

**Adult *Homo naledi* hand skeleton
points to life before birth**

Zachary COFRAN & Tracy L. KIVELL



LUCY'S HEIRS – TRIBUTE TO YVES COPPENS

Edited by Jean-Jacques HUBLIN, Aurélien MOUNIER & Nicolas TEYSSANDIER

DIRECTEURS DE LA PUBLICATION / PUBLICATION DIRECTORS :
Gilles Bloch, Président du Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle
Étienne Ghys, Secrétaire perpétuel de l'Académie des sciences

RÉDACTEURS EN CHEF / EDITORS-IN-CHIEF : Michel Laurin (CNRS), Philippe Taquet (Académie des sciences)

ASSISTANTE DE RÉDACTION / ASSISTANT EDITOR : Adenise Lopes (Académie des sciences ; cr-palevol@academie-sciences.fr)

MISE EN PAGE / PAGE LAYOUT : Audrina Neveu (Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle ; audrina.neveu@mnhn.fr)

RÉVISIONS LINGUISTIQUES DES TEXTES ANGLAIS / ENGLISH LANGUAGE REVISIONS : Kevin Padian (University of California at Berkeley)

RÉDACTEURS ASSOCIÉS / ASSOCIATE EDITORS (*, took charge of the editorial process of the article/a pris en charge le suivi éditorial de l'article):

Micropaléontologie/Micropalaeontology

Lorenzo Consorti (Institute of Marine Sciences, Italian National Research Council, Trieste)

Paléobotanique/Palaeobotany

Cyrille Prestianni (Royal Belgian Institute of Natural Sciences, Brussels)

Anaïs Boura (Sorbonne Université, Paris)

Métazoaires/Metazoa

Annalisa Ferretti (Università di Modena e Reggio Emilia, Modena)

Paléoichthyologie/Palaeoichthyology

Philippe Janvier (Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, Académie des sciences, Paris)

Amniotes du Mésozoïque/Mesozoic amniotes

Hans-Dieter Sues (Smithsonian National Museum of Natural History, Washington)

Tortues/Turtles

Walter Joyce (Universität Freiburg, Switzerland)

Lépidosauromorphes/Lepidosauromorphs

Hussam Zaher (Universidade de São Paulo)

Oiseaux/Birds

Jingmai O'Connor (Field Museum, Chicago)

Paléomammalogie (mammifères de moyenne et grande taille)/Palaeomammalogy (large and mid-sized mammals)

Grégoire Métais (CNRS, Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, Sorbonne Université, Paris)

Paléomammalogie (petits mammifères sauf Euarchontoglires)/Palaeomammalogy (small mammals except for Euarchontoglires)

Robert Asher (Cambridge University, Cambridge)

Paléomammalogie (Euarchontoglires)/Palaeomammalogy (Euarchontoglires)

K. Christopher Beard (University of Kansas, Lawrence)

Paléoanthropologie/Palaeoanthropology

Aurélien Mounier* (CNRS/Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, Paris)

Archéologie préhistorique (Paléolithique et Mésolithique)/Prehistoric archaeology (Palaeolithic and Mesolithic)

Nicolas Teyssandier (CNRS/Université de Toulouse, Toulouse)

Archéologie préhistorique (Néolithique et âge du bronze)/Prehistoric archaeology (Neolithic and Bronze Age)

Marc Vander Linden (Bournemouth University, Bournemouth)

RÉFÉRÉS / REVIEWERS : <https://sciencepress.mnhn.fr/fr/periodiques/comptes-rendus-palevol/referes-du-journal>

COUVERTURE / COVER :

Dorsal view of the "Hand 1" skeleton of *Homo naledi*. Credits: photograph by Peter Schmid.

Comptes Rendus Palevol est indexé dans / *Comptes Rendus Palevol* is indexed by:

- Cambridge Scientific Abstracts
- Current Contents® Physical
- Chemical, and Earth Sciences®
- ISI Alerting Services®
- Geoabstracts, Geobase, Georef, Inspec, Pascal
- Science Citation Index®, Science Citation Index Expanded®
- Scopus®.

Les articles ainsi que les nouveautés nomenclaturales publiés dans *Comptes Rendus Palevol* sont référencés par /
Articles and nomenclatural novelties published in Comptes Rendus Palevol are registered on:

- ZooBank® (<http://zoobank.org>)

Comptes Rendus Palevol est une revue en flux continu publiée par les Publications scientifiques du Muséum, Paris et l'Académie des sciences, Paris
Comptes Rendus Palevol is a fast track journal published by the Museum Science Press, Paris and the Académie des sciences, Paris

Les Publications scientifiques du Muséum publient aussi / The Museum Science Press also publish:

Adansonia, *Geodiversitas*, *Zoosystema*, *Anthropozoologica*, *European Journal of Taxonomy*, *Naturae*, *Cryptogamie* sous-sections *Algologie*, *Bryologie*, *Mycologie*.

L'Académie des sciences publie aussi / The Académie des sciences also publishes:

Comptes Rendus Mathématique, *Comptes Rendus Physique*, *Comptes Rendus Mécanique*, *Comptes Rendus Chimie*, *Comptes Rendus Géoscience*, *Comptes Rendus Biologies*.

Diffusion – Publications scientifiques Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle

CP 41 – 57 rue Cuvier F-75231 Paris cedex 05 (France)

Tél. : 33 (0)1 40 79 48 05 / Fax : 33 (0)1 40 79 38 40

diff.pub@mnhn.fr / <https://sciencepress.mnhn.fr>

Académie des sciences, Institut de France, 23 quai de Conti, 75006 Paris.

© This article is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)
ISSN (imprimé / print) : 1631-0683/ ISSN (électronique / electronic) : 1777-571X

Adult *Homo naledi* hand skeleton points to life before birth

Zachary COFRAN

Anthropology Department, Vassar College, 124 Raymond Avenue,
Poughkeepsie, NY 12604 (United States)
and Centre for the Exploration of the Deep Human Journey,
University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg (South Africa)
zcofran@vassar.edu (corresponding author)

Tracy L. KIVELL

Department of Human Origins, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology,
Deutscher Platz 6, 04103 Leipzig (Germany)
and Centre for the Exploration of the Deep Human Journey,
University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg (South Africa)
tracy_kivell@eva.mpg.de

Submitted on 16 December 2023 | Accepted on 26 April 2024 | Published on 27 November 2024

urn:lsid:zoobank.org:pub:91A71E05-D55C-45A5-B545-AD3C689B32E7

Cofran Z. & Kivell T. L. 2024. — Adult *Homo naledi* hand skeleton points to life before birth, in Hublin J.-J., Mounier A. & Teyssandier N. (eds), *Lucy's Heirs – Tribute to Yves Coppens. Comptes Rendus Palevol* 23 (28): 441-451. <https://doi.org/10.5852/cr-palevol2024v23a28>

ABSTRACT

Morphology evolves through modifications to growth and development, yet inferences about ontogeny of extinct organisms are often limited by small and fragmentary fossil samples. The remarkable circumstances and preservation of *Homo naledi* Berger *et al.*, 2015 material from Rising Star Cave, South Africa allow unique insights into the prenatal period of growth and development. We focus here on what a nearly complete adult *H. naledi* hand skeleton can tell us about embryonic pattern formation. On the one hand, it has been proposed that the proportional lengths of phalanges within a digit are established by a reaction-diffusion mechanism that can be described mathematically by the “inhibitory cascade” model. On the other hand, the proportional lengths of the second and fourth digits are mediated by prenatal exposure to sex hormones, and may serve as a biomarker for social behavior. Viewed through the lens of development, the *H. naledi* hand suggests that a simple developmental shift could have facilitated the evolution of manual dexterity in early hominins. In addition, *H. naledi* presents the highest ratio of second to fourth digit of all known fossil hominins, which may reflect reduced aggression compared to other fossil *Homo* Linnaeus, 1758. The remarkable preservation of the *H. naledi* hand skeleton provides a unique view of life before birth.

KEY WORDS

Hominin,
ontogeny,
development,
phalanx,
prenatal androgens.

RÉSUMÉ

Le squelette de la main adulte d'Homo naledi montre la vie avant la naissance.

La morphologie évolue au fil des modifications de la croissance et du développement, mais les inférences sur l'ontogenèse d'organismes disparus sont souvent limitées par des échantillons fossiles petits et fragmentaires. Les circonstances remarquables et la préservation du matériel d'*Homo naledi* Berger *et al.*, 2015 provenant de Rising Star Cave, en Afrique du Sud, offrent un aperçu unique de la période prénatale de croissance et de développement. Nous nous concentrons ici sur ce qu'un squelette de main adulte presque complet d'*H. naledi* peut nous apprendre sur la formation de modèles embryonnaires. D'une part, il a été proposé que les longueurs proportionnelles des phalanges au sein d'un doigt soient établies par un mécanisme de réaction-diffusion qui peut être décrit mathématiquement par le modèle de la « cascade inhibitrice ». D'autre part, les longueurs proportionnelles des deuxième et quatrième doigts dépendent de l'exposition prénatale aux hormones sexuelles et peuvent servir de biomarqueur du comportement social. Considérée sous l'angle du développement, la main d'*H. naledi* suggère qu'un simple changement dans le développement aurait pu faciliter l'évolution de la dextérité manuelle chez les premiers hominidés. De plus, *H. naledi* présente le rapport le plus élevé entre le deuxième et le quatrième doigt de tous les hominines fossiles connus, ce qui peut refléter une agressivité réduite par rapport aux autres fossiles du genre *Homo* Linnaeus, 1758. La préservation remarquable du squelette de la main d'*H. naledi* offre une vision unique de la vie avant la naissance.

MOTS CLÉS

Hominine, ontogenèse, développement, phalange, androgènes prénataux.

INTRODUCTION

Morphology evolves through modifications to ontogenetic processes that tend to be phylogenetically conserved. Within a body or organ, shared developmental processes integrate structures such that they may not evolve completely independently of one another (Olson & Miller 1958; Gould & Lewontin 1979; Cheverud 1996). Understanding these developmental patterns can therefore provide insight into how and why species vary in morphology. Importantly, this “morphological integration” of structures, such as bones of the hand skeleton (Rolian 2014), means that developmental patterns can be inferred from adult remains. The goal of this study is to use an adult *Homo naledi* Berger *et al.*, 2015 hand skeleton, along with insights from developmental biology, to illuminate the evolution of finger bone lengths.

Homo naledi is a recently discovered, extinct hominin known from the Rising Star Cave system in the Cradle of Humankind, South Africa (Berger *et al.* 2015). One of the many remarkable aspects of the *H. naledi* assemblage is its immense volume, with over 2 000 fragmentary remains representing most of the skeleton and elements deriving from over a dozen individuals who ranged in age from young infants to old adults (Hawks *et al.* 2017; Bolter *et al.* 2018; Brophy *et al.* 2021). Although the morphology of *H. naledi* is in many ways similar to earlier hominins from over two million years ago, the fossils likely date to between 241–330 kya (Dirks *et al.* 2017; Robbins *et al.* 2021). *Homo naledi* was therefore a primitive species that was contemporaneous with early members of the modern *Homo sapiens* Linnaeus, 1758 and Neandertal lineages, among others (Hublin *et al.* 2017).

Because of the remarkable representation across the skeleton and lifespan, *H. naledi* provides a unique lens into ontogeny, or the patterns and processes of individual growth and development. Previous research in this fossil assemblage has

focused largely on single skeletal elements to infer growth during the postnatal period. For example, an ilium fragment, U.W. 102a-138, is clearly unfused at the acetabulum, and its size relative to adult remains is similar to that of humans in the juvenile state of development (Cofran *et al.* 2022). The ilium further suggests that the flaring ilium similar to 2-million-year-old australopiths was present early in development, yet its sacroiliac joint is larger and more similar to humans of a similar overall size. While this individual suggests interesting differences (morphology) and similarities (joint size) with human growth, it nevertheless represents a snapshot of the dynamic process of growth and development.

Inferring patterns of postnatal growth and development generally requires representation of multiple individuals at different, known stages of maturation or even chronological ages at death. In contrast, because many aspects of adult morphology are established prenatally (Weaver *et al.* 2016; Young *et al.* 2022), even remains from a single adult may provide a surprising window into developmental processes during the embryonic and fetal periods of life before birth. For example, the tetrapod limb is a well-coordinated proliferation of segments, well-illustrated by the primate autopod (i.e., hand and foot) containing five rays each of which is composed of 3–4 bones arranged end to end (Kivell *et al.* 2023). Primate hands are adapted for both diverse types of locomotion as well as enhanced manipulation relative to most other mammals. Compared with many other primates, such as lorises, spider monkeys or aye-ayes, the human hand can be described as surprisingly conservative/primitive in many aspects of its form but derived in its dexterous function (Kivell *et al.* 2023). This form-function combination is traditionally considered to be the result of shifting hand function away from locomotion towards primarily object manipulation throughout hominin evolution. Among several morphological features that distinguish the human hand from that of other apes, the intrinsic

hand proportions are considered a key adaptation to enhanced dexterity and particularly the use of forceful pad-to-pad precision grips (Marzke 1997; e.g. Alba *et al.* 2003; Feix *et al.* 2015; Kivell 2015). Whereas non-human apes have long fingers with a shorter thumb, humans have short fingers and a relatively long thumb (Napier 1960). These intrinsic hand proportions appear in the fossil hominin record by at least two million years ago (Kivell *et al.* 2011) and perhaps much earlier (Almécija *et al.* 2015).

Because robustly quantifying intrinsic hand proportions involves multiple associated elements from the same individual, reconstructing manual evolution is generally hampered by a lack of associated hand skeletons (Rolian & Gordon 2013). In the past 15 years, the fortuitous discoveries of *Australopithecus sediba* (Berger *et al.*, 2010) and *Homo naledi* (Berger *et al.* 2015) include partial skeletons of single individuals preserving relatively complete hands found in semi-articulation (Kivell *et al.* 2011, 2015). The adult “MH 2” *Au. sediba* individual, dating to just under 2 mya (Dirks *et al.* 2010; Pickering *et al.* 2011), preserves a right hand skeleton that is nearly complete and missing only the distal phalanges of rays 2-5 and three carpal bones (Kivell *et al.* 2011, 2018). Similarly, “Hand 1” of *H. naledi* contains all the hand and wrist bones except the pisiform from an adult individual (Kivell *et al.* 2015). These hand skeletons show human-like intrinsic hand proportions with a relatively long thumb (particularly in *Au. sediba*), and enthesal markings suggestive of tool-making and -using capabilities (particularly in *H. naledi*).

Relatively complete hand skeletons like those of *Au. sediba* and *H. naledi* allow for robust inferences about hand function and potential adaptation, as well as the developmental bases of the hominin autopod. Intrinsic hand proportions are established by mechanisms of pattern formation during embryonic development (Green & Sharpe 2015). Specifically, the mass of mesenchymal cells that will become the hand or foot (i.e., the autopod) differentiate proximodistally, forming first the carpus, then metacarpus followed by the phalanges (Stricker & Mundlos 2011; Rolian 2016). Each digital ray (e.g. the index finger) is initially represented by a single cartilage precursor that elongates and divides into separate digit segments (Hamrick 2001; Sanz-Ezquerro & Tickle 2003). This segmentation occurs due to concentrations of gene expression that repress cartilage formation and initiate joint cavitation (Hiscock *et al.* 2017). It is hypothesized that a reaction-diffusion mechanism involving the coordinated activation and inhibition of these genes (Turing 1952) specifies where these joint interzones will form (Stricker & Mundlos 2011; Kavanagh *et al.* 2013; Hiscock *et al.* 2017), which in turn determines the relative length of each phalanx in a ray (Young *et al.* 2015).

The evolutionary diversity in digit proportions likely reflects—and is even biased by—fundamental developmental patterns (Kavanagh *et al.* 2013). Kavanagh and colleagues (2007) theorized a mathematical model for the proportional size relationships between serially repeating structures, which they called the ‘inhibitory cascade’ (IC) model. While their analyses were based on mouse molars, the model has been applied to other skeletal elements including avian limb

digits (Young *et al.* 2015). Young and colleagues (2015) showed that the IC model makes specific predictions for a three-segment series (e.g. finger phalanges). First, the intermediate phalanx should be roughly 1/3 of the total series length. Second, the relationship between the proximal and distal phalanges (PP and DP, respectively) can be modeled by the line: $DP = 0.667 \cdot 1 \cdot PP$, where DP and PP lengths are proportional to the full series length. Analyzing the degree to which *Homo naledi* “Hand 1” and other hominin finger skeletons fit this developmental model can yield insights into how manual dexterity evolved (Fig. 1).

Another marker of embryonic development recorded in hand proportions is the ratio of the second to fourth digit lengths (Nelson & Shultz 2010; Nelson *et al.* 2011). In humans and many other mammals (e.g. baboons), the second and fourth manual digits tend to be more similar in length among females (i.e., a higher 2D:4D “digit ratio”) whereas males tend to have relatively longer fourth digits (i.e., a lower digit ratio). This digit ratio dimorphism has been argued to reflect exposure to sex hormones during embryonic and fetal development (Lutchmaya *et al.* 2004). On the one hand, experimental evidence in mice suggests that differing androgen/estrogen-receptor activity levels early during hand development influence cartilage cell morphology and proliferation, and therefore growth of the fourth digit (Zheng & Cohn 2011). On the other hand, a recent meta-analysis of dozens of 2D:4D studies in humans found much more limited support for a relationship between the digit ratio and various measures of prenatal testosterone exposure (Sorokowski & Kowal 2024). While this meta-analysis might seem to undermine the digit ratio as a biomarker, those reviewed studies examined testosterone only, while the experimental mouse evidence examined androgen and estrogen *receptors* and identified a narrow window of embryonic development when sexual dimorphism arises. Thus, even if the exact mechanisms influencing 2D:4D ratio in humans remain obscure, there is still compelling evidence that the ratio is established during embryonic development and influenced by sex hormones (Hönekopp *et al.* 2007).

Prenatal sex hormones are not only vital for development of the female and male phenotype in mammals (Thornton *et al.* 2009), but because they affect brain development, they are also associated with variation in behavior and sociality (Josephs *et al.* 2006, 2003; Trumble *et al.* 2015). Prenatal androgens play a key role in shaping an individual’s competitive behaviors (Josephs *et al.* 2003, 2006; Bodo & Rissman 2008) while prenatal estrogens play a role in enhancing cooperative and affiliative behaviors (Coleman *et al.* 2011; Trumble *et al.* 2015). Thus, variation in digit ratios can be used as a proxy not only for exposure to sex hormones during development, but also, as a consequence, for social behavior in extant and extinct taxa. For example, comparisons among non-human primates reveal lower average digit ratios among species with higher levels of male-male mating competition and agonistic aggression (McIntyre *et al.* 2009; Nelson & Shultz 2010; Howlett *et al.* 2015; Howlett 2019). Examining the more limited fossil evidence, Nelson and colleagues (2011) found that the digit ratio based solely on the second and fourth proximal



FIG. 1. — Dorsal view of the “Hand 1” skeleton of *Homo naledi* Berger *et al.*, 2015 illustrating the data used in this study; **blue highlights** the three phalanges of the second ray used for the Inhibitory Cascade analysis; **red highlights** the PP4 used for the 2P:4P analysis. Abbreviations: **DP**, distal phalanx; **IP**, intermediate phalanx; **PP**, proximal phalanx. Scale bar: 1 cm. Credits: photograph by Peter Schmid.

phalanges (“2P:4P ratio”) yields similar results as full-finger studies, and that extant humans have a lower 2P:4P ratio on average compared to Neandertals and other Pleistocene humans (Fig. 1). This finding has been used in support of the “Human Self-Domestication” hypothesis, that prosocial behavior and reduced aggression and reactivity were critical in our recent cognitive and social evolution (Hare 2017).

Here, we use these developmental models to infer potential developmental expressions and social behavior from adult hominin hand skeletons with emphasis on *H. naledi* (“Hand 1”). We first examine the relative segment lengths of the second ray in extant apes, humans, and fossil hominins, to test the degree to which they fit the IC model. We then compare the ratio of second and fourth proximal phalanges (2P:4P) across these taxa.

TABLE 1. — Fossil specimens analyzed in this study. Columns indicate whether the specimen was included in the Inhibitory Cascade and/or 2P:4P analyses. Fossils are listed in roughly chronological order from geologically oldest to most recent.

Fossil ID	Taxon	Inhibitory Cascade	2P:4P	Data source
IPS21350	<i>Pierolapithecus catalunicus</i> Moyà-Solà, Köhler, Alba, Casanovas-Vilar & Galindo, 2004	–	×	Fossil (Sergio Almécija, personal communication)
IPS18800	<i>Hispanopithecus laietanus</i> Comella & Crusafont-Pairó, 1944	×	×	Fossil (Sergio Almécija, personal communication)
BA 140	<i>Oropithecus bambolii</i> Gervais, 1872	–	×	Fossil (Sergio Almécija, personal communication)
IGF 11778	<i>Oropithecus bambolii</i>	×	–	Fossil (Sergio Almécija, personal communication)
ARA-VP-6/500	<i>Ardipithecus ramidus</i> (White, Suwa, & Asfaw, 1995)	×	×	Fossil (Kivell); Lovejoy <i>et al.</i> (2009)
StW 573	<i>Australopithecus africanus</i> Dart, 1925	×	×	Fossil (Kivell)
MH 2	<i>Australopithecus sediba</i> Berger, de Ruiter, Churchill, Schmid, Carlson, Dirks & Kibii, 2010	–	×	Fossil (Kivell)
naledi Hand 1	<i>Homo naledi</i> Berger <i>et al.</i> , 2015	×	×	Fossil (Kivell)
Kebara 2	<i>Homo sapiens neanderthalensis</i> Kleinshmidt, 1922	×	×	Fossil (Kivell)
Spy II	<i>Homo sapiens neanderthalensis</i>	–	×	Nelson <i>et al.</i> (2011)
Regourdou	<i>Homo sapiens neanderthalensis</i>	–	×	Nelson <i>et al.</i> (2011)
La Ferrassie I	<i>Homo sapiens neanderthalensis</i>	–	×	Nelson <i>et al.</i> (2011)
Shanidar 4	<i>Homo sapiens neanderthalensis</i>	–	×	Nelson <i>et al.</i> (2011)
Qafzeh 9	<i>Homo sapiens</i> Linnaeus, 1758	×	×	Fossil (Kivell); Nelson <i>et al.</i> (2011)
Ohalo II	<i>Homo sapiens</i>	×	–	Fossil (Kivell); Nelson <i>et al.</i> (2011)
Dolni Věstonice 16	<i>Homo sapiens</i>	×	×	Sládek <i>et al.</i> (2000)

MATERIAL AND METHODS

SAMPLES

Raw data include the maximum lengths of the proximal, intermediate, and distal phalanges from articulated hand skeletons of hominoids including *Hyllobates lar* (Linnaeus, 1771) (N = 5), *Pongo pygmaeus* (Linnaeus, 1760) (N = 10), *Gorilla gorilla* (Savage, 1847) (N = 4), *Pan paniscus* Schwarz, 1929 (N = 5), *Pan troglodytes* (Blumenbach, 1775) (N = 9), and recent humans (N = 45). Human phalanges represent individuals of African and European ancestry. Data are drawn from the Supplemental Material of Feix *et al.* (2015), which includes both measurements and names of museum collections associated with each skeletal individual.

We only included fossils for which phalanges could be confidently associated to the second and fourth rays and their full lengths measured or reliably estimated (Table 1). Data come from direct observation (TLK and Sergio Almécija, personal communication) and published literature (Sládek *et al.* 2000; Almécija *et al.* 2007, 2009; Lovejoy *et al.* 2009; Feix *et al.* 2015; Kivell *et al.* 2023). *Australopithecus* R.A.Dart, 1925 specimen StW 573 was measured directly on fossils still embedded in breccia, so its data are tentative and must be interpreted cautiously. We do not include the composite hand of *Australopithecus afarensis* Johanson, White & Coppens, 1978 in this analysis because it includes elements from different individuals (Marzke 1983; Kivell *et al.* 2023).

ANALYSES

We follow the approach of Young *et al.* (2015) to assess the degree to which taxa meet the predictions of the IC model, by examining proportional lengths of second ray phalanges.

We converted raw phalanx length to its proportional size by dividing each phalanx in the series by the sum of the proximal, intermediate, and distal phalanges for each individual. We used reduced major axis (RMA) regression of distal versus proximal phalanx relative length to examine the scaling relationship between these variables separately for humans, non-human hominoids, and non-human great apes, using the “lmodel2” package (Legendre 2018) in R version 4.1.2 (R Core Team 2021). We also plotted the proportional lengths of each segment individually, comparing humans, non-human hominoids, and fossil hominins; this allowed a visual appraisal of interspecific patterns, as well as a test of whether the intermediate phalanx is two-thirds of the series length as the IC model predicts.

We assessed the 2P:4P ratio among the fossil sample, comparing these ratios with the summary statistics for mixed-sex samples of humans and other apes published by Nelson and colleagues (2011). To help visualize these published patterns, we plotted each extant genus' mean \pm two standard deviations (i.e., 95% range). We do not test specific hypotheses about the 2P:4P ratio, but simply examine the fossils in light of extant ranges of variation.

RESULTS

Phalanx proportional lengths show that humans and other apes generally follow the predicted IC patterns, but with some interesting deviations (Table 2 and Fig. 2). The IC model predicts $DP = 0.667 \cdot 1 \cdot PP$ (Young *et al.* 2015). The model slope and intercept are within the 95% confidence intervals for RMA regression parameters for the modern human sample, but just outside the ape confidence intervals.




FIG. 2. — **A**, Distal/proximal intermediate phalanx proportional length among extant and extinct hominids. The **dashed line** depicts the IC model prediction; **B**, boxplot of proportional length of the proximal, intermediate, and distal phalanges, with colors matching the taxonomic groups in the left graph; fossil numbers: 1, ARA-VP-6/500; 2, Dolni Vestonice 16; 3, *Homo naledi* Berger *et al.*, 2015; 4, IGF 11778; 5, IPS 18800; 6, Kebara 2; 7, Ohalo II; 8, Qafzeh 9; 9, StW 573.

TABLE 2. — Results of the RMA regressions used to test the inhibitory cascade model of distal and proximal phalanx relative lengths. Model predictions are in the first row while subsequent rows provide regression results for specific samples. Hominoidea Gray, 1925 includes all apes except humans, and “Great Apes” excludes *Hylobates* Illiger, 1811 from Hominoidea.

Group	Slope	Slope (95%)	Intercept	Intercept (95%)	R ²	P (2-tailed)
IC model	-1.00	—	0.67	—	—	—
Homo sapiens	-1.03	-1.29, -0.82	0.72	0.62, 0.85	0.46	3.46E-07
Hominoidea	-0.75	-0.98, -0.57	0.55	0.46, 0.67	0.43	3.62E-05
Great Apes	-0.69	-0.88, -0.54	0.52	0.45, 0.62	0.65	2.61E-07

This disparity may be due to the taxonomic heterogeneity of the “ape” sample and limited sample sizes. The fossil assemblage, including Miocene apes and Plio-Pleistocene hominins, bridges the gap between the extant ape and human distributions. Notably, all specimens attributed to genus *Homo* including *H. naledi* fall in or around the extant human range, with the exception Dolni Vestonice 16 from Late Pleistocene, who falls nearest StW 573 (*Australopithecus*) below the extant human distribution. In contrast, both the Middle Miocene ape *Hispanopithecus* Villalta & Crusafont Pairó, 1944 (IPS 18800) and Early Pliocene *Ar. ramidus* White, Suwa & Asfaw, 1995 (ARA-VP-6/500) fall within the extant ape range. The Late Miocene *Oreopithecus* Gervais, 1872 (IGF 11778) is intermediate between the ape and human extremes. StW 573 and Dolni Vestonice 16 fit the ape RMA model nearly perfectly, coincidentally almost identical to IC model predictions.

The IC model also predicts that as the second segment in the series, the intermediate phalanx should be about two-thirds of the entire series length (Fig. 2B). Nearly all individuals in the sample fall just shy of this prediction. Human intermediate phalanges are entirely below the model prediction (mean = 0.29, SD = 0.008), while the ape range (mean = 0.32, SD = 0.016) more closely approximates the prediction. The human range encompasses most of the smaller half of the ape distribution. The limited fossil sample shows little taxonomic patterning. As with the proximal and distal phalanges, both StW 573 and Dolni Vestonice deviate from other hominin fossils in closely matching the model predictions; these individuals’ relatively longer intermediate phalanges explain why they fall away from the human cluster in the graph of distal versus proximal phalanx length. *Hispanopithecus* is close to the ape average and just outside the human range. All other fossils fall within the human range overlapping the lower half of the ape distribution.




FIG. 3. — 2P:4P ratios for extant and extinct hominoids. **Solid circles and lines** represent species mean \pm 2 standard deviations, respectively, as reported in Nelson *et al.* (2011). Fossil specimens are organized with Miocene apes on the left, Plio-Pleistocene hominins in the center, and Neandertals/early modern humans on the right.

The proportional length of each the proximal and intermediate phalanges individually does not show any clear taxonomic patterning. Proportional length of the distal phalanx, however, does seem to show a graded pattern between “ape” and human, whose distributions are more differentiated than for the proximal and intermediate phalanges. Fossils fit or bridge this ape-human trend with *Australopithecus* and older taxa falling in the upper half of the ape range and all *Homo* specimens being higher, falling within or beyond the modern human range.

In addition to examining intrinsic digit proportions, we also examined the ratio of the second and fourth proximal phalanges (2P:4P), which is also established during embryonic development. Figure 3 depicts the summary statistics for extant genera as reported by Nelson and colleagues (2011: table 1). The fossils as a whole span from beyond the low end of the great ape range to the lower half of the human range. The Miocene apes *Hispanopithecus* (IPS 18800) and *Oreopithecus* (BA 140) have lower ratios than almost all extant taxa reflecting an especially long PP4 relative to PP2. The remaining extinct taxa, from the Miocene *Pierolapithecus* (IPS 21350) to later Pleistocene humans and Neandertals, fall within the overlap between the upper end of extant apes and the lower half of the modern human range. While this intermediacy makes it difficult to infer social behavior for fossil specimens, none of them approaches the pair-bonded *Hylobates* Illiger, 1811 distribution. *Homo naledi* Hand 1 has the highest 2P:4P ratio of the entire fossil sample, joined only by the Shanidar 4 Neandertal above the extant human average.

DISCUSSION

A developmental perspective elucidates the proximate mechanisms that led to major evolutionary changes in the hominin lineage. Advances in developmental biology over the past few

decades have shown that many species-specific morphologies that distinguish adults are established in the earliest stages of development. Adult remains can therefore provide evidence of ontogenetic patterns, with the caveat that relatively complete and reliably associated elements must be preserved for serially repeating structures. Although such conditions are rarely met in the fossil record, a fortuitous handful of specimens from the Middle Miocene to the present day helps establish the ancestral conditions out of which hominin finger proportions may have evolved.

Phalanx lengths support the hypothesis that intrinsic finger proportions reflect a general developmental mechanism, i.e., reaction-diffusion pattern formation, which can be mathematically described by the inhibitory cascade model. The present samples do not fit the model perfectly, however, perhaps best illustrated by the fact that most individuals’ intermediate phalanx is slightly shorter than the predicted one-third of the total series length. One explanation for this modest discrepancy is that adult morphology is the result of myriad developmental events (Hallgrímsson *et al.* 2009), such that it is possible that the model predictions hold perfectly in the earliest stages of development, but this pattern becomes obscured by subsequent growth processes. Proximal-distal phalanx curvature is probably not a confounding factor since the highly curved phalanges of *Pongo* Lacépède, 1799 and *Hylobates* (e.g. Wennemann *et al.* 2022) differ in intermediate phalanx proportional length, with *Pongo* encompassing the lower half and *Hylobates* bracketing the upper half of the entire non-human ape range in Figure 2 (not shown). Similarly, the proportionally shortest intermediate phalanges among the fossil sample are the highly curved phalanx *H. naledi* (Kivell *et al.* 2015) and straight phalanx of the Kebara 2 Neandertal.

An evolutionary interpretation of the IC model results based on the sample available in the current study is that the ancestral developmental pattern seen in living apes and *Hispanopithecus*

also characterized the earliest hominins (*Ardipithecus* White, Suwa & Asfaw, 1995 and *Australopithecus*). A relatively simple developmental shift occurred at some point in the evolution of genus *Homo*; given the uncertain phylogenetic position of *H. naledi* (Dembo *et al.* 2016), it is unclear whether this developmental pattern was established at the origin of the genus or later on. The somewhat “intermediate” positioning of *Oreopithecus* (IGF 11778; Fig. 2) could be interpreted as convergent evolution with the *Homo* condition, similar to what has been suggested for other hand proportions in this unusual Late Miocene ape (Moyà-Solà *et al.* 1999). The IC model therefore likely describes a developmental mechanism underlying the evolution of precision grip.

The 2P:4P results are based on data presented by Nelson and colleagues (2011), with the addition of *Oreopithecus*, South African *Australopithecus*, and *H. naledi*. These additional samples are largely consistent with Nelson and colleagues’ (2011) interpretation that prenatal androgen exposure decreased over time from hominin origins to the present day. Intriguingly, the *H. naledi* Hand 1 skeleton yields the highest ratio in the hominin fossil record. Alongside low levels of skeletal and dental size variation (Garvin *et al.* 2017), this uniquely high 2P:4P ratio could reflect lower levels of intraspecific aggression compared with the living great apes, and possibly even compared with other Middle Pleistocene hominins.

The high digit ratio of *H. naledi* is interesting in the context of the Human Self-Domestication hypothesis (Hare 2017; Sánchez-Villagra & van Schaik 2019; Benítez-Burraco *et al.* 2020). Proponents of this hypothesis posit that many morphological differences between recent *H. sapiens* and Middle-Late Pleistocene hominins mirror the “domestication syndrome” in other animals: anatomical byproducts of selection for reduced aggression (Trut *et al.* 2009; Hare *et al.* 2012; Wilkins *et al.* 2014). Along with higher digit ratios, smaller faces and brain sizes have also been argued to be part of the domestication syndrome (Cieri *et al.* 2014; Hare 2017). Craniodental characteristics support a close evolutionary relationship between *H. naledi* and later Middle Pleistocene *Homo* (Dembo *et al.* 2016; Schroeder *et al.* 2017). In this light, the small brain size and low degree of encephalization of *H. naledi* compared with other *Homo* taxa (Grabowski *et al.* 2016; Garvin *et al.* 2017; Hawks *et al.* 2017) could be interpreted as evidence for “self-domestication” in *H. naledi*. Along these lines, cranial lesions caused by blunt force trauma show a high frequency in fossil *Homo* crania, and have been interpreted by some researchers as evidence for pervasive interpersonal violence from the oldest *H. erectus* to the present day (Saladié *et al.* 2012; Estabrook & Frayer 2013; Sala *et al.* 2015; Margvelashvili *et al.* 2022). Such lesions have not been documented in any of the numerous *H. naledi* cranial remains representing several individuals, although the cranial remains of *H. naledi* include a “taphonomic divot” on the supraorbital torus of the DH3 cranium and another possible pathology of unknown etiology on another frontal fragment (Laird *et al.* 2017: 107). Thus, the low frequency or potential absence of healed cranial wounds in the Rising Star hominins could indicate lower levels of violence and aggression compared with other Pleistocene *Homo*.

Other evidence of more affiliative and less aggressive behaviors in *H. naledi* may come from the unusual taphonomic context of the remains in Rising Star Cave itself (Berger *et al.* 2015; Dirks *et al.* 2017). Of over 2000 fragmentary elements recovered from the Dinaledi Chamber, nearly all are *H. naledi* that come from around 20 individuals (Dirks *et al.* 2015; Bolter *et al.* 2018). At least one immature and one adult individual are known from the Lesedi Chamber of the cave system (Hawks *et al.* 2017), and isolated fragments of an infant cranium were recovered from a small fissure of another corridor (Brophy *et al.* 2021). No other South African cave site to date has yielded so many hominins and so little other fauna. This, and other evidence, has led some to argue that *H. naledi* engaged in human-like (i.e., cultural) mortuary practices (Dirks *et al.* 2015; Randolph-Quinney 2015; Berger *et al.* 2023), although others are highly skeptical (Val 2016; Martínón-Torres *et al.* 2023). Regardless of how and why partial skeletons of several *H. naledi* individuals ended up deep within the dark and remote reaches of Rising Star Cave system, the abundance of remains could reasonably reflect group-affiliative behaviors in *H. naledi*. This interpretation of the taphonomic evidence is complemented by the behavioral implications of the high 2P:4P ratio of *H. naledi* Hand 1 skeleton. Future research on the unusual preservation and context of the *H. naledi* remains, in addition to the possibility of more associated hand skeletons will provide further insights into potential behavioral implications of its distinct digit ratios.

CONCLUSION

The nearly complete adult hand skeleton of *H. naledi* provides insights into the developmental biology and social behavior of this extinct species. Proportional relationships among associated phalanges suggest, first, that a shift in embryonic development may have facilitated the evolution of precision grip in early hominins. Based on our fossil sample, this developmental shift may have occurred after the divergence of *Homo* from australopiths, but this does not necessarily preclude the dexterous hand use, and particularly tool use, in earlier hominins. Second, the ratio of second and fourth manual phalanges could reflect reduced aggressive and increased prosocial behaviors in *H. naledi* compared with other fossil *Homo*. These interpretations are based on a single *H. naledi* hand skeleton, and could potentially be supported or refuted by the discovery of new associations among *H. naledi* phalanges, or by development of randomization-based approaches to analyze commingled remains (cf. Rolian & Gordon 2013).

Acknowledgements

This article is dedicated to the legacy of Yves Coppens, whose career helped illuminate the great diversity of hominins to which *Homo naledi* was recently added. We are grateful to the organizers of the symposium *Les héritiers de Lucy*, and to Jean-Jacques Hublin for further arranging this special issue.

We thank following individuals for access to fossils in their care: Bernhard Zipfel (University of the Witwatersrand), Alon Barash, Yoel Rak and Israel Herskovitz (Sackler School of Medicine at Tel Aviv University) and Bill Kimbel, Tim White, Berhane Asfaw, Gen Suwa, and Gideon Shimelies (National Museum of Ethiopia). Sergio Almécija kindly provided data for Miocene apes.

REFERENCES

- ALBA D. M., MOYA-SOLÀ S. & KÖHLER M. 2003. — Morphological affinities of the *Australopithecus afarensis* hand on the basis of manual proportions and relative thumb length. *Journal of Human Evolution* 44 (2): 225-254. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2484\(02\)00207-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2484(02)00207-5)
- ALMÉCIJA S., ALBA D. M. & MOYA-SOLÀ S. 2009. — *Pierolapithecus* and the functional morphology of Miocene ape hand phalanges: paleobiological and evolutionary implications. *Journal of Human Evolution* 57 (3): 284-297. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2009.02.008>
- ALMÉCIJA S., ALBA D. M., MOYA-SOLÀ S. & KÖHLER M. 2007. — Orang-like manual adaptations in the fossil hominoid *Hispánopithecus laietanus*: first steps towards great ape suspensory behaviours. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 274 (1624): 2375-2384. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2007.0750>
- ALMÉCIJA S., SMAERS J. B. & JUNGERS W. L. 2015. — The evolution of human and ape hand proportions. *Nature Communications* 6: 7717. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms8717>
- BENÍTEZ-BURRACO A., CLAY Z. & KEMPE V. 2020. — Editorial: Self-Domestication and Human Evolution. *Frontiers in Psychology* 11, 2 p. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.02007>
- BERGER L. R., DE RUITER D. J., CHURCHILL S. E., SCHMID P., CARLSON K. J., DIRKS P. H. G. M. & KIBII J. M. 2010. — *Australopithecus sediba*: a new species of *Homo*-like Australopithecus from South Africa. *Science* 328 (5975): 195-204. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1184944>
- BERGER L. R., HAWKS J., DE RUITER D. J., CHURCHILL S. E., SCHMID P., DELEZENE L. K., KIVELL T. L., GARVIN H. M., WILLIAMS S. A., DE SILVA J. M., SKINNER M. M., MUSIBA C. M., CAMERON N., HOLLIDAY T. W., HARCOURT-SMITH W., ACKERMANN R. R., BASTIR M., BOGIN B., BOLTER D., BROPHY J., COFRAN Z. D., CONGDON K. A., DEANE A. S., DEMBO M., DRAPEAU M., ELLIOTT M. C., FEUERRIEGEL E. M., GARCIA-MARTINEZ D., GREEN D. J., GURTOV A., IRISH J. D., KRUGER A., LAIRD M. F., MARCHI D., MEYER M. R., NALLA S., NEGASH E. W., ORR C. M., RADOVICIC D., SCHROEDER L., SCOTT J. E., THROCKMORTON Z., TOCHERI M. W., VAN-SICKLE C., WALKER C. S., WEI P. & ZIPFEL B. 2015. — *Homo naledi*, a new species of the genus *Homo* from the Dinaledi Chamber, South Africa. *eLife* 4: e09560. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.09560>
- BERGER L. R., MAKHUBELA T., MOLOPYANE K., KRÜGER A., RANDOLPH-QUINNEY P., ELLIOTT M., PEIXOTTO B., FUENTES A., TAFFOREAU P., BEYRAND V., DOLLMAN K., JINNAH Z., A. B., BROAD K., BROPHY J., CHINAMATIRA G., DIRKS P. H. M., FEUERRIEGEL E., GURTOV A., HLOPHE N., HUNTER L., HUNTER R., JAKATA K., JASKOLSKI C., MORRIS H., PRYOR E., RAMAPHELA M., ROBERTS E. W., SMILG J. S., TSIKOANE M., TUCKER S., ROOYEN D. VAN, WARREN K., WREN C. D., KISSEL M., SPIKINS P. & HAWKS J. 2023. — Evidence for deliberate burial of the dead by *Homo naledi*. *eLife* 12. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.89106>
- BODO C. & RISSMAN E. F. 2008. — The androgen receptor is selectively involved in organization of sexually dimorphic social behaviors in mice. *Endocrinology* 149 (8): 4142-4150. <https://doi.org/10.1210/en.2008-0183>
- BOLTER D. R., HAWKS J., BOGIN B. & CAMERON N. 2018. — Palaeodemographics of individuals in Dinaledi Chamber using dental remains. *South African Journal of Science* 114 (1/2): 6. <https://doi.org/10.17159/sajs.2018/20170066>
- BROPHY J. K., ELLIOTT M. C., DE RUITER D. J., BOLTER D. R., CHURCHILL S. E., WALKER C. S., HAWKS J. & BERGER L. R. 2021. — Immature hominin craniodental remains from a new locality in the Rising Star Cave System, South Africa. *PaleoAnthropology*: 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.48738/2021.iss1.64>
- CHEVERUD J. M. 1996. — Developmental integration and the evolution of pleiotropy. *American Zoologist* 36 (1): 44-50. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icb/36.1.44>
- CIERI R. L., CHURCHILL S. E., FRANCISCUS R. G., TAN J. & HARE B. 2014. — Craniofacial Feminization, Social Tolerance, and the Origins of Behavioral Modernity. *Current Anthropology* 55 (4): 419-443. <https://doi.org/10.1086/677209>
- COFRAN Z., VAN-SICKLE C., VALENZUELA R., GARCÍA-MARTÍNEZ D., WALKER C. S., HAWKS J., ZIPFEL B., WILLIAMS S. A. & BERGER L. R. 2022. — The immature *Homo naledi* ilium from the Lesedi Chamber, Rising Star Cave, South Africa. *American Journal of Biological Anthropology* 179: 3-17. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.24522>
- COLEMAN K., ROBERTSON N. D. & BETHEA C. L. 2011. — Long-term ovariectomy alters social and anxious behaviors in semi-free ranging Japanese macaques. *Behavioural Brain Research* 225 (1): 317-327. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbr.2011.07.046>
- DEMBO M., RADOVICIC D., GARVIN H. M., LAIRD M. F., SCHROEDER L., SCOTT J. E., BROPHY J., ACKERMANN R. R., MUSIBA C. M., DE RUITER D. J., MOOERS A. Ø. & COLLARD M. 2016. — The evolutionary relationships and age of *Homo naledi*: an assessment using dated Bayesian phylogenetic methods. *Journal of Human Evolution* 97: 17-26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2016.04.008>
- DIRKS P. H. G. M., KIBII J. M., KUHN B. F., STEININGER C., CHURCHILL S. E., KRAMERS J. D., PICKERING R., FARBER D. L., MÉRIAUX A.-S., HERRIES A. I. R., KING G. C. P. & BERGER L. R. 2010. — Geological setting and age of *Australopithecus sediba* from Southern Africa. *Science* 328: 205-208. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1184950>
- DIRKS P. H. G. M., BERGER L. R., ROBERTS E. M., KRAMERS J. D., HAWKS J., RANDOLPH-QUINNEY P. S., ELLIOTT M., MUSIBA C. M., CHURCHILL S. E., DE RUITER D. J., SCHMID P., BACKWELL L. R., BELYANIN G. A., BOSHOFF P., HUNTER K. L., FEUERRIEGEL E. M., GURTOV A., HARRISON J. DU G., HUNTER R., KRUGER A., MORRIS H., MAKHUBELA T. V., PEIXOTTO B. & TUCKER S. 2015. — Geological and taphonomic context for the new hominin species *Homo naledi* from the Dinaledi Chamber, South Africa. *eLife* 4: e09561. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.09561>
- DIRKS P. H. G. M., ROBERTS E. M., HILBERT-WOLF H., KRAMERS J. D., HAWKS J., DOSSETO A., DUVAL M., ELLIOTT M., EVANS M., GRÜN R., HELLSTROM J., HERRIES A. I., JOANNES-BOYAU R., MAKHUBELA T. V., PLACZEK C. J., ROBBINS J., SPANDLER C., WIERSMA J., WOODHEAD J. & BERGER L. R. 2017. — The age of *Homo naledi* and associated sediments in the Rising Star Cave, South Africa. *eLife* 6: e24231. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.24231>
- ESTABROOK V. H. & FRAYER D. W. 2013. — Trauma in the Krapina Neandertals: violence in the Middle Palaeolithic?, in Knüsel C. & Smith M. (eds), *The Routledge Handbook of the Bioarchaeology of Human Conflict*. Routledge, London, 752 p.
- FEIX T., KIVELL T. L., POUYDEBAT E. & DOLLAR A. M. 2015. — Estimating thumb-index finger precision grip and manipulation potential in extant and fossil primates. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface* 12 (106): 20150176. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2015.0176>
- GARVIN H. M., ELLIOTT M. C., DELEZENE L. K., HAWKS J., CHURCHILL S. E., BERGER L. R. & HOLLIDAY T. W. 2017. — Body size, brain size, and sexual dimorphism in *Homo naledi* from the Dinaledi Chamber. *Journal of Human Evolution* 111: 119-138. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2017.06.010>

- GOULD S. J. & LEWONTIN R. C. 1979. — The spandrels of San Marco and the Panglossian paradigm: a critique of the adaptationist programme. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences* 205 (1161): 581-598. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.1979.0086>
- GRABOWSKI M., VOJE K. L. & HANSEN T. F. 2016. — Evolutionary modeling and correcting for observation error support a 3/5 brain-body allometry for primates. *Journal of Human Evolution* 94: 106-116. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2016.03.001>
- GREEN J. B. A. & SHARPE J. 2015. — Positional information and reaction-diffusion: two big ideas in developmental biology combine. *Development* 142 (7): 1203-1211. <https://doi.org/10.1242/dev.114991>
- HALLGRÍMSSON B., JAMNICZYK H., YOUNG N. M., ROLIAN C., PARSONS T. E., BOUGHNER J. C. & MARCUCIO R. S. 2009. — Deciphering the palimpsest: studying the relationship between morphological integration and phenotypic covariation. *Evolutionary Biology* 36: 355-376. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11692-009-9076-5>
- HAMRICK M. W. 2001. — Primate origins: evolutionary change in digital ray patterning and segmentation. *Journal of Human Evolution* 40 (4): 339-351. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jhevol.2001.0467>
- HARE B. 2017. — Survival of the friendliest: *Homo sapiens* evolved via selection for prosociality. *Annual Review of Psychology* 68: 155-186. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010416-044201>
- HARE B., WOBBER V. & WRANGHAM R. 2012. — The self-domestication hypothesis: evolution of bonobo psychology is due to selection against aggression. *Animal Behaviour* 83 (3): 573-585. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2011.12.007>
- HAWKS J., ELLIOTT M., SCHMID P., CHURCHILL S. E., DE RUITER D. J., ROBERTS E. M., HILBERT-WOLF H., GARVIN H. M., WILLIAMS S. A., DELEZENE L. K., FEUERRIEGEL E. M., RANDOLPH-QUINNEY P., KIVELL T. L., LAIRD M. F., TAWANE G., DESILVA J. M., BAILEY S. E., BROPHY J. K., MEYER M. R., SKINNER M. M., TOCHERI M. W., VANSICKLE C., WALKER C. S., CAMPBELL T. L., KUHN B., KRUGER A., TUCKER S., GURTOV A., HLOPHE N., HUNTER R., MORRIS H., PEIXOTTO B., RAMALEPA M., VAN ROOYEN D., TSIKOANE M., BOSHOFF P., DIRKS P. H. & BERGER L. R. 2017. — New fossil remains of *Homo naledi* from the Lesedi Chamber, South Africa. *eLife* 6: e24232. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.24232>
- HISCOCK T. W., TSCHOPP P. & TABIN C. J. 2017. — On the formation of digits and joints during limb development. *Developmental Cell* 41 (5): 459-465. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.devcel.2017.04.021>
- HÖNEKOPP J., BARTHOLDT L., BEIER L. & LIEBERT A. 2007. — Second to fourth digit length ratio (2D:4D) and adult sex hormone levels: new data and a meta-analytic review. *Psychoneuroendocrinology* 32 (4): 313-321. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2007.01.007>
- HOWLETT C. 2019. — *The Expression of the 2D:4D Ratio Across the Order Primates*. PhD thesis, University of Kent (United Kingdom), 296 p. <https://kar.kent.ac.uk/73408/>
- HOWLETT C., SETCHELL J. M., HILL R. A. & BARTON R. A. 2015. — The 2D:4D digit ratio and social behaviour in wild female chacma baboons (*Papio ursinus*) in relation to dominance, aggression, interest in infants, affiliation and heritability. *Behavioral Ecology Sociobiology* 69: 61-74. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-014-1817-5>
- HUBLIN J.-J., BEN-NCER A., BAILEY S. E., FREIDLINE S. E., NEUBAUER S., SKINNER M. M., BERGMANN I., LE CABEC A., BENAZZI S., HARVATI K. & GUNZ P. 2017. — New fossils from Jebel Irhoud, Morocco and the pan-African origin of *Homo sapiens*. *Nature* 546: 289-292. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature22336>
- JOSEPHS R. A., NEWMAN M. L., BROWN R. P. & BEER J. M. 2003. — Status, testosterone, and human intellectual performance: stereotype threat as status concern. *Psychological Science* 14 (2): 158-163. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9280.t01-1-01435>
- JOSEPHS R. A., SELLERS J. G., NEWMAN M. L. & MEHTA P. H. 2006. — The mismatch effect: when testosterone and status are at odds. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 90 (6): 999-1013. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.6.999>
- KAVANAGH K. D., EVANS A. R. & JERNVALL J. 2007. — Predicting evolutionary patterns of mammalian teeth from development. *Nature* 449: 427-432. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature06153>
- KAVANAGH K. D., SHOVAL O., WINSLOW B. B., ALON U., LEARY B. P., KAN A. & TABIN C. J. 2013. — Developmental bias in the evolution of phalanges. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110 (45): 18190-18195. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1315213110>
- KIVELL T. L. 2015. — Evidence in hand: recent discoveries and the early evolution of human manual manipulation. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 370 (1682): 20150105. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2015.0105>
- KIVELL T. L., KIBII J. M., CHURCHILL S. E., SCHMID P. & BERGER L. R. 2011. — *Australopithecus sediba* hand demonstrates mosaic evolution of locomotor and manipulative abilities. *Science* 333: 1411-1417. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1202625>
- KIVELL T. L., DEANE A. S., TOCHERI M. W., ORR C. M., SCHMID P., HAWKS J., BERGER L. R. & CHURCHILL S. E. 2015. — The hand of *Homo naledi*. *Nature Communications* 6: 8431. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms9431>
- KIVELL T. L., CHURCHILL S. E., KIBII J. M., SCHMID P. & BERGER L. R. 2018. — The Hand of *Australopithecus sediba*. *PaleoAnthropology* 2018: 282-333.
- KIVELL T. L., BARAKI N., LOCKWOOD V., WILLIAMS-HATALA E. M. & WOOD B. A. 2023. — Form, function and evolution of the human hand. *American Journal of Biological Anthropology* 181 (S76): 6-57. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.24667>
- LAIRD M. F., SCHROEDER L., GARVIN H. M., SCOTT J. E., DEMBO M., RADOVČIĆ D., MUSIBA C. M., ACKERMANN R. R., SCHMID P., HAWKS J., BERGER L. R. & DE RUITER D. J. 2017. — The skull of *Homo naledi*. *Journal of Human Evolution* 104: 100-123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2016.09.009>
- LEGENDRE P. 2018. — lmodel2: Model II Regression.
- LOVEJOY C. O., SIMPSON S. W., WHITE T. D., ASFAW B. & SUWA G. 2009. — Careful climbing in the Miocene: the forelimbs of *Ardipithecus ramidus* and humans are primitive. *Science* 326 (5949): 70-70e8. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1175827>
- LUTCHMAYA S., BARON-COHEN S., RAGGATT P., KNICKMEYER R. & MANNING J. T. 2004. — 2nd to 4th digit ratios, fetal testosterone and estradiol. *Early Human Development* 77 (1-2): 23-28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2003.12.002>
- MARGVELASHVILI A., TAPPEN M., RIGHTMIRE G. P., TSIKARIDZE N. & LORDKIPANIDZE D. 2022. — An ancient cranium from Dmanisi: evidence for interpersonal violence, disease, and possible predation by carnivores on Early Pleistocene *Homo*. *Journal of Human Evolution* 166: 103180. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2022.103180>
- MARTINÓN-TORRES M., GARATE D., HERRIES A. I. R. & PETRAGLIA M. D. 2023. — No scientific evidence that *Homo naledi* buried their dead and produced rock art. *Journal of Human Evolution* 195: 103464. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2023.103464>
- MARZKE M. W. 1983. — Joint functions and grips of the *Australopithecus afarensis* hand, with special reference to the region of the capitate. *Journal of Human Evolution* 12 (2): 197-211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2484\(83\)80025-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2484(83)80025-6)
- MARZKE M. W. 1997. — Precision grips, hand morphology, and tools. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 102 (1): 91-110. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1096-8644\(199701\)102:1<91::AID-AJPA8>3.0.CO;2-G](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1096-8644(199701)102:1<91::AID-AJPA8>3.0.CO;2-G)
- MCINTYRE M. H., HERRMANN E., WOBBER V., HALBWAX M., MOHAMBA C., DE SOUSA N., ATENCIA R., COX D. & HARE B. 2009. — Bonobos have a more human-like second-to-fourth finger length ratio (2D:4D) than chimpanzees: a hypothesized indication of lower prenatal androgens. *Journal of Human Evolution* 56 (4): 361-365. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2008.12.004>
- MOYA-SOLÀ S., KÖHLER M. & ROOK L. 1999. — Evidence of hominid-like precision grip capability in the hand of the Miocene ape *Oreopithecus*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 96 (1): 313-317. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.96.1.313>

- NAPIER J. R. 1960. — Studies of the hands of living primates. *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London* 134 (4): 647-657. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7998.1960.tb05606.x>
- NELSON E. & SHULTZ S. 2010. — Finger length ratios (2D:4D) in anthropoids implicate reduced prenatal androgens in social bonding. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 141 (3): 395-405. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.21157>
- NELSON E., ROLIAN C., CASHMORE L. & SHULTZ S. 2011. — Digit ratios predict polygyny in early apes, *Ardipithecus*, Neanderthals and early modern humans but not in *Australopithecus*. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 278 (1711): 1556-1563. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2010.1740>
- OLSON E. C. & MILLER R. L. 1958. — *Morphological Integration*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 376 p.
- PICKERING R., DIRKS P. H. G. M., JINNAH Z., DE RUITER D. J., CHURCHILL S. E., HERRIES A. I. R., WOODHEAD J. D., HELLSTROM J. C. & BERGER L. R. 2011. — *Australopithecus sediba* at 1.977 Ma and implications for the origins of the genus *Homo*. *Science* 333 (6048): 1421-1423. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1203697>
- R CORE TEAM 2021. — R: a language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna. <https://www.r-project.org/>
- RANDOLPH-QUINNEY P. S. 2015. — A new star rising: biology and mortuary behaviour of *Homo naledi*. *South African Journal of Science* 111 (9/10): 4-4. <https://doi.org/10.17159/sajs.2015/a0122>
- ROBBINS J. L., DIRKS P. H. G. M., ROBERTS E. M., KRAMERS J. D., MAKHUBELA T. V., HILBERT-WOLF H. L., ELLIOTT M., WIERSMA J. P., PLACZEK C. J., EVANS M. & BERGER L. R. 2021. — Providing context to the *Homo naledi* fossils: constraints from flowstones on the age of sediment deposits in Rising Star Cave, South Africa. *Chemical Geology* 567: 120108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemgeo.2021.120108>
- ROLIAN C. 2014. — Genes, development, and evolvability in primate evolution. *Evolutionary Anthropology: Issues, News, and Reviews* 23: 93-104. <https://doi.org/10.1002/evan.21409>
- ROLIAN C. 2016. — The role of genes and development in the evolution of the primate hand, in KIVELL T. L., LEMELIN P., RICHMOND B. G. & SCHMITT D. (eds), *The Evolution of the Primate Hand: Anatomical, Developmental, Functional, and Paleontological Evidence, Developments in Primatology: Progress and Prospects*. Springer, New York, NY: 101-130. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-3646-5_5
- ROLIAN C. & GORDON A. D. 2013. — Reassessing manual proportions in *Australopithecus afarensis*. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 152 (3): 393-406. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.22365>
- SALA N., ARSUAGA J. L., PANTOJA-PÉREZ A., PABLOS A., MARTÍNEZ I., QUAM R. M., GÓMEZ-OLIVENCIA A., CASTRO J. M. B. DE & CARBONELL E. 2015. — Lethal interpersonal violence in the Middle Pleistocene. *PLoS ONE* 10: e0126589. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0126589>
- SALADIÉ P., HUGUET R., RODRÍGUEZ-HIDALGO A., CÁCERES I., ESTEBAN-NADAL M., ARSUAGA J. L. BERMÚDEZ DE CASTRO J. M. & CARBONELL E. 2012. — Intergroup cannibalism in the European Early Pleistocene: the range expansion and imbalance of power hypotheses. *Journal of Human Evolution* 63: 682-695. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2012.07.004>
- SÁNCHEZ-VILLAGRA M. R. & VAN SCHAİK C. P. 2019. — Evaluating the self-domestication hypothesis of human evolution. *Evolutionary Anthropology: Issues, News, and Reviews* 28 (3): 133-143. <https://doi.org/10.1002/evan.21777>
- SANZ-EZQUERRO J. J. & TICKLE C. 2003. — Digital development and morphogenesis. *Journal of Anatomy* 202 (1): 51-58. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1469-7580.2003.00134.x>
- SCHROEDER L., SCOTT J. E., GARVIN H. M., LAIRD M. F., DEMBO M., RADOVČIĆ D., BERGER L. R., DE RUITER D. J. & ACKERMANN R. R. 2017. — Skull diversity in the *Homo* lineage and the relative position of *Homo naledi*. *Journal of Human Evolution* 104: 124-135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2016.09.014>
- SLÁDEK V., TRINKAUS E., HILLSON S. W. & HOLLIDAY T. W. 2000. — *The People of the Pavlovian: Skeletal Catalogue and Osteometrics of the Gravettian Fossil Hominids from Dolní Věstonice and Pavlov, Dolnověstonické studie*. Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Institute of Archaeology, Department of Paleolithic and Paleoethnology, Brno, Dolní Věstonice, 244 p.
- SOROKOWSKI P. & KOWAL M. 2024. — Relationship between the 2D:4D and prenatal testosterone, adult level testosterone, and testosterone change: meta-analysis of 54 studies. *American Journal of Biological Anthropology* 183 (1): 20-38. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.24852>
- STRICKER S. & MUNDLOS S. 2011. — Mechanisms of digit formation: Human malformation syndromes tell the story. *Developmental Dynamics* 240 (5): 990-1004. <https://doi.org/10.1002/dvdy.22565>
- THORNTON J., ZEHR J. L. & LOOSE M. D. 2009. — Effects of prenatal androgens on rhesus monkeys: a model system to explore the organizational hypothesis in primates. *Hormones and Behavior* 55 (5): 633-644. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yhbeh.2009.03.015>
- TRUMBLE B. C., JAEGGI A. V. & GURVEN M. 2015. — Evolving the neuroendocrine physiology of human and primate cooperation and collective action. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 370 (1683): 20150014. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2015.0014>
- TRUT L., OSKINA I. & KHARLAMOVA A. 2009. — Animal evolution during domestication: the domesticated fox as a model. *BioEssays* 31 (3): 349-360. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bies.200800070>
- TURING A. M. 1952. — The chemical basis of morphogenesis. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences* 237 (641): 37-72. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.1952.0012>
- VAL A. 2016. — Deliberate body disposal by hominins in the Dinaledi Chamber, Cradle of Humankind, South Africa? *Journal of Human Evolution* 96: 145-148. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2016.02.004>
- WEAVER T. D., COQUEUGNIOT H., GOLOVANOVA L. V., DORONICHEV V. B., MAUREILLE B. & HUBLIN J.-J. 2016. — Neonatal postcrania from Mezmaiskaya, Russia, and Le Moustier, France, and the development of Neanderthal body form. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 113 (23): 6472-6477. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1523677113>
- WENNEMANN S. E., LEWTON K. L., ORR C. M., ALMÉCIJA S., TOCHERI M. W., JUNGERS W. L. & PATEL B. A. 2022. — A geometric morphometric approach to investigate primate proximal phalanx diaphysis shape. *American Journal of Biological Anthropology* 177 (3): 581-602. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.24460>
- WILKINS A. S., WRANGHAM R. W. & FITCH W. T. 2014. — The “Domestication Syndrome” in mammals: a unified explanation based on neural crest cell behavior and genetics. *Genetics* 197 (3): 795-808. <https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.114.165423>
- YOUNG M., RICHARD D., GRABOWSKI M., AUERBACH B. M., DE BAKKER B. S., HAGOORT J., MUTHUIRULAN P., KHARKAR V., KURKI H. K., BETTI L., BIRKENSTOCK L., LEWTON K. L. & CAPELLINI T. D. 2022. — The developmental impacts of natural selection on human pelvic morphology. *Science Advances* 8 (33): eabq4884. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abq4884>
- YOUNG N. M., WINSLOW B., TAKKELLAPATI S. & KAVANAGH K. 2015. — Shared rules of development predict patterns of evolution in vertebrate segmentation. *Nature Communications* 6: 6690. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms7690>
- ZHENG Z. & COHN M. J. 2011. — Developmental basis of sexually dimorphic digit ratios. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 108 (39): 16289-16294. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1108312108>

Submitted on 16 December 2023;
 accepted on 26 April 2024;
 published on 27 November 2024.