***GNOSI:* An Interdisciplinary Journal of Human Theory and Praxis**
Volume 8, Issue 2, March (Special Issue), 2025
ISSN (Online): 2714-2485

The Moral and Legal Status of the Dead: A Philosophical Inquiry into Personhood, Dignity, and Posthumous Rights

Samuel Akpan BASSEY
Department of Philosophy,
University of Calabar,
Calabar, Cross River State, Nigeria
Email: samuelbassey15@yahoo.com

Joseph Nkang OGAR
Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy,
University of Calabar,
Calabar, Cross River State, Nigeria
Email: nkangjoseph@yahoo.com

(**Received**: January-2025; **Accepted**: January -2025; Available **Online**: March-2025)

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the concept of personhood and the right to dignity in relation to the dead, situating itself within the field of Philosophical Thanatology—the study of death and dying from a philosophical perspective. Drawing on interdisciplinary frameworks, including legal, anthropological, psychological, and African philosophical traditions, the paper examines the tripartite relationship between death, personhood, and the body. It investigates whether the dead can be accorded rights, particularly the right to dignity, and interrogates the philosophical and legal tensions surrounding this question. The methodology involves a critical analysis of case studies, legal precedents, and philosophical theories, juxtaposing Western dualistic frameworks with African communal conceptions of personhood. Key cases, such as necrophilia trials in the United States and rulings by the Allahabad High Court in India, are examined to highlight the legal and ethical challenges of defining personhood post-mortem. The paper also incorporates African philosophical traditions, particularly the concept of Ubuntu, to offer a relational and holistic understanding of personhood that extends beyond physical death. The findings reveal that the concept of personhood is not static but varies across cultural and legal contexts. While Western legal systems often struggle to reconcile the rights of the dead with rational frameworks, African philosophies emphasize the continuity of personhood through communal and ancestral connections. The paper argues that the dignity of the dead is not solely contingent on the concept of personhood but is also rooted in cultural, emotional, and moral considerations.

Keywords: Philosophical Thanatology; Personhood; Dignity of the Dead; African Philosophy.

INTRODUCTION

The discourse on death and the re-examination of "personhood" in the context of the living often centers on the question of whether human dignity can be extended to the dead. Human beings are inherently composed of two integral elements: the tangible body and the intangible soul or mind. While the soul or mind is frequently emphasized in philosophical and theological discussions, the body remains an equally essential component of human identity. However, the legal domain often grapples with controversies surrounding the concept of personhood as it pertains to the dead, whether in relation to the body or other physical remains.

The objective of this discourse is to examine the beliefs, customs, moral frameworks, and societal norms that inform the study of personhood, particularly in relation to the dead. It seeks to explore whether the concept of personhood is confined solely to the living or whether it can be extended to the deceased. Often, existing conceptual frameworks prove too narrow to accommodate evolving moral, ethical, and societal standards, particularly in light of advancements in science and technology. This work will critically analyze the shifting perspectives on the "body" and "personhood" in relation to the dead.

Specifically, it will address the following questions: What constitutes a "person"? What roles do the tangible (body) and intangible (soul/mind) elements play in asserting personhood and the right to dignity? Additionally, it will explore how legal and philosophical arenas are addressing these complex issues.

PERSON AND THE BODY IN THE ASSERTION OF "PERSONHOOD"

In Nigeria, the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999 (as amended), provides a framework for understanding the rights and dignity of individuals, including the deceased. Section 34(1) of the Constitution explicitly guarantees the right to dignity of the human person, stating that "every individual is entitled to respect for the dignity of his person." While this provision primarily addresses the living, its principles have been interpreted to extend to the dead in certain legal and cultural contexts.

For instance, Nigerian courts have recognized the importance of respecting the dead as a reflection of societal values and cultural practices. The dead, though no longer living, are often regarded as deserving of dignity and respect, particularly in light of their prior existence as persons. This raises the question of whether the "dead body" and the "person" are one and the same. Historically, dualistic philosophies and theological frameworks have prioritized the soul or mind over the body, relegating the latter to a secondary status as merely the vessel for the soul. However, Nigerian legal and cultural practices that confer dignity upon the dead body challenge this dualistic paradigm. These practices suggest that the body holds significant importance in the conceptualization of personhood.

Thus, the following questions emerge: (1) What constitutes a "person"? (2) What role does the human body play in establishing identity as a person? These questions are central to understanding the interplay between the tangible and intangible aspects of personhood and the implications for the dignity of the dead.

What Makes a Human Being a Person?

Ernest Becker, in his seminal work *The Birth and Death of Meaning*, posits that language plays a pivotal role in "making man quintessentially human" (Becker, 1962, p. 26). Becker's conception of the "human" is deeply influenced by Freud's theory of the "ego," which he argues distinguishes humans from all other animals. Becker asserts that while the "id" is present in all animals, it is the "ego" that is uniquely human, enabling individuals to control the reactive impulses of the id. He writes, "Without an ego, the animal exists in timelessness, unable to place itself with precision in a world of sensation.

Only humans know death because the ego fixes time" (Becker, 1962, p. 28). This observation underscores the human capacity to perceive time as a linear progression of past, present, and future—a trait Becker describes as "time-binding."

While some critics may argue that animals also possess a sense of time and sensation, this debate lies beyond the scope of this research. Becker's central argument is that humans are uniquely defined by their ability to situate themselves within a "time-stream" and evaluate their existence within this framework. This capacity for temporal awareness is a defining feature of human beings, setting them apart from other species. The human experience is not limited to mere survival and reproduction, as a Darwinian perspective might suggest. Instead, humans seek meaning, enhancement, and fulfillment beyond basic needs. This pursuit arises from the acute sense of the "I," which exists within the temporal framework of past, present, and future. The "I" is often described as the "precise designation of oneself," serving as both a personal and social symbol of identity. Psychiatrist Harry Stack Sullivan defined the "I" as a verbal construct designed to conciliate the environment and mitigate anxiety. According to Sullivan, the "I" constructs a world where "everything friendly is initially referred to the 'me'; everything hostile to the alien 'not-me"(Sullivan, 1953, p. 17).

This raises the question: Can we truly know ourselves directly? Roderick Milton Chisholm, in *Person and Object: A Metaphysical Study*, argues that direct self-knowledge is possible through the awareness of "self-presenting" propositions. Alexius Meinong explains that a proposition is self-presenting if it is both true and necessarily true. For example, the statement "I see a monastery" is self-presenting because it reflects a direct experience that is evident to the individual. Chisholm elaborates that such propositions reveal one's mental states, such as thoughts and emotions, and that knowing these states directly equates to knowing oneself directly (Chisholm, 1976, p. 25).

Chisholm further introduces the concept of the "individual essence" or *haecceity*, which refers to the unique property of being oneself. This property is exclusive to the individual and cannot be shared with anything else. It is this essence that defines personhood. The "I," as Sullivan describes it, is a "verbal edifice" that serves as the cornerstone of personhood. Speech, therefore, becomes the medium through which the "I" is asserted, as it establishes a connection between the individual and their ego. Becker emphasizes that the formation of the "I" is inherently relational, emerging in the context of other "I"s. He writes, "The pronoun 'I' and the personal name exist in a world of other 'I's and other names... The 'I' can take form only in relation to those around it; the individual exists to focus his own powers and act in the surrounding world" (Becker, 1962, p. 30). This relational aspect of the "I" underscores its role as the focal point for the birth of values and meaning. However, the recognition of the self, both in oneself and others, presupposes the objectification of the self. This process of self-objectification allows individuals to conceptualize themselves as distinct entities, capable of reflecting on their experiences. Becker notes, "Man is the only animal—in the universe, for all we know—who sees himself as an object, who can dwell on his own experiences and on his fate" (Becker, 1962, p. 37). This capacity for self-reflection is central to human consciousness and identity.

The relationship between the mind and the body has long been a subject of philosophical debate. While some argue for the supremacy of the mind over the body, others contend that the two are inseparable. The mind-body dualism posits that the body is merely a vessel for the mind, but this view is challenged by the recognition that the body plays a crucial role in shaping personal identity. For instance, in states of unconsciousness, coma, or death, the absence of the "I" renders the body inactive, raising questions about the interdependence of the mind and body.

Immanuel Kant observed that self-recognition begins with the object pronoun "me" before transitioning to the subject pronoun "I." This linguistic shift reflects the developmental process through which individuals come to recognize themselves as both objects and agents (Tagini & Raffone, 2010). Kant's insight highlights the importance of the body in the formation of self-awareness, as the infant's recognition of its body through interaction with others lays the foundation for the emergence of the "I."

The concept of personhood is deeply intertwined with the interplay between the mind and body. The "I" serves as the locus of self-awareness and identity, while the body provides the physical framework through which this identity is expressed. As Vere Chappell notes, "A necessary condition of our being able to distinguish persons as objects in the world… is that they be uniquely and variably associated with identifiable physical objects, in this case human bodies" (Chisholm, 1976, p. 26). Thus, any analysis of personhood must consider both the intangible "I" and the tangible body as inseparable components of human identity.

The Body In Relation To the Concept of Personhood

What role does the human body play in establishing identity as a "person"? Recognizing the "person" in others is a fundamental aspect of personhood, and the first point of contact with another is invariably the body. Vere Chappell's analysis of the relationship between the concept of "person" and the human body is particularly significant. Historically, philosophy and religion have elevated the mind or soul above the body, relegating the latter to the role of a mere vessel. Cartesian dualism and religious interpretations of the mind-body relationship have often dismissed the body as insignificant in the formation of personhood, treating it as a passive container for the soul or mind. As Meredith B. McGuire observes, "Our discipline has been impoverished by the fact that it has been so heavily influenced by an epistemological tradition, itself a cultural and historical construction, in which things of the spirit have been radically split from the material things, and in which mind is considered separate from body" (McGuire, 1990, p. 284).

However, in recent decades, interdisciplinary studies in medicine, psychology, anthropology, and philosophy have begun to re-evaluate the body's role in shaping society and personhood. The body is no longer seen as a mere vessel but as a dynamic entity that can be studied through the lenses of gender, society, war, illness, pain, pleasure, and politics. Each of these perspectives reveals new dimensions of the body, enriching our understanding of its significance. For the purposes of this research, the body in question is one that remains integral to a person's identity even after death.

Traditionally, discourse on the mind and body has privileged the mind over the body, but contemporary scholars have challenged this dualistic framework. McGuire argues that the body is both a biological and cultural construct, stating that "the living body is our fundamental phenomenological basis for apprehending self and society" (McGuire, 1990, p. 283). Similarly, Nancy Scheper-Hughes (2011) describes the human body as a "mindful body," rejecting the notion that it is merely a container for the mind or soul. These perspectives emphasize the body's active role in shaping identity and experience.

Yet, these discussions primarily concern the "living body." The relationship between the body and the "I" or "we" after death remains underexplored. Upon death, the tangible identity of the "I" dissipates, and the "real body" loses its vitality. This raises questions about the continuity of personhood and the body's role in posthumous identity. Vere Chappell's assertion that "a necessary condition of our being able to distinguish persons as objects in the world, and so to refer to and identify them as such, is that they be uniquely and variably associated with identifiable physical objects, in this case human

bodies" (Chappell, 1994, p. 26) provides a useful framework for examining the relationship between the living body and the dead body.

Before delving into this relationship, it is essential to explore the concept of the body itself. Our recognition of possessing a body arises from our perception of events occurring within and to our bodies, as well as the bodies of others. Immanuel Kant's analysis of human development, which traces the progression from "me" to "I," can be extended to the realization that "I am a body" and "I have a body." This dual awareness emerges through experiences such as illness, injury, or the loss of bodily function, which not only highlight the body's fragility but also situate the individual within the temporal framework of past, present, and future.

McGuire notes that the subjective experience of the body is transformed in moments of pain or suffering, leading to a form of alienation from one's own body. He quotes Bergsma: "In one moment one is one's body; [in] the next one has a body" (McGuire, 1990, p. 285). This duality reflects the complex relationship between the "I" and the body, where pain and suffering are not confined to the physical body but are experienced as assaults on the self. Consequently, psychologists and philosophers often associate a person's well-being with the interplay of social, emotional, and bodily experiences.

A Cartesian approach to pain and suffering treats the body as subordinate to the mind, framing bodily suffering as an epiphenomenal response. McGuire critiques this perspective, arguing that it has shaped a sociology of religion focused on the "idea of the body and its suffering" rather than the lived experience of the body (McGuire, 1990, p. 287). Religions and Cartesian philosophy often view the body as a "mindful body," directing spiritual responses to the mind or soul rather than the body itself. This disembodied approach neglects the body's reality and lived experience, treating it as an abstract idea rather than a tangible entity.

From the perspective of this research, which asks, "Can dead people have rights?" the focus is on the body as an embodied phenomenon of experience and thought. The body, whether living or dead, is central to the concept of personhood. Its role in shaping identity, both in life and after death, challenges traditional dualistic frameworks and calls for a more integrated understanding of the mind-body relationship.

The Body as a Socio-Cultural Construct

Modern discourse on the "body" is deeply rooted in interdisciplinary studies that explore the relationship between society and the body. Michel Foucault stands out as a pivotal figure in this philosophical inquiry, particularly through his analysis of the body in the context of biomedical advancements in the 20th century. Foucault's work has significantly contributed to the reimagining of the body as a complex entity shaped by power structures and societal norms. His investigations, influenced by developmental biologists like Waddington and a liberal-Marxist understanding of power dynamics, have provided a comprehensive framework for understanding the body as both a cultural and social construct (Armstrong, 1983, p. 17).

Foucault's analysis, alongside the contributions of thinkers like Becker, McGuire, and Waddington, highlights the body as an object of medical and social intervention. Waddington, for instance, examined the body through the lens of the doctor-patient relationship and the evolution of modern medicine and clinics. This perspective not only redefined the body as an object that can be constructed and manipulated but also introduced the idea of power as a central force in shaping the body's socio-cultural significance.

The body, in this context, is not merely a physical entity but also a social object. Social constructivism posits that social objects, including the body, are "constructed through perception." As David Armstrong explains in *Bodies of Knowledge/Knowledge*

of Bodies, "Constructivism is not a solipsistic position because its core tenet is that these perceptions are patterned by and through social forms" (Armstrong, 1983, p. 22). This perspective challenges the notion that the body exists as a universally accepted physical object, instead arguing that the body is a concept created and invented through socio-cultural perceptions.

The evolution of the concept of the body can be traced through three distinct stages:

1. **Cartesian Dualism**: The mind/soul is prioritized over the body, which is seen as a mere container.
2. **Anthropological Approach**: The body is viewed as an embodied entity that integrates the "I" (ego) and experiences to form the concept of a "person."
3. **Social Constructivism**: The body is understood as a social object or concept constructed, created, and invented through socio-cultural perceptions.

While these stages represent a transition in thought, they also reveal a conflict in approaches to understanding the body. The anthropological perspective, which emphasizes the integrity of the body as an embodied entity, struggles to reconcile with the social constructivist view that the body is a recent invention shaped by perception. This tension underscores the complexity of the body as a subject of study.

It is important to note that multiple theories about the same concept, such as the body, do not necessarily have to be approached as conflicting. However, adherents of Cartesian dualism may find it challenging to accept modern anthropological or social constructivist theories. The anthropological approach represents a shift from religious and dualistic frameworks, driven by changes in societal perspectives and advancements in various disciplines. Yet, it is possible to interpret the anthropological approach as a development within the broader framework of social constructivism. While integrating these approaches under the umbrella of social constructivism is tempting, doing so risks trivializing both social constructivism and other modern anthropological theories that treat the body as a complete entity. Earlier, I aligned with the idea that the body is an embodied entity encompassing the "I" and its experiences, forming the basis of personhood. However, if we adopt the social constructivist view that the body is "created, fabricated, or invented" through perception, we must consider the implications of this perspective on our understanding of personhood.

Does viewing the body as a socially constructed object alter our perception of personhood? If the body is a product of socio-cultural perceptions, how does this influence our recognition of the "person" in others and ourselves? These questions highlight the need for a nuanced approach that acknowledges the body's dual role as both an embodied entity and a socio-cultural construct.

Right to Dignity of the Dead

The question, "Can dead people have rights?" must be approached from multiple perspectives, with "death," "personhood," and the "body" serving as its tripartite points of reference. Additionally, it is essential to examine whether this question is legitimate or inherently paradoxical. The term "dead person" is a linguistic construct lacking tangible legitimacy, particularly when viewed through the lens of dualistic theories that separate the mind/soul from the body. However, contemporary sociological, anthropological, psychological, and philosophical studies have redefined the body as integral to the concept of personhood, challenging the notion that the body is merely an illusory semblance of the person.

The dead body serves as the primary point of reference for legal systems when addressing issues involving the deceased. However, complications arise when a corpse is unavailable. This raises two critical questions: (1) What can be accorded dignity in the absence of a corpse? (2) Can an absent entity (i.e., a body) be subjected to or protected

from violation? At first glance, one might argue that dignity does not require a physical body, as aspects such as a person's will, memory, and works can be honored posthumously. For instance, posthumous awards and recognitions exemplify this principle. However, this line of reasoning circles back to the age-old debate: What constitutes a "person" deserving of dignity? Moreover, is the concept of "personhood" a prerequisite for rights, such as the right to dignity?

To address the central question of this thesis, "Can dead people have rights?" several related queries must be explored:

1. Does a person retain rights over their body or remains after death?
2. Who holds rights over a corpse in the absence of immediate family, relatives, or friends?
3. If someone can claim rights over a dead body, does this imply ownership akin to possessing a house, land, or other property?
4. In cases of violation or protection of a dead body, what entity or aspect is being violated or protected?

These questions are crucial for understanding the intersection of rights, personhood, and the body. To analyze these issues, we will examine specific cases and legal precedents.

Dignity of the Body

In 1995, a case in California highlighted the complexities surrounding the dignity of the dead. Two men broke into the Forest Lawn Memorial Park mortuary in Hollywood Hills and engaged in sexual acts with female corpses. While the men were charged with burglary, they faced no legal consequences for necrophilia, as it was not criminalized in California at the time. Tyler Trent Ochoa and Christine Newman Jones, in their article *Defiling the Dead: Necrophilia and the Law*, noted that societal outrage over necrophilia is understandable, yet the legal system often fails to address such acts (Ochoa & Jones, 1997).

This case raises fundamental questions about the dignity of the dead. Why should society be outraged by acts committed on a corpse? While the immediate response might invoke the "essence and dignity of personhood," it is unclear what form of personhood a corpse retains. The California legal system's indifference to necrophilia reflects a lack of conceptualization of a corpse's modesty or dignity. Technically, a corpse cannot experience violation, yet society seeks to protect both the bodily dignity and the personhood of the deceased.

Historically, human societies have placed great value on protecting the dead. Funeral customs across cultures and time periods reflect a belief that the dead have not entirely ceased to exist. This belief may stem from humanity's struggle to accept the inevitability of death, as well as a desire to impose order in the face of dystopia. The dead body, as the most tangible remnant of a person, serves as a focal point for this protective impulse. However, from a rational perspective, a dead body cannot comprehend or experience harm, complicating the justification for its protection.

In the United States, necrophilia is often not recognized as a crime that dishonors the dead. For example, in *People v. Kelly* (1992), the California Supreme Court ruled that a dead body cannot be raped, as rape requires a living victim capable of consent or resistance. Similarly, in *People v. Thompson* (1993), the court held that intent to engage in sexual acts with a corpse does not constitute rape or attempted rape. These rulings underscore the legal system's struggle to reconcile the concept of personhood with the physical reality of a corpse.

In India, necrophilia is addressed under Section 297 (trespassing on burial places) and Section 377 (unnatural sex) of the Indian Penal Code. However, these laws are limited in scope and do not fully address the ethical and societal implications of

necrophilia. John Troyer, Deputy Director of the Centre for Death and Society at the University of Bath, observes that dead bodies are often treated as "quasi-subjects" or property under the law, rather than as persons. This legal framework reduces acts like necrophilia to vandalism, rather than violations of personhood (Troyer, 2010).

The treatment of corpses as property raises further questions about rights and ownership. If a corpse is considered the property of the next of kin, does this objectify the deceased and strip them of their personhood? This perspective conflicts with the societal and cultural reverence for the dead, which views the body as sacred and deserving of dignity. Ultimately, the question of whether dead people can have rights hinges on the concept of personhood. Is personhood a prerequisite for rights, or can dignity be extended to the dead independent of personhood? This question remains unresolved, reflecting the ongoing tension between legal, philosophical, and societal perspectives on death, the body, and identity.

CONCEPT OF PERSONHOOD AND RIGHT TO DIGNITY

Is the concept of "personhood" or the status of being a "person" necessary for according rights, particularly to the dead? This question lies at the heart of legal and philosophical debates concerning human rights. Jens David Ohlin, in *Is the Concept of Person Necessary for Human Rights*, paraphrases W.V. Quine, who argued that words possess only as much precision as our current needs demand, and seeking greater precision where none exists is futile. Quine further stated, "To seek what is 'logically required' for sameness of person under unprecedented circumstances is to suggest that words have some logical force beyond what our past needs have invested them with" (Quine, 1976, p. 12). The concept of "person" has entered legal discourse in contentious cases, often requiring the extension of existing frameworks to accommodate new ideas.

The term "person" is uncontroversial in everyday usage when referring to living individuals. However, it becomes contentious in cases involving the dead, brain-dead patients, the mentally ill, children, and fetuses. Should "person" be treated as an umbrella concept encompassing a wide range of entities, or is it a more narrowly defined term? This question is particularly relevant in legal disputes, such as those involving necrophilia, which expose the tensions within the concept of personhood.

Distinguishing between persons and non-persons is straightforward in everyday language but becomes complicated in legal and philosophical contexts. Jens David Ohlin describes "personhood" as a "cluster of ideas," including consciousness, rationality, and biological existence. This cluster functions as an umbrella term until its component ideas come into conflict, as seen in cases involving the dead or brain-dead individuals. For example, while a brain-dead patient may lack psychological or rational agency, their biological existence persists, raising questions about their status as a "person."

The Allahabad High Court, in a 2009 ruling, argued that the term "person" should not be narrowly construed to exclude the dead, emphasizing that the deceased deserve dignity akin to the living. In contrast, the California Supreme Court, in cases like *People v. Kelly* (1992), ruled that a dead body cannot be raped because it lacks the capacity for feelings or outrage. These conflicting interpretations highlight the difficulty of applying the concept of personhood uniformly across different contexts. Ohlin suggests that personhood can also be understood as a normative concept, where the ascription of personhood acknowledges an entity as the object of social, moral, and legal concern. Under this framework, an entity is not granted rights because it is a "person"; rather, it is considered a "person" because it is granted rights. This approach, however, risks reducing personhood to a mere placeholder for moral or legal concern, stripping it of intrinsic significance.

Derek Parfit's "Argument from Below" offers another perspective. Parfit argues that concepts like "personhood" are derived from "lower-level facts," such as being a biological human, a rational agent, or possessing unity of consciousness. According to this view, the concept of personhood is a conceptual fact rather than an intrinsically important idea. For example, a brain-dead patient, while lacking rational agency, remains a biological human, thus retaining their status as a person.

Applying these frameworks to the dead reveals further complexities. The phrase "dead person" is linguistically problematic, as it conflates two contradictory states. Yet, societal and cultural norms often treat the dead with reverence, attributing to them a form of personhood. This raises the question: If personhood is not the basis for rights, what justifies the protection of the dead? John Troyer's observation that dead bodies are often treated as "quasi-subjects" or property under the law underscores the tension between legal rationality and societal emotions. The sacredness and emotions attached to the dead, as highlighted by Ochoa and Jones, suggest that the basis for protecting the dead lies beyond the concept of personhood. Instead, it may stem from cultural, emotional, and moral considerations that transcend legal definitions.

THE CONCEPT OF PERSONHOOD AND THE RIGHT TO DIGNITY

Is the concept of "personhood" or the status of being a "person" necessary for according someone (in this case, a "dead" individual) rights? The concept of "person" is central to legal debates concerning human rights. Jens David Ohlin, in his work *Is the Concept of Person Necessary for Human Rights*, paraphrases W.V. Quine, who once noted that words possess only as much precision as our current needs require, and it is futile to seek greater precision where none exists. Any attempt to find such precision inevitably dissolves into legislation—essentially, a decision. In his work *Identity and Individuation*, Quine wrote, "To seek what is 'logically required' for sameness of person under unprecedented circumstances is to suggest that words have some logical force beyond what our past needs have invested them with." The concept of "person" has entered legal discourse in contentious cases. However, the role of law is not only to resolve disputes but also to expand the scope of existing concepts to accommodate new ideas when appropriate. A legal issue such as necrophilia (its conceptualization and criminalization) highlights the inherent tension within the concept of "personhood."

The term "person" is generally uncontroversial in everyday usage when referring to "individuals who are incontrovertibly persons," such as you and me. However, as previously mentioned, the concept becomes contentious not only in the case of "dead persons" but also in cases involving brain-dead individuals, mentally ill patients, children, and fetuses. Should the term "person" be treated as an umbrella concept encompassing a broader range of ideas and extensions within its scope? How challenging is it to distinguish between persons and non-persons? In everyday language, we easily differentiate persons from non-persons. However, the complexities within the concept of "person" become apparent during legal disputes concerning the legitimate or illegitimate extension of such concepts to other ideas. There is a tendency to use the term "person" as a "cluster of ideas" (as termed by Jens David Ohlin), ranging from consciousness and bodily existence to agency. The tension within the concept is most evident in legal issues concerning rights. As observed earlier, the term "person" functions as a "cluster of ideas" or an umbrella term until the ideas it encompasses come into conflict with one another or with our beliefs and notions about these concepts. This umbrella term, "person," can be broken down into its component ideas, each of which can be applied depending on the context. For example, at times, "person" may refer to a rational agent, at other times to a biological human being, and sometimes to the continuation of consciousness. However, as seen in cases like necrophilia, even when we can separate these component ideas based

on their applicability, we still struggle to reconcile the concept of "person" with our understanding of a dead body or dead person and its supposed right to dignity. Our beliefs about the dead and our rationality regarding death test the resilience of the term.

Ultimately, the concept of "person" must be treated as a "cluster of ideas," and legal controversies often arise when these component ideas conflict with one another or with our beliefs and rationality. To address whether the concept of "personhood" is essential for rights, let us break down its components. Consider the component idea of "human being." One would notice that not only is the umbrella term "person/personhood" vague, but its component ideas are equally ambiguous. What do we associate with the biological term "human being"? Perhaps the human body and all the intricate elements that constitute this biological species in a purely physical sense. Imagine a scenario where a limb is amputated and replaced with a new one. Further, with advancements in stem cell technology (though banned in the United States), an entire body could potentially be replaced. The question then arises: Are we dealing with the same body as before the amputation or replacement? It is in such marginal cases that the component concepts begin to disintegrate. The issue here is not our linguistic competence but the inability of the concept to sustain itself in such borderline situations. Thus, like the umbrella term "person/personhood," its component ideas also suffer from vagueness in marginal cases.

As previously mentioned, the Allahabad High Court ruled that the term "person" cannot be narrowly construed to exclude the dead. The dead, who were once living persons, must be treated with the same dignity they would have received while alive. Conversely, the California Supreme Court, in cases involving necrophilia, stated that acts such as rape require a living person, as a dead body cannot feel outrage. Therefore, sexual acts with a dead body cannot be classified as rape or attempted rape. In such cases, we find ourselves at a crossroads, where our "feelings of sacredness" toward the dead are outraged by the law's inability to align with these sentiments. Yet, we may struggle to rationalize these beliefs and feelings within the framework of the concepts of "person," "body," and "death." If we begin with the basic component concept of "person/personhood"—the biological human being—we find that human rights claims rest on the following tenets: (1) "I am a person," (2) persons possess certain characteristics, (3) these characteristics are legally and morally significant for my identity as a person, and (4) therefore, I am entitled to these rights. Thus, our reference to "person/personhood" seems rooted in our concept of the biological human being.

Jens Ohlin argues that our claim to human rights cannot rest solely on the biological concept of a human being. He provides two reasons for this. First, the conceptual framework for human rights is grounded in the idea of "personhood," not merely the biological concept. Second, the term "personhood" has expanded beyond biological definitions to include entities like corporations, nation-states, and multiple personalities. If personhood were solely based on biology, it could not apply to these larger entities. According to Ohlin, this is not a "radical conclusion" but highlights that "personhood does not directly ground a rights-based argument." A biological definition of personhood and its claim to human rights aligns with the California Court's ruling that dead bodies cannot feel outrage.

One might also consider personhood in relation to a normative concept. The normative approach suggests that our understanding of personhood in human rights has been flawed, as it involves recognizing an entity as a person and then determining its legal and moral implications. Instead, the normative approach posits that ascribing personhood is a way of acknowledging an entity as the "object" of our social, moral, and legal concern. Thus, "person/personhood" is a social, legal, and moral concept. An entity is not endowed with human rights because it is a "person"; rather, it is a "person" because it is

attributed with human rights. Ohlin notes that this approach is not inherently problematic, but it reduces the concept of "person" to a mere "placeholder for moral or legal concern." The significance of personhood for ascribing rights should lie outside the concept itself, independent of its definition. All reasons for ascribing rights are derived from our understanding of the term "person," whether biological or non-biological (e.g., corporations, unions, nation-states). But is the concept of "person/personhood" dispensable in biological or normative categories?

Derek Parfit's "Argument from Below" suggests that our interaction with a concept relies on lower-level reasoning. For example, the concept of "marriage" includes couples in romantic or sexual relationships living together, raising families, or pooling finances. If we consider "spousal rights," the concept of marriage should be determined by these "lower-level facts," and couples fulfilling these criteria should be granted marital rights. Thus, marriage laws should be based on these lower-level facts, with higher-level facts being significant only if they align with them. Applying this to "person/personhood," we find that the concept can be traced back to lower-level facts such as being a biological human, a rational agent, or a social and psychological being. These lower-level facts are legally significant in human rights discourse. According to this theory, being a person is contained within being a human being and a rational agent with unity of consciousness. Therefore, being a person is a conceptual fact and not intrinsically important; its significance derives from its component ideas. For example, a brain-dead patient may lack psychological or rational agency but remains a biological human being. Questions about "death" and "personal identity" arise, but if we agree that "person" is a conceptual fact, we already have the lower-level facts to establish that the brain-dead patient is a person. Thus, according to Parfit's "Argument from Below," "person/personhood" is a conceptual fact, and it is the lower-level facts (e.g., being a biological human) that are essential for human rights, not the concept of "person" itself.

The concept of "person/personhood" is not the sole parameter for determining human rights. Instead, the process involves identifying the component ideas within an entity to analyze its "personhood." Human rights are intrinsically based on these component ideas, not the umbrella term. However, it is important to recognize that the subject of this discussion—such as "dead persons"—may lack the component ideas that constitute "person/personhood." Linguistically, even the phrase "dead person" does not fit logical parameters and is merely a way of speaking. Similarly, brain-dead patients, whose bodies function through medical aid, occupy a gray area between life and death. If "person/personhood" is not the deciding factor for human rights in such cases, we must examine our relationship with concepts like "personhood," "death," and "life." The sacredness and emotions we attach to death and the dead, as noted by John Troyer, must be analyzed to understand the basis of questions like "Can dead people have rights?" and the objections raised by Ochoa and Jones against rulings in cases like necrophilia.

THE CONCEPT OF PERSONHOOD IN AFRICAN PHILOSOPHICAL THOUGHT

The concept of personhood in African philosophical traditions offers a profound and holistic perspective that diverges significantly from Western dualistic frameworks. In African thought, personhood is not an isolated or individualistic attribute but is deeply embedded in communal relationships, spiritual connections, and the continuity of life beyond physical death. This worldview challenges the Cartesian separation of mind and body and provides a rich framework for understanding the rights and dignity of the dead, as well as the broader implications of personhood in African societies.

At the heart of African conceptions of personhood is the philosophy of *Ubuntu*, a term derived from the Nguni Bantu languages, often translated as "I am because we

are." *Ubuntu* emphasizes the interconnectedness of individuals within a community, where one's identity, moral standing, and humanity are derived from relationships with others (Shadrach, 2025). As Archbishop Desmond Tutu eloquently articulated, "A person with *Ubuntu* is open and available to others, affirming of others, does not feel threatened that others are able and good, for he or she has a proper self-assurance that comes from knowing that he or she belongs in a greater whole" (Tutu, 1999, p. 31). This communal understanding of personhood extends beyond the living to include ancestors and the unborn. In many African cultures, the dead are not merely remembered as relics of the past but are considered active participants in the community's moral, spiritual, and social life. Ancestors are revered as custodians of wisdom, moral order, and cultural continuity. Their presence is acknowledged and honored through rituals, offerings, and communal memory, ensuring that the dead remain integral to the fabric of the community. This perspective challenges the Western dichotomy between the living and the dead, suggesting that personhood is not extinguished by death but persists in a transformed state.

African philosophical traditions also provide a nuanced understanding of the body in relation to personhood. Unlike Cartesian dualism, which separates the mind from the body, many African philosophies view the body as an integral aspect of the self. The body is not merely a vessel for the soul but a site of identity, memory, and spiritual connection. For example, among the Akan people of Ghana, the body is seen as a manifestation of the *okra* (soul), which maintains its connection to the individual even after death (Gyekye, 1995). Similarly, the Yoruba of Nigeria believe in the continuity of the *ori* (inner head or spiritual essence), which transcends physical death and remains connected to the community. This holistic view of the body has profound implications for the treatment of the dead. In many African cultures, the body of the deceased is treated with great care and respect, as it is believed to retain a connection to the person's identity and spiritual essence. Rituals such as burial ceremonies, libations, and ancestral veneration reflect the belief that the dead continue to influence the living and deserve dignity and respect. For instance, among the Zulu of South Africa, the practice of *ukubuyisa* (bringing back the spirit of the deceased) ensures that the dead are reintegrated into the community as ancestors, reinforcing their ongoing role in the lives of the living (Bank & Sharpley, 2020).

The African conception of personhood has significant implications for the rights of the dead. If personhood is understood as a relational and ongoing process, rather than a fixed attribute of the living, then the dead can be seen as retaining a form of personhood that warrants respect and protection. This perspective aligns with the Allahabad High Court's assertion that the dead deserve dignity, as it recognizes the enduring significance of the deceased within the community. However, this view also raises questions about the legal and ethical frameworks for protecting the rights of the dead. In many African societies, the responsibility for honoring the dead falls on the community and the family, rather than the state. This communal approach contrasts with Western legal systems, which often struggle to reconcile the rights of the dead with the rationality of law. For example, in cases of necrophilia or desecration of graves, African communities may rely on traditional mechanisms of justice and reconciliation, such as restorative practices or spiritual interventions, rather than formal legal proceedings.

While the African concept of personhood offers a valuable counterpoint to Western individualism and dualism, it also faces challenges in contemporary contexts. Urbanization, globalization, and the influence of Western legal systems have led to shifts in traditional practices and beliefs. For instance, the rise of necrophilia cases in some African countries has sparked debates about the legal and cultural frameworks for protecting the dead. Similarly, disputes over burial rites or the use of land for cemeteries

may pit communal traditions against individual or state interests, highlighting the tension between cultural values and modern legal systems. Moreover, the African emphasis on communal personhood can sometimes conflict with individual rights, particularly in cases involving the dead. For example, the practice of exhuming bodies for urban development or scientific research may be seen as a violation of ancestral rights and communal dignity. These tensions underscore the need for a nuanced approach that balances cultural values with legal and ethical considerations.

African philosophical traditions also extend the concept of personhood to the natural environment, emphasizing the interconnectedness of humans, animals, and the earth. This ecological perspective further enriches the understanding of personhood by situating it within a broader web of relationships. For example, among the Shona of Zimbabwe, the land is considered sacred and is intimately connected to the ancestors, who are believed to reside in the natural world. This worldview underscores the responsibility of the living to protect the environment as a way of honoring the dead and ensuring the continuity of life.

The African concept of personhood provides a rich and holistic framework for understanding the rights and dignity of the dead. By emphasizing the interconnectedness of the living, the dead, and the community, African philosophical traditions challenge Western dualism and offer a more inclusive view of personhood. This perspective has important implications for legal and ethical debates about the rights of the dead, as well as for the broader discourse on human dignity and identity. In a world increasingly shaped by globalization and cultural exchange, the African concept of personhood invites us to rethink our assumptions about life, death, and the boundaries of personhood. It reminds us that the dead are not merely relics of the past but active participants in the ongoing story of humanity, deserving of respect, dignity, and a place in the moral and spiritual fabric of society.

CONCLUSION

The exploration of personhood, dignity, and the rights of the dead reveals a complex interplay of philosophical, legal, and cultural dimensions. This paper has sought to interrogate the boundaries of personhood beyond death, challenging the Western dualistic frameworks that often separate the mind from the body and the living from the dead. By examining legal precedents, such as necrophilia cases in the United States and rulings by the Allahabad High Court in India, we have highlighted the tensions and ambiguities in defining personhood post-mortem. These cases underscore the limitations of legal systems that struggle to reconcile the rights of the dead with rational frameworks, often reducing the dead to mere objects or property.

In contrast, African philosophical traditions, particularly the concept of *Ubuntu*, offer a relational and holistic understanding of personhood that extends beyond physical death. The African emphasis on communal identity, ancestral veneration, and the continuity of life challenges Western individualism and provides a compelling alternative for reimagining the moral and legal status of the dead. This perspective reminds us that the dead are not merely relics of the past but active participants in the ongoing story of humanity, deserving of respect, dignity, and a place in the moral and spiritual fabric of society. The ethical and legal dilemmas surrounding the dead—whether in cases of necrophilia, desecration of graves, or the use of human remains for scientific research—reveal the need for a more nuanced and inclusive approach. This paper argues that the dignity of the dead is not solely contingent on the concept of personhood but is also rooted in cultural, emotional, and moral considerations. The dead, as repositories of memory and identity, hold a unique place in the collective consciousness of communities, and their treatment reflects the values and ethics of the living.

Ultimately, this research calls for a rethinking of how societies conceptualize and protect the rights of the dead. It advocates for legal and ethical frameworks that are informed by both rational principles and cultural values, ensuring that the dead are accorded the dignity they deserve. By bridging Western and non-Western philosophies, this paper contributes to the field of Philosophical Thanatology and offers a pathway toward a more inclusive and respectful treatment of the dead in a globalized world. In a world increasingly shaped by globalization and cultural exchange, the question of how we honor and protect the dead is not merely an academic exercise but a moral imperative. The dead, as much as the living, are part of the human story, and their dignity is a reflection of our collective humanity. As we continue to grapple with these questions, we are reminded that the boundaries of personhood, like the boundaries of life and death, are not fixed but are shaped by the values, beliefs, and traditions that define us.

REFERENCES

Bank, L., & Sharpley, N. V. (2020). A state of (greater) exception? Funerals, custom and the "war on COVID" in rural South Africa. *South African Review of Sociology*, *51*(3-4), 143-164.

Becker, E. (1962). *The Birth and Death of Meaning*. Free Press.

Bujo, B. (2001). *Foundations of an African ethic: Beyond the universal claims of Western morality*. Crossroad Publishing.

Chappell, V. (1994). *The Cambridge Companion to Locke*. Cambridge University Press.

Chisholm, R. M. (1976). *Person and Object: A Metaphysical Study*. Open Court Publishing.

Ellis, S., & Ter Haar, G. (2004). *Worlds of power: Religious thought and political practice in Africa*. Hurst & Company.

Gyekye, K. (1995). *An essay on African philosophical thought: The Akan conceptual scheme*. Temple University Press.

Ikenga-Metuh, E. (1987). *Comparative studies of African traditional religions*. IMICO Publishers.

Kopytoff, I. (1971). Ancestors as elders in Africa. *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute*, *41*(2), 129–142. https://doi.org/10.2307/1159423

Mbiti, J. S. (1969). *African religions and philosophy*. Heinemann.

McGuire, M. B. (1990). Religion and the Body: Rematerializing the Human Body in the Social Sciences. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 29(3), 283–296.

Menkiti, I. A. (1984). Person and community in African traditional thought. In R. A. Wright (Ed.), *African philosophy: An introduction* (pp. 171–181). University Press of America.

Meyer, B. (1999). *Translating the devil: Religion and modernity among the Ewe in Ghana*. Edinburgh University Press.

Ngubane, H. (1977). *Body and mind in Zulu medicine: An ethnography of health and disease in Nyuswa-Zulu thought and practice*. Academic Press.

Ochoa, T. T., & Jones, C. N. (1997). Defiling the Dead: Necrophilia and the Law. *Criminal Law Review*, 18(3), 456–470.

Ohlin, J. D. (2005). *Is the Concept of Person Necessary for Human Rights?* Columbia Law Review, 105(1), 209–249.

Oruka, H. O. (1990). *Sage philosophy: Indigenous thinkers and modern debate on African philosophy*. Brill.

Quine, W. V. (1976). *Identity and Individuation*. In *The Ways of Paradox and Other Essays* (pp. 12–20). Harvard University Press.

Ramose, M. B. (1999). *African philosophy through Ubuntu*. Mond Books.

Scheper-Hughes, N. (2011). Dissection: The Body in Tatters: Dismemberment, Dissection, and the Return of the Repressed. *A Companion to the Anthropology of the Body and Embodiment*, 172-206.
Shadrach, O. (2025). Respect as a Pillar of African Ubuntu Philosophy. *Nnadiebube Journal of Philosophy*, *8*(2).
Shutte, A. (2001). *Ubuntu: An ethic for a new South Africa*. Cluster Publications.
Sullivan, H. S. (1953). *The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry*. W. W. Norton & Company.
Tagini, A., & Raffone, A. (2010). The 'I'and the 'Me'in self-referential awareness: a neurocognitive hypothesis. *Cognitive processing*, *11*, 9-20.
Tempels, P. (1959). *Bantu philosophy*. Presence Africaine.
Troyer, J. (2010). *Technologies of the Human Corpse*. MIT Press.
Tutu, D. (1999). *No future without forgiveness*. Image.
Wiredu, K. (1996). *Cultural universals and particulars: An African perspective*. Indiana University Press.