

SENSORY SPINES IN THE JURASSIC BRACHIOPOD *ACANTHOTHIRIS*

by M. J. S. RUDWICK

ABSTRACT. The rhynchonelloid *Acanthothiris* has tubular external spines similar to the spines of productoids and chonetoids. Their structure, arrangement and mode of growth are described in detail, on the basis of a study of exceptionally well-preserved specimens of *A. spinosa*. They are compared to the spines of the related genus *Acanthorhynchia*, and to those of the living oyster *Crassostrea echinata*. On the basis of the known sensory physiology of living brachiopods, it is inferred that the spines near the valve-edges of *Acanthothiris* contained extensions of the mantle, and that their tips bore portions of the highly sensitive mantle-edge tissue. These sensitive spine-tips could have provided the brachiopod with effective 'early warning' protection against potentially harmful agents in the environment; and the radiating spines themselves could have formed a protective grille straddling the apertures leading into the mantle cavity. Spines further from the valve-edge are blocked, and are regarded as having been superseded functionally. This interpretation is discussed in relation to the spines of other brachiopods and *Crassostrea*, and in relation to the ontogeny, ecology and phylogeny of *Acanthothiris*.

TUBULAR external spines were developed in great abundance and diversity in one sub-order of the Brachiopoda, namely the Upper Palaeozoic Productoidea. Similar spines, developed only in one particular position on the shell, characterize another Upper Palaeozoic suborder, the Chonetoida. Outside these two suborders, tubular spines are rare and sporadic. This paper is concerned with one of the best known of these anomalous genera, the Jurassic rhynchonelloid *Acanthothiris*. This is separated by a span of about 100 million years from the last of the spiny productoids and chonetoids, and is even more decisively separated from them by morphology and taxonomy. In all characters except the spines, it is a 'normal' rhynchonelloid. It thus illustrates a common phenomenon in brachiopod evolution: a structure characteristic of some major group is often found to have been evolved independently by one or a few anomalous genera which clearly belong (on every other criterion) to a quite different group (cf. Williams 1956). A functional analysis of the spines of *Acanthothiris* may help to throw light on this phenomenon.

Material. For this study, I have used a small collection of very well-preserved specimens of *A. spinosa* (Schlotheim), the genotype, from the Inferior Oolite (Middle Jurassic) of 'Collier's Lane, nr. Bath' (Sedgwick Museum, Cambridge, SM J57751-71), together with some similar specimens from another old collection, labelled 'Gt. Oolite, Bath' (Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard, MCZ 5794). Despite the difference of labelling, all these specimens may come from the same locality. 'Collier's Lane' is unfortunately not mentioned by name in Richardson's (1907) account of the stratigraphy of the Inferior Oolite around Bath. Richardson records *A. spinosa* from most units of the Inferior Oolite; but the matrix suggests that the specimens came from the Upper Trigonina Grit. The matrix is a hard oolitic limestone, but it has weathered in pockets to a much softer material which, with care, can be dissected away from the spines. Normally only the stumps of the spines are preserved.

For comparative purposes, I have also studied the closely related species *Acantho-*
[Palaeontology, Vol. 8, Part 4, 1965, pp. 604-17, pls. 84-87.]

rhynchiã senticosa (von Buch) from the Inferior Oolite of Dorset. There are no living brachiopods with true tubular spines. But the mollusc *Crassostrea echinata* (Quoy and Gaimard) is a possible functional analogue. I have collected this oyster from intertidal localities on the Queensland coast and offshore islands, and studied it alive in a small aquarium.

The photographs in this paper were taken with a Leitz Aristophot on Ilford Pan F film; all except Plate 86, fig. 5 were lightly coated with ammonium chloride.

Acknowledgements. I am indebted to Mr. A. G. Brighton (Sedgwick Museum, Cambridge) and Professor H. B. Whittington (Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard) for access to collections, and to Mr. M. J. Collins for the loan of an exceptionally well-preserved specimen of *Acanthorhynchia*. A grant from the Daniel Pidgeon Fund, awarded by the Geological Society of London, was used to defray the expenses of studying marine biology, *inter alia* that of *Crassostrea*, on the Great Barrier Reef and adjacent coastline.

STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS

General description. The shells of *Acanthothiris* (the 'corrected' spelling *Acanthothyris* is invalid: see Ager 1960) are typically 'rhynchonelloid' in form. They are strongly biconvex in profile, broadly elliptical in plan, and have a non-strophic hinge. There is a small incurved ventral umbo; the dorsal umbo is tucked inside the delthyrium. There is a dorsal median deflexion in the commissure, a low median fold on the dorsal valve, and a shallow median sulcus on the ventral. The surface of each valve is covered with a pattern of fine costellae radiating from the umbo. On most specimens, the costellae appear to be swollen at intervals into small pustules (Pl. 84, fig. 1); but well-preserved specimens show that these pustules are in fact the broken stumps of slender spines.


The whole *array* of spines covers almost all parts of the valve-surfaces. The spines are arranged in *rows* corresponding to the costellae from which they project, radiating from the umbo of each valve towards the valve-edge. The number of rows, like the number of costellae, increases progressively in this direction. Within each row, the spines project from the costella at fairly regular intervals (Pl. 84, figs. 1-3; Pl. 85, figs. 1, 3, 4). They are not arranged regularly in concentric fashion, but it will be convenient to refer to a *set* of spines as those projecting from any narrow concentric zone of the valve-surface (cf. Rudwick 1959). On most parts of the shell the spines project almost tangentially from the curved surface of the valves; but in the lateral sectors, and especially near the commissure, they project at higher angles and even perpendicularly (Pl. 84, fig. 5).

The spines are very rarely preserved to their full length; some have been dissected from the matrix to a length of 8 mm. (Pl. 85, fig. 5) but were certainly longer than this. They are cylindrical; at the base they are about 0.5 mm. in diameter, but they taper gradually to about 0.2 mm. diameter on those preserved to the greatest length (Pl. 84, fig. 6; Pl. 85, figs. 1, 5; Pl. 86, figs. 1, 5). They are straight or slightly curved. They are composed of an external sheath of dense primary-layer shell, of matt appearance, within which there is generally an almost solid core of shiny fibrous secondary-layer shell. The contrast between the two layers is easily seen at the broken tips of the spines (Pl. 86, fig. 5) or on the broken stumps (Pl. 85, fig. 2).

Mode of growth of spines. Since the spines are sheathed in primary-layer shell, which is continuous with that of the rest of the valve, it is clear that they are derivatives of the valve-edge, at which the primary-layer was secreted. Their mode of growth can be

reconstructed from a study of individual spines preserved at various stages of growth, and from the growth-lines on the primary-layer.

The commissure was affected throughout ontogeny by a serial deflexion of small wavelength and low amplitude. Thus the valve-edges were slightly crinkled and interlocked with one another (Pl. 84, fig. 2; Pl. 86, figs. 6, 7), while the cumulative effect of the deflexion was to produce the costellae on the valve surfaces. Each spine first appeared at the valve-edge on one of the crests (text-fig. 1A) of the deflexion. Initially it was marked only by a slight expansion of the valve-edge at this point (text-fig. 1B). Successive increments of primary-layer accentuated this into a small 'collar' (text-fig. 1C). At the next stage observed the 'collar' had been completed into a shelly ring surrounding a small foramen, while the main growing-edge had resumed its normal form (text-fig. 1D). In other words, a small circle of valve-edge had, in effect, been 'budded off' from the



TEXT-FIG. 1. Initial stages in the growth of a tubular spine at a valve-edge in *Acanthothiris*. For further explanation, see text. Semi-diagrammatic, about $\times 20$.

rest of the valve-edge. Thereafter it grew independently, adding circular increments of primary-layer, which lengthened the ring into a tube; while the continued growth on the main growing-edge isolated the base of the incipient spine further from the valve-edge (text-fig. 1E). All these early stages in the growth of a spine can be recognized near the valve-edges of well-preserved specimens (Pl. 84, figs. 3, 4; Pl. 86, figs. 2, 3, 4). Further growth at the distal end of the spine, with a gradual reduction in the diameter of the circle of growing-edge, would have produced the long, gently tapering form of the full-grown spines.

Relation of spines to mantle-tissue. These growth-stages can be interpreted in terms of the secretory activity of the mantle-tissue by using the standard homological relation between shell and mantle as known in living brachiopods (cf. Williams 1956). Thus the budding-off of a ring of valve-edge material reflects an identical budding-off of a ring of mantle-edge tissue, by which the primary-layer was secreted. Each hollow-growing spine must have been lined with an inner tube (or possibly a solid cylinder) of mantle-tissue, connecting the distal ring of mantle-edge tissue to the rest of the mantle. Obviously the spine could have grown in length only so long as this connexion was maintained.

If the spines are examined in cross-section near the base (e.g. where they have all been broken off) it is clear that their walls were progressively thickened with secondary-layer, until the central lumen was constricted to vanishing point. Only the spines nearest the valve-edge (i.e. the youngest spines) have a clear central lumen; those further from the valve-edge (formed earlier in ontogeny) are blocked with concentric layers of shell-material (Pl. 84, fig. 3; Pl. 85, figs. 1, 2; Pl. 86, fig. 4). This secondary-layer material must have been secreted by the inner tube or core of mantle-tissue, which must thereby have been progressively constricted. Ultimately the tissue must have been abandoned; the spine could then have grown no more. The completion of this process is seen also in

the blocking of the internal foramina leading into the spines: these are clearly open near the valve-edges, but are blocked further in from the valve-edges (Pl. 86, figs. 2, 3, 6, 7).


Time-sequence of growth of spines. This distinction between *open* and *blocked* spines leads to an interpretation of the time-relations of the whole array of spines. The spines in each row are those that were successively budded off, during ontogeny, from the same crest of the serial deflexion. The spines in each set, lying on or near any single growth-line on the valve-surface, are those that were formed all round the valve-edge at or about the same time during ontogeny. In any given row, at the moment when a new spine began to be formed at the valve-edge, the immediately preceding spines would still be open, but the earlier ones would have been blocked. On the valve as a whole, at any given moment in ontogeny, the most recently formed set or sets of spines, all round the valve-edge, would still be open, but all those nearer the umbo would have been blocked (Pl. 86, figs. 6, 7). Although a spine might have remained open after ceasing to grow, the converse is of course impossible; hence the actively growing spines must also have been restricted to the peripheral zone of each valve. Each individual spine must therefore have grown relatively quickly to its full length.

Orientation and arrangement of spines. If the shell is described 'statically', the orientation of the spines appears to be rather haphazard: especially in the lateral sectors they seem to project at many different angles (Pl. 84, fig. 2). A more 'dynamic' description, taking into account the time-relations of the spines, reveals a simpler and more orderly arrangement. Seen in plan, each spine projects perpendicularly from the growth-lines on the valve-surface at its base (Pl. 84, fig. 2; Pl. 85, figs. 1-4); in other words, during the time of its formation and growth it projected *radially* from the valve-edge. Seen in profile, each spine projects obliquely from the valve-surface and curves gently towards the opposite valve (Pl. 84, fig. 6; Pl. 86, fig. 1); during the time of its formation and growth it would have projected at a low angle across the plane of the commissure. The most recently formed sets of spines on the two valves would thus have projected radially and interdigitated with each other (text-fig. 2). Since all the spines were formed from the crests of the serial deflexion, and the crests necessarily alternate in position on the two valves, the projecting spines would have alternated likewise, and therefore would not have obstructed the closing of the shell. The spacing of the spines around the valve-edges was markedly uniform at any given growth-stage. In the later stages there was generally a gap of about 0.7 mm. between the bases of adjacent spines. Since the spines diverge and also taper, this spacing would obviously have increased away from the valve-edge.

Ontogeny of spines. The formation of radiating spines began very early in ontogeny. On large shells the stumps of the earliest spines are preserved very close to the umbo of each valve (Pl. 84, fig. 1; Pl. 85, fig. 2). The growth-lines show that they correspond to a stage at which the shell was only about 1.5 mm. broad. A rough estimate from the size of the stumps suggests that the spines themselves were about 0.15 mm. in diameter near the base, and were there separated from each other by spaces about 0.25 mm. across.

During the next stage of ontogeny the diameter and spacing of the spines increased rather rapidly to the adult size (Pl. 84, fig. 2). Thereafter, notwithstanding the progressive increase in the size of the shell, both the diameter and the spacing of the spines remained remarkably constant. This probably reflects a similar constancy in the original length of the spines. The average spacing of the peripheral spines (about 0.7 mm. at the base) was

maintained, in spite of the increasing length of the valve-edges, by the progressive introduction of new rows of spines (borne on new costellae) intercalated between the earlier rows. The effect of this is to be seen in the overall appearance of the whole shell: the bases of the spines appear to be scattered at a uniform density over all parts of the valve-surfaces (Pl. 84, figs. 1-3, 5; Pl. 85, figs. 1-4).



TEXT-FIG. 2. Reconstruction of parts of the valve-edges in *Acanthothiris*, gaping apart as in life, showing grille of spines straddling the aperture, and sensitive spine-tips projecting outwards from the shell; about $\times 10$.

Only the peripheral zone of 'open' spines is shown: note apertures on inner surface of lower valve. Costellae I, III, ... on one valve alternate with costellae II, IV, ... on the other; hence spine-rows 1, 3, ... interdigitate with spine-rows 2, 4, ... In each row there is one fully-grown 'open' spine (*a*): spines of the next set (*b*), which would ultimately supersede them, are at various stages of growth (*9b* and *8b* are most advanced, *5b* and *4b* least; *1b* has not yet appeared).

The spacing between successive spines in a single row was also kept remarkably constant during ontogeny. This is particularly striking if a row on the anterior sector of the

EXPLANATION OF PLATE 84

Figs. 1-6. *Acanthothiris spinosa* (Schlotheim); Inferior Oolite (Middle Jurassic); Bath, England. 1. Left postero-lateral view of SM J57759, $\times 3$, showing general form of shell, costellae, and stumps of broken spines. 2. Spines on left antero-lateral sector of dorsal valve of SM J57757, $\times 6$. 3. Spines on left lateral sectors of MCZ 5794a, $\times 6$, showing short 'active' or 'open' spines near commissure (two with white pointers), and 'blocked' stumps of earlier spines. 4. Fragment of valve-edge MCZ 5794c, $\times 6$, showing two very young spines. 5. Spines on left postero-lateral sector of SM J57757, $\times 6$, showing radial orientation of later spines (one complete young spine with white pointer). 6. Row of spines on left lateral sector of dorsal valve of SM J57753, seen in profile (valve broken), $\times 6$, showing slight curvature towards commissure.

shell is compared with one of the much shorter rows on the postero-lateral sectors. The total number of spines projecting from a long row is much greater than from a short row, although both of course represent the same span of time. Yet the spacing between successive spine-bases is approximately the same (about 1.2–1.5 mm.). This implies that a new spine began to be formed at the valve-edge whenever the preceding spine had become distant from the edge by that amount, regardless of the length of time that had elapsed since the preceding spine was formed.

Comparison with spines in other shells. The related genus *Acanthorhynchia* has spines which are closely similar to those of *Acanthothiris*, except that they are on a smaller scale. Thus, where only the stumps of the spines are preserved, they form a similar but much finer pattern on the valve-surface (Pl. 87, fig. 2; compare Pl. 84, fig. 1, at same magnification). The spines themselves are very similar in appearance, but are only about 0.1 mm. in diameter near the base, though they reach over 4 mm. in length (Pl. 87, fig. 1; compare Pl. 85, fig. 2, at same magnification).

No other rhynchonelloid has comparable spines. The living species *Tegulorhynchia döderleini* (Davidson) has radial rows of very short projections, scarcely deserving the name of spines, each of which is a short incomplete tube with a slit or seam on the side nearest the valve-edge (Leidhold 1922, Taf. XIII). In this they resemble the earliest stage in the formation of a true tubular spine; but the budded-off portion of the valve-edge evidently fails to fuse into a complete isolated ring. As Leidhold pointed out, such short spines have more resemblance to the short spines of some bivalve molluscs (e.g. *Pinna*) than to the tubular spines of fossil brachiopods.

Hölder (1958) has likewise emphasized the fundamental difference between such molluscan spines and the spines of *Acanthothiris*. Nevertheless, at least one mollusc shows a moderately close, though imperfect, analogy. This is the oyster *Crassostrea echinata* (Quoy and Gaimard), which in the juvenile stage develops moderately long quasi-tubular spines. They are not truly tubular, for they invariably have a narrow slit or seam on the side nearest the valve-edge (Pl. 87, figs. 6, 8); but they may reach a length of 5 mm. at an external diameter of about 0.7 mm. They are formed by the development of an upturned 'collar' of valve-edge (Pl. 87, figs. 1, 2), which fails to fuse into a complete ring; but the further addition of incomplete rings of shell-material builds up a cylinder which, from the side furthest from the valve-edge, appears to be a complete tube (Pl. 87, figs. 5, 7). The spines project almost perpendicularly from the surface of the free (uncemented) right valve of the oyster. They are not arranged in regular radial rows, but generally occur in roughly concentric sets. Each set consists of spines which, at their time of formation, were spaced at fairly regular intervals around the edge of the valve. The set nearest the valve-edge has open apertures to the interior; earlier sets have been blocked off at the base (Pl. 87, figs. 4, 6, 8).

Rather similar spines seem to have developed in one orthoid brachiopod, *Spinorthis geniculata* Wright (1964), of Upper Ordovician age. These spines are arranged in radial rows and concentric sets, and project almost perpendicularly from the valve-surfaces. They are short, and appear to be incomplete tubes. Spines with a greater similarity to those of *Acanthothiris* have been found in an atrypoid brachiopod, *Atrypa* cf. *aspera*, of Middle Devonian age (Jux 1962). They are arranged in radial rows, and seem to have been long and tapering; it is not clear whether they were true or incomplete tubes.

Apart from such sporadic occurrences, the only genuine structural analogues to the spines of *Acanthothiris* are the spines of productoids and chonetoids. These are truly tubular spines, and were apparently formed in an identical manner, by the 'budding-off' of small portions of the valve-edge. The spines of some spiriferoids, which may be 'double-barrelled' and bear hooks or barbs, do not seem to be comparable.

FUNCTIONAL ANALYSIS

Rejected interpretations. Many functional interpretations have been suggested for spines in general, or for the spines of brachiopods in particular. Most of them, however, are clearly inapplicable to the spines of *Acanthothiris*. These are so narrow in bore, and would have been even narrower when lined with an inner tube of mantle-tissue, that it is inconceivable that they could have acted as channels for the water-currents flowing through the mantle-cavity. For the same reason, and since few of them were open at any given growth-stage, it is inconceivable that they could have increased significantly the area of mantle-tissue available for gaseous exchange. Moreover, as Hölder (1958) has pointed out, *Acanthothiris* is generally found in calcareous sediments, which are unlikely to have been deposited in poorly aerated conditions. The spines are fragile (at least in the fossil state: they would have been less so when the organic component of the shell-material was still present); and once they were broken they could not be repaired (unless they were still 'open'). It is therefore difficult to believe that they performed any porcupine-like function of protection against large predators. On the other hand, it is perhaps possible that they might have served to camouflage the shell, by breaking up its otherwise sharp and distinctive outline. This fails to account, however, for most of the detailed characteristics of the spines. Finally, whatever the natural orientation of the shell, most of it must have been above the level of the substratum, in order to provide the apertures with clear access to food- and oxygen-bearing water. Hence only a few of the spines (probably the earliest, in the umbonal region) could ever have served to anchor the shell in a soft substratum (cf. text-fig. 3B). Unlike the rhizoid spines of productoids (Muir-Wood and Cooper 1960), the spines of *Acanthothiris* have never been found cemented to substratal material.

Spines as a sensory mechanism. A more promising interpretation can be derived from knowledge of the sensory mechanisms of living articulate brachiopods. Although the exact nature of the sensory receptors is at present unknown, they are apparently confined to the extreme edge of the mantle. The mantle-edge is highly sensitive to touch, light, and some chemical stimuli, and is richly supplied with nerve-endings. (If setae are present, they too are sensitive, but only to tactile stimuli.) A simple reflex nerve circuit from the mantle-edge causes the shell to be snapped shut in response to stimuli (Rudwick

EXPLANATION OF PLATE 85

Figs. 1-5. *Acanthothiris spinosa* (Schlotheim); Inferior Oolite (Middle Jurassic); Bath, England.
 1. Later spines on dorsal valve of SM J57756, $\times 6$, showing radial orientation and gently tapering form. 2. Umbonal region and right postero-lateral sectors of SM J57759, $\times 9$, showing structure of stumps of spines, and their early origin. 3. Spines on left lateral sector of dorsal valve of MCZ 5794a, $\times 6$, showing radial orientation. 4. The same, on SM J57757, $\times 6$. 5. Later spines on anterior sector of (broken) dorsal valve of MCZ 5794b, $\times 6$, showing gently tapering form.

1961). Hence any modification of the form of the mantle-edges can be considered as a possible modification of this protective system. For example, sharply zigzagged valve-edges would have reduced the distance between the sensitive mantle-edges without any corresponding reduction in the area of the apertures (Rudwick 1964a). This would have improved the quality of protection at the apertures, but would not have given the brachiopod any *earlier* warning of the approach of potentially harmful agents. Early warning could only be provided by extending the sensitive mantle-edges, or parts of them, outwards away from the rest of the shell. This would have been precisely the effect of the spines of *Acanthothiris*. Each of the 'open' spines would have carried at its tip a small piece of the sensitive mantle-edge tissue (and possibly, but not necessarily, one or more setae). Assuming only that at least one of the many peripheral nerve-fibres extended along each spine, the tip would have formed a highly sensitive 'outpost' of the brachiopod's protective system, giving early warning of the approach of harmful agents and enabling the shell to be snapped shut well in advance.


The paradigm, or optimal specification for this function (Rudwick 1964b), is fairly easy to determine. Ideally the tips of the spines might be situated very far from the shell, but in reality the length of the spines would presumably be limited by the supply of material available for their construction and by the strength of the material itself. They would need to be as slender as possible, consistent with strength, since they would otherwise tend to obstruct the free flow of the water-currents in and out of the mantle-cavity. A cylindrical form is of course the most effective shape by which to combine strength with economy. Their sensitive tips would be disposed most effectively if they were situated at uniform intervals all round the approaches to the apertures. With the continuing growth of the shell, the tips of these 'active' spines would inevitably be shifted further and further from the apertures, and would gradually become less effective; and they would need to be replaced by new spines, projecting from the valve-edges in their new position.

The observed structure and arrangement of the spines of *Acanthothiris* fit this specification very well. If the tips of the 'open' spines are identified as the points of chief functional importance, much that is otherwise obscure about the spines becomes intelligible. This interpretation explains the radial orientation and regular spacing of the spines in each set; the time-sequence of growth and blockage that marks each row; and their slender cylindrical form. It implies that only the most recently formed sets of spines were fully functional at any given growth-stage; and that all the earlier spines had been superseded and had become functionally redundant through the inevitable shift in their relative position (text-fig. 3A, B).

The range of sensitivity around each spine-tip would depend on the sensitivity of the mantle-edge tissue. This in turn would probably depend on properties at the cellular level, which would be unlikely to change in proportion to the growth of the whole organism. There would therefore be certain optimal distances for the spacing of adjacent spine-tips, both between spines in adjacent rows, and between successive spines in the same row; and these optimal values would remain relatively constant during ontogeny. Although the validity of this aspect of the paradigm cannot be demonstrated conclusively, it is at least probable, and it would explain the remarkable constancy in the spacing of the spines.

This interpretation is compatible with another, slightly different, concept of protection.

The peripheral spines, by their orientation and slight curvature towards the opposite valve, would have interdigitated when the shell was closed. When the valves gaped apart through a small angle (as they do in living brachiopods), and water-currents were being pumped by the lophophore through the mantle-cavity, the same spines would therefore have straddled the apertures with a protective grille (text-fig. 2). No 'particle' (e.g. a swimming animal or piece of floating debris) larger than the spaces between



TEXT-FIG. 3. Reconstructions of *Acanthothiris* (A, B) and *Acanthorhynchia* (C), with analogous section of *Crassostrea* (D), showing functional interpretation of spines as sensory 'antennae'. Note peripheral 'open' spines and earlier 'blocked' spines. 'Contours' of chemo-sensitivity (radii arbitrary) shown around open spine-tips and mantle-edges; for tactile sensitivity all the spines would be operative, and the protection would surround the whole shell. Reconstructions based on conservative estimates of original length of spines. 'Body' of animals close-stippled; lophophore, gills, &c., omitted. About $\times 1.5$.

A, young *Acanthothiris*, with pedicle attached to shell fragment. B, adult *Acanthothiris*, with pedicle atrophied, resting loosely on unconsolidated substratum. C, *Acanthorhynchia*, with similar but more slender spines, and smaller shell. D, young *Crassostrea echinata*, with broad tubular spines on upper (right) valve, left valve cemented to rock surface.

EXPLANATION OF PLATE 86

Figs. 1-7. *Acanthothiris spinosa* (Schlotheim); Inferior Oolite (Middle Jurassic); Bath, England.
 1. Rows of spines on right antero-lateral sectors of SM J57757, $\times 6$, showing slight curvature towards commissure. 2. Interior of right antero-lateral sector of dorsal valve of SM J57753, $\times 6$, showing broad peripheral zone of unblocked spine-apertures. 3. Oblique view of same valve-edge, $\times 6$, showing connexion between two marginal apertures and their respective spines. 4. Very young spines on peripheral part of left antero-lateral sector of dorsal valve of SM J57756, $\times 6$. 5. Close-up of spines on anterior sector of dorsal valve of SM J57757, $\times 18$, showing shell-structure and growth-lines (not whitened). 6. Interior of left antero-lateral sector of MCZ 5794b, $\times 6$, showing narrow peripheral zone of unblocked spine-apertures. 7. The same, anterior sectors, $\times 6$.

adjacent spines could have penetrated to the apertures. The slender and uniformly spaced spines would have been highly effective as a protective grille of this kind.

In living brachiopods the shell itself is often highly sensitive to tactile stimuli (apparently by transmission of vibrations through the shell to the receptors in the mantle-edge). Thus another animal, alighting or crawling on to the brachiopod, even some way from the shell edge, may cause an immediate and rapid protective closure of the shell. In *Acanthothiris*, assuming the same properties, this type of tactile sensitivity would have extended to the whole length of the spines, *in addition to* the broader sensitivity (including photo- and chemo-sensitivity) of the mantle-edge tissue at the tips of the spines. Thus the protective grille of spines would have been more than a passive sorting device, barring the passage of particles larger than a certain size. Any but the lightest particles that collided with any part of any of the spines forming the grille would probably have caused a closure of the shell, and the grille would thus have acted as a protective warning device. (Even the 'blocked' spines further from the apertures could, of course, have acted in this way.)

It is not possible to decide conclusively between these two related interpretations of 'protection', because their paradigms are so similar (cf. Rudwick 1964*b*). In any case, given the validity of the anatomical reconstruction suggested here, the spines must necessarily have provided both varieties of protection, simply by virtue of their form and arrangement.

Functional analogues. The spines of *Crassostrea echinata* appear to serve a similar function of early warning protection. In the younger growth-stages, this species is cemented by the whole of its left valve to a substratum such as a rock surface or the root of a mangrove. When the shell is open, therefore, its apertures are immediately adjacent to the substratum. The peripheral set of spines projects perpendicularly from the edge of the right valve, and encloses quasi-tubular extensions of the right mantle. At the tip of each of these 'open' spines is a portion of the mantle-edge, which, as in brachiopods, is highly sensitive. Hence the peripheral set of spines extends the sensitivity of the oyster away from the shell in the most strategic direction, that is, away from the surface of the substratum (text-fig. 3D). When, during the growth of the shell, a set of spines is no longer close to the valve-edge, a new set is formed and the older set is blocked off at the base. This oyster provides a fairly close functional analogue to the interpretation suggested here for the spines of *Acanthothiris*.

The spines that Jux (1962) has described on a Devonian atrypid may also have been analogous in function. Though they are more irregular than the spines of *Acanthothiris*, they are roughly radial and would have interdigitated; and Jux suggests that they could have formed a grille guarding the apertures and excluding larger particles of shell-debris, &c. On the present interpretation this grille would have been not merely a kind of sieve but an active sensory device, causing the protective closure of the shell.

The tubular spines of productoids are diverse in form and arrangement, and were probably equally diverse in function, though all seem to have been formed in essentially the same manner. Of the varieties distinguished by Muir-Wood and Cooper (1960), the *rhizoid* spines manifestly served to anchor the shell to the substratum, and the *halteroid* spines are reasonably interpreted as serving to stabilize the shell on or in a soft substratum. The spines most closely analogous to the spines of *Acanthothiris* are the *prostrate*

spines, which are generally slender and project radially at a low angle to the valve-surface. These are interpreted as 'serving partly for protection or as a strainer when radiating out from the anterior of the shell' (p. 16). This statement is not amplified, and is not entirely clear. 'Protection' seems to imply protection by camouflage, or else what I have termed porcupine-like protection. A 'strainer' probably implies a structure similar to what I have termed a protective grille. But the primary function assigned to these spines in *Waagenoconcha*, which is one of the best examples, is 'to prevent the shell from sinking into soft mud' (p. 17). This could not be applied, however, to the prostrate spines on the dorsal valve, which are structurally identical to those on the ventral (assuming the shell lay on the convex ventral valve). But if they are interpreted instead as providing early warning protection, their distinctive arrangement becomes intelligible. They are very slender (about 0.15 mm. diameter) but relatively long (preserved to 5 mm. length or more); and they are arranged radially, projecting outwards around both valve-edges, even posteriorly across the hinge-line (Muir-Wood and Cooper 1960, pl. 90). If the peripheral sets of spines were 'open' and contained extensions of the mantle, with sensitive mantle-edge tissue at the tip of each, they could have provided this productoid with efficient all-round early warning protection.

The complex spines of some spiriferoids are different in structure, and presumably in mode of growth, from those of *Acanthothiris*. But they might have been similar in function. They are generally oriented radially, and are spaced uniformly all round the valve-edges.

The internal marginal spines of *Uncinulus* and *Hypothyridina* covered the apertures with a protective grille (Schmidt 1937), but could not have given early warning protection.

Ecology of Acanthothiris. Young shells of *A. spinosa* have a hypothyrid pedicle foramen, and were evidently attached to the substratum by a pedicle (text-fig. 3A). In larger shells, however, the ventral umbo has become tightly incurved towards the dorsal valve, leaving no space for the emergence of the pedicle. Thus the pedicle probably atrophied during ontogeny, and the adult brachiopods would have lain freely on the substratum. They were probably stabilized in orientation by shell-thickening in the umbonal region, and perhaps, adventitiously, by some of the earliest and superseded spines. The commissural plane was probably held in an oblique or even vertical orientation, so that all the apertures were clear of the substratum (text-fig. 3B). The current system may have been the same as in adult living rhynchonellids (Rudwick 1962), the water entering the mantle-cavity laterally and being ejected through an anterior aperture corresponding in position

EXPLANATION OF PLATE 87

Figs. 1-2. *Acanthorhynchia senticosa* (von Buch); Inferior Oolite (Middle Jurassic); Loder's Hill, near Bridport, Dorset, England. 1. Spines on right lateral sector of dorsal valve of specimen in collection of M. J. Collins, $\times 9$. 2. Ventral valve of same specimen, $\times 3$, showing arrangement of stumps of spines at all growth-stages.

Figs. 3-8. *Crassostrea echinata* (Quoy and Gaimard); Recent; intertidal rock-surfaces at Eimeo, near Mackay, Queensland. (SM). 3, 4. External and internal views of right (free) valve of young shell, $\times 6$, showing one set of 'open' spines, with previous set blocked. 5, 6. External and internal views of part of right valve of another young shell, $\times 6$, showing 'seam' on outer side of each spine. 7, 8. External and internal views of ventral edge of right valve of a larger shell, $\times 6$, showing several sets of blocked spines.

to the median deflexion of the commissure. In any case, whatever the arrangement of the apertures around the commissure, it is clear that the spines provided the same degree of putative protection to all the apertures.

It is impossible to infer, with any supporting evidence, the exact nature of the 'harmful agents' against which the protection would have been effective. They might have included 'particles' as diverse as saltating shell-fragments, sand-grains or ooliths, pieces of organic debris in suspension, and small floating or swimming animals. Any of these might have clogged the delicate ciliary feeding apparatus of the brachiopod. The tips of the spines might also have been able, through the chemosensory properties of the mantle-edge, to detect the approach of potential predators, noxious water-conditions, &c.

If *Acanthothiris* was equipped with such an effective sensory apparatus, it is perhaps surprising that it is generally found in association with other, more 'normal' brachiopods (rhynchonelloids and terebratuloids without spines). This, however, overlooks the fact that such sensory apparatus as a brachiopod may possess is necessarily co-ordinated with other functional systems, especially the rejection mechanisms, which leave no structural trace in the fossil state. It is therefore invalid to assert that *Acanthothiris* must have been better adapted to its particular environment than the more 'normal' brachiopods with which it is associated, or (conversely) that since it is so associated its spines cannot have been an effective adaptation.

Phylogeny of Acanthothiris. Buckman (1907) asserted that a spiny shell was the phylogenetic terminal stage of a trend from a smooth shell through a stage in which the shell was ribbed. In the case of *Acanthothiris* there would seem to be no evidence for this. Its evolutionary origin is in fact obscure. Throughout its ontogeny (except in the earliest stage of growth), it seems to have been equipped with fully functional sensory spines. Unless some other rhynchonelloid is found, in which spines are less well developed or confined to a shorter part of ontogeny, it may be necessary to infer that the ancestor of *Acanthothiris* was a brachiopod of very small adult size, i.e. that it evolved by paedomorphosis.

The development of an early warning protective system in *Acanthothiris* was made possible by the evolution of the capacity for forming tubular spines at the valve-edges. This enabled portions of the sensitive mantle-edges to be extended outwards from the shell. This capacity had not, apparently, been evolved previously among the rhynchonelloids, and only rarely (e.g. productoids and chonetoids) in the whole history of the brachiopods. Considering the great adaptational potential of tubular spines (as shown in the history of the productoids), it is surprising that the development of spines in this rhynchonelloid stock should have been so short-lived and 'unsuccessful'. Possibly *Acanthothiris* and its allies became extinct, through the chances of environmental change, too soon for that potential to be realized. Possibly the many ecological niches that were open to the productoids in the Upper Palaeozoic were no longer open by the Jurassic, having been occupied perhaps by the bivalve molluscs. In any case, this is a problem that deserves closer analysis.

Without the capacity for forming spines, it would be difficult for a brachiopod to evolve an effective early warning system. One possibility, which appears to have been realized on two separate occasions, involved the formation of long narrow projections

of the mantle- and valve-edges. This gave rise to the well-known and astonishingly close homoeomorphic resemblance between the Middle Triassic athyracean *Tetractinella* and the Upper Jurassic terebratellacean *Cheirothyris* (Cloud 1941, Rudwick 1965). Given the limited anatomical 'materials' out of which any brachiopod adaptation must be formed, the only other means of providing early warning protection would be by the use of the sensitive setae projecting from the mantle-edge. This possibility is in fact utilized by several living brachiopods, and was almost certainly exploited by many fossil groups; but it suffers from the inherent limitation that the setae are only sensitive to tactile stimuli.

CONCLUSION

The structure and arrangement of the spines of *Acanthothiris* accord with a functional interpretation based on the known sensory properties of the mantle-edge in living brachiopods. On this interpretation, the spines projecting from the periphery of each valve acted like inflexible antennae, projecting outwards from the shell into the environment, and enabling the brachiopod to receive early warning of the approach of potentially harmful agents. They would also have straddled all parts of the gape into the mantle-cavity with a protective grille. The brachiopod would have had this protection throughout life; the spines formed earlier in ontogeny were progressively superseded by those formed later, the functional spines remaining close to the valve-edges.

Such spines would have been an effective adaptation in any brachiopod. Yet in fact they seem to have been evolved only once among the rhynchonelloids, and even on that occasion the adaptation had a relatively short history. They may have been evolved sporadically in other groups of brachiopods at other times, but were only common among the Upper Palaeozoic productoids. In view of their adaptive utility, their relative rarity needs some explanation. Their formation depended on the ability of the shell and mantle to form tubular spines, and this may have been a property that was only rarely evolved. But this fails to account for their generally short history, once they had been evolved. This problem may remain insoluble, until the ecological environment of these brachiopods has been rigorously analysed.

REFERENCES

- AGER, D. V. 1960. Nomenclatural problems in the Mesozoic Rhynchonelloidea. *Geol. Mag.* **97**, 157-62.
- BUCKMAN, S. S. 1907. Brachiopod morphology: *Cincta*, *Eudesia* and the development of ribs. *Quart. J. Geol. Soc. Lond.* **63**, 338-43.
- CLOUD, P. E. 1941. Homeomorphy, and a remarkable illustration. *Amer. J. Sci.* **239**, 899-904.
- HÖLDER, H. 1958. Über das Nadelkleid einiger Jura-Brachiopoden. *Neues Jb. Geol. Paläont. Mh.*, **1958**, 151-4.
- JUX, U. 1962. Atrypiden mit erhaltener Bestachelung aus der Sötenicher Mulde (N.-Eifel). *Ibid.*, **1962**, 505-13.
- LEIDHOLD, C. 1922. *Rhynchonella Döderleini* Dav., eine kritische Brachiopodenuntersuchung. *Neues Jb. Min. Geol. Paläont.* **45**, 423-70.
- MUIR-WOOD, H. M. and COOPER, G. A. 1960. Morphology, classification and life habits of the Productoidea (Brachiopoda). *Mem. Geol. Soc. Amer.* **81**, pp. xi+447.
- RICHARDSON, L. 1907. The Inferior Oolite and contiguous deposits of the Bath-Doultling district. *Quart. J. Geol. Soc. Lond.* **63**, 383-426.

- RUDWICK, M. J. S. 1959. The growth and form of brachiopod shells. *Geol. Mag.* **96**, 1–24.
- 1961. 'Quick' and 'catch' adductor muscles in brachiopods. *Nature*, **191**, 1021.
- 1962. Filter-feeding mechanisms in some brachiopods from New Zealand. *J. Linn. Soc. Lond. (Zool.)*, **44**, 592–615.
- 1964a. The function of zigzag deflexions in the commissures of fossil brachiopods. *Palaeontology*, **7**, 135–71.
- 1964b. The inference of function from structure in fossils. *Brit. J. Philos. Sci.* **15**, 27–40.
- 1965. Adaptive homoeomorphy in the brachiopods *Tetractinella* and *Cheirothyris*. *Paläont. Zeitschr.* **39**, Heft 3/4 (in the press).
- SCHMIDT, H. 1937. Zur Morphogenie der Rhynchonelliden. *Senckenbergiana*, **19**, 22–60.
- WILLIAMS, A. 1956. The calcareous shell of the Brachiopoda and its importance to their classification. *Biol. Rev.* **31**, 243–87.
- WRIGHT, A. D. 1964. The fauna of the Portrane Limestone, II. *Bull. Brit. Mus. (Nat. Hist.), Geol.* **9**, 157–256.

M. J. S. RUDWICK
Sedgwick Museum,
Cambridge


Manuscript received 28 October 1964



1




2



3



4



5



6


RUDWICK, Spines of *Acanthothiris*




1



2



3



5




4


RUDWICK, Spines of *Acanthothiris*




1



2



4



3



6



5



7

RUDWICK, Spines of *Acanthothiris*




1



3



4



2



7



5



6



8

RUDWICK, Spines of *Acanthorhynchia* and *Crassostrea*