

## LIST OF FIGURES

<b>Figure Number</b>		<b>Page No</b>
Figure. 1	Palaeolithic record of South Asia from 400 – 10 ka (Adopted from Anil et al. 2018) .....	3
Figure. 3.2.1	Luminescence signal in saturation for the OSL sample from Retlapalle.....	25
Figure. 3.2.2	Preheat plateau test: equivalent dose ( $d_e$ ) variation with preheat temperature for the natural samples. At each point, $d_e$ is the arithmetic mean of three values. The error bar is the standard error of the three values. The doses for 260° c, 280° c, 300° c, and 320° c fell within 5% of the estimated paleo-dose. a) Sample from Hanumanthunipadu;b) Sample from Retlapalle .....	27
Figure. 3.3.1	Flow chart showing the broader lithic technological classification adopted in this study .....	29
Figure. 3.3.2	Technological Classification of flakes .....	30
Figure. 3.3.3	Classification of Cores .....	30
Figure. 3.3.4	Core attributes recorded in this study .....	31
Figure. 3.3.5	Flake attributes recorded in this study .....	32
Figure. 3.3.6	Attributes recorded for retouched artefacts .....	33
Figure. 3.3.7	Metrical attributes recorded for Bifaces .....	33
Figure. 3.3.8	Schematic sketch showing the recording of core dimensions (modified after Jones, 2007) .....	35
Figure. 3.3.9	Recording of last scar dimensions (modified after Jones, 2007) .....	36
Figure. 3.3.10	Recording of Flake dimensions (modified after Jones, 2007) .....	39
Figure. 3.3.11	Recording of flake platform dimensions (modified after Jones, 2007) .....	39
Figure. 3.3.12	Flake platform types recorded (Source: Jones 2007) .....	40
Figure. 3.3.13	Schematic sketch showing platform preparations (modified after Jones 2007) .....	41
Figure. 3.3.14	Flake terminations recorded in this study (Source: Jones 2007) .....	41
Figure. 3.3.15	Dorsal scar patterns recorded in this study (Source: Jones 2007) .....	41
Figure. 3.3.16	Recording of type of arises on flakes dorsal surface .....	42

Figure. 4.1.1	Composite stratigraphy of the upper Gundlakamma river basin (a); Unit A exposed at Kalagotla III (b); step trench from Retlapalle (c); Unit F exposed at Chintakunta (d) .....	46
Figure. 4.1.2	UNIT F exposures at Chintakunta (a); conglomerate with artefacts (b); Handaxe eroded from Unit F (c) .....	47
Figure. 4.1.3	The site of Kalagotla III shows well-represented Unit A sediments and associated microlithic artefacts (Source: Anil et al. 2022) .....	47
Figure. 4.1.4	Carbonate concretions above and within the ash beds observed at Kagitalagudem (Source: Anil et al. 2022) .....	48
Figure. 4.1.5	Images showing the sites with sediments (Unit D) underlying the YTT deposits. A) below YTT sediments with artefacts exposed at Telladinne; b) Unit D sediments exposed at Kalagotla-I due to anthropogenic activities; c and d) below YTT sediments exposed at Kagitalagudem (source: Anil et al. 2022) .....	49
Figure. 4.1.6	Sediments with artefacts overlying the ash beds exposed at JP Cheruvu (Source: Anil et al. 2022) .....	49
Figure. 4.1.7	In situ artefacts eroding from the sediments (Unit B) stratigraphically overlying the YTT deposits. Artefact clusters from a) Chimaletipalle; b) JP Cheruvu; c) Ardhaveedu; d) Veerabhadrapuram (source: Anil et al. 2022)...	52
Figure. 4.1.8	Embedded artefacts exposed at Rangannapalle (source: Anil et al. 2018) ...	54
Figure. 4.1.9	Colluvial fan exposed at Rangannapalle (source: Anil et al 2018) .....	55
Figure. 4.1.10	Pebble conglomerate observed at Kutagundla (source: Anil et al. 2018) .....	55
Figure. 4.1.11	Calcrete bed (tufa) exposed on the surface at Vemulapadu 2 (source: Anil et al. 2018) .....	56
Figure. 4.1.12	Calcretized sandy silt at Hanumanthunipadu (source: Anil et al. 2018).....	56
Figure. 4.1.13	Calcretized sandy silt overlain by a-2 sand dunes at Vemulapadu (source: Anil et al. 2018).....	57
Figure. 4.1.14	Composite Stratigraphy of the upper Paleru basin (Source: Anil et al. 2018) .....	58

Figure. 4.2.1	Composite stratigraphy observed at Vemulapadu with artefact associations. 1: Schematic sketch of the composite stratigraphy; 2: Photograph of the layers, Units E and D; 3: Units C and B; 4 and 5: embedded handaxes within unit E; 6: Artefacts from Unit C; 7: microlithic artefacts from Unit B .....	64
Figure. 4.2.2	In Situ Hand axe associated with Unit E sediments at Vemulapadu .....	65
Figure. 4.2.3	Sediment sample collected from Unit E for age estimations .....	66
Figure. 4.2.4	Results of p-IR-IRSL analyses of sample from Unit E. a: typical feldspar shine down curve; b: typical growth curve; c: radial plot representing the estimated palaeodoses .....	66
Figure. 4.2.5	Hand axes recovered from Unit E, at Vemulapadu .....	67
Figure. 4.3.1	Images showing the location of site A. Agraharam and exposed artefact clusters. a: several streams cut through the site; b: Artefact cluster exposed due to the stream erosion; c: Artefact cluster exposed due to anthropogenic activities .....	69
Figure. 4.3.2	Artefacts and their geological context. a and b: Artefacts embedded within the ferricrete gravels; c and d: test pit showing the stratigraphic context of sedimentary units .....	70
Figure. 4.3.3	Results of p-IR-IRSL analyses of sample from artefact bearing horizon. a: typical feldspar shine down curve; b: typical growth curve showing saturation of the signal .....	71
Figure. 4.2.4	Large flakes recovered from the site. a to d: large flakes with prepared platforms; e and f: retouched large flakes .....	72
Figure. 4.3.5	Variation in mean biface elongation (length to width ratio) for Indian assemblages. Comparative data from Gaillard et al. 1986; 2008; Paddayya & Petraglia 1993; Chauhan 2010 .....	75
Figure. 4.3.6	Variation in mean biface refinement (thickness to width ratio) for Indian assemblages. Comparative data from Shipton 2016. Note that A. Agrahara, occurs next to the Bhimbetka on one end of the distribution, while assemblages with Early Pleistocene age estimates occur on the other end of the distribution .....	76
Figure 4.3.7	Refined, symmetrical bifaces from A. Agraharam. a to d: Handaxes; e and f: Cleavers .....	77

Figure. 4.3.8	Cores from the assemblage. a: Giant core; b and c: preferential surface cores; d and e: discoidal cores; f: laminar flake core; g and h: Levallois cores .....	78
Figure. 4.3.9	Transverse flakes from the assemblage. a to e: transverse flakes with platforms extend over to lateral margins; f to i: transverse flakes with prepared platforms; j: transverse flake recovered from test pit; k to n: tang like point made on a transverse flake (arrows indicate the position of the platform); o: Bifacial point made on a transverse flake; p: notch made on a transverse flake .....	81
Figure 4.3.10	Bifacial points. a, b, h, j, k: Bifacial points with basal modifications; c to g and i, l: bifacial points .....	84
Figure. 4.3.11	Flake tools. a: Split discoidal core; b to h: points with basal modifications (tangs); I and j: points on prepared core flakes; k to m: prepared core flakes; n: Scraper; o and p: Laminar flakes .....	85
Figure 4.3.12	Hand axes with preferential flake removals .....	86
Figure. 4.4.1	Anthropogenic activities exposed artefacts bearing horizons at Nandanavanam .....	90
Figure. 4.4.2	Shale bed rock exposed at the site .....	91
Figure. 4.4.3	Images showing the geological context of the artefacts. a: Artefact bearing horizon overlain by reddish sandy silts; b: artefact bearing horizon; c: In situ artefacts exposed .....	91
Figure. 4.4.4	Test pit showing the artefact bearing horizon .....	92
Figure. 4.4.5	Results of p-IR-IRSL analyses of sample from artefact bearing horizon. a: typical feldspar shine down curve; b: typical growth curve showing saturation of the signal .....	93
Figure. 4.4.6	Variation in mean biface elongation (length to width ratio) for Indian assemblages. Comparative data from Gaillard et al. 1986; 2008; Paddayya & Petraglia 1993; Chauhan 2010 .....	97
Figure. 4.4.7	Bifaces in the assemblage. a: Hand axe; b: Cleaver; c: Diminutive Hand axe .....	98
Figure. 4.4.8	Variation in mean biface refinement (thickness to width ratio) for Indian assemblages. Comparative data from Shipton 2016 .....	99
Figure. 4.4.9	Discoidal core .....	99

Figure. 4.4.10	Preferential Surface Core .....	100
Figure. 4.5.1	Anthropogenically exposed vertical section with artefacts at Hanumanthunipadu and location of the trench .....	106
Figure. 4.5.2	Images showing exposed sections and in situ artefacts. a) Artefact exposures (above), in situ artefacts (below) (Source: Anil et al 2022) .....	107
Figure. 4.5.3	Section facing north (right) and a schematic sketch of the section (left). U: identifying specific lithological units; dots and codes: positions of OSL samples (Source: Anil et al 2022) .....	108
Figure. 4.5.4	a) SAR growth curve for p-IR-IRSL signal, b) luminescence decay curve for p-IR-IRSL signal, c) Radial plot of estimated $D_{es}$ using p-IR-IRSL protocol indicating that dose scatter is less. Over-dispersion (OD) for all $D_{es}$ is ~8%, d) Large dose scatter observed in the sample recovered from Unit 15 (Source: Anil et al 2022) .....	111
Figure. 4.5.5	Anomalous fading (g-value) measurements on a single aliquot by using a series of prompt and delayed sensitivity corrected measurements of the HMP sample (source: Anil et al 2022) .....	111
Figure. 4.5.6	The measured dose response curve (DRC), unfaded DRC and the simulated natural DRC are shown (Kars et al., 2008; Kars and Wallinga, 2009). The natural $L_x/T_x$ is also shown. The natural luminescence signal is higher than the simulated natural DRC and hence gives the dose saturation value only ( $2d_0 = 511 \pm 1$ gy) (Source: Anil et al 2022) .....	112
Figure. 4.5.7	Core and debitage pieces recovered from the trench (Source: Anil et al 2022) .....	114
Figure. 4.5.8	Schematic sketches of the two (a and b) Preferential Levallois cores from the assemblages (source: anil et al 2022) .....	115
Figure. 4.5.9	Large quartzite blocks used as cores (multi-platform cores) recovered from the trench (Source: Anil et al 2022) .....	116
Figure. 4.5.10	Representative samples of Levallois debitage products present in the assemblage. a to d: Levallois point; e and f: Levallois flakes .....	117
Figure. 4.5.11	Bifacial artefacts recovered from the trench. a to c: Bifacial points; d: Diminutive Hand axe .....	118
Figure 4.6.1	1: Step-trench section showing the lithological Units: 2: Unit A; 3: General view of the site, Retlapalle .....	121

Figure 4.6.2	Rock magnetic parameters and inter parametric ratios for sediment samples from Retlapalle step trench .....	124
Figure 4.6.3	Particle size, organic matter, and carbonate values for the Retlapalle step trench. The sediment log shows the position of the YTT deposits and samples collected at 10 cm interval .....	125
Figure. 4.6.4	A scanning electron microscope image of glass shards and (brighter) biotite grains (top right corner and bottom left corner of the image) from Retlapalle.....	126
Figure. 4.6.5	a: Glass shard compositions (normalized to 100%) from Retlapalle tephra (black diamonds) compared with published proximal YTT data (grey triangles; from Smith et al., 2011). b: Biotite composition of crystals from the deposits at Retlapalle compared with those from the tephra in the Son and Jurerru valleys and proximal samples of OTT, MTT And YTT (data from Smith et al., 2011) .....	127
Figure. 4.6.6	Results of pIR-IRSL analyses at Retlapalle. Each panel shows a-d separately for the samples RTP-18-1, RTP-18-3, and RTP-18-4. a: typical feldspar shine down curve; b: typical growth curve; c: radial plot representing the estimated palaeodoses; d: typical g-value data .....	129
Figure 4.6.7	Representative lithic artefacts from UNIT E at the Retlapalle step-trench. 1: Multiplatform core; 3: Unidirectional core; 2,8,9 and 10: flakes; 6 and 7: Prepared core flakes; 4: retouched piece; 5: diminutive handaxe .....	130
Figure. 4.6.8	Preferential Levallois core .....	133
Figure. 4.6.9	Levallois point core .....	133
Figure. 4.6.10	Recurrent Levallois cores .....	134
Figure. 4.6.11	Discoidal cores in the assemblage. Note the variation in the size of the cores .....	135
Figure. 4.6.12	Small Discoidal cores .....	136
Figure. 4.6.13	Blade cores in the assemblage .....	137
Figure. 4.6.14	Prepared core and Levallois flakes. a to e: Prepared core flakes; f to i: Levallois flakes .....	139
Figure. 4.6.15	Blades in the assemblage .....	139
Figure. 4.7.1	Trench and a schematic sketch of the stratigraphy of Vemulapadu .....	145
Figure. 4.7.2	Artefact exposures within Unit D .....	146

Figure. 4.7.3	Thin calcrete layers observed within Unit E .....	146
Figure. 4.7.4	Results of p-IR-IRSL analyses for sediment sample from Unit D. a: typical feldspar shine down curve; b: typical growth curve; c: radial plot representing the estimated palaeodoses .....	147
Figure. 4.7.5	Location of the Trench and Grid .....	149
Figure. 4.7.6	Variation in mean biface elongation (length to width ratio) for Indian assemblages. Comparative data from Gaillard et al. 1986; 2008; Paddayya & Petraglia 1993; Chauhan 2010 .....	153
Figure. 4.7.7	Variation in mean biface refinement (thickness to width ratio) for Indian assemblages. Comparative data from Shipton 2016. Note that Vemulapadu occurs on the lower end of the distribution, while assemblages with early Pleistocene age estimates occur on the other end .....	154
Figure. 4.7.8	Preferential Levallois core .....	155
Figure. 4.7.9	Recurrent Levallois core .....	155
Figure. 4.7.10	Uni-directional Recurrent Levallois core .....	156
Figure. 4.7.11	Levallois point core .....	156
Figure. 4.7.12	Discoidal cores .....	157
Figure. 4.7.13	Transverse flakes .....	160
Figure. 4.7.14	Levallois flakes in the assemblage. a to d: Levallois flakes (d is from Trench); e: platform rejuvenated flake .....	161
Figure. 4.7.15	Blades in the assemblage .....	161
Figure. 4.7.16	Levallois points in the assemblage .....	163
Figure. 4.7.17	Bifacial and Tanged points. a to d: bifacial points; e to g: tanged points ....	164
Figure. 4.8.1	Trench 1 excavations .....	169
Figure. 4.8.2	a: Section facing west, trench 1; b: Schematic sketch of the section .....	170
Figure. 4.8.3	Coarse sediments within Unit 2 .....	170
Figure. 4.8.4	Results of p-IR-IRSL analyses for sediment sample from Unit 3. a: typical feldspar shine down curve; b: typical growth curve; c: radial plot representing the estimated palaeodoses .....	171
Figure. 4.8.5	Results of p-IR-IRSL analyses for sediment sample from Unit 3. a: typical feldspar shine down curve; b: typical growth curve; c: radial plot representing the estimated palaeodoses .....	173

Figure. 4.8.6	Results of p-IR-IRSL analyses for sediment sample from Unit 4. a: typical feldspar shine down curve; b: typical growth curve; c: radial plot representing the estimated palaeodoses .....	174
Figure. 4.8.7	In situ artefacts excavated from the Unit 3 of Trench 1 .....	175
Figure. 4.8.8	Unidirectional cores .....	177
Figure. 4.8.9	Worked pebbles. a; split cobble with platform preparation; b: worked nodule .....	178
Figure. 4.8.10	Flake component in the assemblage. a and b: flakes with cortical platform and dorsal surface with 100% cortex; c: Flake with cortical platform with flake scars on the dorsal surface; d: flake with prepared platform and prepared dorsal surface; e: platform rejuvenation flake .....	178
Figure. 4.8.11	Levallois cores. a: Preferential Levallois core; b: Recurrent Levallois core...	180
Figure. 4.8.12	Levallois point cores .....	181
Figure. 4.8.13	Unidirectional Recurrent Levallois core .....	182
Figure. 4.8.14	Cortical flakes with cortical platform .....	184
Figure. 4.8.15	Cortical flakes with prepared platforms .....	185
Figure. 4.8.16	Prepared core products. a to c: Levallois flakes; d and e: blades; f: platform rejuvenation flake .....	186
Figure. 4.8.17	Levallois points .....	187
Figure. 4.8.18	Trench 2 with YTT as a distinct Unit .....	189
Figure. 4.8.19	Schematic sketch of section facing north of Trench 2, Motravulapadu .....	190
Figure. 4.8.20	YTT horizon in the western section of the trench 2 .....	191
Figure. 4.8.21	Close view of the YTT sediment with diffused contact with underlying and overlying sediments .....	191
Figure. 4.8.22	Results of p-IR-IRSL analyses for sediment sample overlying the YTT horizon. a: typical feldspar shine down curve; b: typical growth curve; c: radial plot representing the estimated palaeodoses .....	192
Figure. 4.8.23	Results of p-IR-IRSL analyses for sediment sample underlying the YTT horizon. a: typical feldspar shine down curve; b: typical growth curve; c: radial plot representing the estimated palaeodoses .....	194
Figure. 4.8.24	Trench 4: sedimentary units and the location of luminescence samples and artefacts .....	195
Figure. 4.8.25	In situ blade exposed during the excavation .....	196

Figure. 4.8.26	Results of p-IR-IRSL analyses for sediment sample from Unit 2 above the artefact horizon. a: typical feldspar shine down curve; b: typical growth curve; c: radial plot representing the estimated palaeodoses .....	198
Figure. 4.8.27	Results of p-IR-IRSL analyses for sediment sample from Unit 2 below the artefact horizon. a: typical feldspar shine down curve; b: typical growth curve; c: radial plot representing the estimated palaeodoses .....	199
Figure. 4.8.28	Cores from Trench 4. a: Blade core; b: Manuport .....	201
Figure. 4.8.29	Blades in the assemblage. a and b: Cortical blade with cortical platform; c and d: Cortical blades with prepared platforms; d to f: Blades .....	202
Figure. 4.8.30	Flakes and broken blades. A: Pointed blade; b: Point; c: Platform rejuvenation flake; d to i: Broken blades .....	202
Figure. 4.8.31	In situ and articulated skeletal remains of <i>Bos</i> sp .....	205
Figure. 4.8.32	Stratigraphy and position of the sediment samples used for Luminescence age estimations .....	206
Figure. 4.8.33	Test pits excavated below surface exposures of fossil remains .....	207
Figure. 4.8.34	Results of p-IR-IRSL analyses for sediment sample from Unit 2 above the fossil horizon. a: typical feldspar shine down curve; b: typical growth curve; c: radial plot representing the estimated palaeodoses .....	208
Figure. 4.8.35	Results of p-IR-IRSL analyses for sediment sample from Unit 3 below the fossil horizon. a: typical feldspar shine down curve; b: typical growth curve; c: radial plot representing the estimated palaeodoses .....	210
Figure. 4.8.36	Postcranial elements from surface collection .....	213
Figure. 4.8.37	Cranial elements from surface collection .....	213
Figure. 4.8.38	Cranial elements from surface collection .....	214
Figure. 4.8.39	Taxonomy of the surface collected fossil remains .....	215
Figure. 4.8.40	Identified specimens from trench 5 .....	216
Figure 4.9.1	Excavated trench at the site of Ardhavedu .....	220
Figure. 4.9.2	Schematic sketch of the trench at Ardhavedu .....	221
Figure. 4.9.3	Artefact exposures within Unit 3. Black circles indicate the location of artefacts .....	221
Figure. 4.9.4	Results of p-IR-IRSL analyses for sediment sample from Unit 3. a: typical feldspar shine down curve; b: typical growth curve; c: radial plot representing the estimated palaeodoses .....	222

Figure. 4.9.5	Hammerstones .....	228
Figure. 4.9.6	Early-stage flakes of core reduction sequence. a and b: cortical flakes with cortical platforms; c to e: cortical flakes with prepared platform .....	228
Figure. 4.9.7	Representative blade artefacts from the assemblage .....	229
Figure. 4.9.8	Backed tabular piece (top left) and backed blades .....	229
Figure. 4.9.9	Core showing the early-stage reduction from Ardhaveedu .....	231
Figure. 4.9.10	Blade cores .....	232
Figure. 4.9.11	Levallois cores .....	233
Figure. 4.9.12	Radial cores .....	234
Figure. 5.3.1	Graph showing the relative abundance of Biface elements .....	249
Figure. 5.3.2	Temporal distribution of Levallois cores .....	250
Figure. 5.3.3	Scatter plot (with biplot) of first two principal components of Core shape which account for ~ 65% variability and do not differ significantly between sites .....	254
Figure. 5.3.4	Scatter plot (with biplot) of first two principal components of Flake production which account for ~ 60% variability, which do not differ significantly between sites .....	255
Figure. 5.3.5	Temporal Distribution of other core types .....	256
Figure. 5.3.6	Temporal distribution of retouched artefacts .....	258
Figure. 5.3.7	Temporal Distribution of informal retouched artefacts .....	258
Figure. 5.3.8	Temporal distribution of Points .....	259
Figure. 5.3.9	Temporal distribution of unretouched artefacts .....	259
Figure. 5.5.1	Artefacts representing the below YTT archaeology from the upper Gundlakamma river basin. 1 and 2: Recurrent Levallois core (KGM); 3: Unidirectional Levallois core (TDE); 4: Bidirectional Levallois core (KGM); 6 to 10: Retouched Points (KGT, RVP, TDE); 11 and 12: Levallois points (NMP, KGT); 13 to 17: Tanged points (AGB, KGM, KGT); 18 to 21: Scrapers (TDE, NMP, KGT, HMT, CTK); 22 and 23: Borers (AVK, ERK); 24: Burin (TDE); 25: Notch (CVD); 26 to 28: Flake-blades/Blades (NMP, KGT); 29 and 30: Levallois flakes (TDE, NMP). All these artefacts are from the surface collections of twelve different sites and are shown together for representative purposes. (Source Anil et al 2022) .....	267

Figure. 5.5.2	<p>Artefacts representing the above YTT archaeology from the upper Gundlakamma river basin. 1: Blade core (VPT); 2: Unidirectional core (CLP); 3: Recurrent Levallois core (JPC); 4 to 12: Levallois points (VPT, VBP, JPC); 13: Levallois flake (VBP); 14 to 18: Blades (VBP, VPT, BNV, AVD); 19 to 22: Tanged points (VPT, JPC, MDM); 23 to 26: Borers (MMp, JMG); 27: Burin (MDM); 28: Notch (AGB II); 29 to 31: Scrapers (BNV, MDM, JNV). All these artefacts are surface collections from eleven different sites and shown together for representative purposes (Source Anil et al 2022) .....</p>	268
Figure. 6.1	<p>Comparison between the Pleistocene cultural developments in South Asia and current study region. Sites with firm chronological framework and secure geological context are shown here and other sites with chronometric ages are considered in the overall temporal range of the different cultural phases .....</p>	284