

Understanding Lithic Recycling at the Late Lower Palaeolithic Qesem Cave, Israel

A functional and chemical investigation
of small flakes

Flavia Venditti



ARCHAEOPRESS PUBLISHING LTD
Summertown Pavilion
18-24 Middle Way
Summertown
Oxford OX2 7LG

www.archaeopress.com

ISBN 978-1-78969-101-6
ISBN 978-1-78969-102-3 (e-Pdf)

© Flavia Venditti and Archaeopress 2019

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the copyright owners.

Printed in England by Oxuniprint, Oxford

This book is available direct from Archaeopress or from our website www.archaeopress.com

To my Family

Contents

List of Figures	iv
Preface	vii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: Methodology and techniques	4
2.1 Use-wear analysis: the state of the art.....	4
2.2 Use-wear analysis: the experimental protocol.....	6
2.3 Cleaning procedures	8
2.4 Microscopy and photography	9
2.5 Documentation	10
2.5.1 Variables recorded per artefact: general information	12
2.5.2 Variables recorded per artefact: description of wear traces on functional edges.....	12
2.5.3 Variables recorded per artefact: description of hafting traces.....	14
2.6 Chemical techniques for residue detection: the state of the art	15
2.7 FTIR and EDX experimental sampling and cleaning procedures	16
Chapter 3: The archaeological context: Qesem Cave and the Lower Palaeolithic in the Levant	18
3.1 Introduction	18
3.2 The Lower Palaeolithic in the Levant: The Acheulo-Yabrudian Cultural Complex.....	18
3.3 Speleological setting of Qesem Cave	20
3.4 Chronology	21
3.5 Lithic production.....	23
3.5.1 Amudian sequence	23
3.5.2 Yabrudian sequence	25
3.5.3 Raw material procurement	26
3.6 Spatial distribution and density aspects of lithics at Qesem Cave	27
3.6.1 The rock shelf area ('shelf').....	27
3.6.2 'Hearth'	28
3.6.3 Area south of the 'hearth'	30
3.7 Faunal and micro-faunal remains	30
3.8 Human remains	32
Chapter 4: The recycling phenomenon and it's manifestations at Qesem Cave	35
4.1 Defining flint recycling	35
4.2 Recycling flint: history of research	38
4.2.1 State of the art: core-on-flake (COF) for specific production of small blanks	38
4.2.2 State of the art: blanks produced from cores-on-flake (COF).....	41
4.3 Recycling production at Qesem Cave.....	42
4.3.1 Parent flakes at Qesem Cave (cores-on-flakes/flaked flakes/COF-FFs)	42
4.3.2 Blanks produced from COF/FF at Qesem Cave.....	43
4.4 Discussion and summary.....	45
Chapter 5: The experimental programme	50
5.1 Introduction	50
5.2 Exploitation of vegetal resources: plant working.....	51
5.2.1 Use-wear traces from woodworking	52

5.2.2 Use-wear traces from woody plants.....	55
5.2.3 Use-wear traces from wild plant.....	57
5.3 Exploitation of animal resources: hide, bone and meat processing	61
5.3.1 Use-wear traces from hide working	63
5.3.2 Use-wear traces from bone working	64
5.3.3 Use-wear traces from meat processing: butchering activities	68
5.4 Looking for prehensile wear and hafting.....	72
5.5 Experimental residues: morphological and chemical analyses and results	75
5.5.1 Vegetal resources	76
5.5.2 Animal resources.....	82
5.6 The experimental programme – conclusion.....	87
Chapter 6: Post-depositional surface modification.....	89
6.1 Introduction	89
6.1.1 White patina	89
6.1.2 Colour patina.....	89
6.1.3 Gloss and sugary patinas	90
6.1.4 Soil sheen and bright spots.....	90
6.1.5 Thermal alteration	90
6.1.6 Trampling damage	90
6.2 Post-depositional surface modification at Qesem Cave	91
Chapter 7: Functional and residue analyses of the archaeological materials.....	97
7.1 Sampling products of recycling for use-wear analysis	97
7.1.1 Shelf area	97
7.1.2 Hearth area.....	99
7.1.3 Area south of the hearth	100
7.2 Sampling products of recycling for chemical analysis	100
7.2.1 Scanning electron microscope with energy dispersive X-ray spectroscopy analysis (SEM-EDX).....	100
7.2.2 Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy analysis (FTIR)	101
7.3 Inferred activities	101
7.3.1 Bone working	102
7.3.2 Hide working.....	107
7.3.3 Processing animal carcasses	112
7.3.4 Plants and tubers.....	118
7.3.5 Contact with soft and medium materials	123
7.3.5.1 Unknown materials	126
7.3.5.2 Unresolved longitudinal motion	126
7.4 Synthesis/summary of analyses	128
7.4.1 Yabrudian strata in the shelf area	128
7.4.2 Amudian strata in the shelf area.....	129
7.4.3 Amudian strata in the hearth area	129
7.4.4 Amudian strata in the area south of the hearth.....	130
7.5 Spatial organisation of hominin activities.....	130
7.6 Prehensile wear	135
7.7 Discussion	138
7.8 Conclusion	140
Chapter 8: Discussion.....	143
8.1 Small tool production technologies: Europe and the Levant.....	145
8.1.1 European contexts: western and central Europe	145
8.1.2 Lower Palaeolithic technological variability of small tools in Europe and the Levantine recycling phenomenon at Qesem Cave	150

8.2 Small tool functions: similarities and differences within Qesem Cave	153
8.3 Using small tools: the Qesem Cave perspective	154
8.4 Qesem Cave and variability within the Acheuleo-Yabrudian Cultural Complex.....	157
Chapter 9: Conclusion.....	162
Bibliography.....	165
Appendix A	182
Appendix B.....	184
Appendix C.....	187

List of Figures and Tables

Chapter 2: Methodology and techniques

Figure 2.1: Tribological system	7
Figure 2.2: Overview of the optical equipment at <i>LTFAPA</i>	9
Figure 2.3: Example of the experimental (A) and archaeological, (B) database file.....	11
Figure 2.4: Illustration of the description of the functional edge.....	13

Chapter 3: The archaeological context: Qesem Cave and the Lower Palaeolithic in the Levant

Figure 3.1: Qesem Cave, Israel.....	19
Figure 3.2: Qesem Cave stratigraphic sequence	21
Figure 3.3: The upper sequence during the 2009 season	21
Figure 3.4: Chrono-stratigraphic chart.....	22
Figure 3.5: Schematic reconstruction of the laminar trajectories I (A) and II (B) observed at Qesem Cave.....	24
Figure 3.6: Typical Yabrudian scrapers from Qesem Cave	25
Figure 3.7: Qesem Cave map	27
Figure 3.8: A) general view of the site with the 'shelf' area, 2009 excavation season; B) close-up of the deepest area under the 'shelf', 2016 excavation season.....	28
Figure 3.9: Plan of the 'hearth' and its surrounding area.....	29
Figure 3.10: A) general view of the southern area looking west; B) the southern area view of the eastern section.....	30
Figure 3.11: Different examples of cut marks on limb bones fragments belonging to medium- and small-sized ungulates from the 'hearth' faunal assemblage of Qesem Cave.....	31
Figure 3.12: Qesem lower left second deciduous molar	32
Figure 3.13: Root striations on the cervical third of the crown on a deciduous canine (A) from Qesem Cave	33

Chapter 4: The recycling phenomenon and its manifestations at Qesem Cave

Figure 4.1: A) débitage of a Kombewa flake; B) Kombewa core from the production of small flakes	39
Figure 4.2: Flaked flake piece	39
Figure 4.3: Truncated-faceted piece.....	40
Figure 4.4: Kostienki technique on a burin.....	40
Figure 4.5: The reduction sequence of Kombewa flakes.....	41
Figure 4.6: A group of COF-FFs	42
Figure 4.7: Group of blanks produced from COF-FFs.....	43
Figure 4.8: Regular double-ventral blanks. Dotted white line highlights the bulb of percussion	44
Figure 4.9: Double bulb double-ventral Kombewa blanks.....	45
Figure 4.10: Double bulb double-ventral 'non-Kombewa' blanks	46
Figure 4.11: Lateral double-ventral blanks. Dotted white line denotes the actual bulb of percussion.....	47

Chapter 5: The experimental programme

Figure 5.1: Experimental activities.....	52
Figure 5.2: Experimental replicas used to process wood.....	53
Figure 5.3: Use-wear from wood working.....	54
Figure 5.4: Experimental replicas used to process woody plants.....	55
Figure 5.5: Experimental activities.....	55
Figure 5.6: Use-wear from woody plant working	56
Figure 5.7: Polish observed after cutting willow branches	57
Figure 5.8: Experimental activities.....	58
Figure 5.9: Experimental replicas used to gather wild plants	58
Figure 5.10: Experimental activities	59
Figure 5.11: Experimental replicas used to process tubers.....	59
Figure 5.12: Use-wear from wild plant gathering.....	60
Figure 5.13: Use-wear from cutting different edible plants.....	61
Figure 5.14: Use-wear from tuber working.....	62
Figure 5.15: Experimental replicas used to cut dry hide	64
Figure 5.16: Experimental replicas used to cut fresh hide	64

Figure 5.17: Experimental activities	65
Figure 5.18: Use-wear from hide working.....	66
Figure 5.19: Experimental activities	67
Figure 5.20: Experimental replicas used to cut dry and fresh bone	67
Figure 5.21: Experimental replicas used to cut, scrape and clean bone.....	67
Figure 5.22: Use-wear from bone working.....	68
Figure 5.23: Experimental replicas used to process four sheep metapodials.....	69
Figure 5.24: Experimental replicas used to process a wild boar carcass.....	69
Figure 5.25: Experimental activities	69
Figure 5.26: Experimental activities from processing metapodials.....	70
Figure 5.27: Use-wear from butchery activities.....	71
Figure 5.28: Micro wear after disarticulating limb bones of a wild boar	72
Figure 5.29: Hafting arrangements in wooden handles	73
Figure 5.30: Hafting arrangements with resin	73
Figure 5.31: Experimental micro wear related to prehension.....	74
Figure 5.32: Spectrum showing the fundamental mode of pure silica.....	76
Figure 5.33: A, B, C) wood residues on tools used to cut woody plants	77
Figure 5.34: Micro-FTIR spectrum showing absorption bands related to lignin, cellulose and organic compound.....	78
Figure 5.35: Micro-FTIR spectrum of flake 5, used for processing juncus, showing absorption bands related to cellulose	79
Figure 5.36: A, B) flint surface after working fresh tubers	79
Figure 5.37: Micro-FTIR spectra of experimental flakes used to process fresh tubers.....	80
Figure 5.38: Vegetal residues on flakes used to process herbaceous plants, wood and tubers imaged at SEM with EDX analysis	81
Figure 5.39: Experimental residues	83
Figure 5.40: A, B) globular, white concretions packed along the edge of the tool used for sawing bone	84
Figure 5.41: A) Micro-FTIR spectrum showing bone peaks on the edge of a tool after processing bone; B) Micro-FTIR spectrum showing collagen peaks on the edge of a tool after butchery activity; C) Micro-FTIR spectrum showing adipocere peaks on the edge of a tool used for scraping dry bone preserved under ash.....	85
Figure 5.42: A, B) SEM micrograph of connective tissue micro residue and related EDX analysis; C-F) SEM micrograph of bone micro residue and related EDX analysis; H) SEM micrograph of animal tissue fibre; I) SEM micrograph of connective tissue along the used edge	86

Chapter 6: Post-depositional surface modification

Figure 6.1: Different types of alterations observed on the products of recycling with OLM	92
Figure 6.2: Chart showing different types of alteration recovered on the dorsal surface of the products of recycling	93
Figure 6.3: Chart showing different types of alteration recovered on the ventral surface of the products of recycling	95

Chapter 7: Functional and residue analyses of the archaeological materials

Figure 7.1: List of the products of recycling under the 'shelf' found during the excavation seasons 2006–2001	98
Figure 7.2: Use-wear traces, FTIR and SEM-EDX results.....	103
Figure 7.3: Use-wear traces and FTIR results	104
Figure 7.4: Use-wear traces and FTIR results	105
Figure 7.5: Use-wear traces	106
Figure 7.6: Edge damage and micro wear related to the processing of fresh hide.....	108
Figure 7.7: Use-wear traces and FTIR results	109
Figure 7.8: Use-wear traces and FTIR results	110
Figure 7.9: Use-wear and SEM-EDX results.....	111
Figure 7.10: Edge damage and micro wear related to processing animal carcasses	113
Figure 7.11: Use-wear, SEM-EDX and FTIR results.....	114
Figure 7.12: Use-wear, FTIR and SEM-EDX results.....	115
Figure 7.13: Use-wear, FTIR and SEM-EDX results.....	116
Figure 7.14: Use-wear and SEM-EDX results.....	117
Figure 7.15: Use-wear results	119
Figure 7.16: Use-wear and SEM-EDX results.....	120
Figure 7.17: Use-wear and SEM-EDX results.....	121

Figure 7.18: Use-wear results	122
Figure 7.19: Use-wear and SEM-EDX results.....	124
Figure 7.20: Edge damage interpreted as having been in contact with soft, medium and soft/medium materials.....	125
Figure 7.21: A) Chart showing the number of products of recycling interpreted as having been in contact with soft and medium material in the three analysed areas; B) chart of the actions carried out with the implements used to process soft and medium materials divided for the three analysed areas.....	126
Figure 7.22: A) Specimen J12b 560-570-2; B) edge damage; C) weak polish localised along the dorsal edge; D, E) residues assigned to vegetal material	127
Figure 7.23: Edge damage and micro wear related to the unknown material	128
Figure 7.24: A) chart showing the worked material and related four associated recycling categories from the Yabrudian strata under the 'shelf'; B) chart of the actions carried out with the four associated recycling categories from the Yabrudian strata under the 'shelf'	129
Figure 7.25: A) chart showing the worked material and related four associated recycling categories from the Amudian strata under the 'shelf'; B) chart of the actions carried out with the four associated recycling categories from the Amudian strata under the 'shelf'	130
Figure 7.26: A) chart showing the worked material and related four associated recycling categories from the Amudian strata of the 'hearth' area; B) chart of the actions carried out with the four associated recycling categories from the Amudian strata of the 'hearth' area.....	131
Figure 7.27: A) chart showing the worked material and related four associated recycling categories from the Amudian strata of the area south of the 'hearth'; B) chart of the actions carried out with the four associated recycling categories from the Amudian strata of the area south of the 'hearth'	131
Figure 7.28: Kernel density maps showing the distribution of each recycling category in relation to the grid system of Qesem Cave	132
Figure 7.29: Kernel density map showing the spatial distribution of inferred activities in relation to the grid system of Qesem Cave	133
Figure 7.30: Kernel density maps showing concentrations of lateral (B) and regular blanks (C) concerning butchery activity (A) in relation to the grid system of Qesem Cave	134
Figure 7.31: Chart showing the number of blanks with prehensile wear according to the areas studied	135
Figure 7.32: Use-wear and prehension traces	136
Figure 7.33: Use-wear and FTIR results	137
Table 7.1: Number of the Yabrudian and Amudian products of recycling according to the four identified categories	99
Table 7.2: Number of used, unused and non-diagnostic products of recycling divided by Yabrudian and Amudian assemblages, according to the four identified categories.....	99
Table 7.3: Number of Amudian products of recycling, according to the four identified categories.....	99
Table 7.4: Number of used, unused and non-diagnostic products of recycling divided by Yabrudian and Amudian assemblages, according to the four identified categories.....	100
Table 7.5: Number of Amudian products of recycling, according to the four identified categories.....	100
Table 7.6: Number of used, unused and non-diagnostic products of recycling divided by Yabrudian and Amudian assemblages, according to the four identified categories.....	100
Table 7.7: Infrared absorption frequencies (cm ⁻¹) of the experimental and archeological residues with the proposed assignment	101
Table 7.8: Used edge morphology of Kombewa and lateral flakes	106
Table 7.9: Used edge morphology of Kombewa, regular, non-Kombewa and lateral flakes.....	112
Table 7.10: Used edge morphology of Kombewa, regular, non-Kombewa and lateral flakes.....	118
Table 7.11: Used edge morphology of non-Kombewa and lateral flakes	123

Chapter 8: Discussion

Figure 8.1: Flint artefacts from Isernia La Pineta level t.3c.....	147
Figure 8.2: Typology of cores found in the area of the elephant	148
Figure 8.3: Schematic representation of two reduction sequences and three groups of tools identified at La Ficocella.....	149
Figure 8.4: Two examples of techno-functional analyses of small tools at the Cimitero di Atella site.....	150
Figure 8.5: Schematic representation of the reduction sequence of tool manufacture at Vértesszőlős and Bilzingsleben	151
Figure 8.6: Example of flake manipulation during a butchery experiment	155
Figure 8.7: Chart showing the Yabrudian <i>versus</i> Amudian functionality under the 'shelf'	158

Preface

The present work deals with two important topics that mainly characterise the Middle Pleistocene contexts: the practice of recycling old discarded flakes to be used as core for the production of new objects by means of recycling on one hand, and the production of flakes and tools of small dimension on the other. Both these subjects have not gained sufficient attention by the scientific community for many years due to methodological issues, preventing a detailed knowledge of these two phenomena. The possibility to study these lithic strategies, from a functional point of view, at a unique, well preserved and investigated site such as Qesem Cave, will allow us to enrich and stimulate the debate regarding the discussion on the theorisation of the recycling concept in the Palaeolithic and the comprehension of the functional role of small tools in the Lower Palaeolithic assemblages. Investigating the use of small flakes produced by means of recycling can provide significant insights into the strategies adopted by human groups towards raw material procurement, mobility patterns, use and intensity of utilisation of lithic resources, along with the study of artefacts' use/life-history, knapping trajectories, and human cognitive abilities in general.

This monograph is the revised, updated and corrected version of my PhD dissertation *The recycling phenomenon during the Late Lower Palaeolithic. The case study of Qesem Cave, Israel*, submitted to the 'Sapienza' University of Rome, Italy.

After an intensive period of three years, and one year later my doctorate degree, the publication of this work is the finishing touch of my PhD student career. It has been a period of intense learning for me, not only in the scientific domain, but also on a personal level. I would like to reflect on the people who have supported and helped me so much throughout this period because I achieve this goal also thanks to them.

I would first like to thank Ran Barkai and Avi Gopher for according me the possibility to study the Qesem Cave materials and be part of the Qesem Cave project. Even if physically far, they always have been present to dispel my doubts and uncertainty. I really thank them for making me feel part of their research group and for always welcoming me with enthusiasm during all my stays in Israel.

I am extremely grateful to my supervisor Cristina Lemorini to whom I owe all my knowledge in the field of use-wear analysis and experimental archaeology. Since the time of my Master's thesis, she has always been a mentor for me and her role in my scientific formation as a researcher has been fundamental. Her constant presence, never invasive, along with her positive influence have helped me to overcome the difficulties that this study has sometimes brought.

I want to thank for her excellent cooperation Stella Nunziante Cesaro who dedicated most of her time to my research, contributing with all the FTIR analysis and interpretations. Without her important contribution part of the residue investigation on the Qesem materials would not have been possible. I also would express my gratitude to Alessandra Celant and Emanuela Cristiani for their availability in discussing with me some residue evidence on the Qesem lithic materials. I am most grateful to Ran Barkai and Laurence Bourguignon who produce all the lithic replicas of the products of recycling in order to perform the experimental activities.

I would also like to thank the following: all my colleagues from the 'LTFAPA' laboratory of Sapienza, Rome, and in particular Andrea Zupancich, with whom I have shared the Israeli experience, thanks for being always available when I needed your precious help; Jacopo Tirillò for generously sharing his knowledge on SEM-EDX working principles; Roxane Rocca, Daniele Aureli, Laurence Bourguignon, Amèlie Da Costa for inviting me to be part of the project concerning small tool production and use which proved a productive interchange of research ideas; all the Israeli colleagues at Tel Aviv University and in particular Yoni Parush for being my reference point in answering all my questions on the Qesem Cave site; Ruth Blasco and Jordi Resell for their stimulating discussion on the Qesem Cave data; Giovanni Morra for being

our botanical guide during the experimentations at Parco degli Aurunci; Sara Stellacci for helping me during the butchery experiments on the metapodials; Flavia Marinelli and Silvia Moscato for sharing with me some experimental results of their Master's thesis; Isabella Caricola, Stefano Caruso, Antonella De Angelis, Lorena Lombardi, Davide D'Errico, Chiara Rozera and Michele Cammarota for being first colleagues, then friends, and for having, more or less closely, shared the course of research with me.

I am also very grateful to MAECI (Ministero degli Affari Esteri e della Cooperazione Internazionale) for its financial support of this research.

Last but not least, I want to express all my gratitude to my parents, to whom this work is dedicated and without whom it would never have seen the light of day. In particular, special thanks are due to my mother, very passionate about archaeology and always there to listen with enthusiasm to the progress of my research. Her constant presence and support have contributed to the achievement of this work. I finally thank Claudia, my best friend ever, and Paolo for his understanding and love.

Chapter 1

Introduction

For many years, recycling was only considered a contemporary manifestation, linked to the economic and ecological politics of industrialised societies. However, archaeological and historical records testify that this practice was firmly adopted by many past societies, as well as traditional hunter-gatherer groups (e.g. Amick 2007; Binford 1977; Gould 1968; Kelly 1964).

The discussion concerning the phenomenon of recycling in prehistory has recently attracted the attention of researchers. But since the theoretical foundations set by Michael B. Schiffer (1972; 1976; 1977; Schiffer *et al.* 1981) regarding the role of recycling, especially within Palaeolithic lithic assemblages, progress in this field has been rather limited. Moreover, the difficulty in recognising evidence of recycling behaviours in archaeological assemblages discouraged the dissemination of studies in this field (Odell 1996).

The renewed interest in Palaeolithic recycling in recent years has resulted in publications concerning the production sequences of lithic recycling and the archaeological criteria to identify it (Amick 2007; contributions in Barkai *et al.* 2015; Hiscock 2009; Thiébaud *et al.* 2010; Vaquero *et al.* 2012). Archaeologists are now aware of the fact that the study of recycling has enormous potential, providing significant insights on the strategies adopted by human groups in terms of the procurement of raw materials, mobility patterns, use and intensity of utilisation of lithic resources, along with the study of artefact use, life-history, knapping trajectories, and human cognitive abilities in general.

Moreover, studying recycling procedures helps to define the temporal nature of the archaeological assemblages, formed by a succession of depositional events (Vaquero *et al.* 2012). Like archaeological palimpsests, artefacts too may show different cycles of use or manufacturing events. The recycling of previously abandoned blanks for tool production is one of the best examples of temporal dynamics in the stories of artefacts (Vaquero *et al.* 2012).

This present work focuses on the study of selected recycling aspects in the late Lower Palaeolithic, 420–200 kya Qesem Cave, located by the Mediterranean coast near Tel Aviv, Israel. The cave consists of a deep (c. 11 m) series of sediments bearing finds of the Acheulo-Yabrudian Cultural Complex (AYCC) (Barkai *et al.* 2009; Barkai and Gopher 2011; Falguères *et al.* 2016; Mercier *et al.* 2013).

Lithic recycling at Qesem Cave is fully integrated within lithic production, and consists of several recycling modes. Recycling behaviour was well planned and regularly practised by the cave's inhabitants throughout its many archaeological contexts. At least five recycling trajectories were reconstructed, including hand-axes recycled into cores, patinated flakes recycled into side scrapers, recycled side scrapers, patinated cores recycled, or reused as 'regular' cores, and small flakes and blades produced from old, discarded 'parent' flakes or blades (Parush *et al.* 2015; 2016). This latter recurrent mode of recycling, which is the focus of this work, was accomplished by selecting existing flakes/blades from a great array of blanks available in or out of the cave, and using them to produce new items. Technological analysis of these 'old and fresh' items, called cores-on-flakes, has demonstrated that a variety of blanks was selected for recycling, including flakes, primary flakes, fully patinated flakes, primary blades, naturally-backed knives (NBKs) flakes, NBK blades, blades, core-trimming element (CTE) flakes, CTE blades, tools (shaped items), scrapers, and undetermined items. These items show variability in size, length, width and weight, as well as shape, indicating no preferential selection towards specific types or shapes. The results of this production are flakes and blades knapped from 'parent' flakes and which are usually small in size and with specific and desired features.

Investigating the use of these small implements produced by means of recycling will allow the shedding of new light on the behavioural and functional significance of this practice, along with enriching and

stimulating the theoretical debate regarding two main issues: the recycling concept in the Palaeolithic; and the renewed interest of researchers in the production of small tools and their use. The recycling phenomena of Qesem Cave may significantly contribute to the debate as it is a Lower Palaeolithic site providing a large, well-preserved and diverse assemblage of recycled items and recycling products that has the potential to illustrate the roots of recycling as part of the technological history of our ancestors (Agam *et al.* 2015, 2018; Shimelmitz 2015). The comprehension of recycling procedures at Qesem Cave constitutes the starting point of this work, which is devoted to functional analyses of the products of this recycling practice.

Although the scientific literature has been recently enriched by papers discussing the technological aspects of lithic recycling, very few studies have yet taken into consideration the functional aspect linked to this particular behaviour, and, as a consequence, little is known concerning the purpose of this production (Beyries and Cattin 2015; Claud *et al.* 2010; Lemorini *et al.* 2015).

The aim of this research is, first of all, to fill this gap through a systematic study based on the use-wear and residue analysis of a large sample of 609 products of recycling coming from discarded flakes and blades from the huge span (420,000–200,000 years) of the Lower Palaeolithic site of Qesem Cave. To achieve this, the methodology applied here combines the analysis of use-wear with analyses of residues, performed by exploiting advanced microscopes capable of different magnifications. Residues were detected morphologically and chemically by applying two different techniques: Fourier Transform Infrared (FTIR) micro-spectroscopy, and Energy Dispersive X-ray Spectroscopy (EDX or EDS), while use-wear analysis was performed by applying both Low- and High-power techniques, with the use of a stereo-microscope, a metallurgical microscope, and a scanning electron microscope (SEM).

The association between use-wear traces and organic remains is a recent achievement. For many years residue analysis was a separate approach disconnected from functional interpretation (Marreiros *et al.* 2015). Although these studies have increased in recent years (Borel *et al.* 2015; Bradtmöller *et al.* 2016; Fullagar *et al.* 2006; Kononenko 2011; Lanjeans 2010; Lombard 2008; Nunziante and Lemorini 2012; Prinsloo *et al.* 2014; Rots *et al.* 2016; Wadley *et al.* 2004), comparative analysis between two different chemical techniques is an innovation. An experimental protocol was established to identify and localise the distribution of residue after the activities are carried out. The residues were microscopically observed, described, photographed, and then subjected to two spectroscopy techniques. The cross-checking of the obtained results from both analyses allowed an understanding of the quality and potential of the data provided by each technique, as well as testing to what extent the two techniques offered complementary results.

The analyses, conducted in such a systematic way across a large sample of products of recycling, will shed new light on these items and the purpose of their production. Moreover, the possibility of sampling three separate areas of the cave (the 'rock shelf', the 'central hearth' area and the area south of the hearth) provides important information and insights regarding the way the inhabitants of Qesem conceived their activity areas, and may indirectly provide information regarding social and spatial organisation and the division of space in the cave.

The studied samples originate from assemblages of both the Yabrudian and Amudian industries – two distinct components of the Acheulean-Yabrudian Cultural Complex (AYCC), to which the Qesem Cave is assigned. The AYCC, as represented by the Qesem finds, shows a significant turning point in human cultural and biological evolution as it displays a series of innovative behaviours, including, amongst other things, the habitual use of fire, hunting and sharing of game meat, use of bone retouchers for shaping flint tools, sophisticated raw material acquisition, systematic blade production and intensive flint recycling, all carried out by this innovative human community.

The AYCC is a local entity known in a limited number of caves and open-air Levantine sites and no systematic functional studies have been undertaken at these sites, specifically regarding the recycling

phenomenon. This research presents a unique opportunity to investigate, the function of the products of recycling, accompanied by an experimental programme in a well-dated and persistently occupied Late Lower Palaeolithic site. This present study will establish Qesem as a reference site for recycling studies, to the extent that it can serve as a comparative model for other sites displaying similar behaviours and habits in the Levant, as well as in Europe.

The Qesem Cave is a well-known and well-published site thanks to the contributions of many researchers who have produced a wealth of data regarding cultural and biological transformations that took place in the Levant between 420,000–200,000 years ago. The result of this research will thus be cross-checked against other studies concerning faunal remains, lithic technology, raw material procurement and more, contributing to a richer comprehension of the Qesem Cave site within the AYCC. Furthermore, its geographical position in the Levant, the crossroads between the African and European continents, makes Qesem a crucial site for understanding the dynamic evolution of early hominins.