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I. ABSTRACT

This study deals with various ways of defining the identities of children and young individuals found in Neolithic inhumation burials in southern Sweden, with the help of age categories and without using them as an opposite to adults. And, young people do exist in the burial material, and can be uncovered in our theories and interpretations; a change of perspective might be all that we need. Interpreting identities of individuals through their burial situation is difficult, and ultimately comes down to interpretation, but more important is that we actually try to interpret! The material is vast and the study of children in the past is still in its cradle, so to speak.
II. PREFACE

Children. They are all around us, both in the past and in the present. They have always existed and always will, as long as humanity. But the definitions of whom they are changes throughout time and how they are perceived fluctuates. If we ask ourselves how we define children of today, the answers might be quite simple; those individuals who are under a certain age, and who are legally deemed as dependent on other people who are above that age-limit. But glancing at the Neolithic times we can not be certain that people then felt the same, or used the similar age-related classifications. Most likely there were some variations. Children as a social category are interesting, because ‘we’, adults in the modern world, tend to see them separate from ourselves, even though we have all been there; younger and shorter...

Children as a category are sometimes overlooked or deemed invisible in theoretical archaeological approaches, often because of the lack of good material. But they existed. They helped form the past, the present and the future. But who were they?

III. CENTRAL ISSUES

Ways of defining the child

What and who is a child and what other factors play a role in these definitions other than biological and osteological ones? This is a very central question for me; as ultimately I feel it is possible for a child to be perceived differently by his/ her society, alternatively perceive each other, regardless if they are of the same biological age. A person can be considered an ‘adult’ in one society and a ‘child’ in another, but does this manifest in the burials? How are age and other classifications determined and defined?

How do we locate the identity of the child in the past?

The children in the past were perhaps very similar to us, but it is still hard to make a mental image of them, as it comes natural to think of people far back in time as living a very different life to ourselves. Can we identify differences/ similarities between the burials, both in terms of the individual and as a group, within various categories?

I want to find out how material culture can help us define Neolithic children and their identity and role in their own society, what the grave goods (or lack thereof) can tell us, and what information the
level of decomposition and placement of the body can give us. The social categories will be put in relation to the biological and osteological ones. How do they differ, how can they work together? Only young individuals between the ages of 0 to 20 are being used in my study, why is explained below.

IV. PURPOSES & DEMARCATIONS

The discussion on the definitions of a child and the overall social and cultural context could perhaps be taken to enormous lengths. I have chosen to centre on human individuals whose bones have been osteologically or biologically interpreted as belonging to individuals who died at age 0-20 years. Later I will define classifications for this group that in itself contains several groups.

I am limiting my discussion to non-megalithic inhumation burials in Scandinavia during the Neolithic. The megalithic findings can not be deemed as a good foundation for my research, as many of them have been interpreted as ‘non-intact’ (the chambers were often reused during long periods of time, and also disturbed, both in their time and later).

I want to put a strong emphasis on the ‘child’ her/him-self, as opposed to just comparing them to the adults of their own time, or referring to them as ‘inferior’ or less than an adult person. I do not wish to interpret the children completely in relation to the adults, as my main objective is to focus on their identity as much as possible. There is naturally a contrast between children and adults, but is it possibly determined by cultural tradition rather than age? We need osteological analysis of skeletal material, to define someone’s biological age. But the biological age might not coincide with the social, and it becomes difficult to use osteological methods alone, when we interpret who is a child or an adult (Kanvall 1995:9). According to Petra Kanvall, the potential of the archaeological material can be expanded if the children are seen from a holistic perspective. Children are children because their adult surroundings says so (Andersson et al 1995:29), and analysing the child’s self-image in the world they lived in, will give us an idea of the adults’ interest in the child and how this affected the child (Kanvall 1995:29).

I am going to discuss the burials, and attempt to focus on the young individuals that they contain, and make comparisons between them, to try and unfold other classifications than that which is the opposite of adulthood. Hopefully I will be closer to the children in the past at the end of this, as my goal is to sever the distance that stands between us and them.
V. METHODS & MATERIAL

The method used here is an initial discussion about children in archaeology and the presence of age structuring principles in societies. I will be looking at biological, social and material ways of determining various categories for individuals aged 0 to 20 years. I have chosen written material based on excavations of burials mainly around southern Sweden, and where the burials have been interpreted as stemming from the Neolithic era. I intend to put social and other categories against each other to bring the understanding of the individual in the past closer to the present. I will be searching for common denominators between the geographical areas and the individuals. A micro as well as a macro-perspective will be used, as I am looking for common denominators at the same time as patterns that display the possibility of individualistic behaviour as well as group connections. To accomplish this I have combined a quantitative and qualitative method; I want to home in on a different point of view, rather than fully explore every issue. My intention is not to criticise previous research, although I feel there is a lack of perspective when it comes to the younger individuals in prehistoric societies. Especially as young people are most often discussed in a child vs. adult context. My relative point of view is that our conceptions and behaviour are to a certain degree decided and affected by our cultural environment, although not exclusively. There should be room for individualistic personal identity as well as a cultural and psychological one.

Photographs and illustrations of the burials will be studied, as I aim to draw my own conclusions, as well as descriptions of finds and other significant markers of identity, such as interment and position of the deceased individual. Unfortunately I will not have the possibility to examine the actual burials myself, or the osteological material. In figure 1 & 2 the different dating of the sites and cultures can be seen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE NAME</th>
<th>DATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIVIDE</td>
<td>EN-MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BORGEBY</td>
<td>MNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRE / HANGVAR</td>
<td>MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KASTANJEGÅRDEN</td>
<td>MNB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISBY</td>
<td>MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VÄSTERBJERS</td>
<td>MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LILLA BEDINGE</td>
<td>LN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OXIE</td>
<td>LN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLÄBORG</td>
<td>LN-EBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME PERIOD</th>
<th>CULTURE</th>
<th>DATING C 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EARLY NEOLITHIC</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>FINE BEAKER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE NEOLITHIC</td>
<td>MN A</td>
<td>FINE BEAKER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATE NEOLITHIC</td>
<td>LN</td>
<td>BATTLE AXE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARLY BRONZE AGE</td>
<td>EBA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 & 2: Dating of cultures and sites
My material consists of non-megalithic and mostly ground or below ground-level graves in southern Sweden that contain skeletal remains from individuals interpreted to be under 20 years of age (osteologically), e.g. inhumation burials, and dated to the Neolithic, or 4100-1700 BC (Burenhult 1999). I have avoided burials that do not contain any skeletal remains at all, as this poses too great a problem of interpretation. This includes some of the burials at Borgeby, all of which have been interpreted as belonging to individuals between the ages of 0-20, but some of them are empty, none contain any actual bones, but teeth. If there is no evidence of an individual, I find they can not help me in my research. The culture groups included during this period are: funnel beaker, pitted ware, battleaxe and late Neolithic (FB, PW, BAX, and LN). The locations where I have found such burials are; the island of Gotland; Ajvide, Västerbjer, Ire/Hangvar and Visby, mainland Sweden; Borgeby, Kastanjegården, Oxie, Gläborg-Rabbalshede and Lilla Bedinge.

VI. RESEARCH HISTORY – children in archaeology

An energetic debate on gender and the construction of it has been going on within archaeology since the 1980’s. Mainly in sociology and anthropology the topic has been much debated, but the discussion within archaeology is becoming increasingly more evident, and in comparison it is rather young in this field (Fahlander 2005:1). Many archaeologists have realized the importance of such a debate in their own subject. A lively debate was well underway in the early 1980’s, but not thoroughly recognized, due to the fact that it was in Norway (Hodder 1997: 75). By this I think he means that the discussion mainly happened in Norwegian, and was therefore unavailable to researchers outside the country. The archaeologist Grete Lillemhammer (Lillemhammer 1986, 2000) has now produced quite a few works where she discusses the need for a strong debate on gender, and she focuses on the children in her research.

An issue within the gender field is that the meaning of the word ‘gender’ is ambiguous. ‘Gender’ is often referred to as the sex of an individual or a way to group someone. Because gender can mean so much more than the sex, it is a categorisation and a classification of humans. It implies that someone belongs to a certain sex, age or other ‘group’, such as hermaphrodite, someone who is gender-ambiguous due to physical or mental differentiations. In the Swedish language we have the word ‘genus’ which means gender, but this is directly separated from the word for sex, which is ‘kön’. This can be helpful for works written in Swedish, but not in English, where the word gender can mean more than one thing (Arwill-Nordbladh 2001:29).

In the recent decade quite a few important studies have been published; Scott 1999(*The Archaeology of Infancy and Infant death*), where she discusses the need to identify the essence of topics such as
mothering, the birthing event and materiality in archaeology. She feels this starting point in life has been given little attention, compared to its end. Scott and Moore (1997) collects important articles about children in archaeology in *Invisible People and Processes*, writing *gender and childhood into European archaeology*, as does Sofaaer Derevenski (*Children and Material Culture* 2000), Ingvarsson-Sundström (2003) wrote *Children Lost and Found - A bio-archaeological study of middle Helladic children...*, which is a case study that combines many general issues concerning the lack of varying perspectives on children in archaeology. She uses osteology as a firm base to discuss the biological and psychological factors that are the basis for how we determine people’s development.

There is also *Hide and seek – the archaeology of childhood* (Wileman 2005) and *Arkeologi om Barn* (Archaeology about children), which is edited by Johnsen & Welinder in 1995, and a good, recent study of the subject in Sweden, and consists of a series of articles by mainly archaeologists and students in the subject. It deals with the definitions and limitations of small individuals we come across in the archaeological material. In the last few years a number of papers have been written by university students, focusing on children in prehistory, their burials as well as issues concerning the sex and age determination on individuals who are young. Examples are ‘Mellanneolitisk hantering av barn i gravritualen’ (The management of middle Neolithic children in the burial ritual) was written by Collmar, an archaeology student, in 2004 and it is a quantitative study focusing on the presence of amber in middle Neolithic burials in Sweden. In a thesis by an osteology student; ‘Flickor och pojkar i det förgångna’ (Boys and girls in the past) by Näström 2005, it is discussed why gender-determination of young individuals can be of importance, and how this determination takes place.

**VII. CRITICISM**

*Children: a gender category?*

Few comparative studies of children’s identity in prehistoric times have been done; this could be because of the fact that children sometimes get treated as an unchanging part of any society, by archaeologists as well as other scholars. If one thinks of children as a homogenous group who are perceived the same across time and space, then research could be deemed unnecessary. Often children are thought of as ‘not yet adults’, and not always in a category of their own. But what does this mean? Is it so that children are a homogenous group, with similar mental and physical development? In some cases this could probably prove to be true, but we must not forget that social and cultural influences make a big difference in a child’s development, maybe not in a strict biological sense, but for a child’s view of the world. Generally, one could say that this means that a person’s behaviour and sense of self is affected by how they are treated by their surroundings. The status of children is often also defined as non-male (the norm), within the complex categories of gender evaluation (Baker:
The effect of this seems to be that the gender-classification is enhanced, by saying that a child is simply a man or not, making it a part of the ‘man the norm – woman the other’ debate. Children become the ‘other’: not male. The woman in contrast to man, the ‘second’ in relation to men have occurred during European history (Beausang 2005: 40, Arwill-Nordbladh 2001:30).

Young individuals often remain “gender-less “, except when their sex is assumed to play an important role in interpreting children in a prehistoric way of life. To this I draw parallels with earlier archaeological and anthropological studies, and historic ones, where the image and gender of the child (male) is often automatically stated, even if it is not on purpose. What I mean is that the image is proposed, even though it is not explicitly outspoken. The same can be suggested with how we sometimes picture prehistoric children. With this in mind, I am reluctant to make children a part of gender-studies. Not because they should remain gender-less, it is perfectly obvious they are not, but because I am interested in other boundaries in which the individual existed, and the biological terms ‘male’ and ‘female’ can sometimes act as restrictive barriers.

I sense a lack of classifications of the spheres where children live, whereas adults are more commonly classified, in a much more natural way. With the aid of the progressing gender movement, people are almost instantly divided into man/ woman and their respective status, duties and roles in the society that is being studied. Even if the gender movement does not specifically aim towards emphasising the gender-roles as such, this is sometimes the unwanted but yet real result of discussing classifications. Although I do not aim to explain the gender-movement and its possible causes and effects, I want to use its models in my discussion on identity. Gender classifications and divisions are sometimes proposed even if it is not possible to determine the sex of an individual found (which opens for the possibility that gender is not only in connection to a person’s sex).

Another source critical issue concerns osteological analysis. It is often not possible to determine gender and age on young individuals, as their bones tend to be badly decomposed and so a lack of preservation is a big problem. Many times all that can be determined is whether it is a fully grown adult or not that have been found, in which case interpretation will have to start there. Generally, gender-determining indicators do not start to appear on the skeleton until puberty, sometime between 15 and 18 years of age (Näsström 2005:6). Obviously many categories will be left undiscovered because of this problem, as preservation of the remains helps us understand the context in which the person was laid to rest. Adding to this is the issue of the skeletal remains that do exist not being examined properly by osteologists or anyone (Ingvarsson-Sundström 2003:23; Näsström 2005).

An individual’s gender might not have had any importance in the time that I am studying, but it is just as likely that could have. Despite this I have chosen not to designate a gender (boy or girl) to the
individuals. It is possible that I am missing out on important information this way, but as I do not have a specified gender on all of them, it seems irrelevant to discuss it. I also feel deep scepticism towards defining gender via artefacts found in a person’s burial, even if it is possible. Ascribing sex to a small person might bring us closer to them, but really it just creates an illusion that it is possible to determine gender on such young individuals the same way as on adults, and that gender in fact was established on them (Näsström 2005:23).

Where are the children?
It is often stated that there are not enough child graves found and that this present problems with statistics, there are not enough for them to be representative of a whole population’s death rate (Winge 1976:43; Lundin & Skoglund 1995:57; Molin 1999:43 Lillehammer 2000:17; Ingvarsson-Sundström 2003:87). The difficulty in studying children in prehistory, which is also mentioned, lies in that they are hard to find in the archaeological material, and difficult to interpret because of the lack of finds (Lundin & Skoglund 1995:57). Are we looking for the wrong parameters? Often groups are searched after, groups that can be defined as gender, age or other constructions. It is important to be wary of the fact that this guides us in our interpretation of the material. If we search for gender or age groupings and do not find them, we might think this is strange (see Lundin & Skoglund 1995:63). Indeed, what happens if and when we do not locate the child in the material? In my study I am using the age categories as a starting point, but I do assume that other ones exist, as well as other types of classifications. Mainly they are meant to be put in contrast to how we today group individuals because of age and / or biological development. The intervals are quite short, which tends to correspond with growth development. The idea that assemblages are commonly chased after comes from a kind of dualities view. Pairing things in our surrounding make them easier to define e.g.: big-small, child-adult, dry-wet, uncomplicated-intricate and so on. We can not assume that these dualities were the same in the past, or if they even existed, but I find the use of this kind of definition plausible. We use our own parameters to measure and view others in a way that also corresponds to our surveying and scrutinising of them.

Some burials I have chosen to exclude, for the reason that they do not contain enough evidence of containing an individual between the ages 0-20, and sometimes because of the geographical limitation of my study. There is of course a risk that I have actually missed out on important information by doing so. Another potential problem is that other burials with young individuals exists, some I have not been able to locate, and some are cremations, which I have decided to exclude from my study all together. Many of the cremation-burials have a potential to be determined as child-burials at a later stage, but I find that not all have yet been examined thoroughly. Apart from the cremation burials,
there will be others not yet located. I have looked for individuals osteologically determined to be between the ages of 0-20, but this does not mean that a division between these individuals and older ones existed in the past. It is a way for me to indirectly connect my study with the modern way of looking at children (as I see it); their individuality is inextricably linked to their biological development, and their gender. The limitation of the osteological material means that there will be burials that could have been used in this study, but have been excluded due to the interpreted ages of the individuals. I have searched for these individuals in the printed reports and studies made of excavated material in southern Sweden. There is a possibility that some individuals could have been excluded from the studies and would therefore be unbeknownst to me, as well as the fact that I might have not located the correct or most well informed material.

VIII. POSSIBLE DEFINITIONS OF A CHILD

Age & perceptions

Age is one of the four structuring principles of human societies, according to archaeologist Eleanor Scott. The other ones are race, class and gender (Scott 1999:92). I believe that there are room for a few more groupings that can be a structuring part of a society, or any group of human beings. But in our present society, the age-grouping is our most prominent, as much of the society is based on them. There seem to be a lack of agreement as to the definitions of a child, especially for the very youngest groups, I believe. A child’s development can often be determined by the level of cognitive ability, physical and mental maturity and also ‘schooling’ he or she has attained, which corresponds to the age. Mostly, children of a certain age are considered to be on the same level mentally and physically. This is not always the case, but few exceptions exist. Eleanor Scott feels that a variety of different age categories exist within the archaeological research, but it is quite possible that they were completely meaningless to the societies we study (Scott 1999:94), as well as our definitions of what constitutes a ‘child’. It is undisputable that humans are located on various platforms of development, as are all animals, all through out life. We are helpless at birth and slowly move towards independence as we grow. This can be said to be true for everyone, unless an individual for one reason or another is hindered in their biological or mental growth, possibly because of a disability. But that the perceptions of this development were and are the same through time and cultures is unlikely, I feel that mental development is also dependent on social factors. In many cultures these stages of development marks the transition from childhood to adulthood (Ingvarsson-Sundström 2003:22) and several other transitions also occur.
I have chosen to classify the individuals in my study into age categories, as seen in figure 3, mainly to make my interpretations easier to outline. I have the intention, however, to not let these categories limit me, as I look for identity markers. They are fairly even and I decided upon them after looking though my material. They can be said to agree with the biological steps in a person’s life. I have tried to look for identity markers within the age categories that I consider important for determining who is considered a child, today, and if they match divisions made in the burials in the past. The categories also agree with ones made by various osteologists, as seen in figure 12-14.

The first two periods in a child’s life (0-2, 2-4) refer to a time in a person’s life when we indisputably dependent on someone else, normally our mother, or another woman while we are nursing. The third period is a time when development is at its peak (5-7), but breastfeeding is not necessary (but it’s possible and even common that breastfeeding continues for some time). 8-11 is an age when we consider people to be more developed but not yet teenagers (teenager: sexually mature and physically able to have children), which come into the ages 11-13, 14-17. The last category, 18-20 is one which today (in the western world) would be considered to be an individual who is on their way to becoming a fully responsible self-reliant adult, this can also take place earlier or later in life.

The engendered and cultured child

We cannot completely ignore the importance of age and sex determination of skeletal remains, as it can help in identifying how social order was constructed and how age and sex affected mortuary treatment (Nilsson Stutz 2003:165). But it is equally important that we are aware of how these correlations display the social standing of the prehistoric children. Biological data such as sex and age is given, but perhaps only when we assume that communities in the past had clear gender-related social standings, which ruled their personal and communal identities. The cultural construction of gender roles is largely modelled on sex, sexuality and sexual reproduction relations, but a particular past society might not have defined its gender categories on these biological classifications (Nilsson Stutz 2003: 168). Certainly this is the case for adults. It makes sense that gender roles are modelled and defined on the passing through various stages in our biological growth, e.g.; when we are able to pass on our genes to a new generation. By this I mean that our state of ‘childhood’ is really a term for saying that we are not physically mature and able to procreate. And ‘adulthood’ means that we can. Of course, these are not the only definitions where structures are developed. Logically we can assume that historic societies, as well as present ones, existed with possible alternative constructions. The majority of humans are genetically and anatomically either male or female (Nilsson Stutz 2003: 168), but variations such as hermaphrodites exist. There would have been such variations in the past as well, but this is not possible to recognize on the skeletal remains, as it is a condition that mainly affect
the sexual organs, a person’s genetic material and behaviour. The behaviour differences mostly come into affect when these individuals differ in some way to the rest of the population, depending on the current social rules that exist. Biological and cultural factors can not be separated when we define the child (Ingvarsson-Sundström 2003:20), or anyone.

Work and subsistence

The Latin word for ‘baby’ is...it does not exist, instead ‘infantia’ was used, which means ‘unable to speak’ and this was used for small children (Wileman 2005:17). The education of children in ancient societies was often informal and directly related to the work they would assume as adults (Wileman 2005:47). It was probably not a case of whether the work was suitable or should be regarded as labour. Today we often use child-labour as a negative and abusive term, which entails small children being exposed to dangerous physical and potentially fatal work. Regulations are constructed so that children are not used in unscrupulous ways, and to ensure their education. But, in many societies (past and present?), children at work are valued, cared for and regarded as a positive force (Wileman 2005:56). Their role is central within the community and they are gradually socialized and prepared for their adult life, and provide a welcome help with the families’ subsistence. Instead of spending a number of years separated from the adult world practically without responsibility, they are quickly introduced to whatever needs to be done for the sake of survival. A task such as picking berries or collecting items for the adults and play-learning with the other youngsters can be well important. No doubt there would have been periods where subsistence was extra tough and the work was harder and the absence of the adults were more common, just as it can be today.

Child vs. Adult

An application of social theory is necessary to approach the child’s part in a society. A child can perhaps be seen as a new member of the society, so what impact does it have on the individuals already members of it? Social theory is needed in order to understand how society responds; it rejects or recognizes the new, both in terms of the birth of the individual and its behaviour and achievements within that society (Lillehammer 2000:19).

There are stages in a person’s life, which act as a boundary between childhood and adulthood, or between other stages. These differ as well as the definition of a child, so one cannot assume that the stages or passages were the same in the past as today. When past and present societies are studied in archaeology and anthropology we come across ‘rites de passage’, rituals that are more or less formal and made to represent a person crossing over from one stage to another in his or her life. The stages we come across on our way into adulthood are simply one of many in life and perhaps not even the
most important one. Within some of the present religious faiths, rituals exist when a person is considered an adult and ready to recognize their responsibilities. These rituals have many shapes. Within Christianity and Judaism, for example, this occurs when an individual becomes a teenager, around 13-15 years old. But for Catholics, which is a form of Christianity, it is staged quite a few years earlier, around 8-9 years old, and a new, Christian name is also received. In other cultures such passages might entail celebrating or performing rites when a person has decided upon their gender identity, their first spoken word or the receival of particular duties, but they do not have to be a mark of stepping from childhood to adulthood, they can happen at any age. To relate back to the Christian tradition; at age eight children are not considered an adult in the eyes of the law, only in a religious sense. Such ‘pseudo-steps’ could have taken place in prehistory as well.

“In earlier mortuary analysis children were included only as factors in understanding the adult society which they were thought to mirror” (Ingvarsson-Sundström 2003:21).

It can seem obvious to make an analysis in the field on how to properly define a child (Johnson et al 1995:7) when faced with a grave, but this is not always the case. How we define a child depends on many factors, many of them social. And we can really only define a child or childhood if we put it in contrast to something; adulthood is what is normally used here. Is it only in contrast to ‘adults’ that we can discuss what makes a child a child, and how they as a group are different to other groups in a society? If it is so then this is exactly what I choose to regard from. What happens if we take the opposite to childhood out of the equation? More correctly, what people today consider the opposite. To enable a study on the impact of age categories in the burial rite, we perhaps have to see children from a different and separate angle. Because there is no doubt in my mind that it had an impact, and that the child had its own social identity (Ingvarsson-Sundström 2003:21). This discussion also becomes evident when looking at burials which contain both adults and children. Is the child put in the burial with the adult, or is it the adult that has been put in with the child? Both possibilities exist, especially if this really is a decision made by the living, rather than the dead individuals.
IX. PLACES TO CALL HOME – the material

First of all I will present each site with a short introduction before I list the age categories. The sites are marked out on the map in figure no 3.

**Borgeby:** (No 8 on figure 3& figure 7)
Dated to MN A, the burial ground in western Skåne comprises of 17 seemingly unmarked graves. Very few markers were visible above ground, just some flint artefacts were found, hinting that this might have been a Stone Age settlement. It is unique in the way that it was meant only for burying young individuals, none of the remains belong to an individual older than 20 years. 10 of the burials definitely contained the remains of a human individual and all 10 of them are aged 0–20 years old.
Several times during archaeological research, questions have been raised about ‘where the children have gone’. Burial areas suggested, but none has ever been found. The burial ground at Borgeby was probably in use over several hundred years; this is based on the deposited pottery, its décor and design (Runcis 2002:69).

The preservation state of the burials is here rather special; most of them only contain a few artefacts and the teeth of the deceased individuals.

**Ajvide:** (No 4 on figure 3) dated to EN-MN, the Ajvide settlement and burial ground is situated on the west coast of Gotland, approximately one kilometre inland from the present coast line. During the Neolithic times it would have been almost directly by the shore (Burenhult 2002:31). The extraordinary preservation of the culture layers and burials is due to the fact that the site has not been ploughed since the 1940’s, and then it was by horses, whose ploughs only cut about 15 cm into the soil. Most of the burials contain skeletal remains; some are in excellent condition, so extensive
osteological research on them has been made possible. Find material include over 7000 artefacts, 2.5 tonnes of pottery and 3.5 tonnes of animal bones (Burenhult 2002:31). It consists of 24 burials with individuals aged 0-20 years.

**Visby:** (No 2 on figure 3 & figure 8) Containing 13 individuals aged 0-20, this is the location of a settlement from the middle Neolithic that lies below a medieval and modern day rural settlement, which has made excavation rather difficult. Archaeologists have only been able to explore the site when work on laying pipes or similar has been carried out (Janzon 1974:4). Just like the Ajvide site, it was located close to the shoreline, and the main subsistence base was seal and domesticated pig (Flyg 2002:215).

**Västerbjers:** (No 3 on figure 3 & figure 6) dated to MN and containing 12 individuals between the ages 0-20, this is a site that is located on the west coast of Gotland. A burial was discovered here in 1886, but any major excavations did not take place until the 1930’s (Janzon 1974:7). It is a burial site with a connecting settlement. Unfortunately, the main report covering the results is written in German (by Stenberger 1943) and therefore I was not able to dig deeper into the material, but was able to use the short description and charts about the site covered in *The Middle Neolithic Graves of Gotland (Gotlands mellanneolitiska gravar)* by Janzon from 1974.

**Kastanjegården:** (no 7 on figure 3& figure 4)This burial ground is located close to an area rich in prehistoric remains dating from the Stone age to the Middle Ages; Fosie, in southern Skåne. All the individuals found here were buried in soil consisting mainly of sand and covered in a paved stone construction (Winge 1975:7). The burials have been interpreted as belonging to the battleaxe period, 2150 – 1900 BC, or MN B, and contain 5 individuals aged 0-20 years.

**Ire/ Hangvar:** (no 1 on figure 3 & figure 5) Dated to MN and containing 3 individuals aged 0-20, this one is also located on Gotland, and this site has, like Västerbjers, been damaged by the use of its gravel for making cement etc. This could be why only three individuals under the age of 20 have been found (Janzon 1974: 8).

**Gläborg-Rabbalsjede:** (no 9 on figure 3) this site is located on the west coast of Sweden, north of Munkedal (see map.....). This area has a large number of rivers and fjords leading out to sea. It actually contains very few burials or settlement signs from the Neolithic period, and the burial I have chosen to include in my study has been dated to LN – EBA (Claesson & Munkeberg 2004).
Lilla Bedinge: (No 5 on figure 3) A burial field that has been dated to the middle to late Neolithic, specifically Battleaxe-period. The stone constructions which the burials have been located in seem to have had a wooden casket inside them. The site contains 13 burials, but I have only got information on the two I have studied, unfortunately.

Oxie: (No 6 on figure 3) Located about half a kilometre north of RAÅ 47 which is a settlement site found by Fosie in southern Skåne (Stensköld 2004:198), this site has been dated to the Late Neolithic and contains one infant individual.

Figure 4: The burials at Kastanjegården (Winge 1976)
Figure 5: Ire / Hangvar (Janzon 1974)
Marked in red are the burials mentioned in the study.

Figure 6: Västerbjer (Janzon 1974)
Marked in red are the burials mentioned in the study.
Figure 7: Borgeby burial ground (Runcis 2002) Marked in blue the burials mentioned in the study.

Figure 8: Visby (Janzon 1974) the burials mentioned in the study has been marked in red.
X. HOW OLD?

Age groups

On page 16 is a map of where the sites are located and each age category will be surveyed and some apparent patterns and differences between them are presented. Some of the individuals and burials have received a heading of their own, as the patterns emerge. After the paragraph I have summarised a few constellations and absent similarities. Below is a table which demonstrates the age group divisions that have been used in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUPS</th>
<th>INDIVIDUALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDETERMINABLE</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18-20 years old

This group is relatively average in size, nine 18-20 year olds have been observed at the sites I have been looking at. Ajvide contains the most of them, six. All these individuals have been found on the island of Gotland, and none on the mainland! They are evenly spread out between the periods, but none are found during the MNB or the late Neolithic. The contents of the burials are quite similar, even though some difference in time exists. All nine of them had been placed on their back, except the interred in burial no. 28 at Ajvide, who was placed in a hocker position. It contains no other specific markers that separate this individual from the other ones.

Both this one and no. 2 is dated to the early Neolithic, but perhaps the individual placed in a hocker position was the earlier of the two, as this interment was commonly used in the Mesolithic.

Fishhooks occur in three of the graves, so this could have been an important tool for individuals in this age group, as was needles and points made from animal bone. Burial no. 6 at Ajvide also contains a harpoon, not unusual at this site, but certainly not common throughout the whole geographical area for individuals aged 0-20. The individuals buried at Ajvide in no.48 and burial no. 6 at Ire/Hangvar are the only two in this age group who also had ochre with them. It could be that this is just a coincidence and that the ochre simply wasn’t observed in the other burials, but it could also have a specific meaning, as ochre is more common in the younger age groups. No. 14 at Visby also stands out, as it is the only burial containing a large number of beads, 159 to be exact.
14-17 years old

Within this group I have observed some similarities that span across geographical areas. The individual in burial no. 1 at Ajvide was interred with plenty of gifts and tools; bone points, arrowhead, fishhook, flint axe, pigs tusks and amber, this individual was certainly well equipped for anything the afterlife had to bring. Like the Ajvide burial, an individual at Lilla Bedinge had plenty of artefacts in the burial, but was also interred together with another individual, similar in age; this makes it more difficult to say which of the two the artefacts ‘belonged’ to, it could indeed have been them both, if they were buried at the same time. The big difference between these three individuals can be seen mainly in the fact that they were buried at different times, the one at Ajvide during the Early Neolithic, the other two during the Late Neolithic.

The four individuals at Visby are interesting, as one was placed in a single grave (no. 17) and the remaining in a triple grave (no. 30). They are both stone paved on bottom and top and contain plenty of beads and not much else, just one miniature vessel inside the triple grave. In fact, most of the burials at Visby contain many beads of all kinds, so it is easy to assume that beads were a common way to decorate clothing and/ or the burial garment, for individuals of all ages. Producing them could very well have been an important job. Interesting as well is that the single buried individual was placed facing north, but the three south. Obviously the direction had some significance as well, perhaps it was even the most important one for these three youngsters who were buried together, a way of signifying their distinction perhaps?

Image 1: Ajvide burial no. 1, a 14-15 year old interred on the back.

Figure 10: How the age groups are divided amongst all the individuals aged 0-20 years.
11-13 years old

Number 23 at Ajvide is a ‘rich’ burial, but it was also badly distorted and contains a second individual as well. The remains appear to have been distorted on purpose, why is impossible to say, but it does not have anything to do with the age group per say, it was a highly personal act.

Beads, again, occur frequently within this group, as do the usage of ochre and the absence of other artefacts.

No. 68 at Västerbjers stand out here, as this burial contains no artefacts and the individual was placed lying on the right side. The only other individual to have been place on its right side (as far as it is possible to tell), is an 18-year old from the same site. Overall, the directions of the burials seem to fluctuate often at the Västerbjers site, although NW (north-west) appears to have been the most common.

8-11 years old

Most of the burials in this category are near empty in artefacts, apart from beads and some animal teeth, except no. 23 at Ajvide and 106 at Kastanjegården. The group as a whole contains nine burials, and most of them contain ceramic shards or vessels, especially at Kastanjegården. No. 106 contains plenty of amber beads and tools made out of flint, for example. The burials at Borgeby do contain many amber beads, more frequently than in the other burials as a whole, but as all the burials here are roughly similar, these do not differ at all.

5-7 years old

This is a mixed group of individuals, some burials are rich in artefacts, others contain very few. The overall impression is that this actually was a group than can be said to have had significance, perhaps because of their age or for some other criteria. Most of the burials, they are 11 in total, contain everything a person might have needed in life or after it. With 13 individuals, this is also the largest group. Out of 11, five burials contain more than one individual. Death at this age was not at all unusual, perhaps due to a certain activity or ritual they underwent at this time in their life, or perhaps these are just individuals who were injury-prone. They took part in daily activities and chores, and there might have been a certain rites-de-passage they had to undergo at this specific age.

The two burials found at Ajvide (no. 47, 52), differ from each other in the way that one has very few grave goods, just a bone point and some seal teeth. The second one, no. 52, had many items including an axe, a grind stone and some flint tools, but no ochre. In addition to this, he or she was buried next to an individual who was just 18-24 months old. Was it a young ‘sister’ or friend perhaps?
Burial 105 at Kastanjegården, which contains two individuals aged 5-7 does not differ largely from the other ones at this site, except the fact that it contains a grind stone and a stone that has cup marks on it. Grind stones are not uncommon at this time in burials, in this age group, but cup-mark stones have not been found in any of the other burials. It is also interesting that Kastanjegården contains another burial which is similar to this one, but do not have the stone-artefacts.

2-4 years old

All the burials in this category are similar; they contain few or no artefacts. The exception is no. 38 at Ajvide, which contains many items, but no more than anyone else in all the age-groups at this site. The burials at Västerbjerds (no. 40, 67) contain beads, which mean that they are similar to the burials within the ages of 8-14, which is interesting. At Västerbjers, not all the burials contain beads, but the ones that do are from a varying age-span, so the beads were definitely not ‘given’ (if one assumes that a third party was in charge of this) to everyone nor possessed by individuals belonging to a certain age-group or interment.

0-2 years old

The last ‘proper’ category contains eight individuals. Six of these are infants or newborn/ full time foetus to about 1 year old. This means that there is only one individual in all that have been determined as 1-2 years of age. It is difficult to say why, perhaps these individuals are the ones hardest to find in the material, or the mortality was simply low at this age, at all sites. Another possibility is of course that they were buried differently or in another location; although looking at the material this seems unlikely, all ages appear to be represented. Most of the infants probably died soon after birth, they are of course very fragile at this time, before they can fend for them self.

Two of the infants are found at Ajvide (no. 10, 52), and they contrast each other. The nil-year old have few burial items in the grave, where as the 18-24 month old is buried next to a 7-year old individual, and with them an array of items (see under 5-7 yrs old page 24). A whistle is also found in the grave, made out of animal bone. They are not uncommon at Ajvide, but this is the only one found here in a burial containing someone below the age of 20.

At Västerbjerds, the infant burials have few similarities with the other burials at this site. No. 91 was distorted due to agriculture, and no artefacts were found. In addition to this, the remains were found on a very small surface and 0.25-0.30 m below the surface. It is quite possible that this is not a burial indeed. It is located on the outmost end of the burial ground (see fig no: 6) and somehow seems less connected to the area over all. This individual might have been ‘unwanted’ or someone who
carried special powers. It does not seem to share its parameters with the foetus that was buried ‘within’ the burial ground itself (no. 66).

Undetermined

In Fig 10, a total of 8% of the burials need to be defined specifically, as they do not fit into the existing groups or the age span is too great. Four burials at Borgeby have been interpreted as containing individuals 3-18 years old. This is problematic, as I can not really say anything specific about them, in relation to all the other buried individuals, at least not from an age perspective. Burials no. 3, 11 and 12 have been put in this category.
Teeth from these individuals were found, more exactly the molars. Unfortunately it could not be determined which of the molars they are and this meant that a closer indication of age could not be made (Arcini 2002: 203-204). As it is, they are similar to the other Borgeby children; they have not been treated any different.

Burial number 108 at Kastanjegården is the last one in this category for ‘others’. Here, one individual determined as a ‘teenager’ by excavators, was buried with three axes and some flint flakes. The individual was determined a ‘teenager’ because it was evident from the molars found that they had entered occlusion (Johanson & Mårtensson 1976:50).

Don’t go by yourself

Out of the twenty buried individuals under the age of 20 at Visby on the island of Gotland, eleven of them were not buried alone when they passed away. This means that a high percentage contains more than one individual. This of course has an importance for the interpretation of the burials and obviously meant something to the people living in the Neolithic settlement on what today is the town of Visby. They also had something special in mind for the 4 young people who were buried together with an ‘adult’. What this means is difficult to say, but as both types of interments exist (single and non-single graves), a slight time difference between the burials over all could be one answer. The ways of interment could have changed and fluctuated within short intervals. It is also possible that other reasons existed, such as socio-cultural regulations that stipulated who was to be buried in a specific way.
In the first grave, no. 30, three individuals were buried. And from looking at the dating (see Janzon 1974), they do not seem to be completely contemporary with each other. Individuals A (14-15 years) and C (15-17 years) are closest in time; they might even be roughly contemporary. This would mean that the last individual (B) (13-14 years old), was buried slightly later, which is emphasised by the fact that he or she was placed directly on top of individual C. There seems to be no level of soil separating the two of them; was it removed when the second person was to be buried, or was the grave enclosed? Damaged lime stones were found, and most likely covered the burial containing the three individuals. The lime stones are also present on some of the other burials, so this could have been common.

The remains belonged to people who were roughly of the same osteological age, which also raises questions. What was the mutual relationship between the three, if there was any? A burial for young people who suffered a similar fate in their life, or did they belong to a particular category or share a family tree/clan, which meant they were ultimately buried together? The second example also contains three individuals. This one is located at the site of Ire/Hangvar and is no. 6. They have also been interpreted as not being completely contemporary. This is based on the fact that there is a slight difference in levels between each of them. This is however only a slight slope downwards of about 16 cm (Janzon 1974:274).

The youngest individuals who were 12-13 years old and 18-20 years old, were buried ‘toe to toe’, ‘she’ had her feet under the feet of the other one. (See image no 9 further down) The third individuals has been determined as 40-50 years old and seem to share a certain connection with the youngest in the burial, as they face the same direction, where as the 18-20 year old was placed opposite them. But still they were deliberately placed in the same burial together.

In no.7, also at Ire/Hangvar, another three was buried together. From the illustrations it seems individuals A and B were buried together, but the last individual, C, seems separate to them, contrary to what Janzon (1974:283) has interpreted. All of them have been placed in a hocker position which makes me believe that they were buried during a time when this type of interment was used (More on
this subject further on). In this case, a very young individual; 2.5-3 years old, was buried with two much older ones, 30-40 (ind. A) and 50-60 (ind. C) years old. A close relationship between A and B was probably in place in their lifetime, even if it was simply a symbolic one. In death they were placed facing each other. A large number of lower jaws from boar, 19 in total, was placed in a half moon shape below the two of them, which enforces this impression and even more sets them apart from the third and older individual, who was placed to the SW of them. But as in grave no 30 in Visby, a relationship between them all is still plausible.

And then there is no. 29 at Ajvide. This burial is relatively empty in artefacts, and mostly interesting because of the placement of the three individuals in it. An older individual is placed with one four- and one two- year old, one under each arm. The older individuals head tilts ever so slightly to one side and the whole burial gives a feeling of complete symmetry. We can not be certain of the connection here, but as the age difference between the two on the side and the individual in the middle, it is easy to assume a very close relationship between the three. If they actually died at the same time; what on earth happened to them? Perhaps an illness that untimely struck all of them, and then emphasized because they were members of the same household?

There is a strong likelihood that some of these multi-individual burials were used as secondary ones, as the individuals in them seem to not have been buried simultaneously. And this was quite a common occurrence. It is obvious that some individuals were not intended to be buried alone, and it becomes even more interesting if we consider that they might not have died at the same time. Why place an individual in a grave that is already being used? Was it convenience or evidence of a personal relationship between the two alt. an already prepared plan of action? What I refer to as ‘sharing of a
similar fate’ is something that I find very possible when looking at the triple burial from Visby. Unless the three of them together in the grave indicates that an age divided society in their community indeed existed (which would be a reason for sharing similar activities), a simple kinship bond could be the answer. A kind of ‘one for all – all for one’ attitude, or a conjoint punishment for a crime committed in consensus is possible. The interments are either a form of collective burials where the individuals have been deposited at different occasions or simultaneous and deposited at the same time (Nilsson Stutz 2003:305).

I am my own?

Some of the burials I have chosen to give some extra attention, to get close to them on a more intimate level.

° No. 24 at Visby. This young individual about 18 years old at death, gives an over all impression of either being distorted or his/ her burial position chosen with extreme specifics. The legs are placed crossed with one arm straight and one across the abdomen. (Image no 8). The skull is on its side with the nose pointing upwards. By distorted I here mean a burial situation which some how differs from the ‘norm’, not necessarily a negative term, although ‘distorted’ is a rather loaded term. Another
individual interred not far from this one, was buried in a similar fashion, so it can not be said to appear by chance. Perhaps the individuals had committed something which was considered bad, and that it was then chosen to be reflected in this way, so that the individuals were still able to be buried.

- No. 105 at Kastanjegården this particular burial caught my attention not because of the individuals in it (two 5-7 year olds), but because it contains a cup marked stone. As I have said earlier, this is an unusual thing to find in connection with burials. It was, however, not placed inside the burial/ casket it self, but among the rocks that makes up the outer paved frame of this burial. It has been dated to the battle axe period. It could have significance that it was placed amongst the paving, where also a grind stone was found. It could be argued that they share a special meaning which warranted their placement on the outside of the burial chamber, but they could also have been collected together with the other paving stones and used as part of the structure. In fact, the cup marks could just be a coincidence, and not manufactured by the ones who buried the individuals.

- No. 6 at Ire / Hangvar (image no9) this is a triple grave; two are under 20 years old. One of them is especially interesting, an individual who was 12-13 years old and appears to have been bitten by an animal, possibly a pig, and bares the evidence of a trepanation on the skull (Janzon 1974:145). Toothlike impressions are found on the rearmost part of the skull and an almost oval hole can be seen at the side of the skull. The most logical interpretation is that the individual got injured by an animal and was forced to endure a trepanation, which he or she did not survive. Unfortunately it has not been determined whether the bite marks are actually a result of gnawing after the individual was deceased, but they most likely occurred when the flesh was in “a fresh state”(Janzon 1974:145).

Individuals with trepanations found in Europe have mainly been dated to the Neolithic times (Bengtsson 2004:2 after Jennbert 1991), but have been found to exist from earliest stone age till the present. It has primarily been used as a way to cure illness in the head region (such as internal bleeding or angry spirits) and also for possible ritualistic purposes, such as cutting a part of the skull out on a dead (or living!) individual and then used as a protective charm or trophy. If healing has commenced, then the person has survived the ordeal, and if no healing of the bone is evident, death has occurred immediately or shortly after the procedure (Bengtsson 2004:3). This individual does not show any signs of healing, so death would have been very imminent. The individuals death does not seem to be connected with the other two in this burial, and they do not all share the same position in it; two are placed in hocker and one on its back.

- No 60 at Ajvide. (Image no 11) A 7 year old individual interred with no less than 32 pig jaws, and no other specific markers in the burial. It is possible that this individual actually had a special
relationship with the pigs, caretaker perhaps; it would then seem fitting to be buried with selected parts of them. A specific ritual role could also have been the case, since it was obviously important that so many pigs were killed and possibly eaten when this individual's death occurred, they would have been a stable part of their subsistence.

Image 9: Burial no 6 from Ire/Hangvar. Individual C is placed in the middle.

Image 10. The young individual in burial 6 at Ire, who's skull bares evidence of a trepanation

Image 11. Burial no 60 at Ajvide. Note the large amount of jaws by the individuals' feet.
XI. PATTERNS OF AFFINITY

Similar, not the same

If individuals aged 18-20 were an important part of a prehistoric society’s work and subsistence, this could be reflected in the burials, at least if a sense of omittance is what we expect to find. They all contain few artefacts and hardly any amber beads, which is a clear difference between them and the other age categories. Only one burial here contains some, no. 2 at Ajvide, it contains three amber beads. Of course, it is quite possible that many have simply been missed, as amber tends to build up a rather dull brownish-red colour after some time in the ground, and become extremely fragile, which makes them difficult to detect (Runcis 2002). It should be mentioned that at Borgeby, several of the interpreted burials did not contain any skeletal remains or were not possible to be more exactly age-determined than 3-18 years old. Most of them contained amber beads, and some probably contain individuals belonging to the oldest age category (see Runcis 2002:148).

A suggestion is that these individuals were a stable part of the community’s work and subsistence and that no reason for this to be expressed in the burials existed. Or they could have just participated in a form of rites – de – passage, reached a certain passage in their life, which meant they had received a level of psychological/spiritual awareness that did not need to be expressed after death; their destiny was clear.
Some evident patterns tells me that the importance of the individual, as oppose to the community, has varied between the different ‘cultures’, and the geographical areas. (But the will of an individual does not mean that everyone should be different, we people are slaves to the ‘norm’). This might or might not reflect homogeneity between the individuals in life, and could also be a way of bringing people security when faced with death. Two areas where this kind of particular homogeneity seems to have taken place are Borgeby and Kastanjegården. Besides the fact that the site at Borgeby is special because it only contains young buried individuals, it is also surprisingly consistent in its structure. Unfortunately, evidence has been lost forever because extremely few actual remains have been preserved, only the teeth in most cases. Teeth are very good for determining the age of an individual, but without any other skeletal remains we are left only to speculate about things like the position and direction of the deceased’s body and what this could have meant in the burial procedure, if anything.

The second site with a very consistent construction and material is the one at Kastanjegården. Like the burials at Borgeby, these are roughly contemporary, the time difference between them can not be said to be very long. They are also very similar to each other. All of the individuals here were interred in a stone paved construction which probably also contained a wooden casket inside which the body was placed in (Winge 1976: 33-34). If it was not for the one individual of the age 25-30 buried in no. 105 together with 5-7 year old, the site could have been interpreted as yet another one created especially for young individuals. But this one older person could very well have been seen as a part of ‘the younger ones’ if such a categorisation existed. I am not sure that a possible division was made strictly on ‘maturity’, as the individuals vary slightly in age (4 to ‘teen’).

A pattern exists between the sites scattered around the island of Gotland. They shared a similar subsistence based on fishing and keeping of pigs, which is evident in the burials. There is a strong similarity in gifts, tools and decorative materials. This does not mean that the sites shared the same culture, just that their practical starting point was similar. The burials located on the mainland almost totally lack in items made out of fish, fowl and pig-material. The communities on Gotland could have been more settled, which would explain why most of the burials are found here (80%).

**Miniature tools: miniature people: large identities?**

During the middle-Neolithic, miniatures were put in burials, especially common from two burial-grounds at Borgeby and on the island of Gotland. Malmer claims that there is a clear connection between...
miniature battleaxes and child-burials (Malmer 1975:45) but Gunborg Janzon, who looked at the Gotland burials especially, do not think that this connection can be considered to be automatic (Janzon 1974:54, Collmar 2004:5).

When I consider the coordination it takes to peck a battleaxe from solid stone, I am still pretty certain that the miniature ones are even more complex to make, I doubt that these miniatures were made by children under the age of 8, if I have to specify an age.

Because of the rich findings of miniature amber-battleaxes in the burials at Borgeby (Runcis 2002), the connection between miniatures and children seems logical, as they were found only in child-graves. But also, in Borgeby, no adults at all were found (or, rather; no people over the age of 18). The buried in Borgeby are all between the ages of three and eighteen years old, which is another reason why I doubt the small amber axes were made by the youngest themselves, and rather by the older ones or even adults. It is clear, though, that in Borgeby, the rest of the community and those under the age of 18 were kept separate in the afterlife and maybe in life as well, in a ritual or tradition that spanned over generations.

Runcis does point out that in this burial ground, the found miniature axes are considered to be ceremonial (Runcis 2002), especially since they are made of amber. Differences in size and type do not have to display diversifications in the age of individuals, in this case child vs. adult (Claesson, Munkeberg 2004:73), but there are difficulties in separating ‘toys’ from the archaeological material, if this is what they were.

Facing me, facing you, facing the Spirits.

In some cases, the positions of the individuals seem to be connected with the different time periods. It is interesting when ‘disturbed’ remains appear where burials otherwise display a rather consistent positioning of the dead, if they appear to be contemporary. An example of this is burial no. 23 at Ajvide, which appear to be partly decarnated (Burenhult 2002:98). The remains have been badly dislocated and also placed on top of
another individual (not dislocated). It actually seems as if the two individuals were treated very differently, the second one perhaps moved from an earlier burial place somewhere else, and placed in this grave which should have been the original one. This would explain why the bones are found in such disarray.

In a total of 34% (see fig 12) or 25 in total, of all the burials the individuals were extended on their backs and 10% in a hocker position. Mostly the individuals who were placed on their back were placed with the back of the skull down, and it is difficult to say if the ones who are not found in this way, actually were placed differently, or just forced out of its position. The head assumable being an important part of the body and spirit, it was probably well thought of when it came to an individual being interred. I can not tell whether the direction of the face is what mattered, or the actual head, but I do not think so, unless people thought of the face or the eyes as something that contained special abilities even after death. In life this is the location of many important ways of communication and understanding of ones surroundings; seeing, hearing, smelling, talking etc. For the head to face a certain direction in death might have been very important, such as the sun/moon/water/ vegetation/ forefathers or other things that mattered in the spiritual and/or world of subsistence.

The hocker position appears to be more recurring for individuals aged 11-13, even though they are evenly spread out among the sites. The individuals here were all from the MN to LN, middle Neolithic to Late Neolithic. I think this could indicate that it was a position chosen for highly personal/ specific reasons. In no. 7 at Ire/ Hangvar a middle aged individual and a 2.5-3 year old were buried together, and placed facing each other, in a hocker position. The older individual’s arms are almost embracing the little one, which leaves me with a feeling that this burial is highly personal, and that the buried were placed in a position which they both would have felt comfortable with when they lived.

The indication that the hocker position was more common for individuals aged 0-20 that were placed in a multiple burial, could suggest that these individuals in particular needed special attention or protection in death, or that they were actually personally attached to the individual with whom they shared their burial. It is not specific to any one age category, but more frequent amongst the older individuals.

Painted safe

Ochre are pigments made from naturally tinted clay; chemically it is hydrated oxide (www.wikipedia.org/red ochre 20061028). Ochre often appear in prehistoric burials, from many time periods. It is found by all parts of the body and can appear in a thin layer or thick accumulations, often close to the head. Both yellow and red ochre have been found, but red is more common and sometimes referred to simply as ‘iron ochre’ or ‘reddish tinted sand’. On occasion lumps of dried clay have been
found and interpreted as being used as a possible substitute for ochre (Janzon 1974:110). Small organic containers could have been used to hold the ochre, and when decomposed, the pigments could have trickled out into the burial and strongly dying the contents of it (Janzon 1974:110). Ochre is high in iron and strongly dyes anything it touches; it is today a common component in oil and water based paints.

Sometimes it’s as if I am forced to look at the past in black-and-white, even though I strongly desire to see it in colour. Colour has everything to do with how we see the world, I think. Occasionally artefacts with traces of paint are found, but the strongest indication for the use of paint is in the adaptation of ochre in the Neolithic burials. This is where it is mostly found, placed on and around the deceased. But paint and colour must have been a part of daily life; it is through it that we interpret things in our surroundings, as well as through the shape of things. It would have been implemented on art, tools, the accommodation, garments and ultimately, the body itself. Face painting and tattoos are just some examples of the many uses for it in ritual or for special occasions. Perhaps a mask was painted onto the ill / dying / deceased individuals face to represent a certain sentiment or the wish for a swift and kind reception by the ‘other side’. And it might have been used as a way to protect the living from a disease that had struck the individual.

In my material, the use of ochre is most common on Gotland, but it is also here that most of the burials are found. Only one burial contains yellow ochre, no. 6 in Ire/ Hangvar. An interesting note is that the pigment was more commonly used when burying individuals aged 11-13. It could be that they had a special relationship towards the ochre, and that it helped them communicate with the spirits?

*And I dress thee...*

Pigs’ teeth are commonly found in burials, especially on Gotland (see: Burenhult 2002), pierced and used for decorating the hems and edges of skirts or other clothes, I think. Perhaps the occurrence in some burials of a large number of animal jaws can be connected with this, but it is rather unlikely the jaws were implemented as a part of a clothing construction, as they are rather large and bulky. It would have been a very heavy item in that case. They could have been sewn on to a cloak of some sort I suppose, used for placing over the dead individual. Or the pigs were a part of a burial-ritual specific for this individual, and then the jaws were placed with her/ him in the grave. The pigs’ teeth occur in masses at Ajvide, along with teeth and bones from seal and fowl. At Visby and Västerbjers it is a similar story, plus the presence of beads from dog and fox. Hollowed bones from animals have been popular for use as beads as well, but they only seem to occur in Gotland.
It is not certain that everyone wore clothing that had beads sewn on to them in everyday life; it could just have been implemented in a burial situation.

The amber beads that are very common at Borgeby (image 4 and 12) have probably been worn as necklaces, bracelets and sometimes implemented in the clothing as well. Without knowing anything about the rest of the possible population here, these beads certainly were popular amongst the young individuals. It could simply have been a way to show the connection between the individuals in the community, or they were used for a ritual purpose, for use in the burial alone. Interestingly the age group that contains the most burials, 5-7 year olds (18% in total) is also where the highest number of amber beads is found, together with the 8-11 year olds. Between the ages of 11-20 beads were obviously uncommon, only nine have been found in these burials. Burials containing hollow beads made out of bone were mainly used with 18-20 year olds. Beads made out of pig, fowl and fish (the teeth were mainly used from the first two) are much more frequent in all the groups and the use of these were not restricted to any one group. They occur in higher numbers and the only group that really do not have many is the 0-2 year olds. It could be that these were decorative items that some of the individuals actually crafted them selves, using material that was lying around from old suppers. Perhaps it would be an easier way to learn how to craft more exclusive items.

![Occurrence of beads](image)

**Figure 13. Occurrence of beads in the age groups**
Image 13-16. Burial 35 at Ajvide and some of the commonly occurring artifacts on the island of Gotland. 14: fishhooks, 15: pierced animal teeth, 16: tusks. (not to scale)
XII. THIS IS ME – WHO ARE YOU? –The results

I am over here, you are over there

I was pleasantly surprised to find as many young buried individuals from the Neolithic as I did. This tells me that young people were certainly not invisible and truly were present in life during this period. It is likely that a division between people existed, due to their age or other maturity markers, and were possibly more common in areas where the young individuals have not been located. My logic tells me: why bury an individual who is not really recognized by society? And when it comes to individuals who in death were separated from their peers, is it not just a matter of interpretation and wording that we point out, who has been separated from whom, and why? The word ‘separation’ has a negative ring, because in our own society, it brings on fearful thoughts when we think about ‘children being separated from their parents’, and it is easy to assume that people in prehistory felt the same. Maybe they did. Maybe they did not. And why bury some individuals in one place and others somewhere else? Even the term ‘somewhere else’ is a tricky one, because in one swoop we have decided what is norm and what is not. At Borgeby, only individuals aged 3-18 were interred, no one older and no infants. So individuals who fell into the ages outside of this particular span, were excluded from the grouping or at least separated from it somehow, it is safe to say. It could be that in this society an individual dying so young was indeed very unusual, and more probable amongst individuals older than 18 years of age, and infants could have been included here as well. This may well have warranted this ‘severance’ in death, they were simply interred together, ‘somewhere else’.

The only other burials that have a possibility of being interpreted in a similar manner are the infant burials at Västerbjers. They do not share many similarities with the other graves at this site. There appears to be a gap between them and the rest of the areas burials, they have both been placed at the outskirts of the burial ground, with one or no other burials close to them, and have very few artefacts placed in them. In fact, they are at least 20 metres away from the rest, who are all buried evenly spread out within a central area at the site. No such pattern can be observed for burials that contain individuals aged 3-20 years.

It is difficult to interpret burials that are not a part of a larger communal burial ground. Sometimes it is reflected in them if people lived settled or not, ones that where settled all year around, for decades or more would be more likely to build up a larger assembly of burials in the one area, than ones who were not, unless people routinely returned to the same area every year to bury their dead. Also, seasonal burial could have been performed, using different places according to season. I can imagine that some locations would have been difficult to dig up in the winter, due to extreme soil conditions, or simply to wet during the summer.
The group which contains the individuals aged 5-7 can be considered very interesting. Many things separate this group from the others, and bring out questions whether age was even a factor in these Neolithic communities. This could still be the case, but from my modern point of view, these individuals are too young to have at least a strong position which is based on physical strength. Other denominators were in use here. A strong ritual and/or spiritual connection could have existed for these individuals. The use of so many beads for these individuals and the ones aged 8-14 enforces that they stood out somehow, to the rest of the community. Alternatively it could mean that individuals in these age groups had a tendency to have accidents and pass away, and it affected the ones left behind greatly.

I have discovered that many different interpretations can be applied to the burials I have studied. A part from some exceptions, many burials contain evidence of a highly personal, yet standardised method of interment. It was not a more common tradition to bury young individuals together with an ‘adult’, during the Neolithic. If this means that these young individuals were seen as independent or simply an indication of individuality, is difficult to say. Individuality does not per se have to have anything to do with levels of personal independence. Some individuals had to be interred with other ones, sometimes older individuals, sometimes of the same age or younger. It appears to be a highly personal act, where individuals have been assigned a companion in death, and maybe this was meant to ensure that they did not go through it alone. Only in a few cases can I see a possible connection between the burial gifts and strict social rules, the direction of their bodies and heads are a more likely sign of this. By strict social rules I refer to stipulations that controlled and emphasized the various social divisions that possibly existed. Just like the separation of individuality and independency, a division can be made between social regulation meant to strengthen individual divisions, and ones that exist ‘in the quiet’ and really are more meant to strengthen the individual and the collective at the same time, a way of defining one self and others.

Neither is it possible to see any difference in how the ‘status’ of the young ones differed, the youngest; 0-2 years old were not left out from the rest of the community in death, and I do not think that infants had a particular high death rate, although it is possible and likely, that more foetuses should exist, but it depends on how common stillborns, abortions and infant death was. And if these deaths were indeed treated the same, the occurrence of such young ones in the burials would certainly suggest it.
XIII. CONCLUDING DISCUSSION

When a person is laid to rest- Identities articulated in the burials

The interment of dead individuals has the potential to tell a great story about prehistoric lives and rituals. As with everything within the archaeological field, artefacts and monuments are what we are left with when we strive to interpret the past. If we are lucky we can end up with a sense of closeness and not feeling quite so far away in time and space. The individual’s role within the group through variations in the interment and deposited material is one of the many things that have the possibility to be discovered. Naturally, the ‘social persona’ of the interred is essential for the design of the burial and its symbolic synthesis (Artelius 1988:23). In our own society, personal status and power is more often expressed in a ritualized form, rather than a materialized one (Artelius 1988:24), so it is easy to see how it becomes difficult to interpret rituals based on material remains only, I am not sure it is really possible at all.

Really, actions have three different causes; the self-planned, the unaware impulsive and that which other people have ‘planned’ for us. These are all causes that bring our actions towards a certain direction, and can of course be a combination of the above. For example, we often act and react in a certain way because our surroundings expect or wish it, which often leads to us acting in a way that in fact becomes ‘natural’ to us. The burial is a ‘product’ in this way, the result of deliberate actions by people (Gerdin 2002:52). But it is not necessarily just seen from the point of view of the ones who remain after ‘a loved one’ is gone. It will be an interpretation of what that individual might have wanted, depending on how much the personal wills were taken into account. If a society practises actions and rituals centred on death, aimed at minimizing the fear of it; and perhaps increase the understanding of the connection between life and death, they probably talked about it. Rituals and traditions can be an aid in making death a normal thing and not something to fear or fear being excluded from, including a common interment. It does not have to be a reflection of a society’s possible division in life, but rather its uniformity in death, or when standing face to face with it. In a similar way, differentiations in the interment do not have to mean a division of ranks or importance; it could just as well be the survivors’ interpretation of the personality, relations and likes/ dislikes of the individual.

Cultural conceptions

The concept of a child is culturally constructed but connected to physiological age, although not determined by it (Ingvarsson-Sundström 2003:20). In determining the boundary between children and adults, is it necessary to think of it in terms of mature/ immature? Are we looking for these
determinates when we investigate the buried children? When looking at graves, both with children and otherwise, there is always going to be a problem in defining the social identity of the individuals through the findings in the grave. It may or may not represent the world of the deceased/ the living or the children vs. the adults. This often transforms into searching for differences between adults and children, perhaps because we expect them to be present. Thus we compare the children’s graves with the adults to see how they differ.

Were they buried differently, in an area separate to that of the adult community, and how much in terms of grave goods does the burial contain? Often a lack of grave goods and a ‘lack of energy’ when burying the children are mentioned and seen as showing a lack of attachment from the parents, due to high mortality rate amongst young children (Fahlander 2005:5). And when they are buried in an area separate from the rest of the population, does this indicate that they were treated differently (or deemed less worthy) than adults? Were they actually different because they were children? Perhaps, but this division in space could also indicate a slightly larger trauma for the people involved with the child, rather than the children being less important. Placing of the graves near of far away from the housing could also be significant. Presence or lack of grave goods could contain similar dimensions of death trauma. They do not have to signify status or identity of the individuals, but it is possible.

I am open to the possibility that different deaths could mean different burial-rites. Adult humans might be prone to dying differently than children; they might more frequently have accidents, or be murdered and die a natural death. Children are perhaps more prone to dying of malnutrition, infant disease or other types of accidents (war, infanticide), due to their physical lack of strength or experience in certain situations, or cultural influences that depict their survival in the community.

It is normal to try and see the connections between skeletal remains and material culture, as this is what archaeologists rely on after civilisations have evolved, changed and disappeared. Viewing the child as completely culturally constructed just replaces one reductionism with another (Sofaer Derevenski 2000:8, after James et al. 1998), and could challenge the discipline all together. Physicality and the meaning of the body itself is a part of what makes up an individual, socially as well. If we remove the physicality of the individual we stand to lose potential ways in which social relations may be shaped by their bodies and vice versa (Sofaer Derevenski 2000:9, after Turner 1996 etc.).

Who determines the specific requirements for any group in any society? As the children are a part of the society, it is not unlikely that they too have some part in the decision-making process. But for the very youngest ones the adults are assumed responsible and in charge. If not for the specific age of the child, then for the child’s lack of experience, they simply can not have made the same realizations as a grown person has. But this does not mean that the younger person is in any way less ‘important’,

Now you see me now you don’t
or seen as less worthy of respect among the rest of the society. It is possible that the children in prehistoric societies were treated as less credible in various situations, because that is how they are seen in modern society. We look upon children in our own time as solely dependant on adults and as fairly anonymous in decisions concerning their own entity, although it varies depending on the age group the individual belongs to. And this continues for many years. But is this because of biological factors rather than a result of socialisation? A person is more or less forced to, in continuous steps; prove to the surrounding caretakers a degree of independence and maturity. I believe a similar system could have been in place in the past. Just like today, the individuals would have participated in this ritual on their own account, yet strongly reinforced by the current standards and traditions. As Lillehammer states; archaeology may be engaged in recognising difference, categorisations and value systems, and may be able to view children as social actors. But this does not mean that they regard them as representatives of change. She goes on saying that childhood relates passively to the state and period of being a child and this can be restrictive, as the use of childhood or other stages neglects the factors that bring about wide-scale change when we define children and adult roles (Lillehammer:2000:20). The social variables that change these perceptions go beyond age-determined factors; age does not have to determine social status and sometimes not even individual behaviour. Certainly humans of the same age behave differently, mainly due to where they grew up and how and their personal perception of the world around them. So it is unlikely that it is ever a good idea to use age as a fixed variable for interpreting behaviour and the importance of social roles.

The individual adult’s perception of the child is not always a conscious choice (Ingvarsson-Sundström 2003: 19), neither are actions towards it. It is important to also be vigilant of these unconscious decisions made by people; they are brought on by cultural and social differentiations and habits, but this does not have to mean that they are completely unaware. We can be aware of certain actions, but not always understand why we perform them. The difficulty, of course, is to actually determine these social habits, and to not become totally snowed in by our own interpretations.

Much of this I can see signs of in the burials, although it is all interpretations which I have made, probably much based on a combination of my own history, life perceptions and of course; the material I have studied.

Where did the children go? Well, I think we can safely say now that during the Neolithic, they were buried and very much present in the material. More individuals could be found in the future, to help us understand who they were, just like with any other category. We can also assume they were present in Neolithic life, everyone was once young. Their roles in society can never be fully
discovered, but they existed in multiple numbers. At the start of this study I assumed that a lengthy discussion about the sparse appearance of young people in the archaeological record would be necessary, as well as one about individuals who were not buried at all. Instead I realised that the presence of them is great. When claims about the missing children are being made, I would say that really it is a case of them being missing from the written archaeological accounts and interpretations of the prehistoric societies and its people, not the physical material. They are often invisible and hidden behind interpretations about economic systems, functions, trading, contacts and products (Claesson, Munkeberg 2004:73).

![Figure 14. Diagram showing the most common artifact categories and how they are divided amongst the burials, the number on top of each box is how many burials contain this type.](image-url)
XIV. SUMMARY

Defining childhood can indeed be a contradiction, as the very defining springs from our desire to see children and adults as separate entities. But as more and more buried young individuals see the light, childhood needs to be viewed as a very flowing category, because the fact that we today mostly see childhood and adulthood separate for quite a long time is not enough to assume it functioned this way in the past. Identities and entities change and become other identities. Variations among individuals are unlimited, even at a very young age. I found that there is much more information to be found from the young individuals buried in the past, from all time periods. This means that children were certainly not invisible to the people who buried them, nor can we assume that they did not have an important role in their time, whatever that might have been. So they need to be brought to life in the present as well, to enable them to help us interpret the past.

We do not necessarily need to first identify the adults to locate the children, but in excluding certain groups we could loose the pig picture. If we insist on looking at ‘children’ and ‘adults’ as separate entities rather than parts of an entirety; the ‘us and them’ element can never be disregarded from. As a paradox, there is actually a risk of emphasising the difference between groups, and thus creating (or continuing) the classical opposite pair that ‘adult-child’ is (which becomes ‘child vs. adult’ as it implies they are opposites).

Somewhere I read that to be able to identify the children in the prehistoric communities, we must first identify the adults. This became a statement which I have routinely returned to in my head, sometimes it has haunted me! Is it really that simple or need it be that difficult? I think that we instead should look for the adults through the children. All people were once children and we should look at the importance the young individuals have in creating a society, and how the relationships between people are reflected in the children. Children do not belong to the adults; they might be submissive to them, which do not have to imply that they lack a voice! This is why I chose to study various age categories in my quest to find other significative markers that tell of identities in the past, which could be seen as a contradiction, but I chose this method to enable myself to step out of my own box.

The study of children in the past is still rather unexplored, but important. I would like to witness a larger one in the future, which looks at young individuals in time and space, crossing any boundaries, assumptions and images that we might have about children in the past.
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### Appendix 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Dating</th>
<th>Sing/mult</th>
<th>Interment</th>
<th>Preserv.</th>
<th>Pottery</th>
<th>Stone</th>
<th>Bone: points/needles /beads</th>
<th>Amber</th>
<th>Flint</th>
<th>Boar/Pig etc</th>
<th>Fowl/fish /seal/fox/dog</th>
<th>Ochre</th>
<th>Fish-hook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ajvide 1</td>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>B (NE)</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Part.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Scraper</td>
<td>7 points, aw-head</td>
<td>Axe*, 2 pcs worked</td>
<td>2 tusks</td>
<td>Teeth*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>B (W)</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 vessel</td>
<td>Whetst</td>
<td>Point</td>
<td>3 Scraper</td>
<td>5 jaws, quills*</td>
<td>Teeth*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>B (N)</td>
<td>MN A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Harpoon, 3 points</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 pig-tibia, 4 b-tusks</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MN?</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 aw-head, point</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MN?</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Frag.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B Frag</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9 fish-beads</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>Dist. (SW)</td>
<td>MN?</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Part.</td>
<td>4 conc./ 1 vessel</td>
<td>Needle, harpoon</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 flakes, 5 blades</td>
<td>p-tusk, jaw</td>
<td>20 teeth*</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>9-11</td>
<td>B (N)</td>
<td>MN?</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Axe, lrg</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>H (S)</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 pcs</td>
<td>Working set</td>
<td>Pcs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pcs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B (SW)</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 pcs</td>
<td>Needle</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Pcs</td>
<td>p-tusk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>MN?</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Frag. conc.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Needle</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 flake, blade, harpoon, aw-head</td>
<td>5 p-tusks, 160 teeth</td>
<td>Fowl, seal, 103 beads</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>B (W)</td>
<td>MN?</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 pcs</td>
<td>vessel</td>
<td>Whetst</td>
<td>Point</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 scrapers, 4 flakes, axe-frag</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12 beads*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>B (W)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Beads</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Conc</td>
<td>Blade, point</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 beads</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>3-7</td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MN?</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Point</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>175 teeth*</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>17-19</td>
<td>B (E)</td>
<td>MN?</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Needle</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>B (S)</td>
<td>MN?</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>H (W)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18-24m</td>
<td>B (NW)</td>
<td>MN?</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Conc. Axe, grindstone</td>
<td>2 aw-head, whistle, 3 points</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 scrapers, flake</td>
<td>tusk</td>
<td>43 beads*, 33 teeth*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>0-6m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MN?</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>B (W)</td>
<td>MN?</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Conc.</td>
<td>Pcs</td>
<td>Harpoon, point</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5 pcs</td>
<td>32 p-jaws, 5 teeth</td>
<td>Tooth* bead*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MN?</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MN?</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site/Date</td>
<td>Burial no</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Pos (dir)</td>
<td>Dating</td>
<td>Sing/mult</td>
<td>Interment</td>
<td>Preserv.</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Bone: points/needles/beads</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>Boar/Pig etc</td>
<td>Fowl/fish/seal/fox/dog</td>
<td>Ochré</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borgeby</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7-11</td>
<td>- MN A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frag⁸</td>
<td>&gt;20 vssl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&gt;40</td>
<td>Flake</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>- MN A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frag⁸</td>
<td>Vessl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Flake</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-18</td>
<td>- MN A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frag⁸</td>
<td>Pcs</td>
<td>axe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5±16m</td>
<td>- MN A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frag⁸</td>
<td>2-3 vessl/pcs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Flake</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7-11</td>
<td>- MN A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frag⁸</td>
<td>Pcs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Flake</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3-18</td>
<td>B (NE)</td>
<td>MN A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frag⁸</td>
<td>Pcs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Flake</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3-18</td>
<td>- MN A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frag⁸</td>
<td>2 pcs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3-18</td>
<td>- MN A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frag⁸</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6±24m</td>
<td>- MN A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frag⁸</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>- MN A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frag⁸</td>
<td>vssl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>flake</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glåborg/Rabbalshede</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>- LN-EBA</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>St-paving</td>
<td>frag</td>
<td>pcs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>flake</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ire/Hangvar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>B H MN</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 points, 105 beads²</td>
<td>flake</td>
<td>2 pig.-items</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y²  3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2-5-3</td>
<td>H (W) MN</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kastanjegården</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>- MN B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>St-paving</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 vssl</td>
<td>Grind.st, cupst³</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Axe, 9 flakes, 2 scrapers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>- MN B</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>St-paving + casket?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>vssl</td>
<td>2 pcs⁴</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Point, axe, 8 flakes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>teen</td>
<td>- MN B</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>St-paving + casket?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pcs</td>
<td>Axe⁵⁵</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 axes, 4 flakes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>- MN B</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>St-paving</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>vssl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Axe, 2 flakes, scraper</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilla Bedinge</td>
<td>XII/52</td>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>H H MN B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>St-paving</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>4 vssl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>‘bone-thing’</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 axes, 4 blades</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX/49</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>D MN B-LN</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>St-paving</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxie A9</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>LN MN</td>
<td>St-paving</td>
<td>Frag</td>
<td>pcs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Blade, 2 flakes, arwpoint</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table of Burial Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Burial no</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Pos (dir)</th>
<th>Dating</th>
<th>Sing/mult</th>
<th>Interment</th>
<th>Preserv.</th>
<th>Pottery</th>
<th>Stone</th>
<th>Bone: points/needles/beads</th>
<th>Amber</th>
<th>Flint</th>
<th>Boar/pig etc.</th>
<th>Fowl/fish/seal/fox/dog</th>
<th>Ochre</th>
<th>Fish-hook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visby</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>B (N)</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Under-slabs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>B (NE)</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Minor/under-slabs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&gt;70 beads</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 beads</td>
<td>Y, red</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>B (S)</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>159 beads *14</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>(W)</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>B (N)</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Under-slabs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>138 beads *13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>X (N)</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>/-</td>
<td>/-</td>
<td>7 arw, 10 beads</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>B Ø</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>14-17</td>
<td>B (S)</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>St-paving</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 small vessel</td>
<td>22 beads</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>156 beads</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.5-3.5</td>
<td>B (N)</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>St-paving</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Västerbjer 3</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7 beads</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 beads *10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>B (S)</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bead *10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>H (W)</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bead *10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37 beads *10</td>
<td>Y, red</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 beads</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22 beads *10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>3 (NW)</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3 beads</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>16 teeth</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>9 (NW)</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>&gt;1 Dist.</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Keys to appendix 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keys:</th>
<th>Directions:</th>
<th>Positions:</th>
<th>Items:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pos/ (Dir):</td>
<td>(N): North</td>
<td>B: back</td>
<td>Whetst: whetstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(S): South</td>
<td>H: hocker</td>
<td>Grindst: grindstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sing/mult:</td>
<td>(E): East</td>
<td>Dist: distorted,</td>
<td>Arw-head: arrow-head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>(W): West</td>
<td>X: legs crossed</td>
<td>St.paving: stone paving was used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN: Early</td>
<td>(N): North</td>
<td>B: back</td>
<td>Whetst: whetstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>(S): South</td>
<td>H: hocker</td>
<td>Grindst: grindstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN: Middle</td>
<td>(E): East</td>
<td>Dist: distorted,</td>
<td>Arw-head: arrow-head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>(W): West</td>
<td>X: legs crossed</td>
<td>St.paving: stone paving was used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LN: Late</td>
<td>(N): North</td>
<td>B: back</td>
<td>Whetst: whetstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>(S): South</td>
<td>H: hocker</td>
<td>Grindst: grindstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBA: Early</td>
<td>(E): East</td>
<td>Dist: distorted,</td>
<td>Arw-head: arrow-head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>(W): West</td>
<td>X: legs crossed</td>
<td>St.paving: stone paving was used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR: Side right</td>
<td>SL: Side left</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnotes:

1 Vessel containing animal bones
2 thin butted
3 Quills from hedgehog
4 Teeth from seal
5 Fowl
6 In Borgeby the remains consisted of teeth and little else
7 Hollow beads
8 Yellow ochre
9 Cupmarks on the stone
10 Pieces of grind stone
11 Battleaxe
12 Fragmented
13 Toothbeads from seal and fox
14 dog
Appendix 2 Osteological stages of human childhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage I: infancy</th>
<th>Birth to 18-24 months; behavior is instinctive and reflexive, the baby acquires basic motor habits but lacks language and cognitive skills.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage II: early childhood</td>
<td>Age 2-7 years; the child displays intuitive intelligence and spontaneous inter-personal feelings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage III: middle childhood</td>
<td>Age 7-11/12; the child is capable of concrete intellectual operations and displays a moral sense and the ability to engage in social and co-operative behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage IV: adolescence</td>
<td>Age 11-12 years; the child is capable of abstract intellectual operations, and the individual’s personality is fully formed. The child approaches sexual and physical maturity and can act effectively in social and ritual behaviors alongside adults.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Wileman 2005:162)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fetus</td>
<td>From nine weeks to birth, expressed in lunar months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stillbirth</td>
<td>Those born dead after 24 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perinatal</td>
<td>Around birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neonatal, neonate</td>
<td>Birth-27 postnatal days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-neonatal</td>
<td>28 days-364 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant</td>
<td>Birth-1 year of age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Infans I’</td>
<td>Birth-7 years of age (birth to eruption of first permanent molar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Infans II’</td>
<td>5-14 years (complete eruption of first to complete eruption of second permanent molar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>&gt;15 years of age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub adult</td>
<td>&lt;= 15 years of age</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Claesson & Munkeberg 2004:81)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Martin &amp; Saller 1957</th>
<th>Sjøvold 1978</th>
<th>Sellevold etc 1984</th>
<th>Arcini 1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fetus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infants I</td>
<td>0-6/7</td>
<td>0-7</td>
<td>0-6</td>
<td>1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infants II</td>
<td>6/7-14/15</td>
<td>5-14</td>
<td>6-12/14</td>
<td>7-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile</td>
<td>14/15-18/20</td>
<td>10-24</td>
<td>12-14-17-19</td>
<td>15-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juveniles / adults</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17/21</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>18/20-35/40</td>
<td>18-44</td>
<td>20-35</td>
<td>20-39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Ingvarsson-Sundström 2003:28)
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Appendix 4 Cover image: The young skeleton (Ingvarsson-Sundström 2003:221)

Plate 1. Fetal (newborn) skeleton, anterior view (modified from Buikstra & Ubelaker 1994, attachment 5b).