

Postprint del artículo publicado en: *Journal of Mammalian Evolution* 22(2): 243-258 (2015)

Gema Siliceo, Manuel J. Salesa, Mauricio Antón, Juan F. Pastor, Jorge Morales

**Comparative anatomy of the shoulder region in the late Miocene
amphicyonid *Magericyon anceps* (Carnivora): functional and
paleoecological inferences**

Gema Siliceo

Departamento de Paleobiología, Museo Nacional de Ciencias Naturales-CSIC, C/José

Gutiérrez Abascal, 2. 28006 Madrid, Spain

Manuel J. Salesa (corresponding author)

Departamento de Paleobiología, Museo Nacional de Ciencias Naturales-CSIC, C/José

Gutiérrez Abascal, 2. 28006 Madrid, Spain

Mauricio Antón

Departamento de Paleobiología, Museo Nacional de Ciencias Naturales-CSIC, C/José

Gutiérrez Abascal, 2. 28006 Madrid, Spain

Juan F. Pastor

Departamento de Anatomía, Facultad de Medicina, Universidad de Valladolid, C/ Ramón y

Cajal 7, 47005 Valladolid, Spain

Jorge Morales

Departamento de Paleobiología, Museo Nacional de Ciencias Naturales-CSIC, C/José

Gutiérrez Abascal, 2. 28006 Madrid, Spain

1
2 E-mail: msalesa@mncn.csic.es; telephone number: +34 915668979; fax number: +34
3
4 915668960
5
6
7
8
9
10

11 **Abstract** We describe and discuss several aspects of the functional anatomy of the shoulder
12 of the Miocene amphicyonid *Magericyon anceps*, focusing on the scapula and proximal half
13 of the humerus. This species, only known from the late Miocene (Vallesian, MN 10) site of
14 Batallones-1 (Madrid, Spain), is the last amphicyonid known in the fossil record of Western
15 Europe. *Magericyon anceps* combines a more hypercarnivorous dentition than previous
16 amphicyonids (including relatively more flattened canines) with primitive features on its
17 shoulder region: its scapulo-humeral region shows a reduced caudoventral projection of the
18 acromion, the postscapular fossa, and the teres major process, suggesting some differentiation
19 from the two morphotypes exhibited by other derived amphicyonids, and showing similarities
20 with primitive, generalized, medium-sized species of this family. This unique combination of
21 a derived dentition and a relatively generalized shoulder region points towards *M. anceps*
22 being a different ecological morphotype from that showed by other amphicyonids such as the
23 larger, bear-like amphicyonines from the European middle Miocene and the markedly
24 cursorial North American temnocyonines and daphoenines.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Keywords** Anatomy; Amphicyonidae; Carnivora; Miocene; shoulder; locomotion;
49
50
51 *Magericyon anceps*
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Introduction

1
2
3
4
5 The Amphicyonidae is a very diverse and geographically widespread family of
6
7 Arctoid carnivorans known from the late Eocene to the late Miocene of North America and
8
9 Eurasia, which attained its greatest diversification during the Oligocene and early-middle
10
11 Miocene. Its diversity was reduced in the late Miocene, with only a few taxa surviving in the
12
13 Vallesian or earliest Turolian, around 8 Ma (Hunt 1998). The dentition of this group is
14
15 relatively homogeneous, and a diet varying from omnivorous to hyper-carnivorous has been
16
17 inferred depending on the species (Viranta 1996; Hunt 1998; Peigné et al. 2008). On the
18
19 contrary, the overall morphology of the postcranial skeleton of amphicyonids shows a mosaic
20
21 of features not seen together in any other group of extant carnivorans, although some of these
22
23 traits are observed separately in ursids, canids, or even in felids (Olsen 1960; Ginsburg 1961;
24
25 Bergounioux and Crouzel 1973; Viranta 1996; Hunt 1998, 2009; Argot 2010). In general,
26
27 amphicyonids show a more generalized postcranial skeleton than that of extant large
28
29 carnivorans, although some taxa (e. g., *Borocyon*) have features indicative of a cursorial
30
31 specialization, similar to that of extant canids, and they were probably pursuit predators (Hunt
32
33 1998, 2009, 2011). Most other amphicyonids show less specialization for running, and they
34
35 probably possessed an ambulatory locomotion with certain climbing abilities, resembling in
36
37 some ways modern ursids (Hunt 1998, 2001, 2002, 2003; Sorkin 2006; Argot 2010).
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Four subfamilies are traditionally recognized within Amphicyonidae: Amphicyoninae,
47
48 Haplocyoninae, Daphoeninae and Temnocyoninae, the two later restricted to North America,
49
50 whereas Haplocyoninae is only present in the European faunas and Amphicyoninae is found
51
52 in Eurasia, North America, and Africa (Hunt 1998). This last subfamily includes the late
53
54 Miocene *Magericyon anceps*, the last amphicyonid of the Western European record. The most
55
56 common genera of European amphicyonines (*Amphicyon*, *Cynelos*, *Ysengrinia*) appear
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 abruptly at various moments in the Miocene of North America and these appearances are
2 interpreted as migration events (Hunt 1998, 2002, 2003). Thus, those North American middle
3 and upper Miocene amphicyonids would derive from immigrant Eurasian species (Hunt
4 1998). The estimated body size of amphicyonids ranges from few kilograms for the smallest
5 species up to 550 kg for *Amphicyon ingens* (Viranta 1996; Hunt 2001, 2003; Sorkin 2006;
6 Figueirido et al. 2011). Given this wide size range, Figueirido et al. (2011) proposed the
7 existence of three different size categories within Amphicyonidae that these authors relate to
8 different ecomorphs of extant carnivorans: small daphoenines would fit within the ecomorph
9 of living foxes, jackals, and coyotes; mid-sized daphoenines would be similar to pack-hunting
10 canids (*Canis lupus* or *Lycaon pictus*), and the largest amphicyonines would be the ecological
11 equivalent to extant large bears.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 The Cerro de los Batallones is a low hill located 30 km south of the city of Madrid
27 (Spain) that has been exploited as an opencast mine of sepiolite since 1974. In July 1991,
28 during mining works, the mechanical diggers discovered a rich accumulation of fossils of
29 Carnivora within a lens of greenish marls intercalated between the levels of sepiolite. The site
30 was named Batallones-1 and it was the first of a series of nine fossil sites discovered in the
31 hill over the following years. The sites were formed during the late Miocene due to a
32 geological process of piping, which consisted in the erosion of the sepiolite levels by water
33 flowing along fractures, causing collapses and the development of a karst-like ('pseudokarst')
34 topography (Pozo et al. 2004; Calvo et al. 2013). This process finally led to the formation of
35 irregular cavities within the sepiolite levels, up to 15 m deep, later filled with greenish clay.
36 These cavities acted as a natural trap for many animals inhabiting the area, probably due to
37 the fact that when the sepiolite is wet, its surface becomes slippery, which would make escape
38 from the trap almost impossible. Concerning Batallones-1, a remarkable 98% of all the
39 macro-mammal bones recovered from the site corresponds to members of the order
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Carnivora, which were probably trapped while attempting to scavenge (Antón and Morales
2 2000). This carnivoran assemblage includes the ailurid *Simocyon batalleri*, two species of
3
4 mustelids (*Sabadellictis* sp. and *Proputorius* sp.), the primitive hyaenid *Protictitherium*
5
6 *crassum*, the machairodont felids *Machairodus aphanistus* and *Promegantereon ogygia*, two
7
8 species of felines, *Styriofelis vallesiensis* and an undetermined, larger species, and the
9
10 amphicyonid *Magericyon anceps*. This impressive sample has allowed several systematic,
11
12 paleoecological and functional studies on the carnivoran fauna (Morales et al. 2000, 2004;
13
14 Antón and Morales 2000; Antón et al. 2004; Peigné et al. 2005, 2008; Salesa et al. 2005,
15
16 2006a, b, 2008, 2010a, b, 2012). The fossils of *M. anceps* from Batallones-1 represent one of
17
18 the best samples of Amphicyonidae in Eurasia, with at least 12 individuals represented,
19
20 including juveniles, young adults, and adults, in a fair state of preservation (Peigné et al.
21
22 2008).

23
24
25
26
27
28
29 The study of the cranial remains of *M. anceps* revealed a set of hypercarnivorous
30
31 features that pointed towards a more specialized hunting technique than that of other
32
33 amphicyonids (Peigné et al. 2008), with moderately flattened upper canines with weakly
34
35 serrated margins, and absence or strong reduction of some teeth; these features suggest a
36
37 reduced importance of the crushing function in the dentition, and a greater proportion of meat
38
39 in its diet compared with other amphicyonines (Peigné et al. 2008), placing the genus
40
41 *Magericyon* in a separate clade from other, less derived amphicyonids (Fig. 1). Although the
42
43 derived dental morphology of *M. anceps* suggests that it was a hypercarnivorous predator, its
44
45 postcranial skeleton has remained unstudied, and the present work is the first functional
46
47 analysis on the locomotor adaptations of this species. Among large carnivorans,
48
49 hypercarnivorous dentitions are in some cases associated with a cursorial or sub-cursorial
50
51 postcranial skeleton, as is the case in some canids, hyaenids, or felids, which use sprint or
52
53 sustained pursuit to catch their prey. In other cases, hypercarnivorous dentitions occur in taxa
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 (such as some large extant felids and many extinct saber-toothed carnivorans) that have robust
2 postcranial skeletons more fitting with patient stalking and subduing prey through muscular
3 force (Taylor 1989; Andersson and Werdelin 2003; Argot 2004; Salesa et al. 2010a;
4 Meachen-Samuels 2012). Although only a detailed study of the whole skeleton of *M. anceps*
5 will reveal if this amphicyonid fitted any or none of these models, the present work provides
6 the first detailed description of the shoulder anatomy of this species, the last of all the
7 Western European fossil record. Although the shoulder could be seen as a small part of the
8 whole appendicular skeleton, its study is imperative when analyzing the locomotion and
9 behavior of amphicyonids due to its peculiar morphology, with a more or less developed
10 postscapular fossa and teres major process, two structures whose functional significance
11 remains an open question.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 **Material and methods**

30 **Material**

31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39 The fossils of *Magericyon anceps* analyzed in this study belong to the extensive sample from
40 the late Miocene locality of Batallones-1 (Late Vallesian, MN 10, Madrid, Spain), housed in
41 the paleontological collections of the Museo Nacional de Ciencias Naturales-CSIC (Madrid,
42 Spain). We focus our study on the shoulder because this region plays an important role in the
43 biomechanics of the forelimb, and also due to the presence of a postscapular fossa, a structure
44 observed in other carnivorans, but with no clear functional explanation. The list of material is
45 as follows: Scapulae: six specimens: four right, B-713 (2), B-5255, B-5255 (1), and B-2703
46 (1), and two left, B-2215 and B-1903 (1); Humeri: **five** specimens: **three** right, B-1440, B-
47 1506-1 and BAT-1'05 E4-59, and two left, B-565 (1) and BAT-1'07 F3-35. Comparisons
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 with extant carnivorans were made using the collections of the Museo Anatómico de la
2 Universidad de Valladolid (Spain) (labeled with the acronym MAV) and Museo Nacional de
3 Ciencias Naturales-CSIC (Madrid, Spain) (labeled with the acronym MNCN), which
4 provided complete skeletons of the ursids *Ursus americanus* (MAV-259), *Ursus arctos*
5 (MNCN-16821), *Tremarctos ornatus* (MAV-1661), and *Ailuropoda melanoleuca* (MNCN-
6 12831), the mustelids *Gulo gulo* (MAV-469), *Aonyx cinerus* (MAV-2909, MAV-4616 and
7 MAV-6038), *Lutra lutra* (MAV-6066), and *Lontra canadensis* (MAV-3784), the feline
8 *Panthera leo* (MAV-2313, MAV-3046 and MAV-276), and the canid *Canis lupus* (MNCN-
9 16118 and MNCN-16150). We performed dissections of two adults specimens of *T. ornatus*,
10 one male and one female, at the departamento de Anatomía, Universidad de Valladolid
11 (Spain) in order to complete the observations made by previous authors on the anatomy of
12 some of the discussed muscles. We choose this species for dissection because it shows a
13 relatively poorly developed teres major process within Ursidae, similar to that of *M. anceps*.

14 We compared the studied fossils with specimens belonging to three of the four
15 subfamilies included in the Family Amphicyonidae: *Cynelos lemanensis*, *Ysengrinia*
16 *americana*, and some species of the genus *Amphicyon* (Subfamily Amphicyoninae);
17 *Daphoenodon* (*Daphoenodon*) *superbus* and *Daphoenodon* (*Borocyon*) *niobrarensis*
18 (Subfamily Daphoeninae); and *Delotrochanter oryktes* (Subfamily Temnocyoninae). We did
19 not include members of the subfamily Haplocyoninae in our comparisons due to the scarcity
20 of available postcranial material. The material of *Cynelos lemanensis* from the locality of
21 Saint Gerand-le-Puy (France) and *Amphicyon major* from the locality of Sansan was studied
22 in the collections of the Museum national d'Histoire naturelle (Paris, France) and that of
23 *Amphicyon ingens* in the collections of the American Museum of Natural History (New York,
24 USA); for the two former species we also used published data (Ginsburg 1961, 1977;
25 Bergounioux and Crouzel 1966; Argot 2010). Comparisons with other fossil Amphicyonidae

1 (such as *Amphicyon longiramus*, *Amphicyon galushai*, *Daphoenodon superbus*,
2 *Delotrochanter oryktes*, *Borocyon niobrarensis*, or *Ysengrinia americana*) were made using
3
4 published data (Peterson 1910; Olsen 1960; Hunt 2002, 2003, 2009, 2011). Although the
5
6 genera *Daphoenodon* and *Borocyon* were considered by Hunt (2009) as subgenera within the
7
8 genus *Daphoenodon*, we have preferred to follow the traditional classification, and thus they
9
10 are cited throughout the text as different genera.
11
12
13
14
15

16 Methods

17
18
19
20
21 The anatomical descriptions follow the terminology used by Barone (2010), Evans (1993),
22
23 and the *Nomina Anatomica Veterinaria* (2005). Here we describe and compare the principal
24
25 structures of both scapula and humerus of *M. anceps* and other species of arctoid Carnivora,
26
27 focusing on those features with remarkable relevance for the biomechanics of the shoulder.
28
29 Thus, some muscles are only described, but not included in the discussion. The aim of our
30
31 study is the comparative analysis of the shoulder biomechanics in *M. anceps* and other
32
33 amphicyonids, but in the context of other large carnivorans. In consequence, we use for
34
35 comparison several groups of carnivorans that are not closely related to Amphicyonidae.
36
37
38
39
40

41 In several parts of the manuscript we use the term “cursorial,” following the definition
42
43 of Hunt (2009: 72): “to refer to carnivorans with morphological specialization of their
44
45 postcranial skeleton favoring parasagittal alignment of the limbs and demonstrated ability for
46
47 fore-aft movement of the limb segments and feet, indicating increased stride length and
48
49 locomotor efficiency. There is the tacit assumption that physiological endurance and an
50
51 economy of gait in some form are the likely accompaniments to this morphology.”
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 **Body mass estimation in *Magericyon anceps***

1
2 We estimated the body mass of *M. anceps* using the formula of Figueirido et al. (2011) for
3
4 Amphicyonidae, based on the medio-lateral diameter of the femur at the middle of the
5
6 diaphysis, a measure that shows a better correlation to body mass than other measurements
7
8 taken on both long bones and skull (Figueirido et al. 2011). We had three complete adult
9
10 femora of *M. anceps* (BAT-1'06 E3-91, BAT-1'06 D3-41, and B-5255), which provided a
11
12 body mass estimation between 172-199 kg. We also obtained an estimated body mass of 152
13
14 kg from a right femur (B-2651) belonging to a sub-adult individual (the distal epiphysis is not
15
16 totally fused and it is slightly displaced from the diaphysis). Besides this, we also calculated
17
18 the body mass of *M. anceps* using the regression of Van Valkenburgh (1990) for Carnivora
19
20 based on the total length of the skull, obtaining a range of 172-205 kg, very similar to the
21
22 estimation provided by the femoral measurement. Thus, the variability in the estimated body
23
24 mass of *M. anceps* is relatively low, and would imply that this species exhibited a low index
25
26 of sexual dimorphism, which is not typical within Amphicyonidae (Ginsburg 1961; Viranta
27
28 1996; Hunt 1998, 2002, 2003, 2009; Peigné and Heizmann 2003). Nevertheless, the available
29
30 sample of *M. anceps* from Batallones-1 (with a minimum number of 12 individuals) is
31
32 dominated by juveniles and young adults (Peigné et al. 2008), and it could correspond to a
33
34 biased sample lacking the larger male individuals. This is also supported by the fact that,
35
36 although all the bones of *M. anceps* are represented at Batallones-1 (ribs, tarsals, carpals, even
37
38 tibial sesamoids) not a single baculum has been found, suggesting the absence of males.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Other authors have estimated the body mass of most of the amphicyonids included in
50
51 the present paper. Most of them are amphicyonines, such as *Amphicyon major*, with an
52
53 estimated body mass of 140-183 kg (Argot 2010; Figueirido et al. 2011); the gigantic
54
55 *Amphicyon ingens*: 547-706 kg (Sorkin 2006; Figueirido et al. 2011); *Ysengrinia americana*:
56
57 173-231 kg (Figueirido et al. 2011); *Amphicyon galushai*: 191-204 kg (Figueirido et al. 2011);
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 and *Cynelos lemanensis*: 46-91 kg (Peigné and Heizmann 2003). There is no direct estimation
2 of the body mass of the temnocyonines and daphoenines compared in this work:
3
4 *Delotrochanter oryktes*, *Daphoenodon superbus*, and *Borocyon niobrarensis*. However, *De.*
5 *oryktes* is considered as one of the largest Temnocyoninae, for which a body mass of 65-80
6 kg has been estimated (Hunt 2011). Regarding the daphoenines included in our study, a
7 relatively good approach can be made considering the available data on the body mass of
8 closely related forms, such as *B. robustum* (100-150 kg) (Hunt 2009) and *B. neomexicanum*
9 (135 kg) (Figueirido et al. 2011). Taking into account that *B. niobrarensis* has an intermediate
10 size between both *B. robustum* and *B. neomexicanum* (Hunt 2009), it probably did not weigh
11 more than 150 kg. On the other hand, *Da. superbus* was smaller than all these taxa (Hunt
12 2009), and thus this species probably had a maximum weight of around 100 kg.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 In summary, the estimated body mass of *M. anceps* places this species within the third
27 size group of Figueirido et al. (2011), which includes the largest known amphicyonines
28 (*Amphicyon*, *Ischyrocyon*, *Ysengrinia*, and *Pseudocyon*), all weighing more than 150 kg.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 **Anatomical descriptions**

37 **Scapula**

38
39
40
41 The scapula of *Magericyon anceps* has a quadrangular overall shape (Fig. 2), with a piriform,
42 medio-laterally flattened, and slightly concave glenoid cavity. Dorsal to this, on the cranial
43 border of the scapula, there is a well-developed supraglenoid tubercle for the attachment of
44 the muscle biceps brachii. The coracoid process (attachment area for the muscle
45 coracobrachialis), located on the dorsomedial margin of the supraglenoid tubercle, is
46 developed as a very small bulge, lacking any projection, very similar to that of some ursids
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 such as *U. americanus* or *T. ornatus*. The infraglenoid tubercle is developed as a small
2 tuberosity, more or less similar to that seen in ursids. On this tubercle both the muscles teres
3 minor and the long branch of the triceps brachii are attached, this latter extending its
4 attachment area onto the caudal border of the infraspinous fossa, which is slightly caudally
5 protruded (Davis 1949; Barone 2010). The scapular spine of *M. anceps* is well developed, and
6 divides the lateral surface of the scapula into two similarly sized infraspinous and
7 supraspinous fossae (attachment areas for the muscles infraspinatus and supraspinatus,
8 respectively), the former having a slightly protruding and sinuous caudal border. The spine
9 extends from near the dorsal border of the scapula, to the level of the glenoid cavity; it is not
10 different from that of ursids, canids, or large felids. The spine has a rough surface for the
11 attachment of the muscles trapezius and deltoideus pars scapularis. The cranioventral part of
12 the spine has a broad and rough acromion (where the muscle deltoideus pars acromialis is
13 attached) with a very small suprahamatus process, only developed as a small rugosity where
14 the muscle omotransversarius attaches. The acromion is cranioventrally projected and
15 strongly cranially curved over the border of the glenoid cavity, but it does not surpass the
16 ventral border of the glenoid cavity (Fig. 2). This morphology is similar to that of ursids,
17 although in this group the acromion widely surpasses the ventral level of the glenoid cavity
18 (Davis 1949) (Fig. 3f). In some amphicyonids such as *Amphicyon longiramus* and *A. major*
19 the acromion surpasses, to a greater or lesser extent, the level of the glenoid cavity (Olsen
20 1960; Argot 2010) (Fig. 3). In other species, such as the daphoenine *Da. superbus*, the
21 acromion development resembles the morphology observed in *M. anceps* (Peterson 1910).
22 The North American large amphicyonid *A. ingens* shows an acromion that does not surpass
23 that level of the glenoid cavity, although it is straighter than that of *M. anceps*, without cranial
24 curvature.

1 The dorsal border of the scapula shows a rough surface for the attachment of the
2 muscle rhomboideus; the shape and curvature of this border is similar to that of *Ursus arctos*
3 and *U. americanus*, and different to that of *Ailuropoda melanoleuca*, which has a more
4 craniocaudally elongated dorsal border (Davis 1964). On the craniodorsal angle of the medial
5 surface of the scapula there is a rough and sub-rectangular facies serrata, where the muscle
6 serratus ventralis would attach (Davis 1949; Barone 2010). The neck of the scapula of *M.*
7 *anceps* is not so wide as that of ursids (Figs. 2, 3f), although among this group, the ursines *U.*
8 *arctos* and *U. americanus* show wider scapular necks than other bears such as *T. ornatus* or *A.*
9 *melanoleuca*. Among the compared amphicyonids, *A. major* shows the relatively widest
10 scapular neck, similar to that of extant ursids (Argot 2010).

11 Apart from the typical small foramina seen close to the ventral surface of the scapular
12 spine of several species of carnivorans, the scapula of *M. anceps* also shows a much larger
13 nutrient foramen on the ventral part of the infraspinous fossa, just on the base of the acromion
14 (Fig. 2); among the Carnivora, this character is only observed in other amphicyonids such as
15 *A. longiramus*, *A. major*, and *Ysengrinia americana* (Olsen 1960; Hunt 2002; Argot 2010).
16 The presence of this foramen in *Y. americana* was interpreted by Hunt (2002) as being the
17 passage for both the suprascapular artery and nerve, which in other carnivorans lacking this
18 foramen, such as felids or ursids, lie ventrally to the scapular spine (Hunt 2002). We agree
19 with this interpretation, confirmed by means of a CT scan of the scapula of *M. anceps* that
20 there is a canal going through the base of the acromion (in cranio-caudal direction) connected
21 with another foramen in the supraspinous fossa (Fig. 4).

22 Nevertheless, one of the most interesting features of the scapula of *M. anceps* is the
23 presence of postscapular fossa and teres major process (Fig. 2), two structures that are also
24 developed in ursids and other amphicyonids. The postscapular fossa of *M. anceps* is
25 developed as an excavation along the caudal border of the scapula, extending from the

1 caudomedial margin, next to the glenoid fossa, to the lateral surface of the teres major
2 process, on the caudal vertex. It is separated from the infraspinous fossa by the caudal border
3 of the latter. This caudal border is caudally expanded along its ventral half, whereas the dorsal
4 half shows a slight ridge that finishes before it reaches the dorsal border of the scapula. Given
5 its similarity with that of ursids, we can assume that the postscapular fossa of amphicyonids
6 was also completely occupied by the muscle subscapularis minor, as it has been described in
7 bears (Davis 1949). In addition, the teres major process of *M. anceps*, as well as that of ursids
8 and other amphicyonids, is developed as a thin bone expansion of the caudal angle of the
9 scapula (Fig. 2a), with a smooth surface lacking any scar for the attachment of the muscle
10 teres major, and separated from the infraspinous fossa by the caudal border of the scapula. It
11 should be noted that, despite its name, the teres major process of ursids is not the attachment
12 area for the muscle teres major, as this muscle exclusively attaches on a rough surface on the
13 caudal margin of the process (Davis 1949, 1964; personal observation). In fact, most of the
14 surface of the teres major process is occupied by the prolongation of the attachment area of
15 the muscle subscapularis minor, as a continuation of the caudal excavation of the postscapular
16 fossa (Fig. 2c). Given the similarities in morphology between ursids and amphicyonids, a
17 similar muscular pattern can be inferred for the second group.

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 Within Ursidae, both the postscapular fossa and the teres major process show some
42 minor differences, with *Ursus* and *Melursus* having the relatively largest postscapular fossae
43 (Davis 1949), mainly due to the large size of the teres major process, whereas they are
44 reduced in *Tremarctos* and *Ailuropoda*. The differences in the development of these two
45 structures could seem related to body size, although this is not so clear when considering the
46 maximum body mass of the compared species (*U. arctos*, 550 kg; *U. americanus*, 225 kg; *T.*
47 *ornatus*, 175 kg; *M. ursinus*, 145 kg; and *A. melanoleuca*, 125 kg) (Garshelis 2009). For
48 example, in spite of the remarkable difference in body size between *U. arctos* and *U.*
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
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
61
62
63
64
65

americanus, their postscapular fossae show very similar proportions. On the other hand, although *T. ornatus* is larger than *M. ursinus*, this latter species has a more developed postscapular fossa than the former (Davis 1949).

The development of the postscapular fossa and the teres major process in *M. anceps* resembles that of *A. melanoleuca* and *T.ornatus*, although in this former species the teres major process is even slightly more reduced, and the caudal margin of the process is straight, lacking the marked notch typical of ursids (Fig. 3 c, f). Also, it is remarkable that in *M. anceps* the caudal margin of the teres major process does not show the rough area for the attachment of muscle teres major observed in ursids. In this group, the muscle teres major originates almost exclusively on the surface of the muscle subscapularis minor, although some fibers also attach on a rough area of the caudal border of the teres major process (Davis 1949). Given the absence of this area in *M. anceps*, it is probable that the muscle teres major was reduced in relation to that of bears.

The development of both the teres major process and the postscapular fossa in some amphicyonids shows also differences with those of *M. anceps* (Fig. 3). Thus, in *A. major*, *A. longiramus*, *Y. americana*, and *B. niobrarensis* the development of these structures is similar to that observed in the ursids *U. arctos* or *U. americanus* (Olsen 1960; Hunt 2002, 2009; Argot 2010), mainly in relation to the size of the teres major process (Fig. 3). These amphicyonids have a much larger teres major process than *M. anceps*, although they also lack the ventral notch of the teres major process observed in ursids, it showing the continuous border seen in *M. anceps*. Nevertheless, the scapulae of some of these amphicyonids (*A. longiramus* and *A. major*) also resemble the morphology of the *Ursus* species in having a wide scapular neck and an acromion surpassing the glenoid cavity (Fig. 3d) (Olsen 1960; Argot 2010). On the other hand, other amphicyonids such as *Da. superbis* (Fig. 3a) and *De. oryktes* (Hunt 2011:fig. 57a) show a teres major process very similar to that of *M. anceps*. As

1 described for Ursidae (see above) the development of these structures in Amphicyonidae is
2 apparently independent from body mass. For example, although *M. anceps* and *A. major* show
3 a similar estimated body weight, the former species shows a markedly reduced process (Fig. 3
4 c, d). Furthermore, with *B. niobrarenensis* being probably smaller than both *A. major* and *M.*
5 *anceps*, it also shows a more developed teres major process than the latter, although smaller
6 than that of *A. major*.
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

14 The teres major process is also present in extant procyonids: it is well developed in
15 *Potos flavus*, whereas it is almost vestigial in *Procyon lotor* and *Nasua nasua* (Salesa et al.
16 2008). In the primitive late Miocene ailurid *Simocyon batalleri* the process is large, but it is
17 mostly occupied by the enlarged attachment area for the muscle teres major, that for the
18 muscle subscapularis minor being relatively small (Salesa et al. 2008). This process is also
19 present, although very reduced, in borophagine canids (Munthe 1989), probably indicating the
20 presence of a relatively larger muscle teres major in relation to other canids, which lack this
21 structure. The teres major process is also developed in the otters (Lutrinae), such as *Aonyx*
22 *cinereus*, *Lutra lutra*, and especially *Lontra canadensis*, although there is no trace of a
23 postscapular fossa; other mustelids, such as the wolverine (*Gulo gulo*) and the fisher (*Martes*
24 *pennanti*) have medially expanded areas for the attachment of the muscle teres major (Leach
25 1977) but without forming the mentioned process. Finally, other groups such as most
26 pinnipeds or anteaters (*Myrmecophaga*, *Tamandua*) have a well-developed caudal accessory
27 fossa of the scapula, which probably correspond to the postscapular fossa, although it is larger
28 than that seen in the carnivorans mentioned above (Davis 1949; English 1977; Taylor 1978;
29 Hildebrand 1988). Nevertheless, most pinnipeds (basically Phocidae and Otariidae) have wide
30 scapulae showing other modifications such as an expanded supraspinous fossa, a low spine
31 with a very reduced acromion, and a great development of the postscapular fossa (English
32 1977). This implies a reorganization of the muscles attaching on the scapula, not only the
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
61
62
63
64
65

1 teres major and the caudal portion of the muscle subscapularis, but also others such as the
2 muscle deltoideus, which attaches on the postscapular fossa (English 1977:fig.1 and p.329).
3
4 On the other hand, in anteaters, the dorsal area of the postscapular fossa (teres major process
5 in other groups) is principally occupied by the muscle teres major (Taylor 1978; Hildebrand
6
7 1988). Thus, in phocids, otariids, and anteaters, the attachment area for the caudal portion of
8
9 the muscle subscapularis (which probably correspond to the subscapularis minor of Davis
10
11 1949), occupies only a caudoventral area of the postscapular fossa (English 1977; Taylor
12
13 1978:fig.1) it being relatively smaller than that of ursids or amphicyonids, and less caudo-
14
15 dorsally extended (as it does not reach the dorsal margin of the fossa).
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Proximal half of the humerus

25
26
27
28
29 The proximal epiphysis of the humerus of *M. anceps* (Fig. 5) shows a round, slightly distally
30
31 inclined articular head, and a marked humeral neck, mostly developed on the caudal side of
32
33 the humerus. This neck is more marked in *M. anceps* than in the ursines and *T. ornatus*, and
34
35 similar to that of *A. melanoleuca* and large felids such as *Panthera leo*. These latter species
36
37 also show a distally inclined and projected articular head. Most of the compared ursids, except
38
39 *A. melanoleuca*, have more circular and convex articular heads, lacking any distal projection,
40
41 and they have a relatively less marked humeral neck (Fig. 6a, d, e). The morphology of both
42
43 the articular head and the neck in *M. anceps* is also different from that of other amphicyonids
44
45 such as *A. major* (Fig. 6b) and *A. longiramus*, which show less marked necks and a shorter
46
47 caudal projection, in a similar way to that of ursids (Olsen 1960; Argot 2010).
48
49
50
51
52

53 The lesser tubercle of *M. anceps* (the attachment area for the muscle subscapularis in
54
55 ursids) (Davis 1964) does not significantly differ from the morphology observed in ursids and
56
57 other amphicyonids. It is located on the craniomedial margin of the articular head, slightly
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
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
proximally prominent. In turn, the greater tubercle is located on the cranio-lateral margin of
the articular head, more cranially and proximally projected than that of ursids. The proximal
and caudal faces of this tubercle are the attachment areas for the muscle supraspinatus,
whereas the muscle infraspinatus attaches on a marked and deep round scar located on the
lateral face. The greater tubercle of *M. anceps* slightly surpasses proximally the level of the
humeral head, just a little more than in ursids and *A. major*, it being more similar to that of
other amphicyonids such as *C. lemanensis* and *Da. superbus* (Fig. 6 a–c). The distance
between the cranial border of the greater tubercle and the articular head of the humerus is
longer in *M. anceps* than in the ursids, a morphology that is more similar to that of large felids
and canids than to that of ursids (Fig. 6a, d, e). The greater tubercle continues distally in a
marked crest for the attachment of the muscles pectorales (superficialis and profundus) (Davis
1964). This crest extends along the two-thirds of the cranial margin of the diaphysis. Both the
morphology and development of this crest in *M. anceps* is similar to that of ursids and other
amphicyonids such as *A. major*, *A. longiramus*, *C. lemanensis*, or *Da. superbus*, whilst in the
temnocyonine amphicyonid *De. oryktes* the crest is restricted to the proximal part of the
humerus (Hunt 2011).

39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
The intertubercular groove of *M. anceps*, developed between both lesser and greater
tubercles, is L-shaped in proximal view (Fig. 6a), due to the cranially projected greater
tubercle, much more open than in ursids, and similar to that of other compared amphicyonids
such as *A. major* and *C. lemanensis* (Fig. 6b, c). Extant felids and canids also show a cranially
projected, similarly L-shaped intertubercular groove, whereas in all the compared ursids both
the greater and the lesser tubercles are similarly cranially projected, with the former being
located closely to the articular head, and with a more enclosed intertubercular groove,
developed as a shallow canal separating both tubercles (Fig. 6d).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
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
61
62
63
64
65

On the lateral face of the diaphysis, the tricipital line (for the attachment of the lateral head of the muscle triceps brachii) extends from the neck to the distal end of the greater tubercle crest, where it joins this crest (Fig. 5c). On the cranial margin, adjacent to the proximal extreme of the tricipital line, there is a smooth bulge for the attachment of the muscle teres minor, whereas on the distal third of the line, a marked deltoid tuberosity is present. The length of the greater tubercle crest and the tricipital line in *M. anceps* is similar to those of ursids (Fig. 6) but the latter structure is less ridged and its surface is smoother in the former. The distal joining of both crests is markedly rough and slightly cranially projected, this area being the attachment surface of the muscles cleidobrachialis and pectoralis superficialis (Davis 1964). There is no humeral crest, as in some ursids such as *A. melanoleuca* and large felids.

Functional implications of the shoulder anatomy of *Magericyon anceps*

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
61
62
63
64
65

The overall shoulder morphology of amphicyonids (including *M. anceps*) resembles that of ursids in several features, such as the general shape of the scapula and proximal humerus, and the presence of postscapular fossa and teres major process (Ginsburg 1961; Olsen 1961; Hunt 2002, 2009; Sorkin 2006; Argot 2010; Figueirido et al. 2011). But it also shows interesting differences with ursids, such as the presence of a large nutrient foramen on the ventral surface of the infraspinous fossa (Olsen 1961; Hunt 2002; Argot 2010), the absence of a caudal notch in the teres major process, the lesser development of the acromion, and the different configuration of the intertubercular groove. This combination indicates that, although both groups share a generally similar shoulder architecture, they should not be considered as mere ecological homologues; moreover if we consider the presence of different morphotypes within Amphicyonidae (Hunt 1998; Figueirido et al. 2011), including the medium-sized,

1 relatively generalized *C. lemanensis*, the giant, bear-like *A. major*, or the more cursorial
2 species *Da. superbus* and *B. niobrarenensis* (the former species being medium-sized, whereas
3 the latter is larger) (Peigné and Heizmann 2003; Hunt 2009; Argot 2010; Figueirido et al.
4 2011). Given this scenario, it seems clear that, although some amphicyonids could have been
5 biomechanically roughly similar to ursids, other species probably exhibited a wider range of
6 locomotor behaviors, which were independent from body size.

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15 Focusing on the scapula of *M. anceps*, the presence of a postscapular fossa and a teres
16 major process allows interpreting a similar muscular disposition in this area as that of ursids,
17 with the muscle subscapularis minor occupying most of the surfaces of these two structures
18 (Fig. 7), whereas the muscle teres major would be relatively reduced and attached almost
19 exclusively onto the muscle subscapularis minor, as strongly suggested by the absence of an
20 attachment area on the caudal border of the scapula. It is remarkable that although the teres
21 major process is also well developed in other carnivorans, such as ailurids, procyonids
22 (especially in *P. flavus*), and otters, in all these taxa the process is almost completely occupied
23 by the enlarged attachment area for the muscle teres major (Howard 1973; Salesa et al. 2008;
24 Fisher et al. 2009). In phocids and otariids, the process also provides the attachment area for
25 other muscles, such as the deltoideus (English 1977). In all these carnivorans the attachment
26 area for the muscle subscapularis minor is relatively reduced in comparison to the condition
27 seen in ursids. Even in non-carnivorans such as the Myrmecophagidae (anteaters), the
28 attachment area for the muscle subscapularis minor occupies only the ventral part of the very
29 large postscapular fossa, whereas its dorsal part serves as the attachment surface for the
30 muscle teres major (Davis 1949; Taylor 1978). In some of these groups the peculiar
31 morphology of their scapulae has been associated to a special locomotion type: aquatic
32 locomotion in phocids, otariids, and otters (English 1977; Howard 1973), climbing abilities in
33 fossil ailurids (Salesa et al. 2008) and the arboreal anteater *Tamandua* (Taylor 1978), or
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
61
62
63
64
65

1 digging capacities in the anteater *Myrmecophaga* (Hildebrand 1988). Also, in anteaters the
2 scapular morphology has been associated to their special feeding behavior, which includes
3 strong tearing movements with their forelimbs (Davis 1949; Taylor 1978; Hildebrand 1988).
4
5

6
7 It should be noted that in all these groups of mammals having well-developed teres
8 major process and postscapular fossa the relative importance of the muscles subscapularis
9 minor and teres major is different, with ailurids, procyonids, otters, phocids, otariids, and
10 anteaters having a proportionally large muscle teres major, whereas this is relatively small in
11 ursids, which have a proportionally large muscle subscapularis minor (Davis 1949).
12
13

14 Nevertheless, the implications for shoulder biomechanics of the presence of a large muscle
15 subscapularis minor are not clear. According to Davis (1949) the fibers of the muscle
16 subscapularis minor are separated from the main mass of the much larger muscle
17 subscapularis by a fascial septum, it being innervated by a separate subscapular branch of the
18 axillary nerve. However, Hunt (2009), in a dissection of the shoulder of a specimen of sun
19 bear (*Helarctos malayanus*), observed that the subscapularis minor is “a fusiform ventral
20 derivative of the muscle subscapularis” and “its fibers merge with the ventral part of the
21 subscapularis.” In a dissection of an adult male specimen of *T. ornatus* we observed a similar
22 morphology for these muscles as that described by Hunt (2009) for *H. malayanus*, with the
23 muscle subscapularis occupying the whole medial part of the scapula, and being composed of
24 several fusiform fascicles that can be easily delimited but remain part of the same muscular
25 mass (Fig. 7b). One of these fascicles, the most caudally located, fits into the postscapular
26 fossa, with some of its fibers attaching on the lateral portion of the teres major process (Fig.
27 7a). This caudal portion of the muscle subscapularis in *T. ornatus* is not separated from the
28 rest of the fascicles forming the muscle, and it joins them before attaching onto the same area
29 of the humerus (Fig. 7b). The only difference of the muscle subscapularis minor with respect
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
61
62
63
64
65

1 to the rest of the fibers of the subscapularis is that some fibers of the former attach on a small
2 lateral area of the teres major process.
3

4 Given this, the function of the muscle subscapularis minor should not be markedly
5 different from that of the muscle subscapularis. Hunt (2009) suggested that the presence of
6 both teres major process and postscapular fossa in ursids and amphicyonids would be a
7 retention of an ancestral, common pattern shared by these families, with no clear functional
8 significance. This idea is also supported by the presence of similar structures in other arctoid
9 carnivorans, as discussed above, such as ailurids, otters, procyonids, some canids, and some
10 pinnipeds (Davis 1964; Howard 1973; English 1977; Munthe 1989; Salesa et al. 2008; Fisher
11 et al. 2009). It is easy to assume that, since both muscles (subscapularis and subscapularis
12 minor) share the same attachment area on the humerus (Fig. 7b), and they originate on
13 adjacent areas of the scapula, their functions have to be very similar. But there is a difference
14 in the conformation of these muscles that could determine some degree of functional
15 separation: whereas the muscle subscapularis occupies most of the medial surface of the
16 scapula, the subscapularis minor attaches along its caudal margin occupying both the lateral
17 and medial surfaces of the postscapular fossa. This change from the lateral to the medial
18 surface along its length, probably affects the function of the muscle subscapularis minor, and
19 even that of the muscle subscapularis due to the fact that both muscular masses are not
20 independent (see above). However, at least in *T. ornatus* the muscle subscapularis minor can
21 be considered as the last caudal fascicle of the muscle subscapularis, and only a few fibers of
22 the former attach onto the teres major process. The muscle subscapularis is essentially an
23 adductor of the shoulder, its tendon also acting as a medial collateral ligament that restricts
24 the abduction range of the shoulder (Barone 2010). Other muscles, such as the infraspinatus
25 and supraspinatus (the former abducts the gleno-humeral articulation, whereas the latter
26 abducts and extends it) also stabilize this articulation, restricting both the cranial displacement
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
61
62
63
64
65

1 of the humeral head, and the transversal movement of the scapula (Barone 2010; Evans 1993).
2 Several studies on electromyography of the muscles subscapularis, infraspinatus, and
3
4 supraspinatus in dogs and cats reveal that they are electrically active throughout most of the
5
6 stance phase of the locomotion, which is consistent with the importance of these muscles in
7
8 the shoulder joint stabilization (Tokuriki 1973a, b; English 1978; Goslow et al. 1981). Thus,
9
10 an important function of these muscles is stabilizing the gleno-humeral articulation during the
11
12 movement of the humerus, restricting its range of abduction-adduction. Also, the function of
13
14 the muscles subscapularis, infraspinatus, and supraspinatus has been related to the necessity
15
16 for a strong control of rotatory movements of the shoulder in pinnipeds during swimming, in
17
18 which the large muscle subscapularis would have an important role due to the complex
19
20 orientation of their fascicles (English 1977). It is possible that in ursids and amphicyonids,
21
22 due to their wide range of movements in the shoulder articulation (Davis 1949; Argot 2010),
23
24 the muscle subscapularis minor, as a caudoventral projection of the muscle subscapularis,
25
26 actually improves this shoulder stabilization. Also, the prolongation of the attachment area of
27
28 the subscapularis minor onto the lateral surface of the teres major process could add an
29
30 inwards rotatory component to the adduction of the humerus (Salesa et al. 2008) or at least
31
32 increase the shoulder stabilization during lateral rotation of the humerus. Thus, the combined
33
34 contraction of the muscles subscapularis and subscapularis minor would improve the shoulder
35
36 joint stability during the grasping and pulling actions in ursids and amphicyonids (Hunt
37
38 2009), as it has been also proposed for *P. flavus* and *S. batalleri* (Salesa et al. 2008). In ursids,
39
40 the development of both the postscapular fossa and the teres major process besides the mobile
41
42 shoulder articulation and the overall powerful shoulder musculature have been related to the
43
44 ability of this group for climbing trees, an activity that implies that part of the body weight is
45
46 supported by the forelimbs (Davis 1949; Argot 2003, 2010), but also to other types of
47
48 behavior, such as overturning stones and digging (Gambaryan 1974).
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
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
61
62
63
64
65

Some of the mentioned activities (climbing, digging) could have been also accomplished by the primitive species of amphicyonids, most of them considered as having a non-cursorial, generalized postcranial skeleton (Hunt 1998, 2001, 2009; Peigné and Heizmann 2003). Following this, it would be expected that in more cursorial amphicyonids such as *De. oryktes* and *B. niobrarensis*, the increased importance of shoulder stabilization during running should have provoked a certain degree of differentiation from the scapular morphology seen in more typical amphicyonids, producing scapulae more similar to those of cursorial carnivorans, which are elongated and slender, and lack both the postscapular fossa and the teres major process (Smith and Savage 1956; Gambaryan 1974; Seckel and Janis 2008). In this respect, Hunt (2009) suggested that the necessity for digging would have been a strong reason for retaining these structures on the scapula of the most cursorial amphicyonids, moreover when specimens of at least two species (*De. oryktes* and *Da. superbus*) have been found in fossil burrows (Hunt et al. 1983; Hunt 2011). In amphicyonids, improving the shoulder stabilization would have been also useful during prey capture, an activity in which the forelimbs exert a great strength to subdue prey (Sorkin 2006), especially since most of the larger amphicyonids are considered ambush predators and more active hunters than extant ursids (Hunt 2002, 2003; Sorkin 2006; Argot 2010). Also, as Gambaryan (1974) suggested for ursids, the strong shoulder musculature of amphicyonids, which would be primarily used for digging and climbing in primitive species, would have been secondarily used during the support period of the gallop in more cursorial forms, basically providing strength and stabilization. In this regard, it is remarkable that the scapula of *M. anceps* shows the relatively smallest teres major process of all the compared amphicyonids, including both ursid-like and cursorial forms (*A. major* and *B. niobrarensis*, for example, showing both the larger teres major processes). This suggests that the presence of this structure cannot be associated to a specific locomotor adaptation in Amphicyonidae, and its reduction in *M. anceps* should be

1 considered in the context of the whole scapular morphology. In fact, Argot (2010) already
2 pointed out the difficulty in providing a completely satisfactory hypothesis explaining the
3 origin and functional significance of the postscapular fossa. Within Ursidae, the species with
4 less cursorial adaptations such as *T. ornatus* and *A. melanoleuca*, show reduced teres major
5 processes in comparison to ursine ursids such as *U. arctos*. But the former species are also
6 much smaller than the latter, and a strong allometric relationship could be determining part of
7 the variation in the size of this process. In our opinion, and considering the morphology
8 observed in ailurids, procyonids, ursids, and amphicyonids, the presence of a muscle
9 subscapularis minor and its attachment areas (postscapular fossa and teres major process) in
10 terrestrial carnivorans could be interpreted as indicative of the development of a secondary
11 function for this muscle, from primarily stabilizing the shoulder when climbing (Davis 1949;
12 Argot 2010), to improving that stabilization during running, digging, and even prey
13 immobilization.

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
61
62
63
64
65

The relatively narrower scapular neck of *M. aniceps* when compared to that of ursids and *A. major* would be pointing towards relatively less-developed climbing abilities, as the presence of a robust scapular necks in ursids and other scansorial mammals has been related by Argot (2003, 2010) with an increase of resistance against tensile forces during climbing. Considering that *M. aniceps* and *A. major* had similar body sizes, and the suggestion of Argot (2010) that the latter was only an occasional climber, it would be expected that *M. aniceps* was a very rare climber, with only young individuals being able of an effective development of this activity.

The presence of the teres major process and postscapular fossa in the scapulae of ursids and amphicyonids also produces a slight increase in the length of the attachment surfaces of the muscles rhomboideus and serratus ventralis (the former attaching on the dorsal margin of the scapula, and the latter on the dorsomedial margin). The functions of these two

1 muscles are related to rotation of the scapula, the suspension of the limb from the trunk, and
2 the load transmission from trunk to limb (Davis 1949; Taylor 1978; Barone 2010). In
3
4 anteaters, phocids, and otariids these muscles are relatively large when compared to those of
5
6 other groups, and this has been related to the rotation movements of the scapula during
7
8 climbing, tearing, or swimming (English 1977; Taylor 1978). Also, an expanded caudodorsal
9
10 border of the scapula has been related to an increase in the mechanical advantage of the
11
12 muscle teres major due to the increased moment arm in fossorial and aquatic mammals
13
14 (Smith and Savage 1956). However, in amphicyonids and ursids this caudal angle is not as
15
16 elongated as in those groups, and the attachment surface for the muscle teres major just
17
18 occupies a small portion of this area (as commented above). Furthermore, the quadrangular
19
20 overall shape of the scapula in amphicyonids and ursids is very similar to that of other arctoid
21
22 carnivorans, very far from the fan-shaped scapulae of phocids, otariids, and anteaters, which
23
24 markedly expand their dorsal margin (English 1977; Taylor 1978). Besides this, the
25
26 expansion of the caudal angle in *M. anceps* is small when compared to other amphicyonids,
27
28 with *A. major* showing the largest caudal angle, which would point towards the relatively
29
30 enhanced climbing abilities suggested by Argot (2010).
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Another interesting feature observed in the scapula of *M. anceps* is the reduced
40
41 acromion, which does not surpass the level of the glenoid cavity (Fig. 2a). This morphology is
42
43 different from that of ursids, and it has been associated to a decreased abductor function of the
44
45 acromial part of the muscle deltoideus in cursorial carnivorans (Taylor 1974), in which the
46
47 humerus moves around the scapula mostly in the parasagittal plane. Other amphicyonids
48
49 show different patterns, with *A. major* (Fig. 3d) or *A. longiramus* showing an acromion more
50
51 similar to that of ursids, and *Da. superbis* (Fig. 3a) and *A. ingens* showing a reduced
52
53 acromion in a similar way to that of *M. anceps*. Thus, this character would indicate that most
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 of the amphicyonids had more cursorial abilities than ursids, with *A. major* probably being the
2 most bear-like of all the compared amphicyonids.
3

4 The abduction of the humerus is also restricted by the size of its greater tubercle,
5 because if this is large enough, it could contact the lateral surface of the glenoid cavity
6 (Barone 2010), preventing any abduction movement of the humerus. Thus, with ursids and
7 amphicyonids having relatively small greater tubercles, the importance of the subscapularis
8 minor and the teres major process in the shoulder stabilization could be higher in relation to
9 other carnivorans with relatively larger greater tubercles, which would a priori show lower
10 ranges of humerus abduction. However, the morphology of the greater tubercle of *M. anceps*
11 and most of the compared amphicyonids, (*Y. americana*, *C. lemanensis*, *A. galushai*, *De.*
12 *oryktes*) is slightly different from that observed in ursids and more bear-like amphicyonids
13 such as *A. major*, which show a less proximally projected greater tubercle (Fig. 6b). Within
14 the former group *De. oryktes* shows a strongly proximally projected greater tubercle, more
15 than the other compared amphicyonids, once again indicating the presence of different
16 locomotor types within Amphicyonidae. A more projecting greater tubercle is typical of
17 cursorial carnivorans (Taylor 1974) and it would indicate that many amphicyonids, including
18 *M. anceps*, were more capable runners than ursids and bear-like amphicyonids such as *A.*
19 *major*. It is remarkable that this morphology is already present in the primitive form *C.*
20 *lemanensis* (Fig. 6c), which would indicate that the earliest amphicyonids, although being
21 generalized forms, already exhibited certain cursorial capabilities (Viranta 1996; Peigné and
22 Heizmann 2003), and a projected greater tubercle would be a plesiomorphy for
23 Amphicyonidae, which later changed in ursid-like forms such as *A. major*, which shows a less
24 projected greater tubercle.
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 *Magericyon anceps* also shows long greater tubercle crest and tricripital line, which
56 imply the existence of a distally elongated attachment area for the muscles pectorales,
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 deltoideus, and cleidobrachialis (Fig. 5a). These muscles control the shoulder rotation and
2 thus are related to manipulative behavior, as well as to climbing or digging abilities (Argot
3 2003, 2010; Barone 2010). Both the greater tubercle crest and the tricipital line are long and
4 rough in ursids, and shorter in felids and canids, implying relatively smaller muscles in the
5 latter groups. In *M. anceps* these crests are as long as those of ursids (Fig. 6a,d), suggesting
6 similarly powerful muscles pectorales and deltoideus. Most of the compared amphicyonids
7 show this pattern, except the cursorial temnocyonine amphicyonids such as *De. oryktes*,
8 which show a relatively reduced crest, restricted to the proximal part of the humerus (Hunt
9 2011).

10 Besides all these features of the scapula and the proximal half of the humerus
11 indicating some degree of similarity between ursids and amphicyonids, there are other traits,
12 observed in most of the species of amphicyonids except *A. major* that resemble the
13 morphology present in large felids such as *Panthera leo*. These features are: 1) the greater
14 tubercle is proximally projected, surpassing the level of the articular head of the humerus
15 (although slightly less than in large felids); 2) the scapular neck is relatively narrow; 3) the
16 articular head of the humerus is distally inclined, which produces a marked humeral neck; 4)
17 the intertubercular groove of the humerus is open, L-shaped in proximal view (all the
18 amphicyonids compared, including *A. major*); and 5) at least in *M. anceps* and *Da. superbus*
19 the acromion does not surpass the level of the glenoid cavity. Among these traits, the
20 intertubercular groove morphology has interesting functional implications: the tendon of the
21 muscle biceps brachii runs into this groove, with the transversal humeral ligament (developed
22 between both the greater and the lesser tubercles) keeping the tendon in place inside the
23 groove (Evans 1993; Barone 2010). As described previously, the shape of the intertubercular
24 groove is similar in canids, felids, and amphicyonids in general (thus including *M. anceps*), it
25 being markedly different from that of ursids, which have a much more closed, canal-like

1 groove (Fig. 6). Taylor (1974) associated this character with both the power of the muscle
2 biceps brachii and the degree of usage: a clearly defined intertubercular groove, such as that
3 of ursids, would allow a better control of movements, and probably a powerful muscle.
4 According to Taylor (1974) the nandiniid *Nandinia binotata*, which shows an ursid-like
5 groove, employs this muscle to a much greater degree than the viverrid *Civettictis civetta*
6 (with a much more open groove) and this would be related to the greater climbing ability of
7 the former. In the case of ursids and amphicyonids, the different shape of the intertubercular
8 groove, besides reflecting differences in muscle strength, would indicate its different usage.
9 Thus, whereas in ursids the muscle biceps brachii probably participates in a higher range of
10 activities, such as those related to food acquisition, and also climbing, manipulating stones, or
11 digging, in amphicyonids the muscle biceps brachii would have had a more restricted role,
12 mainly related to locomotor activities. In addition, the more cranially projected greater
13 tubercle of amphicyonids compared to that of ursids, implies a longer distance between the
14 gleno-humeral articulation and the attachment area of the muscle supraspinatus (Feeney
15 1999). As this muscle helps in the extension and stabilization of the gleno-humeral
16 articulation, this longer distance increases the extension range of this joint in the parasagittal
17 plane, as it has been described in canids (Feeney 1999), also improving its mechanical
18 stabilization. In this respect it is remarkable that this cranial projection of the greater tubercle
19 is also observed in larger felids such as *P. leo*, indicating similar degree of extension in the
20 forelimb as that of most of the amphicyonids.

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 In summary, although the scapulo-humeral morphology of *M. anceps* is similar to that
50 of other amphicyonids, it also shows interesting peculiarities. Among these, the relatively
51 reduced acromion, postscapular fossa, and teres major process suggest some differentiation
52 from the two ecological morphotypes shown by derived Amphicyonidae, and a similarity with
53 primitive, generalized forms such as *C. lemanensis*. This would indicate that *M. anceps*
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 occupied an intermediate ecological niche between that of the ursid-like amphicyonines and
2 that of the highly cursorial North American daphoenines and temnocyonines.
3
4
5
6

7 **Conclusions**

8
9

10
11 *Magericyon anceps* is an atypical amphicyonid for several reasons. Its dentition, although
12 being roughly similar to that of other amphicyonids, also shows several derived features
13 pointing towards a more hypercarnivorous diet than those of most of the species of this family
14 (Peigné et al. 2008). Besides this, the presence of postcranial features suggesting more
15 cursorial abilities than those of the middle Miocene amphicyonines (such as *A. major*),
16 including reduced postscapular fossa and teres major process, and a more projected greater
17 tubercle, would place *M. anceps* in a different ecological niche than that of these larger forms.
18 In fact, its shoulder anatomy is similar to that of the primitive and relatively generalized
19 species *Cynelos lemanensis* and *Daphoenodon superbus*, and thus intermediate between that
20 of the ursid-like amphicyonines (*A. major*) and that of the markedly cursorial temnocyonines
21 (*Delotrochanter oryktes*) and daphoenines (*Borocyon niobrarensis*). Thus, with *M. anceps*
22 showing a relatively large body size and a non-specialized shoulder, it is very likely that it
23 inhabited moderately vegetated habitats, very different from those open environments
24 probably occupied by the cursorial temnocyonines and daphoenines. This agrees with the
25 habitat inferred for the Batallones environment, probably a mosaic of woodland areas besides
26 more open, savannah-like patches (Salesa et al. 2006b); this landscape was derived from the
27 progressive aridification process that started in the Vallesian, and finally led to the
28 predominance of savannas over wooded habitats during the Turolian (Agustí et al. 1999;
29 Fortelius et al. 2002). This habitat is very different from that inferred for *A. major*, a species
30 that inhabited Europe during the middle Miocene, when climatic conditions were more humid
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
61
62
63
64
65

1 and warm than during the Vallesian and Turolian (Zachos et al. 2001; Böhme 2003; Tong et
2 al. 2009; Bruch et al. 2010; Böhme et al. 2011). Thus, it is not surprising that these two
3
4 similarly sized amphicyonids show different models on their shoulder region: *A. major* has an
5
6 ursid-like scapula, with large postcapular fossa and teres major process, whereas in *M. anceps*
7
8 these structures are clearly reduced. This indicates that these two species probably played
9
10 different ecological roles within their ecosystems, although other important functional
11
12 complexes should be considered before proposing any functional model for *M. anceps*. Argot
13
14 (2010) studied an almost complete skeleton of *A. major*, proposing the hypothesis that this
15
16 species “was a more efficient runner than are modern bears,” so with *M. anceps* showing the
17
18 above-mentioned features on its shoulder, it is highly probable that it were even more
19
20 cursorial than the middle Miocene species.
21
22
23
24
25

26
27 Finally, when considering together the relatively primitive shoulder morphology of *M.*
28
29 *anceps* and its hypercarnivorous dentition, which includes reduced post-carnassial teeth and
30
31 markedly flattened upper canines (Peigné et al. 2008), this species reveals itself as a unique
32
33 ecological type within Amphicyonidae. This combination of features suggests the importance
34
35 of flesh in the diet of *M. anceps*, and supports the hypothesis that the need for an efficient
36
37 hunting was the major evolutionary pressure determining the evolution of the appendicular
38
39 skeleton of this amphicyonid. Nevertheless, any functional or ecological inference made from
40
41 the study of such a concrete region as the shoulder must be taken with caution, and only
42
43 future studies on the whole postcranial anatomy of *M. anceps* will allow a more complete
44
45 understanding of the ecological role and locomotor adaptations of this unusual amphicyonid.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 **Acknowledgements** This study is part of the research projects CGL2008-00034, and
54
55 CGL2011-25754 (Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad, Spanish Government) and
56
57 PICS-CNRS 4737. MJS and JM belong to the Research Group UCM-BSCH 910607. GS was
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 a pre-doctoral FPI fellowship of the project CGL2008-00034. We thank Dr Josefina Barreiro
2 (Museo Nacional de Ciencias Naturales-CSIC) and Dr Christine Argot (Museum national
3 d'Histoire naturelle, Paris, France) for kindly loaning the specimens used for comparison. We
4
5 thank Dr Borja Figueirido (Universidad de Málaga, Spain) for providing us with images of
6
7 the fossils of *Amphicyon ingens* used for comparison. We thank the government of the
8
9 Comunidad de Madrid (Spain) for providing funding for the excavations at Cerro de los
10
11 Batallones. Finally, we thank the editor and two anonymous reviewers for their constructive
12
13 suggestions and comments.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 **References**

23
24
25
26 Agustí J, Cabrera L, Garcés M, Llenas M (1999) Mammal turnover and global climate change
27
28 in the late Miocene terrestrial record of the Vallès-Penedès Basin (NE Spain). In: Agustí J,
29
30 Rook L, Andrews P (eds) Hominoid Evolution and Climatic Change in Europe, Vol. 1.
31
32 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp 390–397
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Andersson K, Werdelin L (2003) The evolution of cursorial carnivores in the Tertiary:
40
41 implications of elbow joint morphology. Proc R Soc B (Suppl) 270:163–165
42
43
44
45

46 Antón M, Morales J (2000) Inferencias paleoecológicas de la asociación de carnívoros del
47
48 yacimiento de Cerro Batallones. In: Morales J, Nieto M, Amezua L, Fraile S, Gómez E,
49
50 Herráez E, Peláez-Campomanes P, Salesa MJ, Sánchez IM, Soria D (eds) Patrimonio
51
52 Paleontológico de la Comunidad de Madrid. Madrid: Serie “Arqueología Paleontología y
53
54 Etnografía,” Monográfico 6. Consejería de Educación, Comunidad de Madrid, pp 109–201
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Antón M, Salesa MJ, Morales J, Turner A (2004) First known complete skulls of the scimitar-
2 toothed cat *Machairodus aphanistus* (Felidae, Carnivora) from the Spanish late Miocene site
3 of Batallones-1. *J Vertebr Paleontol* 24:957–969
4
5
6

7
8
9
10 Argot C (2003) Functional adaptations of the postcranial skeleton of two Miocene
11 borhyaenoids (Mammalia, Metatheria), *Borhyaena* and *Prothylacinus*, from South America.
12 *Palaeontology* 46:1213–1267
13
14
15

16
17
18
19 Argot C (2004) Functional-adaptive features and palaeobiologic implications of the
20 postcranial skeleton of the late Miocene sabretooth borhyaenoid *Thylacosmilus atrox*
21 (Metatheria). *Alcheringa* 28:229–266
22
23
24
25

26
27
28
29 Argot C (2010) Morphofunctional analysis of the postcranium of *Amphicyon major*
30 (Mammalia, Carnivora, Amphicyonidae) from the Miocene of Sansan (Gers, France)
31 compared to three extant carnivores: *Ursus arctos*, *Panthera leo*, and *Canis lupus*.
32 *Geodiversitas* 32:65–106
33
34
35
36

37
38
39
40
41 Barone R (2010) Anatomie comparée des mammifères domestiques, Tome 2, Arthrologie et
42 myologie. Éditions Vigot, Paris
43
44
45

46
47
48 Bergounioux FM, Cruzel F (1966) Découverte d'un squelette d'*Amphicyon major* Blainville
49 dans le Miocène moyen de Sansan (Gers). *C R Acad Sci Paris Sci de la Terre* 262:2015–2017
50
51
52
53

54
55
56 Böhme M (2003) The Miocene Climatic Optimum: evidence from ectothermic vertebrates of
57 Central Europe. *Palaeogeogr Palaeoclimatol Palaeoecol* 195:389–401
58
59
60
61

1
2 Böhme M, Winklhofer M, Ilg A (2011) Miocene precipitation in Europe: temporal trends and
3
4 spatial gradients. *Palaeogeogr Palaeoclimatol Palaeoecol* 304:212–218
5
6

7
8
9
10 Bonis LDe (1966) Arrière-Crâne et Moulages endocrâniens de Carnivores fossiles. *Ann*
11
12 *Paleontol Vertebr* 53:143–162
13
14

15
16
17 Bruch A, Utescher T, Mosbrugger V (2010) Precipitation patterns in the Miocene of Central
18
19 Europe and the development of continentality. *Palaeogeogr Palaeoclimatol Palaeoecol*
20
21 304:202–211
22
23

24
25
26 Calvo JP, Pozo M, Silva PG, Morales J (2013) Pattern of sedimentary infilling of fossil
27
28 mammal traps formed in pseudokarst at Cerro de los Batallones, Madrid Basin, central Spain.
29
30 *Sedimentology* 60:1681–1708
31
32

33
34
35
36 Davis DD (1949) The shoulder architecture of bears and other carnivores. *Fieldiana Zool*
37
38 31:285–305
39
40

41
42
43 Davis DD (1964) The giant panda: a morphological study of evolutionary mechanisms.
44
45 *Fieldiana Zool Mem* 3:1–339
46
47

48
49
50
51 English AW (1977) Structural correlates of forelimb function in fur seals and sea lions. *J*
52
53 *Morphol* 151:325–352
54
55

1 English AW (1978) Functional analysis of the shoulder girdle of cats during locomotion. J
2 Morphol 156:279–292
3

4
5
6
7 Evans HE (1993) Miller's Anatomy of the Dog. W.B. Saunders Company, Philadelphia
8
9

10
11
12 Feeney S (1999) Comparative osteology, myology, and locomotor specializations of the fore
13 and hind limbs of the North American foxes *Vulpes vulpes* and *Urocyon cinereoargenteus*.
14
15 Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst
16
17
18
19
20

21
22 Figueirido B, Pérez-Claros JA, Hunt RM Jr, Palmqvist P (2011) Body mass estimation in
23 amphicyonid carnivoran mammals: a multiple regression approach from the skull and
24
25 skeleton. Acta Palaeontol Pol 56:225–246
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 Fisher RE, Adrian B, Barton M, Holmgren J, Tang SY (2009) The phylogeny of the red
33
34 panda (*Ailurus fulgens*): evidence from the forelimb. J Anat 215:611–635
35
36
37
38

39 Fortelius M, Eronen J, Jernvall J, Liu L, Pushinka D, Rinne J, Tesakov A, Vislobokova I,
40
41 Zhang Z, Zhou L (2002) Fossil mammals resolve regional patterns of Eurasian climate
42
43 change over 20 million years. Evol Ecol Res 4:1005–1016
44
45
46
47
48

49 Gambaryan PP (1974) How Mammals Run: Anatomical Adaptations. John Wiley & Sons,
50
51 New York
52
53
54
55

56 Garshelis DL (2009) Family Ursidae. In: Wilson DE, Mittermeier RA (eds) Handbook of the
57
58 Mammals of the World, Volume 1, Carnivores. Lynx Editions, Barcelona, pp 448–497
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2 Ginsburg L (1961) La faune carnivores miocènes de Sansan (Gers). Mem Mus Nat Hist Nat N
3
4 Ser C 9:1–190
5

6
7
8
9
10 Ginsburg L (1977) *Cynelos lemanensis* (Pomel), carnivore ursidé de l' Aquitanien d'Europe.
11
12 Ann Paleontol Vertebr 63 (1):57–104
13

14
15
16
17 Ginsburg L (1999) Order Carnivora. In: Rössner GE, Heissig K (eds) The Miocene Land
18
19 Mammals of Europe. Verlag Dr Friedlich Pfeil, Munich, pp 109–148
20

21
22
23
24 Goslow GE Jr, Seeherman HJ, Taylor CR, McCutchin MN, Heglund NC (1981) Electrical
25
26 activity and relative length changes of dog limb muscles as a function of speed and gait. J Exp
27
28 Biol 94:15–42
29

30
31
32
33
34 Haeckel E (1866) Generelle Morphologie der Organismen. Volume 2. Georg Reimer, Berlin
35

36
37
38
39 Hildebrand M (1988) Analysis of Vertebrate Structure. John Wiley & Sons, New York
40

41
42
43
44 Hough JR (1948) A systematic revision of *Daphoenus* and some allied genera. J Paleontol
45
46 22:573–600
47

48
49
50
51 Howard LD (1973) Muscular anatomy of the forelimb of the sea otter (*Enhydra lutris*). Proc
52
53 Calif Acad Sci 39:411–500
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Hunt RM Jr (1998) Amphicyonidae. In: Janis CM, Scott KM, Jacobs LL (eds) Evolution of
2 Tertiary Mammals of North America. Volume I: Terrestrial Carnivores, Ungulates, and
3 Ungulatelike **Mammals**. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp 196–227
4
5
6
7
8

9 Hunt RM Jr (2001) Small Oligocene amphicyonids from North America (*Paradaphoenus*,
10 Mammalia, Carnivora). Am Mus Novitates 3331:1–20
11
12
13
14
15

16 Hunt RM Jr (2002) Intercontinental migration of Neogene amphicyonids (Mammalia,
17 Carnivora): appearance of the Eurasian bearded dog *Ysengrinia* in North America. Am Mus
18 Novitates 3384:1–53
19
20
21
22
23

24 Hunt RM Jr (2003) Intercontinental migration of large mammalian carnivores: earliest
25 occurrence of the Old World bearded dog *Amphicyon* (Carnivora, Amphicyonidae) in North
26 America. Bull Am Mus Nat Hist 279:77–115
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Hunt RM Jr (2009) Long-legged pursuit carnivorans (Amphicyonidae, Daphoeninae) from the
35 early Miocene of North America. Bull Am Mus Nat Hist 318:1–95
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Hunt RM Jr (2011) Evolution of large carnivores during the mid-cenozoic of North America:
44 the Temnocyonine radiation (Mammalia, Amphicyonidae). Bull Am Mus Nat Hist 358:1–153
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Hunt RM Jr, Xiang-Xu X, Kaufman J (1983) Miocene burrows of extinct bear dogs:
52 indication of early denning behavior of large mammalian carnivores. Science 221
53 (4608):364–366
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 International Committee on Veterinary Gross Anatomical Nomenclature (2005) Nomina
2 Anatomica Veterinaria. Editorial Committee of the ICVGAN, Hannover
3

4
5
6
7 Leach D (1977) The descriptive and comparative postcranial osteology of marten (*Martes*
8
9
10 *americana* Turton) and fisher (*Martes pennanti* Erxleben): the appendicular skeleton. Can J
11
12 Zool 55:199–214
13

14
15
16
17 Meachen-Samuels J (2012) Morphological convergence of the prey-killing arsenal of
18
19
20 sabertooth predators. Paleobiology 38:1–14.
21

22
23
24 Morales J, Alcalá L, Álvarez-Sierra MA, Antón M, Azanza B, Calvo JP, Carrasco P, Fraile S,
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
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Morales J, Alcalá L, Amezua L, Antón M, Fraile S, Gómez E, Montoya P, Nieto M, Pérez B,
Salesa MJ, Sánchez IM (2000) El yacimiento de el Cerro de los Batallones. In: Morales J,
Nieto M, Amezua L, Fraile S, Gómez E, Herráez E, Peláez-Campomanes P, Salesa MJ,
Sánchez IM, Soria D (eds) Patrimonio Paleontológico de la Comunidad de Madrid. Madrid:
Serie “Arqueología Paleontología y Etnografía,” monográfico 6. Consejería de Educación,
Comunidad de Madrid, Spain, pp 179–190

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
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
61
62
63
64
65

Munthe K (1989) The skeleton of the Borophaginae (Carnivora, Canidae). Morphology and
function. Univ Calif Publ Geol Sci 133:1–115

Olsen SJ (1960) The fossil carnivore *Amphicyon longiramus* from the Thomas farm Miocene.
Part II – Postcranial skeleton. Bull Mus Comp Zool 123:1–45

Peigné S, Heizmann EPJ (2003) The Amphicyonidae (Mammalia: Carnivora) from the early
Miocene locality of Ulm-Westtangente, Baden-Württemberg, Germany: systematics and
ecomorphology. Stuttg Beitr Natkd B Geol Palaeontol 343:1–133

Peigné S, Salesa MJ, Antón M, Morales J (2005) Ailurid carnivoran mammal *Simocyon* from
the late Miocene of Spain and the systematics of the genus. Acta Palaeontol Pol 50:219–238

Peigné S, Salesa MJ, Antón M, Morales J (2008) A new amphicyonine (Carnivora:
Amphicyonidae) from the upper Miocene of Batallones-1, Madrid, Spain. Palaeontology
51:943–965

Peterson OA (1910) Description of new carnivores from the Miocene of western Nebraska.
Mem Carnegie Mus 4:205–278

Pozo M, Calvo JP, Silva P, Morales J, Peláez-Campomanes P, Nieto M (2004) Geología del
sistema de yacimientos de mamíferos miocenos del Cerro de los Batallones, Cuenca de
Madrid. Geogaceta 35:143–146

1 Salesa MJ, Antón M, Morales J, Peigné S (2012) Systematics and phylogeny of the small
2 felines (Carnivora, Felidae) from the late Miocene of Europe: a new species of Felinae from
3 the Vallesian of Batallones (MN 10, Madrid, Spain). *J Syst Palaeontol* 10:87–102
4
5
6
7

8
9 Salesa MJ, Antón M, Peigné S, Morales J (2006a) Evidence of a false thumb in a fossil
10 carnivore clarifies the evolution of pandas. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 103:379–382
11
12
13
14
15

16 Salesa MJ, Antón M, Peigné S, Morales J (2008) Functional anatomy and biomechanics of
17 the postcranial skeleton of *Simocyon batalleri* (Viret, 1929) (Carnivora, Ailuridae) from the
18 late Miocene of Spain. *Zool J Linn Soc* 152:593–621
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Salesa MJ, Antón M, Turner A, Alcalá L, Montoya P, Morales J (2010b) Systematic revision
26 of the Late Miocene sabretoothed felid *Paramachaerodus* in Spain. *Palaeontology* 53:1369–
27 1391
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Salesa MJ, Antón M, Turner A, Morales J (2005) Aspects of the functional morphology in the
35 cranial and cervical skeleton of the sabre-toothed cat *Paramachairodus ogygia* (Kaup, 1832)
36 (Felidae, Machairodontinae) from the late Miocene of Spain: implications for the origins of
37 the machairodont killing bite. *Zool J Linn Soc* 144:363–377
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Salesa MJ, Antón M, Turner A, Morales J (2006b) Inferred behaviour and ecology of the
49 primitive sabre-toothed cat *Paramachairodus ogygia* (Felidae, Machairodontinae) from the
50 late Miocene of Spain. *J Zool* 268:243–254
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Salesa MJ, Antón M, Turner A, Morales J (2010a) Functional anatomy of the forelimb in
2 *Promegantereon ogygia* (Felidae, Machairodontinae, Smilodontini) from the late Miocene of
3 Spain and the origins of the sabre-toothed felid model. *J Anat* 216:381–396
4

5
6
7
8
9
10 Seckel L, Janis C (2008) Convergences in scapula morphology among small cursorial
11 mammals: an osteological correlate for locomotory specialization. *J Mammal Evol* 15:261–
12 279
13
14

15
16
17
18
19 Sorkin B (2006) Ecomorphology of the giant beardog *Amphicyon* and *Ischyrocyon*. *Hist Biol*
20 18:375–388
21
22

23
24
25
26 Taylor BK (1978) The anatomy of the forelimb in the anteater (*Tamandua*) and its functional
27 implications. *J Morphol* 157:347–368
28
29

30
31
32
33 Taylor ME (1974) The functional anatomy of the forelimb of some African Viverridae
34 (Carnivora). *J Morphol* 143:307–331
35
36

37
38
39
40 Taylor ME (1989) Locomotor adaptations by carnivores. In: Gittleman J (ed) *Carnivore*
41 *Behavior, Ecology and Evolution*. Volume 1. Comstock Publishing Associates, Ithaca, pp
42 382–409
43
44
45

46
47
48
49 Tokuriki N (1973a) Electromyographic and joint-mechanical studies in quadrupedal
50 locomotion. I. Walk. *Jpn J Vet Sci* 35:433–448
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Tokuriki N (1973b) Electromyographic and joint-mechanical studies in quadrupedal
2 locomotion. II. Trot. *Jpn J Vet Sci* 35:525–535
3

4
5
6
7 Tong J, You Y, Müller R, Seton M (2009) Climate model sensitivity to atmospheric CO₂
8 concentrations for the middle Miocene. *Global Planet Change* 67:129–140
9

10
11
12
13
14 Viranta S (1996) European Miocene Amphicyonidae – taxonomy, systematics and ecology.
15
16 *Acta Zool Fenn* 204:1–61
17

18
19
20
21 Zachos J, Pagani M, Sloan L, Thomas E, Billups K (2001) Trends, rhythms, and aberrations
22 in global climate 65 Ma to Present. *Science* 292:686–693
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
61
62
63
64
65

Figure captions

Fig. 1 Phylogeny of *Magericyon* after Peigné et al. (2008).

Fig. 2 Right scapula (B-5255a) of *Magericyon anceps* from Batallones-1 in lateral (**a**), medial (**b**), and caudal (**c**) views, showing the development of the acromion (acr), the teres major process (tmp), the foramen of the base of the acromion (f), and the postscapular fossa (psf)

Fig. 3 Comparison between right scapulae in lateral view of *Magericyon anceps* from Batallones-1, other Amphicyonidae, and extant Felidae and Ursidae (shown at the same size; scale bar represents 5 cm). *Daphoenodon superbis* (taken from Peterson, 1910) (**a**), *Borocyon niobrarenensis*, ACM-3452 (taken from Hunt, 2009) (**b**), *Magericyon anceps* from Batallones-1 (**c**), *Amphicyon major* from Sansan (France) (**d**), *Panthera leo* (**e**), and *Ursus arctos* (**f**)

Fig. 4 3D reconstruction of the ventrolateral region of a right scapula (B-5255a) of *Magericyon anceps* from Batallones-1, showing (white arrow) the passage for the suprascapular artery and nerve

Fig. 5 Left humerus (BAT-1'07 F3-35) of *Magericyon anceps* from Batallones-1 in cranial (**a**), medial (**b**), and lateral (**c**) views, showing the principal structures: lesser tubercle (lt), greater tubercle (gt), tricipital crest (tc), and greater tubercle crest (gtc)

Fig. 6 Comparison between humeri in proximal and lateral views of *Magericyon anceps* from Batallones-1, other Amphicyonidae, extant Felidae, and Ursidae (shown at the same size; scale bar represents 5 cm). *Magericyon anceps* from Batallones-1 (**a**), *Amphicyon major* from

1 Sansan (France) (b), *Cynelos lemanensis* from Saint Gerand-le-Puy (France) (c), *Ursus arctos*
2 (d), and *Panthera leo* (e)
3
4
5
6

7 **Fig. 7** Reconstruction of the shoulder joint of *Magericyon anceps* showing the disposition of
8 some of the muscles discussed in the text. Lateral view showing the muscles supraspinatus,
9 infraspinatus, and subscapularis minor (occupying the postcapular fossa) (a); and medial view
10 showing the muscle subscapularis minor and the different fascicles composing the muscle
11 subscapularis (b). Artwork by M. Antón
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
61
62
63
64
65

Figure
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)






Figure
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)



Figure

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)



Figure

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)



Figure
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

