

1 **Short Paper**

2 **TITLE:** Evidence for previously unknown mortuary practices in the Southwest of France (Fournol, Lot)
3 during the Gravettian.

4 **Authors:**

5 Sébastien Villotte, UMR5199 PACEA, CNRS, bâtiment B8, allée Geoffroy St Hilaire, 33615 Pessac cedex,
6 France. Sebastien.villotte@u-bordeaux.fr

7 Laurent Crépin, Unité Histoire Naturelle de l'Homme Préhistorique (HNHP), Muséum national
8 d'histoire naturelle, CNRS, UPVD, Institut de Paléontologie Humaine, 1 rue René Panhard, 75013 Paris,
9 France. laurent.crepin@mnhn.fr

10 Mathieu Rué, Paléotime, 38250 Villard-de-Lans, France and UMR 5140 CNRS, Archéologie des Sociétés
11 Méditerranéennes, Université Paul-Valéry, 34199 Montpellier, France, mathieu.rue@paleotime.fr

12 Emmy Bocaege, Skeletal Biology Research Centre, School of Anthropology and Conservation, Marlowe
13 Building, University of Kent, Canterbury, Kent CT2 7NR, United Kingdom, e.bocaege@kent.ac.uk

14 Mona Le Luyer, Skeletal Biology Research Centre, School of Anthropology and Conservation, Marlowe
15 Building, University of Kent, Canterbury, Kent, CT2 7NR, United Kingdom & UMR5199 PACEA,
16 Université de Bordeaux, bâtiment B8, allée Geoffroy St Hilaire, 33615 Pessac cedex, France. m.le-luyer@kent.ac.uk

18 Stéphane Madelaine, Musée National de Préhistoire, 1 rue du Musée, F-24620 Les Eyzies de Tayac &
19 Université Bordeaux, UMR 5199 (PACEA), bâtiment B8, allée Geoffroy Saint Hilaire, CS 50023, F-33615
20 Pessac cedex. stephane.madelaine@culture.gouv.fr

21 Jean-Baptiste Caverne. Association APRAGE (Approches pluridisciplinaires de recherche archéologique
22 du Grand-Est), 25000 Besançon, France. jean-baptiste.caverne@laposte.net

23 André Morala UMR 59199 PACEA, Bât. B2 Allée Geoffroy Saint Hilaire, 33615 PESSAC cedex, France.
24 andre.morala@orange.fr

25 **Corresponding author:**

26 Sébastien Villotte. UMR5199 PACEA, CNRS, bâtiment B8, allée Geoffroy St Hilaire, 33615 Pessac cedex,
27 France. Sebastien.villotte@u-bordeaux.fr

28

29 **Highlights:**

30 - Red ochre burials are characteristic of European Mid Upper Paleolithic (MUP)

31 - The situation seems different In the Southwest of France

32 - A site from this area with cut marks on MUP human remains is presented here

33 **Abstract:** European Mid Upper Paleolithic mortuary practices have been traditionally associated with
34 primary burials, ochre, body ornaments and grave goods. Recently, evidence of the post-mortem
35 treatment of skeletal remains, such as the displacement and removal of skeletal elements, has been
36 reported for the Gravettian period in the Southwest of France. Here, we present the preliminary results
37 of anthropological and taphonomic analyses of the human remains from the Gravettian site of Fournol
38 (Soturac, Lot, France). We describe the first evidence of the scalping and disarticulation of human
39 remains, a previously unknown post-mortem treatment in Gravettian contexts from the South West
40 of France.

41 **Keywords:** Mortuary practices; Mid Upper Paleolithic; post-mortem treatment, cut marks;
42 Cannibalism.

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55 **1 Introduction**

56 The European Mid Upper Paleolithic (MUP, ca. 30-20 000 BP or 34-24 000 calBP) is well known for the
57 so-called "red ochre burials" across Europe and is mostly (but not only) associated with the Gravettian
58 culture (Mussi, 2001; Henry-Gambier, 2008; Riel-Salvatore and Gravel-Miguel, 2013; Trinkaus et al.,
59 2014; Reynolds et al., 2017). Until recently, all the securely dated MUP burials which were sufficiently
60 preserved to allow interpretations of the mortuary practices have been considered as primary deposits
61 (Henry-Gambier, 2008). Post-mortem manipulations of the body (apart from pierced teeth, see
62 Vercoûtère et al., 2008) were not known for this period. However, recent discoveries and reanalyses
63 significantly modified this paradigm.


64 A recent reanalysis of the burial practices at Sunghir (Vladimir Oblast, Russia) indicated that an isolated
65 adult femur was intentionally placed within the grave of two immature individuals (Trinkaus et al.,
66 2014; Trinkaus and Buzhilova, 2018). The left forearm and hand of one of these individuals (Sunghir 2)
67 had been noted as missing during the excavation, implying a potential prehistoric human post-
68 depositional intervention (Trinkaus et al., 2014; Trinkaus and Buzhilova, 2018). At Paglicci (Apulia,
69 Italy), the left humerus of an adolescent buried with grave goods and ornaments (PAII) is missing
70 (Ronchitelli et al., 2015), suggesting a similar post-depositional intervention. At Pavlov I (Moravia,
71 Czech Republic), one pair of hands and two pairs of feet, disassociated from any distal long bones, have
72 been interpreted as indicators of cultural treatment of the individuals' remains (Trinkaus et al., 2010,
73 2017). At Buran-Kaya III (Crimea), fragmented human remains with cut marks were recently discovered
74 in several archeological layers associated with the Gravettian techno-complex (Prat et al., 2011;
75 Yanevich, 2014; Crépin et al. 2016). These were the first ever cut marks reported so far for MUP human
76 remains and have been interpreted as the result of a mortuary ritual (either specific mortuary practices
77 or a ritual cannibalism).

78 Apart from these examples from Central and Eastern Europe, most of the evidence for MUP post-
79 mortem manipulations comes from one region: the Southwest of France. At Pataud (Dordogne), the
80 Late Gravettian human remains from layer 2 (minimum number of individuals (MNI) of 6) had a
81 complex post-mortem history involving secondary deposits, displacement of cranial remains, and
82 removal of some long bones (Chiotti et al., 2013; Henry-Gambier et al., 2013a). At Cro-Magnon
83 (Dordogne), now securely dated to the Early Gravettian, the human remains (MNI=5) were likely not
84 buried, but instead deposited in the back of the shelter (Henry-Gambier, 2002; Henry-Gambier et al.,
85 2013a, 2013b). At Cussac (Dordogne), a Middle Gravettian decorated cave, human remains (MNI=6)
86 were not buried in the ground, but deposited in bear nests and some bones (including five crania) are
87 apparently missing (Henry-Gambier et al., 2013c; Jaubert et al., 2017; Peignaux et al., 2019). At Gargas
88 (Hautes-Pyrénées), several human remains, including an isolated juvenile mandible and adult femur
89 (both directly dated to ca. 25,000 ¹⁴C years BP) were recovered from the Gravettian layers close to

90 decorated walls (Foucher et al., 2019). In addition to this, some of the human remains from Gargas
91 were covered with a thin calcite layer, suggesting they were also deposited on the surface (Foucher et
92 al., 2019). Finally, at Vilhonneur (Charente), human remains (cranium, ribs, vertebrae, sacrum, left and
93 right os coxae, left and right femora and tibiae) of a young adult (directly dated to ca. 27,000 ¹⁴C years
94 BP) were found scattered on the floor of a decorated cave (Henry-Gambier et al., 2007).

95 To summarize, the Gravettian human remains from the Southwest of France seem to be associated to
96 mortuary practices that contrast greatly with the general idea of MUP primary burials where one, two
97 or three individuals were buried with ochre, body ornaments and grave goods (Mussi, 2001; Henry-
98 Gambier, 2008). Here we present the preliminary results of the anthropological study of Fournol
99 (Soturac, Lot, France) (Fig. 1). We provide evidence for a previously unknown Gravettian post-mortem
100 treatment in the Southwest of France.

101



102

103 Figure 1. Location of the site and schematic illustration of the excavation area. Data source of the
104 colored digital elevation model: SRTM, 1 Arc-Second Global. Authors: MR and JBC.

106 2 The Fournol rockshelter

107 Fournol is a relatively small rock shelter (ca. 10 meters long and 3 meters depth), open to the south
108 (Fig. 1) and developed into Coniacian limestone 162 m a.s.l. (above seal level). This prehistoric site was
109 likely known at the beginning of the last century, as in 1908, the Museum of Toulouse received a
110 number of excavated prehistoric remains from this site (Morala, pers. obs.). After World War II, the
111 site was occasionally excavated again, but the nature and location of the recovered material are
112 unknown (Morala, 1979, 1984, 2017). One of us (AM) did surface prospecting at Fournol in the 70's
113 and 80's. Typological and technological analyses of the lithic material found at the site identified two
114 chronocultures of the Upper Paleolithic: the Middle Gravettian and the Early Solutrean (Morala, 1979,
115 1984). An isolated human tooth was also discovered during this surface prospecting.

116 Between 2000 and 2005, clandestine excavations were carried out at the site. In 2012, at least a part
117 of the illegally excavated material was seized by the Gendarmerie of Villeneuve-sur-Lot. The
118 confiscated material (lithic artifacts and human and faunal remains) was then acquired by the *Musée*
119 *national de Préhistoire*. The lithic material can be typologically assigned to the Middle Gravettian
120 (Morala, 2015). A direct date was obtained from a frontal bone fragment displaying anthropic marks
121 (i.e. cut marks). The result of $24\ 820 \pm 220$ BP (Lyon-9985 SacA 32610) (Morala, 2015) falls within the
122 age range for the Middle Gravettian in the Southwest of France (e.g. Klaric, 2007).

123 From 2015 onwards, several excavation seasons took place, led by one of us (AM) and funded by the
124 Ministry of Culture and Communication. The degree of deterioration caused by the last clandestine
125 excavations was evaluated (Fig. 1). At the front of the shelter, a large trench (nearly 5m long to a depth
126 of 50-80 cm) had been dug by the looter(s) with the excavated sediment (including archaeological
127 material) thrown inside the shelter and retained by a dry stone wall (Morala, 2017).

128

129 Three main georcheological units have been identified so far within and in front of the rock shelter,
130 with a 15° to 5° slope to the outside. Unit 1 is formed by a dark brown, carbonated sandy loam matrix
131 with limestone clasts (gravels to blocks). This unit is several decimeters thick (possibly close to one
132 meter in some areas), and was highly disturbed, both by bioturbation and by the previous illicit
133 excavations. Faunal and human remains, as well as lithic material characteristic of the Middle
134 Gravettian, were found in this unit (Morala, 2017). The artifact assemblage seemed homogenous,
135 apart from a few modern artifacts (some glass shards and small metallic fragments) likely related to
136 the previous excavations, and no evidence of intermixture between archeological layers from different
137 cultures was found. Unit 2, below Unit 1, is composed of limestone clasts in a yellowish loamy sand
138 carbonated matrix, and was much thinner than Unit 1 (0 to 20 cm). Less archeological material (and

139 no human remains) were found in this unit. The analysis of the lithic material points toward one or
140 several Late Aurignacian occupation(s). Unit 3 corresponds to limestone clasts in a yellowish loamy
141 sand cemented matrix (breccia). This phase of calcitic cementation had affected different deposits
142 including a residual coating preserved against the wall of the shelter with Early Solutrean artifacts.

143

144 **3 Material and methods**

145 The human remains from the looter's collection and from the recent excavation campaigns were first
146 studied by Dominique Henry-Gambier, and then by four of us (SV, LC, EB, MLL). Here, we present the
147 results of the anthropological and taphonomical analyses of the human remains from the looter
148 collection and those discovered during the archeological field seasons of 2015, 2016 and 2017.

149 A total of 127 skeletal remains were identified as probably or certainly human (table 1). One was
150 discovered in 1986, 45 are from the looter's collection and the other remains were excavated during
151 the three campaigns from 2015 to 2017 (respectively 32, 29 and 20 skeletal remains). All of the remains
152 discovered during the excavations were found in the Unit 1, spread over 24m² (but 73% of them derive
153 from 9m²).

154 The majority of the human remains (110, 86.6%) are fragmented, while only 17 remains are complete
155 (including 15 teeth). The maximum preserved length is very small on average (26 mm) and inferior to
156 40 mm for 90% of the assemblage. Teeth are the most common elements (28.3%), followed by bones
157 from the hand (23.6%) and neurocranial fragments (18.9%) (Table 1).

158 A part of the human remains (21.3%, mostly teeth) was clearly identified as juvenile. The remaining
159 skeletal and dental elements (78.7%) were considered adult. However, it is worthwhile mentioning
160 that, considering the high degree of fragmentation of the bones, the skeletal maturity cannot be
161 ascertained with complete confidence for a significant part of the remains. It is thus possible that the
162 percentage of adult remains is actually inflated.

163 Because of the small size of the fragments, systematic refitting, probable re-association and exclusion
164 was attempted only for the teeth. At least six individuals were identified from the dental remains,
165 including three juveniles and three adults. Individuals were identified based on the presence of
166 duplicate elements, dental morphology, dental developmental stages and wear patterns.

167 We did not attempt to assess the sex of the individuals or the age at death of the adult bone fragments
168 due to the very important degree of fragmentation. We did not attempt to estimate the age-at-death
169 of the adults based on the degree of tooth wear due to the many factors that can influence this
170 phenomenon. The age-at-death of the three identified juveniles were estimated to be 4-8, 6-10 and 8-
171 12 years, based on dental developmental stages (AlQahtani et al. 2010).

Skeletal element	Adult		Juvenile		Total		
	N	N with cut marks	N	N with cut marks	N	N with cut marks	% with cut marks
Skull (without mandible)	23	12	2	1	25	13	52.0%
Mandible	2	2	0	0	2	2	100.0%
Isolated tooth	16	1	20	1	36	2	5.6%
Vertebra	7	0	0	0	7	0	0.0%
Rib	5	0	0	0	5	0	0.0%
Clavicle	5	3	2	1	7	4	57.1%
Scapula	2	2	0	0	2	2	100.0%
Radius	0	0	1	1	1	1	100.0%
Ulna	2	0	0	0	2	0	0.0%
Metacarpal	6	2	0	0	6	2	33.3%
Hand phalanx	23	3	1	0	24	3	12.5%
Femur	4	1	0	0	4	1	25.0%
Tibia	3	0	0	0	3	0	0.0%
Fibula	1	0	1	0	2	0	0.0%
Pedal phalanx	1	0	0	0	1	0	0.0%
Total	100	26	27	4	127	30	23.6%

173 Table 1. Summary of human remains from Fournol and number of modified elements. N: Number of
174 fragments.

176 The taphonomic analysis of the anthropological sample was carried out visually, using a magnifying
177 glass and a light microscope (x10 - x60). Taphonomic modifications were recorded and tentatively
178 linked to specific taphonomic processes and agents following Binford, (1981), Potts and Shipman
179 (1981), Behrensmeyer et al. (1986), Reitz and Wing (1999), and Fernández-Jalvo and Andrews (2016).
180 In this article, we focus on the peri-mortem anthropic modifications such as cut marks or bone
181 breakage. Fracture morphologies (fracture outline, angle, edge and the extent of survivorship of the
182 shaft circumference of long bones) were recorded following Villa and Mahieu (1991). Fractures with
183 smooth textures, an oblique fracture angle and a curved or spiral outline usually occur on green bone
184 (e.g. Binford, 1981; Villa and Mahieu, 1991; Fernández-Jalvo and Andrews, 2016). The morphological
185 properties of the linear marks (trajectory of the groove, its orientation relative to the axis of the bone,
186 its position, and the section profile, symmetry, length and depth of the groove), as well as the presence
187 or absence of structural features inside (internal microstriations) or close to (shoulder effect) the
188 grooves were recorded following Bello and Soligo (2008), Domínguez-Rodrigo et al. (2009) and
189 Fernández-Jalvo and Andrews (2016). Many organic and inorganic processes can produce linear marks
190 on bones, the main problem being the possible confusion between superficial traces on bone produced
191 by trampling and those made during butchering. Some trampling marks can show similarities to
192 butchery marks (e.g. Andrews and Cook, 1985; Behrensmeyer et al., 1986), but they can usually be

193 differentiated when the following discriminating variables are applied jointly (e.g. Olsen and Shipman,
194 1988; Domínguez-Rodrigo et al., 2009):

195 - cut marks are usually deeper and longer than trampling marks;

196 - cut marks tend to have more frequently than trampling marks an asymmetrical V-shaped cross
197 section;

198 - the groove trajectory of cut marks is straight most of the time whereas trampling marks tend to be
199 sinuous;


200 - the shoulder effect tends to be more common in cut marks than in trampling marks.

201 Trampling marks also tend to be randomly placed whereas cut marks occur preferentially in
202 anatomically meaningful locations (e.g. Binford, 1981; Andrews and Cook, 1985; Olsen and Shipman,
203 1988; Lyman, 1994; Reitz and Wing, 1999; Fernández-Jalvo and Andrews, 2016). The superimposition
204 and succession of marks caused by different post-depositional processes and agents (humans, plant
205 roots, trampling, calcitic concretion, etc.) were taken into account in order to attest the antiquity of
206 the anthropic marks analyzed here. Only unequivocal ancient evidence of human-induced linear marks
207 were considered for the present study.

208 **4 Results**

209 At least 30 skeletal elements (23.6 % of the assemblage) displayed striations very likely made with lithic
210 tools (Table 1). When isolated teeth are excluded, this percentage increases to 30.8% of the
211 assemblage (28/91). Interestingly, no clear evidence of other human induced modifications, such as
212 peri-mortem breakage, were observed on the human remains.

213 Cut marks were recorded on 26 adult skeletal remains (26.0% of the adult assemblage), the vast
214 majority of these were found on the cranial remains, the bones of the pectoral girdle and the hand.
215 Half of the adult neurocranial fragments exhibit cut marks. For example, the frontal remains (RH-084)
216 showed several groups of parallel marks with microstriations and shoulder effects (Fig. 2). They are
217 quite short (7-10 mm) and superficial, presenting the same patina as the bone and mostly covered by
218 calcite concretion. A right temporal bone fragment (RH-004), showed several very fine and short (1-3
219 mm) and longer (5-9 mm) cut marks in three different directions around the mandibular fossa.




220 220

221 Figure 2. Cut marks on the external surface of a human frontal fragment (RH-084) from Fournol (scale:
 222 10 mm). From top to bottom: picture of the external surface of the fragment, sketch with cut marks
 223 highlighted in red, and close-up view (not to scale) of the framed area. Photographs: AM and Maryelle
 224 Bessou, sketch: LC.

225 225

226 One of the best preserved bones in the sample is a right corpus and ramus of an adult mandible (RH-
 227 001) with more than twenty cut marks, located on both surfaces and ranging from 2 to 15 mm (Fig. 3).
 228 The majority of these cuts are on the ramus, but some are also present on the external surface of the
 229 body. They are almost all parallel, continuous, more or less deep and clear, and arranged in small
 230 groups. Most of the marks seem to be located on the attachment sites of the lateral pterygoid muscle,
 231 the capsule, and the associated ligaments.

232 232



233 233

234 Figure 3. Cut marks on the external (left) and internal (right) surface of a human hemi-mandible (RH-
 235 001) from Fournol (scale: 10 mm). From top to bottom: pictures of the fragment, sketches with cut
 236 marks highlighted in red, and close-up views (not to scale) of the framed areas. Photographs: AM and
 237 Maryelle Bessou, sketches: LC and SV.


238 238

239 One of the two teeth displaying cut marks, the first right premolar (RH-002), refits with the mandible
 240 RH-001. The oblique linear marks are visible on the vestibular surface of the crown in two locations
 241 (Fig. 4).

242

243

244



245


246 Figure 4. Cut marks on the vestibular aspect of a human premolar (RH-002) from Fournol (scale: 10
 247 mm). Top: picture of the tooth and sketch with cut marks highlighted in red. Bottom: close-up view
 248 (not to scale) of the framed area. Photographs: Maryelle Bessou, sketch: VL.

249249

250 Three adult clavicular fragments display cut marks on their diaphyses. For instance, RH-012 (left
 251 clavicle) shows four fine, short and oblique cut marks on its inferior surface. Its anterior surface
 252 presents many more anthropic marks with ca. 16 very short (3-4 mm), deep and parallel marks (with
 253 shoulder effects and microstriations) along the diaphysis (Fig. 5). They are covered by reddish and/or
 254 calcified sediment. These incisions are located at the attachment site of the deltoid muscle. Cut marks
 255 on the other adult clavicular fragments are also short and parallel, done transversally or obliquely to
 256 the long axis of the bones on one or two directions maximum.

257257

258258



259259

260 Figure 5. Cut marks on the inferior and anterior surfaces of a human left clavicle (RH-012) from Fournol
 261 (scale: 10 mm). From top to bottom: picture of the inferior surface of the fragment, sketch with cut
 262 marks highlighted in red, and close-up view (not to scale) of the framed area. Photographs: AM, sketch:
 263 LC.

264 Human modifications are also visible on three hand phalanges and two metacarpal fragments. Cut
 265 marks are principally located on the palmar surface except for one intermediate phalanx (RH-017),
 266 where they were found on one side (Fig. 6). These marks are short, deep and parallel, grouped by two
 267 or three at maximum, and appear transversally to the long axis of the bone.


268268

269269

270270

271271

272272



273273

274 Figure 6. Cut marks on the palmar and lateral surfaces of a human phalanx (RH-017) from Fournol
 275 (scale: 10 mm). Top: palmar view, bottom: lateral view. From right to left: picture of the surface of the
 276 fragment, sketch with cut marks highlighted in red, and close-up view (not to scale) of the framed area.
 277 Photographs: AM, sketch: LC.

278278

279 Only four elements (one neurocranial fragment, one molar, one radial fragment and one clavicular
 280 fragment) displaying cut marks are from immature individual(s). On the radial (RH-020) and right
 281 clavicular (RH-015) fragments, the cut marks seem to correspond to one single event characterized by
 282 two to four short (2 to 5 mm long), fine and parallel striations appearing transversally to the long axis
 283 of the bone. The cut marks on the molar (RH-119) are short, sub-horizontal, and located close to the
 284 cervix on the mesio-vestibular aspect of the crown.

285 5 Discussions and conclusions

286 Isolated human remains are known from a variety of Gravettian sites, both with and without formal
 287 burials (e.g. Mallegni and Palma di Cesnola, 1994; Trinkaus et al. 2010, 2014; Foucher et al., 2019). The
 288 taphonomic histories of most of these remains are unclear, but their presence at sites with ritual
 289 burials (e.g. Paglicci, Dolní Věstonice, Sungir) has raised questions as to why the remains of some but

290 not all people were formally buried. In the Southwest of France, the situation is quite different: formal
291 Gravettian burials are unknown and there is substantial evidence for the depositing of the body on
292 rather than in the ground as well as the displacement of body parts and the removal of long bones and
293 crania (Henry-Gambier et al., 2013a, 2013c; Foucher et al. 2019). Cut marks on human remains have
294 not been described previously for this time period in this region.

295 The anthropogenic nature of the marks seen at Fournol is attested by the frequency of surfaces
296 displaying several parallel incisions as well as the morphology and the anatomically meaningful
297 location of the marks. One of the remains with anthropogenic marks has been directly dated to the
298 Middle Gravettian, which is consistent with the typotechnological characterization of the lithic
299 material both from the looters' collection and Unit 1. Thus, despite disturbances, there are strong
300 arguments to consider all the human remains discovered so far as a chronologically homogenous
301 assemblage dated to the Middle Gravettian. Future work will involve obtaining more direct 14C dates
302 for the individuals represented in the assemblage.

303 The interpretation of the anthropic marks recorded on the human skeletal assemblage is hindered by
304 the small size of the fragments and the difficulty in attributing the bones to separate individuals.
305 However, it is likely that most of the marks on the neurocranial fragments are associated with skinning,
306 because this would involve repeated strokes, resulting in a series of striations. It is likely that the right
307 temporal bone RH-004 and the condylar process of the mandible RH-001 belong to the same individual
308 and the marks on these elements can be tentatively interpreted as the result of the disarticulation of
309 the temporomandibular joint. Labial cut marks on teeth are relatively frequent in the fossil record and
310 have been associated to the so-called "stuff and cut" behavior. However, these marks are
311 overwhelmingly found on in very large quantities on anterior teeth and spread throughout the labial
312 aspect of the crown (e.g. Fox and Pérez-Pérez, 1994; Volpato et al., 2012), whereas at Fournol, the cut
313 marks are visible on the vestibular aspect of a premolar and a molar, on a small surface relatively close
314 to the cervix. By analogy with zooarcheological studies (e.g. Soulier and Mallye, 2012; Mallye et al.,
315 2013), these marks can be tentatively associated with the skinning of the head. Finally, the cut marks
316 on the pectoral girdle and the phalanges of the hand seem to be mainly related to disarticulation of
317 joints.

318 There are at least two (not mutually exclusive, see for instance Belcastro et al., 2010) scenarios to
319 account for the human bone assemblage discovered so far at Fournol: cannibalism, or/and specific
320 mortuary rites. The frequency of human remains with cut marks, which is relatively high (ca. 24%) at
321 Fournol, is in the range of variation of what is seen in assemblages for which cannibalism has been
322 considered as probable (Table 2). However, cannibalism was also inferred from other anthropic

323 modifications identified in these sites, including scrape marks, tooth marks, destruction of vertebral
 324 bodies and long bone extremities, etc. for which evidence is currently lacking at Fournol. To infer the
 325 practice of cannibalism solely based on the relative high frequency of cut marks seen in this assemblage
 326 is therefore highly problematic. Moreover, the presence of residual red pigment on some human
 327 bones displaying cut marks (e.g. Fig. 3 and 5) may indicate a complex post-mortem treatment of the
 328 bodies involving dismemberment, skinning and defleshing of the cadaver, as well as the use of
 329 pigments. The (limited) skeletal representation of the current assemblage from Fournol is likely
 330 related, at least in part, to previous looting practices, as part of the looted material may have been
 331 sold or kept in personal collections. However, it might also be possible that the very partial skeletal
 332 representation (a minimum number of individuals of six) and the overrepresentation of metacarpals
 333 and manual phalanges indicates a specific focus on some parts of the body, namely the head and the
 334 hands. Interestingly, most of the hand prints and stencils in European cave art, some characterized by
 335 missing or partial fingers, are thought to be Gravettian (e.g. Jaubert 2008; Lorblanchet, 2010; but see
 336 Pettitt et al., 2015). The importance of hands and fingers during the MUP is also illustrated by the
 337 isolated pair of hands at Pavlov I (Trinkaus et al., 2010, 2017) and the discovery of two isolated manual
 338 phalanges close to a boomerang at Obłazowa Cave (Valde-Nowak, 2009).

Site	Country	Period	Frequency of bones with cut marks	Main other types of marks						Reference
				Scr.	Fr.	Per.	Peel.	Bur.	Tooth	
Les Pradelles	France	Late Middle Paleolithic	38%	X	X	X			X	Mussini 2011
Goyet	Belgium	Late Middle Paleolithic	32%		X	X	X?		X?	Rougier et al. 2016
Gough's Cave	England	Late Upper Paleolithic	65%	X	X	X	X		X	Bello et al., 2015
La grotte des Perrats	France	Mesolithic	42%	X	X	X	X		X	Boulestin, 1998
Herxheim	Germany	Neolithic	22%		X	X	X		X	Boulestin et al., 2009
Mancos 5MTUMR- 2346	U.S.A.	Pueblo III	12%	X	X	X	X	X	X	White, 1992

339 Table 2. Examples of archeological sites where cannibalism has been considered as probable. Scr.:
 340 Scrape-marks; Fr.: Fractures on fresh bones; Per.: Percussion marks; Peel.: Peeling; Bur.: Burning
 341 damage; Tooth: Human tooth marks.

342 Further analyses, as well as increasing the sample size of the assemblage through continued
343 excavation, are required in order to identify the most likely scenario resulting in the observed cut
344 marks. Microscopic studies will be carried out in order to better characterize the direction and the
345 movement of the marks, and will help to get a better understanding of the practices resulting in these
346 marks. The systematic study of ochre distribution on the skeletal remains will allow a discussion as to
347 whether the coloration was carried out on disarticulated and defleshed bones. Finally, comparative
348 taphonomic analysis of the faunal and human remains (e.g. Mussini, 2011; Prat et al., 2011; Rougier et
349 al., 2016) may allow the identification of a specific mortuary treatment of the human cadavers at this
350 site. To conclude, the evidence from Fournol, although limited in scope, suggests that the treatment
351 of human bodies during the MUP was much more diversified than previously thought, and that
352 Gravettian mortuary practices in the Southwest of France clearly deviate from the main pattern
353 observed elsewhere, i.e. the primary burials associating one or several individuals, ochre, body
354 ornaments and grave goods.

355355

356 **6 Acknowledgments**

357 SV thanks Dominique Henry-Gambier (UMR 5199 PACEA, Université de Bordeaux - CNRS) for giving
358 him the opportunity to study these fossils. The authors thank the curators of the MNP who allowed
359 access to a part of the material, Jean-Paul Bayle, the owner of the site, for granting the right to excavate
360 and study the material, and the *Service Régional d'Archéologie* of Occitanie. The authors also thank
361 the three reviewers for their useful comments, and Maryelle Bessou (UMR 5199 PACEA, Université de
362 Bordeaux – CNRS) for the close-up images of the remains.

363 **7 Funding**

364 This work was supported by the Agence Nationale de la Recherche (ANR) GRAVETT'OS (grant number
365 ANR-15-CE-0004). EB's work was supported by a British Academy Postdoctoral Fellowship. MLL's was
366 supported by a Marie Skłodowska-Curie Individual Fellowship (grant agreement n°796499). Excavation
367 campaigns at Fournol are funded by the French Ministry of Culture and Communication.

368368

369 **8 References cited**

- 370 AlQahtani, S.J., Hector, M.P., Liversidge, H.M., 2010. Brief communication: The London atlas of
371 human tooth development and eruption. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*. 142,481–490.
- 372 Andrews, P., Cook, J., 1985. Natural modifications to bones in a temperate setting. *Man*, 675–691.

- 373 Behrensmeyer A.K., Gordon, K.D., Yanagi, G.T., 1986. Trampling as a cause of bone surface damage
374 and pseudo-cutmarks. *Nature*. 319, 768-771.
- 375 Belcastro, M.G., Condemi, S., Mariotti, V., 2010. Funerary practices of the Iberomaurusian population
376 of Taforalt (Tafoughalt, Morocco, 11–12,000 BP): the case of Grave XII. *Journal of Human Evolution*
377 58, 522–532.
- 378 Bello, S.M., Saladié, P., Cáceres, I., Rodríguez-Hidalgo, A., Parfitt, S.A., 2015. Upper Palaeolithic
379 ritualistic cannibalism at Gough’s Cave (Somerset, UK): The human remains from head to toe. *Journal*
380 *of Human Evolution*. 82, 170–189.
- 381 Bello, S.M., Soligo, C., 2008. A new method for the quantitative analysis of cutmark
382 micromorphology. *Journal of Archaeological Science*. 35 (6), 1542-1552
- 383 Binford, L.R., 1981. *Bones. Ancient Men and Modern Myths*. Academic Press, New-York, 320 p..
- 384 Boulestin, B., 1999. Approche taphonomique des restes humains. Le cas des Mésolithiques de la
385 grotte des Perrats et le problème du cannibalisme en Préhistoire récente européenne. *Archaeopress*,
386 Oxford.
- 387 Boulestin, B., Zeeb-Lanz, A., Jeunesse, C., Haack, F., Arbogast, R.-M., Denaire, A., 2009. Mass
388 cannibalism in the linear pottery culture at Herxheim (Palatinate, Germany). *Antiquity*. 83, 968–982.
- 389 Chiotti, Laurent, Nespoulet, Roland, Henry-Gambier, D., 2013. Une nouvelle fouille à l’abri Pataud. In:
390 Nespoulet, R., Chiotti, L., Henry-Gambier, D. (Eds.), *Le Gravettien Final de l’abri Pataud (Dordogne,*
391 *France). Fouilles et Études 2005-2009*. *Archaeopress, BAR International Series*, 2458, Oxford, pp. 13–
392 21.
- 393 Crépin, L., Prat, S., Péan, S., Yanevich, A., 2016. Contribution of taphonomy of human and faunal
394 remains to the understanding of mortuary practices of Gravettians from far south-eastern Europe :
395 Level 6-1 of Buran-Kaya III (Crimea). In: *Abstract Book. ICAZ Taphonomy Working Group. Taphonomy*
396 *Quatenaire : Du Général Au Particulier, 7-10 Septembre 2016*. Brugal J.P., Denys C., p. 11.
- 397 Domínguez-Rodrigo, M., de Juana, S., Galán, A.B., Rodríguez, M., 2009. A new protocol to
398 differentiate trampling marks from butchery cut marks. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 36, 2643–
399 2654.
- 400 Fernández-Jalvo, Y., Andrews, P., 2016. *Atlas of Taphonomic Identification (Vertebrate Paleobiology*
401 *and Palaeanthropology Series)*. Springer.
- 402 Foucher, P., San Juan-Foucher, C., Villotte, S., Bayle, P., Vercoutère, C., Ferrier, C., 2019. Les vestiges
403 humains gravettiens de la grotte de Gargas (Aventignan, France): datations 14C AMS directes et
404 contexte chrono-culturel. *Bulletin de la Société Préhistorique Française* 116, 29–39.
- 405 Fox, C.L., Pérez-Pérez, A., 1994. Cutmarks and post-mortem striations in fossil human teeth. *Human*
406 *Evolution* 9, 165–172.
- 407

- 408 Henry-Gambier, D., 2002. Les fossiles de Cro-Magnon (Les eyzies-de-Tayac, Dordogne) : nouvelles
 409 données sur leur position chronologique et leur attribution culturelle. *Bulletins et Mémoires de la*
 410 *Société d'Anthropologie de Paris*. n.s., 14, 89–112.
- 411 Henry-Gambier, D., 2008. Comportement des populations d'Europe au Gravettien : Pratiques
 412 funéraires et interprétations. *Paleo*. 20, 399–438.
- 413 Henry-Gambier, D., Beauval, C., Airvaux, J., Aujoulat, N., Baratin, J.F., Buisson-Catil, J., 2007. New
 414 hominid remains associated with gravettian parietal art (Les Garennes, Vilhonneur, France). *Journal*
 415 *of Human Evolution*. 53, 747–750.
- 416 Henry-Gambier, D., Villotte, S., Beauval, C., Brůžek, J., Grimaud-Hervé, D., 2013a. Les vestiges
 417 humains : un assemblage original. In: Nespoulet, R., Chiotti, L., Henry-Gambier, D. (Eds.), *Le*
 418 *Gravettien Final de l'abri Pataud (Dordogne, France). Fouilles et Études 2005-2009*. Archaeopress,
 419 *BAR International Series*, 2458, Oxford, pp. 135–177.
- 420 Henry-Gambier, D., Nespoulet, R., Chiotti, L., 2013b. An Early Gravettian cultural attribution for the
 421 human fossils from the Cro-Magnon rock shelter (Les Eyzies-de-Tayac, Dordogne). *Paleo*. 24, 121–
 422 138.
- 423 Henry-Gambier, D., Courtaud, P., Duday, H., Dutailly, B., Villotte, S., Deguilloux, M.-F., Pémonge, M.-
 424 H., Aujoulat, N., Delluc, M., Fourment, N., Jaubert, J., 2013c. Grotte de Cussac (Le Buisson-de-
 425 Cadouin, Dordogne) : un exemple de comportement original pour le Gravettien. In: Jaubert, J.,
 426 Fourment, N., Depaepe, P. (Eds.), *Transitions, Ruptures et Continuité En Préhistoire : XXVIIe Congrès*
 427 *Préhistorique de France, Bordeaux - Les Eyzies 31 Mai-5 Juin 2010*. Vol. 1. Société Préhistorique
 428 Française, Paris, pp. 169–182.
- 429 Jaubert, J., 2008. L'« art » pariétal gravettien en France : éléments pour un bilan chronologique.
 430 *Paléo* 20, 439–474.
- 431 Jaubert, J., Genty, D., Valladas, H., Camus, H., Courtaud, P., Ferrier, C., Feruglio, V., Fourment, N.,
 432 Konik, S., Villotte, S., Bourdier, C., Costamagno, S., Delluc, M., Goutas, N., Katnecker, É., Klaric, L.,
 433 Langlais, M., Ledoux, L., Maksud, F., O'Farrell, M., Mallye, J.-B., Pierre, M., Pons-Branchu, E., Régner,
 434 É., Théry-Parisot, I., 2017. The chronology of human and animal presence in the decorated and
 435 sepulchral cave of Cussac (France). *Quaternary International*. 432, 5–24.
- 436 Klaric, L., 2007. Regional groups in the European Middle Gravettian: a reconsideration of the Rayssian
 437 technology. *Antiquity*. 81, 176–190.
- 438 Lorblanchet, M., 2010. *Art Pariétal. Grottes ornées du Quercy*. Editions Rouergue, Parc-Saint-Joseph.
- 439 Lyman, R.L., 1994. *Vertebrate taphonomy*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- 440 Mallegni, F., Palma di Cesnola, A., 1994. Les restes humains découverts dans les niveaux gravettiens
 441 de la grotte Paglicci (Rignano Garganico, Pouilles, Italie). *anthropologie (Brno)* 32, 45–57.
- 442 Mallye, J.-B., Soulier, M.-C., Laroulandie, V., 2013. Large carnivores and small games use from the
 443 Early Aurignacian of La Quina aval (Charente, France) (V. Dujardin excavations). *Paleo* 24, 235–248.
- 444 Morala, A., 1979. Soturac (Lot) - Les Ardailloux et Couvert. *Gallia Préhistoire*. 22, 648–649.

- 445 Morala, A., 1984. Périgordien et Aurignacien en Haut-Agenais : Etude d'ensembles lithiques. Archives
446 d'Ecologie Préhistorique, Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales. Tome 7, Toulouse.
- 447 Morala, A., 2015. Abri de Fournol, Soturac, Lot. *La Revue des Musées de France*. 2, 56.
- 448 Morala, A., 2017. Soturac. Fournol (Lot). Bilan scientifique 2015 - Direction Régionale des Affaires
449 Culturelles Midi-Pyrénées, Service Régional de l'Archéologie et de la Connaissance du Patrimoine.
450 137–138.
- 451 Mussi, M., 2001. *Earliest Italy: an overview of the Italian Paleolithic and Mesolithic*. Kluwer Academic
452 Publishers, New York.
- 453 Mussini, C., 2011. Les restes humains moustériens des Pradelles (Marillac-le-Franc, Charente,
454 France): étude morphométrique et réflexions sur un aspect comportemental des Néandertaliens.
455 Université de Bordeaux.
- 456 Peignaux, C., Kacki, S., Guyomarc'h, P., Schotsmans, E.M.J., Villotte S., 2019. New Anthropological
457 Data from Cussac Cave (Gravettian, Dordogne, France): In Situ and Virtual Analyses of Locus 3.
458 *Comptes Rendus Palevol* 18 (4), 455–64.
- 459 Olsen, S.L., Shipman, P., 1988. Surface modification to bone: trampling versus butchery. *Journal of*
460 *Archaeological Science*. 15 (5), 535-553.
- 461 Pettitt, P.B., García-Diez, M., Hoffmann, D., Maximiano Castillejo, A., Ontañón-Peredo, R., Pike, A.,
462 Zilhão, J., 2015. Are hand stencils in European cave art older than we think? An evaluation of the
463 existing data and their potential implications., in: Bueno-Ramírez, P., Bahn, P. (Eds.), *Prehistoric Art*
464 *as Prehistoric Culture : Studies in Honour of Professor Rodrigo de Balbín-Behrmann.*, Archaeopress
465 Archaeology. Archaeopress, Oxford, pp. 31–43.
- 466 Potts, R.B., Shipman, P., 1981. Cutmarks made by stone tools on bones from olduvai Gorge, Tanzania.
467 *Nature*. 291, 577-580.
- 468 Prat, S., Péan, S.C., Crépin, L., Drucker, D.G., Puaud, S.J., Valladas, H., Lázničková-Galetová, M., van
469 der Plicht, J., Yanevich, A., 2011. The Oldest Anatomically Modern Humans from Far Southeast
470 Europe: Direct Dating, Culture and Behavior. *PLOS ONE*. 6, e20834.
- 471 Reitz, E.J., Wing, E.S., 1999. *Zooarchaeology*. Cambridge University Press.
- 472 Reynolds, N., Dinnis, R., Bessudnov, A.A., Devière, T., Higham, T., 2017. The Kostënki 18 child burial
473 and the cultural and funerary landscape of Mid Upper Palaeolithic European Russia. *Antiquity*. 91,
474 1435–1450.
- 475 Riel-Salvatore, J., Gravel-Miguel, C., 2013. Upper Palaeolithic Mortuary Practices in Eurasia: A Critical
476 Look at the Burial Record. In: Tarlow, S., Nilsson Stutz, L. (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the*
477 *Archaeology of Death and Burial*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 303–347.
- 478 Ronchitelli, A., Mugnaini, S., Arrighi, S., Atrei, A., Capecchi, G., Giamello, M., Longo, L., Marchettini,
479 N., Viti, C., Moroni, A., 2015. When technology joins symbolic behaviour: the Gravettian burials at
480 grotta Paglicci (Rignano Garganico–Foggia–Southern Italy). *Quaternary International* 359, 423–441.

481 Rougier, H., Crevecoeur, I., Beauval, C., Posth, C., Flas, D., Wißing, C., Furtwängler, A., Germonpré,
482 M., Gómez-Olivencia, A., Semal, P., van der Plicht, J., Bocherens, H., Krause, J., 2016. Neandertal
483 cannibalism and Neandertal bones used as tools in Northern Europe. *Scientific Reports*. 6, 29005.

484 Soulier, M.-C., Mallye, J.-B., 2012. Hominid subsistence strategies in the South-West of France: A new
485 look at the early Upper Palaeolithic faunal material from Roc-de-Combe (Lot, France). *Quaternary*
486 *International* 252, 99–108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2011.03.053>

487 Trinkaus, E., Buzhilova, A.P., 2018. Diversity and differential disposal of the dead at Sunghir.
488 *Antiquity*. 92, 7–21.

489 Trinkaus, E., Buzhilova, A.P., Mednikova, M.B., Dobrovolskaya, M.V., 2014. *The People of Sunghir.*
490 *Burials, Bodies, and Behavior in the Earlier Upper Paleolithic.* Oxford University Press, New York.

491 Trinkaus, E., Svoboda, J.A., Wojtal, P., Fišáková, M.N., Wilczyński, J., 2010. Human remains from the
492 Moravian Gravettian: morphology and taphonomy of additional elements from Dolní Věstonice II and
493 Pavlov I. *International Journal of Osteoarchaeology*. 20, 645–669.

494 Trinkaus, E., Wojtal, P., Wilczyński, J., Sázelová, S., Svoboda, J., 2017. Palmar, Patellar, and Pedal
495 Human Remains from Pavlov. *PaleoAnthropology*. 73–101.

496 Valde-Nowak, P., 2009. Obłazowa and Hłomcza: Two Paleolithic Sites in the North Carpathians
497 Province of Southern Poland, in: Adams, B., Blades, B.S. (Eds.), *Lithic Materials and Paleolithic Societies.*
498 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, pp. 196–207.



499 Vercoutère, C., Giacobini, G., Patou-Mathis, M., 2008. Une dent humaine perforée découverte en
500 contexte Gravettien ancien à l’abri Pataud (Dordogne, France). *Paléolithique supérieur*. 112, 273–
501 283.


502 Villa, P., Mahieu, E., 1991. Breakage patterns of human long bones. *Journal of Human Evolution*. 21,
503 27–48.


504 Volpato, V., Macchiarelli, R., Guatelli-Steinberg, D., Fiore, I., Bondioli, L., Frayer, D.W., 2012. Hand to
505 mouth in a neandertal: right-handedness in Regourdou 1. *PLoS One* 7, e43949–e43949.


506 White, D., 1992. *Prehistoric Cannibalism at Mancos 5MTUMR-2346.* Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton.


507 Yanevich, A., 2014. Les occupations gravettiennes de Buran-Kaya III (Crimée) : contexte
508 archéologique. *Hommes et environnements au Paléolithique supérieur en Ukraine continentale et en*
509 *Crimée*. 118, 554–566.















Skeletal element	Adult		Juvenile		N	Total		% with cut marks
	N	N with cut marks	N	N with cut marks		N with cut marks		
Skull (without mandible)	23	12	2	1	25	13	52.0%	
Mandible	2	2	0	0	2	2	100.0%	
Isolated tooth	16	1	20	1	36	2	5.6%	
Vertebra	7	0	0	0	7	0	0.0%	
Rib	5	0	0	0	5	0	0.0%	
Clavicle	5	3	2	1	7	4	57.1%	
Scapula	2	2	0	0	2	2	100.0%	
Radius	0	0	1	1	1	1	100.0%	
Ulna	2	0	0	0	2	0	0.0%	
Metacarpal	6	2	0	0	6	2	33.3%	
Hand phalanx	23	3	1	0	24	3	12.5%	
Femur	4	1	0	0	4	1	25.0%	
Tibia	3	0	0	0	3	0	0.0%	
Fibula	1	0	1	0	2	0	0.0%	
Pedal phalanx	1	0	0	0	1	0	0.0%	
Total	100	26	27	4	127	30	23.6%	

Table 1. Summary of human remains from Fournol and number of modified elements. N: Number of fragments.

Site	Country	Period	Frequency of bones with cut marks	Main other types of marks						Reference
				Scr.	Fr.	Per.	Peel.	Bur.	Tooth	
Les Pradelles	France	Late Middle Paleolithic	38%	X	X	X			X	Mussini 2011
Goyet	Belgium	Late Middle Paleolithic	32%		X	X	X?		X?	Rougier et al. 2016
Gough's Cave	England	Late Upper Paleolithic	65%	X	X	X	X		X	Bello et al., 2015
La grotte des Perrats	France	Mesolithic	42%	X	X	X	X		X	Boulestin, 1998
Herxheim	Germany	Neolithic	22%		X	X	X		X	Boulestin et al., 2009
Mancos 5MTUMR-2346	U.S.A.	Pueblo III	12%	X	X	X	X	X	X	White, 1992

Table 2. Examples of archeological sites where cannibalism has been considered as probable. Scr.: Scrape-marks; Fr.: Fractures on fresh bones; Per.: Percussion marks; Peel.: Peeling; Bur.: Burning damage; Tooth: Human tooth marks