



HAL
open science

Constructing chronologies for the late Middle Paleolithic and Upper Paleolithic: limitations and means to overcome them

William E. Banks

► To cite this version:

William E. Banks. Constructing chronologies for the late Middle Paleolithic and Upper Paleolithic: limitations and means to overcome them. *World Archaeology*, 2015, 47 (4), pp.585-600. 10.1080/00438243.2015.1052544 . hal-03007334


HAL Id: hal-03007334

<https://cnrs.hal.science/hal-03007334>

Submitted on 16 Nov 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Constructing chronologies for the late Middle Paleolithic and Upper Paleolithic: limitations and means to overcome them

Journal:	<i>World Archaeology</i>
Manuscript ID:	RWAR-2015-0002.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Papers
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Banks, William; CNRS, PACEA - UMR 5199
Keywords:	Paleolithic chronology, Bayesian age modeling, collective radiocarbon datasets, culture-environment relationships

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Constructing chronologies for the late Middle Paleolithic and Upper Paleolithic: limitations and
10 means to overcome them
11

12
13
14 William E. Banks ^{1,2}
15
16

17
18
19 1 – CNRS, UMR 5199-PACEA, Université de Bordeaux, Bâtiment B18, Allée Geoffroy Saint Hilaire,
20 CS 50023, 33615 Pessac Cedex, France.
21

22
23 2 – Biodiversity Institute, University of Kansas, 1345 Jayhawk Blvd., Dyche Hall, Lawrence, KS
24 66045-7562, USA.
25
26

27
28
29 E-mail: william.banks@u-bordeaux.fr
30

31 Telephone: +33 5 40 00 28 40
32
33

34
35 **Abstract**
36

37 Improvements in our understandings of the timing and nature of millennial-scale climatic
38 variability combined with improved dating methods and more accurate calibration curves have
39 allowed researchers to better place archaeological cultures within their paleoenvironmental
40 contexts. Since all human cultures operate within an environmental framework, these
41 developments allow researchers to investigate if and how cultural variability is related to
42 temporal shifts in culture-environment relationships. Studying such relationships, however, is
43 dependent on our ability to construct robust chronologies, and this need has been by
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 incorporating Bayesian modeling methods into archaeological investigations. This paper reviews
10 the assumptions and methods behind this practice and argues that while site-specific age
11 models are useful, we should also employ methods with which chronological models for broad
12 archaeological cultures can be constructed. Such a combination approach allows one to
13 thoroughly incorporate available chronological data and build reliable chronologies that are
14 critical to investigations aimed at examining culture-environment relationships.
15
16
17
18
19

20 21 22 **Keywords**

23 Paleolithic chronology, Bayesian age modeling, collective radiocarbon datasets, culture-
24 environment relationships
25
26
27
28
29

30 31 **Introduction**

32 Based on temporal variability in the structure of fossil faunal and pollen assemblages,
33 archaeologists, paleontologists, and paleoclimatologists had long known that the Last Glacial
34 period was characterized by climatic, and subsequent environmental, changes. However, it was
35 not until a little over 20 years ago that paleoclimatologists discovered that in the northern
36 hemisphere this period was characterized by abrupt and dramatic climatic fluctuations that
37 occurred on millennial and sub-millennial time scales (Dansgaard et al. 1993; Heinrich 1988;
38 Johnsen et al. 1992). Temporal resolution of this Dansgaard-Oeschger (D-O) variability has
39 continually increased (Shackleton et al. 2004; Svensson et al. 2008) and is now well-established
40 (Rasmussen et al. 2014). Completely deciphering the complexity of these events and the
41 mechanisms behind them, however, remains problematic (Broecker 2006; Marcott et al. 2011;
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Menviel et al. 2014; Roche et al. 2014; Wolff et al. 2010). Detailed analyses of marine and
10 terrestrial climatic archives, along with paleoclimatic simulation methods, have allowed for
11 detailed reconstructions of climatic and environmental conditions across Europe during the Last
12 Glacial (Fletcher et al. 2010; Kageyama et al. 2013; Wu et al. 2007). Analyses of tephra
13 signatures suggest that D-O events were largely synchronous across the North Atlantic and
14 Europe (Austin and Hibbert 2012; Davies et al. 2012), although the expression of these events
15 differed regionally as demonstrated by marine and terrestrial archives (Lane et al. 2012;
16 Fletcher et al. 2010; Harrison and Sanchez Goñi 2010; Sánchez Goñi et al. 2008). Improvements
17 in radiocarbon age calibration curves (Reimer et al. 2013) have allowed researchers to better
18 correlate late Middle Paleolithic and Upper Paleolithic archaeological cultures with particular
19 climatic events and their corresponding environmental frameworks.

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31 With such knowledge, it is possible to correlate archaeological data with D-O climatic
32 variability and related environmental changes more reliably and better infer how these shifting
33 environmental frameworks may have influenced Paleolithic cultural adaptations and
34 demography (Banks et al. 2009; Banks, d'Errico, and Zilhão 2013a; Bertran et al. 2013; Birks et
35 al. 2014; Bradtmöller et al. 2012; d'Errico and Sánchez Goñi 2003; Discamps, Jaubert, and
36 Bachellerie 2011; Gamble et al. 2004; Miller 2012; Schmidt et al. 2012; Weber, Grimm, and
37 Baales 2011). Pertinent questions center on determining if and when shifts in material culture,
38 cultural innovations, or inferred adaptive shifts are associated with environmental changes.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46 More recently, the integration of ecological niche modeling methods, derived from the
47 biodiversity sciences, has allowed for investigations of how technological or organizational
48 changes observed in the Paleolithic archaeological record correlate with ecological niche
49
50
51

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 dynamics (Banks et al. 2009; d'Errico and Banks 2013; Banks, d'Errico, and Zilhão 2013a).

10
11 In order to be sure that examinations of culture-environment relationships are in fact
12 capturing or describing some past reality, it is paramount that archaeologists have accurate and
13 robust chronological frameworks at their disposal. The reason being that if one's aim is to
14 determine if and how specific climatic events and related environmental settings are correlated
15 with behavior changes inferred from the archaeological record, it is critical that one be able to
16 determine accurately the appearance and duration of both broad archaeological cultures and
17 potential regional variants within them. This focus on chronology is not new and has figured at
18 the center of numerous archaeological debates, one example being the Middle-to-Upper
19 Paleolithic transitions (e.g., Roebroeks 2008). With accurate archaeological chronological
20 frameworks, one can effectively examine culture-environment relationships and identify
21 instances for which cultural adaptive shifts have an ecological basis. Equally as important is our
22 ability to recognize when adaptive changes do not appear to be related, or at least only
23 marginally so, to environmental or ecological restructuring but rather were more influenced by
24 cultural processes.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38
39 Such undertakings are highly dependent on our cultural units of analysis. Archaeologists
40 typically employ the concept of technocomplex to define an archaeological culture based on
41 similar assemblages of material culture remains, produced via the same or similar technological
42 schema(s), which is assumed to reflect to some degree a past cultural reality. Problems related
43 to the definition or classification of an archaeological culture or technocomplex can be reduced
44 or minimized by focusing on well-defined, easily recognized, and unambiguous material culture
45 diagnostics (i.e., *fossiles directeurs*), as is the case with the late Middle Paleolithic and Upper
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Paleolithic. With respect to this same time range, questions related to changes within and
10 between technocomplexes, such as whether cultural changes occurred synchronously, are for
11 the most part beyond our grasp. The reason being that the low resolution of both stratigraphic
12 sequences and radiometric age determinations mean that we can only work at a temporal
13 resolution that ranges between 500 and a thousand years (Zilhão 2013). As he points out,
14 however, such chronological limitations are not necessarily a handicap, and can be seen as an
15 advantage, when the focus is on long-term stasis, as well as long-term cultural change.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 The concept of technocomplex is associated with known ambiguities, but more importantly
24 it is often divorced from the environmental framework within which a past culture operated.
25 For this reason, the concept of Cohesive Adaptive System (CAS) has been proposed (d'Errico and
26 Banks 2013) and is defined as a cultural entity characterized by shared and transmitted
27 knowledge reflected by a recognizable suite of cultural traits that a population uses to operate
28 within both cultural and environmental contexts. Because a CAS is also defined on the basis of
29 material culture remains, this concept is not divorced from ambiguity. Nonetheless, it does
30 provide the possibility to better understand how the material culture record, shaped by cultural
31 rules and norms, reflects a past cultural entity's relationship with its environment. Regardless of
32 the employed concepts and terminology, it is paramount when constructing chronologies and
33 examining human-environmental relationships that archaeologists be transparent with respect
34 to what they conceive to be a past cultural entity, what data were used in its definition, and
35 how they envision to use such constructs as proxies of past cultural behavior. With such
36 transparency, the classificatory assumptions and priors that underlie a reconstructed
37 chronological framework for a single archaeological culture, or multiple, successive ones, are
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 apparent and can be taken into account and potentially corrected in subsequent work aimed at
10 testing results and proposed hypotheses.
11

12 13 14 15 **Chronological Frameworks**

16
17 Of the numerous methods that archaeologists have at their disposal for placing
18 archaeological cultures into a chronological framework, and in turn a paleoclimatic context, the
19 most widely used are stratigraphy, radiometric ages, and diagnostic elements of material
20 culture, although use of the latter is dependent on known stratigraphic sequences or
21 radiometric ages within a prescribed geographic area. Of these methods, stratigraphy is
22 paramount because without a solid understanding of a site's stratigraphy (including inherent
23 issues such as taphonomic biases, depositional hiatuses and resulting archaeological
24 palimpsests) one cannot reliably interpret material culture remains and age determinations
25 from its specific archaeological levels.
26
27

28
29 One solution is the inclusion of radiometric dating results into the construction of
30 chronologies, but it is paramount that the use of chronological data be done in conjunction with
31 taphonomic and geomorphological analyses (e.g., refitting, granulometry, micromorphology,
32 geochemistry, etc.)—chronological data cannot be placed before those related to site formation
33 processes and can be of limited utility, or even misleading, if such processes are not taken into
34 account. Of equal importance is the issue of association—meaning that interpreting radiocarbon
35 (^{14}C) ages may be problematic if a reliable association between the dated material and
36 archaeological material culture remains does not exist or is uncertain (Waterbolk 1983). Any
37 chronological construction has a strong potential of being flawed if it incorporates radiometric
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

ages from sites where issues concerning association have not been resolved.

For the latter part of Marine Isotope Stage (MIS) 3 and all of MIS 2, radiocarbon dating is the most widely used method in archaeology and offers relatively good chronological resolution.

The accuracy and precision of radiocarbon ages has been improved with the development of new pretreatment protocols for charcoal and bone, ABOx-SC (Bird et al. 1999) and ultrafiltration (Higham, Jacobi, and Ramsey 2006), respectively. These improvements, paired with the creation of a calibration curve that is reliable well into the range of MIS 3 (Reimer et al. 2013), make a focus on ^{14}C ages for building late Middle Paleolithic and Upper Paleolithic chronologies worthwhile. The use of accurate calibration curves is paramount since radiocarbon ages represent measurements of isotope ratios and must be converted into a calendar age range if one wishes to correlate archaeological phenomena to climatic events. Dating methods that produce calendar age estimates (OSL, TL, etc.) also can be used alone or in conjunction with radiocarbon measurements, but their larger standard errors, relative to radiocarbon dating, can be a handicap when the focus is on millennial or sub-millennial time scales. An example of this is the recent publication of single-grain OSL dates from the site of Les Cottés (Jacobs et al. 2015). The authors argue that the OSL dates are largely consistent with the ^{14}C AMS ages on bone, and this is more or less the case, with the exception of Mousterian level US08 (Fig. 1a). What is clear from this figure is that while many of the single-grain dates are consistent with the calibrated ^{14}C ages, the OSL dates' errors from each archaeological level essentially cover the entire range of time represented by the calibrated ^{14}C estimates and their associated errors. For this part of the late Middle and early Upper Paleolithic, the addition of OSL results does not necessarily aid efforts to more precisely define the period of time represented by individual archaeological

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 levels. Nevertheless, luminescence dates can provide complementary information with which
10 to better understand site formation processes and evaluate the homogeneity of the
11 lithostratigraphic units defined within an archaeological sequence.
12

13
14 Another advantage in focusing on radiocarbon data is that there exists a vast corpus of
15 published or readily available ^{14}C ages (e.g., d'Errico et al. 2011; Vermeersch 2005). However,
16 many of the previously run conventional, as well as AMS, ages in such compiled datasets lack
17 published details concerning % collagen, carbon and nitrogen ratios, % carbon at combustion,
18 etc., thus making them difficult to evaluate. Furthermore, these data cannot be used uncritically
19 as many were produced with older pretreatment and conventional counting methods thus
20 calling into question their accuracy. There is no question that the latest pretreatment protocols
21 cited above allow one to obtain reliable ages, with respect to those produced more than 20
22 years ago. In a number of instances (e.g., Higham et al. 2009), newly obtained ages produced
23 with such methods have served to show that many previously run ages were underestimates.
24 This does not mean, however, that one should systematically discount all conventional and AMS
25 ages produced without the latest protocols as not all are problematic. For example, if one
26 examines the ages used by Banks, d'Errico and Zilhão (2013a) to place the Proto-Aurignacian
27 and Early Aurignacian within their respective chronological and paleoenvironmental contexts, it
28 can be seen that a number of previously run ages correspond well to those produced with the
29 latest pretreatment protocols. Furthermore, when the chronological ranges of these two
30 archaeological cultures were reexamined, the inclusion of more recently published ABOx-SC and
31 ultrafiltration methods did not serve to push back their chronological limits and, in fact, the
32 termination of the Early Aurignacian became slightly younger (Banks, d'Errico, and Zilhão
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 2013b). When one omits from consideration studies for which the chronology of anatomically
10 modern human entry into Europe is based on sites with problematic stratigraphy or
11 questionable archaeological associations (Benazzi et al. 2011; Higham et al. 2011; Higham et al.
12 2012a), the more recent radiocarbon ages associated with the Middle-to-Upper Paleolithic
13 transition, analyzed with the latest age modeling methods, have not significantly altered
14 conclusions reached 15 years ago and based on radiocarbon data available at the time (Zilhão
15 and d'Errico 1999). It is also important to keep in mind that with ultrafiltration it is still not
16 clearly understood what exactly the ultrafilters are removing, and while the method is effective
17 in removing small molecular-weight contaminant materials from samples, it does not
18 necessarily remove them all (Brock et al. 2013). Thus, we should not uncritically assume that all
19 ages produced with the latest pretreatment protocols are accurately dating an archaeological
20 event, nor that all ages produced years ago are underestimations.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 With respect to radiocarbon ages, a number of statistical methods can be used to compare
34 and interpret them. For example, prior to calibration, since radiocarbon measures are normally
35 distributed, variations of the *t*-test statistic (Sokal and Rohlf 1995) are well-adapted for
36 examining whether different radiocarbon ages come from the same statistical population, how
37 a specific age determination is statistically related to a homogenous sample of ages, or if two
38 different assemblages of ages differ statistically from one another. Once a radiocarbon age is
39 calibrated, the resulting calendar date probability is not normally distributed, so standard
40 statistical methods are no longer applicable. The application of Bayes theorem to the analysis of
41 calibrated dates, often with a focus on individual sites, has become common for analyzing and
42 interpreting radiocarbon age assemblages and constructing chronologies within a
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 methodological framework that takes archaeological and stratigraphic contextual information
10 into consideration (Bronk Ramsey 1995; Bronk Ramsey 1998; Bronk Ramsey 2009; Buck,
11 Cavanagh, and Litton 1996; Lee and Bronk Ramsey 2012).
12
13

14 15 16 17 **A Tandem Approach**

18
19 Constructing archaeological chronologies that can be reliably correlated with D-O climatic
20 events is not possible without the use of calibration and Bayesian statistics. The advantage of
21 Bayesian age modeling techniques, and resultant probability measures, is that they allow one to
22 better constrain the time interval to which a single radiocarbon age, or population of
23 radiocarbon ages, belongs—a crucial endeavor when the goal is to correlate archaeological
24 occupations to documented paleoclimatic variability. The most common approach is to
25 construct age models for specific archaeological sites. It can be argued, however, that a
26 complementary methodology can also provide a valuable contribution to such research: this
27 approach being the consideration of all regionally or multi-regionally available radiometric age
28 data that are grouped or differentiated based on their attribution to specific, successive
29 archaeological cultures and analyzed collectively. Each has its advantages and limitations, and
30 by using the two approaches in concert one should be able to place archaeological cultures in
31 their respective temporal contexts more accurately.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 47 ***Site-specific Age Models***

48
49 This approach is of obvious utility when one considers the number of stratified and well-
50 dated archaeological sites for which we possess detailed data with respect to stratigraphy and
51

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 formational processes. These priors can be used to construct reliable site-specific age models. If
10 an adequate number of reliable sequences are studied individually in this manner, it should be
11 possible, in theory, to better understand peopling or settlement scenarios within the context of
12 a broad archaeological culture or to make comparisons between temporally successive cultures.
13
14

15
16 While such practice is valuable, this approach can have shortcomings in certain instances.
17 First, it is paramount that age modeling analyses for specific sites fully take into account
18 detailed stratigraphic and site formation data, information related to post-depositional
19 processes, the results of refitting studies, etc. If such data are not considered or are not
20 adequately understood, there exists the possibility that resulting age models may be erroneous
21 and misleading. An example of this can be found in the recent exchange between Higham et al.
22 (2013) and Banks and collaborators (2013b) surrounding the archaeological context of early
23 Upper Paleolithic levels and Bayesian modeling results for the site of Gießenklösterle. In two
24 published studies (Higham et al. 2012a; Higham et al. 2013), new radiocarbon ages from the site
25 and resulting age models are used to argue for a precocious presence of anatomically modern
26 humans in Western Europe. However, the results must be viewed with caution because site
27 formational studies (Teyssandier 2003) and critical analysis of ^{14}C ages (Verpoorte 2005), which
28 predate the most recent dating campaign, have demonstrated that the relationships between
29 the dated samples and Aurignacian occupations of the site are not unambiguous. These
30 problems are compounded when the originally defined archaeological horizons (Hahn 1988) are
31 used as chronological phases to constrain a Bayesian age model (Zilhão 2013). Based on the
32 degree of post-depositional mixing, it has been argued that the Aurignacian levels at the site
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 should be viewed as a continuum and thus a single phase within a Bayesian model's structure
10
11 (Banks, d'Errico, and Zilhão 2013b).

12
13 Another illustration of problematic Bayesian age models derived from sites with possible
14 stratigraphic problems is provided by the site of Les Cottés. When one examines the modeled
15 date ranges for the Proto-Aurignacian (US04 lower) and Early Aurignacian (US04 upper) levels
16 (Talamo et al. 2012; reproduced here in Fig. 1b), it is immediately evident that the Proto-
17 Aurignacian level is much younger than other reliable Proto-Aurignacian contexts in Europe and
18 falls more within the time frame of the Early Aurignacian (Fig. 2). Taking into account the fact
19 that many of the ages from this level come from a portion of the site that is strongly sloped and
20 where levels US04 upper and lower are in direct contact with one another (Talamo et al. 2012),
21 it is entirely possible that many of the dated materials from US04 lower were originally
22 associated with the Early Aurignacian US04 upper.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 A final illustration of the importance of stratigraphic priors in age model construction is the
34 example of the Grotte du Renne. The age models produced by Higham et al. (2010) and Hublin
35 et al. (2012) differ quite markedly with respect to the date ranges calculated for the
36 Châtelperronian and Aurignacian occupations of the cave. Aside from the debate concerning
37 whether or not it was appropriate to focus solely on humanly-modified bone for producing ages
38 (Hublin et al. 2012; Higham et al. 2012b) and what influence the inclusion of non-humanly-
39 modified may have on accurately capturing the timing of human occupation of the cave, the
40 differences between these two teams' age models are also the result of how stratigraphic priors
41 are incorporated into the Bayesian age model structure. Higham et al. (2010) keep stratigraphic
42 levels X and IX separate, whereas Hublin and colleagues (2012) group them together based on
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 the existence of a lithic refit between the two levels. These two different structures of
10 stratigraphic priors strongly influence the number of identified radiocarbon age outliers and in
11 turn the chronological intervals for the site's Châtelperronian and Aurignacian occupations.
12
13

14
15 Secondly, when an emphasis is placed on individual archaeological sequences, the possibility
16 arises that one is inadequately capturing the full time range of an archaeological culture. For
17 example, if one particular region is dominated by stratified sequences and is the focus of age
18 modeling research, then one is potentially missing archeological events from sites outside that
19 region that may not necessarily fall entirely within the temporal range of the archaeological
20 culture in the context of the more restricted geographic framework.
21
22
23
24
25

26
27 Lastly, a focus on constructing age models for stratified sequences makes it difficult to
28 understand how single component archaeological sites fit within a cultural chronological
29 framework. Calibrated date ranges from single component sites can be compared to age models
30 from stratified sequences, but evaluating their statistical relationships to modeled ranges
31 derived from the latter is rendered difficult.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 ***Age Models for an Entire Archaeological Culture***

40
41 There exist a number of ways for attempting to capture the full temporal range of a
42 particular archaeological culture. One methodology used recently (Banks, d'Errico, and Zilhão
43 2013a, 2013b; d'Errico and Banks 2014) is to collectively examine all radiocarbon ages belonging
44 to specific archaeological cultures. By focusing on multiple sites characterized by reliable
45 archaeological contexts with culturally diagnostic material culture remains, radiocarbon ages
46 can be grouped together by archaeological culture, the latter being used as temporal phases in
47
48
49
50
51
52

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 the construction of a Bayesian age model.

10 Higham et al. (2014) employ an approach that integrates the results of age models for
11 individual archaeological sequences (i.e., sites) into a subsequent, broader model focused on
12 archaeological cultures. As described in their Supplementary Information (Higham et al. 2014),
13 OxCal4.2 (Bronk Ramsey 2009) is used to construct age models for individual site sequences.
14 The probability distribution functions for the simulated boundaries, those which also
15 correspond to the termination a specific archaeological culture at the site, are then inserted as
16 'priors' within a 'phase' pertaining to that same technocomplex in a more generalized Bayesian
17 model. This latter age model calculates probability distribution functions that estimate date
18 ranges for the beginning and end of the targeted archaeological cultures. With this approach,
19 the stratigraphic priors observed at individual sites are incorporated into the model that
20 examines distinct and successive archaeological cultures.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 A similar approach can be followed with the newly available Bayesian age modeling
34 software named ChronoModel (Chronological Modelling of Archaeological Data using Bayesian
35 Statistics; www.chronomodel.fr), which differs somewhat from OxCal with respect to how it
36 views and uses radiocarbon ages to construct probability distributions. With this software, one
37 constructs age models for site sequences, whose individual levels and associated stratigraphic
38 priors can then be grouped together into phases according to archaeological culture. More
39 specifically, each archaeological level within a broader phase includes a set of 'event' models
40 composed of one or several dates/ages with unknown individual errors in addition to
41 experimental errors. Thus, one is able to calculate date ranges for site-specific archaeological
42 levels based on their associated radiocarbon ages (nested in 'events'—either individually or
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 together when there are ages from multiple samples demonstrated to have been
10 contemporaneous), as well as for a particular archaeological culture, the latter being
11 determined by its population of related 'events' and associated stratigraphic priors. One
12 advantage of ChronoModel is that the user interface allows one to construct site-specific event
13 models and a broader phase model simultaneously, thereby eliminating the need to run
14 individual site age models, save the probability distribution functions for each boundary, and
15 then incorporate these boundary probabilities into a subsequent phase model, as is the case
16 with OxCal.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 These multi-site approaches to building cultural chronologies allow one to capture the full
26 temporal extent of an archaeological culture (Fig. 2) in a way that might not be possible if only
27 particular sites or geographically restricted regions are the focus of study. This is dependent, of
28 course, on the assumption that such age models incorporate a representative sample of
29 radiometric ages. Representativeness of a sample of ages can be increased by the fact that a
30 focus on archaeological cultures as a whole allows one to incorporate ages from single
31 component sites into an age model. A comprehensive approach also has the advantage of
32 potentially minimizing the contribution made by ages that are erroneous due to inadequate pre-
33 treatment methods, contamination, or site formational processes and that were not recognized
34 as outliers when considered with the more restricted context of a site-specific age model.
35
36 Another advantage is that previously run radiocarbon ages (e.g., non-ABOx-SC or non-
37 ultrafiltration ages) from reliable contexts can be included in the construction of cultural
38 chronologies. When previously run ages are incorporated into a Bayesian age model that also
39 includes ages produced with the latest pre-treatment protocols and the former are not
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 subsequently flagged as outliers, one can take this as a quantitative indication that they provide
10 relevant and reliable information with respect to the timing of archaeological events. Sample
11 size differences between populations of previously runs ages and those produced more recently
12 may play a role in determining which and how many ages are identified as outliers.

13
14
15
16
17 Experimental modeling work is needed along these lines to better understand the potential
18 influences that differing sample sizes between previously- and newly-produced ages may have.
19

20 21 22 23 **Discussion and Conclusions**

24
25 Approaches that only examine individual archaeological sequences and those that analyze
26 ages in a collective manner with respect to a broader archaeological culture have advantages
27 and disadvantages. Using both in conjunction, as done by Higham et al. (2014) and as is possible
28 with ChronoModel, serves to overcome the disadvantages associated with each. For example,
29 take a hypothetical case where we have a site with a number of stratified archaeological levels
30 and with each level are associated a number of radiocarbon ages. Let's also say that two levels
31 are in contact with one another, appear to represent two different archaeological cultures, and
32 taphonomic studies have demonstrated that there has been mixing of archaeological materials
33 between the two. Without being able to reliably discern between dated materials that are in
34 their original context and those that have been subjected to vertical movement, one would be
35 forced to combine these two levels into a single phase in the Bayesian age model's structure.
36
37 Thus, when an age model is produced, one cannot definitively ascertain the chronological time
38 span for each of the different archaeological cultures. If one widens the scope of study to a
39 multi-regional scale and constructs a Bayesian age model that treats each archaeological culture
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 or cohesive adaptive system as a phase and incorporates a representative sample of ages from
10 reliable contexts, the resulting age model will provide a robust temporal interval for each.
11
12 Moving back to our hypothetical archaeological site for which there was mixing of materials
13 between adjacent and culturally different levels, the chronological intervals derived from the
14 age model of these cultures as a whole can be used a frame of reference to which each of the
15 radiocarbon ages from the mixed levels is compared in order to determine with which
16 archaeological level each dated item was likely originally associated—a practice that could not
17 be undertaken without the broader scale Bayesian age model.
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Likewise, with a multi-regional age model that uses a “technocomplex” as its smallest unit of
25 study, it would not be possible to quantitatively ascertain whether there existed temporal
26 variability within an archaeological culture from a geographic standpoint. This limitation could
27 be overcome by examining the temporal ranges for a particular adaptive system provided by
28 age models constructed for individual site sequences against the backdrop of the broader time
29 interval modeled for that same culture. Such a protocol would provide the possibility of
30 identifying temporal differences that have a geographic basis. This, however, may be too
31 optimistic for late Middle and early Upper Paleolithic archaeological cultures (ca. 50–30 ka cal
32 BP) as radiometric dating errors and low stratigraphic resolution typical of this period are such
33 that it is difficult for us to capture such cultural dynamics at a resolution finer than 500 years, at
34 best—a considerable span of time considering the speed at which cultural innovations can
35 spread (Zilhão 2013).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Finally, there exist the issues of how to refine models and how to evaluate the relative
50 reliability of the different approaches. For the former, two possibilities are immediately evident.
51
52

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Age models can be continually refined as new radiometric ages become available, either from
10 existing sites or from newly discovered, dated sites. Another approach with which to refine age
11 models would be to incorporate data from other chronological markers, such as tephtras (e.g.,
12 Blockley et al. 2015; Housley et al. 2014). When multiple, diagnostic tephtras or cryptotephtras
13 are present within a site's stratigraphy, their ages and stratigraphic position can be evaluated
14 against an age model constructed from other radiometric data from the site, and if these two
15 bodies of data are congruent, then they can be combined into a single age model.
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 Efforts to refine age models, however, do not necessarily pertain to the issue of determining
23 model reliability. To this end, one way to evaluate model reliability would be to construct age
24 models by means of multiple software packages and compare results. If a majority of age
25 models agree with one another, then one could consider their reconstructed chronologies to be
26 reliable. However, if only two software packages are used and their outputs do not agree, then
27 issues related to age model structures, employed priors, and statistical methods used would
28 need to be examined in an effort to determine, if possible, which model is aberrant. Clearly, this
29 is an issue that warrants further work. Returning to the topic of newly discovered and dated
30 sites, characterized by unambiguous cultural attributions and associations between material
31 cultural remains and dated samples, it is also conceivable that the comparison of such data to
32 an existing age model could be a means of evaluating whether the latter is reliable.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 A large number of chronological studies in the field of archaeology are focused on individual
46 sites, and while this is of obvious utility, the above discussion highlights certain instances for
47 which such a focus can be problematic. This is especially the case when the focus is on
48 examining how an archaeological culture, in its entirety, relates to D-O climatic variability. By
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 employing approaches that apply Bayesian methods to collective samples of chronological data
10 that are associated with unambiguous, distinct, and successive cohesive adaptive systems,
11 especially approaches that allow site-specific stratigraphic priors to be incorporated into a
12 broader cultural phase model, it is possible to overcome potential limitations associated with
13 site-specific age models, produce age models that rely on more representative samples of past
14 human occupation, especially for regions or archaeological records dominated by single-
15 component sites, and construct broad chronologies that can more accurately place human
16 cultures within their respective paleoenvironmental frameworks. At the same time, by
17 incorporating results from individual sequences, one has an increased potential, with respect to
18 more recent time periods, to recognize temporally differentiated cultural variability within and
19 between regions.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 **Acknowledgments**

34 I would like to thank Paul Pettitt and João Zilhão for inviting me to contribute to this edited
35 volume and for providing constructive comments. I also thank: Philippe Lanos for clarifications
36 pertaining to the ChronoModel software package; Francesco d'Errico for his reading of on an
37 earlier draft of this paper; the two anonymous referees whose critical comments served to
38 improve the paper.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 **Figure captions**

48 Figure 1 a) comparison of single grain OSL ages and calibrated 14C AMS ages from the site of Les
49 Cottés (reproduced from Jacobs et al. 2015); b) an excerpt of the Bayesian age model for Les
50
51

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Cottés concerning the Protoaurignacian and Early Aurignacian levels (modified from Figure 4 of
10 Talamo et al. 2012).

11
12
13
14
15 Figure 2 Top: climatic variability between 43 ka and 36 ka cal BP as recorded in the NGRIP ice,
16 along with numbered Dansgaard-Oeschger Interstadials and the approximate temporal
17 boundaries (light grey) of Heinrich Stadial 4 (H4), the latter derived from Sánchez Goñi and
18 Harrison (2010). Superimposed is the internal propagated uncertainty (dark grey) calculated for
19 the age determination of the Campanian Ignimbrite (CI) eruption according to de Vivo et al.
20 (2001).

21
22
23
24
25
26 Bottom: Banks et al.'s (2013b) modeled temporal boundaries between Transitional Industries
27 (TI: Uluzzian and Châtelperronian), the Protoaurignacian (PA), Early Aurignacian (EA), and
28 Evolved Aurignacian (AII). The 68.2% and 95.4% probability intervals for the modeled
29 boundaries between the archaeological cultures are indicated.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 References

- 40
41 Austin, William E. N., and Fiona D. Hibbert. 2012. "Tracing Time in the Ocean: A Brief Review of
42 Chronological Constraints (60–8 Kyr) on North Atlantic Marine Event-Based
43 Stratigraphies." *Quaternary Science Reviews* 36: 28–37.
44 doi:10.1016/j.quascirev.2012.01.015.
45
46 Banks, William E., João Zilhão, Francesco d'Errico, Masa Kageyama, Adriana Sima, and
47 Annamaria Ronchitelli. 2009. "Investigating Links between Ecology and Bifacial Tool
48 Types in Western Europe during the Last Glacial Maximum." *Journal of Archaeological
49 Science* 36 (12): 2853–67. doi:10.1016/j.jas.2009.09.014.
50
51 Banks, William E., Francesco d'Errico, and João Zilhão. 2013a. "Human-Climate Interaction
52 during the Early Upper Paleolithic: Testing the Hypothesis of an Adaptive Shift between
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 the Proto-Aurignacian and the Early Aurignacian." *Journal of Human Evolution* 64 (1):
10 39–55.
- 11 Banks, William E., Francesco d'Errico, and Joao Zilhão. 2013b. "Revisiting the Chronology of the
12 Proto-Aurignacian and the Early Aurignacian in Europe: A Reply to Higham et Al.'s
13 Comments on Banks et Al. (2013)." *Journal of Human Evolution* 65 (6): 810–17.
- 14 Banks, William E., João Zilhão, Francesco d'Errico, Masa Kageyama, Adriana Sima, and
15 Annamaria Ronchitelli. 2009. "Investigating Links between Ecology and Bifacial Tool
16 Types in Western Europe during the Last Glacial Maximum." *Journal of Archaeological
17 Science* 36 (12): 2853–67. doi:10.1016/j.jas.2009.09.014.
- 18 Benazzi, Stefano, Katerina Douka, Cinzia Fornai, Catherine C. Bauer, Ottmar Kullmer, Jiří
19 Svoboda, Ildikó Pap, et al. 2011. "Early Dispersal of Modern Humans in Europe and
20 Implications for Neanderthal Behaviour." *Nature* 479 (7374): 525–29.
21 doi:10.1038/nature10617.
- 22 Bertran, Pascal, Luca Sitzia, William E. Banks, Mark D. Bateman, Pierre-Yves Demars, Marion
23 Hernandez, Michel Lenoir, Norbert Mercier, and Frédéric Prodeo. 2013. "The Landes de
24 Gascogne (southwest France): Periglacial Desert and Cultural Frontier during the
25 Palaeolithic." *Journal of Archaeological Science* 40 (5): 2274–85.
26 doi:10.1016/j.jas.2013.01.012.
- 27 Bird, M. I., L. K. Ayliffe, L. K. Fifield, C. M. Turney, R. G. Cresswell, T. T. Barrows, and B. David.
28 1999. "Radiocarbon Dating of 'Old' Charcoal Using a Wet Oxidation, Stepped-
29 Combustion Procedure." *Radiocarbon* 41 (2): 127–40. doi:10.2458/azu_js_rc.41.3802.
- 30 Birks, Hilary H., Vanessa Gelorini, Erick Robinson, and Wim Z. Hoek. 2014. "Impacts of
31 Palaeoclimate Change 60 000–8000 Years Ago on Humans and Their Environments in
32 Europe: Integrating Palaeoenvironmental and Archaeological Data." *Quaternary
33 International*. Accessed December 11. doi:10.1016/j.quaint.2014.02.022.
- 34 Blockley, Simon P. E., Kevin J. Edwards, J. Edward Schofield, Sean D. F. Pyne-O'Donnell, Britta J.
35 L. Jensen, Ian P. Matthews, Gordon T. Cook, Kristi L. Wallace, and Duane Froese. 2015.
36 "First Evidence of Cryptotephra in Palaeoenvironmental Records Associated with Norse
37 Occupation Sites in Greenland." *Quaternary Geochronology* 27 (April): 145–57.
38 doi:10.1016/j.quageo.2015.02.023.
- 39 Bradtmöller, Marcel, Andreas Pastoors, Bernhard Weninger, and Gerd-Christian Weniger. 2012.
40 "The Repeated Replacement Model – Rapid Climate Change and Population Dynamics in
41 Late Pleistocene Europe." *Quaternary International* 247 (January): 38–49.
42 doi:10.1016/j.quaint.2010.10.015.
- 43 Brock, F., Geoghegan, V., Thomas, B., Jurkschat, K., and T. F. G. Higham. 2013. Analysis of Bone
44 "Collagen" Extraction Products for Radiocarbon Dating. *Radiocarbon* 55(2–3): 445–463.
- 45 Broecker, Wallace S. 2006. "Abrupt Climate Change Revisited." *Global and Planetary Change* 54
46 (3–4): 211–15. doi:10.1016/j.gloplacha.2006.06.019.
- 47 Bronk Ramsey, Christopher. 1995. "Radiocarbon Calibration and Analysis of Stratigraphy; the
48 OxCal Program." *Radiocarbon* 37 (2): 425–30. doi:10.2458/azu_js_rc.37.1690.
- 49 Bronk Ramsey, Christopher. 1998. "Probability and Dating." *Radiocarbon* 40 (1): 461–74.
50 doi:10.2458/azu_js_rc.40.2033.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Bronk Ramsey, Christopher. 2009. "Bayesian Analysis of Radiocarbon Dates." *Radiocarbon* 51
10 (1): 337–60. doi:10.2458/rc.v51i1.3494.
- 11 Buck, Caitlin E., William G. Cavanagh, and Cliff Litton. 1996. *Bayesian Approach to Interpreting*
12 *Archaeological Data*. 1 edition. Chichester, England: Wiley.
- 13 Dansgaard, W., S. J. Johnsen, H. B. Clausen, D. Dahl-Jensen, N. S. Gundestrup, C. U. Hammer, C.
14 S. Hvidberg, et al. 1993. "Evidence for General Instability of Past Climate from a 250-Kyr
15 Ice-Core Record." *Nature* 364 (6434): 218–20. doi:10.1038/364218a0.
- 16 Davies, Siwan M., Peter M. Abbott, Nicholas J. G. Pearce, Stefan Wastegård, and Simon P. E.
17 Blockley. 2012. "Integrating the INTIMATE Records Using Tephrochronology: Rising to
18 the Challenge." *Quaternary Science Reviews*, The INTegration of Ice core, Marine and
19 TERrestrial records of the last termination (INTIMATE) 60,000 to 8000 BP, 36 (March):
20 11–27. doi:10.1016/j.quascirev.2011.04.005.
- 21 d'Errico, Francesco, and William E. Banks. 2013. "Identifying Mechanisms behind Middle
22 Paleolithic and Middle Stone Age Cultural Trajectories." *Current Anthropology* 54 (S8):
23 S371–87.
- 24 d'Errico, Francesco, and William E. Banks. 2014. "Tephra Studies and the Reconstruction of
25 Middle-to-Upper Paleolithic Cultural Trajectories." *Quaternary Science Reviews*.
26 doi:10.1016/j.quascirev.2014.05.014.
- 27 d'Errico, Francesco, William E. Banks, Marian Vanhaeren, Véronique Laroulandie, and MATHIEU
28 Langlais. 2011. "PACEA Geo-Referenced Radiocarbon Database." *PaleoAnthropology*
29 2011: 1–12.
- 30 d'Errico, Francesco, and María Fernanda Sánchez Goñi. 2003. "Neandertal Extinction and the
31 Millennial Scale Climatic Variability of OIS 3." *Quaternary Science Reviews* 22 (8–9): 769–
32 88. doi:10.1016/S0277-3791(03)00009-X.
- 33 De Vivo, B., G. Rolandi, P. B. Gans, A. Calvert, W. A. Bohrson, F. J. Spera, and H. E. Belkin. 2001.
34 "New Constraints on the Pyroclastic Eruptive History of the Campanian Volcanic Plain
35 (Italy)." *Mineralogy and Petrology* 73 (1-3): 47–65. doi:10.1007/s007100170010.
- 36 Discamps, Emmanuel, Jacques Jaubert, and François Bachelier. 2011. "Human Choices and
37 Environmental Constraints: Deciphering the Variability of Large Game Procurement from
38 Mousterian to Aurignacian Times (MIS 5-3) in Southwestern France." *Quaternary Science*
39 *Reviews* 30 (19–20): 2755–75. doi:10.1016/j.quascirev.2011.06.009.
- 40 Fletcher, William J., María Fernanda Sánchez Goñi, Judy R.M. Allen, Rachid Cheddadi, Nathalie
41 Combourieu-Nebout, Brian Huntley, Ian Lawson, et al. 2010. "Millennial-Scale Variability
42 during the Last Glacial in Vegetation Records from Europe." *Quaternary Science Reviews*
43 29 (21-22): 2839–64. doi:10.1016/j.quascirev.2009.11.015.
- 44 Gamble, C., W. Davies, P. Pettitt, and M. Richards. 2004. "Climate Change and Evolving Human
45 Diversity in Europe during the Last Glacial." *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal*
46 *Society B: Biological Sciences* 359 (1442): 243–54. doi:10.1098/rstb.2003.1396.
- 47 Hahn, J. 1988. *Das Geißenklösterle I*. Stuttgart: Konrad Theiss.
- 48 Harrison, S.P., and M.F. Sanchez Goñi. 2010. "Global Patterns of Vegetation Response to
49 Millennial-Scale Variability and Rapid Climate Change during the Last Glacial Period."
50 *Quaternary Science Reviews* 29 (21-22): 2957–80. doi:10.1016/j.quascirev.2010.07.016.
- 51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Formatted: English (U.S.)

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Heinrich, Hartmut. 1988. "Origin and Consequences of Cyclic Ice Rafting in the Northeast
10 Atlantic Ocean during the Past 130,000 Years." *Quaternary Research* 29 (2): 142–52.
11 doi:10.1016/0033-5894(88)90057-9.
- 12 Higham, T. G., R. M. Jacobi, and C. Bronk Ramsey. 2006. "AMS Radiocarbon Dating Of Ancient
13 Bone Using Ultrafiltration." *Radiocarbon* 48 (2): 179–95. doi:10.2458/azu_js_rc.48.2861.
- 14 Higham, Thomas, Fiona Brock, Marco Peresani, Alberto Broglio, Rachel Wood, and Katerina
15 Douka. 2009. "Problems with Radiocarbon Dating the Middle to Upper Palaeolithic
16 Transition in Italy." *Quaternary Science Reviews* 28 (13–14): 1257–67.
17 doi:10.1016/j.quascirev.2008.12.018.
- 18 Higham, Thomas, Roger Jacobi, Michèle Julien, Francine David, Laura Basell, Rachel Wood,
19 William Davies, and Christopher Bronk Ramsey. 2010. "Chronology of the Grotte Du
20 Renne (France) and Implications for the Context of Ornaments and Human Remains
21 within the Châtelperronian." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 107 (47):
22 20234–39. doi:10.1073/pnas.1007963107.
- 23 Higham, Tom, Tim Compton, Chris Stringer, Roger Jacobi, Beth Shapiro, Erik Trinkaus, Barry
24 Chandler, et al. 2011. "The Earliest Evidence for Anatomically Modern Humans in
25 Northwestern Europe." *Nature* 479 (7374): 521–24. doi:10.1038/nature10484.
- 26 Higham, Thomas, Laura Basell, Roger Jacobi, Rachel Wood, Christopher Bronk Ramsey, and
27 Nicholas J. Conard. 2012a. "Testing Models for the Beginnings of the Aurignacian and the
28 Advent of Figurative Art and Music: The Radiocarbon Chronology of Geißenklösterle."
29 *Journal of Human Evolution* 62 (6): 664–76. doi:10.1016/j.jhevol.2012.03.003.
- 30 Higham, Thomas, C. Bronk Ramsey, Laura Basell, Fiona Brock, Rachel Wood, and William Davies.
31 2012b. "Radiocarbon Dating & Bayesian Modelling from the Grotte Du Renne & a
32 Neanderthal Origin for the Châtelperronian." *Before Farming* 2012 (3): article 2.
- 33 Higham, Tom, Rachel Wood, Luc Moreau, Nicholas Conard, and Christopher Bronk Ramsey.
34 2013. "Comments on 'Human–climate Interaction during the Early Upper Paleolithic:
35 Testing the Hypothesis of an Adaptive Shift between the Proto-Aurignacian and the Early
36 Aurignacian' by Banks et Al." *Journal of Human Evolution* 65 (6): 806–9.
37 doi:10.1016/j.jhevol.2013.06.010.
- 38 Higham, Tom, Katerina Douka, Rachel Wood, Christopher Bronk Ramsey, Fiona Brock, Laura
39 Basell, Marta Camps, et al. 2014. "The Timing and Spatiotemporal Patterning of
40 Neanderthal Disappearance." *Nature* 512 (7514): 306–9. doi:10.1038/nature13621.
- 41 Housley, Rupert A., Alison MacLeod, Simon J. Armitage, Jacek Kabaciński, and Clive S. Gamble.
42 2014. "The Potential of Cryptotephra and OSL Dating for Refining the Chronology of
43 Open-Air Archaeological Windblown Sand Sites: A Case Study from Mirkowice 33,
44 Northwest Poland." *Quaternary Geochronology* 20 (April): 99–108.
45 doi:10.1016/j.quageo.2013.11.003.
- 46 Hublin, Jean-Jacques, Sahrá Talamo, Michèle Julien, Francine David, Nelly Connet, Pierre Bodu,
47 Bernard Vandermeersch, and Michael P. Richards. 2012. "Radiocarbon Dates from the
48 Grotte Du Renne and Saint-Césaire Support a Neanderthal Origin for the
49 Châtelperronian." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 109 (46): 18743–48.
50 doi:10.1073/pnas.1212924109.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Jacobs, Zenobia, Bo Li, Nathan Jankowski, and Marie Soressi. 2015. "Testing of a Single Grain
10 OSL Chronology across the Middle to Upper Palaeolithic Transition at Les Cottés
11 (France)." *Journal of Archaeological Science* 54 (February): 110–22.
12 doi:10.1016/j.jas.2014.11.020.
- 13 Johnsen, S. J., H. B. Clausen, W. Dansgaard, K. Fuhrer, N. Gundestrup, C. U. Hammer, P. Iversen,
14 J. Jouzel, B. Stauffer, and J. P. Steffensen. 1992. "Irregular Glacial Interstadials Recorded
15 in a New Greenland Ice Core." *Nature* 359 (6393): 311–13. doi:10.1038/359311a0.
- 16 Kageyama, M., U. Merkel, B. Otto-Bliesner, M. Prange, A. Abe-Ouchi, G. Lohmann, R. Ohgaito, et
17 al. 2013. "Climatic Impacts of Fresh Water Hosing under Last Glacial Maximum
18 Conditions: A Multi-Model Study." *Clim. Past* 9 (2): 935–53. doi:10.5194/cp-9-935-2013.
- 19 Lane, C. S., S. P. E. Blockley, A. F. Lotter, W. Finsinger, M. L. Filippi, and I. P. Matthews. 2012. "A
20 Regional Tephrostratigraphic Framework for Central and Southern European Climate
21 Archives during the Last Glacial to Interglacial Transition: Comparisons North and South
22 of the Alps." *Quaternary Science Reviews, The Integration of Ice core, Marine and
23 Terrestrial records of the last termination (INTIMATE) 60,000 to 8000 BP*, 36 (March):
24 50–58. doi:10.1016/j.quascirev.2010.10.015.
- 25 Lee, Sharen, and Christopher Bronk Ramsey. 2012. "Development and Application of the
26 Trapezoidal Model for Archaeological Chronologies." *Radiocarbon* 54 (1): 107–22.
27 doi:10.2458/azu_js_rc.v54i1.12397.
- 28 Marcott, Shaun A., Peter U. Clark, Laurie Padman, Gary P. Klinkhammer, Scott R. Springer,
29 Zhengyu Liu, Bette L. Otto-Bliesner, et al. 2011. "Ice-Shelf Collapse from Subsurface
30 Warming as a Trigger for Heinrich Events." *Proceedings of the National Academy of
31 Sciences* 108 (33): 13415–19.
- 32 Menviel, L., A. Timmermann, T. Friedrich, and M. H. England. 2014. "Hindcasting the Continuum
33 of Dansgaard–Oeschger Variability: Mechanisms, Patterns and Timing."
34 *Climate of the Past* 10 (1): 63–77. doi:10.5194/cp-10-63-2014.
- 35 Miller, Rebecca. 2012. "Mapping the Expansion of the Northwest Magdalenian." *Quaternary
36 International* 272-273 (September): 209–30. doi:10.1016/j.quaint.2012.05.034.
- 37 Rasmussen, Sune O., Matthias Bigler, Simon P. Blockley, Thomas Blunier, Susanne L. Buchardt,
38 Henrik B. Clausen, Ivana Cvijanovic, et al. 2014. "A Stratigraphic Framework for Abrupt
39 Climatic Changes during the Last Glacial Period Based on Three Synchronized Greenland
40 Ice-Core Records: Refining and Extending the INTIMATE Event Stratigraphy." *Quaternary
41 Science Reviews* 106: 14–28. doi:10.1016/j.quascirev.2014.09.007.
- 42 Reimer, Paula J., Edouard Bard, Alex Bayliss, J W Beck, P G Blackwell, C. Bronk Ramsey, C E Buck,
43 et al. 2013. "IntCal13 and Marine13 Radiocarbon Age Calibration Curves 0–50,000 Years
44 Cal BP." *Radiocarbon* 55 (4): 1869–87. doi:10.2458/azu_js_rc.55.16947.
- 45 Roche, Didier M., Didier Paillard, Thibaut Caley, and Claire Waelbroeck. 2014. "LGM Hosing
46 Approach to Heinrich Event 1: Results and Perspectives from Data–model Integration
47 Using Water Isotopes." *Quaternary Science Reviews, Dating, Synthesis, and
48 Interpretation of Palaeoclimatic Records and Model-data Integration: Advances of the
49 INTIMATE project (INTEgration of Ice core, Marine and TERrestrial records, COST Action
50 ES0907)*, 106 (December): 247–61. doi:10.1016/j.quascirev.2014.07.020.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Roebroeks, Wil. 2008. "Time for the Middle to Upper Paleolithic Transition in Europe." *Journal*
10 *of Human Evolution*, Chronology of the Middle-Upper Paleolithic Transition in Eurasia, 55
11 (5): 918–26. doi:10.1016/j.jhevol.2008.08.008.
- 12 Sánchez Goñi, María Fernanda, Amaelle Landais, William J. Fletcher, Filipa Naughton, Stéphanie
13 Desprat, and Josette Duprat. 2008. "Contrasting Impacts of Dansgaard–Oeschger Events
14 over a Western European Latitudinal Transect Modulated by Orbital Parameters." *Quaternary*
15 *Science Reviews* 27 (11–12): 1136–51. doi:10.1016/j.quascirev.2008.03.003.
- 16 Sanchez Goñi, Maria Fernanda, and Sandy P. Harrison. 2010. "Millennial-Scale Climate
17 Variability and Vegetation Changes during the Last Glacial: Concepts and Terminology." *Quaternary*
18 *Science Reviews* 29 (21–22): 2823–27. doi:10.1016/j.quascirev.2009.11.014.
- 19 Schmidt, Isabell, Marcel Bradtmöller, Martin Kehl, Andreas Pastoors, Yvonne Tafelmaier,
20 Bernhard Weninger, and Gerd-Christian Weniger. 2012. "Rapid Climate Change and
21 Variability of Settlement Patterns in Iberia during the Late Pleistocene." *Quaternary*
22 *International*, Temporal and spatial corridors of Homo sapiens sapiens population
23 dynamics during the Late Pleistocene and Early Holocene, 274 (October): 179–204.
24 doi:10.1016/j.quaint.2012.01.018.
- 25 Shackleton, N.J., R.G Fairbanks, Tzu-chien Chiu, and F Parrenin. 2004. "Absolute Calibration of
26 the Greenland Time Scale: Implications for Antarctic Time Scales and for $\Delta^{14}\text{C}$." *Quaternary*
27 *Science Reviews* 23 (14–15): 1513–22. doi:10.1016/j.quascirev.2004.03.006.
- 28 Sokal, Robert R., and F. James Rohlf. 1995. *Biometry: The Principles and Practices of Statistics in*
29 *Biological Research*. 3rd edition. New York: W. H. Freeman.
- 30 Svensson, A., K. K. Andersen, M. Bigler, H. B. Clausen, D. Dahl-Jensen, S. M. Davies, S. J. Johnsen,
31 et al. 2008. "A 60 000 Year Greenland Stratigraphic Ice Core Chronology." *Climate of the*
32 *Past* 4 (1): 47–57.
- 33 Talamo, Sahra, Marie Soressi, Morgan Roussel, Mike Richards, and Jean-Jacques Hublin. 2012.
34 "A Radiocarbon Chronology for the Complete Middle to Upper Palaeolithic Transitional
35 Sequence of Les Cottés (France)." *Journal of Archaeological Science* 39 (1): 175–83.
36 doi:10.1016/j.jas.2011.09.019.
- 37 Teyssandier, Nicolas. 2003. "Les Débuts de l'Aurignacien En Europe. Discussion À Partir Des Sites
38 de Geissenklosterle, Willendorf II, Krems-Hundssteig et Bacho Kiro." Nanterre: Université
39 Paris X.
- 40 Vermeersch, Pierre M. 2005. "European Population Changes during Marine Isotope Stages 2 and
41 3." *Quaternary International*, Armageddon or entente? The demise of the European
42 Neandertals in Isotope Stage 3, 137 (1): 77–85. doi:10.1016/j.quaint.2004.11.021.
- 43 Verpoorte, A. 2005. "The First Modern Humans in Europe? A Closer Look at the Dating Evidence
44 from the Swabian Jura (Germany)." *Antiquity* 79 (304): 269–79.
45 doi:10.1017/S0003598X00114073.
- 46 Weber, Mara-Julia, Sonja B. Grimm, and Michael Baales. 2011. "Between Warm and Cold:
47 Impact of the Younger Dryas on Human Behavior in Central Europe." *Quaternary*
48 *International* 242 (2): 277–301. doi:10.1016/j.quaint.2010.12.002.
- 49 Wolff, E.W., J. Chappellaz, T. Blunier, S.O. Rasmussen, and A. Svensson. 2010. "Millennial-Scale
50 Variability during the Last Glacial: The Ice Core Record." *Quaternary Science Reviews* 29
51 (21–22): 2828–38. doi:10.1016/j.quascirev.2009.10.013.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Wu, Haibin, Joël Guiot, Simon Brewer, and Zhengtang Guo. 2007. "Climatic Changes in Eurasia
10 and Africa at the Last Glacial Maximum and Mid-Holocene: Reconstruction from Pollen
11 Data Using Inverse Vegetation Modelling." *Climate Dynamics* 29 (2-3): 211–29.
12 doi:10.1007/s00382-007-0231-3.
- 13 Zilhão, João. 2013. "Neandertal-Modern Human Contact in Western Eurasia: Issues of Dating,
14 Taxonomy, and Cultural Associations." In *Dynamics of Learning in Neanderthals and*
15 *Modern Humans: Cultural Perspectives*, edited by T Akazawa, Y Nishiaki, and K Aoki, 21–
16 57. Tokyo: Springer.
- 17 Zilhão, João, and Francesco d'Errico. 1999. "The Chronology and Taphonomy of the Earliest
18 Aurignacian and Its Implications for the Understanding of Neandertal Extinction." *Journal*
19 *of World Prehistory* 13 (1): 1–68. doi:10.1023/A:1022348410845.
- 20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 1 a) comparison of single grain OSL ages and calibrated 14C AMS ages from the site of Les Cottés (reproduced from Jacobs et al. 2015); b) an excerpt of the Bayesian age model for Les Cottés concerning the Protoaurignacian and Early Aurignacian levels (modified from Figure 4 of Talamo et al. 2012).
133x75mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 2 Top: climatic variability between 43 ka and 36 ka cal BP as recorded in the NGRIP ice, along with numbered Dansgaard-Oeschger Interstadials and the approximate temporal boundaries (light grey) of Heinrich Stadial 4 (H4), the latter derived from Sánchez Goñi and Harrison (2010). Superimposed is the internal propagated uncertainty (dark grey) calculated for the age determination of the Campanian Ignimbrite (CI) eruption according to de Vivo et al. (2001).

Bottom: Banks et al.'s (2013b) modeled temporal boundaries between Transitional Industries (TI: Uluzzian and Châtelperronian), the Protoaurignacian (PA), Early Aurignacian (EA), and Evolved Aurignacian (AII). The 68.2% and 95.4% probability intervals for the modeled boundaries between the archaeological cultures are indicated.

108x103mm (300 x 300 DPI)