



Focus

A wolf in dog's clothing: Initial dog domestication and Pleistocene wolf variation



Angela Perri

Department of Human Evolution, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Deutscher Platz 6, D-04103 Leipzig, Germany

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 5 August 2015

Received in revised form

7 January 2016

Accepted 26 February 2016

Keywords:

Domestication

Dog

Canis familiaris

Wolf variation

Paleolithic

ABSTRACT

The process and timing of initial dog domestication is an important topic in human evolution and one which has inspired much recent debate. Findings of putative domesticated dogs have recently been reported from two Gravettian sites by Germonpré et al. (2015a), joining a handful of other reputed “Paleolithic dogs” dating to before the Last Glacial Maximum (LGM). Though these findings have been challenged previously, this paper draws attention to the most significant shortcoming in claims of early domesticated dogs – a lack of data on Pleistocene wolf variation. Without comprehensive data on the range of variation within Pleistocene wolf populations, the identification of domesticated dogs from prior to the Late Upper Paleolithic cannot be conclusively accepted or rejected.

© 2016 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

The timing of initial dog (*Canis familiaris*) domestication is critical to our understanding of human evolution. As our first domesticate, dogs are an important model for evaluating the pathways in which human populations may have initiated or responded to increasingly domestic interactions with animals (e.g. Zeder, 2012). Though domestication from a gray wolf (*Canis lupus*) ancestor is widely accepted (Vilà et al., 1997), recent research suggests this ancestor is from a now-extinct population of wolves (Freedman et al., 2014). Dog domestication poses additional complex questions about Pleistocene human–carnivore interactions, as unlike later domesticated livestock species, the wolf is a predator that would have been in competition with human hunters for local prey species. Moreover, wolves were the only animal known to have been domesticated by prehistoric hunter-gatherers (e.g. Thalmann et al., 2013), posing further questions about their initial uses, the process of domestication within a highly-mobile lifestyle, and the location of initial domestication events.

Based on substantial archaeological and genetic evidence, a Late Upper Paleolithic (ca. 16,000 BP) timing for dog domestication is generally accepted. A recent paper by Germonpré et al. (2015a) claims to identify earlier Paleolithic dogs from the Gravettian

sites of Předmostí (ca. 31,000 BP, Czech Republic) and Kostenki 8 (c. 33,500–26,500 BP, Russia). These join three previously-contended “dogs” dating to before 16,000 years ago (Table 1). Though their identification as dogs is widely disputed, researchers have now begun to formulate hypotheses regarding the evolution of human groups in Eurasia based on earlier dates for dog domestication (Bocherens et al., 2015; Shipman, 2015a,b; but see Perri et al., 2015). The domestication of dogs predating the Last Glacial Maximum (LGM) also conflicts with most genetic evidence of a more recent divergence between wolves and dogs (e.g. Axelsson et al., 2013; Freedman et al., 2014; Larson and Bradley, 2014; but see Druzhkova et al., 2013; Thalmann et al., 2013). Importantly, comprehensive comparative data on Pleistocene wolf variation are severely lacking and poorly incorporated into discussions of dog domestication. This deficiency means morphological variations being used to identify putative Paleolithic dogs may actually be identifying natural variation in local wolves. Consequently, recently discovered “Paleolithic dogs” may simply represent previously unknown Pleistocene gray wolf subspecies.

2. Pre-LGM “Paleolithic dogs”

A date of roughly 16,000 years ago has long been the accepted time frame for initial dog domestication (Morey, 1992; Clutton-Brock, 1995; Freedman et al., 2014). Recently, there have been a handful of earlier Paleolithic *Canis* remains proposed as incipient

E-mail address: angela_perri@eva.mpg.de.

Table 1
Putative incipient dogs dated to before 16,000 BP.

Site	Location	Age (cal. BP)	Reference
Goyet Cave	Belgium	ca. 36,500	Germonpré et al., 2009
Razboinichya Cave	Russia	ca. 33,500	Ovodov et al., 2011
Kostenki 8	Russia	ca. 33,500–26,500	Germonpré et al., 2015a
Předmostí	Czech Republic	ca. 31,000	Germonpré et al., 2012; Germonpré et al., 2015a
Eliseevichi 1	Russia	ca. 17,000	Sablin and Khlopachev, 2002

domesticated dogs (Table 1). These sites are all within Europe or Southern Siberia and include Goyet Cave (Germonpré et al., 2009), Razboinichya Cave (Ovodov et al., 2011), Kostenki 8 (Germonpré et al., 2015a), Předmostí (Germonpré et al., 2012, 2015a), and Eliseevichi 1 (Sablin and Khlopachev, 2002). Identifications of these putative dogs were made on the basis of cranial morphometrics, in particular analyses of skull variation, but also mandibles and teeth. These data were analyzed using univariate and multivariate approaches (e.g. ANOVA, Discriminate Function Analysis), utilizing comparative data from ancient and modern dogs and wolves from varying sample sizes. However, the comparative data used can be problematic. Current Pleistocene wolf data suffers from not only a lack of samples, but a bias towards incorporating large northern specimens in analyses, regardless of temporal or geographic parallels (Crockford and Kuzmin, 2012; Morey, 2014). Furthermore, modern wolves are not from the same lineage as domesticated dogs (Freeman et al., 2014), which may cause issues when using them as a comparative model. A continuous decline in wolf populations since ca. 20,000 years ago has also left these modern populations much less varied than during the pre-LGM (Pilot et al., 2014).

The classification of these canids as incipient domesticated dogs is highly contentious and issues related to their identification have been raised previously and will not be repeated here (see Crockford and Kuzmin, 2012; Napierala and Uerpmann, 2012; Boudadi-Maligne and Escarguel, 2014; Morey, 2014; Drake et al., 2015; Morey and Jeger, 2015; but see Germonpré et al., 2013; Germonpré et al., 2015b). Nevertheless, Germonpré et al. (2012) have speculated that these “Paleolithic dogs” were used to haul mammoth meat and recently Shipman (2015a) hypothesized that they helped humans actively hunt mammoth, leading to their outcompeting Neanderthals (but see Perri et al., 2015). Bocherens et al. (2015) also recently speculated that dietary variation among canids at Předmostí supported claims of both wolves and domesticated dogs from the site, suggesting humans were specifically provisioning these “dogs” with a special diet.

3. Variation in Pleistocene wolf populations

The range of natural variation among Pleistocene wolves is the most significantly overlooked factor affecting the identification of potential domesticated dogs. This problem holds similarities to debates regarding the identification of hominin species based on osteological data (e.g. White et al., 2009; Wood and Harrison, 2011) and larger questions about identifying speciation through morphology. Some discussions of dog domestication have recognized that proposed pre-LGM “Paleolithic dogs” may just represent variation within European gray wolf populations (Larson et al., 2012; Thalmann et al., 2013). Skoglund et al. (2015: 4) recently concluded that the more recent timing for dog domestication (ca. 16,000 BP) “would require that the majority of present-day dog ancestry originates from an extinct or presently unsampled wolf population” (see also Freedman et al., 2014; Morey and Jeger, 2015). This same paper (Skoglund et al., 2015) serves to highlight how little is known about multiple regional wolf populations. They sequenced a 35,000 year-old wolf from northern Siberia (Taimyr)

and found that individual was from an unknown Pleistocene wolf lineage which diverged from both the modern wolves and the wolves that went on to become domesticated dogs. Similar findings of extinct late Pleistocene wolf types have been found previously (Leonard et al., 2007), suggesting significant variation in Pleistocene wolf populations.

Ecological factors such as prey specialization, predatory competition, habitat type and climate greatly affect the cranio-dental plasticity and genetic population structure of gray wolves (Carmichael et al., 2001, Carmichael, 2006; Geffen et al., 2004; Pilot et al., 2006; Musiani et al., 2007; Hofreiter and Barnes, 2010; Flowers and Schreve, 2014; Leonard, 2015). This means that within the Pleistocene gray wolf population, variation in local environments would have encouraged a range of wolf ecotypes that were genetically, morphologically, and ecologically distinctive. In locations where human groups were accessing a variety of environments (e.g. uplands, lowlands, arid regions) and in turn may have had contact with several different wolf ecomorphs, variation can be expected in wolf remains from Paleolithic sites. Pleistocene wolf variation may also be a relic of wolves moving into different niches as predator competition varies, as in Central Europe after 35,000 BP, when a significant change in the faunal community led to the disappearance of many species (Musil, 2010). This period also coincided with a warmer, more humid climate which may have encouraged smaller wolf morphs (e.g. Flower and Schreve, 2014). Additionally, wolves are highly mobile in search of mates, territory, or tracking migratory prey. Dispersal distances of several hundred kilometers are common and movements over 1000 km are recorded (Fritts, 1983; Mech, 1987; Mech et al., 1995). Some wolves are also migratory, instead of territorial, following herds of large migratory animals across distances of >1000 km (Mech and Boitani, 2003; Musiani et al., 2007). Given these wide-ranging movements, variation in *Canis* material from archaeological sites, especially in the case of a single individual, may also be the result of interactions between human hunters and transient non-local (dispersing or migratory) wolves.

Recent research intended to verify claims of early domesticated dogs may actually support the concept of ecologically-driven variation in Pleistocene wolves. Dietary isotopic analysis of multiple canids from Předmostí found dietary variation between two groups, with one focusing primarily on mammoth and larger herbivores and the other on reindeer (Bocherens et al., 2015). Though analysis of humans from the same site did not find reindeer to be a significant component of the human diet, the authors suggest the canids with a reindeer-based diet were domesticated dogs. This would imply that human hunters were provisioning dogs with reindeer which they did not eat themselves. A more likely scenario is the presence of multiple wolf ecomorphs in the region — one which functioned in a niche which included scavenging mammoth and taking larger prey like horses, and another which was migratory, targeting medium-sized migratory reindeer.

Additional support for multiple Pleistocene wolf subpopulations may also be found from the site of the oldest proposed “Paleolithic dog”, Goyet Cave. Here, Germonpré et al. (2009) identified unique mtDNA haplotypes from each of the six canids sampled,

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/7441501>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/7441501>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)