paleocene (Danian) tectonic-sedimentary events in the Paris Basin. Sedimentology 49:421–440.

Moore, Raymond C., & R. M. Jeffords. 1945. Descriptions of lower Pennsylvanian corals from Texas and adjacent states. University of Texas Publication 4401:77–208, fig. 1–214, pl. 14.

Moret, Leon. 1966. Manuel de Paleontologie Animale. Masson & Cie, Éditeurs. Paris. 781 p.

Morgan, George D. 1924. Geology of the Stonewall Quadrangle, Oklahoma. Bureau of Geology, Bulletin 2:248 p.

Mori, K. 1976. A new Recent sclerosponge from Ngargol, Palau Islands and its fossil relatives. Tohoku University Scientific Reports (2nd series) (Geology) 46(1):1–9.

Mori, K. 1977. A calcitic sclerosponge from Ishigaki-shima Coast, Ryukyu Islands, Japan. Tohoku University Scientific Reports (2nd series) (Geology) 47(1):1–5.

Mortensen, P. B., & H. T. Rapp. 1998. Oxygen- and carbon isotope ratios related to growth line patterns in skeletons of *Lophelia pertusa* (L.) (Anthozoa: Scleractinia): Implications for determination of linear extension rates. Saria 83:433–446.

Mostler, Helfried. 1990. Mikroskleren von demospongien (Porifera) aus dem basalen Jura der nördlichen Kalkalpen. Geologisch-Paläontologische Mitteilungen Innsbruck 17:119–142.

Müller, Arno Hermann. 1963. Lehrbuch der Paläozoologie. Band II, Invertebraten, Teil 1, Protozoa, Mollusca 1. VEB Gustav Fischer Verlag. Jena. 575 p.

Müller, Werner E. G., Anatoli Krasko, Gael Le Pennec, Renate Steffen, Matthias Wiens, Mohammed Shokry A. Ammar, Isabel Müller, & Heinz C. Schroder. 2003. Molecular mechanism of spicule formation in the demosonge *Suberites domuncula*: Silicatein–Collegan–Myotrophin. *In* W. E. G. Müller, ed., Silicon Biomineralization–Biology–Biochemistry–Molecular Biology–Biotechnology. Progress in Molecular and Subcellular Biology 33:195–221.

Nagai, Koichi. 1979. Organic reef deposits developed in the lower part of the Akiyoshi Limestone Group. Chikyu 1:661–667. In Japanese.

Nagai, Koichi. 1985. Reef-forming algal chaetetid boundstones found in the Akiyoshi limestone Group, southwest Japan. Bulletin of the Akiyoshi-dai Museum of Natural History 20:1–15.

Nagai, Koichi. 1992. Growing mechanism of the Carboniferous Akiyoshi Organic Reef Complex. Doctoral dissertation. Kyushu University. Fukuoka, Japan. 238 p., 64 pl.

Nagai, Koichi., A. Kano, T. Sugiyama, T. Haikawa, & A. Sugimura. 1999. Carboniferous oceanic reef complex in the Akiyoshi terrane, southwest Japan. Guidebook for Field Trip B1. 8th International Symposium on Fossil Cnidaria and Porifera. Sendai, Japan. 56 p.

Nagai, Koichi, Erika Kido, & Tetsuo Sugiyama. 2007. Late Palaeozoic oceanic reef complex, Akiyoshi limestone, Japan. *In* E. Vennin, M. Aretz, F. Boulvain, & A. Munnecke, eds., Facies from Palaeozoic reefs and bioaccumulations. Mémoires du Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle 195:257–259.

Nagai, Koichi, R. R. West, T. Sugiyama, & S. Mizuki. 2007. Living and Pleistocene chaetetid sponges from

Okinawa, Southwest Japan. *In* Olga Kossovaya, Ian Somerville, & Irina Evdokimova, eds., Tenth International Symposium on Fossil Cnidaria and Porifera, Abstracts. Russian Academy of Sciences, Federal Agency on Mineral resources of the Russian Federation, Russian National Committee of Geologists, International Association for the Study of Fossil Cnidaria and Porifera, and A. P. Karpinsky. Russian Geological Research Institute (VSEGEI). Saint-Petersburg, Russia. p. 66.

Nakamori, T. 1986. Community structures of Recent and Pleistocene hermatypic corals in the Ryukyu Islands, Japan. Tohoku University Scientific Reports (2nd series) (Geology) 56(2):71–133.

Neumayr, Melchior. 1889. Die Stämme des Thierreiches 1. Verlag von F. Tempsky, Buchhändler der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Österreich. Wien and Prague. 603 p.

Neumayr, Melchior. 1890. Beschreibung der Coelenteraten, Echinodermen, und Mollusken aus dem japanischen Jura. *In* E. Neumann & Malchior Neumayr, eds., Zur Geologie und Paläontologie von Japan. Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Mathematisch-Naturwissenschaftliche Classe 57:27–42.

Newell, Norman D. 1935. Some Mid-Pennsylvanian invertebrates from Kansas and Oklahoma: II. Stromatoporoidea, Anthozoa and gastropods. Journal of Paleontology 9(4):341–355.

Nicholson, H. Alleyne. 1874. Descriptions of species of *Chaetetes* from the Lower Silurian rocks of North America. Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society of London 30:499–515.

Nicholson, H. Alleyne. 1879. A Manual of Palaeontology for the Use of Students with a General Introduction on the Principles of Palaeontology, 2nd ed., vol. 1. William Blackwood and Sons. Edinburgh and London. 511 p.

Norford, B. S. 1971. Upper Ordovician corals *Chaetetipora* and *Sibiriolites* from northern Ellesmere Island, District of Franklin. Canadian Geological Survey Bulletin 197:1–11, 1 fig., 2 pl.

Nowinski, A., & E. Sarnecka. 2003. Sclerospongiae, chaetetids. *In* M. Pajchlowa, L. Malinowska, L. Milaczewski, E. Sarnecka, & T. Woroncowa-Marcinowska, eds., Atlas of index and characteristic fossils, vol. III, Pt. 1b, Devonian (Fascicles 1–2). Wydawnictwa PIG. Warsaw, Poland. p. 39–42.

Oakley, Kenneth P. 1936. An Ordovician species of *Chaetetes*. The Geological Magazine 73(10):440–444, pl. 12.

Oekentorp, Klemens. 1985. Spicules in favositid Tabulata—Remarks to J. Kazmierczak's interpretation by Kl. Oekentorp, Fossil Cnidaria 14(1):34–35.

Okulitch, Vladimir. J. 1936a. *Streptindytes chaetetiae*, a new species of "parasitic" annelid found in *Chaetetes radians*. The American Midland Naturalist 17:983– 984.

Okulitch, Vladimir J. 1936b. On the genera *Heliolites*, *Tetradium*, and *Chaetetes*. American Journal of Science 32:361–379.

Oliver, William A., Jr., Charles W. Merriam, & Michael Churkin, Jr. 1975. Ordovician, Silurian, and Devonian corals of Alaska. United States Geological Survey Professional Paper 823-B:13–44, 13 fig., 23 pl., 19 tables.

Oomori, T., Y. Tamaki, K. Nobushima, & Y. Iraha. 1998. The lead ion taken in hard tissues of marine organisms (corals and sclerosponges). Chikyu Monthly 20(4):202–208.

d'Orbigny, Alcide. 1849. Note sur la classe de Amorphozoaires. Revue et Magazine de Zoologie pure et appliquée (Paris) (series 2) 1:545–550.

Ota, Masamichi. 1968. The Akiyoshi Limestone Group: A geosynclinal organic reef complex. Bulletin of the Akiyoshi-dai Museum of Natural History 5:44 p., 17 fig., 31 pl., 6 tables. In Japanese with English abstract and captions.

Ota, Masamichi. 1977. General geology of the Akiyoshi Limestone Group. Geological studies of Akiyoshi, part 1. Bulletin of the Akiyoshi-dai Museum of Natural History 12:33 p., 3 fig., 3 pl., 4 tables.

Ota, N., A. Sugimara, & M. Ota. 1969. Reef deposits in the *Millerella* Zone of the Akiyoshi Limestone Group. Palaeontological Society of Japan Special Paper 14:12 p.

Pacaud, J.-M., D. Merle, & J.-C. Meyer. 2000. La faune danienne de Vigny (Val-d'Oise, France): Importance pour l'étude de la diversification des mollusques au début du Tertiaire. Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences, Sciences de la Terre et des Planètes, Paris (série II a) 330(12):867–873.

Paleobiology Database (PBDB). 2006. http://paleodb.org/cgi-bin/bridge.pl. Checked June 2010.

Paul, V. J. 1992. Chemical defenses of benthic marine invertebrates. *In* V. J. Paul, ed., Ecological Controls of Marine Natural Products. Comstock Publishing Associates. Ithaca, New York. p. 164–188.

Perez-Huerta, Alberto. 2003. Biologically induced changes in the brachiopod *Heteralosia* (sic) *slocomi* during the middle Pennsylvanian. The Palaeontological Association Newsletter 54:148–149.

Perry C. T., & L. J. Hepburn. 2008. Syn-depositional alteration of coral reef framework through bioerosion, encrustation and cementation: Taphonomic signatures of reef accretion and reef depositional events. Earth-Science Reviews 86:106–144.

Peterhans, Emile. 1927. Sur la presence d'un Bryozoaire trepostome dans le Malm de la nappe des "Prealpes medians." Eclogae Geologicae Helvetiae 20:380–399.

Peterhans, Emile. 1929. Étude du genre *Chaetetopsis* Neumayr et classification nouvelle des Chaetetidae. Eclogae Geologicae Helvetiae 22(1):81–85.

Peters, K. J., C. D. Amsler, J. B. McClintock, & B. J. Baker. 2006. Palatability and chemical defenses of Antarctic peninsula sponges. Integrative and Comparative Biology 45(6):1056.

Pickett, John, David Och, & Evan Leitch. 2009. Devonian marine invertebrate fossils from the Port Macquarie Block, New South Wales. Proceedings of the Linnean Society of New South Wales 130:193–216.

Preciado, I., & M. Maldonado. 2005. Reassessing the spatial relationships between sponges and macroalgae in sublittoral rocky bottoms: A descriptive approach. Helgoland Marine Research 59:141–150.

Puce, S., B. Calcinai, G. Bavestrello, C. Cerrano, C. Gravili, & F. Boero. 2005. Hydrozoa (Cnidaria) symbiotic with Porifera: A review. Marine Ecology 26:73–81.

Rasmussen, K. A., & C. E. Brett. 1985. Taphonomy of Holocene cryptic biotas from St. Croix, Virgin Islands: Information loss and preservational biases. Geology 13:551–553.

Reed, J. K. 1981. *In situ* growth rates of the scleractinian coral *Oculina varicose* occurring with zooxanthellae on 6-m reefs and without on 80-m banks. Proceedings of the Fourth International Coral Reef Symposium 2:201–206.

Reincke, T., & D. Barthel. 1997. Silica uptake kinetics of *Halichondria panicea* in Keil Bight. Marine Biology 129:591–593.

Reinhardt, J. W. 1988. Uppermost Permian reefs and Permo-Triassic sedimentary facies from the southeastern margin of Sichuan Basin, China. Facies 18:231–288.

Reitner, Joachim. 1987a. Phylogenie und Konvergenzen bei rezenten un fossilen Calcarea (Porifera) mit einem kalkigen Basalskelett (“Inozoa, Pharetronida”). Berliner Geowissenschaftliche Abhandlungen 86:87–125.

Reitner, Joachim. 1987b. A calcitic sphinctozoan sponge belonging to the Demospongiae from the Cassian Formation (Lower Carnian; Dolomites, Northern Italy) and its phylogenetic relationship. Geobios 20:571–589.

Reitner, Joachim. 1987c. *Euzkadiella erenoensis*, n. gen. n. sp. ein Stromatpore mit spikulärem Skelett aus dem Oberapt von Ereño (Prov. Guipuzcoa, Nordspainen) und die systematische Stellung der Stromatoporen. Palaontologisches Zeitschrift 61:203–222.

Reitner, Joachim. 1987d. Lower and mid-Cretaceous coralline sponge communities of the boreal and tethyan realms in comparison with the modern ones—Palaeoecological and palaeogeographical implications. *In* J. Wiedmann, ed., Ctetaceous of the Western Tethys. Proceedings of the 3rd International Cretaceous Symposium, Tubingen. E. Schweizerbart'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. Stuttgart. p. 851–878.

Reitner, Joachim. 1991. Phylogenetic aspects and new descriptions of spicule-bearing hadromerid sponges with a secondary calcareous skeleton (Tetractinomorpha, Demospongiae). *In* J. Reitner & H. Keupp, eds., Fossil and Recent Sponges. Springer-Verlag. Berlin and Heidelberg. p. 179–211.

Reitner, Joachim. 1992. “Coralline Sponges,” Der Versuch einer Phylogenetisch Taxonomischen Analyses. Berliner Geowissenschaftliche Abhandlungen (Reihe E, Paläobiologie) 1:352 p.

Reitner, Joachim, & Theo S. Engeser. 1983. Contributions to the systematics and the paleoecology of the family Acanthochaetetidae (order Tabulospongida, class Sclerospongiae). Geobios 16(6):773–779.

Reitner, Joachim, & Theo S. Engeser. 1987. Skeletal structures and habitats of Recent and fossil *Acanthochaetetes* (subclass Tetractinomorpha, Demospongiae, Porifera). Coral Reefs 6:13–18.

Reitner, Joachim, & Theo S. Engeser. 1989. *Chaetosclera klipsteini* n. gen n. sp. (Halichondriida, demospongiae) aus dem Unterkarn der Cassianer-Schichten (Dolomiten, Italien). Mitteilungen der Geologisch-Paläontologische Institut der Universität Hamburg 68:159–165, 1 pl.

Reitner, Joachim, & Pascale Gautret. 1996. Skeletal formation in the modern but ultraconservative chaetetid sponge *Spirastrella (Acanthochaetetes) wellsi* (Demospongiae, Porifera). Facies 34:193–208.

Reitner, Joachim, & Felix Schlagintweit. 1990. *Calcisuberites stromatoporoides* n. gen. n. sp., ein neues Taxon der Hadromerida (Demospongiae, Porifera) mit einem kalkigen Basalskelett aus der tethyalen Unterkreide. Berliner Geowissenschaftliche Abhandlungen (Reihe A)124:247–257.

Reitner, Joachim, & Gert Wörheide. 2002. Non-lithistid fossil Demospongiae—Origins of their palaeobiodiversity and highlights in history of preservation. *In* J. N. A. Hooper & R. W. M. van Soest, eds., Systema Porifera, vol. 1. Kluwer Academic/ Plenum Publishers. New York, Boston, Dordrecht, London, and Moscow. p. 52–68.

Reitner, Joachim, Gert Wörheide, Robert Lange, & Gabriela Schumann-Kindel. 2001. Coralline demosponges—A geobiological portrait. Bulletin of the Tohoku University Museum 1:219–235.

Reitner, Joachim, Gert Wörheide, Robert Lange, & Volker Thiel. 1997. Biomineralization of calcified skeletons in three Pacific coralline demosponges—An approach to the evolution of basal skeletons. Courier Forschungsinstitut Senckenberg 201:371–383.

Riding, Robert. 1974. Stromatoporoid diagenesis: Outline of alteration effects. Geological Magazine 111(2):143–148.

Riding, Robert. 2004. *Solenopora* is a chaetetid sponge, not an alga. Palaeontology 47:117–122.

Rios, J. M., & Y. A. Almela. 1944. Un chaetetido del Eoceno español. Notas y Comunicaciones Instituto Geológico y Minero de España 12:19–37.

Rodriguez, S. 2004. Taphonomic alterations in upper Visean dissepimented rugose corals from the Sierra del Castillo Unit (Carboniferous, Cordoba, Spain). Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology 214:135–153.

Rosenheim, Brad E., Peter K. Swart, Simon R. Thorrold, Philippe Willenz, Lorraine Berry, & Christopher Latkoczy. 2004. High-resolution Sr/Ca records in sclerosponges calibrated to temperature in situ. Geology 32:145–148.

Rützler, Klaus. 1965. Systematik und ökolgie der Poriferen aus littoral-schattengebieten der Nordadria. Zeitschrift für Morphologie und Ökologie der Tiere 55:1–82.

Rützler, Klaus. 1970. Spatial competition among Porifera: Solution by epizoism. Oecologia 5:85–95.

Rützler, Klaus. 1971. Bredin-Archbold-Smithsonian Biological survey of Dominica: Burrowing sponges, genus *Siphonodictyon* Bergquist, from the Caribbean. Smithsonian Contributions to Zoology 77:37 p.

Rützler, Klaus. 1990. Associations between Caribbean sponges and photosynthetic organisms. *In* K. Rützler, ed., New Perspectives in Sponge Biology. Smithsonian Institution Press. Washington, D.C. p. 455–466.

Rützler, Klaus, & Jean Vacelet. 2002. Family Acanthochaetetidae Fischer, 1970. *In* J. N. A. Hooper & R. W. M. van Soest, eds., Systema Porifera, vol. 1. Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers. New York, Boston, Dordrecht, London, and Moscow. p. 275–278.

Sandberg, Philip A. 1983. A oscillating trend in Phanerozoic non-skeletal carbonate mineralogy. Nature 305:19–22.

Sandberg, Philip A. 1984. Recognition criteria for calcitized skeletal and non-skeletal aragonites. Palaeontographica Americana 54:272–281.

Sandberg, Philip A. 1985. Nonskeletal aragonite and pCO_2 in the Phanerozoic and Proterozoic. *In* E. T. Sundquist & W. S. Broecker, eds., The Carbon Cycle and Atmospheric CO_2: Natural Variations, Archean to Present. Geophysical Monograph 32. American Geophysical Union. Washington, D.C. p. 585–594.

Sando, William J. 1975. Coelenterata of the Amsden Formation (Mississippian and Pennsylvanian) of Wyoming. United States Geological Survey Professional Paper 848-C:30 p., 6 fig., 10 tables.

Sano, H. 2006. Impact of long-term climate change and sea-level fluctuation on Mississippian to Permian mid-oceanic atoll sedimentation (Akiyoshi Limestone Group) Japan. Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology 236:169–189.

Sano, H., S. Fujii, & F. Matsuura. 2004. Response of Carboniferous-Permian mid-oceanic seamount-capping buildup to global cooling and sea-level change: Akiyoshi, Japan. Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology 213:187–206.

Sara, M., & J. Vacelet. 1973. Ecologie des Demosponges. *In* P. Grassé, ed., Traité de Zoologie Anatomie, Systematique, Biologie, Tome III: Spongiaires, Fascicule 1, Anatomie, Physiologie, Systematique, Ecologie. Masson et Cie. Paris. p. 462–576.

Saunders, W. B., & C. W. Thayer. 1987. A cryptic intertidal brachiopod/sclerosponge community in Palau, W. Caroline Islands. Geological Society of America Abstracts with Program 19:829.

Schnorf-Stenier, Alice. 1963. Sur quelques "Chaetetidae" du Valanginien du Jura. Ecologae Geologicae Helvetiae 56:1117–1129, pl. 1–8.

Scholle, Peter A., & Dana S. Ulmer-Scholle. 2002. A color guide to the petrography of carbonate rocks: Grains, textures, porosity, diagenesis. American Association of Petroleum Geologists Memoir 77:474 p.

Schuhmacher, H., & M. Plewka. 1981. Mechanical resistance of reefbuilders through time. Oecologia 49:279–282.

Scrutton, Colin T. 1997. The Palaeozoic corals, I: Origins and relationships. Proceedings of the Yorkshire Geological Society 51:177–208.

Scrutton, Colin T. 1998. The Palaeozoic corals, II: Structure, variation and palaeoecology. Proceedings of the Yorkshire Geological Society 52:1–57.

Senowbari-Daryan, B., & F. Mauer. 2008. Upper Triassic (Norian) hypercalcified sponges from the Musandam Peninsula (United Arab Emirates and Oman). Facies 54:433–460.

Sepkoski, J. John Jr. 2002. A compendium of fossil marine animal genera. Bulletins of American Paleontology 363:560 p.

Shen Jian-wei, & G. E. Webb. 2008. The role of microbes in reef-building communities of the Cannindah limestone (Mississippian), Monto region, Queensland, Australia. Facies 54:89–105.

Simkiss, K. 1977. Biomineralization and detoxification. Calcified Tissue Research 24:199–200.

Soest, R. W. M. van. 1984. Deficient *Merlia normani* Kirkpatrick, 1908 from the Curacao reefs, with a discussion on the phylogenetic interpretation of sclerosponges. Bijdragen tot de Dierkunde 54:211–219.

Soest, R. W. M. van, Nicole Boury-Esnault, Dorte Janussen, & John Hooper. 2005. World Porifera database. http://www.vliz.be/vmdcdata/porifera. Checked January 2010.

Sokolov, B. S. 1939. Stratigraficheskoe znachenie i tipy Chaetetidae karbona SSSR [Stratigraphical importance and types of Chaetetidae of the Carboniferous of the USSR]. Akademiya Nauk SSSR, Doklady 23(4):409–412.

Sokolov, B. S. 1947. Novy rod *Fistulimurina* gen. nov. iz gruppy Chaetetida [*Fistulimurina* nov. gen., genus of the group Chaetetida]. Akademiya Nauk SSSR, Doklady 66:957–960.

Sokolov, B. S. 1950. Khetetidy karbona severo-vostochnoy Ukrainy i sopredelnykh oblastey [Carboniferous Chaetetidae of southeastern Ukraine and contiguous regions]. Vsesoyuznogo Neftyanogo Nauchno-Issledovatel'skogo Geologo-Razvedochnogo Instituta (VNIGRI), Trudy, Leningrad (new series) 27:144 p.

Sokolov, B. S. 1955. Tabulyaty paleozoya Evropeiskoi chasti SSSR. Vvedenie: Obshchie voprosy sistematiki i istorii razvitiya tabulyat (s kharakteristikoi morfologicheski blizkikh grupp) [Paleozoic Tabulata of the European parts of the USSR: Introduction to the general study of the systematics and development of the tabulates]. Vsesoyuznogo Neftyanogo Nauchno-Issledovatel'skogo Geologo-Razvedochnogo Instituta (VNIGRI), Trudy, Leningrad (new series) 85:527 p.

Sokolov, B. S. 1962. Gruppa Chaetetida, podklass Tabulata, podklass Heliolitoidea [Group Chaetetida, subclass Tabulata, subclass Heliolitoida]. *In* Yu. A. Orlov, ed., Osnovy paleontologii [Fundamentals of Paleontology], vol. 2, B. S. Sokolov, ed., Porifera, Archaeocyatha, Coelenterata, Vermes. Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR. Moscow. p. 169–176, 192–285. In Russian. English translation by Israel Program for Scientific Translations, 1971, Jerusalem, p. 259–270, 293–438.

Solovjeva, V. V. 1980. Nekotorye novye mezozoiskie khetetidy i ih mikrostruktura [Some new Mesozoic Chaetetidae and their microstructure]. Paleontologischeskiy Zhurnal [Paleontological Journal] 1980(4):29–38. English translation in Paleontological Journal 1980(4):32–41.

Sorauf, James E. 2000. Coralomorphs. *In* A. J. Wright, G. C. Young, J. A Talent, and J.R. Laurie, eds., Palaeobiogeography of Australasian faunas and floras. Memoir of the Association of Australasian Palaeontologists 23:38–39.

Soto, Francisco, Isabel Méndez-Bedia, & Esperanza Fernández-Martinez. 1994. Construcciones arrecifales del Devónico de la Cordillera Cantábrica (No de España). Revista Española de Paleontologia 9(1):29–36, 4 fig.

Squires, Richard L. 1973. Burial environment, diagenesis, mineralogy, and magnesium and strontium contents of skeletal carbonates in the Buckhorn Asphalt of Middle Pennsylvanian age, Arbuckle Mountains, Oklahoma. Doctoral dissertation. California Institute of Technology. Pasadena. 184 p.

Stafford, Philip T. 1959. Geology of part of the Horseshoe Atoll in Scurry and Kent Counties, Texas. U. S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 315-A:20 p.

Stanley Jr., George D., ed. 2001. The History and Sedimentology of Ancient Reef Systems. Topics in Geobiology, vol. 17. Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers. New York. 458 p.

Stanley, Steven M. 2006. Influence of seawater chemistry on biomineralization throughout Phanerozoic time: Paleontological and experimental evidence. Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology 232:214–236.

Stanley, Steven M., & Lawrence A. Hardie. 1998. Secular variations in carbonate mineralogy of reef-building and sediment-producig organisms driven by tectonically forced shifts in seawater chemistry. Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology 144:3–19.

Stanley, Steven M., & Lawrence A. Hardie. 1999. Hypercalcification: Paleontology links plate tectonics and geochemistry in sedimentology. GSA Today 9(2):1–7.

Stanley, Steven M., J. B. Reis, & Lawrence A. Hardie. 2002. Low-magnesium calcite produced by coralline algae in seawater of Late Cretaceous composition. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 99:15,323–15,326.

Stanton, Jr., R. J., W. M. Connolly, & L. L. Lambert. 1994. Paleoecology of Upper Carboniferous *Chaetetes*—Morphology, growth style, and spatial distribution. *In* P. Oekentorp-Küster, ed., Proceedings of the VI International Symposium on Fossil Cnidaria and Porifera, Munster Cnidarian Symposium volume 2. Courier Forschungsinstitut Senckenberg 172:365–372.

Stearn, Colin W. 1966. The microstructure of stromatoporoids. Palaeontology 9(1):74–124.

Stearn, Colin W. 1983. Stromatoporoids: Growth and form. *In* T. W. Broadhead, ed., Sponges and Spongiomorphs: Notes for a Short Course, Organized by J. K. Rigby and C. W. Stearn. University of Tennessee Department of Geological Sciences Studies in Geology 7:141–148.

Stearn, C. W. 2010. Part E, Revised, Volume 4, Chapter 9F: Functional morphology of the Paleozoic stromatoporoid skeleton. Treatise Online 8:1–26, fig. 1–9.

Steiner, Alice. 1932. Contribution à l'étude Stromatopores secondaires. Bulletin des Laboratoires de Géologie, Géographie physique, Minéralogie et Paléontologie de l'Université de Lausanne 50:117 p.

Stemmerik, Lars. 1989. Chaetetid bioherm, Upper Carboniferous, Holm Land, eastern north Greenland. *In* H. H. J. Geldsetzer, Noel P. James, & G. E. Tebbutt, eds., Reefs: Canada and adjacent areas. Canadian Society of Petroleum Geologists Memoir 13:688–689, 4 fig.

Stouder, R. E. 1938. Chester rocks of Meade, Hardin, and Breckenridge counties, Kentucky. American Association of Petroleum Geologists Bulletin 22:267–284.

Struve, Alfred. 1898. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis des festen Gerüstes der Steinkorallen. Russisch-Kaiserliche Mineralogische Gesellschaft zu St. Petersburg Verhandlungen (series 2) 35:43–115.

Suchy, Daniel R., & Ronald R. West. 1988. A Pennsylvanian cryptic community associated with laminar chaetetid colonies. PALAIOS 3:404–412.

Suchy, Daniel R., & Ronald R. West. 2001. Chaetetid buildups in a Westphalian (Desmoinesian) cyclothem in southestern Kansas. PALAIOS 16:425–443.

Sugiyama, T., & K. Nagai. 1990. Growth forms of auloporidid corals in the Akiyoshi Limestone group, southwest Japan. Bulletin of the Akiyoshi-dai Museum of Natural History 25:7–25. In Japanese with English abstract.

Sugiyama, T., & K. Nagai. 1994. Reef facies and paleoecology of reef-building corals in the lower part of the Akiyoshi Limestone Group (Carboniferous), southwest Japan. *In* P. Oekentorp-Küster, ed., Proceedings of the VI International Symposium on Fossil Cnidaria and Porifera, Munster Cnidarian Symposium volume 2. Courier Forschungsinstitut Senckenberg 172:231–240.

Sutherland, P. K. 1984. *Chaetetes* reefs of exceptional size in Marble Falls Limestone (Pennsylvanian), central Texas. Palaeontographica Americana 54:543–547.

Talent, J. A. 1988. Organic reef-building: Episodes of extinction and symbiosis? Senckenbergiana Lethaia 69:315–368.

Taylor, P. D., & M. A. Wilson. 2003. Palaeoecology and evolution of marine hard substrate communities. Earth-Science Reviews 62:1–103.

Tchechmedjieva, V. L. 1986. Paléoécologie des Madréporaires du Crétacé supérieur dans le Srednogorié de l'Ouest (Bulgarie occidentale). Geologica Balcanica 16(5):55–81.

Termier, Geneviève, Henri Termier, & M. Ramalho. 1985. Spongiofaunes du Jurassique Supérieur du Portugal. Comunicacoes dos Servicos Geologicos de Portugal 71(2):197–222.

Termier, Henri, & Geneviève Termier. 1974. Spongiaires permiens du Djebel Tebaga (Sud Tunisien). Comptes Rendus Hebdomadaires de l'Académie des Sciences, Paris (series D) 279:247–249.

Termier, Henri, Geneviève Termier, & Daniel Vachard. 1977. Monographie Paléontologique des affleurments Permiens du Djebel Tebaga (Sud Tunisien). Palaeontographica (Abt. A)156:109 p.

Tesakov, Yu. I. 1960. O sistematicheskom polozhenii roda *Desmidopora* Nicholson [On the systematic position of *Desmidopora* Nicholson]. Paleontologischeskiy Zhurnal [Paleontological Journal] 1960(4):48–53.

Toomey, Donald F., & H. Dale Winland. 1973. Rock and biotic facies associated with Middle Pennsylvanian (Desmoinesian) algal buildup, Nena Lucia Field, Nolan County, Texas. American Association of Petroleum Geologists Bulletin 57:1053–1074.

Topsent, E. 1928. Spongiaires de l'Atlantique et de la Méditerranée provenant des croisières du Prince Albert 1er de Monaco. Résultats des campagnes scientifiques accomplies par le Prince Albert 1 Monaco 74:1–376.

Trace, R. D., & P. McGrain. 1985. The *Chaetetella* zone in the Kinkaid Limestone (Mississippian): A useful stratigraphic marker along the southern rim of the Eastern Interior (Illinois) Basin. Kentucky Geological Survey Information Circular (series 11) 14:9 p., 4 fig.

Turnsek, D., S. Buser, & B. Ogorelec. 1987. Upper Carnian reef limestone in clastic beds at Perbla near Tolmin (NW Yugoslavia). Razprave Slovenska Akademija Znanosti in Umetnosti, IV Razred za Prirodoslovne Vede 27(3):37–64.

Twitchell, George B. 1929. The structure and relationship of the true stromatoporoids. The American Midland Naturalist 11(6/7):270–306, 2 fig., pl. 18–26.

Uriz, Maria-J., Xavier Turon, & Mikel A. Becerro. 2003. Silica Deposition in demosponges. *In* W. E. G. Muller, ed., Silicon Biomineralization–Biology–Biochemistry–Molecular Biology–Biotechnology. Progress in Molecular and Subcellular Biology 33:163–193.

Uriz, Maria-J., Xavier Turon, Mikel A. Becerro, & Gemma Agell. 2003. Siliceous spicules and skeleton frameworks in sponges: Origin, diversity, ultrastructural patterns, and biological functions. Microscopy Research and Technique 62:279–299.

Vacelet, Jean. 1980. Squelette calcaire facultatif et corps de régéneration dans le genre *Merlia,* éponges apparentées aux Chaetétidés fossiles. Comptes Rendus hebdomadaire des Séances de l'Académie des Sciences (series D) 290:227–230.

Vacelet, Jean. 1985. Coralline sponges and the evolution of the Porifera. *In* S. Conway Morris, George J. D. Gibson, & H. M. Platt, eds., The Origin and Relationship of Lower Invertebrates, Systematics Association Special Volume 28:1–13.

Vacelet, Jean. 1988. Indications de profundeur donneés par les spongiaires dans les milieux benthiques actuels. Géologie Méditerranéenne 15:13–26.

Vacelet, Jean. 1990. Storage cells of calcified relict sponges. *In* K. Rützler, ed., New Perspectives in Sponges. Smithsonian Institution Press. Washington, D.C. p. 144–152.

Vacelet, Jean. 2002. Family Astroscleridae Lister, 1900. *In* J. N. A. Hooper & R. W. M. van Soest, eds., Systema Porifera, vol. 1. Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers. New York, Boston, Dordrecht, London, and Moscow. p. 824–830.

Vacelet, Jean, & R. Garrone. 1985. Two distinct populations of collagen fibrils in a "sclerosponge" (Porifera). *In* A. Bairati & R. Garrone, eds., Biology of Invertebrate and Lower Invertebrate Collagen. Series A: Life Sciences 93. Nato ASI Series. Berlin. p. 183–189.

Vacelet, Jean, & Maria-J. Uriz. 1991. Deficient spiculation in a new species of *Merlia* (Merliida, Demspongiae) from the Balearic Islands. *In* J. Reitner & H. Keupp, eds., Fossil and Recent Sponges. Springer-Verlag. Berlin and Heidelberg. p. 170–178.

Vacelet, Jean, Philippe Willenz, & W. D. Hartman. 2010. Part E, Revised, Volume 4, Chapter 1: Living hypercalcified sponges. Treatise Online 1:1–16, fig. 1–5.

Vaughan, Thomas W. 1915. The geologic significance of the growth-rate of the Floridian and Bahaman shoal-water corals. Washington Academy of Science Journal 5:591–600.

Veizer, Jan, & Jobst Wendt. 1976. Mineralogy and chemical composition of Recent and fossil skeletons of calcareous sponges. Neues Jahrbuch für Geologie und Paläontologie 9:588–573.

Vinassa de Regny, P. 1915. Triadische Algen, Spongien, Anthozoen und Bryozoen aus Timor. Paläontologie von Timor 4:75–117.

Voegeli, V. J. 1992. Paleoecology of chaetetids in the Amoret Limestone Member (Desmoinesian) in southeast Kansas. Unpublished Master's thesis. Kansas State University. Manhattan. 287 p.

Vogel, Steven. 1994. Life in moving fluids: The philosophical biology of flow, 2nd ed. Princeton University Press. New Jersey. 467 p.

Vogel, Steven. 2003. Comparative biomechanics: Life's physical world. Princeton University Press. New Jersey and Oxford, U.K. 580 p.

Wahlman, Gregory P. 2002. Upper Carboniferous–Lower Permian (Bashkirian–Kungurian) mounds and reefs. *In* W. Kiessling, E. Flügel, & J. Golonka, eds., Phanerozoic Reef Patterns. SEPM (Society of Sedimentary Geology) Publication 72:271–338, 29 fig.

Walker, T. R. 1972. Bioherms in the Minturn Formation (Des Moinesian Age), Vail-Minturn area, Eagle County, Colorado. *In* R. H. De Voto, ed., Paleozoic Stratigraphy and Structural Evolution of Colorado. Quarterly of the Colorado School of Mines 67:249–277.

Webb, G. E., Gert Wörheide, & Luke D. Nothdurft. 2003. Rare earth element geochemistry of Paleozoic stromatoporoids and extant sponge skeletons. Ninth International Symposium on Fossil Cnidaria and Porifera, Abstracts, vol. 7. Berichte des Institutes für Geologie und Paläontologie der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz, Austria. Graz. p. 116.

Webby, B. D., compiler. 2010. Part E, Revised, Volume 4, Chapter 8: Glossary of terms applied to the hypercalcified Porifera. Treatise Online 4:1–21.

Weidlich, Oliver. 2002. Middle and later Permian reefs—Distributional patterns and reservoir potential. *In* W. Kiessling, E. Flügel, & J. Golonka, eds., Phanerozoic Reef Patterns. SEPM (Society of Sedimentary Geology) Publication 72:339–390, 13 fig.

Weidlich, Oliver. 2007a. Permian reefs of the Tethys: tropical vs. cool-water frameworks, Batain area, Sultanate of Oman. *In* E. Vennin, M. Aretz, F. Boulvain, & A. Munnecke, eds., Facies from Palaeozoic reefs and bioaccumulations. Mémoires du Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle 195:311–313.

Weidlich, Oliver. 2007b. Permian reef and shelf carbonates of the Arabian platform and neo-Tethys as recorders of climatic and oceanographic changes. *In* J. J. Alvaro, M. Aretz, F. Boulvain, A. Munnecke, D. Vachard, & E. Vennin, eds., Palaeozoic Reefs and Bioaccumulations: Climatic and Evolutionary Controls. Geological Society, London, Special Publications 275:229–253.

Weidlich, Oliver, & M. Bernecker. 2003. Supersequence and composite sequence carbonate platform growth: Permian and Triassic outcrop data of the Arabian platform and neo-Tethys. Sedimentary Geology 158:87–116, 16 fig.

Weissermel, Waldermar. 1913. *In* J. Bohm & W. Weissermel, eds., Über tertiare Versteinerungen von den Bogenfelser Diamantfeldern, II, Tabulaten und Hydrozoen. Beitreibung Zur Geologie Erforschung der Deutschen Schutzgebiete 5:111 p.

Weissermel, Waldermar. 1927. Die Umbildung der Rugosen in Hexacorallen. Preussische Geologische Landesanstalt, Abhandlungen, Jahrbuch, Sitzungsberichte 2:1–17.

Weissermel, Waldermar. 1937. 5, Coelenterata, a) Anthozoa, Hydrozoa, Scyphozoa. Fortschritte de Paläontologie 1:84–96.

Weissermel, Waldermar. 1939. Neue Beiträge zur Kenntnis für Geologie, Palaeontologie und Petrographie der Umgegend von Konstantinopel, 3, Obersilurische und devonsche Korallem. Stromatoporoiden, und Trepostome von der Prinzeninsel Antitovitha und aus Bithynien. Preussische Geologische Landesanstalt, Abhandlungen, Jahrbuch, Sitzungsberichte (new series) 190:131 p.

Wells, John W. 1957. Corals. *In* Joel W. Hedgeth, ed., Treatise on Marine Ecology and Paleoecology. Geological Society of America Memoir 67(1, Ecology):1087–1108.

Wendt, Jobst. 1974. Der Dkelettbau aragonitischer Kalkschwamme aus der alpinen Obertrias. Neues Jahrbuch für Geologie und Paläontologie, Monatshefte 8:498–511.

Wendt, Jobst. 1979. Development of skeletal formation, microstructure, and mineralogy of rigid calcareous sponges from the Late Palaeozoic to Recent. *In* C. Levi & N. Boury-Esnault, eds., Biologie des Spongiaires. Colloques Internationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique 291:449–457.

Wendt, Jobst. 1984. Skeletal and spicular mineralogy, microstructure and diagenesis of coralline calcareous sponges. Palaeontographica Americana 54:326–336.

West, Ronald R. 1988. Temporal changes in Carboniferous reef mound communities. PALAIOS 3:152–169.

West, Ronald R. 1992. *Chaetetes* (Demospongiae): Its occurrence and biostratigraphic utility. Oklahoma Geological Survey Circular 94:163–169.

West, Ronald R. 1994. Species in coralline demosponges: Chaetetida. *In* P. Oekentorp-Küster, ed., Proceedings of the VI International Symposium on Fossil Cnidaria and Porifera, Munster Cnidarian Symposium volume 2. Courier Forschungsinstitut Senckenberg 172:399–409.

West, Ronald R. 1995. Taphonomy of Porifera: Some taxonomic implications. VII International Symposium on Fossil Cnidaria and Porifera, Abstracts. Madrid. p. 101–103.

West, Ronald R., & George R. Clark II. 1983. Chaetetids. *In* T. W. Broadhead, ed., Sponges and Spongiomorphs: Notes for a Short Course, Organized by J. K. Rigby and C. W. Stearn. University of Tennessee Department of Geological Sciences Studies in Geology 7:130–140.

West, Ronald R., & George R. Clark II. 1984. Palaeobiology and biological affinities of Palaeozoic chaetetids. Palaeontographica Americana 54:337–348.

West, Ronald R., & S. Kershaw. 1991. Chaetetid habitats. *In* J. Reitner & H. Keupp, eds., Fossil and Recent Sponges. Springer-Verlag. Berlin and Heidelberg. p. 445–455.

West, Ronald R., F. K. McKinney, J. A. Fagerstrom, & J. Vacelet. 2010. Biological interactions among extant and fossil clonal organisms. Facies, published online 13 November 2010, 24 p., doi: 10.1007/s10347-010-0250-0.

West, Ronald R., K. Nagai, & T. Sugiyama. 2001. Chaetetid substrates in the Akiyoshi organic reef complex, Akiyoshi-dai, Japan. Bulletin of Tohoku University Museum 1:134–143.

West, Ronald R., & Steven M. Roth. 1991. Siliciclastic content of chaetetid habitats: Preliminary results. Geological Society of America, Abstracts with Programs 23(5):A343.

Wildish, David, & David Kristmanson. 1997. Benthic suspension feeders and flow. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, U.K. 409 p.

Willenz, Phillippe, & Willard D. Hartman. 1985. Calcification rate of *Ceratoporella nicholsoni* (Porifera: Sclerospongiae): An *in situ* study with calcein. Proceedings of the 5th International Coral Reef Congress, vol. 5. Tahiti. p.113–118.

Willenz, Philippe, & Willard D. Hartman. 1989. Micromorphology and ultrastructure of Caribbean sclerosponges: I. *Ceratoporella nicholoni* and *Stromatospongia norae* (Ceratoporellidae: Porifera). Marine Biology 103:307–402.

Willenz, Philippe, & Willard D. Hartman. 1999. Growth and regeneration rates of the calcareous skeleton of the Caribbean coralline sponge *Ceratoporella nicholsoni*: A long term survey. *In* J. N. A. Hooper, ed., Proceedings of the 5th International Sponge Symposium ‘Origin and Outlook,’ Brisbane 1998, Queensland Museum. Brisbane. p. 675–686.

Wilmsen, M. 1996. Flecken-riffe in den kalken der “Formacion de Altamira” (Cenoman, Cobreces/Tonanes-Gebiet, Prov. Kantabrien, Nord-Spanien): Stratigraphische position, fazielle rahmenbedingungen und sequenzstratigraphie. Berliner Geowissenschaftliche Abhandlugen E18:353–373.

Winston, D. 1963. Stratigraphy and carbonate petrology of the Marble Falls Formation, Mason and Kimble counties, Texas. PhD dissertation. University of Texas. Austin. 344 p.

Wolfenden, E. Brian. 1958. Paleoecology of the Carboniferous reef complex and shelf limestones in northwest Derbyshire, England. Geological Society of America Bulletin 69:871–898, 12 fig., 3 tables.

Wood, Rachel A. 1987. Biology and revised systematics of some Late Mesozoic stromatoporoids. Special Paper in Palaeontology 37:1–89.

Wood, Rachel A. 1990. Reef-building sponges. American Scientist 78:224–235.

Wood, Rachel A. 1991. Non-spicular biomineralization in calcified Demosponges. *In* J. Reitner & H. Keupp, eds., Fossil and Recent Sponges. Springer-Verlag. Berlin and Heidelberg. p. 322–340.

Wood, Rachel A. 1995. The changing biology of reef-building. PALAIOS 10:517–529.

Wood, Rachel A. 1999. Reef Evolution. Oxford University Press. Oxford. 414 p.

Wood, Rachel A. 2001. Biodiversity and the history of reefs. Geological Journal 36:251–263.

Wood, Rachel A., Paul Copper, & Joachim Reitner. 1990. "Spicules" in halysitids: A reply. Lethaia 23:113–114.

Wood, Rachel A., & Joachim Reitner. 1988. The upper Cretaceous "chaetetid" demosponge *Stromatoaxinella iregularis* n. gen. (Michelin) and its systematic implications. Neues Jahrbuch für Geologie und Paläontologie, Abhandlungen 177(20):213–224.

Wood, Rachel A., Joachim Reitner, & Ronald R. West. 1989. Systematics and phylogenetic implications of the haplosclerid stromatoporoid *Newellia mira* nov. gen. Lethaia 22:85–93.

Wood, R., A. Yu. Zhuravlev, & F. Debrenne. 1992. Functional biology and ecology of Archaeocyatha. PALAIOS 7:131–156.

Wörheide, Gert. 1998. Reef cave dwelling ultraconservative coralline demosponge *Astrosclera willeyana* Lister, 1900 from the Indo-Pacific. Micromorphology, ultrastructure, biocalcification, isotope record, taxonomy, biogeography, phylogeny. Facies 38:1–88.

Wörheide, Gert. 2005. Low variation in partial cytochrome oxidase subunit I (COI) mitochondrial sequences in the coralline demosponge *Astrosclera willeyana* across the Indo-Pacific. Marine Biology 148(5):907–912.

Wörheide, Gert, Pascale Gautret, Joachim Reitner, Florian Bohm, Michael M. Joachimski, Volker Thiel, Walter Michaelis, & Marc Massault. 1997. Basal skeletal formation, role and preservation on intracrystalline organic matrices, and isotopic record in the coralline sponges *Astrosclera willeyana* Lister, 1900. Boletin de la Real Sociedad Española de Historia Natural (Seccion Geologica) 91:355–374.

Wörheide, Gert, Joachim Reitner, & Pascale Gautret. 1996. Biocalcification processes in three coralline sponges from the Lizard Island Section (Great Barrier Reef, Australia); the stromatoporoid *Astrosclera*, the chaetetid *Spirastrella (Acanthochaetetes),* and the sphinctozoan *Vaceletia* (Demospongiae). *In* J. Reitner, F. Neuweiler, & F. Gunkel, eds., Global and regional controls on biogenic sedimentation: 1, Reef evolution research reports. Geologisch-Palaontologisches Institut der Georg-August Universitat. Gottingen. p. 149–153.

Wörheide, Gert, Joachim Reitner, & Pascale Gautret. 1997. Comparison of biocalcification processes in the two coralline demosponges *Astrosclera willeyana* Lister 1900 and *"Acanthochaetetes" wellsi* Hartman and Goreau 1975. Proceedings of the 8th International Coral Reef Symposium, Panama (1966) 2:1427–1432.

Wörheide, Gert, A. M. Solé-Cava, & J. Fromont. 2004. Population genetics and phylogeography of sponges—A workshop synthesis. Bollettino dei Musei e degli Istituti biologici dell'Università di Genova 68:683–688.

Wörheide, Gert, A. M. Solé-Cava, & John N. A. Hooper. 2005. Biodiversity, molecular ecology and phylogeography of marine sponges: Patterns, implications and outlooks. Integrative and Comparative Biology 45(2):377–385.

Wray, John L. 1968. Late Paleozoic phylloid algal limestones in the United States. Proceedings of the 23rd International Geological Congress 8:113–119.

Wray, John L. 1970. Algae in reefs through time. Proceedings of the 1st North American Paleontological Convention 2:1358–1373, 20 fig.

Wray, John L. 1977. Calcareous algae. Developments in palaeontology and stratigraphy, vol. 4. Elsevier Scientific Publishing Company. Amsterdam. 185 p., 170 fig.

Wu Ya Sheng. 1991. Organisms and communities of Permian reef of Xiangbo, China. International Academic Publishers. Beijing. 192 p.

Wulff, J. L. 2006. Ecological interactions of marine sponges. Canadian Journal of Zoology 84:146–166.

Yang Sheng-wu. 1978. [*Tabulata*]. *In* Paleontological Atlas of the Southwestern Regions, Guizhou, vol. 2, Carboniferous-Permian, compiled and written by the Guizhou Stratigraphy and Palaeontology Work Team. Geological Press. Beijing. p. 189–229, pl. 62–84. In Chinese.

Yang Sheng-wu, Kim [Jin] Chuntai, & Chow [Zhou] Xiyun. 1978. [*Tabulata*]. *In* Atlas of the Palaeontology of the Southwestern Regions of China, Guizhou [Kweichow], vol. 1, Cambrian-Devonian, compiled and written by the Guizhou [Kweichow] Stratigraphy and Palaeontology work team. Geological Publishing House. Beijing. p. 161–251, pl. 56–93. In Chinese.

Yourassowsky, C., & R. Rasmont. 1983. The differentiation of sclerocytes in fresh-water sponges grown in a silica-poor medium. Differentiations 25:5–9.

Zapalski, M. K. 2007. Parasitism versus commensalism: The case of tabulate endobionts. Palaeontology 50(6):1375–1380.

Zapalski, M. K., B. Hubert, J.-P. Nicollin, B. Mistiaen, & D. Brice. 2007. The palaeobiodiversity of stromatoporoids, tabulates and brachiopods in the Devonian of the Ardennes: Changes through time. Bulletin de la Société Géologique de France 178(5):383–390.

Zhen Yong-Yi, & Ronald R. West. 1997. Symbionts in a stromatoporoid-chaetetid association from the Middle Devonian Burdekin Basin, North Queensland. Alcheringa 21:271–280.

Zittel, Karl A. von. 1913. Text-Book of Paleontology, vol. 1, 2nd ed., translation by C. R. Eastman. Macmillan & Co., Ltd. London. 839 p.