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Abstract

This paper attempts to describe a cephalopod fauna from the “Cephalopod Beds” in the Shotori Range, Central Iran. The fauna contains 5 genera of nautiloid cephalopods and 12 genera of ammonoids. Among these, 7 ammonoid genera (Tornoceras, Cheiloceras, Maeneceras, Gonioclymenia, Cyrtoclymenia, Staffites, and Falcitornoceras) and 5 nautiloid genera (Ormoceras, Mooreoceras, Sycoceras, Michelinoceras Macroloxoceras) are reported for the first time from Iran.

Ammonoid faunas indicate a Middle(?)/Late Frasnian to Late Famennian age for the “Cephalopod Beds”, confirmed by conodont (Ashouri, 1990, 1995 & 1997) and brachiopod (Rastkar, 1996) studies.

Microfacies analysis of the sections indicates that sedimentation occurred in a mostly shallow and high energy sedimentary environment.

The distribution of goniatite fauna in eastern as well as northern Iran suggests similar paleobiological condition and a marine connection of the two regions during the Famennian stage. A paleogeographical map of the Late Devonian and comparison of the goniatite fauna of the study area with Alborz, Kazakhstan, China, North Africa and Europe indicate that these areas were in low latitudes during this time.
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Introduction

The "Cephalopod Beds" (Stöcklin et al. 1966) conform to the upper part of the Shishtu 1 subformation. The Shishetu Formation was named and described by Ruttner et al. (not published) in the Ozbak-Kuh Mountains. It is divided into two subformations: Shishtu 1 and Shishtu 2. The limit of the two subformation is marked by a characteristic black shale unit called "Mush Horizon“ at the top of Shishtu 1. Later, Ruttner and Stöcklin (1966) recognized a goniatite horizon in each subformation.

Stöcklin et al. (1965) described a reference section about 150 km towards the south from the type area (Howz-e-Dorah) in the south of the Shotori Range, about 40 km south of the Niaz area (Fig. 1). The reference section with a thickness of 543 m represents 2 subdivisions; which are similar to the type area. The equivalent of Shishtu 1 is 326 m thick and consists of dark green shales interbedded with quartzitic sandstone and intercalations of fossiliferous limestone. The uppermost 26.5 m (Fig. 2) are formed by highly fossiliferous shale, sandstone, oolitic limestone and iron-oolites which are equivalent of Goniatite Horizon 1 and of the so called "Cephalopod Beds" (Stöcklin et al. 1965). The lithology of Shishtu 2, which reaches 217 m thickness, is mainly dark gray well-bedded limestone with some inter-bedded black-gray shale at the base and the top. Shishtu 1 ranges from the Frasnian to the topmost Famennian possibly with the Early Tournaisian in barren top beds (Stepanov 1967). The "Cephalopod Beds" can be traced as disconnected outcrops along the thrust zone in the western foot of the Shotori Range towards north around the Niaz area, the last exposure is visible around the Poshan Village.

Despite the fragmentation and remarkable lithological changes in a short distance, the general lithology remains similar. Main characteristics are rust-red iron oolites, highly oolitic and sandy limestone and associated greenish and ash-gray shale (Stöcklin et al. 1965).

Stratigraphy

The highly fossiliferous "Cephalopod Beds" is a remarkable horizon in the Shotori Range and have been the most interesting part of the Shishetu Formation for many authors. Stöcklin et al. (1965) gave a Frasnian-Famennian age to the unit. Walliser (1966) added precision and described Upper Devonian I (Frasnian) and Upper Devonian IV faunas. Stepanov (1967) illustrated a Famennian age but later (1971) he conformed to the age assigned by Stöcklin et al. (1965).

Based on a palynomorph study, Moussavi (1995) and Ghaavdel-Syooki and Moussavi (1996) proposed a Late Frasnian-Late Famennian age. Conodont studies (Ashouri, 1990, 1995, 1997, 2002 & 2004; Yazdi, 1996 & 1999; Gholamalian, 2002) also indicated a Late Frasnian-Late Famennian age. Cephalopod faunas considered by Yamini (1996) and Becker et al. (2004) represent Late Frasnian-Late Famennian time. A brachiopod study (Rastkar, 1996) indicates a Middle Frasnian-Late Famennian age. In this study, the following three areas have been investigated:

1-Howz-e-Dorah area

Cephalopods of this area (Fig. 3) mainly include nautiloids. Only one goniatite specimen has been obtained. The following fossils were collected from the area: Mooreoceras sp., Ormoceras sp., Polyelasmoceratidae indet., Brevicecoratidae indet. and Falcitornoceras sp.

2-Niaz area

Lithologically, the unit comprises iron oolitic limestones and alternations of shales and sandy limestones with minor sandstone beds. These are exposed as disconnected outcrops at the western foot of the Shotori Range (Fig. 4). The succession yielded abundant cephalopods comprising ammonoids and nautiloids. The marly limestone has a thickness of about 10-cm and consists of abundant juveniles...
of ammonoids. The following species have been found:

3- Hurmuk and Pusha area
In this area, the “Cephalopod Beds” is widely distributed. Because of being part of a thrust zone, the stratigraphy is highly complicated. The succession formed herein as disconnected outcrops in a thrust zone across the western foot of the Shotori Range.

The unit is highly fossiliferous and is dominated by cephalopods. The following specimens have been identified: Manticoceras cf. sinuosum, Prionoceras sulcatum, Tornoceras sp., Platyclymenia, (P.) cf. ruedemanni, P. (P.) cf. intracostata, P. (P.) spp., M. cf. biferum, Maeneceras aff.sedgwicki,M.aff. biferum, Maeneceras aff.latilobatum, Iranoceras pingue, I. pachydiscus, I. sphaericum, I. cf. pachydiscus, Cheiloceras (Staffites) curvispina, Michelinoeceras sp., Brevicoceratidae indet. and Actinoceratidae indet.

The faunal composition points to a Frasnian to Late Famennian age of the “Cephalopod Beds”. All of the classical German ammonoid Stufen (do I-VI) seem to be present in the condensed interval, although there is not yet clear evidence for typical do VI species.

Microfacies
The “Cephalopod Beds” has 26.5 m thickness in the Howz-Dorah area. The whole section contains Fe as Hematite, limonite and to a minor extent as Siderite which is recognized by its brown-red color.

Based on Tucker’s (1991) classification for the ironic rocks, the studied rocks can be referred <<ironstone>>. They were deposited under special tectonic condition usually characterized by a low rate of sedimentation (Young, 1989). Such rocks usually are fossiliferous and they are known as good index for stratigraphy and correlation.

A microfacies study briefly yielded the following results: The lower part of the studied section consists of grainstone with bioclasts of echinoid red algae (coralinacea), echinoid spines and ostracods. 7.5 m above the base of the section, the beds include oolites, anchoid and red algae. Some oolites are completely hematitized and their cores are formed by gastropods and by brachiopod shells and other rock particles. Echinoid plates, trilobites and tentaculite particles are also present. There is no matrix between the particles. Based on Dunham classification (1962) the sediments can be named as grainstone (Fig. 7).

Five meters higher in the succession, beds includes crinoids, ostracods, red algae and concentric oolites. Quartz grains occur as subordinate particles in the upper part and the microfauna is similar as in the lower part; however, limestones have changed from grainstone to packstones (Fig. 8) which may indicate low energy deposition.

Based on the above description, it is concluded that the studied section was deposited in a near-shore, shallow and highly energetic environment. The succession changes towards the upper part to greater depth and to a low energy environment.

Conclusion
The cephalopod fauna of the “Cephalopod Beds” in the Shotori Range, east Iran, indicates a Middle (?) / Upper Frasnian to Upper Famennian age. This is confirmed by

The correlation of cephalopod fauna of the studied area with Member A of the Geirood Formation of Central Alborz, North Africa, Europe, Kazakhstan and China indicates similar marine condition at low latitudes.

The microfacies and general sedimentary studies indicates that the unit was deposited in a near-shore, shallow and highly energetic environment.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lithology</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MUSH SHALE</td>
<td>Sandy shale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy hematitic limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calcareous sandstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calcareous sandstone and sandy limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy shale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>alternating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with sandy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>very hematitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy , oolitic limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>very hematitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with shells and coarse oolites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shelly limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in upper part oolitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE Quartzite</td>
<td>Quartzite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig 2- Stratigraphic Section of the Cephalopod Beds in the Howz-e-Dorah area.

Fig 3- Photograph of the Cephalopod Bed outcrops in the Howz-e-Dorah area.
Fig 4- Photograph of the “Cephalopod Beds” outcrops in the Niaz area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENUS (SUBGENUS)</th>
<th>FRASNIAN</th>
<th>FAMENNIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manticoceras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tornoceras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falcitornoceras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheiloceras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheiloceras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maeneceras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporadoceras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iranoceras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platyclusmenia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonioclymenia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prionoceras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig 5- Range chart of the studied genera and subgenera.
### Fig 6 - Range chart of the studied species in the shotori range

### Fig 7 - Bioclast grainstone, with abundant brachiopod shells, trilobite remains, bryozoan corallinean red algae, some ostracod shells, echinoid spine, fragments. X2.1

### Fig 8 - Sandy (brachiopod) bioclast packstone with brachiopod shell and echinoderm fragments. Well sorted and fine grained quartz is dispersed in the micritic matrix.
Explanation of Plate 1

Fig 1- Gonioclymenia sp., Lateral view. Niaz area. X1
Fig 2- Maeneceras cf. latilobatum (Schindewolf), Lateral view. Hormuk area. X0.7
Fig 3- Manticoceras cf. cordatum (Sandberger & Sandberger), Lateral & ventral views. Niaz area. X1
Fig 4- Manticoceras sinuosum (Hall), Lateral view. Hormuk area. X0.8
Fig 5- Tornoceras cf. contractum (Glenister), Lateral view. Niaz area. X0.8
Fig 6- Platyclymenia (P.) spp., Lateral view. Hormuk area. X2.1
Fig 7- Iranoceras sp., Lateral view. Niaz area. X1.7
Fig 8- Cheiloceras (Staffites) curvispina (Sandberger & Sandberger), Lateral view. Hormuk area. X1.6
Fig 9- Iranoceras sphaericum (Walliser), Lateral view. Niaz area. X0.7
Fig 10- Platyclymenia (P.) ruedemanni (Wedekind), Lateral view. Hormuk area. X2.1
Fig 11- Iranoceras pingue (Walliser), Lateral view. Niaz area. X0.7
Explanation of Plate 2

Fig 1- Cyrtoclymenia sp., Lateral view. Niaz area. X0.8
Fig 2- Sporadoceras angustisellatum (Wedekind), Lateral view. Niaz area. X1.4
Fig 3- Tornoceras cf. contractum (Glenister), Lateral view. Hormuk area. X1.3
Figs. 4- Prionoceras sulcatum (Münster), Lateral view. Niaz area. X2.
Fig 5- Cheiloceras (Ch.) cf. sacculus (Sandberger & Sandberger), Lateral view. Niaz area. X1.2
Fig 6- Manticoceras sp., Lateral view. Niaz area. X0.7
Fig 7- Prionoceras cf. sulcatum (Munster), Later and ventral views. Niaz area. X1.1, X1.1 & X0.7
Fig 8-Mimimitoceras cf. liratum (Schmidt), Lateral view. Niaz area. X1.1
Fig 9- Maeneceras sp., Lateral view. Niaz area, X1.1
Fig 10- Maeneceras descendens (Schmidt), Lateral view. Niaz area. X1.3
Fig 11- Falcitornoceras sp., Lateral view. Howz-e-Dorah area. X1.2
Fig 12- Manticoceras sp.2, Lateral view. Niaz area. X1.3
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