



HAL
open science

Anguimorph lizards from the lower Eocene (MP 10–11) of the Cos locality, Phosphorites du Quercy, France, and the early evolution of Glyptosaurinae in Europe

Andrej Čerňanský, Rodolphe Tabuce, Dominique Vidalenc

► To cite this version:

Andrej Čerňanský, Rodolphe Tabuce, Dominique Vidalenc. Anguimorph lizards from the lower Eocene (MP 10–11) of the Cos locality, Phosphorites du Quercy, France, and the early evolution of Glyptosaurinae in Europe. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology*, 2023, 42 (5), 10.1080/02724634.2023.2211646 . hal-04295642

HAL Id: hal-04295642

<https://hal.umontpellier.fr/hal-04295642v1>

Submitted on 23 Nov 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 ARTICLE

2 Anguimorph lizards from the early Eocene (MP 10–11) of the Cos locality, Phosphorites du
3 Quercy, France and the early evolution of Glyptosaurinae in Europe

4

5 ANDREJ ČERNANSKÝ¹*, RODOLPHE TABUCE², AND DOMINIQUE VIDALENC³

6

7 ¹Department of Ecology, Laboratory of Evolutionary Biology, Faculty of Natural Sciences,
8 Comenius University in Bratislava, Mlynská dolina, 84215, Bratislava, Slovakia,
9 cernansky.paleontology@gmail.com;

10 ²ISEM, Université de Montpellier, CNRS, IRD, EPHE, Cc 064, Place Eugène Bataillon,
11 34095 Montpellier Cedex 5, France;

12 ³103 Avenue François Mitterrand, 31800 Saint-Gaudens, France

13

14 *corresponding author: Andrej Čerňanský, cernansky.paleontology@gmail.com

15

16 ABSTRACT— Squamate faunas from the early Eocene of Europe are rare. A newly
17 discovered early Eocene (MP 10–11) Cos locality in southwestern France has yielded an
18 assemblage of anguimorph lizards that sheds light on the early evolution of this group.
19 Among them is a new glyptosaurine lizard *Sullivania gallica* gen. et sp. nov., based on frontal
20 material with a unique pattern and distribution of polygonal osteoderms that is distinct from
21 that of the middle and late Eocene *Placosaurus* from France. It slightly resembles the
22 stratigraphically older glyptosaurine *Gaultia silvaticus* from the earliest Eocene of North

23 America, but differs from it in several aspects. Although fossils of some members of
24 Glyptosaurinae (sensu this paper; Glyptosaurini in previous taxonomies – Glyptosaurinae is
25 returned to the family level originally proposed by Marsh) have been documented rarely from
26 the middle and mainly from the late Eocene of Europe, they are virtually unknown from the
27 early Eocene. One isolated osteoderm is referred only to *Anguioidea* indet. This specimen
28 resembles osteoderms seen in *Anguinae*, provided that the absence of tuberclulate
29 ornamentation is not caused by abrasion.

30 Varanoids are represented by an isolated frontal referred to *Palaeovaranidae* indet. It
31 possesses a complex ornamentation composed of mounds on the dorsal surface. A maxilla is
32 identified as an indeterminate varanoid based on the plicidentine infolding along the bases of
33 the preserved teeth.

34 Although incomplete, this Cos lizard assemblage is an important and rare discovery
35 that provides a glimpse into the ecosystems and paleobiodiversity of the early Eocene in
36 western Europe.

37

38 LSID urn:lsid:zoobank.org:pub:5C6376A3-CC26-4CF1-BE56-E7279D508D5D

39

40

INTRODUCTION

41 The Cos fissure fill was the first “phosphatière” discovered in the Quercy by J. A.
42 Poumarède in 1865 (Pulou, 1980), but one of us (DV) discovered vertebrate fossils in this
43 locality only more recently. Cos constitutes the seventh pre-upper Eocene locality of
44 Phosphorites du Quercy [for others see Astruc et al. (2003): Pasturat (MP 8+9), Viélase and
45 Cazals (both MP 10–11), Cuzal, Parnac and Grélaou (all MP 13)]. Based on the studies of the
46 primates (Godinot et al., 2021) and rodents (Vianey-Liaud et al., 2022), the vertebrate fauna of
47 the Cos site has been dated as MP 10–11, a zone that spans the late Ypresian and early Lutetian.

48 Thus, it corresponds to the Early Eocene Climatic Optimum (EECO; see Inglis et al., 2020),
49 which is dated as 53.3 to 49.1 Ma. EECO was a time of major climatic and environmental
50 change caused by perturbations to the global carbon cycle (Hyland et al., 2017). This makes the
51 Cos locality particularly important because the early Eocene terrestrial fossil record in Europe
52 is poorly known.

53 There have been only a few early Eocene sites where assemblages of amphibians and
54 reptiles have been described. These include: Dormaal (MP 7) in Belgium (Augé, 1990, 1992;
55 Augé & Smith, 1997, 2002; Augé et al., 2022; Čerňanský et al., 2022; Folie et al., 2013;
56 Hecht & Hoffstetter, 1962; Sullivan et al., 2012); Silveirinha (~MP 7) in Portugal (Rage &
57 Augé, 2003); the early Eocene of (different localities in) Catalonia, Spain (Bolet, 2017); and
58 some localities in France, notably Prémontré (~MP 10; Augé, 2003, 2005; Augé et al., 1997),
59 Mutigny (MP 8–9; Čerňanský et al., 2020; Augé et al., 2022) and La Borie (MP 8–9) (Laurent
60 et al., 2010). There are also some other famous early Eocene localities, which yielded snakes,
61 turtles, and crocodiles, such as Monte Bolca, Italy (Seghetti et al., 2022) and the English
62 localities in Isle of Sheppey, Bracklesham, and Kingston (Owen, 1841, 1850; Georgalis &
63 Joyce, 2017; Smith & Georgalis, 2022). In contrast, such assemblages are relatively well-
64 known for the middle and late Eocene in Europe, in part thanks to exceptional localities such
65 as Geiseltal and Messel in Germany (Čerňanský & Smith, 2018, 2019 Keller, 2009; Smith et
66 al., 2018; Sullivan et al., 1999; Villa et al., 2022) and in some of the localities of Phosphorites
67 du Quercy in France (Augé, 2005; Čerňanský et al., 2015; Georgalis et al., 2021). Here we
68 report on the fossil anguimorph lizards from the newly discovered Cos locality, on the
69 southern Quercy limestone plateau, southern France.

70 Modern Anguimorpha includes Anguidae, Diploglossidae, Xenosauridae,
71 Helodermatidae, Lanthanotidae, Varanidae and Shinisauridae. Anguidae represent a
72 diversified and widely distributed group of reptiles of which Anguinae is the most derived

73 clade (Augé, 2005; Uetz et al., 2023). Although there have been recent alterations to
74 phylogenetical conceptions that have been stable for decades (e.g., Burbrink et al., 2020;
75 Pyron et al., 2013) and the position of Diploglossidae is still debated (as a subclade of
76 Anguinae, Conrad 2008; Gauthier et al., 2012; Pyron et al., 2013; as a distinct clade outside of
77 Anguinae, Burbrink et al., 2020; Zheng & Wiens, 2016), aside from Anguinae three other
78 extant clades were traditionally included in Anguinae. These are Gerrhonotinae, Anniellinae,
79 and the extinct Glyptosaurinae (sensu McDowell & Bogert, 1954; see Gauthier et al., 2012;
80 Georgalis et al., 2021; Sullivan, 1979, 2019; note, however, that if Diploglossidae is treated at
81 the family level, then Glyptosaurinae must also be returned to the family level originally
82 proposed by Marsh, 1872, as members of this clade are much morphologically distinct
83 compared to Anguinae, see below). Glyptosaurinae (sensu McDowell & Bogert, 1954)
84 inhabited North America, Europe, and Asia and are known from the Cretaceous to the late
85 Paleogene-Oligocene (Čerňanský and Augé, 2019; Conrad & Norell, 2008; Keller, 2009;
86 Sullivan, 1979, 2019). This clade was traditionally divided into the tribes Glyptosaurini and
87 the paraphyletic “Melanosaurini” (Cicimurri et al., 2016; Estes, 1983; Sullivan, 1979, 2019).
88 Among the former, *Placosaurus* Gervais, 1848–1852 is the only known member of the tribe
89 in Europe (see Sullivan, 2019; Sullivan & Augé, 2006; Sullivan et al., 2012). It is represented
90 by two currently valid species from the late Eocene of France (only the two species are
91 definitely members of the genus, whereas the others are only questionably referred to
92 *Placosaurus*), type of which are cranial remains. This is very low diversity compared to the
93 North American glyptosaurine genera such as *Glyptosaurus* Marsh, 1871, *Paraglyptosaurus*
94 Sullivan, 1979, *Helodermoides* Douglass, 1903 and *Gaultia* Smith, 2009 (Smith, 2009, 2011;
95 Sullivan, 1979). Moreover, although members of the clade were well documented from the
96 early Eocene in North America, glyptosaurines are largely unknown for most of the early and
97 middle Eocene of Europe (Sullivan, 2019). In the early Eocene of Europe, the glyptosaurine

98 taxon ?*Placosaurus ragei* Sullivan, Augé, Wille & Smith, 2012 and *Placosauriops*-like
99 “melanosaurine” are known from Dormaal (MP 7). The Dormaal glyptosaurine ?*Placosaurus*
100 *ragei* is known based on the holotype dentary and a referred parietal. However, the current
101 taxonomy of species of *Placosaurus* is based on the morphology of the frontal (Sullivan &
102 Augé, 2006), so its generic assignment is questionable (Sullivan et al., 2012). Indeterminate
103 material (frontal and parietal) of glyptosaurines is also described from Silveirinha (~MP 7;
104 Rage & Augé, 2003). In Asia, *Stenoplacosaurus mongoliensis* (Sullivan, 1979) was described
105 from the middle Eocene of Mongolia (Sullivan & Dong, 2018; *Helodermoides mongoliensis*
106 in Sullivan 1979; *Placosaurus mongoliensis* in Sullivan and Augé, 2006). This taxon is also
107 based on the frontal morphology. Additionally, several isolated osteoderms of glyptosaurines,
108 plausibly belonging to this early Eocene lineage, were described from the early Oligocene of
109 Mongolia (Čerňanský & Augé, 2019). Thus, Glyptosaurinae has a continuous history in Asia
110 at least until the Oligocene, although disappeared in Europe at the Eocene–Oligocene
111 boundary (Rage, 2013). However, their early history in Europe remains largely unknown. All
112 the specimens in this study are from the Cos fissure fill, Phosphorites du Quercy, 2.5 km
113 southwest of Caylus, France.

114

115 **Institutional Abbreviations**— AMNH, American Museum of Natural History, New York;
116 MNHN, Museum National d’Histoire Naturelle, Paris; UCMP, University of California
117 Museum of Paleontology, Berkeley, USA; UM-COS, Université de Montpellier, France, Cos
118 collection.

119

120

MATERIAL AND METHODS

121

122 **Specimens examined and terminology**

123 The studied material is housed at the University of Montpellier, cataloged under
124 individual UM-COS-numbers. The standard anatomical orientation system is used throughout
125 this paper, and terminology describing individual bone structures is based on Rage & Augé
126 (2010).

127

128 **X-ray Microtomography, Three-Dimensional Visualization, Photography and** 129 **Reconstruction**

130 The fossil specimens were imaged on micro-computed tomography (CT) at the micro-
131 CT facility, Slovak Academy of Sciences in Banská Bystrica, Slovakia, using a Phoenix mikro-
132 CTv|tome|x L240. The settings were as follows: VxSize = 0.01999999; Current = 150; Voltage
133 = 130; Inttime = 20000; Average = 2; Steps = 1600; Steps360 = 2200; Filter = 0.1 mm Cu. The
134 images were recorded over 360°. The CT data sets were analysed using VG Studio Max 3.1.
135 and Avizo 8.1. The photographs of the UM-COS-1011 maxilla were taken with a Leica M205
136 C binocular microscope with an axially mounted DFC 290 HD camera; software: LAS (Leica
137 Application Suite) 4.1.0 (build 1264). The image processing program ImageJ (Schneider et al.,
138 2012) was used for measurements. For frontal reconstruction, the missing areas were restored
139 by mirror imaging of the holotype and paratype, and estimation of the posterior portion is based
140 on the preserved paratype. The holotype (UCMP 216000) and paratype (UCMP 150966) of
141 *Gaultia silvaticus* were drawn from photographs published by Smith (2009: fig. 18). The
142 holotype of *Stenoplacosaurus mongoliensis* (AMNH 6669 left frontal) was drawn based on
143 photographs published by Sullivan & Dong (2018: fig. 1).

144

145 **Geological Setting and Associated Fauna**

146 Located in the southern part of the ‘Causses du Quercy’ plateau, the fissure fills of Cos
147 lie within the Middle Jurassic (late Bajocian/Bathonian) marine limestones of the Cajarc

148 Formation (44°13'11.20"N, 1°44'58.21"E; Fig. 1). The site is a northwest-southeast trending
149 large excavation (~80 m x 50 m), with the phosphate ore deposits nearly depleted. Positioned
150 at the eastern end of the excavation, the fossiliferous fissure-fill at Cos is unlike those found in
151 other localities of the Phosphorites du Quercy in that the strata that contain the fossiliferous unit
152 are composed of small beds of granular and porous stratified limestones, alternating with red
153 clays containing small pisolites. There are still uncertainties about geometric and stratigraphic
154 relationships between the limestones and the interbedded red clays. There are few scattered
155 vertebrate fossils through the entire section. The fauna recovered includes amphibians,
156 squamates, crocodylians, birds, and more than twenty mammal species among which only
157 primates and rodents have been studied (Godinot et al., 2021; Vianey-Liaud et al., 2022). All
158 of the specimens described herein are from the Cos fissure fill of the Phosphorites du Quercy
159 region and are early Eocene (MP 10–11 interval) in age.

160

161 SYSTEMATIC PALEONTOLOGY

162

163 **Taxonomic note**—If most clades previously considered subfamilies of Anguinae sensu
164 Camp, 1923 – viz., Anguinae, Anniellinae and Diplglossinae – are now considered taxa at the
165 family level, and there is no evidence that glyptosauroids are part of any of those radiations, then
166 Glyptosaurinae sensu McDowell & Bogert, 1954 must also be returned to the family level
167 originally proposed by Marsh (1872). Accordingly, we consider Glyptosauridae Marsh, 1872
168 to contain the subfamilies Melanosaurinae Sullivan, 1979, which is paraphyletic, and
169 Glyptosaurinae Marsh, 1872, which correspond to the tribes Melanosaurini and Glyptosaurini
170 of Sullivan (1979). The name “Placosauridae” (e.g., Cope, 1877; Kuhn, 1940) is a junior
171 synonym of Glyptosauridae (Estes, 1983; McDowell & Bogert, 1954), so it does not affect
172 our new status.

173

174

SQUAMATA Opper, 1811

175

ANGUIMORPHA Fürbringer, 1900

176

ANGUIOIDEA Gray, 1825

177

GLYPTOSAURIDAE Marsh, 1872 (emended status)

178

GLYPTOSAURINAE Marsh, 1872 (sensu this paper)

179

SULLIVANIA gen. nov.

180

181

Type species— *Sullivania gallica* sp. nov.

182

Etymology—The genus is named in recognition of the American paleontologist

183

Robert M. Sullivan for his valuable contributions to glyptosaurine morphology,

184

paleobiogeography, and paleobiodiversity.

185

Diagnosis—As for *Sullivania gallica* sp. nov., the only known species.

186

187

Sullivania gallica sp. nov.

188

(Figs. 2, 3, 4A)

189

190

Etymology— The specific epithet *gallica* is based the Latin “gallicus” in reference to

191

the country of France, where the fossils were found.

192

193

Holotype— UM-COS-1001, greater anterior portion of fused frontals.

194

Paratypes— UM-COS-1000, incomplete right frontal; and UM-COS-1003, posterior

195

region of the right frontal.

196

Differential Diagnosis— Glyptosaurine differing from all other Glyptosauridae in

197

having unique pattern of irregular cephalic osteoderms covering the frontal where the first two

198 anterior central osteoderms straddle the midline, and are coalesced or fused, narrow,
199 anteroposteriorly elongate, leaf-shaped, reaching only slightly further anteriorly than the
200 much larger, anteroposteriorly elongated lateral osteoderm with rounded lateral margin. This
201 is in a sharp contrast to several wide, chevron-shaped osteoderms in *Gaultia* (in *Sullivania*,
202 only the second lateral left and right osteoderms appear expanded medially, having contact in
203 the mid-line) and high and regular division of dermal armor into discrete hexagonal
204 osteoderms in *Placosaurus*, *Stenoplacosaurus*, *Glyptosaurus*, *Paraglyptosaurus*,
205 *Helodermoides*, and *Eoglyptosaurus*. It is further distinguished from all other glyptosaurines
206 by the following combination of features of the frontal: (1) osteoderms are apically flat, as
207 *Gaultia*, not thick as in *Placosaurus*, and not inflated (or bulbous) as in *Glyptosaurus*,
208 *Eoglyptosaurus*, *Helodermoides* and *Stenoplacosaurus*; (2) generally rather fewer osteoderms
209 contra numerous in *Placosaurus* (especially *Placosaurus estesi*), *Glyptosaurus*,
210 *Eoglyptosaurus* and *Helodermoides*; (3) concave lateral margins unlike in the North American
211 *Helodermoides*; (4) posterolateral process not distinctly laterally expanded and expansion
212 includes only the posterior 1/3 of the bone, unlike in *Placosaurus estesi* and
213 *Stenoplacosaurus*, in which the lateral expansion starts at the posterior 2/3 of the bone; and
214 (5) frontals fused only in the late ontogeny (fusion is present only in the larger, robust
215 specimen). In *Stenoplacosaurus*, the frontals are unfused.

216 **Type locality and horizon**—Cos, fissure fill in the Quercy region (southwestern France);
217 early Eocene (MP 10–11 interval); the species is so far known exclusively from the type
218 locality.

219 **Description**

220 **Frontal**—The holotype (UM-COS 1001, Fig. 2) represents fused right and left
221 frontals (although traces of fusion are still recognizable). Its lateral margin is slightly concave
222 and gradually widens posteriorly. The dorsal area surrounding the mid-orbital margin slopes

223 slightly toward the orbit. The posterior portion of the bone is missing due to breakage. Thus,
224 only the anterior and mid-portions are preserved. The maximum width of the preserved
225 frontal is 11.7 mm. The element is more robust than UM-COS-1000 and is inferred to be from
226 a larger (older) individual. The external surface is largely covered by ornamented osteodermal
227 shields of various irregular, polygonal to roughly ovoid outline. They are completely fused to
228 the underlying bone and are separated one from another by sulci (note, however, that it is not
229 clear whether the osteodermal boundaries coincide with the epidermal scale boundaries). The
230 ornamentation is formed by small rounded discrete tubercles that are regularly and densely
231 arranged. The exception is in its anterior section, where a broad semi-elliptical smooth surface
232 is located. It forms the articular facet for nasal (which is preserved on the right side). Here, the
233 bone expands into a prominent, pointed anteromedial (nasal) process. The process is
234 triangular. The anterolateral process is only partly preserved on the right side, but this
235 preserved portion extends much less anteriorly than the anteromedial one. Posterior to this,
236 three osteodermal shields are present. The first one is an anterior central shield. Here, the left
237 and right frontal are fused along the mid-line. Thus, the first two anterior osteoderms straddle
238 the midline and are coalesced or fused into the one. The first central shield is narrow,
239 anteroposteriorly elongate and more or less leaf-shaped. It extends only slightly more
240 anteriorly than the lateral shields. The lateral osteodermal shields are large, much larger than
241 the central one (completely preserved on the right side). The medial margin of the lateral
242 shields is V-shaped, whereas the lateral margin is rounded. The medial peak of V-shaped
243 medial margin indicates a mediolateral short sulcus, where the first anterior central shield
244 ends. Posterior to the sulcus in the midline, there is a second central shield. The more
245 posterior region bears several cracks and thus, it is difficult to properly identified the original
246 borders of the osteodermal shields (Fig. 2A, B). However, it appears that the both second
247 lateral shields are medially expanded (best visible on the left side). The left and right shields

248 seem to have a short medial contact. If this is the case, these second lateral osteoderms are
249 mediolaterally wide rather than anteroposteriorly long (in contrast to the first lateral shield).
250 In this case, the second central osteodermal shield has truncated appearance of the posterior
251 portion due to this contact and thus, being trapezoidal in shape.

252 In ventral view, a large and robust frontal cranial crest (*crista cranii frontalis*) is
253 visible. Its anterior portion is expanded forming a well-defined and rounded prefrontal
254 (=subolfactory) process. It is, however, only partly preserved (its end is damaged; Fig. 2C).
255 The anteromedial margin of this crest is thin and sharp. Posteriorly, it widens, gradually
256 diminishing dorsally. The anterior portion of the frontal crest, anterior to the subolfactory
257 process, is less deep, forming a sharp, medially directed ridge. The right and left branches join
258 together in the anterior mid-line, forming a sharp angle. Note, however, that there is the
259 matrix that is still adhering to the ventral side of the frontal between the anterior portions of
260 the left and right frontal cranial crests. It obscures much of the medial ventral surface of the
261 frontal. In the anterior region, lateral to the frontal crest (including its lateral surface), a large
262 facet for the prefrontal is located (the right one is preserved; Fig. 2D). Prefrontal and
263 postfrontal are not in a contact, and did not exclude the frontal from the orbital border.

264 **UM-COS-1000 and UM-COS-1003 (paratypes)**—UM-COS-1000 (Fig. 3A-F) is a
265 nearly complete right frontal, with only the anterior end broken. The maximum
266 anteroposterior length of this incompletely preserved element is 15 mm. It is robust, although
267 less than the holotype. UM-COS-1003 (Fig. 3G, H) represents the posterior portion of the
268 right frontal and this specimen is much more robust than the UM-COS-1000. The
269 posterolateral section of UM-COS-1000 protrudes into a short, but robust, posterolateral
270 process (the expansion starts in the posterior 1/3 of the bone). Here, the bone is widest – the
271 maximum mediolateral width of this part of the bone is 9.1 mm. Further anteriorly, the frontal
272 narrows and the lateral margins are slightly concave. Thus, the bone appears to be narrowest

273 at about mid-orbit (the minimum width of the single right frontal in this area is 5.9 mm). The
274 external surfaces of both specimens are almost completely covered by tuberculated
275 osteoderms of various irregular, polygonal (rhomboidal, hexagonal) to roughly ovoid outlines.
276 The osteoderms are completely fused to the frontal and separated one from another by sulci.
277 The ornamentation is formed by small rounded discrete tubercles that are regularly and
278 densely arranged. The osteodermal shields on the posterior portion in UM-COS-1000, close to
279 the more or less straight contact with the parietal, are weakly ornamented. Only few tubercles
280 are present in this section on an otherwise smooth surface; however, the dorsal surface in this
281 region seems to be slightly eroded. The posterolateral corner is smooth, although it appears
282 that some partial covering was originally here but now is lost. The evidence of this is that a
283 partly preserved medial margin of the shield still has several tubercles. Thus, the posterior
284 portion of the right frontal possessed four osteodermal shields arranged in a mediolateral row.
285 Thus, the frontal is relatively broad. These osteoderms are anteroposteriorly long, roughly
286 trapezoidal except for the third one (Fig. 3B), which has a triangular end due to hexagonal
287 shape of neighboring osteoderms in the second row. This second posterior row, located
288 anterior to the first one (at the level of the anterior beginning of the postfrontal facet),
289 possesses three osteoderms. They differ in shape from those forming the first posterior row,
290 being polygonal (roughly hexagonal). The same condition is present in UM-COS-1003,
291 although the ornamentation is strongly developed here. In the mid-region of UM-COS-1000,
292 there is a shallow light groove close to the orbital margin. This groove extends almost parallel
293 to this margin (Fig. 3B).

294 In ventral view, a frontal cranial crest can be observed in both specimens. Posteriorly,
295 it widens, gradually diminishing dorsally. On the lateral side of the crest, a foramen is visible.
296 The crest fades out at the beginning of the posterolateral process of the frontal (in both
297 paratypes) and does not continue to the posterior end of the bone. Here, the large rugose facet

298 for the postfrontal is clearly visible laterally. In UM-COS-1003, the wedge-shaped facet for
299 parietal tab is visible dorsal to the frontoparietal suture. A facet for the prefrontal is preserved
300 only in UM-COS-1000. The prefrontal and postfrontal are not in a contact, and thus did not
301 exclude the frontal from the orbital border.

302 **Virtual microanatomy and histology**—The micro-CT scans of the frontals revealed
303 a bone structure with a very similar internal microanatomy in terms of a vascular network and
304 spongiosis (Fig. 2E, F; Fig. 3E, F). It revealed a large and complex meshwork of numerous
305 cavities. They are irregular, bubble-shaped, and some are interconnected. Thus, the bone
306 appears to be less compact in both axial and coronal sections. Note that the finer
307 histological details such as growth marks and cell lacunae of the bone are not visible.

308 **Remarks**— UM-COS-1001 is designated as the holotype because it is from a more
309 mature (adult) individual. The paratypes UM-COS-1000, the nearly complete right frontal,
310 and UM-COS-10003, the posterior part of the right frontal, are nearly identical, although UM-
311 COS-1003 is slightly more robust. UM-COS-1000 and UM-COS-10003 have the identical
312 arrangement of osteoderms where they overlap the holotype UM-COS-1001. They can add to
313 the diagnosis a unique character state for Glyptosaurinae - the osteoderms on the
314 posteriormost portion of the frontal are anteroposteriorly elongate and roughly trapezoidal.
315 Four osteoderms of equal size are arranged in a mediolateral row. The second posterior row
316 (located anterior to the first row) possesses three osteoderms, which are roughly hexagonal.
317 Although all frontals are incomplete, preservation of parts shared by all frontals permits for
318 reconstruction of the missing areas based on mirror imaging of the right and left elements
319 (UM-COS-1000). The anterior portion is reconstructed based on the UM-COS-1001 (Fig.
320 2A). The reconstructed image clearly shows that it is very different from the earliest Eocene
321 North American glyptosaurine *Gaultia*, the late Eocene European *Placosaurus* and the middle
322 Eocene Asian *Stenoplacosaurus* (Fig. 4).

323 With regard to the virtual microanatomy, microanatomical studies on fossil anguoids
324 (i.g., anguids) have previously been conducted. These published works deal with parietals of
325 *Ophisaurus holeci* (Georgalis & Scheyer, 2021), *Ophisaurus spinari* (Syromyatnikova et al.,
326 2022), and *Pseudopus pannonicus* (Loréal et al., 2023).

327

328 **Glyptosauridae indet.**

329 (Figs. 5, 6A-J)

330

331 **Referred Material**—UM-COS-1002, medial portion of left maxilla; UM-COS-1011,
332 posterior portion of right maxilla; UM-COS-1004 and 1005, cephalic osteoderms and UM-
333 COS-1006 and 1007, dorsal trunk osteoderms.

334

335 **Description**

336 **Maxilla**—Two incomplete maxillae were recovered (Fig. 5), representing much of the
337 posterior halves of the bone with the posterior ends broken on both specimens. The left
338 maxilla (UM-COS-1002, Fig. 5A-D) has seven tooth positions with four-and-a-half teeth
339 remaining in situ. The right maxilla (UM-COS-1011, Fig. 5E-H) has four posterior teeth and
340 two broken teeth. The nasal process of the maxilla is partly preserved in both specimens,
341 gradually decreasing in height posteriorly. Its external surface is ornamented with tubercles
342 and is best preserved in UM-COS-1011. The extent of this tuberculated surface is not well
343 delineated as the sulci are not recognizable (see Fig. 5A, E and remarks). The supralabial area,
344 below the ornamented field, is pierced by supralabial foramina (two are preserved in UM-
345 COS-1002 and one in 1011). In medial view, the supradental shelf is prominent. The shelf
346 slopes slightly posteroventrally from the level of the third preserved tooth position (counted
347 from posterior). The dorsal area of the shelf is concave, forming a longitudinal shallow

348 depression for articulation with the jugal. The shelf itself expands medially, and this
349 expansion (best preserved in UM-COS-1011) reaches its maximum at the level among third
350 and fifth tooth positions (counted from the posterior end). Here, the contact with the palatine
351 is present. UM-COS-1002 bears the posterior opening of the superior alveolar foramen (Fig.
352 5F, H). It is large, elliptical, and located at the level of the fifth tooth position (counted from
353 posterior).

354 **Dentition**—The tooth implantation is pleurodont. The teeth are heterodont with the
355 lingual sides of the teeth expanding medially and gradually increase in robustness posteriorly.
356 The apices of posterior three teeth are blunt, mesiodistally robust, and possess distinct, well-
357 defined, mesiodistally straight cutting edges. The lingual and labial surfaces of the tooth
358 apices are distinctly striated. The first preserved anterior tooth is less robust and labiolingually
359 compressed.

360 **Remarks**— The maxillae from the Cos site may belong to *Sullivania gallica*, but are
361 here considered Glyptosauridae indet. owing to lack of definitive characters that would allow
362 positive identification. The maxilla is similar to that of the late Eocene species
363 *Paraplacosauriops quercyi* in the lateral ornamentation of the surface of the nasal process of
364 maxilla and the presence of bulbous teeth (see Auge & Sullivan, 2006; Georgalis et al., 2021).
365 The ornamentation lacks discrete hexagonal/polygonal osteoderms that would clearly indicate
366 it was a glyptosaurine. Therefore, the maxilla may be from some unknown “melanosaurine”
367 similar to *Paraplacosauriops*.

368 **Osteoderms**—Four tuberculated osteoderms were recovered from the Cos site (Fig.
369 6A-J). Two are hexagonal/polygonal in shape (Fig. 6A-E) and two are rectangular/rhombic
370 (Fig. 6F-M). The former are from the skull and the latter are from the body. The tubercles are
371 prominent on the cephalic osteoderms and less so on the body osteoderms but this may be an
372 artifact of preservation. The keel and the smooth overlap surface are absent on the first type of

373 osteoderms. These osteoderms are also slightly thicker than the second (rectangular) type. The
374 internal surfaces of the cephalic osteoderms are pierced by numerous foramina along with
375 several grooves and ridges that extend anteroposterly. The rectangular body osteoderms (Fig.
376 6F-J) are distinguished by a prominent contact surface that is nearly one-third the
377 anteroposterior length. It is slightly higher than the posterior ornamented portion, from which
378 it is separated by a transverse groove. The latter is covered by discrete tubercles of various
379 sizes. A blunt, weak and slightly oblique keel is present midway along the posterior margin of
380 the osteoderm. The internal surface is pierced by three foramina located in the central region.

381 **Remarks**—Taxonomic assignment of isolated osteoderms below Glyptosauridae is
382 not possible (de Buffrénil et al., 2010; Estes, 1983; Gauthier et al., 2012; Rage, 1978;
383 Sullivan, 1979, 2019). Although differences in general shape and absence/presence of the
384 overlap surface clearly exist among these osteoderms, their positions on the body plays more
385 likely a major role in this case. Although it seems to be unlikely that these osteoderms belong
386 to a form for which no other elements have not been recorded in the locality, we do not
387 necessarily associate them with the frontals described above and identify them only as
388 Glyptosauridae indet. The hexagonal/polygonal osteoderms strongly suggest that they are
389 cranial. In the case of their cranial placement, they belong to Glyptosaurinae. However, the
390 fact that they may pertain to the cheek region of a “melanosaurine” cannot be ruled out. The
391 rectangular body (trunk) osteoderms could also be equally be attributed to a “melanosaurine.”

392

393

Anguioidea indet.

394

(Fig. 6K-M)

395

396

Referred Material —One isolated osteoderm UM-COS-1008

397

398 **Description**

399 **Osteoderm**— UM-COS-1008, a single isolated rectangular osteoderm (Fig. 6K-M) is
400 thin rather than thick (although slightly thicker than the body osteoderms described above),
401 with a low medial ridge (which is slightly more pronounced in the posterior section)
402 extending along the entire central region, being restricted to the sculptured region. The
403 anterior overlap surface is well defined. It occupies about one quarter of the external surface.
404 The lateral bevel is narrow and the lateral imbrication is weak but present. The posterior
405 portion of the external surface is weakly ornamented. The ornamentation is formed by pits
406 and hardly distinguishable ridges diverging from the central region – pits are transformed into
407 short grooves at the periphery. The internal surface is pierced by several foramina (at least
408 two of which are visible). Besides these, few short grooves are ridges are located on the
409 periphery in the mid-section of the osteoderm, but only on one side.

410 **Remarks**—The osteoderm UM-COS 1008 appears to differ from osteoderms of
411 Glyptosauridae described above by its shape, thickness, length of overlap surface, presence of
412 lateral bevel, and the apparent absence of typical discrete tubercles forming the external
413 ornamentation. This specimen resembles osteoderms present in members of Anguinae
414 (Čerňanský & Klembara, 2017; Estes, 1983; Georgalis et al., 2019; Hoffstetter, 1962;
415 Williams et al., 2022), provided that the absence of tubercululate ornamentation is not caused
416 by abrasion or corrosion. The osteoderm appears to be slightly water-worn. The fact that this
417 osteoderm is thicker might also support glyptosaurid affinity.

418

419 Varanoidea Gray, 1827 (sensu Estes et al., 1988).

420 Palaeovaranidae Georgalis, 2017

421 **Palaeovaranidae indet.**

422 (Fig. 7)

423

424 **Referred Material** — UM-COS-1009, nearly complete frontal.

425

426 **Description**

427 **Frontal**— The nearly complete frontal (Fig. 7) is an unpaired element, missing only
428 the anterior end and the left posterolateral corner. In the posterior section, the frontal bears
429 traces of the original midline suture on both ventral and dorsal surfaces (Fig. 7A, B). It is
430 narrow anteroposteriorly and flares outward posterolaterally on the right side. The frontal is
431 small, measuring only 4.6 mm along the mid-line, but was slightly longer in life as the
432 anterior portion is broken off. The lateral margin of the frontal is concave, with the narrowest
433 part anterior to the mid-orbit region. Although the anterior portion is missing, the frontal
434 widens anteriorly, based on the lateral flaring of the crista cranii frontalis on the ventral side
435 (Fig. 7B).

436 The dorsal surface of the frontal is ornamented with irregular small, distinct mounds.
437 Their structures are complex, having a shrunken (or rumped) appearance with several
438 longitudinal crests, whereas others are pointed, forming several small spike-like structures
439 (they are of high relief). The posterior margin, which contacts the parietal, is anteriorly
440 concave, giving it a slight irregular or wavy appearance in dorsal view (Fig. 7A, B).

441 On the ventral side, the frontal cranial crests are well-developed, forming a prominent
442 orbital rim. The cranial crests are slightly deeper ventrally in the anterior region where the
443 ventral margins are distinct. The crests extend to the posterolateral end of the frontal where
444 they are slightly wider and blunt. They are pierced by three foramina on each side. The left
445 lateral side preserves a wedge-shaped facet for the prefrontal at the anterior end (Fig. 7C). The
446 right lateral side bears a distinct facet at the posterior for the reception of the postfrontal
447 (Fig. 7D). These articular surfaces are separated by a large portion of the orbital margin.

448

449

Varanoidea indet.

450

(Fig. 8)

451

452

Referred Material—UM-COS-1010, greater portion of left maxilla.

453

454 **Description**

455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

470

471

472

Maxilla— The nearly complete left maxilla is preserved in matrix, with the lateral side visible (Fig. 8A). The anterior portion is broken. The preserved portion has a maximum anteroposterior length of 10.2 mm and a maximum height of 4.6 mm, measured from the ventral edge of the maxilla to the uppermost extent of the nasal process. The nasal process of the maxilla is rather thin and has a slightly concave smooth surface with a few fractures along the anterior half of the process due to crushing. The posterior margin of the nasal process slopes posteroventrally at an angle of 28° where it ends near a small slit at the level of the last preserved tooth. The external surface of the process is pierced by a series of four large supralabial foramina along the external labial margin of the tooth row. In addition, there are several smaller foramina located anterodorsally to the anteriormost preserved tooth. The maxilla bears five complete teeth and has positions for four others. Posterior to the last labial foramen, four tooth positions are present. The supradental shelf is relative thin, but widens anteriorly (Fig. 8B). It protrudes medially, reaching its maximum at the level between the fourth and fifth tooth position (counted from posterior) because of its contact with palatine. The posterior opening of the superior alveolar canal is large and located at the level of the sixth tooth position (counted from posterior). The medial surface of the preserved portion of nasal process of maxilla is smooth and no nasal crest on the dorsomedial surface can be observed; however, the dorsal portion of the maxilla is fractured.

473 **Dentition**—The dentition is subpleurodont (*sensu* Hoffstetter 1954, 1955), the maxilla
474 parapet is low, and the bases of the teeth are attached to a sloping, concave surface. The teeth
475 are pointed, tall, and recurved distally and slightly lingually. The mesial and distal cutting
476 edges are sharp. Serrations appear to be absent. Based on the CT images, the tooth bases are
477 mesiodistally broad and bear well preserved typical basal striae (*i.e.*, plicidentine; Fig. 8F),
478 which is typical for both Varanidae and Palaeowaranidae (Kearney & Rieppel, 2006;
479 Georgalis & Scheyer, 2019).

480

481

DISCUSSION

482

483 The Cos locality is as a unique window into the early Eocene "greenhouse world" in
484 Europe, providing a glimpse into the paleobiodiversity of anguimorphs during this geological
485 time. The anguimorphs from this locality include a new glyptosaurine, an indeterminate
486 anguroid (potentially an anguine but its glyptosaurid affinity cannot be ruled out), and
487 varanoids. Although the Cos lizard fauna is important for our understanding of the Eocene
488 ecosystems, many aspects can be fully resolved only by future systematic research and studies
489 of new material from Europe.

490

491 **Glyptosauridae**

492 The tuberculated cranial material and osteoderms from Cos present an autapomorphy of
493 glyptosaurids, *i.g.*, tuberculate ornamentation (Camp, 1923; Gilmore, 1928; Estes, 1983;
494 Gauthier *et al.*, 2012; Sullivan, 1979, 2019). Thus, this material clearly belongs to this clade. In
495 Glyptosaurinae (*sensu* this paper), subhexagonal (or polygonal) osteoderms are present on the
496 skull whereas they have rectangular osteoderms on the most of the dorsal and ventral portions
497 body (Sullivan, 1979). Members of the paraphyletic “Melanosaurinae“ (*sensu* this paper) are

498 characterized by irregular plate-like osteoderms that cover the skull roof (Sullivan, 1979, 2019).
499 Thus, isolated glyptosaurine frontals (and parietals) can be identified based on the presence of
500 hexagonal/polygonal tuberculate osteoderms covering the skull roof. For this reason, the Cos
501 frontal specimens clearly represents a member of Glyptosaurinae.

502 Until now the only glyptosaurine known from Europe has been *Placosaurus* from the
503 Eocene (Depéret, 1917; Gervais, 1848-52; Sullivan, 1979; Sullivan & Augé, 2006). Today, it
504 comprises four species: *Placosaurus rugosus* Gervais, 1848–1852, *Placosaurus estesi* Sullivan
505 & Augé, 2006, “*Placosaurus*” *europaeus* (Filhol, 1876; based on a dentary with teeth, so its
506 generic assignment is equivocal; Sullivan & Augé, 2006), and ?*Placosaurus ragei* Sullivan et
507 al., 2012 (based on a dentary and a referred parietal). Most finds are from the late Eocene
508 (except for ?*P. ragei*), while some are also known from the late middle Eocene (Lavergne and
509 Le Bretou, Quercy; Rage 1988 and Augé 2005, Sullivan & Augé, 2006). *Placosaurus* can be
510 distinguished from the North American glyptosaurine genera *Glyptosaurus*, *Paraglyptosaurus*,
511 *Proglyptosaurus*, and *Helodermoides* by the following combination of features on frontal
512 (Sullivan & Augé, 2006): (1) frontals are fused and (2) slightly arched; and (3) cephalic
513 osteoderms usually form one or two complete rows of hexagonal osteoderms over each orbit.
514 However, the Cos frontals have a unique distribution of skull osteoderms and therefore cannot
515 be referred to this taxon or any of the other taxa (Fig. 4).

516 **The early Eocene glyptosaurines compared to post-early Eocene glyptosaurines**
517 **in Europe**—All glyptosaurine frontals from Cos described here most likely belong to the
518 same taxon as they have the same flat osteoderm morphology and display similar distribution
519 pattern on the frontal where they correspond and are similar size. Moreover, they are
520 comparable in size and come from the same locality. These frontals are markedly different
521 from *Placosaurus* (Sullivan & Augé, 2006; see Diagnosis and descriptions here). For this
522 reason, we proposed a new genus and species for the Cos taxon, *Sullivania gallica*.

523 *Sullivania* cannot be compared with the stratigraphically older ?*Placosaurus ragei*,
524 from the earliest Eocene (MP 7) from Dormaal, because it is based on an isolated dentary and
525 a parietal. For this reason, Sullivan et al. (2012) questionably assigned it to *Placosaurus*. New
526 glyptosaurine lizard material from Dormaal, including a frontal that is different from both
527 *Placosaurus* and *Sullivania*, is currently under study of one of us (AČ).

528 The frontals described by Rage & Augé (2003:fig. 3A) from Silveirinha (~MP 7,
529 Portugal) as indeterminate “Glyptosaurini” (Glyptosaurinae sensu this paper) are also
530 different from *Sullivania* in the following features: (1) the dorsal surface is covered with
531 hexagonal osteoderms; (2) one osteoderm is located in the anterior central region, whereas
532 posterior large ones are arranged in two rows; and (3) the frontal is robust and fused, although
533 it is much smaller than the specimens from Cos (the minimum width of the paratypic right
534 frontal of *Sullivania* is 5.9 mm, whereas the width of the fused paired frontals from
535 Silveirinha is 4.5 mm).

536 **European *Sullivania* compared to North American *Gaultia***—The clade
537 Glyptosauridae first appears in the early Eocene of Europe (Rage, 2013; Sullivan, 2019). The
538 earliest European record of glyptosaurid lizards is from MP 7 at Silveirinha and Dormaal
539 (Rage and Augé, 2003; Sullivan, 2019; Sullivan et al., 2012). Thus, the presence of
540 glyptosaurids is another taxon between Europe and North America during the Eocene (e.g.,
541 the lizard *Saniwa*: Augé et al., 2022; the questionable iguanian *Tinosaurus*: Čerňanský et al.,
542 2023; the turtle *Axestemys*: Georgalis & Joyce, 2017; many other non-congeneric but related
543 taxa on both continents, notably charinaine snakes; Smith & Scanferla, 2021). These imply
544 faunal exchange between North America and Europe during the late Paleocene to early
545 Eocene. Several episodes of faunal exchange occurred between Europe and North America
546 before and after the Palaeocene–Eocene Thermal Maximum PETM, based on mammals
547 (DeBast & Smith, 2017; Smith & Smith, 2013; Solé et al., 2016), but known coeval Asian

548 fossil lizard record is too poor to draw any definite conclusions regarding faunal exchanges.
549 Interestingly, the frontal of *Sullivania gallica* from France resembles *Gaultia silvaticus* from
550 the earliest Eocene (biozone Wa-0, Willwood Formation) of Wyoming (Smith, 2009).

551 The holotype of *Gaultia silvaticus* is an incomplete fused frontal (although no
552 evidence of a suture is apparent on the ventral surface and most of the right half of the bone is
553 broken away, Smith, 2009: fig. 18D, Fig. 4B) diagnosed by: (1) apically flat osteodermal
554 shields covering the frontal and (2) different division of osteodermal cover relative to the
555 typical hexagonal one in other glyptosaurines. However, several differences are notable,
556 especially in the distribution of osteodermal shields and their shapes; in the anterior portion,
557 osteodermal shields are wide in *Gaultia*, mediolaterally elongated and chevron-shaped. They
558 form several lines, with two prominent rows of osteoderms extending along the mediolateral
559 width of the frontal. In contrast, most frontal osteoderms in *Sullivania* are anteroposteriorly
560 elongate rather than wide and, moreover, there is the presence of leaf-shaped first central
561 osteoderm. However, the second lateral left osteoderm crosses over the entire mediolateral
562 width of the frontal in *Sullivania*, having contact with the right one along the mid-line, similar
563 to that seen in *Gaultia*. The overall shape of these lateral osteoderms is different compared to
564 the shevron-shaped osteoderms in *Gaultia*; posteriorly, the osteodermal shields in *Gaultia* are
565 divided into convex polygons that are smaller than the chevrons. However, there is no
566 indication of the presence of anteroposteriorly elongated, roughly trapezoidal osteoderms in
567 the posterior region of both paratype frontals of *Sullivania*.

568 A close relationship between *Gaultia* and *Sullivania* than to *Placosaurus* and
569 *Glyptosaurus* cannot be ruled out. Assuming that they are closely related, *Sullivania* seems to
570 retain some characteristics from its North American ancestor. It worth noting that half of the
571 mammal taxa from the early Eocene of North America are closely related to the mammalian
572 taxa known from Dormaal (Gingerich & Smith, 2006). The breakup of plate-like osteoderms

573 into smaller polygonal/hexagonal osteoderms on the skull roof is likely a derived feature
574 among glyptosaurines, in contrast to plesiomorphic type of the large dermal plates covering
575 the skull roof (Sullivan, 1979). The Late Cretaceous *Odaxosaurus piger* retains the plate-like
576 osteoderm pattern seen in many anguids (Meszoely, 1970; Klembara et al., 2019) and “proto-
577 glyptosaurines” (Sullivan, 2019). The fragmentation of cephalic osteoderms seen in the early
578 Eocene *Sullivania* and *Gaultia* may represent an intermediate stage. *Gaultia*, like *Sullivania*,
579 has its frontal roof armor divided into heterogenous plates as in *Arpadosaurus* (see Meszoely,
580 1970), not into discrete subequal hexagonal osteoderms as in *Glyptosaurus*,
581 *Paraglyptosaurus*, *Placosaurus*, and other taxa (Sullivan, 1979; Sullivan & Augé, 2006).
582 Sullivan (2019:754) considered *Gaultia* a sister taxon to Glyptosaurinae (sensu this paper,
583 “Glyptosaurini” sensu Sullivan, 1979). Ultimately, it is a question of how Glyptosaurinae is
584 circumscribed. At present, no phylogenetic definition of Glyptosaurinae has been put forward.
585 There is no apparent disagreement about the intermediate morphology of *Gaultia* and its close
586 relationship with Glyptosaurinae as circumscribed by Sullivan (1979). Sullivan (1979:15)
587 gave “hexagonal osteoderms that cover the entire skull” as a defining feature, and since such
588 osteoderms are only present on the parietal, not the frontal, of *Gaultia*, it would support
589 Sullivan’s (1979) position. However, *Gaultia* clearly does not fit the definition of
590 “Melanosaurinae” (sensu this paper, “Melanosaurini” sensu Sullivan, 1979) either. For this
591 reason, given the close relationship between *Gaultia* and accepted members of
592 Glyptosaurinae, we continue to follow Smith’s 2009 assignment (“Glyptosaurini” in Smith,
593 2009). We envision a time when a robust phylogenetic hypothesis of glyptosaurine
594 relationships exists and clade names can be redefined on that basis.

595 Hypothetically, this might raise a question whether *Sullivania* is referable to
596 Glyptosaurinae or is a sister taxon to this clade. Again, however, the phylogenetic topology of
597 these taxa within Glyptosauridae can be resolved only based on phylogenetic analyses. For

598 now, we decided to tentatively assign *Sullivania* to Glyptosaurinae. The phylogenetic
599 relationships of *Sullivania* and *Placosaurus* are unknown. Taking account that the taxonomy
600 is based on the frontal bone, *Stenoplacosaurus* from presumably the late-middle Eocene of
601 Mongolia is morphologically more similar to *Placosaurus* (previously, it was even placed to
602 *Placosaurus* [Sullivan & Augé, 2006] and later placed to its own genus [Sullivan & Dong,
603 2018]) than to *Sullivania* gen. nov. Thus, an Asian origin of *Placosaurus* cannot be excluded.
604 Owing to an incomplete glyptosaurine fossil record between the early and late Eocene in
605 Europe, their evolution and distribution patterns between these distant regions remain largely
606 unresolved.

607

608 **Varanoidea**

609 UM-COS 1009 represents a “miniature” palaeowaranid. It differs from currently
610 known genera by the following combination of features: (1) overall small size; the frontals of
611 *Paranecrosaurus feisti* (Stritzke, 1983), which is known only from the early–middle Eocene
612 of Messel in Germany, are much larger (18.2 mm in the holotype and even 30.8 in the
613 paratype; see Smith & Habersetzer, 2021); (2) the non-paired (fused) narrow frontal, as in
614 *Palaeovaranus* Zittel, 1887–1890 (Georgalis et al., 2021) and *Paranecrosaurus feisti*
615 (Stritzke, 1983) (Smith & Habersetzer, 2021), unlike the paired frontals in *Eosaniwa*
616 Haubold, 1977 (Rieppel et al., 2007); (3) the type of an ornamentation. Its ornamentation,
617 which consists of small, densely arranged mounds, slightly resembles that of *Palaeovaranus*
618 *lismonimenos* Georgalis, Čerňanský & Klembara, 2021 (Georgalis et al., 2021).
619 *Palaeovaranus lismonimenos* was previously reported from the late Eocene (~ MP 17, see
620 Georgalis et al., 2021), whereas the Cos frontal is much older. However, the detailed surface
621 texture is different – the ornamentation of the Cos specimen is more complex, having also
622 several spikes forming each mound (rather than possessing more-or-less simple mounds). The

623 ornamentation of UM-COS 1009 differs from the distinct sculpturing pattern observed on the
624 frontal of the holotype of *Melanosauroides giganteus* Kuhn, 1940 from Geiseltal. The dorsal
625 surface of the frontal of *M. giganteus* possesses broad, apically flat, rugose patches that
626 appear to be fused broad (not distinctly keeled) osteoderms (Georgalis, 2017; Smith &
627 Habersetzer, 2021). The dorsal surface of the frontal of *Paranecrosaurus* Smith &
628 Habersetzer, 2021 frontal is also different (Smith & Habersetzer, 2021); and (4) the long
629 posterolateral process relative to the the overall size of the frontal, as *Paranecrosaurus* (Smith
630 & Habersetzer, 2021), and unlike the short process in *Palaeoaranus* (Georgalis et al., 2021)
631 and *Eosaniwa* (Rieppel et al., 2007).

632 UM-COS 1009 represents most likely a new taxon, but the taxonomy of
633 palaeoaranids is now mainly based on the parietal morphology (Georgalis et al., 2021). For
634 this reason, we identified this frontal only as Palaeoaranidae indet.

635 It is unclear whether the maxilla (UM-COS 1010) and the frontal (UM-COS 1009)
636 represent a single taxon, although they are comparable in size and come from the same
637 locality. The overall morphology and plicidentine support allocation of the maxilla to a
638 varanoid (Kearney and Rieppel, 2006; Georgalis & Scheyer, 2019). It cannot be referred to
639 Shinisauridae, a group of anguimorph presence that is well-documented from the Eocene of
640 Europe (Smith, 2017; Smith et al., 2018). The maxilla has several teeth posterior to the last
641 labial foramen where at least four tooth positions are preserved. This condition resembles
642 *Saniwa orsmaelensis* Dollo, 1923, which is known from Dormaal (Augé et al., 2022). Indeed,
643 the teeth and the concave lateral surface (the posterior portion of the maxilla is slightly bent
644 laterally) of the Cos specimen resemble the condition in this taxon (Augé et al., 2022: fig. 2).
645 The geological age of the maxilla would also be consistent with the presence of *Saniwa* in
646 Cos. However, several tooth positions posterior to the last labial foramen are also present in
647 *Paranecrosaurus feisti* (Smith & Habersetzer, 2021). The diagnostic parts of palaeoaranid

648 maxillae, however, are mainly found in medial view. The presence of a distinctly developed
649 nasal crest on the dorsomedial surface of the nasal process is a distinguishing feature of
650 *Palaeovaranus* (Georgalis et al., 2021) and *Paranecrosaurus* (nasolacrimal ridge sensu Smith
651 & Habersetzer, 2021). Unfortunately, this portion in the Cos maxilla is heavily damaged and
652 there is no indication of its presence. The teeth and the overall shape of the Cos specimen are
653 also similar to *Melanosauroides* Kuhn, 1940 (see Georgalis, 2017: fig. 4B). For all these
654 reasons, caution is needed and we decided to identify this maxilla only as Varanoidea indet.
655 (although we cannot be sure if palaeovaranids are indeed varanoids). More complete material
656 from Cos will shed light on the diversity of the varanoids here.

657

658

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

659 For access to this fossil material and help, we thank Mehdi Mouana (Institut des
660 Sciences de l'Evolution de Montpellier, France). For English correction and helpful advice,
661 we are indebted to Robert M. Sullivan (New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science,
662 USA) and Hans-Dieter Sues (Editor). For advice, we thank Georgios Georgalis (Polish
663 Academy of Sciences), Krister Smith (Senckenberg Research Institute, Frankfurt am Main),
664 Thierry Smith and Annelise Folie (both Royal Belgian Institute of Natural Sciences,
665 Brussels). We thank Nour-Eddine Jalile (MNHN) for permissions and sending us additional
666 photographs of specimens under their care. The photographs were taken by Philippe Loubry.
667 For critically reading the manuscript, we thank Hans-Dieter Sues (Editor), Georgios Georgalis
668 (Polish Academy of Sciences, Poland) and one anonymous reviewer. This work was
669 supported by the Scientific Grant Agency of the Ministry of Education of Slovak Republic
670 and Slovak Academy of Sciences, Grant Nr. 1/0191/21 (to A. Č).

671

672 AVAILABILITY OF MATERIALS AND DATA

673 All specimens are catalogued and accessible in the fossil reptile collection of the University of
674 Montpellier in France. Digital surface models of the figured fossil specimens are available on
675 Morphosource and Virtual Collections:
676 UM-COS-1001: <https://www.morphosource.org/concern/parent/000514175/media/000514178>
677 UM-COS-1000: <https://www.morphosource.org/concern/media/000514185?locale=en>
678 UM-COS-1003: <https://www.morphosource.org/concern/media/000514194?locale=en>
679 UM-COS-1002: <https://www.morphosource.org/concern/media/000514200?locale=en>
680 UM-COS-1004: <https://www.morphosource.org/concern/media/000514206?locale=en>
681 UM-COS-1005: <https://www.morphosource.org/concern/media/000514212?locale=en>
682 UM-COS-1006: <https://www.morphosource.org/concern/media/000514218?locale=en>
683 UM-COS-1007: <https://www.morphosource.org/concern/media/000514224?locale=en>
684 UM-COS-1008: <https://www.morphosource.org/concern/media/000514230?locale=en>
685 UM-COS-1009: <https://www.morphosource.org/concern/media/000514236?locale=en>
686 UM-COS-1010: <https://www.morphosource.org/concern/media/000514242?locale=en>

687

688

LITERATURE CITED

689

690 Astruc, J. G., Hugueney, M., Escarguel, G., Legendre, S., Rage, J.-C., Coinçon, R. S., Sudre,
691 J., & Sigé, B. (2003). Puycelci, nouveau site à vertébrés de la série molassique
692 d'Aquitaine. Densité et continuité biochronologique dans la zone Quercy et bassins
693 périphériques au Paléogène. *Geobios*, 36, 629–648.
694 Augé, M. L. (1990). La faune de lézards et d'amphisbènes (Reptilia, Squamata) du gisement
695 de Dormaal (Belgique, Eocène inférieur). *Bulletin de l'Institut Royal des Sciences*
696 *Naturelles de Belgique, Sciences de la Terre*, 60, 161–173.

- 697 Augé, M. L. (1992). *Campinosaurus woutersi* n.g. n.sp., Anguimorphe nouveau (Lacertilia)
698 de l'Éocène inférieur de Dormaal (Belgique). Une relique éocène des Dorsetisauridae
699 du Jurassique terminal/Crétacé basal? *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Sciences*,
700 315, 885–889.
- 701 Augé, M. L. (2003). La faune de Lacertilia (Reptilia, Squamata) de l'Éocène inférieur de
702 Prémontré (Bassin de Paris, France). *Geodiversitas*, 25, 539–574.
- 703 Augé, M. (2005). Evolution des lézards du Paléogène en Europe. *Mémoires du Muséum*
704 *national d'Histoire naturelle, Paris*, 192, 1–369.
- 705 Augé, M. L., Duffaud, S., Lapparent de Broin, F., Rage, J.-C., & Vasse, D. (1997). Les
706 amphibiens et les reptiles de Prémontré (Cuisien, Bassin parisien): une herpétofaune
707 de référence pour l'Eocène inférieur. *Géologie de la France*, 1, 23–33.
- 708 Augé, M. L., Folie, A., Smith, R., Phélizon, A., Gigase, P., & Smith, T. (2022). Revision of
709 the oldest varanid, *Saniwa orsmaelensis* Dollo, 1923, from the earliest Eocene of
710 northwest Europe. *Comptes Rendus Palevol*, 21, 511–529.
- 711 Augé, M. L., & Smith, R. (1997). Les Agamidae (Reptilia, Squamata) du Paléogène d'Europe
712 occidentale. *Belgian Journal of Zoology*, 127, 123–138.
- 713 Augé, M. L., & Smith, R. (2002). Nouveaux Lacertidae (Reptilia, Squamata) de l'Eocène
714 inférieur européen. *Belgian Journal of Zoology*, 131, 3–15.
- 715 Augé, M. L., & Sullivan, R. M. (2006). A new genus, *Paraplacosauriops* (Squamata,
716 Anguinae, Glyptosaurinae) from the Eocene of France. *Journal of Vertebrate*
717 *Paleontology*, 26, 133–137.
- 718 Bolet, A. (2017). First early Eocene lizards from Spain and a study of the compositional
719 changes between late Mesozoic and early Cenozoic Iberian lizard assemblages.
720 *Palaeontologia Electronica*, 20.2.20A, 1–22.

721 Burbrink, F.T., Grazziotin, F.G., Pyron, A.R., Cundall, D., Donnellan, S., Irish, F., Keogh,
722 S.J., Kraus, F., Murphy, R.W., Noonan, B., & Raxworthy, C. J. (2020). Interrogating
723 genomic-scale data for Squamata (lizards, snakes, and amphisbaenians) shows no
724 support for key traditional morphological relationships. *Systematic Biology*, *69*, 502–
725 520.

726 Camp, C. L. (1923). Classification of the lizards. *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural*
727 *History*, *48*, 289–481.

728 Čerňanský, A., & Augé, M. L. (2019). The Oligocene and Miocene fossil lizards (Reptilia,
729 Squamata) of Central Mongolia. *Geodiversitas*, *41*, 811–839.

730 Čerňanský, A., Augé, M. L., & Phelizon, A. (2020). Dawn of lacertids (Squamata,
731 Lacertidae): new finds from the upper Paleocene and the lower Eocene. *Journal of*
732 *Vertebrate Paleontology*, e1768539.

733 Čerňanský, A., Augé, M., & Rage, J.C. (2015). A complete mandible of a new amphisbaenian
734 reptile (Squamata, Amphisbaenia) from the late Middle Eocene (Bartonian, MP 16) of
735 France. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology*, *35*, e902379.

736 Čerňanský, A., Daza, J. D., Smith, R., Bauer, A. M., Smith, T., & Folie, A. (2022). A new
737 gecko from the earliest Eocene of Dormaal, Belgium - a thermophilic element of the
738 "greenhouse world". *Royal Society Open Science*, *9*, 220429.

739 Čerňanský, A., & Klembara, J. (2017). A skeleton of *Ophisaurus* (Squamata: Anguidae) from
740 the middle Miocene of Germany, with a revision of the partly articulated postcranial
741 material from Slovakia using microcomputed tomography. *Journal of Vertebrate*
742 *Paleontology*, e1333515.

743 Čerňanský, A., & Smith, K.T. (2018). Eolacertidae: a new extinct clade of lizards from the
744 Palaeogene; with comments on the origin of the dominant European reptile group –
745 Lacertidae. *Historical Biology*, *30*, 994–1014.

- 746 Čerňanský, A., & Smith, K.T. (2019). The first juvenile specimen of *Eolacerta* (Squamata:
747 Eolacertidae) from the early–middle Eocene of the Messel Pit (Germany). *Comptes*
748 *Rendus Palevol*, *18*, 735–745.
- 749 Čerňanský, A., Smith, R., Smith, T., & Folie, A. (2023). Iguanian lizards (Acrodonta and
750 Pleurodonta) from the earliest Eocene (MP 7) of Dormaal, Belgium: the first stages of
751 these iconic reptiles in Europe. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology*, e2184696.
752 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02724634.2023.2184696>.
- 753 Cicimurri, D. J., Knight, J. L., Self-Trail, J. M., & Ebersole, S. M. (2016). Late Paleocene
754 glyptosaur (Reptilia: Anguidae) osteoderms from South Carolina, USA. *Journal of*
755 *Paleontology*, *90*, 147–153.
- 756 Conrad, J. L. (2008). Phylogeny and systematics of Squamata (Reptilia) based on
757 morphology. *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History*, *2008*, 1–182.
- 758 Conrad, J. L., & Norell, M. A. (2008). The braincases of two glyptosaurines (Anguidae,
759 Squamata) and anguid phylogeny. *American Museum Novitates*, *3613*, 1–24.
- 760 Cope, E. D. (1877). Report on extinct vertebrates obtained in New Mexico by parties of the
761 expedition of 1874. United States. *Geographical Surveys West of the 100th*
762 *Meridian, Wheeler*, *4*, 1–370.
- 763 De Bast E., & Smith T. (2017) The oldest Cenozoic mammal fauna of Europe: implication of
764 the Hainin reference fauna for mammalian evolution and dispersals during the
765 Paleocene. *Journal of Systematic Palaeontology*, *15*, 741–785.
- 766 De Buffrénil, V., Sire, J.-Y., & Rage, J.-C. (2010). The histological structure of glyptosaurine
767 osteoderms (Squamata: Anguidae), and the problem of osteoderm development in
768 squamates. *Journal of Morphology*, *271*, 729–737.

- 769 Depéret, C. (1917). Monographie de la faune de mammifères fossiles du Ludien inférieur
770 d'Euzet-les-Bains (Gard). *Annales de l'Université de Lyon, Nouvelle Série*, 40, 288
771 p.
- 772 Dollo, L. (1923). *Saniwa orsmaelensis*, Varanide nouveau du Landénien supérieur d'Orsmael
773 (Brabant). *Bulletin de la Société belge de géologie, de paléontologie et d'hydrologie*,
774 33, 76–82.
- 775 Douglass, E. (1903). New vertebrates from the Montana Tertiary. *Annals of the Carnegie*
776 *Museum*, 2, 145–199.
- 777 Estes, R. (1983). Sauria Terrestria, Amphisbaenia. In P. Wellnhofer (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of*
778 *Paleoherpetology, Part 10a*. Gustav Fischer Verlag, Stuttgart and New York, 249 pp.
- 779 Estes, R., de Queiroz, K., & Gauthier, J. A. (1988). Phylogenetic relationships within
780 Squamata. In R. Estes, & G. K. Pregill (Eds.), *Phylogenetic Relationships of the*
781 *Lizard Families*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, pp. 119–281.
- 782 Filhol, H. (1876). Sur les reptiles fossiles des phosphorites du Quercy. *Bulletin de la Société*
783 *Philomathique de Paris*, 6, 27–28.
- 784 Folie, A., Smith, R., & Smith, T. (2013). New amphisbaenian lizards from the Early
785 Paleogene of Europe and their implications for the early evolution of modern
786 amphisbaenians. *Geologica Belgica*, 16, 227–235.
- 787 Fürbringer, M. (1900). Zur vergleichenden Anatomie des Brustschulterapparates und der
788 Schultermuskeln. *Jenaische Zeitschrift für Naturwissenschaften*, 34, 215–718.
- 789 Gauthier, J. A., Kearney, M., Maisano, J. A., Rieppel, O., & Behlke, A. D. (2012).
790 Assembling the squamate tree of life: perspectives from the phenotype and the fossil
791 record. *Bulletin of the Peabody Museum of Natural History*, 53, 3–308.

792 Georgalis, G. L. (2017). *Necrosaurus* or *Palaeovaranus*? Appropriate nomenclature and
793 taxonomic content of an enigmatic fossil lizard clade (Squamata). *Annales de*
794 *Paléontologie*, 103, 293–303.

795 Georgalis, G. L., Čerňanský, A., & Klembara, J. (2021). Osteological atlas of new lizards
796 from the Phosphorites du Quercy (France), based on historical, forgotten, fossil
797 material. In Steyer, J.-S., Augé, M. L. & Métais, G. (Eds.), *Memorial Jean-Claude*
798 *Rage: A life of paleo-herpetologist*. *Geodiversitas*, 43, 219–293.

799 Georgalis, G. L., & Joyce, W. G. (2017). A review of the fossil record of Old World turtles of
800 the clade Pan-Trionychidae. *Bulletin of the Peabody Museum of Natural History*, 58,
801 115–208.

802 Georgalis, G. L., & Scheyer T. M. (2021). Lizards and snakes from the earliest Miocene of
803 Saint-Gérard-le-Puy, France: an anatomical and histological approach of some of the
804 oldest Neogene squamates from Europe. *BMC Ecology and Evolution*, 21, 144.

805 Georgalis, G. L., Villa, A., Ivanov, M., Vasilyan, D., & Delfino M. (2019). Fossil amphibians
806 and reptiles from the Neogene locality of Maramena (Greece), the most diverse
807 European herpetofauna at the Miocene/Pliocene transition boundary. *Palaeontologia*
808 *Electronica*, 22.3.68, 1–99.

809 Gervais, P. (1848-1852). *Zoologie et Paléontologie françaises (animaux vertébrés): ou*
810 *nouvelles recherches sur les animaux vivants et fossiles de la France*. Arthus Bertrand,
811 Paris, 271 pp.

812 Gilmore, C. W. (1928). The fossil lizards of North America. *Memoirs of the National*
813 *Academy of Sciences*, 11, 1–197.

814 Gingerich, P. D., & Smith, T. (2006). Paleocene-Eocene land mammals from three new latest
815 Clarkforkian and earliest Wasatchian wash sites at Polecat Bench in the Northern

816 Bighorn Basin, Wyoming. *Contributions from the Museum of Paleontology. The*
817 *University of Michigan*, 31, 245–302.

818 Godinot, M., Blondel, C., Escarguel, G., Lézin, C., Pélissié, T., Tabuce, R., Vidalenc, D.,
819 (2021). Primates and Plesiadapiformes from Cos (Eocene; Quercy, France). *Geobios*,
820 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geobios.2021.03.004>

821 Gray, J. E. (1825). A synopsis of the genera of Reptiles and Amphibia, with a description of
822 some new species. *Annals of Philosophy, Series 2, 10*, 193–217.

823 Gray, J. E. (1827). A synopsis of the genera of saurian reptiles, in which some new genera are
824 indicated, and the others reviewed by actual examination. *The Philosophical*
825 *Magazine, or Annals of Chemistry, Mathematics, Astronomy, Natural History, and*
826 *General Science*, 2, 54–58.

827 Haubold, H. (1977). Zur Kenntnis der Sauria (Lacertilia) aus dem Eozän des Geiseltales. In H.
828 W. Matthes, & B. Thaler (Eds.), *Eozäne Wirbeltiere des Geiseltales*. Vol. 2.
829 Wissenschaftliche Beiträge, Wittenberg, pp. 107–122.

830 Hecht, M. K., & Hoffstetter, R. (1962). Note préliminaire sur les Amphibiens et les
831 Squamates du Landénien supérieur et du Tongrien de Belgique. *Bulletin de l'Institut*
832 *royal des Sciences naturelles de Belgique*, 38, 1–30.

833 Hoffstetter, R. (1954). Sur la position systématique de *Necrosaurus*: saurien de l'Éocène
834 européen. *Comptes Rendus de la Société géologique de France*, 1954, 422–424.

835 Hoffstetter, R. (1955). Squamates de type moderne. In Piveteau J. (Ed.), *Traité de*
836 *Paléontologie*. Volume 5. Masson et Compagnie, Paris, 606–662.

837 Hoffstetter, R. (1962). Observations sur les ostéodermes et la classification des anguïdes
838 actuels et fossiles (Reptiles, Sauriens). *Bulletin du Muséum national d'Histoire*
839 *naturelle*, 34, 149–157.

840 Hyland, E.G., Sheldon, N. D., Cotton, J. M. (2017). Constraining the early Eocene climatic
841 optimum: A terrestrial interhemispheric comparison. *GSA Bulletin*, 129, 244–252

842 Inglis, G. N., Bragg, F., Burls, N. J., Cramwinckel, M. J., Evans, D., Foster, G. L., Huber, M.,
843 Lunt, D. J., Siler, N., Steinig, S., Tierney, J. E., Wilkinson, R., Anagnostou, E., de
844 Boer, A. M., Dunkley Jones, T., Edgar, K. M., Hollis, C. J., Hutchinson, D. K., and
845 Pancost, R. D. (2020). Global mean surface temperature and climate sensitivity of the
846 early Eocene Climatic Optimum (EECO), Paleocene–Eocene Thermal Maximum
847 (PETM), and latest Paleocene. *Climate of the Past*, 16, 1953–1968

848 Kearney, M., & Rieppel, O. (2006). An investigation into the occurrence of plicidentine in the
849 teeth of squamate reptiles. *Copeia*, 2006, 337–350.

850 Keller, T. (2009). Beiträge zur Kenntnis von *Placosauriops abderhaldeni* Kuhn, 1940
851 (Anguinae, Glyptosaurinae March, 1872) aus dem Mitteleozän der Grube Messel –
852 Skelettanatomie, Taphonomie und Biomechanik. *Kaupia*, 16, 3–145.

853 Klembara, J., Hain, M., & Čerňanský, A. (2019). The first record of anguine lizards
854 (Anguimorpha, Anguinae) from the early Miocene locality Ulm – Westtangente in
855 Germany. *Historical Biology*, 31, 1016–1027.

856 Kuhn, O. (1940). Die Placosauriden und Anguinen aus dem Mittleren Eozän des Geiseltales.
857 *Nova Acta Academia Leopoldina, Carolinska*, 53, 461–486.

858 Laurent, Y., Adnet, S., Bourdon, E., Corbalan, D., Danilo, L., Duffaud, S., Fleury, G., Garcia,
859 G., Godinot, M., Le Roux, G., Maisonnave, C., Métais, G., Mourer-Chauviré, C.,
860 Presse, B., Sigé, B., & Solé, F. (2010). La Borie (Saint-Papoul, Aude): un gisement
861 exceptionnel dans l'Éocène basal du Sud de la France. *Bulletin de la Société d'histoire*
862 *naturelle de Toulouse*, 146, 89–103.

863 Loréal, E., Syromyatnikova, E. V., Danilov, I. G., & Čerňanský, A. (2023). The easternmost
864 record of the largest anguine lizard that has ever lived – *Pseudopus pannonicus*

865 (Squamata, Anguidae): new fossils from the late Neogene of Eastern Europe. *Fossil*
866 *Record*, 26, 51–84.

867 Marsh, O. C. (1871). Notice of some new fossil reptiles from the Cretaceous and Tertiary
868 formations. *American Journal of Science*, 3(6), 447–459.

869 Marsh, O. C. (1872). Preliminary description of new Tertiary reptiles. Parts I and II. *American*
870 *Journal of Science*, 4(3), 298–309.

871 McDowell, S. B., & Bogert, C. M. (1954). The systematic position of *Lanthanotus* and the
872 affinities of the anguinomorph lizards. *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural*
873 *History*, 105, 1–142.

874 Meszoely, Ch. A. M. (1970). North American fossil anguid lizards. *Bulletin of the Museum of*
875 *Comparative Zoology at Harvard College*, 139, 87–149.

876 Oppel, M. (1811). *Die Ordnungen, Familien und Gattungen der Reptilien als Prodrum einer*
877 *Naturgeschichte derselben*. Joseph Lindauer, Munich, 87 p.

878 Owen, R. (1841). Description of some ophidiolites (*Palæophis toliapicus*) from the London
879 Clay of Sheppey, indicating an extinct species of serpent. *Transactions of the*
880 *Geological Society Second Series*, 6, 209–210.

881 Owen, R. (1850). Part III. Ophidia (*Palæophis* &c.). In R. Owen (Ed.), *Monograph on the*
882 *fossil Reptilia of the London Clay and of the Bracklesham and other Tertiary beds*.
883 London: Palæontographical Society of London, pp. 51–63.

884 Pulou, R. (1980). Jean-André Poumarède et l'industrie des phosphates du Quercy au XIXe
885 siècle. *Mémoires de l'Académie des Sciences, Inscriptions et Belles Lettres de*
886 *Toulouse*, 16, 83–92.

887 Pyron, R., Burbrink, F. T., & Wiens, J. J. (2013). A phylogeny and revised classification of
888 Squamata, including 4161 species of lizards and snakes. *BMC Evolutionary Biology*,
889 13, 93.

- 890 Rage, J.-C. (1978). 5. Squamates. In B. Geze, J.-C. Rage, F. Vergnaud-Grazzini, F. de Broin,
891 E. Buffetaut, C. Mourier-Chauvire, J.-Y. Crochet, B. Sigé, J. Sudre, A. Remy, L.
892 Langebadre, L., de Bonis, J. L. Hartenberger, & M. Vianey-Liaud (Eds.), *La poche à*
893 *Phosphate de Ste-Néboule (Lot) et sa faune de vertébrés du Ludien supérieur.*
894 *Palaeovertebrata*, 8, 201–215.
- 895 Rage, J.-C. (1988). Le gisement du Bretou (Phosphorites du Quercy, Tarn-et-Garonne,
896 France) et sa faune de vertébrés de l'Éocène supérieur. I Amphibiens et Reptiles.
897 *Palaeontographica Abteilung A*, 205, 3–27.
- 898 Rage, J.-C. (2013). Mesozoic and Cenozoic squamates of Europe. In J. D. Gardner, & R. L.
899 Nydam (Eds.), *Mesozoic and Cenozoic lissamphibian and squamate assemblages of*
900 *Laurasia. Palaeobiodiversity and Palaeoenvironments*, 93, 517–534.
- 901 Rage, J.-C., & Augé, M. L. (2003). Amphibians and squamate reptiles from the lower Eocene
902 of Silveirinha (Portugal). *Ciências da Terra (UNL)*, 15, 103–116.
- 903 Rage, J.-C., & Augé M. L. (2010). Squamate reptiles from the middle Eocene of Lissieu
904 (France). A landmark in the middle Eocene of Europe. *Geobios*, 43, 253–268.
- 905 Rieppel, O., Conrad, J. L., & Maisano, J. A. (2007). New morphological data for *Eosaniwa*
906 *koehni* Haubold, 1977 and a revised phylogenetic analysis. *Journal of Paleontology*,
907 81, 760-769.
- 908 Seghetti, S. M., Georgalis G. L., Tschopp, E., & Delfino, M. (2022). A historical overview of
909 the reptile fauna from the Eocene Bolca Fossil-Lagerstätte (Italy). *Bollettino della*
910 *Società Paleontologica Italiana*, 61, 119–143.
- 911 Schneider, C. A., Rasband, W. S., & Eliceiri, K. W. (2012). NIH Image to ImageJ: 25 years of
912 image analysis. *Nature Methods*, 9, 671–675.
- 913 Solé, F., Smith, T., De Bast, E., Codrea, V., & Gheerbrant, E. (2016). New carnivoraform
914 latest Paleocene of Europe and their bearing on the origin and radiation of

915 Carnivoraformes (Carnivoramorpha, Mammalia). *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology*,
916 e1082480.

917 Smith, K. T. (2009). A new lizard assemblage from the earliest Eocene (zone Wa0) of the
918 Bighorn Basin, Wyoming, USA: biogeography during the warmest interval of the
919 Cenozoic. *Journal of Systematic Palaeontology*, 7, 299–358.

920 Smith, K. T. (2011). The long-term history of dispersal among lizards in the early Eocene:
921 New evidence from a microvertebrate assemblage in the Bighorn Basin of Wyoming,
922 USA. *Palaeontology*, 54, 1243–1270.

923 Smith, K. T. (2017). First crocodile-tailed lizard (Squamata: Pan- *Shinisaurus*) from the
924 Paleogene of Europe. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology*, e1313743.

925 Smith, K. T., Čerňanský, A., Scanferla, A., & Schaal, S. (2018). Lizards and snakes: warmth-
926 loving sunbathers. In K. T. Smith, S. F. K. Schaal, & J. Habersetzer (Eds.), *Messel, An*
927 *Ancient Greenhouse Ecosystem*. Senckenberg Gesellschaft für Naturforschung,
928 Frankfurt am Main, pp. 122–147.

929 Smith, K.T., & Georgalis G. L. (2022). The diversity and distribution of Palaeogene snakes -
930 a review, with comments on vertebral sufficiency. In D. Gower, & H. Zaher (Eds.),
931 *The Origin and Early Evolution of Snakes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,
932 pp. 55–84.

933 Smith, K. T., & Habersetzer, J. (2021). The anatomy, phylogenetic relationships, and
934 autecology of the carnivorous lizard “*Saniwa*” *feisti* Stritzke, 1983 from the Eocene of
935 Messel, Germany. In A. Folie, E. Buffetaut, N. Bardet, A. Houssaye, E. Gheerbrant, &
936 M. Laurin (Eds), *Palaeobiology and palaeobiogeography of amphibians and reptiles:*
937 *An homage to Jean-Claude Rage*. *Comptes Rendus Palevol*, 20 (23), 441–506.

938 Smith, K. T., & Scanferla, A. (2021). A nearly complete skeleton of the oldest definitive
939 erycine boid (Messel, Germany). *Geodiversitas*, 43, 1–24.

- 940 Smith, T., & Smith, R. (2013). A land micro-mammal fauna from the Early Eocene marine
941 Egem deposits (NP12, Belgium) and the first occurrence of the peradectid marsupial
942 *Armintodelphys* outside North America. *Geologica Belgica*, 16, 302–310.
- 943 Stritzke, R. (1983). *Saniwa feisti* n. sp., ein Varanide (Lacertilia, Reptilia) aus dem Mittel-
944 Eozän von Messel bei Darmstadt. *Senckenbergiana Lethaea*, 64, 497–508.
- 945 Sullivan, R. M. (1979). Revision of the Paleogene genus *Glyptosaurus* (Reptilia, Anguidae).
946 *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History*, 163, 1–72.
- 947 Sullivan, R. M. (2019). The taxonomy, chronostratigraphy and paleobiogeography of
948 glyptosaurine lizards (Glyptosaurinae, Anguidae). *Comptes Rendus Palevol*, 18, 747–
949 763.
- 950 Sullivan, R. M., & Augé, M. L. (2006). Redescription of the holotype of *Placosaurus rugosus*
951 Gervais 1848-1852 (Squamata, Anguidae, Glyptosaurinae) from the Eocene of France
952 and a revision of the genus. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology*, 26, 127–132.
- 953 Sullivan, R. M., Augé, M. L., Wille, E., & Smith, R. (2012). A new glyptosaurine lizard from
954 the earliest Eocene of Dormaal, Belgium. *Bulletin de la Société géologique de France*,
955 183, 629–635.
- 956 Sullivan, R. M., & Dong, L. (2018). *Stenoplacosaurus mongoliensis*, a new generic name for
957 *Placosaurus mongoliensis* (Anguidae, Glyptosaurinae) from the Shara Murun
958 Formation, Nei Mongol (Inner Mongolia), China. In S. G. Lucas & R. M. Sullivan
959 (Eds.), *Fossil Record 6. New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science Bulletin*,
960 79, 691–694.
- 961 Sullivan, R. M., Keller T., & Habersetzer, J. 1999. Middle Eocene (Geiseltalian) anguid
962 lizards from Geiseltal and Messel, Germany. I. *Ophisauriscus quadrupes* Kuhn 1940.
963 *Courier Forschungsinstitut Senckenberg*, 216, 97–129.

964 Syromyatnikova, E. V., Klembara, J., & Redkozubov, O. (2022). The Pliocene *Ophisaurus*
965 (Anguidae) from Eastern Europe: new records and additions to the history of the genus
966 and its palaeoenvironment. *Palaeobiodiversity and Palaeoenvironments*.
967 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12549-022-00556-w>.

968 Uetz, P., Freed, P., & Hošek, J. (2023). *The Reptile Database*. <http://www.reptile->
969 [database.org](http://www.reptile-database.org). [accessed February 2023]

970 Vianey-Liaud, M., Vidalenc, D., Orliac M. J., Maugoust, J., Lézin, C., & Pélissié, T. (2022).
971 Rongeurs de la localité éocène de Cos (Tarn-et-Garonne, Quercy, France).
972 Comparaison avec les rongeurs de localités de la transition Éocène inférieur/Éocène
973 moyen. *Geodiversitas*, *44*, 753–800.

974 Villa, A., Wings, O., & Rabi, M. (2022). A new gecko (Squamata, Gekkota) from the Eocene
975 of Geiseltal (Germany) implies long-term persistence of European Sphaerodactylidae.
976 *Papers in Palaeontology*, *8*, 1434.

977 Williams, C., Kirby, A., Marghoub, A., Kéver, L., Ostashevskaya-Gohstand, S., Bertazzo, S.,
978 Moazen, M., Abzhanov, A., Herrel, A., Evans, S. E., & Vickaryous, M. K. (2022).
979 Review of the osteoderms of lizards (Reptilia: Squamata). *Biological Reviews*, *97*, 1–
980 19.

981 Zheng, Y., & Wiens, J. J. (2016). Combining phylogenomic and supermatrix approaches, and
982 a time-calibrated phylogeny for squamate reptiles (lizards and snakes) based on 52
983 genes and 4162 species. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, *94*, 537–547.

984 Zittel, K. A. (1887–1890). *Handbuch der Paläontologie. Palaeozoologie. III. Pisces,*
985 *Amphibia, Reptilia, Aves*. Munchen and Leipzig: Druck und Verlag von R.
986 Oldenbourg, 900 p.

987

988

989 **Figure legend**

990

991 FIGURE 1. Location of the Cos locality in France. [planned for 2/3 of full-page width]

992

993 FIGURE 2. *Sullivania gallica* gen. et sp. nov. from the early Eocene Cos locality of France.

994 UM-COS-1001 (holotype) anterior portion of fused frontals: in **A**, dorsal; **B**, outline drawing

995 showing the armour division pattern; **C**, ventral; and **D**, lateral views (all micro-CT

996 visualizations). **E**, axial section at the mid-level of the dorsoventral thickness; and **F**, coronal

997 section at the level of the frontal cranial crests. [planned for page width]

998

999 FIGURE 3. *Sullivania gallica* gen. et sp. nov. from the early Eocene Cos locality of France.

1000 UM-COS-1000 (paratype), nearly complete right frontal: in **A**, dorsal; **B**, photograph with

1001 line drawing indicating the interpretation of osteoderm distribution; **C**, ventral; and **D**, lateral

1002 views (micro-CT visualizations). **E**, Axial section at the mid-level of the dorsoventral

1003 thickness; and **F**, coronal section at the level of the frontal cranial crests. UM-COS-1003

1004 (paratype), posterior portion of right frontal: in **G**, dorsal; and **H**, ventral views (all micro-CT

1005 visualizations). [planned for page width]

1006

1007 FIGURE 4. The reconstruction of complete frontal of *Sullivania gallica* gen. et sp. nov.

1008 comparing it to frontals of *Gaultia silvaticus*, from the earliest Eocene of Wyoming, USA;

1009 *Placosaurus estesi* and *P. rugosus*, from the middle and late Eocene of France; and

1010 *Stenoplacosaurus mongoliensis* from the late-middle Eocene of Mongolia (all are dorsal

1011 views, except G, which is left lateral view). **A**, *Sullivania gallica*, reconstruction based on

1012 UM-COS-1000 and 01; **B**, *Gaultia silvaticus* UCMP 216000, (holotype) middle portion of
1013 frontal and **C**, UCMP 150966 (paratype) partial left frontal (modified from Smith, 2009); **D**,
1014 *Placosaurus estesi* (MNHN QU-17735, holotype) nearly complete frontal; **E**, *P. rugosus*
1015 (MNHN 1906-25, holotype) nearly complete frontal and left prefrontal; and **F**, **G**,
1016 *Stenoplacosaurus mongoliensis* (AMNH 6669, holotype), left frontal (modified from Sullivan
1017 & Dong, 2018). The arrow in *Gaultia* (**B**) indicates the position of the mid-line between the
1018 left and right frontals (see Smith, 2009). The dotted line in *P. rugosus* (**E**) indicates the frontal
1019 – prefrontal contact. [planned for page width]

1020

1021 FIGURE 5. Glyptosauridae indeterminate from the early Eocene Cos locality of France. UM-
1022 COS-1002 left maxilla. **A**, left lateral view; **B**, medial (lingual) view; **C**, occlusal (ventral)
1023 view; and **D**, dorsal view. **A-D** are micro-CT visualizations; UM-COS-1011, right maxilla. **E**,
1024 right lateral view, **F**, medial (lingual) view, **G**, occlusal (ventral) view (with close-up of teeth
1025 in ventromedial view); and **H**, dorsal view. [planned for page width]

1026

1027 FIGURE 6. Glyptosauridae indeterminate (**A-J**) and Anguioidea indet. (**K-M**) from the early
1028 Eocene Cos locality of France. Isolated cephalic osteoderms. UM-COS-1004, hexagonal
1029 osteoderm: **A**, dorsal; **B**, ventral; and **C**, lateral views. UM-COS-1005, polygonal osteoderm:
1030 **D**, external and **E**, internal views. Isolated body osteoderms. UM-COS-1006: **F**, external; **G**,
1031 internal and **H**, lateral views. UM-COS-1007: **I**, external; and **J**, internal views. UM-COS-
1032 1008; **K**, external; **L**, internal; and **M**, oblique lateral views. All images are micro-CT
1033 visualizations. [planned for page width]


1034



1035 FIGURE 7. Palaeovaranidae indeterminate from the early Eocene Cos locality of France.
1036 UM-COS- 1009, nearly complete frontal. **A**, dorsal; **B**, ventral; **C**, left lateral; **D**, right lateral;
1037 and **E**, anterodorsal views. All images are micro-CT visualizations. [planned for page width]






1038




1039 FIGURE 8. Varanoidea indeterminate from the early Eocene Cos locality of France. UM-
1040 COS-1010, left maxilla. **A**, lateral; **B**, medial; **C**, dorsomedial; **D**, dorsal; and **E**, ventral views
1041 (**A-E** are micro-CT visualizations); and **F**, μ CT slice of tooth bases showing the presence of
1042 plicidentine. [planned for page width]



1043


















5 mm






2 mm



1 mm



A**B****C****D****E**