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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Amotopoan Trails examines the movements of individuals and objects in the contemporary (2001-2008) Trio village of Amotopo (Suriname). It will present a conceptual perspective in order to increase our comprehension of archaeological movements on a micro-level. This thesis will also shed light on a century of Trio movements (1907-2008), the archaeological framework of which is explicitly negotiated towards anticipating a comparison with a preceding, yet unknown, local historical archaeology.

In order to explain the abovementioned conceptual research objective this Introduction will begin with a brief historical survey (1.1). In it I will demonstrate how the breaking down of the resolution of the chronocultural framework within the discipline of archaeology had its repercussions for the various levels of interpretation concerning human mobility. Whereas the initial, large macro-scale population migrations were postulated from scarce archaeological data, we are now dealing with high resolution data signifying micro-scale movements of both individuals and their objects. This increased visibility of the micro-level requires fresh, conceptual food for thought which this thesis aims to provide.

The methodological considerations which led to the adoption of a specific approach to facilitate the abovementioned conceptual investigations will be discussed in 1.2. Moreover, this section will explain why and how I arrived at the micro-level concepts of movement. The formulated concepts have subsequently served as interactive analogies in order to construct a century of recent archaeological history. In short, besides serving as a study to aid archaeological research of the broader region in an analogical way, it should also be perceived as research in its own right which has been ‘restrictively’ documented to connect to a preceding, as yet unknown archaeology in the best possible manner.

The deliverables and conclusions of the present study will be introduced in 1.3. I will argue that the archaeological mobility of a certain archaeological site should be seen as the sum of all the individual material movements of a certain site. This implies that we will venture behind the veil of group mobility to discuss and track its individual moving constituents. In this respect no distinction is made between human beings and objects. From an archaeological perspective both categories are to be considered as *immobilia* once brought to the archaeological site under investi-
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gation. Further conceptual parameters for archaeological movements have been constructed on this primary basis. A brief survey of the contents of the Chapters 2-6 is presented in the final section (1.4).

1.1 From migration and mobility to archaeological movements

When looking into the histories of the anthropological and archaeological disciplines, it seems that each and every deconstruction of existing cultural entities into smaller ones, be it either geographical or temporal, has been followed by the construction of theoretical constructs in an attempt to explain the newly arisen and heterogeneous composition. After many such deconstructions, some form of human movement has been cited in order to deal with the newly emerged complexity. This Introduction will commence with a brief historical survey of the archaeological discipline and then arrive at the research objective of this thesis.

The anthropological and archaeological theories developed during the past 200 years have gradually deconstructed the global human world into a myriad of distinct dynamic cultures. Let us begin with the reigning biblical and evolutionary perspective concerning population movements. The early monogenist perspective reasoned that all human beings were divided into three socio-evolutionary cultures, namely ‘savages’, ‘barbarians’ and the ‘civilised’, and that they could only go back to Adam and Eve. These three cultures, therefore, ultimately all had to evolve from the biblical cradle of the Near East (Greene 1959:221-2; Harris 1968:54-5). This axiomatic perspective sparked the task for early anthropologists and archaeologists to present an explanation for the various trajectories out of the Near East (Barnard 2000:23-5; Harris 1968:83; Trigger 2006:114). The concept of population migration served to explain the global situation at the time of coexisting ‘civilizations’, ‘barbarians’ and ‘savages’.

However, early German anthropologists, and not much later the Boasian Americanist anthropologists too, started deconstructing the two ‘non-civilised’ cultures (‘barbarians’ and ‘savages’) into geographically distinct cultures, based on their specific material characteristics (Trigger 1980:28; Zimmerman 2001:206). Once these first layers of fresh cultural paint had coloured the global canvas the renegotiated, synchronic situation left these early anthropologists once again to explain the newly created cultural areas. In order to make sense of the observed similarities between the various cultural areas these scholars postulated a distinction between

---

1 Adams et al. 1978 and Hakenbeck 2008 have served as fruitful starting points for this brief historical survey, albeit adapted to an Americanist and South American perspective.

2 Franz Boas imported many insights derived from German ethnology into early Americanist anthropology (see Boas 1887; Stocking 1974, 1996; Liss 1996; Barnard 2000:55).
macro-geographical cultural cores of independent inventions on the one hand, and the flow of cultural traits hereof into passive peripheries on the other hand (Goldenweiser 1925:19-22; Steward 1929:43; Kluckhohn 1936:159; Zimmerman 2001: 212-4; Harris 1968:260; Barnard 2000:55; Trigger 2006:278-9). As to the Caribbean and Amazonian region such an initial survey was composed by the socio-cultural anthropologist Julian Steward (1902-1972). Interconnecting the fragmented spectrum of earliest ethnographies and archaeologies, he presented his study on South American cultures.³ Steward postulated the dissemination of certain cultural traits from the Andean cradle towards the circum-Caribbean area and from there to the tropical lowlands. In each of these macro-movements, people had lost more cultural attributes, gradually devolving from an empire to marginal tribes and nomadic groups (Steward 1949:768-72; Steward & Faron 1959:449-55).⁴

Americanist archaeologists had meanwhile relied heavily on such anthropological core-periphery concepts in order to obtain a diachronic grip, lacking appropriate temporal methodological handles themselves (Willey & Sabloff 1974:55-6; Barnard 2000:56; Lyman & O’Brien 2006:224-6). The direct-historical approach, for instance, was not initially adopted for hermeneutic purposes, but to obtain a fixed datum for unknown archaeological sites through their connection with historically known ones (Willey & Sabloff 1974:108-9; Lyman & O’Brien 2006:103; Steward 1942:337). In the early days of European archaeology, in a similar vein, the argument of human movement (in the form of both migration and diffusion) explained the spread of cultural traits from the innovative cradle of the Near East to Western Europe, but also provided temporal handles to cross-date archaeological periods of the European periphery on the basis of Near Eastern historical chronologies (Renfrew 1973:36-7).

In the Americas, where such written chronologies had not yet been discovered, the relative dating methods of seriation and stratigraphy across the Americas gradually came to provide the main handles for deconstructing the deep, homogenous past. Based on these methodologies, the initial anthropological distinction in centres of inventions and those

---

³ Steward borrowed the fourfold division of South American societies into Andean highland cultures, circum-Caribbean cultures, tropical forest cultures and marginal cultures from Cooper (Cooper 1941 in Steward 1946:4; Cooper 1942:7-14,17; compare Wissler 1917:229-44, see also Silverman 2008:7).

⁴ Interestingly a similar situation of increased resolution has recently triggered the movement perspective in Amazonian historical ecology. This view opines that the seemingly green blanket of ‘primordial’ forests has obscured the actual heterogenous anthropogenic nature of the botanical landscape for a long time. After ecologists and archaeologists have historized various localities and their continuities, Alexiades now pleads for (a) an academic departure from this often implicit focus on spatial stasis and (b) the reconstruction of the anthropogenic landscape in tandem with the Amazonian histories of people in movement (Alexiades 2009:1-3).
of passive followers could now be further explored in the temporal dimension too (Freed & Freed 1983:815-6; Barnard 2000:56; Lyman & O’Brien 2006:241). Americanist archaeology set off on its own course in a more independent manner starting from their socio-cultural colleagues (Steward 1942:339; Steward & Setzler 1938:4-7). As to Amazonia and the Caribbean, this implied that Steward’s theories regarding the indigenous history of South America could be further deconstructed by archaeologists. Donald Lathrap (1927-1990), for instance, suggested a much earlier and more complex Amazonian development based on the archaeological finds and historical sources, and refuted Steward’s perspective of the Amazonian periphery (Lathrap 1970:46-7,112). The Caribbean archaeologist Irving Rouse (1913-2006) doubted the Amazonian periphery hypothesis too. Moreover, he pointed at the lack of archaeological evidence for the Andean diffusion into the Circum-Caribbean area (Rouse 1953:196).

With the advent of radiocarbon dating, the latest and most revolutionary temporal deconstruction could be initiated into the archaeology of the Caribbean and Amazonia. The temporal dimension, once again, became revolutionarily deconstructed into smaller periods in time. Its discovery brought about significant consequences with regard to the concept of human movement in archaeology. The main consequence for the focus of the present thesis is that the higher resolution of time introduced a more in-depth insight into the paces and rhythms of human movements underlying the initial large ‘arrows’ on the continental maps. Invasive and event-like population migrations postulated during the pre-carbon dating period increasingly came to be renegotiated into gradual and complex social processes of movements of small groups of people (Clark 1966:172; Trigger 2006:382-4; Hakenbeck 2008:16-21; Curet 2005:61; Hofman et al. 2007; 2011). At present, radiocarbon dating has replaced the relative dating to become the new chronological backbone of archaeology in the region. It creates an archaeological framework for the region with an absolute resolution of c. 100 to 200 years.

In recent decades, Caribbean archaeology has yet again adopted new technologies and approaches in order to increase the archaeological resolution. These technologies such as DNA, stable isotope and geochemical analyses create the possibility to provenance (a) specific individuals by means of their skeletal remains and (b) objects by means of their chemical characteristics (e.g. Booden et al. 2008; Hofman et al. 2008; Isendoorn et al. 2008; Knippenberg & Zijlstra 2008; Laffoon & de Vos 2011; Rodriguez Ramos 2011). Besides these technological developments, archaeologists have increasingly ventured beyond the necessary ‘phone-booth’ excavations in refuse deposits, by thoroughly exploring and excavating as large as possible, horizontal extent of the site (e.g. Versteeg & Schinkel 1992; Hoogland & Hofman 1993; Samson 2010). By visualizing the full
extent of an archaeological site, the quest has increasingly moved towards extricating the intra-site palimpsests and explaining its ultimate static and treacherously synchronic-seeming outcome.

Based on both these latest methodological innovations (Lightfoot 2008:3-4; Hackenbeck 2008:19-21) and the increased attention for the processes and practices of the intra-site, the discipline has been brought closer to the specific actions and movements of individuals. In archaeological theory, a shift has been suggested: from applying ‘human movement’ as the explanation for diachronic change in cultural assemblages towards a focus on the very act of ‘human movement’ itself (Adams et al. 1978:523; Anthony 1990:908-9, 1997:29-30; Burmeister 2000:539; Lightfoot 2008:3-6). The technological innovations in archaeology can facilitate a mobility perspective ‘from the ground up’ (Hakenbeck 2008:20).

Although the concepts of ‘migration’, ‘mobility’ and ‘movement’ have recently been re-evaluated (Wendrich & Barnard 2008:1-10; Lightfoot 2008:1-2), our existing archaeological interpretation and associations concerning these concepts still revolve around ‘groups’ of people. As has previously occurred with the advent of archaeological technologies (for instance, stratigraphy, seriation and radiocarbon dating) the current technological shift in scale and resolution of the archaeological data now also requires other interpretative ‘anchors’. The archaeological pool of interpretative associations concerning individual movements on a micro level now seems understudied and awaits renegotiation. In my thesis I will provide a perspective that will contribute to the conceptualisation of the micro-level of movements of people and goods in the archaeology of the Caribbean-Amazonian region.

1.2 A counter-chronological approach with interactive analogies

“According to [Max] Black, an interaction metaphor, and the analogy it expresses, cut both ways. A metaphor of this sort is not simply an asymmetrical comparison in which the one side is held fixed, while the other is said to be ‘like’ the first in some more or less specified way. Instead, the meanings of the two terms of the metaphor interact, generating a new meaning, with the potential to shed new light on the referents of both terms.” Levine 2009:596 referring to Black 1962:38-47

Before addressing my research objective, several assumptions have to be mentioned in order to explain the adopted approach and direction. Firstly, I will now explain why this study was conducted in the present and why it is not only to be seen as a conceptual study aimed at explaining a different archaeological past, but also as an archaeology of its own recent period.
Secondly, I will reveal my subsequent adoption of a counter-chronological direction and how the mechanism of the interactive analogy has been utilized to construct a century of Trio movements. Thus, a conceptual and an archaeological specific study are combined in a single approach.

This research was conducted in the present since I consider archaeological interpretations to be based on two elements: (a) the analogical departure of every interpretation and (b) the constraints posed to these analogies by the archaeological data. The first of these two elements is based on the assumption that analogical projections start from a setting where material actions can be perceived directly. Although I agree with contextual archaeologists that material culture is meaningfully constituted (Hodder 1992:12), I do not believe we can actually ‘read’ these meanings solely through a careful analysis of its static material context. Instead, I adhere to the assumption that meanings and significances are ascribed to the material world by *perceiving it in action.* We need the action to make sense of it. Therefore, analogy is understood here as information extracted from this arena of action (our own experience and from reported knowledge) which is subsequently transported to the archaeological data (Wylie 2002:165, van Reybrouck 2000:5; David & Kramer 2001:1; Verhoeven 2005:253). Reasoning further from this assumption, I argue that archaeologists who wish to reconceptualise their theories, also need to perceive material in action in order to restructure its significance.

The second element of archaeological interpretations is formed by the constraints posed by the archaeological data on these analogies. Some archaeologists who hold onto the uniformitarian principle refute ethno- and historical analogies, because of their distortion of the unique past (e.g. Freeman 1968:262-5; Wobst 1978:303; see Cameron 1993:43); indeed, both ethnographic and historical parallels are capable of tyrannizing the past. The meanings and significances of matter associated in the present cannot be simply transported to the past in order to imbue the archaeological data with similar significance. This transportation of knowledge (analogy) needs to be confronted with the evidential constraints (Wylie 2002:194) that the archaeological data poses. The contrast emerging from the analogical projections and the constraining archaeological data results in a past that is different and unlike the analogical projections. Therefore, the definition of analogy utilised in the present thesis not only includes the associations or comparisons of similarities between entities, but also their emerging differences (see also Wylie 1982:383,393-394; Ravn 2011:721).

---

5 In the early 20th century Henri Bergson and George Mead postulated that meaning was not to be found in statics (objects), but was created in the perception of movement and action (Bergson 2004 [1912]:86-118; Mead 1982:120). In recent decades, scholars have come to re-embrace this idea (e.g. Lakoff & Johnson 1999:16-7; Ingold 2000:166-7;2011:13-4).
One example of such an archaeological analogy originates from Amazonia. Since Julian Steward and others had ethnographically formulated the Tropical Forest Culture in the mid-20th century, it has been dubbed the standard model (Viveiros de Castro 1996:180). Since then, it has since been explicitly and implicitly applied by archaeologists in order to interpret both Amazonian and Caribbean pasts. The Tropical Forest Culture can be roughly identified as slash-and-burn manioc cultivators inhabiting autonomous small villages counting between 20 and 50 inhabitants. These villagers are characterised by a high rate of residential mobility, which is mainly determined by the limits which the surrounding rainforest poses. This knowledge, that has often been transported to bring about an archaeological interpretation of Amazonian and Caribbean pasts, is the analogical part of the archaeological interpretation.

The second part, however, focuses on the emerging differences between the present and the archaeological past. In recent decades the increase of archaeological evidence has been able to convince a majority of archaeologists that larger populations must have existed in the Amazonian past. The encountered archaeology did not resemble the material remains of the Tropical Forest Cultures. This persuasion started with Lathrap’s reference to early historical sources in which large Amerindian populations in the Amazon region are mentioned (Lathrap 1970:46-7). The fact that this area did have enough potential to sustain large populations, also in the deep past, was later backed up by early radiocarbon dates resulting from large archaeological sites (Roosevelt et al. 1991; Roosevelt 1999:19-28; Isbell 2008:1147).

It is in part due to a recent increase in deforestation that many geoglyphs and large habitation sites have been discovered which appear to be associated with either large patches of terra preta or raised fields (Petersen et al. 2001:100-103; Rostain 2008a; 2008b:284-298; see also Erickson 2008). When combined, these discoveries further strengthen the hypothesis that, in several regions in Amazonia, larger populations than those of the ethnographic Tropical Forest Culture could have existed up to the proto-colonial Amazonian past. Next to this direct evidence, indirect evidence has been sought, too, in order to show that the Tropical Forest Culture image in itself should be considered a post-1492 development (e.g. Denevan 1992:158-161, but see also Rival 2002:viii).

Instead of downplaying the application of these ethnographic analogies I argue that they have been essential for arriving at a significant unique archaeological past (see also Skibo 2009:39; Ravn 2011:719; cf. Jansen

---

6 This development led to a hypothesised continental core-periphery reversal as mentioned in the section 1.1.
The contrast between the archaeological data and the ethnographic analogies has not only created a different past, which is unlike the present but, at the same time, it has also pronounced a different present. To refer to the philosopher Max Black (1909-1988), this analogy has ‘cut both ways’ (Levine 2009:596; Black 1962:38-47). The contemporary analogy does not merely ‘subsidise’ the archaeological period. Instead the analogy has brought both time periods into focus equally (sensu Black 1962:25-63) creating new questions for both. The knowledge extracted from both periods is equal in terms of validity, drawbacks and importance (see also Garrow & Yarrow 2010).

Although knowledge of the present and the archaeological past are equally valid, this does not imply that they can equally be accessed in terms of interpretation. An asymmetry of perception leads the direction of the analogy, from a situation with a greater degree of access to the perception of ‘action’ towards a situation where no perception of such action is possible. This implies that, although past and present are equally valid, the justification for the knowledge of the archaeological past is more strongly dependent on inter-subjective agreement for the adoption of plausible explanations, than the one for an interpretation of a similar event in the present, the potential replicative observations of which seems not to necessitate such an agreement (sensu Kosso 2001:78). This difference in jus-

---

7 For an example of another developing analogy I refer to recent discussions on Pacific-European analogies on themes such as the ‘Big Man’ model, the discussion of which also seems to be relevant to the Caribbean and Amazonia (Spriggs 2008; Roscoe 2009; Ravn 2011).
tification mainly depends on the type of knowledge which is (a) directly observed by the researcher (high justification), (b) perceived through the reported experience of another (moderate justification), or (c) has to be inferred (low justification). Although these types of knowledge coexist in the present, they are divided into ethnography, history and archaeology respectively (see Fig 1.1). The assumption adopted here is that the direction of the analogy is therefore inevitably counter-chronological.

The counter-chronological direction of analogies explains the observed trade deficit between anthropology and archaeology (Garrow & Yarrow 2010; Yarrow 2010). Although archaeology requires ethnography and history in order to obtain the analogies of the direct observations of material in action, anthropologists on the other hand do not need to cope with the low justification of archaeological knowledge for their research. Archaeology in this respect should be seen as a discipline beyond ethnography and history. For a long time, ethnographers and archaeologists shared an interest in situated material culture. Anthropology gradually came to deviate from an explicit material focus during the mid-20th century. Much later the single site focus was lost too (see Marcus 1995; Hamilakis & Anagnostopoulos 2010:75-6). Next, these scholars concentrated more and more on un-situated cultural perceptions and group behaviour. Not surprisingly, archaeologists increasingly began to investigate the present themselves during the mid-20th century.

Archaeological research of the present has moved from an initial focus on the construction of analogies for the sole enhancement of understanding the archaeological past, towards a myriad of research perspectives in recent decades. These perspectives have moved away from this ‘means to an end’ approach towards perceiving the archaeology of the present as a study in its own right (e.g. Buchli & Lucas 2001:4; Meskell 2005:82; see also McAtackney et al. 2007). A large number of these recent research perspectives are now converging with socio-cultural anthropological approaches which have witnessed a material turn (e.g. Geismar & Horst 2004:5; Hicks & Beaudry 2010:1). These studies either focus on abstract un-situated dynamics of the material world (see also Hamilakis & Anagnostopoulos 2010:74-6) or on the perceptions of the archaeological past and how the past is socially constituted. In the present study I wish to add a perspective to this corpus which adopts a counter-chronological approach in order to construct a century of archaeological history in which interactive analogies come to play a central role. My research will deal with a recent archaeological period in its own right which primarily aims to connect to a preceding yet unknown period (see Fig. 1.2). The formulated archaeological concepts applied in the construction of the archaeological history of this period will also have value with regard to the archaeology of the broader Amazonian and Caribbean region.
Taking the research objective and the methodological considerations on board, this thesis aims at delivering the following results: (a) to renegotiate the present group mobility perspective in archaeology by further deconstructing it into various conceptual spheres of human and object movements. These interpretative handles will help conceptualise the micro-level of mobility and migration in Amazonian and Caribbean archaeology, (b) to apply these movement concepts as interactive analogies to shed light on a centennial process of archaeological movements and (c) a final result of my research will produce a specific archaeology of recent times in the Surinamese basin of the Corentyne River creating a fruitful starting point in order to ultimately enhance the comprehension of the post-1492 archaeology of that particular basin.

This study will begin by focussing on the present-day Trio village of Amotopo. Here the movement and action of humans, animals and goods can be perceived, as well as how their interaction takes shape and becomes shaped by the newly constructed material matrix. My research is situated by means of adopting archaeological parameters. The choice for a single-site perspective originated from the awareness that an often sug-
gested contemporaneity of sites (a synchronic multi-site perspective) is not an observable archaeological reality in the prehistoric Caribbean and Amazonia. Due to the present-day calibration margins of radiocarbon dating (rarely with a higher resolution than a period of 100 years), contemporaneity between sites can only be assumed or inferred. By documenting a single village along archaeological parameters, an anchor in time is created enabling future comparisons with earlier archaeological sites that pre-date oral and written histories.

Within the boundaries of an archaeological site we can start to reason towards a movement terminology. We set off very basically by establishing that beings and objects present at a certain archaeological site must once have moved to this specific place. On this notice, our new archaeological parameters come to play. For example, individual $x$, ultimately buried at archaeological site Z, moved from a certain region to this archaeological site. Although this individual most probably did visit other places in his or her life, his/her archaeological trajectory (the ‘arrow’) runs from region $x$ (where he or she was born and raised) to the archaeological site where his/her skeletal remains were excavated. In a similar vein, the trajectory of a certain species of fish that can only be caught in a certain season in a certain habitat, will ultimately lead to the refuse deposit in archaeological site Z. The same goes for durable objects. Though a ceramic sherd might have its raw material origin in clay quarry $y$, its final deposition is at the archaeological site Z. All trajectories ultimately lead to the archaeological site under investigation, but at the same time these trajectories also form the key to comprehending the movements of their carriers. The archaeological mobility of the site in the present thesis is therefore approached as the sum of all movements and trajectories (see also Wagner 1986:21; Ingold 2009:36-7; see also Lightfoot 2008:20; Sheller 2011:5).

With these archaeological parameters in mind I initiated the present research in 2007. That same year, in Paramaribo, I met Atinio Panekke, the son of the captain of the Trio village Amotopo, after having been introduced to him by the linguist Dr. Eithne Carlin. Atinio and his father were willing to ‘adopt’ me into their village. I accompanied them on the Corentyne River (visiting the Trio villages of Sandlanding, Wanapan and Lucie along the way) to finally reach Amotopo. Here I spent six weeks during the rainy season of 2007. During that time I started to map the village of Amotopo. After returning to Amotopo in 2008 for another three months I continued to map the remaining part of the village and started documenting the differences when compared with my research of 2007. During this fieldwork I observed the movements of the inhabitants and

---

8 One could potentially make an exception for archaeological sites connected through paths or causeways, e.g. see Heckenberger 2005.
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their objects in and out of the village, but also interviewed the Amotopoans on the trajectories of their objects in the village as well as their own movements in the past.

Moreover, I recorded the Amotopoan movements out of the village by means of a GPS device, while participating in hunting and fishing trips and visits to gardens. The goal of this was to track the objects entering the village via own procurement (fish, game, crops and firewood). In addition, I also tracked objects that entered the village due to exchange with people from other villages, as well as those leaving the village. These movements I was able to observe directly. In this way the village flux could be determined for certain types of objects. In correspondence to the abovementioned asymmetry of perception, I subsequently focused on the reported movements of the Amotopoans and their objects. In semi-structured interviews the Amotopoans were questioned as to the sequence in which the structures in the village had been built from the year it had been founded up to 2008. The Amotopoans also informed me how they had accumulated the items belonging to their house inventories: when they had received certain objects, where the exchange had taken place, and from whom they had received them.

Speaking of movement instead of mobility therefore not only facilitates the discussion on the movement of people, but also the movement of objects (cf. Sheller 2011:5). In the discipline of archaeology both movements must be considered as inextricably linked. To accentuate the mobility perspective, the material village was envisioned as comprising matter that was moving, referred to here as *mobilia*. *Mobilia* can simply be defined as all matter that human beings bring to a site. Humans themselves are the most important *mobilia*, since they introduce material into a site. The other *mobilia* move between between places because the humans transport them. Not all move in a similar way, and they can be divided into various categories. For instance, the movement of roof supports (for the construction of a house) shows a different trajectory than that of a metal pan. The trajectories of different classes of *mobilia* therefore attest to various spheres of human movement.9

In archaeology, on the other hand, there is no longer any movement; the site and its components can all be considered *immobilia*.10 Of interest therefore is the focus on the transition of *mobilia* into *immobilia*, to magnify the process of how elements (such as bodies and objects) come

---

9 Here the term ‘sphere’ is preferred above ‘dimension’ in order to refer explicitly to the material correlate of human mobility (cf. Kelly 1992:43-4; Curet 2005:60-1; Politis 2007:24-5), and is more specifically understood to be a measurable space delineated by human material influence.

10 Needless to say, the terms *mobilia* and *immobilia* are not new and have been used by many European archaeologists to refer to a group of portable artefacts and the built environment respectively.
to a standstill while others remain perpetuated in their movement towards other places. This process is referred to here as village flux. The following questions now rise. How do various spheres of *mobilia* and *immobilia* attest to the trajectories of people and objects? How do people and objects move to other villages and how do others in turn enter the village? How does the creation of *immobilia* in a certain village, the rendering immobile of matter, in turn determine trajectories of other *mobilia*? Can this be linked to the movement of individuals? And how does this play out beyond the level of a single village, let us say over the course of a century?

Subsequently, the movement concepts resulting from the study in the village of Amotopo are counter-chronologically ‘rooted’. This perspective will move our concepts of human and object movements towards another time scale: the effects of change in human movement and the material spheres concerning the same group of people (the Amotopoans and their direct ancestors) over the period of a century (1907-2008). The information on Trio movements in the Surinamese basin of the Corentyne River is not continuously distributed over this period. A decision was made to focus on three separate and smaller periods within this century. The same questions and concepts for the village of Amotopo were also applied for these other two periods. By adopting a counter-chronological approach due respect was paid to the asymmetry of perception. This implied that the most recent period was placed in an interactive analogy with the preceding period. The latter in turn was contrasted in an interactive analogy by the earliest period. The ultimate result of this counter-chronological approach is to overcome the discreteness of the three sequences. The differences they together express, by means of the interactive analogies, were finally interpolated in order to arrive at a continuous century of Trio movements.

1.4 Brief structure of the thesis

In Chapter 2, a short introduction to the social and the biophysical context of the area of study is provided. Here the Eastern-Guianese ethnography, geology, hydrology and ecology will be discussed as to the extent of Trio movements over the period of a century (1907-2008). Chapter 3 documents a detailed archaeology of the present-day village of Amotopo. Here the *immobilia* are emphasised in order to provide us with the static dimension to which archaeologists are accustomed. The structural features that have already left lasting traces in the soil and in the young history of the village are dealt with. In this chapter, archaeological features and correlations that clarify spatial relations are discussed which will show its merits in future comparisons with preceding archaeological periods.
In Chapter 4, the dimensions of *mobilia* are discussed. The trajectories of both people and objects are placed in concert with each other. The *mobilia* are divided into different categories based on their relationships to certain archaeological spheres of movement, namely subsistence *mobilia*, exchange *mobilia* and residential *mobilia*. In Chapter 5 the Amotoapoan village is diachronically compared with various villages over the period of a century through the application of interactive analogies. Based on analogical comparisons a history of material change can be distilled. The results will be discussed in the final Chapter. Moreover, the proposed aims and questions posed in this Introduction will be answered.