

Approved  
Curricular Revision

**UC Approval:**

**180<sup>th</sup> UPD UC**

**16 August 2023**

**President's Approval:**

**04 October 2023**

SCHOOL OF ARCHAEOLOGY  
University of the Philippines Diliman

**PROPOSED CURRICULAR REVISION OF THE  
MASTER OF ARTS IN ARCHAEOLOGY DEGREE PROGRAM**

**I. Background/Rationale**

The School of Archaeology (UPSA), formerly Archaeological Studies Program, at the University of the Philippines Diliman was established on August 24, 1995. It became a school on November 10, 2022. Multidisciplinary in nature, UPSA is designed to oversee and coordinate instructional, research and extension activities pertaining to the systematic discovery, reclamation, analysis, presentation, and preservation of the material remains of past cultures. UPSA offers Diploma, MA/MS, and PhD programs in coordination with the different colleges of the University of the Philippines, Diliman. For the MA/MS degree programs, the student can specialize either in Prehistory, Historical Archaeology, or Resource Management. Currently, UPSA offers 30 MA/MS courses of which 7 are core courses, and 4 PhD level courses.

This proposed curricular revision is based on the submitted 2019 IAADS which indicated that the last curricular review was conducted in 2016 when UPSA shifted from a semestral calendar to a trimestral one. UPSA instituted the PhD Program in 2009 including new courses i.e., Archaeo 301: Advanced Field Methods, Archaeo 302: Heritage Management, and Archaeo 399: Independent Study. The Diploma Program's curriculum is simultaneously being revised.


In 2019, funding from the Academic Program Improvement allowed UPSA to conduct a curricular review of the PhD Program. The changes proposed here are some of the results of two workshops conducted in 2019. In 2021, the PhD Program was revised to accommodate students with different backgrounds. In 2022, the revised PhD Program was approved by the University Council and the Board of Regents.

UPSA has two degrees under the Master's program, the Master's in Arts and Master's in Science. MA students must enlist in an MA course for their cognate and MS students in an MS course.

For the MA program, we want to add two existing courses to be included as core courses because students will be informed of Philippine archaeology because (a) at the moment, there is no undergraduate degree in archaeology in the University or anywhere in the Philippines, (b) applicants to the program are graduates of varied BA and BS programs and have little

Office of the Secretary  
of the University and of  
the Board of Regents

OFFICIAL  
RELEASE

  
Date: 04 OCT 2023

1 knowledge about Philippine archaeology and (c) for students to have knowledge of the  
2 ethical and legal practice of archaeology. Thus, increasing the number of units from 42 to 48.  
3 A survey of the existing 2014 UPD General Catalogue show that other Colleges also offer 42  
4 to 48 units in their MA programs i.e. 45 units: MA Physics, Master of Music (Instrumental  
5 Performance: Piano, Strings and Guitar, Winds and Percussion); Master of Music  
6 (Musicology); Master of Music (Music Education); Master in Education (42-45 units); and 48  
7 units: Master of Music (Choral/Instrumental Conducting).

8  
9 In the workshops, the mission and vision were also revised to reflect the current practice of  
10 the UPSA:

### 11 MISSION

12 The program oversees and coordinates instructional, research, and extension activities  
13 pertaining to the systematic discovery, reclamation, analysis, interpretation, and conservation  
14 of the material remains of our human cultural past.

### 15 VISION

16 Archaeology in UP Diliman must actively advance the study of archaeology at the highest  
17 accepted quality. It must strive to actively generate new data and push the frontiers of  
18 knowledge. As an academic unit of UP Diliman, it must be at the core of the best archaeology  
19 institutions in the world, while raising the archaeological consciousness of Filipinos.

## 20 **II. Program Learning Outcomes for the Master's in Archaeology<sup>1</sup>**

21 At the end of the program, graduates are expected to:

- 22 1. Apply the methodology of archaeology in independent research.
- 23 2. Practice specialized training in archaeology.
- 24 3. Participate in archaeological research opportunities.
- 25 4. Conduct independent research in the form of a thesis.

## 26 **III. Revision of Courses**

### 27 **A. Change in Course Title, Description, Course Prerequisites**

#### 28 **1.**

29 From: **Archaeo 251 Underwater Archaeology in Southeast Asia.** History,  
30 concepts, and methods in underwater archaeology

31 Prerequisite: Core courses and/or COI and students must be certified  
32 divers

33 To: **Archaeo 251 Maritime and Underwater Archaeology.** History,  
34 concepts, and methods in maritime and underwater archaeology

35 Prerequisite: Archaeo 201 Foundations of Archaeology

36 Justification: The prerequisite is made specific to be Archaeo 201: Foundations  
37 of Archaeology. This course is also taken by non-UPSA graduate students.

38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  

---

<sup>1</sup> PLOs was the output of the 2019 API-funded workshops.

1 Requiring Archaeo 201 ensures that graduate students have learned the  
2 fundamentals of archaeology before enlisting in higher archaeology  
3 courses. Diver certification is not required.

4  
5 Program/s Affected: MS and PhD in Archaeology  
6

## 7 **B. Change in Course Description and Prerequisites**

### 8 **1. Archaeo 241 Mortuary Analysis in Archaeology**

10  
11 From: Course Description: Theories and methods in the analysis of skeletal  
12 remains and human burial practices, with emphasis on Southeast Asia.

13  
14 Prerequisites: Archaeo 201 Foundations of Archaeology,  
15 Archaeo 240 Human Palaeontology  
16

17 To: Course Description: Theoretical approaches in the study of mortuary  
18 sites.

19 Prerequisite: Archaeo 204 Scientific Archaeological Analysis  
20

21 Justification: The change in course description is more encompassing of the  
22 contents of the syllabus and investigates aspects of the burials other  
23 than the skeletons. Students must have finished Archaeo 204 to ensure  
24 that they have learned the basics of archaeological analyses which they  
25 can apply in higher archaeology courses.  
26

27 Program/s Affected: MS and PhD in Archaeology  
28

## 29 **V. Abolition of a course**

### 30 **Archaeo 205 Scientific Illustration and Photography for Archaeology**

31 Justification: The competencies developed here are already covered in Archaeo  
32 204: Scientific Archaeological Analyses, Archaeo 206: Field Methods in  
33 Archaeology, and Archaeo 207: Laboratory and Applied Analysis of  
34 Archaeological Remains. In addition, this course was last offered in the  
35 Second Semester, AY 2014-2015. Thus, no current student is affected by  
36 the abolition of this course.  
37  
38

39  
40 Program/s Affected: MS and PhD in Archaeology  
41  
42  
43  
44

**VI. Change in Program Requirements**

**A. Change in Course Classification from Elective to Core Course**

**1. Archaeo 220 Philippine Prehistoric Archaeology**

Justification: This is proposed to be a core course to ensure that all students who have varied undergraduate degrees have adequate knowledge of current research in Philippine archaeology when they graduate from UPSA.

**2. Archaeo 260 Archaeological Resource Management**

Justification: This is proposed to be a core course to ensure that all students have knowledge of the ethics, issues, and concerns relevant to archaeological heritage management, site protection, and archaeological practice.

**B. Change in Total Number of Units of Required Courses**

From: 21 units

To: 27 units

Justification: Added Archaeo 220 Philippine Prehistoric Archaeology and 260: Archaeological Resource Management as core courses.

**C. Change in the total number of units**

From: 42 units

To: 48 units

Justification: There is an increase of a total of 6 units because of the additions of two core courses: Archaeo 220 Philippine Prehistoric Archaeology and 260: Archaeological Resource Management as core courses.

Subjects	Number of units		Difference in units
	Existing	Proposed	
Required courses	21	27	+6
Elective	12	12	0
Cognate	3	3	0
Thesis	6	6	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>+6</b>



D. Change in Program Length

From: 2 years  
 To: 2 years and 1 trimester

Justification: The change from two years to two years and one trimester is because of the addition of two core courses (6 units): Archaeo 220 Philippine Prehistoric Archaeology and 260: Archaeological Resource Management

IV. Summary of Proposed Changes

Nature	Existing	Proposed
<b>Revision of courses</b>		
1. Change in Course Title, Description, and Prerequisites	Archaeo 251 Underwater Archaeology in Southeast Asia History, concepts, and methods in underwater archaeology Prerequisites: Core courses and/or COI	Archaeo 251 Maritime and Underwater Archaeology. History, concepts, and methods in maritime and underwater archaeology Prerequisite: Archaeo 201 Foundations of Archaeology
2. Change in Course Description and Prerequisites	Archaeo 241 Mortuary Analysis in Archaeology. Theories and methods in the analysis of skeletal remains and human burial practices, with emphasis on Southeast Asia Prerequisite: Archaeo 201 Foundations of Archaeology Archaeo 240 Human Palaeontology	Archaeo 241 Mortuary Analysis in Archaeology. Theoretical approaches in the study of mortuary sites Prerequisite: Archaeo 204 Scientific Archaeological Analysis
Abolition of a Course	Archaeo 205 Scientific Illustration and Photography for Archaeology	
<b>Change in Program Requirements</b>		
1. Change in Course Classification from Elective to Core Course	Archaeo 220 Philippine Prehistoric Archaeology Archaeo 260 Archaeological Resource Management	
2. Change in total number of units	42 units	48 units
<b>3. Change in Program Length</b>		
	2 years	2 years and 1trimester



1  
2

**VI. Checklist of Existing and Proposed Curricula**

Approval of Existing Curriculum:  
140th UC 05 Sept 2016  
President's Approval  
26 Sept 2016

Proposed (48 units)

<b>Existing Program</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Proposed Program</b>	<b>Units</b>
<u>First Year, First Term</u>		<u>First Year, First Trimester</u>	
Archaeo 201*	3	Archaeo 201*	3
Archaeo 202	3	Archaeo 202	3
		Archaeo 220	3
<u>First Year, Second Term</u>		<u>First Year, Second Trimester</u>	
Archaeo 204	3	Archaeo 204	3
Archaeo 269	3	Archaeo 269	3
		Archaeo 260*	3
<u>First Year, Third Term***</u>		<u>First Year, Third Trimester***</u>	
Archaeo 206	3	Archaeo 206	3
Archaeo 207	3	Archaeo 207	3
<u>Second Year, First Term</u>		<u>Second Year, First Trimester</u>	
Elective 1	3	Elective 1	3
Elective 2	3	Elective 2	3
Cognate**	3	Cognate**	3
<u>Second Year, Second Term</u>		<u>Second Year, Second Trimester</u>	
Elective 3	3	Elective 3	3
Elective 4	3	Elective 4	3
Archaeo 299	3	Archaeo 299	3
<u>Second Year, Third Term</u>		<u>Second Year, Third Trimester</u>	
Archaeo 300	6	Archaeo 300	3
		<u>Third Year, First Trimester</u>	
		Archaeo 300	3
Total	42	Total	48

\*Offered in the 1st and 2nd Terms in the Proposed Curriculum

\*\*Cognate which is taken outside of the program has to be taken by the student during the regular / semestral calendar as an additional matriculation.

\*\*\*The shift from the second semester offering for Archaeo 206 and 207 to the 3rd term would ensure that the field activity is conducted during the summer months and that prerequisites for the said subjects are taken in the first and second terms.

\*Offered in the 1st and 2nd Trimester in the Proposed Curriculum

\*\*Cognate which is taken outside of the program must be taken by the student during the regular / semestral calendar as an additional matriculation.

\*\*\*The shift from the second semester offering for Archaeo 206 and 207 to the 3rd trimester would ensure that the field activity is conducted during the summer months and that prerequisites for the said subjects are taken in the first and second trimesters.

**V. B. Comparative Table of the Program Learning Objectives of the MA and MS Programs in Archaeology**

**Program Learning Outcomes for the MA in Archaeology**

After completing the MA in Archaeology program, the student is expected to:

1. Apply the methodology of archaeology in independent research.
2. Practice specialized training in archaeology.
3. Participate in archaeological research opportunities.
4. Conduct independent research in the form of a thesis.

**Program Learning Outcomes for the MS in Archaeology**

After completing the MS in Archaeology program, the student is expected to:

1. Apply various analytical methodologies of archaeology.
2. Practice specialized science and laboratory-based training in archaeology.
3. Participate in archaeological research opportunities.
4. Conduct independent research in the form of a thesis.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33





Courses				Program Learning Outcomes									
MA (Existing)	MA proposed	MS (Existing)	MS proposed	MA				MS					
				PLO 1	PLO 2	PLO 3	PLO 4	PLO 1	PLO 2	PLO 3	PLO 4		
Core Courses													
201*	201*	201*	201*										
202	202	202	202										
204	204	204	204										
269	269	269	269										
206	206	206	206										
207	207	207	207										
299	299	299	299										
300	300	300	300										
	220		220										
	260*		260*										
Cognate**	Cognate**	Cognate**	Cognate**										
Electives													
Elective 1	Elective 1	Elective 1	Elective 1										
Elective 2	Elective 2	Elective 2	Elective 2										
Elective 3	Elective 3	Elective 3	Elective 3										
Elective 4	Elective 4	Elective 4	Elective 4										

Notation for MA/MS Courses

\*Offered in the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Trimester of the proposed curriculum

\*\*Cognate which is taken outside of the program must be taken by the student during the regular / semestral calendar as an additional matriculation.

\*\*\*The shift from the second semester offering for Archaeo 206 and 207 to the 3rd trimester would ensure that the field activity is conducted during the summer months and that prerequisites for the said subjects are taken in the first and second trimesters.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15



**Master of Arts in Archaeology  
School of Archaeology**

FIRST YEAR					
1 <sup>st</sup> Trimester	9 units	2 <sup>nd</sup> Trimester	9 units	3rd Trimester	6 units
Archaeo 201*	3	Archaeo 204	3	Archaeo 206	3
Archaeo 202	3	Archaeo 269	3	Archaeo 207	3
Archaeo 220	3	Archaeo 260*	3		
SECOND YEAR					
1 <sup>st</sup> Trimester	9 units	2 <sup>nd</sup> Trimester	9 units	3rd Trimester	3 units
Elective 1	3	Elective 3	3	Archaeo 300	3
Elective 2	3	Elective 4	3		
Cognate**	3	Archaeo 299	3		
THIRD YEAR					
1 <sup>st</sup> Trimester	3 units	2 <sup>nd</sup> Trimester	units	3rd Trimester	units
Archaeo 300	3				
			<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>48 units</b>	

Notation for MA

\*Offered in the 1st and 2nd Trimester in the proposed curriculum

\*\*Cognate which is taken outside of the program must be taken by the student during the regular / semestral calendar as an additional matriculation.

\*\*\* The shift from the second semester offering for Archaeo 206 and 207 to the 3rd trimester would ensure that the field activity is conducted during the summer months and that prerequisites for the said subjects are taken in the first and second trimesters.





1 **1.1 Course Outcomes and Relationship to Program Learning Outcomes**

2

Course Outcomes	Program Learning Outcomes*			
	A	B	C	D
CO1 Appreciate the scope, history, and development of maritime and underwater archaeology	I			
CO2 Identify the theoretical and applied perspectives of maritime and underwater archaeology	D			
CO3 Critically examine legal and ethical issues concerning maritime and underwater archaeology		R		
CO4 Recognize current research gaps in maritime and underwater archaeology		R		

3 I - Introduced; D - Demonstrated; R – Reinforced

- 4
- 5 A. Apply the methodology of archaeology in independent research.
- 6 B. Practice specialized training in archaeology.
- 7 C. Participate in archaeological research opportunities.
- 8 D. Conduct independent research in the form of a thesis.
- 9

10 **2. Course Content**

Course Topics	No. of Hours
I. Introduction to maritime archaeology A. Underwater archaeology B. Nautical archaeology C. Seafaring D. Maritime culture	8
II. Underwater archaeology A. Shipwrecks/ ship abandonment B. Ships’ cargo and contents C. Ship construction D. Submerged landscapes E. Submerged land or aircraft F. Methods in underwater archaeology	12
III. Nautical archaeology A. History and theory of watercraft construction B. Terminology C. Understanding hull lines D. Hull analysis E. Recording watercraft F. Recording and researching watercraft in the archaeological record	12

IV. Maritime Landscapes A. Definition B. Case studies	8
V. Issues in maritime archaeology A. Ethics B. Legal Instruments C. Management and protection	8
VI. Synthesis	4
Total	48

1  
2

### 3. Course Coverage

Week	Learning Outcome/s	Course Topic	Essential or Key Questions	Suggested Teaching and Learning Activities	Suggested Assessment Tools/Activities	Core Readings/Learning Resources
1-2	The student should be able to: a) discuss the scope and boundaries of maritime and underwater archaeology b) gain substantial insights into the beginnings of maritime and underwater archaeology	I. Introduction to Maritime and underwater archaeology A. Underwater archaeology B. Nautical archaeology C. Seafaring D. Maritime culture	What is maritime and underwater archaeology and its subdisciplines?  What influenced the emergence of maritime and underwater archaeology?	Lecture Discussion Film viewing	Discussion Reaction paper on assigned readings (wk 2)	Babits, L. and H. Van Tilburg 1998. Bass, G. 2011. Bednarik, R. 2003. Muckelroy, K. 1978. Richards, N. 2013. Ford et al. 2020.  Film Viewing: Archaeology in the final frontier Indianapolis PBS Video
3-5	The student should be able to: a) Identify various types of underwater archaeology sites b) Comment	II. Underwater archaeology A. Shipwrecks/ship abandonment B. Ships' cargo and contents C. Ship construction	What can shipwrecks tell us?  What are other examples of underwater sites?  Is underwater	Lecture Discussion Film viewing Practical exercises	Discussion Reaction paper on assigned readings	Adams, J. 2001. Baker, W. 1998. Dizon, E. 1992. Green, J. 2004. Orillaneda, B. and W. Ronquillo. 2011. Ronquillo, W. 1990. Ford et al. 2020. McCarthy et al. 2019

	<p>on the limitations of working underwater</p> <p>c) Identify methods of conducting archaeology underwater</p> <p>d) Assess the significance of underwater archaeology</p>	<p>D. Submerged landscapes</p> <p>E. Submerged land- or aircraft</p> <p>F. Methods in underwater archaeology</p>	<p>archaeology always maritime?</p> <p>How is underwater archaeology practiced?</p>			<p>Film Viewing: Time capsules: the Maritime Archaeology of the Baltic Sea</p>
6-8	<p>The student should be able to:</p> <p>a) Explain watercraft development and traditions</p> <p>b) Define basic nautical terms</p> <p>c) Analyse hull shapes in relation to performance and function</p> <p>d) Record simple hull lines</p>	<p>III. Nautical archaeology</p> <p>A. History and theory of watercraft construction</p> <p>B. Terminology</p> <p>C. Understanding hull lines</p> <p>D. Hull analysis</p> <p>E. Recording watercraft</p> <p>F. Recording and researching watercraft in the archaeological record</p>	<p>What is the importance of nautical archaeology?</p> <p>What can we learn from watercraft remains?</p> <p>What do we know about watercraft development?</p> <p>How are watercraft recorded?</p>	<p>Lecture</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>Film viewing</p> <p>Practical exercises</p>	<p>Discussion</p> <p>Reaction paper on assigned readings</p> <p>Presentation (wk 7)</p>	<p>Adams, J. 2001.</p> <p>Adams, J. and J. Rönby. 2013.</p> <p>Clark, P., et al. 1993.</p> <p>Gould, R. 2000.</p> <p>Green et al. 1995.</p> <p>Hasslöf, O. 1972.</p> <p>Hocker, F. and C. Ward. 2004</p> <p>Kimura, J. 2016.</p> <p>Lacsina, L. 2016.</p> <p>Steffy, J.R. 1994.</p> <p>Ford et al. 2020.</p> <p>Film viewing: How to make and use tree nails How Viking Ship Builders made a plank Building Frames for a small boat Boatbuilding in southern Thailand Boatbuilding in Sulu</p>
9	<p>The student should be able to:</p> <p>a) Explain the concept of maritime landscapes</p> <p>b) Examine how maritime landscapes can be applied in archaeology</p>	<p>IV. Maritime Landscapes</p> <p>A. Definition</p> <p>B. Case studies</p>	<p>How does the concept aid us in reconstructing the past?</p>	<p>Lecture</p> <p>Discussion</p>	<p>Discussion</p> <p>Reaction paper on assigned readings</p>	<p>Ford 2011.</p> <p>Westerdahl 1992.</p> <p>Westerdahl 1994.</p> <p>Ford et al. 2020.</p>

10-11	The student should be able to: a) Comment on ethical issues in maritime and underwater archaeology b) Evaluate perspectives involved in the topic c) Apply legal instruments covering maritime and underwater archaeology d) Create a site management plan	V. Issues in maritime archaeology A. Ethics B. Legal Instruments C. Management and protection	What threatens and endangers maritime and underwater archaeological sites?  What has been done to address the threats in different parts of the world?	Lecture Discussion Film viewing	Discussion Reaction paper on assigned readings (wk 10) Presentation (wk 11)	Flecker, M. 2002. Lim et al. 2021. Maarleveld, T. 2011. McCarthy, M. 2006. Prot, L. (ed). 2006 Ford et al. 2020.  Film viewing: WWII shipwrecks sold as scrap in Indonesia - YouTube
12		VI. Synthesis		Discussion	Submission of final paper	

**4. Course Requirements**

- Individual reaction papers
- Participation in class discussions
- Practical exercises
- Individual reports
- Final paper

**D. References**

Adams, J. 2001. Ships and Boats as Archaeological Source Material. *World Archaeology* 32(3):292–310.

Adams, J. 2013. *A maritime archaeology of ships*. First ed. Oxbow Books, Oxford.

Adams, J. and J. Rönby. 2013. *Interpreting Shipwrecks: Maritime Archaeological Approaches*. Highfield Press, Southampton.

Babits, L. and H. Van Tilburg (eds.). 1998. *Maritime archaeology: A reader of substantive and theoretical contributions*. Plenum, New York.



- 1  
2 Baker, P. and J. Green. 1976. Recording Techniques Used During the Excavation of the  
3 Batavia. *IJNA* 5:143–158.  
4
- 5 Baker, W. 1998. The Technical Importance of Shipwreck Archaeology. In *Maritime  
6 Archaeology: A Reader of Substantive and Theoretical Contributions*, edited by Lawrence E.  
7 Babits and Hans Van Tilburg. Plenum, New York and London.  
8
- 9 Bass, G. 1983. A Plea for Historical Particularism in Nautical Archaeology In *Shipwreck  
10 Anthropology*, edited by R. A. Gould, pp. 91–104. University of New Mexico Press,  
11 Albuquerque.  
12
- 13 Bass, G. 2011. The development of maritime archaeology. In *The Oxford handbook of  
14 maritime archaeology*, edited by A. Catsambis, B. Ford and D. L. Hamilton, pp. 3–22. Oxford  
15 University Press, Oxford.  
16
- 17 Bednarik, R. 2003. Seafaring in the Pleistocene. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal*  
18 13(1):44–66.  
19
- 20 Brown, D. 1998. The Form and Speed of Sailing Warships. *The Mariner's Mirror* 84(3):298–  
21 307.
- 22 Casal, G., J.-P. Desroches, F. Goddio, and A. Giordan (eds.) 1996. *Treasures of the San  
23 Diego*, AFAA; New York: Elf.; [Manilla]: National Museum of the Philippines, Paris.  
24
- 25 Chapelle, H. 1967. *The Search for Speed under Sail*, pp. 3–51. W.W. Norton & Co., New  
26 York.  
27
- 28 Clark, P., J. Green, T. Vosmer and R. Santiago 1993. The Butuan Two Boat known as a  
29 balangay in the National Museum, Manila, Philippines. *The International Journal of Nautical  
30 Archaeology* 22(2):143–159.  
31
- 32 Delgado, J. 2011. Ships on land. In *The Oxford handbook of maritime archaeology*, edited by  
33 A.Catsambis, B. Ford and D. L. Hamilton. Oxford University Press, Oxford.  
34
- 35 Dizon, E. 1992. Status of underwater archaeological researches in the Philippines 1989–91:  
36 Prospect for 1992. *Bulletin of the Australian Institute for Maritime Archaeology* 16(1):41–47.  
37
- 38 Flecker, M. 2002. The ethics, politics and realities of maritime archaeology in Southeast  
39 Asia. *The International Journal of Nautical Archaeology* 31(1):12–24.  
40
- 41 Ford, B. (ed) 2011. *The Archaeology of Maritime Landscapes*. Springer, Indiana.  
42
- 43 Ford, B., J. Halligan and A. Catsambis. 2020. *Our Blue Planet: An Introduction to Maritime  
44 and Underwater Archaeology*. Oxford University Press. New York.  
45
- 46 Green, J. 2004. *Maritime archaeology: A technical handbook*. Second ed. Elsevier,



- 1 Amsterdam.
- 2 Green, J., T. Vosmer, P. Clark, R. Santiago and M. Alvarez. 1995. Interim report on the joint  
3 Australian-Philippines Butuan Boat project, October 1992. *The International Journal of*  
4 *Nautical Archaeology* 24(3):177–188.
- 5
- 6 Gould, R. 1983. *Shipwreck anthropology*. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
- 7
- 8 Gould, R. 2000. *Archaeology and the Social History of Ships*. Second Edition. Cambridge  
9 University Press, Cambridge.
- 10
- 11 Hasslöf, O. 1972. Main principles in the technology of shipbuilding. In *Ships and shipyards,*  
12 *sailors and fishermen: Introduction to maritime ethnology*, edited by O. Hasslöf, H.  
13 Henningsen and A. E. Christensen, Jr. Copenhagen University Press, Copenhagen.
- 14
- 15 Hocker, F. 2004. Shipbuilding: Philosophy, practice and research. In *The philosophy of*  
16 *shipbuilding*, edited by F. M. Hocker and C. A. Ward, pp. 1–11. Texas A&M University  
17 Press, College Station.
- 18
- 19 Hocker, F. and C. Ward. 2004. *The Philosophy of Shipbuilding: Conceptual Approaches to*  
20 *the Study of Wooden Ships*. Texas A&M University Press, College Station.
- 21
- 22 Kimura, J. 2016. *Archaeology of East Asian Shipbuilding*. University Press of Florida  
23 Gainesville.
- 24
- 25 Lacsina, L. 2016. Examining pre-colonial Southeast Asian boatbuilding: An archaeological  
26 study of the Butuan Boats and the use of edge-joined planking in local and regional  
27 construction techniques. Doctoral Thesis. Department of Archaeology, Flinders University,  
28 Adelaide.
- 29
- 30 Lim, K., B. Orillaneda and C. King. 2021. People and the Sea: A Values Perspective in the  
31 Conservation Management of Maritime Heritage in the Philippines. *International Journal of*  
32 *Asia Pacific Studies* 17(2):39-73
- 33
- 34 Lipke, P., P. Specter and B.A.G. Fuller. 1993. *Boats: A Manual for their Documentation*.  
35 Mystic and Nashville. Chapter 8 by D.W. Dillion, Chapter 7 by D.W. Dillion, Chapter 6 by  
36 D.W. Dillion, Chapter 10 by Bray and Lipke, Chapter 13 by Schmid and Lipke.
- 37
- 38 Maarleveld, T. 2011. Ethics, Underwater Cultural Heritage, and International Law. In *The*  
39 *Oxford Handbook of Maritime Archaeology*, edited by A. Catsambis, B. Ford and D. L.  
40 Hamilton, pp. 917–941. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- 41
- 42 McCarthy, M. 2006. Maritime archaeology in Australasia: Views and overviews. In *Maritime*  
43 *archaeology: Australian approaches*, edited by M. Staniforth and M. Nash, pp. 1–12. The  
44 Plenum Series in Underwater.
- 45
- 46 McCarthy, J., J. Benjamin, T. Winton and W. van Duivenvoorde (eds.). 2019. *3D Recording*



- 1 and Interpretation for Maritime Archaeology. Springer Open.  
2 Muckelroy, K. 1978. Maritime Archaeology. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.  
3  
4 Archaeology, J. B. Arnold, III, general editor. Springer, New York.  
5  
6 Orillaneda, B. and W. Ronquillo. 2011. Protecting and preserving the underwater cultural  
7 heritage of the Philippines: A background paper. Proceedings of the Inaugural Asia-Pacific  
8 Conference on Underwater Cultural Heritage. Manila, Philippines.  
9  
10 Prott, L. (ed). 2006. Finishing the interrupted voyage: Papers of the UNESCO Asia-Pacific  
11 workshop on the 2001 convention on the protection of the underwater cultural heritage.  
12 Institute of Art and Law, Leicester.  
13  
14 Richards, N. 2013. Abandoned ships and ship graveyards: Exploring site significance and  
15 research potential. In The archaeology of watercraft abandonment, edited by N. Richards and  
16 S. K. Seeb, pp. 1–16. Springer-Verlag, New York.  
17  
18 Ronquillo, W. 1990. Philippine underwater archaeology: Present research projects and new  
19 developments. Bulletin of the Australian Institute for Maritime Archaeology Vol. 14(1):21–  
20 24.  
21  
22 Steffy, J.R. 1994. Wooden Ship Building and the Interpretation of Shipwrecks. Texas A&M  
23 University Press, College Station.  
24  
25 Westerdahl, C. 1992. The Maritime Cultural Landscape. The International Journal of  
26 Nautical Archaeology Vol. 21(1):5–14.  
27  
28 Westerdahl, C. 1994. Maritime Cultures and Ship Types: Brief Comments on the  
29 Significance of Maritime Archaeology. The International Journal of Nautical Archaeology  
30 Vol 23(4):265–270.  
31

32 **E. List of Faculty who will handle the course.**

33 Associate Professor Ligaya Lacsina, PhD  
34 Professor Armand Salvador B. Mijares, PhD  
35 Professor Victor Paz, PhD  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

**PROPOSAL FOR THE REVISION OF ARCHAEO 241  
MORTUARY ANALYSIS IN ARCHAEOLOGY**

**A. Course Catalogue Description**

- 1. Course Number: Archaeo 241**
- 2. Course Title: Mortuary Analysis in Archaeology**
- 1. Course Description:** Theoretical approaches in the study of mortuary sites.
- 2. Prerequisite: Archaeo 204 Scientific Archaeological Analysis**
- 3. Semester Offered:** First and Second Trimesters
- 4. Course Credit:** 3 units
- 5. Number of Hours:** 3 hours
- 6. Meeting Type:** Lecture
- 7. Course Goal/s:** To analyse archaeological evidence found in burials for the reconstruction of past societies and to evaluate issues concerning the interpretation of burial sites.

**B. Rationale:** For students to have a critical understanding of mortuary sites and to provide them substantial methods and theories that they can use later in preparing for their master’s thesis

**C. Course Outline**

**1. Course Outcomes (CO)**

- Upon completing the course, students must be able to:
- CO 1. Synthesise the different evidence for mortuary sites
  - CO 2. Apply methods and theories learned in Archaeo 201 and 204
  - CO 3. Evaluate concepts in understanding mortuary sites
  - CO 4. Examine issues and ethical concerns related to research on mortuary sites

**1.1. Course Outcomes and Relationship to Program Learning Outcomes**

Course Outcomes	Program Learning Outcomes*			
	A	B	C	D
CO 1. Synthesise the different evidence for mortuary sites	I	D		
CO 2. Apply methods and theories learned in Archaeo 201 and 204	D	R		
CO 3. Evaluate concepts in understanding mortuary sites	D	R		
CO 4. Examine issues and ethical concerns related to research on mortuary sites	R	R		



- 1 I - Introduced; D - Demonstrated; R – Reinforced  
 2 A. Apply the methodology of archaeology in independent research.  
 3 B. Practice specialized training in archaeology.  
 4 C. Participate in archaeological research opportunities.  
 5 D. Conduct independent research in the form of a thesis.  
 6

7 **2. Course Content**  
 8

Course Topics	No. of Hours
I. What can we learn from the dead? A. Introduction to mortuary concepts B. Examining different mortuary sites	4
II. Analogy in the interpretation of mortuary sites A. Data from ethnohistory and ethnography	4
III. The body A. Different treatments of the body	4
IV. Mortuary objects A. Meanings and values of mortuary objects	4
V. Status and rank in mortuary sites A. Social markers in mortuary sites	4
VI. Identity representations in mortuary sites A. Age B. Gender C. Ethnicity D. Religion	4
VII. Past cosmologies based on mortuary sites A. Representation of early belief systems	4
VIII. Where are the Dead A. Immortality and funerary monuments	4
IX. Political uses of the body or graves A. Afterlife of bodies	4
X. Repatriation of skeletal remains and burial issues A. Ethical issues surrounding mortuary sites	4
XI. Colonial interventions A. Impact of colonialism on burial practices	4
XII. Synthesis	4
Total	48

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

1  
2

**3. Course Coverage**

Week	Learning outcome/s	Course Topic	Essential or Key Questions	Suggested Teaching and Learning Activities	Suggested Assessment Tools/Activities
1	I. The student should be able to: a. Explain the key concepts of mortuary sites b. Identify what constitutes a mortuary site.	I. What can we learn from the dead? A. Introduction to mortuary concepts B. Examining different mortuary sites	a. What can we learn from mortuary sites? b. Why is the study of mortuary sites significant?	Lecture	Essay
2	The student should be able to: a. Evaluate the use of analogy in interpreting mortuary sites. b. Justify the validity of using analogy	II. Analogy in the interpretation of mortuary sites A. Data from ethnohistory and ethnography	a. How would you reconcile ethnography, ethnohistory, and folklore with archaeology when interpreting burial sites? b. What could we learn from each field that will be useful in understanding burial sites? c. What can archaeological data say about analogy?	Lecture, reporting	Essay
3	The student should be able to: a. Illustrate the role of the body in mortuary sites. b. Demonstrate how bodies are treated in differently in the past.	III. The body A. Different treatments of the body	a. Why is the body important in performing mortuary rituals? What is the power of the body? b. Explain why some societies deliberately preserve the body while others destroy the body in the context of secondary burials, cremation, cannibalism, and sometimes complete disposal of it that leave no material remains.	Lecture, reporting	Essay, Discussion
4	The student should be able to: a. Identify the categories of mortuary goods. b. Explain the	IV. Mortuary objects Meanings and values of mortuary objects	a. What constitutes a mortuary good? b. What meanings are represented by the mortuary goods?	Lecture, reporting	Essay, Discussion

	roles of mortuary goods.				
5	The student should be able to: a. Examine status and rank in burials b. Correlate the type of society to mortuary rituals. c. Compare health and diet of individuals	V. Status and rank in mortuary sites A. Social markers in mortuary sites	a. How is status and rank determined in mortuary sites?  b. What would the common markers of the following: socio-economic status/wealthy elites, socio-political status/socio-political elites, politico-religious status/ sacral leadership?  b. How does the socio-economic-religious-political order/s of a period of history affect/s burial places and mortuary rituals?  c. Were diet and diseases status specific?	Lecture, reporting	Essay, Discussion
6	The student should be able to: a. Examine the archaeological evidence for the representations of identities  b. Discuss the development of identity research in archaeology.  c. Assess the importance of gender in archaeology.	VI. Identity representations in mortuary sites A. Age B. Gender C. Ethnicity D. Religion	a. How is identity created, negotiated, manifested, and represented in archaeology? b. How was identity studied in cultural-historical approaches, processual, and post-processual? c. Why should we include gender in our study of archaeology? d. What is a 'deviant' burial?	Lecture, reporting	Essay, Discussion
7	The student should be able to: a. Evaluate the archaeological evidence for cosmology. b. Demonstrate past cosmology through regional connections.	VII. Past cosmologies based on mortuary sites  A. Representation of early belief systems	a. What is cosmology and how is this manifested in burial sites? b. What is the relationship of mortuary rituals to cosmology?	Lecture, reporting	Essay, Discussion
8	The student should be able to: a. Assess evidence for immortality in burials. b. Classify the	VIII. Where are the Dead  A. Immortality and funerary monuments	a. How is immortality achieved through mortuary rites? b. When is the dead considered 'sacred' and 'profane'?	Lecture, reporting	Essay, Discussion

	locations of the dead and their relationship to the living.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c. What do the place/s of the dead mean to the community?</li> <li>d. How can we identify ancestor worship in burials?</li> </ul>		
9	The student should be able to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Trace the biography of burial sites and bodies.</li> </ul>	IX. Political uses of the body or graves  A. Afterlife of bodies	a. How were bodies used to forward a political agenda?	Lecture, reporting	Essay, Discussion
10	The student should be able to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Examine key ethical issues in excavating, curating, displaying, and storing human remains.</li> <li>b. Identify the relationship of colonization to the curation of human remains.</li> </ul>	X. Repatriation of skeletal remains and reburial issues  A. Ethical issues surrounding mortuary sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. What are the key ethical issues regarding the study, display, curation, repatriation, and reburial of human remains?</li> <li>b. How are the concepts of colonialism and racism linked with the history of human remains as archaeological materials?</li> </ul>	Lecture, reporting	Essay, Discussion
11	The student should be able to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Discuss colonial interventions that transformed indigenous mortuary traditions.</li> </ul>	XI. Colonial interventions  A. Impact of colonialism on burial practices	a. What are the colonial decrees and ordinances that made an impact on indigenous mortuary traditions?	Lecture, reporting	Essay, Discussion
12	The student should be able to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Construct a sound interpretation for archaeological burial sites</li> <li>b. Synthesize gaps and issues in the mortuary research</li> </ul>	XII. Synthesis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What were the identified gaps and issues in studying mortuary sites?</li> <li>2. What kind of recommendations can we make to address these issues?</li> </ul>	Lecture	Final paper

**4. Course Requirements**

- Individual essays
- Oral reports
- Participation in class discussions
- Final exam

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8





**D. References**

- 1 Albanski, L., and J. C. Lehr. 2012. Identity, Integration, and Assimilation Recorded in Manitoba's Polish and  
2 Ukrainian Cemeteries. *Great Plains Research* 22:3-14.  
3 [https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=22](https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=2213&context=greatplainsresearch)  
4 [13&context=greatplainsresearch](https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=2213&context=greatplainsresearch). 14 June 2020.
- 5  
6  
7  
8 Alberti, Benjamin. 2006. Archaeology, Men, and Masculinities. In *Handbook of Gender Archaeology*,  
9 edited by S. M. Nelson, pp. 401–434. Lanham, MD, USA: AltaMira Press.
- 10  
11 Anderson, D. 1996. “Reburial: Is it Reasonable,” in *Archaeological Ethics*. Edited by K. D. Vitelli, pp. 200-208.  
12 Walnut Creek: Altamira Press.
- 13  
14 Andrews, P., Theya Molleson and Basak Boz. 2005. “The Human Burials at Catalhöyük,” in *Inhabiting*  
15 *Catalhöyük Reports from the 1995-99 Seasons*. Edited by I. Hodder, pp. 261-278. Cambridge/London:  
16 McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research/British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara.
- 17  
18 Aspöck, Edeltraud. 2008. What Actually is a 'Deviant Burial'? Comparing German-Language and  
19 Anglophone Research on 'Deviant Burials'. In *Deviant Burial in the Archaeological Record*, edited by  
20 E. M. Murphy, pp. 17-34. Oxford, UK: Oxbow.
- 21  
22 Australian National University News. 2020. *Ancestral Remains returned to traditional owners*.  
23 Australian National University 2015 [cited September 24 2020]. Available from  
24 <https://www.anu.edu.au/news/all-news/ancestral-remains-returned-to-traditional-owners>.
- 25  
26 Baadsgaard, A., Janet Monge, Samantha Cox, and Richard L. Zettler. 2011. Human sacrifice and intentional  
27 corpse preservation in the Royal Cemetery of Ur. *Antiquity* 85:27-42.\*
- 28  
29 Babić, S. 2005. “Status identity and archaeology,” in *The Archaeology of Identity Approaches to Gender, Age,*  
30 *Status, Ethnicity and Religion*. Edited by M. Díaz-Andreu, S. Lucy, S. Babić and DN Edwards, pp. 67-85.  
31 London and New York: Routledge.
- 32  
33 Barretto, G. 2000. A Survey of Literature on Indigenous Burial Practices and their Archaeological Implications.  
34 *Kasarinlan* 15:95-122.
- 35  
36 Barretto-Tesoro, G. Editor. 2016. *Himlayan, Pantiyon, Kampo Santo, Sementeryo: Exploring Philippine*  
37 *Cemeteries*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- 38  
39 Barretto-Tesoro, G., and Joan Tara Reyes. 2013. “Fame and Fortune in Two Philippine Cemeteries: Tombstones  
40 as Extensions of Identity,” in *Materializing Southeast Asia's Past*, vol. 2, *Selected Papers from the 12th*  
41 *International Conference of the European Association of Southeast Asian Archaeologists, Volume 2*. Edited by  
42 M. J. Klokke, and Véronique Degroot, pp. 253-267. Singapore: National University of Singapore Press.
- 43  
44 Bartel, B. 1982. A Historical Review of Ethnological and Archaeological Analyses of Mortuary Practice.  
45 *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 1:32-58.
- 46  
47 Bentley, R. Alexander, Nancy Tayles, Charles Higham, Colin Macpherson, and Tim C. Atkinson. 2007.  
48 Shifting Gender Relations at Khok Phanom Di, Thailand: Isotopic Evidence from the Skeletons.  
49 *Current Anthropology* 48 (2):301-314.
- 50  
51 Binford, L. R. 1972. “Mortuary Practices: Their Study and Their Potential,” in *An Archaeological Perspective*.  
52 Edited by L. R. Binford, pp. 208-243. New York: Seminar Press.
- 53  
54 Blackburn, K. 2007. Heritage Site, War Memorial, and Tourist Stop: The Japanese Cemetery of Singapore,  
55 1891-2005. *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 80:17-39.



- 1 Blanchard, P., and Dominique Castex, Michael Coquerelle, Raffaella Giuliani, Monica Ricciardi. 2007. A mass  
2 grave from the catacomb of Saints Peter and Marcellinus in Rome, second-third century AD. *Antiquity* 81:989-  
3 998.  
4
- 5 Borić, D. and Sofija Stefanović. 2006. Birth and death: infant burials from Vlasac and Lepenski Vir. *Antiquity*  
6 78:526-546.  
7
- 8 Brauer, Jaymie L. "Out of the Closet: The Research Value of Human Skeletal Collections." *Museum*  
9 *Anthropology* 16, no. 2 (1992): 35-39.  
10
- 11 Bring out your dead: navigating the ethics of displaying humans remains in museums  
12 [http://bonebrokeblog.wordpress.com/2013/12/01/bring-out-your-dead-navigating-the-ethics-of-displaying-](http://bonebrokeblog.wordpress.com/2013/12/01/bring-out-your-dead-navigating-the-ethics-of-displaying-bodies-in-museums/)  
13 [bodies-in-museums/](http://bonebrokeblog.wordpress.com/2013/12/01/bring-out-your-dead-navigating-the-ethics-of-displaying-bodies-in-museums/)  
14
- 15 Bruning, Susan B. 2006. Complex Legal Legacies: The Native American Graves Protection and  
16 Repatriation Act, Scientific Study, and Kennewick Man. *American Antiquity* 71 (3):501-521.  
17
- 18 Buckley, R., and Matthew Morris, Jo Appleby, Turin King, Deirdre O'Sullivan, and Lin Foxhall. 2013. 'The  
19 king in the car park': new light on the death and burial of Richard III in the Grey Friars church, Leicester, in  
20 1485. *Antiquity* 87:519-538.  
21
- 22 Cannon, Aubrey and Katherine Cook. 2015. "Infant Death and the Archaeology of Grief." *Cambridge*  
23 *Archaeological Journal* 25(2):399-416.  
24
- 25 Carr, C. 1995. Mortuary Practices: Their Social, Physical-Religious, Circumstantial, and Physical Determinants.  
26 *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 2:105-200.  
27
- 28 Castillo-Noche, Manuel Maximo Lopez del. "Nacio Fallecio: The Art and Architecture of Spanish Colonial  
29 Baptistry and Cemeteries in the Philippines." *UNITAS* 78, no. 1 (2005): 67-98.  
30
- 31 Cave, Christine M., and Marc F. Oxenham. 2017. Sex and the elderly: Attitudes to long-lived women  
32 and men in early Anglo-Saxon England. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 48:207-216.  
33
- 34 Ceruti, C. 2004. Human bodies as objects of dedication at Inca mountain shrines (north-western Argentina).  
35 *World Archaeology* 36:103-122.  
36
- 37 Chambert-Loir, H., and Anthony Reid. Editor. 2002. *The Potent Dead: Ancestors, Saints and Heroes in*  
38 *Contemporary Indonesia*. New South Wales: Allen and Unwin.  
39
- 40 Chu, R. T., and T. A. See. 2016. Toward a History of Chinese Burial Grounds in Manila during the Spanish  
41 Colonial Period. *Archipel* 92:63-90. <https://doi.org/10.4000/archipel.283>. 15 June 2020.  
42
- 43 Clarke, Alison. "Heavenly Visions: Otago Colonists' Concepts of the Afterlife." *Journal of Religious History*  
44 30, no. 1 (2006): 2-17.  
45
- 46 Cook, K. (2011). A Different Kind of Afterlife: The Cultural Biography of Headstones. *Identity Crisis:*  
47 *Archaeological Perspectives on Social Identity*, 189-198.  
48
- 49 Couderc, Pascal, and Kenneth Sillander. 2012. Introduction. In *Ancestors in Borneo Societies: Death,*  
50 *Transformation, and Social Immortality*, edited by P. Couderc and K. Sillander, pp. 1-61. Copenhagen  
51 S, Denmark: NIAS Press.  
52
- 53 Crass, B. A. 2001. "Gender and Mortuary Analysis: What Can Grave Goods Really Tell Us?," in *Gender and*  
54 *the Archaeology of Death*. Edited by B. Arnold, and Nancy L. Wicker, pp. 105-118. Walnut Creek: Altamira  
55 Press.

- 1 Crubézy, E., F.X. Ricaut, H. Martin, S. Erdenebaatar, H. Coqueugnot, B. Maureille, and P.H. Giscard. 2006.  
2 Inhumation and cremation in medieval Mongolia: analysis and analogy. *Antiquity* 80:894-905.
- 3 Dakudao, M. E. 1992. The Development of Cemeteries in Manila Before 1941. *Philippine Quarterly of Culture*  
4 *and Society* 20:133-150.
- 5
- 6 Deetz, J., and E. N. Dethlefsen. 1971. Some Social Aspects of New England Colonial Mortuary Art. *Memoirs of*  
7 *the Society for American Archaeology, No. 25, Approaches to the Social Dimensions of Mortuary Practices* :30-  
8 38.
- 9
- 10 Díaz-Andreu, M., Sam Lucy, Staša Babic and David N. Edwards. 2005. *The Archaeology of Identity*  
11 *Approaches to Gender, Age, Status, Ethnicity and Religion*. London and New York: Routledge.
- 12
- 13 Díaz-Andreu, M. 2005. "Gender Identity," in *The Archaeology of Identity Approaches to Gender, Age, Status,*  
14 *Ethnicity and Religion*. Edited by M. Díaz-Andreu, Sam Lucy, Staša Babic and David N. Edwards, pp. 13-42.  
15 London and New York: Routledge.
- 16
- 17 Dobat, A. S. 2006. The king and his cult: the axe-hammer from Sutton Hoo and its implications for the concept  
18 of sacral leadership in early medieval Europe. *Antiquity* 80:880-893.
- 19
- 20 Feldman, J. Editor. 1985. *The Eloquent Dead: Ancestral Sculpture of Indonesia and Southeast Asia*. Los  
21 Angeles: UCLA Museum of Cultural History.
- 22
- 23 Francis, D., Leonie Kellaheer, Georgina Neophytou. 2005. *The Secret Cemetery*. Oxford: Berg.
- 24
- 25 Gaither, Catherine, Jonathan Kent, Víctor Vásquez Sánchez, and Teresa Rosales Tham. 2008.  
26 Mortuary Practices and Human Sacrifice in the Middle Chao Valley of Peru: Their Interpretation in  
27 the Context of Andean Mortuary Patterning. *Latin American Antiquity* 19 (2):107-121.
- 28
- 29 Gamble, J. A. 2009. Health and Social Status in early Anglo-Saxon England: A Consideration  
30 of Cemetery Evidence from Edix Hill (Cambridgeshire). *Identity Crisis:*  
31 *Archaeological Perspectives on Social Identity*, 37.
- 32
- 33 Gili, S., Vicente Lull, Rafael Mió, Cristina Rihuette, and Roberto Risch. 2006. An island decides: megalithic  
34 burial rites on Menorca. *Antiquity* 80:829-842.
- 35
- 36 Go, M. C., and D. Docot. 2021. Fire and fear: Rapid cremations in the Philippines amidst COVID-19,. *Forensic*  
37 *Science International: Synergy* 3:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fsisyn.2020.100132>.
- 38
- 39 Halcrow, Sian, Nancy Tayles, Raelene Inglis, and Charles Higham. "Newborn twins from prehistoric mainland  
40 Southeast Asia: birth, death and personhood." *Antiquity* 86 (2012): 838-852.
- 41
- 42 Härke, H. 2000. Social Analysis of Mortuary Evidence in German Protohistoric Archaeology. *Journal of*  
43 *Anthropological Archaeology* 19:369-384.
- 44
- 45 Harper, Susan. 2012. 'I'm glad she has her glasses on. That really makes the difference': Grave goods  
46 in English and American death rituals. *Journal of Material Culture* 17 (1):43-59.
- 47
- 48 Harris, H. J. and N. Tayles. 2012. Burial containers - A hidden aspect of mortuary practices:  
49 Archaeoethanatology. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 31:227-239.
- 50
- 51 Hertz, Robert. 1960. *Death and the right hand*. Translated by R. Needham and C. Needham. Glencoe, Illinois:  
52 Free Press.
- 53
- 54 Huffer, D. and D. Chappell. 2014. The mainly nameless and faceless dead: an exploratory study of the illicit  
55 traffic in archaeological and ethnographic human remains. *Crime, Law and Social Change* 62:131-153.

- 1 Huntington, Richard, and Peter Metcalf. 1979. *Celebrations of Death: The Anthropology of Mortuary Ritual*.  
2 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
3
- 4 Kamp, K. A. 1998. Social hierarchy and burial treatments: A comparative assessment. *Cross-Cultural Research*  
5 32:79-115.  
6
- 7 Knapp, A. Bernard. 2009. Masculinist archaeology? *Archaeological Dialogues* 5 (2):115-125.  
8
- 9 Knudson, K. J. and C. M. Stojanowski. 2008. New Directions in Bioarchaeology: Recent Contributions to the  
10 Study of Human Social Identities. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 16:397-432.  
11
- 12 Langley, Michelle C., and Mirani Litster. 2018. Is It Ritual? Or Is It Children?: Distinguishing  
13 Consequences of Play from Ritual Actions in the Prehistoric Archaeological Record. *Current*  
14 *Anthropology* 59 (5):616-643.  
15
- 16 Lara, Myra, Helen Lewis, Victor Paz, and Wilfredo Ronquillo. 2016. 16 Implications of pathological  
17 changes in cremated human remains from Palawan, Philippines, for Island Southeast Asian  
18 archaeology. In *The Routledge Handbook of Bioarchaeology in Southeast Asia and the Pacific Islands*,  
19 edited by M. Oxenham and H. Buckley, pp. 339-359. New York, NY, USA: Routledge.  
20
- 21 Lara, M., Victor Paz, Helen Lewis, and Wilhelm Solheim II. 2013. Bone Modifications in an Early Holocene  
22 Cremation Burial from Palawan, Philippines. *International Journal of Osteoarchaeology* Published online in  
23 Wiley Online Library (wileyonlinelibrary.com) DOI: 10.1002/oa.2326.\*  
24
- 25 Lewis, H., Victor Paz, Myra Lara, Huw Barton, Philip Piper, Janine Ochoa, Timothy Vitales, A. Jane Carlos,  
26 Tom Higham, Lee Neri, Vito Hernandez, Janelle Stevenson, Emil Charles Robles, Andrea Ragragio, Rojo  
27 Padilla, Wilhelm Solheim II, and Wilfredo Ronquillo. 2008. Terminal Pleistocene to mid-Holocene occupation  
28 and an early cremation burial at Ille Cave, Palawan, Philippines. *Antiquity* 82:318-335.  
29
- 30 Linduff, Katheryn. 2003. Many Wives, One Queen in Shang China. In *Ancient Queens: Archaeological*  
31 *Explorations*, edited by S. M. Nelson, pp. 59-75. Walnut Creek, USA: AltaMira Press.  
32
- 33 Lloyd-Smith, L. and F. Cole. 2010. "The Jar-Burial Tradition in the West Mouth of Niah Cave, Sarawak: Burial  
34 histories, social identities, and changing perceptions of pottery and death," in *50 Years of Archaeology in*  
35 *Southeast Asia: Essays in Honour of Ian Glover*. Edited by B. Bellina, E.A. Bacus, T.O. Pryce, and J. W.  
36 Christie, pp. 114-128. Bangkok: River Books.  
37
- 38 Lloyd-Smith, L., J. Krigbaum, and B. Valentine. 2016. "Social affiliation, settlement pattern histories and  
39 subsistence change in Neolithic Borneo," in *The Routledge Handbook of Bioarchaeology in Southeast Asia and*  
40 *the Pacific Islands*. Edited by M. Oxenham and H. R. Buckley, pp. 257-288. London and New York: Routledge.  
41
- 42 Lucy, S. 1994. Children in early Medieval cemeteries. *Archaeological Review from Cambridge* 13:21-34  
43 (Published in 1996 for 1994).  
44
- 45 Lucy, S., and Andrew Reynolds. 2002. "Burial in Early Medieval England and Wales: Past, Present and  
46 Future," in *Burial in Early Medieval England and Wales, The Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph*  
47 *Series: No. 17*. Edited by S. Lucy, and Andrew Reynolds, pp. 1-23. London: The Society for Medieval  
48 Archaeology.  
49
- 50 Lucy, S. 2002. "Burial Practice in Early Medieval Eastern Britain: Constructing Local Identities, Deconstructing  
51 Ethnicity," in *Burial in Early Medieval England and Wales, The Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph*  
52 *Series: No. 17*. Edited by S. Lucy, and Andrew Reynolds, pp. 72-87. London: The Society for Medieval  
53 Archaeology.  
54
- 55 Lucy, S. 2005. "The archaeology of age," in *The Archaeology of Identity Approaches to Gender, Age, Status,*

- 1 *Ethnicity and Religion*. Edited by M. Díaz-Andreu, S. Lucy, S. Babic and DN Edwards, pp. 43-66. London and  
2 New York: Routledge.  
3
- 4 Martínez, G., G. Flensburg, and P. D. Bayala. 2012. Human corpse manipulation and the body as symbol: A  
5 cast study from the Eastern Pampa-Patagonia transition (Argentina) during the Final Late Holocene. *Journal of*  
6 *Anthropological Archaeology* 31:215-226.  
7
- 8 McCarthy, J. P. 2004. Extraordinary Uses of Ordinary Objects: Material Reflections of Ethnicity and  
9 Community Identity at the Cemeteries of the First African Baptist Church, Philadelphia. *Archaeological Review*  
10 *from Cambridge* 19:25-39.  
11
- 12 Mee, C., and William G. Cavanagh. 1984. Mycenaean tombs as evidence for social and political organisation.  
13 *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 3:45-65.  
14
- 15 Millaire, J.-F. 2004. The Manipulation of Human Remains in Moche Society: Delayed Burials, Grave  
16 Reopening, and Secondary Offerings of Human Bones on the Peruvian North Coast. *Latin American Antiquity*  
17 15:371-388.  
18
- 19 Mazariegos, Oswaldo Chinchilla, Vera Tiesler, Oswaldo Gómez, and T. Douglas Price. 2015. "Myth, Ritual and  
20 Human Sacrifice in Early Classic Mesoamerica: Interpreting a Cremated Double Burial from Tikal, Guatemala."  
21 *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 25(1):187-210.  
22
- 23 McCafferty, Sharisse D., and Geoffrey G. McCafferty. 1994. Engendering Tomb 7 at Monte Alban:  
24 Respinning an Old Yarn [and Comments and Reply]. *Current Anthropology* 35 (2):143-166.  
25
- 26 Metcalf, Peter. 1981. Meaning and Materialism: The Ritual Economy of Death. *Man* 16 (4):563-578.  
27
- 28 Metcalf, Peter. 1982. *A Borneo Journey Into Death: Berawan Eschatology from its Rituals*. Pennsylvania, USA:  
29 University of Pennsylvania Press.  
30
- 31 Metcalf, P. and R. Huntingdon. 1991. *Celebrations of Death: The Anthropology of Mortuary Ritual*. Cambridge:  
32 Cambridge University Press.  
33
- 34 Morris, Ian. 2008. The Archaeology of Ancestors: The Saxe/Goldstein Hypothesis Revisited.  
35 *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 1 (2):147-169.  
36
- 37 Muller, S., H. Burke, C. D. Leiu, H. Degner, and Z. Farrell. 2019. 'Childness': An Alternative Approach to  
38 the Archaeology of Childhood through Cemetery Studies. *Religions* :doi:10.3390/rel10080451. 15 June 2020.  
39
- 40 Murail, P., B. Maureille, D. Peresinotto, and F. Geus. 2004. An infant cemetery of the Classic Kerma period  
41 (1750-1500 BC, Island of Saï, Sudan. *Antiquity* 78:267-279.  
42
- 43 Murphy, E. 1995. *After the Funeral: The Posthumous Adventures of Famous Corpses*. New York: Barnes and  
44 Noble Books.  
45
- 46 Mytum, H. 2004. *Mortuary Monuments and Burial Grounds of the Historic Period*. New York: Kluwer  
47 Academic/Plenum Publishers.  
48
- 49 Nelson, S. M. 2003. "The Queens of Silla: Power and Connections to the Spirit World," in *Ancient Queens*.  
50 Edited by S. M. Nelson, pp. 77-92. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.  
51
- 52 Neri, J. S., S.J. 1979. "Death and Burial Customs of Southeast Mindanao," in *Archaeological Survey in*  
53 *Southeast Mindanao*. Edited by W. G. Solheim, Avelino Legaspi and Jaime S. Neri S.J, pp. 154-160. Manila  
54 and Honolulu: National Museum of the Philippines and University of Hawaii.  
55

- 1 New Straits Times. *Covid-19: Forced cremations traumatising Philippine families*. 2020 May 3 [cited  
2 August 12 2020]. Available from [https://www.nst.com.my/world/world/2020/05/589505/covid-19-  
4 forcedcremations-traumatising-philippine-families](https://www.nst.com.my/world/world/2020/05/589505/covid-19-<br/>3 forcedcremations-traumatising-philippine-families).
- 5 Nielsen, Nina H., Bente Philippsen, Marie Kanstrup, and Jesper Olsen. 2018. Diet and Radiocarbon  
6 Dating of Tollund Man: New Analyses of an Iron Age Bog Body from Denmark. *Radiocarbon* 60  
7 (5):1533-1545.
- 8 Nilsson Stutz, Liv. 2014. Mortuary Practices. In *The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology and  
9 Anthropology of Hunter-Gatherers*, edited by V. Cummings and P. J. M. Zvelebil, pp. 712-728. Oxford,  
10 UK: Oxford University Press.
- 11  
12 Nilsson Stutz, Liv. 2016. Building Bridges Between Burial Archaeology and the Archaeology of Death.  
13 Where is the Archaeological Study of the Dead Going? *Current Swedish Archaeology* 4:13-35.
- 14  
15 Nilsson Stutz, Liv, and Sarah Tarlow. 2013. Beautiful Things and Bones of Desire: Emerging Issues in  
16 the Archaeology of Death and Burial. In *The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of Death and  
17 Burial*, edited by L. Nilsson Stutz and S. Tarlow, pp. 1-14. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- 18  
19 Oestigaard, T. 1999. Cremations as Transformations: When the Dual Cultural Hypothesis was Cremated and  
20 Carried Away in Urns. *European Journal of Archaeology* 2:345-364.
- 21  
22 Oxenham, M., and H. R. Buckley. Editors. 2016. *The Routledge Handbook of Bioarchaeology in Southeast Asia  
23 and the Pacific Islands*. London and New York: Routledge.
- 24  
25 Pader, E.-J. 1982. *Symbolism, Social Relations and the Interpretation of Mortuary Remains*. *BAR International  
26 Series 130*. Oxford: BAR International.
- 27  
28 Parker Pearson, M. 1993. The Powerful Dead: Archaeological Relationships between the Living and the Dead.  
29 *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 3:203-229.
- 30  
31 Parker Pearson, M. 1999. *The Archaeology of Death and Burial*. Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing.
- 32  
33 Parker Pearson, Mike. 2008. Placing the Physical and the Incorporeal Dead: Stonehenge and  
34 Changing Concepts of Ancestral Space in Neolithic Britain. *Archeological Papers of the American  
35 Anthropological Association* 11 (1):145-160.
- 36  
37 Peebles, C. S. and S.M. Kus. 1977. Some Archaeological Correlates of Ranked Societies. *American Antiquity*  
38 42:421-448.
- 39  
40 Pollock, Susan. 2008. Of Priestesses, Princes and Poor Relations: The Dead in the Royal Cemetery of  
41 Ur. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 1 (2):171-189.
- 42  
43 Rasmussen, Morten, Martin Sikora, Anders Albrechtsen, Thorfinn Sand Korneliussen, J. Víctor  
44 Moreno-Mayar, G. David Poznik, Christoph P. E. Zollikofer, Marcia S. Ponce de León, Morten E.  
45 Allentoft, Ida Moltke, Hákon Jónsson, Cristina Valdiosera, Ripan S. Malhi, Ludovic Orlando, Carlos D.  
46 Bustamante, Thomas W. Stafford, David J. Meltzer, Rasmus Nielsen, and Eske Willerslev. 2015. The  
47 ancestry and affiliations of Kennewick Man. *Nature* 523 (7561):455-458.
- 48  
49 Recommendations for the Care of Human Remains in Museums and Collections (have pdf)  
50 [http://bonebrokeblog.files.wordpress.com/2013/11/deutscher-museums-bund-2013-recommendations-for-the-  
52 care-of-human-remains-in-museums-and-collections.pdf](http://bonebrokeblog.files.wordpress.com/2013/11/deutscher-museums-bund-2013-recommendations-for-the-<br/>51 care-of-human-remains-in-museums-and-collections.pdf)
- 53 Renfrew, C. 1986. "Varna and the emergence of wealth in prehistoric Europe," in *The social life of things*.  
54 *Commodities in cultural perspective*. Edited by A. Appadurai, pp. 141-168. Cambridge: Cambridge University  
55 Press.



- 1 Reyes, Joan Tara. 2011. Ginhawa mula sa Patay: Isang Pag-aaral sa Kahalagahan ng Katawan sa Bogwa  
2 (Sekundaryang Paglibing) at Pangangayaw sa mga Ifugao at Kankanay. In *Isip: Mga Kaisipan sa Sikolohiya,*  
3 *Kultura at Lipunang Pilipino*, edited by J. A. R. Cantiller and J. A. Yacat,  
4
- 5 Reyes, M. 2012. Are Archaeologists Desecrators of the Dead? *Test Pit* 18-19:34-39.  
6
- 7 Rosaldo, Renato. 2005. Grief and the Headhunter's Rage. In *Death, Mourning, and Burial: A Cross-*  
8 *Cultural Reader*, edited by A. C. G. M. Robben, pp. 156-178. MA, USA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.  
9 Original edition, 1989.  
10
- 11 Sarauw, T. 2007. Male symbols or warrior identities? The 'archery burials' of the Danish Bell Beaker Culture.  
12 *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 26:65-87.  
13
- 14 Sayer, D. 2010. Who's afraid of the dead? Archaeology, modernity and the death taboo. *World Archaeology*  
15 42:481-491.  
16
- 17 Scott, E. 1999. *The Archaeology of Infancy and Infant Death. BAR International Series 819.* Oxford:  
18 Archaeopress.  
19
- 20 Schwartz, Glenn M. 2017. The Archaeological Study of Sacrifice. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 46  
21 (1):223-240.  
22
- 23 Schwenninger, Gillian Taylor, and Timothy Wess. 2005. Evidence for mummification in Bronze Age Britain.  
24 *Antiquity* 79:529-546.  
25
- 26 Shay, T. 1985. Differential Treatment of Deviancy at Death as Revealed in Anthropological and Archeological  
27 Material. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 4:221-241.  
28
- 29 Smith, P., G. Avishai, J.A. Greene, and L.E. Stager. "Aging cremated infants: the problem of sacrifice at the  
30 Tophet of Carthage." *Antiquity* 85 (2011): 859-874.  
31
- 32 Solheim, W. G. I. 1959. Notes on burial customs in and near Sagada, Mountain Province. *Philippine Journal*  
33 *Science* 88:123-134.  
34
- 35 Strauss, Mark. 2020. *When is it okay to dig up the dead?* 2016 [cited 22 September 2020]. Available from  
36 <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/news/2016/04/160407-archaeology-religion-repatriation-bones-skeletons/>.  
37
- 38 Szabó, K., and Philip J. Piper, and Graeme Barker. 2008. "Sailing Between Worlds: The Symbolism of Death in  
39 Northwest Borneo," in *Islands of Inquiry: Colonisation, seafaring and the archaeology of maritime landscapes,*  
40 *Terra Australis* 29. Edited by G. Clark, and Foss Leach, and Sue O'Connor, pp. 149-170. Canberra: Australian  
41 National University Press.  
42
- 43 Tainter, J. 1975. Social Inference and Mortuary Practices: an experiment in numerical classification. *World*  
44 *Archaeology* 7:1-15.  
45
- 46 Tainter, J. A. 1978. "Mortuary Practices and the Study of Prehistoric Social Systems," in *Advances in*  
47 *Archaeological Method and Theory*, vol. 1. Edited by M. Schiffer, pp. 105-141. New York: Academic Press.  
48
- 49 Tantuico, Kathleen D. C., and Omar K. Choa. 2016. *Death, Grief and Memorial: A Review of the Boy*  
50 *Scouts Tragedy of 1963.* Edited by G. Barretto-Tesoro, *Himlayan, Pantiyon, Kampo Santo,*  
51 *Sementeryo: Exploring Philippine Cemeteries.* Quezon City, PH: University of the Philippines Press.  
52
- 53 Tarlow, Sarah. 2013. Belief and the Archaeology of Death. In *The Oxford Handbook of the*  
54 *Archaeology of Death and Burial*, edited by L. Nilsson Stutz and S. Tarlow, pp. Oxford, UK: Oxford  
55 University Press.

- 1 Tarlow, S. 2015. "Introduction: Death and Burial in Post-medieval Europe," in *The Archaeology of Death in*  
2 *Post-Medieval Europe*. Edited by S. Tarlow, pp. 1-18. Warsaw/Berlin: De Gruyter Open Ltd.
- 3
- 4 Taylor, T. 2002. *The Buried Soul*. London and New York: Fourth Estate.
- 5
- 6 Tenazas, R. C. 1970. Cremation Burial in the Philippines. *Philippine Historical Review* 3:34-38.
- 7
- 8 Thomas, D. H. 2000. *Skull Wars*. New York: Basic Books.
- 9
- 10 Thomas, Aline, Philippe Chambon, and Pascal Murail. "Unpacking burial and rank: the role of children in the  
11 first monumental cemeteries of Western Europe (4600-4300 BC)." *Antiquity* 85 (2011): 772-786.
- 12
- 13 Tilley, L. and M. Oxenham. 2016. "Reflections on life and Times in Neolithic Vietnam: one person's story," in  
14 *The Routledge Handbook of Bioarchaeology in Southeast Asia and the Pacific Islands*. Edited by M. Oxenham  
15 and H. R. Buckley, pp. 95-109. London and New York: Routledge.
- 16
- 17 Trinkaus, K. 1995. "Mortuary Behavior, Labor Organization, and Social Rank," in *Regional Approaches to*  
18 *Mortuary Analysis*. Edited by L. Beck, pp. 53-75. New York: Plenum Press.
- 19
- 20 Turek, J. (2011). Age and gender identities and social differentiation in the Central European Copper age.  
21 *Identity Crisis: Archaeological Perspectives on Social Identity*, 49-61.
- 22
- 23 Tykot, Robert H. 2014. Bone Chemistry and Ancient Diet. In *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*, edited by C.  
24 Smith, pp. 931-941. New York, NY: Springer New York.
- 25
- 26 Ucko, P. 1969. Ethnography and archaeological interpretation of funerary remains. *World Archaeology* 1:262-  
27 280.
- 28
- 29 Vanhaeren, M., and Francesco d'Errico. 2005. Grave goods from the Saint-Germain-la-Rivière burial: Evidence  
30 for social inequality in the Upper Palaeolithic. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 24:117-134.
- 31
- 32 Verdery, Katherine. 2013. *The Political Lives of Dead Bodies: Reburial and Postsocialist Change*. New  
33 York, USA: Columbia University Press.
- 34
- 35 Viana, Lorelei D.C. de. "Public Sanitation and Cemeteries in 19th Century Manila." *UNITAS* 77, no. 1 (2004):  
36 87-132.
- 37
- 38 Voss, Barbara L. 2000. Feminisms, Queer Theories, and the Archaeological Study of Past Sexualities.  
39 *World Archaeology* 32 (2):180-192.
- 40
- 41 Weiss-Krejci, E. 2001. Restless corpses: 'secondary burial' in the Babenberg and Habsburg dynasties.  
42 *ANTIQUITY* 75:769-80.
- 43
- 44 White, Claire J., Maya Marin, and Daniel M.T. Fessler. 2015. Not just dead meat: An evolutionary  
45 account of corpse treatment in mortuary rituals. *Journal of Cognition and Culture* 17 (1-2):146-168.
- 46
- 47 Williams, H. 2005. Review article: Rethinking early medieval mortuary archaeology. *Early Medieval Europe*  
48 13:195-217.
- 49
- 50 Żrałka, Jarosław, Wiesław Koszkuł, Simon Martin, and Bernard Hermes. "In the path of the Maize God: a royal  
51 tomb at Nakum, Petén, Guatemala." *Antiquity* 85 (2011): 890-908.
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55

1 **E. List of Faculty who will handle the course.**

2

3 Professor Grace Barretto-Tesoro, PhD

4 Professor Victor Paz, PhD

5 Associate Professor Kimberly Plomp, PhD

