

Theropod specimens from the Navesink Formation and their implications for the Diversity and Biogeography of Ornithomimosaur and Tyrannosauroids on Appalachia

The sparse dinosaur record of eastern North America has rendered the dinosaurs of the Late Cretaceous landmass of Appalachia obscure. This landmass, isolated from the western landmass Laramidia by a great inland sea known as the Western Interior Seaway, may have been a safe haven for dinosaur species which would be replaced on Appalachia's western contemporary. An excellent example of these isolated forms are the tyrannosaurs of Appalachia, which have not only been grouped outside Tyrannosauridae proper in phylogenetic analyses, but also bear distinct morphologies, including a gigantic manus in one form, from these 'western tyrants'. However, Appalachian tyrannosaurs are only represented currently by the two valid taxa *Dryptosaurus aquilunguis* and *Appalachiosaurus montgomeriensis*, both which are only known from partial skeletons with few overlapping elements. Recently, the generic name *Teihivinator* was given to another tyrannosaur named "*Laelaps*" *macropus* by Cope (1868) by Yun (2017). However, examination of the specimens by the author show morphologies at odds with the morphological descriptions given by Yun (2017). The tyrannosaur named by Yun (2017), known from partial lower hindlimb elements including the portions of two metatarsals and a partial tibia, is shown herein to be a chimaera of ornithomimosaur and tyrannosauroid hindlimb elements. The several different dinosaur specimens which compose the syntypes of "*Teihivinator*" include three ornithomimosaur pedal phalanges with affinities to derived ornithomimid taxa, a proximal end of the right metatarsal II and a distal end of the right metatarsal II from either ornithomimosaur or tyrannosauroids, and a partial tibia of a tyrannosauroid distinct from *Dryptosaurus* or *Appalachiosaurus* but nevertheless considered here to be from an indeterminate taxon based on the lack of observable autapomorphies and issues with the comparability of the specimen to other taxa. The

specimens are nevertheless important for revealing further the theropod fauna of the Maastrichtian Navesink Formation of New Jersey, as well as for possibly increasing the diversity of tyrannosauroids and further illuminating the presence of ornithomimosaur on Appalachia.

1 Theropod specimens from the Navesink Formation and their implications for the Diversity and
2 Biogeography of Ornithomimosaur and Tyrannosauroids on Appalachia

3
4 by Chase Doran Brownstein, Stamford Museum, Stamford, CT.

5
6 Abstract.

7 The sparse dinosaur record of eastern North America has rendered the dinosaurs of the
8 Late Cretaceous landmass of Appalachia obscure. This landmass, isolated from the western
9 landmass Laramidia by a great inland sea known as the Western Interior Seaway, may have been
10 a safe haven for dinosaur species which would be replaced on Appalachia's western
11 contemporary. An excellent example of these isolated forms are the tyrannosaurs of Appalachia,
12 which have not only been grouped outside Tyrannosauridae proper in phylogenetic analyses, but
13 also bare distinct morphologies, including a gigantic manus in one form, from these 'western
14 tyrants'. However, Appalachian tyrannosaurs are only represented currently by the two valid taxa
15 *Dryptosaurus aquilunguis* and *Appalachiosaurus montgomeriensis*, both which are only known
16 from partial skeletons with few overlapping elements. Recently, the generic name
17 *Teihivinator* was given to another tyrannosaur named "*Laelaps*" *macropus* by Cope (1868) by
18 Yun (2017). However, examination of the specimens by the author show morphologies at odds
19 with the morphological descriptions given by Yun (2017). The tyrannosaur named by Yun
20 (2017), known from partial lower hindlimb elements including the portions of two metatarsals
21 and a partial tibia, is shown herein to be a chimaera of ornithomimosaur and tyrannosauroid
22 hindlimb elements. The several different dinosaur specimens which compose the syntypes of

23 “*Teihivenator*” include three ornithomimosaur pedal phalanges with affinities to derived
24 ornithomimid taxa, a proximal end of the right metatarsal II and a distal end of the right
25 metatarsal II from either ornithomimosaur or tyrannosauroids, and a partial tibia of a
26 tyrannosauroid distinct from *Dryptosaurus* or *Appalachiosaurus* but nevertheless considered
27 here to be from an indeterminate taxon based on the lack of observable autapomorphies and
28 issues with the comparability of the specimen to other taxa. The specimens are nevertheless
29 important for revealing further the theropod fauna of the Maastrichtian Navesink Formation of
30 New Jersey, as well as for possibly increasing the diversity of tyrannosauroids and further
31 illuminating the presence of ornithomimosaur on Appalachia.

32 Introduction.

34 The Late Cretaceous saw a major period of change in the geography and ecology of
35 North American ecosystems. During the Cenomanian Stage of the Late Cretaceous, the Western
36 Interior Seaway separated the terrestrial ecosystems of the eastern portion of North America with
37 those of the American west, in turn affecting the faunas of both the east and west of the continent
38 by subjecting each to isolation for millions of years. While in the west, it is known that the
39 ancestors of the iconic *Tyrannosaurus rex* evolved reduced forelimbs and massive, powerful
40 skulls, the tyrannosaurs of the eastern portion of North America, at that time a landmass called
41 Appalachia (e.g., Sampson et al., 2010; Loewen et al., 2013), have remained more obscure, and
42 rarely are associated or partial skeletons ever found. The two most complete tyrannosaurs from
43 Late Cretaceous continent described so far are *Dryptosaurus aquilunguis* and *Appalachiosaurus*
44 *montgomeriensis*, originally known from the Maastrichtian New Egypt Formation of New Jersey

45 and from the middle Campanian Demopolis Chalk Formation of Alabama, respectively (e.g.,
46 Cope, 1866; Marsh, 1877; Weishampel et al., 2004; Carr, Williamson & Schwimmer, 2005;
47 Weishampel, 2006; Brusatte, Benson & Norell, 2011). Additional remains assigned to
48 *Dryptosaurus* have been recovered from the Marshalltown Formation-bearing Ellisdale
49 microfossil site, the Mt. Laurel Formation at upper Hop Brook, and the Navesink Formation at
50 Big Brook in New Jersey (Krause & Baird, 1979; Baird & Galton, 1981; Gallagher & Parris,
51 1986; Grandstaff et al., 1992). Possible additional remains of this taxon have been reported from
52 North Carolina (Baird & Horner, 1979). *Appalachiosaurus* is also known from multiple other
53 Campanian units in the southeastern United States (e.g., Ebersole & King, 2011). Recently,
54 Schwimmer et al. (2015) described teeth and bones of *Appalachiosaurus montgomeriensis* from
55 eastern South Carolina. Remains from the Missouri Chronister Site have also been assigned to an
56 undetermined genus of tyrannosaur (Fix & Darrough, 2004).

57 The holotype specimens of *D. aquilunguis* and *A. montgomeriensis* have been found as
58 “intermediate” tyrannosauroid dinosaurs in multiple phylogenetic analysis, unlike the derived
59 tyrannosaurids of the western portion of North America (e.g., Brusatte, Benson & Norell, 2011;
60 Loewen et al., 2013; Fiorillo & Tykoski, 2014; Brusatte et al., 2016; Brusatte & Carr, 2016).
61 Additionally, striking morphologies completely absent in western tyrannosaurs, such as the
62 gigantic manus with large unguals present in *D. aquilunguis*, are known from Appalachian taxa.
63 However, the lack of overlap of the skeletal elements of *Dryptosaurus aquilunguis* and
64 *Appalachiosaurus montgomeriensis* has made their evolutionary relationships ambiguous
65 (Brusatte, Benson & Norell, 2011).
66

67 Very recently, a third tyrannosauroid, “*Teihivenator macropus*”, was described from the
68 Maastrichtian Formation of New Jersey by Yun (2017). The author, who was also describing and
69 reevaluating the specimens AMNH 2550-2553 at the time of the publication of Yun (2017),
70 though he arrived at different conclusions regarding these specimens. Examination of the
71 specimens by the author reveal that the syntypes of “*Teihivenator*” actually represent specimens
72 of ornithomimosaur and indeterminate tyrannosauroids. One of these specimens, a partial
73 eroded tibia, is from a tyrannosauroid that may be distinguished from *Dryptosaurus aquilunguis*
74 and *Appalachiosaurus montgomeriensis*, suggesting increased diversity for tyrannosauroids on
75 Appalachia through the Maastrichtian. However, the eroded partial tibia is not diagnostic enough
76 to support the existence of a distinct taxon and not comparable to several tyrannosaur specimens
77 from distinct or likely distinct taxa, and thus “*Teihivenator macropus*” is considered a *nomen*
78 *dubium*. Additionally, several of the specimens included in the syntypes of the aforementioned
79 dubious taxon are assignable to ornithomimosaur and have morphological affinities to derived
80 ornithomimids.

81 The reassignment of the syntypes of “*Teihivenator*” to multiple different species may be
82 seen as another example of the mistaken association of dinosaur specimens leading to the naming
83 of a new genus. Baird & Horner (1979), for example, reevaluated Edward Drinker Cope’s
84 holotype specimen of *Hypsibema crassicauda*, finding it to include elements assignable to cf.
85 *Dryptosaurus aquilunguis* and indeterminate hadrosaurids in addition to the lectotype specimen
86 of *H. crassicauda*.

87
88 Methods.

89 Permits.

90 No permits were required for the described study, which complied with all relevant regulations.

91 Access to the collections at the American Museum of Natural History was given by Carl

92 Mehling.

93
94 Institutional Abbreviations.

95 The term “AMNH FARB” is used to refer to the fossil amphibian, reptile and bird collections of
96 the American Museum of Natural History.

97
98 The specimens described herein were photographed using a Canon Powershot G12 camera and
99 cropped using Apple Preview.

100
101 Results.

102 Geologic Setting. AMNH 2550-2553 have been thought as coming from the Maastrichtian Mt.
103 Laurel, Navesink, or New Egypt Formations of New Jersey (e.g., Horner, 1979; Gallagher,
104 1993). Several clues are of help when determining exactly from which of these formations these
105 coelurosaurian elements were recovered. In his original description of the fossils, Leidy (1865)
106 cites the location of the discovery of these fossils as in Monmouth County, New Jersey. Cope
107 (1870) gives a brief description of the stratigraphy of the unit from which the specimens which
108 constitute the holotype of this new tyrannosaur species were recovered, stating it was from the
109 “Upper Cretaceous, upper green sand bed Monmouth Co., N. J.” Gallagher (1997) gives a more
110 detailed location of discovery and discoverer of AMNH 2550-2553, the former being a marl pit

111 in Marlboro, New Jersey, and the later being the notable geologist George Cook. Most recently,
112 Gallagher et al. (2014) identified the location of the discovery of AMNH 2550-2553 as the Big
113 Brook site in Marlboro, New Jersey, noting the Navesink and Mt. Laurel Formations to both be
114 present there. Yun (2017) also suggested a Navesink Formation origin for the specimens, which
115 fits with the coloration of the syntypes. Indeed, AMNH 2550-2553 have coloration that
116 resembles fossils found from the Navesink (e.g., Anné, Hedrick & Schein, 2016). Finally,
117 Brusatte et al. (2012) agree that the origin of these specimens was the Navesink Formation.
118 Notably, the Navesink Formation is a marine deposit.

119 Systematic Paleontology.

120 Dinosauria Owen 1842 sensu Padian and May 1993

121 Theropoda Marsh 1881 sensu Gauthier 1986

122 Coelurosauria Huene 1914 sensu Sereno et al. 2005

123 Tyrannosauroida Walker 1964 sensu Holtz 2004

124 Tyrannosauroida indet.

125 Specimen: AMNH 2550, proximal and distal ends of a right tibia.

126 The proximal end of the right tibia of a tyrannosauroid dinosaur (figure 1.A-F) is eroded, likely
127 from water wear. The specimen measures 95 mm proximodistally and 94 mm dorsoventrally as
128 measured on the lateral surface, 72 mm mediolaterally and 93 mm proximodistally as measured
129 dorsally, 93 mm dorsoventrally and 89 mm proximodistally as measured on the medial surface,
130 and 35 mm mediolaterally and 45 mm proximodistally on the ventral surface. The proximal
131 surface is 95 mm mediolaterally and 60 mm dorsoventrally. The cnemial crest has been partially
132 destroyed by erosion, and thus the autapomorphy of the cnemial crest being visible in ventral

133 view of proximal tibia given by Yun (2017) for “*Teihivenator*” cannot be supported. The lateral
134 portion of the proximal articular surface and lateral portion of the shaft are also not preserved.
135 The incisura tibialis is subtle as in *Dryptosaurus aquilunguis* (Brusatte et al., 2011), and the
136 presence of an anterior process cannot be determined. The medial posterior condyle is well-
137 preserved and triangular. The side of the medial posterior condyle facing the lateral posterior
138 condyle is eroded, and the lateral posterior condyle is also too poorly preserved for
139 morphological description, thus undermining one other autopomorphy listed by Yun (2017) for
140 “*Teihivenator*”. This is the position of the medial condyle being higher than that of the lateral
141 condyle. The lateral surface of the tibia is much more strongly curved towards the proximal
142 surface than in *Dryptosaurus aquilunguis*. The preserved portion of the lateral posterior condyle
143 and the medial posterior condyle are separated by a deep, I-shaped notch, noted as an
144 autopomorphy of “*Teihivenator*” by Yun (2017). This notch is deeper than in *Dryptosaurus* or
145 *Appalachiosaurus* (Carr, Williamson & Schwimmer, 2005; Brusatte, Benson and Norell, 2011),
146 though is very similar in shape to that of the tibia of *Appalachiosaurus* (Carr, Williamson &
147 Schwimmer, 2005). Considering the eroded nature of the specimen, the understanding of this
148 notch as a distinguishing feature of the tyrannosaur to which this tibia corresponds is considered
149 ambiguous. The protuberance within this notch suggested as an autopomorphy of “*Teihivenator*”
150 by Yun (2017) is considered herein to be a taphonomic relic from erosion that simply represents
151 a non-eroded portion of the surface of the posterior lateral condyle. The rounded medial edge of
152 the medial posterior condyle resembles the condition in other tyrannosauroids (Holtz, 2004). As
153 in *Dryptosaurus aquilunguis*, there is a notable depression in the center of the proximal articular
154 surface of the tibia (Brusatte et al., 2011). The medial posterior condyle is strongly offset from

155 where the cnemial crest is indicated to have been located. The proximal and distal ends of the
156 shaft of the tibia indicate an elongate tibia was present in this tyrannosauroid, a feature that is
157 indicative of placement in Tyrannosauroidea (Holtz, 2004).

158 The distal end of the right tibia (figure 1.A-F) is well-preserved. The distal end is
159 dorsoventrally flattened. The lateral malleolus reaches its end very slightly distal to the medial
160 malleolus, though the lateral malleolus shows slight signs of wear. Nevertheless, the position of
161 the lateral malleolus relative to the medial malleolus distinguishes this tibia from *Dryptosaurus*
162 *aquilunguis* or *Appalachiosaurus montgomeriensis* (Carr, Williamson & Schwimmer, 2005;
163 Brusatte, Benson & Norell, 2011). Nevertheless, the identification of this feature as an
164 autapomorphic trait of the tibia by Yun (2017) is considered nebulous, as Yun (2017) even noted
165 that other derived tyrannosauroids display this feature. The lateral malleolus extends 20 mm
166 outward laterally (=33% of the adjacent shaft). Though the medial malleolus does not protrude as
167 strongly outward in this tyrannosaur as in *Dryptosaurus*, in the case of *Dryptosaurus* this
168 morphology of the distal end of the tibia was because of erosional damage (Brusatte, Benson &
169 Norell, 2011). Muscle scars may also be preserved on the distal end of the tibia. As in
170 *Dryptosaurus*, the specimen shows the distal margin of the tibia was concave (Brusatte, Benson
171 & Norell, 2011). The articular facet faces anteriorly as in other tyrannosaurs (Holtz, 2004). The
172 dorsal surface 143 mm proximodistally, 90 mm mediolaterally at the malleoli (55 mm at the
173 shaft), 140 mm proximodistally and 95 mm mediolaterally (55 mm at the shaft) at the ventral
174 surface, 140 mm dorsoventrally and 32 mm proximodistally at the lateral surface, and finally 95
175 mm mediolaterally, and 37 mm and 23 mm dorsoventrally at the lateral and medial malleoli,
176 respectively, as measured on the distal surface. This tibia belongs to a small tyrannosauroid of

177 around 5 to 6 meters in length (based on comparisons with *Appalachiosaurus*)(Carr, Williamson
178 & Schwimmer, 2005).

179 Dinosauria Owen 1842 sensu Padian and May 1993

180 Theropoda Marsh 1881 sensu Gauthier 1986

181 Coelurosauria Huene 1914 sensu Sereno et al. 2005

182 Tyrannosauroida (Walker 1964 sensu Holtz 2004) or Ornithomimosauria (Barsbold 1976 sensu
183 Choiniere, Forster & de Klerk 2012)

184 Tyrannosauroida indet. or Ornithomimosauria indet.

185 Specimens: AMNH 2553, proximal end of right metatarsal II or IV.

186 Description: The proximal end of metatarsal IV or II (figure 2.A-E) is notably different in

187 coloration and preservation from the partial tibia, suggesting the specimens were not associated.

188 The coloration of the bone shaft not destroyed by pyrite disease is a dark black, whereas the tibia

189 ranges in color from brownish-grey to dark grey in color. Though Yun (2017) identified this

190 element as the proximal end of metatarsal II, the specimen may also be half of the proximal end

191 of metatarsal IV of a tyrannosauroid dinosaur. This is due to the fact that, as Yun (2017) noted, a

192 portion of the specimen is missing. Though the specimen (though more gracile) indeed resembles

193 the metatarsal II of *Appalachiosaurus montgomeriensis*, an unnamed specimen of tyrannosauroid

194 from the Merchantville Formation, and other tyrannosauroids (e.g., Holtz, 2004; Carr,

195 Williamson & Schwimmer, 2005, pers. obs.), the morphology of the proximal surface may also

196 represent half of the characteristic v-shaped notch for the articulation of metatarsal III restricted

197 to the plantar half of the foot that is found in derived tyrannosauroids (e.g., Holtz, 2004). In

198 either case, the specimen represents a metatarsal more gracile than either metatarsals II and IV of

199 *Appalachiosaurus* and tyrannosaurids (e.g., Holtz, 2004). As Yun (2017) noted, *Dryptosaurus*
200 *aquilunguis* has a relatively gracile metatarsal IV, and so an affinity with *Dryptosaurus* is
201 certainly worth considering for this specimen. However, the incomplete nature of this metatarsal
202 IV does not allow for the identification of the possible autapomorphy on this specimen that was
203 identified on the metatarsal IV of *D. aquilunguis* found by Brusatte, Benson & Norell, (2011).
204 Brusatte et al. (2012) assigned this specimen to a derived taxon of ornithomimid from the
205 Navasink Formation based on what they interpreted as a weakly-developed articular surface for
206 metatarsal III.

207 The lateral face of the proximal end of AMNH 2553 measures 139 mm proximodistally
208 and 34 mm dorsoventrally at its proximal end, whilst the same measurements of the medial side
209 are 139 mm and 43 mm, respectively. The dorsal face is also 139 mm proximodistally and is 5
210 mm mediolaterally at its proximal end. The same two measurements for the ventral surface are
211 139 mm and 23 mm.

212 Dinosauria Owen 1842 sensu Padian and May 1993

213 Theropoda Marsh 1881 sensu Gauthier 1986

214 Coelurosauria Huene 1914 sensu Sereno et al. 2005

215 Tyrannosauroida (Walker 1964 sensu Holtz 2004) or Ornithomimosauria (Barsbold 1976 sensu
216 Choiniere, Forster & De Klerk 2012)

217 Tyrannosauroida or Ornithomimosauria indet.

218 Specimen: AMNH 2552, distal end of metatarsal II.

219 Description: This gracile distal end of the metatarsal II of a coelurosaurian dinosaur (figure 3.A-
220 E) may be assignable either to Tyrannosauroida or Ornithomimosauria. This assignment is

221 based on the size of the specimen in conjunction with the articular surface for metatarsal III on
222 the medial face of AMNH 2552 suggesting an arctometatarsalian or sub-arctometatarsalian
223 condition where the metatarsals are closely appressed. The size of the specimen and the unfused
224 nature of the metatarsus suggests against assignment of AMNH 2552 to an australian. Additionally,
225 the specimen is more robust than the metatarsals of troodontids (e.g., Makovicky & Norell,
226 2004). Like AMNH 2553, the erosional patterns and color of AMNH 2552 suggest against
227 association with AMNH 2550. Notably, the coloration and wear patterns on AMNH 2552 closely
228 resemble those of AMNH 2553, suggesting possible association between the two specimens.

229 The lateral face of this metatarsal II measures 100 mm proximodistally and 22 mm
230 dorsoventrally at the condyles, whereas the medial face is 101 mm proximodistally and 35 mm
231 dorsoventrally at the condyles. The dorsal surface also measures 101 mm proximodistally, while
232 mediolaterally it measures 31 mm at the distal end. The ventral surface is 100 mm
233 proximodistally and 40 mm mediolaterally at the distal end. The distal surface is 38 mm wide
234 dorsoventrally and 37.8 mm wide mediolaterally.

235 Dinosauria Owen 1842 sensu Padian and May 1993

236 Theropoda Marsh 1881 sensu Gauthier 1986

237 Coelurosauria Huene 1914 sensu Sereno et al. 2005

238 Ornithomimosauria Barsbold 1976 sensu Choiniere, Forster & de Klerk 2012

239 Ornithomimosauria indet.

240 Specimen: AMNH 2551, three pedal phalanges.

241 Description: The three pedal phalanges included in the syntypes of "*Teihivenator*" *macropus* are
242 identified herein as the left and right pedal phalanges III-1 and the right pedal phalanx II-1 of an

243 indeterminate ornithomimosaur or possibly ornithomimid dinosaur. Yun (2017) noted the
244 distinguishability of these phalanges from those of other tyrannosaurs based on the presence of
245 proximally oriented process extending from the proximal ends of each specimen, also noting that
246 these specimens (along with the rest of the syntypes of “*Teihivenator macropus*”) were referred
247 to ornithomimosaur in multiple studies. However, no comparison of these phalanges with those
248 of ornithomimosaur was made in Yun (2017). The dorsoventrally straightened nature of the
249 left and right pedal phalanges III-1 is clearly more congruent with that of the corresponding
250 phalanges of ornithomimosaur than the robust, curved pedal phalanges of derived
251 tyrannosauroids (e.g., Holtz, 2004; Makovicky, Kobayashi & Currie, 2004). Examination of
252 these phalanges reveals that the processes are rather the ventral lateral and medial edges of the
253 proximal articular facets of each phalanx, forming tips proximally but also appearing on the
254 ventral surface towards the diaphysis of the phalanges as ridges that intersect to form a triangular
255 shape in ventral view. In fact, the specimens are almost identical to the corresponding elements
256 in the pes of *Struthiomimus altus* (Osborn, 1921), where these process-like tips of bone at the
257 ventrolateral and ventromedial ends of the rim surrounding the proximal articular facet of the
258 phalanges are clearly visible. This morphology of phalanx appears in many different genera of
259 ornithomimosaur, including possibly in the basalmost ornithomimosaur taxon *Nqwebasaurus*
260 *thwazi* (figure 14.B in Choiniere, Forster & de Klerk, 2012). Additional figures of
261 ornithomimosaur pedal specimens showing this morphology may be found in Cullen et al.
262 (2013). Yun (2017) also noted the presence of this morphology in other clades of theropod
263 dinosaur. As such, these specimens cannot in good faith be used to justify the presence of a
264 distinct taxon of tyrannosauroid or even assigned to Tyrannosauroidea. These phalanges are grey

265 in color and almost match the color of the tyrannosauroid tibia described above, though they are
266 clearly more well-preserved. Thus, these phalanges likely hail from the Navesink Formation,
267 where a distinct taxon of ornithomimid of possibly similar phylogenetic derivation to
268 ornithomimid taxa like *Gallimimus* and *Ornithomimus* known for now as “*Ornithomimus*”
269 *antiquus* is also found (Brusatte et al., 2012). The morphological similarity of these phalanges
270 with *Struthiomimus altus* especially supports their origin from a derived ornithomimosaur. The
271 presence of such an animal in Appalachia would be intriguing, considering the basal position of
272 the tyrannosauroids, hadrosaurids, and hadrosauroids of Appalachia when compared to related
273 genera from other parts of the globe (e.g., Schwimmer, 1997; Carr, Williamson & Schwimmer,
274 2005; Brusatte, Benson & Norell, 2011; Prieto-Marquez, Erickson & Ebersole, 2016).

275 The left pedal phalanx III-1 measures 80 mm proximodistally, 50 mm mediolaterally at
276 the proximal articular facet, and 29 mm mediolaterally at the distal end. The medial surface
277 measures 82 mm proximodistally, 40 mm dorsoventrally at the proximal end and 22 mm at the
278 condyles. The ventral surface measures 80 mm proximodistally, 35 mm mediolaterally at the
279 proximal end, and 26 mm at the condyles. The lateral surface is 83 mm long proximodistally, and
280 dorsoventrally measures 35 mm at the proximal end and 22 mm at the condyles. The distal end is
281 20 mm dorsoventrally between the condyles and 35 mm mediolaterally. The proximal end is 35
282 mm dorsoventrally and 5 mm mediolaterally.

283 The dorsal face of the right pedal phalanx II-1 is 90 mm proximodistally, 40 mm
284 mediolaterally at the proximal end and 30 mm at the distal, whereas the ventral face in the same
285 dimensions is 89 mm, 29 mm, and 26 mm. The medial surface is 93 mm proximodistally, 47 mm
286 dorsoventrally at the proximal end and 31 mm at the distal end. The lateral face is 91 mm

287 proximodistally, 50 mm mediolaterally at the proximal end, and 25 mm at the distal end. The
288 proximal surface is 39 mm dorsoventrally and 36 mm mediolaterally, whereas the distal surface
289 is 25 mm in both the same two dimensions.

291 Discussion.

292 The syntypes of “*Teihivinator macropus*” are herein shown to be the bones of both
293 indeterminate tyrannosauroids and ornithomimosaur. Additionally, the autopomorphies on the
294 tibia of “*Teihivinator macropus*” listed by Yun (2017) are unable to be found on the specimen
295 AMNH 2550 or are found in other tyrannosauroids. Thus, the syntypes of “*Teihivinator*
296 *macropus*” are a chimaera and the tibia lacks any non-dubious autopomorphies. As such,
297 “*Teihivinator macropus*” must be regarded as a *nomen dubium*. Nevertheless, the proximal and
298 distal ends of the Navesink tibia assignable to a tyrannosauroid are distinct enough from
299 *Appalachiosaurus* and *Dryptosaurus* to suggest the presence of another morphotype and possibly
300 distinct taxon of tyrannosauroid in New Jersey during the Maastrichtian. Notably, the small size
301 of the tibia when compared to those of the aforementioned Appalachian tyrannosauroid taxa
302 (suggesting an animal ~5-6 meters in length) may indicate that the tibia was from an immature
303 specimen of tyrannosaur. Additionally, the tibia is unfortunately not comparable to the
304 tyrannosauroid morphotype represented by a partial metatarsus from the Merchantville
305 Formation of New Jersey (pers. obs.). As such, AMNH 2550 is likely best thought of as the tibia
306 of an indeterminate tyrannosauroid that may represent a distinct but indeterminate taxon of
307 tyrannosaur on Appalachia. In addition to this possibly distinct taxon of tyrannosauroid, the
308 Navesink Formation has also been documented as including *Dryptosaurus aquilunguis*,

309 *Hadrosaurus* “*cavatus*”, “*Ornithomimus*” *antiquus*, and an indeterminate theropod based on a
310 tooth known as “*Diplotomodon horrificus*” (e.g., Gallagher, 1993; Gallagher, 1997; Weishampel
311 & Young, 1996; Weishampel, 2006). The presence of two genera of tyrannosauroids in this unit
312 allies it in faunal composition with the Merchantville Formation of New Jersey (fauna includes
313 *Dryptosaurus* sp. and an indeterminate but distinct Merchantville tyrannosauroid)(Gallagher,
314 1993; pers. obs.) and the the temporally equivalent and geographically adjacent faunas of the Tar
315 Heel and Coachman Formations (fauna includes *Dryptosaurus aquilunguis* and
316 *Appalachiosaurus montgomeriensis*)(e.g., Baird & Horner, 1979; Weishampel & Young, 1996;
317 Schwimmer et al., 2015). The presence of two tyrannosauroids in the same ecosystem is also
318 known in a few units from Laramidia (e.g., Weishampel et al., 2004).

319 The ornithomimosaur or tyrannosauroid metatarsals described herein may be assignable
320 to either group. Further study of these elements and comparison with the metatarsals of both
321 ornithomimosaur and tyrannosauroids is needed before more definite assignments may be made.

322 Finally, the phalanges included in AMNH 2551 suggest the presence of a derived taxon
323 of ornithomimosaur in the Navesink Formation, supporting the hypothesis of Brusatte et al.
324 (2012). Whether these pedal elements are assignable to “*Ornithomimus*” *antiquus* will require the
325 collection of further ornithomimosaur specimens from the Maastrichtian of the Atlantic Coastal
326 Plain.

327 The assignment of the remains of several clades of dinosaur to a single taxon is not an
328 occurrence unique to the case of “*Teihivenator macropus*” in eastern dinosaur paleontology. As
329 noted, Baird & Horner (1979) revised the assignment by Cope (1869) of tyrannosauroid and
330 indeterminate hadrosaurid material to the holotype of the gigantic hadrosaurid *Hypsibema*

331 *crassicauda* based on the close location of the specimens. Thus, the cases of both *Hypsibema*
332 *crassicauda* and “*Teihivenator macropus*” represent cautionary tales of mis-assignment from
333 appeared association of specimens.

334 Conclusions.

335 The syntypes of “*Teihivenator macropus*” represent a chimaera composed of the tibia of an
336 indeterminate though possibly distinct tyrannosauroid, metatarsals possibly assignable to either
337 tyrannosauroids or ornithomimosaur, and pedal phalanges likely assignable to a derived
338 ornithomimosaur. The specimens increase the current understanding of theropod dinosaurs from
339 the Navesink Formation, and have implications for the biogeography and diversity of
340 ornithomimosaur and tyrannosauroids on the landmass of Appalachia.

341 Additionally, the case of “*Teihivenator macropus*” should be considered a cautionary tale
342 of dinosaur paleontology, showing that possible association of partial disarticulated specimens
343 (especially from marine deposits) should be rigorously scrutinized before the specimens are
344 remarked to have come from a single animal.

345 Acknowledgements.

346 I thank Carl Mehling of the American Museum for allowing me access to the specimens
347 described herein. I also thank Mr. Chan-gyu Yun for his thoughtful comments regarding these
348 specimens and for his research of them.

References.

Sampson SD, Loewen MA, Farke AA, Roberts EM, Forster CA, Smith JA, Titus AL. 2010. New Horned Dinosaurs from Utah Provide Evidence for Intracontinental Dinosaur Endemism. *PLoS ONE* 5(9):e12292.

Loewen, MA, Irmis RB, Sertich JJW, Currie PJ, Sampson SD. 2013. Tyrant Dinosaur Evolution Tracks the Rise and Fall of Late Cretaceous Oceans. *PLoS ONE* 8(11):e79420.

Cope ED. 1866. On the remains of a gigantic extinct dinosaur, from the Cretaceous Green Sand of New Jersey. *Proceedings of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia* 18:275-279.

Marsh OC. 1877. Notice of a new and gigantic dinosaur. *American Journal of Science and Arts* 14:87-88.

Weishampel DB, Barrett PM, Coria RA, Loeuff JL, Xing X, Xijin Z, Sahni A, Gomani EMP, Noto CR. 2004. Dinosaur Distribution. In: Weishampel DB, Dodson P, Osmólska H, eds: *The Dinosauria*, 2nd Edition. Berkeley: University of California Press. pp. 517-617.

Carr TD, Williamson TE, Schwimmer DR. 2005. A new genus and species of tyrannosauroid from the Late Cretaceous (middle Campanian) Demopolis Formation of Alabama. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 25(1):119–143.

375 Weishampel DB. 2006. Another look at the dinosaurs of the East Coast of North America. In
376 'Coletivo Arqueológico-Paleontológico Salense, eds: *Actas III Jornadas Dinosaurios Entorno*.
377 Burgos: Salas de los Infantes. pp. 129-168.

378
379 Krause DW, Baird D. 1979. Late Cretaceous Mammals East of the North American Western
380 Interior Seaway. *Journal of Paleontology* 53(3):562-565.

381
382 Baird D, Galton PM. 1981. Pterosaur bones from the Upper Cretaceous of Delaware. *Journal of*
383 *Vertebrate Paleontology* 1(1):67-71.

384
385 Gallagher WB, Parris DC. 1986. Paleontology, biostratigraphy, and depositional environments of
386 the Cretaceous-Tertiary transition in the New Jersey coastal plain. *The Mosasaur* 3: 1-35.

387
388 Grandstaff BS, Parris DC, Denton RK, Gallagher WB. 1992. *Alphadon* (Marsupialia) and
389 Multituberculata (Allotheria) in the Cretaceous of eastern North America. *Journal of Vertebrate*
390 *Paleontology* 12(2):217-222.

391
392 Ebersole SM, King JL. 2011. A review of non-avian dinosaurs from the Late Cretaceous of
393 Alabama, Mississippi, Georgia, and Tennessee. *Bulletin of the Alabama Museum of Natural*
394 *History* 28:81-93.

395
396 Schwimmer DR, Sanders AE, Erickson BR, Weems RE. 2015. A Late Cretaceous Dinosaur

397 and Reptile Assemblage from South Carolina, USA. *Transactions of the American Philosophical*
398 *Society* 105(2):1-157.

399
400 Fix MF, Darrough GE. 2004. Dinosauria and Associated Vertebrate Fauna of the Late Cretaceous
401 Chronister Site of Southeast Missouri. *Geological Society of America Abstracts with Programs*
402 36(3):14.

403
404 Fiorillo AR, Tykoski RS. 2014. A Diminutive New Tyrannosaur from the Top of the World. *PLoS*
405 *ONE* 9(3): e91287.

406
407 Brusatte SL, Averianov A, Sues HD, Muir A, Butler IB. 2016. New tyrannosaur from the mid-
408 Cretaceous of Uzbekistan clarifies evolution of giant body sizes and advanced senses in tyrant
409 dinosaurs. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. in
410 press.

411
412 Brusatte SL, Carr TD. 2016. The phylogeny and evolutionary history of tyrannosauroid
413 dinosaurs. *Scientific Reports* 6:20252.

414 Yun, C. 2017. *Teihivenator* gen. nov., a new generic name for the tyrannosauroid dinosaur
415 "*Laelaps*" *macropus* (Cope, 1868; preoccupied by Koch, 1836). *Journal of Zoological and*
416 *Bioscience Research* 4(2):7-13.

417
418 Baird D, Horner JR. 1979. Cretaceous dinosaurs of North Carolina. *Brimleyana* 2:1-28.

419 Horner JR. 1979. Upper Cretaceous Dinosaurs from the Bearpaw Shale (Marine) of South-
420 Central Montana with a Checklist of Upper Cretaceous Dinosaur Remains from Marine
421 Sediments in North America. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 53(3):566-577.

422
423 Gallagher WB. 1993. The Cretaceous/Tertiary mass extinction event in the northern
424 Atlantic Coastal plain. *The Mosasaur* 5:75 - 154.

425
426 Leidy J. 1865. Memoir on the extinct reptiles of the Cretaceous formations of the United States.
427 *Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge* 14:1-135.

428
429 Cope ED. 1870. Synopsis of the extinct Batrachia, Reptilia and Aves of North America,
430 *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 14:1- 252.

431
432 Gallagher WB. 1997. *When Dinosaurs Roamed New Jersey*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University
433 Press.

434
435 Gallagher WB, Camburn J, Camburn S, Hanczaryk PA. 2014. Taphonomy of a Late Campanian
436 Fossil Assemblage at Marlboro, Monmouth County, New Jersey. *The Mosasaur* 8:53-68.

437
438 Brusatte SL, Choiniere JN, Benson RB, Carr TD, Norell MA. Theropod dinosaurs from the Late
439 Cretaceous of eastern North America: anatomy, systematics, biogeography and new information
440 from historic specimens. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 32(5S):70.

441 Anné J, Hendrick BJ, & Schein J. P. 2016. First diagnosis of septic arthritis in a dinosaur. *Royal*
442 *Society Open Science* 3:160222.

443
444 Owen R. 1842. Report on British fossil reptiles, part II. *Report of the British Association for the*
445 *Advancement of Science* 11:60–204.

446
447 Padian K, May CL. 1993. The earliest dinosaurs. In: Lucas SG & Morales M, eds.
448 The Nonmarine Triassic. *New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science Bulletin* 3: 379–
449 381.

450
451 Marsh OC. 1881. Principal characters of American Jurassic dinosaurs. Part V. *American Journal*
452 *of Science Series* 3 21:417–423.

453
454 Gauthier J. 1986. Saurischian monophyly and the origin of birds. *Memoirs of the California*
455 *Academy of Sciences* 8:1–55.

456
457 von Huene F. 1914. Saurischia et Ornithischia Triadica (“Dinosuaria” Triadica). *Animalia.*
458 *Fossilium Catalogus* 4:1–21.

459
460 Sereno PC, McAllister S, Brusatte SL. 2005. TaxonSearch: a relational database for documenting
461 taxa and their phylogenetic definitions. *Phyloinformatics* 8:1–21.

463 Walker AD. 1964. Triassic reptiles from the Elgin area, *Ornithosuchus* and the origin of
464 carnosaurs. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 248:53–134.

465
466 Holtz TR. 2004. Tyrannosauroida. In: Weishampel DB, Dodson P, Osmólska H, eds. *The*
467 *Dinosauria*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 111-136.

468
469 Barsbold R. 1976. K evolyutsii i sistematike pozdnemezozoyskikh khishchnykh dinozavrov (The
470 evolution and systematics of late Mesozoic carnivorous dinosaurs) (Russian). *The Joint Soviet-*
471 *Mongolian Paleontological Expedition, Transactions* 3:68–75.

472
473 Choiniere JN, Forster CA, de Klerk WJ. 2012. New information on *Nqwebasaurus thwazi*, a
474 coelurosaurian theropod from the Early Cretaceous Kirkwood formation in South Africa. *Journal*
475 *of African Earth Sciences* 71–72:1-17.

476
477 Makovicky PJ, Norell MA. 2004. Troodontidae. In: Weishampel DB, Dodson P, Osmólska H,
478 eds. *The Dinosauria* (Second Edition). Berkeley: University of California Press. 184-195.

479
480 Makovicky PJ, Kobayashi Y, Currie PJ. 2004. Ornithomimosauria. In: Weishampel
481 DB, Dodson P, Osmólska H, eds. *The Dinosauria* (Second Edition). Berkeley: University of
482 California Press. 137-150.

485 Osborn HF. 1917. Skeletal adaptations of Ornitholestes, Struthiomimus, Tyrannosaurus. *Bulletin*
486 *of the American Museum of Natural History* 35(43):733-771.

487
488 Cullen TM, Ryan MJ, Schröder-Adams C, Currie PJ, Kobayashi Y. 2013. An Ornithomimid
489 (Dinosauria) Bonebed from the Late Cretaceous of Alberta, with Implications for the Behavior,
490 Classification, and Stratigraphy of North American Ornithomimids. *PLoS ONE* 8(3):e58853.

491
492 Schwimmer DR. 1997. Late Cretaceous dinosaurs in Eastern USA: A taphonomic and
493 biogeographic model of occurrences. *Dinofest International Proceedings*. Philadelphia: Academy
494 of Natural Sciences. pp. 203–211.

495
496 Prieto-Marquez A, Erickson GM, Ebersole JA. 2016. A primitive hadrosaurid from southeastern
497 North America and the origin and early evolution of 'duck-billed' dinosaurs. *Journal of*
498 *Vertebrate Paleontology*: e1054495.

499
500 Weishampel DB, Young L. 1996. *Dinosaurs of the East Coast*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins
501 University Press.

Figure 1. Tibia of an indeterminate taxon of tyrannosauroid, AMNH 2550. Tibia in lateral (A), medial (B), dorsal (C), ventral (D), proximal (E), and distal (D) views. Scale bar = 50 mm.

A.



B.



C.



D.



E.



F.



Figure 2. Metatarsal II or IV of an ornithomimosaur or tyrannosauroid dinosaur, AMNH 2553.

Metatarsal in lateral (A), medial (B), dorsal (C), ventral (D), and proximal (E) views. Scale bar = 50 mm.




Figure 3. Distal metatarsal II of a tyrannosauroid or ornithomimosaur, AMNH 2552. Metatarsal in lateral (A), medial (B), dorsal (C), ventral (D), and distal (E) views. Scale bar = 50 mm.

A.



B.



C.



D.



E.



Figure 4. Phalanges of a derived ornithomimosaur, AMNH 2551. Phalanges in medial (A) dorsal (B), and ventral (C) views. Scale bar = 50 mm.

A.



B.



C.

