Links between Megalithism and Hypogeism in Western Mediterranean Europe

Edited by

Juan Antonio Cámara Serrano
José Andrés Afonso Marrero
Liliana Spanedda

CONCLUSIONS. MONUMENTALITY AMONG STRATEGIES OF CONCEALMENT AND EXHIBITION

Juan Antonio CÁMARA SERRANO, José Andrés AFONSO MARRERO and Liliana SPANEDDA

Depto. Prehistoria y Arqueología
Universidad de Granada

Among the many ways Ideology materializes, monuments stand out for their permanence and their capacity to clearly display power above and beyond funerals and other ritual ceremonies (Bard 1992,8; Bradley 1998,189; Fahlander and Oestigaard 2008, 9; Lindgren 2008,158; Naso 2007,145; Rodríguez Becerra 2000,262-263; Scarre 2008,15; Smith 2007,165), although determining what is understood by "monument" can sometimes be a problem. This is because an intuitive or perceptive definition often predominates, privileging certain constructions over others (Kolb 2005,156, 171-175), and only occasionally with regard to dimension (Muñoz 2007, 256). It has been pointed out that monuments are public structures designed and constructed, in terms of scale and detail, to produce a strong impact on the environment (Johansen 2004, 319; Moore 1996, 92), (Bretschneider *et al.* 2007a,1; Cunningham 2007,26; Driessen 2007,73; Scarre 2007,34; García Sanjuán and Wheatley 2009,140-143; Tilley 1993). The main debate evidently could be about the definition of public character when it is assumed solely by ideological steering, through emphasis on its commemorative aspects (Bloch 2000, 50).

Perhaps the best way to overcome these problems is to attend to the monumental character[3] of the elements rather than monuments as perfectly defined elements. In this respect, one can "anthrophize" or play the role of Nature, endowing monumentality to an immovable element, either natural or constructed, or a movable one (i.e., monumental literary works). The former includes "sculptures" (without useful internal spaces) as well as "architectures" (including natural ones) and most of the discussion that follows centers around them (especially the real, or constructed, ones). What happens is that an ideological message is anchored to a more or less permanent medium that serves as a framework within which, or from which, ritual activities are deployed (carried out). These activities are present in the construction of an architectonic element, the erection of a sculpture, the fabrication of a tool or the inscription/writing of a more or less encoded message. From that point forward, from the construction/erection/fabrication/inscription and from the accompanying consecration, successive ceremonies become integrated and different forms of materialization are articulated. In this respect, even within the so-called natural monuments (Driessen 2007,73, 92; Gradoli 2009,50-51), it is necessary to differentiate between those that configure an internal space, especially those that even form a three-dimensional space with volume, and those other ones that only offer an image, a sculptural dimension. Furthermore, since man is always the producer, no radical opposition exists between a natural landscape and a cultural landscape (Comba 2008, 177), although the definition of monument and, thus, monumental function are subject to continual changes in space and time (Barrett 1999, 256, 260).

In any case, in relation to the immovable architectonic elements, either constructed in the strict sense of the term, or excavated (which are what predominantly interest us here and also have the particularity of being convertible to a container/setting for all other types of ideological formalization), four features have been underscored as defining a monument: contrast with the surroundings/context, prominence (or relevance), clarity of form and sufficient mass for emphasizing presence (Johansen 2004, 319) and a series of variables for evaluating its impact: permanence (by material type, construction method and duration of use/maintenance), scale, centrality, ubiquity and visibility (exhibited or hidden as in the case of caves) (Johansen 2004, 323-326; Kaliff and Oestigaard 2008, 47), and elements have been suggested for qualifying a place as ritual according to the findings, location and structure type (Venclová 1993; Adams 2004; Kyriakidis 2007). Naturally, not all features have to be present (Bretschneider e*t al.* 2007a, 1; Cunningham 2007, 23; Driessen 2007, 74).

In this respect, the differences between free-standing/elevated "architectures" and excavated "architectures" assume varying forms of transcendence and have different connections to particular aspects of the ritual expression of Ideology. Nonetheless, we believe that the differences between monuments respond less to the manifestation of expressed feeling (Thomas 1983, 551) than to the expression/concealment of the concrete ideological message to the number of people for whom it was destined. Hence, not only do they indicate differences in underground and free-standing ideological expression but they also protect relationships of unequal access to the ceremonies performed in the two environments (Whitehouse 1984, 2007; Skeates 2007,

---

[3] We are grateful to our Postgraduate Masters students, and especially Abel Berdejo, for their valuable comments concerning this point.

Malone 2007) and to their knowledge, even when access to hypogean interment is relatively widespread (Stoddart and Malone, this volume; Grima 2007; Stoddart 2007).

In fact, for certain authors, free-standing architecture derives from excavated (and in the last instance, natural) architecture (Aguado, this volume), such that the character of the container (in this case for ritual activities, which might not be spatially separated from domestic activities) precedes the configuration as the true setting, the exhibition. In the last instance, while Architecture, in the strict sense of the term, turns inward, it is the (external or internal) "sculptural" side that looks to exhibition and, ultimately, any mobilized content in ritual might express the differences better, as we will see (Pau, this volume).

Other forms of ideological materialization develop around the monuments that, in the funerary case, take concrete form in periodic interments (and offerings), the construction of these same monuments or commemorative celebrations (Renfrew 2007, 118). Their importance grows rather than declines after the funeral (Peltenburg 1999; Schwartz 2007, 45), since through them the past justifies and explains the present (Schwartz 2007, 46) and projects it (García Sanjuán 2006; Scarre 2008). Debate about the paramount component, container versus content, opens up interesting prospects about the processes, on the one hand, of the sacralization of nature, which prioritize the container or placement, thereby giving rise to debate about the extent to which monuments camouflage, imitate or overcome the natural element in which they are situated or towards which they are oriented and, on the other hand, of the sacralization of man, of some men, which prioritize content, even when within a monumental container.

What is important is the location of ritual activity (Biehl 2008, 186). More complex systems involve more crystallized locations where at times diverse rituals are performed (Kyriakidis 2007, 14), although there tend also to be specialized locations within the general one, and the problem of ritual performance in non-specific spaces (housing) also exists (Kyriakidis 2007, 18); therefore, they should not be included among our monuments.

However, in conceiving of architecture as the creation-demarcation of places for the evolution of human time (Richards 1993, 147-148; Harrison 2004, 7, 23, 25), any space (especially constructed ones) becomes susceptible to being used ideologically, principally in the preservation of memory (Halbwachs 1992, 24; Halbwachs 1992, 24; Jones 2003; Williams 2003; Chesson 2007, 115; Hastorf 2007, 78; Laneri 2007, 9; García Sanjuán 2008, 36; Gee 2008, 61; Kaliff and Oestigaard 2008, 47; Rajala 2008, 79; Scarre 2008, 14; Wickholm 2008:89; Chapman 2009; Kilmurray 2009; Muller 2009; Schulz Paulsson 2009), to legitimize the social order (Plumb 1974, 11, 23-25, 31-32, 67) and to

perpetuate it by means of temporal reiteration (Eliade 2007, 5-6, 30-31, 40. 97, 100).

Undoubtedly, with their permanence, monuments facilitate the use of the past for the legitimization of the present (Crumley 2001, 29-30; Driessen 2007, 73, 86, 92; Fitzsimons 2007, 113-114; Laffineur 2007, 122-123; Oliveira 2008, 97, 106). In some cases in which reference is made to distant forebears or ancestors, justification has its place as an opposition (the construction of others) (Oliveira 2008, 106). Meaningful elements can be retained for the present by contextualizing them in space and time, through the collective imaginary that tradition reformulates (Oliveira 2008, 105). This process can involve a practical use (for instance, as in coats or warehouses) or in the way stones are reused (Oliveira 2008, 98-101) (for instance, to this day for marking routes or limits (Martinón-Torres 2008, 93; Oliveira 2008, 106)), sacro-superstitious attributions and attributions to the distant past (Martinón-Torres 2008, 93-94; Oliveira 2008, 101-104) and abandonment (Oliveira 2008, 98), in addition to historiographic endeavors (Martinón-Torres 2008, 94).

The monitoring of time (García Sanjuán 2008, 37-39) begins with the monitoring of astronomic movement (Stout 2002; Morley 2007; Hoskins 2008), of genealogy through the succession of corpses and their manipulation (Thomas 1993, 35) (including the circulation of relics and other objects), of developed iconographic programs in the sepulchers (Parker Pearson and Ramilisonina 1998; Bueno Ramírez and Balbín Behrmann 2006; Bueno Ramírez *et al.,* 2008), including reuse (Kirk 1993; Patton 1993; Cassen 2002), of a continuity in placement, and with previous monuments or with connections between domestic and funerary spaces (with superimpositions, reuse and close placements) (Delibes de Castro and Zapatero Magdaleno 1996; Criado Boado *et al.,* 2000; Robb 2008, 19; García Sanjuán 2008, 37; Scarre 2008, 21). Images often are used in the structuring of memory (Koortbojian 1996, 210-234) involving size, decoration (including the façade) and design (including inscriptions and titles) (Gee 2008, 62, 66). To develop these functions, undoubtedly the dimensions, complexity and durability of certain spaces simplified the work, even though at times secrecy was emphasized over dissemination.

Hence, we need to revisit the connection between artificial (excavated) caves and free-standing megalithic monuments, not only because of their character as containers which, as we mentioned, in both cases conceals the interior, but because the same elements very often show structures/parts that correspond to the opposite phenomenon (Lo Schiavo 1980; Carrasco *et al.,* 1993; Spanedda, this volume; di Fraia, this volume; Montufo *et al.,* this volume). We are referring to the expression of the assimilation of similar constructive answers in a referential framework that also seeks inseparable objectives, the justification of cohesion or

differentiation (also by masking), and of appropriation (also by different sectors) (Bard 1992; Nocete Calvo *et al.*, 1995; Zvelebil 1998; Cámara Serrano 2001; Depalmas 2001; Wierzbicki 2006; Wallin & Martisson-Wallin 2009). In any case, all of these objectives tend to be related (Bukach 2003, 23; Adams 2004, 26, 30; Díez de Velasco 2006, 7, 13, 15-16, 17, 99, 199, 223; Fabietti 2007, 238, 322; Scarduelli 2007a, 20-22, 2007b, 46-49; Comba 2008, 15) or inverted, as can be observed in the justification of hierarchy even in rituals of presumed cohesion (Barley 2005, 181), and their articulation changes depending on the society that uses them (Cámara Serrano 2001, 62-145; Laneri 2007,5). Thus, the articulation of the different types of monuments acquires special importance in sequences that are divided into phases; they break down into modules that are articulated (or not) in diverse ways, according to the function to be emphasized/concealed. Naturally, this takes place around the appropriation of territory exercised by the sculptural dimension of the monument (and its necessary position), but it is aimed at a different social layer (the community or a section of it), as different as access to monuments can be in life or death.

One possibility is to transmit the different versions (which are sometimes contradictory for the purpose of maintaining the flexibility of the system) of the ideological message by means of different types of architectonic containers in the same territory (Cámara Serrano 2001; Spanedda and Cámara Serrano 2004; Loi, this volumen; Malone and Stoddart, this volume) or use different dimensions (position and visibility, form and content) for the monuments (independently of their hypogean or free-standing character) to express the different realities (functions) (Montufo *et al.*, this volume; Spanedda, this volume; Pau, this volume). For that matter, reference has been made to different meaningful oppositions at different scales (from the outer to the innermost settings) in order to explain the functions of megalithic monuments (Whittle 1988; Thomas 1993; Criado and Vaquero 1991; Villoch 2001).

In any case, public monuments represent a clear message of power because of their appearance and, often, durability (Trigger 1990; Collins and Chalfant 1993, 319; Saitta 1994, 215; Cooney 1999, 52, 61; Bradley 1998, 189) and they express a divided society better than any other element (Laffineur 2007, 117). They are the best way to display control over nature and men (Criado Boado 1993; 1998, 198-200; Collins and Chalfant 1993, 319; Saitta 1994, 215; Cooney 1999, 52, 61; Bradley 1998, 189) since they tend to require considerable work (Parain 1975, 236 ff.; Bretscheneider *et al.*, 2007a, 1; Laffineur 2007, 118, 120), in the case of constructed elements and when within them the dimensions expand to uncommon values. Thus, they involve the ability to organize and mobilize a work force, instruments and basic materials (Cunningham 2007, 27-28), but they also point to restrictions of access (Whittaker 1997, 144; Bradley 1998,190; Schoep 2007, 229). Furthermore, the

constructive process can involve years (sometimes it extends beyond the lives of the first participants) and implies different activities, and possibly even the loss of life (Richards 2008b).

In this context, artificial caves and dolmens are not divided by their (ritual) character or the ceremonies that can take place within each type of monument. The possible differences between the two architectonic manifestations are not defined beforehand, and they often respond to chronological nuances as a response to different ritual phases (of demarcation, exhibition or masking, in the illation between real division and necessary unity, although a definitive dissolution of the ideological person in the generic ancestor does not always occur), and less so to membership in diverse chronocultural horizons (Hernando 1994); an aspect that, in terms of the periods considered, is highly improbable in absolute terms, even if there are particular cases of change at least in the relative frequency of certain areas (Moravetti 1998; Cicilloni 1999; Chambon 2000; Gonçalves 1994; this volume; Loi, this volume). If neither functionality nor cultural or chronological opposition explains funerary diversity, then the selection of a free-standing (sculptural) monument or a hypogean one possibly can be related to processes of segregation between groups within the same community, to the point of concealing differences within the interior of the underground container.

In this regard, meaning can dissolve and change with time (Holtorf 1997, 60; Thomas 1998, 211; Barrett 1999, 258, 263; Bradley 1998, 190; Wrigglesworth, 2006, 148-149; García Sanjuán 2008, 36, 41-44), since participation in construction (Fahlander and Oestigaard 2008, 6; Kristoffersen and Oestigaard 2008, 137) is not the same as in ceremonies that took place when the monument was in use or as when it was perceived in relation to its past importance and was reused with new objectives (Bernardini 2004, 333). A greater audience supplies greater potential to memory, which coordinates experiences and creates a communal identity (Kondoleon 1997, 321; Gallou and Georgiadis 2006, 145; Hastorf 2007, 77; Gee 2008, 67-68) but also helps to maintain social differences.

Within the monuments, legitimization of the social order is produced through the interaction between divinity, the ancestral and the living (Fahlander and Oestigaard 2008, 9, 10). This implies a justification of the appropriation of space and established frontiers (Bard 1992, 5; DeMarrais *et al.*, 1996, 18), but it cannot be disseminated by itself, through transmission of the idea only, perhaps modified in time and space (Bradley 1998, 190).

These processes have two fundamental implications: the inability of those who have few resources to compete, and the difficulty of subverting the dominant ideology if forms of support cannot be reproduced (DeMarrais *et al.*, 1996, 17). For that matter, architecture, which is linked to

specific places that are often related to the actions of the dead/ancestors (Fahlander and Oestigaard 2008, 12), becomes a mechanism of indoctrination, control and propaganda (Bretscheneider *et al.*, 2007b, 3-4; Alconini 2008 67, 72-73, 78, 79) and a means of spreading the "naturalness" of the social situation and its "eternality" (Harris 1990, 336-337). *The monumentality is eternal because it transcends death and seems to have escaped time* (Fahlander and Oestigaard 2008, 9).

*Architecture gives shape to space because monuments of the past integrate the past and the present, and buildings are primarily the context of life (*Fahlander and Oestigaard 2008, 9). Nonetheless, that same architecture can become a clear objective of revolt and we often see the destruction of monuments for what they represent (Bretschneider *et al.*, 2007b, 8; Cunningham 2007, 28, 41; Manoukian 2007, 101; Schwartz 2007, 46, 53) and, in moments of the affirmation of social inequality, they can be sealed and, sometimes, reconstructed/respected (Strathern 1982, 124; Tilley 1999, 44; Brück 2001, 151; Croucher 2006, 20-21) in order to mark a sometimes illusory identity (Gallou and Georgiadis 2006, 127). The absence of a complete elimination brings change to mind (Manoukian 2007, 102); in this respect, even in the context of appreciation, reconstruction and deconstruction prove to be selective (Manoukian 2007, 113). In the transformation of public space, there is special recourse to the destruction of names and dedications and the erection of new monuments, texts and images (Manoukian 2007, 108, 111), which leads to a *damnatio memoriae* or *editing* even of texts, causing them to be put back into circulation even when they are fragmented (Manoukian 2007, 117-119). Sometimes, however, we can speak of forgetting (Schwartz 2007, 53), since *the more total the aspirations of the new regime, the more imperiously will it seek to introduce an era of forced forgetting* (Connerton 1989, 12).

In short, funerary ritual, in particular, can include all of the aspects through which Ideology tends to materialize itself (Miller 1985, 35; Bard 1992, 3, 18-19; DeMarrais e*t al.*, 1996, 15; Criado Boado 1998, 196; Johansen 2004, 322 Potter 2000; Muir and Driver 2004; Harrison 2004, 133; Gallardo Ibáñez 2005, 38); that is, the performance of ceremonies, the mobilization of symbolic objects, the construction of monuments and the addition of written texts (epitaphs). Emerging from this is the conclusion that all ritual implies: (1) a scenic space (with movable and immovable elements), (2) a temporal structure, (3) a series of (real and imagined) agents, and (4) a specific organization of symbols (Molina Castaño 2007, 155-156). This takes place within megaliths as well as hypogea, if the two types of monuments are not already integrated.

Society is represented in cemeteries (Ariès 1987, 419; Molina Castaño 2007, 148, 154). The affirmation of identity is produced by the use/creation of the past largely in times of change, especially in relation to elements useful for reinforcing social, visible and monumental memory (Burström 1996, 25, 32; Wickholm 2008, 95). Necropolises are established in places of memory (Molina Castaño 2007, 148, 150), spaces of reference for a human group, although they also can be spaces of anonymity for a given social group since certain cemeteries take on more visibility (ideological representivity) and cemeteries contain areas that are more marked than others (Molina Castaño 2007, 149-151), because memory sometimes is linked with specific individuals, thereby projecting inequality from the past onto a permanent future (Rowlands 1993, 146-147), and *the tomb of the ruler becomes a sort of axis mundi of the society's cosmology* (Laneri 2007, 9; Morris 2007; Schwartz 2007; Pollock 2007). We are referring to social biographies narrated to the community through the remains of the dead. They imply the incorporation of memory (Chesson 2007; Laneri 2007, 10), thereby formalizing the ideology of the elite, which uses memory to sanction its authority (Earle 1997, 143, 150; Schwartz 2007, 40, 45, 45 n. 18). Justification and the promotion of inequality are produced through funerary ritual (Laneri 2007, 5), to the extent that, according to S. Pollock (1999:216-217), there is competition over who has control of the dead just as there is competition over the workforce and production (Laneri 2007, 5), thereby causing not only the external material culture but also the bodies themselves to be fundamental, since everything communicates an intention (Laneri 2007, 10). Costly funerals often are used to highlight the ambitions of relatives, their desire to display power (Barley 2005, 152). This includes taking on extra expenses (Barley 2005, 188) that do not correspond to their real economic means, which has generated some, often surprising, problems in interpretation.

With this as our starting point, only the study of content (Molina González and Cámara Serrano 2005; Gonçalves, this volume; Pau, this volume), of figurative representations (Bueno and Balbín 2006, Bueno Ramírez *et al.*, 2008; Gonçalves 2004, 2006, this volume) and of cadavers, can open paths to determining the expression of social differences within the context of Late Prehistory (the fifth to the third millennia B.C.), in which inequalities were still mostly hidden. Even these aspects can be diluted by the abstraction (of the representations) and collectivization (of the inhumations) (Molina González and Cámara Serrano 2002), and even within the sepulture grave goods can be moved around or hidden (Juárez Martín *et al.*, 2009:3342) within the framework of the dissolution of individual identities (Bloch 2000).

Nonetheless, independently of the perspective offered to us by diachronic analysis, which reveals the expression of inequalities once they have been assumed ideologically, we can come to develop hypotheses about hierarchization, still within concealment, if *the cemetery is not assumed as a globality (a homogeneous "place") but rather as a network of routes that are ordered according to landmarks constituted by the significant*

tombs situated within it (Molina Castaño 2007, 152). Attention should not be given exclusively to the main or most central monumental tombs because peripheral centers also form and secondary tombs are also relevant, as regards their social significance (Cámara Serrano 2001; Molina Castaño 2007, 157). These differences are especially relevant in relation to the displacements that, moreover, structure memories and fix them to particular, meaningful points (tombs), often but not only because of the individuals interred there (Molina Castaño 2007, 151-152). In this respect, territorial studies demonstrate the differences not only between free-standing and hypogean tombs but also within each group (Spanedda and Cámara Serrano 2004, in press; Afonso *et al.*, 2006, 2007; Loi, this volume.; Montufo *et al.*, this volume; Spanedda, this volume).

Thus, ritual has an important role in the structuring of territory and of the activities performed within it (Zvelebil and Jordan 1999, 101; Barley 2005, 173), and its representation, even when favoring only a section of society (Cassola Guida and Corazza 2002, 56). Location is important in relation to not only past society but also to those that will come after us, since it is also used in the search for/consolidation of identity (Barley 2005, 171, 173), and it is for this reason that one can speak of the desire for transcendence (García Sanjuán 2000, 173-177). This is a form of territorial sacralization, the creation of a landscape (Criado Boado and Vaquero Lastres 1993:240-242; Silva 1993, 97-98; Criado Boado 1997, 7; Villoch Vázquez e*t al.*, 1997, 19; Scarre 1998, 162; Kirk 1998, 103, 110, 114, 122; Johansen 2004, 310) that includes the demarcation of travel routes (Galán and Martín 1991-92; Criado Boado and Vaquero Lastres 1993; Gómez and Sanz 1994; Vaquero Lastres 1995; Villoch Vázquez 2001; Gómez Vila 2005; Fabián *et al.*, 2006, 51; Bueno Ramírez *et al.*, 2007, 76; Wheatley and Murrieta 2008, 29-30) and interaction between different types of sites (Wheatley and Murrieta 2008, 30). Foundation and appropriation take place (Harrison 2004:29-30), albeit diffusely if the tombs are not visible (desert, sea), when there exists the awareness (even if it is made-up) that forebears reside in the zone (Harrison 2004, 30). Even the justification of conquest is provided this way (Harrison 2004, 30, 32) since, in most cases, the foundations are unreal because they are developed over already occupied terrain (Harrison 2004, 36), and they are justified by the mythic heroes that were deified or adopted by the gods.

But here also the monument's limits are diffuse, and the environment is made sacred by the actions of the forebears-ancestors (although not necessarily by their tombs, which facilitate identification with the corresponding group [Comba 2008.180]). In any case, the house-deceased person union is frequent, not only due to the imitation of houses in tombs (Hodder 1990; Sherratt 1990, 1993; Cámara Serrano and Spanedda 2002; Lizcano Prestel *et al.*, 2005), but also due to the literal presence of the dead in the houses (Lull Santiago 2000b;

Cámara Serrano 2001; Harrison 2004, 28, 31, 48) or due to the presence of ancestor worship in the houses (Harrison 2004:46).

References

Adams, E. 2004. Power and ritual in Neopalatial Crete: a regional comparison. In R. Osborne, (ed.), *The Object of Dedication. World Archaeology* 36:1, 26-42. London Routledge.

Alconini, S. 2008. Dis-embedded centers and architecture of power in the fringes of the Inka empire: New perspectives on territorial and hegemonic strategies of domination. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 27, 63-81.

Bard, K.A. 1992. Toward an Interpretation of the Role of Ideology in the Evolution of Complex Society in Egypt. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 11:1, 1-24.
Barley, N. 2005. *Bailando sobre la tumba. Encuentros con la muerte.* Barcelona, Crónicas 44, Anagrama.

Barrett, J. C. 1999. The Mythical Landscapes of the British Iron Age, in W.Ashmore and A. B. Knapp (eds), *Archaeologies of Landscape. Contemporary Perspectives*, 253-265. New York, Blackwell Publishers.

Bell, C. 2007. Response: Defining the Need for a Definition. In E. Kyriakidis (ed.), *The Archaeology of Ritual. Cotsen Advanced Seminars* 3, 277-288. Los Angeles, Cotsen Institute of Archaeology, University of California.

Bellagamba, A. 2007. Giovani e anziani. Cambiamento político e conflitti generazionali nel Gambia di fine Novecento. In R. Malighetti (cur.), *Politiche dell'identità*. Meltemi.edu 82, Antropologia/etnografía, 75-99. Roma, Meltemi.

Bernardini, W. 2004. Hopewell geometric earthworks: a case study in the referential and experiential meaning of monuments. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 23, 331-356.

Biehl, P.F. 2008. Religion and Ritual Practice in Neolithic Europe. In N. Vella (ed.), *Abstracts Book. European Association of Archaeologists. 14th Annual Meeting (Malta, 16-21 September 2008),* 186. Malta*,* University of Malta.

Bloch, M. 2000. Uomini in luoghi. Villaggi, case e pietre come memoria genealogica in Madagascar, in U. Fabietti and V. Matera, *Memorie e identità. Simboli e strategie del ricordo.* Gli argonauti 53, 47-53. Roma, Meltemi.

Bradley, R. 1998. Interpreting Enclosures, in M. Edmonds, and C. Richards (eds), *Understanding the Neolithic of North-Western Europe,* 188-203. Glasgow, Cruithne Press.

Bretscheneider, J., Driessen, J. and Lerberghe, K. van 2007a. Power and Architecture. Monumental Public Architecture in the Bronze Age Near East and Aegean. International Conference Leuven/Louvain-La Neuve/Münster 21-22/11/2002, in J. Bretschneider, J. Driessen and K. van Lerberghe (eds), *Power and Archiecture. Monumental Public Architecture in the Bronze Age Near East and Aegean. Proceedings of the international conference Power and Architecture organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, the Universitè Catholoique de Louvain and the Wstfälische Wilhelms-Universiät Münsters on the 21st and 22nd of November 2002,* 1-2. Leuven-Paris-Dudley, Uitgeveru Peeters en Departement Ooesterse Studies.

Bretscheneider, J., Jans, G. and Lerberghe, K. van 2007b. Power and Architecture. Past and Present, in J. Bretschneider, J. Driessen and K. van Lerberghe (eds), *Power and Archiecture. Monumental Public Architecture in the Bronze Age Near East and Aegean. Proceedings of the international conference Power and Architecture organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, the Universitè Catholoique de Louvain and the Wstfälische Wilhelms-Universiät Münsters on the 21st and 22nd of November 2002,* 3-9. Leuven-Paris-Dudley, Uitgeveru Peeters en Departement Ooesterse Studies.

Brück, J. 2001. Body metaphors and technologies of transformation in the English Middle and Late Bronze Age. In J. Brück (ed.), *Bronze Age Landscapes. Tradition and Transformation,* 149-160. Oxford, Oxbow Books.

Bueno Ramírez, P. and Balbín Behrmann, R. 2006. Between power and mythology. Evidence of social inequality and hierarchisation in Iberian megalithic art, in (P. Díaz del Río and L. García Sanjuán (eds), *Social Inequality in Iberian Late Prehistory. Papers from the session 'Social Inequality in Iberian Late Prehistory' presented at the Congress of Peninsular Archaeology, Faro, 2004.* British Archaeological Reports. International Series 1525, 37-52. Oxford, Archaeopress.

Bueno Ramírez, P., Barroso Bermejo, R. and Balbín Berhmann, R. de. 2007. El dolmen de Lagunilla III: rituales y símbolos de la tradición en el Megalitismo del Tajo internacional, in E. Cerrillo and J.M. Valadés (eds), *Los primeros*

campesinos de La Raya. Aportaciones recientes al conocimiento del Neolítico y Calcolítico en Extremadura y Alentejo. Actas de las Jornadas de Arqueología del Museo de Cáceres Memorias 6, 67-93. Cáceres. Junta de Extremadura.

Bueno Ramírez, P., Balbín Behrmann, R. de and Barroso Bermejo, R. 2008. Dioses y antepasados que salen de las piedras. In L. García Sanjuán (Coord), *Más allá de los límites de la Prehistoria. PH. Boletín del Instituto Andaluz de Patrimonio Histórico* 67. *Especial Monográfico Patrimonio Megalítico*, 46-61.

Bukach, D. 2003. Exploring identity and place: an analysis of the provenance of passage graves stones on Guernsey and Jersey in the Middle Neolithic. *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 22:1, 23-33.

Burström, M. 1996. Other Generations' Interpretation and Use of the Past: the case of the Picture Stones on Gotland. *Current Swedish Archaeology* 4 (M. Burström, A. Carlsson, eds), 21-40.

Cámara Serrano, J.A. 1998. *Bases teóricas y metodológicas para el estudio del ritual funerario utilizado durante la Prehistoria Reciente en el sur de la Península Ibérica*, Tesis Doctoral Microfilmada, Universidad de Granada.

Cámara Serrano, J.A. 2001. *El ritual funerario en la Prehistoria Reciente en el Sur de la Península Ibérica*. British Archaeological Reports. International Series 913. Oxford, Archaeopress.

Cámara Serrano, J.A. and Spanedda, L. 2002. Decoración, representaciones figuradas y áreas rituales en la prehistoria reciente sarda: acumulación, control del territorio y jerarquización, in W.H. Waldren and J.A. Ensenyat (eds.), *World Islands in Prehistory. International Insular Investigations. Vth Deia International Conference in Prehistory.* British Archaeological Reports. International Series 1095, 373-394. Oxford, Archaeopress.

Carrasco Rus, J., Navarrete Enciso, Mª.S., Pachón Romero, J.A., Gámiz Jiménez, J. and Aníbal González, C. 1993. Prospección con sondeos estratigráficos en Sierra Martilla (Loja). *Anuario Arqueológico de Andalucía* 1991:II, 204-211.

Cassen, S. 2002. Stelae reused in the passage graves of western France: history of research and a sexualization of the carvings. In A. Ritchie (ed.), *Neolithic Orkney in its European Context*, 233-246. Cambridge, Oxbow Books.

Càssola Guida, P. and Corazza, S. 2002. *Il túmulo di Santo Osvaldo. Alla ricerca dell'antenato. Guida alla mostra (Udine, 2002)*. Udine, Università degli Studi di Udine.

Chambon, P. 2000. Les pratiques funéraires dans les tombes collectives de la France néolithique. *Bulletin de la Société Préhistorique Française* 97:2, 265-274.

Chapman, J. 2009. Notes on Memory-Work and Materiality, in I. Barbiera, A.M. Choyke, J.A. Rasson (eds), *Materializing Memory. Archaeological material culture and the semantics of the past.* British Archaeological Reports. International Series 1977, 7-16. Oxford.

Chesson, M.S. 2007. Remembering and Forgetting in Early Bronze Age Mortuary Practices on the Southeastern Dead Sea Plain, Jordan. In N. Laneri (ed.), *Performing Death. Social Analyses of Funerary Traditions in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean.* The University of Chicago Oriental Institute Seminars 3, 109-139. Chicago, The University of Chicago.

Cicilloni, R. 1999. I dolmens della Sardegna: analisi e problematiche. *Studi Sardi* XXXI (1994-1998), 51-110.

Collins, J., Chalfant, M. 1993. A second-terrace perspective on Monks Mound. *American Antiquity* 58, 319-332.

Comba, E. 2008. *Antropologia delle religioni. Un'introduzione*. Percorsi Antropologia 104. Roma-Bari, Editori Laterza.

Connerton, P. 1989. *How societies remember*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Cooney, G. 1999. Social landscapes in Irish prehistory, in P.J. Ucko and R. Layton (eds), *The Archaeology and Anthropology of Landscape. Shaping your landscape, Papers presented at the third World Archaeological Congress (New Delhi, India, 1994)*. One World Archaeology 30, 46-64. London, Routledge, 1999.

Criado Boado, F. 1993. Visibilidad e interpretación del registro arqueológico. *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 50, 39-56.

Criado Boado, F. 1997. Introduction: Combining the different dimensions of cultural space: Is a total archaeology of landscape possible?, in F. Criado and C. Parcero (eds), *Landscape, Archaeology, Heritage*. Trabajos de Arqueología del Paisaje 2, 5-9.

Criado Boado, F. 1998. The visibility of the archaeological record and the interpretation of social reality, in I. Hodder, M. Shanks, A. Alexandri, V. Buchli, J. Carman, J. Last and G. Lucas (eds), *Interpreting Archaeology. Finding meaning in the past,* 194-204. London, Routledge.

Criado Boado, F. and Vaquero Lastres, J. 1991. El fenómeno megalítico y tumular: formas diversas de pasado monumental. In F. Criado (dir), *Arqueología del paisaje. El área Bocelo-Furelos entre los tiempos paleolíticos y medievales. (Campañas de 1987, 1988 y 1989)*. Arqueoloxía/Investigación, 129-146.

Criado Boado, F. and Vaquero Lastres, J. 1993. Monumentos, nudos en el pañuelo. Megalitos, nudos en el espacio: análisis del emplazamiento de los monumentos tumulares gallegos. *Espacio, tiempo y forma. Serie I. Prehistoria y Arqueología* 6, 205-248.

Criado Boado, F., Gianotti García, C. and Villoch Vázquez, V. 2000. Los túmulos como asentamientos. *Actas do 3 Congresso de Arqueologia Peninsular (Vila Real, 1999). Volume III. Neolitizaçâo e Megalitismo da Península Ibérica*, 289-302. Porto, ADECAP.

Croucher, K. 2006. Death, Display and Performance. A Discussion of the Mortuary Remains at Çayönü Tepesi, in M. Georgiadis and C. Gallou (eds.), *The Archaeology of Cult and Death. Proceedings of the Session "The Archaeology of Cult and Death" Organized fot the 9th Annual Meeting of the European Association of Archaeologists, 11th September 2003, St. Petersburg, Russia.* Archaeolingua. Series Minor 21, 11-44. Budapest.

Crumley, C.L. 2001. Communication, Holism, and the Evolution of Sociopolitical Complexity. In J. Haas (ed.), *From Leaders to Rulers.* Fundamental Issues in Archaeology, 19-33. New York, Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Cunningham, T. 2007. Havoc: the destruction of power and the power of destruction in Minoan Crete, in J. Bretschneider, J. Driessen, and K. van Lerberghe (eds), *Power and Archiecture. Monumental Public Architecture in the Bronze Age Near East and Aegean. Proceedings of the international conference Power and Architecture organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, the Universitè Catholoique de Louvain and the Wstfälische Wilhelms-Universiät Münsters on the 21st and 22nd of November 2002,* 23-43. Leuven-Paris-Dudley, Uitgeveru Peeters en Departement Ooesterse Studies.

Delibes de Castro and G. Zapatero Magdaleno, P. 1996. De lugar de habitación a sepulcro monumental: una reflexión sobre la trayectoria del yacimiento neolítico de La Velilla, en Osorno (Palencia), in J. Bosch and M. Molist (Orgs), I *Congrés del Neolític a la Península Ibérica. Formació e implantació de les comunitats agrícoles (Gavá-Bellaterra, 1995). Actes. Vol. 1.*, *Rubricatum* 1:1, 337-348. Gavà.

DeMarrais, E., Castillo, L.J. and Earle, T. 1996. Ideology, Materialization, and Power Strategies. *Current Anthropology* 37:1, 15-31.

Depalmas, A. 2001. I monumenti megalitici nello spazio delle comunità delle età dei metalli in Sardegna, in G. Serrelli and D. Vacca (cur.), *Aspetti del megalitismo preistorico,* 99-106. Cagliari, Operatore Collettivo Sa Corona Arrubia/GAL Comarca de Guadix.

Descola, P. 1996. Constructing natures: symbolic ecology and social practice, in P. Descola, and G. Pálsson (eds), *Nature and Society: Anthropological Perspectives,* 82-102. London-New York, Routledge.

Díez de Velasco, F. 2006. *Breve historia de las religiones*. Religión y mitología, Humanidades 4112. Madrid, Alianza Editorial.

Driessen, J. 2007. IIB or not IIB: on the beginnings of Minoan monument building, in J. Bretschneider, J. Driessen, and K. van Lerberghe (eds), *Power and Archiecture. Monumental Public Architecture in the Bronze Age Near East and Aegean. Proceedings of the international conference Power and Architecture organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, the Universitè Catholoique de Louvain and the Wstfälische Wilhelms-Universiät Münsters on the 21st and 22nd of November 2002,* 73-92. Leuven-Paris-Dudley, Uitgeveru Peeters en Departement Ooesterse Studies.

Earle, T.K. 1997. *How Chiefs Come to Power. The Political Economy in Prehistory*. Stanford, Stanford University Press.

Eliade, M. 2007. *Il Mito dell'eterno ritorno. Archetipi e ripetizione*. Roma, Classici Borla, Borla.

Fabián García, J.F., Blanco and A., López, A. 2006. La transición Calcolítico-Bronce Antiguo desde una perspectiva arqueológica y ambiental: el valle Amblés (Ávila) como referencia. In A. Orejas (ed.), *Arqueología Espacial: Espacios agrarios*. Arqueología Espacial 26, 37-56.

Fabietti, U. 2007. *Elementi di antropología cultural*. Città del Castello, Mondadori Università.

Fahlander, F. and Oestigaard, T. 2008. The Materiality of Death: Bodies, Burials, Beliefs, in F. Fahlander and T. Oestigaard (eds), *The Materiality of Death: Bodies, Burials, Beliefs,* British Archaeological Reports. International Series 1768, 1-18. Oxford, Archaeopress.

Fitzsimons, R.D. 2007. Architecture and power in the Bronze Age Argolid, in J. Bretschneider, J. Driessen, and K. van Lerberghe (eds), *Power and Archiecture. Monumental Public Architecture in the Bronze Age Near East and Aegean. Proceedings of the international conference Power and Architecture organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, the Universitè Catholoique de Louvain and the Wstfälische Wilhelms-Universiät Münsters on the 21st and 22nd of November 2002,* Leuven-Paris-Dudley, 93-115. Uitgeveru Peeters en Departement Ooesterse Studies.

Galán Domingo, E. and Martín, A.M. 1991-92. Megalitismo y zonas de paso en la cuenca extremeña del Tajo. *Zephyrus* XLIV-XLV, 193-205.

Gallardo Ibáñez, F. 2005. Arte rupestre, contenido cultural de la forma e ideología durante el Formativo Temprano en el Río Salado (Desierto de Atacama, Chile), in M. Santos and A. Troncoso (Coords), *Reflexiones sobre Arte Rupestre, paisaje, forma y contenido*. Traballos de Arqueoloxía e Patrimonio 33, 37-52. Santiago de Compostela.

Gallou, C. and Georgiadis, M. 2006. Ancestor Worship, Tradition and Regional Variation in Mycenaean Culture, in M. Georgiadis and C. Gallou (eds), *The Archaeology of Cult and Death. Proceedings of the Session "The Archaeology of Cult and Death" Organized fot the 9th Annual Meeting of the European Association of Archaeologists, 11th September 2003, St. Petersburg, Russia*. Archaeolingua. Series Minor 21, 125-149. Budapest.

García Sanjuán, L. 2000. Grandes piedras, paisajes sagrados. *PH. Boletín del Instituto Andaluz del Patrimonio Histórico* 31, 171-178.

García Sanjuán, L. 2006. Funerary ideology and social inequality in the Late Prehistory of the Iberian South-West (c. 3300-850 cal BC), in P. Díaz del Río and L. García Sanjuán (eds), *Social Inequality in Iberian Late Prehistory. Papers from the session 'Social Inequality in Iberian Late Prehistory' presented at the Congress of Peninsular Archaeology, Faro, 2004*. British Archaeological Reports. International Series 1525, 149-169. Oxford, Archaeopress.

García Sanjuán, L. 2008. Muerte, tiempo, memoria. Los megalitos como memoriales culturales. In (L. García Sanjuán, Coord.), *Más allá de los límites de la Prehistoria*. PH. Boletín del Instituto Andaluz de Patrimonio Histórico 67. Especial Monográfico Patrimonio Megalítico, pp. 34-45

García Sanjuán, L. and Wheatley, D. 2009. El marco territorial de los dólmenes de Antequera: valoración preliminar de las primeras investigaciones. In B. Ruiz González, (Coord.), *Dólmenes de Antequera. Tutela y valorización hoy*. PH Cuadernos 23, 128-143.

Gee, R. 2008. From Corpse to Ancestor: The Role of Tombside Dining in the Transformation of the Body in Ancient Rome, In F. Fahlander and T. Oestigaard (eds.), *The Materiality of Death: Bodies, Burials, Beliefs*. British Archaeological Reports. International Series 1768, 59-68. Oxford, Archaeopress.

Gómez, J. and Sanz, M.P. 1994. Valdeprados (Aldea del Rey, Ávila). Un nuevo enterramiento en la submeseta Norte. *Cuadernos Abulenses* 21, 81-116.

Gómez Vila, J. 2005. Caminos y túmulos. Aproximación al estudio de los ejes de comunicación megalíticos en el Noroeste peninsular, in P. Arias, R. Ontañón and C. García-Moncó (eds), *Actas del III Congreso del Neolítico en la Península Ibérica (Santander, 5-8 de octubre de 2003,)* Monografías del Instituto Internacional de Investigaciones Prehistóricas de Cantabria 1, 405-412. Santander, Universidad de Cantabria.

Gonçalves, V.S. 1994. A primeira metade do 3 Milenio no Centro/Sul de Portugal. Algumas breves reflexôes em quanto outras nâo sâo possiveis. In V.O. Jorge (Coord.), *1 Congresso de Arquelogía Peninsular (Porto, 1993), Actas IV, Trabalhos de Antropologia e Etnologia* 34:3-4, 117-131. Porto.

Gonçalves, V. 2004. As placas de xisto gravadas dos sepulcros colectivos de Aljezur (3º milenio a.n.e.). *O Arquélogo Português* Serie IV:22, 163-318.

Gonçalves, V. 2006. Manifestaçôes do Sagrado na Pré-História do Ocidente Peninsular. 8. Sete Placas de xisto gravadas (e algumas outras a propósito). *O Arquélogo Português* Serie IV:24, 167-231.

Gradoli, M.G. 2009. Memory through Time: the Central Sardinia symbolic and physical sacred landscape. In F. de Nicolis (Coord.), *European Association of Archaeologists. 15th Annual Meeting (Riva del Garda, 15-20 September 2009), Abstracts Book. 14th Annual Meeting of the European Association of Archaeologists (Riva del Garda, Trento, Italy, 15-20 September 2009)*, 50-51. Trento. Provincia Autonoma di Trento/Comune di Riva del Garda/Museo Riva del Garda.

Grima, R. 2007. Landscape and Ritual in Late Neolithic Malta, in D.A. Barrowclough and C. Malone (eds.), *Cult in Context. Reconsidering Ritual in Archaeology,* 35-40. Oxford, Oxbow Books.

Halbwachs, M. 1992. *On Collective Memory*. Chicago-London, The University of Chicago Press.

Harris, M. 1990. *Introducción a la antropología general*. Madrid, Alianza Universidad Textos 37, Alianza.

Harrison, R.P. 2004. *Il dominio dei morti*. Le terre/Scritture 90. Roma, Fazi Editore.

Hastorf, C.A. 2007. Archaeological Andean Rituals: Performance, Liturgy, and Meaning. In E. Kyriakidis (ed.), *The Archaeology of Ritual.* Cotsen Advanced Seminars 3, 77-107. Los Angeles, Cotsen Institute of Archaeology. University of California.

Hernando Gonzalo, A. 1994. Aproximación al mundo funerario del Calcolítico en el Sudeste español. *II congreso de Historia de Andalucía (Córdoba, Abril 1991)*, 167-176. Córdoba.

Hodder, I. 1990. *The Domestication of Europe*, Oxford, Blackwell.

Holtorf, C.J. 1997. Megaliths, Monumentality and Memory. *Archaeological Review fom Cambridge* 14:2, 45-66.

Johansen, P.G. 2004. Landscape, monumental architecture, and ritual: a reconsideration of the South Indian ashmounds. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 23:3, 309-330.

Jones, A. 2003. Technologies of remembrance. Memory, materiality and identity in Early Bronze Age Scotland. In H. Williams (ed.), *Archaeologies of Remembrance: Death and Memory in Past Societies,* 65-68. New York, Plenum Publishers.

Juárez Martín, J.M., Moreno Alonso, E. and Cáceres Misa, P. 2009. Intervención arqueológica de urgencia en la necrópolis prehistórica de cuevas artificiales de La Molina (Lora de Estepa, Sevilla)**,** *Anuario Arqueológico de Andalucía* 2004:1, 3326-3352.

Kaliff, A. and Oestigaard, T. 2008. Excavating the Kings' Bones: The Materiality of Death in Practice and Ethics Today, in F. Fahlander and T. Oestigaard (eds), *The Materiality of Death: Bodies, Burials, Beliefs,* British Archaeological Reports. International Series 1768, 47-57. Oxford, Archaeopress.

Kilmurray, L. 2009. The Re-Generation of the Neolithic Social Memory, Monuments and Generations, in I. Barbiera, A.M. Choyke, J.A. Rasson (eds), *Materializing Memory. Archaeological material culture and the semantics of the past.* British Archaeological Reports. International Series 1977, 41-51. Oxford.

Kirk, T. 1993. Space, subjectivity, power and hegemony: megaliths and long mounds in Earlier Neolithic Brittany. In C. Tilley (ed.), *Interpretative Archaeology,* 181-223. Berg, Exeter, Explorations in Anthropology Series.

Kirk, T. 1998. Constucts of Death in the Early Neolithic of the Paris Basin, in M. Edmonds and C. Richards (eds), *Understanding the Neolithic of North-Western Europe,* 102-126. Glasgow, Cruithne Press.

Kolb, M.J. 2005. The Genesis of Monuments among the Mediterranena Islands, in E. Blake and A.B. Knapp (eds), *The Archaeology of Mediterranean Prehistory*. Blackwell Studies in Global Archaeology 6, 156-179. Malden, Blackwell Publishing.

Kondoleon, C. 1997. Timing Spectacles: Roman Domestic Art and Performance*,* in B. Bergman and C. Kondoleon (eds), *The Art of Ancient Spectacle,* 321-342. Washington D.C., National Gallery of Art.

Koortbojian, M. 1996. In commemoration mortuorum: text and image along the "street of tombs". In J. Elsner (ed.), *Art and Text in Roman Culture,* 210-234. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Kristoffersen, S. and Oestigaard, T. 2008. "Death Myths": Performing of Rituals and Variation in Corpse Treatment during the Migration Period in Norway, in F. Fahlander, T. Oestigaard (eds), *The Materiality of Death: Bodies, Burials, Beliefs,* British Archaeological Reports. International Series 1768, 127-139. Oxford, Archaeopress.

Kyriakidis, E. 2007. Finding Ritual: Calibrating the Evidence. In E. Kyriakidis (ed.), *The Archaeology of Ritual.* Cotsen Advanced Seminars 3, 9-22. Los Angeles, Cotsen Institute of Archaeology, University of California.

Laffineur, R. 2007. Building for ruling. Architecture and power at Mycenae, in J. Bretschneider, J. Driessen and K. van Lerberghe (eds), *Power and Archiecture. Monumental Public Architecture in the Bronze Age Near East and Aegean. Proceedings of the international conference Power and Architecture organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, the Universitè Catholoique de Louvain and the Wstfälische Wilhelms-Universiät Münsters on the 21st and 22nd of November 2002,* 117-127. Leuven-Paris-Dudley, Uitgeveru Peeters en Departement Ooesterse Studies.

Laneri, N. 2007. An Archaeology of Funerary Rituals. In N. Laneri (ed.), *Performing Death. Social Analyses of Funerary Traditions in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean.* The University of Chicago Oriental Institute Seminars 3, 1-13. Chicago, The University of Chicago.

Lindgren, C. 2008. Stones and Bones: The Myth of Ymer and Mortuary Practices with an Example from the Migration Period in Uppland, Central Sweden, in F. Fahlander and T. Oestigaard (eds), *The Materiality of Death: Bodies, Burials, Beliefs,* British Archaeological Reports. International Series 1768, 155-160. Oxford, Archaeopress.

Lizcano Prestel, R., Cámara Serrano, J.A., Pérez Bareas, C. and Spanedda, L. 2005. Continuidad en hábitat y continuidad ritual. Hipogeismo en el Alto Guadalquivir, in P. Arias, R. Ontañón and C. García-Moncó (eds), *Actas del III Congreso del Neolítico en la Península Ibérica (Santander, 5-8 de octubre de 2003).* Monografías del Instituto Internacional de Investigaciones Prehistóricas de Cantabria 1, 653-662. Santander*,* Universidad de Cantabria.

Lo Schiavo, F. 1980. Dorgali e il suo teritorio nella Preistoria e Protostoria: osservazioni e problemi, in AA.VV. *Dorgali. Documenti Archeologici,* 9-16. Sassari, Soprintendenza Archeologica per le province di Sassari e Nuoro/Chiarella.

Malone, C. 2007. Ritual, Space and Structure – The Context of Cult in Malta and Gozo, in D.A. Barrowclough and C. Malone (eds.), *Cult in Context. Reconsidering Ritual in Archaeology,* 23-34. Oxford, Oxbow Books.

Manoukian, S. 2007. Potere, storia pubblica e cultura in Iran. In R. Malighetti (cur.), *Politiche dell'identità.* Meltemi.edu 82. Antropologia/etnografia, 101-125. Roma, Meltemi.

Martinón-Torres, M. 2008. El megalito ha muerto ¡Larga vida al megalito!. In L. García Sanjuán (Coord.), *Más allá de los límites de la Prehistoria.* PH. Boletín del Instituto Andaluz de Patrimonio Histórico 67. Especial Monográfico Patrimonio Megalítico*,* 92-95.

Miller, D. 1985. Ideology and the Harappan Civilization. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 4:1, 34-71.

Molina Castaño, D.E. 2007. Como en un juego de espejos, metrópolis vs. necrópolis. Una aproximación al cementerio San Pedro de la ciudad de Medellín como fuente de reflexión histórica y antropológica. *Boletín de Antropología* 21:38, 147-172.

Molina González, F. and Cámara Serrano, J. A. 2002. El Calcolítico y la cultura de Los Millares (paisaje 4). *Nueva Historia de España. La Historia en su lugar. T. I. Los albores de la Historia (desde los orígenes hasta el S. III a.C.)*, 139-150. Barcelona, Planeta.

Molina González, F. and Cámara Serrano, J.A. 2005. *Guía del yacimiento arqueológico Los Millares*. Sevilla, Empresa Pública de Gestión de Programas Culturales, Consejería de Cultura. Junta de Andalucía.

Moore, J. 1996. *Architecture and Power in the Ancient Andes: The Archaeology of Public Buildings*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Moravetti, A. 1998. On the dolmens of Pre-Nuragic Sardinia, in A. Moravetti, M. Pearce and M. Tosi (eds), *Papers from the EAA Third Annual Meeting at Ravenna 1997. Volume III: Sardinia.* British Archaeological Reports. International Series 719, 25-45. Oxford, Archaeopress.

Morley, I. 2007. Time, cycles and ritual behaviour, in D.A. Barrowclough and C. Malone (eds), *Cult in Context. Reconsidering Ritual in Archaeology.* 205-209. Oxbow Books, Oxford.

Morris, E.F. 2007. Sacrifice for the State: First Dynasty Royal Funerals and the Rites at Macramallah's Rectangle. In N. Laneri (ed.), *Performing Death. Social Analyses of Funerary Traditions in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean.* The University of Chicago Oriental Institute Seminars 3, 15-37. Chicago, The University of Chicago.

Muir, R.J. and Driver, J.C. 2004. Identifying ritual use of animals in the northern American Southwest, in S. Jones O'Day, W. Van Neer and A. Ervynck (eds), *Behaviour Behind Bones. The zooarchaeology of ritual, religion, status and identity. Proceedings of the 9th Conference of the International Council of Archaeozoology, Durham, August 2002* Oxbow Books, Oxford, 2004, pp. 128-143.

Muller, J. 2009. Social ritual and megaliths: the production and consumption of Knowledge. In F. de Nicolis (Coord.), *European Association of Archaeologists. 15th Annual Meeting (Riva del Garda, 15-20 September 2009), Abstracts Book. 14th Annual Meeting of the European Association of Archaeologists (Riva del Garda, Trento, Italy, 15-20 September 2009)*, 28. Trento. Provincia Autonoma di Trento/Comune di Riva del Garda/Museo Riva del Garda.

Muñoz, Mª. de los Á. 2007. The Kalanka at Samaipata, Bolivia: An Example of Inka Monumental Architecture, Ecuador, and Samaipata, Bolivia, in R.L. Burger, C. Morris and R. Matos Mendieta (eds), *Variations in the Expression of Inka Power. A Symposium at Dumbarton Oaks 18 and 19 October 1997,* 223-265. Washington, D.C., Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection/Harvard University Press.

Naso, A. 2007. Etruscan Style of Dying: Funerary Architecture, Tomb Groups, and Social Range at Caere and its Hinterland during the Seventh-Sixth Centuries B.C. In N. Laneri (ed.), *Performing Death. Social Analyses of Funerary Traditions in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean.* The University of Chicago Oriental Institute Seminars 3, 141-162. Chicago, The University of Chicago.

Nocete Calvo, F., Orihuela, A., Escalera, P., Linares, J.A., Otero, R. and Romero, J.C. 1995. Prospecciones arqueológicas de superficie en el marco del Proyecto Odiel en 1992: II Muestreo Odiel-Oraque (Calañas, Huelva). *Anuario Arqueológico de Andalucía* 1992:II, 209-214.

Oliveira, C. 2008. Hacia una etnología del megalitismo. Usos y memorias de los sitios megalíticos en las poblaciones rurales del sur de Portugal. In L. García Sanjuán (coord.), *Más allá de los límites de la Prehistoria.* PH. Boletín del Instituto Andaluz de Patrimonio Histórico 67. Especial Monográfico Patrimonio Megalítico, 96-107.

Parain, C. 1975. La protohistoria mediterránea y el modo de producción asiático. In R. Bartra, *El modo de producción asiático. Antología de textos sobre problemas de la historia de los países coloniales*, 232-253. México, Era.

Parker-Pearson, M. and Ramilisonina. 1998. Stonehenge for the ancestors: the stones pass on the message. *Antiquity* 72, 308-326.

Patton, M. 1993. *Statements in Stone: Monuments and Society in Neolithic Brittany*, London, Routledge.

Peltenburg, E. 1999. The Living and the Ancestors, in G. del Olmo Lete, J.L. and Montero Fenollós (eds), *Archaeology of the Upper Syrian Euphrates, the Tishrin Dam Area: Proceedings of the International Symposium Held at Barcelona. January 28th-30th, 1998.* Aula Orientalis Supplement 15, 427-442. Barcelona, AUSA.

Plumb, J.H. 1974. *La muerte del pasado*. Breve Biblioteca de Respuesta 91. Barcelona, Barral Editores.

Pollock, S. 1999. *Ancient Mesopotamia: The Eden that Never Was*. Case Studies in Early Societies. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Potter, J.M. 2004. Hunting and social differentiation in the late prehispanic American Southwest, in S. Jones O'Day, W. Van Neer and A. Ervynck (eds), *Behaviour Behind Bones. The zooarchaeology of ritual, religion, status and identity. Proceedings of the 9th Conference of the International Council of Archaeozoology, Durham, August 2002,* 285-292. Oxford, Oxbow Books.

Rajala, U. 2008. Ritual and Remembrance at Archaic Crustumerium: The Transformation of Past and Modern Materialities in the Cemetery of Cisterna Grande (Rome, Italy), in F. Fahlander and T. Oestigaard (eds), *The Materiality of Death: Bodies, Burials, Beliefs,* British Archaeological Reports. International Series 1768, 79-87. Oxford, Archaeopress.

Remotti, F. 2000. Le capitali mobili africane, in U. Fabietti and V. Matera, *Memorie e identità. Simboli e strategie del ricordo.* Gli argonauti 53, 127-134. Roma, Meltemi.

Renfrew, C. 2007. The Archaeology of Ritual, of Cult, and of Religion. In E. Kyriakidis (ed.), *The Archaeology of Ritual.* Cotsen Advanced Seminars 3, 109-122. Los Angeles, Cotsen Institute of Archaeology. University of California.

Richards, C. 1993. Monumental Choreography: Architecture and Spatial Representation in Late Neolithic Orkney. In C. Tilley (ed.), *Interpretative Archaeology*, 143-178. Berg, Exeter, Explorations in Anthropology Series.

Robb, J. 2008. Agencia, in C. Renfrew and P. Bahn (eds), *Arqueología. Conceptos clave,* 15-20. Tres Cantos, Akal Universitaria. Serie Conceptos Clave, Akal.

Rodríguez Becerra, S. 2000. *Religión y fiesta. Antropología de las creencias y rituales en Andalucía*. Sevilla. Signatura Demos. Una mirada abierta a la Sociedad y la Cultura 3, Signatura Ediciones de Andalucía.

Rowlands, M.J. 1993. The role of memory in the transmission of culture. *World Archaeology* 25:2, 141-151.

Saitta, D.J. 1994. Agency, Class, and Archaeological Interpretation. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 13, 201-227.

Scarduelli, P. 2007a. Introduzione. In P. Scarduelli (cur.), *Antropologia del rito: interpretazioni e spiegazioni.* Universali Bollati Boringhieri 542, 7-65. Torino, Bollati Boringhieri.

Scarduelli, P. 2007b. *Sciamani, stregoni, sacerdoti. Uno studio antropologico dei rituali.* Tutto e subito 10. Palermo, Sellerio.

Scarre, C. 1998. Traditions of Death: Mounded Tombs, Megalithic Art and Funerary Ideology in Neolithic Western Europe, in M. Edmonds and C. Richards (eds), *Understanding the Neolithic of North-Western Europe,* 161-187. Glasgow, Cruithne Press.

Scarre, C. 2007. *The Megalithic Monuments of Britain and Ireland*. London, Thames and Hudson.

Scarre, C. 2008. Nuevos enfoques para el estudio de los monumentos megalíticos de Europa Occidental. In L. García Sanjuán (Coord.), *Más allá de los límites de la Prehistoria*. PH. Boletín del Instituto Andaluz de Patrimonio Histórico 67. Especial Monográfico Patrimonio Megalítico, 12-23.

Schoep, I. 2007. Architecture and Power: the origins of Minoan "Palatial Architecture", in J. Bretschneider, J. Driessen and K. van Lerberghe (eds), *Power and Archiecture. Monumental Public Architecture in the Bronze Age Near East and Aegean. Proceedings of the international conference Power and Architecture organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, the Universitè Catholoique de Louvain and the Wstfälische Wilhelms-Universiät Münsters on the 21st and 22nd of November 2002,* 213-236. Leuven-Paris-Dudley, Uitgeveru Peeters en Departement Ooesterse Studies.

Schulz Paulsson, B. 2009. The origin and spreading of Megaliths in Scandinavia and France: diffusionism versus convergence. In F. de Nicolis (Coord.), *European Association of Archaeologists. 15th Annual Meeting (Riva del Garda, 15-20 September 2009), Abstracts Book. 14th Annual Meeting of the European Association of Archaeologists (Riva del Garda, Trento, Italy, 15-20 September 2009)*, 29. Trento. Provincia Autonoma di Trento/Comune di Riva del Garda/Museo Riva del Garda.

Schwartz, G.M. 2007. Status, Ideology, and Memory in Third-Millennium Syria: "Royal" Tombs at Umm El-Marra. In N. Laneri (ed.), *Performing Death. Social Analyses of Funerary Traditions in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean.* The University of Chicago Oriental Institute Seminars 3, 39-68. Chicago, The University of Chicago.

Sherratt, A. 1990. The genesis of megaliths: monumentality, ethnicity and social complexity in Neolithic north-west Europe. *World Archaeology* 22:2. *Monuments and the Monumental*, 147-167.

Sherratt, A. 1993. Ancestors for the tombs?. *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 12:1, 127-128.

Silva, A.P. da 1993. Megalitismo e tradiçâo megalítica no Centro-Norte Litoral de Portugal: breve ponto da situaçâo. In V.O. Jorge (Coord.), *11 Congresso de Arquelogía Peninsular (Porto, 1993), Actas I*, Trabalhos de Antropologia e Etnologia 33:1-2, 93-130. Porto.

Skeates, R. 2007. Religious Experience in the Prehistoric Maltese Underworld, in D.A. Barrowclough and C. Malone (eds), *Cult in Context. Reconsidering Ritual in Archaeology,* 90-96. Oxford, Oxbow Books.

Smith, A.T. 2007. The Politics of Loss: Comments on a Powerful Death. In N. Laneri (ed.), *Performing Death. Social Analyses of Funerary Traditions in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean.* The University of Chicago Oriental Institute Seminars 3, 163-166. , Chicago, The University of Chicago.

Spanedda, L. and Cámara Serrano, J.A. 2004. Tombe e controllo del territorio. Un esempio di distribuzione spaziale a Dorgali (NU). *Rassegna di Archeologia* 20/A. *Preistorica e protostorica*, 163-182.

Stoddart, S. 2007. The Maltese Death Cult in Context, in D.A. Barrowclough and C. Malone (eds.), *Cult in Context. Reconsidering Ritual in Archaeology,* 54-60. Oxford, Oxbow Books.

Stout, G. 2002. *Newgrange and the Bend of the Boyne*. Cork, Cork University Press.

Strathern, A. 1982. Witchcraft, greed, cannibalism and death: some related themes from the New Guinea Highlands, in M. Bloch and J. Parry (eds), *Death and Regeneration of Life,* 111-133. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Thomas, J. 1993. The Politics of Vision and the Archaeologies of Landscape. In B. Bender (Ed.), *Landscape. Politics and perspectives*, 19-48. Berg, Exeter, Explorations in Anthropology Series.

Thomas, J. 1998. Reconciling symbolic significance with being-in-the-world, in I. Hodder, M. Shanks, A. Alexandri, V. Buchli, J. Carman, J. Last and G. Lucas (eds), *Interpreting Archaeology. Finding meaning in the past,* 210-211. London, Routledge.

Thomas, L.-V. 1983. *Antropología de la muerte*. México, Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Tilley, C. 1993. Art, Architecture, Landscape (Neolithic Sweden). In B. Bender (ed.), *Landscape. Politics and perspectives,* 49-84. Berg, Exeter, Explorations in Anthropology Series.

Tilley, C. 1999. *Metaphor and Material Culture*. Oxford, Blackwell.

Trigger, B.G. 1990. Monumental architecture: a thermodynamic explanation of symbolic behavior. *World Archaeology* 22:2. *Monuments and the monumental*, 119-132.

Vaquero Lastres, J. 1995. Ver y moverse: túmulos en el Noroeste peninsular. XXII *Congreso Nacional de Arquelogía (Vigo, 1993)*, 399-404.

Venclová, N. 1993. Celtic shrines in central Europe: a sceptical approach. *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 12, 55-66.

Villoch Vázquez, V. 2001. El emplazamiento tumular como estrategia de configuración del espacio social: Galicia en la Prehistoria Reciente. *Complutum* 12, 33-49.

Villoch Vázquez, V., Santos, M. and Criado, F. 1997. Forms of Ceremonial Landscapes in Iberia from Neolithic to Bronze Age: essay on an Archaeology of Perception*, in* F. Criado and C. Parcero (eds), *Landscape, Archaeology, Heritage.* Trabajos de Arqueología del Paisaje 2, 19-25. Santiago de Compostela.

Wallin, P. and Martisson-Wallin, H. 2009. Monumental structures and the spirit of chiefly actions. In F. de Nicolis (Coord.), *European Association of Archaeologists. 15th Annual Meeting (Riva del Garda, 15-20 September 2009), Abstracts Book. 14th Annual Meeting of the European Association of Archaeologists (Riva del Garda, Trento, Italy, 15-20 September 2009)*, 56. Trento. Provincia Autonoma di Trento/Comune di Riva del Garda/Museo Riva del Garda.

Wheatley, D. and Murrieta Flores, P. 2008. Grandes piedras en un mundo cambiante: la arqueología de los megalitos en su paisaje. In L. García Sanjuán (coord.), *Más allá de los límites de la Prehistoria*. PH. Boletín del Instituto Andaluz de Patrimonio Histórico 67. Especial Monográfico Patrimonio Megalítico, 24-33.

Whitehouse, R. 1984. Social organization in the Neolithic of Southeast Italy, in W.H. Waldren, R. Chapman, J. Lewthwaite and R.-C. Kennard (eds), *The Deya Conference of Prehistory. Early settlement in the western mediterranean islands and their peripheral areas*. British Archaeological Reports. International Series 229(IV), 1109-1137. Oxford, Archaeopress.

Whitehouse, R. 2007. Underground Religion Revisited, D.A. Barrowclough and C. Malone (eds), *Cult in Context. Reconsidering Ritual in Archaeology* Oxbow Books, Oxford, 2007, pp. 97-106.

Whittaker, H. 1997. *Mycenaean Cult Buildings: A Study of their Architecture and Function in the Context of the Aegean and the Eastern Mediterranean*. Bergen.

Whittle, A. 1988. Burial: the changing role of the dead. In A. Whittle, *Problems in Neolithic Archaeology*. 142-193. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Wickholm, A. 2008. Reuse in Finnish Cremation Cemeteries under Level Ground – Examples of Collective Memory, in F. Fahlander and T. Oestigaard (eds), *The Materiality of Death: Bodies, Burials, Beliefs*. British Archaeological Reports. International Series 1768, 89-97. Oxford, Archaeopress.

Wierzbicki, J. 2006. Megality Kultury Pucharów Lejkowatych – Czy Tylko Grobowce? in J. Livera and K. Tunia (red.), *Idea Megalityczna W Obrządku Pogrzebowym Kultury Pucharóx Lejkowatych,* 87-101. Lublin-Kraków, Instytut Archeologii i Etnologii Pahn, Oddział W Krakowie-Instytut Archeologii UMCS W Lublinie.

Williams, H. 2003. Introduction. In H. Williams (ed.), *Archaeologies of Remembrance: Death and Memory in Past Societies,* 1-24. New York, Plenum Publishers.

Wrigglesworth, M. 2006. Explorations in social memory. Rock art, landscape and the reuse of place, in R. Barndon, S.M. Innselset, K.K. Kristoffersen and T.K. Lodoen (red.), *Samfunn, symboler og identitet – Festkrift til Gro Mandt pa 70-arsdagen UBAS Nordisk. Universitetet I Bergen Arkeologiske Skrifter* 3, 147-162. Bergen.

Zvelebil, M. 1998. What's in a Name: the Mesolithic, the Neolithic, and Social Change at the Mesolithic-Neolithic Transition, in M. Edmonds and C. Richards (eds), *Understanding the Neolithic of North-Western Europe*, 1-36. Glasgow, Cruithne Press.

Zvelebil, M. and Jordan, P. 1999. Hunter fisher gatherer ritual landscpaes - questions of time, space and representation. In J. Goldhahn (ed.), *Rock Art as Social Representation. Papers from a session held at the European Association of Archaeologists Fourth Annual Meeting in Göteborg 1998*. British Archaeological Reports. International Series 794, 101-127. Oxford, Archaeopress.