

PHILOSOPHICAL TRANSACTIONS OF THE ROYAL SOCIETY B

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Homo neanderthalensis and the evolutionary origins of ritual in Homo sapiens

Journal:	<i>Philosophical Transactions B</i>
Manuscript ID	RSTB-2019-0424.R1
Article Type:	Review
Date Submitted by the Author:	09-Jan-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Nielsen, Mark; University of Queensland, School of Psychology; University of Johannesburg, Faculty of Humanities Langley, Michelle; Griffith University, Australian Research Centre for Human Evolution, Environmental Futures Research Institute Shipton, Ceri; Australian National University, Kapitany, Rohan; Keele University, School of Psychology; Oxford University, School of Anthropology
Issue Code (this should have already been entered but please contact the Editorial Office if it is not present):	RITUAL
Subject:	Behaviour < BIOLOGY, Cognition < BIOLOGY, Evolution < BIOLOGY
Keywords:	symbolism, Palaeolithic, Neanderthal, behaviour, cognition, over-imitation

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Author-supplied statements**
4

5 Relevant information will appear here if provided.
6

7
8 **Ethics**
9

10 *Does your article include research that required ethical approval or permits?:*

11 This article does not present research with ethical considerations
12

13 *Statement (if applicable):*

14 CUST_IF_YES_ETHICS :No data available.
15

16
17 **Data**
18

19 *It is a condition of publication that data, code and materials supporting your paper are made publicly*
20 *available. Does your paper present new data?:*

21 My paper has no data
22

23 *Statement (if applicable):*

24 CUST_IF_YES_DATA :No data available.
25

26
27 **Conflict of interest**
28

29 I/We declare we have no competing interests
30

31 *Statement (if applicable):*

32 CUST_STATE_CONFLICT :No data available.
33

34
35 **Authors' contributions**
36

37 This paper has multiple authors and our individual contributions were as below
38

39 *Statement (if applicable):*

40 All authors contributed equally to the writing of this paper.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Homo neanderthalensis* and the evolutionary origins of ritual in *Homo sapiens**Mark Nielsen^{1,2,*}, Michelle C. Langley³, Ceri Shipton⁴ & Rohan Kapitány^{5,6}**

1. Early Cognitive Development Centre, School of Psychology, University of Queensland, Australia
2. Faculty of Humanities, University of Johannesburg, South Africa
3. Australian Research Centre for Human Evolution, Environmental Futures Research Institute, Griffith University, Australia
4. Centre of Excellence for Australian Biodiversity and Heritage, College of Asia and the Pacific, Australian National University, Australia
5. School of Psychology, Keele University, U.K.
6. School of Anthropology and Museum Ethnography, University of Oxford, U.K.

*Author for correspondence: nielsen@psy.uq.edu.au, +61 7 3365 6805

Neanderthalensis, *H. sapiens* & ritual

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

For Review Only

Abstract

There is a large, if disparate, body of archaeological literature discussing specific instantiations of symbolic material culture and the possibility of ritual practices in Neanderthal populations. Despite this attention, however, no single synthesis exists which draws upon cognitive, psychological, and cultural evolutionary theories of ritual. Here we review the evidence for ritual-practice among now extinct *Homo neanderthalensis*, as well as the necessary cognitive pre-conditions for such behaviour, in order to explore the evolution of ritual in *Homo sapiens*. We suggest that the currently available archaeological evidence indicates that Neanderthals may have utilised 'ritualisation' to increase the successful transmission of technical knowledge across generations — providing an explanation for the technological stability of the Middle Palaeolithic and attesting to a survival strategy differing from near contemporary *Homo sapiens*.

Keywords: symbolism; Palaeolithic; Neanderthal; behaviour; cognition; over-imitation.

Introduction

Modern human lives are filled with rituals, from the secular act of blowing out candles on a birthday cake, to the overtly religious, such as performing Islamic salat. Rituals, owing to their ubiquity and embeddedness, can be prominent or invisible, and our engagement with them may be fleeting or profound. Today rituals serve a variety of purposes: They bring people together to form coherent, co-operative groups (1, 2), they may serve signalling and trust functions (3-5), they can reduce individual or collective anxieties (6, 7), and they play a role in the recall and transmission of important cultural knowledge (8, 9). While rituals in *Homo sapiens* appear ubiquitous today, it's not clear when they began to serve these roles in the evolutionary past of the genus *Homo*. As a first step towards exploring the extents of our common heritage of ritualised behaviours, here we review possible instances of ritual-like behaviour in our evolutionary cousins: *Homo neanderthalensis*.

Who were our cousins?

The common ancestor of hominins and chimpanzees existed around 6 million years ago; while *Homo sapiens*, and our relatives, the Neanderthals (*Homo*

Neanderthalensis, *H. sapiens* & ritual

1
2
3
4 *neanderthalensis*) share a common ancestor who lived in the early Middle
5
6
7 Pleistocene, 800-400 ka (10, 11). Though our chimpanzee relatives continue to exist
8
9
10 (somewhat precariously), Neanderthals disappeared approximately 40,000-years-
11
12
13
14 ago (12). Just as evaluation of chimpanzee cognition and behaviour can shed light
15
16
17 on human origins, so too can comparisons between the archaeological record of
18
19
20
21 near contemporary *Homo sapiens* and Neanderthals. What, then, do we know about
22
23
24 the potential for ritual behaviours in our cousins? Let us first provide a sketch of what
25
26
27 we know about their social and cognitive proclivities.

31
32 Having populated Europe and the Middle East between about 300,000 and
33
34
35 40,000 years BP, before being displaced by *Homo sapiens*, Neanderthals left an
36
37
38 extensive — if patchy — record of their lifeways. Neanderthal groups employed
39
40
41 various mobility strategies (13-15), and used a formal stone technology which
42
43
44 represents an increase in hierarchical complexity over that of their Acheulean
45
46
47 forebears (16, 17). This stone technology was part of a wider techno-complex which
48
49
50 included bone, claws, wood, shell, and adhesive components, with tools appearing
51
52
53 to be more diverse and task-specific (in some cases) than those of the Acheulean
54
55
56 (18-20).
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Neanderthal hunting strategies involved coordinated effort (21). For example,
5
6
7 at Mauran (dating to MIS 3) in the foothills of the French Pyrenees, there is evidence
8
9
10 that Neanderthal groups corralled migratory bison into natural geographic traps
11
12
13 where they were slaughtered *en masse*, butchered, and parts taken for consumption
14
15
16
17 (22). This site was used for several hundred years, suggesting the maintenance of
18
19
20 specialised, region specific techniques, through the transmission of adaptive cultural
21
22
23 knowledge, and an understanding of collective intentionality (see also 23, 24).
24
25
26
27

28 The presence of interregional variation in Neanderthal biface traditions
29
30 similarly indicates the transmission of cultural knowledge between generations (25),
31
32
33 with the technological continuity of the Mousterian a feature of the Eurasian Middle
34
35
36
37 Palaeolithic (26). This technological stability, relative to near contemporary *Homo*
38
39
40
41
42 *sapiens*, is the subject of debate (27), with recent research suggesting that a
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
predominance of high fidelity imitation without much experimentation in Neanderthal
social learning may explain the technological stability (28, see also 29, 30, 31).

Neanderthals, then, were expert hunter-gatherers living in a variety of environments,
who transmitted cultural knowledge over tens of thousands of years. But did they
have the capacity for ritual, as we understand it in our own species?

Ritual and ritual actions

For the purposes of our endeavour here, we distinguish 'ritual' and 'ritualistic action' and acknowledge the challenges of applying contemporary standards and definitions that often rely on behaviour and belief to archaic contexts in which access to behaviour and belief can only be inferred. In defining ritual, we follow Hobson et al. (2018) in taking it to be: '*(a) predefined sequences characterized by rigidity, formality, and repetition that are (b) embedded in a larger system of symbolism and meaning, [and] (c) contain elements that lack direct instrumental purpose*' (p. 261).

Element *b* necessarily requires an associated degree of community, shared knowledge and normativity. A 'ritualistic action' is, largely, the behavioural components of elements (*a*) and (*c*): It is an action which is repetitive, redundant, often rigidly or formally performed, and which is causally opaque and goal demoted (32-37). A ritualistic action is often an element of a larger ritual, but unlike rituals, can exist in symbolically impoverished contexts.

The above two terms, *causal opacity* and *goal demotion*, tie into element (*c*) regarding instrumental purpose. A *causally opaque* action is one in which the causal

1
2
3 relationships between the action and the outcome are difficult for an observer to
4
5
6 discern. For example, heating water over fire is *causally transparent* (it is possible to
7
8
9 perceive how the transit of the property of heat from the fire serves to increase the
10
11
12 temperature of the water); in contrast the process of heating water in a microwave is
13
14
15
16
17 *causally opaque* (for most, how the temperature of water increases inside a box that
18
19
20 does not, itself, get hot, is not intuitively comprehensible). Notably, according to
21
22
23 Whitehouse (38), ritual in humans is irretrievably causally opaque, meaning that
24
25
26 causality in human rituals is not just unknown, but actually unknowable. An
27
28
29 archetypical example of this happening is how the performative acts of intercessory
30
31
32 prayer can causally facilitate a channel of communication, and why those actions –
33
34
35 and not others – are superior. Not only is a causal answer not known, such an
36
37
38 answer is unknowable. *Goal demotion* refers to the degree to which a naive observer
39
40
41 is challenged in intuiting the motives and goals of the agent performing the action (6,
42
43
44 9, 32, 33). For example, lighting a candle in a dark room is *goal apparent* (a sensible
45
46
47 and discernible goal is to illuminate the room), whereas lighting a candle in a room
48
49
50 that is not dark is *goal demoted* (the purpose of this action is elusive without context
51
52
53 – for example it is a citronella candle that is being lit to ward off mosquitoes).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Neanderthalensis, *H. sapiens* & ritual

1
2
3
4 We further distinguish individualistic ritualistic actions from collective ritualistic
5
6
7 actions. The former involve (by degrees) actions that are emancipated from
8
9
10 otherwise instrumental purposes, which in the case of the latter, are extended to
11
12
13 become formal, prescriptive, and stylised. In individuals, idiosyncratic individualistic
14
15
16 ritualistic actions can arise through mistaken causal beliefs. Wearing underpants has
17
18
19 utility, while wearing a specific pair for good luck is ritualistic (clearly removed by
20
21
22 some degree from the purpose underpants are intended to serve, and formalised in
23
24
25 the process). Such a belief need not be correct, shared, or symbolic: it merely
26
27
28 requires performance. Similarly, repetitive, formal, and obligatory behaviours that
29
30
31 can feature in Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder (such as turning a light-switch on and
32
33
34 off 13 times) qualify as individualistic ritualistic actions: They are ritualistic, but lack
35
36
37 'sharedness' and symbolism.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 It is also relevant to note that individual rituals need not be independent of, or
46
47
48 in conflict with, collective rituals. Consider, *simpatias*: repetitive, causally opaque
49
50
51 'formulas' employed by Brazilians to resolve common problems (e.g., asthma,
52
53
54 infidelity, bad luck, etc). In one study (39), novel *simpatias* that included a religious
55
56
57 icon (e.g., an image of the Virgin Mary – a prominent feature of Brazilian Catholic
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 belief systems) were rated as significantly more effective than those which did not. In
5
6
7 this way, individualistic rituals that have unfolded to serve instrumental purposes can
8
9
10 be seen to coexist with collective rituals and symbolism.

11
12
13
14 How individual ritualistic actions can transcend into collective rituals remains
15
16
17 undetermined, but the distinction is useful in the context of archaic behaviour, where
18
19
20 individual ritualistic actions (which are apparent across species) can be viewed as a
21
22
23 necessary precursor for collective rituals. These definitions then allow for greater
24
25
26 precision in inferring cognitive capacities. Consider a Western wedding: the
27
28
29 predefined, rigid, formal, and repetitive elements typically involve walking down an
30
31
32 aisle (flanked by a segregated audience broadly divided by affiliation), the statement
33
34
35 and re-statement of specific vows, the exchange of rings, all done in the presence of
36
37
38 a specific authority. Some aspects of this process could be dropped with little
39
40
41 consequence (e.g., walking down the aisle), whereas omitting other aspects could
42
43
44 render the ritual symbolically moot (e.g., failing to exchange rings) or legally invalid
45
46
47 (e.g., the ceremony not being conducted by someone certified to do so). But *what*
48
49
50 *motive* would a naive observer attribute in observing an exchange of identical rings,
51
52
53 with the prescription they be worn on the fourth digit of the left hand? The condition
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Neanderthalensis, *H. sapiens* & ritual

1
2
3
4 of 'instrumental' purpose is important, but is best considered in the context of
5
6
7 ritualistic behaviour where the system of symbolism and meaning are necessary
8
9
10 components which serve a similar (if substitute) role as that of causal explanation.
11
12
13
14
15
16

Evidence for Neanderthal ritual

17
18
19
20
21 If we seek evidence for collective ritualistic actions, death-related behaviours
22
23
24 are a good place to start. A recent review documented a range of death related
25
26
27 behaviours, across a diversity of primate species, that fall into three broad
28
29
30 categories: carrying/dragging of corpses, defending the corpse (individually or as a
31
32
33 group) and/or 'holding vigil' and apparent grieving (40). According to this review,
34
35
36 many non-human primates display this range of behaviours in response to death.
37
38
39 However, with regard to post-mortem treatment, grief, mourning, and consoling, and
40
41
42 other symbolic behaviours, they fall short of human standards (e.g., primates have
43
44
45 rarely been observed consoling grieving group members). In many if not all cases,
46
47
48 their behaviours are examples of individualistic ritual actions, rather than collective
49
50
51 ritualistic actions (even if such individualistic actions are performed by conspecifics
52
53
54 simultaneously – there is no documented or asserted evidence for shared
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 symbolism). The question, then, is to what extent did Neanderthals display primate
5
6
7 death-related behaviours, and to what extent did they 'exceed' them in a human-like
8
9
10 way (thus providing evidence for ritual)?
11
12
13

14 Rituals for disposing of the dead are a significant part of the modern human
15
16
17 experience, and intentional burials provide some of the clearest archaeological
18
19
20 evidence for the presence of ritual. Chimpanzees have been known to place leafy
21
22
23 branches on top of bodies of the deceased, though this behaviour is also performed
24
25
26 for dead hetero-specifics, and might be a method for detecting movement (41). In
27
28
29 hominins, intentional burial of the dead may date back to 400,000 BP — as
30
31
32 suggested by the Iberian site of Sima de los Huesos (42) — although, currently,
33
34
35 evidence is only strong for the last 150,000 years (43). Indeed, the earliest
36
37
38 undisputed evidence for burial is attributed to Neanderthal contexts (43, 44). These
39
40
41
42 burials typically occur in inhabited cave or rockshelter sites, which have been
43
44
45 suggested to reflect an attachment to the dead and a desire to keep them physically
46
47
48 and metaphorically close and safe after they have died (45). For example, at La
49
50
51 Ferrassie (Dordogne, France) foetuses and young children were interred, possibly
52
53
54
55 with grave goods (lithics) (46, 47).
56
57
58
59
60

Neanderthalensis, *H. sapiens* & ritual

1
2
3
4 It is important to note that an apparent preference for burying the dead within
5
6
7 enclosed sites may simply reflect sampling bias — a phenomenon duly noted for
8
9
10 Pleistocene records of symbolic behaviour (see 48). Nevertheless, the recurrent
11
12
13 practice of multiple internments at Neanderthal sites, with over 20 individuals
14
15
16 represented at some, such as Krapina, La Quina, and l'Hortus (43), indicates
17
18
19 Neanderthal burial was in certain cases at least a repeated, normative, practice. In
20
21
22 some instances, rituals are linked to specific places which evoke a sense of
23
24
25 'specialness'. The afore-mentioned sites stand out from other caves in yielding
26
27
28 remains of unusually large numbers of individuals, suggesting that there might have
29
30
31 been fixed points in the Neanderthal landscape where bodies were processed in
32
33
34 mortuary ritual. At Krapina, unusual incisions on a cranium are argued to evoke ritual
35
36
37 treatment of the dead (49). Further, suggestions of Neanderthal grave goods or
38
39
40 markers are present (e.g., at La Ferrassie, Amud, Le Moustier, Dederiyeh I, La
41
42
43 Chapelle-aux-Saint, La Quina), though unambiguous cases only appear in *Homo*
44
45
46 *sapiens* (such as Skhul and Qafzeh and later, in the European Gravettian
47
48
49 complexes; 50, 51, 52). Consequently, questions remain surrounding the intentions
50
51
52 of — and involvement of ritual associated with — Neanderthal burial. Nonetheless,
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 even if rituals were not a feature of Neanderthal burial, it appears that some of the
5
6
7 socio-cognitive underpinnings of it were, including causal opacity (why keep a dead
8
9
10 body close?) and normative action (repeated use of the same cave).
11
12
13

14 Other evidence which may shed light on Neanderthal propensity for ritual is
15
16
17 the extensive record of utilised mineral pigments. It has long been argued that
18
19
20 Neanderthals used red and black pigments for body painting (53-56), and evidence
21
22
23 for Neanderthal ornamentation of the body is growing rapidly, with several clear
24
25
26 cases of the use of feathers and claws of raptors and corvids emerging, as well as
27
28
29 evidence for the wearing of shell beads with pigment (57-60). This decoration of the
30
31
32 body was arguably at least symbolic and may also have involved ritual behaviours —
33
34
35 though access to such an archaeologically invisible behaviour is thus far beyond us,
36
37
38 as is determining how sophisticated the symbolism may have been. Was it part of a
39
40
41 shared semi-doctrinal cosmological understanding of gods, or simply a way to
42
43
44 capture attention to attract or intimidate conspecifics? A rare potential instance of
45
46
47 Neanderthal rock art in Iberia lacks the formality of later *Homo sapiens* rock art in
48
49
50 this region: *Homo sapiens* hand stencils for example are widespread and usually
51
52
53 occur in multiples unlike the isolated Neanderthal example, while *Homo sapiens*
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Neanderthalensis, *H. sapiens* & ritual

1
2
3
4 imagery is often formal and figurative rather than abstract (59, 61-63). Clear
5
6
7 documentation of collective ritualistic actions in Neanderthals is somewhat elusive;
8
9
10 particularly if we accept Whitehouse's stipulation that collective rituals may be
11
12
13
14 irretrievably causally opaque. What then, of individualistic ritualistic actions?
15
16
17
18
19
20

Ritualisation of culture transmission?

21
22
23
24 While showing greater tool innovation than their Acheulean forebears (29, 64),
25
26
27
28 Neanderthal groups nonetheless maintained their material culture without significant
29
30
31 change in some key elements of lithic technology over tens and even hundreds of
32
33
34 thousands of years (65, 66). What features lead to this stability, and simultaneously,
35
36
37 this lack of innovation? We suggest one answer might be the use of ritualistic
38
39
40
41 actions, incorporated into the transmission of cultural knowledge as part of the
42
43
44
45 Neanderthal survival strategy.
46
47
48

49
50
51
52 When learning new skills or behaviours, one can embark on a protracted trial-
53
54
55 and-error expedition. Modern *Homo sapiens* tend not to do this. Rather, we observe
56
57
58 others and copy them. Infants can learn how to use novel objects in this way from
59
60
the middle of their first year (67, 68). By two years of age, learning by observing

1
2
3
4 others intensifies to the extent that children will copy obviously causally irrelevant
5
6
7 actions, in what has come to be known as over-imitation (69-71).
8
9

10 For some authors, the foundations of over-imitation can be found in lithic
11
12 constructions of the Acheulean (29-31). Critical is that many aspects of Acheulean
13
14 stone tool construction involve processes in which outcomes are hidden from and/or
15
16 are counter-intuitive with regard to intended outcomes (e.g., when manufacturing a
17
18 biface to remove mass from one surface one needs to strike on the opposite surface)
19
20 — which is likely to make the intentions of the action goal demoted (what purpose
21
22 did the act serve), and – at least to some extent – causally opaque (in what manner
23
24 did this action causally produce the overall outcome (72, 73). This requirement
25
26 renders unlikely that the propagation of this technological process was achieved via
27
28 individualistic, independent invention, or other processes of social learning (e.g.,
29
30 emulation).
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Over-imitation is increasingly considered the most compelling way in which
50
51 the mind (whether that of a modern *Homo sapiens* child or now-extinct hominins)
52
53 shows social and cognitive preparedness to engage in ritual (23, 28, 30, 74). In over-
54
55 imitation, the sequence of modelled actions includes those that are causally
56
57
58
59
60

Neanderthalensis, *H. sapiens* & ritual

1
2
3
4 irrelevant (e.g., wiping a stick across the top of an unopened box) and the inference
5
6
7 to an intention which is unknown or unavailable (e.g., it is unclear why a stick would
8
9
10 be used to prise open a box's lid when one's fingers would do). There are some
11
12
13 distinctions: Most commonly, in over-imitation the focus is an external object (in
14
15
16 experimental settings, typically a box of some kind) and involves only a demonstrator
17
18
19 and lone observer, whereas ritualistic actions do not always involve objects and are
20
21
22 frequently performed in the service of group identification and group bonding (2, 75)
23
24
25 (though such actions would, by definition, leave no material record). Nonetheless, as
26
27
28 Nielsen and colleagues have argued (34), in over-imitation, causal opacity and goal
29
30
31 demotion synergistically function to yield unique markers indicating that particular
32
33
34 actions are ritualistic, in turn leading them to be reproduced with a starkly increased
35
36
37 frequency from actions that do not share these features.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 Indeed, ritualistic actions tend to beget an imitative response, in which human
47
48 children and adults are predisposed to copy the entire procedure even though they
49
50
51 may recognize some aspects of the action as entirely functionally redundant. The
52
53
54 Levallois technology employed by Neanderthals involves more hierarchically
55
56
57 removed steps and chains than most Acheulean knapping sequences (16), so the
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 need to surmount causal opacity becomes even more salient. The implication here is
5
6
7 that by the time Neanderthals appeared on the palaeolandscape, they were over-
8
9
10 imitators of some aspects of cultural transmission (most visible to us in lithic
11
12
13
14 technology) and thus, capable of engaging in ritual behaviour. Importantly, over-
15
16
17 imitative actions employed during knapping may be causally opaque and initially
18
19
20 unknown, but may ultimately be knowable. That is, through extensive engagement
21
22
23 and faithful repetition of the construction process, it is feasible that redundant actions
24
25
26 can be identified. In the case of lithic technology, modern experts can explicitly state
27
28
29 the purpose of actions several places removed from the ultimate goal in a
30
31
32 hierarchical structure (16). In this sense ritualistic actions (in contrast to
33
34
35 Whitehouse's conception of ritual) are not irretrievably causally opaque, and may
36
37
38 potentially serve as a point of distinction for Neanderthal and *Homo sapiens* ritual
39
40
41
42 behaviour. Regardless, as engagement with individualistic ritualistic actions
43
44
45 increases, there is a platform for them to be converted into collective ritualistic
46
47
48
49 actions. In this, children become critical.
50
51
52
53
54

55
56 Hawcroft and Dennell (76) argue that, given Neanderthals spent less time as
57
58
59 juveniles, both relatively and absolutely compared to *Homo sapiens*, learning the
60

Neanderthalensis, *H. sapiens* & ritual

1
2
3 prerequisite technological and social skills for adult life would have required the
4
5
6
7 adoption of directed instructional learning where subadults acquire existing
8
9
10 knowledge by imitating their elders, rather than through exploratory, experience-
11
12
13 based learning. Just like *Homo sapiens* children, Neanderthal neonates were born
14
15
16 vulnerable and underwent significant brain growth as they matured (77, 78). Overall,
17
18
19 Palaeolithic *Homo sapiens* juveniles appear to have experienced less stress during
20
21
22 their childhood than their Neanderthal counterparts, who had greater juvenile
23
24
25 mortality (79). Debate remains around whether a significant difference in the rate of
26
27
28 maturation to adulthood was experienced by Neanderthals (80-83), though it does
29
30
31 appear that patterns of Neanderthal biological and cognitive growth are subtly
32
33
34 different from those of contemporary and later *Homo sapiens*.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 The significance of a relatively brief childhood and a faster rate of growth, may
43
44
45 imply a lesser 'volume' of cultural information to acquire. *Homo sapiens* have a
46
47
48 childhood lasting until aged 8, followed by 4 years of juvenility (84). By contrast (and
49
50
51 for reference), chimpanzees transition from their juvenile phase into adolescence
52
53
54 after seven years. During these seven years, chimpanzees, while capable of learning
55
56
57 cultural information, appear limited to acquiring techniques for nut-cracking, termite
58
59
60

1
2
3 fishing, and other comparatively simple, adaptively-utilitarian behaviours. It is beyond
4
5
6
7 the scope of the present paper to go into detail, but nonetheless it is worth noting
8
9
10 that there are suggestions that the delayed maturation rate of *Homo sapiens* in
11
12
13
14 comparison to Neanderthals reflects the need to acquire more, and more diverse
15
16
17 social information, as evinced by strategies such as engaging in experimental and
18
19
20
21 fantasy play in the former (85). Indeed, such fantasy play may be a key building
22
23
24
25 block for appreciating the opaque causality of ritual in adulthood.
26
27

28 The idea of fantasy play highlights another key point. There are profound
29
30
31 neural connections between the cerebellum and the parietal and frontal lobes (86,
32
33
34 87), an interconnectivity that suggests the cerebellum may aid in the process of
35
36
37 creative thinking (83, 84); a cognitive prerequisite of fantasy play. The principal
38
39
40
41 morphological differences were that *H. sapiens* had relatively larger parietal lobes
42
43
44
45 and a particularly large cerebellum in comparison to Neanderthals (88). According to
46
47
48 Wynn, Overmann and Coolidge (89), this brain re-structuring meant Neanderthals
49
50
51
52 were very experienced in cognitively managing pragmatic situations through a strong
53
54
55
56 focus on objects and actions while *Homo sapiens* are less attentive to details but
57
58
59
60 more able to develop creative solutions and plastically modify their behaviour

Neanderthalensis, *H. sapiens* & ritual

1
2
3 according to needs (90, 91). A shift away from a more functional to a more creative
4
5
6
7 engagement with objects potentially paved the way for an expansion in symbolic
8
9
10 thinking and with it a key building block for appreciating the opaque causality of ritual
11
12
13
14 in adulthood.

15
16
17 *Homo sapiens* — as a species — also appears to have maintained a large
18
19
20
21 cultural corpus by sustaining large social networks, in which expertise is both widely
22
23
24 shared and occasionally diffuse (92). Neanderthal populations, on the other hand,
25
26
27 are argued to have been smaller and more widely dispersed than subsequent Upper
28
29
30 Palaeolithic *Homo sapiens* (92-95). One possible solution for maintaining a cultural
31
32
33
34
35 corpus might have been reinforcing the teaching of key life skills using ritualistic
36
37
38 actions (i.e., causally opaque and goal demoted actions) — which may have proven
39
40
41
42 itself more dependable in the Neanderthal social context. By embedding ritualistic
43
44
45 actions alongside corresponding information, individuals can be less likely to
46
47
48 question the authority with which it is given. Neanderthal children, under this
49
50
51
52 assumption, may have been recipients of knowledge which was a high fidelity copy
53
54
55 of that acquired by their parents and other community members. If modern evidence
56
57
58 is applicable, this interpretation would represent an efficient solution, as ritualistic
59
60

1
2
3
4 actions tend to arouse over-imitation responses, which themselves may also be
5
6
7 more memorable (9), and which may suppress innovation and change. Prevailing
8
9
10 views are that modern *Homo sapiens* children over-imitate primarily to satisfy social
11
12
13 motivations, whether they be for reasons of affiliation or to satisfy a pull towards
14
15
16 normativity (23). Our speculation here is that Neanderthals may have over-imitated
17
18
19 solely to satisfy skill acquisition motivations. By this line of reasoning, ritualistic
20
21
22 actions may have been present among the Neanderthals, as the cognitive faculties
23
24
25 and corresponding behaviours evolved to serve functional purposes. Only in *Homo*
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

actions tend to arouse over-imitation responses, which themselves may also be more memorable (9), and which may suppress innovation and change. Prevailing views are that modern *Homo sapiens* children over-imitate primarily to satisfy social motivations, whether they be for reasons of affiliation or to satisfy a pull towards normativity (23). Our speculation here is that Neanderthals may have over-imitated solely to satisfy skill acquisition motivations. By this line of reasoning, ritualistic actions may have been present among the Neanderthals, as the cognitive faculties and corresponding behaviours evolved to serve functional purposes. Only in *Homo sapiens* were these same faculties and behaviours co-opted to serve social purposes. This shift between ritualistic action and *collective* ritual is likely to mark a shift from apparently causally opaque to irretrievably causally opaque (38). Indeed, it may have been that the larger group sizes of *Homo sapiens* necessitated the development of stronger social motivations to strengthen in-group cohesion.

There is another aspect to group size that is relevant here, particularly if ritual behaviour is to not only develop, but sustain in such a way that it leaves detectable traces. We already noted that Neanderthal group sizes may have been small and widely spread across the Neanderthal territory. This low density population could be

Neanderthalensis, *H. sapiens* & ritual

1
2
3
4 a likely explanation for the thin evidence for Neanderthal ritual. To be detectable in
5
6
7 the archaeological record, rituals – whether ritualistic, individual, or collective - (like
8
9
10 any other topic subject to archaeological scrutiny) require a sufficiently large
11
12
13
14 population size of individuals engaging in a particular category of behaviour, or a
15
16
17 sufficiently large number of cases practiced across time, to increase the likelihood of
18
19
20 discovery. Though speculative in the historic context, it may be the case that the
21
22
23 more individuals who engage in a specific behaviour, the more likely it is for that
24
25
26 behaviour to propagate. Not only would this provide a greater number of cases that
27
28
29 may leave a record; it also is self-sustaining, as such a tendency acts as a
30
31
32 prophylactic against loss – the greater the number of members of a community who
33
34
35 practice something, the less likely it is for that behaviour to be lost in the face of a
36
37
38 catastrophic event (96-98). Our argument is thus that Neanderthals were a ritual
39
40
41
42 animal – capable of individual ritual actions, though not collective in the sense that
43
44
45 they shared symbolism of cosmology - but that there weren't enough of them in each
46
47
48 individual community for reliable traces of such behaviour to remain in the
49
50
51
52 archaeological record.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Conclusion

Neanderthals were a co-operative, social, intelligent, tool-using species, which shared recent common heritage with our own lineage and likely displayed a propensity for over-imitation, and by implication, a capacity for cognition associated with ritualistic action. Yet the evidence that rituals (larger, shared, complexes of symbolic action and beliefs) featured in their lives is neither widespread nor compelling. By the line of reasoning set out here, the lack of evidence for ritual surrounding symbolic material culture in the Neanderthal record but long-standing continuity within their complex lithic technology may indicate that ritual behaviour was utilised in a alternative way than by near contemporary and modern *Homo sapiens*. Neanderthals' use of ritual and ritualised actions was likely focused on reinforcing the faithful transmission of technical knowledge across generations under conditions of a relatively short childhood and relatively small social groups. In *Homo sapiens* ritual may have initially functioned in a similar way but, underpinned by an enhanced role for the cerebellum in cognition, was later exapted for reinforcing expansive and diffuse social networks. Such an interpretation would indicate that ritual in *Homo* is not a 'one size fits all' behaviour — but a social technique which can

Neanderthalensis, *H. sapiens* & ritual

1
2
3
4 be moulded or applied differently across species. Thus, claims for collective rituals
5
6
7 (corresponding with the psychological and anthropological understanding of cultural
8
9
10 rituals) in Neanderthal may be too rich, while a more precise characterization of
11
12
13 ritualized action (also corresponding to psychological and anthropological definitions)
14
15
16
17 might be more useful and more easily defended.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

References

- 25
26
27
28 1. Wilson M. Rituals of Kinship among the Nyakyusa. London: Oxford University
29
30 Press; 1957.
31
32
33
34 2. Whitehouse H. Modes of religiosity: a cognitive theory of religious
35
36 transmission. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira; 2004.
37
38
39
40
41
42 3. Irons W. Religion as a hard-to-fake sign of commitment. In: Nesse RM, editor.
43
44 Russell Sage Foundation series on trust Evolution and the capacity for commitment.
45
46
47
48 3. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation; 2001. p. 290-309.
49
50
51
52 4. Watanabe JM, Smuts BB. Explaining religion without explaining it away: Trust,
53
54 truth, and the evolution of cooperation in Roy A. Rappaport's "The Obvious Aspects
55
56 of Ritual". American Anthropologist. 1999;101:98-112.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 5. Henrich J. The evolution of costly displays, cooperation and religion:
5
6
7 Credibility enhancing displays and their implications for cultural evolution. *Evolution*
8
9
10 and *Human Behavior*. 2009;30:244-60.
11
12
- 13
14 6. Boyer P, Liénard P. Ritual behavior in obsessive and normal individuals:
15
16
17 Moderating anxiety and reorganizing the flow of action. *Current Directions in*
18
19
20
21 *Psychological Science*. 2008;17:291-4.
22
23
- 24 7. Lang M, Krátký J, Shaver JH, Jerotijević D, Xygalatas D. Effects of anxiety on
25
26
27 spontaneous ritualized behavior. *Current Biology*. 2015;25:1892-7.
28
29
30
- 31 8. De Simini F. *Of gods and books: Ritual and knowledge transmission in the*
32
33
34 *manuscript cultures of premodern India*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter; 2016.
35
36
37
- 38 9. Kapitány R, Kavanagh C, Whitehouse H, Nielsen M. Examining memory for
39
40
41 ritualized gesture in complex causal sequences. *Cognition*. 2018;181:46-57.
42
43
44
- 45 10. Endicott P, Ho SY, Stringer C. Using genetic evidence to evaluate four
46
47
48 palaeoanthropological hypotheses for the timing of Neanderthal and modern human
49
50
51 origins. *Journal of Human Evolution*. 2010;59:87-95.
52
53
- 54 11. Scally A, Durbin R. Revising the human mutation rate: implications for
55
56
57 understanding human evolution. *Nature Reviews Genetics*. 2012;13:745.
58
59
60

Neanderthalensis, *H. sapiens* & ritual

- 1
2
3
4 12. Higham T, Douka K, Wood R, Ramsey CB, Brock F, Basell L, et al. The timing
5
6
7 and spatiotemporal patterning of Neanderthal disappearance. *Nature*. 2014;512:306.
8
9
- 10 13. Conard NJ. *Settlement Dynamics of the Middle Paleolithic and Middle Stone*
11
12
13
14 Age. Tübingen.: Kerns Verlag; 2001.
15
16
- 17 14. Hovers E. Territorial behaviour in the Middle Paleolithic of the Southern
18
19
20 Levant. In: Conard NJ, editor. *Settlement dynamics of the Middle Paleolithic and*
21
22
23
24 Middle Stone Age. Tübingen: Kerns Verlag; 2001. p. 123-52.
25
26
- 27 15. Richter J. Social memory among late Neanderthals. In: Orschiedt J, Weniger
28
29
30 G-C, editors. *Neanderthals and Modern Humans-Discussing the Transition: Central*
31
32
33
34 and Eastern Europe from 50,000-30,000 BP Mettman: Neanderthal Museum; 2000.
35
36
37 p. 123-32.
38
39
- 40 16. Muller A, Clarkson C, Shipton C. Measuring behavioural and cognitive
41
42
43
44 complexity in lithic technology throughout human evolution. *Journal of*
45
46
47
48 Anthropological Archaeology. 2017;48:166-80.
49
50
- 51 17. Wynn T, Coolidge FL. The expert Neandertal mind. *Journal of Human*
52
53
54
55 Evolution. 2004;46:467-87.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 18. Boëda E, Bonilauri S, Connan J, Jarvie D, Mercier N, Tobey M, et al. Middle
5
6
7 Palaeolithic bitumen use at Umm el Tlel around 70 000 BP. *Antiquity*. 2008;82:853-
8
9
10 61.
11
12
13
14 19. Shimelmitz R, Bisson M, Weinstein-Evron M, Kuhn SL. Handaxe manufacture
15
16
17 and re-sharpening throughout the Lower Paleolithic sequence of Tabun Cave.
18
19
20
21 Quaternary International. 2017;428:118-31.
22
23
24 20. Zaidner Y. Adaptive flexibility of Oldowan Hominins: Secondary use of flakes
25
26
27 at Bizat Ruhama, Israel. *PLoS ONE*. 2013;8:e66851.
28
29
30
31 21. Costamagno S, Meignen L, Beauval C, Bernard V, Bruno M. Les Pradelles
32
33
34 (Marillac-le-Franc, France): a Mousterian reindeer hunting camp? . *Journal of*
35
36
37
38 Anthropological Archaeology. 2006;25:466–84.
39
40
41
42 22. Farizy C, David F, Jaubert J. Hommes et bisons du Paleolithique moyen a
43
44
45 Mauran. Paris: CNRS; 1994.
46
47
48
49 23. Nielsen M. The human social mind and the inextricability of science and
50
51
52 religion. . In: Henley TB, Rossano MJ, Kardas EP, editors. *Handbook of Cognitive*
53
54
55
56 Archeology: Psychology in Prehistory New York and London: Routledge; 2019. p.
57
58
59 296-310.
60

Neanderthalensis, *H. sapiens* & ritual

- 1
2
3
4 24. Shipton C. Three stages in the evolution of human cognition normativity,
5
6
7 recursion, and abstraction. In: Henley TB, Rossano MJ, Kardas EP, editors.
8
9
10 Handbook of Cognitive Archeology: Psychology in Prehistory New York and London:
11
12
13 Routledge; 2019. p. 153-74.
14
15
16
17 25. Ruebens K. Regional behaviour among late Neanderthal groups in Western
18
19
20 Europe: a comparative assessment of late Middle Palaeolithic bifacial tool variability.
21
22
23
24 Journal of Human Evolution. 2013;65:341-62.
25
26
27
28 26. de la Torre I, Martínez-Moreno J, Mora R. Change and stasis in the Iberian
29
30
31 Middle Paleolithic: considerations on the significance of Mousterian technological
32
33
34 variability. Current Anthropology. 2013;54:320-36.
35
36
37
38 27. Akazawa T, Nishiaki Y, Aoki K. Dynamics of Learning in Neanderthals and
39
40
41 Modern Humans, Volume 1, Cultural Perspectives. Tokyo: Springer Japan; 2013.
42
43
44
45 28. Langley MC, Benítez-Burraco A, Kempe V. Playing with language, creating
46
47
48 complexity: Has play contributed to the evolution of complex language? submitted.
49
50
51
52 29. Nielsen M. Imitation, pretend play and childhood: Essential elements in the
53
54
55 evolution of human culture? Journal of Comparative Psychology. 2012;126:170-81.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 30. Rossano MJ. Cognitive fluidity and Acheulean over-imitation. Cambridge
5
6
7 Archaeological Journal. 2017;27:495-509.
8
9
10
11 31. Shipton C, Nielsen M. Before cumulative culture: The evolutionary origins of
12
13
14 overimitation and shared intentionality. Human Nature. 2015;26:331-45.
15
16
17 32. Kapitány R, Nielsen M. Adopting the ritual stance: The role of opacity and
18
19
20 context in ritual and everyday actions. Cognition. 2015;145:13-29.
21
22
23
24 33. Kapitány R, Nielsen M. The ritual stance and the precaution system: The role
25
26
27 of goal-demotion and opacity in ritual and everyday actions. Religion, Brain &
28
29
30 Behavior. 2017;7:27-42.
31
32
33
34 34. Nielsen M, Tomaselli K, Kapitány R. The influence of goal demotion on
35
36
37 children's reproduction of ritual behavior. Evolution and Human Behavior.
38
39
40
41 2018;39:343-8.
42
43
44
45 35. Liénard P, Boyer P. Whence collective rituals? A cultural selection model of
46
47
48 ritualized behavior. American Anthropologist. 2006;108:814-27.
49
50
51
52 36. Legare CH, Wen NJ, Herrmann PA, Whitehouse H. Imitative flexibility and the
53
54
55 development of cultural learning. Cognition. 2015;142:351-61.
56
57
58
59
60

Neanderthalensis, *H. sapiens* & ritual

- 1
2
3
4 37. Watson-Jones RE, Legare CH, Whitehouse H, Clegg JM. Task-specific
5
6
7 effects of ostracism on imitative fidelity in early childhood. *Evolution and Human*
8
9
10 Behavior. 2014;35:204-10.
11
12
13
14 38. Whitehouse H. The coexistence problem in psychology, anthropology, and
15
16
17 evolutionary theory. *Human Development*. 2011;54:191–9.
18
19
20
21 39. Legare CH, Souza A. Evaluating ritual efficacy: Evidence from the
22
23
24 supernatural. *Cognition*. 2012;124:1-15.
25
26
27
28 40. Gonçalves A, Carvalho S. Death among primates: a critical review of
29
30
31 non-human primate interactions towards their dead and dying. *Biological Reviews*.
32
33
34 2019;94:1502-29.
35
36
37
38 41. Boesch C. *Wild cultures: A comparison between chimpanzee and human*
39
40
41 cultures. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2012.
42
43
44
45 42. Carbonell E, Mosquera M. The emergence of a symbolic behaviour: The
46
47
48 Sepulchral pit of Sima de los Huesos, Sierra de Atapuerca, Burgos, Spain. *Comptes*
49
50
51 *Rendus Palevol*. 2006; 5:155-60.
52
53
54
55 43. Pettitt P. *The Palaeolithic origins of burial*. London. : Routledge; 2011.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 44. Langley MC, Clarkson C, Ulm S. Behavioural complexity in Eurasian
5
6
7 Neanderthal populations: A chronological examination of the archaeological
8
9
10 evidence. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal*. 2008;18:289-307.
11
12
13
14 45. Stiner MC. Love and death in the Stone Age: What constitutes first evidence
15
16
17 of mortuary treatment of the human body? *Biological Theory*. 2017;4:248–61.
18
19
20
21 46. Capitan L, Peyrony D. Deux squelettes humaines au milieu des foyers de
22
23
24 l'époque Moustérienne. *Revue de l'École d'Anthropologie*. 1909;19:402-9.
25
26
27
28 47. Capitan L, Peyrony D. Station préhistorique de la Ferrassie. *Revue*
29
30
31 *Anthropologique*. 1912;22:29-50.
32
33
34
35 48. Langley MC, Clarkson C, Ulm S. Symbolic expression in Sahul, Sunda, and
36
37
38 Wallacea. *Quaternary Science Reviews*. 2019;221:105883.
39
40
41
42 49. Frayer DW, Orschiedt J, Cook J, Russell MD, Radov J. Krapina 3: Cut marks
43
44
45 and ritual the behavior? *Periodicum Biologorum*. 2006;108:519–24.
46
47
48
49 50. Bar-Yosef Mayer DE, Vandermeersch B, Bar-Yosef O. Modern Behavior of
50
51
52 Anatomically Modern Humans: Shells and ochre from Qafzeh Cave, Israel. *Journal*
53
54
55 of *Human Evolution*. 2009;56:307–14.
56
57
58
59
60

Neanderthalensis, *H. sapiens* & ritual

1
2
3
4 51. Garrod DAE, Bate DMA. The stone age of Mount Carmel. Oxford: Clarendon
5
6
7 Press; 1937.

8
9
10 52. Formicola V, Buzhilova A. Double child burial from Sunghir (Russia):
11
12
13
14 Pathology and inferences for Upper Paleolithic funerary practices. American Journal
15
16
17 of Physical Anthropology. 2004;124:189-98.

18
19
20 53. Bordes F. Stratigraphie du Loess et évolution des industries Paléolithiques
21
22
23 dans l'Ouest du Bassin de Paris. L'Anthropologie. 1952;56:405-52.

24
25
26 54. Kuhn SL, Stiner MC. Body ornamentation as information technology: towards
27
28
29 an understanding of the significance of early beads. In: Mellars P, Boyle K, Bar-
30
31
32 Yosef O, Stringer C, editors. Rethinking the human revolution. Cambridge:
33
34
35 McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research; 2007. p. 45–54.

36
37
38 55. Kuhn SL, Stiner MC. Paleolithic ornaments: Implications for cognition,
39
40
41 demography, and identity. Diogenes. 2007;214:40–8.

42
43
44 56. Zilhão J, Angelucci DE, Badal-García E, d'Errico F, Daniel F, Dayet L, et al.
45
46
47 Symbolic use of marine shells and mineral pigments by Iberian Neandertals.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56 Proceedings of the National Academy of Science. 2010;107:1023-8.

- 1
2
3
4 57. Finlayson C, Brown K, Blasco R, Rosell J, Negro JJ, Bortolotti GR, et al. Birds
5
6
7 of a feather: Neanderthal exploitation of raptors and corvids. PLoS ONE.
8
9
10 2012;7:e45927.
11
12
13
14 58. Morin E, Laroulandie V. Presumed symbolic use of diurnal raptors by
15
16
17 Neanderthals. PLoS ONE. 2012;7:1–5.
18
19
20
21 59. Hoffmann DL, Standish CD, Garcia-Diez M, Pettitt PB, Milton JA, Zilhão J, et
22
23
24 al. U-Th dating of carbonate crusts reveals Neandertal origin of Iberian cave art.
25
26
27 Science 2018;359:912-5.
28
29
30
31 60. Peresani M, Fiore I, Gala M, Romandini M, Tagliacozzo A. Late Neandertals
32
33
34 and the intentional removal of feathers as evidenced from bird bone taphonomy at
35
36
37 Fumane Cave 44 ky B.P., Italy. Proceedings of the National Academy of Science.
38
39
40
41 2011;108:3888–93.
42
43
44
45 61. García-Diez M, Garrido D, Hoffmann DL, Pettitt P, Pike A, Zilhão J. The
46
47
48 chronology of hand stencils in European Palaeolithic rock art: implications of new U-
49
50
51 series results from El Castillo Cave (Cantabria, Spain). Journal of Anthropological
52
53
54 Sciences. 2015;93:135-52.
55
56
57
58
59
60

Neanderthalensis, *H. sapiens* & ritual

- 1
2
3
4 62. Rodriguez-Vidal J, d'Errico F, Pacheco FG, Blasco R, Rosell J, Jennings RP,
5
6
7 et al. A rock engraving made by Neanderthals in Gibraltar. Proceedings of the
8
9
10 National Academy of Sciences. 2014;111:13301–6.
11
12
13
14 63. Lewis-Williams D. Mind in the cave. London: Thames and Hudson; 2002.
15
16
17
18 64. Shipton C. A million years of hominin sociality and cognition: Acheulean
19
20
21 bifaces in the Hunsgi-Baichbal Valley, India. Oxford: Archaeopress (British
22
23
24 Archaeological Reports); 2013.
25
26
27
28 65. Kuhn SL. Cultural transmission, institutional continuity and the persistence of
29
30
31 the Mousterian. In: Akazawa T, Nishiaki Y, Aoki K, editors. Dynamics of learning in
32
33
34 Neanderthals and modern humans. 1. Tokyo: Springer; 2013. p. 105-13.
35
36
37
38 66. Bocquet-Appel JP, Tuffreau A. Technological responses of Neanderthals to
39
40
41 macroclimatic variations (240,000–40,000 BP). Human Biology. 2009;81:287-308.
42
43
44
45 67. Barr R, Dowden A, Hayne H. Developmental changes in deferred imitation by
46
47
48 6- to 24-month-old infants. Infant Behaviour and Development. 1996;19:159-71.
49
50
51
52 68. Meltzoff AN. Infant imitation and memory: Nine-month-olds in immediate and
53
54
55
56 deferred tests. Child Development. 1988;59:217-25.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 69. Horner V, Whiten A. Causal knowledge and imitation/emulation switching in
5
6
7 chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*) and children (*Homo sapiens*). *Animal Cognition*.
8
9
10 2005;8:164-81.
11
12
13
14 70. Lyons DE, Young AG, Keil FC. The hidden structure of overimitation.
15
16
17 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA*. 2007;104:19751-6.
18
19
20
21 71. Nielsen M. Copying actions and copying outcomes: Social learning through
22
23
24 the second year. *Developmental Psychology*. 2006;42:555-65.
25
26
27
28 72. Shipton C. The evolution of social transmission in the Acheulean. In:
29
30
31 Overmann K, Coolidge F, editors. *Squeezing minds from stones: Cognitive*
32
33
34 *archaeology and the evolution of the human mind*. New York: Oxford University
35
36
37 Press; 2019. p. 332-54.
38
39
40
41
42 73. Lycett SJ, Eren MI. Built-in misdirection: On the difficulties of learning to knap.
43
44
45 *Lithic Technology*. 2019;44:8-21.
46
47
48
49 74. Nielsen M. The social glue of cumulative culture and ritual behavior. *Child*
50
51
52 *Development Perspectives*. 2018;12:264-8.
53
54
55
56 75. Wen NJ, Herrmann PA, Legare CH. Ritual increases children's affiliation with
57
58
59 in-group members. *Evolution & Human Behaviour*. 2016;37:54-60.
60

Neanderthalensis, *H. sapiens* & ritual

- 1
2
3
4 76. Hawcroft J, Denell R. Neandertal cognitive life history and its implications for
5
6
7 material culture. In: Derevenski JS, editor. Children and material culture. New York:
8
9
10 Thames and Hudson; 2000. p. 89-99.
11
12
13
14 77. Neubauer S, Hublin J-J, Gunz P. The evolution of modern human brain
15
16
17 shape. *Science Advances*. 2018;24:eaao5961.
18
19
20
21 78. Ponce de León M, Golovanova L, Doronichev V, Romanova G, Akazawa T,
22
23
24 Kondo O, et al. Neanderthal brain size at birth provides insights into the evolution of
25
26
27 human life history. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science*.
28
29
30
31 2008;105:13764–8.
32
33
34
35 79. Soffer O. Ancestral lifeways in Eurasia — The Middle and Upper Paleolithic
36
37
38 Records. In: Nitecki MH, Nitecki DV, editors. *Origins of anatomically modern*
39
40
41
42 humans. Boston: Springer; 1994. p. 101-19.
43
44
45
46 80. Guatelli-Steinberg D, Reid DJ, Bishop TA, Larsen CS. Anterior tooth growth
47
48
49 periods in Neandertals were comparable to those of modern humans. *Proceedings*
50
51
52 of the National Academy of Sciences 2005;102:14197–202.
53
54
55
56 81. Macchiarelli R, Bondioli L, Debenath A, Mazurier A, Tournepiche J-F, Birch
57
58
59 W, et al. How Neanderthal molar teeth grew. *Nature*. 2006;444:748–51.
60

- 1
2
3
4 82. Ramiez-Rossi FV, Bermudez de Castro JM. Surprisingly rapid growth in
5
6
7 Neanderthals. *Nature*. 2004;428:936–9.
8
9
- 10
11 83. Smith TM, Tafforeau P, Reid DJ, Pouech J, Lazzari V, Zermeno JP, et al.
12
13
14 Dental evidence for ontogenic differences between modern humans and
15
16
17 Neanderthals. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science*. 2010;107:20923–8.
18
19
- 20
21 84. Locke JL, Bogin B. Language and life history: A new perspective on the
22
23
24 development and evolution of human language. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*.
25
26
27 2006;29:259-325.
28
29
- 30
31 85. Nowell A. Childhood, play and the evolution of cultural capacity in
32
33
34 Neanderthals and modern humans. In: M. H, N. C, M. B, editors. *The nature of*
35
36
37 *culture Vertebrate paleobiology and paleoanthropology*. Dordrecht: Springer; 2016.
38
39
40
41 p. 87-97.
42
43
44
- 45
46 86. Whiting BA, Barton RA. The evolution of the cortico-cerebellar complex in
47
48
49 primates: anatomical connections predict patterns of correlated evolution. *Journal of*
50
51
52 *Human Evolution*. 2003;44:3-10.
53
54
- 55
56 87. Buckner RL. The cerebellum and cognitive function: 25 years of insight from
57
58
59 anatomy and neuroimaging. *Neuron*. 2013;80:807-15.
60

Neanderthalensis, *H. sapiens* & ritual

- 1
2
3
4 88. Bruner E. Human paleoneurology and the evolution of the parietal cortex.
5
6
7 Brain, Behavior and Evolution. 2018;91:136-47.
8
9
- 10 89. Wynn T, Overmann KA, Coolidge FL. The false dichotomy: a refutation of the
11
12
13 Neandertal indistinguishability claim Journal of Anthropological Sciences
14
15
16
17 2016;94:201-21
18
19
- 20 90. Wynn T, Coolidge FL. The role of expert technical cognition in human
21
22
23 evolution. In: Henley TB, Rossano MJ, Kardas EP, editors. Handbook of cognitive
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
91. Di Paolo LD, Di Vincenzo F. Emulation, (over)imitation and social creation of
cultural information. In: Di Paolo LD, Di Vincenzo F, De Petrillo F, editors. The
evolution of primate social cognition Springer; 2018. p. 267-82.
92. Gamble C. The Palaeolithic societies of Europe. Cambridge: Cambridge
University Press; 1999.
93. Conard NJ. The demise of the Neanderthal cultural niche and the beginning of
the Upper Paleolithic in Southwestern Germany. In: Conard NJ, Richter J, editors.
Neanderthal lifeways, subsistence and technology: One hundred fifty years of
Neanderthal study. London: Springer; 2011. p. 223–40.

- 1
2
3
4 94. Féblot-Augustins J. La circulation des matières premières au Paléolithique.
5
6
7 Liège: ERAUL; 1997.
8
9
10 95. Bocquet-Appel JP, Degioanni A. Neanderthal demographic estimates. Current
11
12
13 Anthropology. 2013;54:S202-S13.
14
15
16
17 96. Derex M, Beugin MP, Godelle B, Raymond M. Experimental evidence for the
18
19
20 influence of group size on cultural complexity. Nature. 2013;503:389.
21
22
23
24 97. Henrich J. Demography and cultural evolution: how adaptive cultural
25
26
27 processes can produce maladaptive losses—the Tasmanian case. American
28
29
30 Antiquity. 2004;69:197-214.
31
32
33
34 98. Powell A, Shennan S, Thomas MG. Late Pleistocene demography and the
35
36
37 appearance of modern human behavior. Science. 2009;324:1298-301.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60