

¹ Exploring the Composition of Lithic Assemblages in Mesolithic
² South-Eastern Norway

³ Isak Roalkvam¹

⁴ 06 January, 2022

⁵ **Abstract**

This paper leverages multivariate statistics to explore the composition of 54 Mesolithic assemblages located in south-eastern Norway. To provide analytical control pertaining to factors such as variable excavation practices, systems for artefact categorisation and raw-material availability, the sites chosen for analysis have all been excavated relatively recently and have a constrained geographical distribution. The assemblages were explored following two strains of analysis. The first of these entailed the use of artefact categories that are in established use within Norwegian Mesolithic archaeology, while the other involved drawing on measures that have been linked directly to land-use and mobility patterns associated with lithic assemblages more widely. The findings pertaining to the established artefact categories largely reflect the temporal development previously reported in Norwegian Mesolithic research, which has been based on more subjectively driven methods. Furthermore, the chronological trends associated with variables taken from the so-called Whole Assemblage Behavioural Indicators (e.g. Clark and Barton 2017), originally devised for characterising Palaeolithic assemblages in terms of associated mobility patterns, also align with the development previously proposed in the literature. This provides an initial indication that these measures are applicable in a Norwegian Mesolithic setting as well, setting the stage for a more targeted and rigorous model evaluation outside this exploratory setting. Furthermore, this finding supports the notion that these measures can offer a powerful comparative tool in the analysis of lithic assemblages more generally.

²³ ¹ University of Oslo, Department of Archaeology, Conservation and History

²⁴ **Highlights**

- Multivariate exploratory analysis of Mesolithic assemblages in south-eastern Norway
- Explores patterns related to established artefact categories in Norwegian archaeology
- Explores variables associated with mobility patterns in lithic assemblage studies
- Draws on the Whole Assemblage Behavioural Indicators (WABI)
- Relevance for Mesolithic Norway supports the notion that WABI are widely applicable

³⁰ Keywords: Mesolithic Scandinavia; Multivariate statistics; Mobility strategies; Whole Assemblage Behavioural
³¹ Indicators

³² **1 Introduction**

³³ This study employs multivariate exploratory statistics to analyse lithic assemblages associated with Mesolithic
³⁴ sites located in south-eastern Norway. This is done to identify latent patterns and structure in the relationship
³⁵ between the assemblages, with the ultimate aim of identifying behaviourally induced variation in their
³⁶ composition across time. However, the composition of the assemblages can be expected to be determined by a
³⁷ multitude of factors (e.g. Dibble et al. 2017; Rezek et al. 2020), ranging from the impact of natural formation
³⁸ processes, to various and intermixed behavioural aspects such as purpose, duration, frequency and group

39 sizes at visits to the sites. The assemblages are also likely to be impacted by variation in lithic technology,
40 artefact function, use-life and discard patterns, as well as procurement strategies and access to raw materials.
41 Finally, analytic and methodological dimensions relating to survey, excavation and classification practices are
42 also fundamental to how the assemblages are defined. Consequently, the analysis conducted here is done
43 from an exploratory perspective, where all of these factors should be seen as potential contributors to any
44 observed pattern. In an attempt to limit the influence of some potentially confounding effects, the material
45 chosen for analysis has a constrained geographical distribution, and stems from recent investigations that
46 have employed comparable methods for excavation and classification within larger unified projects.

47 Even though each individual assemblage can have been impacted by an virtual infinitude of effects that might
48 skew an archaeological interpretation, this does not preclude the applicability of inductive analyses aimed
49 at revealing overarching structure in the data without imposing overly complex analytical frameworks that
50 attempt to account for these particularities (Bevan 2015). Structure that can be revealed from considering all
51 of the assemblages in aggregate can constitute a step in an iterative analytical chain that ultimately aims to
52 tease apart the multitude of factors that have shaped the composition of the assemblages. This would in turn
53 give analytical access to the organisation of lithic technology and variation in past behaviour, adaptation and
54 demographic development (see for example Andrefsky 2009; Barton et al. 2011; Binford 1979; Dibble et al.
55 2017; Rezek et al. 2020). The most immediate danger of the approach outlined here is rather to be overly
56 naive in the causal significance and cultural importance that is ascribed to any identified pattern. As such,
57 the main aim of this analysis is to compare the results with findings reported in previous literature concerned
58 with the Mesolithic in southern Norway and have the generation of new hypotheses as a possible outcome. To
59 this end, the analysis follows two analytical avenues. The first involves an analysis of the assemblages using
60 the classification of the artefacts done for the original excavation reports. The second involves an analysis of
61 the assemblages in light of the so-called Whole Assemblage Behavioural Indicators (e.g. Clark and Barton
62 2017) and other factors that have been employed to align properties of lithic assemblages with land-use and
63 mobility patterns.

64 2 Archaeological context and material

65 The Early Mesolithic, or Flake Axe Phase, is defined as lasting from c. 9300–8200 BCE (Table 2), and is set
66 to start with the first recorded human presence in Norway (Damlien and Solheim 2018). Previous research
67 has typically proposed that the Early Mesolithic is characterised by a relatively high degree of mobility, and
68 low variation in site types and associated mobility patterns (e.g. Bjerck 2008; Breivik and Callanan 2016;
69 Fuglestvedt 2012; Nærøy 2018; but see Åstveit 2014; Viken 2018). Around the transition to the subsequent
70 Middle Mesolithic or Microlith Phase at c. 8200 BCE, pervasive changes in blade and axe technology occur
71 (Damlien 2016; Eymundsson et al. 2018; Solheim et al. 2020), which in turn has been associated with changes
72 in population genetics and related migration events hailing from the Eurasian steppes (Günther et al. 2018;
73 Manninen et al. 2021). The Microlith Phase is defined as lasting until around 7000 BCE, which is followed by
74 the Pecked Adze Phase, characterised by a more dominating presence of non-flint macro tools and associated
75 production waste in the assemblages (Reitan 2016). The next typological transition at c. 5600 BCE signifies
76 the onset of the Nøstvet Adze Phase. While previously defined as having a slightly longer duration, the
77 Nøstvet Phase has traditionally been seen as representing the onset of more varied settlement systems and
78 stable mobility patterns (e.g. Jakslund 2001; Lindblom 1984). In recent years it has been suggested that
79 the transition to a decrease in mobility and more varied land-use patterns can be traced back to the Middle
80 Mesolithic (Solheim and Persson 2016). The subsequent Transverse Arrowhead Phase (c. 4500–3900 BCE) is
81 characterised by a dramatic decrease in axe finds, and the introduction of new flint projectiles (Reitan 2016).
82 It has recently been suggested that a dispersal of people from southern Scandinavia into southern Norway
83 takes place in this period (Eigeland 2015:379; Nielsen 2021), which could follow after a preceding population
84 decline at c. 4300 BCE (Nielsen 2021; cf. Solheim 2020; Solheim and Persson 2018).

85 A defining characteristic of the Norwegian Mesolithic is that a clear majority of the known sites are located
86 in coastal areas (e.g. Bjerck 2008). Furthermore, these coastal sites appear to predominantly have been
87 located on or close to the contemporary shoreline when they were in use (Åstveit 2018; Breivik et al. 2018;




Figure 1: A) Spatial and B) temporal distribution of the sites chosen for analysis. Radiocarbon age determinations are given as the sum of the posterior density estimates. Solid lines indicate that the site has been dated with reference to relative sea-level change and typological indicators. These follow the original reports. Site numbers match those provided in Table 2.

Table 1: Chronological framework. Glørstad's (2010) division of phases reflects the more traditional framework, to which Reitan (2016) has recently suggested considerable changes.

Glørstad (2010)	
Early Mesolithic, Fosna Phase	9500–8200 BCE
Middle Mesolithic, Tørkop Phase	8200–6300 BCE
Late Mesolithic, Nøstvet Phase	6300–4600 BCE
Late Mesolithic, Kjeøy Phase	4600–3800 BCE
Reitan (2016)	
Flake Axe Phase	9300–8200 BCE
Microlith Phase	8200–7000 BCE
Pecked Adze Phase	7000–5600 BCE
Nøstvet Adze Phase	5600–4500 BCE
Transverse Arrowhead Phase	4500–3900 BCE

88 Møller 1987; Solheim 2020). In south-eastern Norway, this pattern is combined with a continuous regression
 89 of the shoreline, following from isostatic rebound (e.g. Romundset et al. 2018; Sørensen 1979). The fairly
 90 rapid shoreline displacement means that the sites tend not to have retained their strategic or ecologically
 91 beneficial shore-bound location for long periods of time (cf. Perreault 2019:47). Consequently, the shore-bound
 92 settlement, combined with the rapid shoreline displacement has resulted in a relatively high degree of spatial
 93 separation of cumulative palimpsests, to follow the terminology of Bailey (2007), while the reconstruction of
 94 the trajectory of relative sea-level change allows for a relatively good control of when these accumulation
 95 events occurred. In other parts of the world, a higher degree of spatial distribution means that while the
 96 physical separation of material can help delineate discrete events, this typically comes at the cost of losing
 97 temporal resolution as any stratigraphic relationship between the events is lost (Bailey 2007).

98 The 54 coastal sites chosen for analysis here have a relatively limited geographical distribution (Figure 1A).
 99 The sites were excavated as part of four larger excavation projects that all took place within the last 15 years
 100 (Jaksland and Persson 2014; Melvold and Persson 2014; Reitan and Persson 2014; Solheim 2017a; Solheim
 101 and Damlien 2013). The sites included in the analysis consist of all Mesolithic sites excavated in conjunction
 102 with the projects that have assemblages holding more than 100 artefacts. The institution responsible for
 103 these excavations was the Museum of Cultural History in Oslo. This has led to a considerable overlap in the
 104 archaeological personnel involved, and comparable excavation practices across the excavations. Furthermore,
 105 with these projects, major efforts were made to standardise how lithic artefacts were to be classified at the
 106 museum (Koxvold and Fossum 2017; Melvold et al. 2014). As a result, this should reduce the amount of
 107 artificial patterning in the data incurred by discrepancies in the employed systems for categorisation (cf.
 108 Clark and Riel-Salvatore 2006; Dibble et al. 2017).

109 The lithic data analysed are based on the classification of the site assemblages done for the original excavation
 110 reports, and consists of 48 variables representing differentdebitage and tool types. The artefact data have
 111 been divided into flint and non-flint materials. Flint does not outcrop naturally in southern Norway, and is
 112 only available locally as nodules that have been transported and deposited by retreating and drifting ice (e.g.
 113 Berg-Hansen 1999). This means that the distribution and quality of flint has been impacted by a diverse set
 114 of climatic and geographical factors (Eigeland 2015:46). Thus, while flint is treated as a unified category here,
 115 the variability in quality could have been substantial. Furthermore, the various non-flint raw materials that
 116 have been lumped together have quite disparate properties, where fine-grained cryptocrystalline materials are
 117 often used as a substitute or supplement to flint, while other, coarser materials are usually associated with
 118 the production of axes and other macro tools. Given this differentiated use, these raw-material properties are
 119 expected to be reflected in the retaineddebitage and tool categories. An important benefit of combining all
 120 of the non-flint materials is that this reduces the dependency on whether or not these have been correctly and
 121 consistently categorised for the reports (cf. Frivoll 2017). Finally, while factors such as landscape changes
 122 through shoreline displacement can have led to variable raw-material availability at the analysed sites, for
 123 example by impacting accessibility by means of watercraft, the relatively constrained geographical distribution

¹²⁴ of the sites hopefully counteracts some environmentally given sources of variation.

Table 2: Analysed sites.

no	Site name	Dating method	Reported start (BCE)	Reported end (BCE)
1	Pauler 1	Shoreline/typology	9200	9000
2	Pauler 2	Shoreline/typology	9150	8950
3	Pauler 3	Shoreline/typology	9000	8800
4	Pauler 5	Shoreline/typology	8975	8775
5	Pauler 4	Shoreline/typology	8950	8750
6	Pauler 6	Shoreline/typology	8850	8650
7	Bakke	Shoreline/typology	8850	8650
8	Pauler 7	Shoreline/typology	8800	8600
9	Nedre Hobekk 2	Shoreline/typology	8800	8500
10	Solum 1	Shoreline/typology	8800	8400
11	Tinderholt 3	Shoreline/typology	8700	8500
12	Tinderholt 2	Shoreline/typology	8700	8400
13	Dørdal	Shoreline/typology	8600	8400
14	Tinderholt 1	Shoreline/typology	8600	8300
15	Skeid	Shoreline/typology	8500	8300
16	Hydal 3	Shoreline/typology	8300	8100
17	Hydal 4	Shoreline/typology	8300	8100
18	Hydal 7	Shoreline/typology	8300	8100
19	Hovland 2	Shoreline/typology	8300	7900
20	Nedre Hobekk 3	Shoreline/typology	8200	8000
21	Hydal 8	Shoreline/typology	8200	8000
22	Hegna vest 1	Radiocarbon	8000	7800
23	Hovland 5	Radiocarbon	8000	7700
24	Sundsaasen 1	Shoreline/typology	7900	7700
25	Hegna øst 6	Shoreline/typology	7900	7700
26	Hegna vest 4	Shoreline/typology	7900	7600
27	Hegna vest 2	Radiocarbon	7900	7550
28	Nordby 2	Shoreline/typology	7900	7500
29	Hovland 4	Radiocarbon	7900	7500
30	Hegna vest 3	Radiocarbon	7800	7600
31	Prestemoen 1	Radiocarbon	7700	7600
32	Hovland 1	Radiocarbon	7700	7400
33	Hovland 3	Radiocarbon	7650	7450
34	Gunnarsrød 7	Shoreline/typology	7800	7300
35	Torstvet	Radiocarbon	7500	7100
36	Hegna øst 5	Shoreline/typology	7500	7000
37	Gunnarsrød 8	Shoreline/typology	7300	7000
38	Langangen Vestgård 1	Radiocarbon	6800	6600
39	Gunnarsrød 2	Shoreline/typology	7000	6000
40	Gunnarsrød 6b	Shoreline/typology	6500	6300
41	Hegna øst 7	Shoreline/typology	6500	6200
42	Gunnarsrød 6a	Shoreline/typology	6300	6100
43	Gunnarsrød 4	Radiocarbon	6000	5800
44	Stokke/Polland 3	Shoreline/typology	6100	5400
45	Gunnarsrød 10	Shoreline/typology	5800	5600
46	Langangen Vestgård 2	Shoreline/typology	5800	5400
47	Vallermyrene 4	Radiocarbon	5500	5200
48	Hegna øst 2	Radiocarbon	5350	5200
49	Stokke/Polland 8	Radiocarbon	5300	5200

50	Stokke/Polland 5	Radiocarbon	5300	5000
51	Prestemoen 2	Shoreline/typology	5000	4800
52	Vallermyrene 1	Radiocarbon	4700	4100
53	Langangen Vestgård 3	Radiocarbon	4350	4000
54	Stokke/Polland 9	Shoreline/typology	4200	4000

125 3 The analysis of lithic assemblages

126 Studies concerned with chronological changes in the composition of lithic assemblages in southern Norway have
 127 typically had a focus on morphological variation among artefacts (e.g. Ballin 1999; Bjerck 1986; Reitan 2016)
 128 or been concerned with technological processes associated with certain sub-categories of the site inventories,
 129 such as the production of blades or axes (e.g. Berg-Hansen 2017; Damlien 2016; Eymundsson et al. 2018;
 130 Solheim et al. 2020). Studies that have involved entire assemblages have either been concerned with general
 131 compositional traits such as relative frequency of various tool types and raw-materials (Breivik 2020; e.g.
 132 Breivik and Callanan 2016; Reitan 2016; Viken 2018), or involved extremely in-depth studies of technological
 133 organisation associated with a handful of assemblages (e.g. Eigeland 2015; Fuglestvedt 2007; Mansrud and
 134 Eymundsson 2016). These studies are, however, based on non-quantitative and less formal methods, leaving
 135 the weighting of the different variables for the final interpretations unclear. To my knowledge, only a single
 136 study dealing with the composition of Mesolithic assemblages in southern Norway has involved the use
 137 of a multivariate quantitative framework, which was employed to structure the analysis of eight Middle
 138 Mesolithic assemblages (Solheim 2013; see Glørstad 2010:145–146 for a spatial application). In sum then,
 139 previous studies have typically either been limited to a small number of sites, to a subset of the inventories,
 140 to morphological characteristics, or to less formal and subjectively driven methods that are difficult to scale
 141 and consistently balance in the comparison of a larger number of artefact categories and assemblages.

142 The aim of the first of part of the analysis conducted here is to evaluate the degree to which the composition
 143 of the assemblages align with earlier studies that have employed more informal methods. This therefore
 144 assumes that the artefact categories employed in Norwegian Stone Age archaeology are, at least to a certain
 145 extent, behaviourally meaningful. However, the approach taken is also partially informed by the so-called
 146 Frison effect (Jelinek 1976), which pertains to the fact that lithics studied by archaeologists can have had
 147 long and complex use-lives in which they took on a multitude of different shapes before they were ultimately
 148 discarded. Several scholars have built on this to argue that morphological variation in retouched lithics
 149 from the Palaeolithic cannot be assumed to predominantly be the result of the intention of the original
 150 knapper to reach some desired end-product, but rather that what is commonly categorised as discrete types
 151 of artefacts by archaeologists can instead in large part be related to variable degrees of modification through
 152 use and rejuvenation (e.g. Barton 1991; Barton and Clark 2021; Dibble 1995). Consequently, several artefact
 153 categories have here been collapsed for the CA (Figure 2). This for example pertains to tool types such as
 154 scrapers, burins, drills, knives and otherwise indeterminate artefacts with retouch. That these categories are
 155 internally consistent and categorically exclusive in terms of fulfilled purpose is at best a dubious proposition,
 156 in turn potentially rendering their contribution as discrete analytic units misleading. While aggregating
 157 artefact categories in this manner could potentially subsume important variation, it does also reduce the
 158 possibility that any conclusions are not simply the result of employing erroneous units of analysis. An
 159 underlying assumption of the aggregation procedure is therefore effectively that the retained categories
 160 represent artefact categories that have fulfilled different purposes or are related to different technological
 161 processes, which, consequently, is largely intuitively determined.

162 However, for the most part we lack even a most basic understanding of what any individual lithic object in
 163 an assemblage has been used for (Dibble et al. 2017). For example, a vast amount of artefacts defined as
 164 debitage are likely to have fulfilled the function of tools, and both debitage and formal tool types could have
 165 had various different purposes and had a multitude of shapes throughout their use-life. As a consequence, the
 166 second part of the analysis employs a suite of measures developed for the classification of lithic assemblages
 167 with these inferential limitations in mind (Barton et al. 2011; Clark and Barton 2017, and below). The logic
 168 behind these measures are founded on an understanding of technology as being organised along a continuum




Figure 2: Aggregation of variables for the correspondence analysis. The column on the left shows the variables as originally compiled. The column on the right shows how these have been aggregated for the analysis.

169 ranging between curated and expedient (Binford 1973, 1977, 1979). An expedient technological organisation
170 pertains to the situational production of tools to meet immediate needs, with little investment of time and
171 resources in modification and rejuvenation, resulting in high rates of tool replacement. Curated technological
172 organisation, on the other hand, has been related to manufacture and maintenance of tools in anticipation of
173 future use, the transport of these artefacts between places of use, and the modification and rejuvenation of
174 artefacts for different and changing situations.

175 However, following not least from the ambiguous definition first put forward by Binford (1973), the theoretical
176 definition of curation, its archaeological correlates, and behavioural implications have been widely discussed
177 and disputed (e.g. Bamforth 1986; Nash 1996; Shott 1996; Surovell 2009:9–13). Still, that the distinction can
178 offer a useful analytical point of departure if clearly and explicitly operationalised seems more or less agreed
179 upon, and some dimensions of the concept are generally accepted. For example, although precisely how it is
180 measured may vary, the empirical correspondent to a curated technological organisation is typically defined
181 by high degrees of retouch, as this is commonly seen as a means of realising the potential utility of a tool—or
182 extending its use-life—by the repeated rejuvenation and modification of edges (e.g. Bamforth 1986; Dibble
183 1995; Shott and Sillitoe 2005).

184 One concrete operationalisation of the terms has been forwarded by Barton (1998) and colleagues (e.g. Barton
185 et al. 1999, 2011, 2013; Barton and Riel-Salvatore 2014; Clark and Barton 2017; Riel-Salvatore and Barton
186 2004, 2007; Villaverde et al. 1998), who through a series of studies have shown that the relationship between
187 volumetric density of lithics and relative frequency of retouched artefacts in lithic assemblages have a consistent
188 negative relationship across a wide range of chronological and cultural context, ranging from Pleistocene and
189 Holocene assemblages in Europe and Asia, to assemblages associated with both Neanderthals and modern
190 humans (Barton et al. 2011; Riel-Salvatore et al. 2008). This relationship is taken to reflect degree of
191 curation, and is in turn mainly to follow from the accumulated nature of land-use and mobility patterns
192 associated with the assemblages (Barton and Riel-Salvatore 2014). Furthermore, the relationship between
193 curated and expedient technological organisation has been related to the continuum defined by Binford (1980)
194 between residentially mobile foragers and logically mobile collectors (Clark and Barton 2017; Riel-Salvatore
195 and Barton 2004; see also Bamforth 1986; Binford 1977). Residential mobility involves the relatively frequent
196 movement of entire groups between resource patches throughout the year, while logistic mobility entails the
197 use of central base-camps that are moved less often and from where smaller task-groups venture on targeted
198 forays to retrieve specific resources. A higher degree of logistic as opposed to residential mobility thus also
199 involves a wider range of site types and associated mobility patterns (Binford 1980).

200 Furthermore, in this model, higher degree of mobility would mean a higher dependency on the artefacts and
201 the material people could bring with them, and dimensions such as weight, reliability, repairability, and the
202 degree to which artefacts could be manipulated to fulfil a wide range of tasks are therefore assumed to have
203 been factors of concern. From this it follows that the empirical expectation for short-term camps is a curated
204 technological organisation with higher relative frequency of retouched artefacts, and a lower overall density of
205 lithics (Clark and Barton 2017). More time spent in a single location, on the other hand, is assumed to lead
206 to better control of raw-material availability and to allow for its accumulation. This should in turn lead to a
207 more expedient technological organisation with reduced necessity for the conservation of lithics and extensive
208 use of retouch. The empirical expectation for lower degree of mobility is therefore relatively high density of
209 lithics, a low relative frequency of retouched artefacts, as well as a higher number of unexhausted cores and
210 unretouched flakes and blades. These variables and underlying logic constitute what has been termed Whole
211 Assemblage Behavioural Indicators (WABI, Clark and Barton 2017), and is the main framework adopted
212 here.

213 As these measures are argued to predominantly be determined by land-use and mobility patterns, relative
214 frequency of chips and relative frequency of non-flint material are also included in the analysis, as these
215 measures have also been linked to mobility patterns (e.g. Bicho and Cascalheira 2020; Kitchel et al. 2021) and
216 are of central importance in Norwegian Stone Age archaeology (e.g. Breivik et al. 2016; Reitan 2016)—the
217 use of local non-flint material has been taken to indicate reduced mobility and increased familiarity with
218 local surroundings (Glørstad 2010:181; Jakslund 2001:112).

219 **4 Methodology**

220 The exploratory approach taken here means that a wide range of combinations and transformations of
221 variables has been explored to identify patterning in the data. While only parts of this process can sensibly
222 be reported upon, all data and employed R programming scripts (R Core Team 2020) are freely available as
223 a research compendium at <https://osf.io/ehjfc/>, following Marwick et al. (2018), allowing readers to explore
224 and scrutinise the data and the final analytical choices made (Marwick 2017).

225 The 54 analysed sites have been dated by reference to relative sea-level change, typology and/or radiocarbon
226 dates (Table 2). Date ranges for sites based on shoreline displacement and typology are taken from the original
227 reports and follow the evaluation done by the original excavators. Where radiocarbon age determinations
228 believed to be associated with the lithic material are available, these have been calibrated using the IntCal20
229 calibration curve (Reimer et al. 2020) and subjected to Bayesian modelling using OxCal v4.4.4 (Bronk
230 Ramsey 2009) through the oxcAAR package (Hinz et al. 2021) for R. The only constraint imposed for the
231 modelling of the dates was that the dates from each site are assumed to represent a related group of events
232 through the application of the Boundary function (Bronk Ramsey 2021). The resulting posterior density
233 estimates were then summed for each site.

234 The first part of the analysis involves employing the method of correspondence analysis (CA), using the lithic
235 count data as classified for the original excavation reports. As this part of the analysis partially draws on the
236 above-mentioned Frison effect, several artefact categories have been collapsed for the CA. A version of the
237 CA using the original artefact categories, as well as some additional configurations and ways to aggregate the
238 variables are also available in the supplementary material to the paper.

239 Following the WABI and other factors associated with mobility patterns, as presented above, the variables
240 employed in the second part of the analysis are relative frequency of secondarily worked lithics (RFSL),
241 defined as the proportion of the assemblages constituted by retouched or ground lithics; volumetric density of
242 lithics (VDL), defined as the total number of artefacts divided by total excavated m³ as given in the original
243 reports; relative frequency of chips, defined as the proportion of artefacts with size < 1 mm; relative frequency
244 of cores, the proportion of all artefacts classified as cores in the original reports; relative frequency of blanks,
245 here defined as the proportion of all artefacts classified as flakes, blades, micro-blades or fragments; and finally
246 relative frequency of non-flint material. Following Bicho and Cascalheira (2020), the analysis is done using
247 principal components analysis (PCA), leading to a shift in focus from the relative composition emphasised by
248 the CA, to having more weight placed on patterning in the most abundant occurrences (Baxter 1994:71–77).

249 A note should also be made on the fact that a few variables that are sometimes invoked for the classification
250 of sites in terms of associated mobility patterns are omitted here (e.g. Bicho and Cascalheira 2020; Breivik et
251 al. 2016). For the assemblage data itself this especially pertains to diversity in tool-types (Canessa 2021),
252 which has been omitted in light of the above-mentioned Frison effect. Number of features on the sites has
253 also been disregarded as taphonomic loss is likely to have led to a chronological bias in their preservation.
254 Similarly, the number of activity areas, effectively number of artefact clusters, however defined, has also been
255 disregarded. This follows most notably from the fact that the impact of post-depositional processes at Stone
256 Age sites in Norway is arguably understudied (Jørgensen 2017). This pertains for example to bio-turbation
257 in the form of three-throws, which can have a detrimental effect on the original distribution of artefacts, and
258 which can be expected to have impacted several of the sites treated here (Darmark 2018; Jørgensen 2017).

259 **5 Results**

260 The general impression from the CA is that a chronological dimension accounts for a substantial amount of
261 patterning in the data (Figure 3). This is indicated by the general transition across the colour scale in the
262 row plot (Figure 3A), as well as the horseshoe curve or Guttman effect evident in the column plot (Figure 3B,
263 Baxter 1994:119–120; Lockyear 2000). The fact that the two first dimensions of the CA accounts for as much
264 as 80.53% of the inertia or variance also means that the structure of the data is well-represented in the plots.

265 The column plot reveals that the earliest sites are characterised by the flint artefact categories microburins,
266 projectiles, as well as flint macro tools and associated debitage. These assemblages are also to a larger extent
267 characterised by core fragments, both in flint and non-flint materials, rather than cores. The non-flint material
268 on the earliest, or among the earliest sites, appears to be centred around the production of projectiles, as
269 both projectiles and non-flint blades are important constituents of the assemblages at these sites. The first
270 dimension, which is pulling some of the later sites towards the right of the plot, is mainly defined by macro
271 tools and associated debitage in non-flint materials that are negatively correlated with more flint dominated
272 assemblages. Site number 9, Nedre Hobekk 2, located in the upper right quadrant of the row plot represents
273 a somewhat curious case in that it is an early assemblage characterised by axe production in metarhyolite
274 (Eigeland 2014). However, the site had been quite heavily impacted by modern disturbances that could have
275 impacted the lithic material and which could explain its position as an outlier in the plot (Eigeland 2014).
276 Finally, although the sample size is quite strained and the discussion of finer chronological points might not
277 be warranted, the first dimension does appear to be of less importance for the absolute latest sites, as
278 indicated by their location to the left of the plot.

279 As most of the variation in the data is accounted for by the dominating non-flint material in later assemblages,
280 this suppresses and makes it difficult to discern patterns in the flint data. A second CA was therefore
281 performed, excluding the non-flint material (Figure 4). While not as substantial, there is clear temporal
282 patterning in the flint data as well. This is most marked for the earliest sites which are pulled away from the
283 main cluster, as projectiles, microburins, macro tools and debitage from their production characterises these
284 sites. Slightly younger sites appear more impacted by core fragments and blades. The temporal transition in
285 the main cluster is not as marked, but clearly present, and is driven by a larger proportion of blades, flakes
286 and small tools in the earliest assemblages of the cluster, which is opposed to chips, fragments and partly
287 micro-blades.

288 Moving on to the PCA of measures that have been linked to mobility, some of the variables with severely
289 skewed distributions were initially transformed (Figure 5). Figure 6 displays the resulting PCA. There is
290 a general temporal transition from the upper left to the bottom right of the plot. The second dimension
291 is mainly defined by a negative correlation between the VDL and RFSL (Figure 7). Almost orthogonal
292 to this is the strong negative correlation between relative frequency of chips and blanks. While there is
293 a slight tendency for blanks to be more associated with younger sites, frequency of chips appears to be
294 largely independent of time. However, this almost suspiciously strong negative correlation can perhaps have
295 a practical explanation. Seeing as the frequency of non-flint material is positively correlated with blanks and
296 negatively correlated with chips (Figure 5), one explanation to this pattern could be that smaller non-flint
297 pieces are simply more difficult to identify and separate from naturally fragmented stone during excavation
298 and classification. This could conceivably have led to an over-representation of blanks as compared to chips in
299 assemblages with a high proportion of non-flint material. While this is not necessarily the entire explanation,
300 this does make it difficult to place much analytical weight on this pattern. Relative frequency of cores is not
301 especially impactful in the PCA, and appears to be independent of the temporal dimension as well. That is
302 not to say that cores may not be indicative of or related to mobility patterns, but to get at this may require
303 further analysis beyond their simple classification as cores (Kitchel et al. 2021).

304 Thus, while some secondary expectations of the WABI as related to cores and blanks do not seem to apply to
305 the present material, it is difficult to say to what degree this is caused by idiosyncrasies in the Norwegian
306 system for classification of lithics and properties of the lithic material itself. The relationship between VDL
307 and RFSL does correspond to the model and follows a clear temporal trend that is also correlated with
308 the increased use of local raw material. Thus, if the relationship between VDL and RFSL is accepted as a
309 proxy for curation, and is related to land-use and mobility patterns, these findings would be in line with
310 previous research into the Mesolithic of Norway, indicating that earlier sites are associated with higher degree
311 of mobility than sites from later phases (e.g. Bergsvik 2001; Bjerck 2008; Glørstad 2010; Jakland 2001). To
312 explore this proposition further, these two variables are subjected to more detailed scrutiny below.

313 There is a strong negative correlation between the two variables ($r = -0.5$) and a general tendency for younger
314 sites to be associated with a higher VDL and a lower RFSL than older sites (Figure 8A). The linear correlation
315 is stronger between the mean site age and RFSL ($r = -0.51$), than between mean site age and VDL ($r = 0.22$).
316 Variable non-flint availability and workability has also been suggested to potentially impact these dimensions




Figure 3: Correspondence analysis using the artefact count data. A) Row plot, B) Column plot. Points close together are more similar. By evaluating how the variables are distributed on the column plot it is possible to say how these define the two axes, in turn making it possible to relate the distribution of the sites in the row plot to the variables. As these are symmetrical plots, only general statements concerning the interrelation between the rows and the columns across the two plots can be made.




Figure 4: Correspondence analysis using the flint data. A) Row plot, B) Column plot.




Figure 5: Correlation matrix showing transformation of skewed variables for the PCA. The mean age of the sites has also been included to visualise overall temporal trends. Cells below the diagonal display the bivariate distributions with a fitted OLS-regression. The cells above the diagonal display and are coloured by the corresponding Pearson's correlation coefficient.




Figure 6: PCA biplot resulting from variables that have been related to mobility patterns. Note that details on the transformation of the variables has been left out of the plot for clarity, but follow those given in Figure 4.




Figure 7: Contribution of variables to the first two components of the PCA. The dotted red line indicates the expected contribution from each variable given a uniform distribution of impact.

317 (cf. Manninen and Knutsson 2014), but while the negative correlation is slightly less marked when only the
 318 flint data is considered ($r = -0.4$), the general pattern is the same (Figure 8B). The relationship between mean
 319 site age and relative frequency of secondarily worked flint is even stronger ($r = -0.57$), but as indicated by
 320 the more spread out distribution along the x-axis, the volumetric density of flint is not temporally contingent
 321 ($r = 0.1$). As was also indicated by the CA, this follows from the fact that non-flint materials make up a
 322 higher share of the assemblages for some of the later Mesolithic sites, and is a point returned to below where
 323 the temporal dimension of the relationship between VDL and RFSL is explored further.




Figure 8: Relative frequency of secondarily worked lithics plotted against the volumetric density of artefacts for A) All lithics ($r = -0.5$), B) Flint ($r = -0.4$). The logarithm is taken to base 10 on all axes.

324 To get more directly at this temporal trend, a curation index based on VDL and RFSL was devised by first
 325 performing a min-max normalisation of the two variables, scaling them to take on values between 0 and 1.
 326 The value for artefact density was then made negative to reflect its relationship with degree of curation. The
 327 mean was then found for each site on these two normalised values. To account for the temporal uncertainty
 328 associated with the dating of the sites, a simulation-based approach was also adopted (e.g. Crema 2012;

329 Orton et al. 2017). A LOESS curve was fit to the curation index and site age for each simulation run, where
330 the age of each site was drawn as a single year from their respective date ranges as provided in Figure 1. For
331 sites with radiocarbon age determinations the dates were drawn from the summed posterior density estimates,
332 while ages for sites dated with reference to relative sea-level change and typology were drawn uniformly from
333 the associated date range (Figure 9). This simulation was repeated 1000 times. Disregarding the edge-effects
334 at either end of the plot, the general tendency is a relatively high degree of curation among the earlier sites,
335 followed by a marked drop around 8000 BCE. This has stabilised by around 7000 BCE and remains stable
336 for the rest of the Mesolithic. The variation in degree of curation is also markedly higher after 8000 BCE.
337 Figure 9B displays the result of running the same procedure on the flint data. The general pattern follows
338 the same trajectory, but the result for some individual sites is noticeably different.

339 6 Discussion

340 The results of the CA appear to align well with previous research (e.g. Solheim 2017b, with references). In
341 the flint material the earliest sites are separated from the rest primarily based on the presence of macro tools,
342 microburins, projectiles, and, for slightly younger sites, core fragments and blades (cf. Bjerck 2017; Breivik
343 et al. 2018; Damlien and Solheim 2018; Fuglestvedt 2009; Jaksland and Fossum 2014). The importance of
344 the latter two can be associated with the blade technology that is introduced with the Middle Mesolithic,
345 characterised by blade production from conical and sub-conical cores with faceted platforms that involves the
346 removal of core tablets and rejuvenation flakes (Damlien 2016). When it comes to the non-flint material,
347 projectiles are to a larger extent a property of the earlier sites than later ones. The use of metarhyolite for
348 the production of axes is present at some earlier sites in addition to the previously mentioned Nedre Hobekk
349 2, and the production of non-flint hatchets and core axes is introduced in the Microlith Phase (Eymundsson
350 et al. 2018; Jaksland and Fossum 2014; Reitan 2016). However, in agreement with the literature, this is
351 evidently not as prominent a part of these assemblages.

352 The flint material of the later sites is to a larger extent characterised by micro-blades, which corresponds to
353 the transition to micro-blade production from handle cores (e.g. Solheim et al. 2020). A more fragmented
354 flint material, as indicated by the relative importance of flint chips and fragments, is also a previously noted
355 property of some later Mesolithic, as well as early Neolithic sites (e.g. Fossum 2017; Stokke and Reitan 2018).
356 The most defining material for the later sites, however, is non-flint macro tools and associated debitage, which
357 is dominating some of these assemblages. It was noted above that this material does not seem to impact
358 the latest sites, which would indicate that specialised axe production sites disappear towards the end of the
359 Mesolithic, a notion that would be in line with previous suggestions (e.g. Glørstad 2011; Reitan 2016).

360 One implication of the fact that the employed artefact categories are so clearly capturing a temporal component
361 could be that the aggregation of artefact categories might have been overly conservative. However, it is also
362 evidently clear, in the words of Kruskal (1971:22), that ‘time is not the only dimension.’ The results of the CA
363 do most certainly correspond to more pervasive cultural change than a purely typo-chronological development
364 of artefact morphology, which is also made evident by some significant deviances from the overall pattern.
365 Unpicking and aligning these patterns with any specific behavioural and technological dimensions using the
366 coarse CA results is, however, another task entirely. This follows most clearly from the fact that for the
367 most part we do not know what individual lithic objects in the assemblages have been used for, leaving the
368 behavioural and social significance of the employed units of analysis unclear. The results of the CA can,
369 however, be used in conjunction with the part of the analysis that has attempted to get at more specific
370 behavioural dimensions to nuance or explain discrepancies in this data.

371 The curation index has relatively high values until some time before 8000 BCE, before it drops and stabilises
372 around 7000 BCE. This pattern is evident in both the flint data and when all lithics are treated in aggregate.
373 Furthermore, the increased variation in degree of curation after around 8000 BCE could indicate that these
374 sites were associated with a more varied mobility pattern. The five sites that have values on the curation
375 index below c. -0.25 could in this perspective have predominantly functioned as base-camps within a logistic
376 settlement pattern. That these assemblages reflect stays of a longer duration was suggested for all five sites
377 in the original reports (Carrasco et al. 2014; Eigeland and Fossum 2017; Persson 2014; Solheim and Olsen




Figure 9: Temporal variation in the curation index for A) All lithics, and B) Flint. The temporal uncertainty is handled by means of a simulation approach where the site ages are drawn from their respective age determination probability density functions given in Figure 1B. A LOESS curve has been fit to the distribution for each of the 1000 simulation runs. Each simulation run is plotted with some transparency. Sites mentioned in the text are given colour.

378 2013), with the exception of for Vallermyrene 4, which was argued to be a specialised axe production site, not
379 necessarily associated with lower degrees of mobility (Eigeland and Fossum 2014). This highlights a possible
380 issue pertaining to raw-material variability, as the coarse non-flint material used for the production of axes
381 generally results in a relatively large amount of waste per produced tool, possibly skewing the curation index
382 when compared to assemblages dominated by flint. Referring back to the CA, the difference is most marked
383 for the sites in the later part of the Mesolithic where non-flint material become more dominating parts of the
384 assemblages. As can be seen in Figure 9B, the degree of curation is markedly higher for both Gunnarsrød 6b
385 and Vallermyrene 4 when the non-flint material is excluded, although they remain more expedient than that
386 of contemporary assemblages. Thus, the degree of expediency for assemblages dominated by non-flint might
387 be somewhat exaggerated when the non-flint material is included, while its exclusion would likely lead to its
388 underestimation. One possible approach could be to weigh the curation index by the proportion of non-flint
389 material in the assemblages. This is not explored further here, however, as the overall tendencies appear
390 robust to this effect.

391 Another case also worth commenting on is Langangen Vestgård 1, which, on the grounds of an overall large
392 number of artefacts and the possible presence of a dwelling structure was argued to reflect a more permanent
393 site location in the original report (Melvold and Eigeland 2014). However, the relatively high value on the
394 curation index could mean that the site reflects the aggregation of stays which predominantly have been of a
395 comparable duration to those on contemporary sites, while the possible dwelling structure, if taken as an
396 indication of longer stays, could in this perspective represent a remnant from one or a few visits of longer
397 duration that constitute a smaller fraction of the use-life of the site as a whole (cf. Barton and Riel-Salvatore
398 2014).

399 While there are certainly nuances in the material that might lead one to question the applicability of the
400 VDL and RFSL measures for any individual site, the overall pattern for curation does appear robust. The
401 curation index is relatively high and uniform until some time before 8000 BCE. This corresponds well with
402 the view that the Early Mesolithic is characterised by a high and uniform degree of mobility. This is followed
403 by a marked increase in expediency, which has stabilised by around 7000 BCE. Again, this corresponds well
404 with the employed chronological framework. Referring back to the demographic changes that are to take
405 place around this transition, the Microlith phase could thus represent a period where migrating people and
406 new living practices were propagating through societies in south-eastern Norway—a process that in light of
407 the curation data would have concluded around 7000 BCE.

408 The curation index then remains stable for the rest of the Mesolithic. This suggests that the transition to
409 mobility patterns traditionally ascribed to the Nøstvet Phase can indeed be traced back to the Microlith
410 Phase (cf. Solheim and Persson 2016). The continued stability of the curation index could also indicate that
411 the demographic changes suggested to take place in the Transverse Arrowhead Phase are not related to major
412 shifts in land-use and mobility patterns. However, it is worth highlighting the strained sample size for the
413 later parts of the Mesolithic, which could mean that the effect is simply missed.

414 As it stands, the main hypotheses resulting from the present analysis would be that settlement patterns in
415 the earliest parts of the Mesolithic were characterised by relatively high and uniform degrees of mobility,
416 which then drop before levelling off at around 7000 BCE. These then remain stable throughout the rest of
417 the period, despite variation pertaining to other aspects of the lithic inventories, as evidenced by the CA.
418 The fall in curation levels and parallel increase in variation would seem to correlate well with a transition
419 from a predominantly residential to logistical settlement system (Binford 1980). This indicates, in turn, that
420 the measures represent an empirical link between technological organisation and economic behaviour and
421 mobility patterns (Riel-Salvatore and Barton 2004).

422 7 Conclusion

423 The results of the CA align well with results of previous research in south-eastern Norway, indicating that
424 meaningful chronological patterning is associated with the employed artefact categories. These tendencies are
425 already well-established when it comes to the formal tool types and some debitage categories, but have been

426 given less focus in light of entire assemblages. Precisely what behavioural implication the development in the
427 occurrences of the tool and debitage categories have are less clear, but appears to follow a different and more
428 complex development over time than that of curation, as operationalised here.

429 The temporal trends associated with the curation index corresponds surprisingly well with trajectories of
430 cultural development previously suggested in the literature, and does therefore, in my view, suggest that
431 shifts in land-use and mobility patterns are the main drivers behind this empirical pattern—in line with the
432 framework of Barton et al. (2011). Another perspective would be that this is not surprising at all (cf. Kuhn
433 and Clark 2015:14), and that the previously demonstrated relevance of these measures across a wide range
434 of contexts points to their pervasive relevance for the organisation of lithic technology, and, therefore, that
435 there should be little reason to think Mesolithic south-eastern Norway should be any different. However,
436 the conclusion that these these measures apply to and appear to capture the dimensions of interest in a
437 relatively controlled empirical setting, reached by means of an exploratory analysis can only constitute a first
438 analytical step. As Elster (2015:12) has pointed out, the human mind seems to have a propensity to settle for
439 an explanation that *can* be true, as soon as this has been reached. This, however, can only constitute the
440 absolute minimum of what is required of a proposed explanation. Subsequent steps should be to probe and
441 challenge this explanatory framework, also in light of alternative hypotheses (e.g. Clark 2009:29–30; Perreault
442 2019). The empirical relationship does nonetheless hold great potential for large scale comparative studies in
443 Mesolithic Scandinavia and beyond. Furthermore, the curation index was here simply narratively associated
444 with the most immediate chronological trends emphasised in the literature concerned with the Mesolithic
445 of south-eastern Norway. The explicit quantification does, however, offer the possibility to conduct formal
446 comparisons with a wide range of environmental, demographic and cultural dimensions across multiple scales
447 of analysis.

448 **Declaration of interest**

449 The author has no conflicts of interest to declare.

450 **References**

- 451 Andrefsky, William
452 2009 The analysis of stone tool procurement, production, and maintenance. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 17(1):65–103. DOI:10.1007/s10814-008-9026-2.
- 453
454 Åstveit, Leif Inge
455 2014 Noen synspunkt på den tidligmesolittiske bosetningen i Sør-Norge. *Primitive tider* 16:87–104. DOI:10.5617/pt.7233.
- 456
457 2018 The Early Mesolithic of Western Norway. In *Early Economy and Settlement in Northern Europe. Pioneering, Resource Use, Coping with Change*, edited by Hans Peter Blankholm, pp. 231–274. Equinox, Sheffield.
- 458
459 Bailey, Geoff
460 2007 Time perspectives, palimpsests and the archaeology of time. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 26(2):198–223. DOI:10.1016/j.jaa.2006.08.002.
- 461
462 Ballin, Torben Bjarke
463 1999 The Middle Mesolithic in Southern Norway. In *The Mesolithic of Central Scandinavia*, edited by Joel Boaz, pp. 203–216. University of Oslo, Oslo.
- 464
465 Bamforth, Douglas B.
466 1986 Technological Efficiency and Tool Curation. *American Antiquity* 51(1):38–50. DOI:10.2307/280392.
- 467
468 Barton, C. Michael
469 1991 Retouched Tools, Fact or Fiction? Paradigms for Interpreting Paleolithic Chipped Stone. In *Perspectives on the Past. Theoretical Biases in Mediterranean Hunter-Gatherer Research*, edited by Geoffrey A. Clark, pp. 143–163. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- 470
471 1998 Looking back from the world's end: paleolithic settlement and mobility at Gibraltar. In *Las Culturas del Pleistoceno Superior en Andalucía*, edited by José Luis Sanchidrián and María Dolores Simón Vallejo, pp. 13–22. Patronato de la Cueva de Nerja, Nerja, Andalucía.
- 472
473 Barton, C. Michael, Joan Bernabeu, J. Emili Aura, and Oreto García
474 1999 Land-Use Dynamics and Socioeconomic Change: An Example from the Polop Alto Valley. *American Antiquity* 64(4):609–634. DOI:10.2307/2694208.
- 475
476 Barton, C. Michael, and Geoffrey A. Clark
477 2021 From Artifacts to Cultures: Technology, Society, and Knowledge in the Upper Paleolithic. *Journal of Paleolithic Archaeology* 4(2):16. DOI:10.1007/s41982-021-00091-8.
- 478
479 Barton, C. Michael, and Julien Riel-Salvatore
480 2014 The Formation of Lithic Assemblages. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 46:334–352. DOI:10.1016/j.jas.2014.03.031.
- 481
482 Barton, C. Michael, Julien Riel-Salvatore, John M. Andries, and Gabriel Popescu
483 2011 Modeling Human Ecodynamics and Biocultural Interactions in the Late Pleistocene of Western Eurasia. *Human Ecology* 39(6):705–725. DOI:10.1007/s10745-011-9433-8.
- 484
485 Barton, C. Michael, Valentin Villaverde, João Zilhão, J. Emili Aura, Oreto Garcia, and Ernestina Badal
486 2013 In glacial environments beyond glacial terrains: Human eco-dynamics in late Pleistocene Mediterranean Iberia. *Quaternary International* 318:53–68. DOI:10.1016/j.quaint.2013.05.007.
- 487
488 Baxter, Michael J.
489 1994 *Exploratory Multivariate Analysis in Archaeology*. Percheron Press, New York.
- 490

- 491 Berg-Hansen, Inger Marie
 492 1999 The Availability of Flint at Lista and Jæren, Southwestern Norway. In *The Mesolithic of Central*
 493 *Scandinavia*, edited by Joel Boaz, pp. 255–266. University of Oslo, Oslo.
- 494 2017 Den sosiale teknologien. Teknologi og tradisjon i Nord-Europa ved slutten av istida, 10 900 - 8500
 495 f.Kr. Unpublished PhD thesis, Oslo.
- 496 Bergsvik, Knut Andreas
 497 2001 Sedentary and Mobile Hunterfishers in Stone Age Western Norway. *Arctic Anthropology* 38(1):2–26.
 498
- 499 Bevan, Andrew
 500 2015 The data deluge. *Antiquity* 89(348):1473–1484. DOI:10.15184/aqy.2015.102.
- 501
- 502 Bicho, Nuno, and João Cascalheira
 503 2020 Use of lithic assemblages for the definition of short-term occupations in hunter-gatherer prehistory.
 504 In *Short-term occupations in Paleolithic archaeology: Definition and interpretation*, edited by João
 505 Cascalheira and Andrea Picin, pp. 19–38. Springer, Cham.
- 506 Binford, Lewis R.
 507 1973 Interassemblage variability - the Mousterian and the "functional" argument. In *The explanation of*
 508 *culture change: Models in prehistory*, edited by Colin Renfrew, pp. 227–254. Duckworth, London.
 509 1977 Forty-seven trips: A case study in the character of archaeological formation processes. In *Stone Tools as*
 510 *Cultural Markers: Change, Evolution and Complexity*, edited by R. V. S. Wright, pp. 24–36. Australian
 511 Institute of Aboriginal Studies, Canberra.
- 512 1979 Organization and Formation Processes: Looking at Curated Technologies. *Journal of Anthropological*
 513 *Research* 35(3):255–273. DOI:10.1086/jar.35.3.3629902.
- 514 1980 Willow Smoke and Dogs' Tails: Hunter-Gatherer Settlement Systems and Archaeological Site Formation.
 515 *American Antiquity* 45(1):4–20. DOI:10.2307/279653.
- 516 Bjerck, Hein Bjartmann
 517 1986 The Fosna-Nøstvet Problem. A Consideration of Archaeological Units and Chronozones
 518 in the South Norwegian Mesolithic Period. *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 19(2):103–121.
 519 DOI:10.1080/00293652.1987.9965440.
- 520 2008 Norwegian Mesolithic Trends: A Review. In *Mesolithic Europe*, edited by Geoff Bailey and Penny
 521 Spikins, pp. 60–106. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- 522 2017 Settlements and Seafaring: Reflections on the Integration of Boats and Settlements Among Marine
 523 Foragers in Early Mesolithic Norway and the Yámana of Tierra del Fuego. *The Journal of Island and*
 524 *Coastal Archaeology* 12(2):276–299. DOI:10.1080/15564894.2016.1190425.
- 525 Breivik, Heidi Mjelva
 526 2020 Diachronic trends among Early Mesolithic sites types? A study from the coast of central Norway. In
 527 *Coastal Landscapes of the Mesolithic: Human Engagement with the Coast from the Atlantic to the*
 528 *Baltic Sea*, edited by Almut Schülke, pp. 121–146. Routledge, London & New York.
- 529 Breivik, Heidi Mjelva, Hein Bjartmann Bjerck, Francisco J Zangrando, and Ernesto L Piana
 530 2016 On the Applicability of Environmental and Ethnographic Reference Frames: An Example from
 531 the High-Latitude Seascapes of Norway and Tierra del Fuego. In *Marine Ventures: Archaeological*
 532 *Perspectives on Human-Sea Relations*, edited by Hein Bjartmann Bjerck, Heidi Mjelva Breivik, Silhe E
 533 Fretheim, Ernesto L Piana, Skar Birgitte, Angélica M Tivoli, and Francisco J Zangrando, pp. 75–94.
 534 Equinox, Sheffield.
- 535 Breivik, Heidi Mjelva, and Martin Callanan
 536 2016 Hunting High and Low: Postglacial Colonization Strategies in Central Norway between 9500 and 8000
 537 cal BC. *European Journal of Archaeology* 19(4):571–595. DOI:10.1080/14619571.2016.1147315.
- 538 Breivik, Heidi Mjelva, Guro Fossum, and Steinar Solheim
 539 2018 Exploring human responses to climatic fluctuations and environmental diversity: Two stories from
 540 Mesolithic Norway. *Quaternary International* 465:258–275. DOI:10.1016/j.quaint.2016.12.019.

- 533 Bronk Ramsey, Christopher
 534 2009 Bayesian Analysis of Radiocarbon Dates. *Radiocarbon* 51(1):337–360.
 DOI:10.1017/S0033822200033865.
- 535
 536 2021 OxCal 4.4 manual. https://c14.arch.ox.ac.uk/oxcalhelp/hlp_contents.html.
- 537
 538 Canessa, Timothy
 539 2021 Mobility and settlement strategies in southern Iberia during the Last Glacial Maximum: Evaluating the region's refugium status. *Journal of Archaeological Science: Reports* 37:102966.
 DOI:10.1016/j.jasrep.2021.102966.
- 540
 541 Carrasco, Lotte, Inger Margrete Eggen, Lotte Eigeland, Guro Fossum, Stine Melvold, Per Persson, and Gaute Reitan
 542
 543 2014 Gunnarsrød 6. Et boplassområde fra overgangen mellomesolitikum-seinmesolitikum. In *Vestfoldbaneprosjektet. Arkeologiske undersøkelser i forbindelse med ny jernbane mellom Larvik og Porsgrunn. Bind 1. Tidlig- og mellomesolittiske lokaliteter i Vestfold og Telemark*, edited by Stine Melvold and Per Persson, pp. 277–308. Portal forlag, Kristiansand.
- 544
 545 Clark, Geoffrey A.
 546 2009 Accidents of history: Conceptual frameworks in paleoarchaeology. In *Sourcebook of Paleolithic Transitions*, edited by Marta Camps and Parth Chauhan, pp. 19–41. Springer, New York.
- 547
 548 Clark, Geoffrey A., and C. Michael Barton
 549 2017 Lithics, landscapes & la Longue-durée – Curation & expediency as expressions of forager mobility. *Quaternary International* 450:137–149. DOI:10.1016/j.quaint.2016.08.002.
- 550
 551 Clark, Geoffrey A., and Julien Riel-Salvatore
 552 2006 Observations on Systematics in Paleolithic Archaeology. In *Transitions Before the Transition: Evolution and Stability in the Middle Paleolithic and Middle Stone Age*, edited by Erella Hovers and Steven Kuhn, pp. 29–56. Springer, New York.
- 553
 554 Crema, Enrico R.
 555 2012 Modelling Temporal Uncertainty in Archaeological Analysis. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 19(3):440–461. DOI:10.1007/s10816-011-9122-3.
- 556
 557 Damlien, Hege
 558 2016 Eastern pioneers in westernmost territories? Current perspectives on Mesolithic hunter-gatherer large-scale interaction and migration within Northern Eurasia. *Quaternary International* 419:5–16.
 DOI:10.1016/j.quaint.2014.02.023.
- 559
 560 Damlien, Hege, and Steinar Solheim
 561 2018 The Pioneer Settlement of Eastern Norway. In *Early Economy and Settlement in Northern Europe. Pioneering, Resource Use, Coping with Change*, edited by Hans Peter Blankholm, pp. 335–367. Equinox, Sheffield.
- 562
 563 Darmark, Kim
 564 2018 A Cautionary Tale. Post-depositional processes affecting Stone Age sites in boreal forests, with examples from southern Norway. In *The Stone Age Coastal Settlement in Aust-Agder, Southeast Norway*, edited by Gaute Reitan and Lars Sundström, pp. 479–488. Cappelen Damm Akademisk, Oslo.
- 565
 566 Dibble, Harold L.
 567 1995 Middle Paleolithic Scraper Reduction: Background, Clarification, and Review of the Evidence to Date. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 2(4):299–368. DOI:10.1007/BF02229003.
- 568
 569 Dibble, Harold L., Simon J. Holdaway, Sam C. Lin, David R. Braun, Matthew J. Douglass, Radu Iovita, Shannon P. McPherron, Deborah I. Olszewski, and Dennis Sandgathe
 570
 571 2017 Major Fallacies Surrounding Stone Artifacts and Assemblages. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 24(3):813–851. DOI:10.1007/s10816-016-9297-8.
- 572
 573 Eigeland, Lotte

- 574 2014 Nedre hobekk 2. Lokalitet med opphold i tidligmesolitikum og senneolitikum/jernalder. In *Vestfoldbaneprosjektet. Arkeologiske undersøkelser i forbindelse med ny jernbane mellom Larvik og Porsgrunn. Bind 1. Tidlig- og mellommesolittiske lokaliteter i Vestfold og Telemark*, edited by Stine Melvold and Per Persson, pp. 110–125. Portal forlag, Kristiansand.
- 575
- 576 2015 Maskinmennesket i steinalderen. Endring og kontinuitet i steinteknologi fram mot neolitiseringen av Øst-Norge. Unpublished PhD thesis, Oslo.
- 577
- 578 Eigeland, Lotte, and Guro Fossum
- 579 2014 Vallermyrene 4. En lokalitet fra nøstvetfasen med spesialisert økseproduksjon. In *Vestfoldbaneprosjektet. Arkeologiske undersøkelser i forbindelse med ny jernbane mellom Larvik og Porsgrunn. Bind 2. Seinmesolittiske, neolittiske og yngre lokaliteter i Vestfold og Telemark*, edited by Gaute Reitan and Per Persson, pp. 31–69. Portal forlag, Kristiansand.
- 580
- 581 2017 Hegna vest 4. En mellommesolittisk lokalitet med to funnkonsentrasjoner. In *E18 Rugtvedt-Dørdal. Arkeologiske undersøkelser av lokaliteter fra steinalder og jernalder i Bamble kommune, Telemark fylke*, edited by Steinar Solheim, pp. 357–370. Portal forlag, Kristiansand.
- 582
- 583 Elster, Jon
- 584 2015 *Explaining Social Behaviour: More Nuts and Bolts for the Social Sciences*. Revised edition. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- 585
- 586 Eymundsson, Carine S. Rosenvinge, Guro Fossum, Lucia Uchermann Koxvold, Anja Mansrud, and Axel Mjærum
- 588 2018 Axes in transformation: A bifocal view of axe technology in the Oslo fjord area, Norway, c. 9200-6000 cal BC. In *The Early Settlement of Northern Europe. Transmission of Knowledge and Culture*, edited by Håkon Glørstad, Kjel Knutsson, Helena Knutsson, and Jan Apel, pp. 221–229. Equinox, Sheffield.
- 589
- 590 Fossum, Guro
- 591 2017 Stokke/Polland 3. En senmesolittisk lokalitet med økseproduksjon. In *E18 Rugtvedt-Dørdal. Arkeologiske undersøkelser av lokaliteter fra steinalder og jernalder i Bamble kommune, Telemark fylke*, edited by Steinar Solheim, pp. 413–434. Portal forlag, Kristiansand.
- 592
- 593 Frivoll, Alexander
- 594 2017 Identifisering og klassifisering av littiske råmaterialer i sør- og østnorsk steinalderforskning. Reliabilitet av visuell klassifiseringsmetode. Unpublished Master's thesis, Oslo.
- 595
- 596 Fuglestvedt, Ingrid
- 597 2007 The Ahrensburgian Galta 3 site in SW Norway. Dating, Technology and Cultural Affinity. *Acta Archaeologica* 78(2):87–110. DOI:10.1111/j.1600-0390.2007.00101.x.
- 598
- 599 2009 *Phenomenology and the Pioneer Settlement on the Western Scandinavian Peninsula*. Bricoleur Press, Lindome.
- 600
- 601 2012 The Pioneer Condition on the Scandinavian Peninsula: the Last Frontier of a ‘Palaeolithic Way’ in Europe. *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 45(1):1–29. DOI:10.1080/00293652.2012.669998.
- 602
- 603 Glørstad, Håkon
- 604 2010 *The Structure and History of the Late Mesolithic Societies in the Oslo Fjord Area 6300-3800 BC*. Bricoleur Press, Lindome.
- 605
- 606 2011 The Nøstvet axe. In *Stone Axe Studies III*, edited by Vin Davis and Mark Edmonds, pp. 21–36. Oxbow Books.
- 607
- 608 Günther, Torsten, Helena Malmström, Emma M. Svensson, Ayça Omrak, Federico Sánchez-Quinto, Gülsah M. Kılınç, Maja Krzewińska, Gunilla Eriksson, Magdalena Fraser, Hanna Edlund, Arielle R. Munters, Alexandra Coutinho, Luciana G. Simões, Mário Vicente, Anders Sjölander, Berit Jansen Sellevold, Roger Jørgensen, Peter Claes, Mark D. Shriver, Cristina Valdiosera, Mihai G. Netea, Jan Apel, Kerstin Lidén, Birgitte Skar, Jan Storå, Anders Götherström, and Mattias Jakobsson
- 613 2018 Population genomics of Mesolithic Scandinavia: Investigating early postglacial migration routes and high-latitude adaptation. *PLOS Biology* 16(1):e2003703. DOI:10.1371/journal.pbio.2003703.
- 614
- 615 Hinz, Martin, Clemens Schmid, Daniel Knitter, and Carolin Tietze
- 616 2021 *oxcAAR: Interface to 'OxCal' radiocarbon calibration. R package version 1.1.0*.
- 617

- 618 Jaksland, Lasse
 619 2001 *Vinterbrolokalitetene – en kronologisk sekvens fra mellom-og senmesolitikum i Ås, Akershus*. University
 620 of Oslo, Museum of Cultural History, Oslo.
- 621 Jaksland, Lasse, and Guro Fossum
 622 2014 Kronologiske trender i det littiske funnmaterialet. Typologi, teknologi og råstoff. In *E18 Brunlanes-
 sprosjektet. Bind I. Forutsetninger og kulturhistorisk sammenstilling*, edited by Lasse Jaksland and
 623 Per Persson, pp. 47–62. University of Oslo, Museum of Cultural History, Oslo.
- 624 Jaksland, Lasse, and Per Persson (editors)
 625 2014 *E18 Brunlanesprosjektet. Bind I. Forutsetninger og kulturhistorisk sammenstilling*. University of Oslo,
 626 Museum of Cultural History, Oslo.
- 627 Jelinek, Arthur J.
 628 1976 Form, function and style in lithic analysis. In *Cultural Change and Continuity: Essays in Honor of
 629 James Bennett Griffin*, edited by Charles E. Cleland, pp. 19–33. Academic Press, New York.
- 630 Jørgensen, Erlend Kirkeng
 631 2017 Om vegetasjonsforstyrrelser: Konsekvenser for bevaringen av arkeologisk kontekstinformasjon i norske
 632 jordsmønster. *Viking* 80:157–180. DOI:10.5617/viking.5477.
- 633 Kitchel, Nathaniel, Mark S. Aldenderfer, and Randall Haas
 634 2021 Diet, Mobility, Technology, and Lithics: Neolithization on the Andean Altiplano, 7.0–3.5 ka. *Journal
 635 of Archaeological Method and Theory*. DOI:10.1007/s10816-021-09525-7.
- 636 Koxvold, Lucia Uchermann, and Guro Fossum
 637 2017 Funnbearbeiding, katalogisering og råstoffanalyser. Erfaringer fra E18 Rugtvedt-Dørdal. In *E18
 638 Rugtvedt-Dørdal. Arkeologiske undersøkelser av lokaliteter fra steinalder og jernalder i Bamble kommune,
 Telemark fylke*, edited by Steinar Solheim, pp. 85–96. Portal forlag, Kristiansand.
- 639 Kruskal, Joseph Bernard
 640 1971 Multi-dimensional Scaling in Archaeology: Time is not the Only Dimension. In *Mathematics in the
 Archeological and Historical Sciences*, edited by F. R. Hodson, D. G. Kendall, and P Täutu, pp. 22–38.
 641 Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.
- 642 Kuhn, Steven L., and Amy E. Clark
 643 2015 Artifact densities and assemblage formation: Evidence from Tabun Cave. *Journal of Anthropological
 644 Archaeology* 38:8–16. DOI:10.1016/j.jaa.2014.09.002.
- 645 Lindblom, Inge
 646 1984 Former for økologisk tilpasning i Mesolitikum, Østfold. *Universitetets Oldsaksamling Årbok
 647 1982/1983*:43–86.
- 648 Lockyear, Kris
 649 2000 Site Finds in Roman Britain: A Comparison of Techniques. *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 19(4):397–
 650 423. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0092.00118>.
- 651 Manninen, Mikael A., Hege Damlien, Jan Ingolf Kleppe, Kjel Knutsson, Anton Murashkin, Anja R. Niemi,
 652 Carine S. Rosenvinge, and Per Persson
 653 2021 First encounters in the north: cultural diversity and gene flow in Early Mesolithic Scandinavia.
Antiquity 95(380):310–328. DOI:10.15184/aqy.2020.252.
- 654 Manninen, Mikael A., and Kjel Knutsson
 655 2014 Lithic raw material diversification as an adaptive strategy—Technology, mobility, and site struc-
 ture in Late Mesolithic northernmost Europe. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 33:84–98.
 656 DOI:10.1016/j.jaa.2013.12.001.
- 657 Mansrud, Anja, and Carine Eymundsson
 658 2016 Socialized landscapes? Lithic clusters, hearths and relocation rituals at Middle Mesolithic sites in
 659 Eastern Norway. *Fennoscandia archaeologica* 33:27–55.
- 660 Marwick, Ben
 661 2017 Computational Reproducibility in Archaeological Research: Basic Principles and a Case Study of Their
 662 Implementation. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 24(2):424–450. DOI:10.1007/s10816-
 015-9272-9.

- 663
- 664 Marwick, Ben, Carl Boettiger, and Lincoln Mullen
- 665 2018 Packaging Data Analytical Work Reproducibly Using R (and Friends). *The American Statistician* 72(1):80–88. DOI:10.1007/s10816-015-9272-9.
- 666
- 667 Melvold, Stine, and Lotte Eigeland
- 668 2014 Langangen Vestgård 1. En boplass fra siste del av mellomesolitikum med trinnøksproduksjon og strukturer. In *Vestfoldbaneprosjektet. Arkeologiske undersøkelser i forbindelse med ny jernbane mellom Larvik og Porsgrunn. Bind 1. Tidlig- og mellomesolittiske lokaliteter i Vestfold og Telemark*, edited by Stine Melvold and Per Persson, pp. 239–276. Portal forlag, Kristiansand.
- 669
- 670 Melvold, Stine, and Per Persson (editors)
- 671 2014 *Vestfoldbaneprosjektet. Arkeologiske undersøkelser i forbindelse med ny jernbane mellom Larvik og Porsgrunn. Bind 1. Tidlig- Og mellomesolittiske lokaliteter i Vestfold og Telemark*. Portal forlag, Kristiansand.
- 672
- 673 Melvold, Stine, Gaute Reitan, Inger Margrete Eggen, and Lotte Eigeland
- 674 2014 Utgravningsstrategi, metode og dokumentasjon. In *Vestfoldbaneprosjektet. Arkeologiske undersøkelser i forbindelse med ny jernbane mellom Larvik og Porsgrunn. Bind 1. Tidlig- og mellomesolittiske lokaliteter i Vestfold og Telemark*, edited by Stine Melvold and Per Persson, pp. 60–71. Portal forlag, Kristiansand.
- 675
- 676 Møller, Jakob J.
- 677 1987 Shoreline relation and prehistoric settlement in northern Norway. *Norwegian Journal of Geography* 41:45–60. DOI:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00291958708552171>.
- 678
- 679 Nærøy, Arne Johan
- 680 2018 Early Mesolithic spatial conformity in southern Norway. *Journal of Archaeological Science: Reports* 18:905–912. DOI:10.1016/j.jasrep.2017.10.021.
- 681
- 682 Nash, Steven E
- 683 1996 Is Curation a Useful Heuristic? In *Stone Tools: Theoretical Insights into Human Prehistory*, edited by George H Odell, pp. 81–99. Springer.
- 684
- 685 Nielsen, Svein Vatsvåg
- 686 2021 A Late Mesolithic Forager Dispersal Caused Pre-Agricultural Demographic Transition in Norway. *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 40(2):153–175. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/ojoa.12218>.
- 687
- 688 Orton, David, James Morris, and Alan Pipe
- 689 2017 Catch Per Unit Research Effort: Sampling Intensity, Chronological Uncertainty, and the Onset of Marine Fish Consumption in Historic London. *Open Quaternary* 3(1):1. DOI:10.5334/oq.29.
- 690
- 691 Perreault, Charles
- 692 2019 *The Quality of the Archaeological Record*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago & London.
- 693
- 694 Persson, Per
- 695 2014 Prestemoen 1. En plats med ben från mellanmesolitikum. In *Vestfoldbaneprosjektet. Arkeologiske undersøkelser i forbindelse med ny jernbane mellom Larvik og Porsgrunn. Bind 1. Tidlig- og mellomesolittiske lokaliteter i Vestfold og Telemark*, edited by Stine Melvold and Per Persson, pp. 202–227. Portal forlag, Kristiansand.
- 696
- 697 R Core Team
- 698 2020 *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna.
- 699
- 700 Reimer, Paula J., William E. N. Austin, Edouard Bard, Alex Bayliss, Paul G. Blackwell, Christopher Bronk
- 701 Ramsey, Martin Butzin, Hai Cheng, R. Lawrence Edwards, Michael Friedrich, Pieter M. Grootes, Thomas
- 702 P. Guilderson, Irka Hajdas, Timothy J. Heaton, Alan G. Hogg, Konrad A. Hughen, Bernd Kromer, Sturt
- 703 W. Manning, Raimund Muscheler, Jonathan G. Palmer, Charlotte Pearson, Johannes van der Plicht, Ron
- 704 W. Reimer, David A. Richards, E. Marian Scott, John R. Southon, Christian S. M. Turney, Lukas Wacker,
- 705 Florian Adolphi, Ulf Büntgen, Manuela Capano, Simon M. Fahrni, Alexandra Fogtmann-Schulz, Ronny
- 706 Friedrich, Peter Köhler, Sabrina Kudsk, Fusa Miyake, Jesper Olsen, Frederick Reinig, Minoru Sakamoto,
- 707 Adam Sookdeo, and Sahra Talamo

- 708 2020 The IntCal20 Northern Hemisphere Radiocarbon Age Calibration Curve (0–55 cal kBP). *Radiocarbon*
 709 62(4):725–757. DOI:10.1017/RDC.2020.41.
- 710 Reitan, Gaute
 711 2016 Mesolittisk kronologi i Sørøst-Norge – et forslag til justering. *Viking* 79:23–51.
 712 DOI:10.5617/viking.3903.
- 713 Reitan, Gaute, and Per Persson (editors)
 714 2014 *Vestfoldbaneprosjektet. Arkeologiske undersøkelser i forbindelse med ny jernbane mellom Larvik og Porsgrunn. Bind 2. Seinmesolittiske, neolittiske og yngre lokaliteter i Vestfold og Telemark*. Portal forlag, Kristiansand.
- 715 Rezek, Zeljko, Simon J. Holdaway, Deborah I. Olszewski, Sam C. Lin, Matthew Douglass, Shannon P. McPherron, Radu Iovita, David R. Braun, and Dennis Sandgathe
 716 2020 Aggregates, Formational Emergence, and the Focus on Practice in Stone Artifact Archaeology. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 27(4):887–928. DOI:10.1007/s10816-020-09445-y.
- 717 Riel-Salvatore, Julien, and C. Michael Barton
 718 2004 Late Pleistocene Technology, Economic Behavior, and Land-Use Dynamics in Southern Italy. *American Antiquity* 69(2):257–274. DOI:10.2307/4128419.
- 719 2007 New Quantitative Perspectives on the Middle–Upper Paleolithic Transition: The View from the Northern Mediterranean. In *Early Upper Paleolithic “Transitional” Industries: New Questions, New Methods*, pp. 61–73.
- 720 Riel-Salvatore, Julien, Gabriel Popescu, and C. Michael Barton
 721 2008 Standing at the gates of Europe: Human behavior and biogeography in the Southern Carpathians during the Late Pleistocene. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 27(4):399–417.
 722 DOI:10.1016/j.jaa.2008.02.002.
- 723 Romundset, Anders, Thomas R. Lakeman, and Fredrik Høgaas
 724 2018 Quantifying variable rates of postglacial relative sea level fall from a cluster of 24 isolation basins in southern Norway. *Quaternary Science Reviews* 197:175–192. DOI:10.1016/j.quascirev.2018.07.041.
- 725 Shott, Michael J.
 726 1996 An Exegesis of the Curation Concept. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 52(3):259–280.
 727 DOI:10.1086/jar.52.3.3630085.
- 728 Shott, Michael J., and Paul Sillitoe
 729 2005 Use life and curation in New Guinea experimental used flakes. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 32(5):653–663. DOI:10.1016/j.jas.2004.11.012.
- 730 Solheim, Steinar
 731 2013 E18-lokalitetene relasjonelle struktur. In *E18 Bommestad-Sky: Undersøkelse av lokaliteter fra mellomesolitikum, Larvik kommune, Vestfold fylke*, edited by Steinar Solheim and Hege Damlien, pp. 276–282. Portal forlag, Kristiansand.
- 732 (editor)
 733 2017a *E18 Rugtvedt-Dørdal. Arkeologiske undersøkelser av lokaliteter fra steinalder og jernalder i Bamble kommune, Telemark fylke*. Portal forlag, Kristiansand.
- 734 2017b Kunnskapsstatus og faglig bakgrunn for undersøkelsene. In *E18 Rugtvedt-Dørdal. Arkeologiske undersøkelser av lokaliteter fra steinalder og jernalder i Bamble kommune, Telemark fylke*, edited by Steinar Solheim, pp. 29–42. University of Oslo, Museum of Cultural History, Oslo.
- 735 2020 Mesolithic coastal landscapes. Demography, settlement patterns and subsistence economy in south-eastern Norway. In *Coastal Landscapes of the Mesolithic: Human Engagement with the Coast from the Atlantic to the Baltic Sea*, edited by Almut Schülke, pp. 44–72. Routledge, London & New York.
- 736 Solheim, Steinar, and Hege Damlien (editors)
 737 2013 *E18 Bommestad-Sky. Undersøkelse av lokaliteter fra mellomesolitikum, Larvik kommune, Vestfold fylke*. Portal forlag, Kristiansand.
- 738 Solheim, Steinar, Hege Damlien, and Guro Fossum

- 751 2020 Technological transitions and human-environment interactions in Mesolithic southeastern Norway,
752 11 500–6000 cal. BP. *Quaternary Science Reviews* 246:106–501. DOI:10.1016/j.quascirev.2020.106501.
- 753 Solheim, Steinar, and Dag Erik Færø Olsen
- 754 2013 Hovland 3. Mellommesolittisk boplass med hyttetuft. In *E18 Bommestad-Sky: Undersøkelse av
755 lokaliteter fra mellommesolitikum, Larvik kommune, Vestfold fylke*, edited by Steinar Solheim and
Hege Damlien, pp. 198–235. Portal forlag, Kristiansand.
- 756 Solheim, Steinar, and Per Persson
- 757 2016 Marine Adaptation in the Middle Mesolithic of South-eastern Norway. In *Marine Ventures: Archaeo-
758 logical Perspectives on Human-Sea Relations*, edited by Hein Bjaartmann Bjerck, Heidi Mjelva Breivik,
Silje E Fretheim, Ernesto L Piana, Birgitte Skar, Angélica M Tivoli, and Francisco J Zangrandino, pp.
759 75–94. Equinox, Sheffield.
- 760 2018 Early and mid-holocene coastal settlement and demography in southeastern norway: Comparing distri-
761 bution of radiocarbon dates and shoreline-dated sites, 8500–2000 cal. BCE. *Journal of Archaeological
762 Science: Reports* 19:334–343. DOI:10.1016/j.jasrep.2018.03.007.
- 763 Sørensen, Rolf
- 764 1979 Late Weichselian deglaciation in the Oslofjord area, south Norway. *Boreas* 8(2):241–246. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1502-3885.1979.tb00806.x>.
- 765 Stokke, Jo-Simon Frøshaug, and Gaute Reitan
- 766 2018 Krøgenes D7 og D10. To tidlige neolittiske lokaliteter med flekkeproduksjon. In *The Stone Age Coastal
767 Settlement in Aust-Agder, Southeast Norway*, edited by Gaute Reitan and Lars Sundström, pp. 309–323.
Cappelen Damm Akademisk, Oslo.
- 768 Surovell, Todd A.
- 769 2009 *Toward a Behavioral Ecology of Lithic Technology*. The University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- 770 Viken, Synnøve
- 771 2018 Early Mesolithic sites – are they all the same? Seventeen find concentrations from Southeast Norway
in a forager-collector perspective. In *The Stone Age Coastal Settlement in Aust-Agder, Southeast
772 Norway*, edited by Gaute Reitan and Lars Sundström, pp. 503–514. Cappelen Damm Akademisk,
Oslo.
- 773 Villaverde, Valentín, J. Emili Aura, and C. Michael Barton
- 774 1998 The Upper Paleolithic in Mediterranean Spain: A Review of Current Evidence. *Journal of World
775 Prehistory* 12(2):121–198. DOI:10.1023/A:1022332217614.

Supplementary material




Figure 10: Correspondence analysis using all original artefact categories. A) Row plot, B) Column plot.




Figure 11: Correspondence analysis collapsing artefact types irrespective of raw-material and including proportion of non-flint as its own variable. A) Row plot, B) Column plot.




Figure 12: Same as above, only that here the proportion of non-flint is used as a supplementary column. The negligible difference between this CA and that above indicates that the flint/non-flint distinction is integrated in the different artefact types, and therefore that the effect of artefact types and raw material cannot be separated. These plots thus hide important variability that is captured in the ones presented in the main text. A) Row plot, B) Column plot.