

Trace fossils on a trace fossil: a vertebrate-bitten vertebrate coprolite from the Miocene of Italy

(Short title: **A vertebrate-bitten vertebrate coprolite**)

5

Alberto Collareta, Maurizio Gemelli, Angelo Varola, and Giovanni Bianucci

With 3 figures and 1 table

Addresses of the Authors:

10 ALBERTO COLLARETA (corresponding author), Dipartimento di Scienze della Terra, Università di Pisa, via S. Maria 53, Pisa, 56126 Pisa, Italy; e-mail: alberto.collareta@unipi.it

MAURIZIO GEMELLI, Dipartimento di Scienze della Terra, Università di Pisa, via S. Maria 53, Pisa, 56126 Pisa, Italy; e-mail: maurizio.gemelli@unipi.it

15 ANGELO VAROLA, Dipartimento di Scienze della Terra, Università di Pisa, via S. Maria 53, Pisa, 56126 Pisa, Italy; e-mail: angelo.varola@alice.it

GIOVANNI BIANUCCI, Dipartimento di Scienze della Terra, Università di Pisa, via S. Maria 53, Pisa, 56126 Pisa, Italy; e-mail: giovanni.bianucci@unipi.it

Abstract:

20 Despite their long history of discoveries and research, of all the vertebrate coprolites currently known worldwide, only a very few have been explicitly recognised as exhibiting bite marks by other vertebrates. These overly rare specimens represent “compound ichnofossils”, i.e., trace fossils (the lithified faeces) on which other trace fossils (the tooth incisions) are present. Here we report on an unusual large-sized coprolite from the Miocene “Pietra leccese” formation of southern Italy that
25 displays several superficial bite marks. This specimen is described, figured, and chemically

characterised by means of hand-held energy dispersive X-ray fluorescence – the first application of this method to the analysis of a vertebrate coprolite. Based on its size, morphology, structure, and major-element composition, the Pietra leccese coprolite is here identified as the fossilised excreta of a large carnivorous vertebrate, possibly a shark, whereas the tooth incisions are attributed to the
30 biting action of indeterminate fish, likely including both bony and cartilaginous fish. Biting seemingly occurred prior to the eventual deposition of the scat at the seafloor (i.e., when it was still in the water column) and probably reflects unintentional snagging or aborted exploratory coprophagy aimed at testing the palatability of the faeces. In conclusion, the highly idiosyncratic specimen described in this paper represents a significant addition to the overly scanty record of
35 vertebrate-bitten vertebrate coprolites and provides a much unusual window on the ecological interactions between marine vertebrates in the Miocene central Mediterranean ecosystems witnessed by the remarkable fossil assemblage of the Pietra leccese.

Key words: bite marks, bromalite, compound ichnofossil, Digestichnia, HHXRF, Mediterranean,
40 palaeoecology, Pietra leccese, vertebrate ichnology, shark.

1. Introduction

Vertebrate coprolites were recognised as fossilised faeces very early in the study of vertebrate fossils, i.e., in the earliest XIX century, by the Reverend William Buckland (HUNT et al. 2012). Even before Buckland's pioneering works, however, vertebrate coprolites had been collected and
45 described without being correctly identified (DUFFIN 2012). In spite of this long history of discoveries and scientific research, of all the vertebrate coprolites currently known worldwide, only a very few have been explicitly recognised as exhibiting bite marks by other vertebrates (GODFREY & SMITH 2010; GODFREY & PALMER 2015; GODFREY & FRANDBSEN 2016; DENTZIEN-DIAS et al. 2018). Each of these overly rare specimens represents a “compound ichnofossil” (*sensu* GODFREY &
50 PALMER 2015), i.e., a trace fossil (the bitten coprolite) on which other trace fossils (the tooth incisions) are present.

In the present paper, we report on another unusual coprolite from the Miocene “Pietra leccese” formation of southern Italy that displays a plethora of superficial bite marks. This specimen is described, figured, and chemically characterised by means of hand-held energy dispersive X-ray
55 fluorescence. The coprolite itself is interpreted as produced by a large carnivorous vertebrate, possibly a shark, whereas the tooth incisions are referred to indeterminate fish, likely including both chondrichthyans and osteichthyans. The processes that led to the formation of this unusual fossil specimen are also briefly discussed.

60 2. Stratigraphic and palaeontological background

The Pietra leccese is a Miocene calcareous formation cropping out in the Salento peninsula (Apulia, southern Italy) (Fig. 1). This sedimentary unit is mostly comprised of foraminiferal biomicrites and biosparites, ranging chronostratigraphically between the Burdigalian and the Messinian (e.g., FORESI et al. 2002; BOSSIO et al. 2005, 2006; MAZZEI et al. 2009). Surprisingly, despite its modest
65 thickness (a few tens of metres; FORESI et al. 2002), the Pietra leccese records a 11-million-year-

long history of sedimentation (BOSSIO et al. 2006); this might be explained by the occurrence of several depositional hiatuses, attributed to the erosional action of marine currents, which are marked by glauconite-rich intervals (BOSSIO et al. 2005). Based on observations on the Pietra leccese microfossils (e.g., BOSSIO et al. 2006) and macrofossils (e.g., CARNEVALE et al. 2001), the
70 depositional environment of this limestone has been interpreted as located in the deepest portion of the outer neritic zone.

Body fossils of marine vertebrates from the Pietra leccese are known to the scientific community since the mid-XIX century and have been thoroughly investigated since; they include turtles, crocodiles, bony and cartilaginous fish, sirenians, and cetaceans (both toothed and baleen-bearing
75 whales) (COSTA 1853, 1856, 1864; CAPELLINI 1878; VIGLIAROLO 1891; MISURI 1910; BASSANI 1911, 1915; MONCHARMONT ZEI 1950, 1956; MENESINI & TAVANI 1968; MENESINI 1969; BIANUCCI et al. 1992, 1994a, 1994b, 2004, 2016; BIANUCCI 2001; CARNEVALE et al. 2001; DELFINO et al. 2001; BISCONTI & VAROLA 2006; BIANUCCI & LANDINI 2002, 2006; CHESI et al. 2007; PERI et al. 2019). The presence of vertebrate Digestichnia (i.e., trace fossils originating from the digestive processes
80 of animals, such as coprolites, regurgitalites, and gastroliths; VALLON 2012) in the Pietra leccese has been proposed by TAVANI (1973) based on the occurrence of centimetre- to decimetre-sized metamorphic and calcareous clasts, possibly interpretable as gastroliths of large-sized cetaceans or fish.

As many other vertebrate fossils from the Pietra leccese, the bitten coprolite here described was
85 collected by one of the authors (A.V.), in the late XX century, in the framework of the activities of “Gruppo Naturalisti Salentini”. This specimen is currently housed in the Museo di Storia Naturale dell'Università di Pisa (=MSNUP, Calci, Pisa Province, Italy) with accession number MSNUP I-17604. Although the provenance of MSNUP I-17604 from the Pietra leccese strata is ascertained, the exact stratigraphic position of this specimen is unfortunately uncertain.

90

3. Methods

Measurements of MSNUP I-17604 were taken using a standard analog caliper. Photographs and microphotographs of MSNUP I-17604 were taken using a Nikon D5200 digital camera and a Canon EOS 60D digital camera mounted on a Zeiss Stemi 2000-C optical stereomicroscope, respectively.

95 Concern for the integrity of MSNUP I-17604 precluded removing any part of it for destructive chemical analyses. Therefore, in order to obtain a major-element compositional characterisation of this fossil specimen, we analysed it by means of hand-held energy dispersive X-ray fluorescence (HHXRF), a non-destructive and non-invasive analytical technique (e.g., PIOREK 1997). Analyses were performed at Dipartimento di Scienze della Terra dell'Università di Pisa (Italy) with a NITON
100 XL3t GOLDD+ hand-held spectrometer (see GEMELLI et al. 2017 for performances and accuracies). Three spot analyses were performed on different areas of the external surface of the studied coprolite. The beam spot diameter was 8 mm. Measurement time was 150 s for each replicate. To our knowledge, this was the very first application of HHXRF to the study of vertebrate coprolites.

105 4. Results

Similar to many vertebrate body fossils from the Pietra leccese, MSNUP I-17604 (Fig. 2) exhibits a pinkish-yellowish colouration. No unambiguous inclusions are visible on its external surface.

Similar to another vertebrate-bitten vertebrate coprolite described by GODFREY & PALMER (2015), the external surface of MSNUP I-17604 displays a somewhat reflective patina.

110 MSNUP I-17604 appears as almost complete, only lacking some fragments (likely because of post-burial breakage) at one termination; it measures 79 mm in maximum preserved length (estimated total length around 85 mm), 58 mm in maximum width, and 54 mm in maximum thickness. The morphology of MSNUP I-17604 could be described as oval (*sensu* HÄNTZSCHEL et al. 1994: fig. 1) (Fig. 2a, c, d). Moreover, following the terminology proposed by HUNT & LUCAS
115 (2012), it might be further characterised as spiral (i.e., it appears as formed by three rather thick

coils of faecal material wrapped around the long axis) and heteropolar (i.e., these coils appear to accumulate at one end of the coprolite) (Fig. 2b, e, f). Reflecting the heteropolar arrangement of the coils, one ending of MSNUP I-17604 is convex (Fig. 2b) whereas the other termination (i.e., the slightly incomplete one) is concave (Fig. 2e). One side of MSNUP I-17604 is distinctly flattened and displays a few roughly circular, badly defined, shallow depressions that do not exceed some millimetres in diameter (Fig. 2d).

The exterior of MSNUP I-17604 displays several different surface textures and features. Some of them seemingly testify to the deformation of the faeces during excretion or the subsequent alteration of their superficial properties and aspect during exposition to seawater. For example, a few parallel folds are observed close to the convex ending of the coprolite (Fig. 3a), and the external surface of MSNUP I-17604 locally exhibits a somewhat wrinkled aspect due to the presence of several very shallow, subparallel, and closely spaced creases (e.g., Fig. 3b). In turn, other typologies of surface features that are observed on MSNUP I-17604 evoke the bioerosional action of organisms other than the producer of the faeces. Centimetre-sized patches of short, shallow, closely spaced, often overlapping, subrectilinear to slightly wavy striations locally provide the external surface of the coprolite with a rough aspect (e.g., Fig. 3c). Similar short, very shallow, sometimes isolated scars are almost ubiquitous all over the specimen. More prominent traces include a pair of close, parallel, weakly curved incisions, having a length of about 7 mm and one termination shaped as a ca. 2-mm-deep conical cavity (Figs. 2a, 3d). Roughly a dozen of scars observed on MSNUP I-17604 can be related to this kind of morphology. Simpler, substraight to weakly sigmoidal gouges, ranging between a few millimetres and 13 mm in length and reaching their maximum depth and width at about mid-length, are also present (e.g., Figs. 2d, 3e). Several traces of this kind are rather evenly distributed over the entire external surface of MSNUP I-17604 (Fig. 2); those that take place on the flat side of the coprolite, however, appear as somewhat planate, which makes their identification and characterisation difficult in some cases. Locally, where the outer aspect of MSNUP I-17604 is

not affected by the aforementioned bioerosional scars, it appears as substantially smooth, although some fracture lines (sometimes lined by inconspicuous manganese coats) are present here and there (e.g., Fig. 3c, d, f).

The application of HHXRF to the major-element chemical characterisation of MSNUP I-17604 proved successful. The results of the HHXRF analysis are reported in Table 1. Noticeably for the purposes of our study, MSNUP I-17604 appears as very rich in phosphorous (ca. 14 wt%) and calcium (ca. 36 wt%).

5. Discussion and conclusions

What kind of organism is responsible for producing MSNUP I-17604? The large size of this specimen excludes any possible derivation from an invertebrate organism; indeed, invertebrate faecal pellets are usually less than 5 mm long (HÄNTZSCHEL et al. 1968). Spirally coiled coprolites are generally referred to non-teleost fish having the intestine shaped as a spiral valve; in particular, of all the spiral coprolites, those exhibiting a heteropolar arrangement of the coils are generally referred to sharks (e.g., WILLIAMS 1972; MCALLISTER 1985; HUNT et al. 1994; STRINGER & KING 2012). In the light of these considerations, the Miocene coprolite described in the present paper might be best interpretable as produced by a shark; corroborating this interpretation, the high abundances of phosphorus and calcium recovered in MSNUP I-17604 (table 1) compare very well with the chemical characteristics of other coprolites from carnivorous vertebrates, including sharks (e.g., CHIN 2002; GODFREY & SMITH 2010; STRINGER & KING 2012; SCHWIMMER et al. 2015). Indeed, remarkable concentrations of phosphorus and calcium in a coprolite suggest that the diet of the producer of the faeces was rich in biogenic calcium phosphate, which is provided by bones, teeth and scales of the prey; this also favours the preservation of the scat as fossil by providing an autochthonous source of the chemical elements that are involved in phosphatisation (e.g., BRADLEY 1946; CHIN 2002) and, possibly, nucleation sites in form of crystallites of undigested

hydroxyapatite, similar to what has recently been proposed for the phosphatisation of poorly calcified “soft tissues” such as baleen (GIONCADA et al. 2016).

Although it is not possible to exactly correlate the coprolite size and the total body size in extinct selachians (SCHWIMMER et al. 2015), given the large size of MSNUP I-17604, the producing shark should also have been large. Large-sized shark species from the Pietra leccese that might account for the production of the studied coprolite include the extinct lamniforms *Carcharocles megalodon*, *Cosmopolitodus hastalis*, *Isurus retroflexus* (= *Anotodus agassizii*), and *Parotodus benedeni* (MENESINI 1969; SORCE 2009).

Following DE FIGUEREIDO SOUTO (2010), LEWIS (2011), MILÀN (2012), and PESQUERO et al. (2013), the slightly incomplete concave ending that characterises one termination of MSNUP I-17604 might be interpreted as resulting from muscular contraction (i.e., peristalsis), as well as a further confirmation of the organic nature of this specimen. Furthermore, following HUNT et al. (1994) and GODFREY & SMITH (2010), we interpret the flattened side of MSNUP I-17604 (Figs. 2d, 3e) as the surface upon which the scat came to rest on the substrate (i.e., its lower surface). In the light of this assumption, the small depressions that are present on this side of the coprolite can be explained via partial draping of substrate asperities by the faecal matter. Therefore, MSNUP I-17604 does not represent the *in situ* content of a chondrichthyan spiral valve (i.e., it is not an enterospira), but it was rather expelled from the producer's digestive tract. This is also supported by the observation of parallel folds close to the convex ending of the coprolite (Fig. 3a), which might indicate intra-coil plastic deformation during evacuation of the faeces (see also DENTZIEN-DIAS et al. 2018 at this regard). If this interpretation is correct, biting of MSNUP I-17604 should have occurred after its excretion, otherwise the tooth marks would have been obliterated during the passage of the plastic faeces through the anus. At the same time, as the tooth incisions are regularly present also on the flattened surface of this coprolite (Fig. 3e), biting should have occurred prior to the eventual deposition of the excreta at the seafloor (i.e., when the scat was still in the water

column).

The tooth incisions observed on the exterior of MSNUP I-17604 are rather shallow, not exceeding 2 mm in maximum depth, thus indicating that the faeces were firm enough at the time it was bitten to inhibit tooth penetration. Moreover, as observed in another recently described
195 vertebrate-bitten vertebrate coprolite from the Eastern U.S.A. (GODFREY & FRANDBEN 2016), the edges of some tooth incisions preserved on MSNUP I-17604 appear as somewhat “ragged”, thus suggesting that the external surface of the excreta did not yield compliantly as it was raked by the teeth. Furthermore, some portions of MSNUP I-17604 display closely spaced, very shallow creases that locally confer a wrinkled aspect to the external surface of the coprolite (Fig. 3b). Although
200 these creases resemble the structures interpreted by WILLIAMS (1972) as impressions of mucosal folds, we concur with DENTZIEN-DIAS et al. (2012) that they are better interpretable as reflecting incipient decomposition of the faeces.

What kinds of organisms and activities are responsible for producing the bioerosional scars observed all over the external surface of MSNUP I-17604? The origin of the very small, often
205 clustered incisions (Fig. 2c) remains unknown. Given their high abundance and frequent clustering, following GODFREY & PALMER (2015), these traces are here interpreted as likely reflecting coprophagy by indeterminate invertebrates. By contrast, in terms of both size and morphology, the larger incisions exemplified in Figure 3e cannot easily match any bioerosional feature originating from the activity of an invertebrate; in turn, they are perfectly consistent with the well-known bite
210 marks left on bones by sharks provided with relatively large, blade-like tooth crowns having unserrated cutting edges (e.g., several species of Lamniformes, including *Anotodus agassizi*, *Cosmopolitodus hastalis*, and *Parotodus benedeni*, which are known from the Pietra leccese strata) (e.g., BIANUCCI et al. 2010, 2018; GOVENDER 2015). In the light of the classification scheme of shark bite marks proposed by CIGALA FULGOSI (1990) and subsequently amended by BIANUCCI et
215 al. (2010) and COLLARETA et al. (2017), these scars are here identified as due to type I (i.e., the

cutting edge of the tooth impacted the surface of the faeces from above downward, thus producing a subrectilinear or weakly curved mark) or type II (i.e., the tooth edge dragged in parallel with the dental axis, thus producing a more or less elongated incision) biting actions. Furthermore, as already observed, a few tooth marks preserved on the surface of MSNUP I-17604 (Fig. 3d) are
220 close, parallel to each other, and have one end shaped as a conical impression, likely reflecting their origin from the impact of two adjoining teeth of a bony fish, as proposed by GODFREY & PALMER (2015) and DENTZIEN-DIAS et al. (2018) for similar features found on other bitten vertebrate coprolites. Indeed, the proximate conical terminations of these furrows seemingly preserve the shape of the pointed apices of conical tooth cusps and indicate the direction of dragging of the teeth
225 over the surface of the faeces.

Therefore, at least two different vertebrates – one shark and, most likely, one bony fish – had their teeth interacting with the faeces now represented by the coprolite specimen MSNUP I-17604. Since the neontological literature dealing with coprophagy by marine vertebrates is rather scanty, the motivations behind such a behaviour can be only tentatively reconstructed. As pointed out by
230 GODFREY & SMITH (2010), extant sharks are known to test the palatability of possible prey or scavenging items via tentative biting (KLIMLEY 1994; COLLIER et al. 1996; RITTER & LEVINE 2004). As regards the bony fish, several lineages of osteichthyans have been observed or hypothesised to engage in coprophagy, at least for exploratory purposes (ROBERTSON 1982; CHERRY et al. 1989; PARRISH 1989; DENTZIEN-DIAS et al. 2018). Given these premises, we argue that the bite marks
235 found on MSNUP I-17604 are the product of aborted exploratory coprophagy or unintentional snagging, as already hypothesised by GODFREY & SMITH (2010), GODFREY & PALMER (2015), GODFREY & FRANDBSEN (2016), and DENTZIEN-DIAS et al. (2018) for explaining the presence of tooth marks on other bitten coprolite specimens. Possibly supporting the hypothesis of unintentional snagging, none of the tooth marks observed on MSNUP I-17604 is deep enough to be consistent
240 with a high level of intent, and the same can be said for the absence of coupled series of furrows

that might indicate an origin from opposing teeth in the upper and lower jaws of the biting fish. On the other hand, the abundance of tooth marks recovered all over the surface of MSNUP I-17604 is a strong argument supporting a not completely fortuitous interaction between the biting fish and the bitten excreta. As suggested by GODFREY & PALMER (2015) for a remarkable gar-bitten coprolite from South Carolina, USA, the faeces might have been momentarily mistaken as prey or snagged unintentionally as the biting organisms were snapping at nearby, genuine food items.

In conclusion, MSNUP I-17604 represents a significant addition to the overly scanty record of vertebrate-bitten vertebrate coprolites, being indeed the first fossilised vertebrate scat from the Euromediterranean region to be formally recognised as preserving tooth impressions. The highly idiosyncratic specimen described in the present paper can thus be regarded as a trace-bearing trace fossil, i.e., a true compound ichnofossil that provides a much unusual window on the ecological interactions between marine vertebrates in the Miocene central Mediterranean ecosystems witnessed by the remarkable fossil assemblage of the Pietra leccese. Therefore, our finding encourages to pursue the quest for marine vertebrate fossils in this well-known fossiliferous limestone by demonstrating that, after more than one century and a half of palaeontological research, the study of the Miocene fossil record of Apulia can still bring significant novelties. Last but not least, HHXRF proved successful in providing a major-element chemical characterisation of MSNUP I-17604, thus suggesting that this non-destructive, non-invasive, rapid, and relatively inexpensive analytical method might be extensively (or even routinely) applied to the study of vertebrate coprolites.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Chiara Sorbini (Museo di Storia Naturale dell'Università di Pisa) for her curatorial support.

265

References

- BASSANI, F. (1911): Sopra un Bericide dal calcare miocenico di Lecce, di Rosignano Piemonte e di Malta (*Myripristis melitensis* A. SMITH WOODWARD sp.). – Atti della Reale Accademia di Scienze Fisiche e Matematiche di Napoli, serie II, **15**: 1-16.
- 270 BASSANI, F. (1915): La ittiofauna della pietra leccese (Terra d’Otranto). – Atti della Reale Accademia delle Scienze Fisiche e Matematiche di Napoli, serie II, **46**: 1-52.
- BIANUCCI, G. (2001): A new genus of kentriodontid (Cetacea: Odontoceti) from the Miocene of South Italy. – *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology*, **21**: 573-577.
- BIANUCCI, G., COLLARETA, A., BOSIO, G., LANDINI, W., GARIBOLDI, K., GIONCADA, A., LAMBERT, 275 O., MALINVERNO, E., MUIZON, C. DE, VARAS-MALCA, R., VILLA, I.M, COLETTI, G. & URBINA, M. (2018): Taphonomy and palaeoecology of the lower Miocene marine vertebrate assemblage of Ullujaya (Chilcatay Formation, East Pisco Basin, southern Peru). – *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, **511**: 256-279.
- BIANUCCI, G., COLLARETA, A., POST, K., VAROLA A. & LAMBERT, O. (2016a): A new record of 280 *Messapicetus* from the Pietra leccese (late Miocene, southern Italy): antitropical distribution in a fossil beaked whale (Cetacea, Ziphiidae). – *Rivista Italiana di Paleontologia e Stratigrafia (Research in Paleontology and Stratigraphy)*, **122**: 63-74.
- BIANUCCI, G. & LANDINI W. (2002): Change in diversity, ecological significance and 285 biogeographical relationships of the Mediterranean Miocene toothed whale fauna. – *Geobios*, **35**: 19-28.
- BIANUCCI, G. & LANDINI W. (2006): Killer sperm whale: a new basal physeteroid (Mammalia, Cetacea) from the Late Miocene of Italy. – *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society*, **148**: 103-131.
- BIANUCCI G., LANDINI W. & VAROLA A. (1992): *Messapicetus longirostris*, a new genus and species 290 of Ziphiidae (Cetacea) from the Late Miocene of “Pietra leccese” (Apulia, Italy). – *Bollettino*

- della Società Paleontologica Italiana, **31**: 261-264.
- BIANUCCI G., LANDINI W. & VAROLA A. (1994a): New remains of Cetacea Odontoceti from the «Pietra leccese» (Apulia, Italy). – Bollettino della Società Paleontologica Italiana, **33**: 215-230.
- BIANUCCI G., LANDINI W. & VAROLA, A. (1994b): Relationships of *Messapicetus longirostris*
295 (Cetacea, Ziphiidae) from the Miocene of South Italy. – Bollettino della Società Paleontologica Italiana, **33**: 231-242.
- BIANUCCI, G., LANDINI, W. & VAROLA, A. (2004): First discovery of the Miocene northern Atlantic sperm whale *Orycterocetus* in the Mediterranean. – Geobios, **37**: 569-573.
- BIANUCCI, G., SORCE, B., STORAI, T. & LANDINI, W. (2010): Killing in the Pliocene: shark attack on
300 a dolphin from Italy. – Palaeontology, **53**: 457-470.
- BISCONTI, M. & VAROLA, A. (2006): The oldest eschrichtiid mysticete and a new morphological diagnosis of Eschrichtiidae (gray whales). – Rivista Italiana di Paleontologia e Stratigrafia (Research in Paleontology and Stratigraphy), **112**: 447- 457.
- BOSSIO, A., FORESI, L. M., MARGIOTTA, S., MAZZEI, R., SALVATORINI, G. & DONIA, F. (2006):
305 Stratigrafia neogenico-quadernaria del settore nord-orientale della Provincia di Lecce (con rilevamento geologico alla scala 1: 25.000).– Geologica Romana, **39**: 63-88.
- BOSSIO, A., MAZZEI, R., MONTEFORTI, B. & SALVATORINI G. (2005): Stratigrafia del Neogene e Quaternario del Salento Sud-orientale (con rilevamento geologico alla scala 1:25.000). – Geologica Romana, **38**: 31-60.
- 310 BRADLEY, W.H. (1946): Coprolites from the Bridger Formation of Wyoming: their composition and microorganisms. – American Journal of Science, **244**: 215-239.
- CALIA, A., LAURENZI TABASSO, M., MARIA MECCHI, A. & QUARTA, G. (2013): The study of stone for conservation purposes: Lecce stone (southern Italy). – Geological Society, London, Special Publications, **391**: 139-156.
- 315 CAPELLINI, G. (1878): Della Pietra leccese e di alcuni suoi fossili. – Memorie della Reale

- Accademia delle Scienze dell'Istituto di Bologna, **9**: 227-258.
- CARNEVALE, G., SORBINI, C., LANDINI, W. & VAROLA A. (2002): *Makaira* cf. *M. nigricans* LACÉPÈDE, 1802 (Teleostei: Perciformes: Istiophoridae) from the Pietra leccese, Late Miocene, Apulia, Southern Italy. – *Palaeontographia Italica*, **88**: 63-75.
- 320 CHERRY, R.D., HEYRAUD, M. & JAMES, A.G. (1989): Diet prediction in common clupeoid fish using Polonium-210 data. – *Journal of Environmental Radioactivity*, **10**: 47-65.
- CHESI, F., DELFINO, M., VAROLA, A. & ROOK, L. (2007): Fossil sea turtles (Chelonii, Dermochelyidae and Cheloniidae) from the Miocene of Pietra Leccese (late Burdigalian–early Messinian), Southern Italy. – *Geodiversitas*, **29**: 231-333.
- 325 CHIN, K. (2002): Analyses of coprolites produced by carnivorous vertebrates. – *The Paleontological Society Papers* **8**: 43-50.
- CIGALA FULGOSI, F. (1990): Predation (or possible scavenging) by a great white shark on an extinct species of bottlenosed dolphin in the Italian Pliocene. – *Tertiary Research*, **12**: 17-36.
- COLLARETA, A., LAMBERT, O., LANDINI, W., DI CELMA, C., MALINVERNO, E., VARAS-MALCA, R.,
 330 URBINA, M. & BIANUCCI, G. (2017): Did the giant extinct shark *Carcharocles megalodon* target small prey? Bite marks on marine mammal remains from the late Miocene of Peru. – *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, **469**: 84-91.
- COLLIER, R.S., MARKS, M. & WARNER, R.W. (1996): White shark attacks on inanimate objects along the Pacific Coast of North America. – In: KLIMLEY, A.P. & AINLEY, D.G. (eds.), *Great white sharks: the biology of *Carcharodon carcharias**, 217–222. San Diego (Academic Press).
- 335 COSTA, O.G. (1853): *Paleontologia del Regno di Napoli. Parte I.* – *Atti dell'Accademia Pontaniana*, **5**: 233-433.
- COSTA, O.G. (1856): *Paleontologia del Regno di Napoli. Parte II.* – *Atti dell'Accademia Pontaniana*, **7**: 1-378.
- 340 COSTA, O.G. (1865): Sul genere *Rythisodon*. – *Rendiconti dell'Accademia di Scienze Fische e*

- Matematiche della Società Nazionale di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti di Napoli, **4**: 163-164.
- DELFINO, M., PACINI, M., VAROLA, A. & ROOK., L. (2003): The crocodiles of the Pietra Leccese (Miocene of southern Italy). – In: Abstract Book of the 1st Meeting of the European Association of Vertebrate Palaeontologists, 18.
- 345 DENTZIEN-DIAS, P., CARRILLO-BRICEÑO, J.D., FRANCISCHINI, H. & SÁNCHEZ, R. (2018): Paleocological and taphonomical aspects of the Late Miocene vertebrate coprolites (Urumaco Formation) of Venezuela. – *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, **490**: 590-603.
- DENTZIEN-DIAS, P.C., DE FIGUEIREDO, A.E.Q., HORN, B., CISNEROS, J.C. & SCHULTZ, C.L. (2012): Paleobiology of a unique vertebrate coprolites concentration from Rio do Rasto Formation
350 (Middle/Upper Permian), Paraná Basin, Brazil. – *Journal of South American Earth Sciences*, **40**: 53-62.
- DUFFIN, C.J. (2012): The earliest published records of coprolites. – *New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science Bulletin*, **57**: 25-29.
- DE FIGUEREIDO SOUTO, P. (2010). Crocodylomorph coprolites from the Bauru basin, upper
355 Cretaceous, Brazil. – *New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science Bulletin*, **51**: 201-208.
- FORESI, L.M., MARGIOTTA, S. & SALVATORINI G. (2002): Bio-cronostratigrafia a foraminiferi planctonici della Pietra leccese (Miocene) nell'area tipo di Cursi-Melpignano (Lecce, Puglia). – *Bollettino della Società Paleontologica Italiana*, **41**: 175-185.
- 360 GEMELLI M., DI ROCCO T., FOLCO L. & D'ORAZIO M. (2017): Parentage identification of differentiated achondritic meteorites by Hand-held Energy Dispersive X-Ray Fluorescence Spectrometry. – *Geostandards and Geoanalytical Research*, **41**: 613-632.
- GIONCADA A., COLLARETA A., GARIBOLDI K., LAMBERT O., DI CELMA C., BONACCORSI E., URBINA M. & BIANUCCI G. (2016): Inside baleen: exceptional microstructure preservation in a late
365 Miocene whale skeleton from Peru. – *Geology*, **44**: 839-842.

- GODFREY, S.J. & FRANDBSEN, G. (2016): Vertebrate-bitten coprolite from South Carolina. – *The Ecphora* **31**: 12-14.
- GODFREY, S.J. & PALMER, B.T. (2015): Gar-bitten coprolite from South Carolina, USA. – *Ichnos*, **22**: 103-108.
- 370 GODFREY, S.J. & SMITH, J.B. (2010): Shark-bitten vertebrate coprolites from the Miocene of Maryland. – *Naturwissenschaften*, **97**: 461-467.
- GOVENDER, R. (2015): Shark-cetacean trophic interaction, Duinefontein, Koeberg, (5 Ma), South Africa. – *South African Journal of Science*, **111**: article #2014-0453.
- HÄNTZSCHEL, W., EL-BAZ, F. & AMSTUTZ, G.C. (1968): Coprolites: an annotated bibliography. –
 375 *Memoirs of the Geological Society of America*, **108**: 1-132.
- HUNT, A.P., CHIN, K. & LOCKLEY, M.G. 1994: The paleobiology of vertebrate coprolites. – In: DONOVAN, S. (ed.), *The Palaeobiology of Trace Fossils*, 221-240. London (John WILEY and sons).
- HUNT, A.P. & LUCAS, S.G. (2012): Descriptive terminology of coprolites and recent feces. – *New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science Bulletin*, **57**: 153-160.
- 380 HUNT, A.P., LUCAS, S.G. MILÀN, J. & SPIELMANN, J.A. (2012): Vertebrate coprolite studies: status and prospectus. – *New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science Bulletin*, **57**: 5-24.
- KLIMLEY, A.P. (1994): The predatory behavior of the white shark. – *American Scientist*, **82**: 122-133.
- 385 LEWIS, M.D. (2011): Pleistocene hyaena coprolite palynology in Britain: implications for the environments of early humans. – *Developments in Quaternary Sciences*, **14**: 263-278.
- MAZZEI, R., MARGIOTTA, S., FORESI, L.M., RIFORGIATO, F. & SALVATORINI, G. (2009): Biostratigraphy and chronostratigraphy of the Miocene Pietra Leccese in the type area of Lecce (Apulia, southern Italy). – *Bollettino della Società Paleontologica Italiana*, **48**: 129-145.
- 390 MCALLISTER, J. (1985): Reevaluation of the formation of spiral coprolites. – *The University of*

- Kansas, *Paleontological Contributions*, **114**: 1-12.
- MENESINI, E. (1969): Ittiodontoliti miocenici di Terra d'Otranto. – *Palaeontographia Italica*, **65**: 1-61.
- MENESINI, E. & TAVANI, G. (1968): Resti di *Scaldicetus* (Cetacea) nel Miocene della Puglia. –
395 *Bollettino della Società Paleontologica Italiana*, **7**: 87-93.
- MILÀN, J. (2012): Crocodylian scatology—a look into morphology, internal architecture, inter-and intraspecific variation and prey remains in extant crocodylian feces. – *New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science Bulletin*, **57**: 65-71.
- MISURI, A. (1910): Sopra un nuovo chelonio del calcare miocenico di Lecce (*Euclastes melii*
400 MISURI). – *Palaeontographia Italica*, **16**: 119-136.
- MONCHARMONT ZEI, M. (1950): Sopra una nuova specie di *Eurhinodelphis* della Pietra leccese. – *Rendiconti dell'Accademia di Scienze Fisiche e Matematiche della Società Nazionale di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti di Napoli*, **4**: 1-11.
- MONCHARMONT ZEI, M. (1956): *Hesperoina dalpiazii* n. gen. et n. sp., Platanistidae, Cetacea, della
405 Pietra leccese. – *Memorie dell'Istituto di Geologia e Mineralogia dell'Università di Padova*, **19**: 1-10.
- PARRISH, J.D. (1989): Fish communities of interacting shallow-water habitats in tropical oceanic regions. – *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, **58**: 143-160.
- PERI, E., COLLARETA, A., INSACCO, G. & BIANUCCI, G. (2019): An *Inticetus*-like (Cetacea:
410 Odontoceti) postcanine tooth from the Pietra leccese (Miocene, southeastern Italy) and its palaeobiogeographical implications. – *Neues Jahrbuch für Geologie und Paläontologie, Abhandlungen* **291**: 221-228.
- PESQUERO, M.D., SALESA, M.J., ESPÍLEZ, E., MAMPEL, L., SILICEO, G. & ALCALÁ, L. (2011): An
415 exceptionally rich hyaena coprolites concentration in the Late Miocene mammal fossil site of La Roma 2 (Teruel, Spain): Taphonomical and palaeoenvironmental inferences. – *Palaeogeography,*

- Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology, **311**: 30-37.
- PIOREK, S. (1997): Field-portable X-ray fluorescence spectrometry: Past, present, and future. –
Field Analytical Chemistry & Technology, **1**: 317-329.
- ROBERTSON, D.R. (1982): Fish feces as fish food on a Pacific Coral Reef. – Marine Ecology
420 Progress Series, **7**: 253-265.
- RITTER, E. & LEVINE, M. (2004): Use of forensic analysis to better understand shark attack
behaviour. – Journal of Forensic Odontostomatology, **22**: 40-46.
- SCHWIMMER, D.R., WEEMS, R.E. & SANDERS, A.E. (2015): A late Cretaceous shark coprolite with
baby freshwater turtle vertebrae inclusions. – Palaios, **30**: 707-713.
- 425 SORCE, B. (2009): palaeontological study of the order Lamniformes in the Miocene Mediterranean
basin. Unpublished PhD Thesis in Earth Science, Università di Pisa.
- STRINGER, G.L. & KING, L. (2012): Late Eocene shark coprolites from the Yazoo Clay in
northeastern Louisiana. – New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science Bulletin, **57**:
275-309.
- 430 TAVANI, G. (1973): Ipotesi sulla presenza di grossi frammenti di gneiss e di calcare nella “Pietra
leccese” della Puglia. – Atti della Società Toscana di Scienze Naturali, Memorie, Serie A, **80**:
121-125.
- VALLON, L.H. (2012): Digestichnia (VIALOV, 1972) – an almost forgotten ethological class for trace
fossils. – New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science Bulletin, **57**: 131-136.
- 435 VIGLIAROLO, G. (1890): Monografia dei *Pristis* fossili con la descrizione di una nuova specie del
calcare miocenico di Lecce. – Atti della Reale Accademia delle Scienze Fisiche e Matematiche di
Napoli, **4**: 1-28.
- WILLIAMS, M.E. (1972): The origin of ‘spiral coprolites’. – The University of Kansas,
Paleontological Contributions, **59**: 1-19.

440 **Figure captions**

[Possible position for the three figures: Fig. 1, possibly 1½ columns wide, between lines 71 and 72; Fig. 2, possibly 2 columns wide, between lines 109 and 110; Fig. 3, possibly 2 columns wide, between lines 143 and 144]

445

Fig. 1. Schematic geological map of the Salento peninsula (Apulia, southern Italy). Grey-shaded areas indicate the exposures of the Pietra leccese, the Miocene calcarenite limestone from which the fossil specimen MSNUP I-17604 originates. Modified from PERI et al. (2019), after the original illustration by CALIA et al. (2013).

450 **Fig. 2.** MSNUP I-17604, vertebrate-bitten vertebrate coprolite from the Miocene Pietra leccese of southern Italy, in (a) upper; (b,e) terminal; (c) lateral; (d) lower; and (f) oblique views (photographs).

Fig. 3. Details of the surface textures and features of MSNUP I-17604, vertebrate-bitten vertebrate coprolite from the Miocene Pietra leccese of southern Italy. (a) Parallel folds (black arrows) taking place close to the convex ending of the coprolite (photograph); (b) very shallow, subparallel, and closely spaced creases (microphotograph); (c) patch of short, shallow, closely spaced, often overlapping, subrectilinear to slightly wavy striations, providing the external surface of the coprolite with a rough aspect (microphotograph); (d) pair of close, parallel, weakly curved incisions (black arrows), having one end shaped as a conical impression (microphotograph); (e) long, substraight to weakly sigmoidal gouges (black arrows), reaching their maximum depth and width at about mid-length (microphotograph); (f) planate scars, recalling those figured in the previous panel, found on the flat (i.e., lower) side of the coprolite (microphotograph).

455

460

Tables


465

Table 1. Results of the HHXRF analyses, detailing the major-element chemical composition of MSNUP I-17604. Element concentrations (wt%) are the average of three spot analyses performed on different areas of the external surface of the studied coprolite. “Bal” stands for “balance”; it includes all elements lighter than magnesium that cannot be detected by means of HHXRF analyses.

470

<i>Element</i>	Ca	P	Si	Al	S	Fe	K	Sr	Sc	Ba	Cl	Ma	Bal
<i>Concentration</i>	36.2	14.0	2.0	1.6	0.8	0.5	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	<<0.1	<<0.1	44.4

Figure 1



475

Figure 2




Figure 3

480

