Introduction

The handaxe is an iconic object in European prehistory. The first discovery (a flint handaxe) was in 1679 in the Grays Inn Road in central London, followed in the late 18th century by the pioneering work of John Frere at Hoxne (Suffolk, eastern England, Fig. 1; Frere, 1800). In the next century, Jacques Boucher de Perthes (1847) made important discoveries of handaxes in the gravels of the River Somme around Abbeville (northern France). His work inspired a distinguished group of British visitors, namely Hugh Falconer, Joseph Prestwich, John Evans and John Lubbock (later Lord Avebury), whom he convinced that these artefacts were manufactured by primitive humans who lived at the time when the gravels were being deposited (see Bridgland and White, this issue). This established an Anglo-French collaboration that continues to this day and is reflected in this Special Issue. Key contributions in the 19th and 20th centuries to the study and understanding of handaxes were made on both sides of the English Channel. In France, Gabriel de Mortillet (1883) was the first to establish nomenclature for these characteristic implements, followed by Victor Commont (1906, 1908), who established the importance of St Acheul, in the Somme valley, eventually the type locality for the handaxe industries. Subsequent work by François Bordes (1961) erected an influential typological classification of handaxe varieties. In England (see Bridgland and White, this issue), Derek Roe (1968a, 1968b) made an exhaustive study of handaxe occurrences and variability, while John Wymer (1968, 1985, 1999) also documented find-spots, particularly in fluvial contexts, and was responsible for his own typological classification.

Figure 1 about here please

There is no doubt that handaxes remain a source of fascination for Palaeolithic archaeologists and Quaternary scientists alike. They have been known by different names: in France as ‘limande’, ‘hache’, ‘coup de poing’ and ‘biface’, and in England as ‘implement’, ‘palaeolith’ (a term that must also be applied to cores and flakes) and ‘biface’, the last being much favoured in recent decades as a descriptive term that made no reference to use and was applicable in both countries. However named, they nevertheless form part of a group of tools commonly referred to as Large Cutting Tools (LCTs) that are frequently (but not always) bifacially worked (Goren-
Inbar and Sharon, 2006). Furthermore, handaxes can be made on a wide range of raw materials, including numerous different rock types (for example, flint, quartz and quartzite and volcanic products such as basalt and andesite), as well as bone. Many questions remain as to the purpose of handaxes (e.g. Keeley, 1980; O’Brien, 1981), the reason for their variable morphologies and possible evolution of this material culture (e.g. Roe, 1968a; White, 1998; Hodgson, 2015 and references therein) and the technological and cognitive capacities of their makers (Gibson and Ingold, 1993 and references therein; McNabb and Ashton, 1995). The long-standing and generally accepted view, and one widely supported by modern experimental evidence, is that handaxes were general-purpose implements for skinning and butchering animal remains, as well as for cutting and shaping wood (Bordaz, 1970; Oakley, 1961; Ohel, 1987).

The collection of papers presented here stems from a conference organised in Paris (19–21 November 2014) on “European Acheuleans. Northern v. Southern Europe: Hominins, technical behaviour, chronological and environmental contexts”, which aimed to address the key issues outlined in the title of the meeting. However, the purpose of the papers in this Special Issue is not to explore the handaxe from a techno-typological viewpoint (a topic to be explored in a forthcoming sister Special Issue in Quaternary International, presenting additional papers from the conference) but rather to provide a state-of-the-art view on the chronology and palaeoenvironments of the earliest handaxe makers in Europe, with a view to understanding key evolutionary trends in the hominin lineage, patterns of occupation and aspects of behaviour. Here, by way of an introduction, we summarise the origin and dispersal of the Acheulean, from its beginnings in Africa through its initial spread in India and western Asia, to its eventual arrival in Europe. The ‘Movius Line’ dichotomy between western and eastern Europe (the former with handaxes and the latter without) is still current but much debate and controversy surrounds the timing of the first appearance of handaxes in the west. The current chronological framework for the earliest Acheulean is then reviewed for western Europe, drawing largely on multiproxy evidence from long fluvial sequences. Finally, individual papers in the Special Issue are summarised with respect to the new contributions that they make to our understanding of Acheulean occupation, palaeoenvironments and behaviour.

2. The origin and dispersal of Acheulean industries

Handaxes appeared during the Early Pleistocene in Africa as early as ~1.75–2 Ma (Semaw et al., 2009; Beyene et al., 2013). This is a topic that is beyond the brief of both the conference in Paris and this Special Issue, although of course it remains one of enormous interest and is the subject of continued intense research.

There are also records of ‘Early Acheulean’ artefacts from Peninsular India, contrasting with later handaxe industries that are associated with low-level fluvial deposits and had long been regarded as of late Quaternary age (Mishra et al., 2007). The recent recognition that areas of cratonic crust such as the Indian subcontinent have not experienced the progressive uplift experienced by younger continental crust elsewhere (cf. Westaway et al., 2003; Bridgland and Westaway, 2014), means that fluvial incision has been minimal and low-level deposits can date back to the Middle or Early Pleistocene. There have been few opportunities to bring geochronological
techniques to bear on the Indian record, but application of Th/U dating of a number of ‘Early Acheulean’ localities in India showed that all were beyond the range of the technique (>400 ka) (Mishra, 1992; Mishra et al., 2007). Paddaya et al. (2002) dated bones associated with Early Acheulean artefacts at Isampur, Karnataka, and obtained Electron Spin Resonance (ESR) ages >1.2 Ma. The same technique was used to obtain a date of > 800 ka for calcretes in the Thar Desert of Rajasthan (Kailath et al., 2001), from which ‘Late Acheulean’ artefacts have been obtained. Palaeomagnetic studies have suggested that the Acheulean contexts at Bori, Morgaon and Nevasa are of Matuyama age (Sangode et al., 2007). Such data led Mishra et al. (2007) to conclude that the Indian ‘Early Acheulean’ probably dates from the Early Pleistocene. However, this remains a topic of debate, as indeed does the veracity of pre-Middle Pleistocene hominin occupation of the Indian subcontinent (cf. Dennell, 2007; Chauhan, 2009, 2010; Patnaik et al., 2009; Dennell et al., 2010; Gaillard et al., 2010; Mishra et al., 2010; Chauhan and Patnaik, 2012).

Handaxes appear at the gates of Europe, in the Levant and southern Turkey, in Early Pleistocene contexts at Ubeidiya in the Jordan valley in Israel (e.g., Bar-Yosef and Goren-Inbar, 1993; Belmaker et al., 2002), at Latamneh in the valley of the Orontes in Syria (Bar-Yosef and Belmaker, 2010; Bridgland et al., 2012) and from Euphrates gravels both north and south of the border between Syria and Turkey (Demir et al., 2007, 2008). Although these occurrences might be imagined to mark the spread of handaxe makers from Africa, this technology was apparently not shared by the earliest inhabitants of Europe, for example at the site of Dmanisi in the Lesser Caucas Mountains of Georgia (Gabunia and Vekua, 1995; Gabunia et al., 2000; de Lumley et al., 2002). Hominin remains in fluvial and volcanogenic deposits at Dmanisi have been dated to 1.8 Ma by Argon-Argon, applied to underlying and overlying basalt flows. This date, which is supported by the normal polarity of the deposits, indicative of the Olduvai subchron, is apparently older than the spread of handaxe industries through the Levant and pre-dates the supposed ages of the Acheulean industries at Ubeidiya (~1.4 Ma: Tchernov, 1987, 1999) and Latamneh (1.2–1.0 Ma: Bar-Yosef and Belmaker, 2010). The Levantine corridor is therefore of great potential significance as the pathway for hominin migration and population exchange between SW Asia and Europe, as well as from Africa (cf. Dennell et al., 2010).

Twenty years ago, the appearance of handaxes on the European continent was widely viewed as delayed until the Middle Pleistocene (the “short chronology” of Roebroeks and van Kolfschoten, 1994), with a series of stringent criteria to be met by sites put forward for early occupation; even then, the Acheulean was widely thought to be restricted to western and southern Europe. Many sites “failed” these criteria on various grounds but in recent years, there has been a resurgence in claims for pre-Middle Pleistocene Acheulean occupation at Solana del Zambrino and at Estrecho del Quípar, in Spain, at ~900 ka (Scott and Gibert, 2009; see, however, Jiménez-Arenas et al., 2011, and Bridgland and White, this volume), at Barranc de la Boella, also in Spain, around 1 Ma (Vallverdú et al., 2014; Mosquera et al., this volume) and >700ka at La Noira, central France (Desprìée et al., 2010, 2011; Moncel et al., 2013). Although controversial in some cases, if the dates of these oldest sites can be verified, then handaxe making in southern Europe might not be so very much later than in areas further to the south.
The question remains as to how the Acheulean dispersed. Several scenarios may be envisaged, for example either (1) rapid and ancient dispersal throughout Western Europe of one (or several) new hominins, (2) separate dispersals of new technical habits through a Levantine corridor or across the Gibraltar Strait from Morocco (cf. Bridgland et al., 2006), where the earliest Acheulean assemblages around Casablanca have been dated by magnetostratigraphy to the latest part of the Matuyama chron (~850 ka, or MIS 21: Raynal and Texier, 1989; Raynal et al., 1995, 2002), or (3) a local origination in some areas due to an increase in skills of established populations.

3. The current chronological framework for Acheulean occupation in western Europe

In western Europe (as indeed in other regions), the record from river terrace ‘staircases’ has provided some of the best-preserved evidence for understanding the timing of the appearance of the Acheulean (Bridgland, 1994; Bridgland et al., 2006; Westaway et al., 2006; Mishra et al., 2007). Within a number of long fluvial sequences, the earliest occurrence of the Acheulean has been consistently estimated at around 500 ka, within the latter part of the early Middle Pleistocene. This is equally the case between Britain and northern France, although given the peninsular status of Britain in the early Middle Pleistocene, this is to be expected. Nevertheless, absolute age estimates for this period have been few from fluvial sequences (e.g. Voinchet et al., 2010; Hérisson et al., 2012; Antoine et al., 2015) and the preponderance of dating information comes from other techniques, such as the relative position of the deposits within the river terrace succession (e.g. Bridgland 1994; Antoine, 1994; Antoine et al., 2007, 2010, 2015), from mammalian and molluscan biostratigraphy (Keen, 1990, 2001; Preece, 1995, 2001; Schreve, 2001; Bridgland and Schreve, 2004; Schreve et al., 2007) and from aminostratigraphy (Penkman et al., 2013).

The majority of Acheulean sites from northern France have been recovered from the terraces of the Somme (Antoine, 1994; Antoine et al., 2000), with the oldest known from the vicinity of Abbeville, from the quarries of Carpentier and Champ de Mars (Tuffreau et al., 2008), and from the Rue du Manège site at Amiens. Although the Champ de Mars site is no longer available for reinvestigation, recent re-dating of the Carpentier site using a combination of terrace stratigraphy, biostratigraphy and ESR suggests an age for the handaxe assemblage within MIS 14 (Voinchet et al., this volume). The same ESR technique at the Rue du Manège site has yielded an age of around 550 ka for the handaxe assemblage, although the artefacts are not in primary context. An age within MIS 15 or MIS 14 is therefore indicated (Antoine et al., 2015).

The Thames terrace sequence dates back to the Early Pleistocene (c. 1.9 Ma) (e.g., Gibbard, 1988; Whiteman and Rose, 1992; Bridgland, 1994; Westaway et al., 2002). However, despite the substantial number of Cromerian Complex sites in Britain, not a single primary context archaeological site of definitive pre-MIS 12 age has been identified in the Thames Valley (Wymer, 1999). Further information comes from the terrace staircases of the Solent River and its tributaries in southern England and interdigitating raised beach sequence, best expressed at the site of Boxgrove (West Sussex). There, an abundance of handaxes (and hominin remains) has been found in association with lagoonal silts and freshwater spring deposits and a late early
Middle Pleistocene mammalian faunal assemblage (Roberts and Parfitt, 1999). Again, although absolute dates are limited, the available evidence tentatively highlights the appearance of the Acheulean prior to MIS 12 in southern England (Ashton and Hosfield, 2010).

In Iberia, the fluvial record also provides a potential dating framework for the Lower Palaeolithic record, although better dating control of the Spanish and Portuguese river-terrace sequences is required (cf. Raposo and Santonja, 1995; Bridgland et al., 2006; Santisteban and Schulte, 2007). Palaeomagnetic criteria have allowed the Matuyama–Brunhes boundary to be defined in several Iberian systems, including the Ebro, Tagus and Guadalquivir, as reviewed by Santisteban and Schulte (2007); they noted, however, that the archaeological record was being used as an indication of the Middle Pleistocene in some systems, based on the occurrence of Acheulean material at particular stratigraphical levels, such as in Terrace 7 in the Guadiana basin. Similarly, non-handaxe (Mode 1 flake and core) archaeology was taken as evidence for a Jaramillo age for high-level Tagus terrace deposits with normal magnetic polarity (Santonja and Pérez-González, 2000–2001; Santisteban and Schulte, 2007), although given the younger occurrence of Mode 1 assemblages in other parts of Europe (e.g. at Pakefield, UK, in the early Middle Pleistocene; Parfitt et al., 2006), this cannot be taken as a reliable indicator of age. Clearly an independent dating system is desirable if the transition into the Acheulean is to be charted in this important region, given that immigration from Africa may have occurred across the Gibraltar Strait. Although a proliferation of open air sites in Italy have been put forward as documenting hominin occupation in the Early Pleistocene and first half of the early Middle Pleistocene (Mussi, 1995; Arzarello et al., 2007), the best evidence for pinpointing the appearance of the Acheulean within a fluvial sequence comes from Notarchirico (see Pereira et al., this volume).

In the cases of the Lower Thames in south-east England and the Somme in northern France, both river systems are apparently responding on a 100 ka climate cycle, for the last 450 ka in the case of the former (Bridgland, 1994, 2006), and for over 1 Ma for the latter (Antoine et al., 2015). It is not yet unequivocally established whether terrace formation in the Bytham River of the English Midlands, which was obliterated by the MIS 12 glaciation (Rose, 1994), is responding on the same timescale, although a similar MIS 13 age is inferred for the appearance of the Acheulean at sites such as Waverley Wood in Warwickshire (Shotton et al., 1993), Brooksbys (Stephens et al., 2008) and Warren Hill in Norfolk (Wymer et al., 1991; see Bridgland and White, this issue) on the basis of their altitudinal position (Westaway 2009a, 2009b, but see Lee et al., 2004 for a contrasting age model).

The combination of biostratigraphy and aminostratigraphy also allows for correlations to be made with other Acheulean sites that occur outside the main fluvial sequences, for example those within the Cromer Forest-bed Formation of eastern England, such as Happisburgh I in Norfolk (Ashton et al., 2008), where deposits of multiple ages within the early Middle Pleistocene Cromerian Complex crop out at sea level and individual finds of handaxes are often made. A small number of cave sequences have yielded Acheulean assemblages, dated through a combination of mammalian biostratigraphy and absolute methods (notably Uranium-series dating), including Kents Cavern (south-west England; Campbell and Sampson, 1971), the basal levels of Aragó and Montmaurin in southern France (Falguères et al., 2004; Lumley and
Barsky, 2004), the Gruta de Aroeira in central Portugal (Hoffman et al., 2010) and Galeria at Atapuerca (northern Spain; Berger et al., 2008; García-Medrano et al., 2014).

4. Contributions within the special issue

As highlighted in McNabb and Cole’s (2015) recent evaluation of handaxe symmetry and refinement, there is an urgent need for a robust chronological underpinning, if any evolution of material culture is to be genuinely identified. Without better dating, the recognition of such patterns and any linkage to biological or behavioural change will be forever obscured (contra Hodgson, 2015).

Two papers in the Special Issue tackle the problems of chronology. Voinchet et al. document the recent application of geochronological techniques to date the earliest Acheulean sites of northwestern Europe. These authors have applied ESR dating of sedimentary quartz and ESR/U-series dating of fossil tooth enamel to obtain new age estimates from a range of key sites, albeit with large associated uncertainties in many cases. By and large the resultant data fit well with previous evidence, largely based on biostratigraphy and the framework control of river-terrace sequences. For Britain, the arrival of Acheulean technologies in late MIS 15 through to MIS 9 is reinforced, with a similar pattern in northern France. Although there is evidence from La Noira in the Cher valley to suggest that the Acheulean was present in central France as early as MIS 17, it remains clear that handaxe-making first appeared in NW Europe significantly later than in the southern parts of the continent.

The second paper on chronology, by Pereira et al., concerns the dating of Notarchirico, the oldest hominin fossil site in Italy. The site preserves a series of fluvial deposits interbedded with volcaniclastic materials, which have yielded a series of handaxes and a femur of Homo heidelbergensis. The authors present new combined Argon-Argon and ESR dates that place both the archaeological assemblage and the hominin specimen within MIS 16. Not only does the new chronological attribution affirm the H. heidelbergensis femur as the oldest Middle Pleistocene hominin fossil known from Italy, but the study demonstrates the importance of the Italian peninsula for hominin populations during this stage. Despite the aforementioned MIS 17 ages from La Noira (Voinchet et al., 2010 and this volume), there is no evidence from either this site or any further north that hominins withstood the subsequent severe cold-climates of MIS 16 in situ. The Italian peninsula may therefore have acted as a refugium for hominin populations and as a source for subsequent re-colonisation during interglacials or interstadials.

With a robust chronological framework in place, even a relative one, the possibility to investigate patterns within the archaeological data then becomes realistic. The paper by Bridgland and White explores the extent to which differing handaxe forms can have chronological relevance, using river terrace sequences in Britain as a chronostratigraphical template. This builds on work done many years ago by Derek Roe (1968a), who recognized statistically meaningful handaxe groups in Britain, with differences in form; however, given the inadequate Quaternary chronostratigraphy of the time, he could make little sense of their distribution. There are now clear indications of patterns, with two of Roe’s groups characterizing early Middle Pleistocene assemblages, another, with high incidence of twisted handaxes,
representing MIS 11–10 and a group in which cleavers and ficrons are common seeming to be associated with MIS 9 contexts. The extent to which these patterns can be extended into France is touched upon, although the emphasis is on a requirement for future research aimed in this direction. Similarly, the available chronological frameworks also set the scene for exploring differences in the archaeological repertoires of northern and southern Europe, for example, the use or otherwise of large flakes for bifacial manufacture, or the presence or otherwise of cleavers made on flakes. This diversity continues through time, even if assemblages dated to 500–350 ka are sometimes considered to be more standardized in terms of their bifacial tools.

Of equal importance is the role of climate, environment and biogeography in the spread of the Acheulean, in particular the occurrence of periods of favourable climatic conditions, biogeographical barriers, competition from large carnivores and changing availability of prey. The youngest interglacial in the early Middle Pleistocene, MIS 13, has been highlighted above as a significant period for hominin occupation in northern Europe. The paper by Candy et al. accordingly explores the palaeoclimatic and palaeoenvironmental context of the earliest Acheulean in Britain during this interglacial. The palaeoclimatic record from Britain and the north Atlantic for MIS 13 indicates enhanced warmth, contrasting markedly with evidence for cooler conditions at this time in the Iberian peninsula and in both ice and marine core records (e.g. Lang and Wolff, 2011). However, the authors conclude that, although there is evidence for occupation under temperate climate conditions in MIS 13, the wealth of multiproxy palaeoenvironmental data from the majority of handaxe sites point to cool to “post-temperate” climates, with winter temperatures at or below freezing, and boreal landscapes. These findings have significant implications for early hominin behavioural adaptations and coping strategies in sub-optimal environmental conditions, such as subsistence practices, use of fire or clothing (see also Leroy et al., 2011). In this respect, the extinction of a number of large carnivores during MIS 12 (Turner, 1992) may have enhanced resource availability for later hominin populations, as well as reducing competition for shelter in caves.

The need for quantifiable palaeotemperature and palaeoprecipitation estimates in order to appreciate fully the hominin environment is highlighted by the paper by Blain et al. These authors apply Mutual Climatic Range and habitat weighting methods to herpetofaunal (amphibian and reptile) assemblages from key MIS 11 archaeological deposits in northern and central Spain, including level TD10 at Gran Dolina (Atapuerca), Áridos-1 (Madrid) and Ambrona (Soria) in order to establish past climatic and environmental parameters at these sites. The results not only allow the observation of climatic evolution through the MIS 11 interglacial, with a decline in temperatures and precipitation, combined with a decrease in woodland cover through time, but also emphasise the importance of such records for depositional environments where other climatically-sensitive proxies such as pollen or beetles may not be preserved.

The contribution to the Special Issue by Limondin-Lozouet et al. underlines the value of molluscan faunas in determining the palaeo-environmental conditions during the MIS 11 (Holsteinian/Hoxnian) interglacial in NW Europe, where this is recognized as an usually long interglacial, important as a period during which hominin populations exploited the varying landscapes, with evidence that they pursued
different tool-making strategies, with both handaxe and non-handaxe traditions represented (cf. White, 2000; White and Schreve, 2000; Bridgland, 2006). Once again there is emphasis on fluvial contexts, with tufa deposits proving especially significant; in France, these authors report on six MIS 11 tufa sites, five with Acheulean assemblages (from north to south, Rue Boileau, St Acheul, St Pierre-les-Elbeuf, Vernon and La Celle), whereas Britain has just two tufa sites dating from this interglacial, at Hitchin and Beeches Pit, West Stow, with only the latter yielding archaeology (Gowlett et al., 2005; Preece et al., 2007). The authors pay particular attention to the unusually long malacological record obtained from the tufa at La Celle, in the Seine system, which provides a precise environmental and chronological framework for Acheulean occupation. Importantly, they are able to demonstrate continued occupation by Palaeolithic populations during the entire optimum phase of the interglacial, showing adaptation by these hominin groups both to fully temperate conditions and to closed forest environments.

Having established a testable chronological framework and elaborated key elements of the palaeoenvironmental context of the earliest Acheuleans in western Europe, it is equally timely to explore in more depth aspects of behaviour such as subsistence practices. The evidence from the flagship site of Boxgrove in southern England has previously demonstrated beyond reasonable doubt that by at least MIS 13, hominins were hunting megafauna such as rhinoceroses, deer and horses, likely using the topography of the landscape to their advantage in terms of trapping and dispatching the animals (Roberts, 1996; Roberts and Parfitt, 1999). The paper of Mosquera et al., however, presents evidence for the oldest elephant butchery site in Europe, from Barranc de la Boella in north-east Spain. Here, a lithic assemblage including several hammerstones, multiple flakes (some refitting) and cores and a large cutting tool (a pick) has been recovered from a palaeo-landsurface, around the disarticulated carcass of a sub-adult mammoth, Mammuthus meridionalis. The appearance of large cutting tools in the archaeological record marks the onset of the Acheulean and Barranc de la Boella therefore witnesses the apparent first occurrence of this industry in Europe. Although the cause of death of the animal is unknown, the presence of cutmarks on the mammoth ribs points to exploitation of the carcass shortly after the death of the animal, thereby providing a more complete picture of Early Pleistocene hominin foraging opportunities at a time when megafaunal exploitation is rare but nevertheless present in both Europe and Africa.

The paper by Rodriguez-Hidalgo et al. continues the theme of analysing subsistence behaviour by reviewing the origins of the prime-age ungulate hunting niche that comes to the fore in the Middle Palaeolithic (Stiner, 2013). Drawing on the evidence from the celebrated TD10.1 bone bed at Gran Dolina (Atapuerca, Spain), dated to around 300 ka, these authors reveal that the site was used extensively by hominins as a long-term residential base camp, where a diversity of domestic activities were undertaken. In particular, the characteristics of the animal bone assemblage indicate a predominance of prime-age ungulate carcasses (mostly of red and fallow deer, with smaller numbers of bison, equids and rhinoceroses). These have been systematically butchered, showing signs of skinning, removal of the guts, disarticulation and defleshing, human tooth marks from chewing, and frequent cracking of long bones and mandibles for marrow access. Together, these lines of evidence present an important overview of subsistence behaviour during the Lower Palaeolithic at this key site for the European Middle Pleistocene and lays the
foundation for our understanding of selective prey exploitation by hominins in the subsequent Middle Palaeolithic.

The identity of the handaxe makers must also be discussed, with Homo ergaster or erectus (e.g. Rightmire et al., 2006), or H. antecessor (e.g. Bermúdez de Castro et al., 1997) inferred for any Early Pleistocene Acheulean localities and Homo heidelbergensis for the Middle Pleistocene (e.g. Roberts et al., 1994; Pérez et al., 1999). However, handaxe manufacture (and therefore the Acheulean) persists into the Middle Palaeolithic under the Neanderthals. The final paper in the Special Issue, by Compton and Stringer, examines an important series of late Middle Pleistocene hominin teeth from the site of Pontnewydd Cave in north Wales, dated to around 225 ka and found in association with both handaxes (the furthest north-west extent of any hominin to be associated with these tools) and Levallois artefacts. Based on the characteristics of the Pontnewydd teeth, the authors classify them as “pre Neanderthal”, drawing particular comparisons with the morphology and size of specimens from the Sima de los Huesos at Atapuerca, and grouping them with other hominin fossils such as Swanscombe (UK) and Bilzingsleben (Germany), which show a similar stage of “neandertalization”. The authors further refute the view that the Pontnewydd and Sima de los Huesos individuals should be regarded as H. heidelbergensis (contra, for example, Martinón-Torres et al., 2007) and highlight the diversity in degree of Neanderthal affinities that are present within apparently contemporary European Middle Pleistocene specimens.

To conclude, the papers presented in this Special Issue address core problems in our understanding of the Acheulean in western Europe, related principally to chronology, environment, behaviour and identity. These papers not only pinpoint the first occurrence of the Acheulean in northern Spain during the Early Pleistocene but also present new dating evidence for hominin fossil material and key archaeological sequences in Italy, northern France and England. In turn, the establishment of a more robust chronology, developed through a multiproxy lithostratigraphic, biostratigraphic, aminostatigraphic and geochronological approach, allows for a more nuanced interpretation of patterns in the archaeological record, as well as direct comparison of variability within the hominin fossils, subsistence practices and detailed palaeoenvironmental records of this region.
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**Figure 1**: John Frere’s “Flint Weapon found at Hoxne in Suffolk” (Frere, 1800).

**References**


detected from fluvial archives in north-west Europe. *Journal of Quaternary Science This volume.*


Compton T, Stringer C. 2015. The morphological affinities of the Middle Pleistocene hominin teeth from Pontnewydd Cave, Wales. *Journal of Quaternary Science. This volume.*


Wymer JJ. 1968. *Lower Palaeolithic Archaeology in Britain, as represented by the Thames Valley*. John Baker, London.

