

Stone tools and cumulative design

Juan Seguro

Core question

What changed when hominins began deliberately transforming stone into repeatable tools whose form embodied previous experience?

Historical and evolutionary context

Stone technology is the earliest durable record of repeated technical behaviour on which later generations could build. The Lomekwi 3 site in West Turkana, Kenya, preserves stone artefacts dated to about 3.3 million years ago. These tools predate the earliest securely known members of the genus *Homo* and therefore overturned an older assumption that stone-tool manufacture began with our genus. The makers are unknown.

The importance of Lomekwi is not that it proves a fully developed cumulative culture at 3.3 Ma. It demonstrates that hominins were already selecting stone, striking or battering it in patterned ways and exploiting fracture properties long before later Oldowan traditions. The archaeological record then documents changes in raw-material selection, reduction sequences, edge production and tool form over immense spans of time.

What could hominins know before this transition?

Many animals use objects as tools, and primates can select stones or sticks for functional tasks. Such behaviour does not by itself require a durable design tradition. The new epistemic possibility appears when material objects become **repositories of procedural knowledge**: a flake angle, striking platform or core geometry reflects choices that can be seen, copied and modified.

Before durable technologies, much practical knowledge would have existed only in behaviour. Stone preserves parts of a technical sequence long after its maker disappears.

What changed?

The makers of early stone artefacts learned that material properties were predictable enough to be exploited. A blow delivered at one place and angle changes the future possibilities of the core. Tool making therefore requires more than force: it creates a sequence in which earlier actions constrain later ones.

At Lomekwi, the assemblage includes large cores, flakes, anvils and hammerstones. The authors described both battering and core-reduction activities and proposed the term “Lomekwian” for this technological pattern. Later Oldowan technologies, beginning by roughly 2.9–2.6 Ma depending on site and criteria, show different and often more systematic flake production. It is unsafe to describe the transition as a single linear progression, but the record demonstrates repeated technical traditions across deep time.

Why could this capability emerge?

Stone has unusual epistemic properties. It is durable, abundant in many landscapes and its fracture mechanics provide immediate feedback. Successful and failed blows remain visible. A learner can inspect the object produced by another individual and infer aspects of the process. This makes stone technology a bridge between embodied skill and externalized information.

Hand anatomy, perceptual-motor control, access to suitable raw materials and social tolerance all matter, but no single anatomical trait explains the record. The crucial PIO point is that **design can be stored in matter**.

What later forms of knowledge did it enable?

Stone-tool traditions enabled more reliable cutting, pounding, carcass processing, woodworking and later composite technologies. They also created a long-running laboratory of causal learning: different rocks fracture differently; edge angle affects performance; transport costs matter; tool form can be adapted to anticipated tasks.

This is one of the earliest cases in which a technology could accumulate structured refinements independent of any single inventor.

New limits and risks

Archaeologists see stone far more readily than wood, fibre, hide or plant technology. The resulting record can exaggerate the importance of lithics relative to perishable technologies. Nor can similarity between artefacts automatically prove teaching, imitation or high-fidelity cultural transmission. Independent convergence is possible.

What changed in the architecture of human knowledge?

Knowledge acquired a **durable material substrate**. A tool was not merely useful in the moment; its form could encode a sequence of choices. Material culture thus became part of the cognitive environment in which later learning occurred.

Loss, exclusion and uncertainty

The lithic record is unusually durable and therefore disproportionately visible. Wooden implements, hafts, plant-working tools and many failed or discarded production sequences usually disappear, so surviving stone cannot be treated as a complete inventory of early technological knowledge.

The makers of Lomekwi 3 are unknown. Attribution to a particular species would exceed current evidence. The relationship between Lomekwian and later Oldowan traditions also remains debated. PIO therefore treats them as evidence of early technological capacity, not as a simple ancestral chain.

Dependency map

- INDIRECT ← PIO-001 Cooperation and cumulative culture
- INDIRECT → PIO-003 Controlled fire, cooking and shared learning
- INDIRECT → PIO-005 Clothing, fibres and environmental adaptation
- INDIRECT → later metallurgy and instrument manufacture

References

1. Harmand, S. et al. 3.3-million-year-old stone tools from Lomekwi 3, West Turkana, Kenya. *Nature* 521, 310–315 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature14464>
2. Hovers, E. Tools go back in time. *Nature* 521, 294–295 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1038/521294a>
3. Morgan, T. J. H. & Feldman, M. W. Human culture is uniquely open-ended rather than uniquely cumulative. *Nature Human Behaviour* 9, 28–42 (2025). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-024-02035-y>