



HAL
open science

The human remains from Axlor (Dima, Biscay, Northern Iberian Peninsula)

Asier Gómez-Olivencia, Diego López-Onaindia, Nohemi Sala, Antoine Balzeau, Ana Pantoja-Pérez, Ignacio Arganda-Carreras, Mikel Arlegi, Joseba Rios-Garaizar, Aida Gómez-Robles

► **To cite this version:**

Asier Gómez-Olivencia, Diego López-Onaindia, Nohemi Sala, Antoine Balzeau, Ana Pantoja-Pérez, et al.. The human remains from Axlor (Dima, Biscay, Northern Iberian Peninsula). *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 2020, 172 (3), pp.475-491. 10.1002/ajpa.23989 . hal-03006439

HAL Id: hal-03006439

<https://hal.science/hal-03006439v1>

Submitted on 15 Nov 2020

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

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



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - ShareAlike 4.0 International License



The human remains from Axlor (Dima, Biscay, Northern Iberian Peninsula)

Journal:	<i>American Journal of Physical Anthropology</i>
Manuscript ID	AJPA-2019-00291.R1
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Research Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Gómez-Olivencia, Asier; Universidad del Pais Vasco, Departamento de Estratigrafía y Paleontología; López-Onaindia, Diego; Autonomous University of Barcelona (UAB), Biología Animal, Biología Vegetal i d'Ecologia Sala, Nohemi; Centro UCM-ISCIIE de Investigación sobre la Evolución y Comportamiento Humanos Balzeau, A; Museum Natl Hist Nat, Dept Prehist, CNRS UMR 7194 du CNRS, Paris, France , Dept. of Prehistory Pantoja-Pérez, Ana; Centro UCM-ISCIIE de Investigación sobre la Evolución y Comportamiento Humanos Arganda-Carreras, Ignacio; Dept. Ciencias de la Computacion e Inteligencia Artificial. Facultad de Informatica, Universidad del País Vasco-Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea (UPV/EHU) Manuel Lardizabal Ibilbidea 1, 20018 Donostia, Gipuzkoa, Spain. Arlegi, Mikel; Universidad del Pais Vasco, Estatigrafía y Paleontología Rios-Garaizar, Joseba; CENIEH Gómez-Robles, Aida; Konrad Lorenz Institute for Evolution and Cognition Research
Key Words:	Neandertal, anatomically modern humans, enamel-dentine junction, geometric morphometrics, Paleolithic
Subfield: Please select 2 subfields. Select the main subject first.:	Paleontology , Human biology [living humans; behavior, ecology, physiology, anatomy]

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

The human remains from Axlor (Dima, Biscay, Northern Iberian Peninsula)

Asier Gómez-Olivencia^{a,b,c,d*}

Diego López-Onaindia^{eOnaindiad}

Nohemi Sala^{f,dSalae,e}

Antoine Balzeau^{g,hBalzeauf,g}

Ana Pantoja-Pérez^{dPantojae}

Ignacio Arganda-Carreras^{i,jCarrerash,b,i}

Mikel Arlegi^{a,kj}

Joseba Rios-Garaizar^{fGaraizare}

Aida Gómez-Robles^{l,m,nRoblesk,l,m}

^aDept. Estratigrafía y Paleontología, Facultad de Ciencia y Tecnología, Universidad del País Vasco-Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea (UPV/EHU). Barrio Sarriena s/n, 48940 Bilbao, Spain.

^bIKERBASQUE. Basque Foundation for Science, [Bilbao, Spain](#).

^c[Sociedad de Ciencias Aranzadi, Zorroagaina 11, 20014 Donostia-San Sebastian, Spain](#).

^d~~Centro~~^eCentro UCM-ISCIH de Investigación sobre Evolución y Comportamiento Humanos, Avda. Monforte de Lemos 5 (Pabellón 14), 28029 Madrid, Spain.

^e~~GREAB~~^dGREAB, Unitat d'Antropologia Biològica, Departament de Biologia Animal, Biologia Vegetal i Ecologia, Facutat de Biociències, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 08193 Bellaterra, Spain.

^f~~Centro~~^eCentro Nacional de Investigación sobre la Evolución Humana (CENIEH), Paseo de la Sierra de Atapuerca 3, 09002 Burgos, Spain.

^g^fÉquipe de Paléontologie Humaine, UMR 7194, CNRS, Département Homme et Environnement, Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle. Musée de l'Homme, 17, Place du Trocadéro, 75016 Paris, France

^hDepartment^g~~Department~~ of African Zoology, Royal Museum for Central Africa, Tervuren, Belgium

ⁱDept^h~~Dept~~. Ciencias de la Computacion e Inteligencia Artificial. Facultad de Informatica, Universidad del País Vasco-Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea (UPV/EHU) Manuel Lardizabal Ibilbidea 1, 20018 Donostia, Gipuzkoa, Spain.

^jDonostiaⁱ~~Donostia~~ International Physics Center (DIPC). Manuel Lardizabal Ibilbidea 4, 20018 Donostia, Gipuzkoa, Spain.

^kUniversitⁱ~~Université~~ de Bordeaux, PACEA UMR 5199, Bâtiment B8, Allée Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, 33615 Pessac, France.

^lDepartment^k~~Department~~ of Anthropology, University College London, WC1E 0BW London, UK.

^mDepartment^l~~Department~~ of Genetics, Evolution and Environment, University College London, WC1E 6BT London, UK.

ⁿDepartment^m~~Department~~ of Life Sciences, Natural History Museum, SW7 5BD London, UK.

Correspondence

Asier Gómez-Olivencia, Dept. Estratigrafía y Paleontología, Facultad de Ciencia y Tecnología, Universidad del País Vasco-Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea (UPV/EHU). Barrio Sarriena s/n, 48940 Bilbao, Spain.

Email: asier.gomez@ehu.eus (A.G.-O.)

Abstract

Objectives: We provide the description and comparative analysis of all the human fossil remains found at Axlor during the excavations carried out by J.M. Barandiarán from 1967 to 1974: a cranial vault fragment and eight teeth, five of which likely belonged to the same individual, although two are currently lost. Our goal is to describe in detail all these human remains and discuss both their taxonomic attribution and their stratigraphic context.

Materials and methods: We describe external and internal anatomy, and use classic and geometric morphometrics. The teeth from Axlor are compared to Neandertals, Upper Paleolithic and recent modern humans.

Results: Three teeth (a left dm^2 , a left di^1 , and a right I_1) and the parietal fragment show morphological features consistent with a Neanderthal classification, and were found in an undisturbed Mousterian context. The remaining three teeth (plus the two lost ones), initially classified as Neandertals, show morphological features and a general size that are more compatible with their classification as modern humans.

Discussion: The combined anatomical and stratigraphic study suggest that the remains of two different adult Neandertals have been recovered during the old excavations performed by Barandiarán: a left parietal fragment (level VIII) and a right I_1 (level V). Additionally, two different Neanderthal children lost deciduous teeth during the formations of levels V (left di^1) and IV (right dm^2). In addition, a modern human individual is represented by five remains (two currently lost) from a complex stratigraphic setting. Some of the morphological features of these remains suggest that they may represent one of the scarce examples of Upper Paleolithic modern human remains in the northern Iberian Peninsula, which should be confirmed by further testing.

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

KEYWORDS

Neandertal, anatomically modern humans, enamel-dentine junction, geometric morphometrics,
Paleolithic

1-Introduction

The rock-shelter of Axlor is located in the mountainous region included in the national park of Urkiola (Biscay, Basque Country) and preserves one of the most important Middle Paleolithic sequences in the northern Iberian Peninsula (Figure 1). Axlor was discovered in 1932 by the Basque prehistorian J. M. Barandiarán. The first archaeological excavations took place in 1967, and encompassed a total of eight field seasons until 1974 (Barandiarán, 1980). These excavations revealed a sequence of nine layers (I-IX), in which Middle Paleolithic lithic assemblages were found in levels III to VIII. Recent excavations (2000-2008) directed by González-Urquijo, Ibáñez and Rios-Garaizar, provide a new stratigraphic sequence, roughly equivalent to the previous one, but with additional levels, not previously identified or excavated by Barandiarán. Some of these levels were deposited before level VIII, but their chronology remains uncertain (González-Urquijo, Ibáñez, Lazuén & Mozota, 2014; Rios-Garaizar, 2017). Additionally, an early Upper Paleolithic occupation has been recognized (level A of the new excavations, equivalent to the base of Barandiarán's level II, previously considered sterile; González-Urquijo et al., 2014). Ultra-filtered dates obtained from red deer with anthropogenic marks from level IV have yielded results that go beyond the radiocarbon limit, correcting previous dating which situated this level at the very end of regional Middle Paleolithic (Marín-Arroyo et al., 2018). Across the sequence, there are clear differences in terms of the technological characteristics, percentage of ungulate taxa consumed, and type of occupation of the cave between the upper (III-VI) and lower levels (VII-VIII) of the Mousterian sequence, which has been confirmed during the recent excavations (Altuna, 1989; Castaños, 2005; González-Urquijo et al., 2014; Rios-Garaizar, 2017). Recent reassessment of the Barandiarán collection has identified the presence of bird and carnivore exploitation for the first time during the Middle Paleolithic of the Cantabrian region: at least a golden eagle and a lynx where exploited for dietary purposes (Gómez-Olivencia et al., 2018a).

1
2 [INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE]
3
4
5

6 The current human fossil record published for Axlor is limited to five upper left dental
7 remains (C, P⁴-M³) with a maxilla fragment, likely belonging to the same individual (a young
8 adult), which were found in 1967 from a level with Quina Mousterian lithics and faunal remains of
9 red deer, reindeer, and steppe bison (Basabe, 1973; [Figure 2](#)). Basabe (1973) seems to be cautious
10 in the taxonomic assessment of these remains. While he considers that the morphology of these
11 dental remains is compatible with that found in similar (Mousterian) archaeological contexts, he
12 nonetheless considers these remains as “evolved”, with “intermediate” size and traits, including the
13 “unclear” taurodontism in M1-M2 (Basabe, 1973). Currently, only three (P⁴, M¹, M³) of these
14 remains are curated at the Arkeologi Museoa (Bilbao), whereas the location of the other teeth is
15 unknown. A more recent reassessment of these teeth supported a Neandertal classification based on
16 their size and the alleged presence of taurodontism in the molars (Rostro-Carmona, 2013).
17 However, a visual inspection of the morphology of the M¹ shows that it does not present the typical
18 Neandertal morphology for this tooth (e.g., Bailey, 2004; Gómez-Robles et al., 2007). Moreover, no
19 study of the internal anatomy of the teeth based on virtual anthropology techniques has been
20 performed, which could provide a more accurate taxonomic assessment. In 2005, the re-assessment
21 of the whole Barandiarán collection (coordinated by J.E. González Urquijo) resulted in the
22 recognition of three additional human remains: two teeth and a cranial fragment. More recently, the
23 reassessment of the faunal collection from Barandiarán's excavation has resulted in the
24 identification of an additional human remain among the faunal remains: an upper deciduous molar.
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 [INSERT FIGURE 2 HERE]
53
54
55

56 Here we provide a detailed description and comparative analysis of all the human fossil
57 remains from Axlor found during J.M. Barandiarán's excavations, including a taphonomic analysis
58
59
60

1
2 of the cranial fragment. This study also reassess the taxonomic affinities of the remains published
3
4 by Basabe (1973) and Rostro-Carmona (2013), and discusses the archaeological context of all the
5
6 human remains from this collection. In fact, the revision of the archaeological context from the
7
8 field-notes taken by J.M. de Barandiarán at the site casts doubts on the stratigraphic position of all
9
10 the teeth studied by Basabe (1973) and Rostro-Carmona (2013), while in the rest of the cases the
11
12 association of these human remains to Mousterian contexts seems secure ([Supplementary](#)
13
14 [Information Text S1](#)).
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 **2-Materials and Methods**

23 *2.1-Materials*

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

The current collection of human remains from the Barandiarán excavations includes an upper fourth premolar, an upper first molar and an upper third molar from the same (young adult) individual (Basabe, 1973), a cranial fragment, a lower right central incisor, an upper left first deciduous incisor and a left upper deciduous second molar ([Table 1](#)). Their spatial location, according to the available information is shown in [Figure 2](#). Access to these materials was granted by the Arkeologi Museoa (Bilbao). The CT scans of these fossils, ~~and~~ the derived segmentation files, and 3D volumes are ~~freely accessible~~ ~~accessible via~~ [XXX](#).

[Note to the Editor and the reviewers: All the original micro-CTs and the derived segmentation files and 3D volumes will be made accessible in a public repository (e.g., morphosource or figshare) and the corresponding DOIs will be included in the next version of this manuscript.]

[INSERT TABLE 1 HERE]

2.2-Micro-CT scanning

All the Axlor human remains were micro-CT scanned at the Spanish National Research Center for Human Evolution (CENIEH) using a Phoenix v/tome/x s (GE Measurement & Control). The resolution was maximized depending on the size of the different fossil remains (teeth: 18.99 μ m; cranial fragment: 33 μ m).

2.3-Anatomical descriptions

Standard methods were used to describe and analyze the external and internal anatomy of the cranial fragment. Previous knowledge of the anatomy and relative variation of exo and endocranial surfaces was used to identify the anatomical position and diagnostic features of the cranial fragment (e.g., Balzeau, 2013; Balzeau, Grimaud-Hervé & Gilissen, 2011; Balzeau et al., 2017). The teeth were described following ~~established~~ anatomical dental terms (Carlsen, 1987). In addition, we scored several non-metric traits following both the Arizona State University Dental Anthropology System (ASUDAS) (Turner, Nichol & Scott, 1991) and some complementary traits described by Bailey (2002), which were compared to Neandertals, Upper Paleolithic modern humans (UPMH) and recent humans (Martínón-Torres, Bermúdez de Castro, Gómez-Robles, Prado-Simón, & Arsuaga, 2012). Some of these traits were also scored in the EDJ surface and completed by the traits described by Martin, Hublin, Gunz, & Skinner (2017) for the molars. The roots of the incisors were measured following the method described by Le Cabec, Gunz, Kupczik, Braga & Hublin (2013): Root Length (RL), Root Volume (RV), Root Pulp Volume (RPV), Crown Pulp Volume (CrPV) and different ratios between these measurements. Dental wear assessment was based on Molnar (1971).

2.4-Bone thickness mapping (cranial fragment) and volume segmentation (teeth)

1
2 The 3D variation of the total bone thickness of the cranial fragment was evaluated using the
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

The 3D variation of the total bone thickness of the cranial fragment was evaluated using the
exo- and endocranial surfaces using the module Surface-Distance of Avizo 7. The results of this
analysis were illustrated using a chromatic scale and compared to previous studies (Balzeau, 2013)
in order to gain insights on the potential taxonomic significance of the thickness distribution
pattern.

In the case of the teeth, before their segmentation, the CT image volumes were pre-
processed using Fiji (Schindelin et al., 2012) by first converting them to 8-bit and then re-sampling
them in the Z direction by a factor of 2 (final volume resolution: 0.019 x 0.019 x 0.038 microns per
voxel). Next, the volumes were segmented using an interactive learning approach (Arganda-
Carreras et al., 2017) that classified each voxel as belonging to one of the following classes: bone,
dentine, enamel, or background. The pulp chamber was afterwards labeled by semi-automatic
filling of the cavity inside the other teeth labels. The output label images were cleaned up by
removing small artifacts and noise by means of morphological operations (Legland, Arganda-
Carreras & Andrey, 2016). Finally, we performed manual correction of the segmented images using
AvizoLite software due to the presence of cracks in some teeth, and lower density zones in the
enamel some of the teeth.

2.5-Taphonomic analysis

The cranial bone was macroscopically and microscopically examined using a hand lens and a
stereoscopic zoom microscope (Olympus SZX10) to examine surface modifications. For the
analysis of striae regarding the differentiation between cut marks and trampling marks we have used
the protocol proposed by Domínguez-Rodrigo, de Juana, Galán & Rodríguez (2009). The cranial
breakage pattern was analyzed following the criteria developed by Sala, Pantoja-Pérez, Arsuaga,
Pablos & Martínez (2016) to assess the presence/absence of perimortem (fresh bone) and
postmortem (dry bone) fractures. Four parameters were recorded: fracture outline (linear, depressed,

1
2 stellate); fracture angle (right or oblique); fracture edge (smooth or jagged); presence/absence of
3
4 cortical delamination.
5
6
7

8 9 *2.6-Geometric morphometrics*

10
11 Geometric morphometric analyses of the occlusal surface of the premolar and molar crowns
12
13 were used to compare the Axlor posterior permanent teeth with the Neandertal and modern human
14
15 samples used in Gomez-Robles et al. (2007), Gómez-Robles, Bermúdez de Castro, Martínón-
16
17 Torres, Prado-Simón, & Arsuaga (2012), and Gómez-Robles, Martínón-Torres, Bermúdez de
18
19 Castro, Prado-Simón, & Arsuaga (2011). Modern human samples included both fossil and recent
20
21 modern humans. Occlusal photographs were used to place 2D configurations of landmarks and
22
23 semilandmarks. For the M¹, analyses were repeated on the original photographs and on an occlusal
24
25 projection of the occlusal surface obtained after virtually correcting enamel cracks. Because the
26
27 Axlor M¹ is heavily worn, the location of anatomical landmarks on cusp apices cannot be
28
29 unequivocally determined. Therefore, M¹ analyses were repeated twice, using the original
30
31 configuration of landmarks and semilandmarks as described in Gómez-Robles et al. (2007) and only
32
33 the configuration of outline semilandmarks (after removing the four anatomical landmarks). The
34
35 second analysis, therefore, focuses on the ability of the M¹ occlusal outline to differentiate
36
37 Neandertal from modern human molars. The Axlor P⁴ and M³ are substantially less worn than the
38
39 M¹, so only the complete configuration of landmarks and semilandmarks was evaluated for them.
40
41 For all the posterior teeth, geometric morphometric analyses were performed that included and
42
43 excluded size variation (in form and shape space, respectively). A discriminant analysis based on
44
45 the first ten principal components of shape variation was carried out to evaluate the species that
46
47 Axlor teeth are assigned to.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

3-Metric, morphological and taphonomic description

1
2
3
4 The cranial and the dental remains are described here. The comparison of the external crown
5
6 metric data between Axlor teeth and different comparative samples are shown in [Table 2](#). Only
7
8 taxonomically useful metric traits are discussed below.
9
10

11
12
13 [INSERT TABLE 2 HERE]
14
15
16
17

18 *3.1-Cranial ~~fragment~~remain*

19
20 AX.11B.415.400 is a fragment (56 × 41 mm) of a left parietal bone, which preserves 54 mm
21
22 of the sagittal suture ([Figure 3](#)). The suture is not fused, and this left fragment has been separated
23
24 from the right parietal bone without any breakage of the indentations. Bone thickness for the
25
26 analyzed area is only slightly smaller than in La Ferrassie 1 (Balzeau, 2013) and thus incompatible
27
28 with a young immature status. Thus, the fragment is not from a child, but may belong to a young
29
30 adult or adult. The antero-posterior curvature of this fragment is not very pronounced.
31
32
33
34
35

36 [INSERT FIGURE 3 HERE]
37
38
39
40

41 Bone thickness distribution was quantified on nearly the whole preserved area of this
42
43 fragment. Thickness varies between 3.4 mm and 10.5 mm. ~~The mean~~Mean thickness of the
44
45 fragment is 5.4 mm. Thickness is evenly distributed along the surface of the fragment, there is no
46
47 clear increase or decrease related to bone thickness variation. The only exception concerns the
48
49 blood vessels on the endocranial surface of the anterior border of the fragment, which are associated
50
51 with a clear thinning of the bone (the area with white dots at the anterior border of the bone, noted
52
53 V on [Figure 3](#)). Moreover, the infero-anterior corner of the fragment shows a slight increase in bone
54
55 thickness (represented by the purple area, noted PC on [Figure 3](#)) which continues posteriorly and
56
57 obliquely. It corresponds to the postcentral sulcus.
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Some clear endocranial features are visible. Some branches of the meningeal system are
5
6 noticeable. They probably all belong to the anterior ramus, one being the anterior branch (noted A
7
8 on [Figure 3](#)), the second corresponding to the obelic branch (noted O on Fig. 3). The anterior branch
9
10 splits in two simple veins that are quite large. The obelic branch splits into two smaller and long
11
12 veins. Concerning the gyral pattern visible on this endocranial surface, two sulci are clear. The
13
14 course of the postcentral sulcus (noted PC on [Figure 3](#)) goes from the antero-inferior corner of the
15
16 fragment to the center of the medial border of the fragment. This sulcus is well printed and shows a
17
18 clear course. Anteriorly, the central sulcus (noted C on [Figure 3](#)) seems to run along the course of
19
20 the most anterior vein of the anterior ramus. Those two sulci have a parallel course, delimiting a
21
22 post-central gyrus that has a regular width on its preserved extension.
23
24
25
26
27
28

29
30 Both bone thickness distribution pattern and endocranial anatomy ~~provide~~
31
32 information that helps to propose a taxonomic attribution for this fragment. Bone thickness shows
33
34 little variation. In modern humans, there is a clear decrease in bone thickness in the area of the
35
36 superior parietal gyrus. The pattern observed on this fragment resembles what has been described
37
38 for Neandertals (Balzeau, 2013). The position and size of the anterior branch of the meningeal
39
40 system on this fragment, as well as its subsequent bone thickness variation, fits with the anatomy
41
42 observed in Neandertals. The meningeal system in this area has more anastomoses than in modern
43
44 humans, and blood vessels are thinner and more numerous (Grimaud-Hervé, 1997). In summary the
45
46 anatomical features preserved in this parietal fragment are consistent with a Neandertal
47
48 classification.
49
50
51

52
53
54
55 The bone surface of the cranial ~~fragment~~~~remain~~ is well preserved and does not show
56
57 weathering (sensu Behrensmeyer, 1978). No direct carnivore activity (i.e., tooth marks) was
58
59 documented, nor any sign of burning. Similarly, no other biological modifications, such as rodent
60

1 activity or root etching, was observed. This cranial fragment shows several striations in the outer
2 table in five different areas (Figure 4). In some cases, the grooves are close “V” shaped, but
3
4 microstriations were not evident. On the other hand, the trajectories of the grooves are usually
5
6 sinuous and most of the bone surface is covered by very shallow striae. In some cases, the color of
7
8 the striations is lighter compared with the bone surface suggesting that they have occurred after its
9
10 deposition. These observations are compatible with trampling marks following the protocol
11
12 described by Domínguez-Rodrigo et al. (2009). Regarding the fracture analysis, this remain
13
14 displays three linear fractures, one of them parallel and two perpendicular to the cranial suture. The
15
16 two fractures perpendicular to the suture have right angled edges, jagged surfaces and absence of
17
18 cortical delamination. These characteristics are typical of fracturing in dry bone (Sala et al., 2016).
19
20 However, the fracture that is parallel to the suture displays an oblique angle, smooth surface and
21
22 presence of cortical delamination (0.75 cm) on the inner table. The combination of these fracture
23
24 attributes is usually considered representative of perimortem fractures (Sala et al., 2016).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 [INSERT FIGURE 4 HERE]
35
36
37
38

39 *3.2-Upper left fourth premolar, maxillary fragment with upper first molar and upper third molar*
40
41 *belonging to the same individual*
42
43
44
45

46 Descriptions and analyses are provided for the three dental remains belonging to the same
47
48 individual. These remains are shown in Figure 5 and are morphologically compared in Tables 3-5.
49
50
51

52 Ax.13F.265.1 (AX.13E/13F.265-270.1 according to the museum records) is a complete
53
54 premolar, although its root is damaged and presents longitudinal cracks on both sides and some
55
56 smaller transversal cracks. In addition, there is a small pitting on the vestibular side of the buccal
57
58 cusp, and erosion on the tip of this cusp (Figure 5). Also, in the areas with the highest enamel
59
60

1
2 thickness of the crown (the buccal and lingual sides) there is a part of the enamel that shows lower
3
4 density in the CT images ([Supplementary information Figure S12](#)). The similarity in height between
5
6 the lingual and buccal cusps and the two long inter-proximal facets suggest it is a P⁴. In addition,
7
8 the distal interproximal wear facet matches well the mesial counterpart of the Axlor M¹ ([Figure 5](#)),
9
10 further supporting that this is a P⁴, and indicating that they both belonged to the same individual
11
12 (see below).
13
14
15
16
17

18 [INSERT FIGURE 5 HERE]
19
20
21

22
23 The occlusal surface is moderately worn (stage 3; Molnar, 1971), and the dentine is exposed
24
25 on the lingual cusp. Yet, the inter-proximal wear facets are visible to the naked eye, and the distal
26
27 one is larger. This premolar shows a distal accessory marginal tubercle, a bifurcated buccal essential
28
29 crest (grade 2 from Bailey, 2002) and a distal accessory ridge on the buccal cusp ([Table 3](#)).
30
31
32
33

34 [INSERT TABLE 3 HERE]
35
36
37

38
39 At the EDJ level, two major cusps are observed: buccal and lingual. The essential crest of
40
41 both the lingual and buccal cusps are bifurcated (Grade 2; [Table 3](#)), which are features typically
42
43 observed on Neandertals (92.3% and 61.5% respectively). On the mesial side it presents a
44
45 continuous transverse crest that does not connect with the horn tip of the lingual cusp, also typical
46
47 in Neandertals (69.2%). In addition, there is an intermediate accessory marginal tubercle distal to
48
49 the buccal cusp. The coronal pulp cavity is conformed by the two horns corresponding to the main
50
51 cusps, where the buccal horn is almost two times larger than the lingual one.
52
53
54
55

56
57 This premolar shows a single, mediolaterally flat root. This root runs wide and straight in
58
59 the most cervical half, while the apical third is narrower. Both the mesial and distal sides present
60

1 longitudinal grooves, of which the distal is more pronounced. The analysis of the root canal based
2 on the μ CT images shows that this is a single canal (Type 1R₁) which is only found in 12.5% of
3
4 Neandertals (Pan & Zanolli, 2019; [Table 3](#)).
5
6
7
8
9

10
11 Geometric morphometric analyses show that Neandertals and recent modern humans are
12 almost completely separated along the P⁴ morphospace, with Neandertals showing a lingually
13 expanded and asymmetric morphology and modern humans showing a symmetric and lingually
14 reduced configuration, where the interfoveal distance is strongly reduced ([Figure 6](#); Gómez-Robles
15 et al., 2011). Interestingly, fossil modern humans completely overlap with Neandertals, showing a
16 premolar configuration that is much more similar to that of Neandertals than to that of recent
17 modern humans. The Axlor P⁴ plots right on the imaginary line that separates the areas of
18 distribution of Neandertals and recent modern humans, but outside the range of distribution of both
19 groups. The Axlor P⁴ plots on this intermediate position because it shares a generally asymmetric
20 morphology with Neandertals, but a moderately reduced distal cusp and a shortened interfoveal
21 distance with modern humans. Based on these traits, a discriminant analysis classifies the Axlor P⁴
22 as a modern human, but with a low probability of only 56%. When adding size information, the
23 Axlor P⁴ plots again in an intermediate position between Neandertals and recent modern humans.
24 Interestingly, it also plots on the lower extreme of the size variation found in fossil modern humans,
25 indicating that the Axlor P⁴ is larger than most recent modern humans, but smaller than most
26 Neandertals and fossil modern humans.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 [INSERT FIGURE 6 HERE]
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 Ax.13F.265.3 (AX.13E/13F.265-270.3 according to the museum records) represents a left
58 maxilla fragment, preserving both the external surface (ca. 13.3 × 9.2 mm), and the internal surface
59
60

1
2 (13.4 × 9.8 mm), with the left M¹ placed in its alveolus. This tooth is fragmented due to longitudinal
3
4 and transversal cracks that affect the crown and roots (Figure 5). Inter-proximal wear facets are
5
6 clear in both sides and the mesial one shows clear grooves on it. This mesial facet shows two
7
8 chippings in its occlusal border. Also, the occlusal surface of the tooth is heavily worn (stage 4-5;
9
10 Molnar, 1971) and the dentine is exposed in all four main cusps, which interferes with the
11
12 observation of several morphological traits.
13
14
15
16
17

18 The metacone and the hypocone of this molar are well developed (grade 4 ASUDAS), and
19
20 there is no cusp 5 (Table 4). The hypocone is not distolingually projected, but it is aligned with the
21
22 protocone on the lingual side and with the metacone on the distal side. Due to the heavy occlusal
23
24 wear, it is not possible to score the presence of Carabelli's tubercle or the mesial marginal accessory
25
26 tubercle. The EDJ reveals the presence of an intermediate post-paracone tubercle and no sign of
27
28 fifth cusp (Table 4). Moreover, there is a type II *crista obliqua*, continuously connecting the
29
30 metacone to the protocone, which is centrally positioned. The occlusal wear also affects the dentine
31
32 to a large extent, which may influence trait assessments, but a Carabelli's tubercle does not seem to
33
34 be present. The horn tip of the hypocone pulp cavity is small and not projected, in contrast with the
35
36 typical Neandertal morphology (Supplementary Information Figure S14).
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 [INSERT TABLE 4 HERE]
44
45
46
47

48 The three roots are separated, all the radicular canals are divergent and the body is relatively
49
50 short. The canal corresponding to the mesio-buccal root is the widest one, being mesiodistally flat.
51
52 Moreover, the cervical third of this root canal is elongated, presenting a wide morphology, and the
53
54 apical end is bifurcated. This root morphology contrasts with the typical Neandertal taurodont
55
56 configuration.
57
58
59
60

1
2 Analyses of shape variation show a generally clear separation between Neandertals and
3
4 modern humans, with Neandertals showing a skewed M¹ configuration and modern humans
5
6 showing a squared configuration ([Figure 6](#); Bailey, 2004; Gómez-Robles et al., 2007). Both groups
7
8 show a minor overlapping area where many fossil modern humans, as well as the Axlor M¹, are
9
10 found. Based on shape data, Axlor M¹ is classified as a modern human with a probability of 88.8%
11
12 or 98.6% (before and after correcting the enamel cracks, respectively). Because of the small size of
13
14 the Axlor M¹, adding size information to the PCA makes this specimen plot comfortably within the
15
16 modern human range of distribution.
17
18
19
20
21

22
23 When assessing only the M¹ outline as defined by curve semilandmarks ([Supplementary](#)
24
25 [Information Figure S15](#)), the differentiation between Neandertals and modern humans is less clear.
26
27 There is still an area of the morphospace occupied only for Neandertals and another one occupied
28
29 only by modern humans on the grounds of their skewed or squared outline configurations,
30
31 respectively. However, the overlapping area between both species is larger in this case.
32
33 Irrespectively of whether enamel cracks are corrected or not, the Axlor M¹ plots again in the area of
34
35 overlapping of both species. Outline shape data also classify the Axlor M¹ as a modern human with
36
37 a very high probability of more than 99% (with and without enamel crack corrections). Form
38
39 analyses (including size information) also make Axlor M¹ plot comfortably within the range of
40
41 variation of modern humans.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 Ax.13F.265.2 (AX.13E/13F.265-270.2 according to museum records) This tooth is well
51
52 preserved upper left M³. The crown is complete, but the lingual root is broken, and it is possible to
53
54 observe longitudinal cracks on both sides of the preserved root fragment. In addition, it shows
55
56 moderate wear on the buccal cusp tips but there is no exposed dentine on them (stage 2; Molnar,
57
58 1971).
59
60

3.3-Additional dental remains

AX.5B.299.16 This is a well-preserved lower right first incisor, although it shows heavy wear on the incisal edge, having lost between the 20-50% of the crown (roughly equivalent to Grade 4; Molnar, 1971; [Figure 7](#)). The degree of shoveling, labial convexity and the interproximal facets cannot be assessed due to the heavy incisal wear. The bucco-lingual diameter (7.7 mm) is larger than the one observed in modern humans and it fits well within the Neandertal range of variation. In contrast, the mesio-distal diameter is slightly smaller than the Neandertal minimum and falls within the modern human distribution ([Table 2](#)). Nonetheless, this mesio-distal measure is most probably affected by the wear of the crown. The cingular region is bulky, although there is no tuberculum dentale. The heavy wear also affects the observation of the degree of shoveling at the EDJ level, where no tuberculum dentale is observed. The root length of this incisor is 20.86 mm, equal to the maximum value reported in Neandertals (13.8-20.86 mm), and longer than the currently known values for Upper Palaeolithic (11.84-14.20 mm) and recent modern humans (13.18-19.22 mm) (comparative samples from Le Cabec et al., 2013). In addition, the root volume is higher than any reported value for Neandertals or anatomically modern humans (458.33 mm³). On the other hand, the volume of the crown pulp (CrPV) and the radicular canal (RpV) are in the low end of the variability of Neandertals, 6.61 mm³ and 2.65 mm³, respectively. The ratio between the volume of these two values is 0.4, which is situated in the highest half of the Neandertal variability, indicating a proportionally bigger crown pulp segment compared to the root (comparative samples from Le Cabec et al., 2013). In sum, the features observed on this tooth (in particular, its crown and root length size) align it with Neandertals.

[INSERT FIGURE 7 HERE]

1
2 AX.5B.299.31.64.17 This is an upper left first deciduous incisor with a well-preserved crown, but
3
4 the root is not complete (Figure 7). The smooth and twisted aspect of the fracture line of the root
5
6 has been interpreted in other individuals as the result of root resorption, corresponding to a 6-8-
7
8 years-old individual based on modern standards (AlQahtani, Hector, & Liversidge, 2010). Despite
9
10 the heavy wear (Grade 5, Molnar, 1971), a marked shovel shape is observable on the enamel
11
12 surface (>3 ASUDAS). The mesio-distal diameter of this incisor falls within the metric variation of
13
14 both Neandertals and modern humans, but the bucco-lingual diameter is larger than the maximum
15
16 value for the latter group (Table 2). There is no tuberculum dentale, and it is not possible to evaluate
17
18 the labial convexity on the enamel. The EDJ shows a strong and asymmetric labial convexity, more
19
20 marked on the mesial side than on the distal. Moreover, there is no tuberculum dentale observed at
21
22 the EDJ level, and it shows a well-developed shovel shape (>3 ASUDAS). In sum, the features
23
24 observed on this tooth (in particular, its strong and asymmetric labial convexity, its well-developed
25
26 shovel shape) and its size align it with Neandertals.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 AX.9E.283.103 This tooth is an upper left second deciduous molar that preserves a nearly complete
37
38 crown. The tooth is heavily worn exhibiting dentine in all four cusps, and the mesial inter-proximal
39
40 side of the enamel is missing. This tooth does not preserve the root, likely resorpted and/or
41
42 subsequently broken, and would have belonged to a 10-11-years-old individual based on modern
43
44 standards (AlQahtani et al., 2010). The size of the crown of this specimen does not provide
45
46 taxonomic information due to the large overlap between Neandertals and modern humans (Table 2).
47
48 Both the metacone and the hypocone are well developed (grade 4 ASUDAS). Despite the heavy
49
50 wear, it is possible to observe a big Carabelli's trait (Grade > 2 ASUDAS), but it is not possible to
51
52 assess the presence of any other accessory tubercles. The EDJ presents a big Carabelli's trait that is
53
54 affected by the fracture of the mesial interproximal side of the tooth, which does not allow locating
55
56 the dentine horn. Moreover, the crista obliqua is continuous, and of type II, with a centered placed
57
58
59
60

1
2 protocone, which is a typical Neandertal trait (Becam et al., 2015; Becam & Chevalier, 2019). A
3
4 quantitative analysis of this molar has not been carried out, but qualitative observation shows that
5
6 the skewed morphology typical of Neandertal dm²s is not present (Bailey et al., 2014). A generally
7
8 squared outline morphology is present in this specimen instead. This squared morphology may
9
10 result from the presence of a well-developed Carabelli's trait, which is reported to give Neandertal
11
12 dm²s a less skewed appearance (Bailey et al., 2014). In sum, most features observed on this tooth
13
14 align it with Neandertals.
15
16
17
18
19

20 **Discussion**

21 *Taxonomic assessment of the Axlor fossil remains*

22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29 The human remains from Axlor can be divided into two different groups. The first group includes a
30
31 series of published dental remains, traditionally regarded as belonging to a single Neandertal
32
33 individual (Basabe, 1973), which our results better classify as belonging to a modern human.

34
35
36 Indeed, a detailed evaluation of the field notes of J.M. Barandiarán and our own assessment of the
37
38 stratigraphy at the place where these remains were found cast doubts regarding their belonging to
39
40 the Middle Paleolithic layers ([Supplementary Information Text S1](#)). The second group of human
41
42 remains includes three dental remains and a cranial fragment, described here for the first time,
43
44 which show clear Neandertal affinities and whose attribution to Mousterian layers seems secure
45
46 based on our assessment of the J.M. Barandiarán field notes.
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 The first group includes three teeth, P⁴, M¹ and M³ (plus two additional lost specimens),
54
55 likely belonging to the same individual as already stated by Basabe (1973). The (moderate) wear
56
57 stage and the fact that the apical tip of the M³ root is closed indicates that they belonged to a young
58
59 adult. Several features, mainly related to the M¹ morphology, question the previous taxonomic
60

1
2 assignment of these teeth. First, the hypocone of the M¹ is not bulky and projected disto-lingually
3
4 (Figures 5-6; Supplementary Information Figures S14-S15), the tips of the dentine horns, as far as it
5
6 can be inferred given the heavy wear of the molar, are not centrally placed, and the molar is not
7
8 taurodont. In summary, this molar lacks all the traits that are typically associated with Neandertal
9
10 M¹s. Second, the P⁴ shows a single root channel (an infrequent trait in Neandertals; Pan & Zanolli,
11
12 2019), a reduced lingual cusp and a shortened interfoveal distance (typically observed in modern
13
14 humans). However, other traits in this individual seem to be more frequent in Neandertals. First, the
15
16 bifurcated buccal and lingual essential crests on the P⁴ EDJ and the continuous transverse crest are
17
18 typically Neandertal features (Becam et al., 2019), as it is a generally asymmetric P⁴ crown
19
20 (Gómez-Robles et al., 2011). Second, the presence of crista obliqua is a Neandertal M³ common
21
22 feature (Martin et al., 2017), but the Axlör specimen does not present it in any typology. Moreover,
23
24 in this M³ only the metacone dentine horn tip is slightly centrally placed, while the rest of the cusps
25
26 show the typical morphology of *Homo sapiens*. However, it should be noted that variation of
27
28 UPMH in many of these traits is not completely understood (e.g., for the P⁴, there is only
29
30 information from one UPMH; Becam et al., 2019). Moreover, the discovery of UPMH with
31
32 evidence of recent Neandertal admixture (Fu et al., 2015) and the mounting evidence that
33
34 Neandertal-modern human hybridization may have been common could partially explain the
35
36 differences found between the dental morphology of the UPMH and Holocene populations.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 In addition, a qualitative assessment of the teeth that are now lost from the collection (C*
47
48 and M²), based on the information and figures provided by Basabe (1973), indicates that they likely
49
50 belonged to the same individual due to the overall morphology and wear degree compatibility.
51
52 Moreover, the M³ presents a small interproximal facet, compatible with the M² with reduced
53
54 hypocone presented by Basabe (1973). Regarding the morphology of these two lost teeth, it is
55
56 possible to observe on the original publication that the upper canine has some archaic features: a
57
58 bulky tuberculum linguale (ASUDAS grade >3) and well developed mesial ridge (grade 2), more
59
60

1
2 common in Neandertals (100% and 42.1%, respectively) and UPMHs (40% and 11.1%,
3
4 respectively) than in recent *Homo sapiens* (8% and 5.3%, respectively) (Martín-Torres et al.,
5
6 2012). On the other hand, the M² presents a large metacone (ASUDAS grade 3-4), a reduced
7
8 hypocone (ASUDAS grade 0-2), and absence of Carabelli's tubercle (ASUDAS grades 0-1).
9
10 Reduced hypocones are more common in UPMHs (50%) than in Neandertals (24.9%) (Martín-
11
12 Torres et al., 2012).
13
14

15
16 Based on this morphological information, the absence of Holocene recent prehistory remains
17
18 from the Axlor sequence, the presence of an early Upper Paleolithic occupation in the site
19
20 (González-Urquijo et al., 2014), and the unclear previous ascription to the Mousterian level III due
21
22 to their finding in loose sediment close to the rock-shelter wall (see [Supplementary information](#)),
23
24 we hypothesize that these human remains could belong to an UPMH, which should be tested in the
25
26 near future using direct C14 datings. Currently, except for a few skeletons (Lagar Velho, Mirón;
27
28 Duarte et al., 1999; Carretero et al., 2015) most of the Upper Paleolithic remains from the Iberian
29
30 Peninsula consist of isolated teeth or cranial remains (Pérez Iglesias, 2007, and references therein).
31
32
33

34
35 We consider that the stratigraphic ascription of these teeth, rather than their morphology *per*
36
37 *se*, have contributed to incorrectly classify the published teeth from Axlor as belonging to
38
39 Neandertals. While Basabe (1973) considers that their general morphology resembles that of other
40
41 individuals found in Mousterian contexts, he still underlines their “evolved” status with the
42
43 presence of “intermediary characters” (Basabe, 1973:200), especially referring to the low degree of
44
45 taurodontism in the M¹ and the M². The same author did classify the M¹ from Lezetxiki, which
46
47 shows the typical Neandertal occlusal morphology and a clear taurodontism (Basabe, 1970), as
48
49 belonging to a Neandertal individual.
50
51

52
53 The second study that classified the Axlor teeth as Neandertals compared them with Sima de
54
55 los Huesos, Neandertals and modern humans both morphologically (using the data by Martín-
56
57 Torres et al., 2012) and metrically (using the data by Rodríguez-Cuenca (2003) and García-Bour,
58
59 Pérez-Pérez, & Chimenos (1997). However, most traits included in that study (Rostro-Carmona,
60

1
2 2013) are not taxonomically distinctive and, for those which are, the Axlor teeth show modern
3
4 human affinities. In terms of size, and using the data provided by Rostro-Carmona (2013), only the
5
6 canine would show a size closer to the Neandertal mean, the P⁴ and M¹ would show intermediate
7
8 affinities while the size of the M² and M³ would be more similar to modern humans. Our study
9
10 shows that, after including UPMHs in the comparative samples, and despite the overlap between
11
12 modern humans and Neandertals, the general size of the Axlor teeth is either non-determinant or
13
14 more similar to modern humans. Finally, Rostro-Carmona (2013) used the presence of taurodontism
15
16 in the Axlor teeth to classify them as belonging to Neandertals, but our assessment indicates that the
17
18 Axlor teeth show a very limited degree of taurodontism, particularly when compared with classic
19
20 Neandertal molars.
21
22
23
24

25 The second group would encompass the cranial fragment and three additional tooth remains
26
27 that have clear Neandertal affinities and their stratigraphic position is secure within the Mousterian
28
29 levels. The bone thickness distribution pattern and endocranial anatomy of the cranial
30
31 fragment remain are consistent with Neandertal anatomy. Additionally, both incisors and the dm²
32
33 present characteristics that allow us to ascribe them to Neandertals. Although heavily worn, the I₁
34
35 shows Neandertal affinities in its root configuration and proportions. Nevertheless, the CrPV and
36
37 RpV values are lower than the Neandertal values reported to date (Le Cabec et al., 2013; Becam &
38
39 Chevalier, 2019). This might be related to an advanced age for the individual, as aging related
40
41 deposition of secondary dentine causes the reduction of the pulp channel (Aboshi, Takahashi, &
42
43 Komuro, 2010; Solheim, 1992). This would be consistent with the heavy wear present in this tooth.
44
45
46
47 Second, both the OES and EDJ of the deciduous upper incisor from Axlor present a set of
48
49 characteristics observed in other Neandertal specimens such as Portel-Ouest, La Ferrassie 8 (strong
50
51 mesial and distal marginal ridges, pronounced and asymmetric labial convexity) (Becam &
52
53 Chevalier, 2019). Third, although the dm² does not show the typical Neanderthal skewed
54
55 configuration, it does show a notable development of the hypocone in relation to the metacone, the
56
57 presence of the crista obliqua, and a large Carabelli's tubercle at the OES and EDJ. These are
58
59
60

1
2 common features to other Neandertal dm²s, such as Arrillor, La Ferrassie 8 or Portel-Ouest (Becam
3 & Chevalier, 2019; Bermúdez de Castro & Saenz de Buruaga, 1999). These new remains confirm
4 the presence of Neandertal fossil remains in Axlor, thus increasing the Neandertal hypodigm
5 recovered in the Eastern Cantabrian Region.
6
7
8
9

10 11 12 13 14 15 16 *Origin of the accumulation of the human fossil remains* 17 18 19

20 Taphonomic and forensic analyses on hominin fossils are important to determine the origin of
21 bone deposition and reconstruct the processes occurred during the fossil-diagenetic processes even
22 for isolated fossils (Sanz et al., 2018). In some cases, it is even possible to determine causes of
23 death (Sala et al., 2015) or drawing inferences about the mortuary practices of hominin groups, such
24 as cannibalism (Rougier et al., 2016; Sala & Conard, 2016; Saladié et al., 2012; Saladié &
25 Rodríguez-Hidalgo, 2017) or funerary activities (Gómez-Olivencia et al., 2018b).
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 In the case of the two deciduous teeth, they were lost by two different Neandertal individuals
37 during the formation of levels V (left di¹) and IV (right dm²). The presence of isolated deciduous
38 teeth is not rare in Middle Paleolithic layers, and the closest example is found less than 25 km south
39 from Axlor, in Arrillor (Figure 1; Bermúdez de Castro & Saénz de Buruaga, 1999; Iriarte-
40 Chiapusso, Wood, & Sáenz de Buruaga, 2019), with other example from Le Portel Ouest (Becam &
41 Chevalier, 2019). The cranial fragment from Axlor displays evidence of postmortem and
42 perimortem fractures, but the absence of traces that could indicate the causes of such fractures
43 makes it difficult to interpret its origin. Although we cannot rule out intentional causes for the
44 perimortem fractures, the lack of clear anthropic cut marks or signs of anthropic manipulation does
45 not allow us to go further in our interpretation. The absence of weathering could be interpreted as a
46 non-aerial (or short-term) exposure of the fossils in the biostratigraphic phase. On the other hand,
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 trampling has been documented on the cranial fragment suggesting certain displacement of the
3
4 fossils which could be one of the explanations of the scarcity of human remains at the site.
5
6 Additionally, the Barandiarán collection shows some significant bias in comparison with the
7
8 richness in fossil remains that we have observed at the site during recent excavations (Gómez-
9
10 Olivencia et al., 2018a), in which smaller shaft fragments are absent. This bias could be a secondary
11
12 reason of this scarcity. In this context, the recovery of additional human fossils in the Axlor site
13
14 would help elucidate the nature of these isolated remains found in a human occupation context.
15
16
17
18
19

20 **Conclusions**

21
22 Axlor (Dima, Biscay) is one of the most important Middle Paleolithic sites in the Cantabrian
23
24 region (northern Iberian Peninsula). The excavations performed by J.M. Barandiarán at the Axlor
25
26 site 50 years ago yielded a cranial vault fragment and eight teeth, five of which likely belonged to
27
28 the same individual, although two are currently lost. Three teeth (a left dm^2 , a left di^1 , and a right I_1)
29
30 and the cranial fragment show morphological features consistent with their classification as
31
32 Neandertals, and were found in undisturbed Mousterian context. However, the remaining three teeth
33
34 (plus two that have been lost since the initial finding), traditionally classified as Neandertals
35
36 (Basabe, 1973; Rostro Carmona, 2013), show morphological features and a general size more
37
38 compatible with their classification as modern humans. Moreover, the review of the original notes
39
40 by J.M. Barandiarán and our own observations during the recent excavations at the site suggest that
41
42 the archaeological context of these remains should be carefully reconsidered. We hypothesize that
43
44 these teeth may constitute one of the scarce examples of Upper Paleolithic remains in the Iberian
45
46 Peninsula, a hypothesis that would require a direct C14 dating to be tested, which currently is not
47
48 possible due to access limitations.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

1 We would like to thank I. García Camino (Arkeologi Museoa) for permission to study these
2 fossils. We thank L. García Boullosa for the cleaning of some of these fossils, and to the rest of the
3 Arkeologi Museoa staff. The Gobierno Vasco-Eusko Jauriaritza granted the permission to micro-CT
4 these specimens. Thanks to the Jose Miguel de Barandiaran Fundazioa and Zuriñe Velez de
5 Mendizabal for the access to J.M. de Barandiarán's field notes. Thanks to B. Notario (CENIEH) for
6 help during the micro-CT scanning process. This research has also received support from the
7 Spanish Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y Universidades (proyecto PGC2018-093925-B-C33),
8 Research Group IT1418-19 from the Eusko Jauriaritza-Gobierno Vasco. AGO was supported by
9 Ramón y Cajal fellowship (RYC-2017-22558). NS was supported by a Juan de la Cierva
10 Incorporación program (IJCI-2017-32804). Thanks also to our colleagues from BBP, UCM-ISCIH,
11 EHU-UPV, as well as to A. Rodríguez-Hidalgo and N. Weaver for stimulating discussions.

Data Availability Statement

The original micro-ct scans, the derived segmentation files, and 3D volumes are available in
figshare at <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.10308272>.

ORCID

Asier Gómez-Olivencia <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7831-3902>

Diego López-Onaindia <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5266-6416>

Nohemi Sala <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0896-1493>

Antoine Balzeau <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4226-611X>

Ana Pantoja-Pérez <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9302-1756>

Ana Pantoja

Ignacio Arganda-Carreras <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0229-5722>

Mikel Arlegi <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5665-9275>

Joseba Rios-Garaizar <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8474-2156>

1
2 Aida Gómez-Robles <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8719-2660>
3
4
5
6
7

8
9 **REFERENCES**
10

- 11
12
13 Aboshi, H., Takahashi, T., & Komuro, T. (2010). Age estimation using microfocus X-ray computed
14 tomography of lower premolars. *Forensic Science International*, *200*, 35-40.
15
16
17
18 Albisu Andrade, C., Etxeberria Gabilondo, F., & Herrasti Erlogorri, L. (2014). Estudio de los restos
19 dentales humanos procedentes de la cueva de Santa Catalina. In E. Berganza Gochi, & J. L.
20 Arribas Pastor (Eds.). *La Cueva de Santa Catalina (Lekeitio): La intervención arqueológica*
21 *Restos vegetales, animales y humanos*, (pp. 361-365). Bilbao: Bizkaiko Foru Aldundia.
22
23
24
25
26
27 Altuna, J. (1989). La subsistance d'origine animal pendant le Moustérien dans la région Cantabrique
28 (Espagne). In M. Pathou, & L. G. Freeman (Eds.). *L'Homme de Neandertal La Subsistance*
29 *Actes du Colloque International de Liège*, vol 6, (pp. 41-43). Liège: ERAUL.
30
31
32
33
34 AlQahtani, S.J., Hector, M.P., & Liversidge, H.M. (2010). The London atlas of human tooth
35 development and eruption. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, *142*, 481-490.
36
37
38
39 ~~Arambourou, R., & Genet Varcin, R. (1965). Nouvelle sépulture du Magdalénien final dans la~~
40 ~~grotte Duruthy à Sorde-l'Abbaye (Landes): Masson.~~
41
42
43
44 Arganda-Carreras, I., Kaynig, V., Rueden, C., Schindelin, J., Eliceiri, K. W., Cardona, A., &
45 Sebastian Seung, H. (2017). Trainable Weka Segmentation: a machine learning tool for
46 microscopy pixel classification. *Bioinformatics*, *33*, 2424-2426.
47
48
49
50 Bayle, P., Le Luyer, M., & Robson Brown, K. A. (2017). The Palomas Dental Remains: Thickness
51 and Tissue Proportions. In E. Trinkaus, & M. J. Walker (Eds.). *Neandertals from the Sima*
52 *de las Palomas del Cabezo Gordo, Southeastern Spain*, (pp. 115-137). College Station,
53 Texas: Texas A&M University Press.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2 Bailey, S. E. (2002). A closer look at Neanderthal postcanine dental morphology: The mandibular
3
4 dentition. *The Anatomical Record*, 269, 148-156.
5
- 6 Bailey, S. E. (2004). A morphometric analysis of maxillary molar crowns of Middle-Late
7
8 Pleistocene hominins. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 47, 183-198.
9
- 10 Bailey, S. E., Benazzi, S., Souday, C., Astorino, C., Paul, K., & Hublin, J.-J. (2014). Taxonomic
11
12 differences in deciduous upper second molar crown outlines of *Homo sapiens*, *Homo*
13
14 *neanderthalensis* and *Homo erectus*. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 72, 1-9.
15
16
- 17 Balzeau, A. (2013). Thickened cranial vault and parasagittal keeling: Correlated traits and
18
19 autapomorphies of *Homo erectus*? *Journal of Human Evolution*, 64, 631-644.
20
21
- 22 Balzeau, A., Buck, L. T., Albessard, L., Becam, G., Grimaud-Hervé, D., Rae, T. C., & Stringer, C.
23
24 B. (2017). The Internal Cranial Anatomy of the Middle Pleistocene Broken Hill 1 Cranium.
25
26 *PaleoAnthropology*, 2017, 107-138.
27
28
- 29 Balzeau, A., Grimaud-Hervé, D., & Gilissen, E. (2011). Where are inion and endinion? Variations
30
31 of the exo- and endocranial morphology of the occipital bone during hominin evolution.
32
33 *Journal of Human Evolution*, 61, 488-502.
34
35
- 36 Barandiarán, I., & Cava, A. (2008). Identificaciones del Gravetiense en las estribaciones
37
38 occidentales del Pirineo: modelos de ocupación y uso. *Trabajos de Prehistoria*, 65, 13-28.
39
40
- 41 Barandiarán, J. M. (1980). Excavaciones en Axlor. 1967-1974. In J. M. Barandiarán (Ed.). *Obras*
42
43 *Completas de José Miguel de Barandiarán Tomo XVII*, (pp. 127-384). Bilbao: La Gran
44
45 *Enciclopedia Vasca*.
46
47
- 48 Basabe, J. M. (1970). Dientes humanos del paleolítico de Lezetxiki (Mondragón). *Munibe*, XXII,
49
50 113-124.
51
- 52 Basabe, J. M. (1973). Dientes humanos del Musteriense de Axlor (Dima. Vizcaya). *Trabajos de*
53
54 *Antropología*, 16, 187-207.
55
56
- 57 Basabe, J. M. (1982). Restos fósiles humanos de la región Vasco-Cantábrica. *Cuadernos de Sección*
58
59 *Antropología-Etnografía*, 1, 67-84.
60

- 1
2 Becam, G., Chevalier, T., Gregoire, S., Braga, J., Balzeau, A., De Lumley, M.A., Vezian, R. 2015.
3
4 The characterization of the outer enamel surface and the enamel dentine junction of
5
6 deciduous and permanent Neandertal teeth from Le Portel-Ouest cave (Ariège, France).
7
8 *1840^{ème} Journée de la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris*.
9
10
11 Becam, G., & Chevalier, T. (2019). Neandertal features of the deciduous and permanent teeth from
12
13 Portel-Ouest Cave (Ariège, France). *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 168, 45-
14
15 69.
16
17
18 Becam, G., Verna, C., Gómez-Robles, A., Gómez-Olivencia, A., Albessard, L., Arnaud, J., . . .
19
20 Balzeau, A. (2019). Isolated teeth from La Ferrassie: Reassessment of the old collections,
21
22 new remains, and their implications. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 169, 132-
23
24 142.
25
26
27 Behrensmeier, A. K. (1978). Taphonomic and ecologic information from bone weathering.
28
29 *Paleobiology*, 4, 150-162.
30
31
32 Bermúdez de Castro, J. M., & Sáenz de Buruaga, A. (1999). Étude Préliminaire du site Pléistocène
33
34 Supérieur à hominidé d'Arrillor (Pays Basque, Espagne). *L'Anthropologie*, 103, 633-639.
35
36
37 Carlsen, O. (1987). Dental Morphology. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
38
39 Carretero, J. M., Quam, R. M., Gómez-Olivencia, A., Castilla, M., Rodríguez, L., & García-
40
41 González, R. (2015). The Magdalenian human remains from El Mirón Cave, Cantabria
42
43 (Spain). *Journal of Archaeological Science*, 60, 10-27.
44
45
46 Castaños, P. M. (2005). Revisión actualizada de las faunas de macromamíferos del Würm antiguo
47
48 en la Región Cantábrica. In J. A. Lasheras, & R. Montes (Eds.). Neandertales cantábricos,
49
50 estado de la cuestión, (pp. 201-207). Santander: Museo de Altamira.
51
52
53 de la Rúa, C., & Hervella, M. (2011). Estudio antropológico de los dientes humanos de la cueva de
54
55 Aitzbitarte III (Rentería. Gipuzkoa) (Paleolítico superior). In J. Altuna, K. Mariezkurrena, &
56
57 J. Rios (Eds.). Ocupaciones humanas en Aitzbitarte III (País Vasco) 33600-18400 BP (Zona
58
59 de entrada a la cueva), (pp. 385-393). Vitoria-Gasteiz: Eusko Jaurlaritza-Gobierno Vasco.
60

- 1
2 Domínguez-Rodrigo, M., de Juana, S., Galán, A. B., & Rodríguez, M. (2009). A new protocol to
3
4 differentiate trampling marks from butchery cut marks. *Journal of Archaeological Science*,
5
6 36, 2643-2654.
7
8
9 Duarte, C., Maurício, J., Souto, P., Pettitt, P. B., Trinkaus, E., Van Plicht, H. D., & Zilhão, J.
10
11 (1999). The early Upper Paleolithic human skeleton from the Abrigo do Lagar Velho
12
13 (Portugal) and modern human emergence in Iberia. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
14
15 *Sciences of the United States of America*, 96, 7604-7609.
16
17
18 Fu, Q., Hajdinjak, M., Moldovan, O. T., Constantin, S., Mallick, S., Skoglund, P., . . . Pääbo, S.
19
20 (2015). An early modern human from Romania with a recent Neanderthal ancestor. *Nature*,
21
22 524, 216-219.
23
24
25 García-Bour, J., Pérez-Pérez, A., & Chimenos, E. (1997). Evolución de la dentición en la transición
26
27 mesolítico-neolítico de la península ibérica; un modelo de sustitución poblacional. *Anales*
28
29 *de Odontostomatología*, 3, 116-121.
30
31
32 Garralda, M. D. (2005). Los Neandertales en la Península Ibérica. *Munibe (Antropología*
33
34 *Arkeologia)*, 57, 289-314.
35
36
37 Garralda, M.-D., Maíllo-Fernández, J.-M., Higham, T., Neira, A., & Bernaldo de Quirós, F. (in
38
39 press). The Gravettian child mandible from El Castillo Cave (Puente Viesgo, Cantabria,
40
41 Spain). *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.23906>
42
43
44 Gómez-Olivencia, A., Quam, R., Sala, N., Bardey, M., Ohman, J. C., & Balzeau, A. (2018b). La
45
46 Ferrassie 1: New perspectives on a “classic” Neandertal. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 117,
47
48 13-32.
49
50
51 Gómez-Olivencia, A., Sala, N., Núñez-Lahuerta, C., Sanchis, A., Arlegi, M., & Rios-Garaizar, J.
52
53 (2018a). First data of Neandertal bird and carnivore exploitation in the Cantabrian Region
54
55 (Axlor; Barandiaran excavations; Dima, Biscay, Northern Iberian Peninsula). *Scientific*
56
57 *Reports*, 8, 10551.
58
59
60

- 1
2 Gómez-Robles, A., Bermúdez de Castro, J. M., Martínón-Torres, M., Prado-Simón, L., & Arsuaga,
3
4 J. L. (2012). A geometric morphometric analysis of hominin upper second and third molars,
5
6 with particular emphasis on European Pleistocene populations. *Journal of Human*
7
8 *Evolution*, 63, 512-526.
9
- 10 Gómez-Robles, A., Martínón-Torres, M., Bermúdez de Castro, J. M., Margvelashvili, A., Bastir,
11
12 M., Arsuaga, J. L., . . . Martínez, L. M. (2007). A geometric morphometric analysis of
13
14 hominin upper first molar shape. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 53, 272-285.
15
16
- 17 Gómez-Robles, A., Martínón-Torres, M., Bermúdez de Castro, J. M., Prado-Simón, L., & Arsuaga,
18
19 J. L. (2011). A geometric morphometric analysis of hominin upper premolars. Shape
20
21 variation and morphological integration. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 61, 688-702.
22
23
- 24 González Echegaray, J., & Freeman, L. G. (1973). Cueva Morín: Excavaciones 1969. Santander:
25
26 Publicaciones del Patronato de las Cuevas Prehistóricas de la Provincia de Santander.
27
28
- 29 González Echegaray, J., García Guinea, M. A., Begines Ramírez, A., & Madariaga de la Campa, B.
30
31 (1963). Cueva de la Chora (Santander). Madrid: Ministerio de Educación Nacional.
32
33 Dirección General de Bellas Artes. Servicio Nacional de Excavaciones Arqueológicas.
34
35
- 36 González Echegaray, J., & Ripoll Perelló, E. (1954). Hallazgos en la cueva de La Pasiega (Puente
37
38 Viesgo, Santander). *Ampurias*, XV-XVI, 43-65.
39
40
- 41 González-Urquijo, J. E., Ibañez, J. J., Lazuén, T., & Mozota, M. (2014). Axlor. In R. Sala (Ed.).
42
43 Los Cazadores Recolectores Del Pleistoceno Y Del Holoceno En Iberia Y El Estrecho de
44
45 Gibraltar, (pp. 45-48). Burgos: Universidad de Burgos.
46
47
- 48 Grimaud-Hervé, D. (1997). L'évolution de l'encéphale chez *Homo erectus* et *Homo sapiens*:
49
50 exemples de l'Asie et de l'Europe: CNRS ed. Paris.
51
52
- 53 Guerrero Sala, L. A., & Lorenzo Lizalde, J. L. (1981). Antropología física en Rascaño. In J.
54
55 González Echegaray, & I. Barandiarán Maestu, (Eds.), *El Paleolítico Superior de la Cueva*
56
57 *de Rascaño (Santander)* (pp. 278-). Santander: Ministerio de Cultura. Dirección General de
58
59 Bellas Artes, Archivos y Bibliotecas.
60

1
2 Henry-Gambier, D. (2006). Les sépultures de Sorde-l'Abbaye (Landes). In M. Dachary, (Ed.), *Les*
3
4 *Magdaléniens à Duruthy Qui étaient-ils, comment vivaient-ils?* (pp. 67-73). Mont-de-
5
6 *Marsan: Conseil général des Landes.*
7

8
9 Henry-Gambier, D., Normand, C., & Pétilion, J.-M. (2013). Datation radiocarbone directe et
10 attribution culturelle des vestiges humains paléolithiques de la grotte d'Isturitz (Pyrénées-
11 Atlantiques). *Bulletin de la Société préhistorique française*, 110, 645-656.
12
13

14
15 Iriarte-Chiapusso, M. J., Wood, R., & Sáenz de Buruaga, A. (2019). Arrillor cave (Basque Country,
16 northern Iberian Peninsula). Chronological, palaeo-environmental and cultural notes on a
17 long Mousterian sequence. *Quaternary International*, 508, 107-115.
18
19

20
21 Jarvis, A., Reuter, H. I., Nelson, A., & Guevara, E. (2008). Hole-filled SRTM for the globe Version
22 4. available from the CGIAR-CSI SRTM 90m Database (<http://srtm.csi.cgiar.org>), 15, 25-
23 54.
24
25
26
27

28
29 Le Cabec, A., Gunz, P., Kupczik, K., Braga, J., & Hublin, J.-J. (2013). Anterior tooth root
30 morphology and size in Neanderthals: Taxonomic and functional implications. *Journal of*
31 *Human Evolution*, 64, 169-193.
32
33
34

35
36 Legland, D., Arganda-Carreras, I., & Andrey, P. (2016). MorphoLibJ: integrated library and plugins
37 for mathematical morphology with ImageJ. *Bioinformatics*, 32, 3532-3534.
38
39

40
41 Marín-Arroyo, A. B., Rios-Garaizar, J., Straus, L. G., Jones, J. R., de la Rasilla, M., González
42 Morales, M. R., . . . Ocio, D. (2018). Chronological reassessment of the Middle to Upper
43 Paleolithic transition and Early Upper Paleolithic cultures in Cantabrian Spain. *Plos one*, 13,
44 e0194708.
45
46
47
48

49
50 Martin, R. M. G., Hublin, J.-J., Gunz, P., & Skinner, M. M. (2017). The morphology of the enamel-
51 dentine junction in Neanderthal molars: Gross morphology, non-metric traits, and temporal
52 trends. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 103, 20-44.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2 Martínón-Torres, M., Bermúdez de Castro, J. M., Gómez-Robles, A., Prado-Simón, L., & Arsuaga,
3
4 J. L. (2012). Morphological description and comparison of the dental remains from
5
6 Atapuerca-Sima de los Huesos site (Spain). *Journal of Human Evolution*, *62*, 7-58.
7
8
9 Molnar, S. (1971). Human tooth wear, tooth function and cultural variability. *American Journal of*
10
11 *Physical Anthropology*, *34*, 175-190.
12
13 Obermaier, H. (1925). *El hombre fósil*. Madrid: Ediciones Istmo.
14
15
16 Pan, L., & Zanolli, C. (2019). Comparative observations on the premolar root and pulp canal
17
18 configurations of Middle Pleistocene Homo in China. *American Journal of Physical*
19
20 *Anthropology*, *168*, 637-646.
21
22
23 Pérez-Iglesias, J. M. (2007). Restos fósiles humanos en el Paleolítico superior de la península
24
25 ibérica. *Arqueoweb*, *8*, 1-17.
26
27
28 QGIS Development Team, 2009. QGIS Geographic Information System. Open Source Geospatial
29
30 Foundation. URL <http://qgis.org>
31
32 Rios-Garaizar, J. (2017). A new chronological and technological synthesis for Late Middle
33
34 Paleolithic of the Eastern Cantabrian Region. *Quaternary International*, *433*, 50-63.
35
36
37 Rodríguez Cuenca, J. V. (2003). *Dientes y diversidad humana: avances de la antropología dental*.
38
39 Bogotá: Editora Guadalupe Ltda.
40
41 Rostro Carmona, J. (2013). Estudio comparado de las piezas dentales de *Homo neanderthalensis* del
42
43 yacimiento Musteriense de Axlor (Dima, Vizcaya). *CKQ Estudios de*
44
45 *Cuaternario/Kuaternario Ikasketak/Quaternary Studies*, *3*, 91-100.
46
47
48 Rougier, H., Crevecoeur, I., Beauval, C., Posth, C., Flas, D., Wißing, C., . . . Krause, J. (2016).
49
50 Neandertal cannibalism and Neandertal bones used as tools in Northern Europe. *Scientific*
51
52 *Reports*, *6*, 29005.
53
54
55 Sala, N., & Conard, N. (2016). Taphonomic analysis of the hominin remains from Swabian Jura and
56
57 their implications for the mortuary practices during the Upper Paleolithic. *Quaternary*
58
59 *Science Reviews*, *150*, 278-300.
60

- 1
2 Sala, N., Pantoja-Pérez, A., Arsuaga, J. L., Pablos, A., & Martínez, I. (2016). The Sima de los
3
4 Huesos Crania: Analysis of the cranial breakage patterns. *Journal of Archaeological*
5
6 *Science*, 72, 25-43.
7
8
9 Saladié, P., Huguet, R., Rodríguez-Hidalgo, A., Cáceres, I., Esteban-Nadal, M., Arsuaga, J. L., . . .
10
11 Carbonell, E. (2012). Intergroup cannibalism in the European Early Pleistocene: The range
12
13 expansion and imbalance of power hypotheses. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 63, 682-695.
14
15
16 Saladié, P., & Rodríguez-Hidalgo, A. (2017). Archaeological Evidence for Cannibalism in
17
18 Prehistoric Western Europe: from Homo antecessor to the Bronze Age. *Journal of*
19
20 *Archaeological Method and Theory*, 24, 1034-1071.
21
22
23 Sanguino González, J., & Montes Barquín, r. (2005). Nuevos datos para el conocimiento del
24
25 Paleolítico Medio en el centro de la Región Cantábrica: la cueva de Covalejos (Piélagos,
26
27 Cantabria). In R. Montes Barquín, & J. A. Lasheras Corruchaga, (Eds.), *Actas de la Reunión*
28
29 *científica: Neandertales cantábricos, estado de la cuestión* (pp. 489-538). Santander: Museo
30
31 Nacional y Centro de Investigación de Altamira. Ministerio de Cultura.
32
33
34 Sanz M., Sala N., Daura J., Pantoja-Pérez A., Santos E, Zilhão J, and Arsuaga JL. (2018).
35
36 Taphonomic inferences about Middle Pleistocene hominins: The human cranium of Gruta
37
38 da Aroeira (Portugal). *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 167, 615-627.
39
40
41 Schindelin, J., Arganda-Carreras, I., Frise, E., Kaynig, V., Longair, M., Pietzsch, T., . . . Cardona,
42
43 A. (2012). Fiji: an open-source platform for biological-image analysis. *Nature Methods*,
44
45 9,676.
46
47
48 Solheim, T. (1992). Amount of secondary dentin as an indicator of age. *European Journal of Oral*
49
50 *Sciences*, 100, 193-199.
51
52
53 Tejero, J. M., Avezuela, B., White, R., Ranlett, S., Quam, R., Tattersall, I., & Bernaldo de Quirós,
54
55 F. (2010). Un pedazo de la Prehistoria cántabra en Nueva York. Las Colecciones de la
56
57 Cueva de El Castillo (Puente Viesgo, Cantabria) en el American Museum of Natural History
58
59 (Nueva York, EEUU). *Munibe (Antropología-Arkeología)*, 61, 5-16.
60

1
2 Turner, C. G., Nichol, C. R., & Scott, G. R. (1991). Scoring procedures for key morphological traits
3
4 of the permanent dentition: the Arizona State University dental anthropology system. In M.
5
6 Kelley, & C. Larsen (Eds.). *Advances in Dental Anthropology*, (pp. 13-31). New York:
7
8 Wiley-Liss.
9

10 Vallois, H., & Delmas, L. (1976). Los frontales de la cueva de El Castillo (España). *Trabajos de*
11
12 *Prehistoria*, 33, 113-120.
13
14

15 Zapata, J., Bayle, P., Lombardi, A. V., Pérez-Pérez, A., & Trinkaus, E. (2017). The Palomas Dental
16
17 Remains: Preservation, Wear, and Morphology. In E. Trinkaus, & M. J. Walker (Eds.),
18
19 *Neandertals from the Sima de las Palomas del Cabezo Gordo, Southeastern Spain* (pp. 52-
20
21 88). College Station, Texas: Texas A&M University Press.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure legends

FIGURE 1 Location of Axlor (red star) and other Paleolithic sites with human remains in the Center and East of the Cantabrian Region (northern Iberian Peninsula and southwestern France). 1: La Pasiega (González Echegaray & Ripoll Perelló, 1954); 2: Castillo (N; HS; Garralda, 2005; Garralda, Maíllo-Fernández, Higham, Neira, & Bernaldo de Quirós, in press; Obermaier, 1925; Tejero et al., 2010; Vallois & Delmas, 1976; 3 Covalejos (N, HS; Sanguino González & Montes Barquín, 2005); 4: Pendo (Basabe, 1982); 5: Morín (HS; González Echegaray & Freeman, 1973; Obermaier, 1925); 6: Rascaño (Guerrero Sala & Lorenzo Lizalde, 1981); 7: La Chora (González Echegaray, García Guinea, Begines Ramírez & Madariaga de la Campa, 1963); 8: Mirón (HS; Carretero et al., 2015); 9: Arrillor (N, Bermúdez de Castro & Sáenz de Buruaga, 1999); 10: Axlor (N; HS; this work); 11: Lezetxiki (N; Basabe, 1970); 12: Santa Catalina (HS; Albisu Andrade, Etxeberria Gabilondo, & Herrasti Erlogorri, 2014); 13: Aitzbitarte III (HS; de la Rúa & Hervella, 2011); 14: Alkerdi (Barandiarán & Cava, 2008); 15: Isturitz (HS; Henry-Gambier, Normand, & Pétilion, 2013); 16: Duruthy (HS; [Henry-Gambier, 2006](#)~~Arambourou & Genet-Varein, 1965~~). N=Neandertal; HS=*Homo sapiens*. Base map made with QGIS 2.18.17 (QGIS Development Team, 2009) with data by Jarvis, Reuter, Nelson, & Guevara (2008).

FIGURE 2 Excavation plan (a) and stratigraphic column (b) of Axlor cave (modified from Gómez-Olivencia et al., 2018a). (a) In the excavation plan the grid system used by J.M. Barandiarán (black square and white numbers) and the excavation area is shadowed in gray. The grid system used by the recent excavations is marked using black letters and numbers and the excavation area is outlined using a thick black line. The dotted line represents the rock-shelter wall when the site was first excavated, during the excavation this wall went back, revealing a possible cave infilling. The colors correspond to the levels to which these remains were attributed based on the notes by

1
2 Barandiarán. (b) Synthetic section of the 1967–1974 excavation stratigraphy, drawn from the
3
4 description of the layers by J. M. Barandiarán (1980). Different levels are marked with different
5
6 colors, and the human remains are marked by silhouettes.
7
8
9

10
11 **FIGURE 3** Ax.11B.415.400 left parietal fragment. The original fossil and the 3D model are
12
13 shown on different views. On the lower row, the approximate location of this fragment is shown on
14
15 the La Ferrassie 1 Neandertal cranium (left), a thickness map (from 2 to 12 mm) is shown (middle)
16
17 with PC that correspond to thicker bone where is located the postcentral sulcus and V to a relative
18
19 thinning produced by the anterior ramus of the meningeal system; and the anatomical features on
20
21 the endocranial surface (right): including meningeal veins, A = anterior branch, O = obelisc branch,
22
23 and sulcal imprints C = central sulcus, PC = postcentral sulcus.
24
25
26
27
28

29
30 **FIGURE 4** Ectocranial view of the specimen Ax.11B.415.400 with the location of zones a-d,
31
32 and detailed images of these zones, where striations are located. In some cases, the grooves show a
33
34 close “V” shape but do not show microstriations. The general morphology of these grooves (see
35
36 text) make them compatible with trampling marks.
37
38
39
40

41
42 **FIGURE 5** Dental remains previously studied by Basabe (1973) and Rostro-Carmona (2013),
43
44 and likely belonging to the same individual. The teeth are shown in mesial, buccal, distal, lingual
45
46 (top) and occlusal (bottom) views, together with the results of the enamel segmentation and the EDJ
47
48 surface morphology. Pulp chamber volumes (in blue) are shown in mesial (P^4 , M^1) and lingual (M^2)
49
50 views. A virtual reconstruction of the teeth in buccal and occlusal views is also provided. Scale bars
51
52 = 1 cm.
53
54
55
56

57
58 **FIGURE 6** Principal components analysis of shape (left column) and form variation (right
59
60 column), corresponding to the teeth previously studied by Basabe (1973) and Rostro-Carmona

1
2 (2013), and likely belonging to the same individual. The Axlor remains have been compared to
3
4 Neandertals (NEA), fossil *Homo sapiens* (FSAP) and recent *Homo sapiens* (RSAP). In both form
5
6 and shape space, the Axlor remains align more closely with modern humans. TPS-grids show
7
8 anatomical variation corresponding to the positive and negative extreme of each PC when all the
9
10 other PCs are held equal to 0. For M¹ variation, the two data points correspond to Axlor's variation
11
12 before (darker red) and after (lighter red) correcting the enamel cracks ([Supplementary information](#)
13
14 [Figure S13](#)).
15
16
17
18
19

20 **FIGURE 7** New dental remains from the Barandiarán collection of Axlor. AX.5B.299.16 (right
21
22 permanent first lower incisor, I₁): root canal morphology (blue) in mesial view; mesial, buccal,
23
24 distal, lingual and occlusal views. AX.5B.299.31.64.17 (upper left first deciduous incisor, dI¹): top,
25
26 mesial, buccal, distal, lingual and occlusal views. AX.9E.283.103 (left dM²): top, mesial, buccal,
27
28 distal, lingual and occlusal views. In the virtual reconstructions, enamel is represented in white and
29
30 dentine in brown. Scale bars = 1 cm
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 The human remains from Axlor (Dima, Biscay, Northern Iberian Peninsula)
3
4
5

6 Asier Gómez-Olivencia^{a,b,c,d*}
7

8 Diego López-Onaindia^e
9

10 Nohemi Sala^{f,d}
11

12 Antoine Balzeau^{g,h}
13

14 Ana Pantoja-Pérez^d
15

16 Ignacio Arganda-Carreras^{i,b,j}
17

18 Mikel Arlegi^{a,k}
19

20 Joseba Rios-Garaizar^f
21

22 Aida Gómez-Robles^{l,m,n}
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 ^aDept. Estratigrafía y Paleontología, Facultad de Ciencia y Tecnología, Universidad del País Vasco-
30 Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea (UPV/EHU). Barrio Sarriena s/n, 48940 Bilbao, Spain.
31

32 ^bIKERBASQUE. Basque Foundation for Science, Bilbao, Spain.
33

34 ^cSociedad de Ciencias Aranzadi, Zorroagaina 11, 20014 Donostia-San Sebastian, Spain.
35

36 ^dCentro UCM-ISCIH de Investigación sobre Evolución y Comportamiento Humanos, Avda.
37 Monforte de Lemos 5 (Pabellón 14), 28029 Madrid, Spain.
38

39 ^eGREAB, Unitat d'Antropologia Biològica, Departament de Biologia Animal, Biologia Vegetal i
40 Ecologia, Facutat de Biociències, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 08193 Bellaterra, Spain.
41

42 ^fCentro Nacional de Investigación sobre la Evolución Humana (CENIEH), Paseo de la Sierra de
43 Atapuerca 3, 09002 Burgos, Spain.
44

45 ^gÉquipe de Paléontologie Humaine, UMR 7194, CNRS, Département Homme et Environnement,
46 Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle. Musée de l'Homme, 17, Place du Trocadéro, 75016 Paris,
47 France
48

49 ^hDepartment of African Zoology, Royal Museum for Central Africa, Tervuren, Belgium
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ⁱDept. Ciencias de la Computacion e Inteligencia Artificial. Facultad de Informatica, Universidad del País Vasco-Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea (UPV/EHU) Manuel Lardizabal Ibilbidea 1, 20018 Donostia, Gipuzkoa, Spain.

^jDonostia International Physics Center (DIPC). Manuel Lardizabal Ibilbidea 4, 20018 Donostia, Gipuzkoa, Spain.

^kUniversité de Bordeaux, PACEA UMR 5199, Bâtiment B8, Allée Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, 33615 Pessac, France.

^lDepartment of Anthropology, University College London, WC1E 0BW London, UK.

^mDepartment of Genetics, Evolution and Environment, University College London, WC1E 6BT London, UK.

ⁿDepartment of Life Sciences, Natural History Museum, SW7 5BD London, UK.

Correspondence

Asier Gómez-Olivencia, Dept. Estratigrafía y Paleontología, Facultad de Ciencia y Tecnología, Universidad del País Vasco-Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea (UPV/EHU). Barrio Sarriena s/n, 48940 Bilbao, Spain.

Email: asier.gomez@ehu.eus (A.G.-O.)

Abstract

Objectives: We provide the description and comparative analysis of all the human fossil remains found at Axlor during the excavations carried out by J.M. Barandiarán from 1967 to 1974: a cranial vault fragment and eight teeth, five of which likely belonged to the same individual, although two are currently lost. Our goal is to describe in detail all these human remains and discuss both their taxonomic attribution and their stratigraphic context.

Materials and methods: We describe external and internal anatomy, and use classic and geometric morphometrics. The teeth from Axlor are compared to Neandertals, Upper Paleolithic and recent modern humans.

Results: Three teeth (a left dm^2 , a left di^1 , and a right I_1) and the parietal fragment show morphological features consistent with a Neanderthal classification, and were found in an undisturbed Mousterian context. The remaining three teeth (plus the two lost ones), initially classified as Neandertals, show morphological features and a general size that are more compatible with their classification as modern humans.

Discussion: The combined anatomical and stratigraphic study suggest that the remains of two different adult Neandertals have been recovered during the old excavations performed by Barandiarán: a left parietal fragment (level VIII) and a right I_1 (level V). Additionally, two different Neanderthal children lost deciduous teeth during the formations of levels V (left di^1) and IV (right dm^2). In addition, a modern human individual is represented by five remains (two currently lost) from a complex stratigraphic setting. Some of the morphological features of these remains suggest that they may represent one of the scarce examples of Upper Paleolithic modern human remains in the northern Iberian Peninsula, which should be confirmed by further testing.

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

KEYWORDS

Neandertal, anatomically modern humans, enamel-dentine junction, geometric morphometrics,
Paleolithic

1-Introduction

The rock-shelter of Axlor is located in the mountainous region included in the national park of Urkiola (Biscay, Basque Country) and preserves one of the most important Middle Paleolithic sequences in the northern Iberian Peninsula (Figure 1). Axlor was discovered in 1932 by the Basque prehistorian J. M. Barandiarán. The first archaeological excavations took place in 1967, and encompassed a total of eight field seasons until 1974 (Barandiarán, 1980). These excavations revealed a sequence of nine layers (I-IX), in which Middle Paleolithic lithic assemblages were found in levels III to VIII. Recent excavations (2000-2008) directed by González-Urquijo, Ibáñez and Rios-Garaizar, provide a new stratigraphic sequence, roughly equivalent to the previous one, but with additional levels, not previously identified or excavated by Barandiarán. Some of these levels were deposited before level VIII, but their chronology remains uncertain (González-Urquijo, Ibáñez, Lazuén & Mozota, 2014; Rios-Garaizar, 2017). Additionally, an early Upper Paleolithic occupation has been recognized (level A of the new excavations, equivalent to the base of Barandiarán's level II, previously considered sterile; González-Urquijo et al., 2014). Ultra-filtered dates obtained from red deer with anthropogenic marks from level IV have yielded results that go beyond the radiocarbon limit, correcting previous dating which situated this level at the very end of regional Middle Paleolithic (Marín-Arroyo et al., 2018). Across the sequence, there are clear differences in terms of the technological characteristics, percentage of ungulate taxa consumed, and type of occupation of the cave between the upper (III-VI) and lower levels (VII-VIII) of the Mousterian sequence, which has been confirmed during the recent excavations (Altuna, 1989; Castaños, 2005; González-Urquijo et al., 2014; Rios-Garaizar, 2017). Recent reassessment of the Barandiarán collection has identified the presence of bird and carnivore exploitation for the first time during the Middle Paleolithic of the Cantabrian region: at least a golden eagle and a lynx where exploited for dietary purposes (Gómez-Olivencia et al., 2018a).

1
2 [INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE]
3
4
5
6

7 The current human fossil record published for Axlor is limited to five upper left dental
8 remains (C, P⁴-M³) with a maxilla fragment, likely belonging to the same individual (a young
9 adult), which were found in 1967 from a level with Quina Mousterian lithics and faunal remains of
10 red deer, reindeer, and steppe bison (Basabe, 1973; [Figure 2](#)). Basabe (1973) seems to be cautious
11 in the taxonomic assessment of these remains. While he considers that the morphology of these
12 dental remains is compatible with that found in similar (Mousterian) archaeological contexts, he
13 nonetheless considers these remains as “evolved”, with “intermediate” size and traits, including the
14 “unclear” taurodontism in M1-M2 (Basabe, 1973). Currently, only three (P⁴, M¹, M³) of these
15 remains are curated at the Arkeologi Museoa (Bilbao), whereas the location of the other teeth is
16 unknown. A more recent reassessment of these teeth supported a Neandertal classification based on
17 their size and the alleged presence of taurodontism in the molars (Rostro-Carmona, 2013).
18 However, a visual inspection of the morphology of the M¹ shows that it does not present the typical
19 Neandertal morphology for this tooth (e.g., Bailey, 2004; Gómez-Robles et al., 2007). Moreover, no
20 study of the internal anatomy of the teeth based on virtual anthropology techniques has been
21 performed, which could provide a more accurate taxonomic assessment. In 2005, the re-assessment
22 of the whole Barandiarán collection (coordinated by J.E. González Urquijo) resulted in the
23 recognition of three additional human remains: two teeth and a cranial fragment. More recently, the
24 reassessment of the faunal collection from Barandiarán's excavation has resulted in the
25 identification of an additional human remain among the faunal remains: an upper deciduous molar.
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 [INSERT FIGURE 2 HERE]
53
54
55
56

57 Here we provide a detailed description and comparative analysis of all the human fossil
58 remains from Axlor found during J.M. Barandiarán's excavations, including a taphonomic analysis
59
60

1
2 of the cranial fragment. This study also reassess the taxonomic affinities of the remains published
3
4 by Basabe (1973) and Rostro-Carmona (2013), and discusses the archaeological context of all the
5
6 human remains from this collection. In fact, the revision of the archaeological context from the
7
8 field-notes taken by J.M. de Barandiarán at the site casts doubts on the stratigraphic position of all
9
10 the teeth studied by Basabe (1973) and Rostro-Carmona (2013), while in the rest of the cases the
11
12 association of these human remains to Mousterian contexts seems secure ([Supplementary](#)
13
14 [Information Text S1](#)).
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 **2-Materials and Methods**

23 *2.1-Materials*

24
25
26
27
28
29 The current collection of human remains from the Barandiarán excavations includes an
30
31 upper fourth premolar, an upper first molar and an upper third molar from the same (young adult)
32
33 individual (Basabe, 1973), a cranial fragment, a lower right central incisor, an upper left first
34
35 deciduous incisor and a left upper deciduous second molar ([Table 1](#)). Their spatial location,
36
37 according to the available information is shown in [Figure 2](#). Access to these materials was granted
38
39 by the Arkeologi Museoa (Bilbao). The CT scans of these fossils, the derived segmentation files,
40
41 and 3D volumes are freely accessible.
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 [INSERT TABLE 1 HERE]
49
50
51
52
53

54 *2.2-Micro-CT scanning*

55
56
57 All the Axlor human remains were micro-CT scanned at the Spanish National Research
58
59 Center for Human Evolution (CENIEH) using a Phoenix v/tome/x s (GE Measurement & Control).
60

1
2 The resolution was maximized depending on the size of the different fossil remains (teeth:
3
4 18.99 μm ; cranial fragment: 33 μm).
5
6
7
8

9 *2.3-Anatomical descriptions*

10
11 Standard methods were used to describe and analyze the external and internal anatomy of
12
13 the cranial fragment. Previous knowledge of the anatomy and relative variation of exo and
14
15 endocranial surfaces was used to identify the anatomical position and diagnostic features of the
16
17 cranial fragment (e.g., Balzeau, 2013; Balzeau, Grimaud-Hervé & Gilissen, 2011; Balzeau et al.,
18
19 2017). The teeth were described following established anatomical dental terms (Carlsen, 1987). In
20
21 addition, we scored several non-metric traits following both the Arizona State University Dental
22
23 Anthropology System (ASUDAS) (Turner, Nichol & Scott, 1991) and some complementary traits
24
25 described by Bailey (2002), which were compared to Neandertals, Upper Paleolithic modern
26
27 humans (UPMH) and recent humans (Martinón-Torres, Bermúdez de Castro, Gómez-Robles,
28
29 Prado-Simón, & Arsuaga, 2012). Some of these traits were also scored in the EDJ surface and
30
31 completed by the traits described by Martin, Hublin, Gunz, & Skinner (2017) for the molars. The
32
33 roots of the incisors were measured following the method described by Le Cabec, Gunz, Kupczik,
34
35 Braga & Hublin (2013): Root Length (RL), Root Volume (RV), Root Pulp Volume (RPV), Crown
36
37 Pulp Volume (CrPV) and different ratios between these measurements. Dental wear assessment was
38
39 based on Molnar (1971).
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 *2.4-Bone thickness mapping (cranial fragment) and volume segmentation (teeth)*

49
50 The 3D variation of the total bone thickness of the cranial fragment was evaluated using the
51
52 exo- and endocranial surfaces using the module Surface-Distance of Avizo 7. The results of this
53
54 analysis were illustrated using a chromatic scale and compared to previous studies (Balzeau, 2013)
55
56 in order to gain insights on the potential taxonomic significance of the thickness distribution
57
58 pattern.
59
60

1
2 In the case of the teeth, before their segmentation, the CT image volumes were pre-
3
4 processed using Fiji (Schindelin et al., 2012) by first converting them to 8-bit and then re-sampling
5
6 them in the Z direction by a factor of 2 (final volume resolution: 0.019 x 0.019 x 0.038 microns per
7
8 voxel). Next, the volumes were segmented using an interactive learning approach (Arganda-
9
10 Carreras et al., 2017) that classified each voxel as belonging to one of the following classes: bone,
11
12 dentine, enamel, or background. The pulp chamber was afterwards labeled by semi-automatic
13
14 filling of the cavity inside the other teeth labels. The output label images were cleaned up by
15
16 removing small artifacts and noise by means of morphological operations (Legland, Arganda-
17
18 Carreras & Andrey, 2016). Finally, we performed manual correction of the segmented images using
19
20 AvizoLite software due to the presence of cracks in some teeth, and lower density zones in the
21
22 enamel some of the teeth.
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 *2.5-Taphonomic analysis*

31
32 The cranial bone was macroscopically and microscopically examined using a hand lens and a
33
34 stereoscopic zoom microscope (Olympus SZX10) to examine surface modifications. For the
35
36 analysis of striae regarding the differentiation between cut marks and trampling marks we have used
37
38 the protocol proposed by Domínguez-Rodrigo, de Juana, Galán & Rodríguez (2009). The cranial
39
40 breakage pattern was analyzed following the criteria developed by Sala, Pantoja-Pérez, Arsuaga,
41
42 Pablos & Martínez (2016) to assess the presence/absence of perimortem (fresh bone) and
43
44 postmortem (dry bone) fractures. Four parameters were recorded: fracture outline (linear, depressed,
45
46 stellate); fracture angle (right or oblique); fracture edge (smooth or jagged); presence/absence of
47
48 cortical delamination.
49
50
51
52
53

54 *2.6-Geometric morphometrics*

55
56
57 Geometric morphometric analyses of the occlusal surface of the premolar and molar crowns
58
59 were used to compare the Axlor posterior permanent teeth with the Neandertal and modern human
60

1 samples used in Gomez-Robles et al. (2007), Gómez-Robles, Bermúdez de Castro, Martínón-
2 Torres, Prado-Simón, & Arsuaga (2012), and Gómez-Robles, Martínón-Torres, Bermúdez de
3 Castro, Prado-Simón, & Arsuaga (2011). Modern human samples included both fossil and recent
4 modern humans. Occlusal photographs were used to place 2D configurations of landmarks and
5 semilandmarks. For the M¹, analyses were repeated on the original photographs and on an occlusal
6 projection of the occlusal surface obtained after virtually correcting enamel cracks. Because the
7 Axlor M¹ is heavily worn, the location of anatomical landmarks on cusp apices cannot be
8 unequivocally determined. Therefore, M¹ analyses were repeated twice, using the original
9 configuration of landmarks and semilandmarks as described in Gómez-Robles et al. (2007) and only
10 the configuration of outline semilandmarks (after removing the four anatomical landmarks). The
11 second analysis, therefore, focuses on the ability of the M¹ occlusal outline to differentiate
12 Neandertal from modern human molars. The Axlor P⁴ and M³ are substantially less worn than the
13 M¹, so only the complete configuration of landmarks and semilandmarks was evaluated for them.
14 For all the posterior teeth, geometric morphometric analyses were performed that included and
15 excluded size variation (in form and shape space, respectively). A discriminant analysis based on
16 the first ten principal components of shape variation was carried out to evaluate the species that
17 Axlor teeth are assigned to.

3-Metric, morphological and taphonomic description

18 The cranial and the dental remains are described here. The comparison of the external crown
19 metric data between Axlor teeth and different comparative samples are shown in [Table 2](#). Only
20 taxonomically useful metric traits are discussed below.

[INSERT TABLE 2 HERE]

3.1-Cranial fragment

AX.11B.415.400 is a fragment (56 × 41 mm) of a left parietal bone, which preserves 54 mm of the sagittal suture (Figure 3). The suture is not fused, and this left fragment has been separated from the right parietal bone without any breakage of the indentations. Bone thickness for the analyzed area is only slightly smaller than in La Ferrassie 1 (Balzeau, 2013) and thus incompatible with a young immature status. Thus, the fragment is not from a child, but may belong to a young adult or adult. The antero-posterior curvature of this fragment is not very pronounced.

[INSERT FIGURE 3 HERE]

Bone thickness distribution was quantified on nearly the whole preserved area of this fragment. Thickness varies between 3.4 mm and 10.5 mm. The mean thickness of the fragment is 5.4 mm. Thickness is evenly distributed along the surface of the fragment, there is no clear increase or decrease related to bone thickness variation. The only exception concerns the blood vessels on the endocranial surface of the anterior border of the fragment, which are associated with a clear thinning of the bone (the area with white dots at the anterior border of the bone, noted V on Figure 3). Moreover, the infero-anterior corner of the fragment shows a slight increase in bone thickness (represented by the purple area, noted PC on Figure 3) which continues posteriorly and obliquely. It corresponds to the postcentral sulcus.

Some clear endocranial features are visible. Some branches of the meningeal system are noticeable. They probably all belong to the anterior ramus, one being the anterior branch (noted A on Figure 3), the second corresponding to the obelic branch (noted O on Fig. 3). The anterior branch splits in two simple veins that are quite large. The obelic branch splits into two smaller and long veins. Concerning the gyral pattern visible on this endocranial surface, two sulci are clear. The

1
2 course of the postcentral sulcus (noted PC on [Figure 3](#)) goes from the antero-inferior corner of the
3
4 fragment to the center of the medial border of the fragment. This sulcus is well printed and shows a
5
6 clear course. Anteriorly, the central sulcus (noted C on [Figure 3](#)) seems to run along the course of
7
8 the most anterior vein of the anterior ramus. Those two sulci have a parallel course, delimiting a
9
10 post-central gyrus that has a regular width on its preserved extension.
11
12
13
14
15

16 Both bone thickness distribution pattern and endocranial anatomy provide information that
17
18 helps to propose a taxonomic attribution for this fragment. Bone thickness shows little variation. In
19
20 modern humans, there is a clear decrease in bone thickness in the area of the superior parietal gyrus.
21
22 The pattern observed on this fragment resembles what has been described for Neandertals (Balzeau,
23
24 2013). The position and size of the anterior branch of the meningeal system on this fragment, as
25
26 well as its subsequent bone thickness variation, fits with the anatomy observed in Neandertals. The
27
28 meningeal system in this area has more anastomoses than in modern humans, and blood vessels are
29
30 thinner and more numerous (Grimaud-Hervé, 1997). In summary the anatomical features preserved
31
32 in this parietal fragment are consistent with a Neandertal classification.
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 The bone surface of the cranial fragment is well preserved and does not show weathering
40
41 (sensu Behrensmeyer, 1978). No direct carnivore activity (i.e., tooth marks) was documented, nor
42
43 any sign of burning. Similarly, no other biological modifications, such as rodent activity or root
44
45 etching, was observed. This cranial fragment shows several striations in the outer table in five
46
47 different areas ([Figure 4](#)). In some cases, the grooves are close “V” shaped, but microstriations were
48
49 not evident. On the other hand, the trajectories of the grooves are usually sinuous and most of the
50
51 bone surface is covered by very shallow striae. In some cases, the color of the striations is lighter
52
53 compared with the bone surface suggesting that they have occurred after its deposition. These
54
55 observations are compatible with trampling marks following the protocol described by Domínguez-
56
57 Rodrigo et al. (2009). Regarding the fracture analysis, this remain displays three linear fractures,
58
59
60

1
2 one of them parallel and two perpendicular to the cranial suture. The two fractures perpendicular to
3
4 the suture have right angled edges, jagged surfaces and absence of cortical delamination. These
5
6 characteristics are typical of fracturing in dry bone (Sala et al., 2016). However, the fracture that is
7
8 parallel to the suture displays an oblique angle, smooth surface and presence of cortical
9
10 delamination (0.75 cm) on the inner table. The combination of these fracture attributes is usually
11
12 considered representative of perimortem fractures (Sala et al., 2016).
13
14
15
16
17

18 [INSERT FIGURE 4 HERE]
19
20
21
22

23 *3.2-Upper left fourth premolar, maxillary fragment with upper first molar and upper third molar*
24
25 *belonging to the same individual*
26
27
28
29

30 Descriptions and analyses are provided for the three dental remains belonging to the same
31
32 individual. These remains are shown in Figure 5 and are morphologically compared in Tables 3-5.
33
34
35

36 Ax.13F.265.1 (AX.13E/13F.265-270.1 according to the museum records) is a complete
37
38 premolar, although its root is damaged and presents longitudinal cracks on both sides and some
39
40 smaller transversal cracks. In addition, there is a small pitting on the vestibular side of the buccal
41
42 cusp, and erosion on the tip of this cusp (Figure 5). Also, in the areas with the highest enamel
43
44 thickness of the crown (the buccal and lingual sides) there is a part of the enamel that shows lower
45
46 density in the CT images (Supplementary information Figure S12). The similarity in height between
47
48 the lingual and buccal cusps and the two long inter-proximal facets suggest it is a P⁴. In addition,
49
50 the distal interproximal wear facet matches well the mesial counterpart of the Axlor M¹ (Figure 5),
51
52 further supporting that this is a P⁴, and indicating that they both belonged to the same individual
53
54
55
56
57 (see below).
58
59
60

1
2 [INSERT FIGURE 5 HERE]
3
4
5

6 The occlusal surface is moderately worn (stage 3; Molnar, 1971), and the dentine is exposed
7 on the lingual cusp. Yet, the inter-proximal wear facets are visible to the naked eye, and the distal
8 one is larger. This premolar shows a distal accessory marginal tubercle, a bifurcated buccal essential
9 crest (grade 2 from Bailey, 2002) and a distal accessory ridge on the buccal cusp (Table 3).
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 [INSERT TABLE 3 HERE]
19
20
21
22

23 At the EDJ level, two major cusps are observed: buccal and lingual. The essential crest of
24 both the lingual and buccal cusps are bifurcated (Grade 2; Table 3), which are features typically
25 observed on Neandertals (92.3% and 61.5% respectively). On the mesial side it presents a
26 continuous transverse crest that does not connect with the horn tip of the lingual cusp, also typical
27 in Neandertals (69.2%). In addition, there is an intermediate accessory marginal tubercle distal to
28 the buccal cusp. The coronal pulp cavity is conformed by the two horns corresponding to the main
29 cusps, where the buccal horn is almost two times larger than the lingual one.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 This premolar shows a single, mediolaterally flat root. This root runs wide and straight in
42 the most cervical half, while the apical third is narrower. Both the mesial and distal sides present
43 longitudinal grooves, of which the distal is more pronounced. The analysis of the root canal based
44 on the μ CT images shows that this is a single canal (Type 1R₁) which is only found in 12.5% of
45 Neandertals (Pan & Zanolli, 2019; Table 3).
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 Geometric morphometric analyses show that Neandertals and recent modern humans are
56 almost completely separated along the P⁴ morphospace, with Neandertals showing a lingually
57 expanded and asymmetric morphology and modern humans showing a symmetric and lingually
58
59
60

1
2 reduced configuration, where the interfoveal distance is strongly reduced (Figure 6; Gómez-Robles
3
4 et al., 2011). Interestingly, fossil modern humans completely overlap with Neandertals, showing a
5
6 premolar configuration that is much more similar to that of Neandertals than to that of recent
7
8 modern humans. The Axlor P⁴ plots right on the imaginary line that separates the areas of
9
10 distribution of Neandertals and recent modern humans, but outside the range of distribution of both
11
12 groups. The Axlor P⁴ plots on this intermediate position because it shares a generally asymmetric
13
14 morphology with Neandertals, but a moderately reduced distal cusp and a shortened interfoveal
15
16 distance with modern humans. Based on these traits, a discriminant analysis classifies the Axlor P⁴
17
18 as a modern human, but with a low probability of only 56%. When adding size information, the
19
20 Axlor P⁴ plots again in an intermediate position between Neandertals and recent modern humans.
21
22 Interestingly, it also plots on the lower extreme of the size variation found in fossil modern humans,
23
24 indicating that the Axlor P⁴ is larger than most recent modern humans, but smaller than most
25
26 Neandertals and fossil modern humans.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 [INSERT FIGURE 6 HERE]
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Ax.13F.265.3 (AX.13E/13F.265-270.3 according to the museum records) represents a left
42
43 maxilla fragment, preserving both the external surface (ca. 13.3 × 9.2 mm), and the internal surface
44
45 (13.4 × 9.8 mm), with the left M¹ placed in its alveolus. This tooth is fragmented due to longitudinal
46
47 and transversal cracks that affect the crown and roots (Figure 5). Inter-proximal wear facets are
48
49 clear in both sides and the mesial one shows clear grooves on it. This mesial facet shows two
50
51 chippings in its occlusal border. Also, the occlusal surface of the tooth is heavily worn (stage 4-5;
52
53 Molnar, 1971) and the dentine is exposed in all four main cusps, which interferes with the
54
55 observation of several morphological traits.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 The metacone and the hypocone of this molar are well developed (grade 4 ASUDAS), and
3
4 there is no cusp 5 (Table 4). The hypocone is not distolingually projected, but it is aligned with the
5
6 protocone on the lingual side and with the metacone on the distal side. Due to the heavy occlusal
7
8 wear, it is not possible to score the presence of Carabelli's tubercle or the mesial marginal accessory
9
10 tubercle. The EDJ reveals the presence of an intermediate post-paracone tubercle and no sign of
11
12 fifth cusp (Table 4). Moreover, there is a type II *crista obliqua*, continuously connecting the
13
14 metacone to the protocone, which is centrally positioned. The occlusal wear also affects the dentine
15
16 to a large extent, which may influence trait assessments, but a Carabelli's tubercle does not seem to
17
18 be present. The horn tip of the hypocone pulp cavity is small and not projected, in contrast with the
19
20 typical Neandertal morphology (Supplementary Information Figure S14).
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 [INSERT TABLE 4 HERE]
28
29
30
31

32 The three roots are separated, all the radicular canals are divergent and the body is relatively
33
34 short. The canal corresponding to the mesio-buccal root is the widest one, being mesiodistally flat.
35
36 Moreover, the cervical third of this root canal is elongated, presenting a wide morphology, and the
37
38 apical end is bifurcated. This root morphology contrasts with the typical Neandertal taurodont
39
40 configuration.
41
42
43
44

45 Analyses of shape variation show a generally clear separation between Neandertals and
46
47 modern humans, with Neandertals showing a skewed M¹ configuration and modern humans
48
49 showing a squared configuration (Figure 6; Bailey, 2004; Gómez-Robles et al., 2007). Both groups
50
51 show a minor overlapping area where many fossil modern humans, as well as the Axlor M¹, are
52
53 found. Based on shape data, Axlor M¹ is classified as a modern human with a probability of 88.8%
54
55 or 98.6% (before and after correcting the enamel cracks, respectively). Because of the small size of
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 the Axlor M¹, adding size information to the PCA makes this specimen plot comfortably within the
3
4 modern human range of distribution.
5
6
7

8
9 When assessing only the M¹ outline as defined by curve semilandmarks ([Supplementary](#)
10
11 [Information Figure S15](#)), the differentiation between Neandertals and modern humans is less clear.
12
13 There is still an area of the morphospace occupied only for Neandertals and another one occupied
14
15 only by modern humans on the grounds of their skewed or squared outline configurations,
16
17 respectively. However, the overlapping area between both species is larger in this case.
18
19 Irrespectively of whether enamel cracks are corrected or not, the Axlor M¹ plots again in the area of
20
21 overlapping of both species. Outline shape data also classify the Axlor M¹ as a modern human with
22
23 a very high probability of more than 99% (with and without enamel crack corrections). Form
24
25 analyses (including size information) also make Axlor M¹ plot comfortably within the range of
26
27 variation of modern humans.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36
37 Ax.13F.265.2 (AX.13E/13F.265-270.2 according to museum records) This tooth is well
38
39 preserved upper left M³. The crown is complete, but the lingual root is broken, and it is possible to
40
41 observe longitudinal cracks on both sides of the preserved root fragment. In addition, it shows
42
43 moderate wear on the buccal cusp tips but there is no exposed dentine on them (stage 2; Molnar,
44
45 1971).
46
47
48
49

50
51 There is a well-developed metacone but the hypocone is absent ([Table 5](#)). Nevertheless,
52
53 there is a small fifth cusp, that is positioned distally to a lingual tubercle. On the EDJ it can be
54
55 observed that there is no crista obliqua, and that the post-paracone tubercle is intermediate ([Table](#)
56
57 [5](#)). Dentine horn tips of the major cusps are not centrally compressed. The preserved part of the root
58
59 corresponds to the two buccal roots, with both apical tips completely closed. These two roots are
60

1
2 fused, but the root canals run independently along most of the root, except in the most apical tip
3
4 where they meet again.
5
6
7

8
9 [INSERT TABLE 5 HERE]
10
11
12

13 Shape analyses show that the separation between Neandertal and modern human M³s is far
14 from clear (Figure 6; Gómez-Robles et al., 2012). Both species overlap completely along PC1, and
15 they show certain morphological trends only along PC2, with Neandertals tending to show positive
16 values associated with a more expanded hypocone, and modern humans tending to show negative
17 values associated with a strongly reduced hypocone that may be absent altogether. As with the other
18 adult posterior teeth, the M³ from Axlor plots on the area of the morphospace where Neandertals
19 and modern humans overlap. Shape data classify this M³ as a modern human with a probability of
20 78.4%, but it should be noted that the percentage of correct classification for Neandertals is very
21 low. The inclusion of size information makes this molar plot far outside the range of variation of
22 Neandertals on the grounds of its small size.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 In summary, based on both morphological and size characteristics, this individual shows
39 stronger affinities with modern humans than with Neandertals.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 *3.3-Additional dental remains* 49 50 51

52 AX.5B.299.16 This is a well-preserved lower right first incisor, although it shows heavy wear on
53 the incisal edge, having lost between the 20-50% of the crown (roughly equivalent to Grade 4;
54 Molnar, 1971; Figure 7). The degree of shoveling, labial convexity and the interproximal facets
55 cannot be assessed due to the heavy incisal wear. The bucco-lingual diameter (7.7 mm) is larger
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 than the one observed in modern humans and it fits well within the Neandertal range of variation. In
3
4 contrast, the mesio-distal diameter is slightly smaller than the Neandertal minimum and falls within
5
6 the modern human distribution (Table 2). Nonetheless, this mesio-distal measure is most probably
7
8 affected by the wear of the crown. The cingular region is bulky, although there is no tuberculum
9
10 dentale. The heavy wear also affects the observation of the degree of shoveling at the EDJ level,
11
12 where no tuberculum dentale is observed. The root length of this incisor is 20.86 mm, equal to the
13
14 maximum value reported in Neandertals (13.8-20.86 mm), and longer than the currently known
15
16 values for Upper Palaeolithic (11.84-14.20 mm) and recent modern humans (13.18-19.22 mm)
17
18 (comparative samples from Le Cabec et al., 2013). In addition, the root volume is higher than any
19
20 reported value for Neandertals or anatomically modern humans (458.33 mm³). On the other hand,
21
22 the volume of the crown pulp (CrPV) and the radicular canal (RpV) are in the low end of the
23
24 variability of Neandertals, 6.61 mm³ and 2.65 mm³, respectively. The ratio between the volume of
25
26 these two values is 0.4, which is situated in the highest half of the Neandertal variability, indicating
27
28 a proportionally bigger crown pulp segment compared to the root (comparative samples from Le
29
30 Cabec et al., 2013). In sum, the features observed on this tooth (in particular, its crown and root
31
32 length size) align it with Neandertals.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 [INSERT FIGURE 7 HERE]
42
43
44

45 AX.5B.299.31.64.17 This is an upper left first deciduous incisor with a well-preserved crown, but
46
47 the root is not complete (Figure 7). The smooth and twisted aspect of the fracture line of the root
48
49 has been interpreted in other individuals as the result of root resorption, corresponding to a 6-8-
50
51 years-old individual based on modern standards (AlQahtani, Hector, & Liversidge, 2010). Despite
52
53 the heavy wear (Grade 5, Molnar, 1971), a marked shovel shape is observable on the enamel
54
55 surface (>3 ASUDAS). The mesio-distal diameter of this incisor falls within the metric variation of
56
57 both Neandertals and modern humans, but the bucco-lingual diameter is larger than the maximum
58
59
60

1
2 value for the latter group (Table 2). There is no tuberculum dentale, and it is not possible to evaluate
3
4 the labial convexity on the enamel. The EDJ shows a strong and asymmetric labial convexity, more
5
6 marked on the mesial side than on the distal. Moreover, there is no tuberculum dentale observed at
7
8 the EDJ level, and it shows a well-developed shovel shape (>3 ASUDAS). In sum, the features
9
10 observed on this tooth (in particular, its strong and asymmetric labial convexity, its well-developed
11
12 shovel shape) and its size align it with Neandertals.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 AX.9E.283.103 This tooth is an upper left second deciduous molar that preserves a nearly complete
21
22 crown. The tooth is heavily worn exhibiting dentine in all four cusps, and the mesial inter-proximal
23
24 side of the enamel is missing. This tooth does not preserve the root, likely resorpted and/or
25
26 subsequently broken, and would have belonged to a 10-11-years-old individual based on modern
27
28 standards (AlQahtani et al., 2010). The size of the crown of this specimen does not provide
29
30 taxonomic information due to the large overlap between Neandertals and modern humans (Table 2).
31
32 Both the metacone and the hypocone are well developed (grade 4 ASUDAS). Despite the heavy
33
34 wear, it is possible to observe a big Carabelli's trait (Grade > 2 ASUDAS), but it is not possible to
35
36 assess the presence of any other accessory tubercles. The EDJ presents a big Carabelli's trait that is
37
38 affected by the fracture of the mesial interproximal side of the tooth, which does not allow locating
39
40 the dentine horn. Moreover, the crista obliqua is continuous, and of type II, with a centered placed
41
42 protocone, which is a typical Neandertal trait (Becam et al., 2015; Becam & Chevalier, 2019). A
43
44 quantitative analysis of this molar has not been carried out, but qualitative observation shows that
45
46 the skewed morphology typical of Neandertal dm²s is not present (Bailey et al., 2014). A generally
47
48 squared outline morphology is present in this specimen instead. This squared morphology may
49
50 result from the presence of a well-developed Carabelli's trait, which is reported to give Neandertal
51
52 dm²s a less skewed appearance (Bailey et al., 2014). In sum, most features observed on this tooth
53
54 align it with Neandertals.
55
56
57
58
59
60

Discussion

Taxonomic assessment of the Axlør fossil remains

The human remains from Axlør can be divided into two different groups. The first group includes a series of published dental remains, traditionally regarded as belonging to a single Neandertal individual (Basabe, 1973), which our results better classify as belonging to a modern human. Indeed, a detailed evaluation of the field notes of J.M. Barandiarán and our own assessment of the stratigraphy at the place where these remains were found cast doubts regarding their belonging to the Middle Paleolithic layers ([Supplementary Information Text S1](#)). The second group of human remains includes three dental remains and a cranial fragment, described here for the first time, which show clear Neandertal affinities and whose attribution to Mousterian layers seems secure based on our assessment of the J.M. Barandiarán field notes.

The first group includes three teeth, P⁴, M¹ and M³ (plus two additional lost specimens), likely belonging to the same individual as already stated by Basabe (1973). The (moderate) wear stage and the fact that the apical tip of the M³ root is closed indicates that they belonged to a young adult. Several features, mainly related to the M¹ morphology, question the previous taxonomic assignment of these teeth. First, the hypocone of the M¹ is not bulky and projected disto-lingually ([Figures 5-6; Supplementary Information Figures S14-S15](#)), the tips of the dentine horns, as far as it can be inferred given the heavy wear of the molar, are not centrally placed, and the molar is not taurodont. In summary, this molar lacks all the traits that are typically associated with Neandertal M¹s. Second, the P⁴ shows a single root channel (an infrequent trait in Neandertals; Pan & Zanolli, 2019), a reduced lingual cusp and a shortened interfoveal distance (typically observed in modern humans). However, other traits in this individual seem to be more frequent in Neandertals. First, the

1
2 bifurcated buccal and lingual essential crests on the P⁴ EDJ and the continuous transverse crest are
3
4 typically Neandertal features (Becam et al., 2019), as it is a generally asymmetric P⁴ crown
5
6 (Gómez-Robles et al., 2011). Second, the presence of crista obliqua is a Neandertal M³ common
7
8 feature (Martin et al., 2017), but the Axlör specimen does not present it in any typology. Moreover,
9
10 in this M³ only the metacone dentine horn tip is slightly centrally placed, while the rest of the cusps
11
12 show the typical morphology of *Homo sapiens*. However, it should be noted that variation of
13
14 UPMH in many of these traits is not completely understood (e.g., for the P⁴, there is only
15
16 information from one UPMH; Becam et al., 2019). Moreover, the discovery of UPMH with
17
18 evidence of recent Neandertal admixture (Fu et al., 2015) and the mounting evidence that
19
20 Neandertal-modern human hybridization may have been common could partially explain the
21
22 differences found between the dental morphology of the UPMH and Holocene populations.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 In addition, a qualitative assessment of the teeth that are now lost from the collection (C*
31
32 and M²), based on the information and figures provided by Basabe (1973), indicates that they likely
33
34 belonged to the same individual due to the overall morphology and wear degree compatibility.
35
36 Moreover, the M³ presents a small interproximal facet, compatible with the M² with reduced
37
38 hypocone presented by Basabe (1973). Regarding the morphology of these two lost teeth, it is
39
40 possible to observe on the original publication that the upper canine has some archaic features: a
41
42 bulky tuberculum linguale (ASUDAS grade >3) and well developed mesial ridge (grade 2), more
43
44 common in Neandertals (100% and 42.1%, respectively) and UPMHs (40% and 11.1%,
45
46 respectively) than in recent *Homo sapiens* (8% and 5.3%, respectively) (Martinón-Torres et al.,
47
48 2012). On the other hand, the M² presents a large metacone (ASUDAS grade 3-4), a reduced
49
50 hypocone (ASUDAS grade 0-2), and absence of Carabelli's tubercle (ASUDAS grades 0-1).
51
52 Reduced hypocones are more common in UPMHs (50%) than in Neandertals (24.9%) (Martinón-
53
54 Torres et al., 2012).
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 Based on this morphological information, the absence of Holocene recent prehistory remains
3
4 from the Axlor sequence, the presence of an early Upper Paleolithic occupation in the site
5
6 (González-Urquijo et al., 2014), and the unclear previous ascription to the Mousterian level III due
7
8 to their finding in loose sediment close to the rock-shelter wall (see [Supplementary information](#)),
9
10 we hypothesize that these human remains could belong to an UPMH, which should be tested in the
11
12 near future using direct C14 datings. Currently, except for a few skeletons (Lagar Velho, Mirón;
13
14 Duarte et al., 1999; Carretero et al., 2015) most of the Upper Paleolithic remains from the Iberian
15
16 Peninsula consist of isolated teeth or cranial remains (Pérez Iglesias, 2007, and references therein).
17
18
19

20 We consider that the stratigraphic ascription of these teeth, rather than their morphology *per*
21
22 *se*, have contributed to incorrectly classify the published teeth from Axlor as belonging to
23
24 Neandertals. While Basabe (1973) considers that their general morphology resembles that of other
25
26 individuals found in Mousterian contexts, he still underlines their “evolved” status with the
27
28 presence of “intermediary characters” (Basabe, 1973:200), especially referring to the low degree of
29
30 taurodontism in the M¹ and the M². The same author did classify the M¹ from Lezetxiki, which
31
32 shows the typical Neandertal occlusal morphology and a clear taurodontism (Basabe, 1970), as
33
34 belonging to a Neandertal individual.
35
36
37

38 The second study that classified the Axlor teeth as Neandertals compared them with Sima de
39
40 los Huesos, Neandertals and modern humans both morphologically (using the data by Martín-
41
42 Torres et al., 2012) and metrically (using the data by Rodríguez-Cuenca (2003) and García-Bour,
43
44 Pérez-Pérez, & Chimenos (1997). However, most traits included in that study (Rostro-Carmona,
45
46 2013) are not taxonomically distinctive and, for those which are, the Axlor teeth show modern
47
48 human affinities. In terms of size, and using the data provided by Rostro-Carmona (2013), only the
49
50 canine would show a size closer to the Neandertal mean, the P⁴ and M¹ would show intermediate
51
52 affinities while the size of the M² and M³ would be more similar to modern humans. Our study
53
54 shows that, after including UPMHs in the comparative samples, and despite the overlap between
55
56 modern humans and Neandertals, the general size of the Axlor teeth is either non-determinant or
57
58
59
60

1
2 more similar to modern humans. Finally, Rostro-Carmona (2013) used the presence of taurodontism
3
4 in the Axlor teeth to classify them as belonging to Neandertals, but our assessment indicates that the
5
6 Axlor teeth show a very limited degree of taurodontism, particularly when compared with classic
7
8 Neandertal molars.
9

10
11 The second group would encompass the cranial fragment and three additional tooth remains
12
13 that have clear Neandertal affinities and their stratigraphic position is secure within the Mousterian
14
15 levels. The bone thickness distribution pattern and endocranial anatomy of the cranial fragment are
16
17 consistent with Neandertal anatomy. Additionally, both incisors and the dm^2 present characteristics
18
19 that allow us to ascribe them to Neandertals. Although heavily worn, the I_1 shows Neandertal
20
21 affinities in its root configuration and proportions. Nevertheless, the CrPV and RpV values are
22
23 lower than the Neandertal values reported to date (Le Cabec et al., 2013; Becam & Chevalier,
24
25 2019). This might be related to an advanced age for the individual, as aging related deposition of
26
27 secondary dentine causes the reduction of the pulp channel (Aboshi, Takahashi, & Komuro, 2010;
28
29 Solheim, 1992). This would be consistent with the heavy wear present in this tooth. Second, both
30
31 the OES and EDJ of the deciduous upper incisor from Axlor present a set of characteristics
32
33 observed in other Neandertal specimens such as Portel-Ouest, La Ferrassie 8 (strong mesial and
34
35 distal marginal ridges, pronounced and asymmetric labial convexity) (Becam & Chevalier, 2019).
36
37 Third, although the dm^2 does not show the typical Neanderthal skewed configuration, it does show
38
39 a notable development of the hypocone in relation to the metacone, the presence of the crista
40
41 obliqua, and a large Carabelli's tubercle at the OES and EDJ. These are common features to other
42
43 Neandertal dm^2 s, such as Arrillor, La Ferrassie 8 or Portel-Ouest (Becam & Chevalier, 2019;
44
45 Bermúdez de Castro & Saenz de Buruaga, 1999). These new remains confirm the presence of
46
47 Neandertal fossil remains in Axlor, thus increasing the Neandertal hypodigm recovered in the
48
49 Eastern Cantabrian Region.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Origin of the accumulation of the human fossil remains

Taphonomic and forensic analyses on hominin fossils are important to determine the origin of bone deposition and reconstruct the processes occurred during the fossil-diagenetic processes even for isolated fossils (Sanz et al., 2018). In some cases, it is even possible to determine causes of death (Sala et al., 2015) or drawing inferences about the mortuary practices of hominin groups, such as cannibalism (Rougier et al., 2016; Sala & Conard, 2016; Saladié et al., 2012; Saladié & Rodríguez-Hidalgo, 2017) or funerary activities (Gómez-Olivencia et al., 2018b).

In the case of the two deciduous teeth, they were lost by two different Neandertal individuals during the formation of levels V (left di¹) and IV (right dm²). The presence of isolated deciduous teeth is not rare in Middle Paleolithic layers, and the closest example is found less than 25 km south from Axlør, in Arrillor (Figure 1; Bermúdez de Castro & Saénz de Buruaga, 1999; Iriarte-Chiapusso, Wood, & Saénz de Buruaga, 2019), with other example from Le Portel Ouest (Becam & Chevalier, 2019). The cranial fragment from Axlør displays evidence of postmortem and perimortem fractures, but the absence of traces that could indicate the causes of such fractures makes it difficult to interpret its origin. Although we cannot rule out intentional causes for the perimortem fractures, the lack of clear anthropic cut marks or signs of anthropic manipulation does not allow us to go further in our interpretation. The absence of weathering could be interpreted as a non-aerial (or short-term) exposure of the fossils in the biostratigraphic phase. On the other hand, trampling has been documented on the cranial fragment suggesting certain displacement of the fossils which could be one of the explanations of the scarcity of human remains at the site. Additionally, the Barandiarán collection shows some significant bias in comparison with the richness in fossil remains that we have observed at the site during recent excavations (Gómez-Olivencia et al., 2018a), in which smaller shaft fragments are absent. This bias could be a secondary

1
2 reason of this scarcity. In this context, the recovery of additional human fossils in the Axlor site
3
4 would help elucidate the nature of these isolated remains found in a human occupation context.
5
6
7

8 9 **Conclusions**

10
11 Axlor (Dima, Biscay) is one of the most important Middle Paleolithic sites in the Cantabrian
12
13 region (northern Iberian Peninsula). The excavations performed by J.M. Barandiarán at the Axlor
14
15 site 50 years ago yielded a cranial vault fragment and eight teeth, five of which likely belonged to
16
17 the same individual, although two are currently lost. Three teeth (a left dm^2 , a left di^1 , and a right I_1)
18
19 and the cranial fragment show morphological features consistent with their classification as
20
21 Neandertals, and were found in undisturbed Mousterian context. However, the remaining three teeth
22
23 (plus two that have been lost since the initial finding), traditionally classified as Neandertals
24
25 (Basabe, 1973; Rostro Carmona, 2013), show morphological features and a general size more
26
27 compatible with their classification as modern humans. Moreover, the review of the original notes
28
29 by J.M. Barandiarán and our own observations during the recent excavations at the site suggest that
30
31 the archaeological context of these remains should be carefully reconsidered. We hypothesize that
32
33 these teeth may constitute one of the scarce examples of Upper Paleolithic remains in the Iberian
34
35 Peninsula, a hypothesis that would require a direct C14 dating to be tested, which currently is not
36
37 possible due to access limitations.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

46
47 We would like to thank I. García Camino (Arkeologi Museoa) for permission to study these
48
49 fossils. We thank L. García Boullosa for the cleaning of some of these fossils, and to the rest of the
50
51 Arkeologi Museoa staff. The Gobierno Vasco-Eusko Jaurlaritza granted the permission to micro-CT
52
53 these specimens. Thanks to the Jose Miguel de Barandiaran Fundazioa and Zuriñe Velez de
54
55 Mendizabal for the access to J.M. de Barandiarán's field notes. Thanks to B. Notario (CENIEH) for
56
57 help during the micro-CT scanning process. This research has also received support from the
58
59
60

1
2 Spanish Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y Universidades (proyecto PGC2018-093925-B-C33),
3
4 Research Group IT1418-19 from the Eusko Jaurlaritza-Gobierno Vasco. AGO was supported by
5
6 Ramón y Cajal fellowship (RYC-2017-22558). NS was supported by a Juan de la Cierva
7
8 Incorporación program (IJCI-2017-32804). Thanks also to our colleagues from BBP, UCM-ISCI, III,
9
10 EHU-UPV, as well as to A. Rodríguez-Hidalgo and N. Weaver for stimulating discussions.
11
12
13
14

15 **Data Availability Statement**

16
17
18 The original micro-ct scans, the derived segmentation files, and 3D volumes are available in
19
20 figshare at <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.10308272>.
21
22
23

24 **ORCID**

25
26
27 *Asier Gómez-Olivencia* <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7831-3902>

28
29
30 *Diego López-Onaindia* <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5266-6416>

31
32
33 *Nohemi Sala* <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0896-1493>

34
35
36 *Antoine Balzeau* <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4226-611X>

37
38
39 *Ana Pantoja-Pérez* <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9302-1756>

40
41
42 *Ignacio Arganda-Carreras* <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0229-5722>

43
44
45 *Mikel Arlegi* <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5665-9275>

46
47
48 *Joseba Rios-Garaizar* <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8474-2156>

49
50
51 *Aida Gómez-Robles* <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8719-2660>

52 **REFERENCES**

53
54
55
56
57 Aboshi, H., Takahashi, T., & Komuro, T. (2010). Age estimation using microfocus X-ray computed
58
59 tomography of lower premolars. *Forensic Science International*, 200, 35-40.
60

- 1
2 Albusu Andrade, C., Etxeberria Gabilondo, F., & Herrasti Erlogorri, L. (2014). Estudio de los restos
3 dentales humanos procedentes de la cueva de Santa Catalina. In E. Berganza Gochi, & J. L.
4 Arribas Pastor (Eds.). *La Cueva de Santa Catalina (Lekeitio): La intervención arqueológica*
5 *Restos vegetales, animales y humanos*, (pp. 361-365). Bilbao: Bizkaiko Foru Aldundia.
6
7
8
9
10
11 Altuna, J. (1989). La subsistance d'origine animal pendant le Moustérien dans la région Cantabrique
12 (Espagne). In M. Pathou, & L. G. Freeman (Eds.). *L'Homme de Neandertal La Subsistance*
13 *Actes du Colloque International de Liège*, vol 6, (pp. 41-43). Liège: ERAUL.
14
15
16
17
18 AlQahtani, S.J., Hector, M.P., & Liversidge, H.M. (2010). The London atlas of human tooth
19 development and eruption. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 142, 481-490.
20
21
22
23 Arganda-Carreras, I., Kaynig, V., Rueden, C., Schindelin, J., Eliceiri, K. W., Cardona, A., &
24 Sebastian Seung, H. (2017). Trainable Weka Segmentation: a machine learning tool for
25 microscopy pixel classification. *Bioinformatics*, 33, 2424-2426.
26
27
28
29
30 Bayle, P., Le Luyer, M., & Robson Brown, K. A. (2017). The Palomas Dental Remains: Thickness
31 and Tissue Proportions. In E. Trinkaus, & M. J. Walker (Eds.). *Neandertals from the Sima*
32 *de las Palomas del Cabezo Gordo, Southeastern Spain*, (pp. 115-137). College Station,
33 Texas: Texas A&M University Press.
34
35
36
37
38
39 Bailey, S. E. (2002). A closer look at Neanderthal postcanine dental morphology: The mandibular
40 dentition. *The Anatomical Record*, 269, 148-156.
41
42
43
44 Bailey, S. E. (2004). A morphometric analysis of maxillary molar crowns of Middle-Late
45 Pleistocene hominins. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 47, 183-198.
46
47
48
49 Bailey, S. E., Benazzi, S., Souday, C., Astorino, C., Paul, K., & Hublin, J.-J. (2014). Taxonomic
50 differences in deciduous upper second molar crown outlines of *Homo sapiens*, *Homo*
51 *neanderthalensis* and *Homo erectus*. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 72, 1-9.
52
53
54
55 Balzeau, A. (2013). Thickened cranial vault and parasagittal keeling: Correlated traits and
56 autapomorphies of *Homo erectus*? *Journal of Human Evolution*, 64, 631-644.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2 Balzeau, A., Buck, L. T., Albessard, L., Becam, G., Grimaud-Hervé, D., Rae, T. C., & Stringer, C.
3
4 B. (2017). The Internal Cranial Anatomy of the Middle Pleistocene Broken Hill 1 Cranium.
5
6 *PaleoAnthropology*, 2017, 107-138.
7
8
9 Balzeau, A., Grimaud-Hervé, D., & Gilissen, E. (2011). Where are inion and endinion? Variations
10
11 of the exo- and endocranial morphology of the occipital bone during hominin evolution.
12
13 *Journal of Human Evolution*, 61, 488-502.
14
15
16 Barandiarán, I., & Cava, A. (2008). Identificaciones del Gravetiense en las estribaciones
17
18 occidentales del Pirineo: modelos de ocupación y uso. *Trabajos de Prehistoria*, 65, 13-28.
19
20
21 Barandiarán, J. M. (1980). Excavaciones en Axló. 1967-1974. In J. M. Barandiarán (Ed.). *Obras*
22
23 *Completas de José Miguel de Barandiarán Tomo XVII*, (pp. 127-384). Bilbao: La Gran
24
25 *Enciclopedia Vasca*.
26
27
28 Basabe, J. M. (1970). Dientes humanos del paleolítico de Lezetxiki (Mondragón). *Munibe*, XXII,
29
30 113-124.
31
32
33 Basabe, J. M. (1973). Dientes humanos del Musteriense de Axló (Dima. Vizcaya). *Trabajos de*
34
35 *Antropología*, 16, 187-207.
36
37
38 Basabe, J. M. (1982). Restos fósiles humanos de la región Vasco-Cantábrica. *Cuadernos de Sección*
39
40 *Antropología-Etnografía*, 1, 67-84.
41
42
43 Becam, G., Chevalier, T., Gregoire, S., Braga, J., Balzeau, A., De Lumley, M.A., Vezian, R. 2015.
44
45 The characterization of the outer enamel surface and the enamel dentine junction of
46
47 deciduous and permanent Neandertal teeth from Le Portel-Ouest cave (Ariège, France).
48
49 *1840^{ème} Journée de la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris*.
50
51
52 Becam, G., & Chevalier, T. (2019). Neandertal features of the deciduous and permanent teeth from
53
54 Portel-Ouest Cave (Ariège, France). *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 168, 45-
55
56 69.
57
58
59 Becam, G., Verna, C., Gómez-Robles, A., Gómez-Olivencia, A., Albessard, L., Arnaud, J., . . .
60
Balzeau, A. (2019). Isolated teeth from La Ferrassie: Reassessment of the old collections,

1
2 new remains, and their implications. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 169, 132-
3
4 142.

5
6 Behrensmeyer, A. K. (1978). Taphonomic and ecologic information from bone weathering.
7
8 *Paleobiology*, 4, 150-162.

9
10 Bermúdez de Castro, J. M., & Sáenz de Buruaga, A. (1999). Étude Préliminaire du site Pléistocène
11
12 Supérieur à hominidé d'Arrillor (Pays Basque, Espagne). *L'Anthropologie*, 103, 633-639.

13
14
15 Carlsen, O. (1987). Dental Morphology. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.

16
17 Carretero, J. M., Quam, R. M., Gómez-Olivencia, A., Castilla, M., Rodríguez, L., & García-
18
19 González, R. (2015). The Magdalenian human remains from El Mirón Cave, Cantabria
20
21 (Spain). *Journal of Archaeological Science*, 60, 10-27.

22
23
24 Castaños, P. M. (2005). Revisión actualizada de las faunas de macromamíferos del Würm antiguo
25
26 en la Región Cantábrica. In J. A. Lasheras, & R. Montes (Eds.). Neandertales cantábricos,
27
28 estado de la cuestión, (pp. 201-207). Santander: Museo de Altamira.

29
30
31 de la Rúa, C., & Hervella, M. (2011). Estudio antropológico de los dientes humanos de la cueva de
32
33 Aitzbitarte III (Rentería. Gipuzkoa) (Paleolítico superior). In J. Altuna, K. Mariezkurrena, &
34
35 J. Rios (Eds.). Ocupaciones humanas en Aitzbitarte III (País Vasco) 33600-18400 BP (Zona
36
37 de entrada a la cueva), (pp. 385-393). Vitoria-Gasteiz: Eusko Jaurlaritza-Gobierno Vasco.

38
39
40 Domínguez-Rodrigo, M., de Juana, S., Galán, A. B., & Rodríguez, M. (2009). A new protocol to
41
42 differentiate trampling marks from butchery cut marks. *Journal of Archaeological Science*,
43
44 36, 2643-2654.

45
46
47 Duarte, C., Maurício, J., Souto, P., Pettitt, P. B., Trinkaus, E., Van Plicht, H. D., & Zilhão, J.
48
49 (1999). The early Upper Paleolithic human skeleton from the Abrigo do Lagar Velho
50
51 (Portugal) and modern human emergence in Iberia. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
52
53 *Sciences of the United States of America*, 96, 7604-7609.

- 1
2 Fu, Q., Hajdinjak, M., Moldovan, O. T., Constantin, S., Mallick, S., Skoglund, P., . . . Pääbo, S.
3
4 (2015). An early modern human from Romania with a recent Neanderthal ancestor. *Nature*,
5
6 524, 216-219.
7
8
9 García-Bour, J., Pérez-Pérez, A., & Chimenos, E. (1997). Evolución de la dentición en la transición
10
11 mesolítico-neolítico de la península ibérica; un modelo de sustitución poblacional. *Anales*
12
13 *de Odontoestomatología*, 3, 116-121.
14
15
16 Garralda, M. D. (2005). Los Neandertales en la Península Ibérica. *Munibe (Antropología*
17
18 *Arkeologia)*, 57, 289-314.
19
20
21 Garralda, M.-D., Maíllo-Fernández, J.-M., Higham, T., Neira, A., & Bernaldo de Quirós, F. (in
22
23 press). The Gravettian child mandible from El Castillo Cave (Puente Viesgo, Cantabria,
24
25 Spain). *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.23906>
26
27
28 Gómez-Olivencia, A., Quam, R., Sala, N., Bardey, M., Ohman, J. C., & Balzeau, A. (2018b). La
29
30 Ferrassie 1: New perspectives on a “classic” Neandertal. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 117,
31
32 13-32.
33
34
35 Gómez-Olivencia, A., Sala, N., Núñez-Lahuerta, C., Sanchis, A., Arlegi, M., & Rios-Garaizar, J.
36
37 (2018a). First data of Neandertal bird and carnivore exploitation in the Cantabrian Region
38
39 (Axlor; Barandiaran excavations; Dima, Biscay, Northern Iberian Peninsula). *Scientific*
40
41 *Reports*, 8, 10551.
42
43
44 Gómez-Robles, A., Bermúdez de Castro, J. M., Martínón-Torres, M., Prado-Simón, L., & Arsuaga,
45
46 J. L. (2012). A geometric morphometric analysis of hominin upper second and third molars,
47
48 with particular emphasis on European Pleistocene populations. *Journal of Human*
49
50 *Evolution*, 63, 512-526.
51
52
53 Gómez-Robles, A., Martínón-Torres, M., Bermúdez de Castro, J. M., Margvelashvili, A., Bastir,
54
55 M., Arsuaga, J. L., . . . Martínez, L. M. (2007). A geometric morphometric analysis of
56
57 hominin upper first molar shape. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 53, 272-285.
58
59
60

- 1
2 Gómez-Robles, A., Martín-Torres, M., Bermúdez de Castro, J. M., Prado-Simón, L., & Arsuaga,
3
4 J. L. (2011). A geometric morphometric analysis of hominin upper premolars. Shape
5
6 variation and morphological integration. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 61, 688-702.
7
8
9 González Echegaray, J., & Freeman, L. G. (1973). Cueva Morín: Excavaciones 1969. Santander:
10
11 Publicaciones del Patronato de las Cuevas Prehistóricas de la Provincia de Santander.
12
13 González Echegaray, J., García Guinea, M. A., Begines Ramírez, A., & Madariaga de la Campa, B.
14
15 (1963). Cueva de la Chora (Santander). Madrid: Ministerio de Educación Nacional.
16
17 Dirección General de Bellas Artes. Servicio Nacional de Excavaciones Arqueológicas.
18
19
20 González Echegaray, J., & Ripoll Perelló, E. (1954). Hallazgos en la cueva de La Pasiega (Puente
21
22 Viesgo, Santander). *Ampurias*, XV-XVI, 43-65.
23
24
25 González-Urquijo, J. E., Ibañez, J. J., Lazuén, T., & Mozota, M. (2014). Axlor. In R. Sala (Ed.).
26
27 Los Cazadores Recolectores Del Pleistoceno Y Del Holoceno En Iberia Y El Estrecho de
28
29 Gibraltar, (pp. 45-48). Burgos: Universidad de Burgos.
30
31
32 Grimaud-Hervé, D. (1997). L'évolution de l'encéphale chez *Homo erectus* et *Homo sapiens*:
33
34 exemples de l'Asie et de l'Europe: CNRS ed. Paris.
35
36
37 Guerrero Sala, L. A., & Lorenzo Lizalde, J. L. (1981). Antropología física en Rascaño. In J.
38
39 González Echegaray, & I. Barandiarán Maestu, (Eds.), *El Paleolítico Superior de la Cueva*
40
41 *de Rascaño (Santander)* (pp. 278-). Santander: Ministerio de Cultura. Dirección General de
42
43 Bellas Artes, Archivos y Bibliotecas.
44
45
46 Henry-Gambier, D. (2006). Les sépultures de Sorde-l'Abbaye (Landes). In M. Dachary, (Ed.), *Les*
47
48 *Magdaléniens à Duruthy Qui étaient-ils, comment vivaient-ils?* (pp. 67-73). Mont-de-
49
50 Marsan: Conseil général des Landes.
51
52
53 Henry-Gambier, D., Normand, C., & Pétilion, J.-M. (2013). Datation radiocarbone directe et
54
55 attribution culturelle des vestiges humains paléolithiques de la grotte d'Isturitz (Pyrénées-
56
57 Atlantiques). *Bulletin de la Société préhistorique française*, 110, 645-656.
58
59
60

- 1
2 Iriarte-Chiapusso, M. J., Wood, R., & Sáenz de Buruaga, A. (2019). Arrillor cave (Basque Country,
3
4 northern Iberian Peninsula). Chronological, palaeo-environmental and cultural notes on a
5
6 long Mousterian sequence. *Quaternary International*, *508*, 107-115.
7
8
9 Jarvis, A., Reuter, H. I., Nelson, A., & Guevara, E. (2008). Hole-filled SRTM for the globe Version
10
11 4. available from the CGIAR-CSI SRTM 90m Database (<http://srtm.csi.cgiar.org>), *15*, 25-
12
13 54.
14
15
16 Le Cabec, A., Gunz, P., Kupczik, K., Braga, J., & Hublin, J.-J. (2013). Anterior tooth root
17
18 morphology and size in Neanderthals: Taxonomic and functional implications. *Journal of*
19
20 *Human Evolution*, *64*, 169-193.
21
22
23 Legland, D., Arganda-Carreras, I., & Andrey, P. (2016). MorphoLibJ: integrated library and plugins
24
25 for mathematical morphology with ImageJ. *Bioinformatics*, *32*, 3532-3534.
26
27
28 Marín-Arroyo, A. B., Rios-Garaizar, J., Straus, L. G., Jones, J. R., de la Rasilla, M., González
29
30 Morales, M. R., . . . Ocio, D. (2018). Chronological reassessment of the Middle to Upper
31
32 Paleolithic transition and Early Upper Paleolithic cultures in Cantabrian Spain. *Plos one*, *13*,
33
34 e0194708.
35
36
37 Martin, R. M. G., Hublin, J.-J., Gunz, P., & Skinner, M. M. (2017). The morphology of the enamel-
38
39 dentine junction in Neanderthal molars: Gross morphology, non-metric traits, and temporal
40
41 trends. *Journal of Human Evolution*, *103*, 20-44.
42
43
44 Martín-Torres, M., Bermúdez de Castro, J. M., Gómez-Robles, A., Prado-Simón, L., & Arsuaga,
45
46 J. L. (2012). Morphological description and comparison of the dental remains from
47
48 Atapuerca-Sima de los Huesos site (Spain). *Journal of Human Evolution*, *62*, 7-58.
49
50
51 Molnar, S. (1971). Human tooth wear, tooth function and cultural variability. *American Journal of*
52
53 *Physical Anthropology*, *34*, 175-190.
54
55
56 Obermaier, H. (1925). El hombre fósil. Madrid: Ediciones Istmo.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2 Pan, L., & Zanolli, C. (2019). Comparative observations on the premolar root and pulp canal
3 configurations of Middle Pleistocene Homo in China. *American Journal of Physical*
4 *Anthropology*, 168, 637-646.
5
6
7
8 Pérez-Iglesias, J. M. (2007). Restos fósiles humanos en el Paleolítico superior de la península
9 ibérica. *Arqueoweb*, 8, 1-17.
10
11
12 QGIS Development Team, 2009. QGIS Geographic Information System. Open Source Geospatial
13 Foundation. URL <http://qgis.org>
14
15
16 Rios-Garaizar, J. (2017). A new chronological and technological synthesis for Late Middle
17 Paleolithic of the Eastern Cantabrian Region. *Quaternary International*, 433, 50-63.
18
19 Rodríguez Cuenca, J. V. (2003). Dientes y diversidad humana: avances de la antropología dental.
20 Bogotá: Editora Guadalupe Ltda.
21
22 Rostro Carmona, J. (2013). Estudio comparado de las piezas dentales de *Homo neanderthalensis* del
23 yacimiento Musteriense de Axlor (Dima, Vizcaya). *CKQ Estudios de*
24 *Cuaternario/Kuaternario Ikasketak/Quaternary Studies*, 3, 91-100.
25
26 Rougier, H., Crevecoeur, I., Beauval, C., Posth, C., Flas, D., Wißing, C., . . . Krause, J. (2016).
27 Neandertal cannibalism and Neandertal bones used as tools in Northern Europe. *Scientific*
28 *Reports*, 6, 29005.
29
30 Sala, N., & Conard, N. (2016). Taphonomic analysis of the hominin remains from Swabian Jura and
31 their implications for the mortuary practices during the Upper Paleolithic. *Quaternary*
32 *Science Reviews*, 150, 278-300.
33
34 Sala, N., Pantoja-Pérez, A., Arsuaga, J. L., Pablos, A., & Martínez, I. (2016). The Sima de los
35 Huesos Crania: Analysis of the cranial breakage patterns. *Journal of Archaeological*
36 *Science*, 72, 25-43.
37
38 Saladié, P., Huguet, R., Rodríguez-Hidalgo, A., Cáceres, I., Esteban-Nadal, M., Arsuaga, J. L., . . .
39 Carbonell, E. (2012). Intergroup cannibalism in the European Early Pleistocene: The range
40 expansion and imbalance of power hypotheses. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 63, 682-695.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2 Saladié, P., & Rodríguez-Hidalgo, A. (2017). Archaeological Evidence for Cannibalism in
3
4 Prehistoric Western Europe: from Homo antecessor to the Bronze Age. *Journal of*
5
6 *Archaeological Method and Theory*, 24, 1034-1071.
7
8
9 Sanguino González, J., & Montes Barquín, r. (2005). Nuevos datos para el conocimiento del
10
11 Paleolítico Medio en el centro de la Región Cantábrica: la cueva de Covalejos (Piélagos,
12
13 Cantabria). In R. Montes Barquín, & J. A. Lasheras Corruchaga, (Eds.), *Actas de la Reunión*
14
15 *científica: Neandertales cantábricos, estado de la cuestión* (pp. 489-538). Santander: Museo
16
17 Nacional y Centro de Investigación de Altamira. Ministerio de Cultura.
18
19
20 Sanz M., Sala N., Daura J., Pantoja-Pérez A., Santos E, Zilhão J, and Arsuaga JL. (2018).
21
22 Taphonomic inferences about Middle Pleistocene hominins: The human cranium of Gruta
23
24 da Aroeira (Portugal). *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 167, 615-627.
25
26
27 Schindelin, J., Arganda-Carreras, I., Frise, E., Kaynig, V., Longair, M., Pietzsch, T., . . . Cardona,
28
29 A. (2012). Fiji: an open-source platform for biological-image analysis. *Nature Methods*,
30
31 9,676.
32
33
34 Solheim, T. (1992). Amount of secondary dentin as an indicator of age. *European Journal of Oral*
35
36 *Sciences*, 100, 193-199.
37
38
39 Tejero, J. M., Avezuela, B., White, R., Ranlett, S., Quam, R., Tattersall, I., & Bernaldo de Quirós,
40
41 F. (2010). Un pedazo de la Prehistoria cántabra en Nueva York. Las Colecciones de la
42
43 Cueva de El Castillo (Puente Viesgo, Cantabria) en el American Museum of Natural History
44
45 (Nueva York, EEUU). *Munibe (Antropología-Arkeología)*, 61, 5-16.
46
47
48 Turner, C. G., Nichol, C. R., & Scott, G. R. (1991). Scoring procedures for key morphological traits
49
50 of the permanent dentition: the Arizona State University dental anthropology system. In M.
51
52 Kelley, & C. Larsen (Eds.). *Advances in Dental Anthropology*, (pp. 13-31). New York:
53
54 Wiley-Liss.
55
56
57 Vallois, H., & Delmas, L. (1976). Los frontales de la cueva de El Castillo (España). *Trabajos de*
58
59 *Prehistoria*, 33, 113-120.
60

1
2 Zapata, J., Bayle, P., Lombardi, A. V., Pérez-Pérez, A., & Trinkaus, E. (2017). The Palomas Dental
3
4 Remains: Preservation, Wear, and Morphology. In E. Trinkaus, & M. J. Walker (Eds.),
5
6 *Neandertals from the Sima de las Palomas del Cabezo Gordo, Southeastern Spain* (pp. 52-
7
8 88). College Station, Texas: Texas A&M University Press.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure legends

FIGURE 1 Location of Axlor (red star) and other Paleolithic sites with human remains in the Center and East of the Cantabrian Region (northern Iberian Peninsula and southwestern France). 1: La Pasiega (González Echegaray & Ripoll Perelló, 1954); 2: Castillo (N; HS; Garralda, 2005; Garralda, Maíllo-Fernández, Higham, Neira, & Bernaldo de Quirós, in press; Obermaier, 1925; Tejero et al., 2010; Vallois & Delmas, 1976; 3 Covalejos (N, HS; Sanguino González & Montes Barquín, 2005); 4: Pendo (Basabe, 1982); 5: Morín (HS; González Echegaray & Freeman, 1973; Obermaier, 1925); 6: Rascaño (Guerrero Sala & Lorenzo Lizalde, 1981); 7: La Chora (González Echegaray, García Guinea, Begines Ramírez & Madariaga de la Campa, 1963); 8: Mirón (HS; Carretero et al., 2015); 9: Arrillor (N, Bermúdez de Castro & Sáenz de Buruaga, 1999); 10: Axlor (N; HS; this work); 11: Lezetxiki (N; Basabe, 1970); 12: Santa Catalina (HS; Albisu Andrade, Etxeberria Gabilondo, & Herrasti Erlogorri, 2014); 13: Aitzbitarte III (HS; de la Rúa & Hervella, 2011); 14: Alkerdi (Barandiarán & Cava, 2008); 15: Isturitz (HS; Henry-Gambier, Normand, & Pétilion, 2013); 16: Duruthy (HS; Henry-Gambier, 2006). N=Neandertal; HS=*Homo sapiens*. Base map made with QGIS 2.18.17 (QGIS Development Team, 2009) with data by Jarvis, Reuter, Nelson, & Guevara (2008).

FIGURE 2 Excavation plan (a) and stratigraphic column (b) of Axlor cave (modified from Gómez-Olivencia et al., 2018a). (a) In the excavation plan the grid system used by J.M. Barandiarán (black square and white numbers) and the excavation area is shadowed in gray. The grid system used by the recent excavations is marked using black letters and numbers and the excavation area is outlined using a thick black line. The dotted line represents the rock-shelter wall when the site was first excavated, during the excavation this wall went back, revealing a possible cave infilling. The colors correspond to the levels to which these remains were attributed based on the notes by

1
2 Barandiarán. (b) Synthetic section of the 1967–1974 excavation stratigraphy, drawn from the
3
4 description of the layers by J. M. Barandiarán (1980). Different levels are marked with different
5
6 colors, and the human remains are marked by silhouettes.
7
8
9

10
11 **FIGURE 3** Ax.11B.415.400 left parietal fragment. The original fossil and the 3D model are
12
13 shown on different views. On the lower row, the approximate location of this fragment is shown on
14
15 the La Ferrassie 1 Neandertal cranium (left), a thickness map (from 2 to 12 mm) is shown (middle)
16
17 with PC that correspond to thicker bone where is located the postcentral sulcus and V to a relative
18
19 thinning produced by the anterior ramus of the meningeal system; and the anatomical features on
20
21 the endocranial surface (right): including meningeal veins, A = anterior branch, O = obelic branch,
22
23 and sulcal imprints C = central sulcus, PC = postcentral sulcus.
24
25
26
27
28

29
30 **FIGURE 4** Ectocranial view of the specimen Ax.11B.415.400 with the location of zones a-d,
31
32 and detailed images of these zones, where striations are located. In some cases, the grooves show a
33
34 close “V” shape but do not show microstriations. The general morphology of these grooves (see
35
36 text) make them compatible with trampling marks.
37
38
39
40

41
42 **FIGURE 5** Dental remains previously studied by Basabe (1973) and Rostro-Carmona (2013),
43
44 and likely belonging to the same individual. The teeth are shown in mesial, buccal, distal, lingual
45
46 (top) and occlusal (bottom) views, together with the results of the enamel segmentation and the EDJ
47
48 surface morphology. Pulp chamber volumes (in blue) are shown in mesial (P^4 , M^1) and lingual (M^2)
49
50 views. A virtual reconstruction of the teeth in buccal and occlusal views is also provided. Scale bars
51
52 = 1 cm.
53
54
55
56

57
58 **FIGURE 6** Principal components analysis of shape (left column) and form variation (right
59
60 column), corresponding to the teeth previously studied by Basabe (1973) and Rostro-Carmona

1
2 (2013), and likely belonging to the same individual. The Axlor remains have been compared to
3
4 Neandertals (NEA), fossil *Homo sapiens* (FSAP) and recent *Homo sapiens* (RSAP). In both form
5
6 and shape space, the Axlor remains align more closely with modern humans. TPS-grids show
7
8 anatomical variation corresponding to the positive and negative extreme of each PC when all the
9
10 other PCs are held equal to 0. For M¹ variation, the two data points correspond to Axlor's variation
11
12 before (darker red) and after (lighter red) correcting the enamel cracks ([Supplementary information](#)
13
14 [Figure S13](#)).
15
16
17
18
19

20 **FIGURE 7** New dental remains from the Barandiarán collection of Axlor. AX.5B.299.16 (right
21
22 permanent first lower incisor, I₁): root canal morphology (blue) in mesial view; mesial, buccal,
23
24 distal, lingual and occlusal views. AX.5B.299.31.64.17 (upper left first deciduous incisor, dI¹): top,
25
26 mesial, buccal, distal, lingual and occlusal views. AX.9E.283.103 (left dM²): top, mesial, buccal,
27
28 distal, lingual and occlusal views. In the virtual reconstructions, enamel is represented in white and
29
30 dentine in brown. Scale bars = 1 cm
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

Table 1

Inventory of the Axlor human remains found during the Barandiarán excavations.

Label	Year	Archaeological context ^a	Revised archaeological context	Museum data base (MDB)/Basabe, 1973 (B)	Present study	Figure
Ax.13F.265.1 ^a Ax.13E/13F.265-270.3 ^b	1967	Level IV (Mousterian)	Doubtful	Neandertal (MDB) Left P ⁴ (B)	Modern human Left P ⁴	Figure 5
Ax.13F.265.3 ^a Ax.13E/13F.265-270.3 ^b	1967	Level IV (Mousterian)	Doubtful	Neandertal (MDB) Left maxillary fragment with M ¹ (B)	Modern human Left maxillary fragment with M ¹	Figure 5
Ax.13F.265.3 ^a	1967	Level IV (Mousterian)	Doubtful	Left M ² (B)	Specimen lost	-
Ax.13F.265.2 ^a Ax.13E/13F.265-270.3	1967	Level IV (Mousterian)	Doubtful	Neandertal (MDB) Left M ³ (B)	Modern human Left M ³	Figure 5
Ax.13E.285.3 ^a	1967	Level IV (Mousterian)	Doubtful	Left C' (B)	Specimen lost	-
Ax.11B.415.9 ^a Ax.11B.415.400 (physical label: Ax.11B.415)b	1969	Level VIII (Mousterian)	Mousterian	Human cranial fragment (MDB) Neandertal (MDB)	Neandertal Left parietal bone	Figure 3
Ax.9E.283.103	1973 or 1974	Level IV (Mousterian)	Mousterian	Fauna (indeterminate taxon) (MDB)	Neandertal Right dm ²	Figure 7
Ax.5B.299.31.64.17	1974	Level V (Mousterian)	Mousterian	Human tooth (MDB)	Neandertal Left di ¹	Figure 7
Ax.5B.299.16	1974	Level V (Mousterian)	Mousterian	Human tooth (MDB)	Neandertal Adult right I ₁	Figure 7

^a Based on the information provided by J.M. de Barandiarán field notes. The M¹ and the M² were found together.

^b Based on the information provided by the Arkeologi Museoa (Bilbao, Biscay).

1
2 ** Virtual (not written) label
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

Table 2

Comparison of external crown metric data between Axlor teeth and Neandertals, Upper Paleolithic modern humans (UPMH), and recent modern humans (RMH).

Tooth	Variable	Axlor			Neandertals ^a					Upper Palaeolithic modern humans ^a					Recent modern humans ^a				
		This study	Rostro-Carmona, 2013	Basabe, 1973	Mean	SD	Min	Max	<i>n</i>	Mean	SD	Min	Max	<i>n</i>	Mean	SD	Min	Max	<i>n</i>
C	M-D	-	-	8.0	8.74	0.67	7.40	10.00	31	8.06	0.58	6.90	9.50	36	7.58	0.43	6.80	8.5	38
	B-L	-	-	9.2	9.92	0.65	8.40	11.40	34	9.02	0.77	7.50	10.74	38	8.26	0.68	7.20	9.4	38
P ⁴	M-D	6.6	6.7	6.6	7.49	0.78	6.10	8.80	30	6.84	0.52	5.90	7.90	38	6.45	0.46	5.50	7.5	38
	B-L	9.7	9.8	9.7	10.39	0.70	9.00	11.70	34	9.69	0.69	7.50	11.29	38	9.04	0.49	8.10	9.9	38
M ¹	M-D	9.8	10.2	10.0	11.61	1.09	9.30	13.60	28	10.71	0.71	8.40	12.30	41	10.03	0.52	8.40	11.4	42
	B-L	11.1	11.2	11.8	12.34	0.70	11.10	14.20	33	12.12	0.63	10.00	13.98	42	11.27	0.56	10.20	12.5	42
M ²	M-D	-	-	9.3	10.84	1.23	9.10	15.90	34	10.10	0.72	8.90	11.80	41	9.22	0.66	7.80	10.5	41
	B-L	-	-	10.0	12.60	0.94	10.54	14.60	38	12.27	0.90	8.30	14.00	42	11.35	0.84	9.90	13.9	41
M ³	M-D	8.7	8.6	8.6	9.74	0.94	6.80	11.35	30	9.01	1.09	7.00	11.60	39	8.55	0.84	7.30	10.5	30
	B-L	10.2	10.1	10.0	11.96	1.16	7.70	14.25	30	11.40	1.10	6.90	13.30	40	10.88	0.98	9.30	13.2	30
I ₁	M-D	4.8	-	-	5.73	0.44	4.92	6.35	24	5.51	0.60	3.70	6.60	22	5.24	0.45	4.60	6.7	31
	B-L	7.7	-	-	7.37	0.51	6.10	8.15	29	6.23	0.45	5.30	7.10	42	6.03	0.44	5.10	6.8	32
di ¹	M-D	7.6	-	-	7.03	0.81	5.60	8.00	11	6.85	0.77	6.20	7.70	4					
	B-L	6.0	-	-	5.67	0.48	4.70	6.20	11	5.30	0.29	4.90	5.70	5					
dm ²	M-D	(9.0)	-	-	9.18	0.70	8.00	10.40	15	9.19	0.30	8.97	9.40	2					
	B-L	10.3	-	-	10.14	0.57	9.00	11.10	16	10.32	0.57	9.90	11.10	4					

B-L= Bucco-lingual; M-D = Mesio-distal. Values between parentheses are estimated.

The C*, P⁴, M¹, M² and M³ were firstly published by Basabe (2013) and are from the same individual.

^aFor sample information see [Supplementary Information Table S5](#).

Table 3

Comparison of non-metric traits at the occlusal enamel surface (OES), at the enamel-dentine junction (EDJ) and root number between the P⁴ and Neandertals, Upper Paleolithic modern humans (UPMH), and recent modern humans (RMH).

Tooth region	Trait	Grade for Axlor	Neandertals		UPMH		RMH	
			<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
OES	Transverse crest	Absent	2/16	12.4	2/11	18.2	0/113	0.0
	Buccal essential crest (BEF)	2	10/15	66.6	4/11*	36.4	10/106	9.4
	Lingual essential crest (LEF)	NO	11/14	78.6	0/11	0.0	9/108	8.3
	BMaxPAR	1 (Dist)	5/12	41.7	5/9	55.6	18/88	20.5
EDJ	Transverse crest	2 (continuous, but not complete)	9/13	69.2	0/1	0.0	2/14	14.3
	Buccal essential crest	2 (bifurcated)	8/13	61.5	0/1	0.0	4/20	20.0
	Lingual essential crest	2 (bifurcated)	12/13	92.3	0/1	0.0	0/20	0.0
	Distal accessory ridge	1 (present)	5/13	38.4	0/1	0.0	12/20	60.0
	Mesial accessory ridge	0 (absent)	8/13	61.5	1/1	100.0	8/20	40.0
	Mesial accessory cusp	0 (absent)	13/13	100.0	1/1	100.0	20/20	100.0
	Distal accessory cusp	0 (absent)	10/13	76.9	1/1	100.0	20/20	100.0
Root	Root canal type	1R ₁	1/10	10.0	-	-	4/13	30.8

OES trait frequencies from Martín-Torres et al. (2012); EDJ data from Becam et al. (2019); Root channel data from Bayle, Le Luyer, & Robson Brown (2017; Las Palomas 53 and 68 left P⁴s), Zapata, Bayle, Lombardi, Pérez-Pérez, & Trinkaus (2017), and Pan & Zanolli (2019).

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

Table 4

Comparison of non-metric traits at the occlusal enamel surface (OES) and enamel-dentine junction (EDJ) between the Axlor M¹, Neandertals, Upper Paleolithic modern humans (UPMH) and recent modern humans (RMH).

Tooth region	Trait	Grade for Axlor	Neandertals		UPMH		RMH	
			<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
OES	Metacone	4	13/23	56.5	11/19	57.9	73/127	57.5
	Hypocone	4	10/23	43.5	10/19	52.6	58/127	45.7
	Cusp 5	0	1/22	4.5	1/18	5.6	44/125	35.2
	Parastyle	0	14/20	70.0	15/15	100.0	121/123	98.4
EDJ	Crista Obliqua	Type II	2/19	10.0	-	-	1/12	8.3
	Post Paracone	Intermediate	10/19	52.6	-	-	0/12	0.0

OES trait frequencies from Martín-Torres et al. (2012); EDJ data from Martin et al. (2017; combining data from early and late Neandertals together).

Table 5

Comparison of non-metric traits at the occlusal enamel surface (OES) and enamel-dentine junction (EDJ) between the Axlor M³, Neandertals, Upper Paleolithic modern humans (UPMH) and recent modern humans (RMH).

Tooth region	Trait	Grade for Axlor	Neandertals		UPMH		RMH	
			<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
OES	Metacone	>3	9/18	50.0	5/10	50.0	58/93	62.4
	Hypocone	0	3/17	17.6	2/10	20.0	15/93	16.1
	Cusp 5	1	1/17	5.9	1/10	10.0	4/93	4.3
	Carabelli	0	12/15	80.0	5/9	55.6	68/89	76.4
	Parastyle	0	14/16	87.5	9/9	100	81/88	92.0
EDJ	Crista Obliqua	absent	0/12	0.0	-	-	3/7	42.9
	Post Paracone	intermediate	1/12	8.3	-	-	2/7	28.6

OES trait frequencies from Martín-Torres et al. (2012); EDJ data from Martín et al. (2017; combining data from early and late Neandertals together).



FIGURE 1 Location of Axlor (red star) and other Paleolithic sites with human remains in the Center and East of the Cantabrian Region (northern Iberian Peninsula and southwestern France). 1: La Pasiega (González Echegaray & Ripoll Perelló, 1954); 2: Castillo (N; HS; Garralda, 2005; Garralda, Maíllo-Fernández, Higham, Neira, & Bernaldo de Quirós, in press; Obermaier, 1925; Tejero et al., 2010; Vallois & Delmas, 1976); 3: Covalejos (N, HS; Sanguino González & Montes Barquín, 2005); 4: Pendo (Basabe, 1982); 5: Morín (HS; González Echegaray & Freeman, 1973; Obermaier, 1925); 6: Rascaño (Guerrero Sala & Lorenzo Lizalde, 1981); 7: La Chora (González Echegaray, García Guinea, Begines Ramírez & Madariaga de la Campa, 1963); 8: Mirón (HS; Carretero et al., 2015); 9: Arrillor (N, Bermúdez de Castro & Sáenz de Buruaga, 1999); 10: Axlor (N; HS; this work); 11: Lezetxiki (N; Basabe, 1970); 12: Santa Catalina (HS; Albisu Andrade, Etxeberria Gabilondo, & Herrasti Erlogorri, 2014); 13: Aitzbitarte III (HS; de la Rúa & Hervella, 2011); 14: Alkerdi (Barandiarán & Cava, 2008); 15: Isturitz (HS; Henry-Gambier, Normand, & Pétilion, 2013); 16: Duruthy (HS; Henry-Gambier, 2006). N=Neandertal; HS=Homo sapiens. Base map made with QGIS 2.18.17 (QGIS Development Team, 2009) with data by Jarvis, Reuter, Nelson, & Guevara (2008).

180x120mm (600 x 600 DPI)





FIGURE 2 Excavation plan (a) and stratigraphic column (b) of Axlora cave (modified from Gómez-Olivencia et al., 2018a). (a) In the excavation plan the grid system used by J.M. Barandiarán (black square and white numbers) and the excavation area is shadowed in gray. The grid system used by the recent excavations is marked using black letters and numbers and the excavation area is outlined using a thick black line. The dotted line represents the rock-shelter wall when the site was first excavated, during the excavation this wall went back, revealing a possible cave infilling. The colors correspond to the levels to which these remains were attributed based on the notes by Barandiarán. (b) Synthetic section of the 1967–1974 excavation stratigraphy, drawn from the description of the layers by J. M. Barandiarán (1980). Different levels are marked with different colors, and the human remains are marked by silhouettes.

132x87mm (300 x 300 DPI)



39
40
41
42
43
44
45

FIGURE 3 Ax.11B.415.400 left parietal fragment. The original fossil and the 3D model are shown on different views. On the lower row, the approximate location of this fragment is shown on the La Ferrassie 1 Neanderthal cranium (left), a thickness map (from 2 to 12 mm) is shown (middle) with PC that correspond to thicker bone where is located the postcentral sulcus and V to a relative thinning produced by the anterior ramus of the meningeal system; and the anatomical features on the endocranial surface (right): including meningeal veins, A = anterior branch, O = obelic branch, and sulcal imprints C = central sulcus, PC = postcentral sulcus.

46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

180x184mm (300 x 300 DPI)




FIGURE 4 Ectocranial view of the specimen Ax.11B.415.400 with the location of zones a-d, and detailed images of these zones, where striations are located. In some cases, the grooves show a close "V" shape but do not show microstriations. The general morphology of these grooves (see text) make them compatible with trampling marks.










FIGURE 5 Dental remains previously studied by Basabe (1973) and Rostro-Carmona (2013), and likely belonging to the same individual. The teeth are shown in mesial, buccal, distal, lingual (top) and occlusal (bottom) views, together with the results of the enamel segmentation and the EDJ surface morphology. Pulp chamber volumes (in blue) are shown in mesial (P4, M1) and lingual (M2) views. A virtual reconstruction of the teeth in buccal and occlusal views is also provided. Scale bars = 1 cm.

180x129mm (300 x 300 DPI)

1 P⁴
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60






FIGURE 7 New dental remains from the Barandiarán collection of Axlór. AX.5B.299.16 (right permanent first lower incisor, I1): root canal morphology (blue) in mesial view; mesial, buccal, distal, lingual and occlusal views. AX.5B.299.31.64.17 (upper left first deciduous incisor, dI1): top, mesial, buccal, distal, lingual and occlusal views. AX.9E.283.103 (left dM2): top, mesial, buccal, distal, lingual and occlusal views. In the virtual reconstructions, enamel is represented in white and dentine in brown. Scale bars = 1 cm

80x180mm (300 x 300 DPI)