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An Early Triassic small shelly fossil-style assemblage from the Virgin Limestone Member, Moenkopi Formation, western United States

VIVIENNE MAXWELL, BEN THUY AND SARA B. PRUSS

Small shelly fossil-style preservation is a unique taphonomic mode in which minute fossils are moulded or replaced by apatite, glauconite and other minerals (e.g. Brasier 1990; Porter 2004; Creveling et al. 2014a, 2014b), often resulting in ‘microsteinkerns’ (e.g. Datillo et al. 2019). This particular style of fossilization is best known from Cambrian deposits, where small shelly fossils record remnants of some early biomineralizers of the Cambrian Explosion and occur across clades. Whilst scattered occurrences of small shelly-style fossilization have been reported from other time periods (Dzik 1994; Datillo et al. 2019; Freeman et al. 2019), the best known and most intensively studied occurrences are Cambrian small shelly fossils (SSFs), in part because the diversity of organisms preserved in this way is not well represented in macrofossil assemblages. The prevalence of Cambrian SSFs, and their apparent decline in the Paleozoic and post-Paleozoic, has been the subject of work seeking to explain the closing of this taphonomic window (Porter 2004; Creveling et al. 2014a, 2014b), though recent work has questioned the notion that a taphonomic window existed (Datillo et al. 2019; Freeman et al. 2019).

Previous work that focused explicitly on the recorded occurrences of SSFs in the Cambrian itself showed that, from the early to the middle Cambrian, the abundance of small shelly fossil occurrences declined (Porter 2004). The spike and decline, therefore, might be linked to Fe and P cycling under low-oxygen conditions which led to phosphatization of the skeletons (Creveling et al. 2014b). Cambrian small shelly fossils occur in a range of settings, so are there generalities that can be made about all small shelly fossil-style preservation, or are there a set of rules that may foster this style of preservation across geological time? Some post-Cambrian examples of small shelly fossil-style preservation may be linked to sedimentary hiatuses and changes in sedimentary regime allowing for the concentration of phosphate and
phosphatic fossils (Freeman et al. 2019), but this does not explain all post-Cambrian occurrences (e.g. Pruss et al. 2018), and may not explain many of them within the Cambrian.

More recently, SSF-style preservation has been documented from Lower Triassic limestones of the Virgin Limestone Member in shallow water settings exposed in the Muddy Mountains of southeastern Nevada. This work revealed minute fossils preserved by apatite and glauconite (Pruss et al. 2018). These assemblages contain small fossils of groups that had been described previously, including many echinoids, gastropods and rare foraminifera (e.g. Schubert & Bottjer 1995). The fossils were found in samples that had been previously examined for their silicified faunas, but these apatitic and glauconitic fossils were found in the smallest size fractions only (between 177 and 420 µm) (Pruss et al. 2018), confirming the notion that small size influences the nature of preservation (Creveling et al. 2014a, 2014b).

Here we describe a new assemblage from the Virgin Limestone Member of the western United States at the Lost Cabin Springs (LCS) locality, an exposure of the Virgin Limestone that records a more distal setting than the units exposed in the Muddy Mountains (Pruss et al. 2005a; Pruss et al. 2005b). We report silicified/dolomitized fossils in the larger size fractions; however, the majority of the fossils that are <1000 µm are phosphatized, indicating that this style of preservation was occurring broadly across the Early Triassic shelf in the western United States. Whilst we report and describe the silicified and dolomitized components of this assemblage, this paper focuses on phosphatization and aims to compare the two occurrences of SSF preservation found in different depositional environments of the Lower Triassic Virgin Limestone Member to add to our understanding of small shelly-style fossil preservation more broadly.

The fossils recovered from LCS samples are similar to those from Muddy Mountains in that they preserve fossils that had been described previously from macrofossil assemblages, but unlike Muddy Mountains, the LCS assemblages contain brachiopods, a more diverse array of gastropods, a single bivalve and two ostracods. Similar to Muddy Mountains, echinoid spines and crinoids are also recovered. Ophiuroid fragments are incredibly abundant in one sample but were found in no others. Additionally, no fossils were preserved by glauconite in LCS assemblages, which was a common replacement or internal moulding mineral at Muddy Mountains. The variability of fossils between assemblages at these two localities points to local controls on diversity but broadly similar, and widespread, taphonomic conditions across the Early Triassic shelf.

Geological setting

During the Permian and Triassic, the Panthalassa sea flooded present-day southwestern North America (e.g. Marzolf 1993; Pruss et al. 2005a). Sedimentation was, however, discontinuous across western North America during the Permo-Triassic, with only a few boundary sections known (Alvarez & O’Connor 2002; Sperling & Ingle 2006). By the later Early Triassic, the Moenkopi Formation was deposited on a broad shallow epicontinental shelf that extended from southern Idaho to southern Arizona (Marzolf 1993). Moenkopi strata record the waxing and waning of the epicontinental sea in non-marine or marginally marine red beds and nearshore to middle-shelf siliciclastics and carbonates (e.g. Shorb 1983).

The uppermost lower Triassic (Spithian) Virgin Limestone Member of the Moenkopi Formation has been studied extensively, both for the various microbialites it preserves (Mata & Bottjer 2011; Pruss et al. 2004; Schubert & Bottjer 1992) and its faunas, which reflect recovery from the end-Permian mass extinction (Schubert and Bottjer, 1995; Fraser & Bottjer 2007; Hoffmann et al. 2013; McGowan et al. 2009; Pruss et al. 2018). The mixed carbonate–siliciclastic Virgin Limestone is composed of limestone, dolomitic limestone, calcareous mudstone and siltstone (Reif & Slatt 1979) and contains fossil material such as echinoderm debris, bivalves, gastropods (e.g. Schubert & Bottjer 1992; Schubert & Bottjer 1995; Hoffmann et al. 2013) and ophiuroids (Twitchett et al. 2005). It was deposited in a storm-dominated subtidal palaeoenvironment (e.g. Poborski 1954; Stewart et al. 1972; Pruss et al. 2005b) as a transgressive marine tongue from Panthalassa.

At the Lost Cabin Springs locality in southern Nevada (Fig. 1), the Virgin Limestone Member overlies the Lower Red Member and is conformably overlain by the evaporitic Shnabkaib Member (e.g. Stewart et al. 1972; Marzolf 1993; Pruss et al. 2005a). Here, the lowest exposed beds consist largely of siliciclastic sediments; carbonate beds become more common and thicker higher in the exposed section (Fig. 2). The Virgin Limestone exposed at the Lost Cabin Springs locality records carbonate-dominated subtidal shelf palaeoenvironments, deeper than coeval sections in the Muddy Mountains (Pruss et al. 2005b).

Methods

For this work, following on the sampling scheme of Pruss et al. (2018), we sampled limestone beds that had silicified fossils present in hand samples. In
previous work, these beds tended to produce abundant fossils in insoluble residues, only some of which were silicified. Ten samples of fossiliferous packstone from Lost Cabin Springs were collected over a ~125 m of section in two field seasons. All ten samples were dissolved in 200–400 mL of 10% glacial acetic acid solution buffered with ammonium acetate. The samples were sieved and insoluble residues >400 µm, >250 µm and >177 µm were collected. These residues were picked for fossils under the Nikon SMZ645 stereoscopic microscope. Only eight samples produced abundant fossils though the diversity and abundance varied between samples; only these fossiliferous residues were considered in further analyses. The fossils were imaged using the Olympus BH2 BH-2 Light Microscope. After light images were captured, the fossils were coated with gold and palladium by a Hummer V Sputter coater and imaged with the FEI Quanta 450 Scanning Electron Microscope (SEM) at Smith College. EDS (Energy-Dispersive Spectroscopy) Team software was also used to analyse the elemental composition of 119 fossils. Finally, SEM images of individual fossils in this work were measured (length of brachiopods, width of echinoid spines, width of crinoid ossicles, long axis of gastropods and width of ophiuroid elements) to determine the range of sizes preserved in each group of fossils, though only some SEM images were suitable for measurement. For example, brachiopods, though abundant in residues overall, did not have many SEM images that could be accurately measured.

Results

Field and sample observations

Five beds (LC-18-18, LC-18-19, LC-18-22, LC-18-34 and LC-18-35) were sampled from the Virgin
Limestone Member of the Moenkopi Formation at Lost Cabin Springs, but the sample from LC-18-35 had very few fossils so was not considered further in this analysis (Fig. 2; Table 1). LC-18-19 was sampled during two different field seasons (LC-18-19 and LC-18-2-19), and beds LC-18-18 and LC-18-22 yielded three samples and two samples respectively (LC-18-18a, LC-18-18b, LC-18-18c, LC-18-22 and LC-18-22a). Of these, LC-18-18b had rare fossils so was excluded from analysis. A total of eight samples were thus considered further in this work. The beds were identified for sampling based on facies previously described in Pruss (2004) as having silicified fossils, the residues of which produced glauconitized and phosphatized fossils in previous work (Pruss et al. 2018).

Packstones with previously noted silicified fossils were sampled in this work (Table 1). Only larger macrofossils are apparent in hand samples – these include crinoids and echinoid spines. Large calcareous gastropods and bivalves were present in some Virgin beds but were not visible in hand samples that produced abundant small shelly-style fossils in residue. The lowermost bed sampled in this work is Bed LC-18-18, a 5-m-thick bed with the lower 1.5 m consisting of limestone with thin silty intercalations with Thalassinoides at the top of the 1.5 m and overlain by a packstone/grainstone with abundant crinoidal debris, ooids and intraclasts. Bed LC-18-19 is a crinoidal packstone with horizontal trace fossils preserved on top. Bed LC-18-22 is a ~7 m-thick fossiliferous packstone with prominent echinoid spines (Moffat & Bottjer 1999) that overlies a well-studied microbial reef horizon (Schubert & Bottjer 1992; Pruss et al. 2004). Two samples were taken from this thick bed and reveal slightly different fossil assemblages: gastropods were abundant in LC-18-22 insoluble residues, whereas crinoids and echinoids were the common fossils in LC-18-22a both in the packstone and in insoluble residues. Bed LC-18-34 is a ~0.5 m-thick packstone of crinoidal debris and intraclasts; it sits 0.2 m above another prominent stromatolitic unit, but one that is much smaller than the reef horizon. Bed LC-18-34 was the only unit to contain ophiuroids, which were found in abundance only in insoluble residues. Gastropods were also present in the insoluble residues of this bed.

### Insoluble residue observations

Eight samples from the Lost Cabin Springs locality contain a greater diversity than those at the Muddy Mountains locality. The smallest fossils in our assemblages are internal moulds of brachiopods, internal moulds of gastropods, a single occurrence of an internal mould of a bivalve and two replaced ostracods (Fig. 3). The majority of these fossils are <1000 μm. Echinoderms are common in LCS assemblages (Fig. 4), and most crinoid ossicles are the largest fossils, with all but 1 > 1000 μm. Echinoid spines and ophiuroids are smaller than the crinoids (all <1000 μm), and all echinoderms are preserved as stereomic moulds. Some fossils were unique to one sample, such as abundant ophiuroid fragments preserved only in LC-18-34, and two occurrences of ostracods found in LC-18-18c (Table 1). Brachiopods were found in 5 samples, but their abundance varied.

Measurements of 120 SEM images of fossils yielded important size distribution data for different groups preserved in our assemblages (Fig. 5, Table S1). Brachiopods range in size from 104 to 250 μm, and the width of echinoid spines range from 57 to 268 μm. Gastropods and ophiuroid elements are generally larger; the former has a range from 230 to 873 μm, and the latter is 242 to 923 μm. Crinoid ossicles range from 938 μm to 2523 μm and are the largest fossils measured in the residues. The size range of crinoid ossicles does not overlap with any fossils that are phosphatized.

### Table 1. Table showing sample names, facies descriptions, common fossils in insoluble residues and minerals preserving the fossils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Facies</th>
<th>Minerals</th>
<th>Fossils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LC-18-18</td>
<td>crinoidal grainstone/packstone with Thalassinoides</td>
<td>Apatite, silica; iron-bearing minerals</td>
<td>brachiopods; echinoid spines; gastropods; echinoid spines; gastropods; ostracods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC-18-19</td>
<td>crinoidal packstone with horizontal bioturbation preserved on top</td>
<td>Apatite; silica; iron-bearing minerals</td>
<td>brachiopods; crinoids; echinoid spines; gastropods; bivalve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC-18-22</td>
<td>limestone ledge overlying microbial mounds, grainy in places, contains echinoid spines, muddier at base, grainer near the top, silicified fossils</td>
<td>Apatite; silica; dolomite; iron-bearing minerals</td>
<td>ophiuroids, gastropods, echinoids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC-18-34</td>
<td>thick packstone with crinoidal debris, some rip-ups, some bioturbation preserved on top of muddy surfaces</td>
<td>Apatite; silica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EDS analysis of Lost Cabin Springs fossils

Unlike the fossils at the Muddy Mountains locality (Pruss et al. 2018), no fully glauconitic fossils were found in Lost Cabin Springs residues. The EDS analysis of 119 fossils shows that there is some variability in the minerals of the fossils (Fig. 6). Ophiuroids and brachiopods (Fig. 6A, B) showed peaks in Ca, P and O, with the brachiopod showing a small F peak, confirming a composition of calcium-fluorapatite.

Fluoride is also present in some ophiuroids, gastropods and a bivalve, and is therefore not unique to brachiopods. The larger crinoids (>1000 µm) contain abundant Si and O (Fig. 6C) suggesting silica as a dominant replacement mineral. Other crinoids revealed peaks in Ca and Mg, consistent with dolomite. Fe is occasionally present in some EDS point analyses; for example, in one EDS point analysis of an internal mould of a gastropod, Fe, Mg, K, Si, Al and O were found, suggesting the presence of glauconite, but overall, glauconite was rare in these assemblages. The smallest size fractions (<1000 µm) are dominated by phosphatized fossils, confirmed by EDS. There was also an observed difference in colour and texture between phosphatized and silicified specimens in residue: the phosphatized fossils had a brownish colour whereas the silicified fossils were yellowish/white.

Discussion

Virgin Limestone palaeoenvironments and palaeoecology at Lost Cabin Springs

The Spathian Moenkopi Formation was deposited on the Colorado Plateau, and the Virgin Limestone Member represents a marine incursion during Early Triassic time (Marzolf 1993). The Virgin Limestone Member was deposited in intertidal to mid-shelf palaeoenvironments and is exposed from eastern California to southwestern Utah (Stewart et al. 1972; Marzolf 1993; Shorb 1983). The Lost Cabin Springs section represents carbonate-dominated inner to middle-shelf palaeoenvironments (Schubert & Bottjer 1995; Pruss et al. 2005a; Mata & Bottjer 2011), a slightly thicker and deeper exposure of the Virgin Limestone Member than the exposures in the Muddy Mountains.
Previous work demonstrated that environments in the Virgin Limestone range from shallow subtidal wave-dominated settings to deeper water storm-dominated settings, with occasional deposition below storm wave base (Schubert & Bottjer 1995; Pruss et al. 2005a; Pruss et al. 2005b). Schubert & Bottjer (1995) identified several palaeocommunities within the Virgin Limestone, all characterized by abundant bivalves and distinguished by the ancillary organisms. Fraiser & Bottjer (2007) also showed bivalve dominance in most Lower Triassic sections of the western United States, including within the Virgin Limestone. Interestingly, bivalves make up a very small proportion of the fossils in our assemblages. Our assemblages are dominated by juvenile brachiopods, echinoderms and gastropods, again pointing to the importance of the size of organisms in phosphatization rather than their original abundances.

Analysis of macrofossils found in previous work on the Virgin Limestone Member include bivalves, gastropods, echinoderms, ophiuroids, and rare ammonoids (e.g. Poborski 1954; Shorb 1983; Stewart et al. 1972; Schubert & Bottjer 1995, Hoffmann et al. 2013). Our samples reveal the presence of similar organisms, though residue abundances do not always match those in macrofossil assemblages, as has been shown in other studies of the Virgin Limestone (Pruss et al. 2018). Brachiopods, crinoids, echinoid spines, gastropods, ophiuroids, rare bivalves and two ostracods are the components of our assemblages (Figs 3, 4). The lack of preservation of meaningful morphological traits make it difficult to determine whether echinoderms and gastropods are adults or juveniles.

The diversity of fossils in the LCS insoluble residue assemblages reflects what is known from macrofossil assemblages with the exception of a new ophiuroid species. LCS juvenile brachiopods belong to *Protogusarella smithi* (Fig. 3A–D). The fossils depicted in Figures 3A–D have symmetry consistent with brachiopods, and there is consistency between the specimens in terms of shape and size, though there are taphonomic effects that alter how some brachiopods appear under the SEM. Crinoid specimens are remnants of *Holocrinus smithi* (Fig. 4A–G). The echinoid spines (Fig. 4H–J) belong to an echinoid from the family Miocidaridae (Kier 1968; Moffat & Bottjer 1999) but are an undetermined genus and species (Rolle 2014). A previously undocumented species of ophiuroids are present in LC-18-34 (Fig. 4L–N), and are likely closely related to the *Praeaplocoma hessi* from the Lower Triassic of Italy. Planispiral and high-spired gastropods are also common components of our assemblage (Fig. 3E–J), but as these are preserved as internal moulds, and thus lack surface ornamentation, no further identification of them is possible. There is one occurrence of a poorly preserved internal mould of a bivalve, likely belonging to *Sementiconcha recuperator* (Fig. 3K) (Hautmann et al. 2013), and two occurrences of ostracods (Fig. 3L, M). Unlike Cambrian SSFs, the Lost Cabin Springs assemblage does not reveal a diversity of organisms that is significantly different from the macrofossil assemblages, but some features of these minute fossils, such as the ophiuroid fragments, will make it possible to identify new species in these assemblages that would have passed unnoticed otherwise.

**Taphonomy of assemblages at Lost Cabin Springs**

The Lost Cabin Springs section provides evidence of deposition in a storm-dominated subtidal palaeoenvironment (Schubert & Bottjer 1995; Pruss et al. 2005b), but questions remain about whether or not this influenced phosphatization. Freeman et al. (2019) report that the majority of millimetre-scale,
steinkern-yielding, phosphorite-rich beds are associated with signs of low sedimentation rates, or sedimentary hiatuses, and that no cases were reported in areas where ongoing rapid or even normal sedimentation occurred (Table 1; Freeman et al. 2019). High-energy mixing events – such as storms – may bury live or recently dead benthic organisms (e.g. Freeman et al. 2013; Milam et al. 2017), which is argued to enhance phosphogenesis. As the organic matter decays, organic-bound phosphorus is rapidly released. This release enhances interstitial phosphorus content, whilst accommodating increased calcium-fluorapatite (CFA) precipitation by enhancing the volume of sediment encompassed by the complex of small redox zones around areas of decaying matter (e.g. Aller 1982; Föllmi 1990, 1996; Föllmi & Garrison 1991). These zones can increase the volume of sediment in the zone of phosphatization, thus enhancing CFA precipitation in areas of high-energy mixing events. This model was developed in part to argue that CFA precipitation is more widespread in the geological record than previously suspected and can occur under common conditions (Freeman et al. 2019).

Indeed, most of the apatite fossil-bearing beds at Lost Cabin Springs are likely storm deposits, particularly Bed 22, a well-studied echinoid spine deposit (Moffat & Bottjer 1999). This thick bed was previously interpreted as a storm bed and the majority of spines ranging from 1 to 6 mm were silici(fo)ed (Moffat & Bottjer 1999), as were the crinoids found in our insoluble residue assemblage. However, phosphatized fossils, while present, are not particularly prevalent in this unit. Furthermore, the spines show evidence for disarticulation and abrasion, suggesting significant working, which likely minimized the effective burial of recently dead organisms and their organic matter. And, as in previous Triassic examples (Pruss et al. 2018), there are no phosphatic hardgrounds or other evidence for widespread concentrations of phosphatized grains or layers. It seems unclear that phosphate concentration via reworking operates as the primary mechanism for fossilization in most Virgin Limestone beds.

Size selectivity and phosphatization

A potential link between small shells and enhanced phosphate precipitation for both Cambrian (Yochelson 1999; Creveling et al. 2014a; Jacquet & Brock 2016) and non-Cambrian occurrences (Lamboy 1987, 1993; Datillo et al. 2016) has been proposed. In previous work, Pruss et al. (2018) suggested a size selectivity of taphonomic processes preserving Triassic phosphatic and glauconitic steinkerns that were related to particle radius and O₂ consumption. Our work here supports similar size selectivity. In measurements of SEM images of fossils that were common in our residues, the range in size of phosphatized fossils is smaller and does not overlap with the sizes of silici(lized) fossils (Fig. 5). All measured phosphatized fossils in LCS assemblages are on average smaller than the silici(lized) crinoids. Crinoids range in size from ~1 to ~2.5 mm whereas none of the phosphatized brachiopods, gastropods, echinoids or ophiuroids had dimensions as long as 1 mm, and all had average sizes of ~550 µm or less. The strongest predictor of phosphatization in LCS assemblages is not original skeletal material nor abundance, but size.

The mechanisms for phosphatization of small fossils are likely variable and related to a host of environmental conditions. In all cases, whilst there may be some common and recurring depositional settings that lend themselves to phosphatization, it is not clear that phosphatization is truly ubiquitous in the fossil record. However, it is also clear that phosphatization is not isolated to the Cambrian (e.g. Dzik 1994; Pruss et al. 2018; Datillo et al. 2019; Freeman et al. 2019). What can be learned from two occurrences of small shelly fossil-style preservation in Lower Triassic sediments in different subtidal settings?

Modern studies point to redox oscillations as controllers of availability of oxidants particularly in pore water pH (Zhu et al. 2006), linking low pore water SO₄^2– to the formation of apatite. For example, along the East Australian continental margin (O’Brien et al. 1990), high organic carbon delivery creates low-oxygen conditions, and iron and phosphorus cycling can increase local concentrations of phosphorus; interestingly, some iron minerals act as more effective P shuttles than others, which relates to adsorption sites and surface area (Creveling et al. 2014a). For example, iron oxyhydroxides are thought to be incredibly efficient at adsorbing phosphate from seawater (Feely et al. 1991, 1998; Peacock et al. 2016) and delivering it to sediments.

The role of iron in Lost Cabin Springs sediments is unclear, though one sample of insoluble residues yielded sparse pyrite grains (LC-18-22a), suggesting local reducing conditions, at least some of the time. Glauconite is far less abundant in these samples as grains and as a replacement and moulding fossil mineral compared to the Muddy Mountains assemblages (Pruss et al. 2018). Much like most Lower Triassic sediments, the total organic carbon (TOC) is low in Lost Cabin Springs strata (Marenco et al. 2012), so it seems clear that in this case, excess organic matter did not contribute significantly to
local phosphorus accumulation. And, as shown in previous work, it is unlikely that enough organic matter existed in the recently dead organisms themselves to account for their phosphatization (Creveling et al. 2014a, 2014b).

Here, we prefer a mechanism in which the small particle size of the organisms coupled with an ambient pore water environment that experienced periodic oscillations in oxygen fostered phosphatization of minute shells. The Early Triassic ocean is thought to have been exceedingly warm (e.g. Sun et al. 2012), which is coupled with (and likely related to) extensive evidence for low-oxygen conditions (e.g. Isozaki 1997; Grice et al. 2005; Grasby et al. 2013; Song et al. 2014; Pietsch et al. 2016). Furthermore, these sections are well known for the absence of deeply penetrating burrows, and many beds contain very little overall bioturbation (Pruss & Bottjer, 2004), which may have also acted to minimize the introduction of oxygen into the sediments. The unique depositional environments of the Early Triassic likely contributed to the glauconitization and phosphatization seen in Virgin Limestone assemblages. No fossils larger than 1000 μm are preserved by apatite in our assemblages – larger fossils, in this case crinoids, are preserved as stereom moulds of silica and dolomite, and often in the same samples where phosphatization is occurring. This again points to a complex taphonomic history in which some fossils are replaced or moulded by silica (crinoids) whilst others, even with a similar skeletal composition of high-Mg calcitic stereom (e.g. ophiuroids and echinoids), are phosphatized. In Ediacaran assemblages that contain both phosphatic and siliceous fossils, many Ediacaran fossils can be preserved by both pathways, but the environments of deposition are slightly different (e.g. Muscente et al. 2014). That the same diagenetic environment in Lower Triassic units can lead to different minerals replacing fossils within the same bed reiterates that the pore water environment and size of shells must be the two most important factors governing silicification and phosphatization of LCS fossils (e.g. Pruss et al. 2018), in both nearshore and more offshore settings.

Conclusions

The occurrence of small shelly-style preservation in samples from the Virgin Limestone Member shows that this style of preservation was occurring broadly across the Early Triassic shelf of eastern Panthalassa. Whilst the majority of our LCS samples reflect deposition in a distal and storm-dominated subtidal palaeoenvironment, we argue that local pore water redox controls on the sediments – which allow for the accumulation of phosphorus – played a more significant role in their preservation than phosphate concentration via reworking. The size selectivity of phosphatization is evident, as the smallest size fraction predominantly contained phosphatized fossils, whereas larger fossils extracted in insoluble residues were replaced or moulded by silica and dolomite. There were rare occurrences of bivalves and ostracods present in our samples, despite the well documented numerical dominance of bivalves in shallow level-bottom benthic marine communities. This further illustrates that the size of fossils more directly controls the nature and distribution of phosphatization than their initial abundance in ancient communities. It is possible that more searching for SSF-style preservation in sediments of other ages will yield additional occurrences; however, the mechanism(s) for their formation, whilst present through time, may be related to many and variable environmental factors. The Early Triassic shallow marine realm seems particularly well suited to the formation of SSF-style fossils, with warm, low-oxygen seas persisting until Middle Triassic time.
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**Table S1.** All size measurements of SEM images of fossils used in the construction of Figure 5.