



Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group

Ethnography and Archaeological Interpretation of Funerary Remains

Author(s): Peter J. Ucko

Source: *World Archaeology*, Vol. 1, No. 2, Techniques of Chronology and Excavation (Oct., 1969), pp. 262-280

Published by: Taylor & Francis, Ltd.

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/123966>

Accessed: 17-09-2024 20:24 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Taylor & Francis, Ltd. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *World Archaeology*

Ethnography and archaeological interpretation of funerary remains¹

Peter J. Ucko

Professor Childe argued on one occasion (1958a: 4) that the value of the specific ethnographic comparison, for example between the designs of modern Australian and prehistoric Irish carvings, was 'just to show the funny kinds of meanings or purposes that may be attached to the queerer kinds of archaeological data', and such comparison, he argued, was a waste of time. However, in the same article he also stated that: 'It is no more legitimate to impute to Palaeolithic hunters or Neolithic farmers the motives and values of twentieth-century Europeans and Americans than to birds or ants.' It is clear that what is considered funny or queer by one person or culture may be thought normal by another, and there is no reason to think that modern peoples living in remote areas of the world are any more or less peculiar than ourselves, or than any of the groups who lived at various different times and in different areas of the ancient world. The primary use of ethnographic parallels, I have argued several times elsewhere (Ucko and Rosenfeld 1967: 150–8; Ucko 1968: 419–26; Ucko in press), is simple. It is to widen the horizons of the interpreter, as Childe recognized was necessary in his second statement. I have tried to show with cave art (1967), figurines (1968) and rock art (in press) that without a widely orientated approach to archaeological interpretation, the data revealed by the archaeological material itself tends to become swamped by unitary and all-embracing explanation. It is true to say that the careful use of ethnographic data has served to do one major thing – to present the possibility of varied and heterogeneous reasons or causes for a practice. As far as I am concerned, the use of ethnographic parallels can only in very

¹ This paper was delivered as a lecture to the Conference of *The Prehistoric Society* on 'The Interpretation of Funerary Evidence' held in London on 21–3 March 1969. I have left the text and style of this paper essentially unchanged from the lecture delivered on that occasion except for the addition of references; the final section of the paper on 'horizontal stratigraphy' is a short preliminary statement which I hope to expand in the near future. For reasons of time I omitted almost all of the introduction to this paper on the use of ethnographic parallels at the Prehistoric Society conference, but I have reinserted my views on this subject for this publication.

I would like to thank the following people for their comments and interest in this paper, for without them it would have been much more restricted in scope and intention: Dr A. J. Arkell, Mrs M. J. Baldwin, Professor N. A. Barnicot, Dr Maurice Bloch, Mr Stephen Cretney, Dr J. P. Garlick, Dr Jack Goody, Mr Mark Hassall, Mr H. W. M. Hodges, Dr G. W. B. Huntingford, Dr P. Kaberry, Mr Robert Layton, Dr Joan Lewis, Dr Godfrey Lienhardt, Miss Mary-Jane Mountain, Mr Kenneth Painter, Mr John Picton, Dr Vernon Reynolds, Dr Andrée Rosenfeld, Mr Michael Rowlands, Dr Ruth Tringham and especially Dr Peter Morton-Williams. Without the prolonged and merciless pressures exerted by my friends Drs John Alexander and Ian Longworth this paper would probably never have been written, and they would have been spared their 'glimpse into the abyss of original chaos'.

exceptional cases suggest a one-to-one correlation between the acts of tribe A and the remains of culture B, but what they *can* do is to suggest the sorts of possible procedures which may result in the traits characterizing culture B. In Professor Hawkes's words: 'You can use ethnological data obtained from modern primitives to stimulate your imagination by suggesting the sort of religious institutions and spiritual life your prehistoric peoples may or could have had . . .' (1954: 162). Unfortunately, Hawkes continues the sentence, 'but you cannot this way demonstrate what they did have, and you know you cannot even hope to unless you can show some real connection between *this* modern and *that* prehistoric', and he thus highlights a view which may, if taken to its extreme, find itself divorced from anthropological methodology. On the one hand, it has been held that cultural tradition alone can be profitably used to link the known (in this case usually the historic) to the unknown (in this case the prehistoric), and this approach leads to the concentration of attention on the practices over time *within one particular area*. On the other hand, anthropologists have long accepted the use of the comparative method (see, for example, Radcliffe-Brown 1951). Its use directs attention to the variety of cultural responses which have arisen, in different areas and at different times, to cope with problems and situations which are common to human existence. The first approach necessarily relies on the assumption of human cultural continuity (in this case restricted and defined geographically) which in the context of funerary procedures suffers from the practical defect that our knowledge of funerary dicta from early historic civilizations is often meagre in the extreme. In many areas of the Old World there are often hundreds, and even thousands, of years between the earliest written funerary records and the earlier prehistoric activities in the same area (Ucko 1968: 412–13). The second view assumes as proven that no human society is static, whether literate, non-literate or pre-literate, and is therefore concerned with the social situations which may result in similar or different cultural solutions, irrespective of the geographical location or the particular peoples concerned. In the context of funerary practices this is especially important for, as will be shown later in this paper, burial rites are known to change frequently in many situations, and yet, as Adams has recently argued (1968: 203), the various functional possibilities of differential disposal of the dead (especially those which can be found in the archaeological record) are few in number, and may appear in the archaeological record as abrupt changes and therefore as particularly significant.

Just as it is no longer felt necessary today to take up the extreme positions of the 'diffusionists' and 'inventionists', so these two views need not be opposed. Where there is good evidence for continued cultural tradition in a particular area, let it by all means be remembered; where there is textual evidence, let it be produced. But it must be realized that where one particular cultural trait has remained the same over time, it does not necessarily follow that other cultural traits have not changed either – where the same pottery types or funerary practices continue over a space of time, religious beliefs may just as well change as remain static. The real test whether or not any set of material from a particular area is really relevant to the interpretation of earlier material from the same region must again depend on the procedures inherent in the comparative method; it must depend on the closeness of the fit between the facts revealed by the archaeological data and the model which can be constructed from other sources, whether these be from the modern practices of human groups elsewhere in the world or from the ancient practices of people in the

same region. If the historic tradition is the important variable, then the fit will be closest with this material; if the common denominator is human experience, then the fit may equally well be with unrelated groups of people.

Normally, when the range of ethnographic activities is considered, the result is a multiplicity of possible explanations of a particular set of archaeological data; to assess the closest fit, or in other words to narrow down the range of possible alternatives, it becomes necessary to focus in detail on the archaeological data which exists. What I am suggesting is that one of the prime results of the use of ethnographic parallels is to take the archaeologist back to his own material – the width of the approach will make the archaeologist re-analyse his own material. In the context of funerary remains, renewed attention will become focused on bone material, on funerary structures and on the context and arrangement of corpses. It may sound as if all archaeologists should also be anthropologists, and to an unfortunate extent this is in many ways true: ‘unfortunately, our ethnologist colleagues tend to concern themselves with aspects of culture not directly manifested in archaeological remains, so that the archaeologist is obliged to invade their realm to secure the data he needs’ (Campbell 1968: 18).

Evelyn Waugh’s mortuary hostess of *Whispering Glades* asked Mr Barlow ‘now what had you in mind? Embalmmment of course, and after that incineration or not, according to taste. . . . Normal disposal is by inhumement, entombment, inurnment, immurement, but many people just lately prefer insarcophagusment.’ Whatever the complexity or simplicity of the rite, the standard disposal of the dead is a characteristic of man not shared by other vertebrates, even the higher apes. It has commonly been held by the archaeologist that burial practices are synonymous with afterworld beliefs, and almost everyone has accepted the presence of burial offerings and funerary goods as an indication of belief in either the sort of afterworld where the goods may be useful, or in a journey to the afterworld during which the offerings will be needed. Thus, ‘. . . Neanderthal man certainly displayed signs of spirituality . . . in his treatment of the dead’ (Clark and Piggott 1965: 61), and ‘. . . ritual burial presupposes some recognition of the spiritual nature of man, of the existence of a soul capable of living on after death’ (Clark 1960: 232). It is also often argued that formally held religious beliefs imply formal disposal of the dead. Ethnographically, at least, the situation is not always so simple.

The pagan Nupe of Nigeria have a myth of the origin of burial which is much older than Islam in that area and which approaches burial in a quite profane way. Two sons and a daughter were born to the ancestress Adama. ‘When they grew up the two young men both desired their sister. They quarrelled and one was killed. It was thus that death and murder first appeared in the world. The remaining couple did not know what to do with the dead body. They carried the corpse on their shoulders for three days, lamenting and crying, but could not get rid of it. At last, god caused the earth to open, and they placed the body inside. Thus the practice of burial and of three days’ mourning for the dead began. [It is, incidentally, interesting to note that the Nupe do not, in fact, observe a three days’ period of mourning.] The couple now stayed together and begot a male child who became the ancestor of the Nupe people’ (Nadel 1954: 9–10). An attitude to burial simply as a means of disposal, even when a specially designated burial area exists, is not uncommon ethnographically.

It is true to say that burial very often does imply some kind of belief in a spiritual

being, but the beliefs involved may be of the most general kind. Amongst the south-eastern Bantu, for example, graves are sacred only because it is at the grave that the spirits of the deceased are contacted, but there is no associated belief in a journey to the afterworld, and there are no developed ideas about the soul (Gluckman 1937: 127). Amongst the Nuer of the Sudan ordinary burial is a matter of little interest to the community; it amounts to a job of disposal to be performed as quickly as possible by close kin and with as little fuss as possible; sacrifices are only very rarely offered to the dead, and their graves are left unmarked and are almost immediately forgotten (Evans-Pritchard 1951: 209–10; 1956: 144). As will be seen shortly, absence of burial in no way signifies absence of afterworld beliefs.

Surely, then, burial goods must be surer signs of afterworld belief? It is clear that many peoples do indeed place offerings in the tomb, and in some cases these are certainly to provide for the needs of the dead. Among the Nankanse of Ghana, however, it is reported that burial goods are not placed in the tomb to accompany the dead. The archaeologist, however, would find some! These would include the occasional arrow or bangle, and he might well be tempted to identify those few graves with objects in them as those of particularly rich individuals. In fact, however, these objects are included because, during the burial activities, the soul of a *living* person has become trapped in the grave and the sexton has failed to get it out. When this happens the favourite articles of the living person are placed by the sexton in the grave, for while they remain in the grave the person will *not* die. As Rattray says 'such a custom might throw a new interpretation on the reason for such articles being found in graves' (1932: 186). More recent ethnography from the Lugbara of Uganda is both interesting and probably applies to quite a number of primitive tribes. Burial amongst the Lugbara has little or nothing to do with the belief in an afterlife, and the tomb goods have no purpose connected with the afterworld; they are simply the visible expression of part of a person's social personality, the visible expression of his having left the living. A man may be buried with his quiver, representing his activities as a hunter and warrior; with his gourd, representing his mature status as a person who drank with other mature men; with his stool, representing his elderhood; with his oracle objects, representing his status as an operator. A woman may be buried with her beads, representing her status as a girl; with her firestones, representing her status as wife; and with her grinding stones, representing her status as a mother (Middleton 1960: 29, 200). Finally, the poor archaeologist might well be misled by the offerings buried with the pets in Woodlands Private Animal Cemetery in Burwash (Sussex) – these include a teddy bear, coats and blankets, collars, favourite toys and foods in the shape of rubber bones and actual chocolate. In several cases, at least, the pet owners had no thoughts about their animals needing these objects in an afterworld, or on the journey to an afterworld, but simply wished to dispose of objects which had particular emotional connotations (M. J. Baldwin, pers. comm.).

The archaeologist has tackled the opposite situation – the absence or paucity of burial offerings – in two different contexts; first, as a general diachronic phenomenon, and secondly, as evidence to distinguish the poor members of a group from the rich of the same society. On the diachronic cultural level there is little to add ethnographically to the work of Childe, who opposed the commonly reiterated view that the richness of tomb offerings must reflect the general cultural level of wealth or poverty, and who stressed

instead that the number and richness of grave goods after the Early Bronze Age, for example, became less and poorer although the cultures were undoubtedly richer than before (Childe 1944: 85, 87–8, 92; 1945: 13–19). As society became richer, so also it became more reluctant to ‘waste’ its riches; in Ashbee’s words, ‘. . . has the greed of the heirs overcome their religious scruples?’ (1960: 173). Childe also opposed the view that there must have been a change in religious beliefs to account for the paucity of grave goods at a time when the culture was certainly rich, and he pointed out that religious ideas need not have changed prior to a change in custom, but that, over time, ideas of the afterworld might well become less individualistic and more spiritual to correspond to burial custom (1944: 88). Ethnographically there is no doubt that paucity of actual grave goods in the tomb does not correlate with particular types or systems of afterworld belief. Offerings may exist but never reach the tomb for two main reasons, either because they are destroyed before burial, or because they are ‘symbolically’ there, in other words they are thought to be there. Thus the LoDagaa of Ghana are a group of people who have an explicit and well-developed mythology and belief in an afterworld, which includes a journey to the afterworld and a river crossing. The dead are given only a nominal number of offerings in the tomb, for the majority are consumed during the funeral ceremonies (Goody 1959: 137; 1962: 73; and pers. comm.). Amongst the nearby Lober, no goods at all are actually placed in the tomb, for the deceased’s weapons had been placed near to him before burial, and by this symbolic action he may take such weapons with him (Rattray 1932: 446).

Ethnographic evidence also suggests that the second archaeological approach, the identification of poor and rich members of the same society from funerary remains, may not always be as simple as it might at first appear. Archaeologists have at different times used very different and various criteria to try to identify and distinguish the rich from the poor within a community; these include paucity or wealth of *all* tomb-goods, paucity or wealth of certain specified *types* of tomb-goods, separate areas of cemeteries and standardization of burial custom, size of funerary constructions, and the indirect evidence of physical remains. This variety of approach to the problem has in itself not always been helpful; for example, most of the literature on Predynastic Egypt suggests that certain tombs were those of particularly rich individuals, and such rich tombs have, in the majority of cases, been so named by the archaeologist because they contained human figurines. However, when the total number of funerary offerings is considered, it is clear that Predynastic human figurines were placed in some tombs with many tomb goods, in many tombs with few tomb goods, and in very many tombs with no tomb goods at all (Ucko 1968: 181). Two important theoretical points have been made on the subject of the social significance of burial goods, but have been little considered in actual analyses. The first, by Professor Piggott, stresses that all tomb offerings are bound to have been socially selected, according to criteria that remain unknown today, and that where offerings were placed in the tomb, these will in no sense represent a random sample (1969: 558). It follows that the richness or poverty of offerings may in no real sense reflect either the actual material conditions of a society or the actual wealth of any individual, for these may both be subordinated to social and ritual sanctions. The second, by Professor Childe, stresses the impossibility of making relative assessments of wealth and poverty without having comparative material (1958a: 3). In other words, it is impossible to assess whether

a particular megalithic burial, for example, is really significantly rich unless one also has available for comparison less rich forms of contemporary burial. As will be seen shortly, it is the absence of comparative 'commoner' material which can frequently be inferred from the physical remains. Even when such comparative potentially 'commoner' material is available, as, for example, in the Bronze Age barrow and flat-grave burials of Denmark, the evidence shows that both forms of burial included particularly rich individuals (Broholm 1944: 285).

It is already clear that, on the general cultural level, paucity of burial goods does not necessarily imply a low level of material wealth. High-ranking and wealthy priests of certain cults of the Yoruba of Nigeria are given funeral rites of great splendour, together with a profusion of valuables which are displayed at the funeral. These valuables, which are provided by the kinsmen of the dead person, do not however find their way into the grave, but are taken by the deceased's fellow priests of the same cult association. In other cases, images of wood, brass, clay or ivory may be placed in a Yoruba grave simply because the dead person's heirs are not members of the same cults as he was and do not know how to handle them, or because they were used for sorcery and are therefore too dangerous to keep. Apart from such images, Yoruba grave goods may include items of personal equipment but not valuables. Clearly, in the Yoruba case, individual wealth will not be reflected in either the number or quality of tomb goods (Peter Morton-Williams, pers. comm.). There are, however, several ethnographic echoes of the criteria already selected by the archaeologists. In Dahomey, for instance, the individual's wealth is reflected both in the number of offerings placed in the tomb and the depth of the actual tomb (Herskovits 1938: 359) – the latter trait, incidentally, being one not always considered by the archaeologist and one which at Tiszapolgar-Basatanya was found to be in no way correlated with richness or poverty of offerings (Bognár-Kutizian 1963: 386 ff.). Amongst various tribes of Nigeria we find that chiefs are always accorded a different burial from all others in the society (Meek 1925: 105, 112–13); furthermore, in certain of these tribes particular areas of the funerary hill are reserved for different ranks of chiefs and nobles (Meek 1931a), a practice which may be thought to parallel the selection of definite areas of various cemeteries for rich and poor. In Madagascar, in the recent past, ordinary tombs of the Merina population (excluding their slaves) were built outside village walls, nobles' tombs inside village walls, those of the highest nobles had mortuary houses built on top of the tombs, and kings were placed in model boats inside one of three especially huge tombs (Bloch 1967: 173; and pers. comm.). But these examples do throw some doubt on Childe's simple twofold distinction between chief and king, the former buried in a way similar to commoners but with more pomp and expense, and the king buried in a way significantly different from anyone else in the society (Childe 1958b: 13). Selection of separate sites for the poor is, of course, also known in Christian cemeteries, customarily the northern parts which were not within the sun's 'genial influence within whose rays no imp or fairy, demon of ill, or spectre pale can haunt the silent graves' (Gomme 1887: 205–6), a reservation for the poor sanctioned by Acts of Parliament from the nineteenth century onwards. In ancient Rome, too, the poor had at certain times a special cemetery reserved for them and at other times were exposed to birds of prey, or were thrown down wells or on to rubbish heaps (Nock 1932: 322). In at least one northern Nigerian tribe, it is the poor who receive no burial at all; Hindus who can afford

it are cremated and then taken to the Ganges for disposal, whereas the poor are now given to burial. For the pets of Woodlands there is similar discrimination, the rich owners burying in one cemetery with headstones and other paraphernalia, and the poor saving some twenty guineas by burying in a separate cemetery, without permanent markers or upkeep. As is known from Dynastic Egypt, for example, burial areas for poor and rich are not always reserved in this way, for at Thebes poor graves are scattered anywhere between and around the larger and richer tombs (Abdul-Qader 1966: 3–4). For the archaeologist to decide what, if any, differentiation of poor from rich has been adopted at a particular site, and to get reasonable comparative material, it is therefore vital to uncover a large area of a burial ground.

This variety of ethnographic practice leads to the vexed archaeological problem of interpreting the significance of barrows, megaliths, and other large funerary structures in terms of the richness and poverty of the deceased. And this problem in itself leads back to the physical remains, as well as to the significance of absence of burial. Several archaeologists have stressed the size of certain funerary structures, and have maintained that the work of their construction was so great that they must have been made for rulers, chiefs or kings of some sort (e.g. Childe 1958b: 66, 128; Fox 1959: 122; Griffiths 1960: 329–30). But one of the confusing elements in such an interpretation is the number of both primary and secondary burials often associated with such constructions, for they are assumed to be too many to represent anything less than several members of a royal, or chiefly, lineage or family, and yet they are too few to represent more than a very small part of the total population. Many archaeologists have assumed that the burials of commoners are still to be uncovered. It was with this problem in mind that Childe paid especial attention to the distribution of the chambered cairns of Rousay Island in the Orkneys, a small area with relatively well preserved remains, and concluded that ‘each tomb . . . belonged to a noble or leader and his or her family, the labour force . . . [being] supplied by his followers’ (1942). It is certainly true that in several societies today the size of tombs often reflects status, and from ancient Egypt, interestingly enough, there seems evidence to show that it is the actual power rather than the theoretical ranking of different established titled groups which is reflected in the size of funerary structures (Abdul-Qader 1966: 13). But there are also ethnographic examples which suggest that the large funerary structure may have a very different meaning: the Merina of Madagascar build large tombs of stone, one or more to each village, which represent to them a visible expression of stability and ‘belonging somewhere’. This tomb construction is extremely costly, so much so that any individual is forced to choose his own potential tomb fairly early in life, shortly after marriage, in order to contribute to regular maintenance of a tomb, improving its appearance, and refurbishing the concrete. A Merina does this by joining a particular tomb association which looks after such funerary affairs, but before this he has to choose which tomb he wishes to be buried in, for he has the right to opt for either of his parents’ tombs, his grandparents’ tomb, or even his wife’s tomb (Bloch 1967; 1968; and pers. comm.). There is a twofold importance to this example; first, that the size and standardization of such tombs is in no way correlated with particular emphasis of religious belief, for in this society, although there is a general belief in ghosts, there is no regular ancestor worship of any kind, and second, that the expenses connected with funerary construction bear no relation to actual material wealth,

for the Merina tombs are by far the best built and most solid structures in their society, and they contrast greatly with the normal poor, impermanent, shabby dwelling houses. They have stone and cement walls with the top packed by a huge stone slab covered with concrete. From a trap-door, an underground staircase leads to a massive stone, acting as the door to an underground burial chamber of about twenty feet square, in which the corpses are laid on shelves. Merina explanation for spending much more on a tomb than a house is that 'one stays much longer in the tomb'. A Merina tomb contains the bones, therefore, not of a royal lineage but of a cross-section of a local population, including males, females and children, some of whom are related by marriage and some by kinship. These bones are in most cases not deposited in the tomb at death but usually after a gap of some years. The more recent corpses are then placed in a more honoured position – the upper shelf on the north side – while the longest dead are moved into new places to make room (Bloch 1967; 1968; and pers. comm.). On the basis of Merina practice, it is perhaps necessary to re-think the assumption that very costly tombs must always imply a ruling family or dynasty. The differently-aged individuals of different sex in several chambered long barrows such as Lanhill and West Kennet, need not all have been either related or sacrificed to accompany a leader (Keiller *et al.* 1938; Piggott 1962). Around the entrances to Merina tombs are 'temporary' burials of children and certain categories of adults, including the very poor who await the reopening of the tomb (Maurice Bloch, pers. comm.). In the Merina case, any interpretation of these 'temporary' burials as satellite burials of wives, slaves or sacrifices would be quite out of place. It is worth noting, at this point, that a lapse of a considerable time, often several years, between funeral and second burial is a very common feature of ethnographic practice. In all cases where there is any data, this long interval is said to be to allow sufficient funds and arrangements to be organized. The lapse in time between death and funeral in many societies, including the Jews who have special experts to guard the body and look for any signs of life (Polzen *et al.* 1962: 229 ff.), may well be correlated with what has been called 'the morbid fear of premature burial' which still causes many people today to order in their wills that their own death must be proved either by surgical incision, the application of heat, or even decapitation before burial (Mant 1968: 18–19). The only sure sign of death until very recent times was the onset of putrefaction.

With the Merina example in mind, the importance of physical remains associated with archaeological material is obvious. In the end it is clear that the number, sex, and age of individuals found in a funerary structure will greatly influence interpretation as to who it was that was selected to be buried in a particular way. In a recent highly ingenious set of calculations, Professor Atkinson has deduced for chambered tombs of Neolithic England that only a selected part of the population received such burial, and he states that 'the bodies of some, and perhaps the majority, of the dead were habitually disposed of in a way which has left no archaeological trace' and that 'the population of the greater part of the British Iron Age does not appear in the funerary record', and he asks 'where, for that matter, are the burials of our Late Bronze Age?' (1968: 92). Atkinson maintains that there is no difficulty in supposing that all this funerary material has no record in the archaeological data (1968: 92). Professor Clarke has also pointed to the combination of frequent human bones on Iron Age A sites and rare burials, and has suggested an explanation in terms of either cannibalism or exposure of the corpses (1962: 169). Nevertheless, it is

striking that it has apparently proved difficult for many archaeologists in the past, including Childe (1951: 61), to accept that any adult section of the population was simply left unburied. The archaeologist's apparent feeling that abandonment implies lack of concern with the dead is not supported by ethnographic practice. Abandonment is simply one of the many forms of disposal of the dead among, for example, the Australian aborigines, and is regarded by them in no different way from all their other methods (Howitt 1904). The Nandi of Kenya can serve as an example of concern with an afterworld nevertheless associated with the practice of abandonment; but the same practice and association of ideas is true of several other tribes (Huntingford 1953a). The Nandi believe that, at death, a person's shadow also dies, but his heart continues to live and eventually journeys to spirit land. This journey can take place only through the agency of hyaenas, and for this reason the corpse is laid out for the hyaenas to eat it. Should it remain uneaten for more than four days, appropriate sacrifices are undertaken to ensure that it will be eaten, for a heart which does not go to spirit-land is highly dangerous (Huntingford 1953b; and pers. comm.).

So far I have only briefly mentioned by implication what is perhaps the most important of all the lessons to be drawn from the ethnographic material – the point stressed most strongly by Dr Goody in his 1955 paper to the British Association (Goody 1959) – namely, that in the vast majority of cases known ethnographically, a culture or society is not characterized by one type of burial only, but that, on the contrary, one society will undertake several different forms of burial, and that these forms will often be correlated with the status of the deceased. Ethnographically, differences in place of burial may differentiate the rich from the poor, and there are several archaeological examples of status differentiation also by place of burial. Thus at Olen Island the lack of very small infants leads to the conclusion that they at least were buried, if they were buried at all, in a different place from the rest of the population, possibly within the settlement (Gurina 1956: 47). At Tiszapolgar-Basatanya, Kutzian records (1963: 392 ff.) that in Period I there was a striking disparity in numbers of males and females, an imbalance of 44 females to 100 adult males, and 50 female children to 100 male children, and concludes that there must have been a social reason, as opposed to a natural sexual disparity, for this imbalance. She postulates either sacrifice or infanticide, with subsequent disposal away from the main cemetery. The archaeological picture so far, therefore, is that certain groups were buried in areas away from the rest of the population. Ethnographically, the picture is rather different; burial customs in society after society reflect different categories of people, categories which are sometimes defined on purely social grounds and sometimes on physical characteristics which may, of course, also have an associated social definition. Furthermore, these differences are reflected not only in the use of different places for burial but also in such funerary features as the degree of elaboration of rites, the types of grave construction used, the different forms of orientation of the bodies, different degree of contraction or 'flexure' (Sprague 1968: 481) of the body, the use of cenotaph as opposed to tomb, or the absence of any form of burial.

In many societies babies and children are distinguished in burial custom from adults. In Rome, babies with no teeth received no burial at all (Nock 1932: 322); amongst the Shona, babies and older children were buried near flood water and away from the rest of the population (Ballock 1950: 175 ff.; Peter Fry, pers. comm.); amongst the Murngin,

there is further differentiation by age: the newborn received no burial, the young child was buried in the camp, and the older child was buried at the camp edge (Warner 1964: 424–5); amongst several Ghanaian tribes, children were placed at crossroads, a place of dispersal to help scatter the potentially annoying habits of individuals who were, by their age, still only incipient human beings (Goody 1962: 148 ff.); amongst the Ashanti, any infant who dies under the age of eight days is buried in a pot in a latrine, for he was in fact just a ghost child and had no real intention of staying in this world (Rattray 1959: 59–60); amongst several tribes, disposal of babies and young children was characterized by an absence of, or at most perfunctory, burial ritual. There seems little reason not to associate these forms of child disposal with the high infant mortality rate amongst most primitive and prehistoric peoples. It is only necessary to remember the advice in the Middle Ages to a woman who had just produced her sixth child, ‘Before they are old enough to bother you, you will have lost half of them, or perhaps all of them’ (Yudkin, 1968: 46) to see, first, why so many societies only accept a child as a fully-fledged social human being after a certain age, and second, why British law is so exceptional when it states that any child, even the stillborn should it have ‘any sign of life’, is subject to the normal adult inhumation and cremation laws of the country (see Polsen *et al.* 1962: 38).

A cursory look at African ethnography shows that in many societies various other categories, apart from children, may be singled out for different burial from the rest of the population. These include lepers, those killed by lightning, those who die in childbirth, those who have died violently in battle, those who have drowned, those who are said to have died of smallpox or dropsy, witches, twins, priests, chiefs, the murderer, the suicide and the very old. It is worth spending just a minute or two with a few specific examples. The Nandi, the tribe who normally dispose of corpses by exposing them to hyaenas, *bury* their very old and those with no first teeth, for both categories can go straight to spirit-land without the hyaena agency, for they are near to the spirits and were in any case just coming or just going (G. W. B. Huntingford, pers. comm.). In many societies the lepers and those who are said to die from dropsy and smallpox receive no burial or are buried in the bush, a fact which makes one wonder whether the physical remains from prehistoric burial grounds really give those who collect incidence of disease in antiquity any sort of reasonable sample. In several societies cenotaphs, with or without replicas of the deceased, are erected for those who die by drowning, or those who died while far away (Herskovits 1938: 394 ff.), a feature tending to reinforce the courage of those who in reports such as the excavation of Crig-a-mennis (Christie 1960: 88–9) have insisted that their particular barrow was empty of any corpse, and have not assumed such factors as particularly bad conditions of preservation to explain the absence of skeletal finds (e.g. Coles *et al.* 1965).

I have already said that many other methods exist, beyond that of placing a body apart or not burying the body at all, to differentiate categories of people. It is quite clear that the more the archaeologist manages to refine his definitions and terminology for describing such factors as body contraction the more likely he is to recognize what may have been socially significant differences in funerary practice. The archaeologist often assumes that the significant features of orientation are the direction of the head and the way the corpse faces; ethnographically, there are many different ways of orientating a body apart from these two more obvious ways. ‘Cases occur when the body is placed to lie in a position of

definite relationship to its axis and not to the direction in which it is facing.' In another case the dead 'are interred on the south side of the village . . . [and] this position is definitely related to the south point of the compass and . . . the act of placing the body in a definite position relative to the village is really orientation' (Perry 1914: 281). It used to be claimed by ethnographers that the corpse was always orientated in the direction in which the spirit was to travel, a direction which correlated both with the position of the land of the dead and the home of the peoples' forefathers (Perry 1914: 282–6). There is no doubt that there are many examples, such as some groups of the Shona of Rhodesia (Ballock 1950: 176) where this *is* the aim of orientation, but this is by no means invariably true. In the case of the Merina, with their huge stone collective tombs, there are strict rules as to the standardization of both tomb structure and orientation, tomb entrances facing west and the heads of all corpses placed at the east end. This strictness has no relation to the ancestral area, which is in the north-east, which itself has no geographical relation to the hill of the dead (Maurice Bloch, pers. comm.). We must note still one more variation on the theme of the direction of the head; in some tribes, where the head is placed south and the feet north, the deceased is in fact orientated to look north at the land of the dead, for this is the position which he will be facing when he rises up (Perry 1914: 282). This practice is reminiscent of Christian practice where the heads should be placed to the west and feet to the east so that, according to folk lore at least, the rising body faces east at the time of the Last Judgment. And here it is important to note that in Christian practice also, orientation of this kind is used to differentiate certain categories of people, for a Roman Catholic priest and bishop is not only buried in a specially reserved part of the cemetery but is also laid with his feet to the west (Dearmer 1931: 42; and see Polson *et al.* 1962: 229) so that 'in death, as in life, he faces his flock'.

It may not be the direction of the head and feet which is in fact the important feature in orientation. At Egyptian Armant the excavators suggested that the rather erratic orientations of north/south and east/west were due either to the Predynastic Egyptians having tried to orientate to the sun and moon, using the river as a convenient guide 'thinking of it as always running north and getting muddled where it changed direction', or that the burials were 'unrelated to the sun and intended to be parallel to the river, the bodies lying in the direction of the flow of the water' (Mond and Myers 1937: 10). Such relation to a river, up which the spirit will travel to the land of the dead, is a practice known ethnographically from several tribes (e.g. Perry 1914: 282).

There is still one more variable to be considered – the direction which the corpse faces – for in some societies it is this which may be the most important criterion. As is well known from Muslim practice, the corpse may face the direction of a particularly important place, in this case Mecca. Most commonly, but not always, in West African practice at least, the body lies on the left or right side depending on its sex, just as was undoubtedly the case at such sites as Tizapoltgar-Basatanya (Bognár-Kutzyan 1963: 354). Ethnographically, in Africa there is usually no religious significance associated with this variable. In Nigeria and Ghana, many different tribes place the male on his right facing east and the female on her left side facing west. The male faces east towards the rising sun so that he knows when to prepare for the hunt or for working on the farm; the female faces west so that she will know when it is time to prepare the food for her husband – 'the sun is setting, I shall not have time to grind; I shall not have time to get my husband's

food' (e.g. Meek 1925: 123; Rattray 1932). Such standardization is not in any way general – thus in Dahomey there is no rule at all regarding on which side the corpse should lie (Herskovits 1938: 352).

I fondly imagine that Ashanti practices would contribute to an archaeologist's nightmare, for in Ashanti there is a general rule that the body should *not* face the village; however, there are some Ashanti who say that immediately after burial the body turns itself round to face the village. Some, but not all, Ashanti therefore bury the dead *facing* the village knowing that the body will turn itself round and will therefore eventually conform to the rule of facing the forest (Rattray 1927: 162).

So much variability has been seen to exist both between cultures and within a culture, that it becomes all-important to consider the question whether prehistorians are generally correct in laying so much stress on the usefulness of burial customs to identify different groups of people, and are right in assuming that burial practices are the kind of traits which can be treated as diagnostic of different cultures (and therefore of cultural contact and change). In a sense there is historic archaeological material to suggest that funerary monuments are not always good indicators of different religious beliefs and different ethnic groups. Finley has recently drawn attention to the fact that we know virtually nothing at all about the Jewish community which undoubtedly existed, in significant numbers, during the Empire in Sicily (Finley 1968: 168–9). The reason for this ignorance is that the Jews spoke Greek not Hebrew, they had no specially reserved burial place apart from the rest of the population, and their tombstones were inscribed like those of the non-Jews, except for the occasional seven-branched candelabrum and the very occasional inscription, 'never having broken the commandment'. If funerary procedures and structures do not always distinguish quite different populations, and if one and the same population uses several different modes of burial, is it really possible to agree with Professor Piggott's view that burial is the most conservative of rites (1938: 92–4)? Ethnographically, and there would seem little necessity to assume a different situation in prehistory, one of the features characterizing burial rites is their speed of change and their relative instability. By far the most important study of this problem was carried out by Professor Kroeber as long ago as 1927: 'The distribution of burial and cremation customs [in aboriginal California] failed to conform to the distribution of other culture traits in the area and was irregular in itself. The line separating the two mortuary practices on the map ran across rather than with topographic, climatic and floral boundaries. They departed considerably from the approximately definable culture areas and sub-areas. *And there was no agreement whatever with the distribution of other customs, connected with death . . .* [my italics]. It must be remembered that native California is a region of unusual cultural stability' (1927: 308). Turning to Africa and Australia, Kroeber notes the infinite variety of burial customs and points out that 'several methods co-exist in one tribe, and the same method has different applications in successive tribes. . . . These variations between adjacent peoples, and the numerous instances of co-existence of several practices within one population, constitute a powerful argument for instability' (1927: 313; and see Meek 1925: 104–5). Certainly it is common in Africa to find that different sections of the same tribe have different burial customs, and that some of these have been adopted and adapted from Muslim influence in a remarkably short time. Similarly, the Australian Murngin were quick to adopt a new way of marking graves, in addition to grave posts, by

setting up ceremonial masks, a feature adapted from Malay ships (Warner 1964: 458). Adams may be correct when he makes the interesting point that, 'Other factors being equal, it is probable that continuity of tradition depends very largely upon frequency of activity . . . and most primitive communities are small and there may be an interval of months, or occasionally even years, between deaths' (Adams 1968: 203). This view recalls Firth's distinction between social organization and social structure. The social structure provides the precedent and limits the range of alternatives while the social organization is concerned with 'concrete activity' and acts of choice and decision in which the time element is an important variable (Firth 1951: 35-40). Furthermore, there are ethnographic indications that rather mundane matters may radically affect burial customs – a feature which again points to relative instability. Thus, the LoDagaa shorten the set length of time before a corpse should be buried if there is farming to be done, and they choose the position of the funeral stand according to the availability of shade trees (Goody 1962: 79). When the archaeological material is examined with variation and instability in mind, there are many echoes of the ethnographic record. At many provincial Roman sites, cremation and inhumation rites followed each other many times and with great rapidity (Nock 1932: 325-7); in several barrows, such as Arreton Down, inhumation and cremation rites were used within a maximum of two generations and possibly within the same generation (Alexander *et al.* 1960: 271); Adams has recently shown for the Sudan that burial customs reflect neither ethnic stability nor ethnic change (1968: 202-3); there is evidence from ancient Egypt that orientation of offering chambers may change without any alteration in religious belief, and that a feature as mundane as the slope of the ground may change the whole orientation of graves (Reisner 1932: 165, 188); there is also the evidence from many sites that at the same time as inhumation in a cemetery, bodies were also disposed of in the settlement (e.g. Gurina 1956: 47); there is evidence of the contemporaneity of barrow and flat grave burials (e.g. Glasbergen 1956: 141); and so on.

For some time now, Professors Piggott and Clark have made it clear that, in their view, a change from inhumation to cremation, or vice versa, cannot simply, or necessarily, be equated with the arrival of newcomers or a change in religious beliefs (e.g. Piggott 1965: 145; Clark 1960: 232). Ethnographically, there are cases from different parts of the world where cremation is used for one section of the population and inhumation for other sections of the same population (e.g. Macleod 1965: 129 ff.). The weight of evidence for ancient Rome is strongly on the side of the view that there were no changes in religious belief to explain the switch from cremation to inhumation, and furthermore these two practices were in no way distinguished either in funerary regulations or by funerary terminology (e.g. Momigliano 1963: 103; Nock 1932; de Visscher 1963: 3, 18, 32). And, after all, England is a country where burial rites have changed both rapidly and considerably in recent times but without an associated change in religious beliefs; in 1885 only 3 cremations took place, 13 years after the Regular Cremation Act there were 1,400, and in 1960 35% of the population was cremated (see Polson *et al.* 1962: 149). Even more striking, perhaps, is the fact that within a space of three years a tenth of the Roman Catholic population of some British towns has adopted cremation rites. Despite this wealth of evidence, there are still many prehistorians who assume that cremation reflects some new form of spiritualism as compared to materialistic inhumation (e.g. Broholm 1944: 291), and many who assume that where both inhumations and cremations are found in a single

site, these represent either the activities of two groups of different peoples or a recent intermingling and fusion of previously independent communities (e.g. Smith and Simpson 1966: 134).

Ethnographically, the funerary record also warns us against being too negative, for clearly at any given moment burial practices *may* in some way characterize particular societies. Ethnography suggests that the archaeologist may perhaps still have further to define and refine his methods of analysing funerary material. It is clear that certain regions and groups of tribes, for example the so-called southern Nilo-Hamites of East Africa, *are* characterized by particular funerary practices – in this case the exposure of the body to hyaenas, although there are minor variations regarding which section of the population, children and/or the very old, receive inhumation burial. Only the Sandawe stand out from the rest of these East African tribes, for they practise deep inhumation burial inside the cattle pen, but these are the very people who, on totally different grounds, have long been thought possibly not to belong to this Nilo-Hamitic linguistic group (Huntingford 1953a: 13, 139). Similarly the funerary customs of three related tribes on the north-west coast of America do serve to link them together, for they share a common cremation practice and yet all of them inhume their shamans in isolation away from the rest of the population. But it is equally important to note that one of these tribes buries the shaman lying on his side, while the other two place him in a sitting position with knees raised to the chin (Macleod 1925: 128–9). It may therefore be true to say for some groups of tribes that there is one particularly characteristic method of disposal of the dead but at the same time no exclusive burial type. In other areas, such as the Mississippi, it may be that some individual tribes, but not *groups* of tribes, are characterized by a particular method of disposal, although again not by an exclusive burial form (Bushnell 1920: 146). Why this should be so for some areas and tribes but not for others, such as Australia, the ethnographer cannot as yet say. In the majority of cases it would seem that the archaeologist may have, where possible, to switch his attention away from the one exclusive burial form (e.g. cremation versus inhumation) to the exceptional and possibly diagnostic cultural trait such as the crossed legs of inhumed skeletons (S. Sulimirski, pers. comm.), or to the varying *proportions* of different burial practices within a particular group or area, in order to construct any sort of diagnostic typology of funerary customs. In no case will this be easy to do, but in many ways it is an essential procedure, for simple classification alone of burial types, without their relative proportions, offers too many dangers. As I have said already, the range of possibilities of different forms of burial is in any case not very large, and it is especially small when considered from the point of view of what is visible in the archaeological record. Hence non-meaningful similarities between different societies are bound to be found wherever a number of societies practise several different disposal methods at the same time. In many cases, those where both exposure and burial existed, this will again focus attention on the physical remains discovered, for only on the basis of comparison between assumed demography and actual numbers of individuals discovered is it possible to assess the likelihood of a form of disposal having existed which has left no direct traces in the archaeological record. The interpretations of the significance of the physical remains will also have to be refined. For example, it is not generally realized that cremation, even at temperatures between 700–950° C as used in modern England, will leave bone remains of up to 3 in. long (Polson *et al.* 1962: 153),

and that ethnographically, for instance on the north-west coast of America, it is the custom for widows to carry around large charred bones for several years while looking after their husband's buried ashes (Macleod 1925: 123). Assessment of the minimum number of individuals represented in cremation remains may have to rely just as much on the total weight of ashes as on large diagnostic bone remains. Similarly, it may not be sufficient simply to assume that incorrect articulation implies that various corpses have been lying around together for some time before burial, for the Ashanti rearranged the skeletons of kings after the flesh had been removed from the bones, and, so it is reported, often rearticulated the skeleton wrongly (Rattray 1959: 59–60).

Several tribes, such as the Nigerian Jukun, dig two different types of grave, one oval with lateral niche and the other rectangular with central niche, and both forms are claimed to be indigenous by the Jukun themselves (Meek 1931b: 218 ff.). It is, of course, possible that they *may* in fact have had different histories, but the important point is that at any given moment a culture may include more than one grave type without the people themselves making any distinction between them. It is possible that, rather than simply recognizing different grave types, the archaeologist may find study of more detailed features more rewarding. Thus the archaeological suggestion that a period of transition may be represented by graves which are large enough for inhumations but in fact contain only cremations (e.g. Proudfoot 1963: 405), may well have much to recommend it. This feature finds an interesting parallel with transitional Jewish practice, for in orthodox terms the instruction 'thou shalt in anywise bury him' rules out the practice of cremation. However, over the last years, more and more rabbis are accepting cremation provided that the ashes are buried in a coffin of the normal size and shape used for inhumation (see Polson *et al.* 1962: 264 ff.).

As I pointed out at the beginning of this paper, the useful ethnographic parallel is almost bound to add variability to archaeological interpretation and to an archaeological approach. Furthermore, although burials and funerary structures, to the archaeologist, are static items uncovered in excavation, they are, of course, the result of various social processes. Several archaeological studies of cemeteries pay close attention to the assumed growth patterns of these burial places, but they focus attention on the chronological implications without considering the possible form of social processes which must have been involved. It is significant that it is standardization which characterizes the archaeologists' concept of 'horizontal stratigraphy', a phenomenon for which there are considerable archaeological claims: '... it is the horizontal spread of a cemetery that gives the best clues. Once the original core can be located ... and the general line of its expansion established ... , it is possible to obtain a fair idea of the relative age of individual graves, even when provided with no closely datable grave goods' (Clark 1960: 130; and see Hodson 1968: 13). Obviously a cemetery must, over time, grow in some way or another but the rows of graves or the 'logical, if not necessarily regular pattern of growth' (Hodson 1968: 22) assumed in several recent archaeological studies, contrasts greatly with most ethnographic procedures. A particular area may be specified for burial for many different reasons, including hygiene, but in the many ethnographic cases where this occurs there is no more regulation than the occasional division of the area by class or clan. Ethnographic practice varies from the Shona, where it is the dying man himself who, where possible, specifies the exact place of his own tomb and is buried by his sons-in-law (Peter

Fry, pers. comm.), to the LoDagaa, where reciprocal groups act mutually for each other as grave diggers and it is they who choose the particular spot for burial (Goody 1962: 67–8; and pers. comm.). Although these practices may lead to groupings of kin or neighbours on some occasions, in most the graves are placed more or less haphazardly within the designated area and in no case do they result in more or less regular rows of chronologically differentiated graves (Bognár-Kutzian 1963: 229–31). Not even the rich and prosperous of Chinese society were laid in orderly manner in a cemetery, for here ‘geomancy was the “cause” of dispersed burial’ (Freedman 1968: 78). Amongst the Egbira of Nigeria, where Muslim and Christian influence has resulted in a graveyard under the control of a resident warden, the colonial policy of separating the graveyard into three different parts, for Muslims, Christians and traditionalists, and arranging the graves in neat rows, has failed – the grave diggers are much too concerned to choose sites where land is relatively free of rocks to conform to government wishes or the nearness of kin (John Picton, pers. comm.). It is only with modern Christianity, where we find an incumbent in whom is vested the freehold of a churchyard, who in practice controls what monuments are erected in the churchyard and who can specify where burials are placed, that there is the sort of organization apparently assumed for prehistory in some studies of horizontal stratigraphy. But even in the growth of Christian cemeteries, chronology and order have often been sacrificed to personal idiosyncrasy, conflicting pressures, and human error. In the newly-acquired extension to a churchyard in Buckinghamshire, for example, the plan was to have several regular rows of graves. The first grave in this new extension was placed centrally in the area furthest from the old graves; the relatives of the deceased managed to prevail over established custom in having the inscribed headstone placed at the east end of the grave so that the new grave could be seen clearly from the longer-established part of the graveyard. Subsequent burials, with headstones at the west end of the graves, were placed in a row on *either side* of this first burial. One grave plot in the row remains empty, for the ground was then so uneven that the part-time gravedigger concerned assumed that a burial had taken place there on a previous occasion; another grave plot contains only the ashes of a male cremation and is marked only with a small horizontal plaque, and this plot will be used later for the inhumation of the deceased’s wife. If this is the sort of irregularity that occurs under even such a strict burial regime, it is vital to ask what sort of social situation must have existed in prehistory which allows the archaeologist to question his own methods of relative dating when he finds a grave which he considers to be out of place (e.g. Hodson 1968: 22). In Allerton cemetery, at least, *grave-goods* would presumably be better guides to the dates of burials than would the horizontal stratigraphy of the graves – a recent advertisement in the *Liverpool Daily Post* read: ‘Double-grave for sale; purchased many years ago by well-known Liverpool family in the best part of Allerton cemetery but now surplus to requirements.’

14.iv.69

University College London

References

- Abdul-Qader, M. Mohammed. 1966. *The Development of the Funerary Beliefs and Practices displayed in the private tombs of the New Kingdom of Thebes*. Cairo.
- Adams, W. Y. 1968. Invasion, Diffusion, Evolution? *Antiquity*. 42:194–215.
- Alexander, J. *et al.* 1960. Report on the Investigation of a round barrow on Arreton Down, Isle of Wight. *Proc. Prehist. Soc.* 26:263–302.
- Ashbee, P. 1960. *The Bronze Age Round Barrow in Britain*. London.
- Atkinson, R. J. C. 1968. Old mortality: some aspects of burial and population in neolithic England. In *Studies in Ancient Europe*, eds J. M. Coles and D. D. A. Simpson. Leicester.
- Ballock, C. 1950. *The Mashona and Metabele*. Cape Town.
- Bloch, M. E. F. 1967. The significance of tombs and ancestral villages of rural Merina social organisation. Ph.D. thesis.
- Bloch, M. E. F. 1968. Tombs and conservatism among the Merina of Madagascar. *Man JRAI*. NS 3 (1):94–104.
- Bognár-Kutzián, I. 1963. *The Copper Age Cemetery of Tiszapolgár-Basatanya*. Budapest.
- Broholm, H. C. 1944. *Danmarks Bronzealder*. Copenhagen.
- Bushnell, D. I. 1920. Native cemeteries and forms of burial east of the Mississippi. *Bureau of Amer. Ethnology*. 71.
- Campbell, J. M. 1968. Territoriality among ancient hunters: interpretations from ethnography and nature. In *Anthropological Archaeology in the Americas*. Washington.
- Childe, V. G. 1942. The chambered cairns of Rousay. *Antiquaries Journal*. 22:138–42.
- Childe, V. G. 1944. *Progress and Archaeology*. London.
- Childe, V. G. 1945. Directional changes in funerary practices during 50,000 years. *Man*. 4:13–19.
- Childe, V. G. 1951 (revised 1963). *Social Evolution*. London.
- Childe, V. G. 1958a. Valediction. *Bull. Inst. of Archaeol.* 1:1 ff.
- Childe, V. G. 1958b. *The Prehistory of European Society*. London.
- Christie, P. M. 1960. Crig-a-mennis: a Bronze Age barrow at Liskey, Perranzahuloe, Cornwall. *Proc. Prehist. Soc.* 26:76–97.
- Clark, G. 1960. *Archaeology and Society*. London.
- Clark, G. 1962. *Prehistoric England*. London.
- Clark, G. and Piggott, S. 1965. *Prehistoric Societies*. London.
- Coles, J. M. *et al.* 1965. The excavation of a neolithic round barrow at Pinacree, Perthshire, Scotland. *Proc. Prehist. Soc.* 31:34–57.
- Dearmer, P. 1931 (12th edn). *The Parson's Handbook*. London.
- Evans-Pritchard, E. E. 1951. *The Nuer*. London.

- Evans-Pritchard, E. E. 1956. *Nuer Religion*. London.
- Finley, M. I. 1968. *Ancient Sicily to the Arab Conquest*. London.
- Firth, R. 1951. *Elements of Social Organisation*. London.
- Fox, C. 1959. *Life and Death in the Bronze Age*. London.
- Freedman, M. 1968. *Lineage Organisation in South-eastern China*. London.
- Glasbergen, W. 1956. Barrow excavations in the eight beatitudes, I. *Palaeohistoria*. 2-3.
- Gluckman, M. 1937. Mortuary customs among the South-eastern Bantu. *Bantu Studies*. 11:117-36.
- Gomme, G. L. (ed.) 1887. Popular superstitions and traditions. *The Gentleman's Magazine Library*.
- Goody, J. 1959. Death and social control among the LoDagaa. *Man*. 59:134-8.
- Goody, J. 1962. *Death, Property and the Ancestors*. London.
- Griffiths, W. E. 1960. The excavation of stone circles near Penmaenmawr, North Wales. *Proc. Prehist. Soc.* 26:303-39.
- Gurina, N. N. 1956. Olen island cemetery. *Materiali Isledovania Po Archaeologii CCCP*. 47.
- Hawkes, C. 1954. Archaeological theory and method; some suggestions from the Old World. *Amer. Anthropol.* 56 (2(1)):155-68.
- Herskovits, M. J. 1938. *Dahomey*. I. New York.
- Hodson, F. R. 1968. The La Tène Cemetery at Munsingen-Rain. *Acta Bernensia*. 5.
- Howitt, A. W. 1904. *The Native Tribes of South-Eastern Australia*. London.
- Huntingford, G. W. B. 1953a. *The Southern Nilo-Hamites*. London.
- Huntingford, G. W. B. 1953b. *The Nandi of Kenya*. London.
- Keiller, A. *et al.* 1938. Excavation of an untouched chamber in the Lanhill long barrow. *Proc. Prehist. Soc.* 4:122-50.
- Kroeber, A. L. 1927. Disposal of the dead. *Amer. Anthropol.* 29:308-15.
- Macleod, W. C. 1925. Certain mortuary aspects of North-west Coast culture. *Amer. Anthropol.* 27:122-48.
- Mant, A. K. 1968. The medical definition of death. In *Man's Concern with Death*. London.
- Meek, C. K. 1925. *The Northern Tribes of Nigeria*. London.
- Meek, C. K. 1931a. *Tribal Studies in Northern Nigeria*. London.
- Meek, C. K. 1931b. *A Sudanese Kingdom*. London.
- Middleton, J. 1960. *Lugbara Religion*. Oxford.
- Momigliano, A. 1963. An interim report on the origins of Rome. *Roman Studies*. 95-121.
- Mond, R. and Myers, O. H. 1937. *Cemeteries of Armant*. I. London.
- Nadel, S. F. 1954. *Nupe Religion*. London.

- Nock, A. D. 1932. Cremation and burial in the Roman Empire. *Harvard Theological Review*. 25 (4):321-59.
- Perry, W. J. 1914. The orientation of the dead in Indonesia. *J. Roy. Anthropol. Inst.* 44:281-93.
- Piggott, S. 1938. The Early Bronze Age in Wessex. *Proc. Prehist. Soc.* 4:52-106.
- Piggott, S. 1962. *The West Kennet Long Barrow*. London.
- Piggott, S. 1965. *Ancient Europe*. Edinburgh.
- Piggott, S. 1969. Conclusion. In *The Domestication and Exploitation of Plants and Animals*, eds P. J. Ucko and G. Dimbleby. London.
- Polson, C. J. *et al.* 1962 (2nd edn). *The Disposal of the Dead*. London.
- Proudfoot, E. V. W. 1963. Excavation of a Bell Barrow in the parish of Edmondstam, Dorset, England. *Proc. Prehist. Soc.* 29:395-425.
- Radcliffe-Brown, A. R. 1951. The comparative method in social anthropology. *J. Roy. Anthropol. Inst.* 51:15-22.
- Rattray, R. S. 1932. *The Tribes of the Ashanti Hinterland*. I. Oxford.
- Rattray, R. S. 1959 (3rd edn). *Religion and Art in Ashanti*. Oxford.
- Reisner, G. A. 1932. *A Provincial Cemetery of the Pyramid Age. Nag-ed-Der*, III. Oxford.
- Smith, I. F. and Simpson, D. D. A. 1966. Excavation of a round barrow on Overton Hill, North Wiltshire. *Proc. Prehist. Soc.* 32:122-55.
- Sprague, R. 1968. A suggested terminology and classification for burial description. *Amer. Antiq.* 33(4):479-85.
- Ucko, P. J. 1968. *Anthropomorphic Figurines of Predynastic Egypt and Neolithic Crete*. London.
- Ucko, P. J. In press. Some aspects of the interpretation of human representations in early post-Palaeolithic prehistoric art. *Archivi di Centro di Studi Preistorici, Val Camonica*.
- Ucko, P. J. and Rosenfeld, A. 1967. *Palaeolithic Cave Art*. London.
- Visscher, F. de. 1963. *Le Droit des Tombeaux Romains*. Milan.
- Warner, W. L. 1964 (revised edn). *A Black Civilization*. New York.
- Yudkin, S. 1968. Death and the young. In *Man's Concern with Death*. London.