# Exceptional soft tissues preservation in a mummified frog-eating Eocene salamander

Jérémy Tissier[1,2], Jean-Claude Rage[3] and Michel Laurin[3]

[1] Cenozoic Research Group, JURASSICA Museum, Porrentruy, Switzerland

[2] Department of Geosciences, University of Fribourg, Fribourg, Switzerland

[3] Département Histoire de la Terre, UMR 7207, Centre de Recherches sur la Paléobiodiversité et les Paléoenvironnements, CNRS/MNHN/UPMC (Sorbonne Universités). Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, Paris, France

Corresponding Author:

Jérémy Tissier[1,2]

Route de Fontenais 21, Porrentruy, 2900, Switzerland

Email address: jeremy.tissier@unifr.ch

## ABSTRACT

Fossils are almost always represented by hard tissues but we present here the exceptional case of
a 3-dimensionally preserved specimen that 'mummified' (likely between 40 and 34 million years
ago) in a terrestrial karstic environment. This fossil is the incomplete body of a salamander,
*Phosphotriton sigei*, whose skeleton and external morphology are well preserved, as revealed by
phase-contrast synchrotron X-ray microtomography. In addition, internal structures composed of
soft tissues preserved in three-dimensions are now identified: a lung, the spinal cord, a
lumbosacral plexus, the digestive tract, muscles and urogenital organs that may be cloacal
glands. These are among the oldest known cases of three-dimensional preservation of these
organs in vertebrates and shed light on the ecology of this salamander. Indeed, the digestive tract
contains remains of a juvenile frog, which represents the only known case of an extinct
salamander that fed on a frog, an extremely rare type of predation in extant salamanders. These
new data improve our scarce knowledge on soft tissue anatomy of early urodeles and should
prove useful for future biologists and palaeontologists working on urodele evolutionary biology.
We also suggest that the presence of bat guano and carcasses represented a close source of
phosphorus, favouring preservation of soft tissues. Bone microanatomy indicates that *P. sigei*
was likely amphibious or terrestrial, and was probably not neotenic.

## INTRODUCTION

The 'Phosphorites du Quercy', in southwestern France, include numerous karstic fissures in-
filled by phosphatic sediments rich in vertebrate remains (Legendre et al., 1997; Pélissié & Sigé,
2006). Almost all remains appear as classical disarticulated fossil bones, but a few of them (a
salamander, anurans and snakes) are spectacular cases of exceptional preservation; the animals
are entirely mineralized, including the skin, in three dimensions. Unfortunately, these
'mummies' were collected in the 19th century and their precise provenance and geological age
are unknown. However, it is suspected that they come from the late middle or late Eocene (Laloy
et al., 2013; Tissier et al., 2016).

Until recently, only the external morphology of the 'mummies' was known. However, recent
tomographic studies showed that the skeleton is preserved within the 'mummies' of the frog
*Thaumastosaurus gezei* (Laloy et al., 2013) and of the salamander *Phosphotriton sigei)* (Tissier
et al., 2016). The specimen of *P. sigei* includes a large part of the trunk (preserved posterior to
the shoulder girdle), the anterior portion of the tail and the proximal portions of the hind limbs
(Fig. 1A). The right side of the trunk is crushed. Diagnostic external features include the absence
of scales, the presence of costal grooves visible on the left side, and the presence of a
longitudinally slit-shaped cloaca.

The study of the skeleton of *Phosphotriton* confirmed that this fossil is a urodele amphibian;
more precisely, the phylogenetic analysis presented by Tissier et al. (2016) suggested that it is a
stem-salamandrid, although they did not definitely discard relationships with the Plethodontidae.

The microtomography of *Phosphotriton* clearly suggested also that, in addition to the skeleton,
soft tissues were preserved. Subsequent segmentations indeed displayed various soft tissues

55  within this specimen, which are the subject of the present article. We show here that the observed
56  organs are not infills of cavities but are really the organs themselves that were permineralized.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

58  The only specimen of *P. sigei* (MNHN.F.QU17755) was investigated with the help of
59  propagation phase contrast synchrotron X-ray microtomography, which gives a better contrast to
60  differentiate tissues from the mineral matrix than traditional absorption based synchrotron X-ray
61  microtomography. The method and parameters of acquisition are described in Tissier et al.
62  (2016). A 3D model is given in Supplementary Information in 3D PDF file format.

63  Several structures composed of soft tissues are preserved and may be identified on the
64  tomograms. They can be distinguished from bones and mineral matrix by their shape, density on
65  tomograms and structure. Their identification is based on comparisons with the literature on
66  urodele soft anatomy because dissecting extant specimens would not have added to what may be
67  drawn from the available literature. Therefore, we use their position in the body, their shape in
68  three dimensions, and their internal structure on tomograms to identify them based on
69  comparisons with existing descriptions. Some of them remain difficult to identify precisely, for
70  several reasons (incompleteness of the organ, segmentation difficulties, small size, etc.).
71  Proposed identifications are therefore tentative in some cases (e.g., an organ of the uro-genital
72  system), although some appear to be certain (spinal cord, lumbosacral plexus).

73  To assess the lifestyle of *P. sigei*, we analysed the compactness profile of femoral mid-
74  diaphyseal virtual cross-sections. We then used these data to infer the lifestyle with the inference
75  models published by Laurin et al. (2009). These are based on statistical analyses of femoral
76  compactness profiles of 46 extant urodele species. Variables in the models were selected through
77  backward elimination and forward selection procedures, respectively, which led to two models
78  with different combinations of variables.

## RESULTS

80  **Muscles**. Not all muscles appear to have been fossilized. In addition, most muscles were not
81  segmented, because of their irregular, ill-defined contour; their segmentation would have
82  required too much subjective interpretation and would have been very time-consuming. It has not
83  been possible to precisely identify the preserved muscles, as their position in the specimen is not
84  sufficient for this. Only three of them were segmented: they are recognizable by their fibrous
85  structure and shape (Figs. 1C-D). We suppose that these may be three ventral caudal muscles
86  described by Francis (1934: 102-103), which arise from the fourth caudal vertebra (i.e. M.
87  caudali-pubo-ischio-tibialis, M. ischio-caudalis [the most mesial one, which inserts on the
88  posterior border of the ischium] and M. caudalifemoralis [the most lateral one, which inserts on
89  the femur]). Francis (1934) described them as having an 'oval cross-section', and being 'narrow
90  and strap-like', which fits the muscles disclosed here. Their function is to flex the tail.

91  **Spinal cord**. It is preserved and visible in section in some vertebrae, inside the neural canal
92  (Figs. 1C, 2). In the vertebrae where it is not preserved, only an empty space is visible (black on
93  the tomogram). Unfortunately, that organ could not be segmented because its preservation is too

94   uneven. No bony support of the spinal cord is visible. Spinal cord supports are bony processes
95   that extend in the neural canal of vertebrae (Wake & Lawson, 1973; Skutschas, 2009; Skutschas
96   & Baleeva, 2012). The fact that supports do not appear on the images does not necessarily mean
97   that they were absent. These structures, which occur in various salamanders, are tiny and
98   difficult to detect on tomograms (Skutschas & Baleeva, 2012; Skutschas, pers. com. 2015).

99   It seems clear that in this specimen, the soft tissues are mineralized, even internally, and do not
100  represent cavity filling. Indeed, the structure of the spinal cord is in some rare places well
101  preserved, in three dimensions. Notably, the external surface of the cord is bordered by empty
102  space on tomograms (Fig. 2), which would not happen if this was a case of cavity filling
103  preservation. This 'empty space' was originally occupied by the cerebrospinal fluid, which
104  cannot fossilize. Internal structure is difficult to discern but it is nevertheless reminiscent to what
105  can be observed in extant urodeles, with a central canal (see Davis et al., 1989: fig. 6A for
106  example).

107  **Lumbosacral plexus**. This plexus comprises three nerves that emerge from the spinal cord
108  through the spinal foramina of the last trunk vertebra, the sacral vertebra and the first caudosacral
109  vertebra. These spinal foramina are large (Tissier et al., 2016: figs. 5B and 6B-C). These three
110  nerves merged lateral to the ilia to form the lumbosacral plexus (Figs. 3A-B) and the resulting
111  nerve entered the hind limb; this is similar to the disposition observed in *Necturus* by
112  Wischnitzer (1979). The nerve exiting the last trunk vertebra corresponds to the 'sixteenth spinal
113  nerve' in *Salamandra* (Francis, 1934: 173). The middle nerve of the plexus, emerging from the
114  sacral vertebra, is the thickest, correlatively with the size of the foramen. It is termed
115  'seventeenth spinal nerve' in *Salamandra* by Francis (1934).The nerve exiting from the first
116  caudosacral vertebra, called *nervus spinalis 18* in *Salamandra* (Francis, 1934), is very thin and
117  the preserved part does not meet the other nerves of the plexus, which are much thicker.
118  However, in view of its orientation, we presume that it took part in the plexus and that the
119  missing part results from incomplete fossilization or from an insufficient contrast on tomograms,
120  leading to segmentation artefacts.

121  **Digestive system**. The alimentary canal is particularly easy to identify by its circular outline on
122  the tomograms in transverse section. It is visible in most of the specimen length, up to the level
123  of the pelvic girdle. It is very well preserved and its shape in three dimensions leaves little to no
124  doubt about its identification (Figs. 3F-G). Its diameter is quite variable and no well-defined
125  stomach may be discerned, which is a characteristic of various urodeles (Delsol, Flatin &
126  Exbrayat, 1995).

127  Here, the content of the digestive system is preserved (Figs. 3C-E), a very rare and exceptional
128  phenomenon: a few bones are present in the digestive tract, including a small humerus (five mm
129  long) of an undetermined anuran, recognizable by its typical spherical distal articular condyle.
130  Four vertebrae in connection are also present and could belong to that same young anuran.

131  **Urogenital organ**. Two paired organs are located just posterior to the pelvic girdle: one ventral
132  to the first two caudosacral vertebrae, the other ventral to the second and third caudosacral
133  vertebrae and dorsal to the cloaca (Figs. 4A-B). Each is comprised of two elongate, fusiform

134  elements situated on both sides of the cloaca. On the specimen, the cloaca is an elongate slit
135  located just posterior to the hind limbs (Figs. 1B, 3F and 4A). These paired organs are
136  approximately five mm long. Both parts of the most dorsal organ, ventral to the first two
137  caudosacral vertebrae, are connected by a plate-like structure that is probably an artefact, given
138  that it was difficult to differentiate it from the surrounding matrix and other elements during
139  segmentation. The two parts of the most ventral organ are also connected, but it is very difficult
140  to tell how, because of low contrast on tomograms. Assuming that these two organs are really
141  paired, i.e. that the plate-like element is an artefact, the elongate parts may represent cloacal
142  glands, the testicles, or the kidneys. In urodeles, testicles and kidneys may be similarly elongated
143  (Delsol, Blond-Fayolle & Flatin, 1995; Gipouloux & Cambar, 1995), but they are located more
144  cranially. These structures are thus more likely to represent dorsal and ventral cloacal glands, but
145  this conclusion must remain tentative because the morphology of these glands in extant urodeles
146  remains poorly described, though some histological descriptions have been published (Sever,
147  1981; 1992). According to Francis (1934), the male cloaca is surrounded by 'a large tubular
148  gland', which fits the description of the ventral glands preserved here. These glands are not
149  found in females *Salamandra* which would mean that this fossil specimen was a male.

150  **Lung**. It was briefly described by Tissier et al. (2016), but a new description is given here,
151  nevertheless. This organ is observable at the anterior part of the specimen, on the left side (Fig.
152  4C). The anterior portion is missing. The preserved part is triangular in dorsal or ventral view, its
153  tip being directed caudally, and flattened in cross section (Fig. 4D). The section shows a vacuolar
154  structure. Despite the absence of the anterior portion, the position of that organ in the body,
155  ventral to the ribs (in the thoracic region), its shape and its vacuolar internal structure suggest
156  that it is a lung (Francis, 1934; ML, pers. obs). Within Caudata, the presence of a lung is
157  primitive but remains useful to exclude some taxonomic affinities (i.e. within Plethodontidae).

## DISCUSSION

159  **Ecology.** The presence of anuran bones in the digestive tract of the fossil (Figs. 3C-E) is
160  evidence of a type of predation that is very rare in urodeles. Preying on frogs was reported in
161  *Amphiuma* (Montaña, Ceneviva-Bastos & Schalk, 2014), a large and especially voracious extant
162  urodele. Another voracious urodele, *Necturus*, has been reported (Hamilton, 1932) to have eaten
163  other urodeles (*Desmognatus* and *Eurycea*), but not frogs. *P. sigei* was relatively small and the
164  swallowed anuran, although small, was likely a metamorphosed individual, as shown by the
165  well-shaped humeral condyle, but not a fully grown adult, as shown by the broad neural canal,
166  assuming that the vertebrae belong to the same individual as the humerus. The straight diaphysis
167  of the humerus and the position of the humeral condyle in line with the diaphysis suggest that the
168  prey was a ranoid. Ranoids were already reported from the Phosphorites (Rage, 1984; 2016). The
169  length of the humerus (five mm) suggests that the individual measured about 18–20 mm in
170  snout-vent length.

171  To further investigate the ecology of the animal, we studied the microanatomy of the femur,
172  through a transverse virtual section of the diaphysis on tomograms, and calculated its
173  compactness profile with the software Bone Profiler (Girondot & Laurin, 2003). Without much
174  surprise, both inference models (based on backward elimination and forward selection

175    procedures, respectively) presented by Laurin et al. (2009) suggest an amphibious or terrestrial
176    lifestyle (see Supplemental Information). This would suggest that *P. sigei* was not neotenic
177    because all extant neotenic urodeles are strictly aquatic.

178    **Exceptional preservation.** The three-dimensionally preserved organs described here rank
179    among the oldest known in vertebrates (even though the geological age of the studied fossil
180    could only be determined indirectly). Putative lungs were described from the Devonian
181    *Bothriolepis* (Denison, 1941), but this interpretation has recently been refuted by Goujet (2011).
182    A probable 'lung' has also been observed in the actinistian sarcopterygian *Axelrodichthys*
183    *araripensis* from the Cretaceous (Brito et al., 2010), but it is structurally very different from the
184    regular lung of other vertebrates; it is geologically older than the lung of *Phosphotriton sigei*, but
185    its fossilization is linked to the fact that it was originally mineralized (in vivo). The spinal cord,
186    although we have not segmented it and it is not visible on all original virtual sections, is partly
187    preserved. It is, to our knowledge, the only case of three-dimensional fossil preservation of that
188    structure. The spinal cord is quite infrequent in the fossil record. It is known in the tadpoles of
189    the Miocene frog *Rana pueyoi*; in fact, in the latter fossils, McNamara et al. (2010) described
190    more precisely the nerve chord, which is the embryonic antecedent of the spinal cord. In these
191    fossils, the cord is preserved in two dimensions. To our knowledge, the specimen of
192    *Phosphotriton* is the only example of a fossilized nerve plexus in vertebrates. The three-
193    dimensional preservation of the digestive tract documented here is also particularly exceptional.
194    In fossils, this tract is generally two-dimensionally preserved, with even sometimes its content
195    (Dal Sasso & Signore, 1998; McNamara et al., 2010), or the tract content may be preserved
196    without impression of the tract itself (e.g. Piñeiro et al., 2012), but never to our knowledge have
197    a three-dimensional fossilized tract and its content been reported in vertebrates; however, three-
198    dimensional tracts, with perhaps remnants of the content, have recently been described in
199    fossilized arthropods, which also come from the 'Phosphorites du Quercy' (Schwermann et al.,
200    2016a). *Phosphotriton* may also be the only case of fossilization of an organ of the urogenital
201    system (likely cloacal glands) among vertebrates (even though our interpretation of this structure
202    is tentative) and it is the first known instance of an extinct salamander taxon and of a putative
203    salamandrid (extinct or not) that fed on an adult anuran. Muscles reported here, on the contrary,
204    are not the oldest known, as they have been reported in *Eastmanosteus calliaspis*, a Late
205    Devonian placoderm (Trinajstic et al., 2007) and in the actinistian sarcopterygian *Wenzia*
206    *latimerae* from the Late Oxfordian (Clément, 2005), for example.

207    This case of exceptional preservation is difficult to explain, more specifically as the fossiliferous
208    locality that produced the fossil is unknown. It is suspected, but cannot be demonstrated, that all
209    mummies from the 'Phosphorites du Quercy' come from a single, lost locality. It is striking that
210    none of the numerous fossiliferous sites of the Phosphorites du Quercy investigated during the
211    last five decades or so did not produce 'mummies'. Equally strange is that none of the mummies
212    pertain to Mammalia, as most skeletal remains found in the Phosphorites du Quercy are
213    mammals. Instead, all belong to ectothermic tetrapods (lissamphibians and snakes; Rage, 2006)
214    and to arthropods (Schwermann et al., 2016a; Schwermann et al., 2016b). Might this result from
215    a taphonomic filter? Was the environment in which these fossils formed (only for the lost
216    locality that yielded mummies) more suitable for lissamphibians and snakes than for mammals?

217   The fact that this locality is now lost prevents us from answering the questions raised above, for
218   now. However, Schwermann et al. (2016a) suggested that such fossils (i.e., arthropods in that
219   case) formed by rapid permineralization of phosphate transported by water that circulated in the
220   fissures and fillings. They suggested that the source of phosphate might have been the numerous
221   bones that accumulated in the fissures. However, another origin deserves consideration. Bats are
222   very numerous in the localities of the Phosphorites (Sigé & Hugueney, 2006) and they likely
223   produced a large amount of guano. Bat guano, which is very rich in phosphate, is known to
224   facilitate preservation in the presence of calcite (Shahack-Gross et al., 2004). Permineralization
225   of soft tissues by phosphorus leading to exceptional preservation was already observed in a few
226   other cases, for embryophytes, arthropods and gastropods (Arena, 2008), ostracod sperm
227   (Matzke-Karasz et al., 2014), and annelids (Wilson et al., 2016). Schwermann et al. (2016a) also
228   showed that air-dried specimens (as can be observed nowadays in lissamphibians after post-
229   mortem desiccation) do not accurately preserve soft tissues. This suggests that dead animals were
230   rapidly buried in the sediment, a prerequisite for phosphatization of soft tissues (Wilson et al.,
231   2016), where they were infiltrated by percolating water and thus permineralized. In any case,
232   given the amazing three-dimensional preservation of soft tissues, we believe that it is appropriate
233   to classify the lost locality of the 'Phosphorites du Quercy' that produced the vertebrate
234   mummies (and the locality that yielded the arthropod mummies) as a Fossil Konservat-
235   Lagerstätte.

## CONCLUSIONS

237   The only specimen of *Phosphotriton sigei* represents a peculiar case of exceptional preservation,
238   in which several organs are preserved in three dimensions, in addition to the skeleton: lung,
239   spinal cord, lumbosacral plexus, digestive tract, muscles, and an unidentified urogenital organ. In
240   addition, the alimentary tract contains skeletal remains of a frog, which is a very rare prey for
241   salamanders. Contrary to the above-cited case of arthropods (Schwermann et al., 2016a), we do
242   not believe that the new data on soft anatomy will revolutionize our understanding of
243   lissamphibian evolution, particularly because such characters have played a modest role in
244   phylogenetic studies of lissamphibians. However, these data, such as the presence of a lung,
245   proved critical to place the mummy in the phylogeny, and these data document the oldest known
246   occurrence of anurophagy in urodeles.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

248   We thank an anonymous reviewer and Pavel P. Skutschas for their comments which helped us
249   improve our manuscript. We thank Patrick Orr for suggesting helpful references during the
250   writing of the manuscript. We are grateful to Renaud Boistel and Vincent Fernandez for their
251   help. We thank the staff of the Centre de microscopie de Fluorescence et d'IMagerie numérique
252   (CeMIM) facilities of the MNHN, and particularly Marc Gèze and Cyril Willig for providing
253   access to computers during the segmentation of the data. The synchrotron microtomography
254   experiments were performed on the ID19 (proposal MD727) beamline at the European
255   Synchrotron Radiation Facility (ESRF), Grenoble, France.

## REFERENCES

**Arena DA. 2008**. Exceptional preservation of plants and invertebrates by phosphatization, Riversleigh, Australia. *Palaios* **23**: 495-502. (doi:10.2110/palo.2006.p06-142r)

**Brito PM, Meunier FJ, Clément G, Geffard-Kuriyama D. 2010**. The histological structure of the calcified lung of the fossil coelacanth *Axelrodichthys araripensis* (Actinistia: Mawsoniidae). *Palaeontology* **53**: 1281-1290. (doi:10.1111/j.1475-4983.2010.01015.x)

**Clément G. 2005**. A new coelacanth (Actinistia, Sarcopterygii) from the Jurassic of France, and the question of the closest relative fossil to *Latimeria*. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* **25**: 481-491. (doi:10.1671/0272-4634(2005)025[0481:ANCASF]2.0.CO;2)

**Dal Sasso C, Signore M. 1998**. Exceptional soft-tissue preservation in a theropod dinosaur from Italy. *Nature* **392**: 383-387. (doi:10.1038/32884)

**Davis BM, Duffy MT, Simpson SB. 1989**. Bulbospinal and intraspinal connections in normal and regenerated salamander spinal cord. *Experimental neurology* **103**: 41-51.

**Delsol M, Flatin J, Exbrayat JM. 1995**. Le tube digestif des amphibiens adultes. In: Grassé PP, ed. *Traité de Zoologie XIV*. Paris: Masson.

**Delsol M, Blond-Fayolle C, Flatin J. 1995**. Appareil génital mâle. Anatomie-histologie, déterminisme du cycle sexuel. In: Grassé PP, ed. *Traité de Zoologie XIV*. Paris: Masson.

**Denison RH. 1941**. The soft anatomy of *Bothriolepis*. *Journal of Paleontology* **15**: 553-561.

**Francis ETB. 1934**. *The anatomy of the salamander*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

**Gipouloux JD, Cambar R. 1995**. Anatomie du rein. In: Grassé PP, ed. *Traité de Zoologie XIV*. Paris: Masson.

**Goujet D. 2011**. "Lungs" in Placoderms, a persistent palaeobiological myth related to environmental preconceived interpretations. *Comptes-Rendus Palevol* **10**: 323-329. (doi:10.1016/j.crpv.2011.03.008)

**Girondot M, Laurin M. 2003**. Bone Profiler: a tool to quantify, model, and statistically compare bone-section compactness profiles. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* **23**: 458-461.

**Hamilton WJ. 1932**. The food and feeding habits of some eastern salamanders. *Copeia* **1932**: 83-86. (doi:10.2307/1435891)

**Laloy F, Rage JC, Evans SE, Boistel R, Lenoir N, Laurin M. 2013**. A Re-Interpretation of the Eocene Anuran *Thaumastosaurus* Based on MicroCT Examination of a 'Mummified' Specimen. *PLoS One* **8**: e74874. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0074874)

**Laurin M, Canoville A, Quilhac A. 2009**. Use of paleontological and molecular data in supertrees for comparative studies: the example of lissamphibian femoral microanatomy. *J Anat* **215**: 110–123. (doi:10.1111/j.1469-7580.2009.01104.x)

290 **Legendre S, Sigé B, Astruc JG, Bonis L, Crochet JY, Denys C, Godinot M, Hartenberger**
291 **JL, Lévêque F, Marandat B, Mourer-Chauviré C, Rage JC, Rémy JA, Sudre J, Vianey-**
292 **Liaud M. 1997**. Les phosphorites du Quercy: 30 ans de recherche. Bilan et perspectives.
293 *Geobios* **30**: 331–345. (doi:10.1016/s0016-6995(97)80038-1)

294 **Matzke-Karasz R, Neil JV, Smith RJ, Symonová R, Mořkovský L, Archer M, Hand SJ,**
295 **Cloetens P, Tafforeau P. 2014**. Subcellular preservation in giant ostracod sperm from an early
296 Miocene cave deposit in Australia. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B* **281**:
297 20140394. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2014.0394)

298 **McNamara ME, Orr PJ, Kearns SL, Alcala L, Anadon P, Peñalver-Mollá E. 2010.**
299 Exceptionally preserved tadpoles from the Miocene of Libros, Spain: ecomorphological
300 reconstruction and the impact of ontogeny upon taphonomy. *Lethaia* **43**: 290-306. (doi:
301 10.1111/j.1502-3931.2009.00192.x)

302 **Montaña CG, Ceneviva-Bastos M, Schalk CM. 2014**. New vertebrate prey for the aquatic
303 salamander *Amphiuma means* (Caudata: Amphiumidae). *Herpetology Notes* **7**: 755-756.

304 **Pélissié T, Sigé B. 2006**. 30 millions d'années de biodiversité dynamique dans le paléokarst du
305 Quercy. *Strata* **13**: 3-284.

306 **Piñeiro G, Ramos A, Goso C, Scarabino FS, Laurin M. 2012**. Unusual environmental
307 conditions preserve a Permian mesosaur-bearing Konservat-Lagerstätte from Uruguay. *Acta*
308 *Palaeontologica Polonica* **57**: 299-318. (doi:10.4202/app.2010.0113)

309 **Rage JC. 1984**. Are the Ranidae (Anura, Amphibia) known prior to the Oligocene? *Amphibia-*
310 *Reptilia* **5**: 281-288.

311 **Rage JC. 2006.** The lower vertebrates from the Eocene and Oligocene of the Phosphorites du
312 Quercy (France): An overview. *Strata* **13:** 161-173.

313 **Rage JC. 2016**. Frogs (Amphibia, Anura) from the Eocene and Oligocene of the Phosphorites du
314 Quercy (France). An overview. *Fossil Imprint* **72***:* 53-66. (doi:10.14446/FI.2016.53)

315 **Schwermann AH, dos Santos Rolo T, Caterino MS, Bechly G, Schmied H, Baumbach T,**
316 **van de Kamp T. 2016a**. Preservation of three-dimensional anatomy in phosphatized fossil
317 arthropods enriches evolutionary inference. *eLife* **5**: e12129. (doi:10.7554/eLife.12129)

318 **Schwermann AH, Wuttke M, dos Santos Rolo T, Caterino MS, Bechly G, Schmied H,**
319 **Baumbach T, van de Kamp T. 2016b**. The Fossil Insects of the Quercy Region: A Historical
320 Review. *Entomologie heute* **28**: 127-142.

321 **Sever DM. 1981.** Cloacal anatomy of male salamanders in the families Ambystomatidae,
322 Salamandridae, and Plethodontidae. *Herpetologica* **37**: 142-155.

323 **Sever DM. 1992**. Comparative anatomy and phylogeny of the cloacae of salamanders
324 (Amphibia: Caudata). IV. Salamandridae. *The Anatomical Record* **233**: 229-244.
325 (doi:10.1002/ar.1092330206)

326    **Shahack-Gross R, Berna F, Karkanas P, Weiner S. 2004**. Bat guano and preservation of
327    archaeological remains in cave sites. *Journal of Archeological Science* **31**: 1259-1272.
328    (doi:10.1016/j.jas.2004.02.004)

329    **Sigé B, Hugueney M. 2006**. Les micromammifères des gisements à phosphate du Quercy (SW
330    France). *Strata* **13**: 207-227.

331    **Skutschas PP. 2009**. Re-Evaluation of *Mynbulakia* (Lissamphibia: Caudata) and Description of
332    a New Salamander Genus from the Late Cretaceous of Uzbekistan. *Journal of Vertebrate*
333    *Paleontol*ogy **29**: 659–664. (doi:10.1671/039.029.0326)

334    **Skutschas PP, Baleeva N V. 2012**. The spinal cord supports of vertebrae in the crown-group
335    salamanders (Caudata, Urodela). *Journal of Morphology* **273**: 1031–1041.
336    (doi:10.1002/jmor.20041)

337    **Tissier J, Rage J-C, Boistel R, Fernandez V, Pollet N, Garcia G, Laurin, M. 2015**.
338    Synchrotron analysis of a 'mummified' salamander (Vertebrata: Caudata) from the Eocene of
339    Quercy, France. *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* **177**: 147-164.
340    (doi:10.1111/zoj.12341)

341    **Trinajstic K, Marshall C, Long J, Bifield K. 2007**. Exceptional preservation of nerve and
342    muscle tissues in Late Devonian placoderm fish and their evolutionary implications. *Biology*
343    *Letters* **3**: 197-200. (doi:10.1098/rsbl.2006.0604)

344    **Wake DB, Lawson R. 1973**. Developmental and adult morphology of the vertebral column in
345    the plethodontid salamander *Eurycea bislineata*, with comments on vertebral evolution in the
346    amphibia. *Journal of Morphology* **139**: 251-299. (doi:10.1002/jmor.1051390302)

347    **Wilson P, Parry LA, Winther J, Edgecombe GD. 2016**. Unveiling biases in soft-tissue
348    phosphatization: extensive preservation of musculature in the Cretaceous (Cenomanian)
349    polychaete *Rollinschaeta myoplena* (Annelida: Amphinomidae). *Palaeontology* **59**: 463-479.
350    (doi:10.1111/pala.12237)

351    **Wischnitzer S. 1979**. *Atlas and dissection guide for comparative anatomy, Third Edition*. San
352    Francisco: W.H. Freeman and Co.

# Figure 1

Specimen MNHN.F.QU17755, holotype of *Phosphotriton sigei*.

(A and B) Fossil in dorsal and ventral views. Some characteristics of urodeles, such as costal grooves or scaleless skin, are observable on the external aspect of the specimen. The cloaca and vertebral column are visible. The dotted line represents the position of the tomogram illustrated in Fig. 1C.

(C) Tomogram of the tail part of the animal showing the muscles, in green, ventral and lateral to the vertebrae, and the spinal cord preserved inside the neural canal of a vertebra. Bony material is characterized by a dark grey shade, because of its light density, compared to the mineral matrix (grey or white) and void (black). Soft-tissues are also mostly darker than the mineral matrix, but are mainly recognizable by their structure and shape, on tomograms or in 3D.

(D) 3D reconstruction of undetermined tail muscles, in green, which could attach to the ischium or femur. Dotted line represents the position of the tomogram illustrated in Fig. 1C.

# Figure 2

Tomogram of the trunk portion of the specimen MNHN.F.QU17755.

Spinal cord is in blue, within the neural canal of a trunk vertebra (in yellow).

# Figure 3

Exceptional preservation of nerves, digestive tract and stomachal content.

(A and B) 3D reconstructions of the pelvic section of MNHN.F.QU17755, in laterodorsal (A) and ventral (B) views. The lumbosacral plexus (in blue) is partly preserved. Nerves exit the last trunk, the sacral and the first caudosacral vertebrae through the spinal nerve foramina.

(C) Preserved bones of an anuran frog (ranoid?), in green, inside the digestive tract (not shown, to better reveal its content; see Fig. 3F) of MNHN.F.QU17755.

(D) Anuran humerus found inside digestive tract of MNHN.F.QU17755, in lateral and ventral views.

(E) Anuran vertebrae found inside digestive tract of MNHN.F.QU17755. The centrum is very thin; the holes may represent segmentation artifacts.

(F) 3D reconstruction of MNHN.F.QU17755 in ventral view, showing the nearly complete digestive tract. The caudal end is very close to the cloaca, and is bordered near the pelvic girdle by presumed dorsal cloacal glands (see Fig. 4A). The dotted line represents the position of the virtual section illustrated in Fig. 3G.

(G) Virtual section of the trunk, showing the digestive tract (in yellow) and its content (frog bones).

Spinal nerve
foramen

Sacral vertebra

2 mm

A

Right
femur

Left
femur

B

2 mm

2 mm

C

D

E

2 mm

Gut

Dorsal cloacal
gland?

Cloaca

Left femur

F

2 mm

dorsal

right

G

2 mm

# Figure 4

Exceptional preservation of cloacal glands (?) and lung.

(A) 3D reconstruction of supposed dorsal and ventral cloacal glands, in ventral view, under the two ischia (not shown). The dorsal cloacal glands are located between the first and second caudosacral vertebrae and the digestive tract (see Fig. 4B). The ventral cloacal glands are located under the digestive tract and anterodorsal to the cloaca. The dotted line represents the position of the virtual section illustrated in Fig. 4B.

(B) Virtual section of the pelvic girdle, illustrating the digestive tract and the dorsal cloacal glands, between a caudal vertebra and the two ischia.

(C) 3D reconstruction of the incomplete lung (in blue), inside the specimen MNHN.F.QU17755, in oblique anterior view. It is located lateroventrally to the trunk vertebrae, in the anteriormost preserved part of the fossil. The dotted line represents the position of the tomogram illustrated in Fig. 4D.

(D) Virtual section of the anteriormost preserved part of MNHN.F.QU17755, showing the inside of the lung in lateral view.

A

Right femur

Sacral rib

2.5 mm

**Digestive tract**

**Dorsal cloacal glands (?)**

**Ventral cloacal glands (?)**

**Cloaca**

B

dorsal
right

2.5 mm

C

Left femur

Left ribs

Vertebra

Lung

2.5 mm

D

dorsal
anterior

2.5 mm