



HAL
open science

**The postcranial skeleton of the gliding reptile
Coelurosauravus elivensis Piveteau, 1926 (Diapsida,
Weigeltisauridae) from the late Permian Of Madagascar**

Valentin Buffa, Eberhard Frey, J.-Sébastien Steyer, Michel Laurin

► **To cite this version:**

Valentin Buffa, Eberhard Frey, J.-Sébastien Steyer, Michel Laurin. The postcranial skeleton of the gliding reptile *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Diapsida, Weigeltisauridae) from the late Permian Of Madagascar. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology*, In press, 10.1080/02724634.2022.2108713 . hal-03799010


HAL Id: hal-03799010

<https://hal.science/hal-03799010v1>

Submitted on 5 Oct 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



**The postcranial skeleton of the gliding reptile
Coelurosauravus elivensis Piveteau, 1926 (Diapsida,
Weigeltisauridae) from the late Permian of Madagascar**

Journal:	<i>Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology</i>
Manuscript ID	JVP-2022-0005.R1
Manuscript Type:	Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Buffa, Valentin; Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Origines et Évolution Frey, Eberhard; Staatliches Museum für Naturkunde Karlsruhe, Geosciences Steyer, Jean-Sébastien; Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle Laurin, Michel; CNRS, URM 7207;
Key Words:	<i>Coelurosauravus</i>, Postcranium, Weigeltisauridae, Permian, Gliding reptiles, Arboreality

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 The postcranial skeleton of the gliding reptile *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926
4
5 (Diapsida, Weigeltisauridae) from the late Permian of Madagascar
6
7

8 VALENTIN BUFFA,^{*,1} EBERHARD FREY,² J.-SÉBASTIEN STEYER,¹ and MICHEL
9
10 LAURIN¹
11
12

13 ¹Centre de Recherche en Paléontologie – Paris, UMR 7207 CNRS-MNHN-SU, Muséum
14 national d’Histoire naturelle, CP38, 8 rue Buffon, 75005 Paris, France,
15

16 valentin.buffa@edu.mnhn.fr;
17
18

19
20
21 ²Sonnenbergstraße 27, 75180 Pforheim, Germany;
22
23

24
25
26
27
28
29
30 RH: BUFFA ET AL.—*COELUROSAURAVUS* POSTCRANIUM
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

* Corresponding author

1
2
3 ABSTRACT—The postcranial skeleton of the gliding neodiapsid reptile *Coelurosauravus*
4
5 *elivensis* (Lower Sakamena Formation, late? Permian, southwestern Madagascar) is re-
6
7 described in detail based on all previously referred specimens. The exquisite preservation of
8
9 the material provides three-dimensional details of the individual bones, which are missing in
10
11 the Laurasian weigeltisaurid material. A new skeletal reconstruction of *C. elivensis* is
12
13 proposed including the first reconstruction of a weigeltisaurid reptile in lateral view. The re-
14
15 examination of the material highlights interspecific differences in the postcranium of
16
17 weigeltisaurids, in particular in the trunk and patagial spars. These animals have long been
18
19 considered as arboreal and gliding reptiles. However, new information on the postcranium of
20
21 *C. elivensis* reveals strong similarities with both extant and extinct quadrupeds specialized for
22
23 a clinging arboreal lifestyle. Additionally, the presence of an additional phalanx in the fifth
24
25 digit of the manus is now attested for all weigeltisaurids where this region is preserved. We
26
27 suggest that this morphology could have allowed weigeltisaurids to grasp their patagium as
28
29 observed in the extant gliding agamid *Draco*. Weigeltisaurids are thus the earliest known
30
31 gliding vertebrates and some of the first tetrapods with an obligatory arboreal lifestyle, but
32
33 also represent the only known vertebrates with a hyperphalangy aligned with a gliding
34
35 apparatus.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

INTRODUCTION

Despite their sparse late Paleozoic fossil record, early diapsids show a surprisingly large morphological disparity (Sues, 2019). Several terrestrial, semi-aquatic and arboreal taxa had indeed appeared by the end of the Permian (Carroll, 1975, 1978, 1981; Gow, 1975; Currie, 1981a). Among those, the late Permian Weigeltisauridae are the earliest known gliding tetrapods (Carroll, 1978; Evans, 1982; Bulanov and Sennikov, 2015a–c; Buffa et al., 2021), and their study is paramount to understand the evolution of gliding flight in amniotes.

Weigeltisauridae include several taxa known from Laurasia and Gondwana (Bulanov and Sennikov, 2015a–c): *Weigeltisaurus jaekeli* (Weigelt, 1930) (Lopingian, Germany and England); *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Capitanian–Lopingian?, Madagascar); *Glaurung schneideri* Bulanov and Sennikov, 2015c (Lopingian, Germany); *Rautiania alexandri* Bulanov and Sennikov, 2006 (Capitanian–Lopingian?, Russia); and *Rautiania minichi* Bulanov and Sennikov, 2006 (Capitanian–Lopingian?, Russia). *Wapitisaurus problematicus* Brinkman, 1988 (Early Triassic, Canada) was described as a weigeltisaurid, but its cranial morphology does not conform to recent descriptions, notably in lacking a large temporal fenestra (TMP 86.153.14, VB, pers. obs.; Brinkman, 1988). Following recent studies (Bulanov and Sennikov, 2010; Buffa et al., 2021), we will thus not consider this taxon as a weigeltisaurid, pending the systematic revision of the sole, poorly known specimen.

Weigeltisaurids have been considered pterosaurs (Weigelt, 1930:626), dinosaur relatives (Boule, 1910; Piveteau, 1926), rhyngocephalians (Weigelt, 1930), early (“pelycosaur-grade”) synapsids (Kuhn, 1939) or stem-saurians (Huene, 1956; Carroll, 1978; Evans and Haubold, 1987; Laurin, 1991). Today, all recent phylogenetical analyses recover weigeltisaurids as stem-saurians (e.g. Ezcurra et al., 2014; Schoch and Sues, 2018; Pritchard

1
2
3 **and** Sues, 2019; Sobral et al., 2020; Griffiths et al., 2021), possibly closely related to
4
5 drepanosauromorphs (Merck, 2003; Senter, 2004; Pritchard et al., 2021) or ‘paliguanids’
6
7 (Müller, 2004).
8
9

10
11 The anatomy of weigeltisaurids is unique with respect to their arboreal and aerial
12
13 lifestyle. While the cranium has recently received a lot of attention (Bulanov and Sennikov,
14
15 2006, 2010, 2015a–c; **Schaumberg et al., 2007**; Buffa et al., 2021; Pritchard et al., 2021), their
16
17 postcranium remains poorly understood (Frey et al., 1997; Schaumberg et al., 2007; Bulanov
18
19 and Sennikov, 2010; Pritchard et al., 2021). The present study aims to describe novel
20
21 **postcranial** details of *Coelurosauravus* from the Lopingian? of Madagascar, which has not
22
23 been revised recently (Carroll, 1978; Evans, 1982; Evans and Haubold, 1987).
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **Institutional Abbreviations**

31
32
33 **GM**, Geiseltalmuseum, Martin-Luther-Universität, Halle, Germany; **MNHN**, Muséum
34
35 national d’Histoire naturelle, Paris, France; **SMNK**, Staatliches Museum für Naturkunde
36
37 Karlsruhe, Karlsruhe, Germany; **SSWG**, Sektion Geologie, Ernst-Moritz-Arndt Universität,
38
39 Griefswald, Germany; **TMP**, Tyrell Museum of Paleontology, Drumheller, Canada;
40
41 **TWCMS**, Sunderland Museum, Tyne and Wear County Museums, Sunderland, England.
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 MATERIAL AND METHODS

49 **Material**

50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57 We examined all specimens previously referred to *Coelurosauravus elivensis* (Carroll,
58
59 1978; Bulanov and Sennikov, 2015a; Buffa et al., 2021). For comparison, we also examined
60

1
2
3 original specimens or high-fidelity epoxy resin casts previously referred to *Weigeltisaurus*.

4
5 The complete list of the studied material is provided in Table 1.
6
7
8
9

10 11 **Geological Background**

12
13
14 All known specimens of *Coelurosauravus elivensis* come from the upper beds of the
15 Lower Sakamena Formation (southwestern Madagascar), which is commonly considered of
16 Wuchiapingian age (e.g. Piveteau, 1926; Currie, 1981a; Hankel, 1994; Lucas, 2017).
17
18 However, recent reinvestigations (Smith, 2020) and a possible Capitanian age for the Russian
19 taxa (Sennikov and Golubev, 2017) suggest that the age of the Lower Sakamena Formation is
20 poorly constrained and could extend from late Guadalupian to late Lopingian (possibly
21 Capitanian to Changhsingian). All specimens are preserved in fine-grained nodular
22 concretions. The remains are mostly preserved as external molds, showing skeletal imprints
23 largely in connection. Most bones have been eroded and possibly further removed by etching
24 or using acid so that only their external molds are preserved. A more comprehensive review
25 of the first excavations led by J.-M. Colcanap in southwestern Madagascar during the early
26 20th century is underway by VB.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **Taxonomic Remarks**

46
47
48 **Buffa et al. (2021) provide an overview of current challenges and uncertainties in**
49 **weigeltisaurid taxonomy. We follow their taxonomic framework (Table 1), summarized as**
50 **follows:** (1) The more recent MNHN.F.MAP inventory numbers for the MNHN specimens
51 (including *Coelurosauravus elivensis*). (2) *Weigeltisaurus jaekeli* is exclusively used for the
52 holotype specimen. (3) All other Western European specimens are referred to by their
53 collection numbers, housing institution or locality reference. (4) All specimens from Eastern
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Europe are referred to as *Rautiania* sp. except for type specimens following Bulanov and
4
5 Sennikov (2010).
6
7

8 According to this framework, SMNK-PAL 2882 is referred to as ‘the Ellrich
9
10 specimen’ (Table 1) in contrast to Pritchard et al.’s (2021) recent referral of this specimen to
11
12 *Weigeltisaurus jaekeli*. This should not be taken as a disagreement with Pritchard et al.’s
13
14 (2021) reexamination of this specimen, but as the result of a more cautious consideration of
15
16 the species *W. jaekeli* itself. As stated by Buffa et al. (2021), this standpoint highlights the
17
18 need for reexamination of this species’ diagnosis in light of other Western European
19
20 specimens, especially since such a revision may result in *W. jaekeli* being recovered as a
21
22 junior synonym of *Gracilisaurus otto* (see Haubold and Shauberg, 1985).
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **Reflectance Transformation Imaging (RTI)**

31
32
33 By computing a single ‘interactive specimen’, on which the illumination can be
34
35 reoriented, RTI can help identify individual bones on jumbled specimens (Hammer et al.,
36
37 2002). We use this method to compensate for the nature of preservation of the specimens
38
39 using the same custom-made portable light dome as Buffa et al. (2021, an updated version of
40
41 that used by Béthoux et al., 2016; Cui et al., 2018). Sets of 54 photographs under different
42
43 LED sources were compiled using the RTIBuilder software. The resulting RTI files provided
44
45 in Supplemental Data (Figs. S1–S3) can be opened using the software RTIViewer (both
46
47 software **packages** are freely available at www.culturalheritageimaging.org).
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 SYSTEMATIC PALEONTOLOGY

56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 NEODIAPSIDA Benton, 1985 sensu Reisz, Modesto and Scott, 2011a
4

5
6 WEIGELTISAURIDAE Kuhn, 1939
7

8
9 COELUROSAURAVUS ELIVENSIS Piveteau, 1926
10

11
12 v*1926 *Coelurosauravus elivensis* (gen. nov, sp. nov.); Piveteau, 1926:173–177, pl.
13

14 17.1, 17.3.
15

16
17 v1977 “Institut de Paléontologie, Paris, no. 1908-5-2”; Carroll, 1977:385, fig. 14.
18

19
20 v1978 *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926; Carroll, 1978:144–149, figs. 1–4.
21

22
23 v1978 *Daedalosaurus madagascariensis* (gen. nov., sp. nov.); Carroll, 1978:149–159, figs.
24

25 5–7.
26

27
28 v1982 *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926; Evans, 1982:111–116, figs. 14–19.
29

30
31 v1987 *Coelurosauravus elivnensis* Piveteau, 1926; Evans and Haubold, 1987:275–302, figs.
32

33 3–5, 12–17, 21.
34

35
36 v2015 *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926; Bulanov and Sennikov, 2015a:413–423,
37

38 figs. 1, 2, pl. 5.
39

40
41 v2021 *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926; Buffa et al., 2021:1–25, figs. 1, 3–8.
42

43
44 **Lectotype**—External mold of the dorsal surface of a partially preserved skeleton,
45

46 MNHN.F.MAP325a (Piveteau, 1926:pl. 17.1; Carroll, 1978:fig. 2; Evans, 1982:fig. 16B;
47

48 Evans and Haubold, 1987:figs. 3B, 13C, 16B, 16D, 17; Bulanov and Sennikov, 2015a:pl.
49

50 5.1b; Buffa et al., 2021:figs. 1, 3). See Buffa et al. (2021) for discussion of the type material.
51

52
53 **Paralectotype**—External mold of the ventral surface of a partially preserved skeleton,
54

55 MNHN.F.MAP317a, b, preserved on two slabs (part and counterpart) (Piveteau, 1926:pl.
56

57
58
59
60

1
2
3 17.3; Carroll, 1978:fig. 3; Evans, 1982:figs. 15, 16A; Evans and Haubold, 1987:figs. 3A,
4
5 13A, 13B; Bulanov and Sennikov, 2015a:pl. 5.2; Buffa et al., 2021:figs. 4, 8A).

6
7
8 **Referred Material**—External mold of a sub-complete skeleton, MNHN.F.MAP327a,
9
10 b, preserved on two slabs (part and counterpart) (Carroll, 1978:figs. 5–7; Evans, 1982:figs. 14,
11
12 17, 18; Evans and Haubold, 1987: figs. 4, 5, 12, 14, 15A, 21; Buffa et al., 2021: figs. 5, 6A, 7,
13
14 8B, 8C).

15
16
17
18 **Type Horizon**—Top of the lower Sakamena Formation, late? Permian (?Capitanian–
19
20 Lopingian).

21
22
23 **Type Locality**—Sakamena River, upstream region, exact location unknown,
24
25 southwestern Madagascar.

26
27
28 **Emended Diagnosis**—Maxillary teeth with symmetrical apices; anterior maxillary
29
30 teeth significantly larger than mid-/posterior teeth; anterior and dorsal jugal processes
31
32 subequal (shared with *Rautiania*); ornamented dorsal jugal process; parietal posttemporal
33
34 process not tapering in width (shared with *Glaurung*); ornamental tubercles on parietal
35
36 posttemporal process (shared with *Glaurung*); patagial spars regularly positioned throughout
37
38 the wing (modified from Buffa et al., 2021).

39
40
41
42
43 **Remarks**—*Coelurosauravus* possesses 23 presacral vertebrae, including five cervicals
44
45 and 18 dorsals. This contrasts with the 21 presacral vertebrae including eight cervicals and 13
46
47 dorsals of the Ellrich specimen. However, as no other weigeltisaurid specimen preserves a
48
49 complete presacral vertebral column, we refrain from polarizing this character state in
50
51 weigeltisaurids and provisionally exclude it from the diagnosis of *Coelurosauravus*, pending
52
53 the discovery of additional weigeltisaurid specimens preserving this feature.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

OSTEOLOGICAL REDESCRIPTION

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 The material of *Coelurosauravus* permits an almost complete examination of the
10 postcranial skeleton. In the lectotype, the individual bone imprints (hereafter ‘bones’ for
11 simplicity) are badly preserved due to late diagenetic compression and disarticulation, but the
12 specimen comprises most of the skeletal elements between the skull and mid-length of the tail
13 (Figs. 1, 2). The paralectotype specimens show well-preserved individual bones still mostly in
14 connection between the skull and last presacral, but the sacral and caudal vertebrae are
15 missing, as are both hindlimbs (Figs. 3, 4). Lastly, MNHN.F.MAP327a, b is the best
16 preserved and one of the most complete weigeltisaurid specimens to date. The main slab
17 preserves most of the skeleton, with the individual lying on its left side although the trunk
18 region is mostly covered by the patagial spars (Figs. 5, 6). The counter slab preserves a large
19 portion of the mid-posterior tail with the vertebrae lying in connection (Fig. 7).

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35 Buffa et al. (2021) previously noted the ontogenetic maturity of all *Coelurosauravus*
36 specimens based on size-independent criteria (recently reviewed in Griffin et al., 2021). This
37 is in contrast to the view of Bulanov and Sennikov (2015a:422), who considered all
38 specimens as ‘juveniles.’ As noted by Buffa et al. (2021), the postcranium shows closed
39 neurocentral sutures, fused scapula and coracoid and well-ossified long bones, carpals and
40 tarsals (see below). All of these characters are commonly used as indicators of morphological
41 maturity in extinct reptiles, such as the coeval stem-saurians from the late Permian of
42 Madagascar (Currie, 1981a; Currie and Carroll, 1984; Caldwell, 1995). The postcranium thus
43 conforms with the evaluation of Buffa et al. (2021) of the ontogenetic maturity of all
44 *Coelurosauravus* specimens.

Vertebral Column

All *Coelurosauravus* specimens preserve portions of the vertebral column, with the vertebrae lying mostly in connection. The presacral series is best preserved in the paralectotypes (Figs. 3, 4), and is less well preserved in the lectotype (Figs. 1, 2) and MNHN.F.MAP327a (Figs. 5, 6). The latter specimen also preserves partial sacral vertebrae. The caudal vertebrae are best preserved in MNHN.F.MAP327a, b (Figs. 5–7). The anterior portion of the tail is also preserved in the lectotype (Figs. 1, 2). For all specimens, the presacrals will be numbered cranial to caudal, starting **with** the atlas (presacral 1).

As is visible on the slightly displaced presacral and caudal vertebrae of MNHN.F.MAP327a (Figs. 5, 6, 8A, 8B), the vertebrae are all deeply amphicoelous, possibly notochordal as is typical in stem-saurians (Carroll, 1975, 1981; Gow, 1975; Currie, 1980, 1981a) including other weigeltisaurids (Evans, 1982). In most archosauromorphs, the notochordal canal is closed (Gow, 1975; Nesbitt et al., 2015; Pritchard et al., 2015). The centra of all vertebrae are long and low (between two or three times as long as high; Fig. 8). In contrast, the centra of other early diapsids are only slightly longer than high (Carroll, 1975, 1981; Gow, 1975; Currie, 1980, 1981a). The neural arches of *Coelurosauravus* are slender with the zygapophyses close to the median line, as is typical in neodiapsids but in contrast to the swollen morphology typical of early eureptiles and araeoscelidians (Sumida, 1990; Sumida and Modesto, 2001). None of the vertebrae show **the** mammillary processes present in araeoscelidians (Vaughn, 1955), *Hovasaurus* (Currie, 1981a) and some early archosauromorphs (Gow, 1975; Gottmann-Quesada and Sander, 2009).

Several vertebrae of *Coelurosauravus* bear sharp laminae extending between anatomical landmarks such as the rib facets or zygapophyses. The description of these structures follows **s** the nomenclature of Wilson (1999).

1
2
3 **Presacral Count**—The anterior-most two vertebrae preserved on MNHN.F.MAP327a
4
5 lie anterior to the pectoral girdle on MNHN.F.MAP327a (Figs. 5, 6, 8A, 8B). Owing to the
6
7 slight anterior displacement of the vertebrae and lateral rotation of the pectoral girdle, we
8
9 identify the first preserved vertebrae as the last cervical, and the second one as the first dorsal.
10
11 In addition, these vertebrae show a transition from a ventrally turned and pointed transverse
12
13 process to a horizontal and blunt one (Figs. 8A, 8B). This transition occurs between presacrals
14
15 5 and 6 in the complete presacral column of MNHN.F.MAP317a (Figs. 3, 4). A similar
16
17 transition is also seen on the lectotype (Figs. 1, 2). According to our interpretation,
18
19 *Coelurosauravus* thus possesses five cervical vertebrae. Lastly, we suggest that
20
21 MNHN.F.MAP317a, b preserves the entire presacral series (Figs. 3, 4), indicating that
22
23 *Coelurosauravus* has 18 dorsal vertebrae. This conforms well to the distance between pectoral
24
25 and pelvic girdles in MNHN.F.MAP327a (see dorsal vertebrae below). Thus, including the
26
27 five cervicals and 18 dorsals, the presacral vertebral column of *Coelurosauravus* consists of
28
29 23 presacral vertebrae.
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 In contrast, eight cervicals and thirteen dorsals **were** reported in the Ellrich specimen
37
38 (Frey et al., 1997; Müller et al., 2010; Pritchard et al., 2021). Similarly, Schaumberg (1976,
39
40 1986) reports at least six or seven cervicals in the Wolfsberg specimen. Thus, there appears to
41
42 be hitherto unreported variability in the number of presacral vertebrae in weigeltisaurids.
43
44
45

46 The total presacral count of weigeltisaurids is low compared with other stem-saurians:
47
48 28 to 29 in *Araeoscelis*, 26 in *Petrolacosaurus*, 25 in *Hovasaurus* and likely in *Thadeosaurus*,
49
50 at least 24 in *Youngina*, and 24 in *Claudiosaurus* (Carroll, 1981; Currie, 1981a; Reisz, 1981;
51
52 Currie and Carroll, 1984; Reisz et al., 1984; Smith and Evans, 1996). Müller et al. (2010)
53
54 suggested that the plesiomorphic state for diapsids was 26 presacrals including 6 cervicals and
55
56 20 dorsals. The presacral count is similarly high in drepanosauromorphs: 31 in
57
58 *Megalancosaurus*, 24 in *Vallesaurus* and at least 27 in *Drepanosaurus* (Renesto et al., 2010).
59
60

1
2
3 **Atlas-Axis Complex**—Most of the bones of the atlas-axis complex are preserved in
4 ventral view in MNHN.F.MAP317a (Figs. 3, 4, 8C, 8D). The bones are slightly disarticulated
5 but lie roughly in their anatomical position relative to the skull and post-axial cervicals.
6
7 According to our interpretation, the preserved elements consist of the atlantal centrum,
8 intercentrum and paired neural arches, the axis, and the axial intercentrum (Figs. 8C–8E). It is
9 unclear whether or not there was a proatlas.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Bulanov and Sennikov (2015a) interpreted a circular element close to the braincase of
MNHN.F.MAP317a as the occipital condyle, formed entirely by the basioccipital. However,
as this does not conform to the better-preserved basioccipital of MNHN.F.MAP327a (Buffa et
al., 2021), we identify this element as an atlantal vertebral centrum in posteroventral view
based on its position relative to the braincase and neck of the animal (Figs. 8C, 8D). The
dorsal margin of the bone is hidden under the right atlantal neural arch. The ventral margin of
the atlantal centrum is rounded, suggesting that it is sub-circular in outline. The bone was not
fused with the axial intercentrum, as in **some early amniotes** *Acerosodontosaurus*,
Hovasaurus **and most early archosauromorphs** (Gow, 1972, 1975; Currie, 1980, 1981a;
Sumida et al., 1992; Dilkes, 1998; deBraga, 2003; Campione and Reisz, 2011; Miedema et al.,
2020) **but unlike some allokotosaurian archosauromorphs and most lepidosauromorphs**
(Hoffstetter and Gasc, 1969; Nesbitt et al., 2015; O'Brien et al., 2018).

59
60
The posterior margin of the atlantal centrum is mostly occupied by a large, circular
notochordal pit. Such a pit is also present in captorhinids (Peabody, 1952; Sumida, 1990) and
varanopids (Campione and Reisz, 2011). This was certainly also the case in most stem-
saurians with a notochordal atlantal centrum (Vaughn, 1955; Carroll, 1981; Reisz, 1981),
although the posterior surface of the atlantal centrum is rarely described. The atlantal centrum
of *Coelurosauravus* is short and ring-like in anterior or posterior view, as is typical in early
amniotes (Romer, 1956; Sumida, 1990; Sumida et al., 1992).

1
2
3 The contralateral atlantal neural arches are unfused. The right neural arch is almost
4 complete and visible in posterior view, **whereas** the left is broken and only its neural spine is
5 visible (Figs. 8C, 8D). We were unable to identify the neurocentral suture between the
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 **unpreserved** anterior portions of the bones. The atlantal neural arch is composed of a ventral
14 process that articulated with the anterior portion of the atlantal centrum, as in most early
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
The atlantal neural arch is composed of a ventral process that articulated with the anterior portion of the atlantal centrum, as in most early amniotes (Romer, 1956; Sumida et al., 1992), and of a slender posterior process projecting posterodorsally that articulated with the axis. The posterior process is narrow and bears the neural spine as well as a small but distinct postzygapophysis (Figs. 8C–8E). There is no trace of an atlantal rib or of a corresponding articular facet on the atlantal neural arch, suggesting that this rib was absent in *Coelurosauravus*, as is the case in *Claudiosaurus* and *Hovasaurus* (Carroll, 1981; Currie, 1981a), but in contrast to the condition in early reptiles (Reisz, 1981; Sumida, 1990).

In MNHN.F.MAP317a, a short, slightly posteriorly concave plate overlies the atlantal centrum (Figs. 8C, 8D). This element likely does not represent the median process of the neural arch because it lacks the robust articular facet for the atlas described for all early amniotes (Currie, 1980; Reisz, 1981; Sumida et al., 1992; Campione and Reisz, 2011). This plate may represent a distinct element, possibly a displaced proatlas.

The atlantal intercentrum lies just posterior to the atlantal centrum and is visible in ventral view (Figs. 8C, 8D). It is about half the length of the axis and the succeeding vertebrae, but is two times longer than the atlantal centrum. The bone tapers slightly posteriorly so that its anterior surface is slightly wider than its posterior one, which is further emphasized by a ventrolateral constriction at midlength (Figs. 8C, 8D). The ventral surface of the bone is beveled anteriorly and posteriorly, forming a X-shaped arrangement of ridges, giving the intercentrum a wide V-shaped outline in lateral view (Fig. 8E). The beveled

1
2
3 anteroventral surface is smoothly convex, merging with the anterior surface of the bone. The
4
5 posteroventral surface is steeply beveled and represents the contact surface for the
6
7 anterodorsal portion of axial intercentrum. Owing to the shape and size of the atlantal
8
9 intercentrum, we suggest that it contacted the atlantal centrum dorsally and articulated with
10
11 the axial intercentrum posteriorly (Figs. 8E). The bone thus excluded the atlantal centrum
12
13 from the ventral margin of the cervical column, as in some early amniotes where the atlantal
14
15 centrum and axial intercentrum are distinct (Gow, 1972; Sumida et al., 1992; deBraga, 2003;
16
17 Campione and Reisz, 2011), araeoscelidians (Vaughn, 1955, Reisz, 1981) and early
18
19 neodiapsids (Currie, 1980, 1981a).
20
21
22
23

24 The axis is almost identical to the succeeding cervical vertebrae, described below (Fig.
25
26 8). Its centrum is amphicoelous, long and low, about three times as long as high. Its ventral
27
28 margin is horizontal in lateral view and lacks a midventral ridge or keel. This ridge is present
29
30 in most early diapsids (Vaughn, 1955; Currie, 1981a; Currie and Carroll, 1984). Both anterior
31
32 and posterior margins are angled anterodorsally, as in araeoscelidians (e.g. Reisz, 1981).
33
34
35

36 The neural arch of the axis bears a pair of transverse processes, two pairs of
37
38 zygapophyses, and the neural spine. The transverse processes are triangular in dorsal aspect.
39
40 They extend laterally at right angle to the neural arch before angling ventrally. They are
41
42 prolonged posteriorly by a low posterior centrodiaepophyseal lamina. Such a lamina is also
43
44 present in *Petrolacosaurus* (Reisz, 1981). As suggested by the poorly preserved remains of
45
46 the axial rib (Figs. 8C, 8D), the diapophysis must have been positioned on the lateral apex of
47
48 the transverse process, whereas the parapophysis was likely positioned near the anterior
49
50 margin of the centrum.
51
52
53
54

55 The zygapophyses extend anteriorly and posteriorly at right angle from the neural
56
57 arch, delimiting the vertebral foramen on either side. The prezygapophyses bear dorsolaterally
58
59 facing articular facets for the postzygapophyses of the atlantal neural arch. In contrast, the
60

1
2
3 prezygapophyses of the succeeding vertebrae are oriented anterodorsally and bear
4
5 dorsomedially facing articular facets (Fig. 8). The neural arch is subtly excavated between the
6
7 zygapophyses at the base of the neural spine, although not to the degree of the third cervical
8
9 (see below). The neural spine is approximately 1.5 times the height of the centrum and
10
11 roughly rectangular in lateral aspect. In contrast to the anterodorsally expanded axial neural
12
13 spine of araeoscelidians and tanystropheids (Vaughn, 1955; Reisz, 1981; Nosotti, 2007;
14
15 Miedema et al., 2020), its dorsal margin is anteroventrally angled, most markedly in its
16
17 anterior portion, where it is angled ca. 30° to the horizontal. The posterior margin of the
18
19 neural spine is subtly concave in lateral view and is thickened ventrally, where it merges with
20
21 the neural arch (Figs. 8C–8E).
22
23
24
25

26
27 The axial intercentrum is small compared to the atlantal one and is visible in
28
29 ventrolateral view. What is preserved suggests that it was crescentic and articulated with the
30
31 beveled posteroventral surface of the atlantal intercentrum.
32
33

34
35 **Post-axial Cervical Vertebrae**—As discussed above, *Coelurosaruavus* has three
36
37 post-axial cervical vertebrae, all of which are preserved in MNHN.F.MAP317a, b (Figs. 3, 4).
38
39 Only the posterior-most cervical is preserved in MNHN.F.MAP327a (Figs. 8A, 8B). The
40
41 outline of at least three poorly preserved cervicals is preserved in the lectotype (Figs. 1, 2).
42
43

44
45 As is best visible in MNHN.F.MAP317a, b, the post-axial cervicals are all similar to
46
47 the axis (Fig. 8F). The centra gradually increase in length along the series. They are all
48
49 slightly longer than those of the anterior-most dorsals but around 1.3 times shorter than the
50
51 mid-posterior dorsals (Table 2), as is the case in the Ellrich specimen (Pritchard et al., 2021).
52
53 Similarly, elongate cervical centra occur in araeoscelidians (Reisz, 1981; Reisz et al., 1984),
54
55 drepanosauromorphs (Renesto et al., 2010) and several early archosauromorphs (Gow, 1975;
56
57 Gottmann-Quesada and Sander, 2009; Nesbitt et al., 2015; Pritchard et al., 2015). The centra
58
59 only show a slight ventrolateral constriction and lack the midventral ridge or keel typically
60

1
2
3 present in early reptiles (Vaughn, 1955; Currie, 1980, 1981a; Reisz, 1981). The anterior and
4
5 posterior margins of each cervical centrum are slightly angled anterodorsally (ca. 15° to the
6
7 vertical), as described for the axis. A similar angulation **was** reported in araeoscelidians. The
8
9 cervicals of *Coelurosauravus* thus differ strongly from those of drepanosauromorphs, their
10
11 putative sister group (Pritchard et al., 2021), which have heterocoelous centra, anteriorly
12
13 displaced neural arches, and posteroventrally projecting hypapophyses (Renesto and Fraser,
14
15 2003; Renesto et al., 2010).
16
17
18
19

20 All centra are closely appressed, lacking the beveling typical of intercentral
21
22 articulations, which appear absent in all specimens. Cervical intercentra are present in almost
23
24 all stem-saurian diapsids (Vaughn, 1955; Carroll, 1981; Currie, 1981a; Reisz, 1981), although
25
26 they are absent in drepanosauromorphs (Renesto et al., 2010) and several early
27
28 archosauromorphs (Nosotti, 2007; Gottmann-Quesada and Sander, 2009; Nesbitt et al., 2015).
29
30
31

32 As is seen in MNHN.F.MAP317a, b, the transverse processes are triangular in dorsal
33
34 aspect, pointing posterolaterally. In contrast to those of the axis, they are straight and not
35
36 turned ventrally (Fig. 8F). The posterior centrodiaepophyseal lamina is more subtle on the third
37
38 cervical than on the axis (Fig. 8F) and is absent in the posteriorly following cervicals. As in
39
40 the axis, the diapophysis occupied the lateral extremity of the transverse process **whereas** the
41
42 parapophysis was positioned near the anterior margin of the centrum.
43
44
45

46 The neural arch of the third cervical of MNHN.F.MAP317a, b bears a shallow
47
48 excavation between the zygapophyses lateral to the base of the neural spine (Fig. 8F). In the
49
50 axis and the other post-axial cervicals, this excavation is much shallower (Figs. 3, 4, 8).
51
52 Similar excavations **were** reported in araeoscelidians (Vaughn, 1955; Reisz, 1984) and some
53
54 archosauromorphs (Nesbitt et al., 2015). The neural spines of the post-axial cervicals are all
55
56 rectangular in lateral aspect and gradually increase in anteroposterior length throughout the
57
58 column with the posterior-most being roughly the size of the axial neural spine. They are
59
60

1
2
3 relatively low, around 1.5 times the height of the centum, in contrast to the very low cervical
4 neural spines of araeoscelidians (Vaughn, 1955), and the triangular neural spines of the
5 *Weigeltisaurus* holotype (Evans and Haubold, 1987; Bulanov and Sennikov, 2015b). As seen
6 in MNHN.F.MAP317a, b, the neural spine of the third cervical vertebra is strongly inclined
7 ventrally (ca. 25° to the horizontal), as in the axis (Fig. 8F). A similar inclination is present in
8 the anterior-most post-axial cervicals of several archosauromorphs (Gottmann-Quesada and
9 Sander, 2009; Nesbitt et al., 2015). The posterior cervical neural spines have a more
10 horizontal dorsal margin (Figs. 3, 4, 8A, 8B, 8F).

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22 The cervical vertebrae of all *Coelurosauravus* specimens are associated with short
23 ribs, in contrast to the prominent long and slender cervical ribs typical of archosauromorphs
24 (Gow, 1975; Nesbitt et al., 2015), and the absence of ribs in the drepanosauromorphs
25 *Megalancosaurus* and *Vallesaurus* (Renesto et al., 2010). The ribs of the third cervical of
26 MNHN.F.MAP317a, b are the only ones preserved in their anatomical position and are
27 oriented parasagittally (Fig. 8F). The ribs of the following cervicals are all preserved in a
28 more posteroventral orientation, but do not appear to lie in connection with the respective
29 vertebrae (Figs. 3, 4). Thus, the orientation of the cervical ribs remains unclear in
30 *Coelurosauravus*. None of the articular ends of the cervical ribs are sufficiently preserved to
31 identify them as holo- or dichoccephalous or to reliably assess the presence of an accessory
32 process. This process was reported in araeoscelidians, *Claudiosaurus* and archosauromorphs
33 (Carroll, 1981; Reisz, 1981; Benton, 1985).

34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51 **Dorsal Vertebrae**—As mentioned above, we reconstruct *Coelurosauravus* with 18
52 dorsal vertebrae, all of which are preserved in connection in the paralectotypes (Figs. 3, 4).
53 The dorsal series is partially preserved and separated in two portions in the lectotype (Figs. 1,
54 2), and most of the vertebrae are covered by the patagial spars on MNHN.F.MAP327a so that
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 only the extremities of some transverse processes of the mid-posterior dorsals are visible
4
5 (Figs. 5, 6).
6
7

8 As measured on the best-preserved vertebral column of the paralectotypes, the dorsal
9
10 vertebrae show incipient regionalization (Table 2). The centra of dorsals one to eight (the
11
12 anterior half of the dorsal column) are all slightly shorter (ca. 0.9 times) than the post-axial
13
14 cervicals. They vary in length, dorsal four being the longest of this series, and dorsal six the
15
16 shortest. Dorsals 10 to 16 are the longest presacral vertebrae, with a maximum central length
17
18 attained for dorsals 11 to 13 (Table 2). The posterior-most two centra show a rapid decrease in
19
20 length, which is also visible in the lectotype (Fig. 3). This rapid length reduction in the two
21
22 posterior-most presacrals is typical in early amniotes (e.g. Reisz et al., 2011b), and further
23
24 supports a count of 18 dorsal vertebrae, which yields a total of 23 presacrals in
25
26
27
28
29 *Coelurosauravus*.

30
31
32 As seen in the paralectotypes, the dorsal centra all have strongly concave ventral
33
34 margins in lateral view, contrary to the straighter ventral margins of the cervical centra (Fig.
35
36 8). There is no trace of a midventral ridge or keel on any dorsal vertebra, as in other
37
38 weigeltisaurids (Pritchard et al., 2021) and *Claudiosaurus* (Carroll, 1981), but in contrast to
39
40 most early diapsids (Vaughn, 1955; Carroll, 1975, 1981; Currie, 1980, 1981a). The anterior
41
42 and posterior surfaces of the centra are vertical throughout the dorsal column contrary to the
43
44 anterodorsally inclined surfaces of the cervicals. Subcentral foramina seem mostly absent, but
45
46 might be represented by a small pit on dorsal 21 (Fig. 8J). Subcentral foramina are evident in
47
48 most dorsals of other early neodiapsids from Madagascar (Currie, 1980, 1981a; Carroll,
49
50 1981).
51
52
53

54
55 As for the cervical series, the dorsal centra of MNHN.F.MAP317a, b are closely
56
57 appressed and lack any articular facet for intercentra, suggesting that intercentra were absent.
58
59 Dorsal intercentra are present in all other early diapsids, but are absent in
60

1
2
3 drepanosauromorphs (Renesto et al., 2010) and in several archosauromorphs (Nosotti, 2007;
4
5 Gottmann-Quesada and Sander, 2009; Nesbitt et al., 2015).
6
7

8 As noted above, the transverse processes are rectangular, contrary to the triangular
9
10 ones of the cervicals. As seen on the paralectotypes, the diapophysis is located on the
11
12 transverse process, while the parapophysis is invariably present on the anterodorsal corner of
13
14 the centrum (Figs. 8G–8K). The transverse processes of *Coelurosauravus* extend lateral to the
15
16 neural arch, as in other weigeltisaurids (Evans, 1982), although not to the level of some early
17
18 archosauromorphs (Gow, 1975; Gottmann-Quesada and Sander, 2009; Nesbitt et al., 2015). In
19
20 contrast, the transverse processes of other neodiapsids barely extend lateral to the neural arch
21
22 and are hardly visible in dorsal view (Currie, 1980, 1981a; Carroll, 1981).
23
24
25
26

27 As best seen in MNHN.F.MAP327a, the transverse processes of the first two dorsals
28
29 end bluntly in an anteroposteriorly oriented facet bearing the diapophysis (Figs. 8A, 8B). On
30
31 both vertebrae, the transverse processes are reinforced by low paradiapophyseal laminae
32
33 extending anteroventrally from the diapophysis to the parapophysis, and posterior
34
35 centrodiapophyseal laminae, as in the anterior cervicals. The second dorsal also shows a low
36
37 prezygodiapophyseal lamina extending anterodorsally from the diapophysis (Figs. 8A, 8B).
38
39 These laminae are also present on the first two dorsals of the paralectotypes, although
40
41 partially obscured by rib fragments (Fig. 8G). As is seen in the paralectotypes and
42
43 MNHN.F.MAP327a, the transverse processes of dorsals three to eight are much shorter
44
45 anteroposteriorly. The prezygodiapophyseal, paradiapophyseal and posterior
46
47 centrodiapophyseal laminae are invariably present and sharper than in the first dorsals (Figs.
48
49 8G, 8H). The posterior dorsals are not as well preserved, but the laminae are clearly less
50
51 marked. As is seen in dorsal 10 (Fig. 8I), the paradiapophyseal lamina is absent **whereas** the
52
53 prezygodiapophyseal lamina remains. This is also the case in the **successive** vertebrae (Figs.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 8J, 8K). The posterior centrodiapophyseal lamina is absent in dorsal 10 (Fig. 8I) but present in
4
5 the posterior dorsals (Figs. 8J, 8K).
6
7

8 All of these laminae are absent in coeval neodiaspids such as *Hovasaurus* (Currie,
9 1981a) and *Thadeosaurus* (MNHN.F.MAP360a, b, VB, pers. obs.), although
10
11 *Acerosodontosaurus* shows sharp prezygodiapophyseal laminae in its dorsal vertebrae
12
13 (MNHN.F.MAP359, VB, pers. obs.). Posterior centrodiapophyseal laminae are also present in
14
15 *Petrolacosaurus* (Reisz, 1981). These laminae are, however, prevalent in early
16
17 archosauromorphs (Ezcurra et al., 2014).
18
19
20
21
22

23 We were unable to detect significant variations in the orientation of the zygapophyses,
24
25 but as most are obscured by rib fragments on the paralectotypes, a substantial variability in
26
27 their orientation cannot be excluded. We found no trace of excavation of neural arches at the
28
29 base of the neural spine of any dorsal vertebra (Fig. 8), contrary to the situation in
30
31 araeoscelidians (Vaughn, 1955) and several early archosauromorphs (Nesbitt et al., 2015;
32
33 Spiekman, 2018), where excavations at the base of the neural spine are present at least in the
34
35 anterior dorsals.
36
37
38

39 There is, however, substantial variability in the size and shape of the neural spines
40
41 (Fig. 8). The first dorsals bear low (subequal to the centrum height), rectangular neural spines
42
43 with a slight increase in length along their dorsal terminus, forming concave anterior and
44
45 posterior margins (Figs. 8A, 8B, 8G). The succeeding vertebrae show slightly dorsally
46
47 tapering neural spines in lateral aspect with a slightly (ca. 30°) anteroventrally angled anterior
48
49 margin (Fig. 8H). As seen in MNHN.F.MAP317b, the neural spines of the succeeding longer
50
51 vertebrae are mostly unpreserved and their dimensions remain unknown (Figs. 8I–8K).
52
53 Overall, the neural spines of *Coelurosauravus* are all subequal or longer than high in lateral
54
55 view, as in *Claudiosaurus*, *Kenyasaurus* and *Saurosternon*, but in contrast to the higher-than-
56
57 long spines of *Acerosodontosaurus*, *Hovasaurus*, *Thadeosaurus* and *Youngina* (Currie, 1981a,
58
59
60

1
2
3 1981b) or drepanosauromorphs (Renesto et al., 2010). They lack a transverse expansion at
4
5 their dorsal terminus, as described for *Hovasaurus* (Currie, 1981a). We found no trace of the
6
7 additional intervertebral articulations described by Currie (1981b) for ‘younginiforms’, nor of
8
9 the zygosphenial joint of *Saurosternon* and some saurians (Hoffstetter and Gasc, 1969;
10
11 Carroll, 1975).

12
13
14
15 Most of the dorsal ribs are incompletely preserved on the *Coelurosauravus* specimens.
16
17 As is best seen on the paralectotypes (Figs. 3, 4), the more anterior dorsal ribs are slender and
18
19 only slightly longer than the cervical ribs. They are strongly dichoccephalous and L-shaped,
20
21 with the capitulum extending at roughly a right angle to the main axis of the rib (Fig. 8H).
22
23 This conforms to the position of the corresponding costal facets on the vertebrae. The ribs
24
25 gradually increase in size in the more posterior vertebrae, reaching a maximum size in the
26
27 mid-dorsal region (dorsals 10–16; Figs. 3, 4), but remain dichoccephalous. The rib of dorsal 10
28
29 is most likely incomplete and thus does not correspond to the associated costal facets (Fig.
30
31 8I). The ribs of the posterior dorsals are poorly preserved in all specimens. What is preserved
32
33 suggests that they rapidly decrease in size, becoming subequal to the anterior dorsal ribs and
34
35 more strongly curved. They appear to be holocephalous, although their preservation precludes
36
37 a definite statement. In contrast to drepanosauromorphs (Renesto et al., 2010) and some
38
39 archosauromorphs (Spielmann et al., 2008; Nesbitt et al., 2015), none of the dorsal ribs are
40
41 fused with the neural arches.
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Sacral Vertebrae**—The sacral vertebrae are only partially visible in right lateral
49
50 aspect in MNHN.F.MAP327a because they are overlain by the iliac blade (Figs. 9A, 9B). One
51
52 vertebra bears a laterally extended rib that is visible near the middle of the dorsal margin of
53
54 the iliac blade and is therefore confidently identified as a sacral due to its position. The
55
56 preceding vertebra is partially hidden below the anterodorsal margin of the iliac blade, but
57
58 bears an expanded rib as well, which is partially visible anterior to the iliac blade (Figs. 9A,
59
60

1
2
3 9B). Lastly, owing to the length of the iliac blade and its slight postmortem rotation ventrally
4 relative to the vertebral column, we consider the vertebra close to the posterior portion of the
5 iliac blade as a sacral vertebra as well (Fig. 9). Its rib cannot be identified because the vertebra
6 is obscured by patagial spars and the iliac blade. According to our interpretation, there are
7 three sacral vertebrae in *Coelurosauravus*. In contrast, Carroll (1978:fig. 6) only identified the
8 posterior-most two sacrals of MNHN.F.MAP327a. However, three sacrals were also reported
9 in *Rautiania* (Bulanov and Sennikov, 2010), and this number was thus likely typical for
10 weigeltisaurids. Only two sacrals were previously reported in the Eppelton specimen (Evans,
11 1982), but the preservation of this specimen precludes a definite statement (TWCMS
12 B5937.1, VB, pers. obs.) *Megalancosaurus* also possesses three sacrals, although only two are
13 reported for other drepanosauromorphs (Renesto et al., 2010). In contrast, all known stem-
14 saurians, and most Permo–Triassic saurians possess two sacral vertebrae (Gow, 1975; Reisz,
15 1981; Nesbitt et al., 2015). Owing to the length of the iliac blade and the position of the sacral
16 neural spines, the sacral vertebrae appear to have been some of the shortest in the column.

17
18
19 The sacral ribs are too poorly preserved to yield anatomical details. Based on the
20 length of the iliac blade it is likely that the ribs of the sacrals from anterior to posterior were
21 oriented posterolaterally, laterally and anterolaterally respectively, as is the case in *Rautiania*
22 (Bulanov and Sennikov, 2010).

23
24
25 **Caudal Vertebrae**—MNHN.F.MAP327a preserves the 29 immediately postsacral
26 caudal vertebrae, with caudals 11 to 29 being also preserved in the counterpart
27 (MNHN.F.MAP327b, Figs. 5–7). A string of at least nine anterior caudal vertebrae is also
28 preserved in the lectotype (Figs. 1, 2). As seen in MNHN.F.MAP327a, b, the anterior-most
29 three caudals are only two-thirds as long as the succeeding ones (Table 3, Figs. 9C, 9D).

30
31
32 Caudals 4 to 8 show a rapid increase in centrum length, whereas the successive caudals show
33 no further significant variation in length.

1
2
3 The centra of the anterior-most three caudals of MNHN.F.MAP327a show a strong
4 ventrolateral constriction (Figs. 9C, 9D). Their ventral margins are slightly concave in lateral
5 view and bear a ventromedian ridge. Their neural arches are similar to those of the presacrals,
6 but the neural spines are not preserved in any of the specimens. The transverse process of the
7 anterior-most caudal is poorly preserved, but the following two show longitudinally expanded
8 transverse processes (Figs. 9C, 9D). The diapophysis and parapophysis are indeed convergent
9 and linked by a paradiapophyseal lamina, forming a L-shaped articular surface with the main
10 axis oriented horizontally. This is reminiscent of the morphology of the sacral and first caudal
11 vertebrae of the Eppelton specimen (Evans, 1982), and suggests the presence of caudal ribs,
12 although they are not visible on MNHN.F.MAP327a. The first three caudals of the lectotype
13 are poorly preserved but conform to the morphology of MNHN.F.MAP327a (Figs. 1, 2).

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29 The successive caudals show a trend of simplification along the vertebral column. The
30 more anterior caudals show a strong ventrolateral constriction, which gradually recedes and is
31 absent in the more posterior caudals, suggesting a gradual decrease in width of the centra
32 posteriorly along the series. Early neodiapsids typically show a transition from a medial ridge
33 to a sagittal canal framed by a pair of longitudinal ridges (Carroll, 1981; Currie, 1981a), but
34 the preservation of the caudals prevents such an observation in *Coelurosauravus*. As seen in
35 the lectotype, the transverse processes rapidly shorten along the proximal portion of the tail,
36 as do the neural spines (Figs. 1, 2). Both appear to be absent from the fifth or sixth caudal
37 posteriorly. The transverse processes are straight, extending at right angle from the neural
38 arch on the lectotype. This contrasts with the posteriorly curved transverse processes of
39 araeoscelidians (Reisz, 1981). The caudal neural spines are all low and triangular, shorter than
40 the centrum and positioned at level with the postzygapophyses (Figs. 1, 2, 9C, 9D). As seen in
41 MNHN.F.MAP327a, b, the zygapophyses remain well-developed throughout the preserved
42 portion of the tail and articulate with those of the neighboring caudals (Figs. 9E, 9F), as in the
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Eppelton and Ellrich specimens (Evans, 1982; Pritchard et al., 2021). We found no trace of an
4 autotomic septum in any of the vertebrae of MNHN.F.MAP327a or the lectotype.
5
6
7

8 Haemal arches are preserved in lateral view in the lectotype and MNHN.F.MAP327a,
9 b and appear to have been present throughout most of the preserved portion of the tail,
10 although small intercentra are present between the anterior-most caudals instead (Figs. 9C–
11 9D). The proximal portion of each haemal arch articulates between succeeding centra, as in
12 most early diapsids, but in contrast to drepanosauromorphs, where the haemal arches are
13 fused to the centra (Renesto et al., 2010). The first haemal arches are visible in the lectotype,
14 showing a slight posteroventral curvature and a shallowly convex ventral margin (Figs. 1, 2).
15 The haemal arches associated with caudals 13 to 29 are preserved in MNHN.F.MAP327b.
16 They differ from those preserved in the lectotype in their proximal portion, which bears an
17 anterior acuminate process (Figs. 9E, 9F). The transition thus occurs between the ninth and
18 thirteenth caudals, but this region is poorly preserved on all *Coelurosauravus* specimens. All
19 haemal arches gradually taper in width in lateral aspect. This morphology is consistent with
20 that described for the Eppelton and Ellrich specimens (Evans, 1982; Pritchard et al., 2021).
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 **Gastralia**

43
44
45 Thin splint-like bones are visible in the abdominal region of all *Coelurosauravus*
46 specimens, but are best preserved in MNHN.F.MAP327a (Figs. 5, 6, 10, S1). Based on their
47 morphology, anatomical position and arrangement described below, we confidently identify
48 these bones as gastralia.
49
50
51
52

53
54 The organization of the gastral basket is unclear because the trunk of
55 MNHN.F.MAP327a is only visible in lateral view and has undergone slight diagenetic
56 compression (Figs. 5, 6). However, the anterior region is better preserved and shows that the
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 gastralialia were organized into a series of transverse rows, the first two of which are visible on
4 the specimen (Fig. 10A). Each row consists of at least two thin splint-like elements, which
5
6 will be numbered from medial to lateral. In contrast, only a single long curved element **was**
7
8 described in the Ellrich specimen (Pritchard et al., 2021). Similarly, we were unable to
9
10 identify more than one gastralium per row in the gastral basket of the Eppelton and Wolfsberg
11
12 specimens, although this may be due to preservation (TWCMS B5937, cast SMNK-PAL
13
14 34910, VB, pers. obs.).

15
16
17
18
19
20 Gastralium 1 is the thinnest and is almost straight (Fig. 10). Its median portion is
21
22 obscured in all visible gastral rows on MNHN.F.MAP327a. Therefore, it remains unclear if it
23
24 corresponds to a pair of medial gastralialia fused into a chevron-like element, as is the case in
25
26 early neodiapsids (Carroll, 1981; Currie, 1981a) and in the most anterior gastral row in later
27
28 saurians (e.g. Claessens, 2004), or if it is indeed the medial-most element. Gastralium 1 bears
29
30 an anterodorsal facet for gastralium 2 in its lateral portion. Gastralium 2 is nearly 1.5 times
31
32 longer and shows a strong curvature (Fig. 10). Its lateral end is strongly expanded (about 1.5
33
34 times the breadth of the corpus) and forms a knob. This knob is closely associated with a
35
36 patagial spar in several places of the trunk in MNHN.F.MAP327a, **suggesting** these elements
37
38 were articulated.
39
40
41
42

43
44 The trunk of MNHN.F.MAP327a has collapsed due to diagenetic compression, so the
45
46 orientation of the gastral rows is uncertain. As preserved, the anterior-most rows appear to be
47
48 posterolaterally oriented (Fig. 10A), suggesting these rows were organized in a series of
49
50 anteriorly oriented chevrons spanning the width of the abdomen (as described by Witzmann,
51
52 2007). This is the typical organization in reptiles (e.g. Carroll, 1981; Claessens, 2004).
53
54 However, the mid-posterior gastralialia, while isolated, are all oriented anterolaterally (Fig.
55
56 10B), suggesting the gastral rows formed wide posteriorly oriented chevrons (as described by
57
58 Witzmann, 2007) in contrast to the more anterior ones. A similar difference in orientation is
59
60

1
2
3 seen in the Ellrich specimen (Pritchard et al., 2021). However, it is also possible that these
4
5 gastralialia formed roughly transverse rows as in the gastral basket of the Eppelton specimen
6
7 (Evans, 1982) or the Wolfsberg specimen (SMNK cast, VB, pers. obs.; Schaumberg, 1976).
8
9

10 Pritchard et al. (2021) recently proposed that the patagial spars of weigeltisaurids
11
12 could be modified gastralialia, as is suggested by their close association with the gastralialia in the
13
14 Ellrich specimen, which is similar to that of MNHN.F.MAP327a. Under that interpretation,
15
16 each transverse gastral row would comprise three elements in *Coelurosauravus*, which is the
17
18 typical number in early diapsids (Carroll, 1981; Currie, 1981a). *Sphenodon* and extant
19
20 crocodylians have a similar number (e.g. Günther, 1867; Howes and Swinnerton, 1901;
21
22 Vickaryous and Hall, 2008) **whereas** dinosaurs and pterosaurs have at most two gastralialia on
23
24 either side (Claessens, 2004; Claessens et al., 2009).
25
26
27
28
29

30 While Pritchard et al.'s (2021) interpretation remains plausible, we stress that more
31
32 data are needed to assess the homology between the patagials of weigeltisaurid and the lateral
33
34 gastralialia of other reptiles, such as histological thin-sections. Thus, we retain the patagial spars
35
36 and gastralialia as distinct, potentially non-homologous elements in the following description.
37
38
39
40
41

42 **Patagial Spars**

43
44
45 **P**atagial spars (hereafter “patagials”, following Pritchard et al., 2021:47) forming the
46
47 bony support of the patagium, **have** long been recognized as diagnostic of weigeltisaurids
48
49 (Frey et al., 1997; Schaumberg et al., 2007; Pritchard et al., 2021). Isolated spars are visible
50
51 on the lectotype and paralectotypes, but MNHN.F.MAP327a appears to show a complete
52
53 patagial skeleton and will thus serve as the **basis** for the following description (Figs. 5, 6).
54
55
56
57

58 MNHN.F.MAP327a shows at least 29 spars on the right side, with patagials 13 to 16
59
60 lying rotated anteriorly (Figs. 5, 6). Pritchard et al. (2021) reported the same number in this

1
2
3 specimen and counted at least 24 patagials in the Ellrich specimen. The distal extremities of
4 the patagials from the left side are visible in the specimen, but their proximal portions are
5 obscured. As is visible on the right side, the patagials are roughly regularly spaced throughout
6 the patagium (Figs. 5, 6). This is in stark contrast to the “bundles” described for the Ellrich
7 specimen (Frey et al., 1997:1451), suggesting a different organization of the patagial support.
8 The individual spars are long and thin in MNHN.F.MAP327a. They maintain a roughly
9 constant width for at least half to **two-thirds** of their length before tapering distally. Each
10 patagial bears a longitudinal groove in its proximal and middle portions, and they were likely
11 biconcave in cross-section, as described by Schaumberg et al. (2007).
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Patagials 1 to 9 rapidly increase in length, with patagial 9 being the longest in the
25 patagium (Table 3). Patagials 10 to 14 are incomplete distally, but what is preserved suggests
26 a gradual decrease in length along the series. Between patagials 15 and 22, only patagials 16
27 and 19 are sub-complete distally, but the preserved patagial portions suggest a slightly more
28 rapid decrease in length as concluded from the thickness at the distal breaks. The proximal
29 portions of the more posterior patagials are missing so their length cannot be assessed.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **P**atagials 1 to 10 show an increase in thickness and the following ones become gradually
39 thinner along the wing. All this conforms well with the patagial series of the Ellrich specimen
40 (Pritchard et al., 2021).
41
42
43
44
45

46 Patagials 1 and 2, the shortest in the patagium (Table 3), are oriented anterolaterally so
47 that their distal portion lies anterior to their proximal one when the wing is deployed (Figs. 5,
48 6). They are sigmoidal, curving anteriorly in their proximal half and posteriorly in their distal
49 half. In contrast, the anterior patagials of the Ellrich specimen are nearly straight (Pritchard et
50 al., 2021). Patagials 3 to 8 of MNHN.F.MAP327a do not show such a sigmoidal curvature,
51 although patagials 1 through 4 and 8 are posteriorly curved distally (Figs. 5, 6). Except for
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 patagials 19, 23 and 24, none of the more posterior patagials show a complete distal end.
4

5 Thus, it remains unclear whether or not they were curved distally.
6
7
8
9

10 11 **Pectoral Girdle** 12

13
14 The pectoral girdle is preserved in all *Coelurosauravus* specimens. It is visible in right
15 lateral view in the lectotype but is badly weathered (Figs. 1, 2). The individual bones are
16 slightly disarticulated in the paralectotypes, allowing for the description of the articular
17 surfaces (Figs. 3, 4). The pectoral girdle is exquisitely preserved in MNHN.F.MAP327a. This
18 specimen will thus serve as the basis for the following description (Figs. 5, 6, 11A). The
19 elements are preserved in connection, and the pectoral girdle is slightly angled relative to the
20 transverse plane in a way that the right side is visible in lateral view and the left in medial
21 view (Fig. 11A).
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 The pectoral girdle of MNHN.F.MAP327a comprises both scapulocoracoids, clavicles
34 and cleithra (Fig. 11A). There is no trace of the interclavicle (contra Evans and Haubold,
35 1987:fig. 14), which is also not visible in the paralectotypes despite all the other bones being
36 present. Owing to the otherwise exquisite preservation of all other bones that remain roughly
37 in anatomical position, we **propose** this element was reduced or missing in *Coelurosauravus*.
38 In contrast, the interclavicle is prominent in all early diapsids (Carroll, 1975; 1981; Gow,
39 1975; Currie, 1981a). Among diapsid reptiles, the loss of the interclavicle **was** only reported
40 in limbless squamates (Conrad, 2008; Gauthier et al., 2012) and dinosaurs (Nesbitt, 2011, but
41 see Vickaryous and Hall, 2010; Tschopp and Mateus, 2013).
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 None of the *Coelurosauravus* specimens preserves an ossified sternum, which is
55 otherwise present in *Araeoscelis* and common among ‘younginiforms’ and ‘paliguanids’
56 (Vaughn, 1955; Carroll, 1975; Currie, 1981a; Zanon, 1990). However, as indicated by Carroll
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (1978), the empty space between the posterior margin of the scapulocoracoid and the anterior-
4 most row of gastralia in MNHN.F.MAP327a suggests that a broad cartilaginous sternum was
5
6 likely present in *Coelurosauravus* (Figs. 5, 6).
7
8
9

10 **Scapulocoracoid**—The scapula and coracoid are fused in MNHN.F.MAP327a
11 without any discernable suture (Fig. 11), as is the case in the lectotype and paralectotype
12 (Figs. 1–4). This has been proposed as indicating maturity in diapsid reptiles (Currie and
13 Carroll, 1984; Griffin et al., 2021) and thus suggests a mature age of the *Coelurosauravus*
14 specimens (see Buffa et al., 2021 for a more detailed assessment based on the skull).
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 The scapular blade extends vertically as a rectangular plate and is about three times as
24 high as it is wide (Fig. 11). Dorsally, it extends roughly to the level of the vertebral column
25 (Fig. 11) in contrast to the shorter scapular blades of *Claudiosaurus* and *Hovasaurus* (Carroll,
26 1981; Currie, 1981a) and the extremely tall and narrow blades of drepanosauromorphs
27 (Renesto et al., 2010; Castiello et al., 2016). As is visible in medial view on the left side of
28 MNHN.F.MAP327a, the scapular blade is reinforced anteriorly by a low scapular torus (sensu
29 Pawley and Warren, 2006), and the blade becomes gradually thinner dorsally in longitudinal
30 direction (Fig. 11). Its anterior margin is roughly vertical in contrast to the strongly convex
31 anterodorsal margin of the scapular blade of araeoscelidians (Vaughn, 1955; Reisz, 1981), and
32 the concave one of drepanosauromorphs (Renesto et al., 2010; Castiello et al., 2016) and
33 several archosauromorphs (Dilkes, 1998; Spielmann et al., 2008; Nesbitt et al., 2015). The
34 dorsal surface of the blade forms a rugose margin suggesting the presence of a cartilaginous
35 suprascapula. The anterior margin of the scapular blade bears a thin articular surface for the
36 cleithrum.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 The scapular blade progressively becomes transversely and longitudinally broader just
56 dorsal to the glenoid and its contact with the coracoid portion of the scapulocoracoid. The
57 posterior margin of the scapular blade is prolonged by a low-but-robust lateral supraglenoid
58
59
60

1
2
3 ridge dorsal to the glenoid (Fig. 11). There is neither a supraglenoid buttress nor a
4
5 supraglenoid foramen, as is typical in neodiapsids (deBraga and Rieppel, 1997) but in contrast
6
7 to araeoscelidians (Vaughn, 1955; Reisz, 1981).
8
9

10 As is visible on MNHN.F.MAP327a and MNHN.F.MAP317a, b, the coracoid and
11
12 scapular portions of the scapulocoracoid meet at slightly more than a right angle (Fig. 11).
13
14 The coracoid plate extends medially to the sagittal plane of the animal. It does not protrude
15
16 anterior to the scapular blade, and its posterior extent is not visible in any specimen. From
17
18 what is preserved we conclude that it extended for a short distance posterior to the glenoid.
19
20 The posteromedial portion coracoid of MNHN.F.MAP317b appears turned dorsally, although
21
22 this is likely due to diagenetic compression (Figs. 3, 4).
23
24
25
26

27 The glenoid is poorly preserved in all specimens. Two triangular protrusions, the
28
29 scapular and coracoidal contributions to the glenoid articulation, are exposed in the vicinity of
30
31 the humeral head in the lectotype (Figs. 1, 2). The glenoid of *Coelurosauravus* had the
32
33 ‘screw-shaped’ morphology typical of early tetrapods (Romer, 1956).
34
35
36

37 **Cleithrum**—Cleithra are visible in all specimens, but are best preserved in
38
39 MNHN.F.MAP327a (Fig. 11). The bone comprises a slender cleithral shaft, extending
40
41 ventrally from the dorsal region of the scapular blade to the level of the top of the lateral
42
43 supraglenoid ridge. As visible in both MNHN.F.MAP327a and the lectotype, the bone fans
44
45 slightly dorsally over the top of the scapular blade. The posterior margin of the cleithral shaft
46
47 bears a long articular surface that meets the anterior margin of the scapular blade along most
48
49 of its height.
50
51
52
53

54 Paired cleithra **were** described in araeoscelidians, *Acerosodontosaurus* and
55
56 *Hovasaurus* (Currie, 1980, 1981a; Reisz, 1981) but **were** considered absent in most other
57
58 stem-saurians. As the cleithrum is liable to be unpreserved or misinterpreted (e.g. as a cervical
59
60

1
2
3 rib, Romer and Price, 1940:114), we suggest that its absence in *Youngina* (Gow, 1975) is
4
5 equivocal. On the contrary, as indicated by numerous specimens, we follow Carroll (1981) in
6
7 considering this bone absent in *Claudiosaurus*.
8
9

10 **Clavicles**—The clavicles are visible in dorsal and lateral views on
11
12 MNHN.F.MAP327a and MNHN.F.MAP317a and in posteroventral view in
13
14 MNHN.F.MAP317b (Figs. 3, 4H). As seen in MNHN.F.MAP327a, the clavicles are
15
16 composed of a dorsal portion that covered the cleithrum and a ventral one that articulates with
17
18 the anterior margin of the scapular blade. Part of the ventral portion of the clavicle extends
19
20 the anterior margin of the scapular blade. Part of the ventral portion of the clavicle extends
21
22 medially along the anterior margin of the coracoid plate (Fig. 11). Both portions merge
23
24 smoothly into each other at an obtuse angle of about 120°.
25
26

27 The dorsal process of the clavicle gradually tapers towards its terminus. It is convex
28
29 anteriorly, but its posterior surface bears an elongate articular surface for the cleithrum and
30
31 scapulocoracoid, as is visible in MNHN.F.MAP317b (Fig. 2). On the contrary, the ventral
32
33 process of the clavicle becomes gradually broader medially. At the same time, it gradually
34
35 decreases in height medially and possibly forms an articular surface for the interclavicle,
36
37 although we were unable to identify a corresponding sutural surface. The subtle, gradual
38
39 expansion of the ventral process of the clavicle conforms well with that of other neodiapsids
40
41 (e.g. Currie, 1981a), but lacks the broader expansion typical of early reptiles and
42
43 araeoscelidians (Holmes, 1977; Reisz, 1981).
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **Forelimb**

52 Elements of the forelimb are preserved in all specimens. The description of the long
53
54 bones follows the terminology of Romer (1922) and considers that the humerus is oriented
55
56 perpendicular to the sagittal plane of the animal, with the lower arm set at a right angle to the
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 humerus, pointing downwards. The orientation axes of the individual bones are thus
4
5 consistent with previous studies on stem-saurian reptiles (e.g. Carroll, 1981; Currie, 1981a).
6
7 The long bones are slightly disarticulated in the lectotype (Figs. 1, 2) but are mostly complete
8
9 and lie in connection with each other on both sides in the paralectotypes (Figs. 3, 4). The right
10
11 forelimb is exquisitely preserved in MNHN.F.MAP327a and lies in connection with the
12
13 pectoral girdle (Figs. 5, 6, 11).
14
15

16
17 **Humerus**—The humerus is the longest bone in the forelimb (Fig. 11). It has the
18
19 tetrahedral shape typical of all early tetrapods (Romer, 1922), with the epiphyses twisted
20
21 almost at right angle to each other. As is seen in all specimens, the humerus of
22
23 *Coelurosauravus* is gracile, with the epiphyses only slightly enlarged relative to the diaphysis.
24
25 Among early diapsids, this morphology is typical for weigeltisaurids (Evans and Haubold,
26
27 1987; Bulanov and Sennikov, 2010; Pritchard et al., 2021), and araeoscelidians (Vaughn,
28
29 1955; Reisz, 1981; Reisz et al., 1984). In contrast, other early neodiapsids possess greatly
30
31 enlarged humeral heads (Carroll, 1975, 1981; Currie, 1980, 1981a), as do most early
32
33 archosauromorphs (Gottmann-Quesada and Sander, 2009; Nesbitt et al., 2015). As seen in all
34
35 *Coelurosauravus* specimens, the humerus is nearly straight with both epiphyses aligned in the
36
37 proximodistal axis of the bone (Fig. 11). This is also the case in the *Weigeltisaurus* holotype
38
39 (Evans and Haubold, 1987), but contrasts with the strongly curved humerus of *Rautiania*
40
41 (Bulanov and Sennikov, 2010).
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 The humerus is preserved either in dorsal or ventral view in all specimens (Figs. 1–4,
49
50 11). Thus, the proximal epiphysis is only partially visible. The proximal epiphysis of
51
52 MNHN.F.MAP327a is partially visible in ventral view (Fig. 11B). It bears a robust
53
54 deltopectoral crest extending ventrally from the proximal articulation over the length of the
55
56 epiphysis. This crest delimits deep anteroproximal and posteroproximal concavities on the
57
58 proximal epiphysis and is prolonged distally by a low longitudinal ridge separating the ventral
59
60

1
2
3 and posterior surfaces of the bone. The anteroproximal cavity is delimited ventrally by a sharp
4
5 transverse ridge (transverse humeral line of Romer, 1922:555). The dimensions of this cavity
6
7 suggest an extensive insertion for the M. scapulohumeralis. The posteroproximal cavity
8
9 probably represents the broad proximal insertion pit of the M. coracobrachialis brevis
10
11 (Holmes, 1977). MNHN.F.MAP317b exposes the proximal epiphyses of both humeri in
12
13 dorsal view (Fig. 11C). The robust humeral head comprises of a smooth, ovate condyle. It is
14
15 oriented dorsoventrally as in *Rautiania* (Bulanov and Sennikov, 2010). More distally, the
16
17 proximal epiphysis bears a strong tuber on its dorsal surface, separated from the humeral head
18
19 by an anteroposteriorly oriented groove. Based on its position relative to the articular head,
20
21 this conforms well with the insertion of the M. subcoracoscapularis described for *Captorhinus*
22
23 (Holmes, 1977). Kuehneosaurids also show a prominent insertion area for the M.
24
25 subcoracoscapularis (Colbert, 1970).
26
27
28
29
30

31 All preserved humeri bear longitudinal grooves on their dorsal and ventral surfaces,
32
33 likely due to slight diagenetic compression. This indicates that the bone structure was fragile,
34
35 more so than that of the exceptionally preserved vertebrae, suggesting **it was mostly hollow**
36
37 **with** thin cortical walls.
38
39
40

41 The distal epiphysis is about twice as wide as the diaphysis. As is seen in all
42
43 specimens, the ectepicondyle is small and does not extend beyond the posterior margin of the
44
45 diaphysis (Fig. 11). As is best seen in MNHN.F.MAP317a, the supinator process is slender
46
47 and extends distally parallel to the main axis of the bone, forming the anterior wall of the
48
49 ectepicondylar foramen (Figs. 3, 4). This foramen appears open in the lectotype and
50
51 MNHN.F.MAP327a because the supinator process is obscured or broken distally (Fig. 11),
52
53 but was presumably closed in these specimens prior to the fracture, as in the paralectotypes
54
55 (Figs. 3, 4). An enclosed ectepicondylar foramen **was** also described for *Rautiania* (Bulanov
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and Sennikov, 2010). In contrast, this foramen is not enclosed by the supinator process in the
4
5 *Weigeltisaurus* holotype (Evans and Haubold, 1987).
6
7

8
9 As seen in all *Coelurosauravus* specimens, the entepicondyle extends slightly
10
11 posteriorly beyond the distal margin of the diaphysis and distal to the trochlea (Fig. 11) as in
12
13 *Rautiania* (Bulanov and Sennikov, 2010). The entepicondyle is roughly triangular, meeting
14
15 the diaphysis at an obtuse angle (ca. 160°), unlike the robust and rectangular entepicondyle of
16
17 *Hovasaurus* and *Thadeosaurus* (Carroll, 1981; Currie, 1981a). An entepicondylar foramen is
18
19 visible in all *Coelurosauravus* specimens on the proximal portion of the entepicondyle as in
20
21 *Rautiania* (Bulanov and Sennikov, 2010). The capitellum consists of a robust ovate condyle
22
23 that articulated with the proximal epiphysis of the radius. The trochlea of the distal epiphysis
24
25 is subtle and rounded distally. The capitellum and trochlea are well ossified and prominent in
26
27 comparison to those of *Youngina* (BP/1/3859, VB, pers. obs.) or contemporaneous
28
29 neodiapsids (Currie, 1980, 1981a; Carroll, 1981). Such a morphology is also present in
30
31 *Rautiania* (Bulanov and Sennikov, 2010) and is reminiscent of early reptiles (Holmes, 1977;
32
33 Reisz, 1981) or putative arboreal reptiles such as drepanosauromorphs (Pritchard et al., 2016).
34
35 As best seen in MNHN.F.MAP327a, the ventral surface of the entepicondyle posterior to the
36
37 trochlea forms a low crest, suggesting a strong origin point of the *M. epitrochleoanconaeus*
38
39 (Fig. 11B; Holmes, 1977). This appears to be the case in *Rautiania* as well (Bulanov and
40
41 Sennikov, 2010:fig. 4). The dorsal surface of the distal epiphysis is broken and weathered on
42
43 both the lectotype and MNHN.F.MAP317b. What is preserved in MNHN.F.MAP317b
44
45 suggests that there was a deep olecranon fossa framed on either side by low epicondylar
46
47 ridges.
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 **Radius**—The radius is visible in all specimens but is best preserved in
56
57 MNHN.F.MAP327a, where the bone is seen in posterior view. The radius is an elongate and
58
59 gracile bone with a cylindrical shaft. The bone is slightly sigmoidal, and the distal epiphysis
60

1
2
3 appears to be inclined anterodistally (Fig. 11). There is no trace of the strong twisting
4
5 observed in other neodiapsids (*Claudiosaurus*, *Hovasaurus*, Carroll, 1981; Currie, 1981a).
6
7 The radius of other weigeltisaurids was described as straight in the *Weigeltisaurus* holotype
8
9 and the Ellrich specimen (Pritchard et al., 2021), but we think that a slight inclination of the
10
11 distal epiphysis may have been obliterated by diagenetic compression. Both epiphyses are
12
13 only slightly expanded relative to the diaphysis.
14
15
16

17
18 The proximal epiphysis of the radius is best preserved in MNHN.F.MAP317a (Figs. 3,
19
20 4). Its proximal surface is strongly concave to accommodate the prominent capitellum of the
21
22 humerus. As is best seen in the paralectotypes (Figs. 3, 4), the radius bears a slight lateral lip
23
24 reminiscent of a tiny olecranon (“posterior lip” of Carroll, 1981:330). This structure is
25
26 obscured by the ulna in MNHN.F.MAP327a (Fig. 11). This lip was otherwise recognized in
27
28 *Hovasaurus* and *Thadeosaurus* (Carroll, 1981; Currie, 1981a). Pritchard et al. (2021)
29
30 described a radioulnar articulation in the Ellrich specimen. However, we were unable to
31
32 identify an articular facet on either bone in any *Coelurosauravus* specimen. Owing to the
33
34 slight rotation of these bones, we think that the presence of this articulation is equivocal (see
35
36 below). The proximal epiphysis becomes gradually more slender and continues into the
37
38 diaphysis.
39
40
41
42

43
44 The distal epiphysis is best preserved in MNHN.F.MAP327a (Fig. 11B). Its distal
45
46 surface is slightly concave and oriented anterodistally. It shows an anteroposterior
47
48 constriction slightly lateral to the longitudinal axis of the bone, dividing the distal articular
49
50 surface into a broad medial surface and a small lateral surface (Figs. 11C, 12). This lateral
51
52 surface is roughly four times smaller than the medial one. It served for the articulation with
53
54 the intermedium whereas the medial one served for the articulation with the radiale.
55
56
57

58 **Ulna**—The ulna is preserved in similar manner as the radius in the *Coelurosauravus*
59
60 material. It is an elongate, gracile bone with a cylindrical shaft and is slightly sigmoidal in

1
2
3 posterior view. Both epiphyses are expanded relative to the diaphysis, reaching up to twice
4
5 the width of the shaft in posterior aspect.
6
7

8 The proximal epiphysis bears a well-developed olecranon delimited medially by a
9
10 deeply concave sigmoid notch (Fig. 11). This process is also seen in the *Weigeltisaurus*
11
12 holotype and the Ellrich specimen (Evans and Haubold, 1987; Pritchard et al., 2021). As is
13
14 seen in MNHN.F.MAP327a, the olecranon and sigmoid notch are reinforced by a prominent
15
16 ridge running along the posterior surface of the bone. The posterior surface of the olecranon
17
18 bears subtle pits, suggesting that the olecranon served as the insertion of a robust tendon for
19
20 the *M. triceps medialis* (Holmes, 1977).
21
22
23
24

25 The distal epiphysis of the ulna is best preserved in posterior view in
26
27 MNHN.F.MAP327a but is broken in two parts distally (Fig. 11A). According to the outline of
28
29 the less well-preserved ulnae of the paralectotypes (Figs. 3, 4), the distal epiphysis of the ulna
30
31 was slightly broader than the diaphysis and presumably articulated with both the intermedium
32
33 and ulnare. It also articulated with the neighboring pisiform, as in all amniotes (Romer, 1956)
34
35 but this articular surface is obscured in all specimens.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **Manus**

44
45 Elements of the manus are preserved in all specimens, although none of them are
46
47 complete. The carpal elements are best preserved in MNHN.F.MAP327a, where they are seen
48
49 in ventral view (Figs. 12, S2). This specimen will thus serve as the basis of the following
50
51 description.
52
53
54

55 Our re-examination of the carpus resulted in a novel interpretation of the individual
56
57 elements, which slightly differs from that of Carroll (1978:fig. 6) and Evans and Haubold
58
59 (1987:fig. 15A). The carpus of *Coelurosauravus* comprises 11 bones, which is the standard
60

1
2
3 number in early amniotes (Romer, 1956), and includes the radiale, intermedium, ulnare,
4
5 pisiform, two centralia and five distal carpals. Carpal elements are also present in the
6
7 paralectotypes but are mostly obscured and hard to identify (Figs. 3, 4). Some are also
8
9 completely disarticulated and unidentifiable on the lectotype (Figs. 1, 2).
10
11
12

13 None of the digits are preserved in the left manus, but preservation **permits**
14
15 examination of the metacarpals (Fig. 12). The digits of the right hand of the paralectotype is
16
17 slightly more complete (Figs. 3, 4). The digit that lies closest to the skull shows three
18
19 phalanges in connection, none of which being the ungual. This digit likely represents digit V
20
21 (see below). The manus has thus rotated relative to the forearm because this digit now lies
22
23 medial to the others.
24
25
26

27 **Radiale**—The radiale is a small, rounded bone lying in proximoventral view close to
28
29 the articular surface of the distal epiphysis of the radius (Fig. 12). The ventral surface of the
30
31 bone bears a deep recess with a circular outline. Owing to its size and position relative to the
32
33 other carpals, this bone likely articulated with the distomedial articular surface of the radius
34
35 and the intermedium proximally, the medial centrale laterally and distal carpal 1 distally. It
36
37 **may** have articulated with distal carpal 2 as well, although this cannot be ascertained because
38
39 both bones are partially obscured and the individual elements slightly displaced. In
40
41 araeoscelidians (Reisz, 1981) and early neodiapsids (Carroll, 1981; Currie, 1981a), the radiale
42
43 is excluded from an articulation with distal carpal 1 by the medial centrale.
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Intermedium**—We identify a small bone lying just distal to the ulna as the
50
51 intermedium, which is visible in proximoventral view (Fig. 12). Evans and Haubold (1987)
52
53 only described the ventral surface of this element, and Carroll (1978) identified this element
54
55 as the lateral centrale. According to its broad proximal surface, the bone likely articulated
56
57 with the distolateral articular facet of the radius and distomedial portion of the ulna
58
59 proximally. The long medial margin of the bone suggests that it articulated with the radiale
60

1
2
3 medially (see above). The lateral surface of the intermedium bears a low incisura, indicating
4
5 its contribution to the perforating foramen. As in most early amniotes, the intermedium likely
6
7 formed the median half of the perforating foramen and articulated with the medial margin of
8
9 the ulnare. However, we failed to identify a corresponding incisura on the ulnare (see below).
10
11
12 Based on its position and the size of the neighboring elements, the intermedium likely
13
14 articulated with both centralia distally. This conforms with the contacts reconstructed by
15
16 Evans and Haubold (1987).
17
18
19

20 **Ulnare**—As described by Carroll (1978) and Evans and Haubold (1987), the ulnare is
21
22 a rectangular element, which is visible in ventral view, lying slightly distal to the intermedium
23
24 and pisiform in MNHN.F.MAP327a (Fig. 12). The ventral surface of the bone is shallowly
25
26 concave and bears a low ridge near its center. Owing to its slight displacement and the lack of
27
28 an identifiable incisura for the perforating foramen, it is difficult to say whether or not the
29
30 ulnare has rotated. Therefore, the reconstruction of its contacts with the neighboring bones is
31
32 somewhat speculative. The shape of the carpal elements is compatible with the typical carpal
33
34 articulation in early amniotes (Romer, 1956), suggesting the ulnare may have contacted the
35
36 ulna, intermedium and pisiform proximally, the lateral centrale medially, and distal carpal 5
37
38 distally. Based on the size of the lateral centrale, it is possible that it articulated with distal
39
40 carpal 4 as well, although this cannot be ascertained. This configuration would conform with
41
42 the contacts proposed by Evans and Haubold (1987).
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Pisiform**—We follow Carroll (1978) and Evans and Haubold (1987) in their
49
50 identification of the pisiform in MNHN.F.MAP327a, which is visible in proximoventral view
51
52 (Fig. 12). This carpal lies distolateral to the ulna close to its anatomical position. Based on its
53
54 position relative to the neighboring elements, it articulated with the ulna proximally and the
55
56 ulnare medially, as is typical in early amniotes (Romer, 1956). A small sub-rectangular
57
58 structure lies proximal to the pisiform, lateral to the distal head of the ulna. It may correspond
59
60

1
2
3 to a broken-off portion of the pisiform, although this remains tentative because the pisiform
4
5 would then be unusually large compared to other amniotes (Romer, 1956).
6
7

8 **Medial Centrale**—The medial centrale is a small polygonal element visible in
9
10 distoventral view in MNHN.F.MAP327a (Fig. 12). It is keystone-shaped, with its distal
11
12 margin being wider than its proximal one. Based on its position and the articular surfaces on
13
14 the neighboring elements, the medial centrale likely articulated with the radiale, intermedium
15
16 and lateral centrale proximally, and distal carpals 1 and 2 distally. Whether or not it
17
18 articulated with distal carpal 3 cannot be ascertained because of the disarticulation of the
19
20 bones in MNHN.F.MAP327a. Contrary to Evans and Haubold (1987), we suggest no contact
21
22 between the medial centrale and distal carpal 4. Both *Hovasaurus* and *Thadeosaurus* have a
23
24 wide medial centrale that contacts distal carpal 4 (Carroll, 1981; Currie, 1981a).
25
26
27
28
29

30 **Lateral Centrale**—We follow Evans and Haubold (1987) in their identification of the
31
32 lateral centrale of MNHN.F.MAP327a (Fig. 12). This rectangular element is seen in ventral
33
34 aspect but is partially obscured by the ulnare and distal carpal 3. It is unclear whether or not
35
36 this element has rotated, making the reconstruction of its articulations difficult. As the shape
37
38 of the carpal elements is compatible with the typical carpal articulation in early amniotes (see
39
40 **ulnare** above), the lateral centrale may have articulated with the intermedium and ulnare
41
42 proximally, the medial centrale medially and distal carpal 4 distally.
43
44
45

46 **Distal Carpals**—All five distal carpals are preserved in MNHN.F.MAP327a (Fig. 12).
47
48 Our interpretation follows that of Carroll (1978). Distal carpal 1 is seen in ventral view. It is a
49
50 robust cylindrical bone that articulated with the radiale proximally, distal carpal 2 laterally
51
52 and metacarpal I distally (Fig. 12). Because of its slender distal terminus, a distal contact with
53
54 metacarpal II seems unlikely.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Following Carroll (1978), we consider a broad, mostly obscured element as distal
4 carpal 2 (Fig. 12) and not as fused distal carpals 2 and 3 as reported by Evans and Haubold
5 (1987). Distal carpal 2 articulated with the medial centrale proximally, distal carpals 1
6 medially, distal carpal 3 laterally and metacarpal II distally. Contacts with the radiale
7 proximomedially and metacarpal III distolaterally are equivocal because these elements are
8 slightly displaced and partially unpreserved. Distal carpal 2 was likely excluded from a
9 contact with metacarpal III by the large distal carpal 3.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 Evans and Haubold (1987) identified the large subcircular element lying lateral to
21 metacarpal III as distal carpal 4 because of its large size as is typical in most early amniotes
22 (Romer, 1956). However, we concur with Carroll (1978) in identifying this bone as distal
23 carpal 3 instead based on its close location to distal carpal 2 and metacarpal III (Fig. 12). The
24 size and robustness of distal carpal 3 conforms well with that of the less well-preserved carpus
25 of the *Weigeltisaurus* holotype (SMNK cast of SSWG 113/7, VB, pers. obs.). This bone likely
26 articulated with the lateral centrale proximally, distal carpals 2 medially, distal carpal 4
27 laterally and metacarpals III and IV distally. A contact between distal carpal 3 and the medial
28 centrale is equivocal because these two bones are only partially preserved.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Distal carpal 4 is a relatively small subtriangular element compared to distal carpal 3
42 (Fig. 12), at most as large as distal carpal 3. In contrast, distal carpal 4 is typically the largest
43 of the series in early amniotes (Romer, 1956). Based on the articular facets of the bone, distal
44 carpal 4 articulated with the ulnare proximally, the lateral centrale proximomedially, distal
45 carpals 3 medially, distal carpal 5 laterally, and metacarpal IV distally.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 Distal carpal 5 is sub-rectangular and the smallest of the series. Distal carpal 5 thus
54 articulated with the ulnare proximally, distal carpal 4 medially, and metacarpal V distally.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Metacarpals**—The proximal portions of the metacarpals are preserved in
4
5 MNHN.F.MAP327a, but the rest of the bones are not preserved in this specimen (Fig. 12).
6
7 The right manus of the paralectotypes is the most complete of any specimen, but its
8
9 metacarpal I is also partially preserved (Figs. 3, 4). Metacarpal III is the longest in the series,
10
11 as is the case in the *Weigeltisaurus* holotype and *Rautiania* (Evans and Haubold, 1987;
12
13 Bulanov and Sennikov, 2010). In contrast, the longest in the series is typically metacarpal IV
14
15 in early amniotes (Romer, 1956). Owing to the preservation of the paralectotypes and
16
17 MNHN.F.MAP327a, it remains unclear whether or not the metacarpals overlapped each other
18
19 proximally. Such an overlap is described for the *Weigeltisaurus* holotype (Evans and
20
21 Haubold, 1987).
22
23
24
25

26
27 As seen in MNHN.F.MAP327a, metacarpal I bears a slightly expanded proximal
28
29 extremity relative to the shaft, which bears a shallowly concave articular facet for distal carpal
30
31 1 (Fig. 12). Metacarpals II and III are visible mostly in ventrolateral view (Fig. 12). Their
32
33 proximal articular surfaces are slightly concave to accommodate the respective distal carpals.
34
35 Metacarpal III is more robust than the other metacarpals, as seen on MNHN.F.MAP317a, b
36
37 (Fig. 4). The head of metacarpal IV is 1.2 times wider than that of metacarpal I in
38
39 MNHN.F.MAP327a (Fig. 12). As for metacarpals II and III, metacarpal V is mostly visible in
40
41 ventrolateral view. It bears a prominent proximolateral process that frames the entire lateral
42
43 margin of distal carpal 5.
44
45
46
47

48 **Phalanges**—All *Coelurosauravus* specimens preserve portions of the phalangeal
49
50 series. The non-ungual phalanges are all long slender bones with slightly expanded
51
52 extremities (Figs. 1–4). Digit V of the right manus of the paralectotypes is the only reasonably
53
54 complete digit (Figs. 3, 4). It shows two phalanges in connection with the space for the
55
56 missing first phalanx between this series and metacarpal V. The most distal phalanx is the
57
58 longest, and identified as the penultimate by comparison with the long penultimate phalanx in
59
60

1
2
3 digit V of *Rautiania* (Bulanov and Sennikov, 2010). The ungual phalanx is missing,
4
5 indicating that digit V of *Coelurosauravus* comprised four phalanges as in other
6
7 weigeltisaurids (Evans and Haubold, 1987; Bulanov and Sennikov, 2010; Pritchard et al.,
8
9 2021). In contrast, all Permo–Carboniferous diapsids have three phalanges in digit V (Romer,
10
11 1956).

12
13
14
15 Ungual phalanges are preserved in the lectotype and MNHN.F.MAP327b. They are all
16
17 recurved and sharply pointed with the distal tip of the claw extending roughly to the level of
18
19 the strong flexor tubercle. These bones all bear lateral longitudinal carinae.

20 21 22 23 24 25 26 **Pelvic Girdle**

27
28
29 The right pelvis is well-preserved in lateral view in MNHN.F.MAP327a (Figs. 9A,
30
31 9B). It is partially obscured by the femoral head so that only portions of the ilium and pubis
32
33 are visible. The left puboischiatic plate is visible in medial view in the lectotype (Figs. 1, 2),
34
35 as suggested by Carroll (1978) based on its shape and position relative to the sacral region.
36
37 This plate is badly weathered with a triangular pubic portion pointing anteroventrally and a
38
39 trapezoidal ischiatic portion pointing posteriorly (Figs. 1, 2). An even more weathered
40
41 triangular structure expands dorsally from this puboischiatic plate, which might represent the
42
43 ilium. However, this identification remains tentative. The pelvis is missing in the
44
45 paralectotype (Figs. 3, 4).

46
47
48
49
50 Provided that our identification of the pelvic girdle of the lectotype is correct, the
51
52 putative puboischiatic plate shows no trace of a thyroid fenestra (Figs. 1, 2). This fenestra is
53
54 also absent in the puboischiadic plates of other weigeltisaurids (Evans, 1982).

55
56
57
58 **Ilium**—The outline of the ilium seems to be partially preserved on the lectotype,
59
60 although this identification remains tentative (see above; Figs. 1, 2). The bone is otherwise

1
2
3 preserved in lateral view in MNHN.F.MAP327a (Figs. 9A, 9B). It is a thin dorsoventrally
4
5 compressed bone. The pubic peduncle bears an anteroventrally oriented surface for the pubis
6
7 as indicated by the low groove separating both bones. Nothing can be said about the ischiatic
8
9 peduncle.
10
11

12
13 A robust, posterodorsally oriented supraacetabular buttress borders the acetabular
14
15 cavity (Figs. 9A, 9B). A similarly robust supraacetabular buttress is present in *Claudiosaurus*
16
17 and ‘younginiforms’ (Carroll, 1981; Currie, 1980, 1981a). This supraacetabular buttress is
18
19 most massive in its middle portion, immediately dorsal to the acetabulum. Anteriorly, it
20
21 merges into the pubic peduncle and is aligned with the preacetabular buttress of the pubis
22
23 (Figs. 9A, 9B). More posteriorly, the supraacetabular buttress forms the posteroventral margin
24
25 of the iliac blade and gradually decreases in transverse thickness, fading into the iliac blade
26
27 posterodorsally.
28
29
30
31

32 The iliac blade is triangular in lateral aspect, flaring dorsally and with roughly
33
34 symmetrical preacetabular and postacetabular processes, the latter being only slightly longer
35
36 (Figs. 9A, 9B). The antero- and posteroventral margins of the iliac blade thus diverge
37
38 anterodorsally and posterodorsally **whereas** its dorsal margin runs roughly horizontally. This
39
40 morphology is similar to other weigeltisaurids (Evans, 1982; Pritchard et al., 2021), but we
41
42 found no trace of the dorsal embayment reported by Pritchard et al. (2021) for the Ellrich
43
44 specimen. In contrast, the iliac blade of other stem-saurians is typically lanceolate in lateral
45
46 aspect and lacks a preacetabular process, as in *Hovasaurus* or *Thadeosaurus* (Carroll, 1981;
47
48 Currie, 1981a), or only bears a small preacetabular tuber as in *Acerosodontosaurus* (Currie,
49
50 1980). However, a similar but smaller preacetabular process is present in several
51
52 archosauromorphs (Nesbitt et al., 2015; Pritchard and Sues, 2019). Provided our interpretation
53
54 of the pelvic girdle of the lectotype is correct, the postacetabular process did not extend
55
56 posterior to the ischium in *Coelurosauravus* (Figs. 1, 2). This would contrast with the
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 situation in other stem-saurians, where the postacetabular process of the iliac blade extends
4 beyond the posterior margin of the ischium (Currie, 1980, 1981a; Carroll, 1981). Fine
5 striations radiate dorsally across the lateral surface of the iliac blade in MNHN.F.MAP327a
6 (Figs. 9A, 9B). They presumably mark the attachment area of the thigh musculature (Romer,
7 1922).

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15 **Pubis**—Little of the pubis is visible in MNHN.F.MAP327a (Figs. 9A, 9B). As
16 described by Carroll (1978), the most conspicuous part of the bone is the prominent,
17 anteroventrally oriented pubic tubercle, which ends with a concavity presumably housing the
18 iliopubic ligament (Romer, 1922). A robust ridge extends from the preacetabular buttress of
19 the pubis to this concavity. Anteriorly, the preacetabular buttress delimits a broad posteriorly
20 facing surface for the contribution of the pubis to the acetabulum. In *Acerosodontosaurus*,
21 *Hovasaurus* and *Thadeosaurus* the pubis barely contributes to the acetabulum, and none of
22 these taxa have a preacetabular buttress (Currie, 1980, 1981a; Carroll, 1981). Lastly, the
23 anterodorsal margin of the pubis of MNHN.F.MAP327a lacks the short flange present in
24 ‘younginiforms’ (Currie, 1980, 1981a; Carroll, 1981).

25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39 **Ischium**—Provided our interpretation of the pelvic girdle of the lectotype is correct,
40 the ischium is preserved in medial view (Figs. 1, 2). The bone is short and trapezoidal in
41 lateral aspect, being slightly anteroposteriorly longer than the ischium. The medial surface of
42 the ischium is shallowly concave.

43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 **Hindlimb**

52
53
54 The lectotype preserves elements of both hindlimbs, with both femora lying
55 perpendicular to the long axis of the body and the knees bent in a way that the forelegs and
56 pes extend posteromedially along the vertebral column of the tail of the animal (Figs. 1, 2).

1
2
3 The left hindlimb underlies the broken-off trunk of the animal and is mostly obscured, but the
4
5 right one is almost complete. Despite being weathered, the individual bones remain mostly in
6
7 anatomical position. Elements of the hindlimbs in MNHN.F.MAP327a are more poorly
8
9 preserved. They extend posteriorly from the pelvic region and are oriented posteroventrally
10
11 with respect to the tail (Figs. 5, 6). There is no trace of the hindlimbs in the paralectotypes
12
13 (Figs. 3, 4).
14
15

16
17 As for the forelimb, we follow the terminology of Romer (1922) for the description.
18
19 For the sake of clarity, the femora are described as if oriented perpendicular to the sagittal
20
21 plane, with the foreleg bent ventrally roughly at a right angle. This is consistent with previous
22
23 descriptions of weigeltisaurids including *Coelurosauravus* (Carroll, 1978; Evans and
24
25 Haubold, 1987).
26
27

28
29 **Femur**—The right femur is subcomplete and visible in anteroventral view on the
30
31 lectotype (Fig. 13). The left one is also preserved in anteroventral view, but only its distal
32
33 epiphysis is exposed (Figs. 1, 2). Both femora are also partially preserved in
34
35 MNHN.F.MAP327a but overlie each other (Figs. 5, 6). The diaphysis of the left femur is seen
36
37 between the broken-off epiphyses of the right one.
38
39

40
41 As is best visible in the lectotype, the femur is a long and slender bone, being slightly
42
43 longer than the humerus (Figs. 1, 2, 13). It consists of a cylindrical diaphysis with epiphyses
44
45 that are about twice as wide as the shaft. In anterior view, the bone shows a slight sigmoidal
46
47 curvature (Fig. 13) as is typical for early diapsids (Benton, 1985).
48
49

50
51 The proximal epiphysis is diagenetically compressed in the lectotype (Fig. 13). The
52
53 femoral head is rounded in anteroventral view. As described by Carroll (1978), the low
54
55 internal trochanter is visible distoventral to the femoral head, framing a mostly obscured
56
57 intertrochanteric fossa. It does not extend proximally to the level of the proximal articulation,
58
59
60

1
2
3 as in the Ellrich specimen (Pritchard et al., 2021). Nothing can be said about the poorly
4 preserved proximal surface of the right femur of MNHN.F.MAP327a (Figs. 9A, 9B).
5
6
7

8 The diaphysis is best preserved in the lectotype (Fig. 13). It is cylindrical and shows a
9 slightly larger diameter than the humeral shaft (Figs. 1, 2). There is no trace of a fourth
10 trochanter or an adductor crest which are typically present in early reptiles (Holmes, 2003), or
11 of the thin linea aspera described for araeoscelidians (Vaughn, 1955; Reisz, 1981).
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 The distal epiphysis is visible in anteroventral view in the lectotype (Fig. 13A). Based
19 on the position of the hindlimb relative to the pelvis and our identification of the shallow
20 intercondylar fossa, it is also visible in posterodorsal view in MNHN.F.MAP327a (Fig. 13B).
21 The tibial condyle is preserved on both sides of the lectotype. It is rounded in outline and
22 forms a low anteroventral crest slightly offset from the bone (Fig. 13). Dorsal to this crest, the
23 tibial condyle bears a low, triangular tibial fossa on its posterior surface. The slightly concave
24 popliteal area is partially visible in the lectotype (Fig. 13). The fibular condyle is mostly
25 obscured by tarsal elements in MNHN.F.MAP327a, but its outline suggests that it is rounded
26 (Fig. 13B). What is visible in this specimen suggests that the tibial and fibular condyles
27 extended posteriorly to the same level. This is typical for early neodiapsids (Carroll, 1975,
28 1981; Gow, 1975; Currie, 1980, 1981a). In contrast, in early amniotes, including
29 araeoscelidians, the fibular condyle extends distal to the tibial one (Reisz, 1981; Holmes,
30 2003). Pritchard et al. (2021), described the latter morphology in the more poorly preserved
31 Ellrich specimen, contrasting with the femur of *Coelurosauravus*.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 As is seen in MNHN.F.MAP327a, the posterior and dorsal surfaces of the distal
52 epiphyses bear short longitudinal striations, which likely mark the insertions areas of the
53 flexor and extensor musculature respectively.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Tibia**—The tibia is exquisitely preserved in lateral view on the right side of
4
5 MNHN.F.MAP327a (Fig. 13B). Both tibiae are also preserved in connection with the femur
6
7 in the lectotype, where they are visible in medial view (Figs. 1, 2, 13). The tibia is a long and
8
9 slender bone with a slender distal epiphysis but a highly expanded proximal one reaching up
10
11 to three times the width of the shaft. As is best seen in the lectotype, the bone is slightly
12
13 curved, with a shallowly concave posterior margin and a convex anterior one.
14
15

16
17 As is best seen in MNHN.F.MAP327a, the proximal epiphysis rapidly expands from
18
19 the diaphysis (Fig. 13B). It bears a prominent cnemial crest anteriorly, which is separated
20
21 from the proximal epiphysis by a deep cnemial trough (sensu Pawley and Warren, 2006). The
22
23 anteroproximal portion of the cnemial crest is obscured by tarsal elements, so it is impossible
24
25 to say whether or not a cnemial tuber was present (Fig. 13B). A prominent cnemial crest is
26
27 typically present in early reptiles (Holmes, 2003), including araeoscelidians (Vaughn, 1955;
28
29 Reisz, 1981), but this structure is generally considered absent in early neodiapsids (Ford and
30
31 Benson, 2020: character 282), although it **was** also described in some early saurians (e.g.,
32
33 Nesbitt et al., 2015).
34
35

36
37 As is seen in MNHN.F.MAP327a, a low ridge runs along the anterior surface of the
38
39 bone as a continuation of the cnemial crest (Fig. 13B). The diaphysis thus appears
40
41 mediolaterally compressed. Most of the lateral surface of the bone bears short pits and scars,
42
43 suggesting the insertion area of the extensor musculature of the tarsus. These scars extend
44
45 distally to the base of the distal epiphysis (Fig. 13B).
46
47

48
49 The distal epiphysis is poorly preserved in both specimens. As is seen in the lectotype,
50
51 it is only barely expanded relative to the diaphysis and rounded in medial view (Figs. 1, 2,
52
53 14). It articulates distally with the astragalus, but the distal surface of the bone is missing. It is
54
55 thus unclear whether or not it showed a “stepped” outline, as described for the Ellrich
56
57 specimen (Pritchard et al., 2021:44).
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Fibula**—The right fibula is visible in medial view in the lectotype. It is poorly
4 preserved, with a mostly collapsed medial surface (Figs. 1, 2). Only the distal portion of the
5 right fibula is seen in MNHN.F.MAP327a, lying among the tarsal elements (Fig. 13B).
6
7

8
9
10 As is visible in the lectotype, the distal anterior margin of the bone is weakly concave
11 (Figs. 1, 2). However, because the proximal epiphysis of the bone is obscured, it remains
12 unclear whether or not the bone was arcuate as in early reptiles (Holmes, 2003) or sigmoidal
13 as in early neodiapsids (Carroll, 1981; Currie, 1981a). Little can be said about the medial
14 surface of the diaphysis because it is compacted. The distal epiphysis is slightly expanded
15 with respect to the diaphysis and accommodates the adjacent astragalus and calcaneus (Figs.
16 1, 2, 14).
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **Pes**

31
32
33 The right pes is completely preserved in the lectotype and is visible in ventral view,
34 including the proximal portions of several digits (Figs. 14, S3). Disarticulated tarsals,
35 metatarsals and phalanges are also preserved in MNHN.F.MAP327a, although the individual
36 bones are impossible to distinguish (Fig. 13B). Carroll (1978:fig. 2) and Evans and Haubold
37 (1987:fig. 17A) proposed various interpretations of the tarsus of the lectotype, but both
38 illustrated a proximolateral expansion of the astragalus. Careful examination of the cast and
39 original specimen indeed shows a polygonal structure proximolateral to the astragalus (Fig.
40 14), but it is located too far from the latter to be a part of it. It remains unclear if this element
41 is a portion of the calcaneus or just a concretion.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 **Astragalus**—The astragalus of the lectotype lies distal to the tibia. It has slightly
55 rotated from its anatomical orientation, and is now visible in lateral view (Fig. 14). The
56 overall shape of the bone and its articular surface for the tibia thus remain unknown. In lateral
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 view, the bone shows a gradual increase in thickness, with its distal margin being twice as
4
5 thick as its proximal one. The bone bears a short proximolaterally oriented articular facet for
6
7 the fibula (Fig. 14).
8
9

10 The entire lateral surface of the astragalus served as an articular surface for the
11
12 calcaneus (Fig. 14). However, this surface is interrupted near its mid-height by an incisura
13
14 forming the medial wall of the foramen for the perforating artery. This foramen forms a
15
16 ventrodistally running groove separating the calcaneal articulation into proximal and distal
17
18 facets that are subequal in height. This morphology is typical in early neodiapsids (Brinkman,
19
20 1979; Carroll, 1981; Currie, 1981a). In contrast, the proximal facet is roughly twice as wide as
21
22 the distal one in araeoscelidians (Vaughn, 1955; Reisz, 1981). The proximal calcaneal facet is
23
24 slightly convex whereas the distal one is concave and oriented distolaterally, corresponding to
25
26 the respective facets of the calcaneus (Fig. 14).
27
28
29
30
31

32 Because the astragalus of the lectotype is only visible in lateral view, its distal
33
34 articulations with the other bones are hard to reconstruct. However, based on the very slight
35
36 displacement of the bones and the morphology of distal tarsal 4 (see below), the astragalus of
37
38 *Coelurosauravus* likely articulated with the navicular and distal tarsals 2 and 4 distally.
39
40
41

42 **Calcaneus**—The calcaneus is the least well-preserved tarsal, visible in ventral view in
43
44 the lectotype (Fig. 14). Its ventral surface seems slightly concave, but this may be due to
45
46 slight diagenetic compression. As stated above, the proximal extent of the bone is unclear due
47
48 to a small, indeterminate structure just distal to the fibula that may be a fragment of the
49
50 calcaneus.
51
52
53

54 The medial margin of the bone bears a shallow incisura, forming the lateral margin of
55
56 the perforating foramen (Fig. 14). As for the astragalus, this foramen divides the astragalar
57
58 contact in proximal and distal portions. Whereas the proximal extent of the bone remains
59
60

1
2
3 uncertain, the distal articular facet is slightly proximomedially oriented, which conforms well
4
5 with the corresponding facet on the astragalus. The distal margin of the bone is transversely
6
7 short relative to the preserved lateral extent of the bone. It articulated with distal carpals 4 and
8
9 5 along its entire length.
10
11

12
13 As is seen in ventral view, the calcaneus shows its greatest thickness at its medial
14
15 margin, which is also indicated by the calcaneal facets of the astragalus (Fig. 14). The bone
16
17 then gradually tapers laterally. Carroll (1978:fig. 2) recognized a large lateral expansion,
18
19 which was not identified by Evans and Haubold (1987:fig. 17A). Although the lateral extent
20
21 of the bone is unpreserved, it certainly extended beyond the level of its distal margin (Fig.
22
23 14).
24
25

26
27 **Navicular**—The navicular (following Piñeiro et al., 2016, the ‘centrale’ or ‘lateral
28
29 centrale’ of other authors) lies distal to the medial portion of the astragalus in the lectotype
30
31 (Fig. 14). It is an almost quadratic bone in ventral view. Owing to its shape, the bone bears
32
33 subequal articular facets for the astragalus proximally, distal tarsal 2 laterally, and distal tarsal
34
35 1 distally. It thus overhangs distal tarsal 1 and is excluded from distal tarsal 3 by the contact
36
37 between the astragalus and distal tarsal 2.
38
39

40
41 A bone of similar shape and position was identified as distal tarsal 1 in the
42
43 *Weigeltisaurus* holotype by Evans and Haubold (1987:fig. 11). We suggest that this element
44
45 corresponds to the navicular, with distal tarsal 1 missing (SMNK cast of SSWG 113/7, VB,
46
47 pers. obs.). We interpret the element identified as the navicular by Evans and Haubold
48
49 (1987:fig.11) as the distal calcaneal articular surface of the astragalus, which is here visible in
50
51 medial view. This conforms well with the morphology of the astragalus of *Coelurosauravus*,
52
53 which is preserved in a similar view (see above).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Distal Tarsals**—All five distal tarsals are visible in ventral view in the lectotype (Fig.
4 14). Each one shows a strongly concave dorsal surface, although this may be due to diagenetic
5 compression.
6
7

8
9
10 Distal tarsal 1 lies between the navicular and metatarsal II in the lectotype (Fig. 14). It
11 is a proximodistally compressed bone, at least twice as wide as it is long. It is the widest of all
12 distal tarsals. The bone articulated with metatarsal I, but it is unclear whether or not it also
13 articulated with metatarsal II because the latter bone is missing.
14
15

16
17 Distal tarsal 2 is the transversely thinnest in the series (Fig. 14). It is rectangular in
18 dorsal aspect and its distal portion is obscured by distal tarsal 3. As described above, it
19 articulated with the astragalus proximally, thereby excluding distal tarsal 3 from the navicular.
20 Owing to its width, distal tarsal 2 articulated with metatarsal II only.
21
22

23
24 Distal tarsal 3 is teardrop-shaped, with its tapered end pointing proximally (Fig. 14). It
25 is overhung proximally by distal tarsal 4, which excludes the bone from the astragalus. Owing
26 to the shape of the proximal surface of metatarsal IV, it appears that distal tarsal 3 articulated
27 with both metacarpals III and IV.
28
29

30
31 Distal tarsal 4 is the proximodistally longest in the series (Fig. 14). It is very slender,
32 being roughly twice as long as it is wide. The bone bears a strong proximomedial process that
33 overhangs distal tarsal 3 and articulates with the astragalus. Lateral to the astragalar contact,
34 the proximal margin of the bone articulates with the calcaneus. The lateral margin of the bone
35 is slightly convex and provides the articulation for distal tarsal 5.
36
37

38
39 Distal tarsal 5 is the smallest of the series (Fig. 14). It is subtriangular in dorsal aspect,
40 points proximomedially and has a short proximal contact with the calcaneus.
41
42

43
44 Owing to our interpretation of the navicular of the *Weigeltisaurus* holotype, the tarsals
45 of *Coelurosauravus* and *Weigeltisaurus* conform well with one another.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Metatarsals**—The metatarsal series is partially preserved in the lectotype (Fig. 14).

4
5 As identified by Evans and Haubold (1987), the digits are slightly jumbled so that metatarsals
6
7 I, IV and V are visible, while metatarsal II is missing and metatarsal III is partially visible
8
9 between metatarsals I and IV. All preserved metatarsals have long and slender shafts with
10
11 slightly expanded proximal and distal articular extremities.
12
13
14

15 Metatarsal I has an almost flat proximal articular surface for distal tarsal 1. Its distal
16
17 terminus has a quadrangular extremity, framed proximally by a pair of contralateral ridges.
18
19 Metatarsal IV is only slightly longer than metatarsal I. As described above, its wide proximal
20
21 extremity likely articulated with distal tarsals 3 and 4. The distal end of the bone is convex in
22
23 ventral view, lacking the quadrangular extremity and contralateral ridges of metatarsal I.
24
25 Metatarsal V is subequal in length to metatarsal I, but its overall morphology is more similar
26
27 to that of metatarsal IV. It is not hooked, in contrast to most saurian reptiles (Lee, 1997) and
28
29 lacks the outer (poterolateral) process that is present in other early neodiapsids (Robinson,
30
31 1975; Brinkman, 1979; Borsuk-Bialynicka, 2018). The fifth metatarsal of the lectotype also
32
33 bears a proximolateral tubercle, just distal to its proximal articulation.
34
35
36
37
38

39 **Phalanges**—The digits are only partially preserved in the lectotype, but preservation
40
41 allows for a minimal count of the phalanges of each digit (Fig. 14). Elements of all digits are
42
43 preserved. These include both phalanges of digit I, the second of which being the unguis, at
44
45 least two of digit II, one of digit III, and two of digits IV and V respectively (Fig. 14). Several
46
47 disarticulated phalanges are also visible in MNHN.F.MAP327a, although none can be
48
49 assigned to a given digit (Fig. 13B).
50
51
52

53 The non-unguis phalanges of the pes are roughly identical in shape to those of the
54
55 manus, consisting of slender shafts with slightly expanded extremities (Fig. 14). A
56
57 disarticulated distal digit comprising four bones including the unguis suggests that the
58
59 penultimate phalanx was substantially longer than the antepenultimate.
60

DISCUSSION

A reappraisal of the phylogenetic position of weigeltisaurids is currently under study by the authors, and is **outside** the scope of **this** paper. However, the detailed re-description of the postcranial skeleton of *Coelurosauravus elivensis* provided here allows for a discussion of the anatomy, functional morphology and paleoecology of these enigmatic gliding reptiles.

Skeletal Reconstruction

The material available for *Coelurosauravus* allows for an almost complete reconstruction of the skeleton of this reptile (Fig. 15). We focus here on the postcranial skeleton of *Coelurosauravus*, as the skull reconstruction has already been provided by Buffa et al. (2021). The mandible, poorly preserved in all *Coelurosauravus* specimens, is reconstructed following the proportions of that of the *Weigeltisaurus* holotype (Bulanov and Sennikov, 2015b).

The reconstruction of the presacral vertebral column is based on the complete series preserved in the paralectotypes (Figs. 3, 4, 8), **whereas** the outline of the trunk is based on the partial Eppleton specimen, which is preserved mostly in dorsal view (TWCMS B5937, VB, pers. obs.; Evans, 1982). The latter specimen was also used by Pritchard et al. (2021) for their reconstruction of the Ellrich specimen. The rest of the vertebral column is mostly based on MNHN.F.MAP327a, although the tail of this specimen is incomplete and includes only the first 29 vertebrae (Figs. 5–7). Given a vertebral count of 50 to 70 among early amniotes (Romer, 1956), the tail of *Coelurosauravus* **was** much longer than what is preserved. The

1
2
3 girdles and limbs are reconstructed based on all known specimens. The manual and pedal
4 digits, which are fragmentary in all *Coelurosauravus* specimens, are reconstructed based on
5 the complete series of the Ellrich specimen (Pritchard et al., 2021). Several patagials are
6 incompletely preserved in MNHN.F.MAP327a. Their extent was reconstructed by following
7 the outline of the wing reconstructed from the few complete elements (Fig. 15).
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15 Carroll (1978) provided the first and only skeletal reconstruction of *Coelurosauravus*
16 *elivensis* to date. However, this reconstruction assumes that the wing was supported by the
17 trunk ribs as in the extant agamid *Draco* and the Late Triassic kuehneosaurids. For a long
18 time, this was a commonly accepted interpretation (Evans, 1982; Evans and Haubold, 1987,
19 but see Schaumberg, 1976, 1986). All of the more recent reconstructions are based on the
20 German material, particularly the Ellrich specimen (Frey et al., 1997; Schaumberg et al.,
21 2007; Pritchard et al., 2021), and do not reflect the anatomy of *Coelurosauravus* from
22 Madagascar. We thus provide a revised reconstruction of this taxon in dorsal view, as well as
23 the first skeletal reconstruction of a weigeltisaurid in lateral view (Fig. 15).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 According to our reconstruction, *Coelurosauravus* is a gracile reptile of ca. 180 mm in
37 snout-vent length, and at least 320 mm in total length including the preserved portion of the
38 tail (Fig. 15). Based on the length of the longest patagials (Table 3) and the width of the trunk
39 preserved at this level in the Eppelton specimen (TWCMS B5937, VB, pers. obs.), this animal
40 had a wingspan of ca. 350 mm (Fig. 15). These values differ slightly from those provided by
41 Evans (1982), but this probably reflects differences in the reconstruction and interpretation of
42 the patagials. *Coelurosauravus* had a dorsoventrally compressed body. Both limbs are long
43 and slender, with large autopodia. Based on our reconstruction, the forelimb is ca. 80 mm in
44 length, with the manus being ca. 33 mm long. The hindlimb is slightly longer, measuring ca.
45 90 mm with a 40 mm long pes.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Our reconstruction broadly conforms to that of Pritchard et al. (2021) for the Ellrich
4 specimen **but with** some significant differences, such as in the proportions of the skull, neck
5 and trunk, or the arrangement of the patagials. **B**ased on direct observation of those
6 specimens, we interpret these differences as interspecific differences between
7 *Coelurosauravus elivensis* and *Weigeltisaurus jaekeli* (or at least the Ellrich specimen) rather
8 than differences in interpretation.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 **Remarks on the Homology of Patagials**

21
22
23 As summarized by Pritchard et al. (2021), early workers interpreted the patagials as
24 true ribs, and consequently reconstructed the wing as derived from the dorsal half of the trunk
25 (Carroll, 1978; Evans, 1982). The interpretation of the patagials as dermal ossification by
26 Schaumburg (1976, 1986) and Frey et al. (1997) invalidated these reconstructions although
27 the anchoring of the patagials, and consequently of the wing skeleton, to the rest of the body
28 remained unknown. Based mostly on the Ellrich specimen, Pritchard et al. (2021) recently
29 suggested that the base of the patagials was closely associated with the gastral basket, and
30 thus emerged from the ventral half of the flanks. Our observations of MNHN.F.MAP327a
31 confirm this interpretation and indicate a possible articulation between each patagial and the
32 lateral-most element of each transverse gastral row (Figs. 10, 15).
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 The exact nature of the patagial ossifications, however, remains unclear. Based on
48 previous works, it may be proposed that the patagials are: (1) neomorph ossifications with no
49 known homologue; (2) intramembranous ossification from the laterally expanded myosepta of
50 the trunk wall musculature; (3) lateral gastralialia. We concur with Pritchard et al.'s (2021)
51 assessment that these structures may be homologues of lateral gastralialia. This interpretation
52 indeed conforms best with the putative articulation between patagials and gastralialia described
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 above because similar articulations are present between adjacent gastralia in other reptiles
4
5 (Claessens, 2004). Further studies are needed to confirm this hypothesis.
6
7
8
9

10 11 **Paleoecology of Weigeltisaurids** 12

13
14 Weigeltisaurids have long been considered as arboreal and gliding reptiles (Carroll,
15 1978; Evans, 1982; Evans and Haubold, 1987; Frey et al., 1997; Schaumberg et al., 2007;
16 17 Bulanov and Sennikov, 2010; Buffa et al., 2021; Pritchard et al., 2021), an interpretation
18 followed here. Yet, the exquisite preservation of the *Coelurosauravus* material re-described
19 20 above provides an opportunity to further discuss the functional morphology of the postcranial
21 22 skeleton and lifestyle of these enigmatic animals.
23
24
25
26
27

28
29 Inferring the function of a given structure in the fossil record and reconstructing the
30 paleoecology of extinct organisms is notoriously difficult (e.g. Gould, 1974; Benton, 2010;
31 32 Padian and Horner, 2011; Hone and Faulkes, 2014). This is particularly true for
33 34 weigeltisaurids in light of the scarcity of specimens and their phylogenetical distance to recent
35 36 analogues (Buffa et al., 2021). As a result, the interpretations discussed here must remain
37 38 speculative.
39
40
41
42

43 **Arboreality**—Weigelt (1930) and Huene (1930) first identified the arboreal lifestyle
44 of weigeltisaurids by analogy with extant chamaeleonids mainly based on cranial similarities.
45 46 The patagial skeleton was only recognized in later studies. As all extant gliding tetrapods are
47 48 exclusively arboreal (Dudley et al., 2007; Socha et al., 2015), every study since then has
49 50 accepted an obligatory arboreal life style of weigeltisaurids. However, they hardly consider
51 52 the presence of non-patagial features, which are indicative of arboreality. Only Bulanov and
53 54 Sennikov (2010) discuss the forelimb of *Rautiania* in the context of climbing. This is
55 56 particularly surprising, as the patagium of weigeltisaurids would severely hinder terrestrial
57 58
59
60

1
2
3 locomotion (Bulanov and Sennikov, 2010), making weigeltisaurids some of the earliest
4 known amniotes with an obligatory arboreal lifestyle, and among the first ones to be described
5 from the Paleozoic in the literature.
6
7
8
9

10 For quadrupedal animals, locomotion in an arboreal habitat is subject to various
11 challenges that include (1) moving up and down on inclined, vertical or overhanging surfaces,
12 (2) bridging distances between branches, and (3) moving in a three-dimensional environment
13 on substrates of variable width and compliance (Cartmill, 1974, 1985).
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 (1) Moving on inclined or vertical and often narrow and irregular surfaces requires
21 generating traction to counteract the weight of the animal and prevent pitching in order to
22 minimize the risk of falling (Cartmill, 1974, 1985). Traction is generated at the contact points
23 or surfaces between animal and substrate. In medium- to large-sized quadrupeds (> 100 mm),
24 traction is generated by interlocking the claws into the surface irregularities of the substrate
25 (clinging), or by encircling the substrate with supporting appendages or the entire body
26 (grasping; Cartmill, 1974, 1985; Hildebrand and Goslow, 2001; Fröbisch and Reisz, 2009). A
27 third mechanism (adhesion), implies the generation of capillary or van der Waals forces
28 though adhesive surfaces (Cartmill, 1985; Labonte et al., 2016). This mechanism is common
29 in small-sized animals (< 100 mm; Fröbisch and Reisz, 2009), and is represented in larger
30 animals by gekkotans (up to 200 g; Russell et al., 2019). In the latter, the presence of large
31 adhesive surfaces implies prominent specializations of the autopodia such as the dorsal
32 flexion of the penultimate phalanges, eventual reduction of other phalanges including unguals,
33 and presence of paraphalanges (summarized in Russell and Bauer, 2008). As there is no
34 evidence for such specializations in the large-sized weigeltisaurids (> 250 g, Evans, 1982), it
35 seems unlikely that these reptiles clung to trees through adhesion.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 As identified by Fröbisch and Reisz (2009), claw-based clinging is characterized by an
59 elongation of the penultimate phalanges, whereas autopodial grasping is characterized by an
60

1
2
3 elongation of the proximal ones. All known weigeltisaurid autopodia show conspicuous
4 elongation of the penultimate phalanges (Figs. 3, 4, 14; Evans, 1982; Evans and Haubold,
5 1987; Bulanov and Sennikov, 2010; Pritchard et al., 2021), suggesting that as arboreal
6 quadrupeds, weigeltisaurids likely used clinging to generate traction (Fig. 16). This is strongly
7 supported by the sharp, laterally compressed and strongly recurved unguis phalanges of
8 weigeltisaurids (Bulanov and Sennikov, 2010; Pritchard et al., 2021), which have long been
9 considered typical of clinging arboreal taxa (Arnold, 1998; Zani, 2000; Tulli et al., 2009;
10 D'Amore et al., 2018). Such claws are commonly used to infer an arboreal lifestyle in extinct
11 and extant taxa (Feduccia, 1993; Spielmann et al., 2005, 2006; Fröbisch and Reisz, 2009;
12 Birn-Jeffrey et al., 2012; Simões et al., 2015, 2017; Jenkins et al., 2020).

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 Among clinging arboreal quadrupeds, pitching during arboreal locomotion is avoided
28 by keeping the body, and thus the center of gravity, close to the substrate (Cartmill, 1974,
29 1985; Higham and Jayne, 2004; Lammers and Zurcher, 2011; Schmidt and Fischer, 2011).
30 These taxa thus typically show a dorsoventrally compressed body. Such a flat body outline is
31 seen in many extant and extinct arboreal squamates (e.g. Arnold, 1998; Simões et al., 2017)
32 such as the gliding agamid *Draco* (Hoffstetter and Gasc, 1969) and the putative arboreal
33 varanopid *Ascendonanus* from the Middle Permian of Germany (Spindler et al., 2018). The
34 dorsoventrally compressed body of *Coelurosauravus* (Fig. 15) could allow for a locomotion
35 on inclined surfaces and is thus suggestive of an arboreal lifestyle (Fig. 16).

36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48 Extant arboreal limbed squamates, further counterbalance pitching through active
49 stiffening of the trunk (Grinham and Norman, 2020). These taxa typically exhibit an elongate
50 preacetabular process of the ilium compared to closely related terrestrial forms (e.g. Tinius et
51 al., 2018). This process serves as the origin of the *M. quadratus lumborum* (Russell and
52 Bauer, 2008), a dorsoflexor muscle that stiffens the posterior part of the trunk and thus
53 provides bracing against gravitational forces during arboreal or bipedal locomotion (Borsuk-

1
2
3 Bialynicka, 2008; Grinham and Norman, 2020; Paparella et al., 2020). Provided
4
5 weigeltisaurids had a similar muscular arrangement, their prominent preacetabular process
6
7 suggests a similar active pitching control during arboreal locomotion.
8
9

10 **In addition**, arboreal quadrupeds typically use their forelimbs to generate traction
11 during locomotion (Arnold, 1998). In **such** taxa, the **forelimbs approximate** the hindlimbs in
12 length. This is seen in various squamates (Arnold, 1998), including extinct taxa (Evans and
13 Barbadillo, 1998; Simões et al., 2015, 2017), and the Permian varanopid *Ascendonanus*
14 (Spindler et al., 2018). This morphology would provide more symmetrical attachment points
15 anterior and posterior to the center of gravity, which would further help in keeping the body
16 of the animal close to the substrate (Arnold, 1998; Alexander, 2013), and would increase
17 reach to bridge gaps. In weigeltisaurids, the forelimb is ca. 90% the length of the hindlimb,
18 which is consistent with those taxa that use the forelimbs significantly during arboreal
19 locomotion (Fig. 16).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Lastly, most of the propulsion is generated during the retraction phase of the hindlimb
35 in quadrupedal climbers (Zaaf et al., 1999; Anzai et al., 2014). These taxa thus typically show
36 a larger area of origin for the hindlimb retractor muscles than for the protractor muscles
37 (Tinius et al., 2018). In contrast, the large preacetabular process of the ilium in weigeltisaurids
38 could have served as a broad origin area for the hindlimb protractors, suggesting a faster and
39 more powerful protraction during locomotion (Hutchinson, 2001; Russell and Bauer, 2008).
40 As noted by Tinius et al. (2018), an increase in hindlimb protractor origin area could be linked
41 to frequent controlled arboreal head-down descent in extant squamates, suggesting a similar
42 behavior for weigeltisaurids. However, given that gliding is a rather energetically cheap
43 locomotion (e.g. Socha et al., 2015), it may have been cheaper than frequent arboreal descent.
44 It is thus likely that the protractor muscles were involved during other movements, possibly
45 allowing for a faster arboreal ascent, or were also active during gliding (see below).
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (2) In an arboreal habitat, the substrate is discontinuous (Cartmill, 1985). To
4
5 compensate such discontinuities, extant arboreal tetrapods show a variety of gap-crossing
6
7 behaviors such as swinging (exclusively in graspers), jumping, gliding or flying (Cartmill,
8
9 1974, 1985; Graham and Socha, 2020). Evidently, the patagia of weigeltisaurids would have
10
11 allowed them to cross large gaps by gliding similar to extant arboreal gliders (Graham and
12
13 Socha, 2020). As argued by Pritchard et al. (2021), the patagia of weigeltisaurids are inserted
14
15 more ventrally than in *Draco* and are thus likely attached below the center of gravity of the
16
17 animal (Fig. 15). This low-wing configuration would offer maneuverability but less stability
18
19 (Frey et al., 2003). However, the large wingspan of weigeltisaurids could have allowed for a
20
21 dihedral position of the patagia, which would have stabilized flight and thus effectively
22
23 counterbalanced this trade-off (Frey et al., 2003). Such a wing conformation would have
24
25 provided both a stable long-distance flight combined with optional maneuverability when
26
27 necessary.
28
29
30
31
32

33
34 Lastly, the tail has been identified as a key component of locomotion in arboreal
35
36 habitats (Gillis and Higham, 2016). Indeed, numerous extant arboreal quadrupeds, namely
37
38 reptiles, use their tail for balance while climbing (Jusufi et al., 2008; Fleming and Bateman,
39
40 2012), turning or crossing gaps (Higham et al., 2001; Larson and Stern, 2006), jumping
41
42 (Gillis et al., 2009; Kuo et al., 2012; Libby et al., 2012) or falling (Jusufi et al., 2008, 2010,
43
44 2011). In the case of *Draco*, tail stiffness is muscularly controlled and serves to direct the
45
46 gliding course (John, 1971; Clark et al., 2021). The tail of weigeltisaurids is long and slender
47
48 **with** short neural and haemal spines (Fig. 9; Evans, 1982). As argued for coelurosaurian
49
50 dinosaurs, which show a similar morphology of the tail skeleton, this may indicate a reduction
51
52 of the caudofemoral musculature and suggest a decoupling of the tail and hindlimb. **This**
53
54 **decoupling would** allow the tail to act as a stabilizer (Persons and Currie, 2012; Persons et al.,
55
56 2013; Pittman et al., 2013).
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (3) There is little to no evidence to support a discussion regarding the diameter and
4 compliance of the substrates favored by weigeltisaurids, or to assess the density of foliage or
5 branches in the late Permian forest ecosystems where these reptiles lived. Most extant
6 arboreal squamates have slender bodies enabling them to walk on narrow substrates and move
7 around obstructions (Arnold, 1998). While the dorsoventrally compressed body of
8 weigeltisaurids seems consistent with such environments, one must account for the patagia of
9 these animals. Their large span, especially compared to *Draco*, would physically have
10 hindered locomotion with lateral body undulations, even when folded back (Fig. 16).
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 **Gliding**—The gliding locomotion of weigeltisaurids has long been consensual
23 (Schaumberg, 1976, 1986; Carroll, 1978; Evans, 1982; Evans and Haubold, 1987; Frey et al.,
24 1997), and is not challenged here. However, little is known on the gliding performance of
25 these animals. McGuire and Dudley (2011) suggested that weigeltisaurids were too big to be
26 efficient gliders by comparison with the extant agamid *Draco*. However, the patagia of
27 weigeltisaurids is unique in terms of shape and high aspect ratio (Fig. 15; Evans, 1982), low-
28 wing configuration with the option for a dihedral configuration during flight (Fig. 15;
29 Pritchard et al., 2021), and supporting structures (Schaumberg, 1976, 1986; Frey et al., 1997;
30 Schaumberg et al., 2007; Pritchard et al., 2021). All of these factors may have increased the
31 gliding capacity of weigeltisaurids although this cannot be ascertained without studying the
32 aerodynamic performance of these animals.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 At present, it is unclear how the wing of weigeltisaurids was extended during flight.
49 Schaumberg et al. (2007), based on their reconstruction of the patagium very close to the
50 forelimb, suggested a tendinous connection between the scapula and anterior-most patagial.
51 According to that interpretation, the wing could be extended by a sharp protraction of the
52 forelimb and could be further stabilized by filling the lungs with air to inflate the ribcage
53 (Schaumberg et al., 2007). While there is no basis to discuss the benefits of inspiration during
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 gliding in the available material, it is apparent that the anterior margin of the patagium is
4
5 positioned at a distance to the forelimb in MNHN.F.MAP327a, likely due to the presence of a
6
7 cartilaginous sternum (Figs. 5, 6). Such a gap would have been difficult to bridge by a tendon
8
9 while maintaining an efficient angle of attack. Furthermore, extension of the patagia through
10
11 protraction of the forelimb is unlikely because it would cause accidental openings of the
12
13 patagia during limb-based locomotion.
14
15

16
17 In *Draco*, the patagia are first extended by the contraction of the iliocostal and
18
19 intercostal musculature (Colbert, 1967; John, 1970; Russell and Dijkstra, 2001) and can be
20
21 further expanded by **interlocking the claws in the scales on the anterior dorsal surface** of the
22
23 patagia (Dehling, 2017). This is permitted by the long arms of this squamate and by a
24
25 postaxial abduction of the manus. As indicated by Dehling (2017), such an abduction appears
26
27 possible in weigeltisaurids as well, as shown by the position of the right manus of the Ellrich
28
29 specimen (Pritchard et al., 2021). Furthermore, as exemplified by *Coelurosauravus* (Fig. 15),
30
31 the forelimb could likely extend across the proximal half of the leading edge of the wing.
32
33 Provided our reconstruction of the digits is correct, they could **reach the level of the fifth**
34
35 patagial, which incidentally corresponds to the first patagial without distal curvature (Fig. 15).
36
37 In *Draco*, the aspect ratio of the patagia is much lower than in weigeltisaurids. Thus, the
38
39 forelimb spans the entire leading edge, and grasps the almost straight first rib, forming the
40
41 transverse leading edge of the wing. Based on the similarities between *Draco* and
42
43 *Coelurosauravus*, we suggest that weigeltisaurids **were** able to grasp, extend, hold, and to a
44
45 certain degree manipulate the patagia during gliding flight, even if they could not reach the
46
47 distal end of the leading edge (**Fig. 16**).
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 Interestingly, weigeltisaurids have an additional phalanx in manual digit V, as reported
56
57 in *Rautiania*, *Weigeltisaurus* (Bulanov and Sennikov, 2010; Pritchard et al., 2021), and now
58
59 in *Coelurosauravus* (Figs. 3, 4, 15). Their manual phalangeal formula is thus 2/3/4/5/4 instead
60

1
2
3 of the plesiomorphic 2/3/4/5/3 formula of amniotes (Romer, 1956). This is surprising in light
4
5 of the extreme rarity of such occurrences of hyperphalangy in terrestrial amniotes (Greer,
6
7 1992; Russell and Bauer, 2008). Similar cases of hyperphalangy have been reported in a few
8
9 gekkotan genera (Russell and Bauer, 1990, 2008), and a similar morphology can be attained
10
11 in anurans by the addition of an intercalary bone between the penultimate and ungual
12
13 phalanges (Greene, 1981; Paukstis and Brown, 1990; Manzano et al., 2007). However, in both
14
15 cases, such hyperphalangy evolved in the context of an increase in adhesive surface, which is
16
17 unlikely to have been the case in weigeltisaurids because of their larger size (see above).
18
19
20
21

22
23 However, the digit morphology of weigeltisaurids follows the pattern known in extant
24
25 tetrapods in adding a phalanx to digit V, the lateral-most digit (Greer, 1992; Fedak and Hall,
26
27 2004). This additional phalanx would increase the reach of the hand significantly in
28
29 weigeltisaurids (Greer, 1992), which Bulanov and Sennikov (2010) interpreted as an
30
31 adaptation to arboreal lifestyle that would have a negative effect on terrestrial locomotion.
32
33

34
35 We further suggest that the increase in reach by the lateral-most manual digit could
36
37 facilitate the grasping of the leading edge of the wing and thus could have helped in
38
39 controlling the expansion, tension, orientation and camber of the large patagia of
40
41 weigeltisaurids. According to this interpretation, weigeltisaurids would represent the first
42
43 known tetrapods to have evolved hyperphalangy in the context of aerial locomotion (Fedak
44
45 and Hall, 2004).
46
47
48

49
50 The hindlimbs are involved during gliding in most extant gliding reptiles. They are
51
52 often abducted, positioned at or slightly below the coronal plane of the animal, and bent at the
53
54 knees so that the forelegs are oriented posteromedially (Emerson and Koehl, 1990; McGuire,
55
56 2003; Dehling, 2017). This posture has been proposed to increase stability (Emerson and
57
58 Koehl, 1990). A similar behavior has been inferred for extinct paravians, which may have
59
60 employed a biplane gliding apparatus (Longrich, 2006; Catterjee and Tremplin, 2007, but see

1
2
3 Padian and Dial, 2005; Dececchi and Larsson, 2011). As seen in MNHN.F.MAP327a,
4
5 weigeltisaurids appear to have been capable of an extensive hind limb abduction (Figs. 5, 6).
6
7 This is further supported by the triangular iliac blade of these animals, which would have
8
9 provided a large origin area for the iliofemoral abductor muscle (Hutchinson, 2001; Russell
10
11 and Bauer, 2008). The hind limbs of the *Coelurosauravus* lectotype also show a bended
12
13 posture similar to that employed by extant gliders (Figs. 1, 2; Emerson and Koehl, 1990).
14
15 Weigeltisaurids thus likely employed a gliding posture similar to that of the extant agamid
16
17 *Draco* (Fig. 16).
18
19
20
21

22
23 Lastly, evidence from in situ forests suggests that late Pennsylvanian forests, while
24
25 taxonomically and vertically heterogenous, had rather open canopy strata with spatially
26
27 separated arborescent taxa resulting in little crown overlap (reviewed in DiMichele and
28
29 Falcon-Lang, 2011, but see Opluštil et al., 2009, 2014). In contrast, Cisularian forests show
30
31 evidence of denser communities, suggestive of more continuous canopy strata (Gulbranson et
32
33 al., 2012; Wang et al., 2012; Luthardt et al., 2016), although less dense forests also occurred
34
35 (Gulbranson et al., 2012; Opluštil et al., 2021). It could thus be argued that selective pressure
36
37 for an aerial locomotion in a continuous canopy was minimal prior to the Cisularian, but this
38
39 assumption requires further paleoecological studies, especially with respect to canopy density
40
41 and continuity. However, such change in forest structure could explain why no gliders have
42
43 been reported prior to weigeltisaurids although several arboreal or scansorial amniotes have
44
45 been described from Pennsylvanian and Cisularian deposits (Spindler et al., 2018; Mann et al.
46
47 2021).
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 CONCLUSION

57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The detailed re-description of the postcranial skeleton of all known specimens of
4
5 *Coelurosauravus elivensis* reveals hitherto unknown anatomical details. *C. elivensis* has a
6
7 shorter neck and longer trunk than the weigeltisaurids from Western Europe (at least the
8
9 Ellrich specimen). The re-examination of the osteology of these specimens yields new
10
11 information for future phylogenetic and biomechanical analyses of weigeltisaurids.
12
13 Weigeltisaurids have long been considered as arboreal, mostly in relation to their assumed
14
15 gliding capacities, but this has only barely been discussed with respect to the non-patagial
16
17 postcranium. However, the long, gracile and dorsoventrally compressed body of
18
19 weigeltisaurids, as well as their almost equally long fore- and hindlimbs with elongate
20
21 autopodia strongly support a clinging arboreal lifestyle for these animals.
22
23
24
25

26
27 Additionally, we describe a fourth phalanx in the fifth manual digit of *C. elivensis*,
28
29 making it the third weigeltisaurid taxon showing this apomorphy. This supernumerary
30
31 phalanx has previously been interpreted as feature to increase reach during tree climbing. We
32
33 further suggest that the longer reach of digit V of the weigeltisaurid manus aligned with an
34
35 apparent abduction ability, would have allowed these animals to grasp the leading edge of
36
37 their patagia at the midpoint of their leading edges. The extant agamid *Draco*, which controls
38
39 the expansion, orientation and camber of its wing in part through such a grasp, supports this
40
41 assumption. The likely derivation of the patagial spars from the gastralia basket resulting in an
42
43 attachment of the patagium below the center of gravity would have increased the
44
45 maneuverability by destabilizing the flight. Stable flight could have been brought about by the
46
47 dihedral angling of the patagia with the help of the arms. Thus, we suggest that
48
49 weigeltisaurids were both the first known gliding tetrapods with an adjustable flight apparatus
50
51 and among the first with an anatomically supported obligatory arboreal lifestyle. Furthermore,
52
53 weigeltisaurid appear to represent the only known animals to have evolved hyperphalangy in
54
55 the context of both climbing and gliding.
56
57
58
59
60

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank N.-E. Jalil (MNNH) for access to the MNHN specimens and constructive discussions on weigeltisaurids and Permo–Triassic amniotes. Many thanks to C. Letenneur (MNHN) for her life reconstruction of *Coelurosauravus*. Thanks also to D. M. Henderson (TMP) for his help in the examination of *Wapitisaurus*. We thank O. Béthoux (MNHN) for his help in RTI methodology and loaning the necessary hardware to V.B., and P. Loubry (CNRS) and D. Germain (MNHN) for their help in photography. We also thank J. Falconnet (MNHN), A. Pritchard (VMNH) and H.-D. Sues (NMNH) for constructive discussions on weigeltisaurids and Permo–Triassic reptiles. Finally, we thank X. Jenkins and an anonymous reviewer for their constructing reviews of the manuscript, and G. Bever and L. Leuzinger for their editorial work. This work is supported by the French Ministry of Superior Education and Research (annual credits of the CR2P and Ph.D. grant to V.B.).

DATA AVAILABILITY

The data underlying this article are available in Zenodo, at <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6078599>.

LITERATURE CITED

- Alexander, R. M. 2013. Principles of Animal Locomotion. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 384 pp.
- Anzai, W., A. Omura, A. C. Diaz, M. Kawata, and H. Endo. 2014. Functional morphology and comparative anatomy of appendicular musculature in Cuban Anolis lizards with different locomotor habits. *Zoological Science* 31:454–463.
- Arnold, E. N. 1998. Structural niche, limb morphology and locomotion in lacertid lizards (Squamata, Lacertidae); a preliminary survey. *Bulletin of the Natural History Museum (Zoology Series)* 64:63–89.
- Benton, M. J. 1985. Classification and phylogeny of the diapsid reptiles. *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* 84:97–164.
- Benton, M. J. 2010. Studying function and behavior in the fossil record. *PLoS Biology* 8:e1000321.
- Béthoux, O., A. Llamosi, and S. Toussaint. 2016. Reinvestigation of *Protelytron permianum* (Insecta; Early Permian; USA) as an example for applying reflectance transformation imaging to insect imprint fossils. *Fossil Record* 20:1–7.
- Birn-Jeffery, A. V., C. E. Miller, D. Naish, E. J. Rayfield, and D. W. E. Hone. 2012. Pedal claw curvature in birds, lizards and Mesozoic dinosaurs – complicated categories and compensating for mass-specific and phylogenetic control. *PLoS ONE* 7:e50555.
- Borsuk-Białynicka, M. 2018. Diversity of diapsid fifth metatarsals from the Lower Triassic karst deposits of Czatkowice, southern Poland—functional and phylogenetic implications. *Acta Palaeontologica Polonica* 63.
- Boule, M. 1910. Sur le Permien de Madagascar. *Bulletin de la Société Géologique de France* 10:314–316.

- 1
2
3 Brinkman, D. 1979. The structural and functional evolution of the diapsid tarsus. Ph.D.
4
5 dissertation, McGill University, Montreal, 328 pp.
6
7
8 Brinkman, D. 1988. A weigeltisaurid reptile from the Lower Triassic of British Columbia.
9
10 Palaeontology 31:951–956.
11
12 Buffa, V., E. Frey, J.-S. Steyer, and M. Laurin. 2021. A new cranial reconstruction of
13
14 *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Diapsida, Weigeltisauridae) and its implications
15
16 on the paleoecology of the first gliding vertebrates. Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology
17
18 0:e1930020.
19
20
21 Bulanov, V. V., and A. G. Sennikov. 2006. The first gliding reptiles from the Upper Permian of
22
23 Russia. Paleontological Journal 40:S567–S570.
24
25
26 Bulanov, V. V., and A. G. Sennikov. 2010. New data on the morphology of Permian gliding
27
28 weigeltisaurid reptiles of Eastern Europe. Paleontological Journal 44:682–694.
29
30
31 Bulanov, V. V., and A. G. Sennikov. 2015a. New data on the morphology of the Late Permian
32
33 gliding reptile *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau. Paleontological Journal 49:413–423.
34
35
36 Bulanov, V. V., and A. G. Sennikov. 2015b. *Glaurung schneideri* gen. et sp. nov., a new
37
38 weigeltisaurid (Reptilia) from the Kupferschiefer (Upper Permian) of Germany.
39
40 Paleontological Journal 49:1353–1364.
41
42
43 Bulanov, V. V., and A. G. Sennikov. 2015c. Substantiation of validity of the Late Permian genus
44
45 *Weigeltisaurus* Kuhn, 1939 (Reptilia, Weigeltisauridae). Paleontological Journal 49:1101–
46
47 1111.
48
49
50 Caldwell, M. W. 1995. Developmental constraints and limb evolution in Permian and extant
51
52 lepidosauromorph diapsids. Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology 14:459–471.
53
54
55 Campione, N. E., and R. R. Reisz. 2011. Morphology and evolutionary significance of the atlas-
56
57 axis complex in varanopid synspsids. Acta Palaeontologica Polonica 56:739–748.
58
59
60 Carroll, R. L. 1975. Permo–Triassic “lizards” from the Karroo. Paleontologia Africana 18:71–87.

- 1
2
3 Carroll, R. L. 1977. The origin of lizards; pp. 359–396 in S. M. Andrews, R. S. Miles, and A. D.
4 Walker (eds.), Problems in Vertebrate Evolution. Academic Press, London.
5
6
7 Carroll, R. L. 1978. Permo–Triassic “lizards” from the Karoo System. Part II. A gliding reptile
8 from the Upper Permian of Madagascar. *Paleontologia Africana* 21:143–159.
9
10
11 Carroll, R. L. 1981. Plesiosaur ancestors from the Upper Permian of Madagascar. *Philosophical*
12 *Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences* 293:315–383.
13
14
15 Cartmill, M. 1974. Pads and claws in arboreal locomotion. *Primate Locomotion* 1:43–83.
16
17
18 Cartmill, M. 1985. Climbing; pp. 73–88 in M. Hildebrand, D. M. Bramble, K. F. Liem, and D. B.
19 Wake (eds.), *Functional Vertebrate Morphology*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MS.
20
21
22 Castiello, M., S. Renesto, and S. C. Bennett. 2016. The role of the forelimb in prey capture in the
23 Late Triassic reptile *Megalancosaurus* (Diapsida, Drepanosauromorpha). *Historical Biology*
24 28:1090–1100.
25
26
27
28
29
30 Chatterjee, S., and R. J. Templin. 2007. Biplane wing planform and flight performance of the
31 feathered dinosaur *Microraptor gui*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*
32 104:1576–1580.
33
34
35
36
37 Claessens, L. P. A. M. 2004. Dinosaur gastralia; origin, morphology, and function. *Journal of*
38 *Vertebrate Paleontology* 24:89–106.
39
40
41 Claessens, L. P. A. M., P. M. O’Connor, and D. M. Unwin. 2009. Respiratory evolution facilitated
42 the origin of pterosaur flight and aerial gigantism. *PLoS ONE* 4:e4497.
43
44
45
46 Clark, J., C. Clark, and T. E. Higham. 2021. Tail control enhances gliding in arboreal lizards: an
47 integrative study using a 3D geometric model and numerical simulation. *Integrative and*
48 *Comparative Biology* 61:579–588.
49
50
51
52
53 Colbert, E. H. 1967. Adaptations for gliding in the lizard *Draco*. *American Museum Novitates*
54 2283:1–20.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Colbert, E. H. 1970. The Triassic gliding reptile *Icarosaurus*. Bulletin of the American Museum of
4
5 Natural History 143:87–142.
6
7
8 Conrad, J. L. 2008. Phylogeny and systematics of Squamata (Reptilia) based on morphology.
9
10 Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History 310:1–182.
11
12 Cui, Y., S. Toussaint, and O. Béthoux. 2018. The systematic position of the stonefly †*culonga*
13
14 Sinitshenkova, 2011 (Plecoptera: Leuctrida) reassessed using Reflectance Transforming
15
16 Imaging and cladistic analysis. Arthropod Systematics & Phylogeny 72:173–178.
17
18
19 Currie, P. J. 1980. A new younginid (Reptilia: Eosuchia) from the Upper Permian of Madagascar.
20
21 Canadian Journal of Earth Sciences 17:500–511.
22
23
24 Currie, P. J. 1981a. *Hovasaurus boulei*, an aquatic eosuchian from the Upper Permian of
25
26 Madagascar. Paleontologia Africana 24:99–168.
27
28
29 Currie, P. J. 1981b. The vertebrae of *Youngina* (Reptilia: Eosuchia). Canadian Journal of Earth
30
31 Sciences 18:815–818.
32
33
34 Currie, P. J., and R. L. Carroll. 1984. Ontogenetic changes in the eosuchian reptile *Thadeosaurus*.
35
36 Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology 4:68–84.
37
38
39 D'Amore, D. C., S. Clulow, J. S. Doody, D. Rhind, and C. R. McHenry. 2018. Claw
40
41 morphometrics in monitor lizards: variable substrate and habitat use correlate to shape
42
43 diversity within a predator guild. Ecology and Evolution 8:6766–6778.
44
45 **deBraga, M. 2003. The postcranial skeleton, phylogenetic position, and probable lifestyle of the**
46
47 **Early Triassic reptile *Procolophon trigoniceps*. Canadian Journal of Earth Sciences 40:527–**
48
49 **556.**
50
51
52 deBraga, M., and O. Rieppel. 1997. Reptile phylogeny and the interrelationships of turtles.
53
54 Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society 120:281–354.
55
56 **Dececchi, T. A., and H. C. E. Larsson. 2011. Assessing arboreal adaptations of bird antecedents:**
57
58 **testing the ecological setting of the origin of the avian flight stroke. PLoS ONE 6:e22292.**
59
60

- 1
2
3 Dehling, J. M. 2017. How lizards fly: a novel type of wing in animals. PLoS ONE 12:e0189573.
4
5 Dilkes, D. W. 1998. The early Triassic rhynchosaur *Mesosuchus browni* and the interrelationships
6
7 of basal archosauromorph reptiles. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of
8
9 London. Series B, Biological Sciences 353:501–541.
10
11
12 DiMichele, W. A., and H. J. Falcon-Lang. 2011. Pennsylvanian ‘fossil forests’ in growth position
13
14 (T0 assemblages): origin, taphonomic bias and palaeoecological insights. Journal of the
15
16 Geological Society 168:585–605.
17
18
19 Dudley, R., G. Byrnes, S. P. Yanoviak, B. Borrell, R. M. Brown, and J. A. McGuire. 2007. Gliding
20
21 and the functional origins of flight: biomechanical novelty or necessity? Annual Review of
22
23 Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics 38:179–201.
24
25
26 Emerson, S. B., and M. a. R. Koehl. 1990. The interaction of behavioral and morphological change
27
28 in the evolution of a novel locomotor type: “flying” frogs. Evolution 44:1931–1946.
29
30
31 Evans, S. E. 1982. The gliding reptiles of the Upper Permian. Zoological Journal of the Linnean
32
33 Society 76:97–123.
34
35
36 Evans, S. E., and H. Haubold. 1987. A review of the Upper Permian genera *Coelurosauravus*,
37
38 *Weigeltisaurus* and *Gracilisaurus* (Reptilia: Diapsida). Zoological Journal of the Linnean
39
40 Society 90:275–303.
41
42
43 Evans, S. E., and L. J. Barbadillo. 1998. An unusual lizard (Reptilia: Squamata) from the Early
44
45 Cretaceous of Las Hoyas, Spain. Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society 124:235–265.
46
47
48 Ezcurra, M. D., T. M. Scheyer, and R. J. Butler. 2014. The origin and early evolution of Sauria:
49
50 reassessing the Permian saurian fossil record and the timing of the crocodile-lizard
51
52 divergence. PLoS ONE 9:e89165.
53
54
55 Fedak, T. J., and B. K. Hall. 2004. Perspectives on hyperphalangy: patterns and processes. Journal
56
57 of Anatomy 204:151–163.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Feduccia, A. 1993. Evidence from claw geometry indicating arboreal habits of *Archaeopteryx*.
4
5 Science 259:790–793.
6
7
8 Fleming, P. A., and P. W. Bateman. 2012. Autotomy, tail regeneration and jumping ability in Cape
9
10 dwarf geckos (*Lygodactylus capensis*) (Gekkonidae). African Zoology 47:55–59.
11
12 Ford, D. P., and R. B. J. Benson. 2020. The phylogeny of early amniotes and the affinities of
13
14 Parareptilia and Varanopidae. Nature Ecology & Evolution 4:57–65.
15
16
17 Frey, E., H.-D. Sues, and W. Munk. 1997. Gliding mechanism in the Late Permian reptile
18
19 *Coelurosauravus*. Science 275:1450–1452.
20
21
22 Frey, E., M.-C. Buchy, and D. M. Martill. 2003. Middle- and bottom-decker Cretaceous
23
24 pterosaurs: unique designs in active flying vertebrates. Geological Society Special
25
26 Publications 217:267–274.
27
28
29 Fröbisch, J., and R. R. Reisz. 2009. The Late Permian herbivore *Suminia* and the early evolution of
30
31 arboreality in terrestrial vertebrate ecosystems. Proceedings of the Royal Society B:
32
33 Biological Sciences 276:3611–3618.
34
35
36 Gauthier, J. A., M. Kearney, J. A. Maisano, O. Rieppel, and A. D. Behlke. 2012. Assembling the
37
38 squamate Tree of Life: perspectives from the phenotype and the fossil record. Bulletin of the
39
40 Peabody Museum of Natural History 53:3–308.
41
42
43 Gillis, G., and T. E. Higham. 2016. Consequences of lost endings: caudal autotomy as a lens for
44
45 focusing attention on tail function during locomotion. Journal of Experimental Biology
46
47 219:2416–2422.
48
49
50 Gillis, G. B., L. A. Bonvini, and D. J. Irschick. 2009. Losing stability: tail loss and jumping in the
51
52 arboreal lizard *Anolis carolinensis*. Journal of Experimental Biology 212:604–609.
53
54
55 Gottmann-Quesada, A., and P. M. Sander. 2009. A redescription of the early archosauromorph
56
57 *Protorosaurus speneri* Meyer, 1832, and its phylogenetic relationships. Palaeontographica
58
59 Abteilung A 287:123–220.
60

- 1
2
3 Gould, S. J. 1974. The origin and function of “bizarre” structures: antler size and skull size in the
4
5 “Irish Elk,” *Megaloceros giganteus*. *Evolution* 28:191–220.
6
7
8 **Gow, C. E. 1972. The osteology and relationships of the Millerettidae (Reptilia: Cotylosauria).**
9
10 ***Journal of Zoology* 167:219–264.**
11
12 Gow, C. E. 1975. The morphology and relationships of *Youngina capensis* Broom and *Prolacerta*
13
14 *broomi* Parrington. *Paleontologia Africana* 89–131.
15
16
17 Graham, M., and J. J. Socha. 2020. Going the distance: the biomechanics of gap-crossing
18
19 behaviors. *Journal of Experimental Zoology Part A: Ecological and Integrative Physiology*
20
21 333:60–73.
22
23
24 Green, D. M. 1981. Adhesion and the toe-pads of treefrogs. *Copeia* 1981:790–796.
25
26 Greer, A. E. 1992. Hyperphalangy in squamates: insight on the reacquisition of primitive character
27
28 states in limb-reduced lineages. *Journal of Herpetology* 26:327–329.
29
30
31 Griffin, C. T., M. R. Stocker, C. Colleary, C. M. Stefanic, E. J. Lessner, M. Riegler, K. Formoso,
32
33 K. Koeller, and S. J. Nesbitt. 2021. Assessing ontogenetic maturity in extinct saurian reptiles.
34
35 *Biological Reviews* 96:470–525.
36
37
38 Griffiths, E. F., D. P. Ford, R. B. J. Benson, and S. E. Evans. 2021. New information on the
39
40 Jurassic lepidosauromorph *Marmoretta oxoniensis*. *Papers in Palaeontology* 7:2255–2278.
41
42 **Grinham, L. R., and D. B. Norman. 2020. The pelvis as an anatomical indicator for facultative**
43
44 **bipedality and substrate use in lepidosaurs. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society***
45
46 **129:398–413.**
47
48
49 **Gulbranson, E. L., J. L. Isbell, E. L. Taylor, P. E. Ryberg, T. N. Taylor, and P. P. Flaig. 2012.**
50
51 **Permian polar forests: deciduousness and environmental variation. *Geobiology* 10:479–495.**
52
53
54 Günther, A. 1867. Contribution to the anatomy of *Hatteria* (*Rhynchocephalus*, Owen).
55
56 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London* 157:595–629.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Hammer, Ø., S. Bengtson, T. Malzbender, and D. Gelb. 2002. Imaging fossils using reflectance
4
5 transforation and interactive manipulation of virtual light sources. *Palaeontologia Electronica*
6
7 5:1–9.
8
9
- 10 Hankel, O. 1994. Early Permian to Middle Jurassic rifting and sedimentation in East Africa and
11
12 Madagascar. *Geologische Rundschau* 83:703–710.
13
- 14 Higham, T. E., and B. C. Jayne. 2004. Locomotion of lizards on inclines and perches: hindlimb
15
16 kinematics of an arboreal specialist and a terrestrial generalist. *Journal of Experimental*
17
18 *Biology* 207:233–248.
19
- 20 Higham, T. E., M. S. Davenport, and B. C. Jayne. 2001. Maneuvering in an arboreal habitat: the
21
22 effects of turning angle on the locomotion of three sympatric ecomorphs of *Anolis* lizards.
23
24 *Journal of Experimental Biology* 204:4141–4155.
25
- 26 Hildebrand, M., and G. E. Goslow. 2001. *Analysis of Vertebrate Structure*, 5th ed. John Wiley &
27
28 Sons, New York, NY, 656 pp.
29
- 30 Hoffstetter, R., and J.-P. Gasc. 1969. Vertebrae and ribs of modern reptiles; pp. 201–310 in C.
31
32 Gans, A. d'A. Bellairs, and T. S. Parsons (eds.), *Biology of the Reptilia*. Volume 1.
33
34 *Morphology A*. Academic Press, New York, NY.
35
36
- 37 Holmes, R. 1977. The osteology and musculature of the pectoral limb of small captorhinids.
38
39 *Journal of Morphology* 152:101–140.
40
41
- 42 Holmes, R. B. 2003. The hind limb of *Captorhinus aguti* and the step cycle of basal amniotes.
43
44 *Canadian Journal of Earth Sciences* 40:515–526.
45
46
- 47 Hone, D. W. E., and C. G. Faulkes. 2014. A proposed framework for establishing and evaluating
48
49 hypotheses about the behaviour of extinct organisms. *Journal of Zoology* 292:260–267.
50
51
- 52 Howes, G. B., and H. H. Swinerton. 1901. On the development of the skeleton of the tuatara,
53
54 *Sphenodon punctatus*; with remarks on the egg, on the hatching, and on the hatched young.
55
56 *Transactions of the Zoological Society of London* 16:1–84.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Huene, F. R. von. 1930. *Palaeochameleo* und *Coelurosauravus*. **Centralblatt für Geologie und**
4
5 **Paläontologie** (B) 440–441.
6
7 Huene, F. R. von. 1956. Paläontologie und Phylogenie der Niederen Tetrapoden. **VEB Gustav**
8
9 **Fischer Verlag**, Jena, 716 pp.
10
11
12 Hutchinson, J. R. 2001. The evolution of pelvic osteology and soft tissues on the line to extant
13
14 birds (Neornithes). **Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society** 131:123–168.
15
16
17 Jenkins, X. A., A. C. Pritchard, A. D. Marsh, B. T. Kligman, C. A. Sidor, and K. E. Reed. 2020.
18
19 Using manual ungual morphology to predict substrate use in the Drepanosauromorpha and the
20
21 description of a new species. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 40:e1810058.
22
23
24 John, K. O. 1970. On the ‘patagial musculature’ of the South Indian flying lizard *Draco dussumieri*
25
26 Dum and Bib. *British Journal of Herpetology* 4:161–168.
27
28
29 John, K. O. 1971. Caudal musculature of the South Indian flying lizard *Draco dussumieri* Dum.
30
31 and Bib. *Acta Zoologica* 52:249–255.
32
33
34 Jusufi, A., D. I. Goldman, S. Revzen, and R. J. Full. 2008. Active tails enhance arboreal acrobatics
35
36 in geckos. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 105:4215–4219.
37
38
39 Jusufi, A., D. T. Kawano, T. Libby, and R. J. Full. 2010. Righting and turning in mid-air using
40
41 appendage inertia: reptile tails, analytical models and bio-inspired robots. *Bioinspiration &*
42
43 *Biomimetics* 5:045001.
44
45
46 Jusufi, A., Y. Zeng, R. J. Full, and R. Dudley. 2011. Aerial righting reflexes in flightless animals.
47
48 *Integrative and Comparative Biology* 51:937–943.
49
50
51 Kuhn, O. 1939. Schädelbau und systematische Stellung von *Weigeltisaurus*. *Paläontologische*
52
53 *Zeitschrift* 21:163–167.
54
55
56 Kuo, C.-Y., G. B. Gillis, and D. J. Irschick. 2012. Take this broken tail and learn to jump: the
57
58 ability to recover from reduced in-air stability in tailless green anole lizards [*Anolis*
59
60

1
2
3 *carolinensis* (Squamata: Dactyloidae)]. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* 107:583–
4
5 592.
6

7 Labonte, D., C. J. Clemente, A. Dittrich, C.-Y. Kuo, A. J. Crosby, D. J. Irschick, and W. Federle.
8
9 2016. Extreme positive allometry of animal adhesive pads and the size limits of adhesion-
10
11 based climbing. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 113:1297–1302.
12

13
14 Lammers, A., and U. Zurcher. 2011. Stability During Arboreal Locomotion; pp. 319–334 in V.
15
16 Klika (ed.), *Theoretical Biomechanics*. IntechOpen Limited, London.
17

18
19 Larson, S. G., and J. T. Stern. 2006. Maintenance of above-branch balance during primate arboreal
20
21 quadrupedalism: Coordinated use of forearm rotators and tail motion. *American Journal of*
22
23 *Physical Anthropology* 129:71–81.
24

25
26 Laurin, M. 1991. The osteology of a Lower Permian eosuchian from Texas and a review of diapsid
27
28 phylogeny. *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* 101:59–95.
29

30
31 Libby, T., T. Y. Moore, E. Chang-Siu, D. Li, D. J. Cohen, A. Jusufi, and R. J. Full. 2012. Tail-
32
33 assisted pitch control in lizards, robots and dinosaurs. *Nature* 481:181–184.
34

35 Longrich, N. 2006. Structure and function of hindlimb feathers in *Archaeopteryx lithographica*.
36
37 *Paleobiology* 32:417–431.
38

39
40 Lucas, S. G. 2017. Permian tetrapod biochronology, correlation and evolutionary events.
41
42 Geological Society, London, Special Publications 450:405–444.
43

44 Luthardt, L., R. Rößler, and J. W. Schneider. 2016. Palaeoclimatic and site-specific conditions in
45
46 the early Permian fossil forest of Chemnitz—sedimentological, geochemical and
47
48 palaeobotanical evidence. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* 441:627–652.
49

50
51 Mann, A., T. W. Dudgeon, A. C. Henrici, D. S. Berman, and S. E. Pierce. 2021. Digit and ungual
52
53 morphology suggest adaptations for scansoriality in the Late Carboniferous eureptile
54
55 *Anthracodromeus longipes*. *Frontiers in Earth Science* 9:675337.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Manzano, A. S., M. Fabrezi, and M. Vences. 2007. Intercalary elements, treefrogs, and the early
4 differentiation of a complex system in the Neobatrachia. *The Anatomical Record* 290:1551–
5 1567.
6
7
8
9
10 McGuire, J. A. 2003. Allometric prediction of locomotor performance: an example from Southeast
11 Asian flying lizards. *The American Naturalist* 161:337–349.
12
13
14 McGuire, J. A., and R. Dudley. 2011. The Biology of Gliding in Flying Lizards (Genus *Draco*)
15 and their Fossil and Extant Analogs. *Integrative and Comparative Biology* 51:983–990.
16
17
18 Merck, J. 2003. An arboreal radiation of non-saurian diapsids. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology*
19 23:78A.
20
21
22
23 Miedema, F., S. N. F. Spiekman, V. Fernandez, J. W. F. Reumer, and T. M. Scheyer. 2020. Cranial
24 morphology of the tanystropheid *Macrocnemus bassanii* unveiled using synchrotron
25 microtomography. *Scientific Reports* 10:12412.
26
27
28
29 Müller, J. 2004. The relationships among diapsid reptiles and the influence of taxon selection; pp.
30 379–408 in M. V. H. Arratia and R. Cloutier (eds.), *Recent Advances in the Origin and Early*
31 *Radiation of Vertebrates*. Dr. Friedrich Pfeil, München.
32
33
34
35 Müller, J., T. M. Scheyer, J. J. Head, P. M. Barrett, I. Werneburg, P. G. P. Ericson, D. Pol, and M.
36 R. Sánchez-Villagra. 2010. Homeotic effects, somitogenesis and the evolution of vertebral
37 numbers in recent and fossil amniotes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*
38 107:2118–2123.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46 Nesbitt, S. J. 2011. The early evolution of archosaurs: relationships and the origin of major clades.
47 *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History* 352:1–292.
48
49
50
51 Nesbitt, S. J., J. J. Flynn, A. C. Pritchard, J. M. Parrish, L. Ranivoharimanana, and A. R. Wyss.
52 2015. Postcranial osteology of *Azendohsaurus madagaskarensis* (?Middle to Upper Triassic,
53 Isalo Group, Madagascar) and its systematic position among stem archosaur reptiles. *Bulletin*
54 *of the American Museum of Natural History* 398:1–126.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Nosotti, S. 2007. *Tanystropheus Longobardicus* (Reptilia, Protorosauria): re-interpretations of the
4 anatomy based on new specimens from the Middle Triassic of Besano (Lombardy, Northern
5 Italy). *Memorie Della Società Italiana Di Scienze Naturali e Del Museo Civico Di Storia*
6 *Naturale Di Milano* 35:1–88.
7
8
9
10
11
12 O'Brien, A., D. I. Whiteside, and J. E. A. Marshall. 2018. Anatomical study of two previously
13 undescribed specimens of *Clevosaurus hudsoni* (Lepidosauria: Rhynchocephalia) from
14 Cromhall Quarry, UK, aided by computed tomography, yields additional information on the
15 skeleton and hitherto undescribed bones. *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* 183:163–
16 195.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24 Opluštil, S., J. Pšenička, J. Bek, J. Wang, Z. Feng, M. Libertín, Z. Šimůnek, J. Bureš, and J.
25 Drábková. 2014. T0 peat-forming plant assemblage preserved in growth position by volcanic
26 ash-fall: a case study from the Middle Pennsylvanian of the Czech Republic. *Bulletin of*
27 *Geosciences* 89.
28
29
30
31
32
33 Opluštil, S., J. Pšenička, M. Libertín, A. R. Bashforth, Z. Šimůnek, J. Drábková, and J. Dašková.
34 2009. A Middle Pennsylvanian (Bolsovian) peat-forming forest preserved in situ in volcanic
35 ash of the Whetstone Horizon in the Radnice Basin, Czech Republic. *Review of Palaeobotany*
36 *and Palynology* 155:234–274.
37
38
39
40
41
42 Opluštil, S., J. Wang, H. W. Pfefferkorn, J. Pšenička, J. Bek, M. Libertín, J. Wang, M. Wan, X.
43 He, M. Yan, H. Wei, and J. Votočková Frojdová. 2021. T0 Early Permian coal-forest
44 preserved in situ in volcanic ash bed in the Wuda Coalfield, Inner Mongolia, China. *Review*
45 *of Palaeobotany and Palynology* 294:104347.
46
47
48
49
50
51 Padian, K., and K. P. Dial. 2005. Could 'four-winged' dinosaurs fly? *Nature* 438:E3–E3.
52
53
54 Padian, K., and J. R. Horner. 2011. The evolution of 'bizarre structures' in dinosaurs:
55 biomechanics, sexual selection, social selection or species recognition? *Journal of Zoology*
56 283:3–17.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Paparella, I., A. R. H. LeBlanc, M. R. Doschak, and M. W. Caldwell. 2020. The iliosacral joint in
4
5 lizards: an osteological and histological analysis. *Journal of Anatomy* 236:668–687.
6
7
8 Paukstis, G. L., and L. E. Brown. 1990. Evolutionary trends in the morphology of the intercalary
9
10 phalanx of anuran amphibians. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 69:1297–1301.
11
12 Pawley, K. A. T., and A. Warren. 2006. The appendicular skeleton of *Eryops megacephalus* Cope,
13
14 1877 (Temnospondyli: Eryopoidea) from the lower Permian of North America. *Journal of*
15
16 *Paleontology* 80:561–580.
17
18
19 Peabody, F. E. 1952. *Petrolacosaurus kansensis* Lane, a Pennsylvanian reptile from Kansas.
20
21 University of Kansas Paleontological Contributions, Vertebrata 1:1–41.
22
23
24 Persons, S. W. IV., and P. J. Currie. 2012. Dragon tails: convergent caudal morphology in winged
25
26 archosaurs. *Acta Geologica Sinica (English Edition)* 86:1402–1412.
27
28
29 Persons, S. W. IV., P. J. Currie, and M. A. Norell. 2013. Oviraptorosaur tail forms and functions.
30
31 *Acta Palaeontologica Polonica* 59:553–567.
32
33 Piñeiro, G., P. Núñez Demarco, and M. D. Meneghel. 2016. The ontogenetic transformation of the
34
35 mesosaurid tarsus: a contribution to the origin of the primitive amniotic astragalus. *PeerJ*
36
37 4:e2036.
38
39
40 Pittman, M., S. M. Gatesy, P. Upchurch, A. Goswami, and J. R. Hutchinson. 2013. Shake a tail
41
42 feather: the evolution of the theropod tail into a stiff aerodynamic surface. *PLoS ONE*
43
44 8:e63115.
45
46
47 Piveteau, J. 1926. Paléontologie de Madagascar: XII. amphibiens et reptiles Permians. *Annales de*
48
49 *Paléontologie* 1–151.
50
51
52 Pritchard, A. C., and H.-D. Sues. 2019. Postcranial remains of *Teraterpeton hrynewichorum*
53
54 (Reptilia: Archosauromorpha) and the mosaic evolution of the saurian postcranial skeleton.
55
56 *Journal of Systematic Palaeontology* 17:1745–1765.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Pritchard, A. C., H.-D. Sues, D. Scott, and R. R. Reisz. 2021. Osteology, relationships and
4
5 functional morphology of *Weigeltisaurus jaekeli* (Diapsida, Weigeltisauridae) based on a
6
7 complete skeleton from the Upper Permian Kupferschiefer of Germany. *PeerJ* 9:e11413.
8
9
10 Pritchard, A. C., A. H. Turner, S. J. Nesbitt, R. B. Irmis, and N. D. Smith. 2015. Late Triassic
11
12 tanystropheids (Reptilia, Archosauromorpha) from northern New Mexico (Petrified Forest
13
14 Member, Chinle Formation) and the biogeography, functional morphology, and evolution of
15
16 Tanystropheidae. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 35:e911186.
17
18
19 Pritchard, A. C., A. H. Turner, R. B. Irmis, S. J. Nesbitt, and N. D. Smith. 2016. Extreme
20
21 modification of the tetrapod forelimb in a Triassic diapsid reptile. *Current Biology* 26:2779–
22
23 2786.
24
25
26 Reisz, R. R. 1981. A diapsid reptile from the Pennsylvanian of Kansas. Special Publication of the
27
28 Museum of Natural History, University of Kansas 7:1–74.
29
30
31 Reisz, R. R., D. S. Berman, and D. Scott. 1984. The anatomy and relationships of the Lower
32
33 Permian reptile *Araeoscelis*. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 4:57–67.
34
35
36 Reisz, R. R., S. P. Modesto, and D. M. Scott. 2011a. A new Early Permian reptile and its
37
38 significance in early diapsid evolution. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological*
39
40 *Sciences* 278:3731–3737.
41
42
43 Reisz, R. R., H. C. Maddin, J. Fröbisch, and J. Falconnet. 2011b. A new large caseid (Synapsida,
44
45 Caseasauria) from the Permian of Rodez (France), including a reappraisal of “*Casea*” *rutena*
46
47 Sigogneau-Russell & Russell, 1974. *Geodiversitas* 33:227–246.
48
49
50 Renesto, S., and N. C. Fraser. 2003. Drepanosaurid (Reptilia: Diapsida) remains from a Late
51
52 Triassic fissure infilling at Cromhall Quarry (Avon, Great Britain). *Journal of Vertebrate*
53
54 *Paleontology* 23:703–705.
55
56
57 Renesto, S., J. A. Spielmann, S. G. Lucas, and G. T. Spagnoli. 2010. The taxonomy and
58
59 paleobiology of the Late Triassic (Carnian–Norian: Adamanian–Apachean) drepanosaurs
60

- (Diapsida: Archosauromorpha: Drepanosauromorpha). New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science Bulletin 46:1–81.
- Romer, A. S. 1922. The locomotor apparatus of certain primitive and mammal-like reptiles. Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History 40:517–606.
- Romer, A. S. 1956. Osteology of the Reptiles, 3rd ed. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 772 pp.
- Romer, A. S., and L. I. Price. 1940. Review of the Pelycosauria. Geological Society of America, Special Papers 28:1–538.
- Russell, A. P., and A. M. Bauer. 1990. Digit I in pad-bearing gekkonine geckos: alternate designs and the potential constraints of phalangeal number. Memoirs of the Queensland Museum 29:453–472.
- Russell, A. P., and A. M. Bauer. 2008. The appendicular locomotor apparatus of *Sphenodon* and Normal-limbed Squamates; pp. 1–465 in C. Gans, A. S. Gaunt, and K. Adler (eds.), Biology of the Reptilia, Volume 21, Morphology I. The Skull and Appendicular Locomotor Apparatus of Lepidosauria. Society for the Study of Amphibians and Reptiles, Ithaca, New York.
- Russell, A. P., and L. D. Dijkstra. 2001. Patagial morphology of *Draco volans* (Reptilia: Agamidae) and the origin of glissant locomotion in flying dragons. Journal of Zoology 253:457–471.
- Russell, A. P., A. Y. Stark, and T. E. Higham. 2019. The integrative biology of gecko adhesion: historical review, current understanding, and grand challenges. Integrative and Comparative Biology 59:101–116.
- Schaumberg, G. 1976. Zwei Reptilneufunde (*Weigeltisaurus* Kuhn [?], Lepidosauria [?], Reptilia) aus dem Kupferschiefer von Richelsdorf (Perm, Hessen). Philippia 3:3–8. [German 3–8; English 3]

- 1
2
3 Schaumberg, G. 1986. Bemerkungen zu einem Neufund von *Weigeltisaurus jaekeli* (Weigelt) im
4 nordhessischen Kupferschiefer. *Paläontologische Zeitschrift* 60:319–327. [German 319–327;
5 English 319]
6
7
8
9
10 Schaumberg, G., D. M. Unwin, and S. Brandt. 2007. New information on the anatomy of the Late
11 Permian gliding reptile *Coelurosauravus*. *Paläontologische Zeitschrift* 81:160–173.
12
13
14 Schmidt, A., and M. S. Fischer. 2011. The kinematic consequences of locomotion on sloped
15 arboreal substrates in a generalized (*Rattus norvegicus*) and a specialized (*Sciurus vulgaris*)
16 rodent. *Journal of Experimental Biology* 214:2544–2559.
17
18
19
20
21 Schoch, R. R., and H.-D. Sues. 2018. Osteology of the Middle Triassic stem-turtle *Pappochelys*
22 *rosinae* and the early evolution of the turtle skeleton. *Journal of Systematic Palaeontology*
23 16:927–965.
24
25
26
27
28 Sennikov, A. G., and V. K. Golubev. 2017. Sequence of Permian tetrapod faunas of Eastern
29 Europe and the Permian–Triassic ecological crisis. *Paleontological Journal* 51:600–611.
30
31
32
33 Senter, P. 2004. Phylogeny of Drepanosauridae (Reptilia: Diapsida). *Journal of Systematic*
34 *Palaeontology* 2:257–268.
35
36
37 Simões, T. R., M. W. Caldwell, and A. W. A. Kellner. 2015. A new Early Cretaceous lizard
38 species from Brazil, and the phylogenetic position of the oldest known South American
39 squamates. *Journal of Systematic Palaeontology* 13:601–614.
40
41
42
43
44 Simões, T. R., M. W. Caldwell, R. L. Nydam, and P. Jiménez-Huidobro. 2017. Osteology,
45 phylogeny, and functional morphology of two Jurassic lizard species and the early evolution
46 of scansoriality in geckoes. *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* 180:216–241.
47
48
49
50
51 Smith, R. M. H. 2020. Biostratigraphy of the *Cistecephalus* Assemblage Zone (Beaufort Group,
52 Karoo Supergroup), South Africa. *South African Journal of Geology* 123:181–190.
53
54
55
56 Smith, R. M. H., and S. E. Evans. 1996. New material of *Youngina*: evidence of juvenile
57 aggregation in Permian diapsid reptiles. *Palaeontology* 39:289–304.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Sobral, G., T. R. Simões, and R. R. Schoch. 2020. A tiny new Middle Triassic stem-
4
5 lepidosauromorph from Germany: implications for the early evolution of lepidosauromorphs
6
7 and the Vellberg fauna. *Scientific Reports* 10:2273.
8
9
- 10 Socha, J. J., F. Jafari, Y. Munk, and G. Byrnes. 2015. How animals glide: from trajectory to
11
12 morphology. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 93:901–924.
13
14
- 15 Spielmann, J. A., A. B. Heckert, and S. G. Lucas. 2005. The Late Triassic archosauromorph
16
17 *Trilophosaurus* as an arboreal climber. *Rivista Italiana Di Paleontologia e Stratigrafia*
18
19 111:395–412.
20
21
- 22 Spielmann, J. A., S. Renesto, and S. G. Lucas. 2006. The utility of claw curvature in assessing the
23
24 arboreality of fossil reptiles. *New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science Bulletin*
25
26 37:365–368.
27
28
- 29 Spielmann, J. A., S. G. Lucas, L. F. Rhinehart, and A. B. Heckert. 2008. The Late Triassic
30
31 archosauromorph *Trilophosaurus*. *New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science*
32
33 *Bulletin* 43:1–177.
34
35
- 36 Spindler, F., R. Werneburg, J. W. Schneider, L. Luthardt, V. Annacker, and R. Röbber. 2018. First
37
38 arboreal “pelycosaurs” (Synapsida: Varanopidae) from the early Permian Chemnitz Fossil
39
40 Lagerstätte, SE Germany, with a review of varanopid phylogeny. *PalZ* 92:315–364.
41
42
- 43 Sues, H.-D. 2019. *The Rise of Reptiles: 320 Million Years of Evolution*. Johns Hopkins University
44
45 Press, Baltimore, MD, 401 pp.
46
47
- 48 Sumida, S. S. 1990. Vertebral morphology, alternation of neural spine height, and structure in
49
50 Permo–Carboniferous tetrapods, and a reappraisal of primitive modes of terrestrial
51
52 locomotion. *University of California Publications, Zoology* 122:1–129.
53
54
- 55 Sumida, S. S., and S. Modesto. 2001. A phylogenetic perspective on locomotory strategies in early
56
57 amniotes. *Integrative and Comparative Biology* 41:586–597.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Sumida, S. S., R. E. Lombard, and D. S. Berman. 1992. Morphology of the atlas-axis complex of
4
5 the late Palaeozoic tetrapod suborders Diadectomorpha and Seymouriamorpha. Philosophical
6
7 Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences 336:259–273.
8
9
10 **Tinius, A., A. P. Russell, H. A. Jamniczky, and J. S. Anderson. 2018. What is bred in the bone:
11
12 ecomorphological associations of pelvic girdle form in greater Antillean *Anolis* lizards.
13
14 *Journal of Morphology* 279:1016–1030.**
15
16
17 Tschopp, E., and O. Mateus. 2013. Clavicles, interclavicles, gastralia, and sternal ribs in sauropod
18
19 dinosaurs: new reports from Diplodocidae and their morphological, functional and
20
21 evolutionary implications. *Journal of Anatomy* 222:321–340.
22
23
24 Tulli, M. J., F. B. Cruz, A. Herrel, B. Vanhooydonck, and V. Abdala. 2009. The interplay between
25
26 claw morphology and microhabitat use in neotropical iguanian lizards. *Zoology* 112:379–392.
27
28
29 Vaughn, P. P. 1955. The Permian reptile *Araeoscelis* restudied. *Bulletin of the Museum of
30
31 Comparative Zoology* 113:1–467.
32
33
34 Vickaryous, M. K., and B. K. Hall. 2008. Development of the dermal skeleton in *Alligator
35
36 mississippiensis* (Archosauria, Crocodylia) with comments on the homology of osteoderms.
37
38 *Journal of Morphology* 269:398–422.
39
40
41 Vickaryous, M. K., and B. K. Hall. 2010. Comparative development of the crocodylian
42
43 interclavicle and avian furcula, with comments on the homology of dermal elements in the
44
45 pectoral apparatus. *Journal of Experimental Zoology Part B: Molecular and Developmental
46
47 Evolution* 314B:196–207.
48
49 **Wang, J., H. W. Pfefferkorn, Y. Zhang, and Z. Feng. 2012. Permian vegetational Pompeii from
50
51 Inner Mongolia and its implications for landscape paleoecology and paleobiogeography of
52
53 Cathaysia. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 109:4927–4932.**
54
55
56 Weigelt, J. 1930. *Palaeochamaeleo jaekeli* nov. gen. nov. sp. Ein neuer Rhynchocephale aus dem
57
58 Mansfelder Kupfer schiefer. *Leopoldina* 6:625–642.
59
60

1
2
3 Wilson, J. A. 1999. A nomenclature for vertebral laminae in sauropods and other saurischian
4
5 dinosaurs. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 19:639–653.
6

7
8 Witzmann, F. 2007. The evolution of the scalation pattern in temnospondyl amphibians.
9

10 *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* 150:815–834.
11

12 Zaaf, A., A. Herrel, P. Aerts, and F. De Vree. 1999. Morphology and morphometrics of the
13
14 appendicular musculature in geckoes with different locomotor habits (Lepidosauria).
15

16
17 *Zoomorphology* 119:9–22.
18

19 Zani, P. A. 2000. The comparative evolution of lizard claw and toe morphology and clinging
20
21 performance. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* 13:316–325.
22

23
24 Zanon, R. T. 1990. The sternum of *Araeoscelis* and its implications for basal diapsid phylogeny.
25
26 *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 10:51A.
27

28
29
30 Submitted February 15, 2022; revisions received Month DD, YYYY; accepted Month DD,
31
32
33 YYYY. [dates left blank, to be completed by the editors]
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

FIGURE CAPTIONS

FIGURE 1. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian), lectotype MNHN.F.MAP325a. **A**, dorsal surface of individual preserved as a natural external mold; **B**, silicone cast of **A**. Scale bar equals 5 cm. [planned for page width]

FIGURE 2. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian), lectotype MNHN.F.MAP325a. Interpretative drawing of dorsal surface of individual preserved as a natural external mold. **Abbreviations:** **carp**, carpal elements; **ch**, chevron; **cv**, cervical vertebra; **ct**, cleithrum; **dv**, dorsal vertebra; **ect.f**, ectepicondylar foramen; **ent.f**, entepicondylar foramen; **fe**, femur; **fi**, fibula; **gas**, gastralia; **gl**, glenoid; **hu**, humerus; **il**, ilium; **is**, ischium; **Mtt**, metatarsus; **pata**, patagial spar; **ph**, phalanx; **pub**, pubis; **ra**, radius; **scc**, scapulocoracoid; **sk**, skull; **tars**, tarsal elements; **ti**, tibia; **ul**, ulna. Scale bar equals 5 cm. [planned for column]

FIGURE 3. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian), paralectotypes MNHN.F.MAP317a, b. **A**, MNHN.F.MAP317b, dorsal surface of individual preserved as a natural mold; **B**, silicone cast of **A**; **C**, MNHN.F.MAP317a, ventral surface of individual preserved as a natural mold; **D**, silicone cast of **C**. Scale bar equals 5 cm. [planned for page width]

FIGURE 4. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian), paralectotypes MNHN.F.MAP317a, b. **A**, interpretative drawing of MNHN.F.MAP317b, dorsal surface of individual preserved as a natural mold; **B**, interpretative drawing of MNHN.F.MAP317b, dorsal surface of individual preserved as a natural mold. **Abbreviations:** **carp**, carpal elements; **cl**, clavicle; **ct**, cleithrum; **cv**, cervical vertebra; **dv**, dorsal vertebra; **ect.f**, ectepicondylar foramen; **ent.f**, entepicondylar foramen; **gas**, gastralia;

hu, humerus; **Mtc**, metacarpal; **ol**, olecranon process of ulna; **pata**, patagial spar; **ph**, phalanx (digit number in brackets when known); **ra**, radius; **scc**, scapulocoracoid; **sk**, skull; **ul**, ulna.

Scale bar equals 5 cm. [planned for page width]

FIGURE 5. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian)

MNHN.F.MAP327a. **A**, right lateral surface of individual preserved as a natural external mold; **B**, silicone cast of **A**. Scale bar equals 10 cm. [planned for page width]

FIGURE 6. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian)

MNHN.F.MAP327a. Interpretative drawing of right lateral surface of individual preserved as a natural external mold. **Abbreviations:** **carp**, carpal elements; **cdv**, caudal vertebra; **cl**, clavicle; **ct**, cleithrum; **cv**, cervical vertebra; **dv**, dorsal vertebra; **fe**, femur; **gas**, gastralia; **hu**, humerus; **il**, ilium; **Mtc**, metacarpus; **pa**, parietal; **pata**, patagial spar; **ph**, phalanx; **pob**, postorbital; **pub**, pubis; **ra**, radius; **scc**, scapulocoracoid; **sk**, skull elements; **sq**, squamosal; **sv**, sacral vertebra; **tars**, tarsal elements; **ti**, tibia; **tvp**, transverse process of dorsal vertebra; **ul**, ulna. Scale bar equals 10 cm. [planned for page width]

FIGURE 7. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian)

MNHN.F.MAP327b. **A**, left lateral surface of individual preserved as a natural external mold; **B**, silicone cast of **A**. **Abbreviations:** **cdv**, caudal vertebra; **pata**, patagial spar; **sk**, skull elements. Scale bar equals 10 cm. [planned for page width]

FIGURE 8. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian), presacral vertebrae. **A**, **B**, last cervicals and first dorsals of MNHN.F.MAP327a in right lateral view,

silicone cast (**A**) and interpretative drawing (**B**) of individual preserved as a natural external mold; **C–E**, atlas-axis complex of paralectotype MNHN.F.MAP317a in right lateral view, silicone cast (**C**), interpretative drawing (**D**) and reconstruction (**E**) of individual preserved as a natural external mold; **F–K**, presacral vertebrae of paralectotype MNHN.F.MAP317a in

1
2
3 right lateral view, silicone cast and interpretative drawing of cervical 3 (F) and dorsals 2 and 3
4
5 (G), 6 (H), 10 (I), 16 (J), 18 (K). **Abbreviations:** **atc**, atlantal centrum; **ati**, atlantal
6
7 intercentrum; **atn**, atlantal neural arch; **axi**, axial intercentrum; **axn**, axial neural spine; **axr**,
8
9 axial rib; **ca**, capitulum; **cv**, cervical vertebra; **cvr**, cervical rib; **dia**, diapophysis; **dr**, dorsal
10
11 rib; **dv**, dorsal vertebra; **exc**, excavation; **exo**, exoccipital; **nc**, notochordal canal; **ns**, neural
12
13 spine; **para**, parapophysis; **pcdl**, posterior centrodiapophyseal lamina; **poa**, proatlas; **poz**,
14
15 postzygapophysis; **ppdl**, paradiapophyseal lamina; **prdl**, prezygodiapophyseal lamina; **prz**,
16
17 prezygodiapophysis; **sc.f**, subcentral foramen; **tu**, tuberculum; **tv**, transverse process.
18
19 Arrows indicate anterior direction. Scale bars equal 5 mm (A–E) and 2 mm (F–K). [planned
20
21 for page width]
22
23
24
25

26
27 FIGURE 9. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian),
28
29 MNHN.F.MAP327a, b, right pelvis, sacral and caudal vertebrae in right lateral view,
30
31 individual preserved as a natural external mold. **A, B**, sacrum and right pelvis of
32
33 MNHN.F.MAP327a, right lateral view; **C, D**, caudals 1 to 5 of MNHN.F.MAP327a, right
34
35 lateral view; **E, F**, caudals 13 to 15 of MNHN.F.MAP327b, left lateral view. **Silicone casts (A,**
36
37 **C, E) and interpretive drawings (B, D, F).** **Abbreviations:** **ac**, acetabulum; **cdv**, caudal
38
39 vertebra; **ch**, chevron; **ch.ap**, anterior process of chevron; **dia**, diapophysis; **dr**, dorsal rib; **fe**,
40
41 femur; **ic**, intercentrum; **il**, ilium; **nc**, notochordal canal; **ns**, neural spine; **para**, parapophysis;
42
43 **pata**, patagial spar; **poap**, postacetabular process of iliac blade; **poz**, postzygapophysis; **ppdl**,
44
45 paradiapophyseal lamina; **prab**, preacetabular buttress; **prap**, preacetabular process of iliac
46
47 blade; **prz**, prezygapophysis; **pu.tb**, pubic tubercle; **sab**, supraacetabular buttress; **sr**, sacral
48
49 rib; **sv**, sacral vertebra; **vmr**, ventromedian ridge. Arrows indicate anterior direction. Dashed
50
51 areas indicate breaks. Scale bars equal 5 mm. [planned for page width]
52
53
54
55

56
57 FIGURE 10. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian),
58
59 MNHN.F.MAP327a, b, gastralia, silicone cast individual preserved as a natural external mold.
60

1
2
3 **A**, gastralial rows 1 and 2 in right anterolateral view; **B**, mid-posterior gastralial row in right
4 lateral view. **Abbreviations:** **brk**, break; **gas**, gastralial; **pata**, patagium. Scale bars equal 5
5 mm. [planned for column]

6
7
8
9
10
11 FIGURE 11. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian),
12 forelimb, silicone casts of individuals preserved as natural external molds. **A**, pectoral girdle
13 and right forelimb of MNHN.F.MAP in right lateral view; **B**, humerus of **A** in ventral view;
14 **C**, humerus of paralectotype MNHN.F.MAP317b in dorsal view. **Abbreviations:** **bo**,
15 basioccipital; **cap**, capitulum; **carp**, carpal elements; **cbb.c**, cavity for *M. coracobrachialis*
16 *brevis*; **cl**, clavicle; **co**, coracoid plate; **ct**, cleithrum; **hu**, humerus; **delt**, deltopectoral crest;
17 **ect**, ectepicondyle; **ect.f**, ectepicondylar foramen; **ent**, entepicondyle; **ent.f**, entepicondylar
18 foramen; **epitr**, crest for *M. epitrochleoanconaeus*; **gv**, groove; **lsr**, lateral scapular ridge;
19 **Mtc**, metacarpal; **ol**, olecranon process of ulna; **ol.f**, olecranon fossa; **pas**, proximal articular
20 surface; **pbs**, parabasisphenoid; **ra**, radius; **rid**, ridge; **sca**, scapular blade; **scsc**, crest for *M.*
21 *subcoracoscapularis*; **sector**, scapular torus; **sh.c**, cavity for *M. scapulohumeralis*; **ul**, ulna; **trcl**,
22 trochlea; **tv**, transverse humeral line; **ve**, vertebra. Scale bars equal 1 cm (**A**) and 5 mm (**B**–
23 **C**). [planned for page width]

24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 FIGURE 12. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian),
42 MNHN.F.MAP327a, carpus, ventral view. **A**, silicone cast of individual preserved as a natural
43 external mold; **B**, interpretative drawing of **A**. **Abbreviations:** **dc**, distal carpal; **in**,
44 intermedium; **lc**, lateral centrale; **mc**, medial centrale; **Mtc**, metacarpal; **pbs**,
45 parabasisphenoid; **pf.f**, perforating foramen; **pi**, pisiform; **ra**, radius; **rae**, radiale; **ul**, ulna;
46 **ule**, ulnare. Scale bars equal 2 mm. [planned for page width]

47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56 FIGURE 13. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian),
57 hindlimb, silicone casts of individuals preserved as natural external molds. **A**, right femur of
58 lectotype MNHN.F.MAP325a in anteroventral view; **B**, right tibia and partial fibula and
59
60

tarsus of MNHN.F.MAP327a in posterodorsal view. **Abbreviations:** **cn**, cnemial crest; **cnt**, cnemial trough; **fi**, fibula; **fic**, fibular condyle; **ic.fo**, intercondylar fossa; **intr**, internal trochanter; **intr.fo**, intertrochanteric fossa; **pas**, proximal articular surface; **ph**, phalanx; **popa**, popliteal area; **rid**, ridge; **tars**, tarsal elements; **ti**, tibia; **tic**, tibial condyle; **tif**, tibial fossa.

Scale bars equal 5 mm. [planned for column]

FIGURE 14. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian), lectotype MNHN.F.MAP325a, right foot, dorsal view, individual preserved as a natural external mold. **A**, silicone cast; **B**, interpretative drawing of **A**. **Abbreviations:** **ast**, astragalus; **cal**, calcaneus; **clr**, contralateral ridge; **dcaf**, distal calcaneal facet of astragalus; **dt**, distal tarsal; **fi**, fibula; **fi.f**, fibular facet; **Mtt**, metatarsal; **nav**, navicular; **pcaf**, proximal calcaneal facet of astragalus; **pf.f**, perforating foramen; **ph**, phalanx (digit number in brackets); **phu**, ungual phalanx (digit number in brackets); **tb**, tubercle; **ti**, tibia. Scale bars equal 5 mm. [planned for page width]

FIGURE 15. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian), skeletal reconstruction in dorsal (**A**) and right lateral (**B**) view based on all referred specimens. Poorly known or unpreserved elements outlined by dashed lines and reconstructed from the Ellrich specimen (Pritchard et al., 2021). Skull reconstruction based on Buffa et al. (2021); outline of trunk in dorsal view based in part on the Eppelton specimen (TWCMS B5937, VB, pers. obs.); elements from the left side not figured; gastral basket too incomplete to be accurately reconstructed (see text). Scale bar equals 10 cm. [planned for page width]

FIGURE 16. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian), life reconstruction. Individuals clinging to *Glossopteris* trunk (*Glossopteris* leaves are associated with *C. elivensis* in the fossil assemblage) (Left), and gliding while grasping its wing (Right). The colors are based on the extant agamid *Draco* and chamaeleonid squamates. Illustration by Charlène Letenneur (MNHN). [planned for page width]




FIGURE 1. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian), lectotype MNHN.F.MAP325a. **A**, dorsal surface of individual preserved as a natural external mold; **B**, silicone cast of A. Scale bar equals 5 cm.

182x94mm (300 x 300 DPI)




FIGURE 1. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian), lectotype MNHN.F.MAP325a. **A**, dorsal surface of individual preserved as a natural external mold; **B**, silicone cast of A. Scale bar equals 5 cm.

182x94mm (300 x 300 DPI)




FIGURE 2. *Coelurosaurus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian), lectotype MNHN.F.MAP325a. Interpretative drawing of dorsal surface of individual preserved as a natural external mold. **Abbreviations:** **carp**, carpal elements; **ch**, chevron; **cv**, cervical vertebra; **ct**, cleithrum; **dv**, dorsal vertebra; **ect.f**, ectepicondylar foramen; **ent.f**, entepicondylar foramen; **fe**, femur; **fi**, fibula; **gas**, gastralia; **gl**, glenoid; **hu**, humerus; **il**, ilium; **is**, ischium; **Mtt**, metatarsus; **pata**, patagial spar; **ph**, phalanx; **pub**, pubis; **ra**, radius; **scc**, scapulocoracoid; **sk**, skull; **tars**, tarsal elements; **ti**, tibia; **ul**, ulna. Scale bar equals 5 cm.



FIGURE 3. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian), paralectotypes MNHN.F.MAP317a, b. **A**, MNHN.F.MAP317b, dorsal surface of individual preserved as a natural mold; **B**, silicone cast of A; **C**, MNHN.F.MAP317a, ventral surface of individual preserved as a natural mold; **D**, silicone cast of C. Scale bar equals 5 cm.




FIGURE 3. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian), paralectotypes MNHN.F.MAP317a, b. **A**, MNHN.F.MAP317b, dorsal surface of individual preserved as a natural mold; **B**, silicone cast of A; **C**, MNHN.F.MAP317a, ventral surface of individual preserved as a natural mold; **D**, silicone cast of C. Scale bar equals 5 cm.




FIGURE 4. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian), paralectotypes MNHN.F.MAP317a, b. **A**, interpretative drawing of MNHN.F.MAP317b, dorsal surface of individual preserved as a natural mold; **B**, interpretative drawing of MNHN.F.MAP317b, dorsal surface of individual preserved as a natural mold. **Abbreviations:** **carp**, carpal elements; **cl**, clavicle; **ct**, cleithrum; **cv**, cervical vertebra; **dv**, dorsal vertebra; **ect.f**, ectepicondylar foramen; **ent.f**, entepicondylar foramen; **gas**, gastralia; **hu**, humerus; **Mtc**, metacarpal; **ol**, olecranon process of ulna; **pata**, patagial spar; **ph**, phalanx (digit number in brackets when known); **ra**, radius; **scc**, scapulocoracoid; **sk**, skull; **ul**, ulna. Scale bar equals 5 cm.



FIGURE 5. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian) MNHN.F.MAP327a. **A**, right lateral surface of individual preserved as a natural external mold; **B**, silicone cast of A. Scale bar equals 10 cm.




FIGURE 5. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian) MNHN.F.MAP327a. **A**, right lateral surface of individual preserved as a natural external mold; **B**, silicone cast of A. Scale bar equals 10 cm.




FIGURE 6. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian) MNHN.F.MAP327a.

Interpretative drawing of right lateral surface of individual preserved as a natural external mold.

Abbreviations: **carp**, carpal elements; **cdv**, caudal vertebra; **cl**, clavicle; **ct**, cleithrum; **cv**, cervical vertebra; **dv**, dorsal vertebra; **fe**, femur; **gas**, gastralia; **hu**, humerus; **il**, ilium; **Mtc**, metacarpus; **pa**, parietal; **pata**, patagial spar; **ph**, phalanx; **pob**, postorbital; **pub**, pubis; **ra**, radius; **scc**, scapulocoracoid; **sk**, skull elements; **sq**, squamosal; **sv**, sacral vertebra; **tars**, tarsal elements; **ti**, tibia; **tvp**, transverse process of dorsal vertebra; **ul**, ulna. Scale bar equals 10 cm.




FIGURE 7. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian) MNHN.F.MAP327b. **A**, left lateral surface of individual preserved as a natural external mold; **B**, silicone cast of A. **Abbreviations:** **cdv**, caudal vertebra; **pata**, patagial spar; **sk**, skull elements. Scale bar equals 10 cm.




FIGURE 7. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian) MNHN.F.MAP327b. **A**, left lateral surface of individual preserved as a natural external mold; **B**, silicone cast of A. **Abbreviations:** **cdv**, caudal vertebra; **pata**, patagial spar; **sk**, skull elements. Scale bar equals 10 cm.




FIGURE 8. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian), presacral vertebrae. **A**, **B**, last cervicals and first dorsals of MNHN.F.MAP327a in right lateral view, silicone cast (A) and interpretative drawing (B) of individual preserved as a natural external mold; **C–E**, atlas-axis complex of paralectotype MNHN.F.MAP317a in right lateral view, silicone cast (C), interpretative drawing (D) and reconstruction (E) of individual preserved as a natural external mold; **F–K**, presacral vertebrae of paralectotype MNHN.F.MAP317a in right lateral view, silicone cast and interpretative drawing of cervical 3 (F) and dorsals 2 and 3 (G), 6 (H), 10 (I), 16 (J), 18 (K). **Abbreviations:** **atc**, atlantal centrum; **ati**, atlantal intercentrum; **atn**, atlantal neural arch; **axi**, axial intercentrum; **axn**, axial neural spine; **axr**, axial rib; **ca**, capitulum; **cv**, cervical vertebra; **cvr**, cervical rib; **dia**, diapophysis; **dr**, dorsal rib; **dv**, dorsal vertebra; **exc**, excavation; **exo**, exoccipital; **nc**, notochordal canal; **ns**, neural spine; **para**, parapophysis; **pcdl**, posterior centrodiapophyseal lamina; **poa**, proatlas; **poz**, postzygapophysis; **ppdl**, paradiapophyseal lamina; **prdl**, prezygodiapophyseal lamina; **prz**, prezygodiapophysis; **sc.f**, subcentral foramen; **tu**, tuberculum; **tvp**, transverse process. Arrows indicate anterior direction. Scale bars equal 5 mm (A–E) and 2 mm (F–K).




FIGURE 9. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian), MNHN.F.MAP327a, b, right pelvis, sacral and caudal vertebrae in right lateral view, individual preserved as a natural external mold. **A, B**, sacrum and right pelvis of MNHN.F.MAP327a, right lateral view; **C, D**, caudals 1 to 5 of MNHN.F.MAP327a, right lateral view; **E, F**, caudals 13 to 15 of MNHN.F.MAP327b, left lateral view. Silicone casts (A, C, E) and interpretive drawings (B, D, F). **Abbreviations:** **ac**, acetabulum; **cdv**, caudal vertebra; **ch**, chevron; **ch.ap**, anterior process of chevron; **dia**, diapophysis; **dr**, dorsal rib; **fe**, femur; **ic**, intercentrum; **il**, ilium; **nc**, notochordal canal; **ns**, neural spine; **para**, parapophysis; **pata**, patagial spar; **poap**, postacetabular process of iliac blade; **poz**, postzygapophysis; **ppdl**, paradiapophyseal lamina; **prab**, preacetabular buttress; **prap**, preacetabular process of iliac blade; **prz**, prezygapophysis; **pu.tb**, pubic tubercle; **sab**, supraacetabular buttress; **sr**, sacral rib; **sv**, sacral vertebra; **vmr**, ventromedian ridge. Arrows indicate anterior direction. Dashed areas indicate breaks. Scale bars equal 5 mm.




FIGURE 10. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian), MNHN.F.MAP327a, b, gastralia, silicone cast individual preserved as a natural external mold. **A**, gastralia rows 1 and 2 in right anterolateral view; **B**, mid-posterior gastralia row in right lateral view. **Abbreviations:** **brk**, break; **gas**, gastralia; **pata**, patagium. Scale bars equal 5 mm.



FIGURE 11. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian), forelimb, silicone casts of individuals preserved as natural external molds. **A**, pectoral girdle and right forelimb of MNHN.F.MAP in right lateral view; **B**, humerus of A in ventral view; **C**, humerus of paralectotype MNHN.F.MAP317b in dorsal view. **Abbreviations:** **bo**, basioccipital; **cap**, capitulum; **carp**, carpal elements; **cbb.c**, cavity for M. coracobrachialis brevis; **cl**, clavicle; **co**, coracoid plate; **ct**, cleithrum; **hu**, humerus; **delt**, deltopectoral crest; **ect**, ectepicondyle; **ect.f**, ectepicondylar foramen; **ent**, entepicondyle; **ent.f**, entepicondylar foramen; **epitr**, crest for M. epitrochleoanconaeus; **gv**, groove; **lsr**, lateral scapular ridge; **Mtc**, metacarpal; **ol**, olecranon process of ulna; **ol.f**, olecranon fossa; **pas**, proximal articular surface; **pbs**, parabasisphenoid; **ra**, radius; **rid**, ridge; **sca**, scapular blade; **scsc**, crest for M. subcoracoscapularis; **sctor**, scapular torus; **sh.c**, cavity for M. scapulohumeralis; **ul**, ulna; **trcl**, trochlea; **tv**, transverse humeral line; **ve**, vertebra. Scale bars equal 1 cm (A) and 5 mm (B–C).




FIGURE 12. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian), MNHN.F.MAP327a, carpus, ventral view. **A**, silicone cast of individual preserved as a natural external mold; **B**, interpretative drawing of A. **Abbreviations:** **dc**, distal carpal; **in**, intermedium; **lc**, lateral centrale; **mc**, medial centrale; **Mtc**, metacarpal; **pbs**, parabasisphenoid; **pf.f**, perforating foramen; **pi**, pisiform; **ra**, radius; **rae**, radiale; **ul**, ulna; **ule**, ulnare. Scale bars equal 2 mm.




FIGURE 13. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian), hindlimb, silicone casts of individuals preserved as natural external molds. **A**, right femur of lectotype MNHN.F.MAP325a in anteroventral view; **B**, right tibia and partial fibula and tarsus of MNHN.F.MAP327a in posterodorsal view. **Abbreviations:** **cn**, cnemial crest; **cnt**, cnemial trough; **fi**, fibula; **fic**, fibular condyle; **ic.fo**, intercondylar fossa; **intr**, internal trochanter; **intr.fo**, intertrochanteric fossa; **pas**, proximal articular surface; **ph**, phalanx; **popa**, popliteal area; **rid**, ridge; **tars**, tarsal elements; **ti**, tibia; **tic**, tibial condyle; **tif**, tibial fossa. Scale bars equal 5 mm.




FIGURE 14. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian), lectotype MNHN.F.MAP325a, right foot, dorsal view, individual preserved as a natural external mold. **A**, silicone cast; **B**, interpretative drawing of **A**. **Abbreviations:** **ast**, astragalus; **cal**, calcaneus; **clr**, contralateral ridge; **dcaf**, distal calcaneal facet of astragalus; **dt**, distal tarsal; **fi**, fibula; **fi.f**, fibular facet; **Mtt**, metatarsal; **nav**, navicular; **pcaf**, proximal calcaneal facet of astragalus; **pf.f**, perforating foramen; **ph**, phalanx (digit number in brackets); **phu**, ungual phalanx (digit number in brackets); **tb**, tubercle; **ti**, tibia. Scale bars equal 5 mm.




FIGURE 15. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian), skeletal reconstruction in dorsal (**A**) and right lateral (**B**) view based on all referred specimens. Poorly known or unpreserved elements outlined by dashed lines and reconstructed from the Ellrich specimen (Pritchard et al., 2021). Skull reconstruction based on Buffa et al. (2021); outline of trunk in dorsal view based in part on the Eppelton specimen (TWCMS B5937, VB, pers. obs.); elements from the left side not figured; gastral basket too incomplete to be accurately reconstructed (see text). Scale bar equals 10 cm.



FIGURE 16. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian), life reconstruction. Individuals clinging to *Glossopteris* trunk (*Glossopteris* leaves are associated with *C. elivensis* in the fossil assemblage) (Left), and gliding while grasping its wing (Right). The colors are based on the extant agamid *Draco* and chamaeleonid squamates. Illustration by Charlène Letenneur (MNHN).

182x136mm (300 x 300 DPI)



FIGURE 16. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian), life reconstruction. Individuals clinging to *Glossopteris* trunk (*Glossopteris* leaves are associated with *C. elivensis* in the fossil assemblage) (Left), and gliding while grasping its wing (Right). The colors are based on the extant agamid *Draco* and chamaeleonid squamates. Illustration by Charlène Letenneur (MNHN).

182x136mm (300 x 300 DPI)

TABLE 1. Denominations and identifications of previously published specimens referred to the genera *Coelurosauravus* and *Weigeltisaurus*.

Specimen denomination	Identification	Material examined	Remarks
MNHN.F.MAP325a	<i>Coelurosauravus elivensis</i> (Lectotype)	MNHN.F.MAP325a	Patrimonial number 1908-11-21a
MNHN.F.MAP317a & b	<i>Coelurosauravus elivensis</i> (Paralectotype)	MNHN.F.MAP317a-b	Patrimonial number 1908-11-22a & b
MNHN.F.MAP327a & b	<i>Coelurosauravus elivensis</i>	MNHN.F.MAP327a-b	Patrimonial number 1908-5-2

TABLE 1. (Continued)

Specimen denomination	Identification	Material examined	Remarks
SSWG 113/7	<i>Weigeltisaurus jaekeli</i> (Holotype)	SMNK-PAL 34899a (cast)	-
Ellrich specimen	<i>Weigeltisaurus</i> sp.	SMNK-PAL 2882	Counterpart in unknown private collection
GM 1462	<i>Weigeltisaurus</i> sp.	SMNK-PAL 34899b (cast)	-
Bodental specimen	<i>Weigeltisaurus</i> sp.	SMNK-PAL 34866 (cast) & 34866b (original)	Main slab in Bürger private collection
Wolfsberg specimen	<i>Weigeltisaurus</i> sp.	SMNK-PAL 34910 (cast)	Specimens in Munk private collection, currently being transferred to the Naturkundemuseum im Ottoneum, Kassel
Bahaus specimen	<i>Weigeltisaurus</i> sp.	-	Specimen in Simon private collection
Eppelton specimen	? <i>Weigeltisaurus</i> sp.	TWCMS B5937 (photographs)	-

TABLE 2. Presacral centrum length of paralectotype MNHN.F.MAP317a, b. ‘*’ indicates approximate measurements due to incomplete preservation.

Presacral vertebra	Centrum length (mm)
Cervical 1 (= atlas)	0.80*
Cervical 2 (= axis)	5.31
Cervical 3	5.52
Cervical 4	5.62
Cervical 5	5.98
Dorsal 1	5.50
Dorsal 2	5.17
Dorsal 3	5.23
Dorsal 4	5.63
Dorsal 5	5.43*
Dorsal 6	5.01
Dorsal 7	5.41
Dorsal 8	5.60
Dorsal 9	6.84
Dorsal 10	7.15
Dorsal 11	7.47
Dorsal 12	7.50
Dorsal 13	7.30
Dorsal 14	7.19
Dorsal 15	7.07
Dorsal 16	7.04
Dorsal 17	6.69
Dorsal 18	5.99

TABLE 3. Selected measurements of MNHN.F.MAP327a, b. ‘*’ indicates approximate measurements due to incomplete preservation. Chord length is measured along the line linking the proximal and distal ends of each patagial, and is thus independent from the curvature of each element.

Caudal vertebra	Centrum length (mm)	Patagial	Absolute length (mm)	Chord length (mm)
Caudal 1	3.39*	Patagial 1	15.80	15.47
Caudal 2	3.51	Patagial 2	20.26	19.41
Caudal 3	3.35*	Patagial 3	28.97	28.81
Caudal 4	3.85*	Patagial 4	42.40	41.74
Caudal 5	4.20	Patagial 5	60.83	60.71
Caudal 6	4.61	Patagial 6	86.53	86.20
Caudal 7	4.90	Patagial 7	105.97*	105.76*
Caudal 8	5.10	Patagial 8	153.405	152.32
Caudal 9	5.24	Patagial 9	163.755*	162.84*
Caudal 10	5.03	Patagial 10	> 53.37	> 53.32
Caudal 11	5.03	Patagial 11	119.51*	118.21*
Caudal 12	4.99	Patagial 12	118.77*	117.56*
Caudal 13	5.20	Patagial 13	130.91*	129.84*
Caudal 14	5.15	Patagial 14	135.73*	133.74*
Caudal 15	5.11	Patagial 15	> 16.53	> 16.53
Caudal 16	4.99	Patagial 16	131.64*	130.11*
Caudal 17	5.14	Patagial 17	> 56.73	> 56.36
Caudal 18	5.20	Patagial 18	> 49.86	> 49.56
Caudal 19	4.99	Patagial 19	73.38	73.20
Caudal 20	5.02	Patagial 20	> 39.99	> 39.66
Caudal 21	5.20	Patagial 21	> 37.38	> 37.22
Caudal 22	5.02	Patagial 22	> 50.59	> 50.15

TABLE 3. (Continued)

Caudal vertebra	Centrum length (mm)	Patagial	Absolute length (mm)	Chord length (mm)
Caudal 23	5.04	Patagial 23	> 12.95	> 12.95
Caudal 24	5.13	Patagial 24	> 12.93	> 12.93
Caudal 25	4.93	Patagial 25	> 11.15	> 11.15
Caudal 26	4.80	Patagial 26	> 10.97	> 10.97
Caudal 27	4.74	Patagial 27	> 11.60	> 11.60
Caudal 28	4.87	Patagial 28	> 15.709	> 15.709
Caudal 29	-	Patagial 29	> 6.162	> 6.162

SUPPLEMENTAL DATA

Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology

The postcranial skeleton of the gliding reptile *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926
(Diapsida, Weigeltisauridae) from the late Permian of Madagascar

VALENTIN BUFFA,^{*,1} EBERHARD FREY,² J.-SÉBASTIEN STEYER,¹ and MICHEL
LAURIN¹

¹Centre de Recherche en Paléontologie – Paris, UMR 7207 CNRS-MNHN-SU, Muséum
national d'Histoire naturelle, CP38, 8 rue Buffon, 75005 Paris, France,

valentin.buffa@edu.mnhn.fr;

²Abteilung Geowissenschaften, Staatliches Museum für Naturkunde Karlsruhe, Germany

* Corresponding author



Coelurosauravus elivensis Piveteau, 1926

MNHN.F.MAP327a

Trunk and forelimb, right lateral view

1 cm

FIGURE S1. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian), MNHN.F.MAP327a, trunk and forelimb in right lateral view. Individual preserved as a natural external mold. Extract from RTI file available in Zenodo, at <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6078599>.



***Coelurosaurus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926**

MNHN.F.MAP327a

Carpus, ventral (palmar) view

5 mm

FIGURE S2. *Coelurosaurus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian), MNHN.F.MAP327a, carpus, ventral (palmar) view. Silicone cast of individual preserved as a natural external mold. Extract from RTI file available in Zenodo, at <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6078599>.



Coelurosauravus elivensis Piveteau, 1926

MNHN.F.MAP325a

Pes, ventral (plantar) view

5 mm

FIGURE S3. *Coelurosauravus elivensis* Piveteau, 1926 (Madagascar, late? Permian), lectotype MNHN.F.MAP325a, pes in ventral (plantar) view. Silicone cast of individual preserved as a natural external mold. Extract from RTI file available in Zenodo, at <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6078599>.