

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
SEMINAR FOR ARABIAN STUDIES

VOLUME 44
2014

Papers from the forty-seventh meeting of the
Seminar for Arabian Studies
held at the British Museum, London,
26 to 28 July 2013

SEMINAR FOR ARABIAN STUDIES

ARCHAEOPRESS
OXFORD

Orders for copies of this volume of the *Proceedings* and all back numbers should be sent to Archaeopress, Gordon House, 276 Banbury Road, Oxford OX2 7ED, UK.
Tel +44-(0)1865-311914 Fax +44(0)1865-512231
e-mail archaeo@archaeopress.com
<http://www.archaeopress.com>
For the availability of back issues see The British Foundation for the Study of Arabia's website:
<http://www.thebfsa.org/content/seminar-proceedings>

Seminar for Arabian Studies

c/o the Department of the Middle East, The British Museum
London, WC1B 3DG, United Kingdom
e-mail seminar.arab@durham.ac.uk
The British Foundation for the Study of Arabia: www.thebfsa.org

The Steering Committee of the Seminar for Arabian Studies is currently made up of sixteen academic members. The Editorial Committee of the *Proceedings of the Seminar for Arabian Studies* includes seven additional members as follows:

STEERING COMMITTEE

Dr Derek Kennet (Chairman)
Dr Robert Wilson (Treasurer)
Prof. Robert G. Hoyland (joint editor of PSAS)
Ms Sarah Morriss (Secretary and joint editor of PSAS)
Dr Mark Beech
Dr Rob Carter
Dr Nadia Durrani
Dr Orhan Elmaz
Dr Julian Jansen van Rensburg
Mr Michael C.A. Macdonald
Dr Harry Munt
Dr Venetia Porter
Dr St John Simpson
Dr Janet C.M. Starkey
Dr Lucy Wadson
Prof. Janet C.E. Watson

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE: ADDITIONAL MEMBERS

Prof. Alessandra Avanzini
Prof. Soumyen Bandyopadhyay
Dr Ricardo Eichmann
Prof. Clive Holes
Prof. Khalil Al-Muaikel
Prof. Daniel T. Potts
Prof. Christian Robin

Opinions expressed in papers published in the *Proceedings* are those of the authors and are not necessarily shared by the Editorial Committee.

The *Proceedings* is produced in the Times Semitic New font, which was designed by Paul Bibire for the Seminar for Arabian Studies.

© 2014 Archaeopress, Oxford, UK.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

ISSN 0308-8421

ISBN 978-1-905739-80-6

Contents

Transliteration	iii
Editors' Foreword	v
M.F. al-Hamad, <i>Nabataean in contact with Arabic: grammatical borrowing</i>	1
Hatem Arroq, Frédéric Abbès & Faisal Al Naimi, <i>Excavations at Deroisa, Al Khor, Qatar (poster)</i>	11
A. Avanzini, A. Prioleta & I. Rossi, <i>The Digital Archive for the Study of Pre-Islamic Arabian Inscriptions: an ERC project</i>	15
Émilie Badel & Ulrich Kramm, <i>Mineralogical investigations of Ra's al Jinz 2 bitumen (Ja'alān, Sultanate of Oman)</i>	25
Kate Bain, Richard Cuttler, Eoghan Kieran & Saif Al Naimi, <i>Wreck and ruin — mapping the shipwreck resource of Qatar</i>	35
Cassandra Bennett, <i>Geographic and religious trends in the pre-Islamic religious beliefs of the North Arabian nomadic and semi-nomadic tribes</i>	43
Lucy Blue, Nasser Said Al-Jahwari, Eric Staples, Lorena Giorgio, Paolo Croce, Alessandro Ghidoni, Ayyoub Nagmouh Al Busaidi & Luca Belfioretti, <i>Maritime footprints: examining the maritime cultural landscape of Masirah Island, Oman, past and present</i>	53
Knut Bretzke, Nicholas J. Conard & Hans-Peter Uerpmann, <i>Excavations at Jebel Faya — The FAY-NE1 shelter sequence</i>	69
Julien Charbonnier, <i>In the shadow of the palm trees: time management and water allocation in the oasis of Ādam (Sultanate of Oman)</i>	83
Chiara Condoluci, Michele Degli Esposti & Carl Phillips, <i>Iron Age settlement patterns at Salūt c. 1300–300 BC</i>	99
Christian Darles, <i>Typologie des sanctuaires de l'Arabie du Sud antique : tentative pour une nouvelle classification</i>	121
William M. Deadman, <i>Investigating the orientation of Hafit tomb entrances in Wādī 'Andām, Oman</i>	139
Caroline Durand & Yvonne Gerber, <i>The pottery production from Hegra/Madā'in Sālih (Saudi Arabia) during the Nabataean period. Preliminary results, 2008–2011</i>	153
W.D. Glanzman, <i>Pottery, people, and politics: a case from southern Arabia</i>	169
Ronald Hawker, Michael Whiteley & Thomas Tucker, <i>Computer-based analysis of the performance and spatial organization of a historic town in Qatar</i>	181
Robyn Inglis, Anthony Sinclair, Andrew Shuttleworth, Abdullah Alsharekh, Maud Devès, Saud Al Ghamdi, Matthew Meredith-Williams & Geoff Bailey, <i>Investigating the Palaeolithic landscapes and archaeology of the Jizan and Asir regions, south-western Saudi Arabia</i>	193
Christine Kainert & Philipp Drechsler, <i>An interplay of imports and local traditions? The pottery assemblage from Dosariyah, Saudi Arabia</i>	213
Yasuhisa Kondo, Tara Beuzen-Waller, Takehiro Miki, Atsushi Noguchi, Stéphane Desruelles & Éric Fouache, <i>Geoarchaeological survey in the Wādī al-Kabīr basin, Wilāyāt Ibrī, Oman: a preliminary report (poster)</i>	227

Lapo Gianni Marcucci, Émilie Badel, Francesco Genchi, Olivia Munoz, Antonio Todero & Maurizio Tosi, <i>New investigations at the prehistoric shell midden of Ra's al-Hamra 6 (Sultanate of Oman): results of the 2012 and 2013 excavation seasons</i>	235
Lynne S. Newton & Juris Zarins, <i>A possible Indian quarter at al-Baleed in the fourteenth–seventeenth centuries AD?</i>	257
Eric Olijdram, <i>From rags to riches: three crucial steps in Dilmun's rise to fame (poster)</i>	277
Zacharie Mochtari de Pierrepont, <i>Aḥmad Ibn ʿUjayl and Bayt al-Faqīh: the birth of a sacred site</i>	299
Axelle Rougeulle, H��l��ne Renel, G��lsu Simsek & Philippe Colomban, <i>Medieval ceramic production at Qalh��t, Oman, a multidisciplinary approach</i>	287
Julie E. Scott-Jackson, William Scott-Jackson, Faisal Abdulla Al Naimi, Emma Tetlow & R��my Crassard, <i>The Stone Age of Qatar: new investigations, new finds; interim report (poster)</i>	317
James Edgar Taylor, <i>Vikings in the Gulf: fact or fancy?</i>	325
William Gerard Zimmerle, <i>Ethnographic light on the form, function, and decoration of 'Arabian-style' cuboid incense burners from first-millennium BC Nippur</i>	337
Titles of papers read at the Seminar for Arabian Studies held at the British Museum, London, 26–28 July 2013	353

Investigating the Palaeolithic landscapes and archaeology of the Jizan and Asir regions, south-western Saudi Arabia

ROBYN INGLIS, ANTHONY SINCLAIR, ANDREW SHUTTLEWORTH, ABDULLAH ALSHAREKH, MAUD DEVÈS, SAUD AL GHAMDI, MATTHEW MEREDITH-WILLIAMS & GEOFF BAILEY

Summary

The archaeology of the Arabian Peninsula is pivotal to understanding the timing and mode of dispersals of hominin populations from Africa, with growing evidence supporting a ‘Southern Route’ across the Hanish Sill in the southern Red Sea. Yet despite recent key discoveries, our understanding of the hominin occupation of the Peninsula remains patchy. This situation is particularly marked in coastal south-western Saudi Arabia, a key region in dispersal debates given its proximity to the proposed Southern Route.

Identification of the routes and conditions of hominin dispersals from Africa has focused on reconstructing broad-scale climatic and vegetation zones. Yet physical landscapes are also critical to palaeoenvironmental reconstruction at the local scale. They can moderate or amplify climatic influence, and modify the distribution of plant and animal resources. The DISPERSE project aims to develop systematic methods for reconstructing Palaeolithic landscapes on a variety of geographical scales, and their impact on patterns of human evolution and dispersal.

This paper reports the preliminary results of archaeological and geomorphological survey carried out in February–March 2013 in the Jizan and Asir regions, south-western Saudi Arabia. Satellite imagery was used to identify areas of potential preservation and visibility of Palaeolithic sites, as well as key geomorphological features to inform landscape reconstruction. ESA, MSA, and potentially later artefacts were recorded at a number of locations and geographical settings in the region. These sites are placed within the developing model of landscape evolution, and preliminary hypotheses of hominin landscape use and technological aspects are outlined. These hypotheses will be tested through future survey seasons, ultimately allowing assessment of the factors controlling human occupation and dispersal.

Keywords: Palaeolithic, landscape archaeology, geomorphology, palaeoenvironment, dispersals

Introduction

The Arabian Peninsula, situated between Africa and Eurasia, is key to narratives of global hominin dispersals. Traditional emphasis on the Nile-Levant corridor as the primary Palaeolithic dispersal route between Africa and Eurasia has recently been challenged by evidence for dispersals across the southern Red Sea during low sea stands (Bailey 2009; Beyin 2006; 2011; Lambeck et al. 2011; Petraglia & Alsharekh 2003; Rose 2004). Yet despite this renewed focus on Palaeolithic Arabia, the timing and conditions of the presence of hominin populations in the Peninsula remain unclear. Lithic assemblages dated to MIS5 in the east and south of the Peninsula possess African affinities (Armitage et al. 2011; Rose et al. 2011), while a Levantine influence has been proposed for Middle Palaeolithic (MP) assemblages at 75,000 BP from northern Saudi Arabia (Groucutt & Petraglia 2012;

Petraglia et al. 2011). MIS3 MP industries from Yemen appear local in origin (Delagnes et al. 2012; 2013; Sitzia et al. 2012). Documented in a range of geographical settings, from the Arabian escarpment foothills to fossil lake beds in the hyper-arid interior of the Peninsula, these discoveries illustrate a rich record of occupation that is crucial to the narratives of global dispersals but a record that remains, at present, only poorly understood.

Palaeolithic occupation of the Peninsula took place in the context of long-term, dynamic environmental trends. During humid periods, populations expanded into now hyperarid areas across the continent (Groucutt & Petraglia 2012; Parker 2009; Parker & Rose 2008). During arid periods, populations persisted in environmentally buffered regions at the Peninsula’s edges (Delagnes et al. 2012; 2013; Sitzia et al. 2012). Yet while broad-scale environmental reconstructions are crucial to understanding peninsula-scale population trends, the physical landscape




FIGURE 1. The location of the study area and broad-scale geomorphological zones in the study area as defined by the DISPERSE project (after Deves et al. 2013) (elevation data © CGIAR-CSI SRTM 90m v4.1 database).

is important when considering occupation patterns and landscape use. Topographic features at the regional and local scale can moderate or amplify environmental change, altering the distribution of plant and animal resources. Features such as watercourses and raw material sources could have attracted activity. Specific landscapes, for example coastlines, may have provided particular concentrations of resources potentially attractive to past populations (Bailey & King 2011; Bailey, Reynolds & King 2011; Bailey et al. 2012). Physical landscape characteristics may have therefore played a key role in hominin dispersals, with groups potentially following attractive concentrations of resources within certain landscape types and ecozones.

The DISPERSE project is undertaking a new archaeological and geomorphological survey in south-western Saudi Arabia, in the Jizan and Asir regions, combined with mapping techniques to reconstruct landscape evolution and site location from the regional to site scale. Such reconstruction will allow the assessment of the relationships between Palaeolithic sites and their landscapes and potentially, choices made by the hominins inhabiting the landscapes. This paper reports on the first full season of geoarchaeological survey undertaken over four weeks in February and March 2013 and presents preliminary observations on the Palaeolithic record of the region.

Geological setting

The study area can be divided into four broad geomorphic units (Fig. 1; Devès et al. 2013). To the east of the study area, the escarpment of the Arabian plateau rises to over 2700 m above sea level (asl). Erosion of this scarp has produced steep-sided valleys in the shists, granites, and greenstones (Müller 1984). At its foot the 190 km-wide coastal plain, the Tihamat Asir, is divided into the Upper and Lower Coastal Plains along the line of metamorphic schist foothills that run parallel to the escarpment and the Red Sea rift and rise to *c.* 700 m asl, 40 km from the coast (Müller 1984) — the ‘Magmatic Line’ (Devès et al. 2013). These hills are associated with Quaternary cinder cones and lava flows, as well as Miocene dyke intrusions. To the west, the Lower Coastal Plain is largely flat, covered by Quaternary and Holocene sediments. To the east, the Upper Coastal Plain has a steeper slope and consists largely of bare basement rock overlain by alluvial fans (Dabbagh et al. 1984; Müller 1984). The topographic uniformity of the Lower Coastal Plain is interrupted in the north by the Harrat Al Birk lava fields, active before

and during the Quaternary, and potentially the Holocene (Bailey et al. 2007*b*; Brown, Schmidt & Huffman 1989; Coleman, Gregory & Brown 1983).

February 2013 field season

Prior to survey, satellite imagery (LandsatGeoCover 2000/ETM+ Mosaics and imagery accessed through Google Earth imagery) and DEMs (ASTER GDM v2 and SRTM 90m v4.1) was used to map and classify landforms, with ground-truthing visits in May–June and November 2012 (Devès et al. 2013; Inglis et al., in preparation). Landforms were assessed for their potential for surface Palaeolithic archaeology and preservation of, and access to, potentially artefact-bearing stratigraphy. Survey in February 2013 focused primarily on areas of low sedimentation and high potential for visible surface archaeology (e.g. lava flows and exposed bedrock), to assess rapidly the region’s archaeological potential. Key geomorphological features for dating landscape evolution, such as raised beach terraces, were targeted for sampling and dating where appropriate.

Fifty-four locations were visited and Palaeolithic artefacts recorded at the vast majority of them (Fig. 2). Over 700 lithics were recorded, logged with a handheld GPS, and collected. GPS waypoints were grouped later into localities. Preliminary lithic analysis was conducted prior to deposit in Sabiya Museum, Jizan Province. While work is still at an early stage, this paper highlights locations and their contents, which proved particularly useful in informing on the region’s archaeological potential and its landscape development. For descriptive purposes, we use the terms Early, Middle, and Later Stone Age to label, in broad terms, assemblages containing, among other items, bifacial hand axes, cleavers, and large cutting tools (Early Stone Age — ESA), flake and blade products from prepared cores (Middle Stone Age — MSA), and bladelet and microlithic elements (Later Stone Age — LSA), recognizing a broad comparability to the Lower, Middle, and Upper Palaeolithic terminology used by others (see Groucutt & Blinkhorn 2013 for discussion). The use of this essentially African terminology also reflects the Project’s interest in the dispersal of hominins out of that continent.

Harrat Al Birk, Asir Region

The Harrat Al Birk, Asir Region, extends *c.* 100 km along the coast, and the basalt lava flows have yielded previous observations of ESA and MSA artefacts (Overstreet 1973;




FIGURE 2. Locations visited during the February 2013 survey, showing the locations that yielded Palaeolithic artefacts (elevation data © CGIAR-CSI SRTM 90m v4.1 database).

Zarins et al. 1980; Zarins, Murad & Al-Yaish 1981). The flows extend into the sea, and the relatively steep coastline this produces (in contrast to the low-relief Tihamat) has preserved a series of raised beach and coral terraces, themselves sometimes associated with artefacts (Bailey 2009; Bailey et al. 2007a; Zarins, Murad & Al-Yaish 1981).

Wādī Najla

Wādī Najla runs north-east–south-west for 12 km from the middle of the *harrat* (lava field) to the sea north of Al Quamah, beginning in a 3.5 km wide basin before diving into a deep gorge for c.4 km, where a columnar basalt flow filled an existing valley in the schist bedrock (Fig. 3/a). Overlying the lava in the gorge are numerous tufa/wadi calcrete outcrops, up to 3 m in thickness (Fig. 3/b). At the edge of the lava flow, the wadi widens and flows through a broad valley to the sea.

In the basin at the head of the wadi twenty lithics, of MSA and ESA typology, were recovered from around the base of a small (c.20 m high) bedrock *jabal* and a transect extending 150 m south-west from its base

(L0039). Artefacts were primarily basalt, but also quartz and andesite. The material appeared greater in density towards the base of the *jabal*, in contrast to the flat area to the south-west. A potential core rejuvenation flake from a basalt blade core, and a flake from a small basalt pyramidal core suggesting MSA activity were observed on top of the *jabal*.

At the head of the gorge (L0040), twenty-three ESA and MSA artefacts (predominantly basalt, but also quartz and andesite) were recorded along a 200 m transect along the upper surface of the lava flow. Discoidal cores were present, as well as two MSA convergent flakes, and an ESA horseshoe-shaped core, all on basalt. In the base of the gorge, extensive tufa outcrops were also sampled for future analyses.

At L0041, little archaeology was observed from the gorge floor, or from the lava flow above the wadi to the east, where the potential proximal end of a quartz bladelet with signs of preparation prior to removal was the only lithic observed. A single undiagnostic basalt flake was recorded from just below two small rock shelters on the north-west side of the wadi gorge.




FIGURE 3. a. An aerial view of Wādī Najla, showing the main geomorphological units and localities visited in the area. Note the deep gorge running roughly along the edge of the younger lava flow to the south of the wadi (satellite imagery © DigitalGlobe 2013, accessed through Google Earth; imagery date 7/5/2005); **b.** a view of the jabal and L0039, looking east. MSA material was found on the near flanks of the jabal, as well as on top of the left-hand side of the larger, right-hand part of the ridge. Car ringed for scale (photograph A. Sinclair); **c.** the view from L0041, looking south-west down the wadi gorge. Note the incised columnar basalt lava flow and tufa outcrops in the base of the present wadi to the bottom right of the photograph. Car ringed for scale (photograph R. Inglis).

A 400 m transect, from a short tributary draining the north-west side of the wadi, across wadi floor alluvium to the top of the lava flow (L0042), yielded twelve lithics. In the tributary, large basalt and andesite flakes,

one retouched to create a straight ESA large cutting-tool edge, were collected. On alluvium at the wadi edge, MSA lithics were observed in the form of an unsuccessful convergent flake on basalt, and a flake from a very small




FIGURE 4. a. An aerial view of Dhababan Quarry showing the local geomorphological zones, and the location of the section that contains embedded lithics exposed at the edge of the wadi (see Fig. 5), as well as the location of the main marine sediment section exposed by quarrying (satellite imagery © DigitalGlobe 2013, accessed through Google Earth; imagery date 21/09/2009); **b.** marine sediment section exposed by quarrying (photograph R. Inglis).

basalt discoid core. On top of the lava flow, an MSA flake from a radial core as well as two large (potentially ESA) basalt flakes, including one from a possible discoid core, were observed.

At the mouth of the wadi, 1 km south-east from the edge of the basalt lava flow and gorge, no artefacts were observed around or on top of a bedrock *jabal* (L0043) rising *c.* 10 m above the broad valley.

The archaeological record illustrates the wadi's use by ESA and MSA populations. While the sample remains small, more artefacts were observed in the upper parts of the wadi (e.g. L0039 and L0040), than along the gorge, potentially indicating a focus of activity in the former. This may suggest that the gorge was used as a corridor for movement between the coast and the inland of the *harrat*, and more time spent in its headwaters. The tufa belies a period in the past when the environment was much wetter than today, with the finely laminar nature of

the tufa indicating perennial flows in the wadi (I. Candy, personal communication, 2013). Locating unaltered tufa deposits for dating in order to chronologically constrain this period (or periods) of humidity chronologically will be a key future priority.

Wādī Dhababan quarry and coral terraces

Adjacent to the coast road and 5 km north of Al Quamah, a quarry exposes sediments overlying a lava flow (L0034) at 11 m asl (Fig. 4/a). Basalt artefacts were observed on the surface of the profile in May 2012 (Devès et al. 2013).

The *c.* 5 m-deep sequence in the quarry consists predominantly of carbonate and shell sand layers, varying in their degree of consolidation and lamination. The sequence, capped by 1.25 m of indurated, heavily weathered beach rock, was interpreted as beach/marine sediments (Fig. 4/b). Bulldozing has removed the majority




FIGURE 5. **a.** An area of beach rock and associated sediments containing lithics, exposed by wadi action. Note the change from the lower, cobble unit to overlying more laminar sands at the height of the feet of the left-hand figure (photograph R. Inglis); **b.** a basalt flake with a potentially prepared striking platform embedded in the lower cobble unit of the section. Scale with 1 cm divisions (photograph R. Inglis); **c.** a basalt flake accommodated in the upper fine shell sand unit. Scale with 1 cm divisions (photograph A. Sinclair).

of the lateral extent of the beach rock, destroying the clear relationship between these sediments and aeolianite deposits on the lava flows at the eastern edge of the quarry.

At the northern edge of the quarry the beach sediments are cut by a small wadi. Here the sequence consists of a poorly sorted unit of well-rounded cobbles of lava and coral concreted with carbonate (potentially indicating coastal wadi activity) overlain by finer, laminar units similar to those exposed in the main section (Fig. 5/a). Unrolled lithics were observed concreted within the cobble unit, as well as a smaller number within the laminar sand units. The lithics were left *in situ* pending future detailed

recording in 2014. Flakes observed within the cobble unit appear to derive from prepared cores consistent with MSA lithics found elsewhere at the locality (Fig. 5/b) while the large basalt flake accommodated within the top of the marine sand unit shows no clear signs of prepared core working (Fig. 5/c).

About 100 ESA and MSA surface lithics, overwhelmingly manufactured on basalt, were collected from the quarry and lava flows. ESA artefacts included large flakes, cleavers, and a hand axe, while convergent flakes and flake-blades indicated an MSA presence. There was some spatial variation in the cultural affinities; on




FIGURE 6. a. The Jabal Akwah area showing the localities visited and the cultural affiliations. Note the two cinder cones of Jabal Akwah to the left of the image, with their associated lava flows, and the line of jabbals to the right of the image that mark the northernmost part of the Magmatic Line (satellite imagery © USGS Landsat ETM+ 2000 Gecover Mosaics); **b.** a view of Jabal Akwah from L0017, showing the broad alluvial plain. Note the topographic prominence of the cinder cones (photograph R. Inglis); **c.** wadi floodplain sediments underlying tuff in the quarry adjacent to the present course of Wādī Sabiya, south of Jabal Akwah (photograph R. Inglis).

the unbulldozed beach rock in the north-west of the quarry, there was a mixture of ESA and MSA artefacts. MSA artefacts were recorded on the edge of the lava

flows to the north-east of the quarry while separately, to the south-east on the lava flows the artefacts appeared predominantly ESA.

At present, the timing and conditions of the deposition of artefacts and their relationship to the marine sediments is unclear. The artefacts may have been deposited on dry land prior to marine transgression, or rolled into the finer sediments from the flows. Future investigations will focus on confirming the sedimentary context of the lithics, as well as dating the beach sediments. Investigation of past shorelines will be extended to recording and dating the raised coral terraces along the Harrat Al Birk coast associated with artefacts (Bailey et al. 2007b; Devès et al. 2013; Zarins, Murad & Al-Yaish 1981).

Southern Jizan Region

Investigations in southern Jizan centred on the region east of Sabiya and Abu Arish, specifically on the volcanics associated with the Magmatic Line. Due to the extensive Quaternary and Holocene sediment cover, investigation focused on areas where Palaeolithic surface archaeology would be most visible, such as lava flows and exposed basement rock.

Wādī Sabiya and Jabal Akwah

The twin cinder cones and lava flows of Jabal Akwah lie 8 km west of the Magmatic Line. Together with the Magmatic Line *jabals*, they form marked topographic points in an otherwise flat landscape (dominated by Quaternary and later alluvium and aeolian deposits), rising to *c.* 60 m and *c.* 30 m above the present plain respectively (Fig. 6/b). Wādī Sabiya and a tributary, as well as Wādī Nakhlan, flow through the Magmatic Line with Wādī Nakhlan continuing between Jabal Akwah's cinder cones and Wādī Sabiya flowing to the south (Fig. 6/a). Incision by Wādī Sabiya has exposed up to 15 m of silts, wadi sands, and gravels under volcanic tuff (Fig. 6/c). The tuff has been linked to the earliest date for the Jabal Akwah lava flows of 0.44 ± 0.26 mya (K/Ar, Dabbagh et al. 1984).

Artefacts were observed at ten localities, all on areas of low sedimentation (lava flows and *jabals*), while stops on the Quaternary/Holocene alluvial and aeolian sediments yielded no artefacts. On the lava around the northern cinder cone, a total of twenty-three lithics were recorded at three localities (L0013–15). The material, observed on exposed lava surfaces, includes ESA and MSA forms on basalt and andesite: a potential ESA basalt cleaver or core, and MSA flakes and cores including a recurrent Levallois core. A single undiagnostic andesite flake was observed on the eastern edge of the southern cinder cone lava flows (L0001), and two rounded basalt cobbles were

observed on the otherwise angular lava flows overlooking the wadi between the cinder cones (L0019).

Two areas to the east of Jabal Akwah, where tributaries of Wādī Sabiya flow through gaps in the *jabals*, were visited. The northernmost consisted of two localities: L0016, on alluvium, and L0017, on top of the *jabals*. Two undiagnostic quartz flakes and a pottery sherd were the only artefacts observed on the alluvium at L0016. The area on the *jabals* above the wadi yielded twenty-eight ESA and MSA artefacts on quartz, basalt, chert, and shale. The ESA was less prevalent than the MSA, represented by flakes and a potential basalt scraper. MSA artefacts from the *jabal* top included a potential retouched core preparation basal flake from a recurrent Levallois core, and a quartz flake with a faceted platform. Towards the foot of the *jabal*, an area a few metres across yielded a particular concentration of MSA flakes and cores on green chert, shale, quartz, and basalt, potentially representing at least two clear sets of flaking activity.

This pattern is mirrored 8 km to the south-west at L0024, where thirty-eight lithics were recorded on top of the *jabals* overlooking Wādī Sabiya. A 300 m transect from the top of the *jabal* to the alluvium yielded no artefacts on the alluvium. ESA and MSA artefacts were instead observed on the *jabal*, as well as a few potential LSA indurate shale flakes. The ESA artefacts are a discoidal core and flake on basalt, while MSA pieces comprise the remainder of the assemblage, including potential convergent flakes, points on chert and andesite, as well as prepared basalt cores and flakes.

Away from the cinder cones and *jabals*, two areas were visited to the east of the Magmatic Line, an area of exposed bedrock (L0002) and a low schist *jabal* (L0025). Both locations were very low density, with L0002 yielding a small quartzite convergent flake and another chert flake, and L0025 yielding a small number of both basalt and shale flakes.

The final location where artefacts were observed was a basalt dyke (L0023) visible in Wādī Sabiya, 1 km downstream from L0024. The andesite flake and basalt discoidal core could be either ESA or MSA. No artefacts were observed in and around the present wadi.

Although the alluvial plain was not investigated extensively, the above confirms its low potential for Palaeolithic surface archaeology. Due to this taphonomic variability, bias in artefact distribution towards the *jabals* and lava flows cannot be interpreted as a result of behavioural patterning. Yet a difference in artefact density appears to exist between Jabal Akwah (relatively low) and the Magmatic Line *jabals* (relatively high). Whether this

reflects a preferential attraction to the *jabals*, driven by the views they afforded over watercourses and potential prey, requires further testing. In addition, further investigation of the sediments underlying the volcanic tuff in Wādī Sabiya is required: if the eruption of Jabal Akwah dates from 0.44 ± 0.26 mya, the sediments protected below the tuff potentially contain sediments and artefacts from within the time period of the earliest hominin dispersals from Africa.

Abu Arish lava flows

East of Abu Arish, lava flows from cinder cones in the Magmatic Line spread west over 12 km and are incised by Wādī Jizan (Fig. 7). The eruption of these flows at 0.8 ± 0.3 mya (K/Ar), buried a wadi floodplain (Dabbagh et al. 1984), sediments that are exposed in quarries and wadi sections in the region. Palaeolithic artefacts have been reported from locations around the edges of these




FIGURE 7. An aerial view of the Abu Arish lava flow area. Note the linear schistic *jabals* to the top and bottom of the picture, and the extensive preservation of the lava flows, as well as the major incision into the lava flows of Wādī Jizan. The town of Abu Arish is visible in the bottom left-hand corner of the image (satellite imagery © USGS, accessed through Google Earth; imagery date 6/04/2009).




FIGURE 8. An aerial view of the south-west edge of Jabal Umm al Qumman's northern cinder cone, locality L0010, showing the major geomorphological units and main concentrations of artefacts. Note the restriction of artefacts to the exposed lava surface. The transect was walked from the lower left-hand edge of the lava flow north-east to the base of the cinder cone (satellite imagery © Digital Globe, accessed through Google Earth; imagery date 29/10/2010).

flows (G.N. Bailey, personal communication, 2012; Devès et al. 2013; Zarins, Murad & Al-Yaish 1981).

Locations at the edges of the flows, as well as their interior, were visited. A very low density scatter of ESA and MSA artefacts appears to cover the flows, with a few occurrences of potential LSA artefacts (L0003 and L0026), but there is some variation in artefact number between locations.

A 200 m transect along a lava flow at the eastern edge of the Wādī Jizan Dam lake (L0006) yielded fourteen artefacts on basalt, quartzite, and chert, with MSA or later affinities. These included convergent flakes on basalt, as well as five small chert flakes, three of which have evidence of retouching to scraper form. The locality provides commanding views over the area now flooded by the dam lake, where four wadis converge into Wādī Jizan,

an area potentially attractive to past animal populations.

At the north-eastern edge of the flows, superimposed lava flows were visited. L0008 on a lower, more porous flow yielded no artefacts, yet 1 km to the south-east, on slightly less porous, younger lava, two ESA basalt cores and ten MSA flakes and cores on basalt (including a possible recurrent Levallois or convergent core) and chert were observed within a few metres. The basalt artefacts were usually found in association with areas of denser, fine-grained basaltic lava.

Other localities overlooked wadis or small basins, aside from one (L0028) situated in the centre of the flows. All (save for L0007 on the north-eastern side of the Magmatic Line where a single, c.30 cm undiagnostic basalt flake was observed but not collected) yielded small numbers of ESA and MSA artefacts, with L0003, south-

east of the Abu Arish–Fifa road, potentially containing LSA quartz flakes alongside ESA and MSA artefacts.

These localities only begin to illustrate the archaeological potential of the lava flows, but some hypotheses regarding hominin landscape use can be formed. Differences in artefact density between the lava flows at L0008 and 0009 suggest preferences for locations with views over the surrounding landscape, as well as the targeting of certain lava types for exploitation. In the same way, areas on the lava flows overlooking wadis (for example L0006 overlooking the dam lake) may have been visited more frequently due to a concentration of water and potential animal resources, and thus more material deposited. These hypotheses need, of course, to be tested through further systematic survey of the lava flows.

Jabal Umm Al Qumman

To the south of the Abu Arish lava flows, the twin cinder cones of Jabal Umm Al Qumman lie 3 km west of the Magmatic Line. Lava flows from the cones, dating to 0.9 ± 0.3 mya (K/Ar), are covered by orange, alluvial, or aeolian, sediments (Dabbagh et al. 1984). This palaeosurface is buried by aeolian sedimentation, subsequently eroded by dendritic wadis (Fig. 8). A calcareous crust and carbonate concretions associated with the old land surface have dated to 8100 BP and 7200 BP respectively (^{14}C) (Dabbagh et al. 1984: 157). OSL samples were taken from the major sediment units.

The western edge of the northern cinder cone yielded a single ESA discoidal core on andesite (L0005). In contrast, a 1.2 km transect along the exposed lava to the south-west of the cinder cone, bisected by a wadi, yielded sixty-two artefacts (L0010) (Fig. 8). The artefacts, predominantly ESA and MSA, were overwhelmingly basalt with some chert, quartz, and andesite pieces. ESA artefacts included large flakes and simple cores as well as a basalt cleaver. MSA affinities were present in recurrent Levallois flakes, including a convergent flake struck from the tip and a blade core. The MSA artefacts were predominantly basalt, yet quartzite and chert flakes were present. The LSA is potentially present in the form of a fine retouched chert flake, as well as a fragment of a basalt bladelet core and a quartz bladelet. Material was concentrated towards the southern end of the transect, but was present at low density across the entire lava surface. No artefacts were observed on the old land surface or the dunes, consistent with a relatively recent deposition.

The number of artefacts observed in this location was rivalled by few other locations (e.g. L0034) during this

survey season. Whether this is linked to preservation of the lava surface and artefacts, or to attractive locality features such as raw material availability, views over the coastal plain, and the potential capture of water and prey in the small gorge, remains to be tested. Given the high potential for preservation of stratigraphy above the *c.* 1 mya lava flow, future work will include test pitting and renewed dating of the major landscape units in this area.

Discussion

This fieldwork has widened our understanding of the potential of the region to inform on the Palaeolithic occupation of Arabia. While the hypotheses outlined above must be tested with further survey, some preliminary conclusions can be made from the material recovered.

Lithic observations

The lithic assemblages observed and recorded by the survey allow us to draw preliminary observations about the typology and technology of lithic tools in the region, some initial thoughts on the choice and use of raw materials, and some clear observations about the nature of technological behaviour in this landscape.

Typologically speaking, artefacts collected as individual finds or parts of assemblages from localities testify to a prolonged, but not necessarily continuous hominin presence in the region. In all of the areas examined by the survey, we have found pieces that can be typologically identified as ESA or MSA, as well as a smaller number of localities with materials identified as possibly of LSA date.

ESA artefacts, although fewer in number than MSA artefacts, include a small number of cleavers and hand axes, as well as cutting tools on large flakes. There are also a number of large and medium-sized discoidal cores and associated flakes (Fig. 9/a). Hand axes on basalt, andesite, and quartzite, are relatively simply made, with bifacial retouch outlining the perimeter and minimal bifacial retouch covering interior faces (Fig. 9/c). They are not dissimilar to those from Ad-Dawadmi (Whalen et al. 1983). Two basalt cleavers have been identified. One piece has the sharp cleaver edge at the end of the tool created as a natural distal end of a large flake blank, with flake removals to shape the other end and sides (Fig. 9/b). The other (possible) cleaver is made on a large cortical flake from a rolled cobble, with large flakes removed once struck to shape (Fig. 9/d). With the exception of flakes from discoidal cores, other ESA flakes are large and




FIGURE 9. Examples of ESA artefacts recorded in the survey: **a.** flakes and discoidal cores (Wādī Jizan; L0006); **b.** a cleaver (Jabal Umm Al Qummam; L0010); **c.** a hand axe (Abu Arish lava flows; L0009); **d.** a possible cleaver (Jabal Akwah; L0013) (all photographs A. Sinclair).

irregular, giving the impression of largely opportunistic manufacture.

MSA artefacts, on a range of materials, were the most common artefacts recorded. They include a large number of identifiable flakes from prepared cores, core forms including radial cores, pointed-flake cores, and flake-blades cores (Fig. 10). There are also a small number of blade cores that are conical in form and almost classically prismatic in their working. The MSA flake-blade artefacts are similar in form to Levallois blade collections reported from Wādī Surdud (Delagnes et al. 2012; 2013), although the raw material differs and it is not possible as yet to say

whether the cores are worked in the same exact fashion as at Wādī Surdud. Pointed flake forms appear to have been almost exclusively made on unidirectional point cores, with no evidence so far observed for the Nubian complex working observed in Oman (Rose et al. 2011) and central Saudi Arabia (Crassard & Hilbert 2013). In addition to classic prepared core flake forms, localities with MSA artefacts often contain small discoidal shaped cores and their flakes, made on similar materials to accompanying, larger prepared cores and flakes.

Possible LSA artefacts are few in number, and restricted to localities in the Abu Arish lava flows (L0003




FIGURE 10. *Examples of Middle Stone Age artefacts recorded in the survey: a. flake blades, pointed flakes, and a radial core (Jabal Umm Al Qummam; L0010); b. flake blades and a pointed flake (Harrat Al Birk; L0032); c. a radial core (Jabal Bagarah; L0054); d. a prismatic blade core (Jabal Akwah area; L0017) (all photographs A. Sinclair).*

and L0026) and Jabal Umm Al Qummam (L0010). They include bladelets and small blade cores made on quartz and basalt, as well as small retouched flakes made on a variety of cherts.

The raw materials utilized vary widely. Basalt artefacts predominate, as might be expected from the survey's initial targeting of basalt lava flows. Quartz, andesite, shales, cherts, and even fine-grained sandstone were all utilized by Palaeolithic populations, however,

and this diversity reflects the available material within the study area. In addition to basaltic lava flows, areas of exposed basement would have provided access to quartz and shales, as well as chert sources. Furthermore, wadis draining the escarpment facilitated transport of materials onto the coastal plain, providing other potential raw material types. Such abundance and wide distribution of raw material indicates that human groups were not limited in their movements by the availability of raw material.

Despite this abundance, however, finely worked tool forms are rare. Indeed, with the exception of the prepared core forms, lithics show little evidence of extensive time spent in manufacture or retouch, or regularity in finished form. There is a general lack of ESA hand axes, despite their presence elsewhere in the Peninsula (e.g. Petraglia, Drake & Alsharekh 2009; Whalen et al. 1983; Whalen, Siraj-Ali & Davis 1984; Zarins et al. 1979; 1980). Where they are found, they lack extensive bifacial retouching. This evident simplicity in tool manufacture might be explained by a number of factors. Raw material abundance may have precluded the need to manufacture tools for use in areas of material scarcity or to ensure a necessarily long use-life. Given the raw material abundance in the region, an effective technological approach may have been based on extensive, simple flaking and selection of a small number of appropriate blanks, as has been observed in other areas with abundant materials (e.g. Holdaway & Douglass 2011). Moreover, many of the use actions imagined for finely retouched tools, for example hand axes, can be achieved using simple edges with minimal retouch. This apparently simple approach to blank production is accompanied by rapid discard of flakes after use as evidenced by minimal retouching, although a few rare examples of flake tools do show more extensive retouching of working edges.

Landscape archaeology and site distribution — lithics in their landscape

The observations highlight the taphonomic role of sediment cover in understanding surface artefact distributions at regional and local scales. At the regional scale, investigation specifically focused on areas of low sedimentation and high potential archaeological visibility, areas that almost always yielded artefacts. When areas of high sedimentation were visited, albeit briefly, no Palaeolithic artefacts were observed. This is mirrored at the local scale, for example at Jabal Umm Al Qummam, where artefacts were restricted to the exposed lava surface. Further mapping, field observations, and targeted absolute dating will be required to characterize and temporally constrain landscape development in the region in order to locate surfaces of Palaeolithic age, as well as target areas where buried surfaces can be accessed.

Furthermore, the presently limited coverage of the study area means that the data above cannot be used to interrogate regional patterning. Yet within areas of low sedimentation, such as the Abu Arish lava flows, surfaces may have been largely stable since the Palaeolithic. The

distribution of artefacts within these areas can therefore be more confidently interpreted as the result of spatial variation in artefact deposition, rather than of taphonomic factors. Variation in artefact numbers between L0008 on the lower, more porous lava flows, and L0009 on an adjacent, but higher and more fine-grained lava flow, could indicate preference for certain raw materials and a concentration of highly archaeologically visible manufacturing activities around these sources. It may also represent repeated visits to a location with good views over the surrounding landscape for navigation or prey location. This potential emphasis on views over areas of prey movement is mirrored in L0006 above the Wādī Jizan Dam lake, above the confluence of a number of wadis in a broad plain. In addition, between areas of low sedimentation, there is variation in the number of artefacts. While in part this may be due to variations in time spent investigating each area, localities such as Jabal Umm Al Qummam (L0010), a flat-topped volcanic *jabal* on the southern edge of the Harrat Al Birk (L0032), and Dhahaban Quarry (L0034) yielded higher numbers of artefacts, atypical of the majority of localities. These localities may represent particular focal points in the landscape, potentially due to factors such as views over the landscape and raw material and water availability.

The surface artefacts observed comprise a palimpsest created over many thousands of years. The pattern of artefact distribution is therefore time-averaged, with the isolation of single visits difficult. Observed artefact concentrations are unlikely to be ‘living sites’, but may be locations that were visited repeatedly, where lithics were worked and discarded. Yet there are occasional concentrations of artefacts whose forms and similarity of working and of raw material imply that they represent the still-recognizable remains of discrete moments of observable short-term action. Reduction of a green chert nodule at L0017 is one possible instance. What remains to be disentangled from this pattern of repeated visits is whether they were for the same purpose, or were subject to a shift of different actions occurring in the same place — an ‘archaeology of place’ (Binford 1982).

While acknowledging the impact of time averaging, one broad-scale distinction can be tentatively drawn between cultural units on typological grounds. The vast majority of ESA lithics were on local material, usually basalts, observed in locations close to flows or dykes. MSA material was almost always also present in these locations, sometimes alongside LSA. Yet in a few cases, MSA and LSA material was the only material recovered from the tops of the *jabals* (e.g. L0039, Wādī Najla).

Together with the use of apparently more exotic materials (e.g. chert) during these periods, this may indicate a 'release from proximity' (following Gamble 1998) of later populations from raw material sources. While this requires further testing, it may mark differential landscape use between earlier and later, more mobile, populations.

Conclusions

On the basis of typological observations we believe that Palaeolithic occupation of the region was not restricted to a single period. The presence of ESA, MSA, and LSA artefacts highlights a long, though by no means continuous, occupation history of the study area. This fits well with the potential of the coastal area to be habitable throughout the Pleistocene (Bailey 2009), and supports previous archaeological surveys (Bailey et al. 2007a; 2007b; Overstreet 1973; Zarins et al. 1980; Zarins, Murad & Al-Yaish 1981). This inference is also supported by recent findings in the Yemeni foothills to the immediate south of the Jizan region (Delagnes et al. 2012; 2013). Importantly, the presence of possible lithic evidence of an LSA contrasts with sites in the interior of the Arabian Peninsula that lack LSA/Upper Palaeolithic assemblages (Groucutt & Petraglia 2012) due to their depopulation during hyperarid episodes. Exact timings and conditions of occupation in this coastal region, however, can only be established through future location and dating of stratified sites. The possibility remains therefore that the south-western Arabian refugium suggested for Yemen and parts of Oman may have extended into the study area, and possibly further.

The survey has highlighted the major potential of the Jizan and Asir regions to inform on the archaeological

record of the Arabian Peninsula, with artefacts from throughout the Palaeolithic sequence documenting a long history of occupation. Issues of taphonomy hamper conclusions at the regional scale and can only be approached through a more detailed understanding of Quaternary landscape evolution. Yet within areas of high visibility of surface archaeology, some patterns in site locations and artefact typology are emerging. By integrating a detailed understanding of landscape evolution and the Palaeolithic occupations within it, future survey and mapping will allow the assessment of the ways in which these populations were moving through, and depositing lithics within, their landscapes.

Acknowledgements

We thank HRH Prince Sultan bin Salman bin Abdul Aziz, President of the Saudi Commission for Tourism and Antiquities (SCTA), KSA, Professor Ali Al-Ghabban, Vice-President, and Jamal Al Omar, Director General, for granting fieldwork permission and for supporting our work in Saudi Arabia. Grateful thanks are also extended to the staff of the SCTA in Jizan and Asir regions and their offices in Sabiya and Abha. The 2013 survey team consisted of Bassam Al Hilal (National Museum, Riyadh, KSA), Aied Al Hmaed (SCTA Dawasir, KSA), Robyn Inglis (University of York, UK), Hussein Mofareh (SCTA Sabiya, KSA), and Andrew Shuttleworth and Anthony Sinclair (University of Liverpool, UK). This research is funded by the European Research Council (ERC) under the Ideas Programme of the 7th Framework Programme as Advanced Grant 269586 'DISPERSE: Dynamic Landscapes, Coastal Environments and Human Dispersals. This is DISPERSE contribution no. 11.

References

- Armitage S.J., Jasim S.A., Marks A.E., Parker A.G. et al.
2011. The Southern Route 'Out of Africa': evidence for an early expansion of modern humans into Arabia. *Science* 331: 453–456.
- Bailey G.N.
2009. The Red Sea, Coastal Landscapes, and Hominin Dispersals. Pages 15–37 in M.D. Petraglia & J.I. Rose (eds), *The Evolution of Human Populations in Arabia*. Amsterdam: Springer.
- Bailey G.N. & King G.C.P.
2011. Dynamic landscapes and human dispersal patterns: tectonics, coastlines, and the reconstruction of human habitats. *Quaternary Science Reviews* 30/11–12: 1533–1553.
- Bailey G.N., Reynolds S.C. & King G.C.
2011. Landscapes of human evolution: models and methods of tectonic geomorphology and the reconstruction of hominin landscapes. *Journal of Human Evolution* 60/3: 257–280.

- Bailey G.N., Alsharekh A., Flemming N.C., Lambeck K. et al.
2007a. Coastal prehistory in the southern Red Sea basin, underwater archaeology, and the Farasan Islands. *Proceedings of the Seminar for Arabian Studies* 37: 1–16.
- Bailey G.N., Flemming N.C., King G.C.P., Lambeck K. et al.
2007b. Coastlines, Submerged Landscapes, and Human Evolution: The Red Sea Basin and the Farasan Islands. *The Journal of Island and Coastal Archaeology* 2/2: 127–160.
- Bailey G.N., King G.C.P., Devès M., Hausmann N. et al.
2012. DISPERSE: dynamic landscapes, coastal environments and human dispersals. *Antiquity Project Gallery* 86/334. www.antiquity.ac.uk/projgall/bailey334/
- Beyin A.
2006. The Bab al Mandab vs the Nile-Levant: an appraisal of the two dispersal routes for early modern humans out of Africa. *African Archaeological Review* 23: 5–30.
2011. Upper Pleistocene Human Dispersals out of Africa: A Review of the Current State of the Debate. *International Journal of Evolutionary Biology* 615094: 1–17.
- Binford L.R.
1982. The Archaeology of Place. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 1/1: 5–31.
- Brown G.F., Schmidt D.L. & Huffman A.C.
1989. Geology of the Arabian Peninsula: Shield Area of Western Saudi Arabia. *US Geological Survey Professional Paper*: 560-A.
- Coleman R.G., Gregory R.T. & Brown G.F.
1983. Cenozoic volcanic rocks of Saudi Arabia. *United States Geological Survey, Open-File Report*: 83–788.
- Crassard R. & Hilbert Y.H.
2013. A Nubian Complex Site from Central Arabia: Implications for Levallois Taxonomy and Human Dispersals during the Upper Pleistocene. *PLoS ONE* 8/7: e69221. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0069221
- Dabbagh A., Emmermann R., Hötzel H., Jado A.R. et al.
1984. The development of Tihamat Asir during the Quaternary. Pages 150–173 in A.R. Jado & J.G. Zötl (eds), *Quaternary Period in Saudi Arabia. ii. Sedimentological, Hydrogeological, Hydrochemical, Geomorphological, Geochronological and Climatological Investigations in Western Saudi Arabia*. Vienna: Springer-Verlag.
- Delagnes A., Crassard R., Bertran P. & Sitzia L.
2013. Cultural and human dynamics in southern Arabia at the end of the Middle Paleolithic. *Quaternary International* 300: 234–243.
- Delagnes A., Tribolo C., Bertran P., Brenet M. et al.
2012. Inland human settlement in southern Arabia 55,000 years ago. New evidence from the Wadi Surdud Middle Paleolithic site complex, western Yemen. *Journal of Human Evolution* 63: 452–474.
- Devès M.H., Inglis R.H., Meredith-Williams M.G., Al Ghamdi S. et al.
2013. Palaeolithic survey in southwest Saudi Arabia: methodology and preliminary results. *Adumatu* 27: 7–30.
- Gamble C.
1998. Palaeolithic Society and the Release from Proximity: A Network Approach to Intimate Relations. *World Archaeology* 29/3: 426–449.
- Groucutt H.S. & Blinkhorn, J.
2013. The Middle Palaeolithic in the desert and its implications for understanding hominin adaptation and dispersal. *Quaternary International* 300: 1–12.
- Groucutt H.S. & Petraglia M.D.
2012. The prehistory of the Arabian Peninsula: Deserts, dispersals, and demography. *Evolutionary Anthropology* 21/3: 113–125.
- Holdaway S. & Douglass M.
2011. A Twenty-first Century Archaeology of Stone Artefacts. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*. 19/1: 101–131.

- Inglis R.H., Devès M.H., Sinclair A., Shuttleworth A. et al.
(in preparation). Landscape evolution, taphonomy and Palaeolithic archaeology in Southwest Saudi Arabia: Issues in archaeological survey. *Geoarchaeology*.
- Lambeck K., Purcell A., Flemming N.C., Vita-Finzi C. et al.
2011. Sea level and shoreline reconstructions for the Red Sea: isostatic and tectonic considerations and implications for hominin migration out of Africa. *Quaternary Science Reviews* 30/25–26: 3542–3574.
- Müller E.
1984. Geology of the Tihamat Asir. Pages 141–149 in A.R. Jado & J.G. Zötl (eds), *Quaternary Period in Saudi Arabia*. ii. *Sedimentological, Hydrogeological, Hydrochemical, Geomorphological, Geochronological and Climatological Investigations in Western Saudi Arabia*. Vienna: Springer-Verlag.
- Overstreet W.C.
1973. *Contributions to the prehistory of Saudi Arabia, I*. Miami: Field Research Projects.
- Parker A.G.
2009. Pleistocene Climate Change in Arabia: Developing a Framework for Hominin Dispersal over the Last 350 ka. Pages 39–49 in M.D. Petraglia & J.I. Rose (eds), *The Evolution of Human Populations in Arabia*. Amsterdam: Springer.
- Parker A.G. & Rose J.I.
2008. Climate change and human origins in southern Arabia. *Proceedings of the Seminar for Arabian Studies* 38: 25–42.
- Petraglia M.D. & Alsharekh A.
2003. The Middle Palaeolithic of Arabia: implications for modern human origins, behaviour and dispersals. *Antiquity* 77: 671–684.
- Petraglia M.D., Drake N. & Alsharekh A.
2009. Acheulean Landscapes and Large Cutting Tools Assemblages in the Arabian Peninsula. Pages 103–116 in M.D. Petraglia & J.I. Rose (eds), *The Evolution of Human Populations in Arabia*. Amsterdam: Springer.
- Petraglia M.D., Alsharekh A.M., Crassard R., Drake N.A. et al.
2011. Middle Paleolithic occupation on a Marine Isotope Stage 5 lakeshore in the Nefud Desert, Saudi Arabia. *Quaternary Science Reviews* 30/13–14: 1555–1559.
- Rose J.I.
2004. The Question of Upper Pleistocene Connections between East Africa and South Arabia. *Current Anthropology* 45/4: 551–556.
- Rose J.I., Usik V.I., Marks A.E., Hilbert Y. et al.
2011. The Nubian Complex of Dhofar, Oman: An African Middle Stone Age Industry in Southern Arabia. *PLoS One* 6/11: 1–22.
- Sitzia L., Bertran P., Boulogne S., Brenet M. et al.
2012. The Palaeoenvironment and Lithic Taphonomy of Shi’Bat Dihya 1, a Middle Paleolithic Site in Wadi Surdud, Yemen. *Geoarchaeology* 27/6: 471–491.
- Whalen N.M., Siraj-Ali J.S. & Davis W.
1984. Excavation of Acheulean sites near Saffaqah, Saudi Arabia. *Atlatl* 8: 9–24.
- Whalen N.M., Sindi H., Wahida G. & Siraj-Ali J.S.
1983. Excavation of Acheulean Sites Near Saffaqah in Ad Damdawi. *Atlatl* 7: 9–21.
- Zarins J., Murad A. & Al-Yaish K.
1981. The Second Preliminary Report on the Southwestern Province. *Atlatl* 5: 9–42.
- Zarins J., Ibrahim I., Potts D.T. & Edens C.M.
1979. Comprehensive Archaeological Survey Program: preliminary report on the survey of the Central Province 1978. *Atlatl* 3: 9–42.
- Zarins J., Whalen N.M., Ibrahim I., Morad A. et al.
1980. Comprehensive Archaeological Survey Program: preliminary report on the Central Southwestern Provinces survey. *Atlatl* 4: 9–117.

Authors' addresses

Dr Robyn Inglis, Department of Archaeology, University of York, The King's Manor, Exhibition Square, York, YO1 7EP, UK.

e-mail robyn.inglis@york.ac.uk

Dr Anthony Sinclair, Department of Archaeology, Classics & Egyptology, University of Liverpool, Hartley Building, Brownlow Street, Liverpool, L69 3GS, UK.

e-mail A.G.M.Sinclair@liverpool.ac.uk

Dr Andrew Shuttleworth, Department of Archaeology, Classics & Egyptology, University of Liverpool, Hartley Building, Brownlow Street, Liverpool, L69 3GS, UK.

e-mail A.Shuttleworth@liverpool.ac.uk

Dr Abdullah Alsharekh, Department of Archaeology, College of Tourism and Archaeology, King Saud University, PO Box 2627, Riyadh 12372-7524, Saudi Arabia.

e-mail asharekh@hotmail.com

Dr Maud Devès, Laboratoire Tectonique, Institut de Physique du Globe de Paris, Sorbonne Paris Cité, Univ. Paris Diderot, UMR 7154 CNRS, 1 rue Jussieu, F-75005 Paris, France.

e-mail deve@ipgp.fr

Dr Saud Al Ghamdi, Department of Archaeology, College of Tourism and Archaeology, King Saud University, PO Box 2627, Riyadh 12372-7524, Saudi Arabia.

e-mail saudalg@yahoo.com

Dr Matthew Meredith-Williams, Department of Archaeology, University of York, The King's Manor, Exhibition Square, York, YO1 7EP, UK.

e-mail matthew.meredith-williams@york.ac.uk

Prof. Geoff Bailey, Department of Archaeology, University of York, The King's Manor, Exhibition Square, York, YO1 7EP, UK.

e-mail geoff.bailey@york.ac.uk