

10 Conclusion

The body of the deceased is not regarded like the carcass of some animal: specific care must be given to it and a correct burial: not merely for reasons of hygiene but out of moral obligation.

(Hertz 1960, 27)

As seen in the previous chapter, while the spectres of omnipresent ancestors may loom large in British and Levantine prehistory, the discipline of mortuary archaeology at large deals with no less powerful ghosts, the legacies of early-twentieth-century scholars such as Hertz (1907, 1960) and Van Gennep (1909, 1960). These figures and their scholarship have shaped and dominated literature (see Chapter 2), not only within Western Asia but also within the Mediterranean and Europe, from prehistory onwards. The quotation used to open this chapter, albeit in a more lengthened format, has even been used in a book on Palaeolithic burials (Pettitt 2011, 261). As has been discussed throughout this volume, however, what constitutes a ‘correct’ burial differed vastly across the Levant and broader Western Asia. Moreover, as Pettitt (2011, 261–62) highlights, the strict distinction between human and non-human practices envisaged by the quoted passage, as well as the simple equation between burial, symbolism, and meaning, is not without its problems. To bring this volume to a close, here I seek to address some of these spectres, providing a brief overview of the main findings of this research and reminding us that notions of care and correctness are not static phenomena. I will then turn my attention to the future, to consider the moral obligation that we, the living, have to the long-departed dead.

Drawing the Threads Together

Mortuary remains have played an integral part in the archaeology of Western Asia since its origins, but despite hundreds of years of excavation and survey, there have been few attempts to holistically untangle the many complexities of this record (Chapter 1). The ways in which such material has been documented, approached, and understood, as seen in Chapter 2, have also shifted over time.

Research has benefitted from broader scientific developments, the growth of new technologies, as well as more robust and nuanced theoretical frameworks. In the preceding chapters, I sought to understand some of the intricacies, meanings, and variations visible in the mortuary record. Rather than identifying a single ‘normative’ or ‘typical’ burial, the volume has explored the multitude of ways in which the living approached and interacted with the dead from the Late Chalcolithic to the Iron Age (fifth to first millennia BCE).

Bringing together data on thousands of burials, alongside individual case studies, has been a process with many challenges. As discussed in Chapter 1, we are often dealing with highly fragmentary and variable data, ranging from the simple mention of a looted or un-excavated burial monument to comprehensive publications on large-scale and well-studied cemeteries. The sheer volume of data is also an issue. This has enabled the multi-scalar approach that lies at the heart of this volume but also meant that, at times, it was necessary to zoom in and focus on specific periods or regions by way of a case study. While this is a book on mortuary archaeology, as the perhaps overused (e.g. Brownlee 2020, 406; Williams 2004, 264) saying goes, “... the dead do not bury themselves...” (Parker Pearson 1999, 3). Thus, a discussion of the ways in which the lives of the dead intersect with the lives of the living, and an overview of settlement and non-funerary archaeology, were necessary undertakings (Chapter 3). In Chapter 1, I set the temporal and spatial parameters for this volume, focusing on the Bronze Age (during the fourth to second millennia BCE), while being brought into conversation with materials from the Late Chalcolithic and Iron Age. Moreover, while focused on the Levant, many of the themes and ideas brought up in this volume have implications for wider Western Asia and the Mediterranean, and thus throughout the preceding chapters, I have attempted to adopt an interdisciplinary and cross-cultural approach to understanding temporal and spatial variability.

The volume focused on three general themes, woven throughout the chapters; the manipulation and treatment of the human body; the relationships between human bodies within burial contexts; and, finally, the relationships between human bodies and non-human agents. It is these broad themes that I want to offer a final reflection on here, in order to bring conversations to a close.

Manipulating the Human Body

As touched upon in several chapters, an idealised view of the dead is often presented within research, popular publications, and museum displays. Fragmentary and cremated remains, for example, are much less commonly displayed or depicted (e.g. Bolchini 2019), despite the fact that, as this volume has illustrated, such bodily forms are prolific within the archaeological record. The popularity and archaeological visibility of practices involving disarticulated and fragmentary skeletal material, as well as incineration of the human body are, however, temporally, and spatially variable. Chapter 4 deconstructed several broad temporal patterns, highlighting two periods during which collective

burial and the presence of disarticulated remains appear to be popular, the EB I (and EB II–III) in the south and the second millennium BCE (and particularly MB II) in both the northern and southern Levant. Despite evidence from these different periods often being subsumed under the general category of ‘secondary’ burial practices, in this chapter I problematised this approach, suggesting that very different motivations and factors may have been at play within these mortuary spaces. For the EB I southern Levant, it was suggested that the body, in both its living and deceased forms, may have been understood as mutable, relational, and partible, able to fission, fragment, and subsequently coalesce and reform (Bradbury 2024). Fragmentation, removal, and continued interaction with body parts, as touched upon again in Chapter 9, could be an integral part of EB I mortuary practices. In contrast, deliberate, highly structured, and performative fragmentation of the human body was less of a concern during the MB II and later second millennium BCE. Fragmentation, while clearly a sanctioned way of treating and manipulating the dead, was a by-product of lengthened engagement and not necessarily a deliberate and intentional transformation.

Many of these themes and ideas continued to be discussed in Chapter 5, where I deconstructed our evidence for heat treatment practices. Once again, this chapter emphasised the huge variations hidden within our existing categorisations. It highlighted the necessity of moving beyond the simple documentation of ‘a cremation’, to better understand the processes and practices that lead us to find burnt human remains within the archaeological record. In doing so I discussed several main themes, from the use of fire in the manipulation and fragmentation of the deceased’s body, to fire as a means of display or even closure and sanitisation. Although seeking to focus more on the how and why, this chapter also argued that the sporadic appearance of heat treatment practices in the second millennium, and increasing popularity during the early first millennium, was a temporal pattern worthy of note. A pattern likely linked to changing beliefs and identities during the final phases of the LBA and IA. Cremation, in this setting, offered new opportunities for a different type of memorialisation and memory.

Having set the scene and characterised several different types of bodily treatment, Chapter 6 turned to a consideration of the ways in which different biological parameters and life histories could shape how the dead were manipulated. In addition to age and biological sex, I explored how bodily affordances and experiences may have dictated or influenced the ways in which individual corpses were treated by the living. Chapter 7 picked up on many of these themes by considering what wider shifts in burial positioning across the Levant might be able to tell us about ideas of identity, difference, and belief at both macro and micro scales. In line with previous scholarship, this chapter discussed the broad shift that we see from flexed to extended burials during the late second millennium BCE. Bringing these patterns into conversation with the trends discussed in Chapter 5, I argued that despite local variability and regionality, ideas of containment and control could be seen as emerging

concerns during this period. Thus, whether inhumed or cremated, emphasis may have been placed on the manipulation of decay, its timing and display. Within such broad trends, however, complex local and regional expressions were also highlighted. Towards the end of the chapter, I turned my attention to a more 'atypical', splayed burial positioning. By deconstructing the processes and practices leading to this arrangement, and interrogating the corpses relationship with both surrounding burials, as well as associated material culture, I highlighted the production of evocative visual (and likely sensorial) tableaux.

Creating Relationships

One of the primary aims of the original research behind this volume was to better understand the significant spatial and temporal variations in the distribution of burial data (Bradbury and Philip 2017, 2020). As argued in Chapter 4, in addition to the influences of excavation biases and sampling, we can also detect meaningful choices being made by the living. Thus, while stressing the need for more precise terminology, especially when dealing with collective burial spaces, Chapter 4 also explored the different opportunities afforded by the burial of a single corpse as opposed to the burial of multiple individuals within a single context. Within a large cemetery of individual inhumations, society is provided with the flexibility to highlight either the wider collective or the individual both at the point of deposition and in the weeks to years following the burial. In contrast, if we view burials as venues for communication and expression, multiple collective tombs can be seen as depriving or hastening the end of potential individualised, communications between the dead, living, and possibly even the gods.

Located in the spaces between individual burial within a cemetery and burial in a large collective tomb lies the poorly understood phenomenon of multiple simultaneous burials, contexts in which multiple deceased appear to have been deposited at the same time or following a very short span of time. The strict lines between these different forms of burial blur, as simultaneous depositions can also be found within individual cemeteries, as well as within multiple successive burials. What remains intriguing, however, is the variable popularity of simultaneous burial, with the majority of our evidence dating to the MBA. Accepting the fact that more people were not simultaneously dying during the MBA than any other period, my discussions focused on the tension and negotiation between familial, communal, and individualising practices. Thus, when individuals died at the same or similar time during the MBA, more attention and significance appear to have been paid to their co-burial. For this period (and earlier and later examples) we see a repeated association between adult and non-adult burials in these simultaneous contexts, potentially suggesting a familial relationship, whether biologically or culturally constructed.

In some respects, these observations correlate well with the increasing role played by infants and young children in the MBA mortuary record discussed in Chapter 6. Such patterns stand in contrast with evidence from other periods,

whereby younger individuals appear to have been deliberately excluded from practices used for adults (e.g. IA cremation, Chapter 5). Alongside the growing importance of ongoing interactions with the dead, particularly during the MB II (Chapter 4), children's burials in the MBA were an important arena for both elite and non-elite groups. Active locations for the (re-)creation and negotiation of elite power, hoarding of generational capital, as well as serving as a tool through which personal and familial identities could be shaped and reshaped. Also worth highlighting, however, are the ways in which non-human agents and objects, the visible adornment and provisioning of infants and children, may have served to create a new status and identity for both the deceased and living. Irrespective of chronological age, as discussed in Chapter 6, through such practices, adults could perhaps be created.

Human Bodies and Non-Human Agents

These very themes were taken up in Chapter 8, which turned attention to the objects and artefacts found buried (or not buried) alongside and with the dead. By seeing these as potential active agents within the mortuary process, I explored shifting patterns and changes over time, considering their role in the construction and negotiation of identity and personhood, as well as belief in the afterlife. Acknowledging the wealth of the literature on this subject, this chapter began by taking a slightly different approach to discussing comfort and provisioning of the dead. Rather than focusing on sustenance through food or other types of consumables, I sought to explore evidence for comfort offered to the corpse itself by way of tomb furniture/equipment, such as matting, pillow stones, or even in some cases wooden beds or platforms. Again, rather than proposing a single explanation for the inclusion of such equipment within tombs, Chapter 8 suggested that several different motivations may have been at play. From comfort and protection or visual reminders of decay, to maintenance of the individuality and integrity of the human body, at least for a short period of time.

Building upon earlier discussions, this chapter also explored patterns of personal ornamentation, suggesting that the ways in which people were being clothed, dressed, and presented within mortuary contexts changed over time. In Chapter 6, I had already problematised the category of so-called 'warrior burials', highlighting the need to further deconstruct this term and consider the intersectional identities represented through weapon associated burials in the MBA Levant. The use of bodily adornment to convey identity was again explored in Chapter 8, and here I highlighted the decreasing importance of pins during the LBA and IA, arguing that with increased repertoires and opportunities for bodily decoration (in terms of clothing and jewellery), variation would seem to be a key element.

Chapter 8 concluded by setting the scene for many of the discussions in Chapter 9, considering what burials without associated goods may be able to tell us about access to and the use of different artefacts and objects within the

funerary sphere. After offering an overview of different types of empty graves, I explored potential explanations for these contexts, from practices associated with the age of the individual (e.g. MBA), sociocultural and religious beliefs (e.g. Iron Age and Persian period) to 'atypical' burials, a topic taken up again in the previous chapter. As I emphasised, a lack of goods is not necessarily indicative of a lack of care, status, or wealth. The same can also be said for the fragments of human bone found within non-funerary contexts discussed in Chapter 9. Here, contrary to the quote used to open this chapter, we do find potential evidence for human corpses being treated in the same way as animals; from their deliberate and structured integration into sacrificial depositions to their presence within occupation areas via the disturbance of poorly marked shallow burials or discarded human corpses. These observations return us to the idea of the moral obligations the living have to the dead and, importantly, the duties and responsibilities of the contemporary living.

The Future of Mortuary Archaeology

Mortality is something shared, a process we must all go through. I have personally experienced the death of beloved pets, friends, and grandparents, from old age but also what seems like meaningless diseases or accidents. I am also, however, very privileged. I have never had to personally live through or experience discriminatory violence, war, or genocide. How, then, can I expect my views and perceptions of death and the dead to be the same as those around me, who may have had entirely different experiences to my own? This volume opened with an acknowledgement of the fact that ways in which people coped and dealt with death in the ancient world varied significantly. The same, however, can also be said for the contemporary moment. With this comes the necessity of recognising that, as archaeologists, we are only one of the many voices that need to be heard when it comes to discussions around treatment of the long dead within modern society.

All the research carried out for this project derives from legacy data. Published materials from the nineteenth through the twenty-first centuries, online databases, colleagues, and friends who have shared dissertations and works in progress. The dead have been excavated from dusty pages and digital collections, rather than from the ground, and thus it might be easy to suggest that there are no ethical implications of this work. Yet the dead, as rows and columns or printed on a page, always carry with them complex pasts. Archaeological work in Western Asia was carried out under and often in the name of colonialist agendas, a legacy and, in some areas of Western Asia, a reality that still remains today (e.g. Greenberg and Hamilakis 2022, 158; Tahan 2010, 300). Such research often presented distorted and harmful racial stereotypes (e.g. Perry 2012)¹ and, despite ongoing victories against such dangerous narratives, continue to affect the discipline. In different settings, however, ethically engaged research in Western Asia, North America, and the UK² has begun to illustrate the ways in which archaeology can be used as a tool for

social justice, giving voice to the life histories, experiences, and identities of ignored and sometimes deliberately silenced populations (e.g. Boutin 2016; Boutin et al. 2017; Croucher 2008; de la Cova 2020; Greenberg 2015, 29–30; Montgomery and Supernant 2022; Pearson and Meskell 2015). As numerous scholars have demonstrated, however, this project is always ongoing. Research and work towards deconstructing, dismantling, and disrupting colonial legacies and inequalities continue to be vital, not only within bioarchaeology and mortuary archaeology, but also within the discipline more broadly (e.g. de la Cova 2020; Franklin et al. 2020; Greenberg 2015; Greenberg and Hamilakis 2022; Stantis et al. 2023). What role, then, might present and past collections hold in such work?

In part due to the harmful narratives of the past, persuasive arguments exist for the necessity of prioritising the reassessment and publication of already collected and even previously studied human remains, allowing us to re-interrogate, correct, and challenge misleading analyses (e.g. Bradbury and Scarre 2017, 218; Gregoricka 2023; Voss 2012). Some of the ideas and interpretations offered in this volume would clearly have been much more limited without studies that have taken place on institutionally curated human remains. Moreover, in spite of current funding strategies that prioritise new discoveries, as archaeologists we have an ethical responsibility to publish, research, and re-contextualise ‘orphaned’ collections (e.g. Cherry 2011; Gregoricka 2023, 301), as well as, I would argue, the data that have been previously published or collated about such collections. Indeed, taking inspiration from Voss’s (2012) curation as research approach, I would suggest that working with difficult, partial, and sometimes orphaned *data* can be as fruitful as working with orphaned collections, allowing new questions to be asked and new avenues for research to emerge.

Archaeologists and archaeological institutions, however, have often been poor custodians of human remains. We have not only improperly curated, protected, and given voice to these once living people, but also failed to consider the multiplicity of interests and needs of the living (e.g. Boutin et al. 2017, 195; Gregoricka 2023, 2024; Sheridan 2017, 115–17; Stantis et al. 2023). While institutions are slowly beginning to acknowledge these problematic pasts and presents, far more needs to be done to earn the trust of those affected by the harmful legacies and history of anthropological collections. An acknowledgement that, as archaeologists, we do not own the past or the skeletal collections we work with (e.g. Gregoricka 2024). Alongside such endeavours, therefore, consent and collaboration with descendant communities are a necessity for any form of ethically engaged human skeletal study and curation (e.g. Boutin et al. 2017, 197; Gregoricka 2024).

This is not to suggest that this is an easy or unilinear undertaking. There is no one-size-fits-all for such work. Not only do (and should) ethical guidelines differ by country and situation, each and every study will, by necessity, likely also involve different groups and individuals, as well as different challenges and different perspectives. The benefits (and obligations) of working with descendent

and local communities around issues of repatriation, restitution, and community engagement are clear, but what about cases whereby no claims are made and/or where the claims that are made could perpetuate new forms of settler colonialism (e.g. Greenberg 2015, 29; Ikram 2018, 52)? As Boutin et al.'s (2017, 197) research on the skull from a MBA 'warrior' burial from Hebron illustrates, numerous parties could be interested or affected by the ongoing curation of this individual within Sonoma State University's anthropology department, including different individuals and groups currently living around Hebron, many of whom have different beliefs, viewpoints, and needs, as well as descendant communities within the United States.

Across Western Asia and North Africa, rules, regulations, and official guidelines around the excavation, curation, and display of human skeletal remains differ significantly. These include both prohibitions and laws (or, in some cases, simply commonly upheld conventions) against disturbing the graves of particular groups (e.g. Islamic and Jewish graves), reburial following study irrespective of the age/religious affiliation of the remains, to the retention and continued analysis of skeletal assemblages, if undertaken by qualified specialists (e.g. Ikram 2011, 497; 2018, 51–53; Nagar 2011, 614; Schrader et al. 2024, 8–9; Sheridan 2017, 118–20). Moreover, in parallel to divergences between existing legal frameworks, tensions can also arise between different groups including governmental authorities, foreign and local archaeologists, as well as local communities, who may all hold different beliefs, ideas, and motivations (e.g. Greenberg 2015; Nagar 2011, 614).

In the wake of calls to utilise archaeology as a tool for good, numerous institutions, journals, and associations have established task forces to explore the ethical study of human remains and produced guidelines on best practices for curation, display, study, and publication (e.g. Agarwal et al. 2024; British Association for Biological Anthropology and Osteoarchaeology 2019; Halcrow et al. 2024). Similar documents and guidelines, however, do not necessarily exist in Western Asia, and while some of the examples mentioned above can serve as useful templates, as Schrader et al. (2024) have identified through their work in Sudan, country- and region-specific documentation is needed. The shortcomings of ethical codes and guidelines have also been raised, again returning us to the necessity of continued conversation and collaboration—work that will always be ongoing (e.g. Greenberg 2015, 24; Tarlow 2006, 200; 2024, 2).

Beyond the long-term curation of skeletal material, this issue also plays out within the display of the ancient dead, and there is a huge range of literature on this subject (e.g. Biers 2020; Swain 2002, 2016; Exell 2016; Mui 2019; Nordström 2016; Nilsson Stutz 2016). Again, practices and traditions vary across the Levant, and also in terms of ancient human remains from Western Asia on display outside of the region. The National Museum of Lebanon in Beirut, for example, relatively recently opened a gallery in the basement of the museum, focused on mortuary and funerary practices. In addition to sarcophagi and tomb façades, human skeletal remains from the site of Byblos (including those of a child), as well as eight medieval mummies from the Assi el-Hadath

Cave, are on display within this space.³ The limited data that exist on public opinion in Western Asia and North Africa around the display of human remains do not necessarily follow particular socioeconomic or religious lines, nor are they neatly tied to the display of human remains from particular periods or groups (e.g. Doğan, Thys-Senocak, and Joy 2021; Ikram 2018, 52). Economic realities, ongoing colonial legacies, and neoliberal heritage policies, however, can mean that local communities and groups in Western Asia are disenfranchised and, in some cases, denied access to the past (e.g. Tahan 2010; Tully and Hanna 2013). As a result, local beliefs, emotions, and reactions to the display of human remains are a subject area that needs far more exploration and research in the future.

Outside of Western Asia, the display (or lack of display) of human remains from the region is dictated by national legislation, questions and debates around ethical engagement, public sentiment as well as debates on the legacies and role of museums within post-colonial and post-national settings (e.g. Biers 2020; Exell 2016; Nilsson Stutz 2016; Swain 2016; Tarlow 2006). By way of example, in the UK, surveys have suggested that the majority of visitors to museums are comfortable with or even expect to see human remains on display (Biers 2020, 251). Questions around who is visiting these institutions, and therefore who is being surveyed, obviously need to be considered. Moreover, it should also be noted that DCMS (2005) and Museums Association (2015) guidelines specify that display should only take place if institutions believe that the inclusion of the human remains themselves makes a material contribution and/or that the messages being conveyed would not be as effective without them.

In a United States setting, the Penn Museum, a few miles away from where I teach, within its recent Human Remains policy and “Out of respect for the deceased and consideration of visitor comfort...”, states that no exposed human remains will be considered for display (Penn Museum, n.d.). This includes human skeletal remains from Western Asia held by the museum. By way of example, the human remains from the Royal Cemetery of Ur, having been removed from display, are now represented by installations which incorporate the outlines of human bodies, grave plans, or high-quality images of the once displayed human remains. As is generally common practice in the United States, in the classes I teach on Western Asia at Bryn Mawr, I note before and during lectures if I will be showing imagery (including plans) of human remains and try to provide articles with images of human remains in both original and redacted formats.⁴ Along the same lines and, although this volume solely focuses on the ancient dead and their remains, for this book I sought to include images of the dead *only*, when necessary, in order to make clear a particular point, rather than simply ‘illustrate’. As Squires et al. (2020, 630) note in the conclusion of their volume, it is not only the human remains themselves that raise ethical issues, but also data on the dead, including photographs, plans, published and digital resources.

With all of these discussions in mind, I want to briefly consider two final concepts by way of conclusion: (visitor) comfort and the notion of respect for

the deceased. Comfort is an interesting term to think with here, and throughout this volume I have referred to ideas like comforting or supporting the deceased (Chapter 8), but what about the comfort of the living? Best practices for the display of ancient human remains continue to be discussed within the literature and include everything from their removal, to in-depth signage, to allowing visitors to choose whether or not to view human remains and many others (e.g. Biers 2020; Exell 2016; Mui 2019; Swain 2002, 2016; Tarlow 2024). The term ‘comfort’, to some extent, also obfuscates the huge diversity of reasons why the living may not want to encounter the dead within a museum setting, from religious/cultural beliefs and practices to a desire not to see certain types of dead (e.g. victims of violence, young children). Within an educational setting, it has even been suggested that some level of discomfort might be positive.

As Parker Pearson (1999, 183) has argued, due to the ongoing sanitisation and hidden nature of death, museums may be one of the only settings in which the dead can be viewed, interacted with and our own mortality confronted. In the United Kingdom, the work of archaeologists, alongside psychologists and healthcare professionals, has demonstrated how discussions linked to the ancient dead can be highly effective in allowing for difficult questions and dialogue around contemporary death and dying. In an interdisciplinary pilot study with health and social care practitioners, for example, Croucher et al.’s (2021) work highlighted how exposure to archaeological examples facilitated multilayered and sometimes difficult discourse, requiring participants to confront their own biases and expectations around treatment of the dead. Similarly, the Dying to Talk (2021) project stemmed from the use of archaeological prompts and aimed to co-produce resources for young people in order to encourage constructive and compassionate conversation around death, dying, and bereavement. The dead of the distant past, in this sense, can allow us to contemplate and think through our own mortality in a more manageable and less fearful fashion (e.g. Nordström 2016, 206). But what of our duties, ethical and moral responsibilities to these now dead and once living persons? What does ‘respect’ for the dead actually look like and mean?

Even as a term, ‘respect’ is culturally constructed and variable, making it almost impossible to identify and work with universal moral obligations and responses (Tarlow 2024, 6). The sheer variety of practices discussed throughout this volume highlights the extreme difficulty of determining what respectful treatment is. Is respect to be based on our own modern ideals, which come with their own histories and legacies, or ancient values and perspectives? As Geller (2021, 128) has highlighted, recognising and understanding emic positions are a challenge if we fail to recognise how our own beliefs and ideals differ from those we investigate. In such situations, “... even the best-intentioned researchers may find themselves at odds with communities, both *past* and present, whose ideas about the proper preservation of the dead are in sharp contrast with their own” (Scarre 2006, 183, my emphasis).

From disarticulation and fragmentation, to individual protection, containment, and comfort, for some periods and individuals, even the contained

display of the dead may be seen as disrespectful. Given the evidence for individual beautification and remembrance, for others, ongoing display and memorialisation might be more than respectful. By this, I certainly do not mean to suggest that institutions should be throwing out some of the new policies or necessarily re-displaying ancient human remains that have been removed from view. As much of the scholarship discussed above demonstrates, there is no one-size-fits-all approach. Instead, contextual and individual responses and solutions are likely going to be required (e.g. Tarlow 2006, 216). More dialogue, education, research, and collaboration, particularly in the Levant and wider Western Asia, are needed on the topic of what we actually mean by the respectful treatment of the deceased, both in the past and in the present. Moreover, if recognition and discussion of variability in mortuary practices is, as I have tried to argue here, of significance for the past, it is of equal, if not more importance, for a discussion of the present and future of funerary and mortuary archaeology.

Notes

- 1 And see Chapter 2 for further discussion.
- 2 The same could also be said for many other parts of the world, and I simply use these by way of illustration.
- 3 The mummies from Assi el-Hadath are also part of a multidisciplinary study by the Institute for Mummy Studies in collaboration with the General Directorate of Antiquities of Lebanon (<https://www.eurac.edu/en/institutes-centers/institute-for-mummy-studies>).
- 4 The utility and efficacy of ‘trigger warnings’ is not without its own debates within educational and museum settings, but also for individuals who have experienced traumatic events (e.g. Jenkins 2011; Jones, Bellet, and McNally 2020; Tarlow 2024, 3–4).

Bibliography

- Agarwal, Sabrina C., Michael L. Blakey, Thomas H. Champney, Carlina de la Cova, Jenny L. Davis, Debra L. Martin, Kisha Supernant, Deborah A. Thomas, Rachel Watkins, and Terrence Weik. 2024. *The Commission for the Ethical Treatment of Human Remains American Anthropological Association*. American Anthropological Association.
- Biers, Trish. 2020. “Rethinking Purpose, Protocol, and Popularity in Displaying the Dead in Museums.” In *Ethical Approaches to Human Remains. A Global Challenge in Bioarchaeology and Forensic Anthropology*, edited by K. Squires, D. Errickson, and N. Márquez-Grant, 239–63. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
- Bolchini, Chiara. 2019. “Photographing the Dead: Images in Public Mortuary Archaeology.” In *The Public Archaeology of Death*, edited by H. Williams, B. Wills-Eve, and J. Osborne, 85–93. Bristol: Equinox.
- Boutin, Alexis T. 2016. “Exploring the Social Construction of Disability: An Application of the Bioarchaeology of Personhood Model to a Pathological Skeleton from Ancient Bahrain.” *International Journal of Paleopathology* 12 (March): 17–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpp.2015.10.005>
- Boutin, Alexis T., Madison Long, Rudy A. Dinarte, and Erica R. Thompson. 2017. “Building a Better Bioarchaeology through Community Collaboration.” *Bioarchaeology International* 1 (3–4): 191–204.

- Bradbury, Jennie. (2024). "Individuality, Collectivity, and everything in between: burial practices in the Bronze Age Levant". In *Die Kunst des Findens. Beiträge zur Altertumskunde des östlichen Mittelmeerraumes und Westasiens Festschrift zum 65. Geburtstag von Peter Pfälzner*, edited by A. Wissing, S. Lange-Weber, E. Geith, B. Glissmann, T. Köster, and P. Sconzo, 373–90. Münster: Zaphon.
- Bradbury, Jennie, and Graham Philip. 2017. "Shifting Identities: The Human Corpse and Treatment of the Dead in the Levantine Bronze Age." In *Engaging with the Dead: Exploring Changing Human Beliefs about Death, Mortality and the Human Body*, edited by J. Bradbury and C. Scarre, 87–102. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Bradbury, Jennie, and Graham Philip. 2020. "Mapping and Modelling the "Invisible Dead": Reconstructing Demographics in the Ancient Near East." In *Studies in Honour of Tony J. Wilkinson: New Agendas in Remote Sensing and Landscape Archaeology in the Near East*, edited by D. Lawrence, M. Altaaweel, and G. Philip, 63–79. Oxford: Archaeopress Archaeology.
- Bradbury, Jennie, and Chris Scarre. 2017. "Beyond the Invisible Dead: Future Priorities, Opportunities and Challenges." In *Engaging with the Dead: Exploring Changing Human Beliefs about Death, Mortality and the Human Body*, edited by J. Bradbury and C. Scarre, 217–19. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- British Association for Biological Anthropology and Osteoarchaeology. 2019. "BABAO Code of Ethics." <https://babao.org.uk/resources/guidelines-codes/>
- Brownlee, Emma Claire. 2020. "The Dead and Their Possessions: The Declining Agency of the Cadaver in Early Medieval Europe." *European Journal of Archaeology* 23 (3): 406–27. <https://doi.org/10.1017/eea.2020.3>
- Cherry, John F. 2011. "Still Not Digging, Much." *Archaeological Dialogues* 18 (1): 10–17.
- Croucher, Karina. 2008. "Ambiguous Genders? Alternative Interpretations a Discussion of Case Studies from the Pre-Pottery Neolithic and Halaf Periods." In *Gender Through Time in the Ancient Near East*, edited by D. Bolger, 21–51. Lanham: AltaMira Press.
- Croucher, Karina, Lindsey Büster, Jennifer Dayes, Laura Green, Justine Raynsford, Louise Comerford Boyes, and Christina Faull. 2021. "Archaeology and Contemporary Death: Using the Past to Provoke, Challenge and Engage." *PLoS One* 15 (12): e0244058. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0244058>
- de la Cova, Carlina. 2020. "Making Silenced Voices Speak: Restoring Neglected and Ignored Identities in Anatomical Collections." In *Theoretical Approaches in Bioarchaeology*, edited by C.M. Cheverko, J. R. Prince-Buitenhuys, and M. Hubbe. London: Routledge.
- Department for Culture, Media and Sport. 2005. *Guidance for the Care of Human Remains in Museums*. London: Department for Culture, Media and Sport.
- Doğan, Elifgöl, Lucienne Thys-Şenocak, and Jody Joy. 2021. "Who Owns the Dead? Legal and Professional Challenges Facing Human Remains Management in Turkey." *Public Archaeology* 20 (1–4): 85–107. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14655187.2022.2070209>
- Dying to Talk. 2021. "About." *Dying to Talk*. <https://dying2talk.org/about>
- Exell, Karen. 2016. "Covering the Mummies at the Manchester Museum: A Discussion of Authority, Authorship, and Agendas in the Human Remains Debate." In *Archaeologists and the Dead: Mortuary Archaeology in Contemporary Society*, edited by H. Williams and M. Giles, 233–50. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198753537.001.0001>
- Franklin, Maria, Justin Dynnavant P., Ayana Omilade Flewellen, and Alicia Odewale. 2020. "The Future Is Now: Archaeology and the Eradication of Anti-Blackness." *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 24: 753–66.
- Geller, Pamela L. 2021. *Theorizing Bioarchaeology*. Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-70704-0_6

- Greenberg, Raphael. 2015. "Ethics in Action: A Viewpoint from Israel/Palestine." In *Ethics and the Archaeology of Violence*, edited by A. González-Ruibal and G. Moshenska, 19–32. New York: Springer New York. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-1643-6_2
- Greenberg, Raphael, and Yannis Hamilakis. 2022. *Archaeology, Nation, and Race: Confronting the Past, Decolonizing the Future in Greece and Israel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009160247>
- Gregoricka, Lesley A. 2023. "The Ethics of Excavating: Bioarchaeology and the Case for Rehabilitating Legacy Human Skeletal Collections in the Near East." *Levant* 55 (3): 294–303. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00758914.2023.2278287>
- Gregoricka, Lesley A. 2024. "Is It Ethical to Continue Excavating the Dead in the Ancient Near East?" *The Ancient Near East Today* (blog). <https://www.asor.org/anetoday/2024/07/excavating-the-dead>
- Halcrow, Siân, Gwen Robbins Schug, Sabrina C. Agarwal, and Brenda Baker. 2024. "Editorial: Ethical Guidelines and Policies of Bioarchaeology International." *Bioarchaeology International*. <https://doi.org/10.5744/bi.2023.7101>
- Hertz, Robert. 1907. "Contribution a Une Etude Sur La Representation Collective de La Mort." *Annee Sociologique* 10: 48–137.
- Hertz, Robert. 1960. *Death and the Right Hand*, translated by Rodney Needham and Claudia Needham. Aberdeen: Cohen and West.
- Ikram, Salima. 2011. "Egypt/Misr." In *The Routledge Handbook of Archaeological Human Remains and Legislation: An International Guide to Laws and Practice in the Excavation and Treatment of Archaeological Human Remains*, edited by N. Marquez-Grant and L. Fibiger, 495–98. Oxford: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Ikram, Salima. 2018. "An Overview of the History of the Excavation and Treatment of Ancient Human Remains in Egypt." In *Archaeological Human Remains: Legacies of Imperialism, Communism and Colonialism*, edited by B. O'Donnabhain and M. C. Lozada, 45–55. Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-89984-8_4
- Jenkins, Tiffany. 2011. *Contesting Human Remains in Museum Collections: The Crisis of Cultural Authority*. London: Routledge.
- Jones, Payton J., Benjamin W. Bellet, and Richard J. McNally. 2020. "Helping or Harming? The Effect of Trigger Warnings on Individuals with Trauma Histories." *Clinical Psychological Science* 8 (5): 905–17.
- Montgomery, Lindsay M., and Kisha Supernant. 2022. "Archaeology in 2021: Repatriation, Reclamation, and Reckoning with Historical Trauma." *American Anthropologist* 124 (4): 800–12. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aman.13778>
- Mui, Sian. 2019. "Grave Expectations: Burial Posture in Popular and Museum Representations." In *The Public Archaeology of Death*, edited by H. Williams, B. Wills-Eve, and J. Osborne, 73–84. Bristol: Equinox.
- Museums Association. 2015. "Code of Ethics: Additional Guidance." Museums Association. <https://www.museumsassociation.org/download?id=1173810>
- Nagar, Yossi. 2011. "Israel." In *The Routledge Handbook of Archaeological Human Remains and Legislation: An International Guide to Laws and Practice in the Excavation and Treatment of Archaeological Human Remains*, edited by N. Marquez-Grant and L. Fibiger, 613–20. Oxford: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Nilsson Stutz, Liv. 2016. "To Gaze Upon the Dead. The Exhibition of Human Remains as Cultural Practice and Political Process in Scandinavia and the USA." In *Archaeologists and the Dead: Mortuary Archaeology in Contemporary Society*, edited by H. Williams and M. Giles, 268–92. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198753537.001.0001>

- Nordström, Nina. 2016. "The Immortals. Prehistoric Individuals as Ideological and Therapeutic Tools in Our Time." In *Archaeologists and the Dead: Mortuary Archaeology in Contemporary Society*, edited by H. Williams and M. Giles, 204–32. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198753537.001.0001>
- Parker Pearson, Mike 1999. *The Archaeology of Death and Burial*. Texas: A & M University Press.
- Pearson, Jessica, and Lynn Meskell. 2015. "Isotopes and Images: Fleshing out Bodies at Çatalhöyük." *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 22 (2): 461–82. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10816-013-9184-5>
- Penn Museum. n.d. "Human Remains Policy." Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.penn.museum/about-collections/statements-and-policies/statement-on-human-remains#:~:text=Out%20of%20respect%20for%20the,condition%20of%20the%20human%20remains>
- Perry, Megan A. 2012. "Paleopathology in Lebanon, Syria, and Jordan." In *The Global History of Paleopathology. Pioneers and Prospects*, edited by J. E. Buikstra and C. Roberts, 451–69. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pettitt, Paul. 2011. *The Palaeolithic Origins of Human Burial*. London: Routledge.
- Scarre, Geoffrey. 2006. "Can Archaeology Harm the Dead?" In *The Ethics of Archaeology. Philosophical Perspectives on Archaeological Practice*, edited by C. Scarre and G. Scarre, 181–98. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schrader, Sarah A., Tomomi Fushiya, Mohamed Saad, and El Hassan Ahmed Mohamed. 2024. "Decolonizing Bioarchaeology in Sudan." *Journal of African Archaeology*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1163/21915784-bja10034>
- Sheridan, Susan G. 2017. "Bioarchaeology in the Ancient Near East: Challenges and Future Directions for the Southern Levant." *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 162 (S63): e23149. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.23149>
- Squires, Kirsty, David Errickson, and Nicholas Márquez-Grant. 2020. "Concluding Remarks." In *Ethical Approaches to Human Remains. A Global Challenge in Bioarchaeology and Forensic Anthropology*, edited by K. Squires, D. Errickson, and N. Márquez-Grant. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
- Stantis, Chris, Carlina de la Cova, Dorothy Lippert, and Sabrina B. Sholts. 2023. "Biological Anthropology Must Reassess Museum Collections for a More Ethical Future." *Nature Ecology & Evolution* 7 (6): 786–89. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-023-02036-6>
- Swain, Hedley. 2002. "The Ethics of Displaying Human Remains from British Archaeological Sites." *Public Archaeology* 2 (2): 95–100. <https://doi.org/10.1179/pua.2002.2.2.95>
- Swain, Hedley. 2016. "Museum Practice and the Display of Human Remains." In *Archaeologists and the Dead: Mortuary Archaeology in Contemporary Society*, edited by H. Williams and M. Giles, 169–83. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198753537.001.0001>
- Tahan, Lina G. 2010. "New Museological Ways of Seeing the World: Decolonizing Archaeology in Lebanese Museums." In *Handbook of Postcolonial Archaeology*, edited by J. Lydon and U. Z. Rizvi, 295–302. Oxford: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Tarlow, Sarah. 2006. "Archaeological Ethics and the People of the Past." In *The Ethics of Archaeology. Philosophical Perspectives on Archaeological Practice*, edited by C. Scarre and G. Scarre, 199–216. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tarlow, Sarah. 2024. "The Names of the Dead: Identity, Privacy and the Ethics of Anonymity in Exhibiting the Dead Body." *Public Archaeology*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14655187.2023.2268384>

- Tully, Gemma, and Monica Hanna. 2013. "One Landscape, Many Tenants: Uncovering Multiple Claims, Visions and Meanings on the Theban Necropolis." *Archaeologies: Journal of the World Archaeological Congress* 9 (2): 362–97.
- Van Gennep, Arnold. 1909. *Les Rites de Passage*. Paris: Emile Nourry.
- Van Gennep, Arnold. 1960. *The Rites of Passage*, translated by M. Vicedon. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Voss, Barbara L. 2012. "Curation as Research. A Case Study in Orphaned and Underreported Archaeological Collections." *Archaeological Dialogues* 19 (2): 145–69. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1380203812000219>
- Williams, Howard. 2004. "Death Warmed Up: The Agency of Bodies and Bones in Early Anglo-Saxon Cremation Rites." *Journal of Material Culture* 9: 263–91.