

CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgement	c
Abstract in Thai	d
Abstract in English	g
List of Tables	1
List of Figures	m
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
1.1 Principles of dental microwear	1
1.2 Literature review of dental microwear	2
1.3 Proboscidea	5
1.3.1 Dental nomenclature	6
1.3.2 Abbreviation of dental position	6
1.4 Sedimentary basins of the fossil locality	6
1.4.1 Ban Na Sai Subbasin	9
1.4.2 Mae Moh Basin	9
1.4.3 Chiang Muan Basin	9
1.4.4 Tha Chang sand pits	12
1.5 Purpose of study	12
Chapter 2 Methodology	15
2.1 Materials and methods for casting	15
2.1.1 Sample selection	15
2.1.2 Fossil specimens	16
2.1.3 Cast preparation	16
2.2 Microwear observation	17

2.2.1	Low-magnification microscopy	17
2.2.2	Scanning electron microscopy (SEM)	19
2.3	Classification of Microwear Features	19
Chapter 3	Results	22
3.1	The characteristic of dental microwear of <i>Stegolophodon</i>	22
1.	<i>Stegolophodon nasaiensis</i>	22
2.	<i>Stegolophodon cf. latidens</i>	28
3.	<i>Stegolophodon cf. stegodontoides</i>	36
3.2	The characteristic of dental microwear of <i>Tetralophodon cf. xiaolongtanensis</i>	44
3.3	The characteristic of dental microwear of <i>cf. Protanancus macinnesi</i>	51
3.4	The characteristic of dental microwear of <i>Prodeinotherium pentapotamiae</i>	59
3.5	Microwear orientation of scratches	63
Chapter 4	Discussion and Interpretation	68
4.1	The paleodiet of the Miocene Proboscidea in Thailand	68
4.2	The possibilities of niche separation between <i>cf. Protanancus macinnesi</i> and <i>Prodeinotherium pentapotamiae</i>	74
4.3	Paleoecology implication	75
4.4	Microwear orientation	76
Chapter 5	Conclusion	78
References		82
Curriculum Vitae		88

LIST OF TABLES

	Page	
Table 3.1	Microwear results of <i>Stegolophodon nasaiensis</i> specimens from Ban Na Sai coal mine, Li District, Lamphun Province	30
Table 3.2	Microwear results of <i>Stegolophodon</i> cf. <i>latidens</i> specimens from Mae Moh coal mine, Lampang Province	38
Table 3.3	Microwear results of <i>Stegolophodon</i> cf. <i>stegodontoides</i> specimens from Tha Chang sand pits, Chaloe Phra Kiat District, Nakhon Ratchasima Province	45
Table 3.4	Microwear results of <i>Tetralophodon</i> cf. <i>xiaolongtanensis</i> specimens from Chiang Muan coal mine, Chiang Muan District, Phayao Province	53
Table 3.5	Microwear results of cf. <i>Protanancus macinnesi</i> from Tha Chang sand pits, Chaloe Phra Kiat District, Nakhon Ratchasima Province	60
Table 3.6	Microwear results of <i>Prodeinotherium pentapotamiae</i> from Tha Chang sand pits, Chaloe Phra Kiat District, Nakhon Ratchasima Province	65
Table 3.7	Microwear orientation observed from scanning electron microscope	67

LIST OF FIGURES

		Page
Figure 1.1	Typical microwear features of proboscidean tooth enamel as observed by low-magnification stereomicroscope at 35 times magnification. A = <i>Mammuthus primigenius</i> from Fairbanks, Alaska (AMNH 651012-1952); B = <i>Mammuthus columbi</i> from South Carolina (AMNH 13708-0); C = <i>Mammuth americanum</i> from Florida (UF 215059). Scale bar = 0.4 mm. (Rivals <i>et al.</i> , 2012)	4
Figure 1.2	Bivariate plot of the average number of pits versus average number of scratches for <i>Mammuth americanum</i> based on Ungulata and Proboscidea database; left: convex hulls are drawn around extant leaf browsing taxa and extant grazing taxa (after Green <i>et al.</i> , 2005), right: centroid are indicated for the extant browsers (B) and grazers (G) (after Rivals <i>et al.</i> , 2012)	5
Figure 1.3	Proboscidean dental nomenclature. Key: Po1, 2, 3, 4, 5, posttrite main cusp of 1 st , 2 nd , 3 rd , 4 th and 5 th lophids; Pr1, 2, 3, 4, 5, pretrite main cusp of 1 st , 2 nd , 3 rd , 4 th and 5 th lophids; Ccpra1, anterior pretrite central conule of 1 st lophid; Ccprp1, 2, 3, posterior pretrite central conule of 1 st , 2 nd , 3 rd lophids; Ms, median sulcus; Meso, mesoconelete of each half-lophid	7
Figure 1.4	Anatomical orientation and number of molar lophid of the right lower third molar, M ₃ , of <i>Stegolophodon nasaiensis</i> having X5X tooth formula. X in the front and the back of the number refer to the anterior cingulum and posterior cingulum, or talonid, respectively	8
Figure 1.5	Stratigraphic succession of the Mae Long Formation at the Ban Na Sai coal mine, Li Basin (modified from Ratanasthien, 1990)	10

Figure 1.6	Stratigraphic succession of Mae Moh coal mine (modified from Jitapankul <i>et al.</i> , 1985)	11
Figure 1.7	Stratigraphic succession of Chiang Muan coal mine (compiled from Chiang Muan Company Limited (unpublished document) in Songtham, 2003; Nagaoka and Suganuma, 2002; Suganuma <i>et al.</i> , 2006; Fukuchi <i>et al.</i> , 2007)	13
Figure 1.8	Stratigraphic succession of the Tha Chang sand pit (after Sato, 2002)	14
Figure 2.1	The procedures for the preparation of the casts for microwear analyses	18
Figure 2.2	Specimen preparation for SEM analysis	20
Figure 2.3	Example of microwear features, including small, large and puncture pits, as well as fine, coarse, and hypercoarse scratches, as seen under a standard stereoscopic microscope at low magnification (50-70×). Scale bar = 0.4 mm. (Semprebon <i>et al.</i> , 2004)	21
Figure 3.1	<i>Stegolophodon nasaiensis</i> from the Ban Na Sai coal mine, Li District, Lamphun Province. A = NS-01a (left M ³): B = NS-01b (left M ³): C = type specimen, M4732a1 (right M ₂): D = type specimen, M4732a2 (right M ₃). Selected positions for microwear analyses are indicated by square markers. All images are occlusal view. Scale bar a, 5 cm. applies to A and B, scale bar b, 10 cm. applies to C and D	23
Figure 3.2	Microwear images of <i>Stegolophodon nasaiensis</i> (NS-01a), as seen under low-magnification microscope (×35); A. and B., and under scanning electron microscope (×65); C. Scale bar 10.0 mm. applies to A., scale bar 0.4 m. applies to B. and C. Microwear orientation; D	25
Figure 3.3	Microwear images of <i>Stegolophodon nasaiensis</i> (NS-01b), as seen under low-magnification microscope (×35); A. and B., and	26

- under scanning electron microscope ($\times 65$); C. Scale bar 10.0 mm. applies to A., scale bar 0.4 m. applies to B. and C. Microwear orientation; D
- Figure 3.4 Microwear images of *Stegolophodon nasaiensis* (M4732a1), as 27
seen under low-magnification microscope ($\times 35$); A. and B., and under scanning electron microscope ($\times 65$); C. Scale bar 10.0 mm. applies to A., scale bar 0.4 m. applies to B. and C. Microwear orientation; D
- Figure 3.5 Microwear images of *Stegolophodon nasaiensis* (M4732a2), as 29
seen under low-magnification microscope ($\times 35$); A. and B., and under scanning electron microscope ($\times 65$); C. Scale bar 10.0 mm. applies to A., scale bar 0.4 m. applies to B. and C. Microwear orientation; D
- Figure 3.6 Bivariate plots of scratch versus pit counts for *Stegolophodon 30 nasaiensis*. Data obtained from light microscope (MIC) and scanning electron microscope (SEM). Gaussian confidence ellipses ($p = 0.95$) on the centroid are indicated for extant browsers and grazers adjusted by sample size (extant data from Solounias and Semperebon, 2002)
- Figure 3.7 *Stegolophodon cf. latidens* from Mae Moh coal mine, Lampang 31 Province. A = M4733f (left M₃): B = fragmented molar of MMEL-3: C = fragmented molar of MMEL-5: D = fragmented molar of MMEL-6. Selected positions for microwear analyses are indicated by square markers. All images are occlusal view. Scale bar = 10 cm. applied to all
- Figure 3.8 Microwear images of *Stegolophodon cf. latidens* (M4733f), as 33
seen under low-magnification microscope ($\times 35$); A. and B., and under scanning electron microscope ($\times 65$); C. Scale bar 10.0 mm. applies to A., scale bar 0.4 m. applies to B. and C. Microwear orientation; D

- Figure 3.9 Microwear images of *Stegolophodon* cf. *latidens* (MMEL-3), as 34
seen under low-magnification microscope ($\times 35$); A. and B., and
under scanning electron microscope ($\times 65$); C. Scale bar 10.0 mm.
applies to A., scale bar 0.4 m. applies to B. and C. Microwear
orientation; D
- Figure 3.10 Microwear images of *Stegolophodon* cf. *latidens* (MMEL-5), as 35
seen under low-magnification microscope ($\times 35$); A. and B., and
under scanning electron microscope ($\times 65$); C. Scale bar 10.0 mm.
applies to A., scale bar 0.4 m. applies to B. and C. Microwear
orientation; D
- Figure 3.11 Microwear images of *Stegolophodon* cf. *latidens* (MMEL-6), as 37
seen under low-magnification microscope ($\times 35$); A. and B., and
under scanning electron microscope ($\times 65$); C. Scale bar 10.0 mm.
applies to A., scale bar 0.4 m. applies to B. and C. Microwear
orientation; D
- Figure 3.12 Bivariate plots of scratch versus pit counts for *Stegolophodon* cf. 38
latidens. Data obtained from light microscope (MIC) and
scanning electron microscope (SEM). Gaussian confidence
ellipses ($p = 0.95$) on the centroid are indicated for extant
browsers and grazers adjusted by sample size (extant data from
Solounias and Semprebon, 2002)
- Figure 3.13 *Stegolophodon* cf. *stegodontoides* from Tha Chang sand pits, 39
Chaloem Phra Kiat District, Nakhon Ratchasima Province. A =
NM1-13 (left M₃): B = RIN55 (right M₂): C = RIN534 (right M₃)
Selected positions for microwear analyses are indicated by square
markers. All images are occlusal view. Scale bar = 10 cm. applied
to all
- Figure 3.14 Microwear images of *Stegolophodon* cf. *stegodontoides* (NM1- 41
13), as seen under low-magnification microscope ($\times 35$); A. and

- B., and under scanning electron microscope ($\times 65$); C. Scale bar 10.0 mm. applies to A., scale bar 0.4 m. applies to B. and C. Microwear orientation; D
- Figure 3.15 Microwear images of *Stegolophodon* cf. *stegodontoides* (RIN55), 42
as seen under low-magnification microscope ($\times 35$); A. and B.,
and under scanning electron microscope ($\times 65$); C. Scale bar 10.0
mm. applies to A., scale bar 0.4 m. applies to B. and C.
Microwear orientation; D
- Figure 3.16 Microwear images of *Stegolophodon* cf. *stegodontoides* 43
(RIN534), as seen under low-magnification microscope ($\times 35$); A.
and B., and under scanning electron microscope ($\times 65$); C. Scale
bar 10.0 mm. applies to A., scale bar 0.4 m. applies to B. and C.
Microwear orientation; D
- Figure 3.17 Bivariate plots of scratch versus pit counts for *Stegolophodon* cf. 45
stegodontoides. Gaussian confidence ellipses ($p = 0.95$) on the
centroid are indicated for extant browsers and grazers adjusted by
sample size (extant data from Solounias and Semperebon, 2002)
- Figure 3.18 *Tetralophodon* cf. *xiaolongtanensis* from Chiang Muan coal 46
mine, Chiang Muan District, Phayao Province. A = CMn2 (left
 M^2): B = CMn5 (left M^2): C = CMn6 (left M_3): D = fragmented
molar of CMn7. Selected positions for microwear analyses are
indicated by square markers. All images are occlusal view. Scale
bar = 10 cm. applied to all
- Figure 3.19 Microwear images of *Tetralophodon* cf. *xiaolongtanensis* 48
(CMn2), as seen under low-magnification microscope ($\times 35$); A.
and B., and under scanning electron microscope ($\times 65$); C. Scale
bar 10.0 mm. applies to A., scale bar 0.4 m. applies to B. and C.
Microwear orientation; D
- Figure 3.20 Microwear images of *Tetralophodon* cf. *xiaolongtanensis* 49
(CMn5), as seen under low-magnification microscope ($\times 35$); A.

- and B., and under scanning electron microscope ($\times 65$); C. Scale bar 10.0 mm. applies to A., scale bar 0.4 m. applies to B. and C. Microwear orientation; D
- Figure 3.21 Microwear images of *Tetralophodon* cf. *xiaolongtanensis* (CMn6), as seen under low-magnification microscope ($\times 35$); A. and B., and under scanning electron microscope ($\times 65$); C. Scale bar 10.0 mm. applies to A., scale bar 0.4 m. applies to B. and C. Microwear orientation; D 50
- Figure 3.22 Microwear images of *Tetralophodon* cf. *xiaolongtanensis* (CMn7), as seen under low-magnification microscope ($\times 35$); A. and B., and under scanning electron microscope ($\times 65$); C. Scale bar 10.0 mm. applies to A., scale bar 0.4 m. applies to B. and C. Microwear orientation; D 52
- Figure 3.23 Bivariate plots of scratch versus pit counts for *Tetralophodon* cf. *xiaolongtanensis*. Gaussian confidence ellipses ($p = 0.95$) on the centroid are indicated for extant browsers and grazers adjusted by sample size (extant data from Solounias and Semprebon, 2002) 53
- Figure 3.24 cf. *Protanancus macinnesi* from Tha Chang sand pits, Chaloe Phra Kiat District, Nakhon Ratchasima Province. A = NM1-17 (left M₃); B = NM1-9 (left M³); C = NM1-3 (right M₃). Selected positions for microwear analyses are indicated by square markers. All images are occlusal view. Scale bar = 10 cm. applied to all 54
- Figure 3.25 Microwear images of *Protanancus macinnesi* (NM1-17), as seen under low-magnification microscope ($\times 35$); A. and B., and under scanning electron microscope ($\times 65$); C. Scale bar 10.0 mm. applies to A., scale bar 0.4 m. applies to B. and C. Microwear orientation; D 56
- Figure 3.26 Microwear images of *Protanancus macinnesi* (NM1-9), as seen under low-magnification microscope ($\times 35$); A. and B., and under 57

- scanning electron microscope ($\times 65$); C. Scale bar 10.0 mm. applies to A., scale bar 0.4 m. applies to B. and C. Microwear orientation; D
- Figure 3.27 Microwear images of *Protanancus macinnesi* (NM1-9), as seen 58
under low-magnification microscope ($\times 35$); A. and B., and under
scanning electron microscope ($\times 65$); C. Scale bar 10.0 mm.
applies to A., scale bar 0.4 m. applies to B. and C. Microwear
orientation; D
- Figure 3.28 Bivariate plots of scratch versus pit counts for cf. *Protanancus* 60
macinnesi. Gaussian confidence ellipses ($p = 0.95$) on the
centroid are indicated for extant browsers and grazers adjusted by
sample size (extant data from Solounias and Semprebon, 2002)
- Figure 3.29 *Prodeinotherium pentapotamiae* from Tha Chang sand pits, 61
Chaloem Phra Kiat District, Nakhon Ratchasima Province. A =
KHO (right mandible with P₄ to M₃): B = RIN15 (right mandible
with M₁ to M₃). Selected positions for microwear analyses are
indicated by square markers. All images are occlusal view. Scale
bar = 10 cm. applied to all
- Figure 3.30 Microwear images of *Prodeinotherium pentapotamiae* (KHO), as 62
seen under low-magnification microscope ($\times 35$); A. and B., and
under scanning electron microscope ($\times 65$); C. Scale bar 10.0 mm.
applies to A., scale bar 0.4 m. applies to B. and C. Microwear
orientation; D
- Figure 3.31 Microwear images of *Prodeinotherium pentapotamiae* (RIN15), 64
as seen under low-magnification microscope ($\times 35$); A. and B.,
and under scanning electron microscope ($\times 65$); C. Scale bar 10.0
mm. applies to A., scale bar 0.4 m. applies to B. and C.
Microwear orientation; D
- Figure 3.32 Bivariate plots of scratch versus pit counts for *Prodeinotherium* 65
pentapotamiae. Gaussian confidence ellipses ($p = 0.95$) on the

centroid are indicated for extant browsers and grazers adjusted by sample size (extant data from Solounias and Semprebon, 2002)

- Figure 3.33 The orientation of microwear features; the dash-line showing the anterolingual-posterobuccal direction and the bold-line showing the anterobuccal-posterolingual direction 66
- Figure 4.1 Proposed age specification of *Prodeinotherium pentapotamiae* and cf. *Protanancus macinnesi* from microwear results 75
- Figure 4.2 The simple average angle of microwear orientation of each species. A = *Stegolophodon nasaiensis* (133°): B = *Stegolophodon* cf. *latidens* (90°): C = *Stegolophodon* cf. *stegodontoides* (80°): D = *Tetralophodon* cf. *xiaolongtanensis* (95°): E = cf. *Protanancus macinnesi* (73°): F = *Prodeinotherium pentapotamiae* (120°) 77
- Figure 5.1 The summary of age of Miocene proboscidean fossils in Thailand from the dental microwear 81