

Introduction (English) from: Von der Höhlenmalerei zur Hochkultur am Göbekli Tepe, zur Soziologie früherer Gemeinschaften, der Kognition und der Geschlechter im Jung-Paläolithikum

Hennings, Lars

Postprint / Postprint

Sonstiges / other

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Hennings, L. (2016). *Introduction (English) from: Von der Höhlenmalerei zur Hochkultur am Göbekli Tepe, zur Soziologie früherer Gemeinschaften, der Kognition und der Geschlechter im Jung-Paläolithikum.* <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-49798-4>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer Basic Digital Peer Publishing-Lizenz zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den DiPP-Lizenzen finden Sie hier: <http://www.dipp.nrw.de/lizenzen/dppl/service/dppl/>

Terms of use:

This document is made available under a Basic Digital Peer Publishing Licence. For more information see: <http://www.dipp.nrw.de/lizenzen/dppl/service/dppl/>

Introduction (English)

From: *Von der Höhlenmalerei zur Hochkultur am Göbekli Tepe, zur Soziologie früherer Gemeinschaften, der Kognition und der Geschlechter im Jung-Paläolithikum*, by Lars Hennings (post@LarsHennings.de)

Beside the biological development of the modern humans their thinking and their logic come into being in a *separate* process. A special innovation arises at the beginning of *Upper-Paleolithic* 40,000 years ago, when *Homo sapiens* reached western Eurasia: in those days a red painted spot on Monte Castillo in Spain already refers to the starting ability of cave painting. 3,000 years younger is the image of a half carcass of a cattle which was found on an overhanging rock in France, the Abri Castanet. Simultaneously carved figures and flutes with several tone holes were produced in the Swabian Alps, Germany. From 32,000 years ago the first simple images originate in the French cave Chauvet: a rhinoceros. Later therein were further elaborated paintings made. These early *reconstructions* of the environment show a new level of *communication*, but as other archeological findings show, it doesn't require a pronounced grammatical speech-language. Origin signs, gestures and only first words that were *learnt* were enough to communicate. This is the starting point argument.

Till today this era, that was replaced after 30,000 years by the farming production way, count as the time of almost of the same "hunter and gatherer" [normally masculine terms are taken into consideration]. But even though we know about the start of the construction of larger settlements from about 20,000 years ago. And 1,500 years before the emergence of agriculture such *sedentary living foragers* built a huge stone monument, the *Göbekli Tepe* (near Şanlıurfa, Turkey). This does not arise unexpected, but in a comprehensible process of cognition.

In easy words and quite illustratively here the Upper-Paleolithic is interdisciplinary analysed from a *sociological* point of view and the subject shall be integrated in social sciences. It deals with the uninhibited attempt of a new perspective on the origins of the culture and of the social, here and there somehow speculative, but ultimately strictly *empirical*, following provable facts. In doing so the basics of the faculties, I based this study on, are

explained to allow anyone to a first discussion that is understandable without any appropriate training. As a result, a significant *social change* is already visible in the early time of forager in Eurasia. The emphasis is on the process of the mind, the cognition, while thinking, logic and communication are not yet adequately considered.

It is only about 200,000 years ago that *Homo sapiens* starts to develop in Africa as a new species to which all human beings belong to today. From 50,000 years onward they had expanded their gathering and hunting grounds gradually to Eurasia. And the *early human*, *Homo erectus*, either *neanderthalensis* or *pekinensis*, died out. Two opposing evaluations were characteristic of the cognition of our species 40,000 years ago in Western Europe:

On *one hand*, the capabilities to create *images*, *sculptures* and *music* offer new intellectual possibilities and new expressions that are to be interpreted as development of intellectual *reflection* too. With the speech-language the cognitive „instruments“ are completed soon. This way allows the permanent growth of competence in the following millennia up to *today*, as much as the environment requires it. In the relatively favorable climate of western Eurasia a *culture* was shaped, a culture whose practice goes far beyond only getting food. It was probably a denser population, and intensive contacts stimulate social skills.

On the *other hand* for the beginning of this new era a very simple mind was enough, we find it hard to imagine today, but at that time only other simple artifacts made out of stone, bone or ivory express that. We have to imagine those *adults* in their spiritual and logical development from animal to man lived still in an early stage of cognition, alternatively at the children state. I suggest the first phase of my investigation to clarify the social processes to see as (ideal-) type of „five-years“. We talk about the very first creation of cognition and language!

In order to get into these thesis, here the central research question: what were those people able to do or *at least*, what was really in any case *necessary* to create the findings presented by archeology?

At the *beginning* of the period far less of what has usually been thought today! This goes with recognizing that early humans (*Homo erectus*...) had a

diminished cognition, as it is often, if not generally done; but without any proof. Though at the *end* of Upper-Paleolithic these foragers already knew significantly more than the following farming communities. This is demonstrated not only with the monuments from Göbekli Tepe, whose pillar shape may be read as a *phallic*, as a sign of male power, as deified Council of Great Men. I speak about this community as an exploitative „high culture“ of foragers. Together with the speech-language, the new *logical* form of thinking existed apparently till the stadium of the Sumerian large cities thousands of years later, when a more extensive stage of cognition was developed! These stages have just to be formulated consistently by Sciences.

There are several empirical findings, to which greater significance is attributed than today. Examples:

First, the archaeological excavations from about 20,000 years already show a relatively extensive settlement construction as a social *type* of early *sedentary life*, which is usually first seen in rural villages 10,000 years later. In archeology it is named the „*complex hunter-gatherer*“, but generally not seen as a central subject. But in this interpretation the enormous social movement force is little considered, which is expressed through the more reflective *social behavior* and the necessary enhanced thinking in larger communities of „families“ living together.

Second, in these larger settlements where sedentary people live at least seasonally we not only recognize the *need* of creating a speech-language. Rather, it slowly formed the constraints, to define the edge of settlements and to consensually define areas for different groups/ families for *gathering*; the vicinity of a fixed center becomes too small for obtaining food hourly or daily; as a model of thinking: the „slices of the pie“ of the surrounding land got steadily narrower. To keep peace in the region and to secure it institutionally a new organization of life is required. Probably later this is one of the causes of agriculture.

Third, graves of 24,000 years ago were already decorated with approximately very much pearls. In Sunghir in Russia one tomb that belonged to an important man was discovered and then another one of decorated children in the same place and a third one of a child in Italy. This shows initial indications of *social stratification*, because children

could not acquire social status. This happened again recently in Spain, where a relatively complex equipped grave of a woman is found, who is called „Red Lady“, 18,700 years old.

Fourth, the new dating exams of a wooden male sculpture shows that it is 11,000 years old, older than originally thought, it is five-meter-high and it comes from the area around the southern Urals. It reveals that in northeast Eurasia a broad culture of forager already existed too; but this work has not reached the unique shape of Göbekli Tepe, it remembers with its simple facial features the older „lion man“ of the Swabian Alps. And just a stone sculpture, two meters tall, that was found during construction work in Şanlıurfa, is believed to be created in the „city“ of the builders of Göbekli Tepe.

Fifth, it should be taken into account that 1,000 years after the start of construction of Göbekli Tepe this community of worship builds once more a new settlement: Nevalı Çori. Within reach and during this same period of time a settlement and later the mighty tower of Jericho are built too. In Eurasia there were more advanced cultures who have already been crosslinked. That period has been underestimated for long enough!

Thus the *transition* towards the Upper-Paleolithic shows a qualitative cognitive upheaval. And it becomes clear, people do not only always acquire more knowledge, but it is more important the historical change of the way of thinking. Acquiring the ability to make sculpture, music and painting, or (somewhat ironically) summarized: „*artistic*“ presentation is primarily an extension of the *logic* that is not recognized either in earlier human species or in Homo sapiens before arriving to Eurasia in their up resembling findings. The speech-language builds up on top of it. However all remains quite unconscious, naturalist developed new skill. As it is likewise in growing kids.

It is not just meant the everyday *logic*, searching for something that is lost or for the cause of a simple event, but it comes up that way of thinking which slowly develops into an understanding of the world; much later it is called: is the earth flat or round? In this particular sense the logic applies to the historically changeable basic categories of our thinking as we understand it: *time, space, matter* and especially *causality* (doing - effect). This qualitatively new but still rudimentary learning grows in the Upper-Paleolithic! There are

only written sources from the ancient Mesopotamia and Egypt, and we know this mythical causal notions analogously from reports of forager and of simple horticultural people still at the beginning of the 20th century: *everything* in the world is *produced* by subjectively acting spirit and moved by ghosts – except the creators themselves. With our logic, this causality is incomprehensible.

But even these mystified ideas had to be learned once in the past time. Therefore it can be assumed that this acting fantasy creatures only had been *felt* in the early days of the mind as nameless forces with no alternative way, as we know it in children's development. From simple pre-animistic conceptions – it may be said, without coming back to old theories – the recognition process led to the defined religion at Göbekli Tepe. Their expressly *male* leaded stone God figures are directed apparently already against women. And this pantheon has similarities with Sumer and even with ancient Greece.

Especially the development of cognition needs to be analyzed, in order to understand the anthropogenesis. Today, after decryption of *postnatal* ontogenesis, we recognize the related process of ontogeny and phylogeny as an *empirical fact*, when the former is the *primary* motive force, and both litigate differently: as an early individual learning still in the biological context of logical stages and following this as social action in the historical process. The cognitive development proceeds as for *today's* children, simply said: point out > gestures > speech-language to reach the early development of the *self* in four to *five year* old children! This could not have been from the beginning. The relationship of ontogeny and phylogeny we see particularly clearly in the pre- and early history in the simple tools of simple people, as it is to be discussed below. But what the *individuals* of the respective elites do not understand or can not be produced as new tools that can not be the basis for ideas and for group/ community/ society actions, even if there are synergistic effects. Sociology starts from this point in considering the individual, without taking into account to psychology, even we will have to talk about psychology intensively.

The postnatal ontogenesis is predetermined by the brain structure. Only in a specific order/ stadium increasingly complex cognitive skills can be acquired in the first years of life. But after a few weeks of life the first reflexes are

supplemented by *acquired* skills and instincts are replaced. Soon the sociality defines primary individual life and history, already early everything is determined by the patriarchal *power* acting; even if that would be „biologically“ pre-embossed, it has now to be implemented into the sociality. Children *construct* their environment in an active acquisition process of thinking, whether in forager camps, in farming communities, in the cities of antiquity, or today.

Thinking and logic can be opened up much more for that early time by the social sciences on the empirically based knowledge of archeology and its auxiliary disciplines, grounded to a total of *natural science*, as it seems possible at first glance. My work is founded - that may be again emphasized - on the sociological *basic thesis*:

Just as every child of *Homo sapiens* *always* and *everywhere* in the ontogeny of his early years in *structurally* the same episode acquires a *cognitive basis* for a wider range of learning, so could the animal-human transition and then the beginning of the human phylogeny and the structures of groups, communities and societies develop only following this pattern, whose realities are ever based on the individual human mind. Only on this basis we can understand how *social change* and *reflexive meaning/sense*, or a „free“ thinking as more than instincts, could have been brought to the world by the people, first it corresponds to a form of cognition, that is not today standards, but to a *traditional* logic that is decrypted below.

The cultural development of *Homo sapiens*, after its formation until about 200,000 years ago in Africa, develops faster and faster from the Upper-Paleolithic and it is *no* longer to be explained biologically; for a process by Darwin's natural selection this time was too short. A species, as the biology tells us, stays largely unchanged within the typical genetic variability (skin color, eye shape, figure ...), otherwise we have a new species to define [according to the new field of Epigenetic this point of view may change and an epigenetic variability seems to be possible too]. So the intellectual capacity of *sapiens* is always applied biologically, and on top of this it is built our historically competence and the special *ability to learn*, which we continue to develop till today. Nobody assumes that the enormous learning progress since

the mid-19th century was genetic, caused by mutations, as in previous times the becoming of Homo sapiens from the first primates. Therefore, the social science today is able to analyze the development of humans more extensively than it is possible by the (1) biological theory of evolution, by the (2) outdated notion of social evolution of the 19th century or by the (3) simple learning theory of the 20th century.

With the help of the drawing and image analysis, we now recognize that, for example, the cave painting could have been made with still relatively low cognition. In the structural *scheme* of the lines it is like a „children's drawing“, which were, however, carried out by fine-motor experienced *adults*. Therefore, it is no longer to be spoken of an already significant and conscious „art“ and of the early painted caves as „sanctuaries“ that hardly could have been *thought* in that first time of Upper-Paleolithic. This is certainly the case if it should be formulated for better understanding with clear definitions in order to make a difference to the contemporary art and the (conscious) *symbology*.

I suggest sociological *theses*, certainly. They should make the early period sociologically tangible and help to explain more than before. My interdisciplinary study is based – let's reiterate – on the *empirical* findings and knowledge of archeology and its auxiliary compartments. Also in the social sciences I build on approved theories and knowledge (Lévy-Bruhl; Frankfort et al; Piaget; Hallpike; Affentranger; Tomasello; Bischof-Köhler; Berger/Luckmann; and especially Dux; out of those writings I won more than below as it can be shown in quotes). Three distinct phases are proven (ideal-) types of social change during the Upper-Paleolithic, long *before* the development of agriculture:

A *first* special type, not the overall development, came up in Western Europe creating the „artistic presentation“ by Homo sapiens, which is different from the previous time. Did this *Older foragers* already think of the *foundation* of the world? Did they need more than a sign language supplemented by learned words? Rather not. Nevertheless, such learned words could have been used in addition to the paintings as a sign.

A *second* type originates from more than 20,000 years ago, in this time large settlements were established: at least now the *Younger foragers* live

sedentary as a type! In narrow villages a new social behavior needed to come up to hold peace under the emotional fast violent men and the cognition must have been further developed.

And a *third* special type is marked by the stone monuments in Near East, which only – always by foragers – through a *Social-differentiated Community* could be both *ideologically* conceived and technically *planned* and built. This community was in the making after the rapid heating phase on factual end of the *ice age* and the change of the natural basics of getting food. During the first time of the construction of Göbekli Tepe there was again a short cooling phase (Younger Dryas), which may have increased the confusion about the weather goddesses. These challenges forced to look for entirely new answers and to rethink and to speak more grammatically precisely in a narrative form! This could only be done further in the context of religiosity, as the now defined religion seems to be expressed in Göbekli Tepe. The analysis of social behavior in larger settlements of foragers shows that agriculture is not to be seen as the „real“ beginning of human *culture*. Forager created it.

The ability of „artistic“ *presentation* required long before a new biological basis for Homo sapiens. Our species perhaps was *stabilized* in the Darwinian sense after its genetic differentiation of Homo erectus about 150,000 years ago or even later as a new biological species, so far in line with the theory of evolution. In opposition to early hominids further learning ability obviously came up with a *mutative* modification of the frontal lobes of the brain, especially on the *Prefrontal cortex* behind the high forehead, featuring only Homo sapiens; that is the place of social coordination. New skills of communication allowed to *paint* objects into the ground, on walls or in the air as supplement of expression; analogous to the process in toddlers who have already learned a lot, as pointing and gestures, before they begin to speak – in today full linguistic environment. Children are often asked about their drawings [in psychology tests]! The reproduction of real things as images is as *imitation* of an elementary capability of learning, as we do see later.

In case of meetings of different groups, still in unconsolidated understanding ways, as it is easy to imagine in the landscapes in western Europe, the *gesture* is already the first choice – as it is today in a holiday

country. Among other things from here the pictorial representation could develop, then the gesture expressed intensity while slowly a more complex speech-language occurs. More was not needed for the simple life in Eurasia, if for instance with only two lines horn and back line of a newly spotted cattle or rhinoceros could be painted in the air, even silently while hunting. The carved flutes with several tone holes simultaneously reveal sound training for calling and singing.

The processes of cognition therefore were still in their *first* coming out. Between the groups and the communities there was hardly a regionally standardized way of life and little *formal* institutionalizations. They emerged mandatory only when living together closer in expanding settlements and between permanent neighborhoods when much more intense arrangements and rules were needed than before at meetings of small groups in the wild. But at the end of Upper-Paleolithic the people often lived in large settlements, they had their cognition, logic and speech-language trained enough to create in the Near East that first – still foraging – *high culture* with social differentiation and the first economic division of labor, for which wild cereals were already an important food as it was found in several mortarium.

In view of climate change the long experience with stone housing projects made it possible for the Göbekli Tepe community to build the mighty monuments whose building concepts are round huts in a larger scale. Both in the centers of these buildings *male* gods were erected from stone blocks which were carved on all sides and were weighting about ten tons. Probably these central pillars and the ones in the circle they support no roof but perhaps they should support the now clouded sky and help to secure the drastically changing basic food (like myths of Sumer may suggest). Long before the nominal start of farming a *spiritual center* was raised there – may be an *oracle*, I imagine – to find and disseminate help for a large networked region in a council of 14 or 15 gods and goddesses which stands for each individual monument. Without widely differentiated speech-language that was not going to be possible.

Under the explicit male upper-gods and their priests regime, women were apparently already institutionally set back; this is the first sense of religions as already some early myths tell us, as we still see. Residences of the people

from Göbekli Tepe have not been found, they may be hidden in the not excavated part of the tepe/ debris hill. However, similar settlements in spatial and temporal proximity are known. The required processes for building these monuments point out, in several ways, that they grow up in a socially well differentiated community. It became necessary to have a comprehensible formal *institutionalization*, as for instance previously, only felt ties were perceived in the maternal line, in order to construct a patriarchal kinship now. In larger settlements new manners between „family groups“ are needed and trained. So influences and alliances become important, and that generally determines the men who are in charge of the „outside“.

With the unconscious processes of everyday *power* communities get differentiated and become institutionalized. Soon there are Great Men, tribal councils or perhaps chiefs with sole leadership of different social roles in which already appears division of labor. This community at Göbekli Tepe apparently is now distinguished into two upper-gods. Are secular and religious areas symbolized? Or joined two empires? Among other things, it comes in the pacification of larger social units about being able to *contain* libel and vendetta, which does not exist in the animal field, whose emotional foundations had to be converted or constructed socially, as well as the *sense* of worship or ritual, like children see it with their parents and take „the mother's milk“. Also psyche and emotions of those people became more differentiated. (thx)