

# **Ancient DNA sheds light on the funerary practices of late Neolithic collective burial in southern France**

Ana Arzelier, Harmony de Belvalet, Marie-Hélène Pemonge, Pauline Garberi, Didier Binder, Henri Duday, Marie-France Deguilloux, Mélanie Pruvost

# **To cite this version:**

Ana Arzelier, Harmony de Belvalet, Marie-Hélène Pemonge, Pauline Garberi, Didier Binder, et al.. Ancient DNA sheds light on the funerary practices of late Neolithic collective burial in southern France. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 2024, 291 (2029), rspb.2024.1215. 10.1098/rspb.2024.1215 . hal-04679849

# **HAL Id: hal-04679849 <https://hal.science/hal-04679849>**

Submitted on 30 Aug 2024

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



 of the Neolithic, i.e., the Ferrières culture. Identifying the social motivation underlying the use of collective burial practices remains challenging for several reasons. For example, the dichotomy between megalithic monuments and cavities gave rise to debates surrounding the reasons for these distinct choices in funerary locations. Since the natural settings of certain regions within southern France permit both types of structures to coexist, the choice of location calls for arguments other than environmental opportunism and could be connected to cultural preferences and traditions (1–4). Frequently used over several generations, collective burials are generally seen to include individuals from the same community, symbolizing collective 44 ancestry without emphasizing individual identities. However, it is also suggested that such burials could have included individuals from various families, thus serving to strengthen sociopolitical ties between distinct local groups (5,6). Here, we propose a multidisciplinary approach combining archaeological, radiocarbon and genomic data from the Aven de la Boucle natural cavity to document for the first time the dynamics of the use of a Neolithic collective burial in France.

 The Aven de la Boucle is located near Corconne (Gard) in southern France and was used as 51 a collective burial from the second half of the  $4<sup>th</sup>$  millennium BCE (Figure 1, SI, Figure C1). The group of the deceased is represented by scattered remains across the funerary space, with few anatomical connections (7–10). The archaeo-anthropological study of the Aven de la Boucle assemblages demonstrated the primary deposition of the dead inside this cavity, with marked selection according to the age at death of the individuals, displayed by the massive exclusion of children.

 The quantitative analysis of skeletal parts identified a minimum number of individuals approximating 75, based on calcaneus bones (MNI by exclusions, SI, Figure C2), with evidence of the retrieval of some skeletal parts by the living (7–11). Indeed, voluminous pieces such as coxal, cranial remains and long bones account for approximately 30 to 45 individuals (SI, Figure C2).

 Two stratigraphic horizons are superposed and distinguished through archeological material, notably ceramic elements. At the base, the first corresponds to a transitional stage from the Final Chasséen to the Ferrières cultures, also referred to as the "Recent Neolithic" or Pre- Ferrières. The second belongs to the Ferrières culture *stricto sensu* (10). These funerary occupations, whether continuous or not, took place as the cavity was accessible through the rearranged joint. This passage was condemned after its use for funerary purposes, and the cavity remained closed until a vertical shaft opened accidentally. Therefore, the cavity was 69 reoccupied sporadically during the Fontbouisse period at the end of the  $3<sup>rd</sup>$  millennium BCE and the final stage of the Bronze Age (Final Bronze Age II; ~1,200-900 BCE) (12). The  succession of these main Neolithic horizons raises the questions of continuity versus discontinuity of communities using the cavity and the evolution of funerary rites at the end of the Neolithic in eastern Languedoc.

At the genomic scale, extensive documentation on the end of the Neolithic period is still lacking

 in France. Recent genome-wide studies revealed 39 individuals for the whole French territory, spanning ~3,600 to 2,000 BCE (13–17). Despite the heterogeneity of cultural contexts and the variability of population dynamics documented during this time transect in the modern-day

French territory, no local or microregional focus has been conducted thus far.

 Our multidisciplinary study was articulated around several lines of research. First, we aimed to document the biological identity of the deceased and to discuss the entwinement of the genomic results and archaeoanthropological observations. Second, we questioned the potential of combining aDNA studies and radiocarbon dating to decipher the dynamics of sepulchral cavity use, notably by addressing the question of continuity *vs.* discontinuity regarding deceased deposits. In a third line of research, we also addressed the genomic results obtained at the population level by examining how the individuals represented at the Aven de la Boucle fit into the regional and pan-European picture.

#### **Results**

#### *Overview of the Aven de la Boucle dataset*

 In this study, we present genome-wide data for 37 individuals from the Aven de la Boucle, including ten previously sequenced individuals from this cavity (18). Among the 37 individuals analyzed, 27 are directly dated, we report 17 new radiocarbon dates, complementing ten dates previously reported (18, Figure 1B, Table 3). The dataset is represented by 34 Neolithic individuals (3,800-2,900 BCE) and three Bronze Age individuals (Table 1, 2 & 3).

 For palaeogenomic analyses, we sampled 41 left petrous bones to retrieve bone powder from which DNA was extracted. Libraries were then constructed, and postmortem deamination patterns consistent with aDNA origin were examined. The first screening via shallow shotgun sequencing allowed us to select libraries from 39 individuals who passed quality filtering (Table 2, mapped reads and more than 0.1% of endogenous DNA). Ten libraries with low proportions of endogenous DNA content (0.3-13.5%) were enriched for 1.2 million SNPs using targeted in- solution capture ("1,240k" SNP capture, (19)), while 29 libraries with satisfactory proportions of endogenous DNA content (10.3-71.3%) were selected for whole-genome shotgun sequencing. After excluding one individual (BOU26) with a coverage of 0.04X, we obtained genome-wide data for nine samples with a mean coverage between 0.08X and 2.7X as well as 29 partial genomes with a coverage between 0.05X and 0.68X (Table 1 & 2). We estimated

- potential contamination of the nuclear genome by examining the heterozygosity of polymorphic
- 107 sites on the X chromosome in males. Assuming a contamination threshold of  $\sim$ 5%, we
- excluded one individual (BOU43) from downstream analyses (Table 5,(20)).

## *Genetic sex determination*

 We confidently identified eight female individuals (XX) and 28 male individuals (XY) (Table 4, SI, Figure C10). For two additional individuals, genetic sex determination provided ambiguous results (BOU29, Y reads ratio 0.0287-0.0299, most likely female; BOU21 Y reads ratio 0.0564- 0.0585, most likely male). Additionally, individual BOU12 displayed a Y/autosome ratio of 0.84, while the X/autosome ratio was within the expected range for a male individual, and X- contamination was low. Therefore, it is likely that this individual carried an XYY karyotype (Table 4, SI, Figure C10). This type of chromosomic anomaly is known as 47,XYY syndrome (21). With a prevalence of one in every 1000 births, it is a relatively rare type of trisomy that can affect male individuals without phenotypic implications. It can also manifest as symptoms such as tall stature, learning disability and infertility.

## *Uniparental markers*

- Uniparentally inherited markers were identified using mitochondrial and Y-chromosome data (Table 6, 7, & 8, SI).
- The Aven de la Boucle individuals carry mitochondrial subhaplogroups H (N=13), K (N=8), U
- (N=9), T (N=4), X2b (N=2) and V (N=1), which were previously reported among Neolithic groups from Western Europe and represent maternal ancestors of both Anatolian farmers and Western European Hunter-Gatherers (Table 6, 7, & 8). Indeed, six individuals carried haplogroups derived from U5b, and three individuals carried haplogroups U2e1c1, U4 and U8,
- which are likely attributable to the Mesolithic ancestry of Western Europe (22–24).
- Neolithic male individuals were found to carry Y chromosome haplogroups derived from I2a1 (N=4), H2a1 (N=2), G2 (N=19) and R1b1b (N=1). Except R1b1b, such haplogroups are relatively common in Western European Neolithic communities from both continental and Mediterranean expansion routes, i.e., France (15,16,18,25,26) Switzerland (17), Germany (26–29) and the Iberian Peninsula (13,14,28,30–33).
- Although rare in Neolithic communities from western Europe, the haplogroup R1b1b carried by BOU38 (3,626–3,369 BCE) has been previously identified in Western Mediterranean Early Neolithic communities from Els Trocs, Cueva de Chaves and Grotta Continenza (19,32,34). The high frequency of the G2a lineage (73%) is similar to what has been previously described for the contemporary cave of Les Treilles (90% of the G2a lineage; Lacan et al., 2011; Aveyron, France). This may reflect a general predominance of this haplogroup in southwestern France 140 at the end of the Neolithic (31,35). BOU44 and BOU17, dated to the second half of the 2<sup>nd</sup>
- millennium BCE, both carry haplogroup R1b1a1b, consistent with previous records regarding
- the genetic impact of Pontic steppe herders (27).

## *Radiocarbon dating*

 Regarding radiocarbon dating, 25 individuals ranged between ~3,800 and 2,900 BCE and 145 confirmed that the collective burial was mainly active during the second half of the  $4<sup>th</sup>$  and 146 beginning of the 3<sup>rd</sup> millennium BCE, which broadly corresponds to the bounds of the Ferrières culture in the region (36). Additionally, five undated individuals can be attributed to this chronological range because they are involved in first- or second-degree biological kinship with

- directly dated individuals (Figure 1C).
- In the scree slope sector and within *Sondage* 1 ("S1", Figure 1D), remains can be attributed to
- 151 sporadic use of the cavity during the Bronze Age. Thus, individual BOU44 ranged from ~1,600
- to 1,500 BCE, corresponding to the Middle Bronze Age, whereas individual BOU17 was
- 153 directly dated to the Late Bronze Age, between ~1,200 and ~1,000 BCE (Table 8, Figure 1C).



 *Figure 1: Geographical and chronological description of the Aven de la Boucle. A) Location of the site in modern-day France and longitudinal section plan of the cavity. B) Skulls and long bones alignments gathered in bundles near the west wall of the cavity, photo: H. Duday, 1981. C) Chronological distribution of samples displaying directly dated individuals and individuals dated through contextual date. Biological relations between individuals are indicated by the full l lines (1<sup>st</sup> degree) and the dashed lines (2<sup>nd</sup> degree), colors indicate stratigraphic attributions (Table 1, 3 & 8). D) Plan and location of sampled petrous bones, samples without genomic results are marked in grey, grids indicate the denomination of excavated sectors within the cavity, colors indicate stratigraphic attributions, first-degree relations are signaled by full lines.*  

## *Integration of the Aven de la Boucle group into macro-regional variability*

 To explore genetic variation among our individuals, we constructed a Principal Component Analysis based on a set of modern-day Eurasians, on which we projected the Aven de la Boucle samples along with previously published ancient individuals (Figure 2). The Neolithic group of the Aven de la Boucle falls within the general variability of Western European Neolithic individuals and, more specifically, with previously reported individuals from France and the 171 Iberian Peninsula dated from the  $5<sup>th</sup>$  to the late  $3<sup>rd</sup>$  millennium. Nevertheless, we detected two outliers, BOU20 and BOU29, which displayed a very distinct shift upwards in PC2 variation from the main cluster. These individuals cluster with previously reported Bell Beaker individuals from Central Europe and the Iberian Peninsula as well as Early to Middle Bronze Age samples from France, despite being contemporaneous with the rest of the Neolithic group from this sepulchral cavity (13,15,16,37). 177 The results of qpWave analysis supported the outlier status of Neolithic individuals BOU20 and

 BOU29 as well as individual BOU6, who carry additional WHG ancestry, as already described (Table 9) (18). The remaining Neolithic individuals formed a clade with a common genetic background (Figure 2B, Table 9).

 At the regional scale, qpWave results highlight the genetic clustering of the Aven de la Boucle Neolithic group with Southern France individuals dating from the late 4th to the mid-3rd millennium and lacking steppe ancestry (Table 9, Figure C20). Conversely, outlier individuals BOU20 and BOU29, as well as the three Bronze Age individuals, cluster with Bell Beaker (La Fare, Grotte des Tortues, Grotte Basse de la Vigne Perdue; (13,16)) and Bronze Age individuals from southern France (Villard, Le Pirou, St Eugène, Quinquiris; (15,37)). This clustering was also supported by the pairwise outgroup-f3 test of the f3 form (Mbuti; Individual 188 1; Individual 2) (Table 10, Figure C16).

 Mirroring these findings, outgroup f3 statistics of the form f3 (Mbuti; *Test*, BOU), using various West European Neolithic groups between ~5,600 and 2,500 BCE as *Test,* permitted us to explore the geographical affinities of the Aven de la Boucle group and outlier individuals with  contemporaneous Western European Neolithic individuals (Table 11, Figure C19). The results indicate that the Aven de la Boucle Neolithic group has local variability, as it shows the highest genetic affinities with neighboring groups originating from collective burials at Les Peirières (2,900-2,650 BCE;(15)) and Collet Redon (3,600-3,400 BCE;(13)). The Neolithic outlier individuals BOU20 and BOU29 display lower f3 values and therefore lower genetic affinities with local groups. Individual BOU20 shares more affinities with contemporaneous individuals from Murcia, Spain (2,900-2,600 BCE), and BOU29 shares the highest genetic affinities with the late Neolithic individual TGM008 from Tangermünde, Germany (13,26).

 We used qpAdm to explore sources of genetic ancestries in the Aven de la Boucle community. First, we modelled the Neolithic individuals as a two-way mixture of Anatolia farmers and European HG ancestries (Table 12). As previously reported, the Neolithic individuals from the Aven de la Boucle carry various amounts of the European HG genetic component (14.7-36.2%; Table 12), consistent with heterogeneous HG legacy and heterogeneous admixture processes between human groups throughout the Neolithic (16,18,26).

 Drawing from the observations reported in previous studies on the differential distribution of 207 various types of HG and early farmer ancestries among Western Europe Neolithic groups, we explored alternative models. We aimed to trace the presence of so-called Magdalenian-related ancestry, as previous studies highlighted the persistence of this type of genetic component among South-Western Europe Neolithic groups. Notably, we sought to test whether an additional GoyetQ2 component could be a candidate for explaining the outlier status of BOU29 and BOU20 (15,18,31,32). We found no evidence of additional Goyet-Q2-like ancestry, as all Neolithic individuals can be modelled with Oberkassel ancestry only (formal Villabruna ancestry (38); Table 14, Model 3). In another test, we modelled the Aven de la Boucle Neolithic 215 group by adding "Iran Ganj Dareh Neolithic" as a third source of the ancestral component to the first model (Table 15, Model 4). This additional genetic component was previously highlighted in several recent studies, appearing sporadically alongside the main Neolithic 218 ancestry component in the Anatolian and Levantine groups from the  $6<sup>th</sup>$  millennium BCE as well as within European Neolithic communities mainly stemming from the Western Mediterranean (31,35,39). This additional source seems to slightly improve the fit of the model, 221 notably for BOU29 ( $p = 0.984886$ ). We note that several individuals can be modelled as a three-way mixture of European HG, Anatolia and Iran Neolithic ancestries (N=12, 7.7-19.9% Iran\_Ganj\_Dareh\_N ancestry). This could therefore indicate that an additional ancestral component maximized in Iranian Neolithic individuals from Ganj Dareh could have contributed to the genetic ancestry of the Aven de la Boucle individuals to various degrees (Table 15, Figure 2C). Individuals BOU20 and BOU29 carry the highest levels of this type of genetic  ancestry, as they can be modelled with 19.9 and 21.9% of Iran\_Ganj\_Dareh ancestry, respectively. This point is also reflected in the results of the outgroup-f3 statistics of the f3 229 (Mbuti; Ind, Iran Ganj Dareh) form, with BOU20 and BOU29 displaying the highest f3 values 230 among the groups (SI, Figure C18).

 It has been hypothesized that farmers spreading towards Europe along the Mediterranean were initially characterized by subtle variation in Near-Eastern ancestry with different proportions of Levantine/Western Caucasus components as opposed to Western Anatolian ancestry. However, we cannot exclude the possibility that this genetic component was implemented in the Western Mediterranean gene pool through exchanges with later groups originating from the Near East (31).





*Figure 2: Population genetics analyses. A) PCA presenting the genetic variability of previously* 

 *published ancient individuals from Eurasia and 37 individuals from the Aven de la Boucle collective burial (newly reported and published) projected onto modern populations from* 

*western Eurasia. B) Heatmap of pairwise qpWave clustering of the Aven de la Boucle* 

*individuals. Pairs represented by light purple squares correspond to p-values below 0.01 and* 

*were rejected based on Fernandes et al., 2020. Matrix details are provided in Table 9. C)* 

 *qpAdm analysis of BOU individuals using Anatolian Neolithic, European\_HG, Iranian Neolithic or Yamnaya Samara groups as ancestral sources (Table 12, 13 & 15).*

- 
- *Bronze Age Individuals*

 The three Bronze Age (BA) samples originating from the Aven de la Boucle correspond to one female (BOU36) and two male individuals (BOU17 and BOU44) belonging to the Y- chromosome haplogroup R1b1a1 (Tables 4 & 7), which has been linked to the dispersion of Pontic steppe herders who moved westwards at the end of the Neolithic Age/beginning of the Bronze Age (13,15,16,27). The projection of the three new BA samples from the Aven de la Boucle collective burials on the PCA overlapped with previously published early to late Bronze Age samples from France and southwestern Europe and clustered more specifically with early to late Bronze Age individuals from southern France (Quinquiris, Le Pirou, Grotte des Tortues, 256 Saint Eugène) (Figure 2A).

- Using qpAdm, we were able to model these individuals as a three-way mixture of Anatolia Farmers (Anatolia\_N), European HG and steppe-related (Russia\_Yamnaya\_Samara) ancestry (Table 13, qpAdm Model 2, Figure 2C). The three individuals exhibited medium to low amounts of steppe-related ancestral components, with estimates ranging between 17 and 43% of Yamnaya\_Samara ancestry. These observations fit previous records of the local impact of steppe migrations, as lower ancestry proportions were reported for South-Western Europe late Neolithic and Bronze Age communities (13,40).
- 

#### *Biological relatedness, funerary and social functioning of the Neolithic community*

 The genetic sex analysis highlighted a strong underrepresentation of female individuals, as only eight were identified as opposed to 26 male individuals, providing a sex-ratio significantly imbalanced in favor of male individuals representing 76% of the Neolithic group (P=0.0432; Table 1 & 4, SI, Figure C10). The morphoscopic examinations of coxal bones also suspected a preponderance of male subjects, although proper quantification could not be performed.

 Among male individuals, the analysis of uniparentally inherited markers underlines the overrepresentation of the Y-chromosome haplogroup G2a2 (N= 19/26 males; 73%). Conversely, mitochondrial haplogroups exhibit a more diverse distribution, as frequently observed among Neolithic groups, which is often interpreted as evidence of female mobility and the practice of female exogamy in a patrilocal system (Table 6 & 7;(41)).

 We analysed the genetic relatedness between all Neolithic individuals and identified 16 pairs 277 of biologically related individuals to the first, second and third-degree relationship (Table 8, Figure 3, SI, Figure C11-C15). Interestingly, biological relatedness involves both male and female individuals despite the marked male-biased selection identified. The only two related female individuals, BOU13 and BOU34, were found in close proximity in the northern part of the cavity. These individuals carry haplogroup H4a and share second-degree relations with several individuals. Combining these observations with sex and uniparental marker  attributions, different pedigree scenarios were explored and are described in the SI (Figure 3, Figure C11-C15). Although we cannot infer precise pedigrees with a satisfactory resolution, the results of biological relatedness and pairwise outgroup-f3 analysis are consistent with a 286 close-knit family group using the cavity as a collective burial between  $\sim$ 3,600 and  $\sim$ 2,900 BCE (Table 8 & 10, SI, Figure C15). Moreover, the anthropological study of the Aven de la Boucle collective burial identified a high frequency of an anatomical variation called *patella emarginata*. Indeed, 75% of the patellae display pronounced emargination of the upper lateral edge, equal to or exceeding a length of 10 mm (SI, Figure C5). Interestingly, out of 11 individuals exhibiting an emargination exceeding 16 mm in length, eight individuals were associated with the C4a unit (SI, Figure C5). Given the unusually high frequency of this anatomical variation, the hypothesis of a high level of biological proximity between the deceased was originally proposed (7,8,10).

 To assess the parental relatedness of the deceased individuals deposited in the Aven de la Boucle, we analysed runs of homozygosity through hapROH (Table 16, Figure C21,(42)). Three individuals displayed long ROH (BOU31, BOU28, BOU35), whose length and distribution could suggest that their parents were related as second cousins. These observations aside, the overall limitation of long ROH could indicate that this funerary group represents a population in which close kin unions were limited. The pattern of ROH distribution observed at the Aven de la Boucle echoes those of contemporaneous Neolithic groups and individuals reported in Western Europe (Table 16, Figure C21).

 To confirm female exogamy practices within this Neolithic community, we tested whether the few female individuals buried at the Aven de la Boucle had fewer close relatives at the site than male individuals (Figure 3B, Table 8, SI, Figure C15, approach described in (31)). The observed mean pairwise mismatch rates between male and female individuals are highly similar; therefore, biological relatedness between Neolithic individuals is unlikely to be sex biased (Figure 3B). We tested for a significant difference in genetic proximity between male and female individuals with f3 statistics for the f3 (Mbuti; female, female), f3 (Mbuti; female, male), and f3 (Mbuti; male, male) forms (SI, Figure C17). We found no significant difference in f3 values between the female‒female and male‒male groups (p value=0.13*)* or between the 312 female-female and female-male groups (p value=0.146). This does not support a significant difference in genetic proximity between females with other female individuals and males with either male or female individuals (SI, Figure C17). These observations contrast with the female exogamy signal expressed by uniparental markers and could be linked to the biased selection of individuals who were granted access to the collective burial.



 *Figure 3: Biological relatedness analysis. A) First, second/third-degree relations using TKGWV2 results. For each pair, mt haplogroups are indicated by the color. B) Mean pairwise mismatch rate extracted from READ for the 34 Neolithic individuals, colors indicate Y chromosome haplogroups for male individuals C) Pedigrees reconstructed for 16 individuals involved in biological relatedness, first-degree relations are represented by full lines, second-degree by dashed lines (Table 8, SI, Section V).* 

# *Chronological modelling*

 We conducted Bayesian modelling of the radiocarbon dates obtained for 26 Neolithic individuals analysed on the genomic scale (Figure 4, Table 17 & 18, SI, Section III). We examined the chronological distribution of different clusters of individuals defined according to stratigraphic attributions. The *a posteriori* modes of phases beginning and ending (43) were

retained here as relevant to describe the phases of site utilization (Table 18;(44)).

 Both models constructed place the C4b unit ("Recent Neolithic"/Pre-Ferrières/Final Chasséen Culture) between 3,600 and 3,185 BCE, with a marked density of activity at approximately 3,350 BCE, and the C4a unit (Ferrières) between 3,140 and 2,880 BCE, with a plateau of activity between ~3,100 and 2,910 BCE (Figure 4).

 The combined observations of stratigraphic attribution and radiocarbon dating of cranial remains therefore reveal no clear break between the first ("Recent Neolithic"/Final Chasséen Culture, C4b unit) and second phases of occupation (Ferrières culture, C4a unit). To an extent, these observations could argue in favour of the continuous use of collective burial throughout the cultural transition reflected in the archaeological deposits rather than a hiatus between distinct phases.

 We also examined the traces of activity *a posteriori* of different clusters of individuals defined according to genetic criteria, i.e., males *vs.* females, males carrying different Y chromosome haplogroups, mitochondrial haplogroup U5 or "Iran Ganj Dareh" ancestry (Table 1, Table 6, Table 7, Table 15; SI, Figure C8 & C9, Table C1). From these models, several observations and hypotheses can be discussed. Traces of Y chromosome haplogroup I2 and mt haplogroup U5 are strongly correlated with each other (results of pairs overlap correlation - hereafter res.OCPairs -: 0.91) and with the activity of the C4b unit (res.OCPairs: 0.86 and 0.82, respectively) but not with C4a (res.OCPairs: 0.14 and 0.13, respectively, Figure 4, SI, Figure C9, Table C1). Moreover, several individuals belonging to the Y chromosome haplogroup G2 cluster contribute to the beginning of the C4b phase (res.OCPairs: 0.59, SI, Figure C9, Table C1), but while the activity traces of haplogroup I2 disappear after 3,100 BCE, the chronological distribution of individuals carrying G2 is wider and vastly extends to the C4a unit (res.OCPairs: 0.57, SI, Figure C9, Table C1). Indeed, if we consider the distribution of the cluster formed by individuals carrying the G2 paternal lineage, as well as the female individual cluster (XX), they both significantly contribute to the C4a unit (and secondarily individuals carrying Y-H2 at the end of the phase).

 Additionally, individuals who can be modelled with "Iran Ganj Dareh" ancestry (GD, Table 15) are correlated with the distribution of the G2 cluster (BOU12, 23 and 30) and the whole female cluster (res.OCPairs: 0.91 and 0.84, respectively; SI, Figure C9, Table C1). These individuals appear to contribute equally to the C4b and C4a units (res.OCPairs: 0.67 and 0.49, respectively). They appear at the beginning of C4b, and even as early as the late Chasséen, during the first half of the 4<sup>th</sup> millennium, if we consider the genetic profile and date of BOU32 (Table 3, Table 17, Table 18).

 It is perhaps necessary to consider the division of C4b into two stages, the earliest more strongly anchored in the late Chasséen and the next marked by the contribution of individuals

- with uniparental markers related to Mesolithic ancestry (Y chromosome haplogroup I2 and mt
- haplogroup U5), whose visibility fades afterwards (Figure 4, SI, Figure C8 & C9, Table C1).





 *Figure 4: Bayesian modelling of the chronological phases of the Aven de la Boucle collective burial. The diagram illustrates the a posteriori chronology described by activity curves (probability densities of events within the different phases and clusters; Table 17 & 18;* SI*, Section III).* 

## **Discussion and perspectives**

 A major challenge in the study of collective burials and commingled assemblages is to decipher the preestablished rules of selection and identify the biological and/or social principles according to which an individual is entitled to access the grave. The Aven de la Boucle sepulchral cavity is one of the most thoroughly documented among the  $4<sup>th</sup>$  millennial collective burials in the Languedoc region. The assemblage that characterizes this site, in which two funerary sequences are discriminated by material culture, is also a unique opportunity to address the notions of cultural versus biological continuity or discontinuity during the late Neolithic period.

 The genomic results highlighted a marked sex-biased selection, manifested by the overrepresentation of male individuals deposited inside the cavity. Within collective burials, morphological sex is frequently inaccessible or unreliable due to commingling and fragmentation of pelvic bones. Therefore, ancient DNA is an important contribution in this regard as reflected in this study.

 This marked imbalance in sexual representation argues in favor of the presence of a male biased selection that could have been added to the selection of adults previously identified (9,10). A differential preservation of less robust craniofacial blocks with a female deficit (through fragmentation or the action of water) appears highly unlikely as the Neolithic levels of the cavity have yielded a high number of much more fragile human bone pieces, such as hyoid bones and ossified thyroid cartilage (9).

 In light of the secondary gestures, the cranial remains represent a sub-sample of the dead population (56%, SI). Therefore, several questions can be raised regarding the underrepresentation of female individuals. First, this biased representation could illustrate that the primary deposition inside the cavity was preferentially granted to male individuals, whereas only a limited number of female individuals were allowed or chose to be included in the collective burial. A second hypothesis to explain the overrepresentation of males could be that cranial and coxal remains belonging to female individuals were preferentially removed from the cavity after decomposition occurred and moved elsewhere. Within the ethnographic record, the practice of temporary access to a collective funerary structure is, for instance, attested in West Sumba, where individuals awaiting their own funerary monument will temporarily be granted access to a collective burial without properly fitting the selective patterns (45). Occurrences of temporary burials are also found among the Merina of the Antananarivo region in Madagascar, where remains can be temporarily placed within a collective tomb before the traditional exhumation of the bones is performed during the *famadihana* ceremonies (46–48). 409 At the Aven de la Boucle, the hypothesis of temporary female burials would presuppose that those bones remained identifiable, even after skeletonization. Considering these observations, the living would have had to recover both craniofacial blocks and coxal bones from a large number of women. Biased selection in favour of male subjects could therefore be more likely than selective recovery of many female remains after decomposition.

Among the Neolithic community, the selection of the deceased could therefore include age at

death and biological sex criteria, but not in a totally fixed and strict manner insofar as a minority

of female and immature individuals still accessed to the cavity.

 Kinship ties, both biologically and socially defined, are often a strong candidate to explain the successive gathering of the deceased in collective burials. At the Aven de la Boucle, the biological proximity of the deceased suspected on the basis of nonmetric traits echoes the patterns of biological relatedness highlighted by genomic results. The overrepresentation of male individuals, as well as the predominance of the G2a2 paternal lineage, which is also the  only lineage represented among closely related individuals, could indicate that selection criteria regarding access to the cavity were also anchored in a patrilineal descent (49).

 These observations are somewhat reminiscent of the selection pattern described in the group buried inside the Treilles I cave, dated to 3,000 BCE and located ~70 km away from the Aven de la Boucle. This sepulchral cave also contains the remains of predominantly male individuals, 427 most of which were found to carry the Y-chromosome lineage G2a (25). Similar patterns have 428 been reported recently in more geographically distant megalithic collective contexts, notably in the British Isles, and have been interpreted as relating to the transgenerational appropriation of burial grounds by patrilineal structured communities (50).

 Furthermore, Bayesian modelling of the chronological distribution of the cranial remains indicate that the use of this collective burial started in a "Recent Neolithic" (pre-Ferrières) phase corresponding to the C4b unit and included a group dominated by male individuals characterized by higher paternal lineage diversity. Without a clear hiatus separating phases, the results indicate that the use of the cavity as a collective burial continued during a period associated with the Ferrières and corresponding to the C4a unit. However, during this phase, a modification of the funerary functioning, or at least of the group using the cavity, is perceived as the G2 paternal lineage becoming largely dominant and almost exclusive. This finding appears to be correlated with the inclusion of several female subjects and the importance of close biological relatedness. Overall, these observations could illustrate a phase during which the male-mediated transmission of social status is more exclusive than during the previous phase. The affiliation with a specific male lineage appears to become a preponderant selection factor that would not be incompatible with the inclusion of certain women tied in this filiation system. These observations might also indicate that women could choose their burial location (52).

 However, both available materials and funerary gestures are important biases to consider, as 447 they undoubtedly impede the ability to make a clear representation of the full living community or communities involved in the utilization of this sepulchral cavity. This representation bias has to consider both the retrieval of bone pieces and funerary selection employed by the living.

 In southern France, genomic studies of late Neolithic megalithic tombs are scarce and have been restricted to a small number of individuals per site, with a focus on population genetics and migration dynamics. The present study represents the first extensive archaeogenomic documentation of a collective burial in France and a mean to explore the funerary selection processes from a different perspective. Additional data retrieved from different contexts, notably dolmens, would therefore be instrumental for properly comparing groups displaying different expressions of collective burial within a restricted region.

## **Materials and Methods**

### *Archaeological context and anthropological observations*

 The Aven de la Boucle is a natural cavity located near Corconne in the Gard region in southern France. The excavations were conducted under the supervision of H. Duday and S. Cours between 1974 and 2002.

 The oldest archaeological deposits, attributed to a transitional stage postdating the late Chasséen stage (also known as the "Recent Neolithic" or Pre-Ferrières), correspond to stratigraphic unit C4b. A second group of deposits, corresponding to the C4a unit, represents a later stage of this late Neolithic horizon and can be attributed to the Ferrières culture.

Archaeo-anthropological analysis revealed that approximately 75 individuals remained, with a

 massive underrepresentation of immature individuals; quantitative osteology revealed a notable deficit of the largest bones (craniomaxillofacial blocks, long bones of the limbs) (SI, Figure C2).

#### *Radiocarbon dating and chronological modelling*

- Four initial radiometric measurements obtained on charcoal attributed the funerary occupation
- 474 of the Aven de la Boucle between the  $37<sup>th</sup>$  and  $25<sup>th</sup>$  centuries BCE.
- During this study, 28 dates were obtained by AMS on human bone collagen. Among them, 26
- refer to Neolithic collective burials and two to punctual introductions of deceased in the cave
- during the Middle and Final Bronze Age.
- 478 We conducted Bayesian modelling of <sup>14</sup>C dates retrieved on petrous bones ((53) SI, Section

 III). To do so, we first constructed different clusters of individuals defined according to stratigraphic attributions

- We then constructed different clusters of dated individuals defined according to genetic criteria:
- *-* males vs females
- male individuals carrying different Y-chromosome haplogroups (Y-G2, Y-H2, Y-R1b1b, Y-I2;
- Table 6, Table 18)
- individuals carrying mitochondrial haplogroup U5 (Table 7, Table 18)
- individuals that we were able to model with "Iran Ganj Dareh" ancestry (see Table 15, qpadm model 4).
- The models are built only from the 26 individuals dated to the Neolithic; indeed, those from the
- Bronze Age are too distant in time to constrain the earlier dates.
- Two Bayesian models were constructed, taking (BCL\_M1) or not taking into account (BCL\_M2)
- an individual (BOU32) whose 14C date and stratigraphic position suggest that the cave was
- used for funerary purposes during the Late Chasséen period.
- Table 18 presents a general overview of the clusters built for Bayesian modelling. Additional
- information is available in the SI, Section III.
- 

## **Palaeogenomic analyses**

# *Sample preparation and DNA extraction*

- All experiments were conducted in dedicated clean rooms of the ancient DNA facilities at the Laboratory of *Anonymous*. We targeted a large number of petrous bones available (N=42) to maximize the achievement of usable genomic results and to extensively document the
- group(s) represented in this sepulchral cavity.
- We sampled 42 human petrous bones to retrieve between 100 and 200 mg of bone powder
- per sample. Steps of decontamination were conducted before sampling. Petrous bones were
- irradiated with ultraviolet light (UV) for 30 minutes on each side, bone surface was scraped on
- the area targeted for sampling and tools were cleaned before drilling into the cochlea to retrieve
- bone powder (54).
- All 42 bone powder samples originating from the Aven de la Boucle were processed according to a two-step extraction procedure and purification followed a silica-based method using a
- MinElute column (QIAGEN) (15).
- 

# *Library preparation and sequencing*

 For each DNA extract, double stranded libraries were produced according to a protocol adapted from *(15,55)*, using a partial UDG treatment (UDG half) to remove deaminations while preserving ancient DNA damage patterns (56). Libraries were pooled and sequenced on an Illumina NextSeq 500 at *Anonymous* using a NextSeq 500/550 High Output Kit v2.5 (150 Cycles).

# *Read processing, alignment and post-mortem damage*

 Raw sequenced data were processed after demultiplexing through EAGER (v 1.92.37) using the following steps (57). Adaptors sequences were trimmed and processed into single reads with Clip&Merge, trimmed sequences were then mapped to Human Reference Genome hs37d5 using BWA v.0.7.12 (58,59). Duplicate reads were removed with DeDup and to observe characteristic aDNA damage patterns we used mapDamage v.2.06, excluding reads with a mapping quality <30 (60). Sequencing results are presented in Table 2.

## *Genotyping*

 All our bam files were trimmed for two bases on each side using trimBam function from BamUtil package and were genotyped by using PileupCaller. We considered the human genome as pseudo-haploïd, randomly calling one allele for each position according to the Human Origin (~600,000 SNPs) and 1240k panels (28,61–63). Individuals having at least 19,000 SNPs on the 1240k panel were considered for further analysis and coverage information for the 37 individuals retained are given in Table 1.

# *Genetic sex determination*

 We determined genetic sex using the method described in (64), based on the estimations of reads ratios mapping to X and Y chromosomes compared to reads mapping to the autosomes. We determined a threshold of Y ratio based on the method published by (64). We used an upper threshold of 0.016 of the ratio of sequence mapping to the Y chromosome for females and a lower bound of 0.077 for males (Table 4). For the ten capture samples, we also calculated the coverage for the X and Y chromosomes and compared to the relative coverage observed for the autosomes (65)(Table 4, SI, Figure C10).

## *Contamination estimations*

 We used ANGSD (Analysis of Next Generation Sequencing Data) package to test the degree of heterozygosity of polymorphic sites on the X chromosome and estimate contamination 546 levels in all male individuals (20). Considering a contamination threshold of  $\sim$ 5%, we excluded one individual (BOU43 – 13.7%) of downstream analyses (Table 5).

## *Uniparental markers*

- Reads were mapped to the revised Cambridge Reference Sequence (rCRS) and VCF files were constructed using bcftools before being processed through HaploGrep 2 and Phy-Mer to determine mitochondrial haplotypes (66,67). Mitochondrial sequences were also visually inspected through Geneious to reinforce mitochondrial lineages attributions, presented in Table 7 and Table 1. For each male individual, Y chromosome haplotypes were inferred using both Yleaf software
- package (v.2.1,(68)) and manual assignment though an in-house script. Results for the 28
- male individuals are provided in Table 6.
- 
- *Biological relatedness*

 Degrees of genetic relatedness between all individuals included in this study were estimated by applying a combination of four methods, TKGWV2, READ (Relationship Estimation from Ancient DNA), lcMLkin and KIN to infer pairwise relationships up to the second and third degree (SI, Section V; (69–72).

## *Statistical exploration of biological relatedness patterns*

 We tested the overall mean relatedness for each Neolithic individual by extracting the pairwise mismatch rate (PWMR) from READ for each pair of individuals. We then calculated the mean PWMR per individual, considering each of the 33 pairs of individuals possible. We also confronted the mean PWMR obtained for all female individuals to the one calculated for all male individuals (Table 8, Figure C15).

## *Population genetic analyses*

 For population genetic analyses, we co-analysed our data with published ancient and modern individuals from Eurasia. To qualitatively explore the genetic variability of our dataset, we conducted a PCA using the HO dataset and the program smartpca (Eigensoft) (73). PCA was constructed based on the genetic variation of 796 modern individuals from Eurasia on which 577 ancient individuals (>10,000 SNPs) were then projected (Isqproject: YES, shrinkmode: YES, Figure 2).

#### *Inbreeding and population size*

 We assessed runs of homozygosity and levels of inbreeding in our samples using the 1000 Genome as a reference panel, calling SNPs for each individual chromosome by chromosome, through hapROH (42). We were able to retrieve data for all our samples (Table 16, SI, Figure C21).

### **Acknowledgement**

 *We thank Olivier Gorgé and the Molecular Biology team of the Département des Plateformes et Recherche Technologique at Institut de Recherche Biomédicale des Armées for processing samples for Next-generation sequencing. We are grateful to the genotoul bioinformatics platform Occitanie (Bioinfo Genotoul, https://doi.org/10.15454/1.5572369328961167E12) for providing help, computing, and storage resources. We thank Wolfgang Haak for discussions and for providing funding for radiocarbon dating. We are grateful to Frédéric Santos at PACEA for discussions and insights into computational analysis.* 

 *We thank Muriel Gandelin and Vincent Ard for discussions regarding archaeological data and cultural background. We thank Etienne Patin at the Institut Pasteur for discussions and insights into computational analysis. The authors are grateful to Dominique Castex, Fanny Mendisco, Juliette Henrion, Eliza Orellana-González as well as other members from PACEA lab for discussions. The authors thank the Service Régional de l'Archéologie Occitanie as well as the Institut National de Recherches Archéologiques Préventives through the PAS ANCESTRA* 

- *(Coord. M. Pruvost and F. Maziere) for granting access to archaeological material.*
- *This project is a part of a PhD Research project carried out at the University of Bordeaux,*
- *supervised by Marie-France Deguilloux and Mélanie Pruvost and funded by the Ministère de*
- *l'Enseignement Supérieur et de la Recherche. Research was conducted in the PACEA lab*
- *(UMR 5199 CNRS). For radiocarbon dating, this study received funding from the PACEA lab*
- *following the ANCOR actions (Actions Nouvelles et COllectives de Recherche).*
- *This project has received funding from the French National Research Agency (ANR) and*
- *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) under both the ANR project ANCESTRA, Grant*
- *ANR15-CE27-0001 coordinated by Mélanie Pruvost and the Franco-German Call in*
- *Humanities and Social Sciences project ANR-DFG INTERACT, grant ANR-17-FRAL-0010,*
- *DFG-HA-5407/4-1, 2018-2023, coordinated by Marie-France Deguilloux and Wolfgang Haak.*
- *This research benefited from the scientific framework of the University of Bordeaux's IdEx*
- *"Investments for the Future" program / GPR "Human Past".*
- 

## **References**

- 1. Duday H. IV Étude des restes humains de la salle sépulcrale IG. Gall Préhistoire. 1976;19(1):215‑20.
- 2. Duday H. Quelques réflexions pour une synthèse au colloque « Grottes et Dolmens :
- relations entre les sépultures collectivesde la fin du Néolithique dans le Sud de la France ».
- Préhistoires Méditerranéennes. 7 déc 2021;(9.2):181‑91.
- 3. Guilaine J. Mégalithes et grottes funéraires. Préhistoires Méditerranéennes. 7 déc 2021;(9.2):11‑20.
- 4. Le Roy M, Recchia-Quiniou J. Approche multidisciplinaire de sépultures collectives en grotte et en dolmen à la fin du Néolithique dans le Languedoc oriental et sud des
- Cévennes. Préhistoires Méditerranéennes. 7 déc 2021;(9.2):97‑118.
- 5. Lee EJ, Renneberg R, Harder M, Krause-Kyora B, Rinne C, Müller J, et al. Collective burials among agro-pastoral societies in later Neolithic Germany: perspectives from ancient DNA. J Archaeol Sci. 1 nov 2014;51:174‑80.
- 6. Furholt M, Müller J. The earliest monuments in Europe architecture and social
- structures (5000-3000 calBC). In: Furholt M, Lüth F, Müller J, éditeurs. Megaliths and
- Identities: Proceedings of the Third European Megalithic Studies Group Meeting. Kiel
- University: Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn; 2011. p. 15‑32.
- 7. Duday H. Contribution des observations ostéologiques à la chronologie interne des sépultures collectives. Anthropol Phys Archaeol. 1987;51‑61.
- 8. Duday H. Organisation et fonctionnement d'une sépulture collective néolithique,

 l'aven de la Boucle à Corconne (Gard). In Toulouse: CNRS edition; 1987. p. 89‑104. 9. Duday H, Cipriani AM, Pearce J. The Archaeology of the Dead: Lectures in Archaeothanatology. Illustrated edition. Oxford Oakville, Conn: Oxbow Books; 2009. 230 p. 10. Jallet F, Duday H, Cours S. Néolithique récent et Néolithique final de l'aven de la Bouche (Corconne, Gard), regards d'archéologues. In: Transitions, Ruptures et Continuité en Préhistoire. Bordeaux-Les Eyzies: Société Préhistorique Française; 2010. 11. Duday H, Demangeot C, Hérouin S. Quelques aspects du fonctionnement des sépultures collectives néolithiques : approches comparées de l'aven de la Boucle à Corconne (Gard) et du dolmen de Peirières à Villedubert (Aude). In: Regroupement des morts Genèse et diversité en archéologie. D. Castex, P. Courtaud, H. Duday, F. Le Mort, A.-M. Tillier. 2011. p. 41‑54. 12. Cours S, Duday H, Vital J. Une occupation du Bronze final 2 dans l'aven de la Boucle à Corconne (Gard). In: Préhistoire de l'espace habité en France du sud, actualité de la recherche,. Valence, Centre d'archéologie préhistorique; 1999. p. 257‑62. 13. Olalde I, Brace S, Allentoft ME, Armit I, Kristiansen K, Booth T, et al. The Beaker phenomenon and the genomic transformation of northwest Europe. Nature. 8 mars 2018;555(7695):190‑6. 14. Olalde I, Mallick S, Patterson N, Rohland N, Villalba-Mouco V, Silva M, et al. The genomic history of the Iberian Peninsula over the past 8000 years. Science. 15 mars 2019;363(6432):1230‑4. 15. Brunel S, Bennett EA, Cardin L, Garraud D, Barrand Emam H, Beylier A, et al. Ancient genomes from present-day France unveil 7,000 years of its demographic history. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 9 juin 2020;117(23):12791‑8. 16. Seguin-Orlando A, Donat R, Der Sarkissian C, Southon J, Thèves C, Manen C, et al. Heterogeneous Hunter-Gatherer and Steppe-Related Ancestries in Late Neolithic and Bell Beaker Genomes from Present-Day France. Curr Biol CB. 8 mars 2021;31(5):1072-1083.e10. 17. Furtwängler A, Rohrlach AB, Lamnidis TC, Papac L, Neumann GU, Siebke I, et al. Ancient genomes reveal social and genetic structure of Late Neolithic Switzerland. Nat Commun. 20 avr 2020;11(1):1915. 18. Arzelier A, Rivollat M, De Belvalet H, Pemonge MH, Binder D, Convertini F, et al. Neolithic genomic data from southern France showcase intensified interactions with hunter- gatherer communities. iScience. 18 nov 2022;25(11):105387. 19. Mathieson I, Alpaslan-Roodenberg S, Posth C, Szécsényi-Nagy A, Rohland N, Mallick S, et al. The genomic history of southeastern Europe. Nature. mars 2018;555(7695):197‑203. 20. Korneliussen TS, Albrechtsen A, Nielsen R. ANGSD: Analysis of Next Generation Sequencing Data. BMC Bioinformatics. 25 nov 2014;15(1):356. 21. Kim IW, Khadilkar AC, Ko EY, Sabanegh ES. 47,XYY Syndrome and Male Infertility. Rev Urol. 2013;15(4):188‑96. 22. Posth C, Renaud G, Mittnik A, Drucker DG, Rougier H, Cupillard C, et al. Pleistocene Mitochondrial Genomes Suggest a Single Major Dispersal of Non-Africans and a Late Glacial Population Turnover in Europe. Curr Biol. mars 2016;26(6):827‑33. 23. Kristjansson D, Bohlin J, Nguyen TT, Jugessur A, Schurr TG. Evolution and dispersal of mitochondrial DNA haplogroup U5 in Northern Europe: insights from an unsupervised learning approach to phylogeography. BMC Genomics. 7 mai 2022;23(1):354. 24. Bramanti B, Thomas MG, Haak W, Unterlaender M, Jores P, Tambets K, et al. Genetic discontinuity between local hunter-gatherers and central Europe's first farmers. Science. 2 oct 2009;326(5949):137‑40. 25. Lacan M, Keyser C, Ricaut FX, Brucato N, Duranthon F, Guilaine J, et al. Ancient DNA reveals male diffusion through the Neolithic Mediterranean route. Proc Natl Acad Sci.

- 14 juin 2011;108(24):9788‑91.
- 26. Rivollat M, Jeong C, Schiffels S, Küçükkalıpçı İ, Pemonge MH, Rohrlach AB, et al. Ancient genome-wide DNA from France highlights the complexity of interactions between
- Mesolithic hunter-gatherers and Neolithic farmers. Sci Adv. 29 mai 2020;6(22):eaaz5344.
- 27. Haak W, Lazaridis I, Patterson N, Rohland N, Mallick S, Llamas B, et al. Massive
- migration from the steppe was a source for Indo-European languages in Europe. Nature. 11 juin 2015;522(7555):207‑11.
- 28. Mathieson I, Lazaridis I, Rohland N, Mallick S, Patterson N, Roodenberg SA, et al.

## Genome-wide patterns of selection in 230 ancient Eurasians. Nature. 24 déc

- 2015;528(7583):499‑503.
- 29. Lipson M, Szécsényi-Nagy A, Mallick S, Pósa A, Stégmár B, Keerl V, et al. Parallel palaeogenomic transects reveal complex genetic history of early European farmers. Nature. nov 2017;551(7680):368‑72.
- 30. Gamba C, Jones ER, Teasdale MD, McLaughlin RL, Gonzalez-Fortes G, Mattiangeli
- V, et al. Genome flux and stasis in a five millennium transect of European prehistory. Nat Commun. déc 2014;5(1):5257.
- 31. Villalba-Mouco V, Oliart C, Rihuete-Herrada C, Childebayeva A, Rohrlach AB,
- Fregeiro MI, et al. Genomic transformation and social organization during the Copper Age-
- Bronze Age transition in southern Iberia. Sci Adv. 19 nov 2021;7(47):eabi7038.
- 32. Villalba-Mouco V, van de Loosdrecht MS, Posth C, Mora R, Martínez-Moreno J,
- Rojo-Guerra M, et al. Survival of Late Pleistocene Hunter-Gatherer Ancestry in the Iberian Peninsula. Curr Biol CB. 1 avr 2019;29(7):1169-1177.e7.
- 33. Valdiosera C, Günther T, Vera-Rodríguez JC, Ureña I, Iriarte E, Rodríguez-Varela R,
- et al. Four millennia of Iberian biomolecular prehistory illustrate the impact of prehistoric
- 709 migrations at the far end of Eurasia. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 27 mars 2018;115(13):3428-33.
- 34. Antonio ML, Gao Z, Moots HM, Lucci M, Candilio F, Sawyer S, et al. Ancient Rome: A genetic crossroads of Europe and the Mediterranean. Science. 8 nov
- 2019;366(6466):708‑14.
- 35. Rivollat M, Thomas A, Ghesquière E, Rohrlach AB, Späth E, Pemonge MH, et al.
- Ancient DNA gives new insights into a Norman Neolithic monumental cemetery dedicated to male elites. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 3 mai 2022;119(18):e2120786119.
- 36. Jallot L, Gutherz X. Le Néolithique final en Languedoc oriental et ses marges : 20 ans après Ambérieu-en-Bugey. 2014.
- 37. Patterson N, Isakov M, Booth T, Büster L, Fischer CE, Olalde I, et al. Large-scale
- migration into Britain during the Middle to Late Bronze Age. Nature. janv
- 2022;601(7894):588‑94.
- 38. Posth C, Yu H, Ghalichi A, Rougier H, Crevecoeur I, Huang Y, et al. Palaeogenomics
- of Upper Palaeolithic to Neolithic European hunter-gatherers. Nature. mars
- 2023;615(7950):117‑26.
- 39. Fernandes DM, Mittnik A, Olalde I, Lazaridis I, Cheronet O, Rohland N, et al. The
- spread of steppe and Iranian-related ancestry in the islands of the western Mediterranean. Nat 726 Ecol Evol. mars 2020;4(3):334-45.
- 40. Fischer CE, Pemonge MH, Ducoussau I, Arzelier A, Rivollat M, Santos F, et al.
- Origin and mobility of Iron Age Gaulish groups in present-day France revealed through
- archaeogenomics. iScience. 15 avr 2022;25(4).
- 41. Rivollat M, Rohrlach AB, Ringbauer H, Childebayeva A, Mendisco F, Barquera R, et
- al. Extensive pedigrees reveal the social organization of a Neolithic community. Nature. août 2023;620(7974):600‑6.
- 42. Ringbauer H, Novembre J, Steinrücken M. Parental relatedness through time revealed by runs of homozygosity in ancient DNA. Nat Commun. 14 sept 2021;12(1):5425.
- 43. Publications related to Chronomodel [Internet]. [cité 5 avr 2024]. Disponible sur:
- https://chronomodel.com/chronomodel-publications-archaeology-bayesian-statistics
- 44. Binder D, Lanos P, Angeli L, Gomart L, Guilaine J, Manen C, et al. Modelling the earliest north-western dispersal of Mediterranean Impressed Wares: New dates and Bayesian chronological model. Doc Praehist. 1 déc 2017;44.
- 45. Adams R. The Megalithic Tradition of West Sumba.
- 46. Molet L. M. Bloch, Placing the Dead. Tombs, Ancestral Villages and Kinship
- Organization in Madagascar. Homme. 1972;12(3):146‑9.
- 47. Graeber D. dancing with corpses reconsidered: an interpretation of famadihana (in
- Arivonimamo, Madagascar). Am Ethnol. 1995;22(2):258‑78.
- 48. Pearson MP, Regnier D. Collective and single burial in Madagascar.
- 49. Godelier M. Métamorphoses de la parenté. MW Books; 1995.
- 50. Sánchez-Quinto F, Malmström H, Fraser M, Girdland-Flink L, Svensson EM, Simões
- LG, et al. Megalithic tombs in western and northern Neolithic Europe were linked to a
- 749 kindred society. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 7 mai 2019;116(19):9469-74.
- 51. Elliott E, Saupe T, Thompson JE, Robb JE, Scheib CL. Sex bias in Neolithic
- megalithic burials. Am J Biol Anthropol. 2023;180(1):196‑206.
- 52. Ensor B. The not very patrilocal European neolithic strontium, aDNA, and
- archaeological kinship analyses. 2021. 252 p. (Archaeopress Archaeology).
- 53. Lanos P, Dufresne P. ChronoModel version 2.0. 2019.
- 54. Pinhasi R, Fernandes D, Sirak K, Novak M, Connell S, Alpaslan-Roodenberg S, et al.

 Optimal Ancient DNA Yields from the Inner Ear Part of the Human Petrous Bone. Petraglia MD, éditeur. PLOS ONE. 18 juin 2015;10(6):e0129102.

- 55. Gorgé O, Bennett EA, Massilani D, Daligault J, Pruvost M, Geigl EM, et al. Analysis
- of Ancient DNA in Microbial Ecology. Methods Mol Biol Clifton NJ. 2016;1399:289‑315.
- 56. Rohland N, Harney E, Mallick S, Nordenfelt S, Reich D. Partial uracil-DNA-
- glycosylase treatment for screening of ancient DNA. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci. 19 janv 2015;370(1660):20130624.
- 57. Peltzer A, Jäger G, Herbig A, Seitz A, Kniep C, Krause J, et al. EAGER: efficient ancient genome reconstruction. Genome Biol. 31 mars 2016;17(1):60.
- 58. Li H, Durbin R. Fast and accurate short read alignment with Burrows-Wheeler transform. Bioinforma Oxf Engl. 15 juill 2009;25(14):1754‑60.
- 59. Schubert M, Lindgreen S, Orlando L. AdapterRemoval v2: rapid adapter trimming, identification, and read merging. BMC Res Notes. 12 févr 2016;9(1):88.
- 60. Ginolhac A, Rasmussen M, Gilbert MTP, Willerslev E, Orlando L. mapDamage:
- testing for damage patterns in ancient DNA sequences. Bioinformatics. 1 août
- 2011;27(15):2153‑5.
- 61. Lazaridis I, Nadel D, Rollefson G, Merrett DC, Rohland N, Mallick S, et al. Genomic
- insights into the origin of farming in the ancient Near East. Nature. 25 août
- 2016;536(7617):419‑24.
- 62. Patterson N, Moorjani P, Luo Y, Mallick S, Rohland N, Zhan Y, et al. Ancient Admixture in Human History. Genetics. 1 nov 2012;192(3):1065‑93.
- 63. Nielsen R, Paul JS, Albrechtsen A, Song YS. Genotype and SNP calling from next-
- 778 generation sequencing data. Nat Rev Genet. juin 2011;12(6):443-51.
- 64. Skoglund P, Storå J, Götherström A, Jakobsson M. Accurate sex identification of
- ancient human remains using DNA shotgun sequencing. J Archaeol Sci. déc
- 2013;40(12):4477‑82.
- 65. Mittnik A, Wang CC, Svoboda J, Krause J. A Molecular Approach to the Sexing of
- the Triple Burial at the Upper Paleolithic Site of Dolní Věstonice. Calafell F, éditeur. PLOS
- 784 ONE. 5 oct 2016;11(10):e0163019.
- 66. Navarro-Gomez D, Leipzig J, Shen L, Lott M, Stassen A, Wallace D, et al. Phy-Mer: a
- novel alignment-free and reference-independent mitochondrial haplogroup classifier.
- 787 Bioinformatics. 2015;31(8):1310-2.
- 67. Weissensteiner H, Pacher D, Kloss-Brandstätter A, Forer L, Specht G, Bandelt HJ, et
- al. HaploGrep 2: mitochondrial haplogroup classification in the era of high-throughput
- sequencing. Nucleic Acids Res. 8 juill 2016;44(W1):W58-63.
- 68. Ralf A, Montiel González D, Zhong K, Kayser M. Yleaf: Software for Human Y-
- Chromosomal Haplogroup Inference from Next-Generation Sequencing Data. Mol Biol Evol. 793 1 mai 2018;35(5):1291-4.
- 69. Lipatov M, Sanjeev K, Patro R, Veeramah KR. Maximum Likelihood Estimation of
- Biological Relatedness from Low Coverage Sequencing Data. bioRxiv; 2015. p. 023374.
- 70. Monroy Kuhn JM, Jakobsson M, Günther T. Estimating genetic kin relationships in prehistoric populations. PloS One. 2018;13(4):e0195491.
- 71. Fernandes DM, Cheronet O, Gelabert P, Pinhasi R. TKGWV2: an ancient DNA
- relatedness pipeline for ultra-low coverage whole genome shotgun data. Sci Rep. 28 oct 2021;11(1):21262.
- 72. Popli D, Peyrégne S, Peter BM. KIN: a method to infer relatedness from low-coverage ancient DNA. Genome Biol. 17 janv 2023;24(1):10.
- 73. Patterson N, Price AL, Reich D. Population Structure and Eigenanalysis. PLOS Genet. 22 déc 2006;2(12):e190.
-