



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Indigenous adornment in the circum-Caribbean: The production, use, and exchange of bodily ornaments through the lenses of the microscope
Falci, C.G.

Citation

Falci, C. G. (2020, March 26). *Indigenous adornment in the circum-Caribbean: The production, use, and exchange of bodily ornaments through the lenses of the microscope*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/137307>

Version: Publisher's Version

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

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/137307>

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

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/137307> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Falci, C. Guzzo

Title: Indigenous adornment in the circum-Caribbean: The production, use, and exchange of bodily ornaments through the lenses of the microscope

Issue date: 2020-03-26

1

Introduction

Bodily adornment was extremely varied and ubiquitous among the indigenous communities of the pre-colonial Caribbean, as noted in both ethnohistoric sources and archaeological collections (*e.g.*, Alegría 1995; Fewkes 1903; Las Casas 1992; Lóven 1935; Petitjean Roget 1963). Body modifications, body paint, hairstyles, tattooing, and the addition of objects to the surface of the body can be encompassed under this general category. However, when it comes to most Caribbean archaeological contexts, only a portion of this last group is commonly recovered. A range of non-perishable artefacts that would have been attached to bodies, such as beads, pendants, plaques, ear spools, and plugs, have been recovered from contexts associated to the Ceramic Age (400 BC – ca. AD 1500). At certain moments during this long time period, such artefacts have not only been produced and used in large numbers, but, most notably, have also been circulated across large distances (Boomert 1987; 2000; 2001a; 2001b; 2007; Cody 1993; Hofman et al. 2007; 2014; Laffoon et al. 2014; Martínón-Torres et al. 2012; Mol 2007; 2014; Narganes Storde 2005; Rodríguez 1993; Rodríguez Ramos 2010a; 2010b; 2011; 2013; Serrand and Cummings 2014; Watters 1997; Watters and Scaglione 1994). Ornaments exhumed from Caribbean archaeological sites are now incorporated in many collections and museum displays across the globe. In these new settings, individual beads are often assembled together with strings or glue in aesthetically pleasing compositions that are at least partially based on analogies with indigenous material culture from the lowlands of South America. While engaging, such reconstructions run the risk of constraining the potential of these artefacts to provide us with insights on the Caribbean past.

The importance of researching collections that have been previously excavated and are now housed in institutional repositories is being increasingly stressed worldwide. A plea for the generation of new data from “old” materials has surfaced around discussions of the “curation crisis” and “legacy collections” (Frieman and Janz 2018; King 2016; Merriman and Swain 1999). Repositories

worldwide harbour understudied collections, excavated at different points in time by both archaeologists and amateurs. Many of these have not been (extensively) described and investigated, lack (substantial) documentation, include potential forgeries or mislabelled items, and/or would profit from new theoretical and methodological developments in archaeology (Brody 2009; Frieman and Janz 2018; Gamble 2002; Guerra 2008; King 2016; Rodet et al. 2013; Woodward and Hunter 2015). Furthermore, even recently excavated collections become, to a certain degree, legacy collections when they enter a repository, as they no longer are under the custody of the investigator who exhumed them (King 2016, 7). The circum-Caribbean is no exception in this regard, with collections of diverse materials housed locally, in Europe, and in the United States (*e.g.*, Antczak et al. 2019; Díaz Peña 2004; Françaço and Strecker 2017; Françaço and Ordoñez 2019; Hardy 2009; Hicks and Cooper 2013; Siegel 2009; Watters and Brown 2001; Watters and Scagliion 1994). Furthermore, Caribbean archaeological material culture is not only housed in institutional repositories, such as museums, but is also in the possession of individuals as private collections.

Despite the regional abundance of ornaments and the interest they have raised, analytical approaches have not been given priority in ornament research in the Caribbean (see section 1.1). As a result, ornaments remain a poorly understood artefact category. The goal of this dissertation is, therefore, to provide new insights concerning the circulation, production, and use of bodily ornaments in the Caribbean. This will be done through the detailed study of assemblages of ornaments from key time periods in the archipelago. Three main research questions will be posed to ornament assemblages from the region:

1. What are the patterns in the ways ornaments were dealt with in each time period?
2. How do such patterns relate to the social roles these objects had?
3. What are the new insights given by a focus on technology and use to our understanding of exchange patterns and the social mechanisms responsible for them?

In order to accomplish this, it is necessary to set out another goal: to devise a strategy for the study of collections of ornaments from diverse origins. One is required to acknowledge the diverse ways in which collections have been and are being formed in the region. Collections have been and are still formed through both systematic archaeological research and unsystematic collecting.

More than requiring a single and specific protocol of actions, such collections demand flexibility and clarity regarding their potentials and limitations. One can identify a number of methodological and interpretative limitations that need to be taken into account during their study. Here we can include 1) extensive raw material and typological variability, 2) low numbers of production debris and associated tools, and 3) challenges with extrapolating from a single artefact (such as a bead) to an object that performed in a certain way in the past (for instance, a whole necklace). Other limitations are related to the lack of sufficient contextual information and to the complex trajectories artefacts undergo after they leave the ground. Devising a strategy to deal with such issues is not only relevant for the Caribbean region, as many limitations permeate the study of collections everywhere.

This chapter introduces the main themes and issues that will serve as threads connecting the individual components of this dissertation. We start with an overview of previous research on bodily adornment from the Ceramic Age Caribbean. The goal of this section is to highlight how ornaments have been integral elements in narratives about socio-cultural interaction and socio-political organization. In particular, focus is given to two time periods in which ornaments were produced in large numbers and exchanged between different islands. Such review will allow us to single out gaps in knowledge that will be addressed by the present research. In order to create a framework for this investigation, we delve into what ornaments are and what kinds of social roles they could have held in the following section. The concept of artefact biographies is introduced as an approach for making sense of the multiple life stages ornaments are engaged in both as individual artefacts and composite constructions. Microwear analysis is then proposed as a method for investigating ornaments, having as basis previous research carried out worldwide. Finally, the outline of the dissertation is explained and the goals of each chapter are made clear.

1.1. Bodily ornaments in Caribbean archaeology

The exchange patterns, sociopolitical organization, and worldview of past Antillean societies have often been interpreted by analogy with indigenous communities from lowland South America (*e.g.*, Boomert 1987; 2001a; 2001b; Rodríguez 1997; Roe 1989; 1997; Siegel 1997; 2010). The location of the Antillean archipelago in relation to surrounding continental masses is shown

in Figure 1. These researchers have favoured such connections on the basis of the purported Orinocan origin of Saladoid communities that occupied the islands, as proposed on the traditional culture-historical schemes put forward by Irving Rouse (1986; 1992). It was posited that, from 500 BC, migration waves of Saladoid peoples would have replaced the Archaic Age populations that occupied the islands. This would mark the beginning of the Ceramic Age period, as these new people would bring with them ceramic making traditions and a horticultural lifestyle, accompanied by the settlement of semi-permanent villages (Rouse 1986; 1992). Over the centuries and through local developments, they would become the bearers of Ostionoid ceramics from the Greater Antilles, which would eventually develop incipient chiefdoms and would give origin to the so-called Taíno peoples met by the first Europeans to arrive to the Americas. As new research has been carried out, different aspects of this culture-historical trajectory have been debated and criticized from a number of standpoints (*e.g.*, Chanlatte-Baik 1983; 1987; Chanlatte-Baik and Narganes 1980; Keegan 2000; Rodríguez Ramos et al. 2008; Veloz Maggiolo et al. 1981). Researchers have challenged the cultural and stylistic boundaries traditionally defined in the discipline and the considerable focus previously given to migration and colonization as monotonic events (Curet 2005; Hauser and Curet 2011). The



Figure 1: Geographical location of the circum-Caribbean in relation to South, Central, and North America.

Caribbean region is now seen as highly interconnected and ethnically diverse throughout its pre-colonial history (Hofman et al. 2007; 2010; 2011; Keegan and Hofman 2017; Mol 2014; Oliver 2009; Rodríguez Ramos 2010b; Rodríguez Ramos and Pagán Jiménez 2006; Wilson 1993; 2007; see also contributions in Curet and Hauser, eds. 2011 and in Hofman and Van Duijvenbode, eds. 2011). In this panorama, ornaments have often served as proxies for reconstructions of past Caribbean connectivity. Island-island and island-continent interactions have been suggested on the basis of the differential distribution of (exotic) goods and on the predominance of similar material culture over large areas. However, the specific social mechanisms responsible for the observed patterns of material translocation are still not fully understood (Curet and Hauser 2011, 7; Hofman et al. 2011).

1.1.1. Some thoughts on material exchange and social organization

More than half a century ago, it was argued that human economy is embedded in socio-political institutions (Polanyi 1957, 250). According to its supporting social structure, the circulation of materials in a given society can take place through different mechanisms or forms of integration, namely reciprocity, redistribution, and market exchange. Reciprocity would be characteristic of symmetrically organized groups, such as kinship groups. The exchange of social valuables or prestige goods has been argued to play an important role in small-scale stateless societies (Dalton 1977). It would be crucial in alliance building between corporate descent groups, having political, economic, and social functions concurrently. Notable among such social transactions are delayed-reciprocal ceremonial exchanges held in the context of feast celebrations and exclusively between group leaders. Amassing and distributing goods would be key factors in crafting a big man's personal success and in outranking potential competitors (Sahlins 1963). Success in ceremonial exchanges would play a role in the attaining and maintaining of political power in one's corporate group, at the same time as providing a big man with fame and renown to outsiders (Dalton 1977, 196; see also Boomert 2001b). In contrast, redistribution would involve movement of goods toward and from a (*e.g.*, political or religious) centre. One should note that Polanyi (1957, 256) stressed that such forms of integration are not stages of development, as no progression in time is implied and as certain societies are known to practice, to varying degrees, both reciprocity and redistribution (see also Ibáñez et al. 2016). Nevertheless, non-reciprocal

modalities of material distribution have generally been connected to systems with institutionalized social hierarchies (Service 1971[1962]).

Abundant archaeological research has focused on evidencing the social patterns producing the translocation of materials in past societies, particularly in connection with the advance of scientific and statistical approaches afforded by processual archaeology (see contributions in Earle and Ericson 1977 and Ericson and Baugh 1993; also Hirth 1978; Hodder 1974; Ibáñez et al. 2016; Kirch 1988). Such efforts have replaced concerns with issues of migration and cultural diffusion that had previously occupied a prominent role in archaeological endeavours. Efforts have been made to explain patterns in artefact distribution across a given region according to specific models of exchange. For instance, reciprocal/symmetrical exchange would produce a down-the-line model, a pattern resulting from materials being passed down from hand to hand in transactions between neighbouring villages (Renfrew 1977, 77-79). As a result of this process, material distribution would follow the “law of monotonic decrement”, according to which materials become rarer with increased distance from the supply zone. In contrast, when a certain location is supplied preferentially, a pattern of directional trade has been referred to (Renfrew 1977, 85). From such a location, i.e. a central place, goods would then be redistributed to neighbouring areas (see also Hirth 1978). This hierarchy of exchange would be reflective of a hierarchy between settlements or individuals. However, limitations have been pointed out in such models, particularly concerning the issue of equifinality (Hodder 1974; Renfrew 1977, 82-83). Furthermore, the presence or absence of a given raw material should not be considered in isolation from data concerning the technical states materials may be in and the different spheres of production they may belong to (Perlès 2007).

Craft specialization and the roles of material culture in legitimizing social hierarchies hold a persistent place in ornament research, due to the exoticness of raw materials used and to the high skill often involved in their production (Arnold and Munns 1994; Baysal 2013; Bellina 2014; Brumfiel and Earle 1987; Carter 2015; Kenoyer and Vidale 1992; Kenoyer et al. 1991; Miller 1996; Trubitt 2003; Watson et al. 2015; Zerboni et al. 2018). However, the large-scale production of lapidary materials and ceremonial artefacts need not to be connected to the presence of an emerging elite social stratum. As Spielmann (2002) highlights, communal rituals and feasts, which are intrinsic part of social life in small-scale and uncentralized societies, create considerable demand for food and for

objects to be used in ritual performance and social transactions. Household-level production, in a context of community-wide specialization, can support large-scale demand for social valuables to be used in display and exchange. In this sense, Spielmann (2002) proposes the “ritual mode of production” as an alternative to the common explanations for production intensification and specialization: economic efficiency in face of uneven resource distribution or demand from aspiring and competitive elites.

In the following, previous efforts to understand the roles of Caribbean bodily adornment and to model its exchange are reviewed. It is not my goal to provide an exhaustive overview of such literature, but instead to provide context to the issues and case-studies that will later on occupy us in the present dissertation.

1.1.2. Profusely adorned: Lapidary materials in the early part of the Early Ceramic Age

Large-scale production of ornaments took place in workshops found throughout the Lesser Antilles and Puerto Rico during the earlier part of the Ceramic Age (400 BC – AD 400) (Figure 2; Bartone and Crock 1991; Boomert 2000; Cody 1991a; Chanlatte-Baik and Narganes 1980; Crock and Bartone 1998; Faber Morse 1989; Hofman et al. 2007; 2014; Murphy et al. 2000; Narganes Storde




Figure 2: Map of the Caribbean.

1999; Rodríguez 1991; Vescelius and Robinson 1979; Watters 1997; Watters and Scaglione 1994). Workshop sites have been identified by the abundance of lapidary remains, in particular unfinished ornaments, flaking debris, and raw materials. Beads and pendants made of a range of raw materials were produced, especially of hard and semi-precious minerals and rocks (see Chapter 4 for an overview of previous studies and the potential geological sources). Further evidence for the circulation of ornaments comes from freshwater mussel shells (*Unionoida*) and perforated mammal teeth, whose origins have been traced to northern South America and/or lower Central America (Laffoon et al. 2014; Narganes Storde 2005; Serrand and Cummings 2014; Vescelius and Robinson 1979). Raw materials and finished products were exchanged between different islands, probably as high prestige valuables (Boomert 2000; 2001b). For instance, carnelian from Antigua, together with other lithic resources (Long Island flint, St. Martin mudstone, and Puerto Rican serpentinite), was entangled in exchange networks connecting the northeastern Caribbean (Hofman et al. 2007; 2014; Knippenberg 2007; Mol 2014). These carnelian beads were also exchanged for amethyst specimens produced in the southern island of Grenada (Cody 1991a; 1991b; Watters 1997). Connections of even greater distances have been suggested: similarities were noted between pendants from Puerto Rico and the Isthmo-Colombian region in terms of iconography and raw material (Rodríguez Ramos 2010a; 2010b; 2011; 2013). However, the jadeitite used for the Antillean artefacts has not been definitely linked to the Guatemalan sources used for Costa Rican specimens (García-Casco et al. 2013; Harlow et al. 2006; Schertl et al. 2019).

The most systematic investigation of exchange patterns in the region through material and technological variability has been carried out by Knippenberg (2007), who examined the mechanisms behind the circulation of lithic materials in the northeastern Caribbean (from Puerto Rico to Martinique). His work focused on how the distribution of three materials, namely Long Island flint, St. Martin mudstone, and calci-rutile, evolved from the beginning of the Early Ceramic Age to the end of the Late Ceramic Age. Based on the study of the assemblages from several sites, Knippenberg (2007) created fall-off graphs illustrating the percentage of materials in the studied region in relation to their geological source, and distribution maps, which show the extent of the interaction networks across the region. Materials used in ornament production were also taken into account. Particularly, it was argued that lapidary materials

were distributed within the same exchange networks as flint and mudstone during the Early Ceramic A (400 BC – AD 400). This would have involved the long distance distribution of rocks, alongside other items, through down-the-line exchange between communities in a context in which the islands were still limitedly occupied.

The long distance connections between the Early Ceramic Age communities with those on the surrounding continental masses (in particular, South America) has been explained through a “lifeline” or “homeland” model (Hofman et al. 2007; 2011; Keegan 2004; Watters 1997). This model, originally proposed for the Lapita cultural complex of the Pacific, sees long-distance exchange of prestige items as a formal mechanism for the maintenance of ties with homeland communities (Kirch 1988). The continuation of regular contacts with parent communities would provide demographic, ecological, and economic safety to colonizing groups faced with uncertainties associated with the occupation of previously unknown and still-sparsely occupied islands. At the same time, we should not overlook the presence of Archaic Age occupations on many islands during the first centuries of this period (until ca. AD 100). Huecoid/Saladoid communities exploited the same flint sources as the Archaic Age populations and are very likely to have interacted on different levels (Hofman et al. 2011; 2014; 2019; Rodríguez Ramos 2010a).

Material specialization and control over the sources of certain lithic materials would have supported the competitive exchange and display of valuables by big men in ceremonial intercommunity feasting (Boomert 2000; 2001b; Hofman et al. 2014; 2019; Mol 2014). In this sense, large settlements were located next to key geological sources, such as those of Antiguan carnelian and Puerto Rican serpentinite. These sites, operating as regional social hubs, also functioned as lapidary producing communities. However, such reconstructions have focused primarily on the northeastern Caribbean islands. On the southern Caribbean, the site of Pearls on the island of Grenada was a large settlement that functioned as lapidary workshop. In contrast to the aforementioned researchers, Cody (1991a; 1993), who investigated the site, has supported a more hierarchical view of Early Ceramic Age communities. Pearls would represent a gateway community, as it was situated in a key locale for controlling the movement of goods (notably amethyst) between South America and the islands (Cody 1991a; 1993, 210). The strategic location of gateway communities would allow for a reduction in transportation costs related to the acquisition of exotic resources to be

redistributed to “hinterland” (consuming) communities (Hirth 1978). This would guarantee a secure supply of goods and would allow the gateway community to assume a hierarchical place in a long distance exchange network. Cody (1991a; 1993) further connected this to the centralization of power by elite groups, who controlled the manufacture of prestige goods; the exchange of such goods would reinforce their status and serve for the formation of alliances. Evidence for this would be found in the intra-site differential distribution of valuables (i.e. ceremonial ceramics and lapidary materials), the investment in the production of such items, and the symbolism of the zoomorphic beings depicted on them; such elements would be supportive of elite ideology. However, one may wonder if it makes sense to import such a hierarchical model from Mesoamerica to the Early Ceramic Age Caribbean, especially as the assemblages of the Pearls site remain understudied. Previous studies of collections of lapidary materials from this site have focused on typological classification and geological identification (Boomert 2007; Cody 1991a). Technological studies, which would be crucial for assessing many of such issues, are still missing.

1.1.3. Beads of the cacique? Ornaments in the later part of the Late Ceramic Age

In the subsequent periods (AD 400 – ca. 1500), beads and pendants still circulated across the Caribbean Sea, but the spheres of interaction were reduced in extent and widely available local raw materials were predominant (Hofman et al. 2007; 2011; Knippenberg 2007; Rodríguez Ramos 2010a, 175-176). Exchange networks involving rock materials become more localized, which is hypothesised to correspond to changes in socio-political organization and in orientation of the social relationships established between different communities (Knippenberg 2007). In contrast to the Early Ceramic Age, in which many exchanged lapidary materials are unequally distributed across the region, the ornament materials used in later periods are often available across the archipelago, thus rendering it more difficult to reconstruct potential networks of ornament circulation (see Chapter 5; Boomert and Rogers 2007; Hofman et al. 2007; 2011, 82; Knippenberg 2007). Marine shells, calcite, and diorite are commonly recovered from archaeological sites across the archipelago (Berman 2011; Blick et al. 2010; Boomert and Rogers 2007; Lammers-Keijsers 2007; Serrand 1997; 2007).

It has been argued that the Late Ceramic Age period (AD 600/800 – ca.

1500) sees the development of greater social complexity in the form of incipient chiefdoms (*cacicazgos*) in the Greater Antilles (Curet 1996; 2014; Keegan 2013; Keegan and Hofman 2017, 11-14; Rouse 1992; Siegel 2010; Wilson 2007). This is particularly expressed in Chican Ostionoid ceramics and other representational material culture (from AD 1200), often connected to the “Classic Taíno” peoples met by the Spaniards (Rouse 1992, 33-34; also Arrom 1975; Bercht et al., eds. 1997; Keegan 2013). The exchange of “Taíno”-like ritual paraphernalia would have taken place in connection with the regional formalization of a ritual grammar across the Greater Antilles and northern Lesser Antilles (Hofman 2013; Hofman et al. 2008; 2011, 82-82; Hofman and Hoogland 2011; Hoogland and Hofman 1999; Rodríguez Ramos 2010a, 197-198). The increase in the numbers of conspicuous ritual artefacts and spaces, as opposed to that of more personal items like bodily ornaments, has been argued to be connected to the greater importance of the public display of power in ceremonial events (Curet 1996; Helms 1987; Rodríguez Ramos 2010a, 198; Roe 1989). This includes intricately carved items such as stone collars, elbow stones, stone three-pointers, and shell ornaments depicting faces (*guaízas*). Whereas the evidence for three-pointer exchange is based on the occurrence of specimens in raw materials exotic to the region/island where they were found (Breukel 2013; Knippenberg 2007; Rodríguez Ramos 2010a, 198), *guaízas* are believed to have been exchanged due to their iconographic distinctiveness and rarity (Mol 2007; 2011; 2014).

At the same time, bodily adornment has been argued to be a crucial aspect of the display and enactment of the supernatural and political power of the *cacique* (Oliver 2000; see complete review in Chapter 5). Ornaments are also thought to have been produced in large numbers as products of specialized workshops and exchanged as part of social transactions between elite groups (Las Casas 1992, 611, 1288; Lóven 1935). However, the archaeological evidence for their specialized production and exchange is not easily traceable. An exception is found in the Turks and Caicos islands, where marine shell beads, notably small beads used for embroidery (“seed beads”), were produced in large numbers in specialized workshops; they would have arguably been commissioned by an elite from the Greater Antilles (Carlson 1995; Littman and Keegan 1991). It has further been argued that, as products of elite wealth, they would be kept in cacical storehouses, where they could be integrated into valuable composite artefacts or be redistributed as gifts (Ostapkowicz 2018; see also Mol 2007, 86-87). In turn, lithic ornaments recovered from sites in the Bahamas archipelago are

hypothesised to be trade items, as diorite and quartz sources cannot be locally found (Berman 2011). Beads and pendants made of lithic materials are indeed known to occur widely across the Greater Antilles, as abundantly illustrated in a number of publications (Arrom 1975; Fewkes 1903; 1922; Knight 2017). Bodily ornaments have also been recovered in caches in Puerto Rico and the Dominican Republic. From the former, a ceramic bowl with hundreds of beads has been recovered from a burial plaza in Utuado (Fewkes 2009 [1907]) and a wooden bowl containing a necklace with indigenous ornaments and European glass beads has been found in Quebradillas (Ostapkowicz 2018; Ostapkowicz et al. 2012). A similar find was made from a rock shelter in El Variar, southern Dominican Republic (Ortega 2005; Ortega and Fondeour 1976; also Keehnen 2019). It included two ceramic bowls with 262 stone beads, 89 shell beads, two anthropomorphic pendants, and four metal beads and pendants. Another find from a rock shelter comes from Sabana Yegua in San Juan de Maguana, on the centre-west of the Dominican Republic (Vega 1979, 11-13). It consisted of abundant European material alongside three stone necklaces, three pendants, and two amber earplugs. In Manantial El Cabo San Rafael, a rock shelter on the eastern tip of the island, another cache has been found with approximately 4000 perforated dog and seal teeth, some of which with decorative carvings (Ortega 2005, 115-116; Samson 2010, 103-104). Based on this combined evidence, it can be hypothesized that there was an increase in the production and circulation of ornaments made of different raw materials in this period. However, apart from the aforementioned studies of shell beads and others focused on gold and *guanín* (Cooper et al. 2008; Martínón-Torres et al. 2012; Valcárcel Rojas et al. 2007), little research has focused on ornaments from the period.

1.1.4. Research gap and case-studies

The present dissertation will be conducted against this background of research regarding periods of increase in production and exchange of bodily adornment in the Caribbean archipelago. The two main case-studies that will concern us are the early part of the Early Ceramic Age in the eastern Caribbean and the later part of the Late Ceramic Age in the Greater Antilles. The two periods highlighted here have been previously regarded as two “climaxes” in the culture-historical development of the pre-colonial Caribbean separated by a “dark age”, in particular in what concerns ceramic styles and so-called ceremonial art (Rouse 1982, 52; for critiques, see Curet 1996 and Oliver 2009). However, this is not

the intention or the approach advocated here. As mentioned previously, this view of Caribbean pre-colonial history is an outdated one.¹ At the same time, the overview presented above shows that there is an overlap in the ways the ornaments from both periods have been interpreted: even though the models of socio-political organization differ, ornaments tend to be unanimously seen as social valuables produced by craft specialists and exchanged between competitive high-status individuals. In this sense, it remains unclear how the social mechanisms and corresponding archaeological patterns differ from one period to the other—even though the material remains themselves (raw materials and types) are notably different. While considerable archaeological attention has been placed on bodily adornment, research that systematically addresses material acquisition, production, use, and deposition of ornaments are scarce or more generally missing (for a more thorough review of this issue, see Falci 2015 and chapters 4 and 5). As the two case-studies selected refer to different regions and time periods, they will be addressed independently from each other in the next chapters. This independent attention will allow us to characterize in detail ornament-related practices that are specific to each context. Nevertheless, we should keep in mind that both case-studies are relatable as evolving patterns in long-term interaction networks that stretched across multiple islands of the archipelago.

1.2. What is in a bead? Theoretical approaches

The previous section has provided a review of hypotheses concerning the abundant presence of bodily adornment in the Ceramic Age Caribbean. We learned from previous research that ornaments functioned both as markers of political and supernatural power and as trade items—and that both functions cannot be entirely disassociated from each other. In other words, ornaments had at least two different roles over their lifetime. It is, therefore, our goal to assess the specific ways in which these roles were performed and how they differed between the Early and the Late Ceramic Age. For this purpose, it is necessary to build a framework through which these artefacts can be investigated.

Beads, pendants, and other artefacts interpreted to be ornaments have been intensively studied by archaeologists worldwide. Since the development

1 Furthermore, bodily ornaments from other time periods should be researched, such as Archaic-Age and early Ostionoid ornaments (for examples, see Rodríguez Ramos 2010a, 65-68, 175-176).

of archaeology as a discipline in the 19th century, the role of bodily adornment in past human societies has been regarded in different ways in connection with trends in the social sciences (notably, anthropology) and art history (Moro Abadía and Nowell 2015). Among others, they have been labelled minor art, decorative items, cosmetics, primitive money, amulets and talismans, identity and status markers, symbolic and communicative items. Perhaps as a result of the challenges in defining the cross-cultural “function” or “role” of ornaments (and, in a sense, justifying their research as a collective), finding an appropriate terminology to refer to this somewhat loosely defined group of “small finds” has also been a concern. Scholars discussing artefacts recovered from archaeological sites have focused on the terms such as personal adornment, ornament, and dress. Both *ornament* and *adornment* have been noted to be problematic terms, in that they imply a lack of practical function, a purely aesthetic role, and a positive value judgement (Moro Abadía and Nowell 2015; Roach-Higgins and Eicher 1992). *Dress* has been proposed as a less ethnocentric, value-charged, or ambiguous term; it conceptually groups under the same rubric direct modifications of and supplements added to the body (Eicher and Roach-Higgins 1992; Roach-Higgins and Eicher 1992). Without overlooking such concerns, I have opted for the words adornment and ornament as the most adequate way to collectively refer to the set of portable artefacts that will be studied here. The use of these terms strengthens the dialogue between the research being conducted here and other analytical archaeological research carried out on ornaments worldwide.

Following a structuralist tradition to the study of art (Lévi-Strauss 1963; Panofsky 1955), bodily adornment has been regarded as part of complex symbolic systems of meanings that have a communicative role in society (Wobst 1977). In this sense, crucial information concerning an individual’s identity and group belonging would be broadcast to those around them through socially-regulated properties of adornment, such as raw material, design, colour, shape, volume, size, and the arrangement and position of components (Lévi-Strauss 1936; Loren 2009; 2010; Newell et al. 1990; Ribeiro 1988; Roach-Higgins and Eicher 1992; Seeger 1975; Turner 2012[1980]; Vidal, ed. 1992; White 1992; White and Beaudry 2008; Wobst 1977; Wright and Garrard 2003). The formal study of such strictly regulated patterns could thus provide insights into a society’s underlying ideas and principles concerning personhood, social norms, and cosmology. As items attached to the bodies of people, ornaments are both personal and social, allowing for the active construction, performance, control,

and manipulation of personal identity *vis-à-vis* the social groups one belongs to. A notable avenue in past bodily adornment research has focused on prehistoric archaeology of Eurasia and Oceania, particularly of the Paleolithic period (see, for instance, recent contributions in Bar-Yosef Mayer and Bosch 2019). In early human contexts, forms of dress are regarded as invaluable proxies to the study of: 1) the emergence of behavioural complexity connected to cognitive or environmental changes (Brumm et al. 2017; d’Errico et al. 2005; Gilligan 2010; Kuhn and Stiner 2007; Rifkin et al. 2015) and 2) prehistoric ethno-linguistic boundaries and identities (Newell et al. 1990; Rigaud et al. 2015; Vanhaeren and d’Errico 2006). The importance of investigating ornaments often made of hard animal materials (i.e. bones, teeth, ivory, claws, and shells) has thus been stressed on account of their symbolic function. It is within this research context that the use of wear-trace analysis of ornaments has developed and expanded, providing a new means of assessing how people from the past produced and used such items (d’Errico 1993a; 1993b; d’Errico et al. 1993; Taborin 1991; 1993; White 1992; 2002; 2007; see section 1.3). Researchers have thus used diverse analytical techniques to address issues such the anthropic and intentional nature of artefacts and the aesthetic, symbolic, or pragmatic function of certain practices. However, one must wonder whether this latter question retains its relevance outside of the field of human evolution and whether the dichotomy between the aesthetic, the symbolic, and the pragmatic (or, more generally, art and artefact) is relevant outside of modern Western society (a.o., Ingold 2001; 2013; Conneller 2004; Dobres 2001; 2010).

Representational and visual characteristics of ornaments have gained great scholarly attention. However, one should not overlook the fact that dress is more than *appearance*, as it has other properties through which it can be experienced, such as texture (touch), odour, and sound (Eicher and Roach-Higgins 1992, 14; Roach-Higgins and Eicher 1992). Furthermore, material culture does not just passively reflect meanings bestowed onto it by a thinking mind (Gosden 2005; Hodder 2011; Ingold 2001; 2013; Jones 2004; Knappett 2012; Olsen 2012; Pfaffenberger 2001). As Malafouris (2008, 408) argues: “instead of seeing early ornaments as existing for the self we should be seeing the self as emerging through the ornament”. The human brain should be understood as intrinsically plastic, being moulded through its interaction with material culture. The body itself is not a purely biological entity to which cultural meanings and materials are added: it cannot be fully disassociated from the experiences, treatments, rituals,

and practices that it has engaged in (Alberti 2012; Conklin 1996; Hamilakis et al. 2002; Joyce 2005; Rival 2005; Thomas 2002; Vilaça 2005; Warnier 2009). This becomes more evident when more permanent forms of body modification are considered. While somewhat elusive in the archaeological record, a number of studies have pursued evidence for such practices, for instance, studies on cranial modification (*e.g.*, Van Duijvenbode 2012), on the impact of the use of lip plugs on an individual's teeth (Cybulski 2001; Torres-Rouf 2012), or on proxies for past tattooing (Deter-Wolf and Peres 2013; Gates St-Pierre 2018). Mauss (1973[1935]), in his essay on the techniques of the body, argues that the habits of the body are transmitted from one generation to the next, being simultaneously mechanical, psychological, and sociological, regardless of how ordinary and innate they may seem (Mauss 1973[1935]). While bodily adornment is not considered a technique of the body, he does refer to “techniques of care for the body” (Mauss 1973[1935], 84) and to walking in particular types of shoes as a learned disposition (Mauss 1973[1935], 83).² In light of more recent theories of the body cited above, this brings an interesting thought to mind: ornament making certainly involves the use of multiple techniques and tools emerging from socially-mediated bodily dispositions (see next section); but one should not overlook the fact that forms of adornment are themselves makers of bodily habits (see Naji and Douny 2009; Warnier 2009). Therefore, bodily ornaments, hygiene, and other forms of bodily care and performance are inseparable as constitutive elements in the creation and maintenance of personhood and, more broadly, social life (Brück and Davies 2018; Choyke 2006; Loren 2010; Miller 2009; Santos-Granero 2012; Turner 2012[1980]; Walker 2009; Warnier 2009). This implies a shift in focus from the potential messages carried by inert ornaments to how artefacts were capable of action: they affected, mediated, and transformed past bodies and minds. Whereas this realization frees us from the conundrum of not being able to assess the meaning of bodily adornment in the past, it does leave us with many unanswered questions. In particular, our main questions remain: how to approach bodily ornaments recovered from archaeological sites? How can we assess the ways in which *specific* ornaments

2 Elsewhere, Mauss (1993[1947]) discusses body arts (cosmetics and ornaments) as forms of plastic arts, i.e. *techniques* marked by a pursuit for the aesthetic. Mauss (1973[1935]) defines a technique as traditional and efficacious action. Warnier (2009) notes that, even though scholars in the anthropology of techniques have taken this to exclusively mean action *on matter*, one should also consider action *on subjects*. As examples, he argues that ritual performance and skin care are technologies of the subject mediated by bodies, material culture, and words.

performed in *specific* past societies?

1.2.1. Status, career, and expectations: objects lead interesting lives

Despite their apparent lack of a pragmatic function, the diverse items that find themselves gathered in the adornment category may have performed multiple tasks: they may have created, unified, protected, reminded, empowered, or even subjugated people. More than labelling and “trapping” certain finds in a self-evident and somewhat static “personal adornment” category, it is important to acknowledge that their function, meaning, or agency are dependent on the archaeological contexts in which such artefacts have been produced, used, assembled, and, ultimately, found (Loren 2010, 10). For this reason, these attributions can also oscillate over the lifetime of such items. It is therefore our goal to inquire into these social lives led by objects (Appadurai 1986; Kopytoff 1986). Objects are expected to follow ideal “careers” in accordance with the social contexts they are part of, involving stages analogue to birth, life, and death (Kopytoff 1986). These pathways are intrinsically connected to their expected performance and perceived value or status.

Building onto the foundations first set out by Mauss (2003[1925]) in his *Essay on the Gift*, Kopytoff (1986) proposes that an object’s status can be seen in a continuum that stretches from gift (sacred/inalienable) to commodity (profane/fully alienable). Through processes of singularization or commoditization, objects can undergo changes in status during their *biographies* as they oscillate between different spheres of circulation. These shifts are particularly striking in cases of culture contact, as materials leave their original social context and enter a new one where they are expected to perform in rather different ways. Examples can be found in mass produced European glass beads received in exchange by indigenous peoples of the Americas, who perceived them to be valuable and powerful items (*e.g.*, Keehnen 2012; 2019); and in indigenous material culture taken from source communities to be stored, catalogued, studied, and exhibited in Western museums (*e.g.*, Françaço 2012; Gosden and Marshall 1999; Grognet 2005). In both cases, items used as bodily adornment have been notable (albeit not sole) “currency” of exchange. Contemporary processes, such as the cultural appropriation of forms of traditional dress by the fashion industry, can likewise serve to illustrate the idea of commoditization as a process: “as one makes [things] worthy of being collected, one makes them valuable; and if they are valuable, they acquire a price and become a commodity and their

singularity is to that extent undermined” (Kopytoff 1986, 81). In modern and contemporary case-studies, historical sources and ethnographic insights play an important role in tracking the regional or global circulation of object types and the corresponding changes in expectations surrounding them.

By reconstructing object biographies, we can assess how objects were entangled in the biographies of people (Gosden and Marshall 1999; Hoskins 1998; 2006). In other words, a biographical approach offers a framework to understand the ways in which objects were appropriated by social actors, who interacted with them and who attributed sets of meanings to them. However, no specific research method is implied by a biographical approach; this has led to varied applications across and within each discipline concerned with the study of material culture. When studying archaeological artefacts, any biographical pursuit must inquire into the properties of materials and into the stages that predate those in which the artefacts are found—since the archaeological context is only their final repository.³ This is done by examining the qualities of objects and materials that demand and encourage action from humans (Gosden 2005; Hodder 2011; Jones 2004). Pursuing *artefact* biographies (Van Gijn 2010; 2012; Van Gijn and Wentink 2013) involves a focus on the materials themselves as means to seek answers. Archaeologists are well equipped to assess the changes artefacts undergo as a result of their successive life stages, as “[b]iographical information resides in the artefact, in the patina of age, wear and repair it acquires through its life” (Joy 2009, 545).

Archaeologists have indeed paid considerable attention to the life stages of artefacts, in particular by using an approach often referred to as the *chaîne opératoire*. This concept was originally proposed in francophone ethnology and archaeology and has since become an analytical tool for the understanding of technical processes (Balfet 1991; Cresswell 1983; Desrosiers 1991; Leroi-Gourhan 1993[1964]). This interest in technical sequences, gestures, and in bodily habits at large can be traced back to, among others, Mauss’s (1973[1935]) essay on techniques of the body. The use of the *chaîne opératoire* in archaeology has involved the detailed study of entire assemblages of, e.g., lithic remains recovered from archaeological sites (Bodu 1999; Cahen et al. 1980; Cahen and Karlin 1980; Inizan et al. 1999; Pelegrin 2000; 2005). Focus is not placed exclusively on (formal) tools to be classified into static typologies based on

3 That is, before they start their new careers as archaeological artefacts, museum objects, and their representations (Joyce and Gillespie 2015; Gosden and Marshall 1999).

their morphological or stylistic attributes. Instead, all remains are hierarchically organized according to their raw material and position in idealized operational sequences. These sequences of technical gestures and procedures would have had specific end-products, set as templates in the mind of the craftsman (Pelegrin 1991). The recovered remains are thus understood as products of (technical) processes, rather than as fixed categories. The typical life stages of artefacts assessed in such manner can include raw material acquisition, production (itself divided in many successive stages: blank production, roughing-out, shaping, retouching, etc.), hafting, use, recycling, reuse, and discard (Cahen et al. 1980; Inizan et al. 1999; Wright 1992). The performance of technical operations, notably artefact production, is at the same time conservative and flexible: it involves individual skill and knowledge of materials, but follows socially-constrained procedures according to which materials can be successfully worked. In combination with experimental replications and contextual studies, such an approach has allowed researchers 1) to investigate processes of decision-making, knowledge transmission, and innovation (Cresswell 1983; Lemonnier 1993; Pelegrin 1991; 2005; Roux and Brill, eds. 2005; Tixier 1980) and 2) to understand how materials and resources were managed by prehistoric communities (Geneste 1992; Perlès 1980; 2007).

This understanding of the performance of techniques follows a social constructionist view of technology (*sensu* Killick 2004; Martín-Torres and Killick 2015), according to which technological choices are not exclusively guided by material constraints, environmental conditions, pragmatism, or efficiency. Instead, the choices made from a pool of available alternatives are influenced by the socio-cultural context an individual was raised in and by what this person has been taught as the correct way of performing a given task (Cresswell 1983; Dobres 2010; Killick 2004; Lemonnier 1993; Pfaffenberger 1988; 1992; Sillar and Tite 2000). For this reason, a *chaîne opératoire* approach has also been regarded as providing an avenue into the social relationships and symbolism that shape and are shaped by craft practice (Dobres 2001; 2010; Farbstein 2011; Knappett 2012; Lemonnier 1993; Pfaffenberger 2001). Here I will use the *chaîne opératoire* approach to organize and make sense of the technological data gathered from the studied ornaments, such as techniques, tools, gestures, and sequences of production, alongside technical performance and technological choices. This data will constitute a key component of the ornament biographies that will be discussed in chapters 2, 4, and 5.

However, one must be aware of the limitations of the chosen approaches. In particular, pleas for a less mechanistic understanding of the life of objects have been made as a reaction to common assumptions in applications of the *chaîne opératoire* approach. The description and classification of material remains is arguably over-formalized and imposes an artificial linearity to the engagement of humans with materials, through the definition of discrete stages with clearly defined goals (Bar-Yosef and Van Peer 2009; Conneller 2006; Ingold 2013). Reconstructions have focused on an image of craft practice as the task of a single problem-solving individual. However, as Conneller (2006, 47) argues: “in practice *chaînes opératoires* are never individual, but always multiple, inter-connected networks of action”. A compartmentalized treatment of past activities often fails to grasp how certain artefacts were integrated in composite objects or in complex (inter-, multi-, or cross-)craft systems (Brysbaert 2007; 2011; Miller 2007; Shimada 1996; Tsoraki 2011; Van Gijn 2012; Van Gijn et al. 2008). Furthermore, an economic perspective is often prioritized when building the life of an artefact as a linear construct that follows a strict sequence of stages towards a single end-product with a specific function. Objects have *use* lives that extend beyond any purely utilitarian expectations; for instance, they can also be handled, passed down from hand to hand, wrapped and unwrapped, hidden away, displayed, cleaned, or be treated with a variety of substances (Breukel 2013; Choyke 2006; 2010; d’Errico 1993b; Van Gijn 2014b; 2017; Van Gijn and Wentink 2013; Wentink 2006; see also Chapter 3). We should not regard these processes as mere aesthetic or curious additions to an artefact’s “real function”. By recording the trajectories undergone by artefacts, we are equipped to highlight departures from our expected “utilitarian” biographies. Likewise, assuming that all object lives have a birth/beginning and a death/end, as understood in analogy with human lives, is rather limiting (Hahn and Weiss 2013; Joyce and Gillespie 2015). This had led researchers to propose *itineraries* as a more dynamic way to frame the lives of objects and their “extraordinary changeability” (Hahn and Weiss 2013, 9; also Fontijn 2013). This can be also linked to a concern with acknowledging that matter is in a perpetual state of becoming (Joyce and Gillespie 2015; also Ingold 2007; 2013). Here I opted for retaining the term biography, but keeping in mind that it does not need to be a coherent narrative with a beginning and an end. An object biography narrative is often incomplete due to limitations intrinsic to archaeological data (Joy 2009, 544). Despite the perpetual continuity of the lives of matter and the intrinsic

incompleteness of our reconstructions, a biographical approach can still be used to pursue a more holistic and relational view of how, throughout its life, an object is entangled in social interactions with other objects and humans. The biography metaphor will thus be used to provide a structuring framework with which we can make sense of the complex, dynamic, cyclical, and perhaps chaotic lives of objects.

1.2.2. No strings attached: pursuing the biographies of ornaments

Even if often found separated from each other in archaeological sites, beads and pendants were likely once connected to other components through string materials. The resulting objects (necklaces, belts, arm bands, and the like) are here collectively referred to as “composite ornaments”⁴. This often overlooked, but intrinsic characteristic of ornaments makes them particularly prone for having unexpected biographies, as aptly put in the following: “The integrity of a beaded dress ornament is as fragile as the material that holds it together [...]. Anyone who wears beaded jewellery or clothing is aware of its precarious nature, and has left at one time or another a trail of sequins or beads that if sufficiently valued are gathered up and refabricated” (Cifarelli 2018, 53; see also Bigi and Vidale 2009). Fragmentation and transformations are thus recurrent in the lives of composite ornaments. This may not be exclusively the product of accidental breakages, but also may be connected to a deliberate desire 1) to refashion a piece once it has served its purpose, 2) to add a personal touch to an object prior to further exchange, or 3) to gather pieces with different biographies in a single (powerful or memory-laden) object (*e.g.*, Campbell 1983; Ewart 2012; Gaydarska et al. 2004; Van Gijn 2017; Wiessner 1982, 72; Walker 2009). This is because composite ornaments are assemblages of components, which are at a given point in time linked to each other. Despite the recurrent reassembly and reconstruction of archaeological necklaces as complete, symmetrical, and harmonious from a Western point of view, the individual components need not to have the same materials, colours, shapes, or even biographies (Frieman 2012; Woodward and Hunter 2015). Studying the biographies of individual components has allowed researchers to identify processes of fragmentation, singularization, and curation. For instance, objects may be removed from their typical life cycles, in order to be made into (parts of) something else. Through such processes, they can become “mnemonic devices” or “ancestor materials”:

4 Examples of such objects are illustrated and discussed in Chapter 3.

new artefacts with a new role, but which are still reminiscent of their prior lives and their prior sets of meaning (Caple 2010; Cifarelli 2018; Jennings 2014; Loren 2009; Skeates 1995). The intergenerational circulation of ornaments as heirlooms has also been put forward on the basis of detailed artefact analysis (Choyke 2010; Van Gijn 2017; Woodward 2002; Woodward and Hunter 2015; see also Lillios 1999).

A biographical approach has often been used in the study of material exchange, particularly across different cultures. The capacities of a given object can be linked to its raw material and to its known or imagined origins. This can be illustrated by several case-studies from across the globe, such as ornaments made of skeletal materials (Chaumeil 2004; Choyke 2010), 18th-19th century remembrance hair jewellery (Holm 2004), and, more generally, exotic materials from faraway (Helms 1988). At the same time, the status of an object at any given time is a “state of being” (Lillios 1999, 243) dependent on the way it is regarded and dealt with by people (Fontijn 2013, 190-191; Stockhammer 2015). Nevertheless, the topic of exchange in archaeology has more often than not been addressed through studies that focus exclusively on the *transfer* of material. As Pollard and colleagues (2014) argue, a “simplistic view of provenance, with ‘instantaneous’ lines drawn from source to the final object, though objectively true, fails to engage with the rich life of the material beyond its first and last points” (Pollard et al. 2014, 627; see also Breukel 2019; Van Gijn and Wentink 2013). As argued above, this “rich life” can be assessed through the identification of processes such as technological modifications, fragmentation, curation, assemblage, and use (Brück and Davies 2018; Choyke 2006; Gaydarska et al. 2004; Perlès 2007; Sheridan and Davies 2012; Van Gijn 2017; Walker 2009; Woodward 2002; Woodward and Hunter 2015). For instance, we know from ethnographic accounts that composite ornaments acquired greater value depending on their specific histories of exchange and ownership, as visible on the surface of the objects themselves (Gosden and Marshall 1999; see references in Pollard et al. 2014, 628, and Spielmann 2002, 201). Practices of repolishing ornaments and groundstone celts upon receipt are also known archaeologically and ethnographically (Breukel 2019; Campbell 1983; Pétrequin and Pétrequin 2016). Researchers, therefore, need to also focus on elucidating what happens to a material after arrival and prior to (further) exchange. A purely quantitative assessment of the occurrence of exotic or presumably valuable materials cannot be sufficient for generating a

comprehensive understanding of how materials were circulated and made active in the past. Artefacts must also be investigated from a qualitative perspective that can further elucidate human action leading to observed patterns in material distribution (Lillios 1999, 238; Perlès 2007). This type of investigation is crucial in making the study of past exchange relevant from a social and technical point of view (Pollard et al. 2014). Furthermore, as discussed in section 1.1.3, certain materials may have been exchanged in the past, but present limited potential for provenance studies due to their wide regional availability. For instance, Kirch (1988) contrasts the exclusive focus archaeologists had placed on the exchange of mineral resources across the Pacific islands to the abundant and well-known ethnographic evidence for the long-distance exchange of shell ornaments. In order to demonstrate the exchange of shell valuables and explore its patterns, Kirch (1988) maps the occurrence of these items, taking into account not only raw material and typological variability, but also evidence for local production. In fact, the operations that compose a *chaîne opératoire* are organized in time and across geographical space (Perlès 1980; Geneste 1992). The hierarchical organization of an archaeological assemblage in technical stages can highlight the presence or absence of certain products, thus pointing to the states in which materials were brought into a given site (Perlès 2007). The percentage of each raw material and the corresponding states of importation can provide insight into the mechanisms of material acquisition and circulation. When seen as a group, these studies stress the need for pursuing the roles of ornaments in the past not only in connection with their types and raw materials, but also through careful examinations of their biographies.

1.3. Methodology

The previous section demonstrated that we cannot successfully inquire into the roles of ornaments by limiting ourselves to a typo-morphological approach. Furthermore, the identification of raw materials and their geological sources also present us with only part of the story. I argued that we should pursue the biographies of ornaments as a means of generating a more holistic understanding of the ways materials were dealt with by people in the past. This pursuit for a less static approach to the study of ornaments forms a key component of this dissertation. In the following, the method used here to operationalize artefact biographies is presented.

1.3.1. *Through the jeweller's loupe: microwear analysis of ornaments*

Biographies can be reconstructed by investigating the artefacts themselves. The direct observation of the surface of artefacts can provide information on the processes they have endured. Technological and functional approaches to artefact analysis have developed on the basis of this general idea, although not specifically visualizing these processes as part of a biography. While microscopic studies of wear traces have originally developed to study the function of isotropic lithic resources (Keeley 1974; 1980; Keeley and Newcomer 1977; Mansur 1990; Odell 2001; Plisson and Van Gijn 1989; Semenov 1973[1964]; Van Gijn 1990), they have been increasingly applied to other raw materials. In particular, microwear analysis⁵ has now been carried out on a much broader range of materials, focusing on traces connected to both technological and use activities (*e.g.*, Adams 2004; Adams et al. 2009; Bradfield 2015; Breukel 2019; Buc 2011; Cuenca Solana et al. 2017; d'Errico 1993a; 1993b; De Angelis and Mansur 2010; Dubreuil and Savage 2014; Hamon 2008; Kelly 2003; Kononenko et al. 2010; Lammers-Keijzers 2007; Little et al. 2016; Maigrot 2005; Sidéra and Legrand 2006; Van Gijn et al. 2008; Van Gijn and Hofman 2008). The most common instruments of analysis are based on optical light microscopy (*i.e.* a stereomicroscope and a reflected or incident light metallographic microscope). At the same time, explorations of new instruments are ongoing, in particular of those providing quantitative measurements of wear (*e.g.*, Borel et al. 2014; d'Errico et al. 2000; Evans and Donahue 2008; Ollé et al. 2016; Procopiou et al. 2013; Stemp et al. 2016). The identification of specific techniques, tools, and, more generally, contact materials is dependent on reproducing observed archaeological traces through controlled experiments (Bamforth 2010; Hurcombe 2008; Keeley 1980; Keeley and Newcomer 1977). Experiments may focus on reproducing specific tasks with controlled conditions (*e.g.*, cleanness, time, number, type and strength of gesture), only changing one variable at a time. This type of clinical experiment allows for the characterization and identification of material interaction. Actualistic experiments can also be conducted, focusing instead on complex activities or production sequences that incorporate multiple gestures and variables. This has proven to be of importance, as real life conditions tend to be markedly different from laboratory settings (Van Gijn 2014a). Furthermore,

5 In order to highlight this focus on the study of traces from multiple origins, I opted for using the term microwear analysis throughout this dissertation, instead of other common terms, but of narrower scope, such as use-wear or functional analysis.

traces form on an artefact from multiple interactions over its biography, creating a micro-stratigraphy or even complex palimpsests on its surface (Akoshima and Kanomata 2015). Researchers have also investigated how natural or post-excavation processes affect studied materials and the preservation of wear, for instance by characterizing the damage caused by predators, taphonomic agents, and cleaning or curating practices on shell and bone (*e.g.*, d'Errico 1993a; Cuenca-Solana 2013; Graziano 2015; Orłowska 2018). It is in this context of an ever-growing and increasingly more diversified field of microwear studies that the present research is situated.

Here we consider primarily the study of ornaments produced through extractive-reductive crafts (*sensu* Miller 2007), such as the working of lithics and hard animal materials.⁶ This is because these are the most commonly recovered ornament raw materials from pre-colonial Caribbean contexts (section 1.1). Ornaments have received considerable attention from an artefact analysis perspective, in particular by researchers using some degree of magnification in search of greater insight on production, use, and taphonomy. The success and popularity of the use of magnification for ornament studies can be at least partially explained by: 1) the small sizes of ornaments, which limit the usefulness of direct observation with the naked eye, and 2) to the recurrent use of abrasive technologies in their production, which not only do not produce abundant remains such as debitage, but also tend to superpose and erase traces left by previous life stages. Many studies have used low power microscopy (magnifications of less than 100×), using a stereomicroscope or a DinoLite. Such instruments allow for the identification of manufacture traces, generally to the level of technique (*i.e.* percussion, pressure, drilling, and grinding), and their sequence of application. They also provide an understanding of use-wear presence, types, distribution, and degree of development. Archaeologists have focused especially on automorphic artefacts (in which the natural shape of the material has not been changed significantly), such as perforated whole shells or teeth (Alarashi 2010; Álvarez Fernández 2006; Bonnardin 2008; 2012; Cristiani and Borić 2012; Cristiani et al. 2014; d'Errico et al. 2005; Gutiérrez Zugasti and Cuenca Solana 2015; Langley and O'Connor 2016; Mărgărit et al. 2018; Sidéra and Giacobini 2002; Sidéra and Legrand 2006; Tatá et al. 2014). Low magnification microscopes have also been used for the study of lithic materials,

⁶ To the exclusion of ornament materials produced by transformative crafts, such as ceramic, porcelain, glass, and metals.

such as amber, jet, calcite, diorite, carnelian, and steatite (Alarashi 2016; Falci 2015; Sebire 2016; Van Gijn 2006; 2008; 2014b; 2017; Verschoof 2008).

Low magnification instruments are often used in combination with at least another microscope providing high magnifications (from 50x up to 1000x). A metallographic microscope can offer insight into contact materials, directionality, and superposition of traces. The analysis works through the same principles as more traditional use-wear studies, entailing the study of the surface micro-topography of an artefact. Observed features include polish, rounding, micro-removals, striations, pits, directionality, the micro-stratigraphy of traces, and potential residues (Adams et al. 2009; Keeley 1980; Mansur 1990; Van Gijn 1990). It has been used to identify both technological and use-related features, such as successive surface treatments, production toolkits, residues associated to attachment systems, and contact with other beads, skin, or fabrics (Brasser 2015; Breukel 2019; Cristiani and Borić 2012; Cristiani et al. 2014; Falci 2015; Groman-Yaroslavski and Bar-Yosef Mayer 2015; Martí et al. 2017; Milner et al. 2016; Van Gijn 2006; 2008; 2014b; 2017; Verschoof 2008). The use of this type of microscope has been somewhat limited in ornament studies. This may be connected to the need for a 90° angle between the light source and the surface of the artefact, which can pose a challenge for the rounded surfaces common in ornaments. In addition, the bright, white, and/or reflective surfaces of certain materials, such as shell, teeth, and some lithics, may render observation of diagnostic features difficult. Furthermore, poor surface preservation affects this type of analysis to a greater degree than analyses with low magnification. Detailed examination of the inside of deep and steep features, such as perforations and incised grooves, requires the production of negative silicone impressions (casts) of the surface.

A Scanning Electron Microscope (SEM) has been used for a long time in bead studies, particularly for assessing the raw material of drill bits and the drilling mechanisms used (*e.g.*, twisting motion, palm drill, bow drill, etc.) (*e.g.*, Bains 2012; Gwinnett and Gorelick 1979; Gorelick and Gwinnett 1989; 1990; Kenoyer 1997; Kenoyer and Vidale 1992; Vidale 1995). This microscope allows good visibility of curvilinear surfaces, wider depth of field, a longer working distance, higher resolutions, and higher magnifications (Borel et al. 2014; Ollé et al. 2016). The SEM is also being used for the identification of carving techniques and toolkits, through the examination of the morphology and sequence of carved grooves and of the width of bands of striations under high

magnification (d'Errico 1993a; 1993b; d'Errico et al. 2005; Melgar Tísoc and Andrieu 2016; Milner et al. 2016; Sax et al. 2004; Sax and Ji 2013; Velázquez Castro 2012). Multiple raw materials have been studied with the use of a SEM, both lapidary materials (agate, carnelian, nephrite, and jadeitite) and hard animal materials (shell, bone, and teeth). Limitations involved with the use of this microscope are higher costs, time-consuming analysis protocol, and the need for sample preparation (i.e. producing silicone casts of artefact surfaces and gold- or carbon-coating them for placement in a high vacuum chamber) (Borel et al. 2014). Furthermore, it does not permit direct observation and instant manipulation of samples.

More recently, X-ray micro-Computed Tomography (μ -CT scanning) has also been used for the study of (non-metallic) ornaments. It creates a 3D virtual model of the scanned object at high resolution (5 – 10 μ), including not only its surface, but also its inner structure. The model can be sectioned in multiple planes and observed features can be measured, isolated, or removed. In this way, it is possible to visualize both technological traces, such as the shape of the perforation and drilling marks, and structural features, such as different layers, inclusions, or air bubbles in a material (Huisman et al. 2012; Ngan-Tillard et al. 2014; 2018; Winnicka 2017; Yang et al. 2009; 2011; 2016). Thus far, it has been used for the study of beads made of glass, amber, steatite, jadeite, ostrich eggshell, and bone. It is a non-destructive technique and no sample preparation is required, as most beads are sufficiently small to be scanned in their entirety. Other analytical techniques have also been experimented with to assess their potential for the study of ornament making, such as microscopes for measuring surface roughness (*e.g.*, Confocal Microscopy; Astruc et al. 2011; d'Errico et al. 2000; Wei et al. 2017) and Reflectance Transformation Imaging for examining incised carvings (Lauffenburger et al. 2015; Milner et al. 2016).

1.3.2. Adjusting the focus: studying ornaments from the Caribbean

The application of technological and, especially, microwear analyses to ornaments has been sparse in the Caribbean. Shell ornaments from sites in the French West Indies and Aruba have been studied, with emphasis on production sequences and toolkits (Lammers-Keijsers 2007; Serrand 1997; 2007). An experimental programme has been conducted alongside the study of shell bead-making remains from the workshop site at Grand Turk (Carlson 1993; 1995). In fact, experiments aiming to replicate the sequence of production and the use

of marine shell tools have been relatively more common in the region (Antczak 1999; Dacal Moure 1997; Lammers-Keijzers 2007; Lundberg 1987; O'Day and Keegan 2001). Despite the abundance of ornaments in lithic materials found throughout the Caribbean, there have not been many studies focused on their technology or use. Ornaments in lapidary materials from Saladoid and Huecoid contexts have received more attention from a technological point of view than later varieties (see Chapter 4 for a complete review). For instance, a study has been carried out on the reduction sequences involved in bead manufacture in lapidary materials, notably carnelian, from Montserrat (Bartone and Crock 1991; Crock and Bartone 1998). Four stages of ornament making were defined, involving hard hammer percussion and pressure flaking in the first two stages, respectively. The authors also recorded remnant drilled cones inside unfinished holes that suggest the use of hollow drill bits for perforating (Crock and Bartone 1998, 213). Other studies have been performed on assemblages recovered from sites in Martinique and St. Martin (Bérard 2004; Haviser 1999). Only a pilot experimental study focused on drilling technologies has been conducted, using SEM to examine traces produced on calcite (De Mille and Varney 2003; De Mille et al. 2008). In summary, despite the abundance of ornaments recovered from archaeological sites across the Caribbean, not many studies have focused on understanding crucial stages in their biographies. Chapters 4 and 5 provide more detailed reviews of previous studies focused on Caribbean ornaments, also including those primarily concerned with typology, iconography, raw material identification, and sourcing.

Microwear analysis of individual ornaments recovered from archaeological sites in the Caribbean will provide first-hand and fine-scale data that can be contrasted to the models reviewed in section 1.1. In order to create a dialogue and challenge previous ideas, we will investigate not only artefacts retrieved during recent systematic excavations, but also specimens from previously excavated and/or looted sites without good provenience data. Sites and collections that have for a long time served as basis for building the regional culture history need to be redressed by new approaches and methods, as noted at the onset of this chapter. Microwear analysis can be used to study artefacts with such different post-excavation biographies, provided that their limitations are acknowledged. Different collections require different approaches to their successful study. In each of the following chapters, collections of different composition and history of formation are researched. As a result, they have

experienced different degrees of modification after removal from archaeological sites or source communities. Furthermore, a great variety of ornament types and raw materials are encompassed in this selection. Different materials have different physico-chemical properties, which affect not only their workability, but also the formation of use-wear and their taphonomic preservation. Ornament types also varied considerably, encompassing minute “seed beads”, 10cm-thick tubular beads, exquisitely carved anthropomorphic pendants, and a broad range of morphologies in between. The setting where the research was conducted oscillated between the Laboratory for Artefact Studies of Leiden University (Chapters 2 and 5), the Atelier de Conservation et Restauration of the Musée du quai Branly (Chapter 3), and field-based improvised laboratories in Grenada and the Dominican Republic (Chapters 4 and 5). This entailed the use of different microscope models for the studies: relatively portable equipment had to be transported to the Caribbean, while microscopes were available in the museum facilities in Paris. The Laboratory in Leiden is especially designed for microwear research; it thus provided ideal conditions for analysis. However, in many instances, it was decided not to take archaeological material from the Caribbean out of its country of origin. In each of the following chapters, the microscopic equipment used and the research protocol are specified. As a general rule, both low and high magnification microscopes were used. In spite of the differences in collections and research setting, the analysis form and registered features remained the same across all case-studies (form in Appendix 1). An image of the Access database used for registering each artefact can be found in Appendix 2. A supplementary analysis form was used for the ethnographic objects studied in Chapter 3 for general description (form in Appendix 3), alongside multiple forms for the individual ornaments that are part of each object. The cleaning protocol for ethnographic objects took into consideration their composite nature and fragility; it is described in detail in Chapter 3. For archaeological artefacts (Chapters 2, 4, and 5), the cleaning protocol involved carefully washing each artefact by hand in water with soap. When it was not possible to remove dirt by hand, artefacts were placed in an ultrasonic tank for a few minutes; this was only done in Leiden, as we did not have an ultrasound in the Caribbean. During analysis, the surfaces of artefacts were often cleaned with cotton soaked in alcohol or lighter fluid in order to remove grease produced by handling.

1.3.3. Reference collections

Bead research has a long tradition of experimental programmes, many of which concerned with technical performance, time expenditure, and craft specialization (e.g., Francis 1982; Carlson 1993; Miller 1996; Yerkes 1993). Only a portion of these experiments have been carried out with the goal of reproducing manufacture traces for comparison to microwear data (e.g., d'Errico et al. 1993; 2000; Groman-Yarolasvski and Bar-Yosef Mayer 2015; Gurova et al. 2013; Mărgărit et al. 2018; Tatá et al. 2014). In the present research, experiments related to ornament production were carried out to support interpretation. They have been performed in different occasions on the years of 2014, 2015, and 2016; experiments from the first two years have been previously reported elsewhere (Breukel 2019; Breukel and Falci 2017; Falci 2015). While the experiments of 2014 were exploratory, the experiments carried out in 2015 and 2016 were focused on addressing specific questions raised by the analysis of archaeological materials. Rather than replicating entire production sequences, I opted for reproducing individual techniques with use of different tools and additives. The techniques were intended to represent the main ornament making operations identified on the studied assemblages, namely blank acquisition (sawing), surface treatments (grinding and polishing), perforating (drilling and sawing), and carving for shaping or decorative purposes (incising and notching). In some cases, more than one technique was applied to a same bead blank; for instance, a surface was ground prior to polishing, while surfaces obtained through sawing were sometimes ground over. This provided insights on the micro-stratigraphy of traces, i.e. how traces belonging to earlier operations in the manufacture sequence would appear on (nearly) finished ornaments. Time was recorded for most experiments and photographic registration was made of all activities and products. The grinding and polishing experiments from 2016 were sequential experiments; in other words, casts were made of the worked surfaces at selected time intervals (for instance, 0', 15', 30', 60'). Moreover, the effects of the addition of abrasives (sand) and lubricants (water) were tested both individually and in combination.

Preference was given to working with only certain raw materials as ornament blanks, in particular those most common in the archaeological case-studies. This led to the choice of three marine shell species (*Lobatus gigas*, *Spondylus americanus*, and *Oliva reticularis*), one stony coral species (*Acropora cervicornis*), and the following lithic materials: calcite, diorite, amethyst, and, to

a lesser degree, nephrite and serpentinite. The contact materials (i.e. tools) used for each experiment were chosen on the basis of a range of factors: preliminary hypotheses concerning the origin of observed traces on archaeological specimens, regional availability of raw materials, hypotheses previously advanced (Clerc 1974; Rostain 2006; Rodríguez Ramos 2010b), experiments by other researchers (Carlson 1993; Kelly 2003; Lammers-Keijzers 2007; Melgar Tísoc and Andrieu 2016), ethnohistoric sources (Las Casas 1992, 587), and ethnographic sources from lowland South America (Koch-Grünberg 2005; Ribeiro 1988; Roth 1924). The complete list of experiments conducted for this research can be found in Appendix 4, while the standard form used for recording the experiments can be found in Appendix 5. The relevant experiments are described and illustrated in Chapters 2 and 5, where they serve as basis for interpretation. Chapter 4 refers to the preliminary results of the sequential grinding and polishing experiments.

For the interpretation of ornament use-wear, we referred to published experiments that describe its location, characteristics, and formation rates (Álvarez Fernández 2006; Brassier 2015; d’Errico 1993a; d’Errico et al. 1993; Langley and O’Connor 2016; Mărgărit 2016; Minotti 2014; Vanhaeren et al. 2013; Verschoof 2008). The contributions and limitations of use-wear experiments for the study of ornaments are discussed in-depth in Chapter 3. Replicating the use of ornaments was not part of the experimental programme carried out here; this was due to the large number of studied raw materials and of artefacts that have undergone multiple stages of production. Their replication for use experiments would require more time and resources than at disposal. Here I investigate use-wear formation on ornaments through the systematic analysis of ethnographic composite ornaments. The studied objects belong to the lowland South American collections of the Musée du quai Branly. The choice for objects from this region is related to the traditionally advanced connections between this region and the Caribbean, as referred to in section 1.1. The studied objects include components made of mollusc shell, animal bone, quartz, among others. Even though we cannot control for variables such as use duration and contact materials when looking at such objects as a reference collection, they do provide a valuable window into attachment systems and the ways that individual components would have undergone processes of wear in real life. The variety of processes an ornament undergoes in its lifetime is very difficult to replicate in experimental programmes. A thorough overview of this study and its results can be found in Chapter 3.

1.4. Thesis outline

The remainder of this dissertation is composed of four chapters and a concluding chapter. The four main chapters have been published in peer-reviewed journals, as independent contributions to ornament studies and circum-Caribbean archaeology. The order of the chapters should not be regarded as a strict and predetermined sequence. Instead, it should be conceived as a beadwork: individual chapters are connected to each other at multiple levels and rely on each other for interpretation, but do not need to be read in the presented order. Nonetheless, they are separated in two consecutive parts, each dealing with one of the two main goals of this dissertation as proposed earlier in this introduction (Figure 3). The aim of Part 1 (Chapters 2 and 3) is to develop an approach for researching the biographies of bodily ornaments, taking into account challenges that are particularly common in circum-Caribbean archaeology—but, certainly not exclusive to it. In this sense, they provide the basis for the interpretations that will be made in the second part of the dissertation.




Figure 3: Graphical representation of the outline of this dissertation.

Part 2 (Chapters 4 and 5) focuses on applying the biographical approach developed in the previous chapters to the study of assemblages of ornaments from the two case-studies selected here. Each chapter primarily deals with the first research question posed above, i.e. how people dealt with ornaments in each of the studied contexts. The two case-studies give us the opportunity to delve into the biographies of ornaments not only from two different time periods, but also from different types of sites and assemblages: 1) a large assemblage of ornaments in different stages of production from a workshop site and 2) smaller assemblages of finished ornaments from settlement sites. In this sense, they illustrate the wide applicability of the approach proposed here. Both chapters include a review of archaeological debates surrounding ornaments and their raw materials for the relevant time period. The newly generated microwear data is interpreted in the form of ornament biographies, which are then contrasted to previous narratives about the socio-political roles of bodily adornment and its exchange.

Part 1: Designing a biographical approach to the study of bodily adornment

Chapter 2: Identifying challenges and proposing solutions

In this chapter, a case-study from north-central Venezuela is used as basis for developing a protocol for approaching ornaments from circum-Caribbean collections. We carried out a microwear study of 15 archaeological marine shell figurative ornaments from an early 20th century collection of the Ethnologisches Museum Berlin.⁷ This study deals with specific challenges faced during the analysis of collections that do not have (abundant) associated data concerning their provenience or specific archaeological context. This chapter, therefore, proposes an avenue for studying ornaments such as those found in many museum and private collections around the world. As (mostly) finished artefacts with no associated tools, production remains, or clear context of usage or deposition, the detailed analysis of their surfaces through microwear analysis offers one of the few avenues into their biographies. With this in mind, we propose a protocol for dealing with the micro-stratigraphy of traces observed on the surfaces

⁷ This research has been presented in its entirety in the author's Research Master thesis (Falci 2015). The processes of recontextualizing this collection in relation to, first, its particular history and, second, to trends in research and collecting in the Valencia Lake Basin are discussed in another two published journal articles (Antczak et al. 2019; Falci et al. 2017).

of such artefacts, involving technological stigma from multiple stages of production, use-wear and rejuvenation, post-depositional surface modifications, and curatorial interventions. The paper contextualizes the studied material in relation to other figurative ornaments, notably pendants, recovered across the Caribbean and northern South America. Similarly figurative artefacts in lithic materials and marine shells from the Antilles will be discussed in Chapters 4 and 5, so Chapter 2 also sets a protocol for investigating such complex items. The contents of this chapter have been published as the following:

Falci, C.G., Van Gijn, A.L., Antczak, M.M., Antczak, A.T., Hofman, C.L., 2017. Challenges for microwear analysis of figurative shell ornaments from pre-Colonial Venezuela. *Journal of Archaeological Science Reports* 11, 115-130. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jasrep.2016.11.029>

Chapter 3: Ornament biographies and use-wear studies

Following one of the research avenues in need of further study suggested in the previous chapter, this chapter looks at ethnographic collections of ornaments from lowland South America. The 38 objects studied here belong to multiple 19th-20th century collections housed at the Musée du quai Branly (Paris). Many specimens are composite objects, incorporating components made of organic, inorganic, and biomineral materials. The chapter reviews studies of ornament use-wear and notes some of their limitations. It critically discusses how the biographies of composite ornaments contrast to common archaeological interpretations, in particular regarding use-wear types and distribution. In other words, composite ornaments from real-world contexts are complex constructions whose biographies do not necessarily proceed in a linear manner. Many of the studied raw materials (*e.g.*, shell, bone, quartz) feature in the case-studies that follow; the ethnographic collection will thus be used as reference for the interpretation of use-wear. The contents of this chapter have been published as the following:

Falci, C.G., Cuisin, J., Delpuech, A., Van Gijn, A.L., Hofman, C.L., 2019. New insights into use-wear development in bodily ornaments through the study of ethnographic collections. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 26(2), 755-805. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10816-018-9389-8>

Part 2: Biographical studies of Ceramic Age bodily ornaments

Chapter 4: A clash between production and exchange: lapidary biographies

The first case-study concerns the circulation of lapidary materials during the early part of the Early Ceramic Age in the eastern Caribbean. We focus on the study of a large private collection of ornaments retrieved from the site of Pearls on the island of Grenada. The site has been regarded as an important node in exchange networks of the period for its size, abundance of recovered materials, and proximity to South America (as discussed in section 1.1.2). This chapter presents the results of a combined study, involving identification of lithologies and technological analysis of 1273 ornaments in varied lithic raw materials and in different production stages. Of this total, a sample set of 100 ornaments was analysed for microwear. The studied collection is recontextualized through comparison with data stemming from previous research on the Pearls site and on other lapidary workshops from across the Caribbean. The combined use of these research methods provides insights on production logics and management strategies specific to each lapidary raw material. While the research carried out in this chapter is guided by a *chaîne opératoire* approach, the distribution of lapidary production sequences not only across time, but also across space highlights the importance of a biographical perspective. Only by tracing networks of action as expressed through the “fragmented” production sequences of many ornament materials, can we reconstruct past networks of interaction taking place across the Caribbean Sea. The contents of this chapter have been published as the following:

Falci, C.G., Knaf, A.C.S., Van Gijn, A.L., Davies, G.R., Hofman, C.L., 2020. Lapidary production in the eastern Caribbean: a typo-technological and microwear study of ornaments from the site of Pearls, Grenada. *Archaeological and Anthropological Sciences* 12:53. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12520-019-01001-4>.

Chapter 5: Recollecting lost beads: the biographies of ornaments from settlement sites

The second case-study concerns bodily adornment in the later part of the Late Ceramic Age in the Greater Antilles. As reviewed in section 1.1.2 and further argued in the chapter itself, ornaments are assumed to have a role in reinforcing inherited social hierarchies. However, few studies have been concerned with material-based research of ornaments from the period, despite

the great interest they have generally sparked. In this chapter, assemblages from five recently excavated settlement sites in the Dominican Republic are studied: the neighbouring sites of El Flaco, El Carril, and La Luperona in the northwestern region⁸, the site of Playa Grande on the northern coast, and the site of El Cabo on the eastern coast. The 312 recovered ornaments are made of a broad range of raw materials, but with clear predominance of calcite, plutonic rocks, and marine shells. The ornaments have been exhumed through modern and systematic excavation techniques, in contrast to materials in the previous chapters. Nevertheless, we are faced with challenges when making sense of such artefacts, albeit different ones: most of them are finished specimens, have been recovered either in isolation or in small groups from across the sites and in non-structured deposits, are not associated to identified ornament production tools or remains, and are not placed in burials that could offer insight on mode of wear and composite ornament type. A microwear study of these assemblages can provide a new perspective on their biographies and on the regional variability in ornament types, technologies, and raw materials. All artefacts were thus studied through microwear analysis and 10 specimens underwent μ -CT scanning to provide better visualization of their perforations. While researchers have stressed the role of bodily adornment in exchange, the widespread regional occurrence of the raw materials from which the studied ornaments are made prevents sourcing efforts. We circumvent this limitation by identifying ornament morpho-technical groups and their occurrence patterns across the five studied sites. The identification of such groupings provided insights into possible regional connections. The contents of this chapter have been published as the following:

Falci, C.G., Ngan-Tillard, D., Hofman, C.L., Van Gijn, A.L., 2020. The biographies of bodily ornaments from indigenous settlements of the Dominican Republic (AD 800–1600). *Latin American Antiquity* 0, 1-22. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1017/laq.2019.101>

In the concluding chapter, the main findings of each study are revisited. In particular, the biographical patterns for ornaments in each time period are

⁸ Part of the research on the ornaments from the northwest of the Dominican Republic has been presented in the author's Research Master thesis (Falci 2015). It included materials from the 2013 and 2014 excavations of El Flaco and La Luperona, in addition to specimens recovered during surveys in the region.

summarized. The second and third research questions are addressed in this chapter: the contributions of our study to the understanding of exchange are discussed, at the same time as providing insights on the social roles held by bodily ornaments in the Caribbean. Furthermore, the contributions and limitations of the chosen approach and methods are evaluated. The implications of the results obtained here in regards to the (microwear) study of ornament collections are also stressed. Finally, avenues for future research are proposed.

1.5. Bibliography

- Adams, J.L., 2014. Ground stone use-wear analysis: A review of terminology and experimental methods. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 48, 129-138. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2013.01.030>
- Adams, J.L., Delgado-Raack, S., Dubreuil, L., Hamon, C., Plisson, H., and Risch, R., 2009. Functional analysis of macro-lithic artefacts: A focus on working surfaces. In: Sternke, F., Costa, L., and Eigeland, L. (eds.), *Non-Flint Raw Material Use in Prehistory: Old prejudices and new directions. Proceedings of the XV World Congress of the UISPP, Volume 11*. Oxford: Archaeopress, 43-66.
- Akoshima, K. and Kanomata, Y., 2015. Technological organization and lithic microwear analysis: an alternative methodology. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 38, 17-24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaa.2014.09.003>
- Alarashi, H., 2010. Shell beads in the Pre-Pottery Neolithic B in Central Levant: Cypraeidae of Tell Aswad (Damascus, Syria). In: Álvarez Fernández, E. and Carvajal Contreras, D.R. (eds.), *Not Only Food: Marine, terrestrial and freshwater molluscs in archaeological sites. Proceedings of the 2nd ICAZ Archaeomalacology Working group, Santander, 2008. Munibe Suplemento* 31, 88-98.
- Alarashi, H., 2016. Butterfly beads in the Neolithic Near East: evolution, technology and socio-cultural implications. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 26(3), 493-512. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774316000342>
- Alberti, B., 2012. Cut, pinch and pierce. Image as practice among the Early Formative La Candelaria, First Millennium AD, northwest Argentina. In: Back Danielsson, I.M, Fahlander, F., and Sjöstrand, Y. (eds.), *Encountering Imagery. Materialities, perceptions, relations*. Stockholm: University of Stockholm Department of Archaeology and Classical Studies, 13-28.
- Alegria, R.E., 1995. La vestimenta y los adornos de los caciques Taínos y la parafernalia asociada a sus funciones mágico-religiosas. In: Alegria, R.E. and Rodríguez, M. (eds.), *Proceedings of the XV International Congress for Caribbean Archaeology, San Juan, Puerto Rico, July 25th-30th 1993*. San Juan: Centro de Estudios Avanzados de Puerto Rico y el Caribe, 295-310.

- Álvarez Fernández, E., 2006. *Los objetos de adorno-colgantes del Paleolítico Superior y del Mesolítico en la cornisa cantábrica y en el valle del Ebro: Una visión europea*. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca.
- Antczak, A.T., 1999. *Late prehistoric economy and society of the islands off the coast of Venezuela: A contextual interpretation of the non-ceramic evidence*. London (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University College London).
- Antczak, A.T., Antczak, M.M., and Falci, C.G., 2019. Vibrant pasts in museum drawers: Advances in the study of late precolonial (AD 800–1500) materials collected from north-central Venezuela. *Museum History Journal* 12(1), 52-74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19369816.2019.1609870>
- Appadurai, A., 1986. Introduction: commodities and the politics of value. In: Appadurai, A. (ed.), *The social life of things: commodities in cultural perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3-63.
- Arnold, J., and Munns, A., 1994. Independent or attached specialization: the organization of shell bead production in California. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 21, 473-489. <https://doi.org/10.1179/009346994797175505>
- Arrom, J.J., 1975. *Mitología e artes prehispánicas de las Antillas*. Santo Domingo: Siglo XXI editores.
- Bains, R.K., 2012. *The social significance of Neolithic stone bead technologies at Çatalhöyük*. London (Ph.D. dissertation, University College London).
- Balfet, H., 1991. Des chaînes opératoires, pour quoi faire? In: Balfet, H. (ed.), *Observer l'action technique: des chaînes opératoires, pour quoi faire?* Paris: Éditions du CNRS, 11-19.
- Bamforth, D.B., 2010. Conducting experimental research as a basis for microwear analysis. In: Ferguson, J. (ed.), *Designing experimental research in archaeology: examining technology through production and use*. Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 93-109.
- Bartone, R.N. and Crock, J.G., 1991. Flaked stone industries at the early Saladoid Trants site, Montserrat, West Indies. In: Cummins, A. and King, P. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Congress for Caribbean Archaeology. Dover Convention Centre, Barbados, 22-28 July, 1991*. Bridgetown: Barbados Museum and Historical Society, 124-146.
- Bar-Yosef Mayer, D.E. and Bosch, M.D., 2019. Special Issue: Early Personal Ornaments --- Humans' Earliest Personal Ornaments: An Introduction. *PaleoAnthropology* 2019, 19-23. <https://doi.org/10.4207/PA.2019.ART121>
- Baysal, E., 2013. Will the real specialist please stand up? Characterising early craft specialisation, a comparative approach for Neolithic Anatolia. *Documenta Praehistorica* 40, 233-246. <https://doi.org/10.4312/dp.40.19>
- Bellina, B., 2014. Maritime Silk Roads' ornament industries: Socio-political practices and cultural transfers in the South China Sea. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal*

- 24(3), 345-377. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774314000547>
- Bérard, B., 2004. *Les premières occupations agricoles de l'arc antillais, migration et insularité. Le cas de l'occupation Saladoïde ancienne de la Martinique*. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Bercht, F., Brodsky, E., Farmer, J.A., and Taylor, D. (eds.), 1997. *Taíno: Pre-Columbian art and culture from the Caribbean*. New York: Monacelli Press.
- Berman, M.J., 2011. Good as gold: The aesthetic brilliance of the Lucayans. In: Hauser, M.W. and Curet, L.A. (eds.), *Islands at the Crossroads: Migration, Seafaring, and Interaction in the Caribbean*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 104-134.
- Bigi, E. and Vidale, M., 2009. Trashy treasures. Beads on the streets of Rome. *Ornament* 33(2), 54-57.
- Bodu, P., 1999. Paroles de pierre: Le concept de la chaîne opératoire appliqué aux industries lithiques paléolithiques. *Cahier des Thèmes Transversaux ArScAn* I, 86-90.
- Bonnardin, S., 2008. From traces to function of ornaments: Some examples. In: Longo, L. and Skakun, N.N. (eds.), *'Prehistoric technology' 40 years later: functional studies and the Russian legacy. Proceedings of the International Congress Verona (Italy), 20-23 April 2005*. Oxford: Archaeopress, 297-308.
- Bonnardin, S., 2012. Parures de coquillages du néolithique en Europe (VIe-Ve millénaires av. J.-C.). *Techniques & Culture* 59, 26-43.
- Boomert, A., 1987. Gifts of the Amazons: "Greenstone" pendants and beads as items of ceremonial exchange in Amazonia and the Caribbean. *Antropológica* 67, 33-54.
- Boomert, A., 2000. *Trinidad, Tobago, and the Lower Orinoco Interaction Sphere: An archaeological/ethnohistorical study*. Alkmaar: Cairi Publications.
- Boomert, A., 2001a. Raptorial birds as icons of shamanism in the prehistoric Caribbean and Amazonia. In: Alofs, L. and Dijkhoff, R.A.C.F. (eds.), *Proceedings of the XIX International Congress for Caribbean Archaeology, Volume I. Aruba, July 22-28, 2001*. Aruba: Archaeological Museum Aruba, 121-157.
- Boomert, A., 2001b. Saladoïd sociopolitical organization. In: *Proceedings of the XVIII International Congress for Caribbean Archaeology, Grenada, July 11-17, 1999*. Guadeloupe: L'Association Internationale d'Archéologie de la Caraïbe, 55-77.
- Boomert, A. 2007. Exotics from Pearls, Grenada. A preliminary assessment. In: *Proceedings of the XXII Conference of the International Association for Caribbean Archaeology (IACA), Kingston, Jamaica, July 23-29, 2007*. Kingston, 1-25.
- Boomert, A. and Rogers, C.T., 2007. Troumassoid stone artifacts in Tobago: Rock types and source areas. In: Reid, B.A., Petitjean-Roget, H., and Curet, L.A. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Twenty-First Congress of the International Association for Caribbean Archaeology, Volume 1. Trinidad and Tobago, 2005*. St. Augustine: The University of the West Indies, 282-294.

- Borel, A., Ollé, A., Vergés, J.M., and Sala, R., 2014. Scanning electron and optical light microscopy: two complementary approaches for the understanding and interpretation of usewear and residues on stone tools. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 48, 46-59. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2013.06.031>
- Bradfield, J., 2015. Use-trace analysis of bone tools: a brief overview of four methodological approaches. *The South African Archaeological Bulletin* 70(201), 3-14.
- Brasser, J.P., 2015. *Jet artifacts from two Neolithic sites on the Dutch coast: An experimental approach*. Leiden (Unpublished MSc thesis, University of Leiden).
- Breukel, T.W., 2013. *Threepointers on trial: a biographical study of Amerindian ritual artefacts from the pre-Columbian Caribbean*. Leiden (Unpublished RMA thesis, University of Leiden).
- Breukel, T.W., 2019. *Tracing interactions in the indigenous Caribbean through a biographical approach: Microwear and material culture across the historical divide (AD 1200-1600)*. Leiden (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Leiden).
- Breukel T.W. and Falci C.G., 2017. Experimental reproduction of wear traces on shell, coral, and lithic materials from the pre-colonial Caribbean. In: Velasquez C.B. and Havisier J.B. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 26th Congress of the IACA (International Association for Caribbean Archaeology)*. Sint Maarten: SIMARC.
- Brody, C.K., 2009. Studying the skeletons in the closet. Unprovenienced archeological collections in museums. *Collections* 5(3), 199-208. <https://doi.org/10.1177/155019060900500303>
- Brück, J. and Davies, A., 2018. The social role of non-metal 'valuables' in Late Bronze Age Britain. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 28(4), 665-688. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S095977431800029X>
- Brumfiel, E.M. and Earle, T.K., 1987. Specialization, exchange and complex societies: an introduction. In: Brumfiel, E.M. and Earle, T.K. (eds), *Specialization, Exchange and Complex Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-9.
- Brumm, A., Langley, M.C., Moore, M.W., Hakim, B., Ramli, M., Sumantri, I., Burhan, B., Saiful, A.M., Siagian, L., Sardi, R., Jusdi, A., 2017. Early human symbolic behavior in the Late Pleistocene of Wallacea. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 114(16), 4105-4110. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1619013114>
- Brysbaert, A., 2007. Cross-craft and cross-cultural interactions during the Aegean and Eastern Mediterranean Late Bronze Age. In: Antoniadou, S. and Pace, A. (eds.), *Mediterranean Crossroads*. Athens: Pierides Museum, 325-359.
- Brysbaert, A., 2011. Technologies of re-using and recycling in the Aegean and beyond. In: Brysbaert, A. (ed.), *Tracing prehistoric social networks through technology: a diachronic perspective on the Aegean*. New York & London: Routledge, 183-203.
- Buc, N., 2011. Experimental series and use-wear in bone tools. *Journal of Archaeological*

- Science 38(3), 546-557. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2010.10.009>
- Cahen, D. and C. Karlin, 1980. Nouvelles voies pour l'étude des pierres taillées. In: Tixier, J. (ed.), *Préhistoire et technologie lithique. Journées d'études à Valbonne, 11-13 mai 1979*. Paris: Éditions du CNRS, 24-27.
- Cahen, D., C. Karlin, L.H. Keeley, and F. Van Noten, 1980. Méthodes d'analyse technique, spatiale et fonctionnelle d'ensembles lithiques. *Helinium Wetteren* 20(3), 209-259.
- Campbell, S., 1983. Attaining rank: a classification of shell valuables. In: Leach, J.W. and Leach, E. (eds.), *The Kula: New Perspectives on Massim Exchange*. Cambridge University Press, 229-248.
- Caple, C., 2010. Ancestor Artefacts—Ancestor Materials. *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 29(3), 305-318. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0092.2010.00350.x>
- Carlson, L.A., 1993. *Strings of command: manufacture and utilization of shell beads among the Taino indians of the West Indies*. Gainesville (Unpublished MA thesis, University of Florida).
- Carlson, L.A., 1995. Strings of command: Manufacture and utilization of shell beads among the Taino. In: Alegría, R.E. and Rodríguez, M. (eds.), *Proceedings of the XV International Congress for Caribbean Archaeology, San Juan, Puerto Rico, July 25th-30th 1993*. San Juan: Centro de Estudios Avanzados de Puerto Rico y el Caribe, 97-109.
- Carter, A.K., 2015. Beads, exchange networks and emerging complexity: A case study from Cambodia and Thailand (500 BCE–CE 500). *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 25(4), 733-757. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774315000207>
- Chanlatte-Baik, L.A., 1983. *Catálogo Arqueología de Vieques. Exposición del 13 de marzo al 22 de abril de 1983*. Santo Domingo: Editora Corripio.
- Chanlatte-Baik, L.A., 1987. Asentamiento poblacional Agro-I, complejo cultural La Hueca, Vieques, Porto Rico. In: Allaire, L. (ed.), *Proceedings of the Tenth International Congress for the Study of the Pre-Columbian Cultures of the Lesser Antilles*. Montréal: Centre de Recherches Caraïbes, Université de Montréal, 225-250.
- Chanlatte-Baik, L.A. and Narganes, Y.M., 1980. La Hueca Vieques: un nuevo complejo cultural agroalfarero en la arqueología antillana. In: Lewenstein, S.M. (ed.), *Proceedings of the Eight International Congress for the Study of the Pre-Columbian Cultures of the Lesser Antilles. St. Kitts, July 30th-August 4th, 1979*. Tempe: Arizona State University, 501-523.
- Chaumeil, J.P., 2004. Armados hasta los dientes. Los trofeos de dientes humanos en la Amazonia. In: Myers, T. and Cipolletti, M.S. (eds.), *Artifacts and society in Amazonia*. Bonn: Förderverein Bonner Amerikanistische Studien, 115-126.
- Choyke, A.M., 2006. Bone tools for a lifetime: Experience and belonging. In: L. Astruc, F. Bon, V. Léa, P.-Y. Milcent, and S. Philibert (eds.), *Normes techniques et pratiques*

- sociales: De la simplicité des outillages pré-et protohistoriques. Actes des XXIV^e Rencontres Internationales d'archéologie et d'histoire d'Antibes*. Antibes: Éditions APDCA, 49-60.
- Choyke, A.M., 2010. The bone is the beast: Animal amulets and ornaments in power and magic. In: Campana, D.V., Crabtree, P., DeFrance, S.D., Lev-Tov, J. and Choyke, A. (eds.), *Anthropological Approaches to Zooarchaeology: Complexity, Colonialism, and Animal Transformations*. Oxford: Oxbow books, 197-209.
- Cifarelli, M., 2018. Entangled relations over geographical and gendered space: multi-component personal ornaments at Hasanlu. In: Di Paolo, S. (ed.), *Composite Artefacts in the Ancient Near East. Exhibiting an imaginative materiality, showing a genealogical nature*. Oxford: Archaeopress, 51-61.
- Clerc, E., 1974. Le travail du coquillage dans les sites precolombiens de la Grande-Terre de Guadeloupe. In: Bullen, R.P. (ed.), *Proceedings of the Fifth International Congress for the Study of pre-Columbian Cultures of the Lesser Antilles. Antigua, July 22-28, 1973*. Antigua: The Antigua National Trust & The Antigua Archaeological Society, 127-132.
- Cody, A.K., 1991a. Prehistoric patterns of exchange in the Lesser Antilles: Materials, models, and preliminary observations. Unpublished MA thesis (San Diego State University).
- Cody A.K., 1991b. From the site of Pearls, Grenada: Exotic lithics and radiocarbon dates. In: Ayubi E.N. and Haviser J.B. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Congress for Caribbean Archaeology Part 2, July 1989, Willemstad, Netherlands Antilles*. Willemstad: AAINA, 589-604.
- Cody, A.K., 1993. Distribution of exotic stone artifacts through the Lesser Antilles: Their implications for prehistoric interaction and exchange. In: Cummins, A. and King, P. (eds), *Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Congress for Caribbean Archaeology, Dover Convention Centre, Barbados, 22-28 July 1991*. Bridgetown: Barbados Museum and Historical Society, 204-226.
- Conklin, B.A., 1996. Reflections on Amazonian anthropologies of the body. *Medical Anthropology Quarterly. New Series* 10(3), 373-375.
- Conneller, C., 2004. Becoming deer. Corporeal transformations at Star Carr. *Archaeological dialogues* 11(1), 37-56. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1380203804001357>
- Conneller, C., 2006. The Space and Time of the *Chaîne Opératoire*: Technological approaches to past landscapes. *Archaeological Review from Cambridge* 21(1), 38-49.
- Cresswell, R., 1983. Transferts de techniques et chaînes opératoires. *Techniques & Culture* 2, 143-159.
- Cristiani, E. and Borić, D., 2012. 8500-year-old Late Mesolithic garment embroidery from Vlasac (Serbia): technological, use-wear and residue analyses. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 39(11), 3450-3469. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas>

- Cristiani, E., Živaljević, I., and Borić, D., 2014. Residue analysis and ornament suspension techniques in prehistory: Cyprinid pharyngeal teeth beads from Late Mesolithic burials at Vlasac (Serbia). *Journal of Archaeological Science* 46, 292-310. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2014.03.018>
- Crock, J.G. and Bartone, R.N., 1998. Archaeology of Trants, Montserrat. Part 4. Flaked stone and stone bead industries. *Annals of Carnegie Museum* 67(3), 197-224.
- Cooper, J., Martínón-Torres, M., and Valcárcel Rojas, R., 2008. American gold and European brass: metal objects and indigenous values in the cemetery of El Chorro de Maíta, Cuba. In: Hofman, C.L., Hoogland, M.L.P., and Van Gijn, A.L. (eds.), *Crossing the Borders: New methods and techniques in the study of archaeological materials from the Caribbean*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 34-42.
- Cuenca Solana, D., 2013. *Utilización de instrumentos de concha para la realización de actividades productivas en las formaciones económico-sociales de los cazadoresrecolectores-pescadores y primeras sociedades tribales de la fachada Atlántica Europea*. Santander: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Cantabria.
- Cuenca Solana, D., Gutiérrez Zugasti, I., and González Morales, M.R., 2017. Use-wear analysis: An optimal methodology for the study of shell tools. *Quaternary International* 427, 192-200. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2015.09.090>
- Curet, L.A., 1996. Ideology, chiefly power, and material culture: an example from the Greater Antilles. *Latin American Antiquity* 7(2), 114-131. <https://doi.org/10.2307/971613>
- Curet, L.A., 2005. *Caribbean paleodemography: population, culture history, and sociopolitical processes in ancient Puerto Rico*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Curet, L.A., 2014. The Taíno: Phenomena, concepts, and terms. *Ethnohistory* 61(3), 467-495. <https://doi.org/10.1215/00141801-2681759>
- Curet, L.A. and Hauser, M.W. (eds.), 2011. *Islands at the crossroads: migration, seafaring, and interaction in the Caribbean*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Curet, L.A. and Hauser, M.W., 2011. Introduction: Migration, seafaring, and cultural contact in the Caribbean. In: Curet, L.A. and Hauser, M.W. (eds.), *Islands at the crossroads: migration, seafaring, and interaction in the Caribbean*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1-10.
- Cybulski, J., 2010. Labrets and teeth on the Northwest Coast. In: Matson, R.G. (ed.), *The Crescent Beach Site and the Place of the Locarno Beach Phase*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia, 1-20.
- Dacal Moure, R., 1997. The recurrent forms in Tanki Flip. In: Versteeg, A.H. and Rostain, S. (eds.), *The archaeology of Aruba: the Tanki Flip site*. Oranjestad:

- Archaeological Museum Aruba, 159-188.
- Dalton, G., 1977. Aboriginal economies in stateless societies. In: Earle, T.K. and Ericson, J.E. (eds), *Exchange Systems in Prehistory*. New York: Academic Press, 191-212.
- De Angelis, H. and Mansur, M.E., 2010. Artefactos de vidrio en contextos cazadores recolectores. consideraciones a partir del análisis tecnológico y funcional. *Revista Atlántica-Mediterránea de Prehistoria y Arqueología Social* 12, 59-73.
- De Mille, C.N. and Varney, T.L., 2003. A preliminary investigation of Saladoid stone bead manufacture. In: *Proceedings of the XIX International Congress for Caribbean Archaeology, Aruba, July 22-28, 2001*. Volume II. Aruba: Archaeological Museum Aruba, 43-55.
- De Mille, C.N., Varney, T.L., and Turney, M.H.J., 2008. Saladoid lapidary technology: New methods for investigating stone bead drilling techniques. In: Hofman, C.L., Hoogland, M.L.P., and Van Gijn, A.L. (eds.), *Crossing the Borders: New methods and techniques in the study of archaeological materials from the Caribbean*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 78-89.
- d'Errico, F., 1993a. Identification des traces de manipulation, suspension, polissage sur l'art mobilier en os, bois de cervidés, ivoire. In: Anderson, P.C., Beyries, S., Otte, M., and Plisson, H. (eds.), *Traces et fonction: les gestes retrouvés. Actes du colloque international de Liège Vol I*. Liège: Service de Préhistoire, 177-188.
- d'Errico, F., 1993b. La vie sociale de l'art mobilier paléolithique. Manipulation, transport, suspension des objets on os, bois de cervidés, ivoire. *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 12(2), 145-174. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0092.1993.tb00289.x>
- d'Errico, F., Jardón-Giner, P., and Soler-Mayor, B., 1993. Critères à base expérimentale pour l'étude des perforations naturelles et intentionnelles sus coquillages. In: Anderson, P.C., Beyries, S., Otte, M., and Plisson, H. (eds.), *Traces et fonction: les gestes retrouvés. Actes du colloque international de Liège Vol I*. Liège: Service de Préhistoire, 255-267.
- d'Errico, F., Roux, V., and Dumond, Y., 2000. Identification des techniques de finition des perles en calcédoine par l'analyse microscopique et rugosimétrique. In: Roux, V. (ed), *Cornaline de l'Inde. Des pratiques techniques de Cambay aux techno-systèmes de l'Indus*. Paris: Maison des sciences de l'homme, 97-169.
- d'Errico, F., Henshilwood, C., Vanhaeren, M., and Van Niekerk, K., 2005. *Nassarius kraussianus* shell beads from Blombos Cave: Evidence for symbolic behaviour in the Middle Stone Age. *Journal of Human Evolution* 48(1), 3-24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2004.09.002>
- Desrosiers, S., 1991. Sur le concept de chaîne opératoire. In: Balfet, H. (ed.), *Observer l'action technique: des chaînes opératoires, pour quoi faire?* Paris: Éditions du CNRS, 21-25.
- Deter-Wolf, A. and Peres, T.M., 2013. Flint, bone, and thorns: using ethnohistorical data, experimental archaeology, and microscopy to examine ancient tattooing in Eastern

- North America. In: Della Casa, P. and Witt, C. (eds.), *Tattoos and Modifications in Antiquity: Proceedings of the sessions at the EAA Annual Meetings in The Hague and Oslo, 2010/11*. Zurich Studies in Archaeology 9, 35-45.
- Díaz Peña, N., 2004. Documentación en colecciones arqueológicas de la cuenca del Lago de Valencia (Venezuela). *Acta Científica Venezolana* 55, 346-353.
- Dobres, M.-A., 2001. Meaning in the making: agency and the social embodiment of technology and art. In: Schiffer, M.B. (ed.), *Anthropological Perspectives on Technology*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 47-76.
- Dobres, M.-A., 2010. Archaeologies of technology. *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 34(1), 103-114. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cje/bep014>
- Dubreuil, L. and Savage, D., 2014. Ground stones: A synthesis of the use-wear approach. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 48, 139-153. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2013.06.023>
- Eicher, J.B. and Roach-Higgins, M.E., 1992. Definition and classification of dress: Implications for analysis of gender roles. In: Barnes R. and Eicher J.B. (eds.), *Dress and Gender: Making and Meaning*. Oxford: Berg Publishers, 8-28.
- Evans, A.A. and Donahue, R.E., 2008. Laser scanning confocal microscopy: a potential technique for the study of lithic microwear. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 35(8), 2223-2230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2008.02.006>
- Ewart, E., 2012. Making and unmaking Panará beadwork – Or, how to overcome the fixity of material things. *Anthropology and Humanism* 37(2), 177-190. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1409.2012.01127.x>
- Faber Morse, B., 1989. Saladoid remains and adaptive strategies in St. Croix, Virgin Islands. In: Siegel, P.E. (ed.), *Early Ceramic population lifeways and adaptive strategies in the Caribbean*. Oxford: Archaeopress, 29-41.
- Falci, C.G., 2015. *Stringing beads together: A microwear study of bodily ornaments in late pre-Colonial north-central Venezuela and north-western Dominican Republic*. Leiden (unpublished RMA thesis Leiden University).
- Falci, C.G., Antczak, M.M., Antczak, A.T., and Van Gijn, A.L., 2017. Recontextualizing bodily ornaments from north-central Venezuela (AD 900-1500): the Alfredo Jahn collection at the Ethnologisches Museum Berlin. *Baessler-Archiv* 64, 87-112.
- Farbstein, R., 2011. Technologies of art: A critical reassessment of Pavlovian art and society, using chaîne opératoire method and theory. *Current Anthropology* 52(3), 401-432. <https://doi.org/10.1086/660057>
- Fewkes, J.W., 1903. Precolumbian West Indian amulets. *American Anthropologist* 5(4), 679-691.
- Fewkes, J.W., 1922. A prehistoric island culture of America. In: Hodge, F.W. (ed.), *34th Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, 1912-1913*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 35-281.

- Fewkes, J.W., 2009 [1907]. *The Aborigines of Porto Rico and Neighboring Islands*. The University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.
- Fontijn, D.R., 2013. Epilogue: cultural biographies and itineraries of things: Second thoughts. In: Hahn, H.P. and Weiss, H. (eds.), *Mobility, meaning and transformations of things: shifting context of material culture through time and space*. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 183-195.
- Francis Jr., P., 1982. Experiments with early techniques for making whole shells into beads. *Current Anthropology* 23(6), 713-714. <https://doi.org/10.1086/202925>
- Françoço, M., 2012. "Dressed like an Amazon": The Transatlantic trajectory of a red feather coat. In: Hill, K. (ed.), *Museums and Biographies: Stories, Objects, Identities*. Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 187-199.
- Françoço, M. and Strecker, A., 2017. Caribbean collections in European museums and the question of returns. *International Journal of Cultural Property* 24(4), 451-477. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0940739117000248>
- Françoço, M. and Ordoñez, M.P., 2019. Introduction to the special issue 'collecting Latin America in the nineteenth century'. *Museum History Journal* 12(1), 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19369816.2019.1614754>
- Frieman, C., 2012. Going to pieces at the funeral: Completeness and complexity in early Bronze Age jet 'necklace' assemblages. *Journal of Social Archaeology* 12(3), 334-355. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469605311431400>
- Frieman, C.J. and Janz, L., 2018. A very remote storage box indeed: The importance of doing archaeology with old museum collections. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 43(4), 257-268. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00934690.2018.1458527>
- Gamble, L.H., 2002. Fact or forgery: dilemmas in museum collections. *Museum Anthropology* 25(2), 3-20. <https://doi.org/10.1525/mua.2002.25.2.3>
- Garcia-Casco, A., Knippenberg, S., Rodríguez Ramos, R., Harlow, G.E., Hofman, C.L., Pomo, J.C., and Blanco-Quintero, I.F., 2013. Pre-Columbian jadeitite artifacts from the Golden Rock Site, St. Eustatius, Lesser Antilles, with special reference to jadeitite artifacts from Elliot's, Antigua: implications for potential source regions and long distance exchange networks in the Greater Caribbean, *Journal of Archaeological Science* 40, 3153-3169. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2013.03.025>
- Gates St-Pierre, C., 2018. Needles and bodies: A microwear analysis of experimental bone tattooing instruments. *Journal of Archaeological Science: Reports* 20, 881-887. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jasrep.2017.10.027>
- Gaydarska, B., Chapman, J.C., Angelova, I., Gurova, M., and Yanev, S., 2004. Breaking, making and trading: the Omurtag Eneolithic Spondylus hoard. *Archaeologia Bulgarica* 8(2), 11-33.
- Geneste, J.-M. 1992. L'approvisionnement en matière première dans les systèmes de production lithique: la dimension spatiale de la technologie. In: Mora, R., Terradas, X., Parpal, A., and Plana, C. (eds.), *Tecnologia y cadenas operativas líticas*,

- Treballs d'arqueologia I, reunió internacional, 15-18 enero de 1991*. Bellaterra: Universitat Autònoma Barcelona, 1-36.
- Gilligan, I., 2010. The prehistoric development of clothing: archaeological implications of a thermal model. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 17(1), 15-80. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10816-009-9076-x>
- Gorelick, L. and Gwinnett, A.J., 1989. Collars in the holes of Near Eastern cylinder seals. *Archeomaterials* 3(1), 39-46.
- Gorelick, L. and Gwinnett, A.J., 1990. Innovative lapidary in craft techniques in Neolithic Jarno. *Archeomaterials* 4(1), 25-32.
- Gosden, C., 2005. What do objects want? *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 12(3), 193-211. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10816-005-6928-x>
- Gosden, C. and Marshall, Y., 1999. The cultural biography of objects. *World Archaeology* 31(2), 169-178. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00438243.1999.9980439>
- Graziano, S., 2015. Traces on Mesolithic bone spatulas: Signs of a hidden craft or post-excavation damage? In: Marreiros, J.M., Bicho, N.F., and Gibaja Bao, J.F. (eds.), *International Conference on Use-wear Analysis: Use-wear 2012*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 539-550.
- Groman-Yaroslavski, I. and Bar Yosef Mayer, D.E., 2015. Lapidary technology revealed by functional analysis of carnelian beads from the early Neolithic site of Nahal Hemar Cave, southern Levant. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 58, 77-88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2015.03.030>
- Gurova, M., Bonsall, C., Bradley, B., and Anastassova, E., 2013. Approaching prehistoric skills: experimental drilling in the context of bead manufacturing. *Bulgarian e-journal of Archaeology* 3(2), 201-221.
- Guerra, M.F., 2008. Archaeometry and museums: Fifty years of curiosity and wonder. *Archaeometry* 50(6), 951-967. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4754.2008.00415.x>
- Gutiérrez Zugasti, I. and Cuenca Solana, D., 2015. Ornaments from the Magdalenian burial area in El Mirón Cave (Cantabria, northern Spain). Were they grave goods? *Journal of Archaeological Science* 60, 112-124. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2015.04.012>
- Gwinnett, A.J. and Gorelick, L., 1979. Ancient lapidary. A study using Scanning Electron Microscopy and functional analysis. *Expedition* 22(1), 17-32.
- Hamilakis, Y., Pluciennik, M., and Tarlow, S., 2002. Introduction. In: Hamilakis, Y., Pluciennik, M., and Tarlow, S. (eds.), *Thinking through the body. Archaeologies of corporeality*. New York: Kluwer/Plenum, 1-21.
- Hamon, C., 2008. Functional analysis of stone grinding and polishing tools from the earliest Neolithic of north-western Europe. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 35(6), 1502-1520. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2007.10.017>
- Harlow, G.E., Murphy, A.R., Hozjan, D.J., De Mille, C.N., and Levinson, A.A., 2006. PreColumbian jadeite axes from Antigua, West Indies: Description and possible

- sources. *Canadian Mineralogist* 44, 305-321.
- Hahn, H.P. and Weiss, H., 2013. Introduction: Biographies, travels and itineraries of things. In: Hahn, H.P. and Weiss, H. (eds.), *Mobility, meaning and transformations of things: shifting contexts of material culture through time and space*. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 1-14.
- Hardy, M.D., 2009. The St. Croix Archaeology Project and the Vescelius Collection: A Reexamination. *Bulletin of the Peabody Museum of Natural History* 50(1), 99-118. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3374/014.050.0108>
- Haviser, J.B., 1999. Hope Estate: lithics. In: Hofman, C.L. and Hoogland, M.L.P. (eds.), *Archaeological Investigations on St. Martin (Lesser Antilles). The sites of Norman Estate, Anse des Peres, and Hope Estate. With a contribution to the 'La Hueca Problem'*. Leiden: Leiden University Press, 203-213.
- Hauser, M.W. and Curet, L.A., 2011. Islands at the crossroads: archaeology of interaction in the Caribbean. In: Curet, L.A. and Hauser, M.W. (eds), *Islands at the crossroads: migration, seafaring, and interaction in the Caribbean*. University of Alabama Press, 219-232.
- Helms, M.W., 1987. Art styles as interaction spheres in Central America and the Caribbean: polished black wood in the Greater Antilles. In: Drennan, R.D. and Uribe, C.A. (eds), *Chiefdoms in the Americas*. Lanham: University Press of America, 67-84.
- Helms, M.W., 1988. *Ulysses' Sail: An ethnographic odyssey of power, knowledge, and geographical distance*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hicks, D. and Cooper, J., 2013. The Caribbean. In: Hicks, D. and Stevenson, A. (eds), *World Archaeology at the Pitt Rivers Museum: a characterization*. Oxford: Archaeopress, 401-408.
- Hirth, K.G., 1978. Interregional trade and the formation of prehistoric gateway communities. *American Antiquity* 43(1), 35-45. <https://doi.org/10.2307/279629>
- Hodder, I., 1974. Regression analysis of some trade and marketing patterns. *World Archaeology* 6(2), 172-189. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00438243.1974.9979600>
- Hodder, I., 2011. Human-thing entanglement: towards an integrated archaeological perspective. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 17(1), 154-177. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9655.2010.01674.x>
- Hofman, C.L., 2013. The Post-Saladoid in the Lesser Antilles (A.D. 600/800–1492). In: Keegan, W.F., Hofman C.L., and Rodríguez Ramos, R. (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of Caribbean archaeology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 205-220.
- Hofman, C.L., Boomert, A., Bright, A.J., Hoogland, M.L.P., Knippenberg, S., and Samson, A.V.M., 2011. Ties with the homelands: archipelagic interaction and the enduring role of the South and Central American mainlands in the Pre-Columbian Lesser Antilles. In: Curet, L.A., and Hauser, M.W. (eds), *Islands at the crossroads: migration, seafaring, and interaction in the Caribbean*. University of Alabama

- Press, 73-86.
- Hofman, C.L., Borck, L., Slayton, E., and Hoogland, M.L.P., 2019. Archaic Age voyaging, networks, and resource mobility around the Caribbean Sea. In: Hofman, C.L., and Antczak, A.T. (eds), *Early Settlers of the Insular Caribbean. Dearchaizing the Archaic*. Leiden: Sidestone Press.
- Hofman, C.L., Bright, A.J., Boomert, A., and Knippenberg, S., 2007. Island rhythms: The web of social relationships and interaction networks in the Lesser Antillean archipelago between 400 BC and AD 1492. *Latin American Antiquity* 18(3), 243-268. <https://doi.org/10.2307/25478180>
- Hofman, C.L., Bright, A.J., Hoogland, M.L., and Keegan, W.F., 2008. Attractive ideas, desirable goods: Examining the Late Ceramic Age relationships between Greater and Lesser Antillean societies. *Journal of Island and Coastal Archaeology* 3(1), 17-34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15564890801984097>
- Hofman, C.L., Bright, A.J., and Rodríguez Ramos, R., 2010. Crossing the Caribbean Sea: towards a holistic view of pre-colonial mobility and exchange. *Journal of Caribbean Archaeology Special Publication* 3, 1-18.
- Hofman, C.L. and Hoogland, M.L.P., 2011. Unravelling the multi-scale networks of mobility and exchange in the pre-colonial circum-Caribbean. In: Hofman, C.L. and Van Duijvenbode, A. (eds.), *Communities in contact: Essays in archaeology, ethnohistory, & ethnography of the Amerindian circum-Caribbean*. Leiden: Sidestone Press, 15-44.
- Hofman, C.L., Mol, A.A.A., Rodríguez Ramos, R., and Knippenberg, S., 2014. Networks set in stone: Archaic-Ceramic interaction in the early pre-Colonial northeastern Caribbean. In: Bérard, B. and Losier, C. (eds), *Archéologie Caraïbe*. Leiden: Sidestone Press, 119-132 (Taboui. Collection d'Archéologie Caraïbe 2).
- Hofman, C.L. and Van Duijvenbode, A. eds., 2011. *Communities in contact: Essays in archaeology, ethnohistory, & ethnography of the Amerindian circum-Caribbean*. Leiden: Sidestone Press
- Hoogland, M.L.P. and Hofman, C.L., 1999. Expansion of the Taino cacicazgos towards the Lesser Antilles. *Journal de la Société des Américanistes* 85, 93-113.
- Hoskins, J., 1998. *Biographical Objects: How things tell the story of people's lives*. London: Routledge.
- Hoskins, J., 2006. Agency, biography and objects. In: Tilley, C., Keane, W., Küchler, S., Rowlands, M., and Spyer, P. (eds.), *Handbook of Material Culture*. London: Sage Publications, 74-84.
- Hurcombe, L., 2008. Organics from inorganics: using experimental archaeology as a research tool for studying perishable material culture. *World Archaeology* 40(1), 83-115. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00438240801889423>
- Ibáñez, J.J., Ortega, D., Campos, D., Khalidi, L., Méndez, V., and Teira, L., 2016. Developing a complex network model of obsidian exchange in the Neolithic Near

- East: Linear regressions, ethnographic models and archaeological data. *Paléorient* 42(2), 9-32. <https://doi.org/10.3406/paleo.2016.5718>
- Ingold, T., 2001. Beyond art and technology: the anthropology of skill. In: Schiffer, M.B. (ed.), *Anthropological Perspectives on Technology*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 17-31.
- Ingold, T., 2007. Materials against materiality. *Archaeological Dialogues* 14(1), 1-16.
- Ingold, T., 2013. *Making: anthropology, archaeology, art and architecture*. Oxford: Routledge.
- Inizan, M.L., Reduron-Ballinger, M., Roche, H., and Tixier, J., 1999. *Technology and Terminology of Knapped Stone*. Nanterre: Cercle de Recherches et d'Études Préhistoriques.
- Jones, A., 2004. Archaeometry and materiality: materials-based analysis in theory and practice. *Archaeometry* 46(3), 327-338. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4754.2004.00161.x>
- Jennings, B., 2014. Repair, recycle or re-use? Creating mnemonic devices through the modification of object biographies during the Late Bronze Age in Switzerland. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 24(1), 163-176. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774314000055>
- Joy, J., 2009. Reinvigorating object biography: reproducing the drama of object lives. *World Archaeology* 41(4), 540-556. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00438240903345530>
- Joyce, R.A., 2005. Archaeology of the body. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34, 139-158. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.33.070203.143729>
- Joyce, R.A. and Gillespie, S.D., 2015. Making things out of objects that move. In: Joyce, R. and Gillespie, S.D. (eds.), *Things in Motion: Object Itineraries in Anthropological Practice*. Santa Fe: School for Advanced Research Press, 3-19.
- Keegan, W.F., 2000. West Indian archaeology. 3. Ceramic age. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 8(2), 135-167. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1009403127753>
- Keegan, W.F., 2004. Islands of chaos. In: Delpuech, A. and Hofman, C.L. (eds), *Late Ceramic Age societies in the eastern Caribbean*. Oxford: Archaeopress, 33-44.
- Keegan, W. F., 2013. The “classic” Taíno. In: Keegan, W.F., Hofman C.L., and Rodríguez Ramos, R. (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of Caribbean archaeology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 70-83.
- Keegan, W.F. and Hofman, C.L., 2017. *The Caribbean before Columbus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Keehnen, F.W.M., 2012. *Trinkets (f)or treasure? The role of European material culture in intercultural contacts in Hispaniola during early colonial times*. Leiden (unpublished RMA thesis, Leiden University).
- Keehnen, F.W.M., 2019. Treating ‘trifles’: The indigenous adoption of European material goods in early colonial Hispaniola (1492–1550). In: Hofman, C.L. and Keehnen, F.W.M. (eds.), *Material Encounters and Indigenous Transformations in*

- the Early Colonial Americas*. Leiden: Brill, 58-83.
- Keeley, L.H., 1974. Technique and methodology in microwear studies: A critical review. *World Archaeology* 5(3), 323-336. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00438243.1974.9979577>
- Keeley, L.H., 1980. *Experimental Determination of Stone Tool Uses: A Microwear Analysis*. Chicago University Press.
- Keeley, L.H. and Newcomer, M.H., 1977. Microwear analysis of experimental flint tools: A test case. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 4(1), 29-52. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-4403\(77\)90111-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-4403(77)90111-X)
- Kelly, H.J., 2003. *Amerindian coral tools: A pilot study in experimental archaeology on coral artefacts from Anse à la Gourde, Guadeloupe*. Leiden (unpublished MA thesis, Leiden University).
- Kenoyer, J.M., 1997. Trade and technology of the Indus Valley: new insights from Harappa, Pakistan. *World Archaeology* 29(2), 262-280. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00438243.1997.9980377>
- Kenoyer, J.M. and Vidale, M., 1992. A new look at stone drills of the Indus Valley Tradition. In: Vandiver, P., Druzick, J.R., Wheeler, G.S., and Freestone, I. (eds), *Materials Issues in Art and Archaeology III*. Pittsburgh: Materials Research Society, 495-518.
- Kenoyer, J.M., Vidale, M., and Bhan, K.K., 1991. Contemporary stone beadmaking in Khambhat, India: Patterns of craft specialization and organization of production as reflected in the archaeological record. *World Archaeology* 23(1), 44-63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00438243.1991.9980158>
- Killick, D., 2004. Social constructionist approaches to the study of technology. *World Archaeology* 36(4), 571-578. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0043824042000303746>
- King, J.A., 2016. Comparative colonialism and collections-based archaeological research: dig less, catalog more. *Museum Worlds* 4(1), 4-17. <https://doi.org/10.3167/armw.2016.040102>
- Kirch, P.V., 1988. Long-distance exchange and island colonization: The Lapita case. *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 21(2), 103-117. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00293652.1988.9965475>
- Knappett, C., 2012. Materiality. In: Hodder, I. (ed.), *Archaeological Theory Today. Second edition*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 188-207.
- Knippenberg, S., 2007. *Stone Artefact Production and Exchange among the Northern Lesser Antilles*. Leiden: Leiden University Press (Archaeological Studies Leiden University 13).
- Koch-Grünberg, T., 2005. *Dois Anos entre os Indígenas: Viagens ao Noroeste do Brasil (1903-1905)*. Manaus: Editora Universidade do Amazonas/Faculdade Dom Bosco.
- Kononenko, N., Torrence, R., Barton, H., and Hennell, A., 2010. Cross-cultural interaction on Wuvulu Island, Papua New Guinea: The perspective from use-wear

- and residue analyses of turtle bone artifacts. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 37(11), 2911-2919. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2010.07.001>
- Kopytoff, I., 1986. The cultural biography of things: Commoditization as process. In: Appadurai, A. (ed.), *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in cultural perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 64-91.
- Kuhn, S.L. and Stiner, M.C., 2007. Body ornamentation as information technology: Towards an understanding of the significance of early beads. In: Mellars, P., Boyle, K., Bar-Yosef, O., and Stringer, C. (eds.), *Rethinking the human revolution: New behavioural and biological perspectives on the origin and dispersal of modern humans*. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, 45-54.
- Laffoon, J.E., Rodríguez Ramos, R., Chanlatte Baik, L.A., Narganes Storde, Y.M., Rodríguez López, M., Davies, G.R., Hofman, C.L., 2014. Long-distance exchange in the precolonial Circum-Caribbean: A multi-isotope study of animal tooth pendants from Puerto Rico. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 35, 220-235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaa.2014.06.004>
- Langley, M.C. and O'Connor, S., 2016. An enduring shell artefact tradition from Timor-Leste: Oliva bead production from the Pleistocene to Late Holocene at Jerimalai, Lene Hara, and Matja Kuru 1 and 2. *PloS ONE* 11(8), e0161071. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0161071>
- Las Casas, B. de, 1992. *Apologética Historia Sumaria*. 3 Volumes. Madrid: Alianza Editorial.
- Lauffenburger, J., Keats Webb, E., and Messier, P., 2015. SEM vs micro-Reflectance Transformation Imaging (RTI) for examining tool marks on Jade. Poster presented at the 43rd Annual Meeting of the American Institute for Conservation, Miami.
- Lemonnier, P., 1993. Introduction. In: Lemonnier, P. (ed.), *Technological Choices: Transformation in material cultures since the Neolithic*. London: Routledge.
- Lévi-Strauss, C., 1936. Contribution à l'étude de l'organisation sociale des Indiens Bororo. *Journal de la Société des Américanistes* 28(2), 269-304.
- Lévi-Strauss, C., 1963. Split representation in the art of Asia and America. In: Lévi-Strauss, C., *Structural anthropology*. New York: Basic Books Inc., 245-268.
- Leroi-Gourhan, A., 1993[1964]. *Gesture and Speech*. Cambridge: The MIT Press
- Lillios, K.T., 1999. Objects of memory: the ethnography and archaeology of heirlooms. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 6, 235-262. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021999319447>
- Loren, D.D., 2009. Material manipulations: Beads and cloth in the French colonies. In: White, C.L. (ed.), *The Materiality of Individuality*. New York: Springer, 109-124.
- Loren, D.D., 2010. *Archaeology of clothing and bodily adornment in colonial America*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- Lóven, S., 1935. *Origins of the Tainan Culture, West Indies*. Gothenburg: Elanders Boktryckeri Aktiebolag.

- Lundberg, E.R., 1987. Observations on *Strombus columella* fragments, cautionary notes and experimental microwear analysis. In: Allaire, L. and Mayer, F.-M. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Tenth International Congress for the Study of the Pre-Columbian Cultures of the Lesser Antilles, Fort-de-France, Martinique, July 2-30, 1983*. Montréal: Centre de Recherches Caraïbes, 347-361.
- Maigrot, Y., 2005. Ivory, bone and antler tools production systems at Chalais 4 (Jura, France), late Neolithic site, 3rd millennium. In: Luik, H., Choyke, A., Batey, C., and Lougas, L. (eds.), *From Hooves to Horns, from Mollusc to Mammoth: Manufacture and Use of Bone Artefacts from Prehistoric Times to the Present. Proceedings of the 4th Meeting of the ICAZ Worked Bone Research Group at Tallinn, 26th-31st of August 2003*. Tallinn Book Printers Ltd., 113-126.
- Malafouris, L., 2008. Beads for a plastic mind: The 'Blind Man's Stick'(BMS) hypothesis and the active nature of material culture. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 18(3), 401-414. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774308000449>
- Mansur, M.E., 1990. Instrumentos líticos: aspectos da análise funcional. *Arquivos do Museu de História Natural da UFMG* 11, 115-171.
- Mărgărit, M., 2016. Testing the endurance of prehistoric adornments: Raw materials from the aquatic environment. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 70, 66-81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2016.04.009>
- Mărgărit, M., Radu, V., Boroneanț, A., and Bonsall, C., 2018. Experimental studies of personal ornaments from the Iron Gates Mesolithic. *Archaeological and Anthropological Sciences* 10(8), 2095-2122. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12520-017-0522-5>
- Martí, A.P., Wei, Y., Gao, X., Chen, F., and d'Errico, F., 2017. The earliest evidence of coloured ornaments in China: The ochred ostrich eggshell beads from Shuidonggou Locality 2. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 48, 102-113. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jaa.2017.07.002>
- Martinón-Torres, M. and Killick, D., 2015. Archaeological theories and archaeological sciences. In: A. Gardner, M. Lake, and U. Sommer (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Archaeological Theory*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199567942.013.004>
- Martinón-Torres, M., Valcárcel Rojas, R., Sáenz Samper, J., and Guerra, M.F., 2012. Metallic encounters in Cuba: the technology, exchange and meaning of metals before and after Columbus. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 31(4), 439-454. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaa.2012.03.006>
- Mauss, M., 2003[1925]. Ensaio sobre a dádiva. In: Mauss, M., *Sociologia e Antropologia*. São Paulo: CosacNaify, 183-314.
- Mauss, M., 1973[1935]. Techniques of the body. *Economy and society* 2(1), 70-88.
- Mauss, M., 1993[1947]. Estética. In: Mauss, M., *Manual de etnografia*. Lisbon: Editorial Dom Quixote, 93-126.

- Melgar Tísoc, E.R. and Andrieu, C., 2016. Informe del análisis tecnológico de objetos de jadeíta de el Perú Waká. In: Pérez J.C. and Pérez, G. (eds.), *Proyecto Arqueológico Regional Waká. Informe No. 13, temporada 15. Informe entregado a la Dirección General del Patrimonio Cultural y Natural, Nueva Guatemala de la Asunción*, 265-280.
- Merriman, N. and Swain, H., 1999. Archaeological archives: serving the public interest? *European Journal of Archaeology* 2(2), 249-267. <https://doi.org/10.1179/eja.1999.2.2.249>
- Miller, M.A., 1996. The Manufacture of Cockle Shell Beads at Early Neolithic Franchthi Cave, Greece: A Case of Craft Specialization? *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 9(1), 7-37.
- Miller, H.M.-L., 2007. *Archaeological Approaches to Technology*. London: Elsevier Academic Press.
- Miller, J., 2009. Things as persons: Body ornaments and alterity among the Mamaindê (Nambikwara). In: Santos-Granero, F. (ed.), *The occult life of things: Native Amazonian theories of materiality and personhood*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 60-80.
- Milner, N., Bamforth, M., Beale, G., Carty, J., Chatzipanagis, K., Croft, S., Conneller, C., Elliott, B., Fitton, L.C., Knight, B., Kröger, R., Little, A., Needham, A., Robson, H.K., Rowley, C.C.A., Taylor, B., 2016. A unique engraved shale pendant from the site of Star Carr: the oldest Mesolithic art in Britain. *Internet Archaeology* 40. <http://dx.doi.org/10.11141/ia.40.8>
- Minotti, M., 2014. Ornaments and use-wear analysis: Methods of study applied to the Adaima necropolises. In: Marreiros, J.M., Bicho, N.F., and Gibaja Bao, J.F. (eds.), *International Conference on Use-wear Analysis: Use-wear 2012*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 80-89.
- Mol, A.A.A., 2007. Costly giving, giving gwaiza's: towards an organic model of the exchange of social valuables in the Late Ceramic Age Caribbean. Leiden: Sidestone Press.
- Mol, A.A.A., 2011. The gift of the "face of the living": Shell faces as social valuables in the Caribbean Late Ceramic Age. *Journal de la Société des Américanistes* 97(2), 7-43. <https://doi.org/10.4000/jsa.11834>
- Mol, A.A.A., 2014. *The connected Caribbean. A socio-material network approach to patterns of homogeneity and diversity in the pre-colonial period*. Leiden: Sidestone Press.
- Moro Abadía, O. and Nowell, A., 2015. Palaeolithic personal ornaments: Historical development and epistemological challenges. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 22, 952-979. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10816-014-9213-z>
- Naji, M. and Douney, L., 2009. Editorial: Special issue on 'making' and 'doing' the material world. *Journal of Material Culture* 14(4), 411-432. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360331709000010>

[org/10.1177/1359183509346184](https://doi.org/10.1177/1359183509346184)

- Narganes Storde, Y.M., 2005. Pendientes Antillanos, animales Suramericanos. In: Tavárez, M.G. and García Arévalo, M.A. (eds.) *Proceedings of the XX International Congress for Caribbean Archaeology, Part I, Santo Domingo, June 29 – July 6, 2003*. Santo Domingo: Museo del Hombre Dominicano and Fundación García Arévalo, 213-220.
- Newell, R.R., Kielman, D., Constandse-Westermann, T.S., Van der Sanden, W.A.B., and Van Gijn, A.L., 1990. *An inquiry into the ethnic resolution of Mesolithic regional groups: The study of their decorative ornaments in time and space*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- O'Day, S.J. and Keegan, W.F., 2001. Expedient shell tools from the northern West Indies. *Latin American Antiquity* 12(3), 274-290. <https://doi.org/10.2307/971633>
- Odell, G.H., 2001. Stone tool research at the end of the millennium: Classification, function, and behavior. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 9(1), 45-100. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1009445104085>
- Oliver, J.R., 2000. Gold Symbolism among Caribbean Chiefdoms: Of Feathers, Çibas and Guanín Power among Taíno Elites. In: McEwan, C. (ed.), *Precolumbian Gold. Technology, Style and Iconography*. London: British Museum Press, 196-219.
- Oliver, J.R., 2009. *Caciques and cemí idols: The web spun by Taíno rulers between Hispaniola and Puerto Rico*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Ollé, A., Pedergnana, A., Fernández-Marchena, J.L., Martín, S., Borel, A., and Aranda, V., 2016. Microwear features on vein quartz, rock crystal and quartzite: A study combining Optical Light and Scanning Electron Microscopy. *Quaternary International* 424, 154-170. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2016.02.005>
- Olsen, B., 2012. Symmetrical archaeology. In: Hodder, I. (ed.), *Archaeological theory today. Second edition*. Cambridge: Polity press, 208-228.
- Orłowska, J., 2018. The same or different? Experimenting with the influence of peat environment on use-wear traces on antler tools. *International Journal of Osteoarchaeology* 28(2), 120-130. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/oa.2638>
- Ortega, E.J., 2005. *Compendio General Arqueológico de Santo Domingo*. Vol. 1. Santo Domingo: Academia de Ciencias de la República Dominicana.
- Ostapkowicz, J., 2018. To produce “a pleasing effect.” Taíno shell and stone cibas and Spanish cuentas in the early colonial Caribbean. *Beads* 30, 3-15.
- Ostapkowicz, J., Ramsey, C.B., Brock, F., Higham, T., Wiedenhoeft, A.C., Ribechini, E., Lucejko, J.J., and Wilson, S.M., 2012. Chronologies in wood and resin: AMS 14C dating of pre-Hispanic Caribbean wood sculpture. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 39(7), 2238-2251. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2012.01.035>
- Panofsky, E., 1955. Iconography and iconology: an introduction to the study of Renaissance art. In: Panofsky, E., *Meaning in the visual arts. Papers in and on art history*. New York: Doubleday & Company, 26-54.

- Pelegrin, J., 1991. Les savoir-faire: Une très longue histoire. *Terrain* 16, 106-113.
- Pelegrin, J., 2000. Les techniques de débitage laminaire au Tardiglaciaire: Critères de diagnose et quelques réflexions. *Mémoires du Musée de préhistoire d'Ile-de-France* 7, 73-86.
- Pelegrin, J., 2005. Remarks about archaeological techniques and methods of knapping: Elements of a cognitive approach to stone knapping. In: Roux, V. and Bril, B. (eds.), *Stone Knapping: The necessary condition for a uniquely hominid behavior*. Exeter: Short Run Press, 23-33.
- Perlès, C., 1980. Économie de la matière première et économie de la débitage: Deux exemples Grecs. In: Tixier, J. (ed.), *Préhistoire et technologie lithique: Journées du 11-12-13 mai 1979*. Valbonne: Éditions du CNRS, 37-41.
- Perlès, C., 2007. Échanges et technologie: L'exemple du Néolithique. In: Évin, J. (ed.), *Un siècle de construction du discours scientifique en Préhistoire. Volume III*. Paris: Société préhistorique française, 53-62.
- Petitjean-Roget, J., 1963. The Caribs as seen through the dictionary of the Reverend Father Breton. In: Marin, B. and Theuvenin, H. (eds.), *Proceedings of the First International Convention for the Study of Pre-Columbian Culture in the Lesser Antilles Vol. 1*. Fort-de-France: Société d'Histoire de la Martinique, 43-68.
- Pétrequin, P., and Pétrequin, A.M., 2016. The production and circulation of Alpine jade axe-heads during the European Neolithic: Ethnoarchaeological bases of their interpretation. In: Biagetti, S., and Lugli, F. (eds.), *The Intangible Elements of Culture in Ethnoarchaeological Research*. Cham: Springer, 47-76.
- Pfaffenberger, B., 1988. Fetishised objects and humanised nature: towards an anthropology of technology. *Man* 23(2), 236-252. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2802804>
- Pfaffenberger, B., 1992. Social anthropology of technology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 21(1), 491-516. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.an.21.100192.002423>
- Pfaffenberger, B., 2001. Symbols do not create meanings—activities do: or, why symbolic anthropology needs the anthropology of technology. In: Schiffer, M.B. (ed.), *Anthropological perspectives on technology*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 77-86.
- Plisson, H. and Van Gijn, A.L., 1989. La tracéologie: mode d'emploi. *L'Anthropologie* 93(3), 631-642.
- Polanyi, K., 1957. The economy as instituted process. In: Polanyi, K., Arensberg, C.M., and Pearson, H.W. (eds.), *Trade and market in the early empires: Economies in history and theory*. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 243-270.
- Pollard, A.M., Bray, P.J., and Gosden, C., 2014. Is there something missing in scientific provenance studies of prehistoric artefacts? *Antiquity* 88(340), 625-631. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003598X00101255>
- Procopiou, H., Morero, E., Vargiolu, R., Suarez-Sanabria, M., and Zahouani, H., 2013. Tactile and visual perception during polishing: An ethnoarchaeological study

- in India (Mahabalipuram, Tamil Nadu). *Wear* 301(1-2), 144-149. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wear.2012.11.058>
- Renfrew, C., 1977. Alternative models for exchange and spatial distribution. In: Earle, T.K. and Ericson, J.E. (eds), *Exchange Systems in Prehistory*. New York: Academic Press, 71-90.
- Ribeiro, B.G., 1988. *Dicionário do artesanato indígena*. São Paulo: Editora da Universidade de São Paulo.
- Rifkin, R.F., Dayet, L., Queffelec, A., Summers, B., Lategan, M., d'Errico, F., 2015. Evaluating the photoprotective effects of ochre on human skin by in vivo SPF assessment: Implications for human evolution, adaptation and dispersal. *PLoS ONE* 10(9), e0136090. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0136090>
- Rigaud, S., d'Errico, F., and Vanhaeren, M., 2015. Ornaments reveal resistance of North European cultures to the spread of farming. *PLoS ONE* 10(4), e0121166. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0121166>
- Rival, L., 2005. Introduction: what constitutes a human body in native Amazonia? *Tipití: Journal of the Society for the Anthropology of Lowland South America* 3(2), 1-6.
- Roach-Higgins, M.E., and Eicher, J.B., 1992. Dress and identity. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal* 10(4), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0887302X9201000401>
- Rodet, M.J., Duarte-Talim, D., and dos Santos Junior, V., 2013. Cadeia operatória e análise tecnológica: uma abordagem metodológica possível mesmo para coleções líticas fora de contexto (exemplo das pontas de projétil do nordeste do Brasil). *Cuadernos del Instituto Nacional de Antropología y Pensamiento Latinoamericano-Series Especiales* 1(2), 264-278.
- Rodríguez, M.A., 1993. Early trade networks in the Caribbean. In: Cummins, A. and King, P. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Congress for Caribbean Archaeology, Dover Convention Centre, Barbados, 22-28 July 1991*. Bridgetown: Barbados Museum and Historical Society, 306-314.
- Rodríguez, M.A., 1997. Religious beliefs of the Saladoid people. In: Wilson, S.M. (ed.), *The Indigenous People of the Caribbean*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 80-87.
- Rodríguez Ramos, R., 2010a. *Rethinking Puerto Rican Precolonial History*. Tuscaloosa: University Alabama Press.
- Rodríguez Ramos, R., 2010b. What is the Caribbean? An archaeological perspective. *Journal of Caribbean Archaeology Special Publication* 3, 19-51.
- Rodríguez Ramos, R., 2011. Close encounters of the Caribbean kind. In: Curet, L.A. and Hauser, M.W. (eds.), *Islands at the crossroads: migration, seafaring, and interaction in the Caribbean*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 164-192.
- Rodríguez Ramos, R., 2013. Isthmo-Antillean engagements. In: Keegan, W.F., Hofman, C.L., and Rodríguez Ramos, R. (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of Caribbean archaeology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 155-170.

- Rodríguez Ramos, R., Babilonia, E., Curet, L.A., and Ulloa Hung, J., 2008. The Pre-Arawak pottery horizon in the Antilles: a new approximation. *Latin American Antiquity* 19(1), 47-63. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1045663500007653>
- Rodríguez Ramos, R. and Pagán Jiménez, J., 2006. Interacciones multivectoriales en el Circum-Caribe precolonial: Un vistazo desde las Antillas. *Caribbean Studies* 34(2), 99-139.
- Roe, P.G., 1989. A grammatical analysis of Cedrosan Saladoid vessel form categories and surface decorations: Aesthetic and technical styles in early Antillean ceramics. In: Siegel, P.E. (ed.), *Early Ceramic Population Lifeways and Adaptive Strategies in the Caribbean*. Oxford: Archaeopress, 267-382.
- Roe, P.G., 1997. Just wasting away: Taíno shamanism and concepts of fertility. In: Bercht, F., Brodsky, E., Farmer, J.A., and Taylor, D. (eds.), *Taíno: Pre-Columbian art and culture from the Caribbean*. New York: Monacelli Press, 124-157.
- Rostain, S., 2006. Spécialisation et commerce dans les Guyanes amérindiennes. *Techniques & Culture* 46/47, 139-174.
- Roth, W.E., 1924. An introductory study of the arts, crafts, and customs of the Guiana Indians, in F.W. Hodge (ed), *Thirty-eighth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology to the secretary of the Smithsonian Institute, 1916-1917*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 25-745.
- Rouse, I.B., 1982. Ceramics and religious development in the Greater Antilles. *Journal of New World Archaeology* 5(2), 45-55.
- Rouse, I.B., 1986. *Migrations in Prehistory: inferring population movement from cultural remains*. Yale University Press.
- Rouse, I.B., 1992. *The Tainos: Rise and decline of the people who greeted Columbus*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Roux, V. and Bril, B., eds., 2005. *Stone Knapping: The necessary condition for a uniquely hominid behavior*. Exeter: Short Run Press.
- Sahlins, M.D., 1963. Poor man, rich man, big-man, chief: political types in Melanesia and Polynesia. *Comparative studies in society and history* 5(3), 285-303. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417500001729>
- Samson, A.V.M., 2010. *Renewing the house: trajectories of social life in the yucayeque (community) of El Cabo, Higüey, Dominican Republic, AD 800 to 1504*. Leiden: Sidestone Press.
- Santos-Granero, F., 2012. Beinghood and people-making in native Amazonia: A constructional approach with a perspectival coda. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 2(1), 181-211. <https://doi.org/10.14318/hau2.1.010>
- Schertl, H.-P., Maresch, W.V., Knippenberg, S., Hertwig, A., Belando, A.L., Rodríguez Ramos, R., Speich, L., and Hofman, C.L., 2019. Petrography, mineralogy and geochemistry of jadeite-rich artefacts from the Playa Grande excavation site, northern Hispaniola: evaluation of local provenance from the Río San Juan

- Complex. *Geological Society, London, Special Publications* 474, SP474-3. <https://doi.org/10.1144/SP474.3>
- Sebire, M., 2016. *The Marks of Metal. An experimental project using microwear analysis to investigate prehistoric amber beads from the northern Netherlands*. Leiden (unpublished MSc thesis, Leiden University).
- Seeger, A., 1975. The meaning of body ornaments: A Suyá example. *Ethnology* 14(3), 211-224. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3773253>
- Semenov, S.A., 1973[1964]. *Prehistoric Technology: An Experimental Study of the Oldest Tools and Artefacts from Traces of Manufacture and Wear*. Bath: Adams & Dart.
- Serrand, N., 1997. Tanki Flip shell artifacts with a relatively high level of modification. In: Versteeg, A.H. and Rostain, S. (eds.), *The archaeology of Aruba: the Tanki Flip site*. Oranjestad: Archaeological Museum Aruba, 189-217.
- Serrand, N., 2007. Exploitation des invertébrés par les sociétés précolombiennes des Petites Antilles. *Journal de la société des américanistes* 93(1), 7-47. <https://doi.org/10.4000/jsa.6213>
- Serrand, N. and Cummings, K.S., 2014. Occurrences of exogenous freshwater mussel shells (Bivalvia: Unionoida) during the precolumbian ceramic age of the Lesser Antilles. In: Szabó, K., Dupont, C., Dimitrijević, V., Gastéllum, L.G., and Serrand, N. (eds.), *Archaeomalacology: Shells in the Archaeological Record*. Oxford: Archaeopress, 65-75.
- Service, E.R., 1971[1962]. *Primitive Social Organization: An Evolutionary Perspective*. New York: Random House.
- Sheridan, A., Davis, M., Clark, I., and Redvers-Jones, H., 2002. Investigating jet and jetlike artefacts from prehistoric Scotland: The National Museums of Scotland project. *Antiquity* 76(293), 812-825. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003598X00091298>
- Shimada, I., 1996. Sicán metallurgy and its cross-craft relationships. *Boletín Museo del Oro* 41, 27-61.
- Sidéra, I. and Giacobini, G., 2002. Outils, armes et parures en os funéraires à la fin du Néolithique d'après Val-de-Reuil et Porte-Joie (Eure) [Représentations individuelles et pratiques collectives]. *Gallia préhistoire* 44, 215-230. <https://doi.org/10.3406/galip.2002.2035>
- Sidéra, I. and Legrand, A., 2006. Tracéologie fonctionnelle des matières osseuses: Une méthode. *Bulletin de la société préhistorique française* 103(2), 291-304.
- Siegel, P.E., 1997. Ancestor worship and cosmology among the Taíno. In: Bercht, F., Brodsky, E., Farmer, J.A., and Taylor, D. (eds.), *Taíno: Pre-Columbian art and culture from the Caribbean*. New York: Monacelli Press, 106-111.
- Siegel, P.E., 2009. Curating the Past: Caribbean Archaeology at the Yale Peabody Museum of Natural History. *Bulletin of the Peabody Museum of Natural History* 50(1), 209-215. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3374/014.050.0115>

- Siegel, P.E., 2010. Continuity and change in the evolution of religion and political organization on pre-Columbian Puerto Rico. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 29(3), 302-326. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaa.2010.04.002>
- Sillar, B. and Tite, M., 2000. The challenge of 'technological choices' for materials science approaches in archaeology. *Archaeometry* 42(1), 2-20.
- Spielmann, K.A., 2002. Feasting, craft specialization, and the ritual mode of production in small-scale societies. *American Anthropologist* 104(1), 195-207. <https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.2002.104.1.195>
- Stemp, W.J., Watson, A.S., and Evans, A.A., 2015. Surface analysis of stone and bone tools. *Surface Topography: Metrology and Properties* 4(1), 013001. <https://doi.org/10.1088/2051-672X/4/1/013001>
- Stockhammer, P.W., 2015. Lost in things: an archaeologist's perspective on the epistemological potential of objects. *Nature and Culture* 10(3), 269-283. <https://doi.org/10.3167/nc.2015.100302>
- Taborin Y., 1991. La parure des Solutréens et des Magdaléniens anciens des Jamblancs. *Paléo* 3, 101-108. <https://doi.org/10.3406/pal.1991.1039>
- Taborin, Y., 1993. Traces de façonnage et d'usage sur les coquillages perforés. In: Anderson, P.C., Beyries, S., Otte, M., and Plisson, H. (eds.), *Traces et Fonction: Les gestes retrouvés. Actes du colloque international de Liège Vol I*. Liège: Service de Préhistoire, 255-267.
- Tátá, F., Cascalheira, J., Marreiros, J., Pereira, T., and Bicho, N., 2014. Shell bead production in the Upper Paleolithic of Vale Boi (SW Portugal): An experimental perspective. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 42, 29-41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2013.10.029>
- Thomas, J., 2002. Archaeology's humanism and the materiality of the body. In: Hamilakis, Y., Pluciennik, M., and Tarlow, S. (eds.), *Thinking through the Body. Archaeologies of corporeality*. New York: Kluwer/Plenum, 29-46.
- Tixier, J., 1980. Expériences de taille. In: Tixier, J. (ed.), *Préhistoire et Technologie Lithique. Journées d'études à Valbonne, 11-13 mai 1979*. Paris: Éditions du CNRS, 47-49.
- Torres-Rouff, C., 2012. Piercing the body: Labret use, identity, and masculinity in prehistoric Chile. In: Baadsgaard, A., Boutin, A.T., and Buikstra, J.E. (eds.), *Breathing new life into the evidence of death: contemporary approaches to bioarchaeology*. Santa Fe: School for Advanced Research Press.
- Trubitt, M.B.D., 2003. The production and exchange of marine shell prestige goods. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 11(3), 243-277. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1025028814962>
- Tsoraki, C., 2011. Disentangling neolithic networks: Ground stone technology, material engagements and networks of action. In: Brysbaert, A. (ed.), *Tracing Prehistoric Social Networks through Technology: A diachronic perspective on the Aegean*.

- New York & London: Routledge, 12-29.
- Turner, T., 2012 [1980]. The social skin. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 2(2), 486-504. <https://doi.org/10.14318/hau2.2.026>
- Valcárcel Rojas, R., Martínón-Torres, M., Cooper, J., and Rehren, T., 2007. Oro, guanines y latón. Metales en contextos aborígenes de Cuba. *El Caribe Arqueológico* 10, 116-131.
- Van Duijvenbode, A., 2012. A reappraisal of intentional cranial modification among the indigenous inhabitants of Suriname in Prehistoric and Historic times. *Caribbean Connections* 2(1), 1-11.
- Van Gijn, A.L., 1990. *The Wear and Tear of Flint. Principles of functional analysis applied to Dutch Neolithic assemblages*. Leiden: Institute of Prehistory.
- Van Gijn, A.L., 2006. Ornaments of jet, amber and bone. In: Louwe Kooijmans, L.P. and Jongste, P.F.B. (eds.), *Schippluizen: A Neolithic Settlement on the Dutch North Sea Coast c. 2500 cal. BC*. Leiden: Faculty of Archaeology, 195-205.
- Van Gijn, A.L., 2008. De ornamenten van Ypenburg. In: Koot, J.M., Bruning, L., and Houkes, R.A. (eds.), *Ypenburg-locatie 4. Een nederzetting met grafveld uit het Midden-Neolithicum in het West-Nederlandse kustgebied*. Leiden: Station Drukwerk Leiden, 277-288.
- Van Gijn, A.L., 2010. *Flint in Focus: Lithic biographies in the Neolithic and Bronze Age*. Leiden: Sidestone Press.
- Van Gijn, A.L., 2012. New perspectives for microwear analysis. In: Bakels, C.C. and Kamermans, H. (eds.), *The End of our Fifth Decade*. Leiden: Faculty of Archaeology, 275-282.
- Van Gijn, A.L., 2014a. Science and interpretation in microwear studies. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 48,166-169. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2013.10.024>
- Van Gijn, A.L., 2014b. Beads and pendants of amber and jet. In: Theunissen, E.M., Brinkkemper, O., Kleijne, J.P., Lauwerier, R.C.G.M., and Smit, B.I. (eds.), *A mosaic of habitation at Zeewijk (the Netherlands). Late Neolithic behavioural variability in a dynamic landscape*. Amersfoort: Cultural Heritage Agency of the Netherlands, 119-128.
- Van Gijn, A.L., 2017. Bead Biographies from Neolithic Burial Contexts: Contributions from the Microscope. In: Bar-Yosef Mayer, D.E., Bonsall, C., and Choyke, A.M. (eds.), *Not just for show: The archaeology of beads, beadwork, and personal ornaments*. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 103-114.
- Van Gijn, A.L. and Hofman, C.L., 2008. Were they used as tools? An exploratory functional study of abraded potsherds from two pre-colonial sites on the island of Guadeloupe, northern Lesser Antilles. *Caribbean Journal of Science* 44(1), 21-36. <https://doi.org/10.18475/cjos.v44i1.a4>
- Van Gijn, A.L., Lammers-Keijsers, Y.M.J., and Briels, I., 2008. Tool use and technological choices: An integral approach toward functional analysis of Caribbean tool

- assemblages. In: Hofman, C.L., Hoogland, M.L.P., and Van Gijn, A.L. (eds.), *Crossing the Borders: New methods and techniques in the study of archaeological materials from the Caribbean*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 101-114.
- Van Gijn, A.L. and Wentink, K., 2013. The role of flint in mediating identities: The microscopic evidence. In: Hahn, H.P., and Weiss, H. (eds.), *Mobility, meaning and transformations of things: shifting contexts of material culture through time and space*. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 120-132.
- Vanhaeren, M. and d'Errico, F., 2006. Aurignacian ethno-linguistic geography of Europe revealed by personal ornaments. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 33(8), 1105-1128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2005.11.017>
- Vanhaeren, M., d'Errico, F., Van Niekerk, K.L., Henshilwood, C.S., and Erasmus, R.M., 2013. Thinking strings: Additional evidence for personal ornament use in the Middle Stone Age at Blombos Cave, South Africa. *Journal of Human Evolution* 64(6), 500-517. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2013.02.001>
- Vega, B., 1979. *Los metales y los aborígenes de la Hispaniola*. Santo Domingo: Ediciones Museo del Hombre Dominicano.
- Veloz Maggiolo, M., Ortega, E.J., and Caba, A. 1981. *Los modos de vida Meillacoides y sus posibles orígenes*. Santo Domingo: Editora Taller.
- Verschoof, W.B., 2008. *Kralen voor de doden: Het gebruik van barnsteen in de TRB-periode (3400-2750 cal. BC)*. Leiden (unpublished BA thesis Leiden University).
- Vescelius, G.S. and Robinson, L.S., 1979. Exotic Items in Archaeological Collections from St. Croix: Prehistoric Imports and their Implications. Paper presented to the Eighth International Congress for the Study of the Pre-Columbian Cultures of the Lesser Antilles, St. Kitts.
- Vidal, L. (ed.), 1992. *Grafismo Indígena. Estudos de Antropologia Estética*. São Paulo: EdUSP.
- Vidale, M., 1995. Early beadmakers of the Indus tradition. The manufacturing sequence of talc beads at Mehrgarh in the 5th Millennium BC. *East and West* 45, 45-80.
- Vilaça, A., 2005. Chronically unstable bodies: Reflections on Amazonian corporalities. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 11 (3), 445-464. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9655.2005.00245.x>
- Walker, H., 2009. Baby hammocks and stone bowls: Urarina technologies of companionship and subjection. In: Santos-Granero, F. (ed.), *The Occult Life of Things: Native Amazonian theories of materiality and personhood*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 81-102.
- Warnier, J.P., 2009. Technology as efficacious action on objects... and subjects. *Journal of Material Culture* 14(4), 459-470. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1359183509345944>
- Watson, A.S., Plog, S., Culleton, B.J., Gilman, P.A., LeBlanc, S.A., Whiteley, P.M., Claramunt, S., and Kennett, D.J., 2015. Early procurement of scarlet macaws and the emergence of social complexity in Chaco Canyon, NM. *Proceedings*

- of the National Academy of Sciences 201509825. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1509825112>
- Watters, D.R., 1997. Maritime trade in the prehistoric Eastern Caribbean. In: Wilson, S.M. (ed.), *The Indigenous people of the Caribbean*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 88-99 (Ripley P. Bullen Series 6).
- Watters, D.R. and Brown, J.A., 2001. New data from old Caribbean collections at Carnegie Museum of Natural History. In: Richard, G. (ed.), *Proceedings of the 18th International Congress for Caribbean Archaeology Vol. 2*. St. George: International Association for Caribbean Archaeology, 291-303.
- Watters, D.R. and Scaglione, R., 1994. Beads and pendants from Trants, Montserrat: Implications for the prehistoric lapidary industry of the Caribbean. *Annals of the Carnegie Museum* 63(3), 215-237.
- Wentink, K., 2006. Ceci n'est pas une hache: *Neolithic depositions in the northern Netherlands*. Leiden: Sidestone Press.
- White, C.L. and Beaudry, M.C., 2008. Artifacts and personal identity. In: Gaimster, D. and Majewski, T. (eds.), *International Handbook of Historical Archaeology*. New York: Springer, 209-225.
- White, R., 1992. Beyond art: Toward an understanding of the origins of material representation in Europe. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 21, 537-564.
- White, R., 2002. Observations technologiques sur les objets de parure de la grotte de Renne. In: Schmider, B. (ed.), *Les fouilles d'André Leroi-Gourhan à Arcy-sur-Cure (Yonne)*. *Gallia Préhistoire Supplément XXXIV*, 257-266.
- White, R., 2007. Systems of personal ornamentation in the Early Upper Palaeolithic: Methodological challenges and new observations. In: Mellars, P., Boyle, K., BarYosef, O., and Stringer, C. (eds.), *Rethinking the Human Revolution: New Behavioural and Biological Perspectives on the Origin and Dispersal of Modern Humans*. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, 287-302.
- Wilson, S.M., 1993. The cultural mosaic of the Indigenous Caribbean. *Proceedings of the British Academy* 81, 37-66.
- Wilson, S.M., 2007. *The Archaeology of the Caribbean*. Cambridge University Press.
- Winnicka, K., 2017. Late Neolithic V-perforated buttons from a female burial in SE Poland: a comprehensive study of raw material, bone technology and use-life. *Analecta Praehistorica Leidensia* 47, 59-73.
- Wobst, H.M., 1977. Stylistic behavior and information exchange. In: Cleland, C.E. (ed.), *For the director: research essays in honor of James B. Griffin*. Anthropology Papers 61. Ann Arbor: Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan, 317-342.
- Woodward, A., 2002. Beads and beakers: heirlooms and relics in the British Early Bronze Age. *Antiquity* 76(294), 1040-1047.
- Woodward, A. and Hunter, J., 2015. *Ritual in Early Bronze Age grave goods*. Oxford:

Oxbow Books.

- Wright, K.I., 1992. A classification system for ground stone tools from the prehistoric Levant. *Paleorient* 18(2), 53- 81.
- Wright, K.I. and Garrard, A.N., 2003. Social identities and the expansion of stone beadmaking in Neolithic western Asia: new evidence from Jordan. *Antiquity* 77(296), 267-284. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003598X00092267>
- Yang, Y., Yang, M., Xie, Y., and Wang, C., 2009. Application of micro-CT: A new method for stone drilling research. *Microscopy research and technique* 72(4), 343-346. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jemt.20659>
- Yang, M., Yang, Y., and Wang, C., 2011. A new 3D information acquisition method of micro-drilling marks on ancient perforated stone bead through micro-CT. *Journal of X-ray science and technology* 19(3), 333-343. <https://doi.org/10.3233/XST-2011-0297>
- Yang, Y., Wang, C., Gao, X., Gu, Z., Wang, N., Xiao, T., and Wang, C., 2018. Micro-CT investigation of ostrich eggshell beads collected from Locality 12, the Shuidonggou site, China. *Archaeological and Anthropological Sciences* 10(2), 305-313. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12520-016-0355-7>
- Yerkes, R.W., 1993. Methods of manufacturing shell beads at prehistoric Mississippian sites in southeastern North America. In: Anderson, P.C., Beyries, S., Otte, M., and Plisson, H. (eds.), *Traces et Fonction: Les Gestes Retrouvés. Actes du colloque international de Liège Vol I*. Liège: Service de Préhistoire, 235-242.
- Zerboni, A., Salvatori, S., Vignola, P., Mohammed, A.E.R.A., and Usai, D., 2018. The long-distance exchange of amazonite and increasing social complexity in the Sudanese Neolithic. *Antiquity* 92(365), 1195-1209. <https://doi.org/10.15184/aqy.2018.196>