AN OSTEOLOGICAL COMPARISON BETWEEN BONTEBOK,

Damaliscus pygargus pygargus, AND BLESBOK, Damaliscus pygargus phillipsi AND ITS BEARING ON THE EVOLUTION OF BONTEBOK.

By

Nonhlanhla Vilakazi

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Science, University of the Witwatersrand,

Johannesburg, in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science.

Johannesburg, 2008.

DECLARATION

I declare that this dissertation is my own, unaided work. It is submitted for the Degree of Master of Science at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination in any other University.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

ABSTRACT

The alcelaphine species *Damaliscus pygargus* has two subspecies: the bontebok *Damaliscus pygargus pygargus* and the blesbok *Damaliscus pygargus phillipsi*. On analogy with black wildebeest evolution, it is thought that the two subspecies became biogeographically distinct during the Last Glacial, when lowered sea levels exposed additional plains habitat on the continental platform. This would have caused reproductive isolation between interior and coastal populations with the Cape Fold Mountains acting as biogeographic barrier. The aim of this study was to test the possibility of the osteological discrimination between the two subspecies by using reference specimens from the National Museum, Bloemfontein, and Iziko South African Museum, Cape Town. It was hypothesized that bone morphology and measurements would serve to differentiate between the subspecies, which are adapted to different environments, and thus experience different stresses. However, results showed no significant differences between the two subspecies osteologically.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
 INTRODUCTION Family Bovidae Tribe Alcelaphini Pleistocene climate change in South Africa Damaliscus pygargus phillipsi Damaliscus pygargus pygargus. Speciation Modes of speciation Biological Species Concept 	1 5 7 10 12 14 14 15
Isolation Species Concept. Recognition Species Concept. Evolutionary Species Concept. Ecological Species Concept. Allopatric Speciation. Peripatric Speciation.	15 16 16 16 17 19 19
Aims. Hypotheses. 2 MATERIALS AND METHODS. Materials. Methods.	20 21 21 22 22 22
 2.2.1 Cranial Measurements. 2.2.1.1 Measurements of the cranium. 2.2.1.2 Measurements of the mandible. 2.2.2 Post-cranial Measurements 	23 23 27 28
2.2.2 Post-crainal measurements 2.2.2.1 Measurements of the atlas 2.2.2.2 Measurements of the axis 2.2.2.3 Measurements of the scarum 2.2.2.4 Measurements of the scapula 2.2.2.5 Measurements of the humerus 2.2.2.6 Measurements of the ulna	28 30 32 34 35 37
2.2.2.7 Measurements of the radius	37

2.2.2.9 Measurements of the femur	39
2.2.2.10 Measurements of the patella	41
2.2.2.11 Measurements of the tibia	41
2.2.2.12 Measurements of the talus (astragalus)	43
2.2.2.13 Measurements of the metapodials	44
2.2.2.14 Measurements of the calcaneus	45
2.2.2.15 Measurements of phalanx I	46
3 RESULTS	47
3.1 Morphology and statistical analyses	47
3.1.1 Crania	47
3.1.2 Mandibular Morphology	58
3.1.3 Post-crania	59
3.1.3.1 Atlas	59
3.1.3.2 Axis	68
3.1.3.3 Scapula	76
3.1.3.4 Humerus	84
3.1.3.5 Ulna	93
3.1.3.6 Radius	101
3.1.3.7 Metacarpal	110
3.1.3.8 Pelvis	117
3.1.3.9 Femur	124
3.1.3.10 Patella	134
3.1.3.11 Tibia	142
3.1.3.12 Metatarsal	149
3.1.3.13 Talus (astragalus)	158
3.1.3.14 Calcaneus	166
3.1.3.15 Phalanx 1	174
4 DISCUSSION	177
4.1 Morphological Analysis	177
4.2 Statistical Analysis	178
5 CONCLUSION	182
REFERENCES	183
APPENDIX I: List of specimens studied	
APPENDIX II: List of all measurements taken	

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisors, Dr James Brink and Dr Lucinda Backwell, for all their guidance, support and contributions to my study.

Thank you very much James Brink for teaching me osteological comparison techniques together with faunal identification, it was very worthy for this particular study, I will forever be grateful for that.

I also thank Lucinda extensively for reading my write-up drafts and helping me out with corrections. I also thank her for awarding me an NRF bursary since she is a grant holder.

The staff at the Florisbad Quaternary Research Station for all their help with the collections.

I acknowledge the many valuable corrections and suggestions made by one of my reviewers that helped improve this work.

Thanks to Sbusiso Mgaga for the support you've shown me throughout my Master of Science study.

Thank you to PAST for awarding me a bursary without which I would not have been able to study and do what I love.

Finally, thank you to my mom, Rebecca, my sister, Nonkululeko, my grandparents, Crown and Adeline, and my uncles, Teboho and Mpho, for moral support. Thank you so much guys for allowing me to follow my passion and study palaeontology. I would also like to thank you for showing interest in what I'm studying.

vi

This is dedicated to my mom and sister:

Rebecca Dube and Nonkululeko Vilakazi

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Left side view of the cranium (after Von den Driesch, 1976)	25
Figure 2: Basal view of the cranium (after Von den Driesch, 1976)	26
Figure 3: Nuchal view of the cranium (after Von den Driesch, 1976)	26
Figure 4: Caudodorsal view of the atlas (after Von den Driesch, 1976)	28
Figure 5: Dorsal view of the atlas (after Von den Driesch, 1976)	29
Figure 6: Cranial view of the atlas (after Von den Driesch, 1976)	29
Figure 7: Caudal view of the axis (after Von den Driesch, 1976)	30
Figure 8: Ventral view of the axis (after Von den Driesch, 1976)	31
Figure 9: Left side view of the axis (after Von den Driesch, 1976)	31
Figure 10: Left side view of the axis (after Von den Driesch, 1976)	32
Figure 11: Cranial view of the sacrum (after Von den Driesch, 1976)	33
Figure 12: Ventral view of the sacrum (after Von den Driesch, 1976)	33
Figure 13: Distal view of the scapula (after Von den Driesch, 1976)	34
Figure 14: Lateral view of the scapula (after Von den Driesch, 1976)	35
Figure 15: Caudo-lateral view of the humerus (after Von den Driesch, 1976)	36
Figure 16: Cranial view of the humerus (after Von den Driesch, 1976)	36
Figure 17: Cranial view of the distal end of the humerus (after Von den Driesch,	
1976)	33
Figure 18: Dorsal view of the radius and ulna (after Von den Driesch, 1976)	38
Figure 19: Lateral view of the radius and ulna (after Von den Driesch, 1976)	
Figure 20: Dorsal view of the pelvis (after Von den Driesch, 1976)	39
Figure 21: Caudal view of the femur (after Von den Driesch, 1976)	40
Figure 22: Cranial view of the femur (after Von den Driesch, 1976)	40
Figure 23: Proximal view of the femur (after Von den Driesch, 1976)	40
Figure 24: Proximal view of the patella (after Von den Driesch, 1976)	41
Figure 25: Dorsal view of the tibia (after Von den Driesch, 1976)	42
Figure 26: Proximal view of the tibia (after Von den Driesch, 1976)	42
Figure 27: Distal view of the tibia (after Von den Driesch, 1976)	43
Figure 28: Medial, dorsal and lateral view of the astragalus (after Von den Driesch,	
1976)	43
Figure 29: Proximal view of the metacarpus (after Von den Driesch, 1976)	44
Figure 30: Dorsal view of the metatarsal (after Von den Driesch, 1976)	45
Figure 31: Plantar view of the calcaneus (after Von den Driesch, 1976)	45
Figure 32: Dorsal view of phalanx I (after Von den Driesch, 1976)	46
Figure 33: Photo showing the bontebok and blesbok male	47
Figure 34: Photo showing the premaxillae of bontebok and blesbok	48
Figure 35: Photo of the frontal of the bontebok and blesbok	48
Figure 36: Photo showing the basal view of the bontebok and blesbok	49
Figure 37: Photo showing the auditory bullae of the bontebok and blesbok	49
Figure 38: Bivariate plot of the cranium from the basion to the prosthion versus from	the
basion to the premolare showing the regression line of both bontebok and blesbok	51
Figure 39: Bivariate plot of the length of the molar row versus the length of the prem	ıolar
row showing regression of both groups	52

Figure 40: Bivariate plot of the greatest breadth of the occipital condyles versus the
breadth at the bases of paraoccipital processes showing regression of both groups 52
Figure 41: Bivariate plot of the breadth at bases of paraoccipital processes versus the
greatest breadth of the occipital condules showing regression of both groups
Figure 42: Bivariate plot of the length of the cheektooth row versus the length of the
premolar row showing 95% regression of both groups
Figure 43: Bivariate plot of the akrokranion to the prosthion versus the akrokranion to the
breams showing regression of both groups
Figure 44: Bivariate plot of the Dostdentale to the prosthion versus from the palatinoorale
to the prosthion showing regression of both groups
Figure 45: Bivariate plot of the polatinoorale to the prosthion versus pescintermaxillare to
the prosthion showing 05% regression of both groups
Eight AG Stondard amor call plot of the cluil from the basics to the prosthion (amor
Figure 40: Standard error cen plot of the skun from the basion to the prostition (error
Dars: ± 1 STD deviation)
Figure 4/: Standard error cell plot for the length of the skull from the akrokranion to the
prostnion (error bars: ± 1 STD deviation)
Figure 48: Standard error cell plot of the skull from the hasion to the minion (error bars: ± 1
STD deviation)
Figure 49: Photo showing the mandibles of bontebok and blesbok
Figure 50: Photo showing the proximal view of the atlas of bontebok and blesbok59
Figure 51: Photo showing the dorsal view of the atlas of bontebok and blesbok
Figure 52: Photo showing the caudodorsal view of the atlas of bontebok and blesbok60
Figure 53: Bivariate plot of the greatest length from the Facies articularis cranialis to the
Facies articularis caudalis versus the height of the atlas showing regression of both groups
Figure 54: Bivariate plot of the breadth of the Facies articularis cranialis versus the
breadth of the Facies articularis caudalis of the atlas showing regression of both
groups62
Figure 55: Bivariate plot of the greatest breadth over the wings versus the greatest length
of the atlas showing regression of both groups63
Figure 56: Standard error cell plot of the greatest length from the Facies articularis
cranialis to the Facies articularis caudalis (error bars: ±1 STD deviation)64
Figure 57: Standard error cell plot of the greatest length of the atlas (error bars: ±1 STD
deviation)64
Figure 58: Standard error cell plot of the height of the atlas (error bars: ±1 STD
deviation)65
Figure 59: Standard error cell plot of the greatest breadth over the wings of the atlas
(error bars: ±1 STD deviation)
Figure 60: Univariate analysis of the breadth of the Facies articularis cranialis of the
atlas
Figure 61: Univariate analysis of the breadth of the Facies articularis caudalis of the atlas
with outliers
Figure 62: Photo showing the left side view of the axis of bontebok and blesbok
Figure 63: Photo showing the arch of the axis of bontebok and blesbok
Figure 64: Photo showing the Facies articularis cranialis of the axis of bontebok and
blesbok

dens versus the length of the arch including the Processus articularis caudalis showing regression of both groups
regression of both groups
Figure 66: Bivariate plot of the breadth of the Facies articularis cranialis versus the breadth of the Facies terminalis caudalis of the axis showing regression of both groups
breadth of the Facies terminalis caudalis of the axis showing regression of both groups
groups
Figure 67: Standard error cell plot of the height of the axis (error bars: ±1 STD deviation)
deviation)72
Figure 68: Standard error cell plot of axis of the length in the region of the corpus (error bars: ±1 STD deviation)
Figure 69: Standard error cell plot of the smallest breadth of the vertebra of the axis (error
bars: ± 1 STD deviation)
Figure 70: Standard error cell plot of the length of the arch including the Processus
articularis caudalis of the axis (error bars: ±1 STD deviation)74
Figure 71: Standard error cell plot of the breadth across the Processus articularis caudalis of the axis (error bars: ±1 STD deviation)
Figure 72: Photo showing the scapulae of bontebok and blesbok
Figure 73: Photo showing the thickness of the scapulae of bontebok and blesbok 76
Figure 74: Photo showing the distal view of the scapulae (the glenoid cavity) of bontebok
and bleshok
Figure 75: Bivariate plot of the height along the spine versus the diagonal height of the
scanula showing regression of both groups
Figure 76: Bivariate plot of the smallest length of the Collum scapulae versus the greatest
length of the Processus articularis of the scapula showing regression of both groups 70
Figure 77: Universite plot of the diagonal height of the second showing the mean at 05%
applie 77. Univariate plot of the diagonal height of the scapula showing the mean at 95%
Eigene 79. Standard error cell rist of the discord height of the second of the second here 11
Figure 78: Standard error cell plot of the diagonal height of the scapula (error bars: ± 1
SID deviation)81
Figure /9: Standard error cell plot of the height along the spine of the scapula (error bars:
±1 S1D deviation)
Figure 80: Standard error cell plot of the greatest length of the Processus articularis of the
scapula (error bars: ±1 STD deviation)
Figure 81: Standard error cell plot of the length of the glenoid cavity of the scapula (error
bars: ±1 STD deviation)83
Figure 82: Photo showing the lateral view of the humeri of bontebok and blesbok 84
Figure 83: Photo showing the proximal end (craniomedial) of the humerus of bontebok
and blesbok
Figure 84: Photo showing the caudo-lateral view of the humerus of bontebok and
blesbok
Figure 85: Photo showing the lateral view of the proximal end of the humerus of
bontebok and blesbok
Figure 86: Photo showing the side view of the humerus of bontebok and blesbok 86
Figure 87: Photo showing the distal end of the humerus (condylus humeri) of bontebok and
blesbok
Figure 88: Photo showing the side view of the distal end of the humerus of the bon.tebok

Figure 89: Bivariate plot of the greatest length from the caput (head) versus the greatest
length of the humerus showing regression of both groups
Figure 90: Bivariate plot of the breadth of the proximal end versus the breadth of the
condulus humeri showing regression of both groups
Figure 91: Univariate plot of the breadth of <i>condylus humeri</i> showing the mean at 95%
confidence interval
Figure 92: Standard error cell plot of the greatest length of the humerus (error bars: +1
r_{1} gure 92. Standard error cen plot of the greatest length of the numerus (error bars. ± 1
Figure 02: Standard arror call plot of the greatest length from the caput of the humarus
(arror bars) +1 STD deviation)
Eigure 04: Universite analysis of the broadth of the condulus humani of the humanic with
an outlier
Eigune 05. Universite analysis of the smallest breadth of the disphysic of the hymerys
Figure 95: Univariate analysis of the smallest breadth of the diaphysis of the numerus
Figure OC University and the last of the last of the manipulation of the last
Figure 96: Univariate analysis of the breadth of the proximal end of the numerus split by
Subspecies and sex of the specimens with an outlier
Figure 97: Photo showing the una of both bontedok and blesbok
Figure 98: Photo showing the proximal end of the una of both bontebok and blesbok93
Figure 99: Bivariate plot of the depth across the Processus anconaeus versus the smallest
depth of the olecranon of the ulna showing regression of both groups
Figure 100: Bivariate plot of the greatest length versus the length of the olecranon of the
ulna showing regression of both groups
Figure 101: Univariate plot of the greatest length showing the mean at 95% confidence
interval
Figure 102: Standard error cell plot of the greatest length of the ulna (error bars: ±1 STD
deviation)97
Figure 103: Standard error cell plot of the length of the olecranon of the ulna (error bars:
±1 STD deviation)
Figure 104: Standard error cell plot of the smallest depth of the olecranon of the ulna
(error bars: ±1 STD deviation)
Figure 105: Univariate analysis of the depth across the Processus anconaeus of the ulna
with outliers
Figure 106: Univariate analysis of the breadth across the coronoid process of the
ulna100
Figure 107: Photo showing the radii of bontebok and blesbok101
Figure 108: Photo showing the distal end of the radii of bontebok and blesbok101
Figure 109: Bivariate plot of the greatest length versus the physiological length of the
radius showing regression of both groups102
Figure 110: Bivariate plot of the breadth of the proximal end versus the breadth of the
distal end of the radius showing regression of both groups103
Figure 111: Bivariate plot of the depth of the articular versus the depth of the lateral of
the distal end of the radius showing regression of both groups104
Figure 112: Bivariate plot of the breadth of the Facies articularis distalis versus the
breadth of the Facies articularis proximalis of the radius showing regression of both
groups
Figure 113: Univariate analysis of the greatest length of the radius with an outlier106

Figure 114: Univariate analysis of the physiological length of the radius107
Figure 115: Standard error cell plot of the depth of the articular at the distal end of the
radius (error bars: ±1 STD deviation)108
Figure 116: Standard error cell plot of the depth of the lateral at the distal end of the
radius (error bars: ±1 STD deviation)108
Figure 117: Standard error cell plot of the physiological length of the radius (error bars:
±1 STD deviation)
Figure 118: Standard error cell plot of the greatest length of the radius (error bars: ± 1
STD deviation)
Figure 119: Photo showing the dorsal view of the metacarpals of bontebok and
blesbok
Figure 120: Photo showing the proximal view of the metacarpals of bontebok and
blesbok
Figure 121: Bivariate plot of the axial versus the peripheral of the metacarpal showing
regression of both groups
Figure 122: Bivariate plot of the smallest breadth of the diaphysis versus the depth of the
diaphysis of the metacarpal showing regression of both groups112
Figure 123: Bivariate plot of the breadth of the proximal end versus the breadth of the
distal end of the metacarpal showing regression of both groups
Figure 124: Standard error cell plot of the greatest length of the metacarpal (error bars:
± 1 STD deviation)
Figure 125: Standard error cell plot of the smallest breadth of the diaphysis of the
metacarpal (error bars: ± 1 S1D deviation)
Figure 126: Standard error cell plot of the depth of the diaphysis of the metacarpal (error
bars: ± 1 STD deviation)
Figure 127: Standard error cell plot of the axial at the distal end of the metacarpal (error
Dars: ± 1 S1D deviation)
(arran harry 11 STD deviation)
(effor bars: $\pm 1.51D$ deviation)
Figure 129. Univariate analysis of the paripharal at the distal end of the metacarpal. 116
Figure 130. Onivariate analysis of the peripheral at the distal clid of the filedacarpar. 110
Figure 131. Photo showing the ventral view of the pelvis of bontebok and blesbok17
Figure 132. Photo showing the dereal view of the palvis of bontabok and blasbok
Figure 133: Photo showing the side view of the dorsal view of the pelvis of bontebok (at
the bottom) and bleshok (at the top)
Figure 135: Bivariate plot of the greatest length versus the smallest breadth of the shaft of
the ilium showing regression of both groups
Figure 136: Bivariate plot of the greatest breadth across the Tubera ischiedica versus the
greatest breadth across the Tubera covarum of the pelvis showing regression of both
groups
Figure 137: Bivariate plot of the smallest breadth of the shaft of the ilium varius the
smallest breadth across the bodies of the ischia showing regression of both groups 122
Figure 138: Standard error cell plot of the greatest breadth across the Tubera covarum of
the pelvis (error bars: +1 STD deviation) 123
12 perilo (error ouro, 11 ori) de (uulon)

Figure 139: Standard error cell plot of the greatest breadth across the Tubera ischiadica of
the pelvis (error bars: ±1 STD deviation)
Figure 140: Photo showing the caudal view of the femur of bontebok and blesbok124
Figure 141: Photo showing the caudal view of the femur of bontebok and blesbok124
Figure 142: Photo showing the proximal view of the femur of bontebok and blesbok in
detail
Figure 143: Photo showing the side view (medial) of the femur of bontebok and blesbok
Figure 144: Bivariate plot of the greatest length versus the greatest length from the caput
femoris (head) of the femur showing regression of both groups
Figure 145: Bivariate plot of distal lateral of the diaphysis versus distal medial of the
diaphysis of the femur showing regression of both groups
Figure 146: Bivariate plot of the breadth of the proximal end versus the breadth of the
distal end of the femur showing regression of both groups
Figure 147: Standard error cell plot of the greatest length of the femur (error bars: +1 STD
deviation)
Figure 148: Standard error cell plot of the greatest length from the caput of the femur (error
bars: ±1 STD deviation)
Figure 149: Univariate analysis of the greatest length of the caput of the femur split by
subspecies and sex of the specimens
Figure 150: Univariate analysis of the breadth of the proximal end of the femur of
bontebok and blesbok
Figure 151: Univariate analysis of the breadth of the distal end of the diaphysis of the
femur
Figure 152: Univariate analysis of the smallest breadth of the diaphysis of the
femur
Figure 153: Photo showing the cranial view of the patella of bontebok and blesbok134
Figure 154: Photo showing the plantar view of the patella of bontebok and
blesbok134
Figure 155: Bivariate plot of the greatest breadth over the wings versus the greatest length
of the patella showing regression for both groups
Figure 156: Standard error cell plot of the greatest breadth of the patella (error bars: ±1
STD deviation)
Figure 157: Standard error cell plot of the greatest length of the patella (error bars: ±1 STD
deviation)
Figure 158: Univariate plot of the greatest breadth of the patella showing
outliers
Figure 159: Univariate plot of the greatest breadth of the patella showing some outliers of
both sexes of both subspecies
Figure 160: Univariate plot of the greatest length of the patella showing outliers141
Figure 161: Photo showing craniolateral view of the tibia of bontebok and
blesbok142
Figure 162: Photo showing the craniolateral view of the tibia of bontebok and
blesbok
Figure 163: Photo showing the distal end of the tibia of bontebok and blesbok143

Figure 164: Photo showing the craniolateral view of the tibia of bontebok and blesbok (in Figure 165: Photo showing dorsal view of the tibia of bontebok and blesbok......144 Figure 166: Bivariate plot showing smallest breadth of diaphysis versus the greatest length of the tibia showing regression of both groups......145 Figure 167: Bivariate plot showing the breadth of proximal end versus the breadth of the distal end of the tibia showing regression of both groups......145 Figure 168: Standard error cell plot of the greatest length of the tibia (error bars: ±1 STD Figure 169: Standard error cell plot of the breadth of the proximal end of the tibia (error bars: ±1 STD deviation)......146 Figure 170: Univariate plot of the smallest breadth of the diaphysis of the tibia.....147 Figure 171: Univariate plot of the smallest breadth of the diaphysis of the tibia split by sex Figure 172: Univariate plot of the breadth of the distal end of the tibia......148 Figure 173: Univariate plot of the breadth of the proximal end of the tibia......148 Figure 174: Photo showing the dorsal view of the metatarsals of bontebok and blesbok......149 Figure 175: Photo showing the proximal view of the metatarsals of bontebok and Figure 176: Bivariate plot of the axial versus the peripheral of the metatarsal bones showing regression of both groups......150 Figure 177: Bivariate plot of the smallest breadth of the diaphysis versus the smallest depth Figure 178: Bivariate plot of the breadth of the proximal end versus the breadth of the distal end of the metatarsal bone showing regression of both groups......152 Figure 179: Standard error cell plot of the greatest length of the metatarsal (error bars: ± 1 Figure 180: Standard error cell plot of the smallest breadth of the diaphysis of the Figure 181: Standard error cell plot of the axial of the distal end of the metatarsal (error Figure 182: Standard error cell plot of the peripheral of the distal end of the metatarsal Figure 183: Univariate analysis of the peripheral of the distal end of the metatarsal with an Figure 184: Univariate analysis of the smallest breadth of the diaphysis of the metatarsal Figure 185: Univariate plot of the depth of the diaphysis of the metatarsal......157 Figure 186: Photo showing the dorsal view of the talus bone of bontebok and Figure 187: Photo showing the lateral view of the talus bone of bontebok and Figure 188: Bivariate plot of the greatest length of the lateral half versus the greatest length of the medial half of the talus bone showing a regression for both groups......160

Figure 189: Bivariate plot of the depth of the lateral half versus the depth of the medial half
of the talus bone showing regression for both groups161
Figure 190: Standard error cell plot of the greatest length of the lateral half of the talus
(astragalus) (error bars: ±1 STD deviation)162
Figure 191: Standard error cell plot of the greatest length of the medial half of the talus
(error bars: ±1 STD deviation)162
Figure 192: Univariate analysis of the depth of the medial half of the talus showing
$\mathbf{U}_{1} = \mathbf{U}_{2} + \mathbf{U}_{1} + \mathbf{U}_{2} $
Figure 193: Univariate analysis of the depth of the lateral half of the talus showing
outliers
Figure 194: Univariate plot of the breadth of the distal end of the
talus
Figure 195: Photo showing the plantar view of the calcaneus of bontebok and
blesbok166
Figure 196: Photo showing the dorsal view of the calcaneus of bontebok and
blesbok166
Figure 197: Bivariate plot of the greatest breadth over the <i>sustenaculum</i> versus the
greatest length of the calcaneus showing regression for both groups167
Figure 198: Standard error cell plot of the greatest length of the calcaneus (error bars: ±1
STD deviation)168
Figure 199: Standard error cell plot of the greatest breadth of the calcaneus (error bars:
±1 STD deviation)
Figure 200: Univariate plot of the greatest breadth of the calcaneus with outliers170
Figure 201: Univariate plot of the greatest breadth split by sex and subspecies171
Figure 202: Univariate plot of the greatest length of the calcaneus
Figure 203: Univariate analysis of the greatest length of the calcaneus split by subspecies
and sex of the specimens
Figure 204: Photo showing the dorsal view of the first phalanx of bontebok and
blesbok
Figure 205: Bivariate analysis showing the greatest length of the peripheral (abaxial) half
versus the smallest breadth of the diaphysis of the first phalanx showing the regression of
both groups
Figure 206: Bivariate analysis of the proximal breadth versus the distal breadth of the
first phalanx showing the regression of both groups
1 0 0 0 0 I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I