

Re: "carnivore tooth marks"

Re: "carnivore tooth marks"

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2008-03/msg00202.html>

- *From:* Rich Travsky <traRvEsky@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 04 Mar 2008 11:43:35 -0700
-

Marc Verhaegen wrote:

Op 19-02-2008 14:36, in artikel
64865e6c-f1ba-4fc2-a453-ad8f65fbc0dd@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx, Lee Olsen
<paleocity@xxxxxxxxxxx> schreef:

On Feb 19, 4:12 am, Marc Verhaegen <m_verhae...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

Domínguez-Rodrigo and his team

Savanna fantast snips the recent stuff & replaces it by outdated stuff:

Not outdated, Marc. *You* cited

http://www.alphagalileo.org/index.cfm?ez_search=1&fuseaction=readrelease&releaseid=527154

which is not a paper. (Why were you afraid to post the url?)

What you miss, Marc, is that the paper below that Lee posted (located at

http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=ArticleURL&_udi=B6WJS-4HYN51P-1&_user=10&_coverDate=02%20

or <http://tinyurl.com/2rrdw2>)

is by the same author(s), Domínguez-Rodrigo et al with the following in the abstract

These multiple lines of evidence support previous analyses of cut marks and their anatomical distribution; all indicate that hominids had early access to fleshed carcasses that were transported, processed, and accumulated at the FLK Zinj site.

The paper referred to in the reference section of your AlphaGalileo link

Five more arguments to invalidate the passive scavenging version of the carnivore-hominid-carnivore model: a reply to Blumenschine et al. (2007a)

Re: "carnivore tooth marks"

Re: "carnivore tooth marks"

is at

http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=ArticleURL&_udi=B6WJS-4PHJMGM-1&_user=10&_rdoc=1&_fmt=&

or <http://tinyurl.com/23fxcn>

states clearly in the intro

In our original paper (Domínguez-Rodrigo and Barba, 2006), we clearly stated that the version of the carnivore–hominid–carnivore model that we falsified was the model most commonly defended...This model is the only one we challenged in our research.

that the scope of their work was limited to examining ONE model.

As usual, you jump to conclusions and failed to fully look into it.

M Dominguez-Rodrigo et al.

New estimates of tooth mark and percussion mark frequencies at the FLK

Zinj site

J Hum Evol. 2005 Dec 30

"Traditional interpretations of hominid carcass acquisition strategies revolve around the debate over whether early hominids hunted or scavenged. A popular version of the scavenging scenario is the carnivore–hominid–carnivore hypothesis, which argues that hominids acquired animal resources primarily through passive opportunistic scavenging from felid–defleshed carcasses. Its main empirical support comes from the analysis of tooth mark frequency and distribution at the FLK Zinj site reported by Blumenschine (Blumenschine, 1995, J. Hum. Evol. 29, 21–51), in which it was shown that long bone mid–shafts exhibited a high frequency of tooth marks, only explainable if felids had preceded hominids in carcass defleshing. The present work shows that previous estimates of tooth marks on the FLK Zinj assemblage were artificially high, since natural biochemical marks were mistaken for tooth marks. Revised estimates are similar to those obtained in experiments in which hyenas intervene after humans in bone modification. Furthermore, analyses of percussion marks, notches, and breakage patterns provide data which are best interpreted as the results of hominid activity (hammerstone percussion and marrow extraction), based on experimentally–derived referential frameworks. These multiple lines of evidence support previous analyses of cut marks and their anatomical distribution; all indicate that hominids had early access to fleshed carcasses that were transported, processed, and accumulated at the FLK Zinj site."

Re: "carnivore tooth marks"