# Pliocene Standard Chronostratigraphy: A Proposal

by

Domenico Rio (1) and Rodolfo Sprovieri(2)

Department of Geological Sciences, University of Padova, Padova, Italy

<sup>2</sup> Department of Geology, University of Palermo, Palermo, Italy

In the last twenty years paramount improvements have been made in dating and correlating the global marine and continental Pliocene stratigraphic record by integrating biomagnetostratigraphy and astrocyclostratigraphy (see Berggren et al., this volume). By contrast, the standard Chronostratigraphy of the Pliocene is in a flux state. Specifically, the lower boundary, the standard stages and the subdivision of the Pliocene have not been rigidly and unequivocally defined. Various specialists have established their own subdivision (twofolded versus threefolded) and/or "biostratigraphic definitions" of chronostratigraphic boundaries, which in most instances have quite different chronologic meanings. As a result chronostratigraphy is often a source of confusion and misunderstandings rather than the common language which should facilitate long-distance correlations and communication among Earth scientists.

In order to overcome this state of affairs and in the firm belief of the usefulness of an internationally agreed upon standard Chronostratigraphic Scale, we have recently reviewed the state of the Pliocene stratigraphy and we have made an organic proposal for its chronostratigraphic subdivision (Rio et al., 1991; Cita et al., in press; Rio et al., in press). Specifically, we have proposed that the Miocene/Pliocene boundary be defined in the Mediterranean stratigraphic record in correspondence with the restoration of normal oceanographic conditions after the termination of the Messinian salinity crisis, and that the Pliocene/Pleistocene boundary be retained in the Vrica section. In addition, we have proposed that the most convenient subdivision of the Pliocene is into three stages (Zanclean, Piacenzian and Gelasian) with the Global Stratotype and Point Sections (GSSP) of each stage defined in the lithostratigraphic record of Southern Sicily. Our proposal is summarized in Figure 1 and briefly commented below for a discussion within the Neogene community, before submitting it formally to the International Commission of Stratigraphy for approval.

# Why a threefolded subdivision?

The chronostratigraphic subdivision of the Pliocene has varied over the years. However, a general twofold subdivision into a lower Pliocene Zanclean stage and an upper Pliocene Piacenzian stage appears to be the most widely accepted practice today (e. g. Berggren et al., 1985). This practice results in placing in the same chronostratigraphic unit (the Piacenzian) sediments predating and following the onset of Northern Hemisphere glaciation around the Gauss-Matuyama boundary, one of the most important event in the Cenozoic evolution of the global climatic system, easily recognizable in the continental and marine stratigraphic records. Actually, a chronostratigraphic boundary in correspondance with this event is used regionally in many parts of the world and the distinction of a preglacial and glacial Pliocene is widespred. The top of the stratotype section of the Piacenzian itself is below a climatic deterioration which can be correlated with the onset of the Northern Hemisphere glaciation (Rio et al., 1991 and in press). The rationale in preferring a threefolded subdivision of the Pliocene is simply the convenience and the utility of distinguishing in the Standard Chronostratigraphic Scale an interval of geologic time which is easily recognized and correlated on global scale, thus improving chronostratigraphic resolution.

### Gelasian and Astian

Rio et al. (in press) have proposed the Gelasian stage as the third uppermost Pliocene subdivision of the Pliocene. The stage name is derived from the greek name of the town of Gela, in southern Sicily, nearby which the GSSP has been proposed. In the past the term Astian has been used for indicating the third uppermost stage of the Pliocene. However, the use of the Astian has been abandoned because its type, located in Piemonte region, is represented by shallow water sandy sediments, difficult to frame in time, and certainly older than the Gelasian as defined by Rio et al. (in press).

# Philosophy in proposing GSSPs.

Our most important guidelines in proposing GSSPs (or reiterating proposals made by others) for the bases of the Zanclean, the Piacenzian and the Gelasian have been the worldwide correlatability and the maximum of stability in the stratigraphic nomenclature. The global correlatability of the proposed chronostratigraphic units (discussed in Cita et al., in press, and in Rio et al., in press), is assured by biostratigraphy, magnetostratigraphy, climatostratigraphy and cyclostratigraphy. The proposed boundaries most probably can be recognized with good approximations in both marine and continental records. However, as well important is the fact that the proposed subdivision does not violate the position in time of the historical stratotypes and does not demand a major upset of the existing geological literature. The need of stability has been the rationale in maintaining the historical definition of the Miocene-Pliocene boundary at the restoration of open marine condition in the Mediterranean after the termination of the Messinian salinity crisis and of the definition of the Pliocene-Pleistocene boundary in Vrica section. In this context, we strongly oppose to the proposal of Benson et al. (1990) of shifting the definition of the Miocene-Pliocene boundary at the Chron 3A-Gilbert boundary because it will lead to placing most of the Mediterranean upper Messinian evaporites in the Pliocene thus upsetting a well consolidated literature more than a century old. For similar reasons we strongly oppose to the mounting proposal by continental stratigraphers of shifting the base of the Pleistocene to the Gauss-Matuyama boundary (at the base of the Gelasian). Gelasian sediments in Castell'Arquato area are the type of the Pliocene as introduced by Lyell and the practice of recognizing the Pliocene-Pleistocene boundary close to the top of the Olduvai subchron as implied by its definition in Vrica section (Aguirre and Pasini, 1985) has proved well practicable and widely accepted (see for example DSDP and ODP Reports and Scientific Results). We do not see any advantage for stratigraphy to "adjust" continuously chronostratigraphic boundaries on the base of new findings.

#### References.

Aguirre E. & Pasini G. (1985) - The Pliocene-Pleistocene Boundary. <u>Episodes</u>, v. 8, pp. 116-120. Berggren W. A., Kent D. V. & Van Couvering J. A. (1985) - Neogene geochronology and chronostratigraphy. In Snelling N. J. (Ed.) - Geochronology of the geological record. <u>Geol. Soc. London</u>, Mem., v. 10, pp. 211-260.

Benson R. H., Kakic-El Bied K., Bonaduce G., Hodell D. A., Berggren W. A., Aubry M. P., Napoleone G. & Kent D. V. (1990) - A proposal for the Pliocene global boundary stratotype section and point: Bou Regreg section, Morocco. *IX RCMNS Congr.*, Barcelona, Abstr., p. 57.

Cita M. B. (1975) - The Miocene/Pliocene boundary: History and definition. In Saito T. & Burckle L. (Eds.) - Late Neogene Epoch boundaries, *Micropaleont.*, Spec. Publ. n. 1, pp. 1-30.

Cita, M. B., Rio, D., and Sprovieri, R. (in press) - The Pliocene Series: Chronology of the type Mediterranean Record and Standard Chronostratigraphy. In: Wrenn, J. H. and Suc, J. P. (eds): Paleoecology, Climate and Sequence Stratigraphy of the Pliocene. Am. Ass. Strat. Palin:, Special volume, Baton Rouge, Lousiana.

- Hilgen F. J. (1991) Extension of the astronomically calibrated (polarity) time scale to the Miocene/Pliocene boundary. *Earth Planet. Sc. Lett.*, v. 107, pp. 349-368.
- Hilgen F. J. & Langereis C. G. (1993) A critical re-evaluation of the Miocene/Pliocene boundary as defined in the Mediterranean. *Earth Planet Sc. Lett.*, v. 118, pp. 167-179.
- Raymo M.E., Ruddiman W. F., Backmann J., Clement B. M. & Martinson D. G. (1989) Late Pliocene variation in northern hemisphere ice sheets and North Atlantic deep water circulation. *Paleoceanography*, v. 4, pp. 413-446, Washington.
- Rio D., Raffi I. & Villa G. (1990) Pliocene-Pleistocene calcareous nannofossil distribution patterns in the western Mediterranean. In Kastens K.A., Mascle J. et al. (Eds.) <u>Proc. ODP. Sc.</u> <u>Res.</u>, v. 107, pp. 513-533, College Station, TX (Ocean Drilling Program).
- Rio, D., Sprovieri, R., and Di Stefano, E., -(in press)- The Gelasian Stage: a new chronostratigraphic unit of the Pliocene Series. *Riv. Ital. Pal.*
- Rio D., Sprovieri R. & Thunell R. (1991) Pliocene Lower Pleistocene chronostratigraphy: a reevaluation of Mediterranean type sections. *Geol. Soc. Am. Bull.*, v. 103, pp. 1049-1058.

## FIGURE 1 CAPTION

Mediterranean Pliocene time framework and the proposed Chronostratigraphy of the Pliocene Series. The chronology of the Geomagnetic Reversal Time Scale is after Hilgen (1991).

