

1      Differential cultural reproduction of skill level and mental  
2      templates in Late Acheulean handaxe morphology:  
3      Archaeological and experimental insights

4      Cheng Liu\*      Nada Khreisheh†      Dietrich Stout‡      Justin Pargeter§

5      2022-12-23

6      **Abstract**

7      Despite the extensive literature focusing on Acheulean handaxes, especially the sources  
8      and meaning of their morphological variability, many aspects of this topic remain elusive.  
9      Archaeologists cite many factors that contribute to the considerable variation of handaxe  
10     morphology, including knapper skill levels and mental templates. Here we present results from  
11     a multidisciplinary study of Late Acheulean handaxe-making skill acquisition involving thirty  
12     naïve participants trained for up to 90 hours in Late Acheulean style handaxe production and  
13     three expert knappers. We compare their handaxe to the Late Acheulean handaxe assemblage  
14     from Boxgrove, UK. Through the principal component analysis of morphometric data derived  
15     from images, our study suggested that knapper skill levels and mental templates have a  
16     relatively clear manifestation in different aspects of handaxe morphology. The former relates  
17     to cross-sectional thinning (PC1), while the latter refers to handaxe elongation and pointedness  
18     (PC2). Moreover, we also evaluated the effects of training using the data from a 90-hour-long  
19     knapping skill acquisition experiment. We found that reaching the skill level of modern experts  
20     requires more training time than was permitted in this extensive and long-running training  
21     program. ¶

22     ¶ **Keywords:** Late Acheulean; Handaxe morphology; Boxgrove; Experimental archaeology;  
23     Skill level; Mental template; Cultural reproduction

24      **Contents**

25 <b>1 Introduction</b>	2
26 <b>2 Materials and methods</b>	6
27         2.1 Boxgrove handaxe collection . . . . .	6
28         2.2 Experimental handaxe collection . . . . .	8
29         2.3 Lithic analysis . . . . .	9
30         2.4 Statistical analyses . . . . .	10

\*Department of Anthropology, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA; [raylc1996@outlook.com](mailto:raylc1996@outlook.com)

†The Ancient Technology Centre, Cranborne, Dorset, UK; [nada.khareisheh@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk](mailto:nada.khareisheh@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk)

‡Department of Anthropology, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA; [dwstout@emory.edu](mailto:dwstout@emory.edu)

§Department of Anthropology, New York University, New York, NY, USA; Rock Art Research Institute, School of Geography, Archaeology, and Environmental Studies, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa; [justin.pargeter@nyu.edu](mailto:justin.pargeter@nyu.edu)

31	<b>3 Results</b>	<b>11</b>
32	3.1 Principal component analysis . . . . .	11
33	3.2 Effects of training . . . . .	15
34	<b>4 Discussion</b>	<b>17</b>
35	<b>5 Conclusions</b>	<b>22</b>
36	<b>6 CRediT authorship contribution statement</b>	<b>23</b>
37	<b>7 Declaration of competing interest</b>	<b>23</b>
38	<b>8 Acknowledgements</b>	<b>23</b>
39	<b>References</b>	<b>23</b>

## 40 **1 Introduction**

41 The morphological variability of Acheulean handaxes has been one of the most well-studied  
 42 and well-published topics in paleolithic archaeology (Key & Lycett, 2019; Petraglia & Korisettar,  
 43 1998; White, 1998). Despite the recurrent narrative emphasizing the homogeneity and longevity  
 44 of handaxe assemblages on a global scale and the conservatism behind this phenomenon that  
 45 evokes genetic explanations (Corbey et al., 2016; Corbey, 2020; Richerson & Boyd, 2005; Sterelny,  
 46 2004), many researchers have recognized the diversity within what has been deemed as a unified  
 47 Acheulean “tradition” and tried to dissect the sources and meaning of this variation (Lycett &  
 48 Gowlett, 2008; Nowell, 2002; Nowell & White, 2010; Sharon et al., 2011). More specifically, a  
 49 complex suite of interconnecting factors (Lycett & Cramon-Taubadel, 2015) have been identified  
 50 to contribute to handaxe morphological variation, including but not limited to raw material  
 51 variability (Eren et al., 2014; Lycett et al., 2016; McNabb & Cole, 2015; Sharon, 2008), percussor  
 52 properties (Shipton et al., 2009), functional differences (Key et al., 2016; Key & Lycett, 2017; Lycett  
 53 & Gowlett, 2008; Machin et al., 2007; White & Foulds, 2018), reduction method/intensity (Shipton  
 54 et al., 2009; Shipton & Clarkson, 2015), time budgets (Schillinger et al., 2014b), learning processes  
 55 (Kempe et al., 2012; Lycett et al., 2016), social signaling (Kohn & Mithen, 1999; Spikins, 2012),  
 56 aesthetic preferences (Gowlett, 2021; Le Tensorer, 2006), knapper skill levels (Caruana & Herries,  
 57 2021; Herzlinger et al., 2017; Stout et al., 2014), and mental templates (García-Medrano et al., 2019;  
 58 Hutchence & Scott, 2021; Schillinger et al., 2017). From this extensive list, knapper skill levels and  
 59 mental templates have been repeatedly mentioned and discussed in the now extensive corpus

60 of handaxe studies, and Boxgrove handaxes have been one of the most studied assemblages  
61 from these two angles. Of particular attention here are the experimental works conducted by  
62 Stout et al. (2014) focusing on inferring knapping skill level and Garcia-Medrano et al. (2019)  
63 identifying the mental template of the Boxgrove assemblage. Our paper combines these two  
64 perspectives and provides novel insights to the same archaeological assemblage by comparing it  
65 with experimentally made handaxes.

66 In its classical definition, the term mental template indicates that the “idea of the proper form  
67 of an object exists in the mind of the maker, and when this idea is expressed in tangible form in  
68 raw material, an artifact results” (Deetz, 1967: 45). This concept lies at the very foundation of the  
69 cultural-historical approach in that the identification of archaeological cultures is based on the  
70 existence of distinct mental templates in a given spatial-temporal framework. Early researchers,  
71 whether explicitly or implicitly, often endorsed this conceptual framework and actively applied it  
72 in the typological analysis of handaxes at the regional level (Roe, 1969; Wenban-Smith et al., 2000;  
73 Wenban-Smith, 2004). Combined with the production of large flakes, the emergence of mental  
74 templates (or “imposed form”) has been recognized as a major technological innovation of the  
75 Acheulean compared with the Oldowan (Isaac, 1986). For a decade or so, this concept has been  
76 less frequently used, since it was criticized for a) its normative and static assumption (Lyman  
77 & O’Brien, 2004), b) ignoring other competing factors such as raw material constraints (White,  
78 1995), and c) being constrained by the basic fracture mechanics and design space of bifacial  
79 technology (Moore, 2011; Moore & Perston, 2016). To avoid the historical baggage associated  
80 with this controversial term, some researchers developed alternative frameworks such as “design  
81 imperatives” derived from utilitarian and ergonomic principles, which refers to a set of minimum  
82 features shared by all handaxes including their glob-but, forward extension, support for the  
83 working edge, lateral extension, thickness adjustment, and skewness (Gowlett, 2006; Wynn &  
84 Gowlett, 2018). The major difference between the concepts of design imperatives and mental  
85 templates lies in the fact that the former does not necessarily require the presence of explicit  
86 internal representations of form, where the shape of handaxes can instead emerge “through the  
87 coalescence of ergonomic needs in the manipulation of large cutting tools (Wynn, 2021: 185).”  
88 Recently, researchers have actively addressed the above-mentioned critiques and reconcep-  
89 tualized the concept of mental template in the study of handaxe morphology. Regarding the  
90 normative and static assumptions, Hutchence and Scott (2021), for example, leveraged the theory

91 of “community of practice” (Wenger, 1998) to explain the stability of Boxgrove handaxe design  
92 across multiple generations. From this perspective, social norms behind the consolidated ma-  
93 terial expressions were developed and negotiated by individuals in a group who have a shared  
94 history of learning. They further emphasized that emergent actions of individual knappers also  
95 contribute greatly to the shape of Boxgrove handaxes but they were simultaneously constrained  
96 by the imposition of social norms. This view also somewhat echoes the “individualized memic  
97 construct” proposed by McNabb et al. (2004), which highlighted the influence of individual  
98 agency that is complementary to the traditionally favored explanation of social learning. As  
99 for the critique towards confounding factors explaining morphological variability, raw material  
100 is often treated as an important variable to be controlled at the very beginning of a research  
101 design focusing on mental templates. This is best exemplified by an experimental study of  
102 García-Medrano et al. (2019), where they carefully chose experimental nodules mirroring those  
103 found in the Boxgrove archaeological assemblage in composition, size, and shape. Regarding  
104 the critique of design space constraint, Moore and Perston’s experiment (2016) suggested that  
105 bifaces can be manufactured through flake removals dictated by a random algorithm. However,  
106 Moore (2020: 656-657) also suggested that these random experiments cannot produce “attributes  
107 like the congruent symmetries of handaxes seen in the Late Acheulean.” In short, when exer-  
108 cised with proper caution, the concept of mental templates still has its value in our study of  
109 handaxe morphological variation, which can be further dissected into a series of shape variables  
110 corresponding to pointedness, elongation, and cross-sectional thinning among other things.

111 Following the reconceptualization of the mental template as a more flexible and interactive  
112 concept, one possible way of defining skill is the capacity for a knapper to realize mental templates  
113 using the resources available (Roux et al., 1995: 66). This version of conceptualization, particularly  
114 relevant when it comes to motor skills such as knapping, can be dismantled into two mutually  
115 dependent aspects, namely the intentional aspect (goal/strategic planning) and the operational  
116 aspect (means/motor execution) (Connolly & Dalgleish, 1989). It also roughly corresponds  
117 to the well-known dichotomy developed by French lithic analysts of “*connaissance*” (abstract  
118 knowledge) and “*savoir-faire*” (practical know-how) (Pelegrin, 1993). As Stout (2002: 694) noted,  
119 the acquisition of skill is deeply rooted in its social context, and it is not composed of “some  
120 rigid motor formula” but “how to act in order to solve a problem”. This ecological notion of skill  
121 somewhat mirrors Hutchence and Scott’s (2021) reconceptualization of the mental template  
122 in that they both refute the idea that technology is simply an internal program expressed by

the mind and they prefer a dynamic approach emphasizing the interaction between perception and action. The manifestations of skill in materialized form display a great amount of variation, but ethnoarchaeological studies have repeatedly suggested that skills can be improved through practice as perceived by local practitioners. It is thus possible to evaluate the skill levels reflected in knapping products (Roux et al., 1995; Stout, 2002). When contextual information is less readily available as in the Late Acheulean archaeological assemblages, how to properly operationalize and measure knapping skills has been a methodological issue receiving much attention among archaeologists (Bamforth & Finlay, 2008; Kolhatkar, 2022). In addition to measurements that can be almost applied in any lithic technological system such as raw materials, platform preparation, as well as hinges, in the context of handaxe technology, symmetry (Hodgson, 2015; Hutchence & Debackere, 2019) and cross-sectional thinning (Caruana, 2020; Pargeter et al., 2019; Stout et al., 2014; Whittaker, 2004: 180-182) have been frequently quoted as reliable and distinctive indicators of the skill level as supported by several experimental studies. These two features have also been commonly used as standards for dividing Early Acheulean and Late Acheulean (Callahan, 1979; Clark, 2001; Schick & Toth, 1993).

Drawing on these two lines of literature, we aim to explore the possibility of dissecting the interaction of skill level and mental template through a comparative study of an archaeological handaxe assemblage known for its remarkable high skill level, a reference handaxe collection produced by modern knapping experts, and an experimental handaxe sample produced by modern novice knappers. We generated the novice handaxe collection from a 90-hour skill acquisition experiment providing the opportunity to introduce the diachronic dimension of training time and interrogate its impact on the variables of interest. As such, we propose the following two interconnected research questions in this article: 1) Can skill level and mental templates be efficiently detected from handaxe morphometric data? Accordingly, we hypothesize that the morphometric variables showing overlap between Boxgrove and expert samples while being markedly different from novice samples reflect skill level differences, and all three group should show a similar mental template since this is the common target. 2) How does training affect novices' performance in these two aspects? Our hypothesis is that throughout the training the novice samples should become more similar to expert samples in both skill level and mental template.

153 **2 Materials and methods**

154 **2.1 Boxgrove handaxe collection**

155 The archaeological site of Boxgrove is located in the former Eartham quarry, Boxgrove, West Sussex,  
156 featuring a long sequence of Middle Pleistocene deposits (Pope et al., 2020; Roberts & Parfitt,  
157 1998). This 500-ka-old site has documented exceedingly rich details of Lower Paleolithic hominin  
158 subsistence behaviors (Smith, 2013, 2012) and their paleoenvironmental contexts (Holmes et al.,  
159 2010). In addition to the presence of one of the earliest hominin fossil (*Homo heidelbergensis*,  
160 Hillson et al., 2010) and bone assemblages with anthropogenic modifications in northern Europe  
161 (Bello et al., 2009), Boxgrove is mostly known for its large sample size of Late Acheulean-style flint  
162 handaxes and the high skill level reflected in their manufacture (Figure 1). As such, it has received  
163 wide research attention in the past two decades regarding the relationships between technology,  
164 cognition, and skills (García-Medrano et al., 2019; Iovita et al., 2017; Iovita & McPherron, 2011; Key,  
165 2019; Shipton & Clarkson, 2015; Stout et al., 2014). To identify the morphological manifestation of  
166 knappers' skill level in our study, we selected a complete handaxe assemblage (n=326) previously  
167 analyzed and reported in digital formats by Iovita and McPherron (2011), which is currently  
168 curated at the Franks House of the British Museum (Iovita et al., 2017). The digital photographs  
169 are taken of each handaxe at a 90° angle, which was oriented with the tip to the right of the photos,  
170 and the camera faces the most convex surface of the handaxe (Iovita & McPherron, 2011).

## **Boxgrove**



## **Expert**



— 5 cm —

## **Novice**



Figure 1: A selection of Boxgrove handaxes and modern replicas produced by experts and novices.

171 **2.2 Experimental handaxe collection**

172 The handaxe experimental replicas used in this study comprised two sub-collection ([Figure 1](#)).  
173 The first sub-collection includes 10 handaxes knapped by three expert knappers, including Bruce  
174 Bradley (n=4), John Lord (n=3), and Dietrich Stout (n=3) ([Stout et al., 2014](#)). These handaxes  
175 were made for previous research projects, which similarly aimed to approximate ‘Late Acheulean’  
176 handaxes explicitly comparable to the Boxgrove assemblage ([Faisal et al., 2010; Stout et al., 2014;](#)  
177 [Stout et al., 2011](#)). The second sub-collection is produced from a 90-hour handaxe knapping skill  
178 acquisition experiment ([Bayani et al., 2021; Pargeter et al., 2020; Pargeter et al., 2019](#)), where 30  
179 adults with no previous experience in knapping were recruited from Emory University and its  
180 surrounding communities and requested to make 132 handaxes in total. Among these 30 adult  
181 participants, 17 have gone through multiple one-to-one or group training sessions that amounted  
182 to 89 hours in maximum, while the remaining 13 were assigned to the controlled group, where  
183 no formal training is given. As part of the preparation efforts, the experimental team spalled  
184 the Norfolk flints acquired through [Neolithics.com](#) into flat blanks of similar size and shape for  
185 training and assessments. The mechanical properties of these raw materials are comparable to  
186 the ones used in Boxgrove in that they are both fine-grained and highly predictable in fracturing  
187 process.

188 In the knapping skill acquisition experiment, all research participants participated in the initial  
189 assessment (assessment 1 in our data set) before formal training, where they each produced a  
190 handaxe after watching three 15-minute videos of Late Acheulean style handaxes demonstrated  
191 by expert knappers and examining four Late Acheulean style handaxe replicas from our expert  
192 sample. Training was provided by verbal instruction and support from the second author, an  
193 experienced knapping instructor ([Khreisheh et al., 2013](#)) with 10 years knapping practice and  
194 specific knowledge of Late Acheulean technology including the Boxgrove handaxe assemblage.  
195 She was present at all training sessions to provide help and instruction to participants. All train-  
196 ing occurred under controlled conditions at the outdoor knapping area of Emory’s Paleolithic  
197 Technology Lab, with knapping tools and raw materials provided. All participants were instructed  
198 in basic knapping techniques including how to select appropriate percussors, initiate flaking  
199 on a nodule, maintain the correct flaking gestures and angles, prepare flake platforms, visualize  
200 outcomes, deal with raw material imperfections, and correct mistakes. Handaxe-specific instruc-  
201 tion included establishment and maintenance of a bifacial plane, cross-sectional thinning, and

202 overall shaping. The training emphasized both aspects of handaxe making technical skill (the  
203 importance of producing thin pieces with centered edges) as well as mental template related  
204 markers (symmetrical edges).

205 Subsequently, the 17 participants in the experimental group were assessed after every ten hours  
206 of the cumulative learning period, where each of them was requested to produce a handaxe for  
207 expert knapper's (N. Khreisheh) review, leading to the compilation of a data set composing 9  
208 assessments in total. It should be also noted that 6 out of 17 participants dropped out of the  
209 research before the final assessment due to personal reasons. To detect the effect of training  
210 on skill level and mental template, we reorganized our assessment classification scheme and  
211 combined it into three broader categories, namely pre-training (assessment 1), early training  
212 (assessment 2-5), and late training (assessment 6-9), which helps increase the sample size of  
213 the measured intervals. A more detailed experimental protocol can be assessed in one of our  
214 published papers ([Pargeter et al., 2019](#)).

### 215 **2.3 Lithic analysis**

216 To better understand the morphological variation of Boxgrove handaxe collection, we adopted a  
217 standardized analytical procedure to extract the morphometric information from 752 photos of  
218 the studied samples ([Iovita & McPherron, 2011](#)), which include both the front and lateral views  
219 of a given specimen. First, we used Adobe Photoshop to conduct a batch transformation of  
220 the samples' pixel scale into a real-world measurement scale based on the fixed photographic  
221 setting. This is then followed by the batch conversion of color photographs to a black-and-white  
222 binary format. Subsequently, we cropped the silhouettes of handaxes one by one using the  
223 Quick Selection Tool in Adobe Photoshop. The metric measurements were conducted in ImageJ  
224 ([Rueden et al., 2017](#)), where we employed a custom ImageJ script ([Pargeter et al., 2019](#)) to mea-  
225 sure the maximum length, width, and thickness of a given silhouette. The width and thickness  
226 measurements are taken at 10% increments of length starting at the tip of each handaxe (**Figure**  
227 [2](#)), which eventually leads to 19 morphometric variables in total (1 length measurement, 9 width  
228 measurements, and 9 thickness measurements). Finally, we calculated the geometric means of all  
229 19 linear measurements to create a scale-free data set that preserves the individual morphological  
230 variation at the same time ([Lycett et al., 2006](#)). This allometric scaling procedure controls for size  
231 variation which may come from initial blanks and/or reduction intensity (shaping/resharpening).

232 Notably, Shipton and Clarkson (2015) previously found that reduction intensity does not have a  
233 strong impact on the shape of handaxes. The same procedure was also applied to the morphome-  
234 tric analyses of the experimental handaxe collection, which was partially published in Pargeter et  
235 al. (2019).




Figure 2: A visual demonstration of the handaxe measurement protocol using Image J (after Pargeter et al. 2019: Figure 5).

## 236 2.4 Statistical analyses

237 We use the statistical programming language R 4.1.1 (R Core Team, 2021) to conduct statistical  
238 analyses and data visualization in this study, particularly the R packages “FactoMineR” (Lê et  
239 al., 2008) and “ggstatsplot” (Patil, 2021). As the initial step, simple visualization techniques such  
240 scatter plots are frequently used to explore the relationships between variables of interest. Given  
241 the number of variables involved in this study, we used principal component analysis (PCA) to  
242 reduce the dimension and identify the possible patterns in this morphometric data set, which  
243 is one of the most used techniques in similar studies (García-Medrano, Maldonado-Garrido, et  
244 al., 2020; García-Medrano, Ashton, et al., 2020; Herzlinger et al., 2017; Iovita & McPherron, 2011;

245 Shipton & Clarkson, 2015; Stout et al., 2014). To detect the effect of training on novices' perfor-  
246 mance as compared with archaeological samples and handaxe made by experts, we also compare  
247 the corresponding metrics built on PCA across different training periods and across all groups  
248 using the Games-Howell nonparametric post-hoc test. Compared with other nonparametric tests  
249 frequently used in archaeological research for multiple group comparison such as Tukey's test,  
250 Games-Howell test does not rely on the assumptions of sample normality, and equal sample sizes  
251 and equal variance are not necessary conditions to perform this test. The sample size of each  
252 compared group can be as low as 6 (Games & Howell, 1976; Sauder & DeMars, 2019). Lastly, we  
253 compare the delta weight, as defined by the difference between initial nodule weight and end  
254 product weight, between these groups to understand the effect of training on reduction intensity.  
255 This study adheres to the principles of reproducibility and data transparency of archaeological  
256 research by depositing all the codes and data sets involved in an open-access online repository  
257 (Marwick, 2017), which are available as supplementary materials and can be accessed through  
258 the author's Github (<https://github.com/Raylc/Boxgrove-Exp>).

## 259 3 Results

### 260 3.1 Principal component analysis

261 Our analysis suggested that the first two components already explain 77.2% of the variation for the  
262 entire morphometric data set composed of 19 variables (Figure 3), which is a rather reasonable  
263 variance ratio to avoid overfitting. Variable loadings (Table 1) indicate that the first principal  
264 component (PC1) captures relative cross-sectional thickness ("refinement"). It is positively corre-  
265 lated with all thickness measurements while negatively correlated with all other measurements.  
266 A higher PC1 value thus indicates a handaxe that is thicker relative to width and length, and vice  
267 versa. The second principal component (PC2) tracks elongation and pointedness, as indicated  
268 by a positive covariance of maximum length and bottom width/thickness. As PC2 increases, a  
269 handaxe will be relatively longer and more convergent from the broad base to the tip. Thus, PC1  
270 corresponds to cross-sectional thinning and PC2 to a narrowing of the tip relative to length and  
271 base dimensions.




Figure 3: A scree plot showing the percentage of explained variances of the first 10 principal components.

Table 1: Variable loadings for the first two principal components. PC1 (Dim.1) is positively correlated with all thickness-related variables and negatively correlated with all width-related variables and the maximum length. PC2 (Dim.2) is positively with bottom width and thickness variables as well as the maximum length and negatively correlated with width and thickness variables of the tip area.

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Dim.1</b>	<b>Dim.2</b>
width_90%	-0.1131	-0.1256
width_80%	-0.1420	-0.1327
width_70%	-0.1684	-0.1232
width_60%	-0.1867	-0.0967
width_50%	-0.2037	-0.0652
width_40%	-0.2121	-0.0197
width_30%	-0.2083	0.0233
width_20%	-0.1886	0.0661
width_10%	-0.1447	0.0806
thickness_90%	0.0143	-0.0240
thickness_80%	0.0247	-0.0227
thickness_70%	0.0436	-0.0094
thickness_60%	0.0668	0.0048
thickness_50%	0.0894	0.0261
thickness_40%	0.1083	0.0485
thickness_30%	0.1288	0.0629
thickness_20%	0.1444	0.0659
thickness_10%	0.1309	0.0487
max_length	-0.3626	0.2507

272 A closer look at the principal component scatter plot ([Figure 4](#)) yields the clustering of different  
 273 groups of handaxes. The majority of Boxgrove handaxes occupy an area featuring negative values  
 274 of both PC1 and PC2. The expert group is similar to the Boxgrove group in PC1, while the former  
 275 has a relatively higher PC2 value than the latter on average. The group of novice displays the  
 276 highest ranges in both PC1 and PC2 values according to the scatter plot, however, it is rather  
 277 pronounced that most handaxes made by novices have a positive PC1 value that is different from  
 278 both the groups of Boxgrove and experts.




Figure 4: A principal component scatter plot of handaxes from the groups of Boxgrove (red, n=326), expert (green, n=10), and novice (blue, n=132).

279 In addition, visual inspection of the principle component scatter plot (**Figure 4**) suggested that  
 280 PC1 and PC2 might be negatively correlated within the Boxgrove and Expert groups. To test this,  
 281 we conducted a series of exploratory plotting and statistical analyses of the PC values of three  
 282 groups analyzed in our analysis (**Figure 5**). Across all three groups, a negative correlation has  
 283 been displayed between the PC1 and PC2 values, although this trend is not statistically significant  
 284 ( $r=-0.41$ ,  $p= 0.24$ ) in the expert group, probably because of its small sample size.




Figure 5: A scatter plot showing the correlation between PC1 and PC2 respectively in the groups of Boxgrove (left,  $n=326$ ), expert (middle,  $n=10$ ), and novice (right,  $n=132$ ). The upper left area in each individual plot displays statistical reporting from a frequentist perspective, including the student-t test statistics, p-value, Pearson correlation coefficient, confidence interval, and sample size. The lower right area in each individual plot displays statistical reporting from a Bayesian perspective, including the natural logarithm of Bayes factor, posterior type and estimate, credible interval, and prior type and value.

### 285 3.2 Effects of training

286 We extracted the PC1 and PC2 values of individual handaxes and compared them between  
 287 different groups, where the novice group was divided into three sub-groups based on their  
 288 training stages as specified in the method section. As such, we found that for PC1 values (**Figure**  
 289 **6**), the only two group comparisons that are **not** statistically significant are the one between  
 290 Boxgrove and Expert ( $t = -1.65, p > 0.05$ ) and the one between Early training and Late training  
 291 stages ( $t = -0.649, p > 0.05$ ), which at least partially confirms our visual observation of the  
 292 general PCA scatter plot. Likewise, for PC2 values (**Figure 7**), the group comparison between  
 293 the Early training and Late stages again is not statistically significant ( $t = 0.333, p > 0.05$ ). An  
 294 unexpected result is that the mean PC2 value difference between the Pre-training group and  
 295 Boxgrove is also not statistically significant ( $t = -0.818, p > 0.05$ ). These results essentially  
 296 suggest that there is a significant difference between the pre-training group and post-training  
 297 groups in both PC1 (thinning) and PC2 (pointedness). However, the effects of training across  
 298 different assessment periods on both dimensions are not significant. Regarding the delta weight  
 299 of different groups, our analysis (**Figure 8**) suggests that there is a significant difference between  
 300 the pre-training group and Late training group, while all other pairwise group comparison results

301 are insignificant. It can also be inferred that the expert group display a higher variability in terms  
 302 of delta weight compared with novices.




Figure 6: A between-group comparison of PC1 values.




Figure 7: A between-group comparison of PC2 values.




Figure 8: A comparison of the delta weight between the pre-training, early training, late training, and the expert group.

## 303 4 Discussion

304 Our study suggests that both skill level and mental template have a relatively clear manifestation in  
 305 different aspects of handaxe morphology, where the former is related to cross-sectional thinning  
 306 (PC1) while the latter relates to handaxe elongation and pointedness (PC2). Moreover, we also  
 307 evaluated the effects of training using the data from a 90-hour long knapping skill acquisition  
 308 experiment and confirmed the previous finding (2019) that reaching the skill level of modern  
 309 experts requires more training time than was permitted in this extensive and long-running  
 310 training program. In accordance with the existing literature on handaxe knapping skill (Callahan,  
 311 1979; Caruana, 2020; Stout et al., 2014), the results of PCA suggested that PC1 (cross-sectional  
 312 thinning) is a robust indicator of skill level as it is a common feature shared by modern expert  
 313 knapper and Boxgrove knappers. Thinning is regarded as a technique requiring a high knapping  
 314 skill level because it requires one to carefully detach flakes in an invasive manner while not  
 315 breaking the handaxe into several pieces, serving the purpose of achieving the desired convexity  
 316 and/or volume. This procedure involves precise control of striking forces, strategic choice of  
 317 platform external angle, and attentive preparation of bifacial intersection plane, all of which  
 318 were part of our experimental training program (Callahan, 1979; Caruana, 2022; Pargeter et  
 319 al., 2020; Shipton et al., 2013; Stout et al., 2014). Experimental studies have also shown that  
 320 the thinning stage of handaxe produce often involves the use of soft hammers, which is also  
 321 supported by indirect archaeological evidence of flake attributes from Boxgrove (Roberts & Parfitt,

322 1998: 384-394; [Roberts & Pope, 2009](#)), although the validity of differentiating purcussor types  
323 (hard hammerstone, soft hammerstone, and antler hammer) based on flake attributes has been  
324 challenged by other experimental studies([Driscoll & García-Rojas, 2014](#)). It should be noted that  
325 both our experts and novices frequently used soft hammers in the production of experimental  
326 assemblages. In the skill acquisition experiments, novice knappers were explicitly taught to  
327 switch to the soft hammer for thinning purposes, but some of them did not follow the instruction  
328 during the assessment. On the other hand, it has also been shown that hard hammers can also  
329 be used to achieve similar thinning results ([Bradley & Sampson, 1986](#); [Pelcin, 1997](#)), and the  
330 replicas produced by Bruce Bradley in our expert reference collection did not involve the use of  
331 soft hammers.

332 Given the dissimilarity of PC2 (elongation and pointedness) values between archaeological and  
333 experimental samples and its similarity among modern knappers, we argue that this dimension  
334 reflects different mental templates, where the Boxgrove assemblage displays an ovate shape  
335 featuring a wider tip while the experimental assemblages are characterized by a more pointed  
336 shape with a longer central axis. Our results regarding the ovate plan morphology of the Boxgrove  
337 assemblage generally supports what have been reported by Shipton and White ([2020](#)) as well  
338 as Garcia-Medrano et al. ([2019](#)). The finding that the expert group has a mental template  
339 different from the Boxgrove assemblage is rather surprising since they were requested to mimic  
340 Boxgrove handaxes, a potential reason of which could be that these expert didn't have Boxgrove  
341 handaxes at hand as model during the manufacture and thus followed their vague memory  
342 of a "representative teardrop Late Acheulean handaxe." In general, this pattern may reflect a  
343 divergence of group-level aesthetic choices as expected under the theoretical framework of the  
344 communities of practice ([Wenger, 1998](#)) as advocated by Hutchence and Scott in handaxe analysis  
345 ([2021](#)). The most common form of learning in the experiment occurred in the group condition,  
346 where the instructor, as the competent group member, directed the joint enterprise through  
347 actively teaching multiple novices at the same time. Meanwhile, novices had the chance to also  
348 communicate and learn from their peers, producing a shared repertoire of artifacts and actions.  
349 Unfortunately, the handaxe data from the instructor (N. Khreisheh) are unavailable, but it should  
350 be noted that the instructor has learned how to knap and how to teach knapping from one of our  
351 expert knapper (Bruce Bradley). This cascading effect of social learning might explain why there  
352 is a shared mental template between the expert group and the novice group after training.

353 The negative correlation between the PC1 and PC2 values revealed a hidden structural constraint  
354 regarding the relationship between cross-sectional thinning and the imposed form. Our results  
355 (**Figure 5**) suggested thinner handaxes (low PC1 value) are generally more pointed/less ovate (high  
356 PC2 value), which was first reported in Crompton and Gowlett's (1993) pioneering study on the  
357 allometry of Kilombe handaxes. In the thinning phase of handaxe making, a knapper must strike  
358 flakes that travel more than one half way across the surface while not breaking the handaxe into  
359 half (1979: 90). As a corollary, we speculate that it would be easier to perform thinning if the plan  
360 shape of a handaxe is narrower and more pointed, echoing the high technological difficulty of  
361 making large yet thin bifacial points as perceived by American hobbyist flintknappers (Whittaker,  
362 2004: 180-182). It is possible that such constraints help to explain why our novice knappers on  
363 average produced more handaxes in similar shapes to those preferred by modern expert knappers,  
364 however, this clearly does not explain the design target at Boxgrove. Given the ovate forms of the  
365 Boxgrove assemblage, it thus requires a high skill level to overcome this structural constraint to  
366 produce thin yet wide handaxes as demonstrated by the Boxgrove knappers. This also provides  
367 an alternative explanation to the social transmission of form for the experimental convergence  
368 on pointed forms. In this comparative context, it would only be the Boxgrove assemblage that  
369 provided evidence of social conformity on a more difficult target shape.

370 In terms of our second research question, this study shows that training does have an immediate  
371 intervention effect (pre-training vs. post-training) in both PC1 (skill level) and PC2 (mental tem-  
372 plate). Nonetheless, once the training has been initiated, its effects across different assessments  
373 on both dimensions are rather non-significant. This finding provides a parallel line of evidence  
374 that corroborates what has been suggested in Pargeter et al. (2019) that 90 hours of training for  
375 handaxe making is still not enough for novices to reach the skill level as reflected in expert knap-  
376 pers, even considering the massive social support involved in the experiment set up including  
377 the direct and deliberate pedagogy and the simplified raw material procurement and preparation  
378 procedures. Methodologically speaking, this study also demonstrated that the pattern revealed by  
379 the multivariate analysis of morphometric data can nicely match with the expert knapper's 5 point  
380 grading scale of novices' knapping performances that takes multiple factors into consideration,  
381 including outcome, perceptual motor execution, and strategic understanding (See Table 2 of 2019  
382 for more details).

383 Moreover, this follow-up project further adds the samples produced by the Late Acheulean

384 toolmaker as a new benchmark to deepen our understanding of this issue. As previously shown  
385 in Key's (2019) previous finding regarding Boxgrove, it is noteworthy how constrained the range  
386 of Boxgrove assemblage morphological variation is as measured by both PC1 and PC2 even when  
387 compared with the modern expert group (Figure 4), especially given the fact that it has the largest  
388 sample size among all studied groups. Some potential explanations for this phenomenon include  
389 1) the strong idiosyncrasy of individual expert knappers shaped by their own unique learning  
390 and practice experience; 2) the present-day skill shortage of our expert knapper as compared  
391 with Boxgrove knappers despite their multiple years of knapping practice (Milks, 2019); and/or  
392 3) modern knappers' skill level was affected by time constraints when they were requested to  
393 produce the reference collections (Lewis et al., 2022; Schillinger et al., 2014b).

394 The pre-training group is unexpectedly similar to the Boxgrove group in PC2 because these  
395 novices lack the ability to effectively reduce the nodules, which are typically flat pre-prepared  
396 cortical flakes, to the desired form (Figure 9). If the given nodules already possess an oval  
397 morphology like those presented in the Boxgrove assemblage, it is likely the form of end products  
398 knapped by novices in the pre-training group will remain roughly unchanged (Winton, 2005: 113).  
399 This explanation is also supported by the comparison of average delta weight, defined as the  
400 difference between the weight of handaxe and the weight of nodule, among four groups, where  
401 the pre-training group displays the lowest value (Figure (ref?)(fig:weight)). It might be worth  
402 noting that the expert group is highly variable probably due to raw material starting size/shape.  
403 Achieve handaxe forms while removing as little mass as possible (i.e. making as big a handaxe as  
404 possible from the nodule) generally requires a higher skill level due to the reductive or subtractive  
405 nature of stone knapping, where correcting an error or any thinning procedure always requires  
406 the removal of raw material and thereby reducing the size of a given handaxe (Schillinger et  
407 al., 2014a: 130; Deetz, 1967: 48-49). On the other hand, the refitting analyses of the Boxgrove  
408 handaxe assemblage have suggested that the nodules exploited by knappers inhabiting this site  
409 are somewhat bulky and amorphous (Roberts & Parfitt, 1998: 339, 360). These characteristics  
410 have been clearly displayed in a recent attempt of slow-motion refitting of a handaxe specimen  
411 from Boxgrove GTP17 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iS58MUJ1ZEo>). As such, we infer that  
412 behind the resemblance of the pre-training group and the Boxgrove assemblage in PC2 are two  
413 types of mechanisms that are fundamentally different from each other, where the latter group  
414 exhibits a complex suite of cognitive and motor execution processes to transform the shapeless  
415 raw materials to a delicate end product in a given shape.



Figure 9: Core 63 before (left) and after knapping(right), showing the minimal morphological change during the knapping process.

416 Although we are not the first research team to use secondary archaeological data (e.g., [Key, 2019](#)),  
 417 we would still like to highlight here that this research project further exemplifies the potential  
 418 of reusing old archaeological data in digital format to address novel research questions. In this  
 419 paper, the main source of archaeological data is a collection of photos produced and curated  
 420 more than 10 years ago, and the morphological variation data of the experimental collection are  
 421 also derived from photographs instead of remeasurements of the original artifacts. Given the  
 422 irreversible nature of archaeological excavations, digitized data, be it text, pictures, or videos,  
 423 often become the sole evidence that is available for certain research questions. Yet, it has been  
 424 widely acknowledged that the reuse of archaeological data has not received enough attention  
 425 among researchers in our discipline ([Faniel et al., 2018](#); [Huggett, 2018](#); [Moody et al., 2021](#)). Among  
 426 many reasons preventing archaeologists from reusing published and digitized data ([Sobotkova,](#)  
 427 [2018](#)), the lack of a standardized practice of and motivation for data sharing is a prominent one  
 428 ([Marwick & Birch, 2018](#)). As stated in the method section, we addressed this issue by sharing the  
 429 raw data and the code for generating the derived data on an open-access repository. Another  
 430 major and legitimate concern of archaeological data reuse is their quality. In terms of this aspect,  
 431 we do acknowledge the limitations of relying on photos when it comes to the more detailed  
 432 technological analysis of stone artifacts, however, our paper shows that finding the appropriate

433 research questions given the data available is key to revealing new novel insights into the studied  
434 topic. Moreover, we believe that this type of research has a strong contemporary relevance due  
435 to the continued influence of the COVID-19 on fieldwork-related travel and direct access to  
436 archaeological artifacts (Balandier et al., 2022; Ogundiran, 2021).

437 **5 Conclusions**

438 Regarding the two research questions we proposed in the beginning, our case study suggested that  
439 1) we can delineate the effects of skill level and mental template through the multivariate analysis  
440 of morphometric data, where the former is associated with cross-sectional thinning while the  
441 latter is reflected in elongation and pointedness; 2) On average training has an immediate effect of  
442 making novices to better understand the shared design targets, but 90 hours of training is still not  
443 enough for novice to reach the level of expertise as reflected in modern experienced knappers, let  
444 alone the Boxgrove tool makers. At a larger theoretical level it questions the distinction between  
445 social learning of design targets vs. individual learning of the skills needed to achieve them. To  
446 illustrate, a thin cross section could be part of a mental template or design target and was explicitly  
447 instructed by our expert instructor to novices, but novices cannot fully understand nor achieve  
448 this technological goal due to the constraint of skill level, making it a robust indicator of the latter.  
449 Traditionally archaeological experiments speaking to the literature of cultural evolution tend to  
450 use handaxe as a model artifact and focus on how copying errors emerge during the transmission  
451 of a fixed and static target using transmission chain design and alternative raw materials such as  
452 foam (Schillinger et al., 2014b, 2017, 2015). This line of inquiry is generally characterized by high  
453 internal validity (causal mechanisms) but low external validity (generalizability to archaeological  
454 data). In contrast, our study unpacks the differential reproductions of two major sources of  
455 variation and reveals how the development of motor skill during learning is constraining the  
456 achievement of the socially learnt design target, through an actualistic experimental setting  
457 featuring a higher degree of external validity (Liu & Stout, 2022). In the future, more robust  
458 experimental studies are needed to deepen our understanding of the relationship between skill  
459 acquisition and the morphological variability of handaxes in the proper developmental context  
460 (Högberg, 2018) as well as their implications for the biological and cultural evolution of the  
461 hominin lineages.

462 **6 CRediT authorship contribution statement**

463 **Cheng Liu:** Data curation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Visualization, Writing  
464 – original draft, Writing – review & editing. **Nada Khreisheh:** Investigation, Writing – review &  
465 editing. **Dietrich Stout:** Conceptualization, Investigation, Resources, Funding acquisition, Super-  
466 vision, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. **Justin Pargeter:** Conceptualization,  
467 Investigation, Methodology, Supervision, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing.

468 **7 Declaration of competing interest**

469 The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relation-  
470 ships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

471 **8 Acknowledgements**

472 We would like to thank Thomas Jennings and three other anonymous reviewers for their insightful  
473 feedback on an earlier draft of this manuscript. This work was supported by funding from  
474 the National Science Foundation of the USA (grants SMA-1328567 & DRL-1631563), the John  
475 Templeton Foundation (grant 47994), and the Emory University Research Council. The handaxe  
476 knapping skill acquisition experiment involved in this study was approved by Emory University's  
477 Internal Review Board (IRB study no: 00067237). We would also like to thank Radu Iovita for  
478 providing us access to the digital photographs of the Boxgrove handaxe assemblage.

479 **References**

- 480 Balandier, C., Cipin, I., Hartenberger, B., & Islam, M. (2022). Archaeology in a pandemic: Four  
481 stories. *Near Eastern Archaeology*, 85(1), 66–73. <https://doi.org/10.1086/718201>
- 482 Bamforth, D. B., & Finlay, N. (2008). Introduction: Archaeological approaches to lithic production  
483 skill and craft learning. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*, 15(1), 1–27. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40345992>
- 485 Bayani, K. Y. T., Natraj, N., Khresdish, N., Pargeter, J., Stout, D., & Wheaton, L. A. (2021). Emergence  
486 of perceptuomotor relationships during paleolithic stone toolmaking learning: intersections  
487 of observation and practice. *Communications Biology*, 4(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s4>

- 488 2003-021-02768-w
- 489 Bello, S. M., Parfitt, S. A., & Stringer, C. (2009). Quantitative micromorphological analyses of cut  
490 marks produced by ancient and modern handaxes. *Journal of Archaeological Science*, 36(9),  
491 1869–1880. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2009.04.014>
- 492 Bradley, B. A., & Sampson, C. G. (1986). *Analysis by replication of two acheuleian artefact assem-*  
493 *blages from caddington, england* (G. Bailey & P. Callow, Eds.; pp. 29–46). Cambridge University  
494 Press.
- 495 Callahan, E. (1979). The basics of biface knapping in the eastern fluted point tradition: A manual  
496 for flintknappers and lithic analysts. *Archaeology of Eastern North America*, 7(1), 1–180.  
497 <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40914177>
- 498 Caruana, M. V. (2022). Extrapolating later acheulian handaxe reduction sequences in south africa:  
499 A case study from the cave of hearths and amanzi springs. *Lithic Technology*, 47(1), 1–12.  
500 <https://doi.org/10.1080/01977261.2021.1924452>
- 501 Caruana, M. V. (2020). South African handaxes reloaded. *Journal of Archaeological Science:*  
502 *Reports*, 34, 102649. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jasrep.2020.102649>
- 503 Caruana, M. V., & Herries, A. I. R. (2021). Modelling production mishaps in later Acheulian  
504 handaxes from the Area 1 excavation at Amanzi Springs (Eastern Cape, South Africa) and their  
505 effects on reduction and morphology. *Journal of Archaeological Science: Reports*, 39, 103121.  
506 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jasrep.2021.103121>
- 507 Clark, J. D. (2001). *Variability in primary and secondary technologies of the later acheulian in*  
508 *africa* (S. Milliken & J. Cook, Eds.; p. 118). Oxbow Books.
- 509 Connolly, K., & Dagleish, M. (1989). The emergence of a tool-using skill in infancy. *Developmental*  
510 *Psychology*, 25(6), 894–912. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.25.6.894>
- 511 Corbey, R. (2020). Baldwin effects in early stone tools. *Evolutionary Anthropology: Issues, News,*  
512 *and Reviews*, 29(5), 237–244. <https://doi.org/10.1002/evan.21864>
- 513 Corbey, R., Jagich, A., Vaesen, K., & Collard, M. (2016). The acheulean handaxe: More like a bird's  
514 song than a beatles' tune? *Evolutionary Anthropology: Issues, News, and Reviews*, 25(1), 6–19.  
515 <https://doi.org/10.1002/evan.21467>
- 516 Crompton, R. H., & Gowlett, J. A. J. (1993). Allometry and multidimensional form in Acheulean  
517 bifaces from Kilombe, Kenya. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 25(3), 175–199. <https://doi.org/10>  
518 .1006/jhev.1993.1043
- 519 Deetz, J. (1967). *Invitation to archaeology*. Natural History Press.

- 520 Driscoll, K., & García-Rojas, M. (2014). Their lips are sealed: identifying hard stone, soft stone,  
521 and antler hammer direct percussion in Palaeolithic prismatic blade production. *Journal of*  
522 *Archaeological Science*, 47, 134–141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2014.04.008>
- 523 Eren, M. I., Roos, C. I., Story, B. A., von Cramon-Taubadel, N., & Lycett, S. J. (2014). The role of raw  
524 material differences in stone tool shape variation: an experimental assessment. *Journal of*  
525 *Archaeological Science*, 49, 472–487. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2014.05.034>
- 526 Faisal, A., Stout, D., Apel, J., & Bradley, B. (2010). The Manipulative Complexity of Lower Paleolithic  
527 Stone Toolmaking. *PLOS ONE*, 5(11), e13718. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0013718>
- 528 Faniel, I. M., Austin, A., Kansa, E., Kansa, S. W., France, P., Jacobs, J., Boytner, R., & Yakel, E.  
529 (2018). Beyond the Archive: Bridging Data Creation and Reuse in Archaeology. *Advances in*  
530 *Archaeological Practice*, 6(2), 105–116. <https://doi.org/10.1017/aap.2018.2>
- 531 Games, P. A., & Howell, J. F. (1976). Pairwise multiple comparison procedures with unequal  
532 n's and/or variances: A monte carlo study. *Journal of Educational Statistics*, 1(2), 113–125.  
533 <https://doi.org/10.2307/1164979>
- 534 García-Medrano, P., Ashton, N., Moncel, M.-H., & Ollé, A. (2020). The WEAP method: A new  
535 age in the analysis of the Acheulean handaxes. *Journal of Paleolithic Archaeology*, 3(4).  
536 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41982-020-00054-5>
- 537 García-Medrano, P., Maldonado-Garrido, E., Ashton, N., & Ollé, A. (2020). Objectifying processes:  
538 The use of geometric morphometrics and multivariate analyses on Acheulean tools. *Journal*  
539 *of Lithic Studies*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.2218/jls.4327>
- 540 García-Medrano, P., Ollé, A., Ashton, N., & Roberts, M. B. (2019). The Mental Template in Handaxe  
541 Manufacture: New Insights into Acheulean Lithic Technological Behavior at Boxgrove, Sussex,  
542 UK. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*, 26(1), 396–422. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10816-018-9376-0>
- 544 Gowlett, J. A. J. (2021). Deep structure in the Acheulean adaptation: technology, sociality and  
545 aesthetic emergence. *Adaptive Behavior*, 29(2), 197–216. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059712320965713>
- 547 Gowlett, J. A. J. (2006). *The elements of design form in acheulian bifaces: Modes, modalities, rules*  
548 *and language* (N. Goren-Inbar & G. Sharon, Eds.; pp. 203–222). Equinox.
- 549 Herzlinger, G., Goren-Inbar, N., & Grosman, L. (2017). A new method for 3D geometric morpho-  
550 metric shape analysis: The case study of handaxe knapping skill. *Journal of Archaeological*  
551 *Science: Reports*, 14, 163–173. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jasrep.2017.05.013>

- 552 Hillson, S. W., Parfitt, S. A., Bello, S. M., Roberts, M. B., & Stringer, C. B. (2010). Two hominin  
553 incisor teeth from the middle Pleistocene site of Boxgrove, Sussex, England. *Journal of Human*  
554 *Evolution*, 59(5), 493–503. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2010.06.004>
- 555 Hodgson, D. (2015). The symmetry of Acheulean handaxes and cognitive evolution. *Journal of*  
556 *Archaeological Science: Reports*, 2, 204–208. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jasrep.2015.02.002>
- 557 Höglberg, A. (2018). Approaches to children's knapping in lithic technology studies. *Revista de*  
558 *Arqueología*, 31(2), 58–74. <https://doi.org/10.24885/sab.v31i2.613>
- 559 Holmes, J. A., Atkinson, T., Fiona Darbyshire, D. P., Horne, D. J., Joordens, J., Roberts, M. B., Sinka,  
560 K. J., & Whittaker, J. E. (2010). Middle Pleistocene climate and hydrological environment at the  
561 Boxgrove hominin site (West Sussex, UK) from ostracod records. *Quaternary Science Reviews*,  
562 29(13), 1515–1527. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quascirev.2009.02.024>
- 563 Huggett, J. (2018). Reuse Remix Recycle: Repurposing Archaeological Digital Data. *Advances in*  
564 *Archaeological Practice*, 6(2), 93–104. <https://doi.org/10.1017/aap.2018.1>
- 565 Hutchence, L., & Debackere, S. (2019). An evaluation of behaviours considered indicative of skill  
566 in handaxe manufacture. *Lithics—The Journal of the Lithic Studies Society*, 39, 36.
- 567 Hutchence, L., & Scott, C. (2021). Is Acheulean Handaxe Shape the Result of Imposed 'Men-  
568 tal Templates' or Emergent in Manufacture? Dissolving the Dichotomy through Exploring  
569 'Communities of Practice' at Boxgrove, UK. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal*, 31(4), 675–686.  
570 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774321000251>
- 571 Iovita, R., & McPherron, S. P. (2011). The handaxe reloaded: A morphometric reassessment  
572 of Acheulian and Middle Paleolithic handaxes. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 61(1), 61–74.  
573 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2011.02.007>
- 574 Iovita, R., Tuvi-Arad, I., Moncel, M.-H., Despriée, J., Voinchet, P., & Bahain, J.-J. (2017). High  
575 handaxe symmetry at the beginning of the European Acheulian: The data from la Noira  
576 (France) in context. *PLOS ONE*, 12(5), e0177063. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0177063>
- 577 63
- 578 Isaac, G. L. (1986). *Foundation stones: Early artefacts as indicators of activities and abilities* (G.  
579 Bailey & P. Callow, Eds.; pp. 221–241). Cambridge University Press.
- 580 Kempe, M., Lycett, S., & Mesoudi, A. (2012). An experimental test of the accumulated copying  
581 error model of cultural mutation for Acheulean handaxe size. *PLOS ONE*, 7(11), e48333.  
582 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0048333>
- 583 Key, A. J. M. (2019). Handaxe shape variation in a relative context. *Comptes Rendus Palevol*, 18(5),

- 584 555–567. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crpv.2019.04.008>
- 585 Key, A. J. M., & Lycett, S. J. (2017). Influence of Handaxe Size and Shape on Cutting Efficiency: A  
586 Large-Scale Experiment and Morphometric Analysis. *Journal of Archaeological Method and*  
587 *Theory*, 24(2), 514–541. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10816-016-9276-0>
- 588 Key, A. J. M., & Lycett, S. J. (2019). Biometric variables predict stone tool functional performance  
589 more effectively than tool-form attributes: a case study in handaxe loading capabilities.  
590 *Archaeometry*, 61(3), 539–555. <https://doi.org/10.1111/arcm.12439>
- 591 Key, A. J. M., Proffitt, T., Stefani, E., & Lycett, S. J. (2016). Looking at handaxes from another  
592 angle: Assessing the ergonomic and functional importance of edge form in Acheulean bifaces.  
593 *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology*, 44, 43–55. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaa.2016.08.002>
- 594 Khreisheh, N. N., Davies, D., & Bradley, B. A. (2013). Extending Experimental Control: The Use of  
595 Porcelain in Flaked Stone Experimentation. *Advances in Archaeological Practice*, 1(1), 38–46.  
596 <https://doi.org/10.7183/2326-3768.1.1.37>
- 597 Kohn, M., & Mithen, S. (1999). Handaxes: products of sexual selection? *Antiquity*, 73(281),  
598 518–526. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003598X00065078>
- 599 Kolhatkar, M. (2022). Skill in Stone Knapping: an Ecological Approach. *Journal of Archaeological*  
600 *Method and Theory*, 29(1), 251–304. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10816-021-09521-x>
- 601 Le Tensorer, J.-M. (2006). Les cultures acheuléennes et la question de l'émergence de la pensée  
602 symbolique chez Homo erectus à partir des données relatives à la forme symétrique et har-  
603 monique des bifaces. *Comptes Rendus Palevol*, 5(1), 127–135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crpv.2005.12.003>
- 605 Lê, S., Josse, J., & Husson, F. (2008). FactoMineR: An R Package for Multivariate Analysis. *Journal*  
606 *of Statistical Software*, 25, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v025.i01>
- 607 Lewis, A. R., Williams, J. C., Buchanan, B., Walker, R. S., Eren, M. I., & Bebber, M. R. (2022).  
608 Knapping quality of local versus exotic Upper Mercer chert (Ohio, USA) during the Holocene.  
609 *Geoarchaeology*, 37(3), 486–496. <https://doi.org/10.1002/gea.21904>
- 610 Liu, C., & Stout, D. (2022). Inferring cultural reproduction from lithic data: A critical review.  
611 *Evolutionary anthropology*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/evan.21964>
- 612 Lycett, S. J., & Cramon-Taubadel, N. von. (2015). Toward a “Quantitative Genetic” Approach  
613 to Lithic Variation. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*, 22(2), 646–675. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10816-013-9200-9>
- 615 Lycett, S. J., & Gowlett, J. A. J. (2008). On questions surrounding the acheulean ‘tradition’. *World*

- 616      *Archaeology*, 40(3), 295–315. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40388215>
- 617    Lycett, S. J., Schillinger, K., Eren, M. I., von Cramon-Taubadel, N., & Mesoudi, A. (2016). Factors  
618      affecting Acheulean handaxe variation: Experimental insights, microevolutionary processes,  
619      and macroevolutionary outcomes. *Quaternary International*, 411, 386–401. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2015.08.021>
- 620
- 621    Lycett, S. J., von Cramon-Taubadel, N., & Foley, R. A. (2006). A crossbeam co-ordinate caliper  
622      for the morphometric analysis of lithic nuclei: a description, test and empirical examples of  
623      application. *Journal of Archaeological Science*, 33(6), 847–861. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2005.10.014>
- 624
- 625    Lyman, R. L., & O'Brien, M. J. (2004). A History of Normative Theory in Americanist Archaeology.  
626      *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*, 11(4), 369–396. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10816-004-1420-6>
- 627
- 628    Machin, A. J., Hosfield, R. T., & Mithen, S. J. (2007). Why are some handaxes symmetrical? Testing  
629      the influence of handaxe morphology on butchery effectiveness. *Journal of Archaeological  
630      Science*, 34(6), 883–893. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2006.09.008>
- 631    Marwick, B. (2017). Computational Reproducibility in Archaeological Research: Basic Principles  
632      and a Case Study of Their Implementation. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*,  
633      24(2), 424–450. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10816-015-9272-9>
- 634    Marwick, B., & Birch, S. E. P. (2018). A Standard for the Scholarly Citation of Archaeological  
635      Data as an Incentive to Data Sharing. *Advances in Archaeological Practice*, 6(2), 125–143.  
636      <https://doi.org/10.1017/aap.2018.3>
- 637    McNabb, J., Binion, F., & Hazelwood, L. (2004). The large cutting tools from the south african  
638      acheulean and the question of social traditions. *Current Anthropology*, 45(5), 653–677. <https://doi.org/10.1086/423973>
- 639
- 640    McNabb, J., & Cole, J. (2015). The mirror cracked: Symmetry and refinement in the Acheulean  
641      handaxe. *Journal of Archaeological Science: Reports*, 3, 100–111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jasrep.2015.06.004>
- 642
- 643    Milks, A. (2019). Skills shortage: a critical evaluation of the use of human participants in early  
644      spear experiments. *EXARC Journal*, 2019(2), 1–11. <https://pdf.printfriendly.com/pdfs/make>
- 645    Moody, B., Dye, T., May, K., Wright, H., & Buck, C. (2021). Digital chronological data reuse in  
646      archaeology: Three case studies with varying purposes and perspectives. *Journal of Archaeo-  
647      logical Science: Reports*, 40, 103188. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jasrep.2021.103188>

- 648 Moore, M. W. (2020). Hominin Stone Flaking and the Emergence of 'Top-down' Design in Human  
649 Evolution. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal*, 30(4), 647–664. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S09597>  
650 74320000190
- 651 Moore, M. W. (2011). The design space of stone flaking: Implications for cognitive evolution.  
652 *World Archaeology*, 43(4), 702–715. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00438243.2011.624778>
- 653 Moore, M. W., & Perston, Y. (2016). Experimental Insights into the Cognitive Significance of Early  
654 Stone Tools. *PLOS ONE*, 11(7), e0158803. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0158803>
- 655 Nowell, A. (2002). Coincidental factors of handaxe morphology. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*,  
656 25(3), 413–414. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X02330073>
- 657 Nowell, A., & White, M. (2010). *Growing up in the middle pleistocene: Life history strategies and*  
658 *their relationship to acheulian industries.* (A. Nowell & I. Davidson, Eds.; pp. 67–82). University  
659 Press of Colorado. [http://www.upcolorado.com/book/Stone\\_Tools\\_and\\_the\\_Evolution\\_of\\_H](http://www.upcolorado.com/book/Stone_Tools_and_the_Evolution_of_H)  
660 [uman\\_Cognition\\_Paper](#)
- 661 Ogundiran, A. (2021). Doing Archaeology in a Turbulent Time. *African Archaeological Review*,  
662 38(3), 397–401. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10437-021-09460-8>
- 663 Pargeter, J., Khreisheh, N., Shea, J. J., & Stout, D. (2020). Knowledge vs. know-how? Dissecting  
664 the foundations of stone knapping skill. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 145, 102807. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2020.102807>
- 666 Pargeter, J., Khreisheh, N., & Stout, D. (2019). Understanding stone tool-making skill acquisition:  
667 Experimental methods and evolutionary implications. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 133,  
668 146–166. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2019.05.010>
- 669 Patil, I. (2021). Visualizations with statistical details: The 'ggstatsplot' approach. *Journal of Open*  
670 *Source Software*, 6(61), 3167. <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.03167>
- 671 Pelcin, A. (1997). The Effect of Indentor Type on Flake Attributes: Evidence from a Controlled  
672 Experiment. *Journal of Archaeological Science*, 24(7), 613–621. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jasc.1>  
673 996.0145
- 674 Pelegrin, J. (1993). *A framework for analysing prehistoric stone tool manufacture and a tentative*  
675 *application to some early stone industries* (pp. 302–317). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198522638.003.0018>
- 677 Petraglia, M. D., & Korisettar, R. (Eds.). (1998). *Early human behaviour in global context: The rise*  
678 *and diversity of the lower palaeolithic record.* Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203203203>
- 679 279

- 680 Pope, M., Parfitt, S., & Roberts, M. (2020). *The horse butchery site 2020: A high-resolution record of*  
681 *lower palaeolithic hominin behaviour at boxgrove, UK*. SpoilHeap Publications.
- 682 R Core Team. (2021). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for  
683 Statistical Computing. <https://www.R-project.org/>
- 684 Richerson, P. J., & Boyd, R. (2005). *Not By Genes Alone: How Culture Transformed Human Evolution*.  
685 University of Chicago Press.
- 686 Roberts, M. B., & Parfitt, S. A. (1998). *Boxgrove: A middle pleistocene hominid site at eartham*  
687 *quarry, boxgrove, west sussex*. English Heritage.
- 688 Roberts, M. B., & Pope, M. (2009). *The archaeological and sedimentary records from boxgrove*  
689 *and slindon* (R. M. Briant, M. R. Bates, R. Hosfield, & F. Wenban-Smith, Eds.; pp. 96–122).  
690 Quaternary Research Association.
- 691 Roe, D. A. (1969). British Lower and Middle Palaeolithic Handaxe Groups\*. *Proceedings of the*  
692 *Prehistoric Society*, 34, 1–82. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0079497X00013840>
- 693 Roux, V., Bril, B., & Dietrich, G. (1995). Skills and learning difficulties involved in stone knapping:  
694 The case of stone-bead knapping in khambhat, india. *World Archaeology*, 27(1), 63–87. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00438243.1995.9980293>
- 695 Rueden, C. T., Schindelin, J., Hiner, M. C., DeZonia, B. E., Walter, A. E., Arena, E. T., & Eliceiri, K. W.  
696 (2017). ImageJ2: ImageJ for the next generation of scientific image data. *BMC Bioinformatics*,  
697 18(1), 529. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12859-017-1934-z>
- 698 Sauder, D. C., & DeMars, C. E. (2019). An Updated Recommendation for Multiple Comparisons.  
699 *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, 2(1), 26–44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2515245918808784>
- 700 Schick, K. D., & Toth, N. P. (1993). *Making Silent Stones Speak: Human Evolution And The Dawn*  
701 *Of Technology*. Simon; Schuster.
- 702 Schillinger, K., Mesoudi, A., & Lycett, S. J. (2014a). Copying error and the cultural evolution  
703 of “additive” vs. “Reductive” material traditions: An experimental assessment. *American*  
704 *Antiquity*, 79(1), 128–143. <https://doi.org/10.7183/0002-7316.79.1.128>
- 705 Schillinger, K., Mesoudi, A., & Lycett, S. J. (2014b). Considering the Role of Time Budgets on  
706 Copy-Error Rates in Material Culture Traditions: An Experimental Assessment. *PLOS ONE*,  
707 9(5), e97157. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0097157>
- 708 Schillinger, K., Mesoudi, A., & Lycett, S. J. (2017). Differences in Manufacturing Traditions and  
709 Assemblage-Level Patterns: the Origins of Cultural Differences in Archaeological Data. *Journal*

- 712       of *Archaeological Method and Theory*, 24(2), 640–658. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10816-016-9280-4>
- 713
- 714   Schillinger, K., Mesoudi, A., & Lycett, S. J. (2015). The impact of imitative versus emulative  
715       learning mechanisms on artifactual variation: implications for the evolution of material  
716       culture. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 36(6), 446–455. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2015.04.003>
- 717
- 718   Sharon, G. (2008). The impact of raw material on Acheulian large flake production. *Journal of  
719       Archaeological Science*, 35(5), 1329–1344. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2007.09.004>
- 720   Sharon, G., Alperson-Afil, N., & Goren-Inbar, N. (2011). Cultural conservatism and variability in  
721       the Acheulian sequence of Gesher Benot Ya‘aqov. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 60(4), 387–397.  
722       <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2009.11.012>
- 723   Shipton, C., & Clarkson, C. (2015). Handaxe reduction and its influence on shape: An experimental  
724       test and archaeological case study. *Journal of Archaeological Science: Reports*, 3, 408–419.  
725       <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jasrep.2015.06.029>
- 726   Shipton, C., Clarkson, C., Pal, J. N., Jones, S. C., Roberts, R. G., Harris, C., Gupta, M. C., Ditchfield, P.  
727       W., & Petraglia, M. D. (2013). Generativity, hierarchical action and recursion in the technology  
728       of the Acheulean to Middle Palaeolithic transition: A perspective from Patpara, the Son Valley,  
729       India. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 65(2), 93–108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2013.03.007>
- 730
- 731   Shipton, C., Petraglia, M. D., & Paddayya, K. (2009). Stone tool experiments and reduction  
732       methods at the Acheulean site of Isampur Quarry, India. *Antiquity*, 83(321), 769–785. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003598X00098987>
- 732
- 733
- 734   Shipton, C., & White, M. (2020). Handaxe types, colonization waves, and social norms in the  
735       British Acheulean. *Journal of Archaeological Science: Reports*, 31, 102352. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jasrep.2020.102352>
- 736
- 737   Smith, G. M. (2013). Taphonomic resolution and hominin subsistence behaviour in the Lower  
738       Palaeolithic: differing data scales and interpretive frameworks at Boxgrove and Swanscombe  
739       (UK). *Journal of Archaeological Science*, 40(10), 3754–3767. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2013.05.002>
- 740
- 741   Smith, G. M. (2012). Hominin-carnivore interaction at the Lower Palaeolithic site of Boxgrove, UK.  
742       *Journal of taphonomy*, 10(3-4), 373–394. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=5002455>
- 743

- 744 Sobotkova, A. (2018). Sociotechnical Obstacles to Archaeological Data Reuse. *Advances in Archaeological Practice*, 6(2), 117–124. <https://doi.org/10.1017/aap.2017.37>
- 745
- 746 Spikins, P. (2012). Goodwill hunting? Debates over the ‘meaning’ of lower palaeolithic handaxe form revisited. *World Archaeology*, 44(3), 378–392. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00438243.2012.725889>
- 747
- 748
- 749 Sterelny, K. (2004). A review of Evolution and learning: the Baldwin effect reconsidered edited by Bruce Weber and David Depew. *Evolution & Development*, 6(4), 295–300. <https://doi.org/10.111/j.1525-142X.2004.04035.x>
- 750
- 751
- 752 Stout, D. (2002). Skill and cognition in stone tool production: An ethnographic case study from irian jaya. *Current Anthropology*, 43(5), 693–722. <https://doi.org/10.1086/342638>
- 753
- 754 Stout, D., Apel, J., Commander, J., & Roberts, M. (2014). Late Acheulean technology and cognition at Boxgrove, UK. *Journal of Archaeological Science*, 41, 576–590. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2013.10.001>
- 755
- 756
- 757 Stout, D., Passingham, R., Frith, C., Apel, J., & Chaminade, T. (2011). Technology, expertise and social cognition in human evolution. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, 33(7), 1328–1338. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-9568.2011.07619.x>
- 758
- 759
- 760 Wenban-Smith, F. (2004). Handaxe typology and Lower Palaeolithic cultural development: flicrons, cleavers and two giant handaxes from Cuxton. *Lithics*, 25, 11–21. <https://eprints.soton.ac.uk/41481/>
- 761
- 762
- 763 Wenban-Smith, F., Gamble, C., & Apsimon, A. (2000). The Lower Palaeolithic Site at Red Barns, Portchester, Hampshire: Bifacial Technology, Raw Material Quality, and the Organisation of Archaic Behaviour. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, 66, 209–255. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0079497X0000181X>
- 764
- 765
- 766
- 767 Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge University Press.
- 768
- 769 White, M. (1998). On the Significance of Acheulean Biface Variability in Southern Britain. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, 64, 15–44. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0079497X00002164>
- 770
- 771 White, M. (1995). Raw materials and biface variability in southern britain: A preliminary examination. *Lithics–The Journal of the Lithic Studies Society*, 15, 1–20.
- 772
- 773 White, M., & Foulds, F. (2018). Symmetry is its own reward: on the character and significance of Acheulean handaxe symmetry in the Middle Pleistocene. *Antiquity*, 92(362), 304–319. <https://doi.org/10.15184/aqy.2018.35>
- 774
- 775

- 776 Whittaker, J. C. (2004). *American Flintknappers: Stone Age Art in the Age of Computers*. University  
777 of Texas Press.
- 778 Winton, V. (2005). An investigation of knapping-skill development in the manufacture of Palae-  
779 olithic handaxes. *Stone Knapping: The Necessary Conditions for a Uniquely Hominin Behaviour*  
780 *Mcdonald Institute for Archaeological Research*, 109e116.
- 781 Wynn, T. (2021). Ergonomic clusters and displaced affordances in early lithic technology. *Adaptive  
782 Behavior*, 29(2), 181–195. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059712320932333>
- 783 Wynn, T., & Gowlett, J. (2018). The handaxe reconsidered. *Evolutionary Anthropology: Issues,  
784 News, and Reviews*, 27(1), 21–29. <https://doi.org/10.1002/evan.21552>