

**A peer-reviewed version of this preprint was published in PeerJ on 23 December 2014.**

[View the peer-reviewed version](https://peerj.com/articles/712) (peerj.com/articles/712), which is the preferred citable publication unless you specifically need to cite this preprint.

Taylor MP. 2014. Quantifying the effect of intervertebral cartilage on neutral posture in the necks of sauropod dinosaurs. PeerJ 2:e712  
<https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.712>

## Quantifying the effect of intervertebral cartilage on neutral posture in the necks of sauropod dinosaurs

Michael Taylor

Attempts to reconstruct the neutral neck posture of sauropod dinosaurs, or indeed any tetrapod, are doomed to failure when based only on the geometry of the bony cervical vertebrae. The thickness of the articular cartilage between the centra of adjacent vertebrae affects posture. It extends (raises) the neck by an amount roughly proportional to the thickness of the cartilage. It is possible to quantify the angle of extension at an intervertebral joint: it is roughly equal, in radians, to the cartilage thickness divided by the height of the zygapophyseal facets over the centre of rotation. Applying this formula to published measurements of well-known sauropod specimens suggests that if the thickness of cartilage were equal to 4.5%, 10% or 18% of centrum length, the neutral pose of the *Apatosaurus louisae* holotype CM 3018 would be extended by an average of 5.5, 11.8 or 21.2 degrees, respectively, at each intervertebral joint. For the *Diplodocus carnegii* holotype CM 84, the corresponding angles of additional extension are even greater: 8.4, 18.6 or 33.3 degrees. The cartilaginous neutral postures (CNPs) calculated for 10% cartilage – the most reasonable estimate – appear outlandish. But it must be remembered that these would not have been the habitual life postures, because tetrapods habitually extend the base of their neck and flex the anterior part, yielding the distinctive S-curve most easily seen in birds.

# 1 Quantifying the effect of intervertebral cartilage on 2 neutral posture in the necks of sauropod dinosaurs

3 Michael P. Taylor

4 Department of Earth Sciences, University of Bristol, Bristol, England.

5 [dino@miketaylor.org.uk](mailto:dino@miketaylor.org.uk)

## 6 Abstract

7 Attempts to reconstruct the neutral neck posture of sauropod dinosaurs, or indeed any  
8 tetrapod, are doomed to failure when based only on the geometry of the bony cervical vertebrae.  
9 The thickness of the articular cartilage between the centra of adjacent vertebrae affects posture. It  
10 extends (raises) the neck by an amount roughly proportional to the thickness of the cartilage. It is  
11 possible to quantify the angle of extension at an intervertebral joint: it is roughly equal, in  
12 radians, to the cartilage thickness divided by the height of the zygapophyseal facets over the  
13 centre of rotation. Applying this formula to published measurements of well-known sauropod  
14 specimens suggests that if the thickness of cartilage were equal to 4.5%, 10% or 18% of centrum  
15 length, the neutral pose of the *Apatosaurus louisae* holotype CM 3018 would be extended by an  
16 average of 5.5, 11.8 or 21.2 degrees, respectively, at each intervertebral joint. For the *Diplodocus*  
17 *carnegii* holotype CM 84, the corresponding angles of additional extension are even greater: 8.4,  
18 18.6 or 33.3 degrees. The cartilaginous neutral postures (CNPs) calculated for 10% cartilage – the  
19 most reasonable estimate – appear outlandish. But it must be remembered that these would not  
20 have been the habitual life postures, because tetrapods habitually extend the base of their neck  
21 and flex the anterior part, yielding the distinctive S-curve most easily seen in birds.

22 **Keywords:** Sauropod, Dinosaur, Cervical vertebra, Neck, Cartilage, Posture

## 23 Introduction

24 The habitual posture of the necks of sauropod dinosaurs has been controversial ever since their  
25 body shape has been understood. Both elevated and more horizontal postures have been depicted,  
26 sometimes even in the same images – for example, Knight's classic 1897 painting of *Apatosaurus*  
27 and *Diplodocus* (Figure 1). See the introduction to Taylor and Wedel (2013) for a more  
28 comprehensive historical overview.

29 Stevens and Parrish (1999) used a computer program of their own devising, named  
30 DinoMorph, to model the intervertebral articulations in the necks of two well-known sauropods,  
31 *Apatosaurus* and *Diplodocus*. They found that when the vertebrae were best aligned — with the  
32 centra in articulation and the zygapophyseal facets maximally overlapped — the necks were held  
33 in roughly horizontal positions; Stevens and Parrish (1999) concluded without further discussion  
34 that this was the habitual posture in life – an assumption which they subsequently asserted was  
35 supported by observation of extant tetrapods (Stevens and Parrish 2005). In fact, as discussed  
36 below, tetrapods do not habitually hold their necks in neutral pose; nevertheless, determining  
37 neutral pose is an important step towards understanding habitual pose.

38 The study of Stevens and Parrish (1999) has been influential, but can and should be further  
39 refined. Taylor and Wedel (2013) demonstrated the important role of a neglected element, the  
40 intervertebral cartilage that separates the centra of adjacent vertebrae. We noted in that paper that  
41 including the cartilage in models affects the neutral posture recovered, causing the neck to be  
42 raised more than when only bone is taken into account; but we failed to quantify the additional  
43 extension of the neck. The present paper remedies this deficiency.

44 The neutral pose determined by Stevens and Parrish from bones alone is termed osteological  
45 neutral pose (ONP). I use the term cartilaginous neutral pose (CNP) for the pose found when  
46 intervertebral cartilage is included. Each specimen has a true CNP, determined by the actual  
47 arrangement of cartilage on its vertebrae. But because we are dealing here with extinct animals  
48 known only from fossils, we must make assumptions about the cartilage that existed in life, and  
49 so can derive only provisional CNPs.

50 Note that zygapophyseal cartilage has no or negligible effect on the angle of extension  
51 between vertebrae. This is partly because this cartilage is so thin compared with that between  
52 consecutive centra, but primarily because of the orientation of the zygapophyseal facets. If they  
53 faced anteriorly and posteriorly, then inserting cartilage between them would push the dorsal part  
54 of the vertebral articulation apart, and so deflect the neutral pose downwards. But because the  
55 facets face dorsomedially and ventrolaterally, the addition of cartilage between them does not  
56 affect their relative anteroposterior position.

57 **Methods**58 **Formula for additional extension**

59 The upper part of Figure 2 shows two adjacent vertebrae in osteological neutral pose (ONP):  
60 the condyle (anterior ball) of one vertebra is nestled in the cotyle (posterior cup) of the other, and  
61 its prezygapophyseal facets are maximally overlapped with the postzygapophyseal facets of the  
62 other.

63 The lower part of the figure shows the effect of including intervertebral cartilage of thickness  $t$   
64 (here depicted as being one tenth as thick as the length of the bony centrum). The cartilage itself  
65 is shown in black. For simplicity, it is depicted as though all attached to the condyle of the more  
66 posterior (grey) vertebra; in fact it would have been roughly half and half on this condyle and on  
67 the cotyle of the more anterior (yellow) vertebra.

68 In order to accommodate the intervertebral cartilage, the cotyle of the anterior vertebra has to  
69 be shifted forward by a distance equal to the thickness of the cartilage, as shown in the lower part  
70 of Figure 2. But in this new “neutral pose”, the zygapophyseal facets remain maximally  
71 overlapped, so the effect is to rotate the anterior vertebra anti-clockwise about the centre of the  
72 zygapophyses, which is at height  $h$  above the midline of the condyle. The red lines are drawn  
73 between the centre of rotation and the anteriormost point of the bony condyle and the cartilage  
74 extension (or, equivalently, the deepest part of the cotyles of both the yellow and blue vertebrae).  
75 The rotation between the blue and yellow vertebrae is equal to the angle  $\theta$  between the red lines.

76 Because the thickness of cartilage is a small proportion of centrum length, this angle is small.  
77 Therefore a line drawn from the anteriormost point of the bony centrum to that of the cartilage  
78 (short line in Figure 3) forms a triangle with the red lines that is close to a right-angled triangle.  
79 Consider the angle  $\theta$ : its opposite is the short line of length  $t$  and its hypotenuse is one of the long  
80 lines of length  $h$ . Therefore  $\sin(\theta) = t/h$ . But for small angles,  $\sin(\theta) \approx \theta$  (measured in radians).

81 Therefore, **the angle of extension due to cartilage at an intervertebral joint, in radians, is**  
82 **approximately equal to the thickness of the cartilage divided by the height of the**  
83 **zygapophyses above half height of the joint between centra.**

$$84 \quad \theta = t/h$$

85 This formula is independent of the unit of linear measurement: inches, millimetres or pixels in  
86 a digitised photograph are all equally valid so long as the same unit is used for cartilage thickness  
87 and zygapophyseal height.

88 Since  $\pi$  radians is equal to  $180^\circ$  (half a circle), an angle in radians can be converted to degrees  
89 by multiplying by  $180/\pi$ . Therefore, the angle of extension in degrees is  $t/h \times 180/\pi$ .

90 This calculation is only approximate: the triangle is not a true right-triangle, and  $\sin(\theta)$  is only  
91 approximately equal to  $\theta$ . However, these minor sources of inaccuracy are dwarfed by other  
92 sources of error when working with sauropods: distortions in the measured vertebrae, estimations  
93 in measurement where the vertebrae are incomplete, and uncertainty about cartilage thickness. In  
94 this context, the  $\theta = t/h$  approximation is quite precise enough.

95 **Cartilage thickness assumptions**

96 Taylor and Wedel (2013:7–8) recently estimated the thickness of intervertebral cartilage, from  
97 vertebral spacing, between adjacent vertebrae in two sauropod genera. We found that cartilage

98 thickness between cervical vertebrae of an adult *Sauroposeidon* individual was about 4.5% of  
99 centrum length; that between anterior dorsal vertebrae of a subadult *Apatosaurus* individual CM  
100 3390 it was about 20% of centrum length; and that between mid-to-posterior dorsal vertebrae of a  
101 second, juvenile, *Apatosaurus* individual CM 11339 it was about 15% of centrum length.  
102 Assuming similar absolute thickness of cartilage in the neck of adult *Apatosaurus* as in  
103 *Sauroposeidon* (about 52 mm), we estimated that cartilage thickness would be about 9.8% the  
104 length of the shorter *Apatosaurus* vertebrae. Similarly, assuming similar absolute thickness of  
105 cartilage in adult *Apatosaurus* necks as in subadult anterior torsos, we estimated cartilage  
106 thickness in adult *Apatosaurus* might have been about 11%, a value fairly consistent with that  
107 derived from *Sauroposeidon* measurements.

108 These cartilage thickness proportions are provisional – we are very aware that our sample is  
109 tiny, and encourage other sauropod workers to CT-scan articulated sequences of vertebrae when  
110 possible. However, since they are the only existing estimates, I calculated the effect of inserting  
111 intervertebral cartilage into the neck of *Apatosaurus* using three possible thicknesses: the 4.5% of  
112 the adult *Sauroposeidon* neck, the 10% that was estimated in two ways as most likely for the  
113 adult *Apatosaurus* neck, and 18%, the average of the 20% and 15% found for the two non-adult  
114 *Apatosaurus* torso sequences. Since *Diplodocus* is closely related to *Apatosaurus*, and was also  
115 discussed by Stevens and Parrish (1999), I also calculated the effect of adding cartilage to its  
116 neck in the same proportions as for *Apatosaurus*.

### 117 **Sauropod specimens**

118 I used the same well-known specimens as Stevens and Parrish (1999): CM 3018, the holotype  
119 of *Apatosaurus louisae*; and CM 84, the holotype of *Diplodocus carnegii*. Both specimens reside  
120 in the Carnegie Museum of Natural History, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA. They are well-  
121 preserved for sauropods, having nearly complete cervical sequences, although the more posterior  
122 vertebrae of CM 3018 are badly damaged and all the vertebrae suffer from some distortion. All  
123 calculations are based only on centrum length, zygapophyseal height (measured from published  
124 illustrations) and hypothetical cartilage thicknesses.

125 **Results**

126 For *Apatosaurus* CM 3018, the results are as shown in Table 1: additional extension across all  
127 13 analysed intervertebral joints sums to  $70^\circ$ ,  $155^\circ$  or  $279^\circ$  for 4.5%, 10% and 18% cartilage  
128 thickness. Figure 4 shows the effect of the additional extension caused by 10% cartilage  
129 compared to a horizontal neck: if osteological neutral pose were horizontal, then the neutral pose  
130 when taking into account intervertebral cartilage whose thickness is 10% of centrum length  
131 would be as depicted. I term this the 10% cartilaginous neutral pose or 10% CNP. (In fact,  
132 Stevens and Parrish (1999) found ONP in both *Apatosaurus* and *Diplodocus* to be somewhat  
133 below horizontal, but since their exact angles of flexion were not published, it is not possible to  
134 determine how their favoured pose would appear when modified by the addition of cartilage.)

135 For *Diplodocus* CM 84, the results are as shown in Table 2: additional extension across all 13  
136 analysed intervertebral joints sums to  $108^\circ$ ,  $241^\circ$  or  $434^\circ$  for 4.5%, 10% and 18% cartilage  
137 thickness. Figure 5 shows the effect of the additional extension caused by 10% cartilage  
138 compared to a horizontal *Diplodocus* neck, as Figure 4 does for *Apatosaurus*; the same caveats  
139 apply.



140 **Discussion**

141 The additional angles of extension calculated here are greater for *Diplodocus* than for  
142 *Apatosaurus* – on average, about 55% greater. This is for two reasons. First, the additional angle  
143 of extension is directly proportional to cartilage thickness, which I calculated as proportional to  
144 centrum length, and the centra are longer in *Diplodocus*; and second, the angle is also inversely  
145 proportional to the height of the zygapophyseal facets above the centre of rotation between  
146 adjacent centra, and this is lower in *Diplodocus*.

147 There is no denying that the cartilaginous neutral poses (CNPs) described here for  
148 *Apatosaurus* and *Diplodocus* appear outlandish. Using the largest of the candidate cartilage  
149 thicknesses, 18% of centrum length, the neutral pose for *Diplodocus* has C3 oriented at 434° to  
150 the horizontal (Table 2, last column) – that is, the neck would be extended all the way around  
151 through 360° and a further 74°. This alone seems to be enough to discount the possibility that the  
152 18% estimate of cartilage thickness is correct – not unreasonably, since this was measured from  
153 the dorsal sequences of sub-adult and juvenile specimens. However, the 10% cartilage thickness  
154 that seems the best estimate also yields surprising neutral postures (Figures 4 and 5). It is  
155 tempting for this reason to prefer the 4.5% cartilage thickness, which results in C3 of *Diplodocus*  
156 extending only 108° – although note that even this is well past vertical. However, it seems  
157 unlikely (based on our small sample of CT scans) that half-meter-long *Apatosaurus* cervicals can  
158 have been separated by as little as 23 mm of cartilage. At present, 10% of centrum length is our  
159 best estimate of cartilage thickness.

160 The CNP for other dinosaurs may be even more extreme than for sauropods. Samman (2013)  
161 articulated the cervical series of *Tyrannosaurus* (using a composite of two specimens, FMNH PR  
162 2081 and TCM 2001.90.1). She found that the centra alone articulate naturally into an 'S'-curve,  
163 due to their keystone shapes in lateral view; but that when the zygapophyses are also articulated,  
164 the ONP was strongly extended into a posture that would surely not have been adopted in life.  
165 Inserting articular cartilage between the centra would raise this posture yet further.

166 Although the 10% CNP calculated and illustrated in this paper is a more defensible neutral  
167 pose than the ONP of Stevens and Parrish (1999), I must emphasised that I do *not* suggest this  
168 was the habitual pose in life. As noted by Vidal et al. (1986) and Taylor et al. (2009), live  
169 tetrapods do not habitually hold their necks in neutral pose. Instead, when awake and alert, they  
170 extend (raise) the base of the neck and flex (lower) the anterior part. The result is that the middle  
171 part of the cervical column is habitually held much more vertically in most tetrapods that would  
172 be apparent from the fleshy envelope (Wedel and Taylor 2014). Indeed, in many mammals that  
173 we hardly even think of having a neck, the vertebral column bends backwards beyond the  
174 vertical: this is seen for example in rabbits, mice and guinea pigs as well as cats and chickens  
175 (Vidal et al. 1986: figs. 2–5, 7, 8). Accordingly, we would expect that the life poses of sauropods  
176 had the base of the neck extended yet further than the angles here shown as neutral; but that the  
177 anterior part of their necks would have been curved forwards and downwards. It seems possible  
178 that in both diplodocids analysed here, part of the neck habitually curved backwards beyond the  
179 vertical in an “S” shape, as in many extant birds.

180 Similarly, *Tyrannosaurus* must have habitually held its neck in a pose differing greatly from its  
181 neutral posture. In particular, much of its neck must have been flexed downwards most of the  
182 time, perhaps extending only when tearing meat from a carcass.

183 The effect of intervertebral cartilage on neck flexibility, as opposed to its effect on neutral  
184 posture, remains to be determined. Taylor and Wedel (2013:15) showed that in turkeys,



185 zygapophyseal surfaces are extended by cartilage, and it is likely that this is true of all tetrapods.  
186 Larger zygapophyseal facets translate to more flexibility, as a greater displacement from the  
187 neutral pose can occur before the facets become disarticulated. But this is only a relatively small  
188 effect (increasing flexibility by about 11% in our turkey specimen) and relates to zygapophyseal  
189 rather than intervertebral cartilage.

190 As noted by Taylor and Wedel (2013:15), Copley et al. (2013) found that ostrich necks with  
191 their soft tissue in place are *less* flexible than bones alone indicate. However, we know that  
192 human necks are much more flexible in life than the bones alone would suggest, since the flat  
193 articular surfaces of human cervical centra taken alone would indicate an almost entirely  
194 inflexible neck. The different effect on neck flexibility of intervertebral cartilage across different  
195 taxa would be a fruitful area for further study.

## 196 **Acknowledgments**

197 This paper could not have been written without numerous stimulating discussions with Matt  
198 Wedel (Western University of Health Sciences). I thank Chris Noto (University of Wisconsin  
199 Parkside) for his swift, efficient and fair editorial handling of this manuscript. All three reviewers  
200 provided careful, detailed, actionable reviews that materially improved this paper: I thank Matt  
201 Bonnan (Richard Stockton College of New Jersey), Heinrich Mallison (Museum für Naturkunde  
202 Berlin) and Eric Snively (University of Wisconsin La Crosse) for their contributions.

203 **References**

- 204 Cobley MJ, Rayfield EJ, Barrett PM. 2013. Inter-vertebral flexibility of the ostrich neck:  
 205 implications for estimating sauropod neck flexibility. *PLOS ONE* **8**:e72187.  
 206 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0072187.
- 207 Gilmore CW. 1936. Osteology of *Apatosaurus*, with special reference to specimens in the  
 208 Carnegie Museum. *Memoirs of the Carnegie Museum* **11**:175–300 and plates XXI–XXXIV.
- 209 Hatcher JB. 1901. *Diplodocus* (Marsh): its osteology, taxonomy and probable habits, with a  
 210 restoration of the skeleton. *Memoirs of the Carnegie Museum* **1**:1–63 and plates I–XIII.
- 211 Knight CR. 1897. Restoration of *Brontosaurus*. Hall of Saurischian Dinosaurs, American  
 212 Museum of Natural History. Guache on artist board.
- 213 Samman T. 2013. Tyrannosaurid craniocervical mobility: a preliminary assessment. pp. 195–210  
 214 in Parrish JM et al. (eds.), *Tyrannosaurid paleobiology*. Indiana University Press,  
 215 Bloomington.
- 216 Stevens KA, Parrish JM. 1999. Neck posture and feeding habits of two Jurassic sauropod  
 217 dinosaurs. *Science* **284**(5415):798–800. doi:10.1126/science.284.5415.798
- 218 Stevens KA, Parrish JM. 2005. Digital reconstructions of sauropod dinosaurs and implications for  
 219 feeding. pp. 178–200 in Wilson JA, Curry-Rogers K (eds.), *The Sauropods: Evolution and*  
 220 *Paleobiology*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- 221 Taylor MP, Wedel MJ. 2013. The effect of intervertebral cartilage on neutral posture and range of  
 222 motion in the necks of sauropod dinosaurs. *PLOS ONE* **8**(10):e78214. 17 pages.  
 223 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0078214
- 224 Taylor MP, Wedel MJ, Naish, D. 2009. Head and neck posture in sauropod dinosaurs inferred  
 225 from extant animals. *Acta Palaeontologica Polonica* **54**(2):213–220.
- 226 Vidal PP, Graf W, Berthoz A. 1986. The orientation of the cervical vertebral column in  
 227 unrestrained awake animals. *Experimental Brain Research* **61**:549–559.  
 228 doi:10.1007/BF00237580
- 229 Wedel MJ, Taylor MP. 2014. Necks Lie: the complete story. *Sauropod Vertebra Picture of the*  
 230 *Week*, 3 November 2014. <http://svpow.com/2014/11/03/necks-lie-the-complete-story/>.  
 231 Archived at <http://www.webcitation.org/6TokgCft2> on 3 November 2014.

232 **Figure captions**

**Figure 1.** Charles R. Knight's famous 1897 painting of sauropods, which were then considered amphibious. In the foreground, *Apatosaurus* (“*Brontosaurus*” of his usage) wades in a lake, its neck erect. In the background, *Diplodocus* wanders on the shore, its neck held low and horizontal. These differences in posture may not represent different perceptions of the habitual behaviour of these different taxa, merely the postures these individuals happened to adopt at a particular moment.

**Figure 2.** Increased angle of elevation at an intervertebral joint when cartilage is included. Posterior cervical vertebrae 13 and 14 of *Diplodocus carnegii* holotype CM 84, from Hatcher (1901:plate III), in right lateral view. Top: C13 (yellow) in osteological neutral posture, with the condyle of C14 embedded in its cotyle and with zygapophyseal facets maximally overlapped. Bottom: intervertebral cartilage (black) added, and C13 (blue) rotated upwards to accommodate it. (For simplicity, the cartilage is depicted as though all attached to the condyle of the posterior vertebra in the present figure and in Figure 3; in fact it would have been roughly half and half on this condyle and on the cotyle of the more anterior vertebra.) Since the zygapophyses remain maximally overlapped, a line between the centre of their facets forms the axis of rotation (white dot); red lines join the centre of rotation to the most anterior point of the bony condyle and of the intervertebral cartilage. By similarity, the angle between the yellow and blue vertebrae is equal to that between the red lines.

**Figure 3.** Close-up of area of rotation in Figure 2. The two long lines, each of length  $h$ , connect the middle of the zygapophyseal facets to the anteriormost point of the condyle of the posterior vertebra and the cotyle of the anterior one. The short line of length  $t$  is projected at a right angle to the left line, and more or less connects the points on the condyle and cotyle. The angle between the two long lines is  $\theta$ .

**Figure 4.** Effect of adding cartilage to the neutral pose of the neck of *Apatosaurus louisae* CM 3018. Images of vertebrae from Gilmore (1936:plate XXIV). At the bottom, the vertebrae are composed in a horizontal posture. Superimposed, the same vertebrae are shown inclined by the additional extension angles indicated in Table 1. If the slightly sub-horizontal osteological neutral pose of Stevens and Parrish (1999) is correct, then the cartilaginous neutral pose would be correspondingly slightly lower than depicted here, but still much closer to the elevated posture than to horizontal. (Note that the posture shown here would *not* have been the habitual posture in life: see discussion.)

**Figure 5.** Effect of adding cartilage to the neutral pose of the neck of *Diplodocus carnegii* CM 84. Images of vertebrae from Hatcher (1901:plate III). At the bottom, the vertebrae are composed in a horizontal posture. Superimposed, the same vertebrae are shown inclined by the additional extension angles indicated in Table 2.

**Table 1** (on next page)

Centrum length, zygapophyseal height, possible cartilage thicknesses and corresponding additional angles of extension in the neck of the *Apatosaurus louisae* holotype CM 3018.

Centrum length, zygapophyseal height, possible cartilage thicknesses and corresponding additional angles of extension in the neck of the *Apatosaurus louisae* holotype CM 3018.

Centrum lengths are taken from Gilmore (1936:196) except for C5, C14 and C15, which are omitted from Gilmore's table and were instead measured from his illustration (Gilmore 1936:plate XXIV). Zygapophyseal height was measured from the midline of the centrum to the midpoint of the postzygapophysis on plate XXIV. Cartilage thicknesses were calculated as percentages of the centrum lengths, using three different percentages as described in the text. Additional angles of extension were calculated using the formula in the Methods section. Cumulative angles measure the total additional extension from ONP, beginning with small extensions at the shoulder and increasing anteriorly. The full spreadsheet from which this table was exported, including formulae, is Supplementary File 1.

TAYLOR — QUANTIFYING EFFECT OF INTERVERTEBRAL CARTILAGE — TABLE 1

Cv#	Centrum length (mm)	Zyg height (mm)	Cartilage (mm)			Angle (degrees)			Cumulative angle (degrees)		
			4.5%	10%	18%	4.5%	10%	18%	4.5%	10%	18%
1	45		2	5	8						
2	190		9	19	34						
3	280	130	13	28	50	6	12	22	70	155	279
4	370	150	17	37	67	6	14	25	64	143	257
5	443	160	20	44	80	7	16	29	58	129	231
6	440	171	20	44	79	7	15	26	51	113	203
7	450	155	20	45	81	8	17	30	44	98	176
8	485	206	22	49	87	6	13	24	37	81	146
9	510	285	23	51	92	5	10	18	30	68	122
10	530	273	24	53	95	5	11	20	26	57	103
11	550	308	25	55	99	5	10	18	21	46	83
12	490	261	22	49	88	5	11	19	16	36	65
13	480	290	22	48	86	4	9	17	11	25	46
14	411	274	19	41	74	4	9	15	7	16	29
15	372	292	17	37	67	3	7	13	3	7	13
	<b>Average</b>		18.3	40.3	72.5	5.5	11.8	21.2			

**Table 1.** Centrum length, zygapophyseal height, possible cartilage thicknesses and corresponding additional angles of extension in the neck of the *Apatosaurus louisae* holotype CM 3018. Centrum lengths are taken from Gilmore (1936:196) except for C5, C14 and C15, which are omitted from Gilmore's table and were instead measured from his illustration (Gilmore 1936:plate XXIV). Zygapophyseal height was measured from the midline of the centrum to the midpoint of the postzygapophysis on plate XXIV. Cartilage thicknesses were calculated as percentages of the centrum lengths, using three different percentages as described in the text. Additional angles of extension were calculated using the formula in the Methods section. Cumulative angles measure the total additional extension from ONP, beginning with small extensions at the shoulder and increasing anteriorly. The full spreadsheet from which this table was exported, including formulae, is Supplementary File 1.

**Table 2** (on next page)

Centrum length, zygapophyseal height, possible cartilage thicknesses and corresponding additional angles of extension in the neck of the *Diplodocus carnegii* holotype CM 84.

Centrum length, zygapophyseal height, possible cartilage thicknesses and corresponding additional angles of extension in the neck of the *Diplodocus carnegii* holotype CM 84.

Centrum lengths are taken from Hatcher (1901:38). Zygapophyseal height was measured from the midline of the centrum to the midpoint of the postzygapophysis on Hatcher (1901:plate III). Cartilage thicknesses, angles and cumulative angles are as for Table 1. The full spreadsheet from which this table was exported, including formulae, is Supplementary File 2.

Cv#	Centrum length (mm)	Zyg height (mm)	Cartilage (mm)			Angle (degrees)			Cumulative angle (degrees)		
			4.5%	10%	18%	4.5%	10%	18%	4.5%	10%	18%
1											
2	165		7	17	30						
3	243	64	11	24	44	10	22	39	108	241	434
4	289	59	13	29	52	13	28	50	99	219	395
5	372	108	17	37	67	9	20	35	86	192	345
6	442	132	20	44	80	9	19	34	77	172	309
7	485	108	22	49	87	12	26	46	69	153	275
8	512	161	23	51	92	8	18	33	57	127	229
9	525	161	24	53	95	8	19	34	49	109	196
10	595	209	27	60	107	7	16	29	41	90	162
11	605	202	27	61	109	8	17	31	33	74	133
12	627	233	28	63	113	7	15	28	25	57	102
13	688	239	31	69	124	7	17	30	18	41	74
14	642	271	29	64	116	6	14	24	11	25	44
15	595	309	27	60	107	5	11	20	5	11	20
<b>Average</b>			21.9	48.6	87.4	8.4	18.6	33.3			

**Table 2.** Centrum length, zygapophyseal height, possible cartilage thicknesses and corresponding additional angles of extension in the neck of the *Diplodocus carnegii* holotype CM 84. Centrum lengths are taken from Hatcher (1901:38). Zygapophyseal height was measured from the midline of the centrum to the midpoint of the postzygapophysis on Hatcher (1901:plate III). Cartilage thicknesses, angles and cumulative angles are as for Table 1. The full spreadsheet from which this table was exported, including formulae, is Supplementary File 2.



## 1

Charles R. Knight's famous 1897 painting of sauropods

Charles R. Knight's famous 1897 painting of sauropods, which were then considered amphibious. In the foreground, *Apatosaurus* ("Brontosaurus" of his usage) wades in a lake, its neck erect. In the background, *Diplodocus* wanders on the shore, its neck held low and horizontal. These differences in posture may not represent different perceptions of the habitual behaviour of these different taxa, merely the postures these individuals happened to adopt at a particular moment.





## 2

Increased angle of elevation at an intervertebral joint when cartilage is included.

Increased angle of elevation at an intervertebral joint when cartilage is included. Posterior cervical vertebrae 13 and 14 of *Diplodocus carnegii* holotype CM 84, from Hatcher (1901:plate III), in right lateral view. Top: C13 (yellow) in osteological neutral posture, with the condyle of C14 embedded in its cotyle and with zygapophyseal facets maximally overlapped. Bottom: intervertebral cartilage (black) added, and C13 (blue) rotated upwards to accommodate it. (For simplicity, the cartilage is depicted as though all attached to the condyle of the posterior vertebra in the present figure and in Figure 3; in fact it would have been roughly half and half on this condyle and on the cotyle of the more anterior vertebra.) Since the zygapophyses remain maximally overlapped, a line between the centre of their facets forms the axis of rotation (white dot); red lines join the centre of rotation to the most anterior point of the bony condyle and of the intervertebral cartilage. By similarity, the angle between the yellow and blue vertebrae is equal to that between the red lines.






## 3

Close-up of area of rotation in Figure 2.

Close-up of area of rotation in Figure 2. The two long lines, each of length  $h$ , connect the middle of the zygapophyseal facets to the anteriormost point of the condyle of the posterior vertebra and the cotyle of the anterior one. The short line of length  $t$  is projected at a right angle to the left line, and more or less connects the points on the condyle and cotyle. The angle between the two long lines is  $\theta$ .





## 4

Effect of adding cartilage to the neutral pose of the neck of *Apatosaurus louisae* CM 3018.

Effect of adding cartilage to the neutral pose of the neck of *Apatosaurus louisae* CM 3018.

Images of vertebrae from Gilmore (1936:plate XXIV). At the bottom, the vertebrae are composed in a horizontal posture. Superimposed, the same vertebrae are shown inclined by the additional extension angles indicated in Table 1. If the slightly sub-horizontal osteological neutral pose of Stevens and Parrish (1999) is correct, then the cartilaginous neutral pose would be correspondingly slightly lower than depicted here, but still much closer to the elevated posture than to horizontal. (Note that the posture shown here would *not* have been the habitual posture in life: see discussion.)





## 5

Effect of adding cartilage to the neutral pose of the neck of *Diplodocus carnegii* CM 84.

Effect of adding cartilage to the neutral pose of the neck of *Diplodocus carnegii* CM 84.

Images of vertebrae from Hatcher (1901:plate III). At the bottom, the vertebrae are composed in a horizontal posture. Superimposed, the same vertebrae are shown inclined by the additional extension angles indicated in Table 2.

