



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

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

Regarding the topic of the dissertation:

1. Each archaeological assemblage of ornaments poses specific challenges in connection to its provenience, composition, and present state. Each will thus require a specific study protocol and afford different levels of interpretation.
2. Examining the micro-stratigraphy of traces on the surface of ornaments is a crucial step in reconstructing artefact biographies, as this method can securely identify specific biographical events and their sequence.
3. The exchange of lapidary materials in the Early Ceramic Age cannot be understood just as movement of material from source to settlement. Technological modifications could happen after materials were received and prior to their further exchange.
4. At Pearls, acquisition and production logics of lapidary materials varied greatly depending on ornament raw material and type. Different mechanisms were in operation giving rise to the extremely diverse nature of the collection.
5. Late Ceramic Age communities from the Dominican Republic chose to obtain finished ornaments through exchange networks. Household-level production happened occasionally, but it was not the primary mode for ornament acquisition.
6. The commonly found double-perforated beads were likely produced in Late Ceramic Age workshops. Technical knowledge necessary for their production was not widely shared among communities. In contrast, these calcite and diorite beads were attached to composite ornaments in varied ways.
7. Many factors come together to produce use-wear on ornaments: not only string placement, but also (1) the raw material, morphology, and weight of elements in contact, (2) the composition, tension, and fixity of the attachment, and (3) the contact with the body or other surfaces.

Regarding the field of inquiry:

8. The presence of bodily ornaments in archaeological sites should not be considered as unquestionable evidence of socio-political inequality.
9. We need to move past attempts at interpreting ornaments exclusively on the basis of their exotic raw materials or figurative depictions.
10. It is a misunderstanding to consider technological evidence as solely informing on production as a discrete event in which matter is transformed into functional object.
11. The close examination of ethnographic ornaments shows that a necklace is often not a homogeneous construct in which all components undergo the same processes of care, wear, and tear.

12. Indigenous Caribbean ornament technologies were highly sophisticated and are still not fully understood. Their continued study can reveal key insights into ancient interaction networks and socio-political organization.

Other subjects:

13. Revisiting museum and even problematic collections can offer valuable new insights into long-standing archaeological questions. This is increasingly necessary in light of resource limitations in the fields of archaeology and heritage management.
14. Using object biographies should not be an excuse for selecting the out-of-the-ordinary elements of an artefact's life to build catchy narratives. A responsible approach to heritage should be committed to telling detailed and data-based stories, even if seemingly boring and ordinary.