

Social Continuity in the Caribbean Past: A *Maison*-Perspective on Cultural Continuity

Joost Morsink

Abstract

Diachronic reconstructions of social development in the prehistoric Caribbean often focus on material aspects of and changes in the archaeological record. Unfortunately, underlying practices that create these materials might indicate much more continuity than the material record suggest. It is argued here that the concept of the “*maison*”, proposed by Levi-Strauss (1982, 1983), has interpretative value concerning the development of practices throughout the Caribbean archipelago and emphasizes continuity rather than discontinuity between Saladoid and post-Saladoid times. The multifaceted concept of the *maison* is discussed and compared to the pre-Columbian Caribbean, proposing an innovative perspective on how social quotidian conduct was constructed in this region between approximately 500 B.C.E. and 1500 C.E.

Introduction

Around 500 B.C.E. the first evidence of Saladoid pottery is recognized in the Caribbean archipelago (Keegan 2000; Rouse 1993). Although this style might not be the first pottery manufactured in the region (Keegan and Ramos 2004; Keegan 2006), the distinct qualities of Saladoid pottery strongly suggests a new movement of people (Keegan 2000; Rouse 1993). However, Saladoid gradually disappears and, at the time of contact, Saladoid pottery had not been produced for centuries.

This change in archaeological material has often been explained as a vast shift in social organization or other structural components in a society (Curet and Oliver 1998; Siegel 1992, 1996, 1999). These approaches have certainly improved our understanding of facets of social organization and change, but also implicitly created a disconnection between different time periods and their associated materials. Certain characteristics are ascribed to Saladoid times and are not replicated in late prehistoric groups, underlining the importance of social change.

Artificially or not, this separation depreciates social continuity. An emphasis on continuity could provide innovative perspectives on social reproduction within the region. Concomitantly, social reproduction and continuity can retrospectively inform us as to why certain aspects did change over time. This approach does not debunk previous theories, but merely provides a different way of perceiving the past. In other words, it is the intention of the discussion here to coexist alongside other theories on social development, rather than a critique of previous interpretations that aims at replacing them.

The *maison* is a useful methodological tool to explore continuity in the prehistoric Caribbean. First, I will explore the underlying premises of this concept together with its theoretical underpinnings. Subsequently, I discuss how this concept can facilitate our understanding of prehistoric Caribbean practices. Finally, a paradigmatic switch from a focus on archaeological material to the practices that produce these materials will indicate that a change in material culture does not necessarily represent a radical shift in practices, but can also reflect a change in media of communication. Diachronic development of different artifact groups can result from a modification of how they communicated certain ideas rather than what they communicated.

Maison

In the social sciences, the concept of the *maison*¹ was developed by Levi-Strauss (Lévi-Strauss 1982, 1983) in response to what he saw as limitations within the accepted divisional categories, such as tribe, clan, and village community, for understanding social organization. As a response, he introduced the concept of *maison*, an analytical category that coincided with the indigenous nomenclature and resonated with emic definitions of social relations (Lévi-Strauss 1982). The *maison*, therefore, is innovative and entails a practice-oriented approach

¹Typically in English literature the concept *maison* is simply translated to house, which primarily concerns the physical structure. However, the original French word *maison*, as formulated by Levi-Strauss, equally refers to a home and includes the social relations associated with the physical structure. Rather than its English variant, the French term is adapted to underline the importance of social and physical structures in this construct.

rather than a normative categorization that reifies ideals (Gillespie 2000, 2007b), centering on the self-identification, negotiation, and manipulation of people's identity. Levi-Strauss (1982:174) articulated the *maison* as:

a corporate body holding estate made up of both material and immaterial wealth, which perpetuates itself through the transmission of its name, its goods, and its titles down a real or imaginary line, considered legitimate as long as this continuity can express itself in the language of kinship or of affinity and, most often, of both.

A multiscalar, diachronic, and relational perspective of the *maison* as an explanatory model and unit of analysis generates a vision and understanding of society that is both based in the reality of the past and archaeologically falsifiable. A *maison* model emphasizes the learned and structuring aspects of a daily, repetitive social life and the linkage between these behaviors and the material record. The concept comprehends both social and material aspects of daily life, providing a point of departure for archaeological investigations on past social relations.

Four aspects of this definition need to be discussed in further detail, starting with kinship. Although Levi-Strauss introduced the concept to transcend traditional kinship classifications, the *maison* is not a denial of kinship as a governing principle of social relations, but merely a counterargument against kinship as an exclusive classificatory tool for societies. Irrelevant of specific social organization of a society, kinship and marriage rules determine social interaction (Gillespie 2007b; Helms 1998, 2007; Morsink and Keegan 2010). Therefore, the way kinship is expressed within a society structures the *maison* (Morsink and Keegan 2010). Moreover, marriages can be strategically exploited to create and solidify inter-*maison* relations between strong and powerful *maisons*, creating long-lasting alliances (Bloch 1995).

Secondly, the significance of a *maison* is manipulated, negotiated, and signified through its inhabitants, and these practices result in a perpetuation, promotion, and confirmation of personhood and group identity (Fowler 2004). This process imbues agency to a *maison* on a diachronic level as it actively interacts with other *maisons* and

competes over status and power. Individual practices are performed on a synchronic platform, but structured through diachronic schemes of the *maison*. Agency is relationally constructed (Bell 1992; Giddens 1984; Joyce and Lopiparo 2005; Munn 1986, 1990), for it is neither located at the level of the individual, nor the *maison* (Gillespie 2007b).

Thirdly, the existence of multiple *maisons* in one society suggests a certain level of difference in material and immaterial wealth, and the strategic exploitation of marriages to form inter-*maison* ties would imply that societies with *maisons* are hierarchical, or at least have minor characteristics of inequality among *maisons* (Carsten and Hugh-Jones 1995a, b; Gillespie 2000; Joyce 2000; Joyce and Gillespie 2000; McKinnon 2000). However, Waterson (1995:51) stresses that societies need not be highly stratified to demonstrate features of societies with *maisons*. This underlines the dynamic character of this concept.

Related to the previous point is the importance of material objects as essential components of the *maison* as a corporate body. Objects materialize and objectify social relations of the *maison* and concomitantly play an active role in the constitution of the *maison's* meaning. Durable material objects ensure the perpetuation of tangible and intangible wealth of the estate and are essential for the transmission of its identity (Bloch 1995; Gillespie 2000, 2007b; Helms 1998; Hendon 2007; Joyce 2000; Joyce 2007; McKinnon 1995; Waterson 1995).

A Social Body of Continuity

All the aspects mentioned above have one central theme: continuity. The *maison* is a social body constituted by people, material, and immaterial wealth. It is a long-lived vehicle of social identification in which people interact over multiple generations as they define themselves by the *maison* to which they belong. *Maisons*, as opposed to concepts such as household (Gillespie 2007a, b), community (Canuto and Yaeger 2000) and traditional kinship classifications, have an intrinsic perpetual quality (Lévi-Strauss 1982, 1983). Isolated from the *maison*, people and short-term social bonds have an ephemeral existence whereas the *maison*, as a corporate body, absorbs individual histories and is eternal. *It is the expression of continuity and durability that*

plays a central role in the creation of identity and history for the individuals within a maison.

The conscious effort to display continuity has significant repercussions on perceptions of time and space. The estate of the *maison* is imbued with the past, materialized and objectified in the present, and perpetuated into the future. Continuity, therefore, deconstructs a linear notion of time and makes it multiscalar. Furthermore, space is multiscalar (Gillespie 2007b; Heckenberger 2005) as the *maison* can extend from an individual to a physical structure, multiple structures, villages, regions, etc. This offers some important advantages over related concepts.

The *maison*, as a heuristic concept, becomes extremely applicable for archaeological interpretation, because its central concern with continuity is expressed by the materiality of the physical structure and related objects. The perpetuation of the *maison* through time induces agency to this social structure. Also, acts of manipulation and negotiation of the *maison's* significance could lead to inter-*maison* variation (Beck 2007; Carsten and Hugh-Jones 1995b; Gillespie 2000, 2007a, b; Helms 1998; Waterson 1995). These aspects produce tangible correlates that are detectable and falsifiable in the archaeological record. The *maison* is a network of social relations and in certain situations can function as a unit of analysis for archaeological interpretations of past practices.

Practice, Materiality, Time & Space

Pierre Bourdieu (Bourdieu 1977:89) emphasizes the importance of inhabited space, and especially the house, as the central location in which the generative schema, the habitus, is objectified. Habitus subsists in practice and therefore constitutes a long-lasting, durable principle embodied through interaction between social agents (Bourdieu 1977). The physical house and the concept of habitus are intrinsically linked for Bourdieu. The lived-in house is the central location where underlying social structures are objectified in and through social agents, underlining the social and physical space of the structure.

Through repetition, history becomes collectively incorporated (Connerton 1989). Some practices are transformed into objective structures that become unquestionable, causing homogeneity and producing a consensus of meaning among individual agents (Bourdieu 1977). Yet, this collective idea of habitus is

subject to manipulations and transformations by individuals in a dynamic social arena, and variation and change become inherent qualities of daily life. It is through active engagement of agents with their locality, the being-in-the-world in a lived-in environment, that the world is experienced. Practice informs agents about and places them within a network of relations (Ingold 1993, 1995). The house is a spatial and temporal fixed structure that forms an enduring object for people to relate to, a tangible habitus.

Although a significant amount of the property of the estate is intangible capital, such as narratives on predecessors and origin stories, memories and rituals (Fox 1993; Lévi-Strauss 1982), strategies to reaffirm and perpetuate the identity of the *maison* in material form are manifold. Specific objectifications of continuity of *maisons* recur among dissimilar societies and include: (1) the repetitive placement of structures in the same locale, resulting in long-term occupation of specific sites, (2) the placement of burials within the boundaries of the structure, (3) the presence of heirlooms and other paraphernalia that are related to the *maison*, (4) caches in or around structures, and (5) inter- and intra-*maison* variability (Beck 2007; Carsten and Hugh-Jones 1995a; Joyce and Gillespie 2000). These objectifications of perpetuity (Gillespie 2000) are potentially visible in the archaeological record, but need not occur simultaneously.

However, process takes precedence over form. The emphasis on continuity of the *maison* is materialized and signified by practices and related objects, concomitantly producing a specific temporality and landscape that is intrinsically related to this social body. These constructed perceptions of time and space cannot be discerned in separate units, but are combined and indivisible concepts (Ingold 2000; Munn 1986). The actual form, the material correlates mentioned above, is not important for archaeological analysis, but how these materializations are used in social interaction is. Why are people manifesting ideas of social identity based on continuity and how are they manipulating the material world to engage in social relations with other people and/or groups? The recognition of these material correlates is not sufficient for archaeological interpretations of the past and an analysis should proceed from these material correlates to the intentions of the people that changed their material

world to convey messages of their social identity and communicate that in a social network of relations.

Caribbean

As mentioned before, the archaeology of the pre-Columbian Caribbean is severely limited by available data. Large-scale excavations uncovering habitation structures are scarce, clearly a problematic point when investigating house structures. Furthermore, little is known about the spatio-temporal dynamics of inter-site settlement patterns. Despite these limitations, the archaeological pre-Columbian record in the Caribbean reveals many references to the materializations of *maisons* as described above.

The earliest inhabitants migrated into the Caribbean archipelago around 5000 B.C.E., but will not be discussed here. By approximately 500 B.C.E. Arawakan speaking people migrated into the archipelago (Rouse 1993), first occupying the Northern Lesser Antilles and Puerto Rico, and later dispersing throughout the Lesser Antilles and the Eastern part of Hispaniola (Haviser 1997). This migration is recognized in the archaeological record by the introduction of Saladoid pottery, associated with the Arawakan diaspora (Heckenberger 2002). The Arawakan diaspora as a “constellation of cultural features” (Heckenberger 2002:111) is characterized by (1) settled village life, (2) institutionalized social hierarchy, and (3) a tendency to form vast regional societies, labeled as regionality (Heckenberger 2002; Santos-Granero 2002).

Saladoid pottery is characterized by high-quality, thin pottery with elaborate designs, and is especially known for red, black, white-on-red, polychrome painting and zone-incised crosshatching (Allaire 1997; Keegan 2000) and is the predominant style until approximately 500 B.C.E. (Rouse 1993). However, only a small fraction of Saladoid pottery is decorated (Petersen and Watters 1995) and there is no clear chronological sequence in decoration styles (Keegan 2000; Petersen and Watters 1995). Although multiple regional differences in the designs of this pottery style are recognized, homogeneity between these local differences is apparent. This homogeneity can be interpreted as a veneer, or *lingua franca* (Keegan 2000), confirming the regionality of the Arawakan people.

Settlement data show that Saladoid burials were located in relatively vacant areas within the site

boundaries (Curet and Oliver 1998; Siegel 1992, 1996, 1999), and often contain a restricted variation of grave goods that include beads, amethyst, greenstone, and quartz amulets, queen conch (*Strombus gigas*) and pottery (Hofman and Hoogland 2004; Siegel 1992). Saladoid burials have been interpreted as places of ancestor veneration (Siegel 1992, 1996, 1999), but recently Keegan (2009) proposed the possibility of post-mortem mobility and clan burials. Rather than signifying ancestor veneration, these burials in communal space emphasized and re-established social bonds between communities. The death of a person was not a personal loss exclusively, but also a loss of social cohesiveness between two groups, formerly connected through a marriage bond. The veneer or *lingua franca* (Keegan 2000) of highly aesthetic Saladoid pottery and communal burial places both indicate that these people attempted to maintain enduring legitimacies with other communities.

Yet, the Saladoid Golden Rock site on St. Eustatius, dated between the 7th to the 9th century C.E., provides a detailed description of the inter-settlement layout of structures and other features for the Saladoid period and indicates that burials were also placed within house structures (Versteeg and Schinkel 1992). However, the radiometric dates place Golden Rock at the end of the Saladoid period and the simultaneous presence of other, supposedly post-Saladoid styles throughout the Caribbean make it difficult to discern if these site-specific characteristics are the result of spatial or temporal variation, or both.

The Golden Rock site also showed evidence of caches, for example a burial of a complete Hawksbill sea turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata*) in normal anatomical context and four broken but complete well-decorated vessels placed on top of each other in a shallow pit with a flat floor. Furthermore, the excavation indicated that one structure was probably rebuilt in approximately the same locale (Versteeg and Schinkel 1992). Recent investigations on Carriacou, the Grenadines, have indicated that heirlooms were introduced and transported into the Caribbean archipelago during this early period as well (Fitzpatrick, et al. 2009).

After 600 C.E. a decrease in quality and diversification in pottery styles is recognizable, concomitant with increased population densities (Curet 1992; Curet, et al. 2004; Keegan 2000; Siegel 1999, 2004). In the Greater Antilles the Ostionoid

series develop, while in the Lesser Antilles Troumassoid and Suazoid series appear, all indicating a continuation from the preceding Saladoid series (Keegan 2000). Moreover, Saladoid decorations are not abandoned simultaneously throughout the region and inter- and intra-island variations are numerous (Hofman 1993; Versteeg, et al. 1993).

Besides the pottery styles, the context for burials and burial practices diversify. Not only habitation sites, but also caves, rockshelters, sinkholes, and ceremonial plazas are places that are utilized for the interment of the deceased (Samson 2006). Primary burials are abundant, but multiple burials also show evidence of the reconfiguration, replacement, and cremation of human remains, arguing for complex secondary burial rituals. Although the removal of long bones and skulls is not restricted to male burials, female burial alteration is less frequent (Hofman and Hoogland 2004). A large variety of grave goods are encountered in burials, like personal items such as snuff inhalers in specific burials (Hoogland 1996:155-157), and large pottery vessels in multiple burials probably representing some form of group identity (e.g. Hofman, et al. 2001).

Marriages between different groups of people may produce the simultaneous occurrence of differences and similarities in burials. Inter-marriage practices are known from ethnohistoric sources, such as the marriage between Anacoana and Caonabo. Anacoana was the sister of Behecchio and part of an elite family ruling a large territory of Hispaniola. Caonabo ruled another region on Hispaniola and through the marriage between Anacoana and Coanabo, these two different families were bonded (Keegan 2007). Both Caonabo and Anacoana were connected to two different elite families, both constituting part of their social identity.

Although ethnohistorical accounts mainly refer to *caciques*, the chiefs in Taíno society, they frequently mention the multiplicity in burial practices in the early contact period. These sources mention burial practices as vital components of ancestor veneration, deifying the remains of deceased *caciques* and emphasizing their genealogical descent (Las Casas 1951; Oviedo 1950; Siegel 1999). Human bodies were placed over fires and dried, *caciques* were buried together with their wives, and bones were placed in gourds and attached to the middle post of the house (Siegel 1999). The diversity in burial customs are

interpreted as an individualization of burial practices, related to the increase in social stratification and the emergence of chiefdoms (Curet and Oliver 1998).

Archaeologically, the placement of burials in Late Ceramic Age habitation sites concentrates within the house structures. Anse à la Gourde, Guadeloupe (Bright 2003; Hofman, et al. 2001; Morsink 2006), Kelbey's ridge, Saba (Hoogland 1996), Tutu, St. Thomas (Richter 2002), Manzanilla, Trinidad (Jansen and Dorst 2007) and Barbados (Drewett 1991) each display clear evidence of the placement of burials within the spatial boundaries of domestic units. Similar to previous periods, the burials show little evidence of unintentional disturbance. This is particularly significant as burials were located beneath structures and construction of subsequent structures could have easily led to modifications to the burials (Bright 2003; Hofman, et al. 2001; Morsink 2006). Further, the settlement system in Puerto Rico (Curet 1992; Curet 2005; Torres 2005), Anguilla (Crock 2000), the Bahamas and Turks and Caicos Islands (Keegan 1985; Keegan 2007) in this period shows evidence for settlement hierarchy, but unfortunately other regions have not been systematically surveyed or published.

Although ballcourts, or *bateyes*, have been recorded throughout the archipelago, Puerto Rico's ballcourts appear to be unrelated to villages. In contrast, they are located in empty or vacant areas and, as argued by Vescelius (1977), were strategically placed in critical locations between different polities or *cacicazgos*. Moreover, these sites are formed by several *bateyes* of various sizes and forms, indicating hierarchy, and do not to serve as primary location of burials. These ballcourts also signify a clear distinction and separation of public and private spaces. Furthermore, the *bateyes* are physically demarcated by stone slabs, determining the difference between the space inside and outside the ballcourt. This does not only affect the space, but also the people present in ceremonies, for this physical demarcation purposefully disconnects the people observing from those performing the ceremony (Oliver 1998).

The power of the *cacique* and other elites in Taíno society came from the reciprocal relation with *zemis*. *Zemi* is an abstract concept that denotes sweetness, which is imbued with the power to alter circumstances and social relations (Oliver 1998, 2009). Essentially, *zemis* possess agency. *Zemis* are

not necessarily physical, but some artifact categories such as *dubos* (ceremonial wooden stools for shamans and *caciques*), ancestor bones, *guizás* (Mol 2007), and stone threepointers are all material manifestations of the zemi. Threepointers have the longest history in the Caribbean and are also encountered in the Saladoid context (Siegel 1997). Historic sources mention the malicious raiding and stealing of zemis among groups living on the islands (Siegel 1999), signifying the power and importance these zemis had. It was the zemi that imbued power to the *cacique*, and losing the zemi would have serious affects to his capability to reign. Zemis, but also *guiazas*, *dubos*, ancestor bones and other materials have power, personhood and genealogies and can be considered as members of *maisons*.

Discussion

The pre-Columbian Caribbean archaeological record demonstrates that both the Saladoid and post-Saladoid periods manifest evidence of objectifications communicating intra-group continuity and inter-group differentiation, which suggest a social organization of these people in *maisons*. In the Saladoid period the local variations on the veneer of Saladoid pottery, caches, and heirlooms, are all material manifestations of intra-*maison* continuity. The institutionalized hierarchy, as part of the Arawakan diaspora, would suggest inter-*maison* differentiation as well. However, the overall homogeneity of Saladoid pottery and the communal clan burials stress the regionality of these migratory groups and obscure possible inter-*maison* differences.

After 600 C.E. intra-*maison* continuity was materialized in the long-term habitation of specific sites, the placement of burials within the boundaries of the physical residence, and the rebuilding of structures atop one another. Burials within settlements were deliberately interred within the boundaries of structures, signifying a bond between the individual, the individual's relatives, and the spatial location of the house. The rebuilding of structures in the same locale is another materialization of spatial continuation, not only relating structures with previous structures, but also structures with previous burials and inhabitants (Beck 2007; Joyce and Gillespie 2000; Morsink 2006; Morsink 2009, 2010; Morsink and Keegan 2010; Samson 2010). The

emphasis on spatial continuity is additionally attested by the long-term habitation of villages. Hence, all these practices established physical and tangible relations between the past, present and future, reaffirming the intangible ideas of perpetuity and continuity.

During the Late Ceramic Age, high-quality and decorated pottery as a signifier of regional coherence was completely abandoned and more local styles developed. The concomitant individualization of higher class individuals, as described by the Spanish chroniclers, was materialized through burial practices and elite relations including the exchange of specific high status zemis, such as *dubos*, threepointers and *guizás*. However, rather than disconnected from the *maison*, the body of the *cacique* and associated objects were emblems of its status and power. The recognized individualization, therefore, is a result of more distinct inter-*maison* differentiation.

Furthermore, the physical demarcations in *bateyes* also stress the significance of space. The variation in Puerto Rican *bateyes* can be explained as the result of different *maisons* that constructed and possessed their own ballcourt within that specific location. *Maisons* gathered and performed their ceremonial dances, the *areitos* (Oliver 1998), in their court, displaying power and authority to other *maisons*. The neutral location of *bateyes* avoided one specific *maison* to spatially identify itself with that locale and accrue power through it.

The significant differences between Saladoid and post-Saladoid times have often been explained as the result of a change in social organization (Curet 1992; Curet and Oliver 1998; Siegel 1996, 1999). However, a *maison*-perspective emphasizes the similarities between the two periods, such as practices that objectified and materialized *maison* continuity. Although the media that signify the *maison* mutate through time, the underlying principle, namely the social organization in *maisons*, did not.

Therefore, the change visible in the archaeological record is not a consequence of social transformation, but from a dissimilar expression of this social organization, and especially inter-*maison* differentiation, in both periods. Where Saladoid peoples emphasized inter-*maison* homogeneity, post-Saladoid peoples stressed inter-*maison* differentiation. In other words, inter-*maison* differences were obscured, suppressed, and concealed in the Saladoid period, while these contrasts were extremely

pronounced and publicly communicated in the subsequent period. This change can be explained by the context of inter-*maison* interaction in both periods.

The insecure conditions in which the new migrants were introduced required specific needs. To avoid and/or reduce the risks involved in initial migration into the Caribbean, migrants were highly dependent on strong, long-distance social bonds with parent villages (Keegan 2009), a phenomena described by Kirch (Kirch 2002) as the “lifeline” model. Besides these parent villages, interaction with other scarcely dispersed communities in the region for exchange of materials and marriage partners was vital for survival. Not surprisingly, an emphasis on regionality and durable social coherence is one characteristic of this early period.

The visible increase in demography due to local population growth and subsequent migrations after 600 C.E. significantly transformed social interaction and the way identity was communicated. Potential exchange partners were abundant and *maisons* were able to emphasize inter-*maison* identity differences without serious immediate detrimental consequences. Furthermore, the continuous habitation of the archipelago for several centuries gave rise to the possibility of creating a social identity based on space. These changes in opportunities materialize in the archaeological record in various ways.

In summary, low population numbers in the Saladoid period created a precarious social arena in which strong emphasis on inter-*maison* differentiation would lead to terminations of social exchange relations with other *maisons*, seriously jeopardizing the continuity of the *maison*. The inter-*maison* hierarchical differences were present, but just not communicated. When the situation permitted the expression of inter-*maison* variation more profoundly due to an increased population, people began to invest more effort in the open communication of hierarchical organization of society. A *maison*-perspective demonstrates that the strict hierarchical organization of the *cacicazgos*, or chiefdoms, present at the time of conquest, was already present during the early migration of Arawakan people from the South American mainland.

Conclusion

It is not the intention of the author in this article to either redefine the concept of *maison*, nor to rewrite

the history of the pre-Columbian Caribbean.

However, a detailed discussion of the *maison* and its encompassing aspects, such as continuity, materiality and practice, allows for an original interpretation of the pre-Columbian Caribbean. An emphasis on continuity through time is represented in the Caribbean archaeological context and people congregated in *maisons* to actively participate in social interaction. The *maison* was a social institution through which people were affiliated, enabling the interactions with other *maisons* in a group-like fashion. Rather than explaining social change through time as the result of social evolution, the *maison* perspective is an alternative that emphasizes continuity. The development of social organization in the pre-Columbian Caribbean was not characterized by a fundamental change in social institutions, but by the media through which the identity of that social institution was communicated, manipulated, negotiated and signified.

References

- Allaire, L.
1997 The Lesser Antilles before Columbus. In *The Indigenous Peoples of the Caribbean*, edited by S. M. Wilson, pp. 20-28. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.
- Beck, R. A., Jr. (editor)
2007 *The Durable House: House Society Models in Archaeology*. Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.
- Bell, J.
1992 On capturing agency in theories about prehistory. In *Representations in Archaeology*, edited by J. C. Gardin and C. Peebles, pp. 30-55. Indiana University Press, Bloomington.
- Bloch, M.
1995 The resurrection of the house amongst the Zafimaniry of Madagascar. In *About the House. Levi-Strauss and beyond*, edited by J. Carsten and S. Hugh-Jones, pp. 69-83. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Bourdieu, P.
1977 *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Bright, A.
2003 Spatial dynamics and social development in the Northern Lesser Antilles—a pilot study based on settlement structure at the site of Anse à la Gourde, Guadeloupe, Faculty of Archaeology, Universiteit Leiden, Leiden.
- Canuto, M. A. and J. Yaeger (editors)
2000 *The Archaeology of Communities: A New World Perspective*. Routledge, London.
- Carsten, J. and S. Hugh-Jones
1995a *About the House. Levi-Strauss and beyond*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Carsten, J. and S. Hugh-Jones
1995b Introduction. In *About the House. Levi-Strauss and beyond*, edited by J. Carsten and S. Hugh-Jones, pp. 1-46. University of Cambridge Press, Cambridge.
- Connerton, P.
1989 *How Societies Remember*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Crock, J. G.
2000 Interisland interaction and the development of chiefdoms in the eastern Caribbean. Ph.D Dissertation, University Microfilms, University of Pittsburgh, Ann Arbor.
- Curet, L. A.
1992 The development of chiefdoms in the Greater Antilles: a regional study of the valley of Maunabo, Puerto Rico, Department of Anthropology, Arizona State University, Tempe.
- Curet, L. A.
2005 *Caribbean paleodemography : population, culture history, and sociopolitical processes in ancient Puerto Rico*. University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.
- Curet, L. A. and J. R. Oliver
1998 Mortuary practices, social development, and ideology in Precolumbian Puerto Rico. *Latin American Antiquity*:217-239.
- Curet, L. A., J. Torres and M. Rodriguez
2004 Political and social history of Eastern Puerto Rico: the Ceramic Age, edited by A. Delpuech and C. L. Hofman, pp. 59-86, BAR International Series.
- Drewett, P. L.
1991 *Prehistoric Barbados*. Institute of Archaeology, University College London and Barbados Museum and Historical Society.
- Fitzpatrick, S. M., Q. Kaye, J. Feathers, J. A. Pavia and K. M. Marsaglia
2009 Evidence for inter-island transport of heirlooms: luminescence dating and petrographic analysis of ceramic inhaling bowls from Carriacou, West Indies. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 36(3):596-606.
- Fowler, C.
2004 *The Archaeology of Personhood: An Anthropological Approach*. Routledge, London.

- Fox, J. J.
1993 Comparative Perspectives on Austronesian Houses: An Introductory Essay. In *Inside Austronesian Houses: Perspectives on domestic designs for living*, edited by J. J. Fox, pp. 1-28. The Australian National University, Canberra.
- Giddens, A.
1984 *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Gillespie, S. D.
2000 Beyond Kinship: An Introduction. In *Beyond Kinship, social & material reproduction in house societies.*, edited by R. A. Joyce and S. D. Gillespie, pp. 1-21, Philadelphia.
- Gillespie, S. D.
2007a The "House Society" Model in the Archaeology of Daily Life. Paper presented at the Ponencia magistral, VII Coloquio Pedro Bosch Gimpera, UNAM.
- Gillespie, S. D.
2007b When is a house? In *The Durable House: House Society Models in Archaeology*, edited by R. A. J. Beck, pp. 25-52. Southern Illinois University, Center for Archaeological Investigations occasional Paper 35, Carbondale.
- Haviser, J. B.
1997 Settlement strategies in the early ceramic age. In *The Indigeneous people of the Caribbean*. University Press of Florida, Gainesville, edited by S. M. Wilson, pp. 57-69. University of Florida Press, Gainesville.
- Heckenberger, M.
2005 *The ecology of power: culture, place, and personhood in the southern Amazon, AD 1000-2000*. Psychology Press.
- Heckenberger, M. J.
2002 Rethinking the Arawakan Diaspora: Hierarchy, Regionality, and the Amazonian Formative. In *Comparative Arawakan Histories: Rethinking Language Family and Culture Area in Amazonia*, edited by J. D. Hill and F. Santos-Granero, pp. 99-122. University of Illinois Press, Urbana.
- Helms, M. W.
1998 *Access to origins: affines, ancestors, and aristocrats*. University of Texas Press, Austin.
- Helms, M. W.
2007 House Life. In *The Durable House: House Society Models in Archaeology*, edited by R. A. J. Beck. Southern Illinois University, Center for Archaeological Investigations occasional Paper 35, Carbondale.
- Hendon, J. A.
2007 Memory, Materiality, and Practice: House Societies in Southeastern Mesoamerica. In *The Durable House: House Society Models in Archaeology*, edited by R. A. J. Beck, pp. 292-316. Southern Illinois University, Center for Archaeological Investigations occasional Paper 35, Carbondale.
- Hofman, C.
1993 In Search of The Native Population of Pre-Columbian Saba (400-1450 AD) Part One: Pottery Styles and Their Interpretations, Rijksuniversiteit Leiden
Leiden.
- Hofman, C., M. Hoogland and A. Delpuech
2001 *Guadeloupe, Saint-Francois, Anse a la Gourde: Fouille programmée pluriannuelle 1995-2000. Rapport de Synthèse*. U.M.R./Leiden University/D.R.A.C.
- Hofman, C. L. and M. L. P. Hoogland
2004 Social dynamics and change in the Northern Lesser Antilles. *BAR International Series*:47-58.
- Hoogland, M. L. P.
1996 In search of the native population of pre-Columbian Saba (400-1450 A.D.), Part. 2: Settlements in their natural and social environment., Faculty of Archaeology, Rijksuniversiteit Leiden, Leiden.
- Ingold, T.
1993 The Temporality of the Landscape. *World Archaeology* 25(2):152-174.
- Ingold, T.
1995 Building, Dwelling, Living: How Animals and People Make Themselves at Home in the World. In *Shifting Contexts: Transformations in Anthropological*

Knowledge, edited by M. Strathern, pp. 57-80.
Routledge, London.

Ingold, T.
2000 *The Perception of the Environment: Essays on
Livelihood, Dwelling, and Skill*. Routledge, London.

Jansen, R. and M. C. Dorst
2007 Spatial Patterning and Structures of the Multi-
Component Ceramic Age Site SAN 1, Manzanilla,
Trinidad. . *Proceedings of the XXIst congress of the
International Association of Caribbean Archaeology*:315-327.
Trinidad and Tobago.

Joyce, R. A.
2000 Hierlooms and houses: Materiality and Social
Memory. In *Beyond Kinship. Social and material
reproduction in house societies*, edited by R. A. Joyce and S.
D. Gillespie, pp. 189-213. University of Pennsylvania
Press, Philadelphia.

Joyce, R. A.
2007 Building Houses: The Materialization of
Lasting Identity in Formative Mesoamerica. In *The
Durable House: House Society Models in Archaeology*, edited
by R. A. Beck, pp. 53-72. Center for Archaeological
Investigations Occasional Paper No. 33. Southern
Illinois University, Carbondale.

Joyce, R. A. and S. D. Gillespie
2000 *Beyond kinship*. University of Pennsylvania
Press, Philadelphia.

Joyce, R. A. and J. Lopiparo
2005 Postscript: Doing Agency in Archaeology.
Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory 12(4):365-374.

Keegan, W.
1985 Dynamic horticulturalists: population
expansion in the prehistoric Bahamas, *Anthropology*,
University of California, Los Angeles.

Keegan, W. and R. R. Ramos
2004 Sin Rodeos. *El Caribe Arqueológico* 7:9-13.

Keegan, W. F.
2000 West Indian archaeology. 3. Ceramic Age.
Journal of Archaeological Research 8(2):135-167.

Keegan, W. F.
2006 Archaic influences in the origins and
development of Taino societies. *Caribbean Journal of
Science* 42(1):1-10.

Keegan, W. F.
2007 *Taino Indian myth and practice: the arrival of the
stranger king*. University of Florida Press, Gainesville.

Keegan, W. F.
2009 Central Plaza Burials in Saladoid Puerto Rico:
An Alternative Perspective. *Latin American Antiquity*
20(2):375-385.

Kirch, P. V.
2002 *On the road of the winds: an archaeological history of
the Pacific Islands before European contact*. University of
California Press, Berkeley.

Las Casas, B. d.
1951 *Historia de las Indias* 3 vols. Fondo de Cultura
Económica, Mexico City.

Lévi-Strauss, C.
1982 *The way of the masks*. University of Washington
press, Washington.

Lévi-Strauss, C.
1983 Histoire et ethnologie. *Annales* 38(2):1217-
1231.

McKinnon, S.
1995 Houses and Hierarchies. In *About the House.
Levi-Strauss and beyond*, edited by J. Carsten and S.
Hugh-Jones, pp. 170-188. Cambridge University
Press, Cambridge.

McKinnon, S.
2000 The Tanimbarese Tavu: The ideology of
Growth and the Material Configurations of Houses
and Hierarchy in an Indonesian Society. In *Beyond
Kinship. Social and material reproduction in house societies*,
edited by R. A. Joyce and S. D. Gillespie, pp. 161-177.
University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

Mol, A. A. A.
2007 *Giving Guaiñas: Towards an organic model of the
exchange of social valuables in the Late Ceramic Age
Caribbean*. Sidestone Press, Leiden.

Morsink, J.

2006 (Re-)Constructing Contructions; Quotidian life and social practice at Anse à la Gourde. MPhil, Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University, Leiden.

Morsink, J.

2009 A 'maison'-perspective on social practices and development in the pre-Columbian Caribbean. Paper presented at the IACA 2009, Antigua.

Morsink, J.

2010 Chiefdoms and Maisons: Socio-political organization in the Caribbean. Paper presented at the SAA, St. Louis.

Morsink, J. and W. F. Keegan

2010 Social Bonds and Cultural Boundaries: Searching for Common Ground Between Kinship Studies and Sociétés à Maison. Paper presented at the AAA, New Orleans.

Munn, N. D.

1986 *The Fame of the Gawa: a Symbolic Study of Value Transformation in a Massim (Papua New Guinea) Society*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Munn, N. D.

1990 Constructing Regional Worlds in Experience: Kula Exchange, Witchcraft and Gawan Local Events. *Man* 25:1-17.

Oliver, J. R.

1998 El Centro Ceremonial de Caguana, Puerto Rico. Simbolismo iconográfico, cosmovisión y el poderío caciquil Taíno de Boriquen. BAR International series 727, Oxford.

Oliver, J. R.

2009 *Caciques and cemi idols: the web spun by Taino rulers between Hispaniola and Puerto Rico*. University Alabama Press.

Oviedo, d., Gonzalo F.

1950 *Sumario de la natural historia de las Indias*. Fondo de Cultura Económica, Mexico.

Petersen, J. B. and D. Watters

1995 A Preliminary Analysis of Amerindian Ceramics from the Trants site, Montserrat. *Proceedings of the XV International Congress for Caribbean Archaeology*:131-140. San Juan, Puerto Rico.

Rouse, I.

1993 *The Tainos: Rise and decline of the people who greeted Columbus*. Yale University Press, New Haven.

Samson, A. V. M.

2006 Loose bones, fixed ideas: a look at burial data and burial archaeology in the Late Ceramic Age Dominican Republic. Paper presented at the "Bring out your dead!": mortuary practices and handling the body., Leiden.

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*. Sidestone Press, Leiden.

Santos-Granero, F.

2002 The arawakan matrix: ethos, language and history in native South America. In *Comparative Arawakan histories: Rethinking language family and culture area in Amazonia*, edited by J. D. Hill and F. Santos-Granero, pp. 25-50. University of Illinois Press, Urbana.

Siegel, P. E.

1992 Ideology, power, and social complexity in prehistoric Puerto Rico, Department of Anthropology, State University of New York at Binghamton, Binghamton.

Siegel, P. E.

1996 Ideology and culture change in prehistoric Puerto Rico: A view from the community. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 23(3):313-333.

Siegel, P. E.

1997 Ancestor worship and cosmology among the Taino. *Taino. Pre-Columbian art and culture from the Caribbean. The Monacelli Press, New York*:106-111.

Siegel, P. E.

1999 Contested Places and Places of Contest: The Evolution of Social Power and Ceremonial Space in

Prehistoric Puerto Rico. *Latin American Antiquity*
10(3):209-238.

Siegel, P. E.

2004 What happened AD 600 in Puerto Rico?
Corporate Groups, Population Restructuring, and
Post-Saladoid Social Changes. In *Late Ceramic Age
Societies in the Eastern Caribbean*, edited by A. Delpuech
and C. L. Hofman. BAR S1273 Archaeopress,
Oxford.

Torres, J.

2005 Deconstructing the Polity: Communities and
Social Landscapes of the Ceramic-Age Peoples of
South Central Puerto Rico. In *Ancient Borinquen:
Archaeology and Ethnohistory of Native Puerto Rico*, edited
by P. E. Siegel. University of Alabama Press,
Tuscaloosa.

Versteeg, A. H. and K. Schinkel

1992 *The Archaeology of St. Eustatius: The Golden Rock
Site*. The St. Eustatius Historical Foundation; The
Foundation for Scientific Research in the Caribbean
Region, Amsterdam.

Versteeg, A. H., K. Schinkel and S. M. Wilson

1993 Large-scale excavations versus surveys:
examples from Nevis, St. Eustatius, and St. Kitts in
the Northern Caribbean. *Analecta Praehistorica Leidensia*
26:139-161.

Vescecius, G. S.

1977 Ball Courts and Boundaries in the Eastern
Antilles. Department of Anthropology, Peabody
Museum, New Haven.

Waterson, R.

1995 Houses and hierarchies in island Southeast
Asia. *About the house: Lévi-Strauss and beyond*:47-68.