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Propositions

1. Single Grave tools worked as a transmitter and generator of ‘mutual knowledge’ (Giddens 1984). During the production and use of the implements social norms and traditions were created and maintained (Costin 1998, 2001; Dobres 1995, 2009; Miller 2009; Schlanger 1994) (see Chapter 3 and 7).

2. Although Single Grave Culture flint technology has been traditionally classified as opportunistic (Peeters 2001a), after the analysis of the three selected settlement assemblages Single Grave Culture technology can be considered complex, conformed by different chaînes opératoires and characterised by the selection of different techniques (see Chapter 7).

3. The study of settlements and burials has to be combined to understand the nature of the Single Grave Culture in the Netherlands.

4. Dwellings played an important role on the social cohesion of Single Grave Culture and the production and use of the domestic assemblage (See Chapter 4, 5, 6 and 7).

5. Use-wear analysis, contextualised within the archaeological data, is a fundamental methodology to understand the social organization of society.

6. The functional preconception of tools implied by traditional typology should be abandoned. By selecting implements that are normally not considered as tools, the understanding of archaeological assemblages will be deepened. Sampling, therefore, is an important step that has to be taken into consideration.

7. Through use-wear analysis different types of activities carried out on Keinsmerbrug, Mienakker and Zeewijk were identified. The results of the study confirmed the identification of different types of settlements characterised by a dissimilar type of occupation (seasonal vs. permanent) and the performance of different tasks.

8. Use-wear analysis on different types of implements (stone, flint, bone…) permits a better understanding of the `chaînes opératoires‘ existing on a site.

9. The study of the interaction of different technologies reveals traits of the interaction between different crafts and the way knowledge is acquired and maintained by the groups.

10. Knowledge is transmitted from one generation to another through myths and stories, but also through the daily practices. Therefore, to study the material culture generated through these practical activities is a key to understand the social organization of the groups.

11. Landscape in prehistory must be considered as part of the ‘mutual knowledge’ (Giddens 1984) of the groups. It works not only as a generator of this knowledge, but also as a ‘tool’ that transmits information to the different members of a group.

12. Tools are the expression of human actions and, as for this book, it takes time to learn how to make them right. At the end, though, learning processes are full of mistakes but also of a great effort and beauty.