



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Facing society : A study of identity through head shaping practices among the indigenous peoples of the Caribbean in the ceramic age and colonial period

Duijvenbode, A. van

Citation

Duijvenbode, A. van. (2017, May 16). *Facing society : A study of identity through head shaping practices among the indigenous peoples of the Caribbean in the ceramic age and colonial period*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/49749>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/49749>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/49749> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation

Author: Duijvenbode, A. van

Title: Facing society: A study of identity through head shaping practices among the indigenous peoples of the Caribbean in the ceramic age and colonial period

Issue Date: 2017-05-16

Facing Society

A study of identity through head shaping practices among the indigenous peoples of the Caribbean in the Ceramic Age and Colonial Period

Proefschrift
ter verkrijging van
de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden
op gezag van Rector Magnificus prof. mr. C.J.J.M. Stolker,
volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties
te verdedigen op dinsdag 16 mei 2017
klokke 11.15 uur

door
Anne van Duijvenbode
geboren te Leiden
in 1987

Promotor:

Prof. dr. Corinne L. Hofman

Co-promotor:

Dr. Darlene A. Weston

Overige leden:

Prof. dr. David R. Fontijn

Prof. dr. Raymond H.A. Corbey

Prof. dr. Joanna R. Sofaer (University of Southampton)

Prof. dr. Pieter J. ter Keurs (Rijksmuseum van Oudheden)

Dr. Arie Boomert

Cover Credits

Design: Laurens van Maren, Maren74 DTP & Vormgeving

Image: Individual LGC447 from Constanza in the Dominican Republic,
catalogue No. 349447, Department of Anthropology, Smithsonian Institution.

This work is part of the research programme
Facing Society with project number 322-60-001,
which is (partly) financed by the Netherlands
Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO).



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Identity and processes of identification revolve around connections between people and the same can be said for the scientific process behind this dissertation. Scientists and studies do not exist in isolation and the current project is inherently tied and indebted to numerous scholars, scientific investigations, and institutions.

First and foremost, I must mention my supervisor Corinne L. Hofman and her scientific endeavours. She has been a continued source of inspiration and has always encouraged me to look for the bigger picture. The Caribbean Research Group she created at the Faculty of Archaeology and her research projects through the years have provided the academic embedding for this project. NWO-VICI project Communicating Communities and ERC-Synergy project NEXUS1492, in particular, have been a vital source of data and ideas for this Ph.D. project. My co-supervisor Darlene Weston has provided valuable advice on both my research and my dissertation. Thank you for taking time out of your busy schedule to help me.

This research has been funded by the Facing Society grant (322-60-001) provided by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) through their PhD's in the Humanities scheme. Additional funds were provided by grants obtained from the Leiden University Fund (LUF)/ Byvanck and the Jo Kolk Studiefonds.

This project would not have been possible without access to numerous collections of Caribbean skeletal material. I would like to thank the following people and institutions for providing generous access to their collections and assisting me throughout my research: Roberto Valcárcel Rojas, Elena Guarch Rodríguez, Lourdes Pérez Iglesias, Marcos Labrada Ochoa, Ileana Rodríguez Pisonero, and Pedro Cruz Ramírez (CISAT, Holguín, Cuba), Marta Mirazon Lahr and Maggie Bellatti (Duckworth Laboratory, LCHES, University of Cambridge), Edwin Crespo Torres (Laboratorio de Antropología Forense y Bioarqueología, Universidad de Puerto Rico, Río Piedras), Menno Hoogland and Andrea Waters-Rist (Laboratory for Human Osteoarchaeology, Leiden University), the director and staff (Musée Edgar Clerc, Guadeloupe), Jorge Ulloa Hung, Clenis Tavarez Maria, and Cristian Martínez Villanueva (Museo del Hombre Dominicano, Dominican Republic), Barbara Teßmann and the Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte (Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte, Berlin), Michele Morgan, Olivia Herschensohn, and Jane Rousseau (Peabody Museum of Archaeology

and Ethnology, Harvard), and last but certainly not least David Hunt (Smithsonian Institution, Washington DC).

The web of the Caribbean Research Group has expanded across seas and oceans to encompass a large number of scholars and friends, all of whom I am indebted to, yet I would be remiss if I failed to mention several colleagues in particular. Menno Hoogland has been an important source of inspiration and knowledge on Caribbean osteology since the start of my academic career. My first introduction to Caribbean archaeology were pretty palm trees and sunny beaches in a presentation by Arie Boomert. Thank you for that persuasive argument and all your great advice since. Roberto Valcárcel Rojas and Jorge Ulloa Hung have gone out of their way to assist me during fieldwork in Cuba and the Dominican Republic and have readily shared their of knowledge on the archaeology of the Greater Antilles.

Hayley Mickleburgh has not just provided important scientific advice and guidance, but has also been great company during data collection and conferences in the Caribbean and abroad. It has certainly taught us that wine should never be made using raisins and you should always bring a bit of Old Amsterdam just in case.

Rachel Schats has been instrumental in keeping me sane throughout my studies through the medium of great food and even better company. Despite your incomprehensible preference for salty over sweet, I hope we will share countless more meals and experiences.

Caribbean archaeology also introduced me to the other significant A: Amanda. Thank you for introducing me to the Big Apple, Hamilton, and tons of other great stuff. I can't wait for the next A&A adventure.

Finally, I must thank my family for their help and support through the years. I can only hope you will forgive me the ultimate faux-pas of switching languages mid-text to thank them properly.

Pap en mam! Wat is het verschrikkelijk moeilijk om de juiste woorden te vinden om jullie te bedanken. Jullie zijn er altijd voor me geweest en hebben elk plan - hoe gek ook! - ondersteund. Dat jullie altijd vertrouwen in me hebben gehad, ook als ik dat zelf wel eens kwijt was, heeft me in staat gesteld mijn dromen waar te maken. Zonder jullie was dit proefschrift er niet geweest!

Toch is dit proefschrift niet opgedragen aan jullie, maar aan mijn nichtjes Sara en Emma. Ik hoop dat jullie, net als ik, onbevreesd jullie dromen kunnen najagen en de wereld een beetje mooier kunnen kleuren!

“Another train...”

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	iii	
List of Figures	vii	
List of Graphs	x	
List of Tables	xv	
1	Introduction	1
1.1	Contested Identities	2
1.2	Facing Society	4
1.3	Dissertation Outline	5
2	Cranial Modification	7
2.1	Human Cranial Development	8
2.2	Deviating Cranial Growth Patterns	9
2.3	Intentional Cranial Modification	13
3	The Social Skull	31
3.1	Motives for Modification	32
3.2	Defining Identity?	38
3.3	Marking the Body	47
3.4	Practicing Head Shaping	51
3.5	The Social Skull	52
4	Caribbean Identities	57
4.1	Seas and Shores	57
4.2	Ancient Mariners	59
4.3	The Connected Caribbean	61
4.4	Caribbean Encounters	71
4.5	Bridging Boundaries	92

5	Methodology	93
5.1	Archaeology	93
5.2	Osteology	96
5.3	Cranial Modification	106
5.4	Documentation	109
5.5	Statistics	112
6	Materials	115
6.1	Sample Overview	115
6.2	Collections Background	119
7	Results	157
7.1	Demographic Overview of Sample	157
7.2	Cranial Metrics	162
7.3	Social Variables	173
7.4	Chronological Patterns	231
8	Shaping Identity	239
8.1	Measuring Modification	239
8.2	From the Individual to the Social	243
8.3	Island Lives	249
8.4	Caribbean Communities	253
8.5	Ties that Bind	258
8.6	Familiar Faces	269
8.7	Living Faces	270
8.8	The Rise and Decline of Intentional Cranial Modification	273
8.9	Shared Motifs	280
9	Facing Society	281
9.1	Shaping Caribbean Identities	282
9.2	Themes and Future Research	284
	References	289
	Appendix A	343
	Appendix B	345
	Appendix C	347
	Summary Facing Society	353
	Samenvatting Hoofdzaken van de Samenleving	357
	Curriculum vitae	361

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1	Lateral and superior view of the infant skull showing the cranial sutures and fontanelles (Gray 1918).	9
Figure 2	An overview of the head shapes produced by craniostenosis.	11
Figure 3	Infant in a traditional Nez Perce cradleboard. Photograph by Edward S. Curtis (1911).	12
Figure 4	Multiple wormian bones visible along the sagittal and lambdoidal sutures in the occipital view of individual LGC443, catalogue No. 349443, from the Department of Anthropology, Smithsonian Institution.	24
Figure 5	Post-bregmatic depression visible in the lateral view of individual DCAJ025, 1895 4038, from Limestone Cave, Jamaica, Duckworth Laboratory, LCHES, Cambridge.	25
Figure 6	Map of the Caribbean (map created by M.L.P. Hoogland).	58
Figure 7	Depiction of gold panning in the Greater Antilles during the early colonial period showing the gathered hair style (Oviedo y Valdés 1851[1535]:plate 2).	76
Figure 8	Black Carib modification device produced for Amic consisting of a single padded board and textile band (Amic 1791:plate 1).	84
Figure 9	Shipibo mother holding her infant undergoing cranial modification through application of a <i>vuitánete</i> (Farabee 1922:98).	91
Figure 10	Map of the Caribbean region showing the geographic distribution of the sites.	116
Figure 11	The temporal overview of the total sample.	118
Figure 12	Visualisation of the distribution of head shaping prevalence in the Caribbean.	189
Figure 13	Frontal, lateral, and superior view of individual CDM72B from El Chorro de Maíta, from the collection of CISAT in Holguín, Cuba. (Photos by Anne van Duijvenbode, 2009).	247

- Figure 14 Lateral view of individual LGC441 from Constanza, catalogue No. 349441, Department of Anthropology, Smithsonian Institution. 252
- Figure 15 Frontal and lateral view of an individual from the Kwakwaka'wakw with cranial modification produced by a cradle board, photographed during the Jesup North Pacific expedition (Boas 1909: Plate XXXVI). 271
- Figure 16 Portrait of Charles Cultee, showing cranial modification produced by a cradle board (Boas 1894 frontispiece/plate 1). 271
- Figure 17 Facial reconstruction of individual TH11 from Kwatta Tingiholo, Suriname, created by Dr. H. Mickleburgh. (Photo by H. Mickleburgh 2014). 272

LIST OF GRAPHS

Graph 1	The percentages of each age category in the total sample.	158
Graph 2	The distribution of biological sex in the total sample.	160
Graph 3	Visual representation of the comparison between the method by Clark et al. (2007) and the visual assessment by the author.	167
Graph 4	Visual representation of the comparison between the method by Clark et al. (2007) and the visual assessment by the author for each modification type.	168
Graph 5	Visual representation of the comparison between the method by Clark et al. (2007) and the visual assessment by the author for each modification subtype.	168
Graph 6	Visual representation of the comparison between the method by O'Brien and Stanley (2013) and the visual assessment by the author.	169
Graph 7	Visual representation of the comparison between the method by O'Brien and Stanley (2013) and the visual assessment by the author for each modification type.	170
Graph 8	Visual representation of the comparison between the method by O'Brien and Stanley (2013) and the visual assessment by the author for each modification subtype.	171
Graph 9	Distribution of grave goods in relation to cranial modification at Kelbey's Ridge 2.	175
Graph 10	Relation between biological sex and cranial modification at El Chorro de Maíta.	176
Graph 11	Relation between biological sex and type of modification at El Chorro de Maíta.	177
Graph 12	Relation between biological sex and subtype of modification at El Chorro de Maíta.	177

Graph 13	Relation between type of burial and cranial modification at El Chorro de Maíta.	178
Graph 14	Relation between burial position and cranial modification at El Chorro de Maíta.	178
Graph 15	Relation between body orientation and cranial modification at El Chorro de Maíta.	179
Graph 16	Distribution of grave goods in relation to cranial modification at El Chorro de Maíta.	179
Graph 17	Relation between isotopic signature and cranial modification at El Chorro de Maíta	180
Graph 18	The prevalence of cranial modification for each examined site from the Dominican Republic.	181
Graph 19	Types of cranial modification found per site in the Dominican Republic.	182
Graph 20	Subtypes of cranial modification found per site from the Dominican Republic.	182
Graph 21	Rates of modification among males and females at the different sites in the Dominican Republic.	184
Graph 22	Rates of modification among males and females in the pooled sample from the Dominican Republic.	184
Graph 23	Burial types in relation to cranial modification at El Soco and Punta Macao.	185
Graph 24	Nature of burial in relation to cranial modification at El Soco and Punta Macao.	185
Graph 25	Rates of modification for each burial types in the Dominican Republic.	186
Graph 26	Rates of modification for single and collective burials in the Dominican Republic.	186
Graph 27	Relation between body orientation and cranial modification in the Dominican Republic.	187
Graph 28	Distribution of grave goods in relation to cranial modification in the Dominican Republic.	188
Graph 29	Adjusted prevalence rates for each location in the sample.	190

Graph 30	Types of cranial modification found per location in the Caribbean.	191
Graph 31	Subtypes of cranial modification found per location in the Caribbean.	192
Graph 32	Rates of modification among males and females per location in the Caribbean.	192
Graph 33	Comparison of the relation between modification type and biological sex per location.	193
Graph 34	Comparison of the relation between modification subtype and biological sex per location.	194
Graph 35	Relation between the type of burial and cranial modification per location.	195
Graph 36	Relation between the amount of individuals in a grave and cranial modification per location.	196
Graph 37	Relation between body position and cranial modification per location.	197
Graph 38	Relation between body orientation and cranial modification per location.	198
Graph 39	Distribution of grave goods in relation to cranial modification per location.	199
Graph 40	Relation between isotopic signature and intentional cranial modification per location.	200
Graph 41	The prevalence of cranial modification for each location in the Greater Antilles.	201
Graph 42	Types of cranial modification found per location in the Greater Antilles.	202
Graph 43	Subtypes of cranial modification found per location in the Greater Antilles.	202
Graph 44	Cranial modification and biological sex for each location in the Greater Antilles.	204
Graph 45	Comparison of the relation between modification type and biological sex in the Greater Antilles.	205
Graph 46	Comparison of the relation between modification subtype and biological sex in the Greater Antilles.	205
Graph 47	Relation between the type of burial and cranial modification per location in the Greater Antilles.	206

Graph 48	Relation between cranial modification and single or collective burial per location in the Greater Antilles.	206
Graph 49	Relation between body position and cranial modification per location in the Greater Antilles.	207
Graph 50	Relation between body orientation and cranial modification per location.	207
Graph 51	Relation between the type of burial and cranial modification in the Greater Antilles.	208
Graph 52	Relation between cranial modification and single or collective burials in the Greater Antilles.	209
Graph 53	Relation between body position and cranial modification in the Greater Antilles.	209
Graph 54	Relation between body orientation and cranial modification in the Greater Antilles.	210
Graph 55	Distribution of grave goods in relation to cranial modification in the Greater Antilles.	210
Graph 56	Relation between isotopic signature and cranial modification in the Greater Antilles.	211
Graph 57	The prevalence of cranial modification for each location in the Lesser Antilles.	211
Graph 58	Types of cranial modification found per location in the Lesser Antilles.	212
Graph 59	Subtypes of cranial modification found per location in the Lesser Antilles.	212
Graph 60	Cranial modification and biological sex for each location in the Lesser Antilles.	213
Graph 61	Cranial modification and biological sex in the Lesser Antilles.	214
Graph 62	Relation between the type of burial and cranial modification per location in the Lesser Antilles.	214
Graph 63	Relation between cranial modification and single or collective burials per location in the Lesser Antilles.	215
Graph 64	Relation between body position and cranial modification per location in the Lesser Antilles.	216

Graph 65	Relation between body orientation and cranial modification per location in the Lesser Antilles.	216
Graph 66	Distribution of grave goods in relation to cranial modification per location in the Lesser Antilles.	217
Graph 67	Relation between type of burial and cranial modification in the Lesser Antilles.	218
Graph 68	Relation between cranial modification and single or collective burials in the Lesser Antilles.	218
Graph 69	Relation between body position and cranial modification in the Lesser Antilles.	219
Graph 70	Relation between body orientation and cranial modification in the Lesser Antilles.	219
Graph 71	Distribution of grave goods in relation to cranial modification in the Lesser Antilles.	220
Graph 72	Relation between isotopic signature and cranial modification in the Lesser Antilles.	220
Graph 73	The prevalence of cranial modification for each location on the Caribbean mainland.	221
Graph 74	Types of cranial modification found per location on the Caribbean mainland.	222
Graph 75	Cranial modification and biological sex for each location on the Caribbean mainland.	223
Graph 76	Cranial modification and biological sex on the Caribbean mainland.	223
Graph 77	Type of modification and biological sex on the Caribbean mainland.	224
Graph 78	Subtype of modification and biological sex on the Caribbean mainland.	224
Graph 79	Regional prevalence rates of intentional cranial modification.	225
Graph 80	Types of cranial modification found per region.	226
Graph 81	Subtypes of cranial modification found per region.	227
Graph 82	Rates of modification among males and females per region.	227

Graph 83	Relation between the type of burial and cranial modification in the Greater and Lesser Antilles.	228
Graph 84	Relation between the amount of individuals in a grave and cranial modification in the Greater and Lesser Antilles.	229
Graph 85	Relation between body position and cranial modification in the Greater and Lesser Antilles.	229
Graph 86	Relation between body orientation and cranial modification in the Greater and Lesser Antilles.	230
Graph 87	Distribution of grave goods in relation to cranial modification in the Greater and Lesser Antilles.	230
Graph 88	The prevalence of cranial modification in each region in the Early and Late Ceramic Age.	232
Graph 89	Types of cranial modification found in each region in the Early and Late Ceramic Age.	232
Graph 90	Subtypes of cranial modification found or each region in the Early and Late Ceramic Age.	233
Graph 91	Cranial modification and biological sex in each region in the Early and Late Ceramic Age.	233
Graph 92	Prevalence of intentional cranial modification in the Colonial period.	234
Graph 93	Types of intentional cranial modification in the Colonial period.	234
Graph 94	Subtypes of intentional cranial modification in the Colonial period.	235
Graph 95	Rates of modification among males and females in the Colonial period.	235
Graph 96	Relation between modification types and age categories at El Chorro de Maíta.	238
Graph 97	Relation between modification subtypes and age categories at El Chorro de Maíta.	238

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	A comparison of the three main classification systems and the nomenclature used in the current study, demonstrating the high degree of overlap between the systems.	17
Table 2	Overview of source data for the sites in the sample.	97
Table 3	The age categories used in this study and their correlation to chronological age (Buikstra and Ubelaker 1994:9).	98
Table 4	The standard suite of cranial measurements used in this study.	103
Table 5	The scoring system for cranial non-metric traits used in this study. All sizes in mm.	105
Table 6	The scoring system for the mandibular non-metric traits employed in this study. All sizes in mm.	105
Table 7	Scoring system for ossicles following Hauser and DeStefano (1989:212).	106
Table 8	Classification system for cranial modification used in this study.	107
Table 9	Overview of Morel skeletal material and origin.	133
Table 10	Overview of the La Cabrera skeletal material excavated by Kidder (1944) currently curated at the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology at Harvard University.	153
Table 11	Overview of individuals with suspected non-Amerindian ancestry.	161
Table 12	Results of Independent Samples t-test comparing the cranial measurement means between Amerindians and those of suspected non-Amerindian origin.	163
Table 13	Results of Independent Samples t-test comparing the cranial measurement means between modified and non-modified crania.	164
Table 14	Results of an Anova comparing the cranial measurement means of different modification types.	165

Table 15	Results of a post hoc Tukey HSD test of significant differences between modification types.	165
Table 16	Results of an Anova test comparing the cranial measurement means of different modification subtypes.	166
Table 17	Results of a post hoc Tukey HSD test of significant differences between modification subtypes.	166
Table 18	Comparison of classification by Clark et al. (2007) and the visual assessment by the author.	167
Table 19	Comparison of classification by Clark et al. (2007) and the visual assessment by the author for each modification type.	168
Table 20	Comparison of classification by Clark et al. (2007) and the visual assessment by the author for each modification subtype.	169
Table 21	Comparison of classification by O'Brien and Stanley (2013) and the visual assessment by the author.	170
Table 22	Comparison of classification by O'Brien and Stanley (2013) and the visual assessment by the author for each modification type.	171
Table 23	Comparison of classification by O'Brien and Stanley (2013) and the visual assessment by the author for each modification subtype.	172
Table 24	Comparison of the results of Clark et al. (2007) and O'Brien and Stanley (2013).	172
Table 25	Comparison of the results of Clark et al. (2007), O'Brien and Stanley (2013), and the visual assessment by the author.	172
Table 26	Prevalence of intentional cranial modification at Kelbey's Ridge 2.	174
Table 27	Prevalence of intentional cranial modification at El Chorro de Maíta..	175
Table 28	Overview of modification types and subtypes at El Chorro de Maíta.	176
Table 29	Prevalence of cranial modification in the Dominican Republic.	181
Table 30	Overview of modification types and subtypes found in the Dominican Republic.	183

Table 31	Prevalence of intentional cranial modification for each location in the sample.	188
Table 32	Results of comparative analysis of sex and modification rates using Fisher's exact tests.	193
Table 33	Results of comparative analysis of sex and modification type using Fisher's exact tests.	193
Table 34	Results of comparative analysis of sex and modification subtype using Fisher's exact tests.	194
Table 35	Results of comparative analysis of burial type and modification using Fisher's exact tests.	195
Table 36	Results of comparative analysis of modification and collective or single burial using Fisher's exact tests.	196
Table 37	Results of comparative analysis of body orientation and modification using Fisher's exact tests.	198
Table 38	Prevalence of intentional cranial modification in the Greater Antilles.	201
Table 39	Overview of modification types and subtypes found in the Greater Antilles.	203
Table 40	Results of comparative analysis of sex and modification rates using Fisher's exact tests.	204
Table 41	Results of comparative analysis of body orientation and modification using Fisher's exact tests.	207
Table 42	Overview of modification types and subtypes found in the Lesser Antilles.	213
Table 43	Results of comparative analysis of burial type and modification using Fisher's exact tests.	215
Table 44	Results of comparative analysis of modification and collective or single burial using Fisher's exact tests.	215
Table 45	Results of comparative analysis of body position and modification using Fisher's exact tests.	216
Table 46	Results of comparative analysis of grave goods and modification using Fisher's exact tests.	217

Table 47	Prevalence of intentional cranial modification on the Caribbean mainland.	221
Table 48	Overview of modification types and subtypes found on the Caribbean mainland.	222
Table 50	Prevalence of intentional cranial modification at El Chorro de Maíta.	236
Table 51	Prevalence of cranial modification in adults and non-adults at El Chorro de Maíta.	237