

The Flexibility and Musculature of the
Ostrich Neck: Implications for the
Feeding Ecology and Reconstruction
of the Sauropoda (Dinosauria:
Saurischia)

Matthew J. Cobley



University of
BRISTOL

Supervised by Drs. Emily Rayfield & Paul Barrett

MSc Palaeobiology Thesis

September 2011

The Flexibility and Musculature of the Ostrich Neck: Implications for the Feeding Ecology and Reconstruction of the Sauropoda (Dinosauria: Saurischia)

M. J. Cobley¹

¹ Department of Earth Sciences, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

Correspondence:

Matthew J. Cobley, Department of Earth Sciences, University of Bristol, Bristol BS8 1RJ, UK.

Email: cobley.mj@gmail.com

Page heading title: Ostrich neck flexibility and musculature: Implications for sauropods

Abstract

The Sauropoda were the largest terrestrial animals ever to have lived on this planet. As their nutritional requirements were so huge, their diet holds sway over the ecology of many Mesozoic herbivores. The diet of the sauropods is limited by their feeding envelope, which in turn is governed by the posture and flexibility of their elongate necks. Yet the exact nature of the flexibility and posture of the neck has been a contentious issue. Previous studies have utilised computer models of dry bone, mechanical principles or the flexibility of the necks of extant animals. However, the effect of the musculature of the neck has yet to be investigated. Through measurements of the flexibility of the ostrich neck after cumulative tissue removal, analyses of the muscle attachment sites of the ostrich and sauropods, and testing of the Osteological Neutral Pose model, this study attempts to rectify this situation. The ostrich neck was shown to have three sections of flexibility; a slightly flexible anterior section, a very flexible middle section and a stiff posterior section. The Osteological Neutral Pose did not show these sections, and was shown to potentially overestimate and underestimate flexibility. It was also found that the inter-vertebral space could account for varying estimates of flexibility, and that sauropods would have proportionally more muscle mass at the base of the neck in relation to the ostrich. Ultimately, it was shown that the tissues of the neck place the limits of flexibility, and that zygapophyseal overlap does not indicate the flexibility of the neck. Should the Osteological Neutral Pose affect sauropod flexibility estimates in the same manner as that of the ostrich (a general overestimate), then the sauropods would have a more limited feeding envelope than previously thought, allowing for greater niche partitioning between groups.

Keywords: sauropod; dinosaur; neck; flexibility; posture; ostrich; muscle; attachment.

Acknowledgements

Initial thanks go to my supervisors Emily Rayfield and Paul Barrett for their patience, support and contributions throughout the completion of this project. I am forever grateful for the opportunity to contribute to a subject that has fascinated me for so long.

Special recognition also goes to Remmert Schouten and Mike Taylor. I doubt this thesis would have been completed without their advice and encouragement. I would also like to thank the sauropod-neck community as a whole: Matt Wedel, Darren Naish, Gordon Dzemski and Kent Stevens have all assisted my work and kindly answered any and all questions I have asked.

For their help in the laboratory, appreciation goes to Pedro Viegas, Suzanne Copley, Sarah Stephens and Anthony Hancy. For their advice and helpful comments on the write-up, I would like to thank Kate Davis.

Additionally I would like to thank my friends and family for supporting me with my work, especially Steven and Mary Copley, Melissa Johnson, Robert Bick, Daniel Finn and Leigh Maddocks, who all made the process much easier for me.

Final thanks go to Michael Kendrick and William Davies, without whom none of this would have been possible.

Declaration

I declare that the work in this dissertation was carried out in accordance with the requirements of the University's Regulations and Code of Practice for Taught Postgraduate Programmes and that it has not been submitted for any other academic award. Except where indicated by specific reference in the text, this work is my own work. Work done in collaboration with, or with the assistance of others, is indicated as such. I have identified all material in this dissertation which is not my own work through appropriate referencing and acknowledgement. Where I have quoted from the work of others, I have included the source in the references/ bibliography. Any views expressed in the dissertation are those of the author.

Signed

Date

Table of Contents

Title Page & Correspondence Details.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Declaration.....	v
Table of Contents	vi
Introduction.....	1
Methodology.....	4
<i>Animals studied.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Analysis of flexibility of the cervical column.....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Proportional variation of muscle attachment sites.....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Osteological Neutral Pose.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Naming conventions used.....</i>	<i>8</i>
Results.....	9
<i>Systematic reconstruction of the tissues present in the ostrich neck.....</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Flexibility.....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Tissue mass & measurements.....</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Osteological Neutral Pose.....</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Proportional variation in muscle attachment sites.....</i>	<i>18</i>
Discussion.....	21
<i>Flexibility.....</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>Tissue mass & measurements.....</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>Osteological Neutral Pose.....</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>Proportions of attachment sites.....</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>Implications for Sauropods.....</i>	<i>28</i>
Conclusions.....	31
Further Work.....	32
References.....	33
Table Legends.....	41
Figure Legends.....	42
Tables.....	46
Figures.....	48

1 **Introduction**

2 The sauropods are unequivocally the largest terrestrial animals ever to have existed.
3 A group of saurischian dinosaurs, the clade Sauropoda was immensely successful
4 from the Late Triassic to the very end of the Cretaceous, with representatives found
5 on all continents (Sander *et al*, 2010). Whilst their general morphology is well
6 understood, the issue of neck posture is still contentious. Some recent studies have
7 proposed the long necks of sauropods evolved for sexual selection (Senter, 2006),
8 however the lack of evidence for this theory (Taylor *et al*, 2011) reinforces the long
9 held view has been that they evolved for maximising the feeding envelope; either for
10 high browsing (Bakker, 1971; Paul, 1987; Christian, 2010) or a wider lateral range of
11 low browsing (Martin, 1987; Ruxton & Wilkinson, 2011). Various theories on the
12 posture and flexibility of the neck have been presented (Stevens & Parrish, 1999;
13 Dzemski & Christian, 2007; Taylor, Wedel & Naish, 2009), with differing approaches
14 leading to various implications for overall biology and ecology. Whilst heart size and
15 output (Seymour, 2009a; 2009b), the structure of the respiratory system (Perry *et al*,
16 2009; Perry, Breuer & Pajor, 2011), risk of predation and intra-species niche
17 partitioning (Stevens & Parrish, 2005a) are all affected by the position of the cervical
18 column, there are also massive implications for the diet and ecology of the
19 sauropods, and therefore the ecology of many other creatures that co-existed with
20 them during the Mesozoic. Whilst neck posture and flexibility in most species has
21 relatively little effect on their ecology, due to them having relatively short necks,
22 sauropod necks can reach as long as 14 m (Wedel & Cifelli, 2005), meaning smaller
23 differences in the angle the neck is held at lead to differing head heights of a metre
24 or more. The Sauropoda display a wide array of morphologies, but broadly speaking
25 if they were to have roughly horizontal, downward sloping necks, their heads would

26 reach ~4 m high (Stevens & Parrish, 2005b), whilst a more vertical posture would
27 lead to some species with head heights of 16-20 m (Holtz & Rey, 2007). Establishing
28 the flexibility of a sauropod neck allows us to estimate the 'feeding envelope' of a
29 given species. This envelope is the maximum range over which an individual could
30 feed, and along with previous work on the flora present at the time (Chin, 1997;
31 Hummel *et al*, 2008; Gee, 2011) and sauropod dentition (Calvo, 1994; Fiorillo, 1998;
32 Upchurch & Barrett, 2004; Stevens & Parrish, 2005a), allows us to identify the diet of
33 the sauropods. Establishing their diet is extremely important; as the sauropods were
34 so large, requiring anywhere up to 400kg of dry plant matter per day for an adult
35 (Hummel *et al*, 2008), it is not hard to imagine a herd of these animals stripping an
36 area of vegetation in a short amount of time. Reducing the resources in a given area
37 would force other species present to adapt by either feeding on different material, or
38 through temporal or spatial niche partitioning of the same plants.

39 Previous work on sauropod neck posture and flexibility has led to three
40 general theories. The first method, through computer modelling of the neck, was
41 based on the assumption that the vertebrae of the neck could not be flexed past the
42 point where there was a minimum of 50% overlap of the zygapophyses of two
43 adjacent vertebrae: The 'Osteological Neutral Pose' (ONP) (Stevens & Parrish,
44 1999). This leads to estimates of low flexibility in sauropod necks, and the conclusion
45 that species such as *Diplodocus* and *Apatosaurus* held their necks in a downward
46 sloping fashion, much different from the classical, vertically held depictions (Stevens
47 & Parrish, 1999; Stevens, 2002; Stevens & Parrish, 2005a; 2005b). This work was
48 questioned by studies using direct comparisons with the posture held by extant
49 species, asserting that all extant amniotes held their heads in a vertical fashion, and
50 as such it was most parsimonious to reconstruct sauropods with a swan-like, 'S'-

51 shaped posture (Taylor *et al*, 2009). Mechanical models have also been
52 implemented, which leads to a middle ground between these two theories; with the
53 neck being held slightly above horizontal with a reasonable amount of flexibility
54 (Preuschoft, 1976; Alexander, 1985; Christian & Preuschoft, 1996; Christian &
55 Heinrich, 1998; Christian, 2002; Christian & Dzemski, 2007; 2011). Studies
56 quantifying the flexibility of extant necks also come to this conclusion; Dzemski &
57 Christian (2007) studied the flexibility of *Struthio camelus* (the ostrich), *Giraffa*
58 *camelopardis* (the giraffe) and *Camelus bactrianus* (the Bactrian camel), with all
59 tissues intact and solely the neck skeleton.

60 However, none of these previous studies have analysed the effects of tissue
61 on the flexibility of the skeleton; the ONP relies solely on bone to make its estimates
62 (Stevens & Parrish, 1999); Taylor *et al* (2009) use the neck as a whole as a more
63 superficial means of comparison; the 'Preuschoft method' (Christian & Dzemski,
64 2007; 2011) deals solely in the mechanics of the neck. Studies based on the
65 flexibility of extant animal necks have yet to study the actual effect of tissues on the
66 flexibility of the neck, instead comparing the flexibility of the whole neck and that of
67 the neck skeleton. This study aims to rectify this situation. By measuring the flexibility
68 of the neck with sequential and cumulative removal of tissues, a picture of how
69 tissues of different sizes and placements around the neck affect flexibility will
70 become apparent. By measuring the attachment site of various muscles in the
71 ostrich neck and in sauropods, we can also attempt to estimate the relative amounts
72 of muscle mass around the necks of the extinct species (Sniveley & Russell, 2007a).
73 Where previous studies have mainly focused on the ONP as a predictor of posture
74 (Christian & Dzemski, 2007; Taylor *et al*, 2009), this study will analyse the theory's
75 potential for estimating maximum flexibility of the neck. The effect of cartilage will

76 also be investigated; whilst the muscles of the neck can be inferred, their mass and
77 placement within the neck are debateable. The presence of cartilage is much less
78 contentious, yet is something that previous studies have not accounted for. The
79 study will be conducted using the ostrich as a representative from the 'extant
80 phylogenetic bracket' (EPB) (Bryant & Russell, 1992; Witmer, 1995), and as it is the
81 most commonly used avian in previous studies (Christian & Dzemski, 2007; Dzemski
82 & Christian, 2007). These analyses will be brought together to assess the feeding
83 envelope of sauropods, and critique previous methods of estimating posture and
84 flexibility.

85 Institutional abbreviations: NSMT: National Science Museum, Tokyo; CM:
86 Carnegie Museum of Natural History, Pittsburgh. Other abbreviations: EPB: Extant
87 Phylogenetic Bracket; ONP: Osteological Neutral Pose. Abbreviations of muscle
88 attachment sites listed in Table 1.

89

90 **Methodology**

91 Animals studied

92 *S. camelus* has been chosen as an analogue for the sauropod neck using the EPB
93 approach (Bryant & Russell, 1992; Witmer, 1995). As the Sauropoda are stem
94 Avians, and the Struthioniformes are the largest birds to exhibit elongate necks,
95 ostriches are a suitable candidate for comparative study. Though the ratites have
96 evolved elongate necks independently several times (van der Leeuw, Bout &
97 Zweers. 2001), they are a more viable candidate for study than mammals, due to
98 their bracketing of the sauropods, and their relatively more similar number of cervical
99 vertebrae; mammals are limited to seven (Galis, 1999). Three female ostrich necks
100 were used in this study, obtained from MNS Ostriches Ltd, U.K. All three were

101 humanely destroyed at around the same age (~ 6 months). All three necks had been
102 separated from the torso prior to being obtained; two had been pre-skinned and
103 decapitated, whilst one had its head and skin intact. The necks were frozen
104 immediately after amputation to minimize decomposition, and frozen for a sufficient
105 amount of time so that rigor mortis would no longer have an effect.

106

107 Analysis of flexibility of the cervical column

108 The necks were examined immediately after thawing. Detailed notes, sketches and
109 digital photographs were made of the muscles and tissues present in the neck of the
110 ostrich. The flexibility of the neck was measured at various stages of cumulative
111 tissue removal: (In sequential order) with all tissue intact, after removal of the long
112 dorsal musculature (M. biventer cervicis; M. longus colli dorsalis; M. ascendens
113 cervicalis), after removal of the long ventral musculature (M. flexor colli medialis; M.
114 longus colli ventralis); after removal of the lateral musculature (M. flexor colli
115 lateralis) after removal of the single-segment muscles (Mm. intercostales; Mm.
116 interspinales; Mm. intertransversarii); after removal of the ligamentum elasticum.
117 These groups are based on the placement of the muscle in relation to the vertebrae
118 rather than their function. Flexibility measurements were made using a medical
119 goniometer, measuring the flexibility about each inter-vertebral joint, where flexibility
120 amounted to the degree of movement a given vertebra was capable of in relation to
121 the vertebra immediately posterior (Fig. 1). All flexibility measurements are given as
122 deviations from 0°, where the anterior vertebra is angled in a straight line with the
123 posterior vertebra. Should the vertebra not align at 0° i.e. if they are unable through
124 natural dorsiflexion, there would be little impact on the measurements as 0° is
125 essentially in line with the posterior vertebra. The mass of removed muscle and other

126 tissues, in addition to the mass of the neck, was measured with a high precision
127 scale after each stage of removal ((0–810g) Ohaus, d=0.01g; (>810g) Ultraship,
128 d=1g). One neck was separated into 15 sections at each intervertebral joint. The
129 mass of each section was measured, and all tissues were removed. After this the
130 mass of the vertebra was measured to give the mass of tissue around each vertebra.
131 The mass of tissue surrounding each inter-vertebral joint was then estimated using
132 half the mass from the vertebra anterior and half from the vertebra posterior to a
133 given joint. Each neck was cleaned of all soft tissue by being boiled several times in
134 water until all tissue and fat was removed. Measurements of neck length along the
135 most dorsal edge of the neck were taken before and after removal of the tissue with
136 a tape measure. The centra were measured with a tape measure immediately after
137 the boiling process whilst the cartilage was still wet; after being left to dry; and after
138 removal of the cartilage with a scalpel

139

140 Proportional variation of muscle attachment sites

141 The size of the muscle attachment sites on the vertebrae of the ostrich was
142 measured using digital photographs and the freeware computer programme ImageJ
143 (Abramoff, Magalhaes & Ram, 2004). The attachment sites measured were; the
144 Ansa costotransversaria; crista transverso-obliqua; cristae laterales; processus
145 caroticus; processus costalis; processus spinosus; tubercula anae; torus dorsalis
146 (Fig. 2). The muscles originating from these attachment sites were identified during
147 the dissections. Digital photographs of two sauropods necks were also measured
148 using ImageJ; one of the fossil remains of *Apatosaurus ajax* (NSMT-PV 20375)
149 (Upchurch, Tomida & Barrett, 2004), and casts of *Diplodocus carnegii* (CM-84).
150 Photographs of *D. carnegii* were taken of casts at the Museum fur Naturkunde

151 Zentralinstitut der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany, and are available online
152 (Dzemeski, 2005). In addition to the above attachment sites, the size of the
153 spinopostzygapophyseal lamina was also measured (equivalent to the crista
154 transverso-obliqua (Wedel & Sanders, 2002)). These sites were then converted into
155 proportions relative to the length of the neck and of the respective centra, allowing us
156 to see how the size of a given attachment site changes across the whole neck. This
157 is similar to a previous study by Sniveley & Russell (2007a), which used the origin
158 sites of muscles to compare the cross-sectional area of muscles in theropods.
159 Sniveley & Russell (2007a) used the length of the entire neck as its scale of
160 proportion; however as this analysis concerns changing flexibility along the neck,
161 rather than flexibility as a whole, the proportion of the attachment sites in relation to
162 length of the associated centrum will also be analysed. Centrum length was
163 measured using ImageJ as with the attachment sites. The length of the neck was
164 measured directly from the ostrich specimen. For the sauropods the estimated length
165 for the *Apatosaurus* specimen given by Upchurch *et al* (2004) was used, and an
166 estimate was taken from scale drawings of *Diplodocus* specimen CM-84 (Hatcher,
167 1901). Though not giving exact figures as to the amount of muscle originating from
168 each site, or the flexibility allowed, the data will show the relative difference in
169 muscle mass in sauropods compared with the ostrich.

170

171 Osteological Neutral Pose

172 A series of analyses were completed to test the hypothesis that the flexibility
173 of extant animal necks could be predicted by the ONP (Stevens & Parrish, 1999).
174 Allowing a minimum of 50% overlap for dorsoventral and lateral movement, and
175 using 100% overlap as a 'resting' position, the maximum degree of flexibility was

176 measured for the ostrich neck skeleton whilst the cartilage was wet (immediately
177 after boiling off the soft tissue); after drying the cartilage; and after removal of the
178 cartilage. By taking the degree of flexibility at 50% zygapophyseal overlap dorsally
179 and ventrally, we can calculate the degree of flexion allowed per 1% change in
180 overlap (1). Applying this to the maximum flexibility values measured from the neck
181 with all tissues intact, we can estimate the actual overlap exhibited during flexion of
182 the complete neck (2).

183

$$184 \text{ (Dorsal flexibility at 50\% overlap + Ventral Flexibility at 50\%)} / 100 = \text{Degrees of} \\ 185 \text{ flexion per 1\% change in zygapophyseal overlap} \quad (1)$$

186

$$187 \text{ Actual Flexibility} / \text{° per 1\%} = \text{Actual Overlap} \quad (2)$$

188

189 Naming conventions used

190 Due to the complex nature of the cervical musculature and a previous lack of
191 consensus over the naming of the various muscles, it is important to state the
192 conventions used for the naming of the various muscles and muscle attachment
193 sites. Recently the terms for musculature of avians have begun to stabilize after the
194 wider implementation of the *Nomina Anatomica Avium* (Baumel *et al*, 1993); as such
195 this will be used as the basis for the naming of the avian musculature. As it is the
196 only paper to explicitly explore the homologous muscle attachment sites (and
197 musculature) of extant avians and sauropods, the naming of the various attachment
198 sites will follow Wilson (1999), congruent with previous studies concerning
199 homologous attachment sites (Wedel & Sanders, 2002), however a full description of
200 the location of these attachment sites is provided when necessary.

201

202 **Results**

203 Systematic reconstruction of the tissues present in the ostrich neck

204 The muscles of the neck and their respective attachment sites were observed in the
205 necks of the ostrich (Table 2).

206

207 *M. biventer cervicis* (m. biv. cerv.)

208 Origin: Neural spines of the posterior-most cervical vertebrae, or anterior-most
209 caudal vertebrae

210 Insertion: Parietals

211 Function: Though the muscle does not 'attach' to any point of the necks studied (the
212 ostriches were both decapitated and separated from the body at the base of the
213 neck), the two bellies of m. biv. cerv. are nonetheless present. These bellies are
214 present within the same sheath of fascia as m. long. col. dors.. The bellies taper
215 gradually to C8, connecting to a pair of tendons that are the dorsal-most tissues of
216 much of the neck (barring connective tissue and skin) (Fig. 3). These tendons run to
217 the base of the head where another paired set of muscular bellies are present.

218 These were not observed in the specimens studied due to aforementioned
219 decapitations.

220

221 *M. longus colli dorsalis* (m. long. col. dors.)

222 Origin: Processus spinosus – Aponeurosis notarii, from neural arches and transverse
223 processes of the posterior-most cervical vertebrae (Fig. 4).

224 Insertion: Torus dorsalis – Slips insert on the dorsal processes alongside m.
225 ascendens cervicalis.

226 Function: Like the m. biv. cerv., m. long. col. dors. consists of a large amount of
227 muscle mass at the base of the neck, connected to the anterior portion of the muscle
228 complex (present around C1-C3) by tendons. The muscles are bound in the same
229 fascial sheath as m. biv. cerv.. The muscle is exclusively used for dorsiflexion of the
230 neck, especially raising of the anterior vertebrae relative to the base of the neck.

231

232 M. ascendens cervicalis (m. asc. cerv.)

233 Origin: Ansa costotransversaria

234 Insertion: Torus dorsalis

235 Function: The m. asc. cerv. runs from the ansa costotransversaria of the posterior
236 vertebra of the posterior vertebra to the torus dorsalis of the second anterior-most
237 vertebra relative to its origin (Fig. 4). Though positioned lateral to the bypassed
238 vertebra (and therefore the centre of rotation), the dorsal position of the anterior
239 insertion allows this muscle to act during dorsiflexion.

240

241 M. flexor colli lateralis (m. flex. col. lat.)

242 Origin: Tubercula ansae, cristae laterales

243 Insertion: Processus costalis

244 Function: As with m. asc. cerv. the insertion of this muscle is on the lateral parts of
245 the vertebrae (here the lateral tubercles rather than the ansa costotransversaria).
246 While m. asc. cerv. runs lateral and dorsal to the centre of rotation, m. flex. col. lat.
247 inserts ventrally at the cervical rib. This muscle is used primarily for ventriflexion,
248 however due to the lack of long lateral muscles in the avian neck it is likely that it
249 also aids in lateral flexion when simultaneously flexing downwards.

250

251 M. flexor colli medialis (m. flex. col. med.)
252 Origin: Processus caroticus, processus costalis
253 Insertion: Processus ventralis corporis, processus costalis
254 Function: Unlike m. flex. col. lat., m. flex. col. med. runs solely along the ventral
255 portion of the neck. Positioned axial to the cervical ribs, the muscle has no input with
256 regards to lateral flexibility and is only utilised for ventral excursions.

257

258 M. longus colli ventralis (m. long. col. ven.)
259 Origin: Processus caroticus, processus ventralis corporis
260 Insertion: Processus costalis
261 Function: Multiple slips of m. long. col. ven. can arise from the same attachment site.
262 This allows for complex ventriflexion (Sniveley & Russell, 2007b). There is a
263 reduction in the number of slips arising from the vertebrae closer to the head
264 compared to vertebrae at the base of the neck. In addition to ventriflexion, the
265 muscles also prevent damage to the neck during dorsiflexion by acting as a damper
266 (van der Leeuw et al, 2001).

267

268 Mm. intercostales
269 Origin: Crista transverso-obliqua
270 Insertion: Crista transverso-obliqua of the immediately anterior vertebra
271 Function: These muscles run from the dorsal surface of one vertebra to the adjoining
272 anterior vertebra. This allows for intervertebral dorsiflexion of individual intervertebral
273 joints. Towards the base of the neck these muscles make up far less of the total
274 muscle mass than they do at the anterior, and due to the increased moment arm that

275 is being raised, it is likely that the mm. intercristales also take up a function in
276 stabilising these joints rather than flexing the neck.

277

278 Mm. interspinales

279 Origin: Processus spinosus

280 Insertion: Processus spinosus

281 Function: Like mm. intercristales, these single-segment muscles run dorsally along
282 the neck between the neural spines of adjacent vertebrae. These are less well
283 defined than the mm. intercristales, and act to stabilise the joints of the neck as they
284 are too small to have a major impact in dorsal flexion.

285

286 Mm. intertransversarii (mm. intertrans.)

287 Origin: Tubercula ansae, cristae laterales

288 Insertion: Tubercula ansae, cristae laterales

289 Function: The muscles both originate and insert at the same attachment sites on the
290 lateral tubercles of adjacent vertebrae (Fig. 4). There is disparity in published
291 literature as to whether the origin or the muscle is on the anterior or posterior of any
292 two vertebrae (Sniveley & Russell, 2007b). However as the smaller of the two
293 vertebrae is most likely to be affected by any contraction or relaxation of mm.
294 intertrans., this study will treat the posterior vertebrae as the origin. Due to the lateral
295 placement of the muscle, contraction of mm. intertrans. leads to lateral flexion to
296 either side of the neck. Though these are short-segmented, inter-vertebral muscles,
297 they are the most important for lateral flexion as there are no laterally flexing long
298 muscles (spanning three or more vertebra) present in avian necks.

299

300 Ligamentum elasticum

301 The ligamentum elasticum is a series of short ligaments present between all
302 vertebrae, adjoining the dorsal processes. The ligament prevents extreme ventral
303 excursions in adjacent vertebrae, and its presence may also prevent dorsal
304 excursions.

305

306 Ligamentum nuchae

307 The ligamentum nuchae is an elastic sheath that surrounds much of the liamentum
308 elasticum. It prevents extreme ventral excursions across the whole neck.

309

310 Skin

311 The skin surrounding the ostrich neck is extremely loose, allowing for the large
312 dorsal and ventral excursions seen in live animals. This prevented any accurate
313 measurement of flexibility between individual vertebral pairs, as the degree of
314 flexibility between the two vertebrae was not conveyed by the skin. This was not the
315 case when the entire neck was dorsally or ventrally flexed, however this study is
316 primarily concerned with the flexibility between individual intervertebral joints.

317

318 Flexibility

319 The maximum dorsoventral flexibility of the ostrich neck after sequential and
320 cumulative removal of muscles was measured (Fig. 5). The flexibility of the ostrich
321 neck with all muscles intact can be divided into 3 sections (Fig.5a). Between C3 –
322 C6, with dorsal extension reaching 12°-19°, C7-C11, with dorsal extension peaking
323 at 25.6° and ranging down to 19.6°, and the posterior section C12-C15, with dorsal
324 extension ranging from 13-15°. Ventral flexion of the neck does not exhibit the same

325 range as dorsal extension, the maximum excursion from 0° being joint 7 at 15.6°,
326 however the same, three sectioned pattern can be observed, especially in C12-C15,
327 where the vertebrae are unable to flex past 0° and thus in a permanent state of
328 dorsal extension. There is a noticeably larger variation in the ventral flexibilities of the
329 neck in comparison to maximum dorsal excursions. Lateral flexibility follows a similar
330 pattern, with comparatively low values at the anterior end of the neck, increasing to
331 >10° for C5-C10, and then decreasing gradually from C11 to the base of the neck,
332 where there is little flexion (<5°) (Fig. 6b).

333 Removing the long dorsal muscles of the neck increases flexibility across the
334 whole neck, allowing up to 10° more dorsal flexibility, and up to an extra 6.5° of
335 ventral flexibility (Fig. 5b). With the removal of these muscles the posterior vertebrae
336 become flexible enough to flex ventrally past the midline, aside from C12 which is
337 still limited to 1° of dorsal extension. The three sections of the neck are less apparent
338 when looking at the figures for dorsal extension, however they are still apparent
339 during ventral flexion, though joint 6 appears to be part of the 'mid-section'.

340 Removing the dorsal muscles of the neck leads to an increase in lateral flexibility
341 across the neck, allowing for large excursions from 0° from C3 – C8, though there is
342 still limited flexibility of a maximum of 6° at the base of the neck (Fig. 6b).

343 Removing the long ventral muscles of the neck again increases the flexibility
344 (Fig. 5c); however this increase is less pronounced than from removal of the dorsal
345 removal, with the highest increase in flexibility being 4° (C3). The three sections of
346 the neck are still apparent, and all vertebrae in the posterior section are capable of
347 ventral flexion. Increased values for lateral flexibility across the whole neck occur
348 after the removal of the ventral musculature (Fig. 6c).

349 Removal of the lateral muscles of the neck leads to further increases in
350 flexibility, much larger than the increase after removal of the ventral musculature
351 (Fig. 5d). This is especially apparent in ventral flexion, where previously overall
352 ventral flexibility was much lower than that of dorsal flexibility, removal of the lateral
353 musculature leads to comparatively similar flexibility values. However, the ventral
354 flexion capabilities of the posterior section of the neck are still limited, at most
355 reaching 10.5°. With regards to lateral flexibility, the large differences between the
356 anterior and posterior joints are less apparent after removal of the lateral muscles,
357 with the range reduced to 10° where previously it was 21° (Fig. 6d).

358 The three sections of the neck are less distinct after removal of the single-
359 segment muscles of the neck, leading to another small increase in flexibility (Fig. 5e).
360 Whilst the posterior section is still apparent in ventral flexion, there appears to be a
361 rise in flexibility between C3 and C7, which then drops from C8 to C11. Removal of
362 the single-segment muscles brings back the observable difference in lateral flexibility
363 between the anterior and posterior portions of the neck, with joints between C3-C8
364 all exhibiting flexibilities of >15° (maximum 23° – Joint 5), whereas the posterior
365 joints all fall between 11° and 13° (Fig. 6e).

366 Removal of the ligamentum elasticum leads to a massive increase in ventral
367 flexibility, especially in joints between C5 and C8 (Fig. 5f). There is no longer any
368 observable pattern in dorsal flexibility, with values ranging anywhere between 19°
369 and 32°. Lateral flexibility of the anterior vertebrae slightly decreases, and the
370 posterior vertebrae show a large decrease aside from joint 15, which increases to
371 25° (Fig. 6f). This is likely due to the measurements being taken from a solitary neck
372 rather than the two or three for the five other stages of measuring.

373

374 Tissue mass & measurements

375 The masses of the various muscle groups of the neck were measured (Table. 3). M.
376 biv. cerv. is by far the most massive at 253g (23.7% of the total weight), making up a
377 large proportion of all the long dorsal muscles (40.5%). The long ventral and lateral
378 muscles are similar in mass (16.47% and 17.22% respectively), whilst the single-
379 segment muscles make up just over a quarter of the total muscle mass of the neck.
380 The mass of each vertebrae and its associated tissue was also measured (Fig. 7a),
381 and the mass of tissue that surrounds each intervertebral joint estimated (Fig. 7b).
382 Whilst the mass of each vertebra shows a steady increase from C3-C17 (6.72g –
383 42.19g), there is a sharp increase in tissue mass from C11–C17 (53.65 – 159.68),
384 where there was previously a steady increase in tissue mass from C3-C10 (23.45 –
385 49.39). On average the tissue associated with each vertebra weighs around 3 times
386 that of the vertebra itself. The mass of tissue around each vertebra follows this same
387 pattern, with a steady increase in mass up to C10, where after the amount of tissue
388 increases dramatically.

389 Measurements were taken of total length of the dorsal side of the neck before
390 and after tissue removal. Prior to tissue removal the average total length of the neck
391 was 76+/-4.5cm (n=3). After tissue removal, with all centra touching, this length was
392 reduced to 70.1 +/-3.75cm (n=3). Lengths of the individual centra were also
393 measured after boiling off all tissue; whilst still wet, after drying, and after removal of
394 the cartilage caps on each end (Table 4). Drying leads to an average loss of 0.16+/-
395 0.15 cm in centrum length for each vertebra, whilst removal of the cartilage caps
396 leads to an average loss of 0.21+/-0.2 cm.

397

398 Osteological Neutral Pose

399 Measurements for the ONP in the ostrich neck show there is a trend towards higher
400 dorsal and lower ventral flexibilities towards the posterior end of the neck in the
401 specimens studied (Fig. 8a). When measuring maximum lateral flexibility in the ONP,
402 there is no clear pattern present and large variation in the maximum flexibility of
403 specimens studied (Fig. 8b). The angles of deflection obtained when the vertebrae
404 are positioned in the 'neutral' position i.e. 100% overlap of the pre- and post-
405 zygapophyses of adjacent vertebrae were measured (Fig, 9). Though there are large
406 variations in the results there is a trend towards a larger neutral angle in the
407 posterior-most vertebrae (15-20°), where in the anterior vertebrae this angle is much
408 lower (3°-8°). This neutral position is illustrated in Figure 10, along with maximum
409 dorsal and ventral flexion with a minimum of 50% overlap of the zygapophyses.

410 The maximum flexibility allowed by the ONP when the cartilage is in different
411 stages of drying was measured (Fig. 11). Dried cartilage allowed slightly more
412 flexibility than wet cartilage (Fig. 11a; 11b). The flexibility of the neck with the
413 cartilage removed from the vertebrae undergoes a large increase in overall flexibility
414 of the neck in comparison with vertebrae with the cartilage present (Fig. 11c).

415 The amount of overlap between adjacent vertebrae when all muscle tissues
416 were intact was estimated from the amount of flexibility allowed when the neck
417 skeletons were oriented with a minimum of 50% overlap dorsally and ventrally (Fig.
418 12). Dorsally there is a large amount of overlap between the anterior joints, lowering
419 to a minimum overlap of about 40%, this then rises consistently to a maximum of 70-
420 80% overlap in joints 11-14, with joint 15 showing about 100% overlap between the
421 pre- and post-zygapophyses. There is less variation in ventral overlap across the
422 whole neck; however it does exhibit the same decrease in overlap in the middle

423 section, before an increase in overlap towards the base of the neck. Overall
424 minimum ventral overlap is much higher than that of dorsal overlap.

425

426 Proportional variation in muscle attachment sites

427 The ratio of size of the muscle attachment sites to the length of the centra (Fig.13)
428 and neck (Fig. 14) was measured in the ostrich, *Apatosaurus* and *Diplodocus*)

429

430 Ansa costotransversaria

431 Whilst in the ostrich the size of the ansa costotransversaria is relatively constant in
432 relation to centrum length, there is a massive increase in relative size in

433 *Apatosaurus*, where the ratio rises from 1.961 in C5 to 7.377 in C10, remaining

434 above 7 through to C14. This increase is also present in *Diplodocus* though not as

435 dramatic, remaining below a ratio of 1:1 (0.667-0.815) through C3-C8, before

436 increasing at C11 and C12 (1.427 and 1.112 respectively), and again at C15-C16

437 (2.785 and 2.205). This same pattern is observable in relation to neck length; with a

438 steep increase observable in the *Apatosaurus* from C5-C10, a steady increase in the

439 *Diplodocus* vertebrae, and a relatively stable proportion over the ostrich neck.

440

441 Processus spinosus

442 Again the ostrich has the lowest attachment site size relative to centrum length, and

443 it varies little over the course of the neck. The *Apatosaurus* processus spinosus

444 drops in relative size from C6 – C9 (0.330-0.167), before rising again to above 0.5 in

445 C12 and C14. The *Diplodocus* processus spinosus trends towards an increase in size

446 over the neck, however there is a large drop off between C14 and C15 (1.381-

447 0.616). In relation to neck length, the three species have similar proportions from C3-

448 C6. Posterior to this the *Diplodocus* shows a sharp increase in size to C8, before
449 levelling off, with a large drop off in relative size is still present in *Diplodocus cervices*
450 C14 and C15. The *Apatosaurus* proportional size decreases slightly to C7 before an
451 increase to C12, then levelling off. The ostrich processus spinosus stays at a
452 comparatively stable relative size, with a slight increase over the course of the whole
453 neck.

454

455 Crista transverso-obliqua / Spinopostzygapophyseal lamina

456 Whilst the size of the crista transverso-obliqua relative to centrum length is similar in
457 all three animals from C3-C9, the ostrich shows a trend towards a lower relative size,
458 which levels off to a near constant ratio between C11 and C16. This is in contrast to
459 the *Apatosaurus* vertebrae which increase greatly from C9-C10 (0.240-0.421). The
460 *Diplodocus* spinopostzygapophyseal lamina decreases in size from C8 to C11/C12,
461 however shows a sharp increase in size in C14 and C15. Where the *Diplodocus*
462 shows a small proportional spinopostzygapophyseal lamina size in relation to neck
463 length in the anterior-most vertebrae, before a sharp increase from C5-C8 and then
464 levelling off, the *Apatosaurus* stays relatively constant, with some undulation, to C9,
465 before a jump up in size at C10, then levelling off. The ostrich shows a similar
466 pattern, with an exponential increase between C3 and C6, decreasing from C7 to C9
467 before a slight increase before a levelling off to C16.

468

469 Torus dorsalis

470 The relative size of the torus dorsalis in comparison to the centrum is much the same
471 as that of the crista transverso-obliqua, with the anterior vertebrae of all three
472 species much the same, but the sauropods showing a gradual trend towards a larger

473 proportional attachment site posterior from C6, whilst the ostrich shows a decrease
474 from C6-C10 before levelling off. Relative to total neck length, the sauropods both
475 show a slight increase in proportional size over the whole neck (*Apatosaurus* C3=
476 0.008, C14=0.014; *Diplodocus* C3=0.005, C14=0.160). The ostrich is proportionally
477 similar to the sauropods over the course of the whole neck; however there is a
478 steepening decrease from C3 – C9, and then a steady increase to C16.

479

480 Tuberculum ansa

481 Proportionally the size of the tuberculum ansa in relation to centrum length is similar
482 in the anterior-most vertebrae; however from C5 onwards the *Apatosaurus* vertebrae
483 show a steep increase in size, *Diplodocus* showing a gentle increase, and the ostrich
484 decreasing slightly down to C9 before increasing slightly through to C16. The figures
485 for relative neck length show much the same pattern, with similar proportions
486 between C3 and C5, before a steep increase in the *Apatosaurus*, a less steep
487 increase in the *Diplodocus*. However the ostrich keeps relatively stable until C12
488 before a trend towards an increase in proportional size of the tuberculum ansa
489 attachment site.

490

491 Processus costalis

492 The relative size of the processus costalis follows the same pattern in relation to
493 neck and centrum length, with a trend towards a larger proportional size in both the
494 *Apatosaurus* and the ostrich, however the relative size of the *Apatosaurus*
495 attachment site is much larger than that of the ostrich across the whole neck.

496

497 Crista lateralis

498 The relative size of the crista lateralis of the ostrich, in relation to both the centrum
499 length and neck length, follows no discernable pattern.

500

501 Processus caroticus

502 The processus caroticus of the ostrich shows a steady increase in relative size
503 compared to both centrum length and neck length.

504

505 **Discussion**

506 Flexibility

507 The general pattern of three sections of the neck with varying flexibility concurs with
508 previous research into the flexibility of avian necks (van der Leeuw *et al*, 2001 (Pg.
509 248, Fig. 2)), where the pattern was observed in smaller birds with elongate necks
510 (*Rhea americana* (rhea) and *Cygnus olor* (Mute swan)), and in birds that did not
511 have relatively long necks. The pattern of flexibility with all tissue intact also mirrors
512 that of previous work on the neck flexibility of ostriches (Dzemeski & Christian, 2007
513 (Pg. 707, Fig. 7a), however maximum flexibility in said study was judged to be much
514 larger than in the research detailed here, with both dorsal and ventral flexibility
515 reaching up to 30° (as opposed to a maximum of 25° dorsal, 15° ventral). The
516 posterior-most vertebrae of the specimens in this study were also incapable of any
517 ventral excursions past the midline of 0°, which is not the case in previous work.
518 However as the same pattern of flexibility is apparent throughout the length of the
519 neck, it is likely the difference is due to the specimens themselves rather than the
520 sampling method. Whilst this study used sub-adult ostriches, adults were used in the
521 previous research. It is possible that the smaller neck of the sub-adult is restricted in
522 its movement, to allow time for the musculature of the neck to develop and properly

523 support and flex the neck. With the musculature of the neck surrounding and
524 attaching to the vertebrae being flexed, it is no surprise that as muscles are
525 removed, maximum flexibility increases. There does not appear to be any group of
526 muscles that specifically affects the total flexibility; though there is a large increase in
527 the maximum dorsal excursions possible in the posterior-most vertebrae after
528 removal of the long, lateral muscles (Fig. 5d), this is likely due to the large amount of
529 tissue that had been removed from those vertebrae (to include the dorsal and ventral
530 muscles). Ventral flexibility is largely limited by the ligamentum elasticum, with
531 extreme excursions possible after the removal of the ligament concurring with
532 Dzemski & Christian (2007) (Fig. 5f). Lateral flexibility is affected by tissue removal in
533 the same way, with overall increases in flexibility. The pattern observed is however
534 much different to that of previous research. Where this study found there is higher
535 flexibility towards the head and middle of the neck, and much lower flexibility at the
536 base (Fig. 6a), the opposite has been presented in prior work (Dzemski & Christian,
537 2007 (Pg. 707, Fig. 7b), which shows little flexibility at joint 1, uniform flexibility of
538 around 15° from between C2 and C10, and higher flexibility of 20-25° from joints 10
539 to 18. Discounting differing absolute values due to specimen age or size, as these
540 would be unlikely to change the pattern of flexibility so dramatically, it is likely due to
541 differences in the methods used and observations made. Whilst in the previous study
542 it was stated that “lateral flexibility is significantly reduced if simultaneously flexed
543 dorsally” (Dzemski & Christian, 2007; Pg. 707), during examinations of the ostrich
544 necks the opposite was observed, with only a limited amount of flexibility allowed
545 whilst two vertebrae are dorsoventrally ‘neutral’ (i.e. at 0°). At a certain point dorsal
546 flexion is required to allow for any further lateral excursion, as when the pre-
547 zygapophyses of the posterior vertebrae pass further under the post-zygapophyses

548 of the anterior vertebrae, the body of the posterior vertebra is inevitably lifted
549 upwards (Fig. 15), leading to dorsal flexion. This is due, in part, to the relative width
550 of the pre- and post-zygapophyses, and the angle at which they slope inwards.
551 Where in the more anterior vertebrae the zygapophyses are thinner in relation to
552 length, and the angles are less pronounced, the larger posterior vertebrae have
553 zygapophyses that are relatively much wider and slope dramatically inwards (Fig.
554 16), This is especially apparent in the posterior-most vertebra, which are naturally
555 inclined towards dorsal flexion (Fig. 5a), and in the case of this study, incapable of
556 ventral excursions with all tissues attached. Inversely, to keep the vertebrae
557 dorsoventrally neutral during larger lateral excursions requires ventral flexion of the
558 anterior vertebrae.

559

560 Tissue mass & measurements

561 The amount of musculature surrounding the vertebrae and joints limits the amount of
562 flexibility in the neck. Whilst osteological stops and ligaments place absolute limits,
563 the amount of musculature around a joint will further limit the maximum flexibility
564 when the animal is alive. There is relatively little difference in the maximum flexibility
565 of the anterior and posterior joints of a neck with little tissue present (Fig. 5e,f), yet
566 there is a much larger difference in one with all musculature intact, with much lower
567 flexibility allowed in the joints towards the base of the neck. As the amount of
568 musculature is much higher in these posterior vertebrae, compared with that of the
569 middle and anterior sections, it is safe to assume that muscle mass has a great deal
570 of influence on the flexibility allowed at the base of the neck, and as this varies not
571 only between species but between individuals, emphasis should be placed on the
572 assumed amount of muscle mass when estimating neck flexibility from fossil

573 specimens. The reduction in flexibility is not caused by the bone itself, as shown by
574 estimates of flexibility from zygapophyseal overlap (Fig. 8). With no tissue present,
575 there is no obvious reduction in the excursions possible in the posterior vertebrae.

576

577 Osteological Neutral Pose

578 Positioning the neck in maximal dorsal flexion allowed when in the ONP does not
579 convey the same pattern (of three sections of flexibility) as that of the neck when
580 manipulated to its actual maximal amount of flexibility. Whilst overall flexibility
581 allowed is much higher in the ONP, there is relatively less flexibility dorsally in the
582 anterior and middle sections of the neck, with the highest flexibilities allowed in the
583 posterior portion, much the opposite of what is implied by maximal flexion. Ventrally
584 there is still little flexibility in the base of the neck compared to the joints anterior to it,
585 but aside from the small amount of flexibility allowed in the joint between the axis
586 and C3, there is no real differentiation between the anterior and middle sections of
587 the neck. Unlike dorsal flexion this is much like the actual pattern observed, however
588 the maximum degree of flexibility is much higher in the ONP. When measuring
589 lateral flexibility there is no clear pattern, whereas with tissues intact there is a higher
590 anterior flexibility, decreasing to very little flexibility at the base of the neck. These
591 findings show that the ONP is not a suitable measure of flexibility of the necks of
592 vertebrates. Whilst a discrepancy between the values for flexibility under the same
593 pattern would allow for adjustments to be made, with the ONP as an over- or under-
594 estimate, the pattern of flexibility across the neck is not conveyed at all aside from in
595 ventral flexion, and as such the ONP does not correctly indicate the flexibility of the
596 cervical column. The amount of overlap between the pre- and post-zygapophyses
597 allowed in the ONP would also appear to be an inappropriate. Where the ONP

598 allows for a minimum of 50% overlap, this minimum is surpassed dorsally between
599 cervicals C7-C10. More interestingly, aside from these three joints the minimum of
600 50% appears to be an overestimate, with values of around 75-100% overlap more
601 common around the base of the neck. It is also of note that the pattern of minimum
602 overlap allowed follows the same pattern as that of flexibility, with reduced
603 excursions at the anterior of the neck, increased excursions in the middle and the
604 largest amount of overlap at the base of the neck; this means that the minimum
605 amount of overlap is dictated by the flexibility of the joint, and that no one rule for
606 zygapophyseal overlap will convey the flexibility across the whole neck.

607 When comparing wet, dry and absent cartilage, there is a general increase in
608 flexibility with a reduction in centrum length for each joint, likely due to an increased
609 amount of room for manoeuvrability between said joints. This has direct
610 consequences for assessments of flexibility based on fossil specimens, whether in
611 ONP or through other methods. As the presence of cartilage reduces the amount of
612 flexibility, any attempts to assess flexibility through dry bone alone must be
613 overestimates due to an under-represented total centrum size. However, the length
614 of the neck decreases when all centra are placed in contact with each other. This
615 indicates that the centra of the neck are not in constant contact with each other, and
616 there is a certain amount of space between vertebrae within the synovial capsules.
617 This is best illustrated by comparing the neck in sub-maximum flexibility prior to
618 dissection, and the neck skeleton articulated to fit the maximum flexibility of the neck
619 with all tissue intact, but with the centra touching (Fig. 17). The ONP does not allow
620 for these deviations, keeping a constant (and minimum) gap between two centra. As
621 there is this room for manoeuvrability, it is possible that the same amount of flexibility
622 can be obtained with a reduced deviation from neutral zygapophyseal overlap (Fig.

623 18). This suggests that the ONP could also lead to underestimates of potential
624 flexibility. Coupled with the differences in flexibility allowed due to the size/presence
625 of cartilage, these findings have huge bearings on future estimates of flexibility. To
626 correctly estimate flexibility of the necks of extinct animals from fossil material alone
627 would also require estimates of the size of any cartilage, along with an estimate of
628 the maximum space allowed in the synovial capsules between adjacent vertebrae.

629

630 Proportions of attachment sites

631 The ansa costotransversaria of the sauropods follows a much steeper increase in
632 proportional size than that of the ostrich. With large increases in proportional size
633 towards the base of the neck, it can be expected that the size of the m. ascendens
634 cervicalis increased in size at a much higher rate towards the base of the neck than
635 it does in the ostrich. The m. ascendens cervicalis is utilised in dorsiflexion of the
636 neck. It is likely due to the extremely large size, and the increased moment arm from
637 the head to the posterior cervicals, that the increase in muscle size is needed in
638 order to lift and stabilise the neck. The change in size is also apparent between
639 sauropods, with the more gracile *Diplodocus* having a lighter neck and a smaller
640 attachment site size, whereas the more robust *Apatosaurus* neck would be much
641 heavier, and as such requiring a larger muscle to accommodate the extra weight.

642 The processus spinosus of the sauropods also increases in proportional size
643 towards the base of the neck, but not to the extent of the ansa costotransversaria.
644 From this attachment site, the m. long. col. dors. and the mm. interspinales originate.
645 M. long. col. dors. is involved not only in dorsiflexion, but in ventriflexion, acting as a
646 support muscle to keep the neck stable, and is used when retracting the neck
647 dorsally from a ventral pose. The need for an increased muscle size here is probably

648 the same as for the ansa costotransversaria. The mm. interspinales are short inter-
649 vertebral muscles running from the spinuous process of one vertebra to the same
650 site on the immediately adjacent vertebra. They are likely to aid dorsiflexion, but also
651 place a limit on ventral flexibility. These muscles are not well defined in extant birds,
652 and it is likely that the change in size of the processus spinosus in sauropods is
653 mostly due to a change in size of the m. long. col. dors.

654 The tuberculum ansa shows a general trend towards increased size towards
655 the base of the neck in all species, though again with the sauropods having larger
656 proportional attachment sites than that of the ostrich. The m. flex. col. lat and the
657 mm. intertrans. both originate from the tuberculum ansa. The mm. intertrans. is
658 utilised in lateral flexion of the neck as there are no long laterally-flexing muscles in
659 bird necks. Whether this is the case for sauropods is unknown, as it would require
660 novel musculature not present in extant avians. The m. flex. col. lat. aids ventral
661 excursions of the neck. The large increase in size in the tuberculum ansa of
662 sauropods may be due to the higher position of the shoulders, allowing ventriflexion
663 of the neck so that the head reaches the ground.

664 The processus costalis of the *Apatosaurus* is relatively much larger than that
665 of the ostrich across the whole neck, whilst similar in size between vertebra. The m.
666 flex. col. med. originates from this site, and as with the m. flex. col. lat. is involved in
667 ventral flexion of the cervical column. As the processus caroticus does not have an
668 equivalent attachment site in sauropods, and this is the site where the long ventral
669 muscles originate in birds, it may be the case that the increased size of the
670 intervertebral ventrally flexing muscles is to compensate for a lack of these longer
671 muscles. The processus caroticus in birds also shows a linear increase in relative
672 size over the length of the bird neck, allowing ventral flexion from a resting raised

673 neck. The lack of this attachment site and its corresponding muscles could be
674 construed as an indicator of a more horizontal neck posture compared to birds, as it
675 would not require the musculature to bring the anterior portion of the neck down to
676 feed on low plants or drink from water sources.

677 The relative attachment site sizes of the crista transverso-obliqua/
678 spinopostzygapophyseal lamina, and the torus dorsalis, both show little signs of any
679 trend in proportional size in any species, and the species analysed do not differ
680 greatly enough to warrant further examination.

681

682 Implications for Sauropods

683 With regards to overall flexibility of the neck, it has been shown that the ONP could
684 potentially lead to either underestimates or overestimates of flexibility; as it
685 overestimates that of the ostrich whilst not accounting for any gaps in the centra we
686 can assume it is a general overestimate. This would decrease the flexibility of the
687 sauropod neck, and therefore decrease the potential range of the feeding envelope
688 over which it was possible for them to feed. This would facilitate even greater niche
689 partitioning than previously suggested in the literature (the ONP gives the lowest
690 estimate in feeding envelope size (Stevens & Parrish, 2005b)). This reduction would
691 potentially bring the feeding envelope of sauropods with necks that certainly had
692 more vertical neutral postures (at least at the base of the neck), such as the
693 Macronarian *Brachiosaurus*, out of range of potential water sources. However, this is
694 not a paradoxical scenario. Barring a novel structure such as an elephant's trunk, it
695 is entirely possible that the sauropods were capable of kneeling to bring their heads
696 closer to the water level. Whilst the obvious example of the giraffe splaying its legs
697 would not apply to the much more robust sauropods, it is important to remember that

698 this behaviour in the giraffe is necessary due to the elongate metapodials. This
699 elongation is not exhibited in sauropods, with the knee joint much closer to the
700 centre of the limb as a whole, allowing the knees to bend and bring the body
701 downwards whilst keeping the manus directly below the body to continue to support
702 the weight of the animal.

703 A decrease in flexibility does however put limitations on the resting posture of
704 the neck, in particular suggestions of a swan-like 'S' shaped posture. A higher head
705 height coupled with a lower flexibility would prevent the head reaching water sources
706 to drink, with the ability to bend the knees only adding a certain amount leeway. Of
707 course it is conceivable that the 'neutral' (i.e. posture that uses the least energy to
708 maintain) posture of the neck is much lower than that of the posture whilst resting,
709 however it would be energetically inefficient to constantly hold the neck close to
710 dorsally flexed the majority of the time. Therefore it is likely that given a decreased
711 feeding envelope, an 'S' shaped neck would be impractical. However it is entirely
712 possible for the neck to have been held in a posture raised slightly above horizontal
713 (Christian & Dzemski, 2007; Dzemski & Christian, 2007; Christian & Dzemski, 2011).
714 The lack of an attachment site that is homologous to the avian processus caroticus
715 suggests one of two things: either there was a novel attachment site that has yet to
716 be identified in the sauropod neck that long, ventral muscles originated from, or
717 these muscles were not present. Without these long ventral muscles, ventral
718 excursions would be limited, implying that a swan-shaped neck would not be
719 possible, as the animal would not be able to lower its head down sufficiently.

720 With regards to flexibility of individual joints of the neck, it is clear that the
721 sauropods have relatively more mass to restrict flexibility at the posterior portion of
722 the neck compared to the ostrich. Whilst the ostrich has very little flexibility at the

723 base of its neck, a reduction in this already small range would seem a hindrance.
724 However, as the length of the neck is much longer in the sauropod than it is in the
725 ostrich, a smaller degree of flexibility would allow for a much larger change in height
726 at the anterior end of the neck. This increase in muscle mass is most likely
727 necessitated by the need to compensate for the increased moment arm produced by
728 a much longer and heavier neck. The muscles that are implied to have an increased
729 relative mass in sauropods include (but are not limited to) those that aid dorsiflexion
730 and stability, which in the ostrich are much more pronounced at the base of the neck.
731 The only other study to deal with flexibility estimates for the individual joints of the
732 neck is Dzemski & Christian (2007). It was proposed that dorsal flexibility was limited
733 by bone, and that ventral excursions were limited to a minimum of 30%
734 zygapophyseal overlap. The results presented here assert that these limitations are
735 demonstrably false. As flexibility is increased through the removal of muscles, bone
736 cannot be the limiting factor in dorsal flexibility. In addition, zygapophyseal overlap in
737 the ostrich is at minimum around 60%, following a pattern where more flexible joints
738 show lower overlaps and vice versa. It has also been shown that allowing for a
739 fluctuating gap between the centra allows a higher amount of flexibility with the same
740 zygapophyseal overlap. The evidence suggests that using percentage overlap of dry
741 bone is not an appropriate measure of flexibility. It is of note that the ventral
742 flexibilities proposed in Dzemski & Christian (2007) (Pg. 709, Fig. 10) contained two
743 large spikes in flexion capabilities at the 8th and 15th joints (accompanied by large
744 drops in dorsal flexion). When viewing the estimated ventral flexibilities of an ostrich
745 in the ONP, which again is based on zygapophyseal overlap, the same
746 comparatively high flexibilities over individual joints can be seen in the 5th, 8th and
747 11th joints, again accompanied by a reduction in dorsal flexion in comparison to the

748 prior vertebrae. This is in conflict with the pattern of actual maximal flexibility which is
749 a much smoother trend divided into three broad sections. It is much more likely that
750 the neck of the sauropods would transition in this smooth fashion, as such large
751 variations in flexibility would require a considerable amount more muscle localised
752 around individual vertebra to accommodate this increase in flexibility; this would be
753 required to bring the joint back up to a more neutral posture. This is not shown in the
754 *Diplodocus* (the same specimen used by Dzemski & Christian, 2007), with
755 attachment site values for the dorsal and ventral muscles showing no obvious
756 decrease or increase in relative size around this joint. However, the processus
757 costalis was not present in the vertebrae of this specimen. In the *Apatosaurus* the
758 cervical ribs were present, and there is a pronounced increase in relative size at the
759 8th vertebrae, where a large amount of muscle devoted to ventral flexion would
760 attach. Though this large attachment site is present, it is unlikely that the neck of the
761 sauropod contained a much larger amount of mass concentrated around the middle
762 of the neck.

763

764 **Conclusions**

765

- 766 • The ostrich neck can be divided into three sections of varying flexibility; a
767 slightly flexible anterior section, a very flexible middle section, and a stiff
768 posterior section.
- 769 • The muscles of the neck are what place limits on flexibility, as removal of the
770 muscles leads to higher maximum flexibility. Therefore muscle mass needs to
771 be taken into account in any predictions of flexibility.

- 772 • Zygapophyseal overlap of bone does not indicate flexibility. Sections of the
773 neck with lower flexibilities show more overlap, and vice versa. Therefore the
774 Osteological Neutral Pose is inappropriate as a measure of flexibility of the
775 neck.
- 776 • The size of cartilage, as well as its presence, affects potential flexibility. This,
777 and the fact that the inter-vertebral spaces are not kept to an absolute
778 minimum at all times, mean that any further work requires the space between
779 two centra to be taken into account to come to a meaningful conclusion.
- 780 • If the Osteological Neutral Pose affects estimates of sauropods in the same
781 way it does the ostrich (a general overestimate), sauropod neck flexibility is
782 lower than previously imagined. Therefore the range of their feeding
783 envelopes would be much smaller than prior estimates.
- 784 • Limited flexibility would prevent more vertical, 'S'-shaped necks due to an
785 inability to reach water sources.

786

787 **Further Work**

788 It is important to note that as the ONP both underestimates and overestimates the
789 flexibility of the joints of the neck, it is entirely possible that for some species, such
790 as the ostrich presented here, it overestimates flexibility of the whole neck, and for
791 some species it underestimates this. More studies into the flexibility of extant animal
792 necks would lead to a more definitive answer to this. As the original DinoMorph and
793 its successive revisions are the only current computer models of sauropod neck
794 flexibility, they are valuable in that their results can be used to base comparisons of
795 actual flexibilities and those provided by the ONP. Definite candidates for further
796 work in this area include the rhea and other extant avians with elongate necks, and

797 mammals such as the giraffe and the camel. Though not exhibiting elongate necks,
798 crocodylians are in dire need of assessment to properly bracket the sauropods.

799 Should further work be completed on attachment site sizes, the rhea is again
800 an ideal candidate for avian musculature, especially as it is the only extant bird that
801 exhibits bifid neural spines (Tsuihiji, 2004). Although many recovered sauropod
802 cervical series are subject to deformation, poor preservation and loss of one or more
803 vertebrae, there are still well preserved representatives available. Measurements of
804 the attachment sites of macronarian sauropods such as *Brachiosaurus* or
805 *Camarasaurus* would prove to be the most informative due to their dramatically
806 different morphology compared to the diplodocids studied here.

807

808 **References**

809

810 Abramoff, M.D., Magalhaes, P.J. & Ram, S.J. (2004). Image Processing with
811 ImageJ. *Bioph. Intl.* **11**, 36-42.

812

813 Alexander, R. (1985). Mechanics of posture and gait of some large dinosaurs. *Zool,*
814 *J. Linn. Soc.* **83**, 1-25.

815

816 Bakker, R. (1971). The ecology of the brontosaurus. *Nature.* **229**, 172-174.

817

818 Bryant, H.N. & Russell, A.P. (1992). The role of phylogenetic analysis in the
819 inference of unpreserved attributes of extinct taxa. *Philos. T. Roy. Soc. B.* **337**, 405-
820 418.

821

822 Baumel, J.J. (1993). *Handbook of avian anatomy: Nomina anatomica avium* (2nd
823 ed.). Publications of the Nuttall Ornithological Club, **33**.
824

825 Calvo, J. (1994). Jaw mechanics in sauropod dinosaurs. *Gaia*. **10**, 183-193.
826

827 Chin, K. (1997). What did dinosaurs eat? Coprolites and other direct evidence of
828 dinosaurs diets. In *The Complete Dinosaur* (Farlow, J.O. and Brett-Surman, M.K.,
829 eds), pp. 371-382. Indiana University Press, Bloomington.
830

831 Christian, A. (2002). Neck posture and overall body design in sauropods. *Foss. Rec.*
832 **5**, 271-281.
833

834 Christian, A. (2010). Some sauropods raised their necks – evidence for high
835 browsing in *Euhelopus zdansyi*. *Biol. Lett.* **6**, 823-825.
836

837 Christian, A. & Dzemski, G. (2007). Reconstruction of the cervical skeleton posture
838 of *Bracosaurus brancai* Janensch, 1914 by an analysis of the intervertebral stress
839 along the neck and a comparison with the results of different approaches. *Foss. Rec.*
840 **10**, 38-49.
841

842 Christian, A. & Dzemski, G. (2011). Neck posture in sauropods. In *Biology of the*
843 *Sauropod Dinosaurs: Understanding the Life of Giants* (Klein, N., Remes, K., Gee,
844 C.T. & Sander. P.M., eds), pp. 251-260. Life of the Past (series ed. Farlow, J.).
845 Indiana University Press, Bloomington.
846

847 Christian, A. & Heinrich, W.D. (1998). The neck posture of *Brachiosaurus brancai*.
848 *Mitt. Mus. Natkd. Humb-Univ. Berl. Geowis. Reihe. 1*, 73-80.
849
850 Christian, A. & Preuschoft, H. (1996). Deducing the body posture of extinct large
851 vertebrates from the shape of the vertebral column. *Palaeontology. 39*, 801-812.
852
853 Dzemski, G. (2005). "Visual archive of long necked animals and sauropod
854 dinosaurs". Available at [http://www.uni-](http://www.uni-flensburg.de/biologie/dinosaurier/Visual%20Archiv.htm)
855 [flensburg.de/biologie/dinosaurier/Visual%20Archiv.htm](http://www.uni-flensburg.de/biologie/dinosaurier/Visual%20Archiv.htm) (accessed 11 September
856 2011).
857
858 Dzemski, G. & Christian, A. (2007). Flexibility along the neck of the ostrich (*Struthio*
859 *camelus*) and consequences for the reconstruction of dinosaurs with extreme neck
860 length. *J. Morphol. 268*, 707-714.
861
862 Fiorillo, A. (1998). Dental microwear patterns of the sauropod dinosaurs
863 *Camarasaurus* and *Diplodocus*: evidence for resource partitioning in the Late
864 Jurassic of North America. *Hist. Biol. 13*, 1-16.
865
866 Galis, F. (1999). Why do almost all mammals have seven cervical vertebrae?
867 Developmental constraints, Hox genes and cancer. *J. Exp. Zool. Part B. 285*, 19-
868 26.
869
870 Gee, C.T. (2011). Dietary options for the sauropod dinosaurs from an integrated
871 botanical and paleobotanical perspective. . In *Biology of the Sauropod Dinosaurs:*

872 *Understanding the Life of Giants* (Klein, N., Remes, K., Gee, C.T. & Sander, P.M.,
873 eds), pp. 34-56. *Life of the Past* (series ed. Farlow, J.). Indiana University Press,
874 Bloomington.

875

876 Hatcher, J.B. (1901). *Diplodocus* (Marsh): Its osteology, taxonomy and probable
877 habits, with a restoration of the skeleton. *Mem. Carnegie Mus.* **1**, 1-63.

878

879 Holtz, T. R. Jr. & Rey, L. (2007). *Dinosaurs: The Most Complete, Up-to-Date*
880 *Encyclopedia for Dinosaur Lovers of All Ages*. Random House, New York.

881

882 Hummel, J., Gee, C.T., Südekum, K-H., Sander, P.M., Nogge, G. & Clauss, M.
883 (2008). In vitro digestibility of fern and gymnosperm foliage: implications for
884 sauropod feeding ecology and diet selection. *P. R. Soc. B.* **275**, 1015-1021.

885

886 Martin, J. (1987). Mobility and feeding of *Cetiosaurus* (Saurischia, Sauropoda) – why
887 the long neck? In *Fourth Symposium on Mesozoic Terrestrial Ecosystems, Short*
888 *Papers* (Currie, P.J. & Koster, E.H., eds), pp. 154-159. Drumheller: Boxtree Books.

889

890 Paul, G.S. (1987). The science and art of restoring the life appearance of dinosaurs
891 and their relatives. In *Dinosaurs Past and Present, Vol. 2* (Czerkas, S.J. & Olsen,
892 E.C. eds). pp. 5-49. Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, California.

893

894 Perry, S.F., Breurer, T. & Pajor, N. (2011). Structure and function of the sauropod
895 respiratory system. In *Biology of the Sauropod Dinosaurs: Understanding the Life of*

896 *Giants* (Klein, N., Remes, K., Gee, C.T. & Sander, P.M., eds), pp. 83-93. Life of the
897 Past (series ed. Farlow, J.). Indiana University Press, Bloomington.
898
899 Perry, S.F., Christian, A., Breuer, T., Pajor, N. & Codd, J.R. (2009). Implications of
900 an avian-style respiratory system for gigantism in sauropod dinosaurs. *J. Exp. Zool.*
901 *Part A.* **311**, 600-610.
902
903 Preuschoft, H. (1976). Funktionelle Anpassung evoluierender Systeme. *Aufs. u.*
904 *Reden D. Senckenberg.Naturf.Ges.* **28**, 98-117.
905
906 Ruxton, G.D. & Wilkinson, D.M. (2011). The energetics of low browsing in
907 sauropods. *Biol. Lett.* Online DOI: 10.1098/rsbl.2011.0116.
908
909 Sander, P.M., Christian, A., Clauss, M., Fechner, R., Gee, C.T., Griebeler, E.M.,
910 Gunga, H-C., Hummel, J., Mallison, H., Perry, S.F., Preuschoft, H., Rauhut, O.W.M.,
911 Remes, K., Tütken, T., Wings, O. & Witzel, U. (2011). Biology of the sauropod
912 dinosaurs: the evolution of gigantism. *Biol. Rev.* **86**, 117-155.
913
914 Senter, P. (2006). Necks for sex: sexual selection as an explanation for sauropod
915 dinosaur neck elongation. *J. Zool.* **271**, 45-53.
916
917 Seymour, R.S. (2009a). Raising the sauropod neck: it costs more to get less. *Biol.*
918 *Lett.* **5**, 317-319.
919
920 Seymour, R.S. (2009b). Sauropods kept their heads down. *Science.* **323**, 1671.

921

922 Sniveley, E. & Russell, A.P. (2007a). Functional variation of neck muscles and their
923 relation to feeding style in Tyrannosauridea and other large theropod dinosaurs. *Ant.
924 Rec.* **290**, 934-957.

925

926 Sniveley, E. & Russell, A.P. (2007b). Functional morphology of neck musculature in
927 the Tyrannosauridae (Dinosauria, Theropoda) as determined via a hierarchical
928 inferential approach. *Zool. J. Linn. Soc-Lond.* **151**, 759-808.

929

930 Stevens, K.A. (2002). DinoMorph: Parametric modelling of skeletal structures.
931 *Senckenb. Lethaea.* **82**, 23-34.

932

933 Stevens, K.A. & Parrish, J.M. (1999). Neck posture and feeding habits of two
934 Jurassic sauropods. *Science.* **284**, 798-800.

935

936 Stevens, K.A. & Parrish, J.M. (2005a). Neck posture, dentition, and feeding
937 strategies in Jurassic sauropod dinosaurs. In *Thunder-lizards. The sauropodomorph
938 dinosaurs* (Tidwell, V. and Carpenter, K., eds), pp. 212-232. Indiana University
939 Press, Bloomington

940

941 Stevens, K.A. & Parrish, J.M. (2005b). Digital reconstructions of sauropod dinosaurs
942 and implications for feeding. In *The Sauropods: Evolution and Paleobiology* (Curry
943 Rogers, K.A. and Wilson, K.A., eds), pp. 178-200. University of California Press,
944 Berkeley

945

946 Taylor, M.P., Hone, D.W.E., Wedel, M.J. & Naish, D. (2011). The long necks of
947 sauropods did not evolve primarily through sexual selection. *J. Zool.* Online DOI:
948 10.1111/j.1469-7998.2011.00824.x
949
950 Taylor, M.P., Wedel, M.J. & Naish, D. (2009). Head and neck posture in sauropod
951 dinosaurs inferred from extant animals. *Acta Palaeontol. Pol.* **54**, 213-220.
952
953 Tsuihiji, T. (2004). The ligament system in the neck of *Rhea Americana* and its
954 implications for the bifurcated neural spines of sauropod dinosaurs. *J. Vert.*
955 *Paleontol.* **24**, 165-172.
956
957 Upchurch, P. & Barrett, P.M. (2000). The evolution of sauropod feeding
958 mechanisms. In *Evolution of herbivory in terrestrial vertebrates* (Sues, H.D., ed), pp.
959 79-122. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
960
961 Upchurch, P., Tomida, Y. & Barrett, P.M. (2005). *A new specimen of Apatosaurus*
962 *ajax (Sauropoda: Diplodocidae) from the Morrison Formation (Upper Jurassic) of*
963 *Wyoming, USA. National Science Museum Monographs No. 26.* National Science
964 Museum, Tokyo.
965
966 Van der Leeuw, A.H.J., Bout, R.G. & Zweers, G.A. (2001). Evolutionary morphology
967 of the neck system in ratites, fowl, and waterfowl. *Neth. J. Zool.* **51**, 243-262.
968

969 Wedel, M.J. & Sanders, R.K. (2002). Osteological correlates of the cervical
970 musculature in Aves and Sauropoda (Dinosauria: Saurischia) with comments on the
971 the cervical ribs of *Apatosaurus*. *PaleoBios*. **22**, 1-6.

972

973 Wedel, M.J. & Cifelli, R.L. (2005). *Sauroposeidon*: Oklahoma's native giant. *Okla.*
974 *Geol. Notes*. **65**, 40-57.

975

976 Wilson, J.A. (1999). A nomenclature for vertebral laminae in sauropods and other
977 saurischian dinosaurs. *J. Vert. Paleontol.* **19**, 639-653.

978

979 Witmer , L.M. (1995). The extant phylogenetic bracket and the importance of
980 reconstructing soft tissues in fossils. In *Functional morphology in vertebrate*
981 *palaeontology* (Thomason, J.J., ed), pp. 19-33. Cambridge University Press,
982 Cambridge.

983 **Table Legends**

984

985 **Table 1.** Muscle attachment site abbreviations used in figures

986

987 **Table 2.** Origins and insertions of the cervical musculature of *Struthio camelus* (the
988 ostrich). Muscles appear in the order removed in this study. Modified from Wedel &
989 Sanders, 2002.

990

991 **Table 3.** Mass measurements of the muscle groups of the neck of *Struthio camelus*
992 (the ostrich). Also presented are groups as a percentage of the total muscle mass of
993 the neck, and as a percentage of the total mass of the neck (Dorsal: M. biv. cerv., m.
994 long. col. dors., m. asc. cerv.; Ventral: m. flex. col. med., m. long. col. ven.; Lateral:
995 M. flex. col. lat.; Single-segment: Mm. intercrustales, mm. interspinales, mm.
996 intertrans.).

997

998 **Table 4.** Length measurements of the centra of the neck of *Struthio camelus* (the
999 ostrich). Measurements were taken whilst cartilage was wet after boiling off tissue;
1000 after 4 days of drying; after removal of the cartilage from the vertebra. All
1001 measurements in cm.

1002 **Figure Legends**

1003

1004 **Figure 1.** Measuring inter-vertebral flexibility of *Struthio camellus* with a medical
1005 goniometer. (a) Measuring flexion of the neck with muscles intact. (b) Measuring
1006 flexion of the cleaned vertebra using adjustable clamps.

1007

1008 **Figure 2.** Mid-cervical vertebrae of *Struthio camelus* (a, b) and *Apatosaurus louisae*
1009 (c, d), with muscle attachment sites labelled. Vertebrae illustrated in left lateral (a, c)
1010 and anterior (b, d) views.

1011

1012 **Figure 3.** The neck of *Struthio camelus*. Annotated to show the muscular bellies and
1013 tendons of m. biventer cervicis. Scale bar = 10cm.

1014

1015 **Figure 4.** The neck of *Struthio camelus*, annotated to show the muscles mm.
1016 intertransversii, m. ascendens cervicalis, m. longus colli dorsalis, and the location of
1017 the muscle attachment sites torus dorsalis and ansa costotransversaria. Scale bar =
1018 10cm.

1019

1020 **Figure 5.** Measurements of dorsoventral flexibility of the neck joints of *Struthio*
1021 *camellus* through stages of cumulative tissue removal. (a) All tissues present. (b)
1022 Long dorsal muscles removed. (c) Long ventral muscles removed. (d) Long lateral
1023 muscles removed. (e) Single-segment muscles removed. (f) Ligamentum elasticum
1024 removed. ((a) n=3; (b-e) n=2; (f) n=1).

1025

1026 **Figure 6.** Measurements of lateral flexibility of the neck joints of *Struthio camelus*
1027 through stages of cumulative tissue removal. (a) All tissues present. (b) Long dorsal
1028 muscles removed. (c) Long ventral muscles removed. (d) Long lateral muscles
1029 removed. (e) Single-segment muscles removed. (f) Ligamentum elasticum removed.
1030 ((a) n=3; (b-e) n=2; (f) n=1).

1031

1032 **Figure 7.** Mass measurements of the neck of *Strutho camelus*, after the neck was
1033 separated at each individual joint. (a) Mass of each cervical vertebra and the tissue
1034 surrounding it. (b) Estimated tissue mass around each inter-vertebral joint.

1035

1036 **Figure 8.** Measurements of flexibility of the neck skeleton of *Struthio camelus* when
1037 limited to a minimum of 50% zygapophyseal overlap, to conform with the
1038 osteological neutral pose (Stevens & Parrish, 1999). (a) Dorsoventral flexibility. (b)
1039 Lateral flexibility. (n=3).

1040

1041 **Figure 9.** The degree of dorsal flexion at each joint when the cervical vertebrae of
1042 *Struthio camelus* are articulated in the osteological neutral pose (100%
1043 zygapophyseal overlap) (Stevens & Parrish, 1999). (n=3) .Figure 10. Neck skeleton
1044 (C3-C17) of *Struthio camelus* articulated to show (a) maximum dorsal flexibility; (b)
1045 neutral position; (c) maximum ventral flexibility allowed by the osteological neutral
1046 pose (Stevens & Parrish, 1999). Scale bar = 10cm.

1047

1048 **Figure 11.** Maximum dorsoventral flexibility of the neck skeleton of *Struthio camelus*
1049 allowed by the osteological neutral pose (minimum 50% zygapophyseal overlap), (a)
1050 whilst the cartilage of the vertebra was wet after boiling off tissue; (b) after drying for

1051 4 days; (c) after removal of the cartilage.

1052

1053 **Figure 12.** Estimated zygapophyseal overlap of the cervical vertebra of *Struthio*
1054 *camelus* whilst the complete neck with all tissue intact is in maximum dorsal and
1055 maximum ventral flexion. (n=3).

1056

1057 **Figure 13.** Proportional size of the attachment sites of the cervical muscles along the
1058 necks of *Struthio camelus*, *Diplodocus carnegii* and *Apatosaurus ajax*, in relation to
1059 length of the respective centrum of each vertebra. (a) Ansa costotransversaria; (b)
1060 processus spinosus; (c) crista transverso-obliqua (*S. camelus*) and
1061 spinopostzygapophyseal lamina (*D. carnegii* & *A. ajax*); (d) torus dorsalis; (e)
1062 tubercula anae; (f) processus costalis; (g) cristae lateralis; (h) processus caroticus.

1063

1064 **Figure 14.** Proportional size of the attachment sites of the cervical muscles along the
1065 necks of *Struthio camelus*, *Diplodocus carnegii* and *Apatosaurus ajax*, in relation to
1066 the total neck length. (a) Ansa costotransversaria; (b) processus spinosus; (c) crista
1067 transverso-obliqua (*S. camelus*) and spinopostzygapophyseal lamina (*D. carnegii* &
1068 *A. ajax*); (d) torus dorsalis; (e) tubercula anae; (f) processus costalis; (g) cristae
1069 lateralis; (h) processus caroticus.

1070

1071 **Figure 15.** The effect of lateral flexion on dorsoventral flexion in the posterior
1072 cervical vertebrae of *Struthio camelus*. (a, c) C15 and C16 with no lateral flexion, and
1073 flexed ventrally to reach a dorsoventral angle of 0° (see zygapophyseal overlap (a)).
1074 (b, d) C15 and C16 flexed laterally, forcing dorsal flexion.

1075

1076 **Figure 16.** Pre- and post-zygapophyses of the cervical vertebrae of *Struthio*
1077 *camelus*. C10 (a) pre-zygapophyses; (b) post-zygapophyses. C15 (c) pre-
1078 zygapophyses; (d) post-zygapophyses.

1079

1080 **Figure 17.** The effect of inter-vertebral space on zygapophyseal overlap in the neck
1081 of *Struthio camelus*. (a) C11 and C12 in 20° dorsiflexion with no space between
1082 centra, with zygapophyseal overlap shown (c). (b) C11 and C12 in 20° dorsiflexion
1083 with 0.2cm gap between centra, with increased overlap of zygapophyses (d). Scale
1084 bars = 2cm.

1085

1086 **Figure 18.** The effect of inter-vertebral space on overall flexibility of the neck of
1087 *Struthio camelus*. (a) neck with all tissues intact in sub-maximal dorsiflexion. (b) the
1088 same neck cleaned of all tissue, articulated to match the maximum dorsal flexibility
1089 of each joint, with all centra touching. Scale bars = 10cm.

Tables

Table 1.

Abbreviation	Attachment site
act	Ansa costotransversaria
cl	Crista lateralis
cto	Crista transverso-obliqua
pca	Processus caroticus
pco	Processus costalis
psp	Processus spinosus
spol	Spinopostzygapophyseal lamina
ta	Tuberculum ansa
td	Torus dorsalis

Table 2.

Table 2.Muscle	Origin	Insertion
M. biventer cervicis	Processus spinosus of the posterior cervical/anterior thoracic vertebrae	Parietals
M. longus colli dorsalis	Processus spinosus	Torus dorsalis
M. ascendens cervicalis	Ansa costotransversaria	Torus dorsalis
M. flexor colli medialis	Processus caroticus Processus costalis	Processus ventralis corporis Processus costalis
M. longus colli ventralis	Processus caroticus Processus ventralis corporis	Processus costalis
M. flexor colli lateralis	Tubercula ansae Cristae laterales	Processus costalis
Mm. intercostales	Crista transverso-obliqua	Crista transverso-obliqua
Mm. insterspinales	Processus spinosus	Processus spinosus
Mm. intertransversarii	Tubercula ansae Cristae laterales	Tubercula ansae Cristae laterales

Table 3.

Muscle group	Mass (g)	% of total muscle mass	% of total neck mass
Dorsal	433	40.53	22.26
<i>Of which m. biv. cerv.</i>	253	23.69	13.01
Ventral	176	16.47	9.05
Lateral	184	17.22	9.46
Single-segment	275	25.74	14.14
<i>Of which dorsal</i>	104	9.74	5.35
<i>Of which mm. intertans.</i>	171	16.01	8.79
Total	1068		

Table 4.

Vertebra	Wet	Dry	Removed
C3	4.3	4	3.7
C4	4.85	4.7	4.5
C5	5.55	5.2	5.2
C6	5.4	5.3	4.9
C7	5.8	5.5	5.35
C8	5.9	5.8	5.5
C9	6.1	6	5.8
C10	6.2	6.15	6.1
C11	6.5	6.5	6.3
C12	6.8	6.7	6.45
C13	7.05	7	6.7
C14	7.1	7	6.9
C15	7.6	7.3	7
C16	7.4	7.2	7
Total	86.55	84.35	81.4

Figures




Figure 1.




Figure 2.




Figure 3.




Figure 4.




Figure 5.




Figure 6.




Figure 7.




Figure 8.




Figure 9.




Figure 10.




Figure 11.




Figure 12.




Figure 13.




Figure 14.




Figure 15.




Figure 16.



Figure 17.





Figure 18.