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ABSTRACT—Assessment of ontogenetic and geographic variation can have substantial influence on species delimitation and thereby on perceived patterns of species-level morphological variation and diversity in space and time. Here we describe the ontogeny and intraspecific variation of the early Cambrian trilobite, Zacanthopsis palmeri n. sp., based on silicified material from east-central Nevada, USA. Zacanthopsis palmeri is the oldest documented Cambrian corynexochine to shift from possessing a fused rostral-hypostomal plate to a functional hypostomal suture in mature specimens during ontogeny. Six geographically distinct samples of mature Z. palmeri from a single silicified limestone bed traceable over tens of kilometers in east-central Nevada permit exploration of geographic variation within this species using geometric morphometric methods. No one sample encompasses all of the shape variation expressed by Z. palmeri and several geographically segregated samples show some degree of morphological separation in pairwise comparison. Nonetheless, these samples are not qualitatively or quantitatively different from one another when all samples are taken into account. The degree of variation within Z. palmeri is similar in magnitude to the differences between other species in the genus known from much less material.

INTRODUCTION

Discerning intraspecific variation from interspecific disparity is necessary for species delimitation but nontrivial, particularly if variation exists among spatially segregated localities (geographic variation). Geographic variation has been documented in many extant marine arthropods (e.g., Riska, 1981; France, 1993; Avise, 2000) but to a much lesser extent in the trilobite fossil record (Best, 1961; Cisne et al., 1980a, 1980b, 1982; Hughes, 1994; Webber and Hunda, 2007). In order to measure variation in the fossil record, studies must account for possible non-biological sources of variation, including taphonomic effects, time-averaging, and measurement error, as well as allometric growth (in addition to previous citations, see also Hughes, 1993; Rushton and Hughes, 1996; Webster and Hughes, 1999; Hunda et al., 2006). Because assessment of geographic variation often suffers from uneven sampling of sclerites across localities, many of the papers that describe some degree of intraspecific variation in Cambrian trilobites of Laurentia do not report any spatial segregation of that variation (e.g., Palmer, 1968; Westrop et al., 1996; Lieberman, 1998; Sundberg, 1999, 2004). Certain traits have been interpreted as taxonomically significant in some groups (e.g., granulation in Dunderbergia Walcott, 1924 species; Palmer, 1965) but not in others (e.g., potential geographic variation in granulation and pitting in Sanktia-zone trilobites; Taylor and Halley, 1974). Hughes (1994) found that within-sample variation accounts for most of the variation within and between “species” of Dikelocephalus Owen, 1852 and synonymized all previously described species into one (Hughes, 1991, 1994). In contrast, increased sampling of silicified material in some latest Cambrian genera has demonstrated that intraspecific variation is rather low in these faunas; instances where widespread “species” also show between-sample variation have thus been interpreted as species complexes rather than geographic variants (Adrain and Westrop, 2005, 2006; Westrop and Adrain, 2007).

We define a species as “the smallest aggregation of comparable individuals diagnosable by a unique combination of characters” in the spirit of the phylogenetic species concept of Nixon and Wheeler (1990; see also Wheeler and Meier, 2000). Species may be distinguished using discrete characters or continuously varying characters whose distributions form at least two statistically distinguishable groups. Zacanthopsis palmeri n. sp. is known only from the upper 2.5 m of the Dyeran (traditional “Lower” Cambrian of Laurentia) of the Pioche district in east-central Nevada (Fig. 1 inset), primarily from silicified beds. Within this 2.5 m stratigraphic interval, most Zacanthopsis palmeri material is found in one silicified bed (maximally 30 cm thick) which can be traced for almost 40 km. Although some geographically segregated samples of Zacanthopsis palmeri do show some degree of morphological separation in pairwise comparison, they are not qualitatively distinct nor can they be separated into statistically distinguishable groups using morphometric data when all samples are taken into account. By the above criteria, these samples are geographic variants of the same species rather than multiple species.

The nature of the preservation also provides an opportunity to describe in detail the ontogeny of a species of this genus for the first time. Of particular note, the hypostome remains conterminant through ontogeny but shifts from a fused rostral-hypostomal plate to a functional hypostomal suture during the meraspid period; other Zacanthopsis species that show this characteristic will be documented in a future paper. The only other corynexochine known to have a functional hypostomal suture at maturity is Fuchouia (Dru- man-Guzhangian, “Middle” Cambrian) for which the ontogeny is currently unknown (Peng et al., 2004; Whittington, 2009). Because Zacanthopsis is one of the earlier representatives of this suborder, this feature may have bearing on corynexochine affinities (Whittington, 1988; Fortey, 1990; Chatterton and Speyer, 1997).

Regional setting and materials—Zacanthopsis palmeri occurs predominantly in a single silicified limestone bed that can be traced from the Highland Range southwards into the northern Delamar Mountains (Fig. 1 inset). The bed lies less than 2 meters below the Dyeran-Delamaran boundary (the
FIGURE 1—Stratigraphic sections for sampled localities included in analysis of geographic variation. The base of the *Nephrolenellus geniculatus* subzone has not yet been identified at Klondike Gap or Antelope Canyon; at Ruin Wash, the base of this biozone is located between −1.0 and −5.0 m. Based on Palmer (1998), Webster (2007a, 2007b), Webster et al. (2008); and unpublished field notes. Inset: Map of sample localities, east-central Nevada, USA. AC = Antelope Canyon; GS = Grassy Spring; HV = Hidden Valley; KG = Klondike Gap; LC = Log Cabin Mine and One Wheel Canyon; OS = Oak Springs; RW = Ruin Wash. Modified from Sundberg and McCollum (2000).
traditional “Lower-Middle Cambrian” boundary of Laurentia in the upper part of the Combined Metals Member of the Pioche Formation (Sundberg and McCollum, 2000). The Pioche Formation is a sequence of alternating siliciclastics and carbonates that range through the upper Dyeran and into the Delamaran (Merriam, 1964; Palmer, 1971; Eddy and McCollum, 1998; Palmer, 1998; Sundberg and McCollum, 2000). The Z. palmeri bed is the highest Dyeran nodular limestone bed in a section of interbedded shales and nodular limestone beds. Karsted calcareous sandstone and oncoclastic limestones below the section of nodular limestone beds, and ribbon limestones above the section of nodular limestone beds (Fig. 1). Thus, it is unclear how much absolute time is represented by this bed, samples from this bed are deemed to be consistently time-averaged and any diachronity across localities is negligible.

The limestone bed was sampled from six localities between 1993 and 2005: Ruin Wash (see Figs. 2, 6.25–39, 6.41 for selection of specimens), Klondike Gap (Figs. 3, 6.40, 6.42–51), Antelope Canyon (Fig. 4.1–24), Oak Springs Summit (Fig. 5.1–11), Hidden Valley (Fig. 5.12–21), and Grassy Spring (Fig. 4.29–32). Stratigraphic sections for these localities have previously been published for Ruin Wash (Palmer, 1998; Webster et al., 2008), Klondike Gap (Webster, 2007b), Antelope Canyon (Sundberg and McCollum, 2000), Oak Springs Summit (Palmer, 1998), Hidden Valley (Palmer, 1998; Sundberg and McCollum, 2000), and Grassy Spring (Palmer, 1998). Additional studies describing material from this bed include Sundberg and McCollum (1997), Webster and Hughes (1999), Webster et al. (2001), Sundberg (2004), and Webster and Zelditch (2005). Smith (1995, 1998a, b) described older Zacanthopsis material from some of these localities.

Olenelloid and ptychoparioid trilobites serve as biostatigraphic indicators for correlation between the sections (Fig. 1). Several species of brachiopod, and rarely pelagiellids, the trilobite Bathynotus, and oryctocephalid trilobites are also preserved in this bed. The relative and absolute abundance of Zacanthopsis palmeri varies across these localities, and large sample sizes of complete cranidia were not available from Oak Springs Summit (N = 6) and Grassy Spring (N = 2). Zacanthopsis palmeri is also found in limestones at Log Cabin Mine (Fig. 4.25–28) and One Wheel Canyon in the northern Highland Range. While these limestones are both within a couple meters of the Dyeran-Delamaran boundary, these samples could not be correlated with other localities to the same resolution and were not included in the analysis of geographic variation.

Although the quality of preservation of exoskeletal features varies among silicified specimens of Z. palmeri, the specimens have not suffered taphonomic deformation (i.e., compaction or shearing). Lack of obvious size sorting (see below) and the presence of delicate features such as axial spines on sclerites and rare articulated specimens indicate that the fossil material was not appreciably transported. The vast majority of specimens are disarticulated, however; therefore variation is assessed separately within cranidia and pygidia. Because apparent intraspecific variation can be inflated by ontogenetic variation (variation in morphology due to allometric growth), the ontogenetic rate of shape change in each sclerite relative to size was used to identify morphologically mature specimens. Variation due to allometric growth in mature specimens was then removed using multiple regression of shape variables on size (see “Choice of specimens for analysis” and “Removal of variation due to allometry” under Geographic Variation).

Specimen preparation.—Specimens were removed from the limestone bed by dissolution of the carbonate matrix in dilute acetic acid. The specimens were then picked from the remaining insoluble residue, blackened with India ink, and whitened with ammonium chloride prior to photography. Cranidia were oriented for photography in dorsal view with the lateral edges of the anterior and posterior branches of the facial suture horizontal. Because the specimens are so small and the palpebral lobe is arched in lateral view, these criteria facilitate consistent orientation. In this orientation the chord of the palpebral lobe is generally horizontal as recommended by Shaw (1957). Pygidia were oriented in dorsal view with the inner pleural field horizontal and the articulating and ring furrows vertical. This is not consistent with Shaw (1957), but is necessary for viewing posterior features, such as pygidial spines, in dorsal view.

SYSTEMATIC PALEONTOLOGY


Order CORYNEXOCHIDA Kobayashi, 1935
Suborder CORYNEXOCHINA Kobayashi, 1935
Family ZACANTHOPHIDAE Swinnerton, 1915
Genus ZACANTHOPSIS Resser, 1938
ZACANTHOPSIS PALMieri n. sp.
Figures 2–7, 10–11

Diagnosis.—Zacanthopsis with hemicylindrical glabella, very slightly expanding forward. Palpebral lobes over two thirds the length of the glabella, well defined, strongly curved, extending laterally beyond frontal area and posterior wings. Ocular ridges as long as width of glabella, well defined, of uniform width, contacting glabella at posterior third of LA. Posterior wings narrow (tr.). Pygidium with large semicircular axial lobe; two axial furrows behind articulating furrow; four pairs of short, triangular pleural spines.

Description (mature morphology: 1.6–5.8 mm in cephalic length; 0.5–1.9 mm in total pygidial length).—Cranidium

Figure 2.—Morphologically mature cranidia and librigena of Zacanthopsis palmeri n. sp. 1, 3, 14, 19; librigena, dorsal, ventral, anterior, and lateral views, FMNH PES8158, ×7; 2, 18, 27, librigena, dorsal, anterior, and ventral views, FMNH PES8159, ×7; 3, 7, 8, 12, 13, cranidium, dorsal, lateral, ventral, posterior, and anterior views, FMNH PES8141, ×7; 4, 9, 10, 16, 17, cranidium, dorsal, ventral, lateral, posterior, and anterior views, FMNH PES8144, ×12; 6, librigena, dorsal view, FMNH PES8160, ×15; 11, 25, cranidium, lateral and oblique views, FMNH PES8143, ×10; 15, 20, 21, 28, 29, cranidium, lateral, posterior, anterior, dorsal, and ventral views, FMNH PES8147, ×15; 22, 26, cranidium, dorsal and oblique views, FMNH PES8142, ×7; 23, cranidium, dorsal view, FMNH PES8150, ×20, 24, cranidium, dorsal view, FMNH PES8148, ×15; 20, cranidium, dorsal view, FMNH PES8149, ×15; 21, 33, cranidium, dorsal and lateral views, FMNH PES8145, ×10; 32, cranidium, dorsal view, FMNH PES8146, ×12. All from Ruin Wash.
subquadrate in outline. Anterior border slightly narrower (sag.) than width (tr.) of palpebral lobes; gentle anterior arch; double narrower than anterior border. Very shallow anterior border furrow; sharp upturn in preglabellar field, sharpest laterally. Glabella expands slightly anteriorly, narrowest at S2. LA rounded anteriorly; preglabellar furrow usually shallower than axial furrows. Dorsal glabellar surface smoothly arched (long.) from occipital furrow to preglabellar field; slope sometimes increases in strength anteriorly. Frontal area strongly concave; anterior arch higher than interocular area but lower than dorsal surface of glabella. Dorsal surface of glabella higher than palpebral lobes with rare exception (Fig. 3.10, 3.14). Interocular areas generally horizontal; occasionally sloping down adaxially (Fig. 3.10, 3.14) or slightly arched (Figs. 2.12, 4.10). Facial sutures opisthoparian; anterior branch diverges from ocular ridges before curving adaxially to merge smoothly with anterior margin. Four glabellar furrows, less well defined anteriorly: S1 oriented postero-adaxially, SO and S2 transverse, S3 and S4 oriented antero-adaxially (Figs. 2.28, 5.1–2); all deepest abaxially, only SO crosses sagittal axis. Posterior margin of LO curves posteriorly. Doublure under LO curves dorsally, extends anteriorly almost to SO (Figs. 2.8, 5.18). Occipital spine shorter than width (sag.) of LO with rare exception (Fig. 5.15), extending posteriorly either horizontally (Figs. 2.7, 4.5), or dipping slightly ventrally (Figs. 2.10, 4.6). Ocular ridges as long as width of glabella, well defined, distinctly narrower than palpebral lobes, of uniform width, terminate at posterior third of LA, extend postero-laterally from glabella at 80° relative to sagittal axis. Palpebral lobes at least two thirds length of glabella, arcuate; oriented obliquely to sagittal axis, anterior ends closer to one another than posterior ends, widest (tr.) at lateralmost extent with tapering anterior and posterior ends; curvature strongest at lateralmost extent. Palpebral lobe extends to posterior border furrow, sometimes to occipital furrow in lateral view (compare Fig. 2.7...
with 2.10 and 2.11), extending laterally beyond posterior wing. Palpebral furrow wider than any other furrows. Posterior border straight (tr.), extends across posterior wing, narrower than but as deep as palpebral furrow. Posterior wing curves ventrally and anteriorly at fulcrum, tapers laterally; doublure along posterior wing widens distally from fulcrum (Fig. 2.8-9). Very fine granulation on interocular areas, frontal area posterior of anterior border, and ocular ridge visible on at least some specimens (Fig. 5.2).

Librigena much narrower (tr.) than interocular area, defined by very shallow border furrow (Fig. 2.1) that may appear only as break in slope (Fig. 2.2, 2.6). Ocular platform narrower than anterior and lateral border. Doublure as wide as anterior border. Genal spine at least as long as pre-occipital cranial length; as wide as doublure at base, tapers to point; hollow, circular in cross-section; extends posteriorly following curvature of anterior border and doublure. Tall eye socle (Fig. 2.14, 2.18, 2.19, 2.27). Terrace lines on outer margin and genal spine.

Hypostome ovate with bulbous anterior lobe. Anterior wings triangular, extend dorso-laterally (Fig. 7.1, 7.4, 7.8). Posterior wings longer than anterior wings with bluntly
rounded tips, extend directly dorsally; not visible in ventral view (Fig. 7.1–3). Posterior wings narrower than anterior wings, distinct from marginal border of hypostomal body. Posterior body well defined by arcuate transverse furrow, no wider (sag.) than anterior wings. Posterior margin more strongly curved than hypostomal suture. Border very narrow, well defined. On largest specimens, large maculae prominent on posterior part of anterior body (Fig. 7.1, 7.4). No ornamentation.

Rostral plate hemicylindrical, broadly curved at anterior margin (rostral suture) (Fig. 7.18–26). Body of plate twice as wide (tr.) as long (sag.). Anterior wings long, narrow;
posterior wings shorter than anterior wings with wide blunt ends. Lateral edges (connective sutures) strongly convex adaxially. Terrace lines present across ventral surface (Fig. 7.21–22).

Each thoracic segment narrow, with length (tr.) to width (exsag.) ratio of each pleura ranging from 1.5 to 3; of uniform width (exsag.). Articulating ring well defined by moderately wide (exsag.) furrow, widest mediadally. Pleural furrow triangulal, as wide as axial ring adaxially, tapers distally to point, extends almost to postero-lateral edge. Pleura curves ventrally at fulcrum, angle of curvature varies from 40° to 50° across segments (Fig. 6.1–24). Sentate pleural spine on all segments. Macroaxial spine present on at least one segment with short (tr.) pleura and strong fulc rum. Macroaxial spine up to ten times as long as segment width (sag.) (Fig. 6.7, 6.13), upsloping at around 45° angle from pleura, terrace lines present. Upsloping axial spines present on all other segments but shorter than segment width (sag.) (Fig. 6.14–18).

Pygidium small, subtriangular, with semicircular axial lobe. Two axial furrows behind prominent articulating furrow; anteriormost ring furrow as wide (sag.) medially as first axial ring, narrows distally, deepest anteriorly; posteriormost ring furrow defined by shallow indentation in middle of axis, rarely extends to axial furrow (Figs. 4.14–18, 6.25–29). Articulating furrow and anteriormost ring furrow visible on the ventral surface as prominent ridges. Axial furrow represented by change in slope between axial rings and pleural field. Anterior margin curves ventrally midway along pleural field at approximately 45° relative to sagittal axis. Two pleural furrows; posteriormost often poorly defined. Pleural furrows extend back from anterior border at about 45° relative to sagittal axis; extend to middle of the base of triangular spine (Fig. 6.41). Four pairs of short, blunt, triangular pleural spines; decrease in size posteriorly. Lateral edge of anteriormost spine meets anterior margin at approximately 80°. Border furrow absent. Doublure on posterior margin no wider (exsag.) than length of pleural spines (Figs. 4.20, 6.26, 6.36).

Etymology.—Named for A. R. Palmer, who has conducted much work on Cambrian trilobites of the Great Basin.

Types.—Holotype, cranidium, FMNH PE58174, and paratypes, FMNH PE58187, FMNH PE58190–193, FMNH PE58195, from the Combined Metals Member, Pioche Formation (late Dyeran), Lincoln County, eastern Nevada. Paratypes, FMNH PE58144, FMNH PE58166, FMNH PE58167, FMNH PE58158, FMNH PE58164, from the Combined Metals Member, Pioche Formation (late Dyeran), Lincoln County, eastern Nevada. Paratype, FMNH PE58216, from the Combined Metals Member, Pioche Formation (late Dyeran), Antelope Canyon, Chief Range, Lincoln County, eastern Nevada.

Material examined and occurrence.—NEVADA: Highland Range, Lincoln County: ICS-1234 (Log Cabin Mine section, Combined Metals Member of the Pioche Formation, 20 cm below top Dyeran). ICS-1077 (One Wheel Canyon section, Combined Metals Member of the Pioche Formation, 0.9 m below top Dyeran). Delamar Mountains, Lincoln County: ICS-1280 and ICS-10252 (Grassy Springs section, 1.5 m below the top Dyeran). ICS-1287 and ICS-10101 (Oak Springs Summit section, Combined Metals Member of the Pioche Formation, carbonate nodules 1.6 m below the top Dyeran). Chief Range, Lincoln County: ICS-1233 and ICS-10020 (Antelope Canyon section, Combined Metals Member of the Pioche Formation, 2.05–2.33 m below top Dyeran). ICS-1048 and ICS-10010 (Ruin Wash section, Combined Metals Member of the Pioche Formation, 24.3–24.54 m above erosion surface at base of Combined Metals Member). ICS-1103 and UCR 10097 (Klondike Gap section, Combined Metals Member of the Pioche Formation, 0.65–0.75 m below top Dyeran). Burnt Springs Range, Lincoln County: ICS-1173 and UCR 9963 (Hidden Valley section, Combined Metals Member of the Pioche Formation, carbonate nodules 1.8 m below the top Dyeran). All material except that from One Wheel Canyon is silicified.

Discussion.—Silicified Zacanthopsis palmeri specimens permit a more nearly complete description of the morphology and ontogeny of the species than is known for other species of the genus. Two articulated specimens of Zacanthopsis are known from shales at Ruin Wash and Grassy Spring but cranial features on both specimens are not sufficiently well preserved to permit species identification. Newly collected silicified material of *Z. levis* was also examined for comparative purposes (see also Smith, 1995). A full revision of the genus will be presented elsewhere.

The Zacanthopsis palmeri cranidium differs from that of *Z. levis* (Walcott, 1886) by being distinctly narrower (tr.) between the anterior branches of the facial sutures than between the palpebral lobes (Fig. 8.1). *Zacanthopsis contractus* Palmer, 1964 and *Z. expansa* Fritz, 1991 also share this distinction from *Z. levis* (Figs. 8.3, 8.7–8). *Zacanthopsis palmeri* differs from *Z. contractus* by having a more gently anteriorly expanding glabella and longer ocular lobes (with the exception of *Z. contractus* specimen GSC 27416, previously described as *Z. stribicus* Fritz, 1972, Fig. 8.6). *Zacanthopsis palmeri* differs from *Z. expansa* by lacking any increase in ocular ridge width towards the palpebral lobes and by having longer ocular ridges (Fig. 8.7–8). The pygidium of *Z. palmeri* differs from that of *Z. expansa* and *Z. levis* by having fewer axial furrows defined behind the articulating furrow despite having the same number of pleural spines (Fig. 8.4–5). The pygidium for *Z. contractus* is not known.

Unlike other corynexochines, the hypostome and rostral plate were not fused in mature individuals of *Zacanthopsis palmeri*. Cranidia may be grouped with librigena of similar sutural morphology and size to estimate the gap size between the librigena where the rostral plate would fit. Rostral plates of the appropriate length (tr.) were wide (sag.) enough to reach the preglabellar furrow, indicating a conterminant hypostomal position (Fortey, 1990) with a functional hypostomal suture. The hypostomal suture must end where the posterior wing of the rostral plate begins (this is represented as a kink in the anterior border of the hypostome in ventral view). Using this functional constraint, the size of the associated hypostome can be estimated; the posterior margin of the hypostome likely lay beneath L2. Although the posterior wings (Fig. 7.2–3) may have been long enough to brace the hypostome against the ventral side of the cranidium, there are no definitive apodermal pits along the axial furrow indicating attachment sites of the wings.

Because of the tall eye socle, the visual surface must have been quite narrow vertically (see Fig. 2.26–27). If the visual surface was horizontal in life, the genal spines would have sloped downwards posteriorly (Fig. 2.19), dipping below the lateral tips of the thoracic segments. It is possible that the genal spines lay about parallel to the ground and that the visual surface sloped anteriorly, as has been argued for other trilobites (e.g., *Dikeloecephalus* Hughes, 1993). In this orientation, the field of vision in the vertical plane would have been greater than if the visual surface were horizontal.
In addition, the visual surface was strongly curved (Fig. 2.14, 2.18, 2.27), indicating a large field of view in the horizontal plane.

**Ontogeny**

Ontogenetic description of *Zacanthopsis palmeri* n. sp. is based on silicified material from all localities (except One Wheel Canyon). Plotting cranidial length against width (or the length and width of the entire dorsal shield for protaspides) does not separate protaspides from meraspides nor reveal discrete instars during any developmental period (Fig. 9). We divide the protaspid period into two stages based on differences in morphology. Two articulated specimens allow us to describe meraspis degree 1 (M1) and meraspis degree 3 (M3). Based on the size and morphology of the cranidia and pygidia in these specimen, other ontogenetic stages are described.

**Early protaspis.**—Figure 10.1–4. Dorsal exoskeleton subcircular in outline, moderately arched transversely and longitudinally. Glabella not defined. Closely spaced posterior fixigenal spines along the posterior margin. Posterior margin indented to superficially resemble a pygidial median notch. Thickened ventral margin between posterior fixigenal spines is precursor to proptopygidium of late protaspis. Hypostome almost the length of the dorsal sclerite (Fig. 10.2–3), anterior wings as large as middle body, extending laterally from narrow middle body, either merged with or serving as the rostral plate; lateralmost pair of spines on posterior border as long as anterior wings, extend postero-laterally; three additional pairs of spines on posterior border, shorter than lateralmost pair, extend dorsally (towards ventral side of dorsal sclerite).

**Late protaspis.**—Figure 10.5–10.10. Dorsal exoskeleton subcircular in outline; moderately arched transversely and longitudinally. Narrow glabella extends across dorsal sclerite, wider at LA. Four transverse glabellar furrows extend across glabella. Frontal pits separate the axial furrows from nearly complete marginal border. Protopygidium curved ventrally between reduced posterior fixigenal spines. Hypostome as in early protaspis with moderately well defined, posteriorly tapering middle body (Fig. 10.7).

**MO(?)—M1.**—Figure 10.21–23. Craniun semicircular in outline. Glabella narrow, strongly expands anteriorly opposite anterior end of palpebral lobe, meets the anterior border. Anterior border curves smoothly to palpebral lobes. Palpebral lobe as narrow as anterior border, distinct from anterior border. Ocular ridge not defined. Posterior border furrow...
straight, extends to lateral edge of cranidium. Posterior border curves posteriorly to form fixigenal spine; fixigenal spine does not extend posterior of LO. LO triangular, tapers posteriorly into axial node.

**M1.**—Known from one incompletely preserved specimen which became partially disarticulated and broken during cleaning (FMNH PE58183–84, Fig. 10.11–16). Specimen approximately 0.5 mm in cephalic length. Cranidium semicircular in outline. Glabella expands anteriorly. Hypostome fused to rostral plate; extends posteriorly halfway down cranidial length, with laterally extending posterior spines, no longer than width (tr.) of middle body; denticate posterior margin. One thoracic segment, slightly wider (tr.) than transitory pygidium, with axial spine. Transitory pygidium trapezoidal in outline. Two axial rings; axial spine on posterior ring. Two pairs of pleural spines extend from posterior margin; lateralmost oriented postero-dorsally; medialmost oriented postero-medially. See also Fig. 10.17–20.

**Post-M1 transitory pygidium.**—(Fig. 11.29–36). Description for M3 applies for all post-M1 transitory pygidia. **M2 or M3.**—Figure 11.1–22. Specimens of smaller size but similar cranidial morphology as M3. Description of M3 applies with the following exceptions. Posterior border may curve posteriorly before curving antero-ventrally. Posterior wing extends laterally beyond palpebral lobe, curves ventrally at posterior end of palpebral lobe, ends bluntly (does not taper). Short, blunt posterior fixigenal spines occasionally present on postero-lateral end of posterior wing.

Fused rostral-hypostomal plate found disarticulated but associated with cranidia of this description (Fig. 11.21–22). Hypostome has well defined denticate posterior margin, large middle body, tapering posteriorly, defined by posterior furrow. Rostral plate wide with blunt ends, strongly curved, extends laterally beyond hypostomal body, ornamentation of terrace lines.

**M3.**—One articulated enrolled specimen (FMNH PE58237, Fig. 11.23–28). Specimen is 1 mm in cephalic length, excluding occipital spine. Cranidium trapezoidal. Glabella expands forward, meets anterior border. Dorsal glabellar surface flat (long.), curves strongly anteriorly at middle (sag.) of LA, S1–S4 unclear; SO straight, narrower than posterior border furrow. Posterior margin of LO curves posteriorly, dorsal surface upsloping posteriorly in lateral view (Fig. 11.26). Occipital spine as long as width (sag.) of LO, extends
posteriorly from dorsal surface of LO. Anterior border as wide (sag.) as palpebral lobes, of uniform width; merges smoothly with anteriorly convergent anterior branch of facial suture; subtle anterior arch. Palpebral lobes two thirds the length of the glabella, slightly curved, widest at lateromedial extent, tapering to anterior and posterior ends. Palpebral furrow widest where palpebral lobe widest. Ocular ridge subparallel to anterior border, meets glabella at anterior end of LA. Very narrow frontal area anterior of ocular ridge. Interocular area arched transversely and longitudinally, summit higher than palpebral lobes but lower than dorsal surface of glabella. Posterior border straight, of similar width as axial furrow, extends to lateral edge of posterior wing. Posterior wing tapers laterally, extends laterally beyond palpebral lobes. Posterior border curves strongly posteriorly at fulcrum (Fig. 11.25).

Three thoracic segments, narrow, curve ventrally at fulcrum. Axial spines at least as long as occipital spine, curve posteriorly. Sentate pleural spines, posteriorly directed. Anteriormost thoracic segment narrower (tr.) than distance between tips of posterior wings.

Pygidium subquadrate in outline. Four axial rings with narrow axial spines curving postero-dorsally, anteriormost as long as width (tr.) of pygidium, decreasing in length down axis (Fig. 11.24, 26 show pygidial spines posterior to axial spine of posteriormost thoracic segment). Anteriormost spine as long as width of pleural field. Two to three pleural furrows visible; extend postero-laterally. Four pairs of pleural spines oriented posteriorly, decreasing in length medially, middle spines extend furthest posteriorly. See also Fig. 11.29–36.

Post-M3 cranidium.—Figure 11.37–40, 44–45. Specimens between 1 and 1.4 mm in cranidial length, excluding occipital spine. Description of morphologically mature specimens applies with the following exceptions. Glabella subparallel or very gently expanding forward. Frontal area less strongly concave (curving upward) than in mature specimens; anterior arch more gently curving. Anterior border more strongly curved than in mature specimens but becomes less so in later meraspis. Preglabellar field as wide (sag.) as anterior border (sag.) but widens through later meraspis stages. Posterior

---

**Figure 9**—Cranidial length-to-width ratio of specimens of *Zacanthopsis palmeri* n. sp. Cranidial length includes the entire dorsal shield in protaspides and includes the occipital ring but excludes the occipital spine in all other specimens. Morphologically immature specimens include obvious meraspides as well as those identified as immature based on the rate of overall shape change (see Fig. 13 and “Choice of specimens for analysis” under Geographic Variation).

**Figure 10**—Silicified specimens representing the ontogenetic development of *Zacanthopsis palmeri* n. sp., protaspid and early meraspis stages. 1, early protaspid showing posterior fixigenal spines, dorsal view, FMNH PE58186, ×35; 2, early protaspid showing posterior fixigenal spines, dorsal view, FMNH PE58212, ×35; 3–4, early protaspid with hypostome, ventral and lateral views, FMNH PE58157, ×35; 5, late protaspid, dorsal view, FMNH PE58185, ×35; 6–8, late protaspid with hypostome, dorsal, ventral, and lateral views, FMNH PE58156, ×35; 9, hypostome assigned to protaspid stage, ventral view, FMNH PE58163, ×35, 10, Late protaspid showing four glabellar furrows, dorsal view, FMNH PE58155, ×35; 11–12, cranidium with hypostome in meraspis degree 1, ventral and lateral views, FMNH PE58183, ×35; 13–16, pygidium with thoracic segment in meraspis degree 1, lateral, dorsal, anterior, and posterior views, FMNH PE58184, ×35; 17–20, pygidium likely in meraspis degree 1, dorsal, anterior, posterior, and lateral views, FMNH PE58173, ×35; 21, cranidium likely in meraspis degree 0 or 1, dorsal view, FMNH PE58153, ×35; 22, cranidium likely in meraspis degree 0 or 1, dorsal view, FMNH PE58154, ×35; 23, cranidium likely in meraspis degree 9 or 1, dorsal view, FMNH PE58230, ×25. Figs. 5, 11–16 from Klondike Gap, 2 from Antelope Canyon, 3–4, 6–10, 17–22 from Ruin Wash, and 23 from Oak Springs Summit.
wings extend laterally just beyond palpebral lobes, taper laterally. Lateral end of posterior wing rounded. Posterior border gradually curves antero-ventrally at fulcrum.

Post-M3 librigena.—Figure 11.41–43. Description of morphologically mature librigena applies with the following exceptions. Ocular platform at least as wide as lateral border. Genal spine slightly shorter than pre-occipital cranial length.

Late meraspis hypostome.—Figure 7.12–16. Hypostome subovate, subovate anterior lobe. Anterior wings broad, triangular, extend dorso-laterally. Posterior wings narrower than anterior wings with bluntly rounded tips, extend directly dorsally; not visible in ventral view. Posterior body smaller than anterior lobe, low, defined by change in slope of hypostomal surface. Posterior margin more strongly rounded than hypostomial suture. Border narrow, well defined on anterior margin. No ornamentation.


The morphology of Zacanthopsis palmeri in the early protaspis period differs from that of Cambrian zacanthoids Fieldaspis quadrangularis and Paralbertella limbata (Hu, 1985b), by lacking a frontal lobe or “axial knives” and possessing distinct posterior fixigenal spines. In the later protaspis period, the posterior margin is indented and lacks the protruding terminal node seen in F. quadrangularis and P. limbata. In contrast, both early and late protaspis morphology of Z. palmeri is very similar to that of the Cambrian dolichometopids Bathyrurusus fimbriatus (Robison, 1967) and Ptarmigania aurita (Hu, 1971; Lee and Chatterton, 2003). The protaspis is also similar to that of the co-occurring ptychoparioid Eokochaspis metalaspis Sundberg and McColllum, 2000 (ontogeny described by Palmer [1958] as Crasifimbria walcotti Resser, 1939), but the hypostome is markedly different. Both the anterior wings and the four pairs of spines on the posterior margin are shorter and blunter on E. metalaspis.

Throughout the meraspis period, the glabella becomes more parallel-sided, until it expands only slightly anteriorly. The frontal area expands anteriorly and laterally. The preglabellar field gets more concave (upward curving). The ocular ridge moves posteriorly from the anterior border; by the late meraspis period it is almost perpendicular to the sagittal axis. The palpebral lobes migrate laterally and the posterior wings migrate inward relative to the palpebral lobes. During earlier meraspis degrees the posterior wing still carries the posterior fixigenal spine on the postero-lateral edge of the posterior wing. From M3, the posterior wing begins to taper distally and the fixigenal spine is lost. LO expands laterally and posteriorly to become even more strongly triangular. The occipital spine decreases in length relative to the length of the cranium. LO becomes less upsloping posteriorly with a smoother transition into the axial spine. It is not until later in the meraspis period that the anterior arch develops and the anterior branches of the facial sutures become divergent from the junction of the ocular ridge and palpebral lobe before curving adaxially towards the anterior border. The dorsal glabellar surface curves less strongly anteriorly. The posterior border begins to curve anteriorly as well as ventrally at the fulcrum. The junction between the ocular ridge and the glabella migrates posteriorly along LA. The interocular area becomes increasingly horizontal and sometimes upsloping abaxially. In the latest developmental stages, the palpebral lobes continue to migrate laterally and become more flexed.

The ocular platform of the librigena decreases in proportional width relative to the anterior border through ontogeny. The genal spine increases in length relative to cranial length.

The hypostome remains fused with the rostral plate through at least M3 (Fig. 11.21). Spines on the posterior margin decrease in size to denticles and are completely lost on all individuals with a functional hypostomal suture. In later stages of development, the anterior body of the hypostome becomes more bulbous and the furrow defining it becomes more distinct around the entire margin of the body but particularly on the posterior margin. The anterior margin is defined in earlier developmental stages; definition along the lateral and posterior margins increases as development progresses.

Stages of development in the transitory pygidium were insufficiently represented by specimens to recognize most instars. Nevertheless, post-M1 pygidia may be distinguished from M1 pygidia by an increase in the number of axial and pleural spines. Axial spines are not retained on the mature pygidium. Thus it appears that all axial spines occur on segments to be released into the thorax. The thoracic pleural spines in the thorax are much shorter than those on the pygidium.

**GEOGRAPHIC VARIATION**

The occurrence of six geographically distinct samples of comparable individuals from one silified limestone bed provides an opportunity to test if all specimens belong to *Zacanthopsis palmeri* n. sp. and to assess the degree of morphological variation among any spatially segregated samples of this species.
Geometric morphometrics.—Morphological variation was assessed using geometric morphometric methods (Bookstein, 1991; Zelditch et al., 2004). Cranidia and pygidia were oriented for photography as described for systematic paleontology. Landmark coordinates (described below) were obtained from the photographs using ImageJ 1.36b (Rasband, 2006), freely available at http://rsb.info.nih.gov/ij/. Landmarks were digitized in dorsal view for both cranidia and pygidia.

Cranidium.—A total of 25 landmarks (three along the sagittal axis and 11 pairs on either side of the axis) were chosen that optimize summary of the overall shape of the cranidium while retaining a reasonable sample size (Fig. 12.1, Appendix 1). Glabellar furrows were not consistently well defined across specimens of Zacanthopsis palmeri for use as landmarks.

Pygidium.—A total of 19 landmarks (five along the sagittal axis and seven pairs on either side of the axis) were chosen that optimize summary of the shape of the axial rings and the anterimost pleural segments and spines, while retaining a reasonable sample size (Fig. 12.3, Appendix 1). The posterior pleural spines were not preserved consistently enough for inclusion.

All paired landmarks were averaged across the sagittal axis because they cannot be regarded as independent (Zelditch et al., 2004; Zelditch, 2005). Averaging paired landmarks also allows for the inclusion of specimens where only one of the pair of landmarks is preserved. This reduces the total number of landmarks on the cranidium to 14 and the total number of landmarks on the pygidium to 12.

All statistical analyses were performed using warp scores, which are derived from thin-plate spline decomposition (Rohlf, 1990; Bookstein, 1991; Zelditch et al., 2004). Variation within and between samples was visually compared using principal component analysis (PCA) of the warp scores. Canonical variates analysis of the warp scores and a bootstrapped F-test of Procrustes coordinates were used to test for significant differences between samples (Zelditch et al., 2004). We use a bootstrapped F-test because it does not assume an isotropic normal distribution of landmarks around
the mean; visual inspection of the variation around each landmark after Procrustes superimposition (e.g., Klondike Gap sample, Figure 12.2, 4) indicates that such an assumption is not met by these data. In order to compensate for the multiple comparisons made using the bootstrapped F-test, we applied a Bonferroni correction to the critical p-value. The degree of variation in each sample was measured as within-group variance in Procrustes distance away from the group mean. The contribution to overall morphological variation by each sample was assessed using partial disparity (Foote, 1993). All analyses were performed using the Integrated Morphometrics Package (Sheets, 2003), freely available at http://www3.canisius.edu/~sheets/morphsoft.html.

Choice of specimens for analysis.—All cranidia with fixigenal spines were excluded from analysis because they lack landmarks which are clearly homologous to that defining the fulcrum in more mature specimens (landmarks 20 and 21, Fig. 12.1). In order to avoid inflating the apparent variation by including other morphologically immature specimens, the Procrustes distance of each of these specimens away from the mean configuration of the three remaining smallest specimens was plotted against the centroid size (Fig. 13.1). Generally, as the specimen size gets larger, the Procrustes distance also increases, indicating a progressive change in shape away from the juvenile reference form. At a centroid size of approximately 2, however, the slope of the Procrustes distance relative to size becomes less steep. Based on this change in slope, all specimens with centroid size greater than 2.05 were selected for analysis. Centroid size of 2.05 is equivalent to a sagittal cephalic length, including the occipital ring but excluding the occipital spine, of 1.4 mm.

Such a change in allometry has been documented for other trilobites and suggested to represent entry into the holaspid period, but there are cases where this change in allometry does not correspond with termination of trunk segment generation (Hughes and Chapman, 1995; Kim et al., 2002). Due to a paucity of articulated specimens, it is unknown whether this break in slope corresponds to entry into the holaspid period in Zacanthopsis palmeri, and this is considered unlikely given the small size of the specimens at this transition relative to the largest known specimens (cf. Hughes and Chapman, 1995). Here, this break in slope is used only to identify morphological maturity of the cranidia.

Pygidia were considered morphologically mature if they did not carry axial spines. Such specimens do show considerable allometric growth but no change in slope of Procrustes distance from the mean configuration of the smallest three specimens relative to specimen size (Fig. 13.2). Sample sizes are shown in Table 1.

Removal of variation due to allometry. Of the morphologically mature specimens, there is no significant difference in size range of cranidia across localities (Fig. 14.1) but there are cases where this change in allometry does not correspond with termination of trunk segment generation (Hughes and Chapman, 1995; Kim et al., 2002). Due to a paucity of articulated specimens, it is unknown whether this break in slope corresponds to entry into the holaspid period in Zacanthopsis palmeri, and this is considered unlikely given the small size of the specimens at this transition relative to the largest known specimens (cf. Hughes and Chapman, 1995). Here, this break in slope is used only to identify morphological maturity of the cranidia.

Table 1.—Within-sample variation and partial disparity of samples of Zacanthopsis palmeri based on shape data from both cranidia and pygidia. Variation and SE values are to 10^3. SE = standard error, based on 1,600 bootstraps; %MD = percentage of morphological disparity that partial disparity represents. Samples are ordered from the northern- to southernmost localities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-size-standardized</th>
<th>Size-standardized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Variation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRANIDIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KG</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HV</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same photo</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remountRW</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remountAC</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PYGIDIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KG</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HV</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remountAC</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
landmarks from each photograph. Digitizing error was assessed by extracting landmark coordinates from the same photograph of one specimen 20 times. Because the variances of the samples are an order of magnitude greater than the variance attributable to orientation or digitizing error for both cranidia and pygidia (Table 1), measurement error is deemed negligible.

**Results: cranidia.**—Figure 15 shows results from PCA of the size-standardized morphologically mature cranidia from the six samples. Data from error assessment are not included. PC 1 accounts for 17.0% of the total variation and relates primarily to the placement of the palpebral lobe and anterior branch of the facial suture relative to the rest of the cranidium (Fig. 15.3). PC 2 accounts for 15.3% of the total variation and is related primarily to the width of the interocular area relative to the rest of the cranidium and to the orientation of the palpebral lobe relative to the sagittal axis (Fig. 15.4). A smaller proportion of variation between specimens is due to differences in the location of the distal end of the posterior wing relative to the rest of cranidium (e.g., PC 3, 9.2% of total variation). The shape of the glabella is fairly uniform across localities with the exception of minor differences in the length and width of the occipital ring. The length of the preglabellar field is uniform.

Two canonical variates are statistically significant discriminators of samples (Bartlett’s test: Wilk’s $\Lambda = 0.0693$, $\chi^2 = 197.5229$, d.f. = 120, $P < 0.001$; Wilk’s $\Lambda = 0.1815$, $\chi^2 = 126.2863$, d.f. = 92, $P = 0.01$). While there is substantial overlap of samples in the PCA, the mean morphologies of a few samples remain significantly different from one another after the Bonferroni correction (bootstrap $F$-test, Table 2). For example, there is a significant difference between means and minimal overlap in morphospace of samples from Hidden Valley and Oak Springs Summit (Fig. 15.1, 2). Though sample means are different, the mean morphology of the species is well represented by FMNH PE58174 (holotype) (Fig. 3.1) and FMNH PE58144 (Fig. 2.4). Morphological features characterizing specimens that lie on the outer edges of the occupied morphospace include either very weakly or very strongly divergent anterior sutures (e.g., compare Fig. 3.4 with Fig. 2.28) and very small or very large width to length ratio in the cranidium (e.g., compare Fig. 2.30 with Fig. 2.31 and Fig. 5.16). Samples represented by a larger sample size show greater within-sample variation (Klondike Gap and Ruin Wash, Table 1, Fig. 15.1).

**Results: pygidia.**—Figure 16 shows results from PCA of size-standardized morphologically mature pygidia from the six samples. Data from error assessment was not included. Like cranidia, a few sample means remain significantly different from one another after Bonferroni correction (bootstrap $F$-test, Table 2). There is more geographical separation along PC 1 in samples of pygidia than cranidia, though the extent to which all pygidial samples overlap increases after size-standardization. Samples of pygidia from Klondike Gap and Oak Springs Summit are no longer separated from one another by PC 1 but Oak Springs Summit is separated from the rest of the samples by PC 3 (Fig.16.2). Nonetheless, specimens from Oak Springs Summit, Hidden Valley, and Grassy Springs tend to have lower PC 1 values and specimens from Klondike Gap, Ruin Wash, and Antelope Canyon tend to have higher PC 1 values suggesting morphological divergence between samples from the Chief Range and samples from the Delamar Mountains (Fig. 1). Two canonical variates are statistically significant discriminators of samples (Bartlett’s test: Wilk’s $\Lambda = 0.0178$, $\chi^2 = 130.9938$, d.f. = 80, $P$
Figure 15—Principal components analysis (PCA) of Zacanthopsis palmeri mature cranidia after size standardization and not including error analyses. Percent variation summarized by each axis shown in axis label. 1, PC 1 vs. 2; PC 2 vs. 3; locality abbreviations as in 15.1. 3, Thin-plate spline projections of variation along PC 1. 4, Thin-plate spline projection of variation along PC 2. 5, Thin-plate spline projection of variation along PC 3. See Figure 12 for landmark configuration. Locality abbreviations as in Figure 1.
Table 2—Pairwise comparisons of Zacanthopsis palmeri samples based on shape data from cranidia and pygidia. $F = \text{bootstraped } F$-score based on 1,600 bootstraps of non-size standardized data; $F^* = \text{bootstraped } F$-score based on 1,600 bootstraps of size-standardized data. $P$-values significant at $\alpha = 0.05$ in bold; $P^*$ values significant after Bonferroni correction in italics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CRANIDIA</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>PYGIDIA</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KG vs RW</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.053</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.2225</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KG vs AC</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.4181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KG vs HV</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KG vs OS</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW vs AC</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.4269</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.1913</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW vs HV</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.1338</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW vs OS</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.1069</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.0575</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC vs HV</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC vs OS</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.6475</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.4694</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.0138</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HV vs OS</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.0875</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

< 0.001; Wilk’s $\Lambda = 0.0944, \chi^2 = 76.6912$, d.f. = 57, $P = 0.04$.

Morphological variation across PC 1–3 is primarily expressed in the size of the pleural field relative to the axial lobe (Fig. 16.3–5). We note, however, that the shape of the variation within the remounted specimen is elliptical along PC 1. The resulting artificial inflation of variation along PC 1 is due to inconsistent orientation of the specimen with the articulating furrow vertical (recognized a posteriori). The magnitude of this error along this axis is not great enough, however, to account for all of the variation in the species along this axis. In addition, measurement error cannot explain the separation of geographic samples in morphospace.

With the exception of Oak Springs Summit, samples with greater sample sizes show greater variation. However, morphologically peripheral samples contribute more to species-level variation in pygidia than does sample size (Table 1). The sample from Oak Springs Summit has both high variation and contributes strongly to species-level variation. This is reflected in the PCA (Fig. 16.2): Oak Springs Summit occupies space along PC 3 that no other sample shares.

DISCUSSION

Cranidial shape change during ontogeny in Zacanthopsis palmeri n. sp. is dominated by lengthening of the ocular ridge, inward movement of the posterior wings, expansion of the preglabellar field, posterolateral expansion of the occipital ring, widening of the interocular area, and transition from convergent anterior branches of the facial suture to divergent anterior branches (Fig. 17.1). In morphologically mature specimens, intraspecific variation is expressed in the same features, particularly the angle of divergence in the anterior branch of the facial suture and the width of the interocular area. Pygidial shape change during ontogeny is dominated by a decrease in the size of the pleural field relative to the axial lobe, decrease in the medial width of the anterior axial ring, and transition from a subtrapezoidal shape to subtriangular shape (Fig. 17.2). Again, intraspecific variation in morphologically mature specimens is expressed in the same features. While there is some change in the shape of the glabella and the pygidial axis, variation of morphologically mature specimens within the species is expressed predominantly in the pleural lobes of both sclerites.

No one sample encompasses all of the variation that is expressed by Zacanthopsis palmeri and the mean morphology at maturity of many samples is significantly different from others (Table 2). If we had only sampled from two localities with significantly different means and minimal overlap (e.g., samples of cranidia from Hidden Valley and Antelope Canyon or samples of pygidia from Klondike Gap and Oak Springs Summit), we would have concluded that those samples represented different groups diagnosable by a unique range of continuous characters. However, after sampling from more localities and aggregating samples by successive pooling of samples that cannot be distinguished from one another (following Davis and Nixon, 1992), we find that these samples are not distinct from another. For example, while Antelope Canyon is significantly different from Hidden Valley, neither is significantly different from Ruin Wash.

Without the Bonferroni correction, a case could be made to distinguish Oak Springs Summit and Hidden Valley pygidia from Ruin Wash, Klondike Gap, and Antelope Canyon pygidia (Table 2). Because of the substantial overlap of samples in morphospace, however, we do not believe that these results warrant the erection of new species or subspecies. Any specimen falling within areas of overlap could not be diagnosed as a member of a particular group or sample without knowledge of the geographic location of the specimen. Thus, the best interpretation of these data is that the specimens represent one species with some morphological variation between pygidia from the Chief Range and pygidia from the Delamar Mountains (Fig. 1).

Interestingly, there is an inconsistency in the localities which show significant differences in mean pygidial form and those that show differences in mean cranidial form (Table 2). For example, while cranidia from Oak Springs Summit and Hidden Valley do not overlap along PC 2 or PC 3 (Fig. 15.1, 2), pygidia from these two localities are more closely aligned morphologically, particularly along PC 1 (Fig. 16.1). While we cannot know how many individuals contributed to these samples of molts nor if the cranidia were shed by the same individuals as the pygidia, the inconsistency between the distributions of variation in the two sclerites suggests a decoupling of the intrinsic controls on variation in different sclerites.

Unfortunately, environmental differences between localities that might be associated with geographic variation in Zacanthopsis palmeri are not readily apparent. The bed itself does not show obvious sedimentological differences between localities. While water depth was increasing at these localities during the late Dyeran (Webster, 2007b), the relative difference in water depth between localities when this bed was deposited is unknown. Further, the relative position of each locality to shoreline remains unclear. There is, however, a dramatic shift in the faunal assemblage between localities. Palmer (1998, fig. 3) recognized a Zacanthopsis-Eokochaspis biofacies in uppermost Dyeran sediments at Log Cabin Mine and One Wheel Canyon (Fig. 18.1). Yet the relative abun-
Figure 16—Principal components analysis (PCA) of Zacanthopsis palmeri mature pygidia after size standardization and not including error analyses. Percent variation summarized by each axis shown in axis label. 1, PC 1 vs. 2. 2, PC 1 vs. 3. Thin-plate spline projection of variation along PC 1. 3, Thin-plate spline projection of variation along PC 2. 4, Thin-plate spline projection of variation along PC 3. See Figure 12 for landmark configuration. Locality abbreviations as in Figure 1.
dance of *Z. palmeri* changes so much across its geographic range that a sample from Grassy Springs better represents Palmer’s *Olenellus-Nephrolenellus* biofacies (Fig. 18.3, Palmer [1998, fig. 3]) in regards to relative abundance. At Ruin Wash and Klondike Gap, *Z. palmeri* dominates the sample (Fig. 18.2). Such dramatic variation in relative abundance suggests that some so far undetectable environmental difference existed between localities.

**Comparison to previously described *Zacanthopsis* species.**—Most species of *Zacanthopsis* are represented by one or only a few cranidia preserved in limestone, and, for some species, pygidia are unknown (Fig. 8). PCA of *Zacanthopsis* specimens shows that the cranidium of *Z. palmeri* is distinct from those of previously described species (Fig. 19, see Appendix 2 for list of specimens included in this analysis). Size standardization of *Z. palmeri* species did not alter the results of the PCA. The difference in shape between many of the species, however, is no greater than the range of variation within *Z. palmeri*, highlighting the need for large sample sizes for robust species delimitation. Indeed, the recognition of the morphological variation in other *Zacanthopsis* species based on new material from Greenland has recently motivated workers to synonymize species originally defined on the basis of one or two specimens (Blaker and Peel, 1997). Discrete characters, such as consistency in width of ocular ridge or numbers of axial furrows on the pygidia, and comparison of ontogenetic trajectories of shape change (such as that of *Z. levis* relative to *Z. palmeri*, to be published elsewhere) help to distinguish some *Zacanthopsis* species. Others remain most readily recognized by relative shape proportions, such as degree of anterior expansion of the glabella, length of the ocular ridge, or the width of palpebral lobes relative to frontal area, the latter of which also shows intraspecific variation among similar-sized specimens.

While the mean morphologies of some samples of *Zacanthopsis palmeri* are significantly different from one
other, within-sample variation accounts for most of the variation in the species (Fig. 15, 16). Moreover, there is no unique combination of characters that distinguish one sample from another, nor are there unique combinations of characters that distinguish clusters of specimens within samples. This, in addition to ontogenetic and discrete morphological characters separating *Z. palmeri* from other *Zacanthopsis* species, indicates that these samples belong to the same species but that this species expressed considerable within- and among-sample variation.

**SUMMARY**

Assessing geographic variation in the fossil record requires accounting for allometric growth, taphonomy, and time-averaging between localities, as well as measurement error for quantitative traits. Despite apparent sedimentological homogeneity across localities where *Zacanthopsis palmeri* n. sp. is found, no single sample encompasses all of the variation expressed by this species. In addition, different exoskeletal components have different patterns of variation. While the degree of intraspecific shape variation in *Z. palmeri* is as great as the shape difference between congeneric species, *Z. palmeri* is distinguishable from other species based on overall shape, discrete morphological features, and ontogeny. While variation exists within and among samples of *Z. palmeri*, samples cannot be consistently distinguished from one another by a unique combination of characters. Finally, the shift between the fused rostral-hypostomal plate and a functional hypostomal suture during *Zacanthopsis* ontogeny has not been reported from any other corynexochine taxa. Instead, corynexochines are generally characterized by a fused rostral-hypostomal plate throughout ontogeny (Fortey, 1990; Chatterton and Speyer, 1997). Because the nature of hypostomal attachment is relevant to order-level systematics and phylogenetics within Trilobita, this characteristic of *Zacanthopsis* may have bearing on corynexochine affinities, particularly in the relationship between this order and other early Cambrian taxa.
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APPENDIX 1

Description of all landmarks shown in Figure 12.

Cranial sagittal landmarks:
1—Intersection of the sagittal line and anterior margin of anterior border.
2—Intersection of the sagittal line and anterior margin of the glabella (or the preglabellar furrow).
3—Intersection of the sagittal line and the occipital furrow.

Cranial paired landmarks:
4, 5—Intersection of the posterior margin of the ocular ridge and axial furrow.
6, 7—Junction of the axial furrow and occipital furrow at posterior margin of L1.
8, 9—Junction of posterior margin of posterior border and the posterior margin of LO.
10, 11—Junction of posterior margin of LO and the occipital spine.
12, 13—Angular junction of anterior facial suture with anterior margin of the anterior border. Coincident with the lateral-most extent of frontal area.
14, 15—Junction of anterior facial suture and palpebral lobe.
16, 17—Point of maximum curvature of lateral edge of palpebral lobe. Coincident with point of lateral-most extent of palpebral lobe.
18, 19—Junction of posterior end of palpebral lobe and posterior border furrow.
20, 21—Angular junction at fulcrum on posterior margin of posterior border.
22, 23—Junction of posterior limb and palpebral lobe.
24, 25—Junction of posterior margin of ocular ridge and anterior end of palpebral lobe.

Pygidial sagittal landmarks:
1—Intersection of sagittal line with anterior margin of articulating half ring.
2—Intersection of sagittal line with anterior edge of first axial ring.
3—Intersection of sagittal line with posterior edge of first axial ring.

4—Intersection of sagittal line and posterior edge of terminal axial piece.
5—Intersection of sagittal line and posterior margin.
6—Intersection of anterior margin of articulating half ring and anterior margin of the pleural field.
8, 9—Intersection of the anterior edge of the first axial ring and the axial furrow.
10, 11—Intersection of the posterior edge of the first axial ring and the axial furrow.
12, 13—Angular junction at fulcrum on anterior margin.
14, 15—Lateral edge of anterior margin of anterior segment.
16, 17—Distal tip of first pleural spine.
18, 19—Intersection of posterior side of base of first pleural spine and posterior margin.

APPENDIX 2

Below is a list of specimens (cranidia) of species other than Zacanthopsis palmeri included in the analysis in Figure 19. See Figure 8 for illustration of holotypes. USNM: U.S. National Museum (Smithsonian); GSC: Geological Society of Canada.


Zacanthopsis expansa Fritz, 1991: GSC 91776, holotype; GSC 91777, paratype (from GSC locality 90666, Illtyd Formation, Wernecke Mountains, Yukon Territory, Canada).