

**Supplementary Figure 1:** The full Jean Fouquet diptych with both left and right panels. Reproduced under a Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 license. Original photo graph credit: Sailko, Wikimedia Commons.

**Supplementary Text 1**

Additional information concerning the 2D shape analyses used to investigate the stone object painted by Jean Fouquet in ‘*Étienne Chevalier with Saint Stephen’*.

The first method uses a Cartesian coordinate grid system widely applied to record the outline shape of the superior or inferior surfaces of Acheulean handaxes (Lycett et al. 2006; Costa, 2010). The method is known to reliably describe the outline shape of lithic artefacts, facilitating comparisons between different handaxe assemblages and the placement of individual handaxes within the wider assemblage-level contexts (Lycett and von Cramon-Taubadel, 2008; Eren et al., 2014; Schillinger et al., 2014; Arroyo et al., 2019; Pargeter et al., 2019; Garcia-Medrano et al., 2020). In brief, the method orientates each handaxe via its line of maximum symmetry (Costa, 2010), and then records a series of metric variables (distances) from the tool’s edges to this line of symmetry at predefined intervals along this line (Lycett and von Cramon Taubadel, 2008; Schillinger et al., 2014). In the present case, we recorded the distances from the left and right edges of each handaxe to the line of symmetry at 10% intervals of the line’s length. In addition, we included measurements of the tool’s maximum length and maximum width, resulting in 20 metric variables. To ensure these data represent each tool’s shape, and not size / scaling differences, all measurements were size adjusted via the geometric mean method on an individual handaxe basis (Lycett et al., 2006). For more methodological detail please see Key and Lycett (2017), as the protocol applied is identical. These data were recorded from the painted stone object at an arbitrary scale where its maximum length equalled 100 mm. The same data were collected from five Middle Pleistocene Acheulean sites using accurately-scaled digital photos of individual artefacts. These sites included Boxgrove (UK; n = 214), Saint-Acheul (France; n = 38), Porzuna (Spain, n = 133), Cunette (Morocco; n = 40), and Tabun (Israel; n = 75), providing a comparative sample from across Europe and its immediate geographic neighbours.

The second technique uses Elliptical Fourier Analysis (EFA), which has again previously been used to study the 2D outline shape of handaxes (Iovita, 2010; Iovita and McPherron, 2011; Hoggard et al., 2019), through the reduction of a handaxe’s outline shape into a series of harmonics, each comprising four trigonometric Fourier coefficients. Prior to applying the EFA, each investigated handaxe was again orientated via its line of maximum symmetry (Costa, 2010). After orientation, handaxe images – artefacts and painting – were converted into black silhouettes on a white background and compiled into a single .tps file for each assemblage. The morphometric program tpsDig2 v.31 (Rohlf 2015, 2017) was then used to replicate each silhouette’s outline as a series (n > 1000) of XY coordinates starting from the tip, from which 60 equidistant landmarks were saved (Iovita and McPherron, 2011). Size variation between handaxe coordinates were removed with a 2D generalised procrustes analysis performed in PAST v.3 (Hammer et al. 2001). Detailed methodological information can be found in Clark (2023, preprint). For the EFA analysis, we restricted the artefact sample to five Acheulean sites from northern and central France, comprising six assemblages. This included Moulin Quignon (n = 5) (Antoine et al., 2019; Moncel et al., 2022a), Carrière Carpentier (n = 5) (Antoine et al., 2016), Saint-Pierre-Lès-Elbeuf (n = 30) (Cliquet et al., 2009; Leroyer and Cliquet, 2010), Saint-Acheul (n = 30) (Antoine and Limondin-Lozouet, 2004) and both the upper and lower levels from la Noira (n = 30 for both) (Moncel et al., 2013, 2016, 2020, 2022b). Note that the Saint-Acheul assemblage is the same one used in the Cartesian coordinate analyses, but the sample of individual handaxes varies. The majority of artefact data were derived from digital photos, with the exception of four of the five handaxes from Moulin Quignon, which were analysed from 2D images presented in Antoine et al. (2018).