NEOLITHIC REMOVED SKULL: AN INTERPRETATIVE PERSPECTIVE

Aven Al Qatameen

Abstract

The removal of skulls is documented for the first time in the Levant during the Natufian period (9000 years BC), and spread to the end of the Pre-Pottery Neolithic B (PPNB) (8500-6000 BC). When this practice was discovered for the first time by Kathleen Kenyon, it was interpreted as a sign of ancestral worship. This study will analyze and discusses the characteristics of socio-cultural community in the southern Levant through the study of skulls found in the southern Levant; the collected data from literature review was made in order to clarify other interpretations for the removal of skulls from that era and this has led to another innovative explanation other than that of ancestral worship. The new interpretation is supported by direct and indirect physical and intangible evidence such as spatial distribution of collective skulls caches, linked with plaster statues, creation of memory, the social construction of identity and its relationship to the issue of abandonment that have occurred in some areas of southern Levant during the (PPNB) period, and why the skull was specifically removed. The evidence showed that the skulls do not all belong to elder males but also to male and females of different ages. This result is contrary to the idea that worship was only associated with older males and other interpretations related to social phenomenon.

Keywords

Neolithic, Removed Skull, Ancestral Worship, Identity, Burial Practices, socio-cultural community.

Introduction

The Neolithic period is considered to be the Agricultural Revolution due to several cultural, humanitarian and environmental variables. During this time, a new culture began with regular practice of cultivation and domesticating animals (livestock production) leading to the emergence of farming villages. With this new way of life and the increase in agricultural economy, man evolved from a hunter-gatherer into a farmer (Rollefson 1998; Kuijt and Goring-Morris 2002).

The study of a removed skull from this period will help us to further understand the transformation of attitudes and social practices of that time. Archaeological results will be used to establish cultural activities and convey the practices of rituals and the relationship between people and their environment. This research attempts to shed light on the comprehensive factors that endured several changes during the Neolithic period. Additionally, it will discuss the removed skull theory within the overall context of the Neolithic period.

Human dependency on environment and eco-system as whole originates from thinking. Therefore, each part results in the previous section and cannot be taken separately from the other. It constitutes a complementary cycle. Hence, this study analyzes and discusses the characteristics of socio-cultural community in the southern Levant through the study of skulls found in the southern Levant. The data collected from literature review was provided to clarify other interpretations of removed skulls from that era. This has led to another innovative

1. Plastered skulls sites during M/LPPN (1. Nahal Hemer, 2. 'Ayn Ghazāl, 3. Jericho, 4. Kfar Hahoresh, 5. Baisamon, 6. Tall Ramad, 7. Tall Aswad.)

explanation other than that of ancestral worship. The new interpretation is supported by direct and indirect physical and intangible evidence, such as spatial distribution of collective skull caches linked with plaster statues, creation of memory, the social construction of identity and its relationship to the issue of abandonment that occurred in some areas of southern Levant during the (PPNB) period, and why the skull was specifically removed.

Neolithic Burial Practices Processing

The Neolithic period witnessed a vast spread of symbols and ritualistic customs throughout the Levant. Emerging burial practices contained new habits such as, secondary burials, skull removal, decapitated, catches of skulls, trash burial, burials within or under floor of the houses and courtyard, ritualistic buildings, plastered human skulls are among the cultural intellectual output as it represents human thought. In our research, we studied this theory to identify the role the skull plays within the cultural contexts dominated in Neolithic period. We used the information available as a result of archaeological studies, resources, researches, and so on.

Skulls, stone statues and stone masks

Additional discoveries representing human remains have been found in a variety of contexts. A ritual is a symbolic or communication system that establishes the social behavior between the individual and the society. Social organizations are formed through symbols and rituals, which produce and reproduce links between humans and the supernatural entities (Verhoeven 2002b).

Ultimately, the nature of the life during the Neolithic period inspired expressive dying through establishing new means.

Skull Removal

What do we know about the practice of skull removal in Natufian period and where the team

finds sculls used for ancestral worship?

The removal of skulls is documented for the first time in the Levant during the Natufian period (9000 years BC), and spread to the end of the Pre-Pottery Neolithic B (PPNB) (8500-6000BC) in the Levant and (7000-6500BC) in Anatolia.(Belfer-Cohen 1991; Byrd 1989; Edwards 1989) Illustrates the most important locations that contain plastered skulls in the Levant during (PPNB). When this practice was discovered for the first time by Kathleen Kenyon, it was interpreted as a sign of ancestral worship (Kenyon 1955; Kuijt 1996).

Skull removal is practiced either by removing skulls[1] or skulls isolated from individual skeletons, or in group caches of removed skulls or groups of headless or decapitated skeletons. Skeletons without removed skull practices either have been treated as plain skulls or a complete skull, crania without a mandible. Approximately 73 modified skulls have been revealed from eight sites in the Near East between the years (1953-2004). Crania plastering was common in the PPNB period in the 3rd millennium BC (the first plastered skull was discovered in Jericho in 1953 by Kathleen Kenyon). The culmination of this practice of skull processing[2] embodies the life cycle of the Neolithic period (Garfinkel 2014). This practice was later revealed in additional sites dating back to the (PPNB) in the Levant such as: Tall Ramad (Contenson 1966; Lechevallier *et al.* 1978); Nahr Hammer (Bar-Yosef and Alon 1988); ʻAyn Ghazāl (Griffin, P. *et al.* 1998; Rollefson 1986, 2000); Kfar-Hahorsh (Goring-Morris 2000; Horwitz and Goring-Morris 2004). (6000-7200BC) (Bonogofsky 2006).

During PPNB (7000-8800BC) the treatment of human skulls took a more varied approach. The number of treated skulls increased within the region and were found within agricultural villages of all sizes from (0.5) to 14 hectares as in ʻAyn Ghazāl (Griffin *et al.* 1998). Several treatments and modifications were applied to the removed skulls to create realistic features and a sense of portrait of the living person. This was accomplished through plastering or painting, the use of clay, gypsum, or lime, on the crania or face without the mandible -mainly after the decomposition of the tissues or after the drying of the skull, (Kenyon 1957; Rollefson and Bienert 1994; Bonogofsly 2001).

Skull Removing Processes and Methods:

Following death, skulls and lower jaws were removed and in some cases covered with plaster. skulls are removed shortly after a death or after body decay (Garfinkel 1994) by one of two methods: either prior to decomposition, as was common in many LPPNB sites such as Jericho (Kenyon and Holland 1981); or after decomposition of the body, as in ʻAyn Ghazāl, Basta, Jericho, Nahal Hemer (Bienert 1991). Skull was discovered individually, buried isolated from other skulls, in double burials, or in caches of three or more. (Banning 1998; Rollefson *et al.* 1992; Hershkovitz and Galili 1990).

ʻAyn Ghazāl Diversification of Skulls Treatment

Skull Treatment is Varied in Several Ways as Follows

1. Partial Treatment: In general, the cranium was treated either in plaster or paint, without the lower Jāwā. However, in some cases skulls were found with its lower jaws in Tall Ramad and one skull from Jericho.
2. Plastered area: Focused on certain areas of the face and left other areas without forming or plastering, this is often called a mask. For example, in the ʻAyn Ghazāl, a young male cranial received special treatment with traces of a thin, black material which may have "Bitumen" (Rollefson 1986).
3. The eyes: In Yiftahal, the eyes were often formed in the eye socket with sea shells to represent the (iris). Some skulls replaced the eyes with shells, and, yet other skulls had left the eyes empty.
4. Teeth: In some cases, it is apparent the teeth have been removed intentionally.
5. Other facial features: Features such as the ear, mouth, nose, and eyes are identified, and the chin was also performed without the lower jaw.

1. That implies that skulls have been removed from the primary graves and then buried either individually or separated from the skeleton, and these skulls are present either in the form of groups or individually.
2. The followed methods in decorating and shaping skulls either by painting it, drawing on it, embodying facial features or plastering it.

6. Painting: In Kfar Hahorash and a Tall Aswad the plastered crania skull was painted red. However, in Nahal Hemer the skulls were painted in black or strips of black on the cranium of the upper skull.
7. Head covered: In the cave of Nahal Hemer skulls were discovered containing the distinguished characteristics of the PPNB period. The skull was covered from the back without the lower jaw with a retinal pattern or covered by asphalt and bitumen. Many textiles were found in the same cave. The fabric could have possibly served as a head cover, covering the top of the skull (Schick 1988; Bar-Yosef and Alon 1988; Arensburg and Hershkovitz 1989).

Skull Removal Theories

The importance of skull removal practices is evident in the frequency of untreated skulls in several regions. Additionally, it was the obvious choice for removal, remodeling, treatment, or presentation.

Initially, the concept of "skull worship" was first debated by Kathleen Kenyon when the skulls were discovered in Jericho in 1950 (Kenyon 1957). Since then, additional burials have been discovered with different stylistic approaches and Kenyon's interpretations were widely accepted by researchers such as, Amiranin 1962, H. de Contenson 1967, G. Rollefson 1986, Garfinkel 1994, and others. According to Rollefson (2004), the practice of skull removal is a cult ritual associated with leaders of a group or clan within residential settlements, likely related to ancestral worship.

However, this belief has been reversed by Bonogofsky (2004, 2001), who argued that skulls also belong to males and females, young and old alike. For example, in Jericho there are two main caches containing 50 percent of youth skulls, with one of the six groups containing three children, and one of the 10 groups containing cache for 10 children of different ages (Kurthand RohcrErtl 1981; Bonogofsky 2006 b).The skulls do not indicate specific treatment by sex or age. They receive similar patterns of treatment and do not indicate unequal or differential treatment between the sexes, there are groups of skulls related to adult females and males. For these reasons, the ancestral worship is not supported. The skulls belonging to youth did not live long enough to be called the predecessor. Additionally, some anthropologists and archaeologists suggest that skulls without teeth belong to men who served the role of leaders as they are older. Therefore, the teeth of certain skulls could have been deliberately removed in an attempt to make them appear older than they were (Bonogofsky 2004).

Another analysis by Bonogofsky of six skulls in Jericho showed the individuals were closely related and were buried simultaneously. It is possible to support that if they want to return the ancestor or glorify the adult, but this is contrary, because it is not logical to have multiple ancestors of the same family at a time.

Another explanation for plastered skulls is the communication between the past and the present, which began between 12,000-7000 years BC. In the Levant, between the Bedouin and the pattern of settled communities living in permanent villages. In the early Neolithic period, stratified societies differed in size from 0.5 to 14 hectares and social competition was common. In these cases, skulls would have to serve as a weapon against the emerging village (Garfinkel 1987; Garfinkel 2014).

According to Finlayson, the burial under the residential floors, the plastering of skulls, and the production of statues, is a social representation of the worship of ancestors based on kinship (Finlayson 2014). Another view by Keeley (1996) discusses a practice called violent head hunting in where skulls were chosen to exercise violence as a result of war at the time. Kenyon also believed that skulls belonged to enemies who kept them in memory (Kenyon 1965) of their defeat. However, this contrasted with skulls that were kept to honor people and keep them among the living. Further, Pearson's point of view was that the removal of skulls does not reflect aggression because there are children's skulls and children are not qualified to be represented as enemies.

According to (Kuijt *et al.* 2009)), the removal and plastering of skulls is a representation of a complex part of the social network nested at the Neolithic period to build memory for generations and build power within agricultural villages. In other words, the process of skull removal is a changing process that focuses on building social memory.

Plastering Skulls and Worship Ancestors. Who They Were and Why?

In Anthropology, the term "ancestors" is used to distinguish those who are mentioned by descendants to indicate specific religious practices as part of the term "worship of ancestors" (Bloch 1996). There is no specific answer, each community has its own criteria based on their own culture, yet, not all the dead who are mentioned are described as ancestors; hence not all of them are considered predecessors. Therefore, the criteria of ancestors differs from the ancestors of the myth-imagined in the memory or conceptual imagination of the community-from family ancestors or congregational groups, so they can not necessarily have similar characteristics like the ancestors of all societies (Whittle 2003; Thomas 1999).

Side position of skulls may indicate social standing. For instance, peripheral skulls can be found guarding the skull of an important individual (Milevski *et al.* 2008). Also of note, tooth avulsion during the Neolithic period was a sign of an elderly person or a symbol of the father or grandparent (Arensburg and Hershkovitz 1988). This is not required if the person with the removed skull is too old.

Statues, Figurines, Mask, and Skulls Relevance

Skull modifications can be made by applying plaster to reproduce the portrait shape of the skull. This style was similar to the statues in terms of style and size. Head area, eyes, eyebrow, forehead, nose, mouth, and chin were all covered in plaster and then re-buried. Masks dating back to the early eighth century BC have also been found, as at 'Ayn Ghazāl in an outer hole inside the soil (Schmandt-Besserat 1998).

For example, animal and human statues were also made to express the individual's activities. Statues expressed in these forms give an indication of the importance of the animal. Additionally, statues that emerged in the image of pregnant women. Birth and fertility often represent agriculture (Schmandt-Besserat 1998). Statues can also belong to identical archaeological contexts, where they are carefully placed in a pit that has been clearly designed for this purpose.

During the early Neolithic periods, statues were characterized by a natural style. In the later stages of the Neolithic period, female statues depicted the role of women arbitrarily in procreation and pregnancy by highlighting and emphasizing the most important female parts, including the female genetalia, which may represent the impact of the agricultural economy and their changing role of society. It signified the important role of women in the new agricultural system, with greater roles in the work distribution among the members of society as a whole. Accordingly, "Funeral are times when the positions of the living are renegotiated. People's roles change, and the funerary process is one step in the renegotiation of changing identities" (Thomas 1999).

So what differentiates skulls within these categories, and what indicates that the skulls are a kind of statue? It is a contradiction to say skulls are a part of ancestral worship and that statues are not, because the skulls (such as sculpture) and (statues) may represent symbols of natural sovereignty as cultural signals that overlap with the nature of an ideology and a culture within a society.

Discussion

What is the New Interpretation and How Does It Compare with the Previous Ideas on Skull Removal Expressed by Scholars?

Veneration of skulls took place at the community level, not merely within the level of individual household. It may have been occurred for generations, since the removed skulls represent a deceased person mentioned by his family and other members of the community. The skulls are preserved for the special and communal memory. To accumulate skulls over time for generations, consequently proves their social identity and territorial property. That comes across clearly through spatial distribution of skulls, where the distribution of skulls within one place and within the same area in circular, cluster or row-shaped in different context such as on the roof or surface of the houses during PPNA, or under the floors, courtyards or communal domestic houses during PPNB (Grafinkel 2014). In addition, skull caches and reshaping them are among the patterns that represent a complex net of interaction to create a memory for the generations (Kujit, 2008). Through general or local rituals, in addition to the organization of ritualistic practices, transferring the social memory contains constant elements of ideologies based

on performing these practices (Koutsadelis, 2007). Thus, these skulls may indicate the value of the owners of skulls in this period perhaps indicating that diversity is the concern for the individual and their appreciation within society, being an agricultural community.

Another view by Rollefson based on the various types of tombs dating to MPPNB ʻAyn Ghazāl including "trash burials" and tombs containing only skulls may suggestvariaiton is based on social groups within the community. Rollefson also argued that large groups of people came from other areas in Palestine and Jordan in this period; a social mixture created cultural variations through cultural objects, including tombs (Rollefson 2004).

In addition, there were tombs outside the settlements, such as Kafr Hahorsh, during the PPNB period in Palestine, which was called the Regional Funeral Center (Rollefson 2004). Similarly, Nahal Hemer, was used as a special place for burial or "storage" for human skulls, which were treated similar to sacred objects. During the PPNB architectural designs are "clearly distinct" compared to residential buildings. Two smaller types of architecture were found: small circular buildings called the "Shrine" within the residential areas, and larger rectangular structures indicating that they were used for rituals. The larger rectangular structures were found in ʻAyn Ghazāl (Rollefson 2001), Baiḍā (Kirkbride 1968), and in Tall As Sultan in Palestine (Kenyon 1981). These buildings are called "private buildings" as revealed in the classroom (Bienert *et al.*2004). This social stereotype within the community reflected a different variation on the location and distribution of graves and burial forms and burial practices as well.

But, how does one to reflect the elements of burial practices (removed skull specialty) on social relationships through theoretical frameworks?

First, we cannot consider the practice of skull removal without considering the elements of other burial customs, as all of the elements are integral to each other. The patterns of burial practices varied during Neolithic period among diverse contexts. The secondary and mass burial within a household was more common than the burial of a primary individual, especially during M/LPPNB. For example, mass burial has prevailed, which highlights its importance in this period and reflects the origin of the group. The economic pattern requires cohesion among individuals to help make an effort in agriculture, which requires time and distribution. This has affected social cohesion, which was assumed by the economic (agricultural) pattern. Thus, this pattern influenced the method of burial practices, which reflects the social pattern of the cultural component left behind. For example, the burial under the floors of houses can reflect the social cohesion between the family and the importance of family cohesion. In can be seen in the impact the individual leaves behind even after the death, as the family has placed importance of burying him near the home or within the home. It is also reflected in the existence of large houses with common walls between the rooms, where the skull of a deceased family member's was placed within the thresholds of doors. This reflects the sincerity, loyalty, respect and appreciation of the great family or one of its members.

According to (Bonogofsky 2004), who explained that people who suddenly died for obscure reasons had been moved out of settlements as disposal methods, such as being a stranger in society (within migratory movements that have been occurred during LPPNB), this explains the differences between removed skulls treatment.

In general, we cannot consider social differentiation in its crystallized form within the society. If we look at the practice of mass burial, which generally prevailed in the early PPN, we can see social cohesion in a large way with the existence of social differentiation. This does not mean there are no social paradoxes, but it began to make an appearance at the end of the PPN. This was accompanied by the decline of mass burial practice and increase in individual burial practice, in addition to the beginning of the presence of grave goods in the tombs. Hence these two practices: the mass and individually burials, indicate the beginning of the social differences in communities. The presence of individual burial reflects the economic value of the individual. The most important social difference that distinguishes the individual from others, in addition to the funerary, is the embodiment of economic value that has become widespread in the society based on economic factors. Is the high storage of food, the high population density and productivity

sign of social inequalities? These variables are associated with the social structures of unequal societies, production and storage work on the existence of inequality between society, which reflected the burial habits in the representation that explains the common of plastered skulls practice and other skulls without any kind of treatment.

Consequently, it is important to refer to the issue of abandonment of many sites in rural communities during the LPPNB period in the south and central Levant, which were abandoned between (8000-7750 BC) and the establishment of a new starting point of the Neolithic. With the passage of time, the increase of population within the site, and the migration they did not practice a special treatments of skulls. The significant increase within the LPPNB community reflects new processes, such as the creation of stressful social conditions, increased social congestion, and conflict between the lineage of individual ratios and rights and duties. Perhaps even the struggle to compete in the organization of rituals within PPNB communities as response to demographic dimensions played a factor (Kujit 2000).

Differences in skull treatments may have arisen depending on the nature of the mobile or permanent settlement, and as a result of the population turmoil at the end of the MPPNB in southern Levant. The population began to move from the western Jordan Valley to the eastern highlands, resulting in the development of sites in LPPNB, later known as "mega-sites" as a result of the continued abandonment of areas (Rollefson 1992). Due to some of the host sites being "mobilized," the incoming population had limited basic resources and compensation. According to the architectural changes, the population increased and reached thousands for the first time in prehistoric times, thus developing the knowledge of social identity (Rolleyson 2010). The above resulted in cultural changes and changes to ritual ideology, and therefore, new funerary behaviors emerged such as the plastered skulls.

The Ecology During PPN in Levant

The first change that influenced the culture was the environmental change of the ancient Middle East climate, which became warmer in the Holocene era, which included a drought during the PPNB period. Improvements were observed with the emergence of the socio-demographic changes that took place during the PPNB period. Changes occurred until the peak of development during LPPNB as the size and distribution of the settlements and population, architecture development, (mega-site) and the emergence of increased exploitation of natural resources (Rollefson, 2004).

After that, LPPNB or PPNC is considered to be the period in which the size of the sites declined. There was a gap in or problem with the indigenous population, as site abandonment and population dispersion attributed to over-exploitation during LPPNB (Kenyon 1987). It could have also been due to the environment or to the influence of previous generations as suggested by Kirkbride (1968).

Therefore, in the early PPN the evolution of home models and housing styles began. The settlement process began in a semi-permanent manner due to the pattern of fishing and agriculture. During the PPN, the settlement model evolved in response to environmental and ecological changes to fit the farming pattern, which required stability in the construction and sufficient storage space and capacity to accommodate the extended family style (Simmons *et al.* 2007).

A numbers of scholars have noted a relationship between the environment and culture (*e.g.* Kuijt 2000; Kuijt and Goring-Morris, 2002), so that each culture is conditioned by their subsistence regime, thus there are links between culture and nature where the difference of nature and its factors are likely to affect culture at different rate. One such change in the social component within the community that depended on the extended family in order to assist in division of works (agriculture) for its multiple tasks and the difficulty of having one or a few groups manage such a source, correspondingly, the agricultural villages were established and social cohesion has been imposed in general and family or kinship cohesion particularly. Therefore, the circumstances of the environment have a significant role in influencing the formation of culture. This requires that humans must be flexible in their culture so that they can connect with ecological niche (Megarry 1995), which is what represented in skull removal practicing (as a component of the whole culture).

Moreover, according to Qzaogun, it must consider the extent and spread of the geographical Neolithic areas, "shared knowledge" and publish "know how" and this idea can be derived from the obsidian trade that has been transferred and exchanged between sites that are far from their main source. This explains the diversity of the skull removal processes.

Conclusion

Within this historical context of organization and social cohesion, removed skulls have been seen as ritual behavior to express the social identity. As reported previously, we note that the aspect of intellectual development is the result of stability which allowed people to think about other issues than living and their subsistence, as a result of securing the basic life needs (food) and resources for livelihood.

From the above, the function of skulls at the beginning of stable life as a factor for the evolution of societies includes:

1. Establishing new villages through new settlers.
2. Finding private ownership.
3. Inheritance by the offspring.
4. The need for an indicator of private ownership and rights.
5. Special skulls that identified the earliest settlers.

The removal of skulls is a way of "blaming/revival" of the dead by removing their skulls.

The spatial distribution of different skulls and keeping the dead inside the house or within the scope of the living or the common areas of the community, aims to create a sense that the individual still exists and has an active role among members of his family or community. The embodiment of the skull within the living quarters, their lives and their homes is a kind of illumination of feelings about this dead individual who, in the view of his community did not die but has begun another kind of life in another world. This is logical in terms of materialism, where it can be explained that the face is the most prominent part of the body and the most important. It represents the person physically and gives purpose to the body that was used in this life. When reconstructed they provide an image of the absent person to act as a reminder, especially when done by physically reconstructing the facial features (plastered and modeled skulls) specifically to appear as they did in life.

Another issue is the variety of spatial distribution of the skulls. They were often placed in different areas as physical tangible evidence of their association with places of worship or with other places where skulls were positioned.

For the different treatment of removed skulls, some of them have been plastered or have had different treatments applied, while some are not believed to be allowed an identity, as they belonged to a "normal person."

The skulls are also reflected in the ritual belief system, which focused on the cohesion of society and the reaffirmation of domestic and societal beliefs. (See Goring-Morris 2000; Kuijt 1996, 2000). Attention was also drawn to how to perform rituals and religious rites (public) by forming "identity" through burial practices (*e.g*. Goring and Morris 2000; Kuijt 1996; Rollefson 2000).

The individualistic rituals are performed within the household and communal context, and are represented by human and animal statues, and it is possible that they are connected with vitality, fertility and "life force." The household rituals are indicated by representing them through the skull in addition to the animals' horns and skulls in the household area, and through figurines as well, and these rituals were concerned in the first place with death and also served as the rituals between reminiscence and memory; because the memory is another fundamental factor in the burial rituals and especially in the removal of the skull, not only to remember the deceased but also to play a fundamental role in transferring social memory. Consequently, stabilizing their identity through display of the skull illustrates the way the family's rituals connect the living with the dead.

The burial customs that play a fundamental role in society and in dealing with the emotional pain caused by death, and its effect on the human consciousness, allow the social structure of the identity and memory of the individual and their place in the community to be expressed, for that reason secondary ritualistic practices such as plastering, drawing on and painting human skulls serves as a form of commemoration of the memory and identity of the individual in society.

In other words, plastering skulls could be a ritualistic memorial ceremony for the dead. Retrieving their skulls and decorating them with plaster, which helps the household or the family to feel that the deceased is still among them, as if they are still alive, provides a means for the relatives to sense the deceased, and to have the deceased back with them.

Based on the above, the belief system during the Neolithic period was represented by focusing on remembrance of the individual and the property and rights of the family members. Many researchers related this to the fact that the Pre Pottery Neolithic B period was distinguished by creating extended families as a basis for domestic economy and societal interaction. Additionally, the family became more productive throughout the Late Pre Pottery Neolithic B (LPPNB) due to the increase in the family size (extended family), which illustrates the increase in specialization and investment in the household. Consequently, the stereotype and lifestyle of the family have been reflected through the burial method, to reflect its perspective toward the family member, which remains a memory by recreating his personality based on the family's point of view. This keeps a line of imaginary connection between the deceased and the family, to feel close to him, and that he is still with them, which is reflected in the bodily representation.

Bibliography

Arensburg, B. and Hershkovitz, I.
1988 Nahal Hemer Cave, Neolithic Human Remains. *'Atiqot* 18: 50-58.
1989 Artificial Skull "Treatment" in the PPNB Period: Nahal Hemer. Pp. 115-133 in I. Hershkovitz (ed.), *People and Culture In Change: Proceedings of the Second Symposium on Upper Palaeolithic, Mesolithic and Neolithic Populations of Europe and the Mediterranean Basin*, Volume 1. British Archaeological Reports, International Series. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports.

Bar-Yosef, O. and Alon, D.
1988 Nahal Hemer Cave: The Excavations. *'Atiqot* 18: 1-30.

Belfer-Cohen, A.
1991 The Natufian in the Levant. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 20(1): 167-186.

Belfer-Cohen, A. and Bar-Yosef, O.
2002 Early Sedentism in the Near East: A Bumpy Ride to Village Life. Pp. 19-37 in I. Kuijt (ed.), *Life in Neolithic Farming Communities. Social Organization, Identity, and Differentiation*. Springer.

Bienert, H.D.; Bonogofsky, M.; Gebel, H.G.; Kuijt, I. and Rollefson, G.O.
2004 Where are the Dead? Central Settlements in Neolithic Jordan. Pp. 157-175 in H.D. Bienert; H.G. Gebel and R. Neef (eds.), *Proceedings of a Symposium Held in Wadi Musa, Jordan, 21st-25th of July, 1997*. Berlin: Ex oriente.

Bloch, M.
1996 *Memory*, in Barnard and J. Spencer (eds.): 361-363.

Bonogofsky, M.
2001 Cranial Modeling and Neolithic Bone Modification at 'Ain Ghazal: New Interpretations. *Paléorient* 27(2): 141-146.
2004 Including Women and Children: Neolithic Modeled Skulls from Jordan, Israel, Syria and Turkey. *Near Eastern Archaeology* 67(2): 118-119.
2006a *Complexity in Context: Plain, Painted and Modeled Skulls from the Neolithic Middle East*. British Archaeological Reports International Series. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports.
2006b *Skull Collection Modification and Decoration*. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports.

Byrd, B.F.
1989 The Natufian: Settlement Variability and Economic Adaptations in the Levant at the End of the Pleistocene. *Journal of World Prehistory* 3(2): 159-197.

Milevski, I.; Khalaily, H.; Getzov, N. and Hershkovitz, I.
2008 The Plastered Skulls and other PPNB Finds from Yiftahel, Lower Galilee (Israel). *Paléorient* 37-46.

Contenson, H.D.
1966 Les trois premières campagnes de fouilles à Tell Ramad (Syrie). *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 110 (4): 531-536.

Edwards, P.C.
1989 Revising the Broad Spectrum Revolution: and its Role in the Origins of Southwest Asian Food Production. *Antiquity* 63/239: 225-246.

Finlayson, B.
2014 *Houses of the Holy: the Evolution of Ritual Buildings. Settlement, Survey, and Stone. Essays on Near Eastern Prehistory in Honour of Gary Rollefson*. Berlin: ex oriente:133-143.

Garfinkel, Y.
1987 Yiftahel: a Neolithic village from the Seventh Millennium BC in Lower Galilee, Israel. *Journal of Field Archaeology*: 14(2): 199-212.
2014 The Life Cycle of Pre-Pottery Neolithic B Plastered Skulls From The Southern Levant. Pp. 145-158 in B. Finlayson and C. Makarewicz (eds.), *Settlement, Survey and Stone. Essays on Near Eastern Prehistory in Honour of Gary Rollefson*. Berlin: ExOriente.

Goring-Morris, A.N.
2000 The Quick and the Dead: the Social Context of Aceramic Neolithic Mortuary Practices as Seen from Kfar Hahoresh. Pp. 103-135 in I. Kuijt

(ed.), *Life in Neolithic Farming Communities. Social Organization, Identity, and Differentiation*. Springer.

Griffin, P.S.; Grissom, C.A. and Rollefson, G.O.
1998 Three Late Eighth Millennium Plastered Faces from 'Aln Ghazal, Jordan: *Paléorient*, 59-70.

Hershkovitz, I. and Galili, E.
1990 8000 Year-Old Human Remains on The Sea Floor Near Atlit, Israel. *Human Evolution* 5/4: 319-358.

Horwitz, L.K. and Goring-Morris, N.
2004 Animals and Ritual During the Levantine PPNB: A Case Study from the Site of Kfar Hahoresh, Israel. *Anthropozoologica* 39(1): 165-178.

Keeley, L.H.
1996 *War Before Civilization: The Myth of the Peaceful Savage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kenyon, K.M.
1955 Excavations at Jericho, 1955. *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 87(2): 108-117.
1957 *Digging Up Jericho.* London: E. Benn.
1965 Excavations in Jerusalem, 1964. *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 97(1): 9-20.
1981 *Excavations at Jericho. Volume 3. The Architecture and Stratigraphy of the Tell.* Plates. British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem.

Kenyon, K.M. and Moorey, P.R.S.
1987 *The Bible and Recent Archaeology*. Knox.

Kirkbride, D.
1968 Beidha: Early Neolithic Village Life South of The Dead Sea. *Antiquity* 42(168): 263-274.

Koutsadelis, C.
2007 *Mortuary Practices in the Process of Levantine Neolithisation*. Hedgesellschaft.

Kuijt, I.
1995 *New Perspectives on old Territories: Ritual Practices and the Emergence of Social Complexity in the Levantine Neolithic.* Harvard University.
1996 Negotiating Equality Through Ritual: a Consideration of Late Natufian and Prepottery Neolithic a Period Mortuary Practices. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology*15(4): 313-336.
2000a *Life in Neolithic Farming Communities-Social Organization, Identity, and Differentiation* (Fundamental Issues in Archaeology).
2000b People and Space in Early Agricultural Villages: Exploring Daily Lives, Community Size and Architecture in the Late Pre-Pottery Neolithic. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 19(1): 75-102.

Kuijt, I. and Goring-Morris, N.
2002 Foraging, Farming, and Social Complexity in the PrePottery Neolithic of The Southern Levant: A Review and Synthesis. *Journal of World Prehistory* 16(4): 361-440.

Kuijt, I.; Belfer-Cohen, A.; Goring-Morris, N.; Clark, J.E.; Fowler, C.; Goldstein, L. and Kuijt, I.
2008 The Regeneration of Life: Neolithic Structures of Symbolic Remembering and Forgetting. *Current Anthropology* 49(2): 171-197.

Kuijt, I.; Özdoğan, M. and Pearson, M.P.
2009 Neolithic Skull Removal: Enemies, Ancestors, and Memory [with Comments]. *Paléorient* 35(1): 117-127.

Lechevallier, M.; Arensburg, B.; Smith, P.; Yakar, R.; Balfet, H.; Davis, S. and Le Brun, A.
1978 Abou Gosh Et Beisamoun. Deux Gisements Du VII Millénaire Avant L'ère Chrétienne En Israël. Mémoires Et Travaux Du Centre De Recherches Préhistoriques Français De Jérusalem. *Jérusalem* (2). Paris: Association Palèorient.

Megarry, T.
1995 *Society in Prehistory: The Origins of Human Culture*. NYU Press.

Rollefson, G.O.
1986 Neolithic 'Ain Ghazal (Jordan): Ritual and Ceremony, II. *Paléorient* 1(12): 45-52.
1992 Neolithic Settlement Patterns in Northern Jordan and Palestine. *SHAJ* IV: 123-127.
1998 'Ain Ghazal (Jordan): Ritual and Ceremony III. *Paléorient* 43-58.
2000 The 1998 Excavations at 'Ain Ghazal: a Preliminary Report. *ADAJ* 4: 91-98
2001 *The Neolithic Period. The Archaeology of Jordan*, Pp. 67-105 in B. MacDonald; R.B. Adams and P. Bienkowski (eds.), Sheffield: Sheffiald Academic Press.
2004 Towards New Frameworks: Supra-Regional Concepts in Near Eastern Neolithization Short Note on the 4th ICAANE Workshop Hold in Berlin, 1-2 April 2004 (Organized by H.G.K. Gebel; M. Özdoğan; G.O. Rollefson and K. Schmidt). *Neo-Lithics* 1/04: 1, 21.

Rollefson,G.; Schmandt-Besserat, D. and Rose, J.
1998. A Decorated Skull from MPPNB Ain Ghazal. *Paléorient* 24(2): 99-104.

Schick, T.
1988 Nahal Hemer Cave. Cordage, Basketry and Fabrics. '*Atiqot* 18: 31-43.

Simmons, A.H.; Kozlowski, S.K. and Aurenche, O.
2007 *Territories, Boundaries and Cultures in The Neolithic Near East*. Michigan: Archaeopress.

Thomas, J.S.
1999 *Understanding the Neolithic*. London: Routledge.

Verhoeven,M.
2002b Transformation of Society: the Changing Role of Ritual and Symbolism in the PPNB and The PN in the Levant, Syria and South-East Anatolia. *Paléorient* 28(1): 5-14.

Whittle, A.W.
2003 *The Archaeology of People: Dimensions of Neolithic Life*. New York: Routledge Publishing.