

1 **Manganese and iron oxide use at Combe-Grenal (Dordogne, France): a proxy for**
2 **cultural change in Neanderthal communities**

3

4 Laure Dayet^{1,2}, Jean-Philippe Faivre¹, François-Xavier Le Bourdonnec³, Emmanuel
5 Discamps², Aurélien Royer⁴, Emilie Claud^{1,5}, Christelle Lahaye³, Nadia Cantin³, Elise Tartar⁶,
6 Alain Queffelec¹, Brad Gravina¹, Alain Turq⁷, Francesco d’Errico^{1,8}.

7

8

9 1. CNRS-Université de Bordeaux, UMR5199 de la Préhistoire à l’Actuel: Culture,
10 Environnement et Anthropologie (PACEA), Université de Bordeaux, Allée Geoffroy Saint
11 Hilaire, CS 50023, F-33615, Pessac Cedex, France

12 2. CNRS-Université Toulouse Jean Jaurès, UMR5608 Travaux et Recherches
13 Archéologiques sur les Cultures, les Espaces et les Sociétés (TRACES), Maison de la
14 Recherche, 5, allée Antonio Machado 31058 Toulouse Cedex 9, France

15 3. CNRS-Université Bordeaux Montagne, UMR5060 Institut de Recherche sur les
16 Archéomatériaux – Centre de Recherche Appliqué à l’Archéologie, Maison de
17 l’Archéologie, Esplanade des Antilles, 33607 Pessac Cedex, France

18 4. CNRS-Université Bourgogne Franche-Comté, UMR 6282 Biogéosciences, 6 Boulevard
19 Gabriel, 21000 Dijon, France

20 5. INRAP Grand-Sud-Ouest, 140 avenue du Maréchal LECLERC, CS50036, 33323 BEGLES
21 CEDEX 210

22 6. CNRS-Université Paris I, UMR 7041 Archéologie et Sciences de l’Antiquité (ArScAn),
23 Equipe Ethnologie Préhistorique, Maison de l’Archéologie et de l’Ethnologie, 21 allée de
24 l’Université, 92023 Nanterre cedex, France.

25 7. Musée Nationale de Préhistoire, Les Eyzies, France

26 8. SFF Centre for Early Sapiens Behaviour (SapienCE), University of Bergen, Øysteinsgate 3,
27 Postboks 7805, 5020, Bergen, Norway

28

1 **Highlights**

- 2
- 3 1) Analysis of Combe-Grenal mineral pigments identifies marked differences across the
- 4 stratigraphy in terms of raw material choices and processing techniques.
- 5 2) The lower Quina Mousterian layers feature the intense use of black manganese oxides
- 6 processed by scraping and grinding.
- 7 3) Overlying Discoid and Discoid/Levallois layers are associated with red and yellow
- 8 iron oxides.
- 9 4) Diachronic variations in mineral pigment frequency and type might reflect cultural
- 10 changes at Combe-Grenal.
- 11
- 12
- 13

14 **Abstract**

15

16 Neanderthal material culture patterning in Western Europe has been primarily approached

17 from retouched stone tools and associated flake production methods. While considerable

18 effort has been devoted over the past decade to better characterize Middle Palaeolithic lithic

19 techno-complexes (LTCs) in this region, the extent to which they reflect cultural groups still

20 remains unclear. In this respect, integrating other forms of archaeological evidence could

21 provide valuable insights on the cultural significance of late Middle Palaeolithic industrial

22 variability. The site of Combe-Grenal (Dordogne, France) has yielded consistent evidence of

23 mineral pigment use throughout the upper part of the sequence. Here we explore whether

24 mineral pigments might be embedded with an indexical meaning and if changes in pigment

25 exploitation potentially reflect cultural changes. We combined a microscopic use-wear

26 approach with SEM-EDS, pXRF, and XRD analyses of 73 pigment fragments from layers 26

27 to 11 in order to reconstruct the different stages of their acquisition and use (provenance,

28 selection, processing, function). Our results show manganese oxides to have been used in the

29 lower layers of the Quina LTC, while red and/or yellow iron oxide pieces were employed

30 during the Discoid and Discoid/Levallois LTCs. This decrease in manganese oxide use

31 correlates with a change in lithic technology and may represent some form of cultural change.

32

33

34

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

1. Introduction

Reliably correlating archaeological assemblage composition with patterns of cultural change remains one of the foremost challenges for Palaeolithic archaeology. This is particularly the case with the late Neanderthal record of Western Europe, where assemblage types are traditionally defined with references to stone tool typology and associated production methods. Consistent efforts over the last decade have made considerable inroads in ‘cleaning-up’ Middle Palaeolithic industrial taxonomy in a key region of the Neanderthal occupation of Western Europe –south-western France (see Faivre et al., 2017a). By moving away from an emphasis on retouched tool proportions and focusing instead on flake production methods in the form of lithic techno-complexes (LTC), Jaubert (2011; 2014) provided one of the most detailed chrono-cultural syntheses of the Middle Palaeolithic succession in south-western France. This revision highlighted a broad tendency of Levallois-based assemblages to precede those assigned to the Quina flaking system, the latter being overlain by layers in which the Discoid flaking system is dominant. Concentrating on production methods instead of stone tool types avoids pitfalls of typological distinctions, which do not accurately reflect past tool categories (see e.g. Chase and Dibble 1987). Variations in the proportions of tool types may instead reflect differences in site function (Binford and Binford 1966; Binford 1983), raw material constraints, tool resharpening intensity (Dibble, 1984, 1987; Rolland and Dibble 1990) and the reuse or recycling of flakes and tools (Vaquero 2011; Turq et al. 2013; Clément 2014; Gravina and Discamps 2015).

Considering difficulties in mobilising stone tool typology for identifying consistent cultural groups in the Middle Palaeolithic, recent studies have increasingly turned to technological systems to address potential cultural distinctions (Delagnes and Meignen 2006). For example, Faivre et al. (2014) demonstrated a clear chronological patterning of the three main Middle Palaeolithic flaking systems -Levallois, Quina, and Discoid -in the deep archaeological sequence of Combe-Grenal. A subsequent statistical analysis of well-defined technological data collated from multiple sites in the same region provided a means for better defining Middle Palaeolithic lithic techno-complexes (LTC) in south-western France (Faivre et al. 2017). This renewed vision of Middle Palaeolithic industrial variability presents a new opportunity to explore how other elements, namely pigment use, can potentially provide

1 additional insights concerning the cultural significance of Neanderthal material culture
2 patterning in this important region of Western Europe. In this respect, the use of manganese
3 and iron oxides during the late Middle Palaeolithic is a well-known but still poorly
4 documented phenomenon of the Neanderthal behavioural repertoire (Demars 1992; Soressi
5 and d’Errico 2007; Roebroeks et al.2011; Bonjean et al. 2015; Heyes et al. 2016; Pitarch and
6 d’Errico 2018). The site of Combe-Grenal has produced one of the rare archaeological
7 sequences from south-western France with evidence for the consistent use of mineral
8 pigments throughout several archaeological layers (Demars 1992). Here we provide a detailed
9 use-wear, mineralogical and diachronic analysis of mineral pigments from multiple layers
10 comprising Combe-Grenal’s late Middle Palaeolithic sequence and explore the anthropogenic
11 origin of the pigments, their provenance and possible uses in order to shed new light on the
12 potential cultural meaning of late Middle Palaeolithic LTCs in south-western France

13

14 **2. Background**

15

16 **2.1 Mineral pigments in question**

17

18 Mineral pigments or colouring materials can be defined as geomaterials with the potential for
19 staining other materials. These minerals contain a tinting agent or pigment in the form of iron
20 oxide (e.g. hematite, red), iron oxy-hydroxide (e.g. goethite, yellow), manganese oxide (e.g.
21 pyrolusite, grey to black), manganese oxy-hydroxide (e.g. manganite, black), or mixed oxides
22 (e.g. hollandite, dark grey). Available archaeological evidence suggests that these materials
23 were most often reduced to powder before use (Couraud 1988; Watts 2002; Salomon 2009;
24 Hodgskiss 2013). While the most archaeologically-visible use of both red and black colouring
25 materials during the Palaeolithic remains parietal art(see e.g. Clottes et al. 1990; Baffier et al.
26 1999; Chalmin et al. 2003; Balbin de Behrmannand Gonzales 2009; Menu 2009; Beck et al.
27 2014), several other uses of these two pigments have equally been documented. Hematite-
28 bearing materials, commonly referred to as ‘ochre’, are the most common pigments described
29 from archaeological and ethnographic contexts. Their potential uses include technical,
30 medicinal, cosmetic, or ritual purposes(Rudner 1982; Watts 2002; Rifkin 2012a), body
31 painting, preserving hides (Audouin and Plisson 1982; Rifkin 2011), or as a loading agent in
32 adhesives (Wadley et al. 2004; 2009; Shaham et al. 2010). Potential uses of black manganese
33 oxide, on the other hand, are currently restricted to their direct application to the skin in the

1 form of body painting or drawing (Soressi and d’Errico 2007, Hodgkiss 2013) or as an
2 accelerant for igniting fires (Heyes et al. 2016).

3

4 Over the last few decades, the exploitation of manganese and iron oxides has been
5 increasingly documented in the Middle Palaeolithic record of Western Europe, demonstrating
6 their widespread use by Neanderthal groups. The most well-documented use of mineral
7 pigments comes from Pech-de-l’Azé I in Dordogne, France (Soressi and d’Errico 2007). 3D
8 reconstruction of use-wear traces and their comparison with experimental data suggested
9 Neanderthals to have used black manganese fragments to draw on their skin. Since this initial
10 study, several other examples of Middle Palaeolithic red and black oxides have been
11 published, including those from Cueva Anton, Spain (Zilhao et al. 2010); Maastricht,
12 Netherlands (Roebroeks et al. 2012); Ormesson, France (Bodu et al. 2014); and Scladina,
13 Belgium (Bonjean et al. 2015). A recent study of black manganese oxide pieces from both
14 Mousterian (Pech de l’Aze I, Le Moustier, Tabaterie) and Upper Palaeolithic (Laugerie Haute,
15 La Ferrassie, Abri Castanet) sites, which included a geochemical analysis of their composition
16 and a comparison with geological samples, revealed differences in the variability of
17 manganese oxides exploited during the Middle and Upper Palaeolithic (Pitarch and d’Errico
18 2018). However, this study did not explore potential differences in mineral pigment
19 exploitation between Middle Palaeolithic lithic techno-complexes. Due to its deep
20 archaeological sequence and setting in a region with a rich record of Middle Palaeolithic
21 occupation, Combe-Grenal is an ideal case study for exploring the distribution and use of
22 black and red/yellow mineral pigments across different late Middle Palaeolithic LTCs.

23

24 **2.2 The Combe-Grenal sequence: archaeological background**

25

26 The rockshelter of Combe-Grenal (Dordogne) lies within a Coniacian limestone escarpment
27 and opens onto a small valley near the Dordogne River (Fig. 1). Since its discovery in 1816,
28 several generations of prehistorians have explored the site’s archaeological deposits.
29 Excavations lead by F. Bordes (1955; 1972) from 1953 to 1965 yielded the most important
30 collection of lithic and faunal material from 65 layers attributed to the early and late Middle
31 Palaeolithic. The colouring materials studied here were recovered from layers near the top of
32 this 13 m deep archaeological sequence (layers 26 to 11). Lithic assemblages from these
33 levels have been the subject of multiple typological, technological and techno-economic
34 analyses (Geneste et al 1997; Turq 2000; Bourguignon et al. 2004; Faivre 2011; Faivre et al.

1 2014; 2017b). The most recent revaluations (Faivre et al. 2014; 2017b) showed many of
2 Bordes' "facies" identified in multiple layers of the site could in fact be grouped together as
3 specific LTC given their similar technological features. In terms of technology, this part of the
4 sequence is characterized by a succession of Quina (layers 26-17), Discoid/Levallois (layers
5 16; 11-12) and Discoid (layers 13-15) lithic techno-complexes, which depict clear variations
6 in tool typology (Fig. 2).

7
8 Several use-wear analyses focused on stone tools recovered from the different LTCs (Quina
9 and Discoid/Levallois) during the 80s and 90s (Anderson-Gerfaud 1981; Beyries 1987;
10 Beyries and Walter 1996) produced evidence for wood and hide processing, butchery and,
11 notably, mineral processing. This latter activity was identified on retouched surfaces of
12 several Quina scrapers that also bear red (35 scrapers) and black residues (one scraper),
13 preserved in the distal portion of the retouch scars. A SEM analysis, combined with X-ray
14 elemental characterisation, carried out on eight of these tools revealed the presence of
15 hematite, ochre, and manganese oxide residues (Beyries and Walter 1996). Scrapers were
16 thus interpreted as having very likely been used to process mineral pigments. Recently, one of
17 us (E. Claud) undertook a use-wear analysis of lithics from on-going excavations. Preliminary
18 results for the Discoid/Levallois LTC produced evidence for butchery, and more rarely,
19 scraping bone. No evidence for the processing of minerals or red or black residues that could
20 correspond to colouring materials were identified.

21
22 The Middle Palaeolithic occupations of Combe-Grenal are currently beyond the limits of
23 conventional radiocarbon dating. However, several regional syntheses of changes in faunal
24 communities proposed the upper part of the Combe-Grenal sequence to span the period from
25 MIS 5 (130-82 ka) to the beginning of MIS 3 (57-29 ka) (Discamps et al., 2011; Faivre et al.,
26 2014; Discamps and Royer 2017). Faunal data from on-going excavations has, however,
27 highlighted substantial recovery biases in Bordes' faunal collections (Discamps and Faivre
28 2017), calling into question previously proposed chronological models (Guadelli and Laville
29 1990; Discamps et al. 2011; Morin et al. 2014). In parallel, an analysis of the small mammal
30 assemblages (Marquet 1989) highlighted only minimal changes in environmental conditions
31 between the Quina and Discoid/Levallois levels, the former containing several more cold-
32 adapted species, such as snow vole (*Chionomys nivalis*). Layer 26, however, stands out from
33 the other Quina levels, given the dominance of temperate species that could live in forest

1 conditions. These correlations should, however, be considered with some caution given the
2 limited sample sizes of small mammals from each level.

3

4 *Fig. 1 – Location of Combe-Grenal and geology of the region. Red dots indicate the*
5 *location of some of the iron oxide outcrops identified in the region (listed in Table 2); The*
6 *black dot indicates the location of the sole local source of manganese reported in the area.*

7

8 *Fig. 2 – Top of the Combe-Grenal sequence with typological and technological attributions*
9 *of each of Bordes' layers (modified after Faivre et al. 2014).*

10

11

12 **3. Material and methods**

13 **3.1 Material**

14

15 *Archaeological collection*

16 In the F. Bordes collections of Combe-Grenal, staining mineral-rich rocks, such as iron and
17 manganese oxides, recovered by Bordes from Combe-Grenal were found partially sorted in
18 separate boxes from the lithic material when we began our study. While this material had
19 been partially inventoried by P.-Y. Demars (1992), we conducted a careful examination of the
20 unsorted material in order to identify any additional fragments of iron and manganese oxides.
21 Sorting was limited to the site's late Middle Palaeolithic layers (layers 26-11), which had
22 previously been shown to contain the highest frequency of staining minerals (Demars1992).
23 The main types of mineral pigments identified in our study are presented in Fig. 3, and
24 descriptions of all archaeological samples are available in Table 1 and Table SI 1.

25

26

27 *Fig. 3 – Sample of archaeological black (A), red, yellow (B) and white (C) pigment*
28 *fragments studied.*

29

30 *Table 1 – General description of the mineral pigment fragments from the upper part of the*
31 *Combe-Grenal sequence.*

32

33 *Geological reference collection*

34

1 Potential iron oxide sources were surveyed within an approximately 5 km radius of the site
2 (Fig. 1). Several sources of ferruginous rocks are located within a few hundred metres to a
3 few kilometres of the site and exist primarily as eroded in situ veins and crusts developed
4 within Upper Cretaceous limestones (D1, D2, D3, D4) or pedogenic nodules (D5, D6, D7)
5 formed from these crusts (Table2) (Astruc 1990). Apart from a vein in unaltered limestone
6 (D4), all of the closest outcrops are found within a deep sequence of alterites that formed in
7 lacustrine conditions during the Oligocene. Ferruginous nodules are found in multiple
8 locations within a few hundred meters from the site, with the only *in situ* alterites containing
9 concretions and nodules located less than 1 km to the south east. Nodules are also found at the
10 top of Cretaceous formations (C1) to the north of the site. Although a ‘siderolithic’ facies had
11 previously been described (Capdeville and Rigaud 1987), we were unable to find nodules
12 where this facies is reported on 1/50 000 geological maps.

13 A recent review of manganese oxide outcrops in the Dordogne identified only one source (Le
14 Theil near La Canéda) within a 5 km radius around Combe-Grenal, with the next closest
15 sources near Sarlat, around 10 km from the site. As data was already available for these
16 sources (Pitarch and d’Errico 2018), they were not resampled during our work.

17
18

19 ***Table 2 – Description and location of iron oxide sources sampled in this study.***

20
21

22 **3.2 Methods**

23

24 All archaeological pieces were submitted to a technological, use-wear (stereomicroscope),
25 chemical (SEM-EDS, pXRF) and structural analyses (XRD). The first two focused on
26 characterising traces of human modification, while the latter two characterised their elemental
27 and mineral composition.

28

29 **3.2.1 Macroscopic examination**

30

31 All archaeological pigments were examined with a Leica S8 APO stereomicroscope to
32 characterize raw material types and identify traces of anthropogenic modification. Material
33 was photographed with a motorized Leica Z6 APOA equipped with a DFC420 digital camera
34 linked to LAS Montage and Leica Map DCM 3D software packages. Hue, size, weight,

1 texture (i.e. clay to silt: fine-grained; sand: coarse-grained), structure (granular, massive,
2 laminated), degree of porosity, presence of cortex or patina, identifiable mineral particles and
3 fossils were systematically recorded. The identification of human modifications was based on
4 criteria available in Salomon (2009), Hodgskiss (2010), Rifkin (2012b), and Dayet et al.
5 (2013). We also recorded evidence of intentional fracturation and crushing (points of impact,
6 flake scars, negative and positive bulbs), as well as surface features (number, location, and
7 section of the facets, orientation and type of striation) referable to rubbing, grinding or
8 scraping.

9

10 **3.2.2 Chemical and mineralogical analyses**

11

12 Of the 73 mineral-rich fragments identified from the site, 39 were selected for portable energy
13 dispersive X-ray fluorescence spectrometry (pXRF), 31 for scanning electron microscopy
14 coupled with energy dispersive spectrometry (SEM-EDS), and 16 for X-ray diffraction
15 (XRD). This sample reflects the variability of colour, texture and structure in the assemblage.
16 Analyses systematically concerned the flatter surface of the archaeological pieces with the
17 minimum of post-depositional crusts (see Dayet et al. 2013; 2014 for more details concerning
18 the analytical protocol). All fragments were cleaned with an alcoholic solution prior to
19 analysis.

20

21 The elemental and mineral composition of the archaeological samples was determined by
22 SEM-EDS and XRD analyses. A JEOL 6460 LV SEM instrument equipped with a *low*
23 *vacuum* system was used for imagery and analysis without any specific preparation (coating)
24 of the sample. Semi-quantitative analyses were carried out directly on the surface of complete
25 archaeological pieces using an EDXS Oxford XMax 20 spectrometer coupled to the SEM
26 instrument. All objects were observed under similar magnification (x100, x200; x1000,
27 x2000, and sometimes as high as x5000). The distribution, size, and shape of minerals
28 measuring more than 1 μm were recorded, and data are presented as mass weight % of oxide
29 (stoichiometric conversion). Structural phases were determined by X-ray diffraction using a
30 Bruker D8 Advance diffractometer with the Bragg-Brentano geometry and equipped with a
31 PSD Lynxeye detector operating with a Cu $K\alpha$ radiation ($\lambda=1.5405\text{\AA}$). A divergent slit of
32 0.2mm was used in order to limit the divergence of the incident rays. Mineral phases were
33 identified based on data available in the ICDD database (PDF2).

34

1 In order to compare data from archaeological iron oxides with the geological reference
2 collection, we used portable XRF (pXRF) measurements, as they are both quicker and record
3 more trace elements than elemental analyses performed with an SEM-EDS. Prior to analysis,
4 the 31 geological samples were fractured with a hammer. Multiple XRF measurements were
5 obtained from these fresh fractures, in order to take into account the heterogeneity of the
6 material. The pXRF measurements were carried out using an Ametek portable SPECTRO
7 xSORT X-ray fluorescence spectrometer equipped with a silicon drift detector (SDD) and an
8 excitation source of 40 kV, 0.1 mA. Measurements were acquired in the air (no detection of
9 Na, Mg, Al) with a constant working distance by fixing the spectrometer to a lead receptacle.
10 A 12 mm² area was analysed using spectra acquisition times of 120s. The spectrometer's
11 internal consistency was assured using an automated measure of the contents of the machine's
12 metal shutter. A CRM-683 standard was also used to ensure the reproducibility of the
13 measurements. For ferruginous rocks, an empirical calibration was used based on the Lucas-
14 Tooth and Price methodology (Lucas-Tooth and Price 1961). This calibration method was
15 improved from previous studies (see Dayet et al. 2014; Queffelec et al. 2017) by increasing
16 the acquisition time (120s), preparing pellets (<80µm grain-size powder mixed with 3% of
17 wax), and selecting homemade standards where more trace elements are dosed (six laboratory
18 specific, five international references). "Theoretical" and "measured" data was compared in
19 absolute weight oxide percentages. A good adequacy between the two was achieved for Si,
20 Fe, Mn, Ca, K, Ti, As, Rb, V and Sr ($R^2=1.0$; $y=1.0$; Fig. SI 1). No similar empirical
21 calibration was done for manganese oxides due to higher methodological constraints (the
22 presence of Ba as a minor element) and the relevance of the results obtained from the SEM-
23 EDS analyses. Data are presented as mass weight % of oxide (stoichiometric conversion).

24

25 **3.2.3 Data treatment**

26

27 Elemental and mineralogical data were used to: 1) distinguish iron from manganese oxides; 2)
28 identify potential selection criteria; and 3) discuss provenance. Pieces were attributed to either
29 manganese or iron oxides only when oxide concentration exceeded 10%. Each group was
30 treated separately. For manganese oxides, a hierarchical clustering (Ward method) followed
31 by a principal component analysis (PCA) was conducted on the semi-quantitative SEM-EDS
32 data by using the centred log ratio (*clr*) (Aitchison, 1986). Using *clr* values smoothes
33 differences between major and trace elements. The following elements, expressed as weight
34 % of oxide, were taken into account: Al₂O₃, SiO₂, MnO₂, Fe₂O₃ and BaO. Other elements

1 were excluded when they displayed more than one third of missing values or showed a
2 heterogeneous distribution likely due to their presence in sediments adhering to the surface of
3 objects (P, K, Ca). Although often absent, Ba was included in our study, as this element
4 appears as a minor and sometimes a major element in several samples. A similar approach
5 was followed for iron oxide pieces (i.e. a hierarchical clustering followed by a PCA of the
6 SEM-EDS *clr* transformed data) and exclusion of elements with a third of missing values. We
7 nevertheless included Mn as it appears as a minor element in several samples. Elements
8 susceptible to deriving from sediment deposits were not removed in this case, as SEM
9 observation showed they represent an integral component of the samples. Eight elements were
10 retained for the statistical analysis of iron oxides: Al₂O₃, SiO₂, P₂O₅, K₂O, CaO, MnO₂,
11 Fe₂O₃.

12 In order to compare archaeological iron oxides with our geological reference samples, we
13 carried out a PCA of pXRF values. Only the geological pieces are taken into account in this
14 analysis, the archaeological measurements are plotted for comparative purposes. The same
15 selection criteria for retaining elements for the statistical treatment of archaeological pieces
16 were applied to the selection of elements used to characterize reference collections. The
17 following elements were chosen: SiO₂, Fe₂O₃, MnO, CaO, K₂O, TiO₂, V₂O₅, As₂O₃. Both
18 centred log ratios and log values weighted by Fe₂O₃ concentration (*alr*) were employed. The
19 latter transformation has been frequently and successfully used to explore the provenance of
20 iron oxides (see for example Popelka-Filcoff et al. 2007; Dayet et al. 2016; MacDonald et al.
21 2018).

22 In all statistical treatments, missing values were replaced by the detection limit multiplied by
23 0.6. All statistical analyses and data treatments were carried out with CODAPAK 2.0 (Comas-
24 Cufí and Thió-Henestrosa, 2011) and JMP® software packages (Version 13.SAS Institute
25 Inc., Cary, NC, 2016).

26 The frequency per layer and mineralogical composition of mineral pigments were submitted
27 to a Fisher's exact test to establish to what extent their occurrence should be attributed to
28 chance (null hypothesis). We performed a simulation of this test with random resampling and
29 calculated the probability that the null hypothesis is valid after a million randomizations.

30

31

32 **5. Results**

33

1 Our sorting of Combe-Grenal archaeological material produced an additional 33 mineral
2 fragments for an overall assemblage comprising 73 pieces that feature red, grey, black, and,
3 more rarely, brown and yellow shades (Fig. 3). Several pieces produce a coloured streak or
4 stain when in contact with a plastic bag or fingers. In other cases, their colour and the absence
5 of flake scars distinguishes them from knapped siliceous and volcanic rocks. We also
6 identified and analysed several white fragments with a high staining power (Fig. 3). Among
7 the selected 73 pieces of mineral pigments, 44 were classified as black, 25 as yellow or red,
8 and 4 as white pigments. This classification is based on colour, composition when chemical
9 analyses were performed, and colour of the streak when the pieces produced one. Despite
10 their colour, two black and dark brown pieces do not contain manganese oxides. These pieces
11 instead consist of massive, crystalline iron oxy-hydroxides forms and were included in the
12 group of yellow and red mineral pigments. When ground or scraped, they would produce
13 brown yellow (goethite-rich) or dark red (hematite-rich) powder instead of the grey to black
14 powder generally produced by manganese oxides. Results of the elemental and mineralogical
15 characterization are reported in Table 3.

16

17 **5.1 Black mineral pigments**

18

19 **5.1.1 Raw material composition**

20

21 This group comprises 44 grey to black pieces that contain manganese oxides or oxy-
22 hydroxides and produce a dark streak when rubbed. Their composition is summarized in
23 Table 3 and detailed results are presented in Table SI 2 and 3 (19 pieces analysed). Most
24 black pieces are composed of almost pure pyrolusite (βMnO_2), in association with traces of
25 manganite ($\gamma\text{MnO}(\text{OH})$), ramsdellite (βMnO_2) and possibly birnessite
26 ($(\text{Ca},\text{Na},\text{K})_x(\text{Mn}^{4+},\text{Mn}^{3+})_6\text{O}_{12}$). Although not detected by XRD, mixed oxides containing
27 barium were identified by SEM-EDS analyses (Table 3; Table SI 2) and could represent
28 romanechite, hollandite or some kind of poorly-crystallized Mn-Ba phases. One of the
29 analysed pieces (CG21) contains a Mn-Co oxide, a variation of lithiophorite, $(\text{Co},\text{Mn})\text{O}(\text{OH})$,
30 with probable atomic replacement of Al in the structure (bohmite $\text{AlO}(\text{OH})$ structure).
31 Manganese oxides are associated with iron oxy-hydroxide goethite ($\alpha\text{FeO}(\text{OH})$) in two pieces
32 (CG28 and CG36). Iron is present as a minor or major component in association with Mn in
33 six other samples. A single piece is richer in calcite than in manganese oxide (CG84). All
34 pieces exhibit concretions featuring more or less visible, mostly fibrous-shaped crystals, and

1 variable frequency of pores and quartz inclusions. The smoothed bright patina evident on
2 some specimens can be interpreted as the cortex of pedogenic nodules.

3
4 Hierarchical clustering based on SEM-EDS data (Fig. 4) identifies four clusters of mineral
5 phases: Mn to Mn-Ba-rich phases, Mn-Fe-rich phases, Al-rich phases and a Si-rich phase
6 (quartz) (see also Table SI 2; Fig. SI 2). The proportion of each mineral cluster in each
7 archaeological sample distinguishes at least three groups: group I includes samples with
8 variable content of Mn and Mn-Ba phases; group II samples are rich in Mn-Fe-bearing phases
9 (CG28 and 36), and group III samples are rich in Al-bearing phases (CG21 and 47) (see also
10 Table SI 3). No clear difference is observed between pure manganese dioxides and Ba-
11 bearing manganese oxides. The majority of black mineral pigments belong to this group, with
12 several pieces composed of almost pure manganese oxides. The two pieces from group III are
13 also the richest in Co (Table SI 2).

14
15
16 *Table 3- Elemental and mineralogical composition of the Combe-Grenal archaeological*
17 *pieces analysed by SEM-EDS and XRD.*

18
19 *Fig. 4 – Statistical treatment of SEM-EDS data (selected elements: Al₂O₃, SiO₂, MnO₂,*
20 *Fe₂O₃ and BaO) of manganese oxide pieces. A: PCA showing the four main clusters of*
21 *mineralogical composition. B: non-parametric distribution of the SEM-EDS data per*
22 *cluster; the contours represent 100 %, 75 %, 50 %, and 25% density. C: Percentages of*
23 *each cluster in each sample; the width of the bars reflects the number of measurements.*

24 25 26 **5.1.2 Raw material provenance**

27 The two pieces from Al and Co-rich group III probably share a similar geological origin.
28 Lithiophorite is an oxidation product of hydrothermal or sedimentary ore of manganese
29 deposits (i.e. wad) (Anthony et al. 2001). This mineral is currently unknown in the area
30 around the site, the manganese outcrops from north of Nontron to south of Thiviers, or in the
31 karstic crusts around Sarlat (Lougnon 1981; Pitarch and d'Errico 2018). This could potentially
32 be explained by the disappearance of this type of ores from the current landscape due to
33 weathering, erosion, or mining activities. Mn-Fe-bearing pieces from group II could have a
34 local origin, as the region is rich in iron oxide concretions. One Mn-rich outcrop is reported

1 less than 5 km north from the site (Le Theil) and not far from where we recorded iron oxide
2 nodules (Pitarch and d'Errico 2018; Fig. 1). A third possibility could be outcrops around
3 Sarlat, less than 10 km from the site, which, based on PIXE analyses, are currently the most
4 iron-rich manganese oxide outcrop in the region (Pitarch and d'Errico 2018). The origin of
5 pure pyrolusite pieces or Ba-bearing manganese oxides is more difficult to identify. The
6 presence of pedogenic cortex could indicate that they derive from a weathering profile. They
7 could result from the weathering of pre-existing manganese oxide deposits in the region.
8 Difficulties in identifying their source could also be connected to these materials having been
9 heavily exploited if not exhausted by 19th century mining operations (Lougnon 1981).

11 **5.1.3 Raw material processing**

12 About 60% (n=28) of the black manganese oxides bear traces of modification in the form of
13 facets overlain by striations (Table 4). Most facets are irregular and, in some cases, concave in
14 section. The presence of intersecting striations (Fig. 5A to D) suggests the facets were scraped
15 with the edge of a thin blade or flake rather than abraded on a grindstone. These features are
16 present on 42% of black pieces, while no less than 14% present flat or convex facets covered
17 by sub-parallel striations indicating that they were abraded on a grindstone (Fig. 5E to H). The
18 distinction between the two processing technique is not always possible (5%), and the
19 presence itself of the striations is sometimes questionable (5%). On more than 50% (N=14) of
20 the striated pieces, striations appear smoothed, and some striated facets exhibit a bright lustre
21 covering the striations (N=6; 21%). Numerous fragments exhibit fractures, although none are
22 clearly diagnostic of intentional knapping or crushing.

24 No consistent association is observed between processing techniques and raw material type.
25 The presence of a bright lustre is, on the other hand, preferentially observed on pieces
26 associating Fe and Mn oxides. Four of the six lusted pieces contain Fe-rich phases (CG28,
27 31, 36 and 58; see Fig. 4), suggesting a different function compared to pieces that lack this
28 feature. One of these pieces, CG31, is special in a number of regards. Two scraped faces bear
29 a heavy, bright lustre (Fig. 6A and B) and one shows a cluster of small, aligned depressions
30 (Fig. 6D). These last traces are similar to those identified archaeologically on bone (Patou-
31 Mathis and Schwab 2002; Verna and d'Errico 2011) and stone (Archambault de Beaune
32 1997) and produced experimentally on bone fragments used to retouched stone tools (Mallye
33 et al. 2012). This piece also presents a deep groove on an edge adjacent to a sharp fracture
34 (Fig. 6A and C) and may reflect the use of a string to suspend the object. Grooves for the

1 suspension of ornaments are known from early Upper Palaeolithic sites such as Grotte-du-
2 Renne (Yonne, France) (Julien et al. 2017) and Les Cottés (Vienne, France) (Rigaud et al.
3 2014). Here, however, a part of the original piece is missing, making it difficult to reach a
4 firm conclusion concerning its potential suspension.

5
6

7 *Table 4 – Number and percentages of pieces with striations resulting from grinding and/or*
8 *scraping.*

9

10 *Fig. 5 – Types of modification recorded on the Combe-Grenal colouring materials. A:*
11 *scraping; B: scraping and lustre; C: grinding; D: grinding and/or scraping and lustre.*

12

13 *Fig. 6 – Traces of modification on manganese oxide fragment CG31. A: striations from*
14 *scraping covered by a bright lustre. B: Notch on an edge. C: traces of modification due to a*
15 *use as a retoucher.*

16

17

18 **5.2 Yellow to red colouring materials**

19

20 **5.2.1 Raw material composition**

21

22 The yellowish and reddish materials were grouped together, as distinguishing pieces that
23 contain goethite (yellow streak) from those containing hematite (red streak) was not always
24 possible. Their composition is summarized in Table 3 and detailed results are provided in
25 Table SI 2 and 3. While goethite is the most frequent phase identified, hematite ($\alpha\text{Fe}_2\text{O}_3$) is
26 also present, along with calcite and quartz. Calcite is found either as deposits or as a substrate
27 (limestone) for iron oxide deposits. SEM-EDS analyses indicate clay minerals (Si and Al) to
28 be almost certainly present. The Fe-bearing materials mostly take the form of concretions or
29 variably porous and quartz-rich sandstones. Several nodules exhibiting a bright cortex were
30 also identified.

31

32 Hierarchical clustering based of SEM-EDS data (Fig. 7) identifies four clusters of mineral
33 phases: pure iron oxides; Mn-bearing iron oxides; a Ca-rich phase associated to other minerals
34 (calcite + clay minerals/sediment deposits); a Si rich phase (quartz) (see Table SI 2; Fig. SI 3).

1 Contrary to what is observed with Mn phases, the proportion of each mineral cluster in each
2 archaeological piece does not identify discrete groups. This heterogeneity can result from
3 phases, such as calcite and alumina-silicates, acquired post-depositionally as a thin film on the
4 surface of the objects.

5
6
7 *Fig.7 – Statistical treatment of SEM-EDS data for iron oxides (selected elements: Al_2O_3 ,
8 SiO_2 , P_2O_5 , K_2O , CaO , MnO_2 , Fe_2O_3). A: PCA showing four main clusters of mineralogical
9 composition. B: non-parametric distribution of the SEM-EDS data per cluster; contours
10 represent 100%, 75%, 50 %, and 25% density. C: Percentages of each cluster within each
11 sample; the width of the bars reflect the number of measurements.*

14 5.2.2 Raw material provenance and selection

15
16 A comparison of the elemental composition of the archaeological iron oxide pieces with the
17 geological samples shows that the archaeological pieces are not concretions derived from
18 nearby unaltered limestone (Fig. 8; raw data in Table SI 4). Their elemental composition
19 better matches nodules and, to a lesser degree, concretions from alterites. These latter two
20 sources are difficult to distinguish regardless the data transformation employed. The PCAs of
21 the *alr* values revealed a clear correspondence between the archaeological pieces and all local
22 nodule sources (less than 5 km) (Fig. 8B). The results of *clr* values are more ambiguous (Fig.
23 8A), as several measurements on archaeological pieces do not match with our geological
24 assemblage. This may be due to a Ca content that partly derives from sediments adhering to
25 the pieces or to the small size of the geological sample. *Alr*, on the other hand, have been
26 shown to more accurately reflect the original geochemical signature of a source than does raw
27 data (Popelka-Filcoff et al. 2007; Eiselt et al. 2011; Dayet et al. 2016). The same limitations
28 of raw data might equally to *clr*. If only the PCA test using *alr* values is retained, a local
29 origin for the iron oxide pieces appears most likely.

30
31 Two interesting features emerge from the *alr* treatment when samples are grouped by LTC.
32 Iron oxide pieces from the Quina layers cluster separately from those found in Discoid and
33 Discoid/Levallois layers (Fig. 8B). Iron oxide data from the latter cluster together in the PCA

1 and their compositional variability is low despite the high number of measurements. This may
2 be due to their homogeneous content in Ca, K and Ti.

3 **Fig.8 – PCA of pXRF data (selected elements: SiO₂, Fe₂O₃, MnO, CaO, K₂O, TiO₂, V₂O₅,
4 As₂O₃) obtained on archaeological and geological iron oxides. A: clr data; B: alr data
5 (ratio to Fe₂O₃). Note the strong heterogeneity of natural outcrops compared to
6 archaeological specimens. Ellipses represent the normal density (p=0.90).**

7
8

9 **5.2.3 Raw material processing**

10

11 Unlike manganese oxides, the iron oxides exhibit no traces of modification in the form of
12 facets and striations. Most pieces exhibit fractures but none shows diagnostic features of
13 intentional fragmentation or crushing (i.e. impact points, flake scars). While the morphology
14 of two pieces is reminiscent of a knapped flake, their smoothed edges, probably due to
15 taphonomic processes, prevents drawing a definitive conclusion.

16

17 **5.3. White mineral pigments**

18

19 Four chalk fragments were identified among the lithics recovered by Bordes from layers 26 to
20 11. SEM-EDS analyses indicate that they are composed of a fine-grained calcite (Table 3).
21 This material, absent in the Coniacian limestone in which the rock-shelter developed, is
22 therefore potentially of a exogenic origin. However, in the absence of any evidence of human
23 modification, their use as colorants is difficult to establish.

24

25 **5.4 Stratigraphic distribution**

26 The stratigraphic distribution of mineral pigments reveals interesting trends (Fig 9): 1)
27 manganese oxides are most frequent in layers 25 to 22; 2) a decrease in the frequency of
28 mineral pigments is observed in layer 21 to 18; 3) iron oxide dominate the top of the
29 sequence (layer 17 to 11). The absence of mineral pigments in layer 13, 18 and 19 may be an
30 artefact of Bordes stratigraphy, as these layers are thin lenses that yielded much less material
31 compared to the other levels from the upper third of the sequence (Faivre 2008). In contrast,
32 the recovery of a single mineral pigment in layer 20 is interesting considering the higher
33 proportion of lithic artefacts found in this level.

34

1 Substantial differences can equally be observed between layers in terms of mineral pigment
2 processing techniques (Fig. 9): scraped and ground pieces are found uniquely in layers 25 to
3 20. This is partly due to the absence of traces of modification on iron oxide pieces and the fact
4 that the few manganese pieces from layers 19 to 11 also exhibit no traces of modification.

5
6 Changes between layers in mineral pigment preferences correlate to some extent with techno-
7 typological changes in lithic industries. The decrease in mineral pigments frequency in the
8 middle of the sequence coincides with a change in the typological composition of the Quina
9 layers, with scrapers being dominant in layers 26 to 21 and denticulates in layer 20. The
10 highest frequency of iron oxides coincides with end of the Quina LTC. Moreover, the
11 elemental composition of iron oxide pieces from these layers differs slightly from what was
12 documented for pieces from the Discoid and Discoid/Levallois LTCs (see 5.2.2, Fig. 8). There
13 is, in contrast, a clear overlap in the composition of red to yellow pieces found in the two last
14 LTCs.

15
16 A Fisher's exact test of the frequency of mineral pigments within the Combe-Grenal
17 stratigraphy rejected the null hypothesis that their stratigraphic distribution could result from
18 random natural accumulation or random introduction of mineral pieces by the Neanderthal
19 groups who occupied Combe-Grenal ($p=0.000001$ after 1 million randomizations).

20
21
22 *Fig.9 – Stratigraphic distribution of mineral pigments by raw material and traces of*
23 *modification. LTC: lithic techno-complex*

24 25 **6. Discussion**

26 27 **6.1 Variations in pigment exploitation throughout Combe-Grenal deposits**

28
29 Our technological, chemical and mineralogical analysis of a larger sample of pigments from
30 Combe-Grenal reveals the use of black manganese oxides and the possible use of iron oxide
31 and chalk. The introduction of black manganese oxides to the site by Neanderthals is
32 indisputable. No pigment sources are found in the immediate vicinity of the site, which
33 demonstrates the transport if not curation of these mineral-rich rocks that exhibit clear traces
34 of scraping or grinding. Characterized by high concentrations in manganese oxides, mostly

1 pyrolusite, the provenance of these materials is, however, still unknown, although a local
2 source cannot be ruled out. Based on their composition, our results suggest that the
3 Neanderthals groups who occupied Combe-Grenal exploited either three different types or
4 three different sources of manganese-rich materials, or perhaps, a combination of the two.
5 Extracted powders may have been used for different functions, including as an accelerant for
6 igniting fires or as a tinting material. Although scraping and grinding are compatible with
7 both uses, the smoothed aspect of the striations is more consistent with the hypothesis that
8 manganese oxides were rubbed on human skins or animal hides, similar to what had
9 previously been proposed for the Pech-de-l'Azé I pigments (Soressi and d'Errico 2007). The
10 presence of impact marks suggesting the use of one piece as a retoucher, the co-existence of
11 both grinding and scraping, and the identification of three types of manganese-rich materials
12 equally argue in favour of the Combe-Grenal pigments having served multiple purposes. The
13 retoucher, which also exhibits traces of scraping, perfectly illustrates the multifunctional
14 nature of the Combe-Grenal pigments. Moreover, the likelihood of it be curated is potentially
15 illustrated by a groove that may have served to suspend the piece.

16

17 The absence of diagnostic human modifications on the iron-rich rock fragments raises the
18 question of whether they were introduced to Combe-Grenal by Neanderthals. The on-going
19 geoarchaeological study of the sequence shows that exogenous materials played a negligible
20 role in the accumulation of layers 16 to 14, where most of the red oxide pieces were found
21 (personal communication). The inclusion of exogenous materials was apparently greater
22 during the accumulation of layers 23 to 17, where the frequency of iron oxide is very low.
23 Other elements equally support a human origin for the iron-rich rocks found at Combe-
24 Grenal. The pXRF analysis of these objects revealed slight differences in elemental
25 composition between iron oxides pieces from the bottom (layers 26 to 17) and top of the
26 sequence. Additionally, the iron oxides from the Discoid and Discoid/Levallois techno-
27 complexes exhibit a particularly low variation in elemental composition compared to
28 geological sources. Both observations argue in favour of the Neanderthal groups who
29 occupied Combe-Grenal to have preferred certain sources or types of iron-rich minerals.

30

31 Visual similarities between dark manganese and dark iron oxide pieces could explain the
32 presence of the latter in the Quina LTC. However, unlike the manganese oxide pieces, none of
33 dark iron oxide pieces bear evidence of scraping. This suggests that Quina groups were well
34 aware of differences in the composition and hence properties of the Mn- and Fe-rich minerals,

1 and used them for different functions. The consistent gathering of iron oxide pieces with red
2 and yellow hues within the Discoid and Discoid/Levallois LTCs is consistent with the idea
3 that they were collected to produce red to yellow powders. How powder was produced and for
4 what end remains unclear. The absence of traces of modification argues in favour of crushing
5 and pounding. The presence of both goethite and hematite that produce a yellow to brown and
6 red powder, respectively, raises the question of whether red, yellow, brown or all three
7 colours were actively sought by Neanderthal groups. Goethite-bearing nodules may have been
8 found in higher proportions at the site because they were less valued than hematite-bearing
9 materials and therefore more frequently abandoned on the site. Visual similarities between the
10 raw (i.e. unprocessed) forms of the two pigments forms may explain why numerous goethite-
11 rich fragments were discarded, and could further support the idea that hematite-rich red
12 powders were preferred over goethite-rich yellow ones.

13
14 Variations in manganese and iron oxide pieces across the sequence are one of the most
15 interesting patterns we found. While the null hypothesis of a random accumulation of iron and
16 manganese oxides within the sequence is highly unlikely ($p < 0.01$), potential biases induced
17 by Bordes' excavation methods cannot be ruled out. For example, a recent comparison of
18 Bordes' faunal assemblage with material recovered during on-going excavations revealed
19 substantial recovery biases (see Discamps and Faivre 2017 for more details). However, the
20 selection by excavators of one type of oxide over the others appears highly unlikely - both
21 types of colouring materials were recognised from the outset of Bordes' excavations.
22 Moreover, our sorting of the unwashed material collected during Bordes' excavation
23 produced only a few mineral pigments, which were either manganese or iron-rich. Several
24 small and unmodified pieces in the collection also demonstrate that particular care was taken
25 in identifying pigments during excavations (see Table 1). Although this does not absolutely
26 rule out a bias for larger, modified pigments, a preliminary examination of the mineral
27 pigments recovered from the 2015 to 2018 excavations produced no pure forms of manganese
28 oxides from stratigraphic units that are the equivalent of Bordes' layers 12 to 16 (for details of
29 stratigraphic correlations see Discamps et al. 2016; Discamps and Faivre 2017). On the other
30 hand, iron oxide pieces were recovered from these layers, corroborating our data from
31 Bordes' pigment assemblage. Taken together, this suggests that trends in mineral pigment
32 frequency and type most likely reflect intentional choices by Neanderthal groups and not
33 excavation biases.

34

1 The low frequency of iron oxide pieces in the Quina LTC, combined with the absence of
2 scraping traces, is at odds with the data obtained from the SEM-EDS residue analysis carried
3 out by Beyries and Walter (1996), who identified iron oxides on seven Quina scrapers. They
4 put forward the hypothesis that these scrapers were used to process iron oxides. They advised
5 to look for scraped iron oxide pieces within the Quina layers in order to validate their
6 hypothesis. This is what we did and we found none. A possible explanation for this absence is
7 that they were modified at another site, with the scrapers subsequently transported and
8 ultimately discarded at Combe-Grenal.

9

10 **6.2. Mineral pigments: proxies for cultural identity in Neanderthal societies?**

11

12 Most of the debate surrounding the significance of Lower and Middle Palaeolithic/Stone Age
13 mineral pigments revolves around the issue of their use in symbolic practices (Marshack
14 1981; McBrearty and Brooks 2000; Watts 2002; 2009; 2010; Henshilwood et al. 2002;
15 Salomon 2009; Zilhao et al. 2010; d’Errico and Stringer 2011; d’Errico et al. 2012). Of equal
16 importance is the potential use of these materials to actively signal cultural identity or group
17 membership. This question is particularly relevant in the context of the still unresolved debate
18 concerning the relative importance of function versus culture in the description of late Middle
19 Palaeolithic industrial variability. For an artefact to be a cultural marker, it is not necessary
20 that it plays a symbolic function or reflects ‘active style’ (Sackett 1982; 1986; Chase 1991). It
21 can simply have an indexical property (Peirce 1932), whose particular traits are independent
22 of raw material, technological or functional constraints (Chase and Dibble 1987; Chase 1991),
23 and therefore reflect a cultural choice specific to a particular human group. The use of such an
24 item creates an enduring link between the object and the group: the object is perceived by the
25 members of the group as naturally identifying the group without any explicit desire of group
26 members to differentiate themselves from a neighbouring group.

27 Did the different Neanderthal groups at Combe-Grenal use mineral pigments in exactly this
28 way? Recorded variations in mineral pigment use through time are difficult to attribute to
29 environmental changes limiting access to particular raw material sources. Our results suggest
30 that both manganese and iron oxides were available around Combe-Grenal throughout the
31 accumulation of the sequence. The lower proportion of manganese oxides at the top of the
32 sequence could potentially reflect increased vegetation restricting access to manganese
33 sources. While available data from small vertebrates does suggest minor environmental
34 changes concomitant with the beginning of the Discoid/Levallois LTC (Marquet 1989), the

1 decrease in manganese oxide use clearly predates this event, which rules out environmental
2 change as a factor. In addition, the fact that three different Upper Palaeolithic groups
3 (Aurignacian, Solutrean, Magdalenian) encompassing numerous climate changes also
4 employed manganese and iron oxides in the region (Chalmin et al. 2003; Beck et al. 2014;
5 Pitarch and d'Errico 2018) corroborates the view that climate changes did not substantially
6 affect access to mineral pigment sources. Testing the hypothesis that changes in mineral
7 pigments are not due to shifts in function is more complex due to the absence of traces of
8 modification on iron oxides. However, the variety of processing techniques and use-wear
9 patterns on manganese pieces, including their occasional use as retouchers, plead in favour of
10 these materials to have likely fulfilled multiple functions. In the absence of substantial
11 concomitant shifts in subsistence strategies, this pattern would be consistent with the
12 hypothesis that function alone does not explain the observed trend in pigment use. With that
13 said, the fact that the decrease in manganese oxide use within the Quina levels accompanies a
14 change in stone tool typology could reflect a general change in site function. However, the
15 diversity of manganese oxide uses that we highlighted may also include a cultural dimension.
16 In other words, differences in pigment use may reflect changes in how Neanderthal groups
17 perceived each other. Additional use-wear analyses of lithic materials are however necessary
18 to further test this hypothesis.

19

20 In parallel, can the association between flake production systems and the use of particular
21 mineral pigments be interpreted as the 'signature' of different cultural groups? At Combe-
22 Grenal, manganese oxide is abundant in Quina LTC levels and iron oxides in the Discoid and
23 Discoid/Levallois LTCs levels. In south-western France, however, the use of manganese
24 oxide is not restricted to the Quina LTC (Table 5). Clear evidence of its use is found in layers
25 attributed to Bordes' Mousterian of Acheulean Tradition (MTA) at Pech-de-l'Azé I (layer 4;
26 Demars 1992; Soressi and d'Errico 2007), in association with Levallois flaking systems at
27 Caminade-Est (layer M2; Sonnevile-Bordes 1969) and Pech de l'Azé IV (layer I and J), or in
28 association with Discoid flaking systems at Le Moustier (Demars 1992) and Pech de l'Aze IV
29 (Demars 1992; Turq et al. 2011). Red iron oxides are, instead, present in the Quina level of
30 La-Chapelle-aux-Saints (Demars 1992). One of the most secure cases of mineral pigment use
31 associated with the Discoid LTC comes from level H of Le Moustier, Dordogne (Peyrony
32 1930; Demars 1992; Pitarch and d'Errico 2018). While iron oxides are absent from this layer,
33 black manganese oxide fragments are found in association with an exclusively discoidal lithic
34 assemblage dominated by notches and denticulates throughout a 1.2 m-thick layer. The

1 Discoid LTC from Combe-Grenal is equally dominated by these tool types. Finally, about 80
2 pieces of red and/or yellow iron concretions, six of which exhibit traces of modification, were
3 discovered in two pits containing typical discoidal artefacts at the open-air site of Ormesson,
4 in the Paris Basin, Seine-et-Marne, France (Bodu et al. 2014).

5
6 In sum, we currently have no unambiguous evidence for a one to one correspondence between
7 mineral pigment and lithic technology at a regional level. This may be due to the fact that
8 layers from different sites and similar lithic assemblages are not contemporaneous, that
9 mineral pigments use was conditioned by economic rather than cultural constraints or that they
10 fulfilled indexical, or even symbolic functions, independent of the technological tradition of a
11 particular group. Better chronological resolution, the reappraisal of key Middle Palaeolithic
12 lithic assemblages, and a more detailed analysis of mineral pigment are needed to tease apart
13 these hypotheses.

14
15
16 *Table 5 – Mousterian sites in south-western France with reliable evidence (more than two*
17 *pieces, secure attribution to a lithic techno-complex) for mineral pigments reported in the*
18 *literature and associated lithic assemblages characteristics.*

19
20

21 **7. Conclusion**

22
23 Middle Palaeolithic mineral pigment use remains both a limited and highly localised
24 phenomenon compared to the much more substantial behavioural record from Neanderthal
25 stone tool technologies and subsistence practices. Our results from Combe-Grenal
26 nevertheless highlight the interest of including variations in pigment selection and use for the
27 definition of Neanderthal material culture patterning. Our detailed analysis of the Combe-
28 Grenal pigment assemblage revealed the intense use of black manganese oxides, the very
29 probable use of yellow to red iron oxides, and the potential use of white chalk. A clear
30 stratigraphic trend in raw materials types and colours was also observed. Black manganese
31 oxides are most abundant in the lower Quina layers, and then drastically decrease in the
32 uppermost part of this LTC; yellow red iron oxide pieces are dominant from the end of the
33 Quina LTC and throughout the Discoid and Discoid/Levallois LTCs. The decrease in
34 manganese oxide use within the Quina LTC might mark some kind of cultural change. Further

1 work on mineral pigment collections, especially those from the Quina and the Discoid LTCs,
2 will shed further light on Neanderthal cultural traditions. Interdisciplinary approaches similar
3 to the one developed here will undoubtedly open new perspectives for deciphering the cultural
4 significance of the Mousterian archaeological record in both south-western France and further
5 afield.

6
7

8 **Acknowledgements**

9

10 We would like to thank the Musée National de la Préhistoire at Les Eyzies, particularly the
11 director, J.-J. Cleyet-Merle, for permission to study the pigments from Bordes' excavations at
12 Combe-Grenal, as well as P. Jacquement and N. Bernard. We would also like to thank A.
13 Gibaud for help with the pXRF measurements, Y. Lefrais (IRAMAT-CRP2A) for help with
14 the SEM-EDS analyses, and F. Santos (PACEA, University of Bordeaux) for help with the
15 statistical tests. We are grateful to the reviewers for their insightful comments that contributed
16 to the improvement of the manuscript. This research was funded by the LabEx LaScArBx, a
17 research programme depending on the French institution ANR (ANR-10-LABX-52). The
18 research presented here was initiated during the "NéMo" (Néandertal face à la mort,
19 culture/pratiques funéraires) LabEx project at the University of Bordeaux (Dirs. Jean-Philippe
20 Faivre, Christelle Lahaye, and Bruno Maureille) and finalized in the course of the LaScArBx
21 (ANR-10-LABX-52) project "The earliest use of pigment in South-West France" led by
22 Francesco d'Errico and the NATCH (*Neanderthalenses Aquitanensis* : Territoires,
23 Chronologie, Humanité) project financed by the Aquitaine Region, France (Dir. J.-P. Faivre).
24 This work was partly supported by the Research Council of Norway through its Centre's of
25 Excellence funding scheme, SFF Centre for Early Sapiens Behaviour (SapienCE),
26 project number 262618.

27
28
29

30 **References**

31 Anderson-Gerfaud, P., 1981. Contribution méthodologique à l'analyse des microtraces
32 d'utilisation sur les outils préhistoriques. Thèse de 3ème cycle, Université de Bordeaux,
33 314 pp.

- 1 Anthony, J.W., Bideaux, R.A., Bladh, K.W., Nichols, M.C., 2001. Handbook of Mineralogy,
2 Mineralogical Society of America.ed. Chantilly, VA 20151-1110, USA.
- 3 Astruc, J.G., 1990. Carte géologique Gourdon (1/50 000) et notice, feuille 832. B.R.G.M.,
4 Orléans.
- 5 Aitchison, J., 1986. The Statistical Analysis of Compositional Data. Monographs on
6 Statistics and Applied Probability. Chapman & Hall Ltd., London (UK), 416 p.
- 7 Archambault De Beaune, S., 1997. Les galets utilisés au Paléolithique supérieur: approche
8 archéologique et expérimentale. CNRS Éditions, pp.298, XXXIIe supplément à Gallia
9 Préhistoire.
- 10 Audouin, F., Plisson, H., 1982. Les ocres et leurs témoins au Paléolithique en France: enquête
11 et expériences sur leur validité archéologique. Cahiers du Centre de Recherches
12 Préhistoriques 8, 33–80.
- 13 Baffier, D., Girard, M., Menu, M., Pomiès, M.-P., Vignaud, C., 1999. La couleur à la Grande
14 Grotte d'Arcy sur Cure(Yonne). L'Anthropologie 103, 1–22.
- 15 Beck, L., Rousselière, H., Castaing, J., Duran, A., Lebon, M., Moignard, B., Plassard, F.,
16 2014. First use of portable system coupling X-ray diffraction and X-ray fluorescence for
17 in-situ analysis of prehistoric rock art. Talanta 129, 459–464.
- 18 Balbín Behrmann, R. D., Alcolea González, J. J., 2009. Les colorants de l'art paléolithique
19 dans les grottes et en plein air. L'Anthropologie 113, 559-601.
- 20 Beyries, S., 1987. Variabilité de l'industrie lithique au Moustérien. Approche fonctionnelle sur
21 quelques gisements français. Oxford, Archaeopress, BAR International Series 328, 204 pp.
- 22 Beyries, S., Walter, P., 1996. Raclours et colorants à Combe-Grenal: Le problème de la
23 retouche.Quina. Quaternaria Nova VI:167–185.
- 24 Binford, L.R., 1983. Interassemblage variability: The Mousterian and the functional
25 argument, in: Binford, Lewis Roberts (Ed.), Working at Archaeology. Academic Press,
26 New York, pp. 131–153.
- 27 Binford, L.R., Binford, S.R., 1966. A Preliminary Analysis of Functional Variability in the
28 Mousterian of LevalloisFacies.American Anthropologist 68, 238–295.
- 29 Bodu, P., Salomon, H., Leroyer, M., Naton, H.-G., Lacarriere, J., Dessoles, M., 2014. An
30 open-air site from the recent Middle Palaeolithic in the Paris Basin (France): Les Bossats at
31 Ormesson (Seine-et-Marne). Quaternary International 331, 39–59.

- 1 Bonjean, D., Vanbrabant, Y., Abrams, G., Pirson, S., Burlet, C., Di Modica, K., Otte, M.,
2 Vander Auwera, J., Golitko, M., McMillan, R., Goemaere, E., 2015. A new Cambrian black
3 pigment used during the late Middle Palaeolithic discovered at Scladina Cave (Andenne,
4 Belgium). *Journal of Archaeological Science* 55, 253–265.
- 5 Bordes, F., 1955. La stratigraphie de la Grotte de Combe-Grenal, commune de Domme
6 (Dordogne) Note préliminaire. *Bulletin de la Société préhistorique de France* 52, 426–429.
- 7 Bordes, F., 1972. *A Tale of Two Caves*. New York: Harper and Row
- 8 Bourguignon, L., Faivre, J.-P., Turq, A., 2004. Ramification des chaînes opératoires: une
9 spécificité du Mousterien? *Paléo* 16, 37–49.
- 10 Capdeville, J.-P., Rigaud, J.P., 1987. Carte géologique 1/50 000 de Sarlat - La Canéda et
11 notice explicative, feuille 808. B.R.G.M., Orléans.
- 12 Caron, F., d'Errico, F., Del Moral, P., Santos, F., Zilhão, J., 2011. The Reality of Neandertal
13 Symbolic Behavior at the Grotte du Renne, Arcy-sur-Cure, France. *PLOS ONE* 6, e21545.
14 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0021545>
- 15 Chalmin, E., Menu, M., Vignaud, C., 2003. Analysis of rock art painting and technology of
16 Palaeolithic painters. *Measurement Science and Technology* 14, 1590–1597.
- 17 Chase, P.G., Dibble, H.L., 1987. Middle paleolithic symbolism: A review of current evidence
18 and interpretations. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 6, 263–296.
- 19 Chase, P.G., 1991. Symbols and paleolithic artifacts: Style, standardization, and the imposition
20 of arbitrary form. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 10, 193–214.
- 21 Clément, S., 2014. Recyclage au Paléolithique moyen. *Bulletin la Société préhistorique*
22 *française*, 131–134.
- 23 Clottes, J., Menu, M., Walter, P., 1990. La préparation des peintures magdaléniennes des
24 cavernes ariégeoises. *Bulletin de la Société Préhistorique Française* 87, 170–192.
- 25 Comas-Cufí, M., Thió-Henestrosa, S., 2011. CoDaPack 2.0: a stand-alone, multi-platform
26 compositional software. In: Egozcue JJ, Tolosana-Delgado R, Ortego MI, eds.
27 CoDaWork'11: 4th International Workshop on Compositional Data Analysis. Sant Feliu de
28 Guíxols.
- 29 Couraud, C., 1988. Pigments utilisés en Préhistoire, provenance, préparation, mode
30 d'utilisation. *L'Anthropologie* 82, 17–28.
- 31 d'Errico, F., Garcia Moreno, R., Rifkin, R.F., 2012. Technological, elemental and colorimetric
32 analysis of an engraved ochre fragment from the Middle Stone Age levels of Klasies River
33 Cave 1, South Africa. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 39 (4), 942–952.

- 1 d'Errico, F., Stringer, C.B., 2011. Evolution, revolution or saltation scenario for the
2 emergence of modern cultures? *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B:*
3 *Biological Sciences* 366 (1567), 1060-1069.
- 4 Dayet, L., d'Errico, F., Garcia-Moreno, R., 2014. Searching for consistencies in
5 Châtelperronian pigment use. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 44, 180–193.
- 6 Dayet, L., Le Bourdonnec, F.-X., Daniel, F., Porraz, G., Texier, P.-J., 2016. Ochre
7 Provenance and Procurement Strategies During The Middle Stone Age at Diepkloof Rock
8 Shelter, South Africa. *Archaeometry* 58, 807–829.
- 9 Dayet, L., Texier, P.-J., Daniel, F., Porraz, G., 2013. Ochre resources from the Middle Stone
10 Age sequence of Diepkloof Rock Shelter, Western Cape, South Africa. *Journal of*
11 *Archaeological Science* 40, 3492–3505.
- 12 Delagnes, A., Meignen, L., 2006. Diversity of Lithic Production Systems During the Middle
13 Paleolithic in France, in: Hovers, E., Kuhn, S.L. (Eds.), *Transitions Before the Transition:*
14 *Evolution and Stability in the Middle Paleolithic and Middle Stone Age.* Springer US,
15 Boston, MA, pp. 85–107.
- 16 Demars, P.-Y., 1992. Les colorants dans le Moustérien du Périgord : l'apport des fouilles de
17 F. Bordes. *Bulletin de la Société préhistorique de l'Ariège* 47, 185–194.
- 18 Dibble, H.L., 1984. Interpreting typological variation of Middle Paleolithic scrapers: Function,
19 style, or sequence of reduction? *Journal of Field Archaeology* 11, 431–436.
- 20 Dibble, H.L., 1987. The Interpretation of Middle Paleolithic Scraper Morphology. *American*
21 *Antiquity* 52(1), 109–117.
- 22 Dibble, H.L., McPherron, S.P., Sandgathe, D., Goldberg, P., Turq, A., Lenoir, M.,
23 2009. Context, curation, and bias: an evaluation of the Middle Paleolithic collections of
24 Combe-Grenal (France). *Journal of Archaeological Science* 36, 2540–2550.
- 25 Discamps, E., Faivre, J.-P., 2017. Substantial biases affecting Combe-Grenal faunal record
26 cast doubts on previous models of Neanderthal subsistence and environmental context.
27 *Journal of Archaeological Science* 81, 128–132.
- 28 Discamps, E., Royer, A., 2017. Reconstructing palaeoenvironmental conditions faced by
29 Mousterian hunters during MIS 5 to 3 in southwestern France: A multi-scale approach
30 using data from large and small mammal communities. *Quaternary International* 433, 64–
31 87.
- 32 Discamps, E., Jaubert, J., Bachellerie, F., 2011. Human choices and environmental constraints:
33 deciphering the variability of large game procurement from Mousterian to Aurignacian
34 times (MIS 5-3) in southwestern France. *Quaternary Science Reviews* 30, 2755-2775.

- 1 Discamps, E., Muth, X., Gravina, B., Lacrampe-Cuyaubère, F., Chadelle, J.-P., Faivre, J.-P.,
2 Maureille, B. (2016). Photogrammetry as a tool for integrating archival data in
3 archaeological fieldwork : Examples from the Middle Palaeolithic sites of Combe-Grenal,
4 Le Moustier, and Regourdou. *Journal of Archaeological Science : Reports* 8, 268–276.
- 5 Eiselt, B.S., Popelka-Filcoff, R.S., Darling, J.A., Glascock, M.D., 2011. Hematite sources and
6 archaeological ochres from Hohokam and O’odham sites in central Arizona: an experiment
7 in type identification and characterization. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 38, 3019–
8 3028.
- 9 Faivre, J.-Ph., 2008. Organisation techno-économique des systèmes de production dans le
10 Paléolithique moyen récent du Nord-est aquitain : Combe-Grenal et Les Fieux, 1.Ph.D.
11 thesis, Université Bordeaux, 555pp.
- 12 Faivre, J.-Ph., 2011. Le « Moustérien à denticulés » de la couche 20 de Combe-Grenal :
13 implications techniques, économiques et fonctionnelles au sein du système de production
14 Quina en Périgord. *PALEO* 21, 135-162.
- 15 Faivre, J.-P., Discamps, E., Gravina, B., Turq, A., Guadelli, J.-L., Lenoir, M., 2014. The
16 contribution of lithic production systems to the interpretation of Mousterian industrial
17 variability in south-western France: The example of Combe-Grenal (Dordogne, France).
18 *Quaternary International* 350, 227–240.
- 19 Faivre, J.-P., Discamps, E., Gravina, B., Turq, A., Bourguignon, L., 2017a. Cleaning up a
20 Messy Mousterian: How to describe and interpret Late Middle Palaeolithic chrono-cultural
21 variability in Atlantic Europe, *Quaternary International* 433, 1-3.
- 22 Faivre, J.-P., Gravina, B., Bourguignon, L., Discamps, E., Turq, A., 2017b. Late Middle
23 Palaeolithic lithic technocomplexes (MIS 5–3) in the northeastern Aquitaine Basin:
24 Advances and challenges. *Quaternary International* 433, 116–131.
- 25 Gravina, B., 2017. Intra-level technological change and its implications for Mousterian
26 assemblage variability. The example of Le Moustier, layer G. *Quaternary International*
27 433, 132–139.
- 28 Gravina, B., Discamps, E., 2015. MTA-B or not to be? Recycled bifaces and shifting hunting
29 strategies at Le Moustier and their implication for the late Middle Palaeolithic in
30 southwestern France. *Journal of Human Evolution* 84, 83–98.
- 31 Geneste, J.-M., Jaubert, J., Lenoir, M., Meignen, L., Turq, A., 1997. Les
32 moustériens charentais du Sud-ouest et du Languedoc oriental: approche technologique et
33 variabilité géographique. *Paléo* 9, 101-142.

- 1 Guadelli, J.-L., Laville, H., 1990. L'environnement climatique de la fin du Moustérien à
2 Combe-Grenal et à Camiac: confrontation des données naturalistes et implications., in:
3 Paléolithique Moyen Récent et Paléolithique Supérieur Ancien En Europe. Ruptures et
4 Transitions : Examen Critique Des Documents Archéologiques, Mémoires Du Musée de
5 Préhistoire d'Ile-de-France. Farizy, C., Nemours, pp. 43–48.
- 6 Henshilwood, C.S., d'Errico, F., Yates, R., Jacobs, Z., Tribolo, C., Duller, G.A.T., Mercier,
7 N., Sealy, J.C., Valladas, H., Watts, I., Wintle, A.G., 2002. Emergence of Modern Human
8 Behavior: Middle Stone Age Engravings from South Africa. *Science* 295 (5558), 1278-
9 1280.
- 10 Heyes, P.J., Anastasakis, K., de Jong, W., van Hoesel, A., Roebroeks, W., Soressi, M., 2016.
11 Selection and Use of Manganese Dioxide by Neanderthals. *Scientific Reports* 6, 22159.
- 12 Hodgskiss, T., 2013. Ochre Use in the Middle Stone Age at Sibudu, South Africa: Grinding,
13 Rubbing, Scoring and Engraving. *Journal of African Archaeology* 11, 75–95.
- 14 Hodgskiss, T., 2010. Identifying grinding, scoring and rubbing use-wear on experimental
15 ochre pieces. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 37, 3344–3358.
- 16 Hublin, J.-J., Talamo, S., Julien, M., David, F., Connet, N., Bodu, P., Vandermeersch, B.,
17 Richards, M.P., 2012. Radiocarbon dates from the Grotte du Renne and Saint-Césaire
18 support a Neandertal origin for the Châtelperronian. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 109, 18743.
- 19 Jaubert, J., 2011. Les archéoséquences du Paléolithique moyen du Sud-Ouest de la France :
20 quel bilan un quart de siècle après François Bordes ? In : F. Delpech et J. Jaubert (Dir.)
21 François Bordes et la Préhistoire. Colloque international François Bordes, Bordeaux 22-24
22 avril 2009, Paris, Édit. du CTHS, p. 235-253.
- 23 Jaubert, J., 2014. Middle Palaeolithic archeo-sequences from southwestern France: where do
24 we stand a quarter century after François Bordes?, in: *Basic Issues in Archaeology,*
25 *Anthropology, and Ethnography of Eurasia. Festschrift on the Occasion of Anatoly*
26 *Derevianko's 70th Birthday.* Novosibirsk, pp. 194–212.
- 27 Lounon, J., 1981. Les gisements de manganèse. *Ressources minières française* tome 10,
28 BRGM.
- 29 Lucas-Tooth, H. J., Price, B. J., 1961. A Mathematical Method for the Investigation of
30 Inter-element Effects in X-Ray Fluorescence Analysis. *Metallurgia* 64 (383), 149.
- 31 MacDonald, B.L., Fox, W., Dubreuil, L., Beddard, J., Pidruczny, A., 2018. Iron oxide
32 geochemistry in the Great Lakes Region (North America): Implications for ochre
33 provenance studies. *Journal of Archaeological Science: Reports* 19, 476–490.

- 1 Mallye, J. B., Thiébaud, C., Mourre, V., Costamagno, S., Claud, É., Weisbecker, P., 2012. The
2 Mousterian bone retouchers of Noisetier Cave: experimentation and identification of
3 marks. *Journal of Archaeological Science*, 39(4), 1131-1142.
- 4 Marquet, J. C., 1989. Paléoenvironnement et chronologie des sites du domaine atlantique
5 français d'âge Pléistocène moyen et supérieur d'après l'étude des rongeurs.
6 Ph.Dthesis Université de Bourgogne, Dijon.
- 7 Marshack, A., 1981. On Paleolithic Ochre and the Early Uses of Color and Symbol. *Current*
8 *Anthropology* 22 (2), 188-191.
- 9 McBrearty, S., Brooks, A.S., 2000. The revolution that wasn't: a new interpretation of the
10 origin of modern human behavior. *Journal of Human Evolution* 39 (5), 453-563.
- 11 Menu, M., 2009. L'analyse de l'art préhistorique. *L'Anthropologie* 113, 547–58.
- 12 Morin, E., Delagnes, A., Armand, D., Castel, J.-C., Hodgkins, J., 2014. Millennial-scale
13 change in archaeofaunas and their implications for Mousterian lithic variability in
14 southwest France. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 36, 158-180.
- 15 Patou-Mathis, M., Schwab, C., 2002. Fiche générale. In: Patou-Mathis M, editor. *Retouchoirs,*
16 *Compresseurs, Percuteurs Os à impressions et éraillures, Fiches de la Commission de*
17 *Nomenclature sur l'Industrie de l'Os Préhistorique Cahier X.* Paris: Éditions de la Société
18 *Préhistorique Française*; pp. 11–19.
- 19 Peirce, C. S., 1932. The icon, index, and symbol. In *Collected papers of Charles*
20 *Sanders Pierce, II*, edited by C. Hartshome and P. Weiss, 1960, pp. 156-173. Harvard
21 *University Press*, Cambridge, MA.
- 22 Peyrony, D., 1921. Une pierre colorée d'époque moustérienne, in: *Compte-Rendu de La 44e*
23 *Session, Strasbourg 1920 / Association Française Pour l'avancement Des Sciences.*
24 *Strasbourg*, pp. 494–495.
- 25 PitarchMartí, A., d'Errico, F., 2018. Seeking black. Geochemical characterization by PIXE of
26 Palaeolithic manganese-rich lumps and their potential sources. *Journal of Anthropological*
27 *Archaeology* 50, 54–68.
- 28 Popelka-Filcoff, R.S., Robertson, J.D., Glascock, M.D., Descantes, C., 2007. Trace element
29 characterization of ochre from geological sources. *Journal of Radioanalytical and Nuclear*
30 *Chemistry* 272, 17–27.
- 31 Queffelec, A., D'Errico, F., Vanhaeren, M., 2017. Analyse des blocs de matière colorante de
32 Praileaitz I (Deba, Gipuzkoa). *Munibe Monographs: Anthropology and Archaeology*
33 *Series 1*, 493-503.

- 1 Rifkin, R.F., 2012a. The symbolic and functional exploitation of ochre during the south
2 african middle stone age. University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.
- 3 Rifkin, R.F., 2012b. Processing ochre in the Middle Stone Age: Testing the inference of
4 prehistoric behaviours from actualistically derived experimental data. *Journal of*
5 *Anthropological Archaeology* 31, 174–195.
- 6 Rifkin, R.F., 2011. Assessing the efficacy of red ochre as a prehistoric hide tanning
7 ingredient. *Journal of African Archaeology* 9, 131–158.
- 8 Roebroeks, W., Sier, M.J., Nielsen, T.K., De Loecker, D., Parés, J.M., Arps, C.E.S., Múcher,
9 H.J., 2012. Use of red ochre by early Neandertals. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 109, 1889.
- 10 Rolland, N., Dibble, H.L., 1990. A New Synthesis of Middle Paleolithic Variability.
11 *American Antiquity* 55, 480–499.
- 12 Rudner, I.E., 1982. Khoisan pigments and paints and their relationship to rock paintings. South
13 African Museum, Cape Town.
- 14 Sackett, J.R., 1986. Isochrestism and style: A clarification. *Journal of Anthropological*
15 *Archaeology* 5, 266–277.
- 16 Salomon, H., 2009. Les matières colorantes au début du Paléolithique supérieur : sources,
17 transformations et fonctions. Université Bordeaux 1, Bordeaux.
- 18 Shaham, D., Grosman, L., Goren-Inbar, N., 2010. The red-stained flint crescent from Gesher:
19 new insights into PPNA hafting technology. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 37, 2010–
20 2016.
- 21 Soressi, M., d’Errico, F., 2007. Pigments, gravures, parures : les comportements symboliques
22 controversés des Néandertaliens, in: *Les Néandertaliens, Biologie et Cultures, Documents*
23 *Préhistoriques*. Vandermeersch, Bernard, Maureille, Bruno, Paris.
- 24 Turq, A., 2000. Le paléolithique inférieur et moyen entre Dordogne et Lot, Paléo:
25 Supplément. Société des amis du Musée national de Préhistoire et de la recherche
26 archéologique.
- 27 Turq, A., 2000. Les bases stratigraphiques régionales. *Paléo, Revue d’Archéologie*
28 *Préhistorique* 45–74.
- 29 Turq, A., Dibble, H. L., Goldberg, P., McPherron, S. P., Sandgathe, D., Jones, H., Maddison,
30 K., Maureille, B., Mentzer, S., Rink, J., Steenhuyse, A., 2011. Les Fouilles Récentes du
31 Pech de l’Azé IV (Dordogne). *Gallia Préhistoire* 53, 1-58.
- 32 Turq, A., Roebroeks, W., Bourguignon, L., Faivre, J.-P., 2013. The fragmented character of
33 Middle Palaeolithic stone tool technology. *Journal of Human Evolution* 65(5), 641–655.

- 1 Vaquero, M., 2011. New perspectives on recycling of lithic resources using refitting and
2 spatial data. *Quartâr* 58, 113–130.
- 3 Verna, C., d'Errico, F., 2011. The earliest evidence for the use of human bone as a tool.
4 *Journal of Human Evolution* 60(2), 145-157.
- 5 Vignaud, C., Salomon, H., Chalmin, E., Geneste, J.-M., Menu, M., 2006. Le groupe
6 des « bisons adossés » de Lascaux. Étude de la technique de l'artiste par analyse
7 des pigments. *L'Anthropologie* 110, 482–499.
- 8 Wadley, L., Hodgskiss, T., Grant, M., 2009. Implications for complex cognition from the
9 hafting of tools with compound adhesives in the Middle Stone Age, South Africa.
10 *ProcNatlAcadSci USA* 106, 9590.
- 11 Wadley, L., Williamson, B., Lombard, M., 2004. Ochre in hafting in Middle Stone Age
12 southern Africa: a practical role. *Antiquity* 78, 661–675.
- 13 Watts, I., 2002. Ochre in the Middle Stone Age of Southern Africa: Ritualised Display or
14 Hide Preservative? *The South African Archaeological Bulletin* 57 (175), 1-14.
- 15 Watts, I., 2009. Red Ochre, Body Painting, and Language: Interpreting the Blombos Ochre,
16 in: Botha, R., Knight, C. (Eds.), *The Cradle of Language*, Oxford University Press, Oxford,
17 pp. 62-92.
- 18 Watts, I., 2010. The pigments from Pinnacle Point Cave 13B, Western Cape, South Africa.
19 *Journal of Human Evolution* 59 (3-4), 392-411. Zilhão, J., Angelucci, D.E., Badal-García,
20 E., d'Errico, F., Daniel, F., Dayet, L., Douka, K., Higham, T.F.G., Martínez-Sánchez, M.J.,
21 Montes-Bernárdez, R., Murcia-Mascarós, S., Pérez-Sirvent, C., Roldán-García, C.,
22 Vanhaeren, M., Villaverde, V., Wood, R., Zapata, J., 2010. Symbolic use of marine shells
23 and mineral pigments by Iberian Neandertals. *ProcNatlAcadSci USA* 107, 1023.

24

25