Boyhood, initiation, homosexual behaviour and homosexuality in European Palaeolithic and Mesolithic

Introduction
This paper is the first in a row about boyhood, homosexual behaviour, homosexuality and homosexual boys in Europe. In this row, in which I am working from period to period, the next period will then the early Neolithic. My research will not pretending to be complete. I combine the boy-centred study of homosexual boys with Boyhood Studies because homosexual boys are just so normal boys as every other boy.

For the archaeology of childhood, it is now only 26 years ago that the study of children and youth in archaeology was started seriously. (Lillehammer 2015). For the study of the history of childhood in general, there is the “Journal of Children in the Past”, founded 2009 which is a very good sign.


Both journals are publishing by Berghahn Journals and are Peer-Reviewed.

Reading some general textbooks about the history of childhood (Ariès 2011, the German translation (17th edition) from Ariès1960, Krüger & Grunert 2010, Fass 2013, see references), most are stick by the Middle Ages. Only the Routledge Encyclopedi a (Fass 2013) goes as far as back to the classical Antiquity. But in all, nothing is to read about childhood and youth in other important cultures like the Vikings or the Celts.

The general bibliographical overview who goes most far back is the bibliography from Ville Vuolanto from the University of Tampere, 8th Edition Dec. 2016, who goes from 800 BC-800 AD. (See references).

Far more worse it is in my own research field of Boyhood Studies and the study of homosexual boys. As to my knowledge, an article from 1907(!) about boyhood in the time of Aristophanes, is going most far back (Bryant 1907).

There are a few more articles and textbooks, but in general I believe we can say that historical research within Boyhood Studies in at least very rare.

The same we can say about the historical research on the theme of homosexual boys. Did homosexual boys exist in the past? Yes, of course they did, but I have the feeling that this theme is widely ignored because it is nowadays, where we have on all concerning child- and youth-sexuality a social, moral and political panic, very controversial. There must be silence. Then what, for example, when scientists are pointing out that homosexual boys in the past and their modern counterparts did and do have consensual pederastic relationships? For this, more research is needed.

What is a Child?
When reading the UN-Children’s Right Convention (CRC) from 1989, all persons under the age of 18 years old are labelled as “Children” which is in full accordance the USA-Law. But no language is using the term “child” for boys and girls who have hit puberty. It was the Convention of the Rights of the Child of 1989 which first did away the distinction between children and adolescents and labelled all minors under 18 “child”. (Graupner 2005).

Cunningham is saying the same: “Puberty in nearly all societies is one of the markers of the end of childhood, and a change of this magnitude is likely to alter the contours of childhood”. (Cunningham 2006, p. 13) The average age for starting puberty by boys is anno 2016 around 12 years old. From then on, we are speaking about youth.
The main reason for this fact is the enormous influence from the USA in the drafting on the CRC. The USA initiated 7 Articles and influenced the textual editing of almost every article. The influence of the USA was so strong that some people referred to the Convention as the “U.S. child rights treaty”. (Cohen 2006, p. 190).

Until now, fall 2016, the USA has not made the ratification the CRC.

In for example, German laws, all persons under the age of 14 are labelled as “child” and from the age of 14 old on youth. In my research, at least for boys in our modern times, children are persons who are <12 years old, all persons from 12-18 years old are youth.

**Boy**
A **boy** is a male human person who is not an adult. When he becomes an adult, usually at the age of 18, he is a **man**.
The word “boy” is oft re-interpreted or misused. In the case of military, very oft is spoken about “our boys” in Anglo-American countries, in the Netherlands they say “Onze jongens”. This is a pertinent misuse from the word “boy” because we have here to do with persons from the age 18 and older. Only in the fall from child- and youth soldiers (which is a very serious problem), we can speak about “boys”.
In popular culture, we see a re-interpretation from the word “boy” in for example the term “Boy-band”. Most boy-band members are over the age of 18 and also young adults or adults, so we can here not speak about a “Boy band”. Bands as LFO and Backstreet Boys have disliked the term “Boy-band” and describe their selves as “male vocal group” (Backstreet Boys Interview 2007, see references).
There are not so much real “Boy bands” by my knowledge. One of the oldest I could found was the German Boy band “The Mini-beats” (According to the Boy Choir- and Soloist Directory, 1999-2002, see References by “The Mini-beats”).
Another, more recent Boy band is Stockwood (Stockwood, see references, video from 2007).
A fall apart is Libera from the UK which are all boys from the choir of St. Philips Church in Southwark, London. They labelled their self as “Boy band”, but I believe it is better here to speak from a “Boys Chamber Choir with performance”. (Libera, see references).
Another example from re-interpretation e.g. misuse from the word “boy”, in this case for pure commercial purposes, we see in the porno-industry, especially by gay-pornography. Here, young adults are labelled as “boy”.
Erotic or pornographic content with male persons under the age of 18 have the name “boy-erotica” e.g. “boy-pornography”. For content which contains adolescent boys, this is usually called “Jailbate”, in most cases 13 years and older. In German law, Jailbate falls under the correct term “Youth-pornography” which is the fall when the person is having the age from 14-17.
According to Bertha Mook, “Boys will we Boys” and never can be girls. A boy is mostly more masculine then girls and thinking and playing different then a girl. (Mook 2009, p. 109). Here is to make an exception for the sissy-boy which is a more feminine boy, for which belongs such to his own nature. This in contrast to the boys who have not from nature this feminine behaviour, but is more or less feminized through the influence on society from the (radical)feminist movement. This is also an unnatural social construct.

**Boyhood**
Childhood is a cultural construct (Kamp 2001, p. 3). Definitions of childhood have changed considerably over time, probably because of changes in economic organization, political climate and patterns of family organization. (Kamp 2001, p. 4)
More at once, one may read that boys in history did not have a boyhood (the same is valid for children and childhood in general), for example in the Middle Age. For the period here described, Spikins et al. are writing “...In some quarters it is still debated whether Neanderthal had a childhood at all” (Spikins et al. 2014, p. 111). But is this really so? Is it true that boys before that time were never alone with other boys without adults? In fact, we are projecting our modern view of boyhood on boys in history which is coming from the Enlightenment and mainly the ideas from the natural, innocent and sacrificed child and youth of Jean-Jacques Rousseau. In our western and modern society, we have the opinion that boys can only have a happy boyhood when they are separated from the adult society because the so called “innocence” of the boy must strictly and rigorous protected. This innocence may not come in danger.

The first people in Europe
The oldest found from hominids in Eurasia we can find on the edge of the continent in Dmanisi in Georgia around 1,7 million years ago who came from Africa. (Jochim, p. 35). Regarding to the written above it is to say that there is suggested that Homo erectus was not in fact an African species but evolved in Western Eurasia from the early human populations represented at Dmanisi, from there spreading east across Asia and south into East Africa. Human prehistory is not a series of high-impact dispersals from Africa but a complex interplay of populations of both continents. This is called the “Out of Asia”-model from who Robin Dennel is one of the architects and which model is formulated to a series of formal testable hypotheses:
1. Humans (including early Homo) left Africa around 1,8 million years BC.
2. Homo erectus originated in South-west Asia, which was a central area for the dispersal of hominins in Eurasia.
3. Hominin dispersals (and extinctions) in Eurasia during the early Pleistocene were primarily driven by climate change that was both long-term (glacial-interglacial cycles) and short-term (millennial-scale oscillations).
4. Dispersals into southern Europe were possible by the early Pleistocene (1,75 million years BC).
5. At least one hominin dispersal event into Europe led to a speciation event by 1,2 million years BC leading to Homo antecessor.
6. Sub-Saharan Africa was isolated from Eurasia after 0,8 million years BC because of the desert barrier between the Sahara and Arabia.
7. Homo heidelbergensis is primary a West Eurasian taxon that is absent from Africa and East-Asia.
8. The Acheulean in Europe (and possible India) was introduced from South-West Asia, not sub-Saharan Africa.
9. After Homo heidelbergensis dispersed into Europe, it replaced or may have interbred with some remnant populations of its own ancestor Homo antecessor. (Petitt & White 2012, p. 22, Dennel et al.2010, p. 439).

There is no evidence for sites above 40°N with little of no evidence north of the Alps. There is also no evidence for human settlement in Central Europe until 600.000 BC, Eastern Europe only insignificant incursions before this date and the same may be true for much of south west France. (Petitt & White 2012, p. 14).
All of the earliest European sites are situated within the Mediterranean belt (Petitt & White 2012, p. 13-14).
The first human skeletal on the continent of Europe are found in Atapuerca in northern Spain, dated 1.1 - 1.2 million years ago and in a nearly cave, Gran Dolina, human skeletal dated around 800,000 years ago, before the last magnetic reversal, were found. (Jochim, p. 36).

The first “Homo neanderthalensis” in Europe was recently found in Spain and lived around 430,000 years ago (Meyers et al, 2016), was reaching physical maturity at around 15 years and most died before the age of 40 years. 40% died between the age from 20-40 years. (Shipman 2004, p. 506-509). These hominids where all hunter-gatherers.

The tools in lower- and middle Palaeolithic, such as the hand-axe and chopper, were from stone, although bones were used as tool as well.

In the Upper Palaeolithic these tools became extended with tools from antler and ivory as found at Grotte du Renne (Jochim 2011, P. 77).

The first hominids in Greece and Italy
When there was a human colonization in later Lower Palaeolithic Greece, then it were probably very early Neanderthals and comes from the Petralona Cave in Northern Greece, probably 300,000 years ago (Bintliff 2012, p.30). More sure we can for the Mousterian populations were the oldest excavated levels are around 100,000 years ago as in the cave of Asprochaliko in Epirus. (Bintliff 2012, p.30). The most recent finds are from 2009 in the Plakias-area (southern Crete) from which in Table 1 the chronology after Strasser et al.is given:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Palaeolithic</th>
<th>Mesolithic</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Damnoni 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damnoni 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damnoni 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammoudi 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammoudi 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayios Pavlos 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayios Pavlos 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayios Pavlos 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schinaria 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schinaria 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schinaria 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schinaria 4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schinaria 5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schinaria 6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preveli 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preveli 2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preveli 3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preveli 6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preveli 7</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preveli 8</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kourtaliotis 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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For Italy, the claim for the earliest site with human occupation is Monte Poggiolo, situated between Bologna and Rimini. This site is dated at around 850,000 years ago. (Muttoni G et al. 2011, Abstract).

In Table 2, the lithic tools are given:

Table 2: Monte Poggiolo. Inventory of the lithic tools of the surface collection:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type List</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single scraper</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double scraper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transverse scraper</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abrupt retouched scraper</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scraper with bifacial retouch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endscraper</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturally backed knife</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raclette</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notch</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>30,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denticulate</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retouched flake</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-notched flake</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chopper/Chopping tool</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 394 99,7

Handaxes 2
Polyhedrons 2
Discoids 1
Utilized pebbles 4
Tested pebbles 605

TOTAL 1308

NOTE: Naturally backed tools, pebbles, choppers and chopping tools are not included when frequencies are calculated
After: Mussi, M, 2001, p. 21

According to Mussi, the real colonization of Italy was in the Middle Pleistocene (Mussi 2001, p. 55-99).
An extraordinary case in Mesolithic Italy in the Grotto del Romito, is the skeleton from a possible 17 year old boy who was suffered from chondrodystrophic dwarfism. The boy was 1-1,30 meter in height.

By the time the boy was expected to begin walking, he was unable to do it properly and his problems became more accentuated in the time and was not be able to hunt any sizeable animal. His group had to support him throughout his life as a permanently handicapped one. When the boy died, he was awarded the not very frequent distinction of a burial in a cave. The nearby occurrence of an engraved panel perhaps gives further ritual emphasis to the burial. The skeleton of the boy was found in the same grave as a much older woman tiny proportions (less then 1,50 meters in height). (Mussi 2001, p. 364-365).

**Children and youth in prehistoric society, some theory**

**Neglecting Children**

In my research, children- and youth studies, with a special focus on boyhood-studies, are full integrated.

Kathryn A. Kamp has written an article with the title "Where have all the Children gone?: The Archaeology of Childhood" with an under-chapter called “The child’s point of view”. (p. 23-24). (Kamp 2001)

For the neglecting from children in the archaeology, Coşkunsu is given different reasons:

1. The supposed intangible nature of childhood in the archaeological record and the a priori assumption that children lack easily recognizable archaeological correlates.
2. Conceptualisations that see children as socio-economically unimportant
3. Acceptance of a universal/stereotypical view of childhood
4. Gender biases
5. Cultural biases
6. The lack of substantial interdisciplinary collaborations of the subject.
   (Coşkunsu 2015, p. 4)

According to Ruthie, Svensson is suggesting that it is our modern view of children that they are neglected in the archaeology because children tend to be a hidden part of modern life, not central to most people’s daily experience. (Ruthie 2005, p. 116, Svensson 1993).

Spikins et al. Spikins is describing this as follows: “Neanderthal children rarely appear in our discussions of Neanderthal society despite making up a significant proportion of the population” (Spikins et al. 2014, p. 111).

The history of childhood and youth is beginning at the moment when the first children came on the world.

According tot Coşkunsu, it is known from historical and ethnographic accounts that children are significant actors in different arenas and often very important in the families and societies they lived in (Coşkunsu 2015, p. 5).
Methodology
Baxter has categorized the studies of archaeological childhood as follows:
1. Mortuary studies
2. Ethno-archaeological studies
3. Ethnographic studies e.g. historical studies for archaeological cases
4. Iconographic studies
5. Archaeological material studies (Lithics and Ceramics)
6. Studies of space and place. This category has following under-categorie:
   Physiological and cognitive development as primary way.
(Baxter 2015, p. 22)

Kathryn Kamp is advocating methodological rigour:
1. Every society has theories about children and childhood and the stages of children´s development. These notions, which I have termed the dominant discourse about are primarily the creation of adults; although children themselves may adopt parts of the dominant discourse about them and reject other parts.
2. In each society there is some attempt by adults to influence the lives of children. These efforts may be large and very structured, as with formal school systems, or slight very casual.
3. Children themselves have some agency, however, and they themselves do not only react to the intervention of adults, but also create their own cultural forms and traditions.
4. These previously enumerated conditions plus cultural circumstances lead to what might to be formed “modal” childhood, some generalized ideas of what childhood was like for the average child. This type of notion, while useful and probably unavoidable as an analytic and communicative device, needs to be approached with care, particularly in non-homogeneous societies such as highly stratified societies or those with multiple types of residential or subsistence patterns, where it is undoubtedly more accurate to speak of multiple childhood.
5. The life history of a particular child, recognizing that no individual lives an “average” life and that variation in experience is important.
6. Finally, the perspective of children themselves must acknowledged and separated from adult perspective.
(Kamp 2015, p. 41).

This child-centred methodology in the field of childhood-studies is in my opinion too, the right one. In my research I will speak about boy-centred methodology e.g. boyhood-studies.

In which societies prehistoric children were living in?
First we have to see in which societies in general palaeolithic and Mesolithic children were living in:

Table 3: The nomadic-style model of hunters and gatherers
Organizational base:
a. Open social structures where local groups are commonly associated with a geographical range.
b. Communication between groups takes the form of marriage alliances and visiting.
   The results in hunting groups consisting of several “bands” which are part of a larger linguistic and breeding community.
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c. The economic system is based on a core of common features:
- A home base.
- Division of labour where the males hunt and the females gather.
- The collected resources are shared.

Social system:
a. The prime necessity of mobility restricts personal possessions and material culture.
   This acts to maintain the egalitarian structure.
b. Food supply keeps the group small, frequently fewer the fifty persons, and
   population is redistributed between bands, thereby maintaining the effectiveness
   of units.
c. Intergroup relations through marriage and other means of alliance are the means
   by which shortfalls in resources are counteracted.
d. Exclusive rights to resources are uncommon.
e. The environment in the storehouse and food supplies are rare. This restricts the
   social use of food resources.
f. Visiting prevents any strong attachment to one area. Conflict within the groups is
   most commonly resolved by fission.

Bones
In Bilzingsleben, bones were found from which one was from a juvenile. The other bones
were from two adults. They lived around 370.000 years ago and belonged to Homo

Footprints
The first signs for the existence of living children are the footsteps in the caves as we for
example can see at two sites: Bahn & Vertut 1988, p.14 Niaux (Ariège) and Bahn &
Vertut 1988, p.15 (Réseaux (Ariège).
Most footprints are destroyed by some modern cave-explorers, but some recently founds
could be saved.
The footprints in Tuc d´Audoubert are from 5-6 kids between 11 and 16 years old. (Figure
1):
Figure 1: Children’s footsteps in the cave of Niaux (Ariège)
Photo: Jean Vertut in Bahn 1988

Hand-prints
For the second evidence for the existence of living children, the cave-visitor will see the different hand-prints. These hand-prints belongs already to the material culture of children, because it is a form of prehistoric art. An example of this hand-prints is given in figure 4 on p.14 from this paper.

Children in the prehistoric society
In what for society where prehistoric children and youth living?
Neanderthal including there children were living in groups from maximum up to 25 people on floor areas from 35-50 sq m. (Hayden 2012, p. 3). The climatic circumstances were very harsh.
Meat, fish and some vegan food, was what they were eating. For the vegan food see Hayden 2012, p.15. Research is suggesting that Neanderthal youth is arising adulthood around 15 years of age. This is somewhat faster then by modern humans. (Spikins et al. 2014, p.113).
Regarding the Mesolithic, interpersonal violence is well-documented for some regions and suggested an increasingly crowded and competitive social landscape (Jochim 2011, p. 148). It is unknown of children were using interpersonal violence too, with or without weapons. This will not say that children were having a harsh childhood, but rather a childhood lived in a harsh environment. Here is to make a critical distinction (Spikins et al, p. 113). For a body-trauma by children, there is only relatively slight evidence (Spikins et al., p. 114). For psychological traumata, we don’t know and can only guess as in the case of cannibalism from which it is possible that children and youth this have seen, but even that is totally unknown.

Archaeologists who have discussed Stone Age children have set three maxims in their interpretations:
1. Children are small
2. They want to play all the time
3. They have to learn a lot.

This is in practice meaning:
1. Children may heft left behind especially small things, for example miniature versions of everyday tools.
2. They may also have left behind toys, made either by themselves or their parents.
3. They may have left traces of the learning process that they went through.
(Stapert 2007, p. 17.)

Children and material culture
Derevenski is beginning here book and on the hand from 2 photos, questioning fundamental questions about the child and childhood in relation to material culture (Derevenski 2000, p. 5). These photos are to find on pages 3 and 4. See the link in the references by the book of Derevenski.
I am quoting here Derevenski:
"If being a child is constructed through material experience then, returning to the image of
the Afrikaner child with a gun, one is suddenly faced with a series of questions:
- She looks physiologically like a child, but is she a child?
- Are here experiences those of child?
- Does she have a childhood?
- Is she a child because she have no control over her actions and is being indoctrinated
  and manipulated?
The social and moral issues raised by this picture are paralleled by important questions
from an archaeological point of view:
- Given that the gun is clearly being used by the child and is part of her material culture, is
  it the a material culture of children?
- If so, does it also form a part of a material culture of childhood or does the weapon
  represent its loss?
- Is a toy gun the real material culture of children?
- Is it the material culture of childhood?
- Is there more then one way of being a child and more then one childhood, each of
  which are equally as valid, if perhaps not as pleasurable as another?"
( Derevenski 2000, p. 5)

The Afrikaner child is also learning to kill, but for example in Germany, schoolchildren in
secondary schools are visited in their classroom by the German Army (Bundeswehr)
because the Bundeswehr is asking for more people to come to them for a job a
professional soldier, the Bundeswehr is here preparing children to kill. Here, the
Bundeswehr is in fact asking in a more or less manipulative and/or indoctrinating art
“When you are 17 or 18, will you then learn how to kill people?”, even already on primary
schools (Kramer, Bernard in “TAZ” 27.08.2012).
When asking the young people themselves, most are not interested in the Bundeswehr
(Budweg, TAZ 29.07.2011)
For the boy with the toy gun in Derevenski on page we can say that already in prehistoric
times, children has weapons to play with.
For example, in the cemetry at La Tene 1 is in the burial of a child a spearhead found
(Champignon 1994, p. 148-149) which is mostly interpreted as a toy (Derevenski 2000, p.
7).
The questions from Derevenski are fundamental and very important.
To the material culture for the period in this paper belongs beside the hand-prints also the
little stone-tools who are made by flint-knapping

Learning
As our modern children, the children in this period as here described has to learn as well.
They has to learn social behaviour, but also how to make their own toys or little weapons.
The first tools by humans were found Ethiopian Rift Valley around 2.5 million years ago.
(Ambrose 2001, p. 1749). The next stage in human technology was around 1.6 million
years ago and is known as the Acheulian Industrial Complex and is associated with the
Hominids in this period manufactured bifaces and were in Europe found in north Wales
(Aldhous-Green 2001, p.114-119). Here we can see social learning in the form of imitation
by face-to-face interactions between individuals. (Porr 2005, p. 80).
From the Middle Palaeolithic on where the Neanderthal has replaced the Homo Erectus,
imitation was also the most important form of learning.
Most of the children who were learning, were probably boys and was mostly taught by fathers to their sons. Advanced Stone Age learners in flint knapping were aged over 9 or 10 years old, probably up to 14 or 15 years old, because to become a decent flint knapper, it takes years. (Stapert 2007, p.18).

Below: Figure 2: Sketch of how one might envisage a flint knapping learning session by a proficient knapper and a learner.


Younger children in the caves
In the case of younger children, there playing in the caves was accompanied and supported by adults or older adolescents. Most of the so called “finger-fluting is from these younger children. Finger-flutings are lines drawn in the soft clay or moonmilch in limestone caves. (van Gelder 2015). This activity found place sometime between 27,000 and 13,000 years ago and maybe it was a form of ancient finger-painting. (Bower 2007, p. 265). An example of finger-fluting is given in figure 3
Older and adolescent boys in the caves
The caves were not only a place for children to take from time to time distance from the adults (Kamp 2015, p. ), but were also an ideal place to play, especially for adolescent boys who were at times joined by female peers and children. (Bower 2007, p. 245).

There are different caves who are discovered and explored by boys from our modern times. According to Guthrie, here a given a few examples.

- 1895. The La Mouthe cave in the Dèzère Valley. Discovered by neighbourhood boys where they found pictures on the walls and ceilings.
- 1914. The cave of Les Trois Trères. Dis covered by three young brothers where they found Palaeolithic art.
- 1922: The cave with the drawings at Pech-Merle is discovered by two boys from 15 and 16 years old.
- 1940. The Lascaux cave. Discovered by a group from 3 teenage boys where they found paintings.
- 1969. Ekain (Spain). Discovered by teenage boys where they found perhaps the best Palaeolithic art in Spain.

Other examples without date:
The art images in Fount de Gaume were well known by the boys from Les Eyzies. The same is the fall for the art in Niaux by Alliat boys and La Baume Latrone and Bayol in Gard were also first discovered by young boys.

(Guthrie 2005, p.193). For both, children and adolescents we can say that the caves were also a secret and special place were they got more autonomy because there were no adults.

(Kamp 2015, p.46).

**Handprints as Palaeolithic arte**
Most of the hand-prints in European caves is made by adolescent boys. To point this out, Guthrie has done forensic research. The results from this research are given in Table 4:

**Table 4:**
- 60% = 12-14yo males
- 20% = 14-16yo males
- 10% = 17-18yo males

(Guthrie 2005, p.470, for whole discussion see Guthrie 2005, p. 464-470).

Why are almost more boys as girls playing in the caves?
On ground from hormonal and thus on biological e.g. natural differences and influences are boys taking more risk and are more “in” for adventure then girls. This is in line with the conclusion from Bertha Mook.
For discussion on this theme see Guthrie 2005, p. 168 ff.
An example of Hand-prints, you can see in Figure 4:
Figure 4: Hand-prints in the Chauvet Cave (France). The material they used was pigment.

Portraits
Guthrie is suggesting that the portraits in the cave from La Marche are portraits from Palaeolithic boys in the form of several faces of single boys, 2 images of 2 boys and 4 images of which of which 4 boys are portrayed together. (Guthrie 2005, p. 196).

Erotic art, made by boys
Of course, Pleistocene boys did not read erotic magazines, were not watching erotic movies and were not visiting erotic websites. They made the erotic art by themselves in the form of paintings. This is, seen from the point of view from natural history and the natural behaviour from adolescent boys, not a surprise. This erotic art contains erotic woman, butts, vulva’s and erect penises. Most of this art is hairless. The suggestion of Guthrie that the boys during or after making this art where talking about sex, seems tome me a valid argument. (Guthrie 2005, p. 191). I will go a step further and would suggest that the boys in that time where not only talking about sex, but also doing some sex, perhaps in the form of individual or mutual masturbation. I don’t see why Palaeolithic boys in such things from boys in later times. In my opinion, boys have done such things al the times and all over the world. This is the homosexual behaviour in which boys are making sexual experiences.
Cannibalism by Neanderthal man in relation to initiation-rites
Is there a relation between cannibalism and initiations-rites as some scholars are suggesting?
The anthropologist Weston La Barre argues that the semen-like marrow (muelos) in the bones is believed the source of semen and that the muelosmarrow in the brain is the major repository of semen. (LaBarre 1987, p. 3). On this basis he is concluding that head-hunting and then eating the brain is for the acquisition of male fertility for which I could not find any support. (LaBarre, p. 14 & 34). The counterargument from Greenberg is that there are doubts that the male role in paternity had been discovered so early and if not, the theory from La Barre is probably false. (Greenberg 1988, p. 33-34). For the eating of the brain, La Barre becomes support from Schutz (Schutz 1983, p. 29-30).
More recent research (DeFleur 1999) is indicating that cannibalism and possible eating of the brain was a part of Neanderthal behaviour, but not for the reason La Barre is giving. It seems that cannibalism was be done to become a source of meat and marrow. For that fact there is, Jochim is suggesting, the following evidence:
1. The human bones were found scattered among the bones of other animals, in generally the same location.
2. The bones bore cut marks in locations appropriate for the removal of meat or tendons.
3. The pattern of cut-mark location mirrored that found on deer bones.
4. Many of the bones, both human and deer, were broken in such a way that the marrow or brains were exposed.
5. There was evidence of impact points at many of the breaks, indicating single, sharp blows rather then diffuse crushing pressure.
(Jochim 2011, p. 58)
In contrast to Jochim and DeFleur, Spikins et al. is suggesting that cannibalism largely restricted to the Quinea Mousterian tradition and that this pattern has a cultural rather then nutritional motivations. (Spikins 2014, p. 116).
The psychological impacts for Neanderthal people in the case of cannibalism, especially the psychological impacts children for so far they are witnesses or heard from it, are totally unknown and to my knowledge, not any research done.
Initiation
The discussion about initiation in European prehistory is not easy. For example, LaBarre is suggesting that there is even evidence for puberty rituals in Montespan (LaBarre, p. 35), Taylor is suggesting that the caves where used for initiation and only for boys. (Taylor, p. 117).
According to more recent studies, as for example from Paul Bahn, there seems no evidence that initiation rituals are done in the Pleistocene. The footprints in the Montespan-cave are probably from a girl from 6-8 years old, which is much too young for initiation. (Bahn 2015, p. 176).
Homosexuality
For homosexuality in the way we as modern people are understanding this and after reading the book of Price (Price 2001) it seems that there is no archaeological evidence. The chance there will be find any evidence for homosexuality in the Pleistocene, is in my opinion very, very small. At that harsh times, the survey of the species was overruling all other behaviour.
Conclusion
Children and youth are existing since there are human beings. The social life of children and youth in the prehistory is long time widely neglected in the field of history of children and youth in general and in archaeology especially for which Coskunsu have give some reasons. For this research Baxter and Kamp have set-up some theoretical standards. For Italy and Greece it may clear that people where living in these countries long before the Antiquity and are also the original population. Children and youth in prehistory have left their marks in the form of paintings and possible in the form of little toys too. They were part of social life, but did also have their own secret places.
The learn-process was mostly done by imitation and learning by playing which was important for the social behaviour. Adolescent boys where making erotic images in the form of vulvas and naked women which was leading to talking about sex and homosexual behaviour. Homosexuality as we understand it, did not exist.
For more research in the case of childhood and youth e.g. boyhood in prehistory is calling.
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