

# JAMAICA JOURNAL

Vol. 36, Nos. 1-2



**Rex Nettleford and  
Barry Chevannes:  
Two of a Mind**

Guest Editors: Rupert Lewis and Barbara Gloudon

**Rex: Inward Stretch, Outward Reach  
Barry: Humble Servant of His People  
Revivalism and Rastafari  
New Ganja Laws**

**Part One**

# The Sculptural Legacy of the Jamaican Taíno

## PART 2: EIGHTEENTH- TO TWENTIETH-CENTURY DISCOVERIES

JOANNA OSTAPKOWICZ

THE 1792 DISCOVERY OF THE CARPENTER'S Mountain sculptures (discussed in part 1 of this article),<sup>1</sup> was not the first 'find' of Taíno wood carvings in Jamaica: other carvings had been documented previously, though their histories have remained, until recently, obscure. Nor were they the last: the most recent finds – remarkably, of another group of three sculptures, as well as a *duho* (ceremonial seat) – came to light in the 1990s, shortly after the Columbus Quincentenary. Although the histories – especially of the very early material – are often convoluted and misattributions abound, it is possible to confirm that a total of twelve unique sculptures are currently known: nine surviving in museum collections, and three documented in archival records.<sup>2</sup> The following pages will explore the histories of Jamaican sculptures discovered from as early as the 1730s, and will bring some of their stories right up to the present, highlighting new directions in their study. Some of the new results – including AMS radiocarbon dates and wood identifications – are given in Table 2 (following on from Table 1 in the previous article), with histories summarised in Table 3; the bracketed

numbers (e.g., [7]) refer to individual artefacts, and cross-reference the tables with the text. Interpreting the emic meanings of these carvings is beyond the remit of this article, which mainly serves to provide a brief overview of the known corpus. Attempting to unravel the significance of spiritually loaded images is difficult given our limited knowledge of the Jamaican Taíno, and this is perhaps one of the last challenges as their material and chronological resolutions are brought into greater focus.

### GUANABOA 'PAGOD' (PRE-1734)

Discoveries of 'new' antiquities continue to emerge with archival research – although calling these new is incongruous given that the documents in question are several centuries old, and the pieces described even older. The Jamaican 'pagod' acquired by Sir Hans Sloane (1660–1753), is a case in point (Figure 1) – an artefact previously unknown in the Jamaican literature. Sloane first built his reputation in Jamaica, where he lived for fifteen months as physician to the governor, the Duke of Albemarle – a period that further influenced his interests in collecting both natural history

specimens and 'curiosities'. Upon his return to Britain in 1689, he developed these interests in ethnographic and archaeological antiquities, adding to his ever-expanding collection, so that by 1725, his *Miscellanies* catalogue listed 1,169 artefacts.<sup>3</sup> Towards the end of the catalogue, after a number of other Jamaican artefacts were acquired via various sources,<sup>4</sup> the following description is provided for the entry 1686: "An image of a heathen pagod [idol], found in a cave at Guanaboa [St Catherine's parish], supposed to have been sev'Il hundred years buried in that place. Said to have come from Jamaica through the hands of Rev. Mr. Scott."

Rev. John Scott (1696–1734) had been stationed at St John's parish, Jamaica since 1716, and from 1720 until his death in 1734, he was rector of the Cathedral of Spanish Town, St Catherine's parish.<sup>5</sup> It is not as yet clear whether the carving entered the Sloane collection prior to Scott's death, potentially as a personal gift or donation (and so some evidence about its history might emerge through

Figure 1: Sloane's entry for the Jamaican 'pagod' acquired via Rev. Scott (1696–1734), listed under number 1686 in Sloane's *Miscellanies* manuscript.

1686. An image of a heathen pagod found in a cave at Guanaboa supposed to have been sev'Il hundred years buried in that place. From Jamaica from the Rev. Mr. Scott.



Sloane's correspondence), or whether it was acquired indirectly.<sup>6</sup> The best that can be surmised is that it was discovered at some point before Scott's death in 1734. Assuming the carving stayed with the Sloane collection until 1753, when an Act of Parliament was passed to accept Sloane's collection on behalf of the nation, it may have then become part of the founding collection of the British Museum – the country's first national, public museum.

As intriguing as the catalogue entry is for this Jamaican 'pagod', it is unfortunately the first and only reference we currently have for it. Of the approximately two thousand ethnographic artefacts acquired by Sloane, and carefully listed in his *Miscellanies*, only one hundred have been identified in the British Museum collections to date, and these are mostly from China and Japan.<sup>7</sup> Whether the carving was in fact transferred to the newly founded British Museum, and whether it might still reside somewhere in the museum holdings, only time will tell: other such early Caribbean carvings have come to light recently (see discussion below). Equally, it may have been exchanged, gifted or sold by Sloane prior to 1753, so attempts to find it in the museum may prove futile. In either scenario, there is the possibility that it may have deteriorated or was otherwise destroyed. The few facts that remain indicate that it came

from Guanaboa, and that it was in the possession of Scott prior to 1734 – making it the earliest documented Jamaican Taíno sculpture currently known.

#### JAMES THEOBALD'S CEMÍ (PRE-1739)

Much confusion still arises from the often sparse information available for early finds and their subsequent histories. One such case is the donation by James Theobald (1688–1759)<sup>8</sup> of a Jamaican carving to the newly opened British Museum in 1757. In correspondence with the museum, Theobald noted that the carving was given to him "some years ago . . . by a gentleman who has a considerable estate on the island of Jamaica, [and who] in searching a deep cave in the hills for runaway slaves found two of these figures at [the] inner end". The piece was officially listed in an entry in the Museum's Book of Presents on 20 May 1757 as "a wooden image brought from Jamaica . . . and supposed to be an American Idol". This was the museum's twenty-fifth entry into the first donation book, and the first Americas item recorded after those in Sloane's *Miscellania*.<sup>9</sup>

Until quite recently, this carving could not be identified in the British Museum collections, which led to some speculation not only about this particular piece but also the second

sculpture reportedly found with it in the cave. George A. Aarons, for example, suggested that a cohoba stand in the British Museum collections, which takes the form of a bird feeding a turtle,<sup>10</sup> was the Theobald donation – however, this carving entered the collections in 1866 after purchase from the London antique dealer William Wareham via the Christy Trust, and its provenance has recently been identified as Hispaniolan.<sup>11</sup> Other researchers believed the second 1757 carving to be the cohoba stand now in the collections of the Metropolitan Museum of Art<sup>12</sup> – but there is nothing in the known history of the carving to substantiate this link,<sup>13</sup> based on its iconography, body posture, and facial details the figure is most likely Hispaniolan, where other stylistically similar examples have been found.<sup>14</sup> The best candidate for the Theobald donation is a small anthropomorphic carving in the British Museum collections

Figure 2: Small anthropomorphic cemí, previously attributed to Hispaniola (José Juan Arrom, *Mitología y artes prehispánicas de las Antillas*, 2nd ed. (Mexico City: Siglo Veintiuno editors, 1989: Fig. 48), but based on style and strontium isotope values, as well as recent archival findings, most likely from Jamaica. The carving was found without documentation in the museum stores, and formally accessioned into the collections in 1997 – although it had been known to Caribbeanists since at least the 1970s (e.g., Arrom, *Mitología*: Fig. 48). *Guaicum* sp., AD 1224–1282; [4]. H: 395 mm (on stand); W: 207 mm (max); D: 56 mm.



(Figure 2), which bears striking stylistic parallels to the Carpenter's Mountain anthropomorph.<sup>15</sup> Its widely splayed legs, carved from a natural bifurcation in the selected branch or bole, closely parallel those of the larger Carpenter's Mountain figure, as does the position of the hands, resting to either side of the erect phallus. Where it parts ways stylistically with the larger figure is in the treatment of the face: it is naturalistic, with slightly raised cheekbones and brow ridge, the mouth, nose and eyes in proportion to each other. Indeed, some have considered this a colonial carving, heavily influenced by European and/or African aesthetics.<sup>16</sup> The radiocarbon dates, however, suggest otherwise (see below).

In further support, an eighteenth-century letter has recently emerged from the Archives of the Royal Society, London, which confirms this carving's Jamaican attribution. The letter, dated 5 May 1757, is written by James Theobald to Lord Macclesfield, president of the Royal Society between 1752 and 1764, and goes into much more detail than that listed in the British Museum's history files. It is worth quoting in full in light of the context it provides:

My Lord

Some years ago, a Gentleman who had a considerable Plantation in the Island of Jamaica, & whose overseer used his Slaves with a little too much severity. Some of them ran away, in order to joyn with those who were then in Rebellion, & who had retired to the Mountain, where they chose one of their body named Cajo [Cudjoe], for their Captain, & Leader, & who frequently sally'd out from their scarce accessible retreats and robbd and plunderd the neighbouring Plantations, carrying away the Negroes as well as the Effects of the Planters. They had furnished themselves with Arms, and tho' frequent Parties had been sent out against them, they

had so fortified themselves in the Woods, and Mountain, that they wise[?] become very formidable, so that after several fruitless attempts to dislodge and Subdue them, the Islanders were at last oblig'd to come to terms of accommodation, & permit them on certain occasions to [?] these & enjoy their Liberties.

As soon as the Gentleman above mentioned had intelligence of the flight of his Slaves he sent out a party in order to overtake & bring them back, before they should joyn the rebels; but not coming up with them so soon as they expected, they imagined they could not have gained the Mountain, but must have conceal[e]d themselves in the neighbouring woods, and therefore solv'd to examine them carefully in hopes to meet with them there. In Searching, they met with a Cave, which to them seemed to be a very proper Place to conceal them, therefore providing themselves lights, they resolv'd to Search it to the Bottom. They found it to enter a considerable way under the Hills, & quite dry, and when they came to the very farther end, they found no Negroes, but only a couple of Wooden Images, much of the Same Form, which they brought away with them, One of which I have the Pleasure of producing to the Inspection of this honourable Society. For the form of the Cave within, the Persons who went in said, they imagin'd it to have been formerly a Place of Worship for the Heathen Inhabitants of the Island, and that these had been Deities they worshiped, and that no Persons in all probability had ever entered so far into the Cave since the Island had been in the possession of either the Spaniards or English.

The Image appears by the rudeness of its Carving to have been done by People almost in a State of Nature, who had little Skill in Sculpture and as rude as many which I have been informed were found among the Virginians on our first discoveries of that Continent, or as those in the Temples of the Geataces [?] on the Coast of [Coromandel] in India and I have been informed by Gentlemen who have visited those parts & been in the Temples that they have many obscene Figures in different attitudes, to which they pray their adoration, which made me apt to conjecture, that this rude representation might have been designed for the Same purpose, and worshiped as the God Priapus was among the Romans. The Image is about 16 inches high, the Head 3 Inches, the Body 6 & the Legs and Thighs 5.<sup>17</sup>

There are several things in this letter that confirm that the small anthropomorph is, indeed, the 1757 donation by James Theobald: the description of the find conforms to the details listed in the British Museum's Book of Presents, the measurements (e.g., "16 inches [c.40 centimetres] high") match those of the figure, and references to Priapus and the "rude representation" elude to the ithyphallic nature of the carving. From the above description, we also learn that the second carving from the cave was "much of the Same Form" – suggesting another anthropomorphic, perhaps ithyphallic sculpture.<sup>18</sup> Further, the letter also mentions the legendary Captain Cudjoe (c.1680–1744), a Maroon leader living in Jamaica's remote mountain regions, who led a sustained rebellion against the British. Given this context, it can be surmised that the carvings were found at some point during the first Maroon War (1730–39), and before the 1739 peace treaty that Cudjoe helped organise. The Maroon stronghold, Cudjoe Town

(also known to the British as Trelawny Town), was in the original parish of St James, near what is currently the town of Flagstaff. The unnamed gentleman's "considerable plantation" may well have been somewhere in the vicinity – either in St James parish (which extended east over the whole of Trelawny parish, the latter not established until 1771), or St Elizabeth parish to the south. Thus, from this valuable document we can tentatively suggest the following sequence of events: that a pair of figures was recovered before 1739, possibly in the parish of St James or St Elizabeth, and that one of these was given to James Theobald, who in turn sent it to the Royal Society on 5 May 1757 for 'inspection' (perhaps a similar event to that held for the Carpenter's Mountain carvings at the Society of Antiquaries in 1799) and fifteen days later, he donated it to the British Museum. Some two and half centuries after its donation, its attribution to Theobald's collection can be confirmed, and its history reinstated. The whereabouts of the second figure, if indeed it survives, remains unknown.

#### **QUESTIONS OVER 'SCHROETER'S' WEST INDIES MAP DEPICTING JAMAICAN ANTIQUITIES (1752)**

In his overview of Jamaican Taíno sculpture, George Aarons lists a 'West Indian' map by Captain John Henry Schroeter reportedly dated 1752, which features along the border illustrations of cemís "characteristic of the aboriginal inhabitants of the Antilles".<sup>19</sup> Two of these images are thought to be of wood carvings. While Aarons added these to his tally of Jamaican Taíno wood sculpture, and they have subsequently been included in later publications,<sup>20</sup> there are some questions about whether these do indeed depict Jamaican cemís. Further, there are a number of discrepancies in the associated information: Schroeter's main body of work was done in the 1790s,<sup>21</sup> so some four decades separated the depiction of the carvings (c.1750s) and his presence in Fort Balcarres, Trelawny. He primarily worked on estate plans – his meticulous illustrations, now in various collections, are of grand houses

and extensive landholds;<sup>22</sup> he is not known to have drawn maps of Jamaica, far less of the West Indies. Aarons, who appears to have seen the original map, or handled a copy, describes one of the carvings as having a "helmeted head on a tapered wood cylinder" – which he suggests resembles the Aboukir anthropomorph (see below). The description is reminiscent of a carving on a long stand illustrated in a 1731 map of Hispaniola by Sr. D'Anville, which shows Hispaniolan "antiquities".<sup>23</sup> The only way to resolve these discrepancies is to review the 'Schroeter' map, but several attempts to trace its current whereabouts have proved unsuccessful. There are at present too many uncertainties over the map's attribution, both in terms of the conflicting information on the 1752 date and its association with Schroeter as well as whether it depicts Jamaican carvings specifically, rather than finds elsewhere in the 'West Indies' region. In light of these issues, this tally excludes the Schroeter map images.

#### **ST ANN CEMÍ (1940s)**

The two sculptures discussed above, collected before 1739, were followed in 1792 by the Carpenter's Mountain discovery<sup>24</sup> – but close to a century and a half would separate the Carpenter's group from the next documented find in the 1940s. A small wooden figure, roughly twelve inches high and carved of lignum vitae, was reportedly found in a shallow cave in the vicinity of New Seville Great House gate, St Ann.<sup>25</sup> The figure disappeared shortly after discovery and its current whereabouts (if, indeed, it survives) are unknown. Aarons, who heard the story in 1975 from Captain Charles Cotter, did not doubt its veracity – and it is hoped that greater clarity concerning this carving will emerge with time.

#### **CAMBRIDGE HILL (1946) AND HELLSHIRE HILLS (1990s) DUHOS**

In Irving Rouse's 1948 overview of the Jamaican Taíno, the absence of duhos on the island, alongside three other diagnostic elements of 'Classic Taíno' culture – ball courts, trigoliths (stone cemís) and petroglyphs – led him to

suggest that the inhabitants of the island were less culturally developed than contemporaneous groups living on Hispaniola or Puerto Rico, relegating them to the "sub-Taíno".<sup>26</sup> However, the presence of all but ball courts on the island has long been known, and in fact, a duho had been recovered some two years before Rouse's chapter appeared. The small seat was found in 1946, during C.B. Lewis's excavations at the Cambridge Hill cave, in association with some forty burials and several complete ceramic vessels (Figure 3).<sup>27</sup> This is the only duho in the Caribbean to be recovered archaeologically in association with skeletal remains. In the few other instances where duhos were reportedly recovered with human remains during guano mining, either the latter were not retained, or the association has been lost.<sup>28</sup> Writing in 1950, Robert R. Howard comments that the Cambridge Hill duho is "the only completely authentic example thus far found on the island of the typical Arawak seat, so commonly associated with Taíno culture elsewhere in the Caribbean area, and follows the general design of such seats fairly closely".<sup>29</sup> In fact, the duho is quite unusual. It is small – essentially a miniature – with a sharp bend to the back that, due to the shrinking and warping of the wood, has resulted in the central base resting on the ground, rendering the legs almost unnecessary apart from balance. This extreme angle of curvature may be indicative of a fracture, possibly resulting from working an internally damaged material, weakening the wood which then warped through drying. This is potentially supported by the presence of a long fissure running the length of the duho's upper surface. The damage, together with the carving's rough surface – in contrast to the smooth finish of other surviving duhos – suggests an expedient construction.

In contrast, a much larger anthropomorphic duho was recovered from a cave in the Hellshire Hills of St Catherine's parish in the early 1990s (Figure 4).<sup>30</sup> Stylistically, this 'high-back'<sup>31</sup> has many similarities with a small group of Hispaniolan



COURTESY, INSTITUTE OF JAMAICA, AR 60



COURTESY, NATIONAL GALLERY OF JAMAICA, ACCESSION #1999-005, OBJECT ID#1999-219



duhos, all of which feature a head at the upper end of the back, with the human body depicted, for the most part, two-dimensionally, conforming to the shape of the four-legged seat. In all examples, the anthropomorph's arms and chest, often featuring skeletal imagery, are carved on the upper surface of the backrest, with the legs morphing into the stool's front legs

and male genitalia depicted at the front base. The depiction of corporeal body and skeletal imagery is a recurring theme in Chican Ostionoid (AD 1200–1500) art, and is paralleled in several other anthropomorphic high-backs, suggesting that Hispaniola may have been a stylistic centre for this type of duho. Intriguingly, another duho in this style has been recovered in Dominica,

quite possibly an import to the island.<sup>32</sup>

The Hellshire Hills duho also features some unusual additions, including a stone bead inserted into the upper backrest, in the figure's upper chest. Both hands are raised to the design panel, as if to emphasise this important feature, and the stone sits proud of its shallowly carved bed, clearly meant as a focal point. Unlike the thin shell disc inlaid within the left ear, which appears to have been specifically made for the duho, the stone bead was likely a functioning object before its incorporation into the carving. Such stone beads – highly laborious to make – were prized possessions of caciques and were fitting gifts in elite exchanges, their value a clear indication of the regard between giver and receiver. This is the only example of this type of inlay in the entire corpus of over three hundred wood carvings that survive from the Caribbean in museum and select private collections:<sup>33</sup> where inlays survive, the majority are shell, and to a far lesser degree, gold.<sup>34</sup>

Another intriguing feature of the Hellshire Hills duho is the care and attention that went into its maintenance during the course of its use-life. The duho features a large cavity at the centre of the backrest (Figure 5) – a result of natural weaknesses along the pith of the selected trunk or branch, an area often susceptible to breakage, especially in unseasoned timbers. This cavity has been infilled with resin of the same appearance and consistency as that placed in the mouth. This suggests that this damage was likely sustained when the duho was being carved, or shortly after it was finished, and that the carver decided to infill this to provide a uniform surface and to provide greater stability. Considering the importance of the object and the labour-intensive manufacture involved (it is carved of *Guaiacum* sp., among the heaviest and densest woods known), it

ABOVE Figure 3: *Duho*, *Guaiacum* sp., AD 1295–1400; Cambridge Hill, St Thomas [7]. L: 257 mm; H: 224 mm; W: 85 mm.

BELOW Figure 4: *Duho*, *Guaiacum* sp., wood: AD 1440–1523 (71.7%); Hellshire Hills, St Catherine's parish [9]. L: 680 mm; H: 350 mm; W: 236 mm.

COURTESY, NATIONAL GALLERY OF JAMAICA, ACCESSION #1999-005, OBJECT ID #1999-219



COURTESY, NATIONAL GALLERY OF JAMAICA, ACCESSION #1999-037, OBJECT ID #1994-160 TO -162



should not be surprising that such care and attention went into ensuring that the object was stable and functional for the long term: these were investment pieces, likely used over generations.

#### THE ABOUKIR FIND (1940s–1990s)

In a remarkable convergence of events, marking both the quincentenary of Columbus’s first voyage and the bicentenary of the Carpenter’s

Mountain carvings discovery (1792), another ‘set’ of Jamaican sculptures came to public attention in 1992.<sup>35</sup> The group consists of a large anthropomorphic carving on a long, undecorated column base, a small, teardrop-shaped spoon with an anthropomorphic head, and a cohoba stand in the form of a bird, possibly a pelican (Figure 6). The carvings were known since the 1940s, when an

Aboukir local recovered them from a small cave, to which he subsequently returned them. In 1972, Mr Clayton, another Aboukir resident, collected the sculptures and brought them to his home, where they remained for the next twenty years.<sup>36</sup> During this time, the sculptures were integrated into what Sharon Chacko calls “a system of local and regional magico-religious practice that helped to ensure their survival in the community”.<sup>37</sup> Ownership was transferred to the Jamaica National Heritage Trust (JNHT) in 1992, which investigated the cave where the figures were found through a series of test pits, though no further cultural material was recovered.<sup>38</sup> The sculptures were then transferred to the National Gallery of Jamaica where they have been on display ever since.<sup>39</sup>

Like the Carpenter’s Mountain carvings, this group also differs in size and subject matter – and has intriguing parallels to the earlier discovery. For example, it maintains the pattern of two anthropomorphic carvings to one zoomorphic, with the latter also a bird – its long beak resting on its barrel chest, its wings tucked neatly to each side. Each set also has a single platformed – or ‘cohoba’ – stand, although they differ in iconography – a bird within the Aboukir set, a human of ambiguous gender in the Carpenter’s Mountain group. Given the presence of these stands, one might expect to find other cohoba-related paraphernalia within each group – such as vomiting spatulas, duhos or snuff tubes – all of which have been documented by the *chronistas* as integral components of the cohoba ‘kit’, and have occasionally

ABOVE Figure 5: Detail of Hellshire Hills duho, with stone inlay at the ‘neck’ (H: 56 mm; W: 22 mm) and large resin infill in the central cavity (H: 105 mm; W: 24 mm).

BELOW Figure 6: The Aboukir group, the carved sections roughly to scale. Left: anthropomorph [6], *Swietenia* sp.; AD 1257–1394 (wood); AD 1286–1397 (resin: *Protium* or *Bursera* sp.); H: 1530 mm (figure: 875 mm); W: 200 mm; D: 170 mm; accession #1994-037, object ID #1994-160. Centre: Pelican cohoba stand [5], *Guaiaacum* sp., resins; AD 1285–1392 (wood); AD 1322–1436 (resin: ID pending); H: 633 mm; W: 215 mm; D: 205 mm; accession #1994-037, object ID #1994-162. Right: spoon [8] *Guaiaacum* sp.; AD 1299–1407, H: 149 mm; W: 63 mm; D: 42 mm; accession #1994-037, object ID #1994-161.





been found together on other islands.<sup>40</sup> Instead, with the exception of the cohoba stands and the Aboukir spoon (Figure 7), which may have functioned as a container within the ceremony, the other figures are not clearly identifiable as ‘functional’ (i.e., made for a specific purpose): they are, rather, free-standing figures – a relatively rare category within surviving Taíno wood sculpture. Indeed, José Juan Arrom and Irving Rouse,<sup>41</sup> in trying to find a purpose for the Aboukir anthropomorph, suggested that the small projection at the top may have extended to support a canopy above the head (i.e., a cohoba stand), but the feature was rounded off during the original carving, suggesting no intention of creating it into a platform (its narrowness is also atypical of the usually wide bases in sculptures where the platform emerges directly from the head, as opposed to the back). Aarons also thought that this projection may have “served as a mount for some finishing feature, e.g., a small cup or bowl”,<sup>42</sup> but such a figure is also atypical in Taíno sculpture. In addition, Aarons considered that, given the long, cylindrical base, this carving may have functioned as a staff of office of a paramount cacique – “perhaps the paramount cacique of eleventh century Jamaica”.<sup>43</sup> But the size (153 cm in height) and weight of this carving

(made of heavy mahogany – *Swietenia* sp.) would seem to preclude its use as a portable staff, which was a relatively small carving, similar in size to a club (*macana*).<sup>44</sup> The carving more likely served as a standing *cemí* stationed in a specific spot, with its long cylindrical base buried in the ground for support.

The anthropomorphic *cemí* has also been attributed to Pané’s pantheon of Macorix/Hispaniolan Taíno *cemís*: according to Arrom and Rouse,<sup>45</sup> the prominent phallus, bent legs, knees channelled for additions of cotton wrapping, thin arms placed on the chest, mimicking the ribcage – indicate that the figure may have been a representation of the *cemí* *Baibrama*. In contrast, Aarons suggests that it is a representation of *Yocahuna*,<sup>46</sup> “the principal male deity”.<sup>47</sup> Similarly, the small spoon has been interpreted by Arrom and Rouse as well as Aarons as a representation of the *cemí* *Maquetarie Guayaba* – “Lord of the Underworld”.<sup>48</sup> Even the pelican cohoba stand is associated with a Hispaniolan ‘deity’ by Aarons – due to the bird’s “link to the heavens (flight) and the earth and sea”, the figure relates to both *Yocahuna* and *Atabeyra*.<sup>49</sup> But, as pointed out in the previous article, such attributions to specific *cemís* are problematic, especially considering that these are based on myths collected in a particular Hispaniolan *cacicazgo*, and may not necessarily pertain to the beliefs in Jamaica at this time. As Saunders and

Gray state with specific reference to the Aboukir *cemís*, it is more useful to open up new lines of debate “rather than simply ‘fit’ the pieces into the accepted hierarchy of putative Taíno deities which themselves are known imperfectly from a fragmentary and often ambiguous ethnohistorical record; [the figures in question] had a more complex symbolic importance”.<sup>50</sup>

### CHRONOLOGIES: PLACING JAMAICAN TAÍNO SCULPTURAL TRADITIONS IN TIME

The nine surviving sculptures, including the Carpenter’s Mountain sculptures discussed in the earlier article, all underwent detailed study – including radiocarbon dating, wood identification and macro-photography – as part of the *Pre-Hispanic Caribbean Sculptural Arts in Wood* project, supported from grants from the British Academy and Getty Foundation. The radiocarbon dating proved particularly illuminating, confirming their period of manufacture and use. Strategic sampling aimed to identify the ‘terminus’ date – or when the tree was felled for carving. Some of the larger sculptures also had multiple radiocarbon dates to better understand the growth rates of the individual trees selected to carve them – important when dealing with woods such as *Guaiaicum* sp., long assumed to be slow-growing. Resinous materials used to adhere inlays in eyes and other focal areas of the carvings were also collected to determine the final manufacturing or refurbishment stages. Results are listed in Tables 1 and 2 in chronological order, although figures with multiple dates are kept together even though some have wide-ranging results. The numbers in brackets (for example, [3.2]) cross-reference to tables in both articles, including Table 3, which summarises the known histories of the carvings.

All carvings fall within Jamaica’s White Marl period (c.AD 950–1550), the earliest just post-dating AD 1000.<sup>51</sup> The earliest dates – for the Carpenter’s Mountain sculptures (particularly, the canopy and ‘Birdman’, which overlap at AD 1028–1156 [1.1; 2.1]) – have been discussed in part 1 of this article. The small anthropomorphic carving

Figure 7: Spoon, *Guaiaicum* sp., AD 1299–1407; Aboukir, Jamaica [8]. H: 149 mm; W: 63 mm; D: 42 mm.



attributed to the James Theobald donation, acquired by the British Museum in 1757 (and so the earliest documented Jamaican wood carving in museum collections) has been radiocarbon-dated to AD 1224–1282 [4]. Interestingly, this overlaps very well with the Carpenter’s Mountain anthropomorph wood dates [3.1], with which it shares so many stylistic similarities. The overlap in dates and style may suggest that the figures could have originated from the same region of Jamaica, their unique features reflecting a regional carving style. This is consistent with the strontium isotope results for this figure (0.70878) which fall within the same range as the results for the Carpenter’s Mountain group (0.70877–70894), and in particular that for the anthropomorphic male (0.70877) [3]. Strontium isotope values relate to the soil values where the tree grew: as a tree takes up nutrients via the ground water, it also picks up the isotopic ‘signature’ of its environment, and this differs between different geologies. The fact that the values for the two figures so closely match lends support to the possibility of a similar regional source for the wood from which they were carved.

Researchers previously estimated the chronological placement of the Aboukir carvings to be c.AD 1000, and quite possibly earlier, based on their aesthetic qualities, “specifically to the premier tradition of Taíno craftsmanship associated with the Redware and ‘earlier’ White Marl style ceramic complexes, datable to c.600 AD–1000 AD”.<sup>52</sup> However, multiple radiocarbon dates on the sculptures place them at least three centuries later, in the period AD 1292–1392, suggesting that they may have been made as a set, or perhaps brought together within a short span of time. In terms of individual results, the anthropomorphic cemi’s wood date [6.1] overlaps with that obtained on its eye resin [6.2], consistent with the idea that the figure was carved and finished with inlays in a single manufacturing sequence. The Pelican cohoba stand results would argue for a similar scenario, although the wood results (AD

1285–1392) [5.1]<sup>53</sup> are slightly older than the resin results (AD 1322–1436, with the greatest likelihood of it falling between AD 1391–1436, (76.7%) [5.2], suggesting that the carving and last inlay were separate events. The spoon, dating to AD 1299–1407 [8], overlaps this period very well.

The two duhos post-date c.AD 1300. The Cambridge Hill duho (AD 1295–1400) [7] confirms the presence of ceremonial seats on the island by at least c.AD 1300. This is not unexpected, and likely reflects a style established over some centuries on the island. A comparable situation is found in the Bahamas and Turks and Caicos Islands which, like Jamaica, were settled after the expansion of people from Hispaniola and Puerto Rico post-AD 600: the earliest surviving duhos from the Bahamas/TCI date to c.AD 1000, and already feature a style unique to the archipelago. Indeed, the Cambridge Hill duho’s small size suggests that it may have been intended as a miniature, which could imply the presence of larger examples in this style. This zoomorphic high back differs from the duho recently discovered in St Catherine’s Hellshire Hills, which features an anthropomorphic head at the top of the backrest and skeletal imagery. Both wood and resin dates for the Hellshire Hills duho place it at c.AD 1440–1523 [9; based on greatest confidence ranges].<sup>54</sup> Of the six other known examples in this duho style (the majority from the Dominican Republic), only one has been radiocarbon dated, and is slightly earlier, AD 1315–1427,<sup>55</sup> indicating that this style may have persisted for at least some centuries.

## CONCLUSIONS

The sculptures discussed here and in the previous part of this article provide insight into Jamaica’s early, rich carving traditions. Some, such as the Carpenter’s Mountain group, have long dominated people’s perceptions of the island’s indigenous artistic heritage, due largely to their early history as well as their frequent illustration in exhibition catalogues and art history books: this has masked, to a degree,

the diversity and quality of other carving from the island – a bias that does not accurately reflect the dynamic, extant corpus of Jamaican sculpture. Although only nine sculptures survive, and another three are documented in archival records – an undoubtedly tiny fraction of the sculpture produced on the island during the pre-colonial period – the corpus is illuminating in many respects, not least the variety of artefact categories it documents. Not only is cohoba-related paraphernalia in evidence, but the presence of duhos and free-standing cemis is on par with the material produced in the Taíno heartland of Hispaniola, often heralded as the apogee of Taíno sculptural arts. Indeed, despite the small number of survivors, there is a wealth of iconography that helps to redefine what we have come to understand as the essence of Taíno art. And although some of the early finds have been controversially exported from the island, over half of the surviving sculptures remain in Jamaica, in the collections of the Institute of Jamaica and the National Gallery of Jamaica, where most are on long-term public display.

In all instances, the carvings have been recovered from caves – from today’s parishes of Manchester, St Catherine, St Thomas, St Ann and possibly St James or St Elizabeth. These ranged from deep, dry caves such as that used for the deposit of the two carvings in Theobald’s account (recovered pre-1739), to small, inaccessible rock shelters that housed the Aboukir figures.<sup>56</sup> This parallels finds on other islands: many wooden – as well as cotton<sup>57</sup> – sculptures have been found in caves spanning the Greater and Lesser Antilles.<sup>58</sup> Caves appear to have had a deep resonance across the pre-colonial Caribbean: in Hispaniola, a myth collected by Ramon Pané, the Jeronimite friar who lived among the Macorix between 1496 and 1498, recounts how the ancestors of the Taíno – the first people – emerged into the world from a cave called *Cacibajagua*.<sup>59</sup> Although it may not be possible to draw specific parallels from this to what the Jamaican

Taíno believed, the fact that burials, petroglyphs and sculptures have all been found in Jamaican caves suggests that they were significant places of deposit and belief. Caves may have been viewed as liminal spaces, openings to the underworld – or netherworld – cool, dark and filled with creatures linked with death and the supernatural, such as bats.<sup>60</sup> Many have assumed that the Taíno placed their carvings in caves to safeguard them against the invading Spanish, but given the resonance of caves, it is more likely that they were placed there for ceremonies, or ritual deposits.

The Jamaican corpus is intriguing in that it features two ‘sets’ of large-scale sculpture that, although recovered from separate caves, share certain parallels. Each set has a cohoba stand and a large anthropomorphic cemí, suggesting that these may have been core to the ceremonial kit that likely involved the ingestion of hallucinogenic snuffs. Parallel groupings have been recovered on other islands – such as the north coast of Hispaniola, where two large, elaborate cohoba stands and a ‘ceremonial baton’ were found prior to 1876 in a cave.<sup>61</sup> Other cohoba sets included duhos and vomiting spatulas, such as the five large examples found in a cave in Loma Sucia, Dominican Republic, each measuring over 30 centimetres in length (and extending up to 50 centimetres).<sup>62</sup> Such large-scale sculptures were made for an audience, whether a small, intimate group of elites participating in a ceremony, or the entire community. They had direct impact, making tangible supernatural forces, mythic beings or revered ancestors, and underscoring the actions and outcomes of ceremonies they participated in. To have access to these potent ‘beings’, and to take part in a ceremony that enabled participants to transcend into another world through a drug-induced trance whereby they gained information to guide future actions, was the pinnacle of spiritual and political power.

Volume and mass were elements that the Jamaican artisan harnessed to create sculptures of remarkable

impact: the Birdman [2] – as eloquently summarised by Henry Moore – appears to “breathe up matter into its great swelling chest” through escalating, rounded volumes. The almost streamlined, abstract nature of the carving belies the complexity of the merging forms, which together create a supernatural ‘being’. In other examples – such as the Aboukir pelican [5] or the Carpenter’s Mountain cohoba stand [1] – the artists condensed the salient features into a few carefully carved lines and angles, the combinations of which are strikingly original. While masters of stylised convention, they were also adept at creating sensitive, portrait-like carving – as in the case of the small anthropomorphic cemí donated to the British Museum by James Theobald in 1757 [4]. This figure has strong parallels to the Carpenter’s Mountain anthropomorph [3] from the neck down – but the face, with its high cheekbones, slender nose, proportionate mouth and eyes, is a further step beyond the usual conventions of Taíno art.

Most of the free-standing sculptures give the impression of being larger than they physically are – such was the adept use of the medium. The weight of some of these objects – carved from one of the world’s densest woods (*Guaiacum* sp.) – is significant: they were not easily portable, and so the larger pieces likely required a dedicated space in which to function. In this sense, people had to come into their presence – a pilgrimage of sorts – potentially in a remote cave or ceremonial house. And here, in this darkened arena, their features illuminated by firelight or natural light penetrating into the cave, these sculptures were far removed to what we see today beneath the bright photographer’s lights or exhibit displays: their forms came to life, spoke, perhaps even moved – participating in the lives of the living. Ramon Pané documented as much in the neighbouring Hispaniolan cacicazgos: cemís were vocal, advised on how and in what way they wanted to be carved, and how they were to be appeased – they even escaped those they did

not wish to assist.<sup>63</sup> They were quite literarily ‘active’ agents despite their confinement to carved form. How these artefacts tie into – and expand on – our understanding of the past is something that is rich in potential for long-term study. We still have a long way to go before we exhaust their meaning or significance. ❖

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The work was part of the *Pre-Hispanic Caribbean Sculptural Arts in Wood* project, funded by grants from the Getty Foundation and British Academy, and involving the following colleagues who contributed their expertise: Christopher Bronk Ramsey, Tom Higham and Fiona Brock, of the Research Laboratory for Archaeology and the History of Art, University of Oxford; Caroline Cartwright and Rebecca Stacey, Scientific Research Laboratory, British Museum, London; Alex Wiedenhoef, Center for Wood Anatomy Research, USDA Forest Service, Madison, USA; Michael Richards, Max Planck Institute, Leipzig, Germany; and Erika Ribechini, University of Pisa, Italy. The project was made possible by the generous support of colleagues and institutions both in Jamaica and England – particularly David Boxer, Veerle Poupeye and Roxanne Silent, of the National Gallery of Jamaica; Jason Ramsay, Institute of Jamaica; Dorrick Gray, Jamaica National Heritage Trust; and Colin McEwan, Jago Cooper, Marjorie Caygill and Jim Hamill of the British Museum. I thank Joanna McManus of the Royal Society for providing images of the Theobald letter, which assisted in confirming the attribution of the small anthropomorphic carving in the British Museum. Rick Schulting made insightful comments on an earlier version of this paper.

*All photographs are by J. Ostapkowicz, courtesy of the museums listed.*



## NOTES

1. See Joanna Ostapowicz, "The Sculptural Legacy of the Jamaican Taíno, Part 1: The Carpenter's Mountain Carvings", *Jamaica Journal* 35, no. 3 (March 2015): 52–61.
2. This tally excludes a historic sculpture in the collections of the National Museum of the American Indian, recovered from Cedar Valley, St Ann's Parish, which may be an example of an eighteenth-century Afro-Jamaican grave marker (see Joanna Ostapowicz, Christopher Bronk Ramsey, Fiona Brock, Tom Higham, Alex C. Wiedenhoef, Erika Ribechini, Jeannette J. Lucejko and Samuel Wilson, "Chronologies in Wood and Resin: AMS 14C Dating of Pre-Hispanic Caribbean Wood Sculpture", *Journal of Archaeological Science* 39 (2012): 2238–51), and a spindle found in Image Cave in 1965 by Dr James W. Lee (James W. Lee, "Site Survey Progress: MC-3, Image Cave, Manchester", in *Archaeology Jamaica* newsletter 66, no. 11 (1966), 1; George A. Aarons, "The Jamaican Taíno: The Aboukir Zemís, Symbols of Taíno Philosophy, Mysticism and Religion", *Jamaica Journal* 25, no. 2 [December 1994]: 15), as it is a tool rather than sculpture. It also does not include any carvings from private collections: should these come to light, they would need careful study, as there has been a recent proliferation of forgeries on the open market.
3. J.C.H. King, "Ethnographic Collections: Collecting in the Context of Sloane's Catalogue of 'Miscellanies'", in *Sir Hans Sloane: Collector, Scientist, Antiquary, Founding Father of the British Museum*, ed. Arthur MacGregor (London: British Museum, 1994), 228–29. It is not clear when the *Miscellanies* catalogue was first started, though it would have been in the 1680s, and it was continued until the 1740s. This was just one of the catalogues that Sloane kept – the others pertaining to various other fields of collecting, including geology and botany.
4. For indigenous materials, these include 503: "A spoon used by the Indians and Negros of Jamaica, made of the side of a calabash" and 1038: "An Indian hatchet made of nephrite stone or Piedra Hajada. From Jamaica, by Mr Barham."
5. Frank Cundall, *Historic Jamaica* (London: Institute of Jamaica, 1915), 94.
6. Sloane absorbed large collections acquired by others, such as that of James Petiver, an avid collector of entomology and botany specimens, particularly those from the colonies.
7. King, "Ethnographic Collections", 239.
8. Theobald, a member of the Royal Society and a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries, was a British antiquarian with a keen interest in 'idolatry' in its various forms – whether Roman, Anglo Saxon or Native American (James Theobald, "Antiquarian miscellany", Add MS 45633, British Library, n.d.; see also John Appleby, "James Theobald", *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); Rosemary Sweet, *Antiquaries: The Discovery of the Past in Eighteenth-Century Britain* [London: Hambledon Continuum, 2004]).
9. King, "Ethnographic Collections", 234–36. Curiously, Theobald's donation is also listed in Sloane's *Miscellanies*, under number 2108 "A wooden image from Jamaica, given by James Theobald Esqr and supposed by him to be an American idol". This entry is almost certainly post-1753, when Sloane's collection became the basis of the British Museum, and with his catalogue continuing to be used for a short period to documenting new donations (Marjorie Caygill, personal communication, 1 May 2014).
10. Aarons, "The Jamaican Taíno", 14.
11. British Museum accession number MI168; see Joanna Ostapowicz, Christopher Bronk Ramsey, Fiona Brock, Caroline Cartwright, Rebecca Stacey, and Mike Richards, "Birdmen, *Cemís* and *Duhos*: Material Studies and AMS 14C Dating of Pre-Hispanic Caribbean Wood Sculptures in the British Museum", *Journal of Archaeological Science* 40 (2013): Figure 4. Some of the confusion surrounding this piece may have stemmed when the British Museum sent casts of the bird/turtle sculpture, along with the Carpenter's Mountain Anthropomorph and Birdman, to Jamaica in the 1930s.
12. Ronald L. Vanderwal, "Problems with Jamaican Pre-History", *Jamaica Journal* 2, no. 3 (September 1968): 10–13; Susan Lester, "Jamaican Treasures in London", *The West Indian Review* 4, no. 3 (1953): 11; Aarons, "The Jamaican Taíno", 14.
13. This was also noted by James Lee, in *Archaeology Jamaica* newsletter 67, no. 2 (1967), 6: "[The Metropolitan Museum of Art cohoba stand] reportedly came from Jamaica, but it has no other data with it. It . . . is obviously Caribbean in origin, but whether or not it in fact came from Jamaica is open to question." See Ostapowicz et al., "Birdmen, *Cemís* and *Duhos*".
14. Joanna Ostapowicz, Alex Wiedenhoef, Christopher Bronk Ramsey, Erika Ribechini, Samuel Wilson, Fiona Brock, and Tom Higham, "'Treasures . . . of black wood, brilliantly polished': Five Examples of *Guaicum* Sculpture from the 10th–16th Century Caribbean", *Antiquity* 85, no. 3 (2011): 942–59.
15. See Colin McEwan, "Colecciones caribenas: culturas curiosas y culturas de curiosidades", in *El Caribe precolombino: Fray Ramón Pané y el universo taíno*, ed. José R. Oliver, Colin McEwan and Anna Casas Gilberga (Barcelona: Museu Barbier Mueller d'Art Precolombí, 2008), 222–45, esp. 234, 244; Nicholas Saunders and Dorrick Gray, "Zemís, Trees and Symbolic Landscapes: Three Taíno Carvings from Jamaica", *Antiquity* 70, no. 270 (1996): 801.
16. Correspondence on file in British Museum.
17. Transcribed from original, with original spellings throughout; courtesy, Royal Society L&P/3/244.
18. As opposed to a zoomorphic one – see Aarons, "The Jamaican Taíno", 14.
19. *Ibid.*
20. Aarons's study identified nine Jamaican Taíno wood carvings known at the time of his 1994 publication (Aarons, "Jamaican Taíno"). Saunders and Gray ("Zemís, Trees and Symbolic Landscapes", 176), building on this, suggested eleven, while Lesley-Gail Atkinson ("Taíno Art Forms", in *The Earliest Inhabitants: The Dynamics of the Jamaican Taíno*, ed. Lesley-Gail Atkinson [Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2006], 176) listed thirteen examples. This is, in part, due to new finds contributing to the tally increase since Aaron's initial summary (the Hellshire Hills duho recovered in the early 1990s).
21. See, for example, B.W. Higman, *Jamaica Surveyed* (Kingston: University of West Indies Press, 2001).
22. *Ibid.*, 72.
23. Pierre Francois Xavier Charlevoix, *Histoire de L'Isle Espagnole ou de S. Domingue* (Paris: Hippolyte-Louis Guerin, 1730).
24. See part 1 of this article.
25. Aarons, "Jamaican Taíno", 15.
26. Irving Rouse, "The West Indies", in *Handbook for South American Indians: The Circum-Caribbean Tribes*, vol. 4, ed. Julian H. Steward, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 143 (Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1948), 495–565; Phillip Allsworth-Jones, *Pre-Columbian Jamaica* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2008); Kit W. Wessler, "Jamaica", in *The Oxford Handbook of Caribbean Archaeology*, ed. William F. Keegan, Corinne L. Hofman and Reniel Rodríguez Ramos (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 250–63.
27. Robert Randolph Howard, "The Archaeology of Jamaica and Its Position in Relation to Circum-Caribbean Culture" (PhD diss., Yale University, 1950), 135; Allsworth-Jones, *Pre-Columbian Jamaica*, 125.
28. Theodoor de Booy, "Lucayan Artifacts from the Bahamas", *American Anthropologist* 14, no. 1 (1912): 81–105; Joanna Ostapowicz, "Carved Histories: Ceremonial Duhos from the Turks and Caicos Islands", *Times of the Islands* 84 (2008): 107.
29. Howard, "Archaeology of Jamaica", 135.
30. Atkinson, "Taíno Art Forms", 176.
31. Joanna Ostapowicz, "To Be Seated with 'Great Courtesy and Veneration': Contextual Aspects of the Taíno Duho", in

- Taíno: Pre-Columbian Art and Culture from the Caribbean*, ed. F. Brecht, E. Brodsky, J.A. Farmer and D. Tayler (New York: El Museo del Barrio and the Monacelli Press, 1997), 56–67.
32. Ostapkowicz, et al., “‘Treasures’”, 147–48.
  33. This excludes the significant corpus undergoing careful, long-term excavation and study at two major waterlogged sites: Los Buchillones, Cuba and La Aleta, Dominican Republic – see Jorge Calvera Roses, Roberto Valcárcel Rojas and Jago Cooper, “Los Buchillones: universo de madera”, *Revista de Ciencias Sociales* (ARCD) (2006): 9–16; G.W. Conrad, J.W. Foster, and C.D. Beeker, “Organic Artefacts from the Manantial de la Aleta, Dominican Republic: Preliminary Observations and Interpretations”, *Journal of Caribbean Archaeology* 2 (2001): 1–20. Undoubtedly, there may also be many other pieces in private hands, but these need careful scrutiny given the proliferation of forgeries, especially over the last two decades (notably after the *L’Art Taíno* exhibition in Paris in 1994).
  34. Joanna Ostapkowicz, “Taíno Wooden Sculptures: Duhos, Rulership and the Visual Arts in the 12th–16th Century Caribbean” (PhD diss., University of East Anglia, 1998).
  35. Aarons, “Jamaican Taíno”; Saunders and Gray, “*Zemís*, Trees and Symbolic Landscapes”.
  36. Ibid.
  37. Sharon Chacko, “Museum Representation of the Taíno and Cultural Power in the Columbian Quincentenary”, in *Jamaica in Slavery and Freedom: History, Heritage and Culture*, ed. Kathleen E.A. Monteith and Glen Richards (Kingston: University of West Indies Press, 2002), 211.
  38. Aarons (“Jamaican Taíno”) mentions that rodent and lizard bones and quartz crystals were found in two small test pits dug in the middle of the cave, but it is unclear whether these were naturally occurring or purposefully deposited.
  39. Aarons, “Jamaican Taíno”, 11; David Boxer, personal communication, 4 May 2009.
  40. Jesse Walter Fewkes, *The Aborigines of Porto Rico and Neighboring Islands*, 25th Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology for 1903–4 (Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1907), 199–200.
  41. José Juan Arrom and Irving Rouse, “Comments on the Three Woodcarvings from St Anne’s, Jamaica”, letter dated 7 October 1992 to the Chairman of the Jamaican National Heritage Trust, on file at the National Gallery, Kingston, Jamaica.
  42. Aarons, “Jamaican Taíno”, 12.
  43. Ibid., 17.
  44. Joanna Ostapkowicz, Christopher Bronk Ramsey, Fiona Brock, Tom Higham, Alex C. Wiedenhoef, Erika Ribechini, Jeannette J. Lucejko, and Samuel Wilson, “Chronologies in Wood and Resin: AMS 14C Dating of Pre-Hispanic Caribbean Wood Sculpture”, *Journal of Archaeological Science* 39 (2012): 2238–51; Figure 3; Ostapkowicz, “Taíno Wooden Sculptures”, 122–24.
  45. Arrom and Rouse, “Comments”.
  46. The correct spelling is Yucahú or Yucahuguamá – see Ramón Pané, *An Account of the Antiquities of the Indians*, ed. José Juan Arrom, trans. Susan C. Griswold (London: Duke University Press, 1999); Antonio M. Stevens-Arroyo, *Cave of the Jagua: The Mythological World of the Taínos* (Scranton: University of Scranton Press, 2006).
  47. Aarons, “Jamaican Taíno”, 16–17.
  48. Ibid., 17; Arrom and Rouse, “Comments”.
  49. Aarons, “Jamaican Taíno”, 17.
  50. Saunders and Gray, “*Zemís*, Trees and Symbolic Landscapes”, 801.
  51. Allsworth-Jones, *Pre-Columbian Jamaica*, 103; Philip Allsworth-Jones and Kit W. Wesler, “Jamaican Taíno Archaeology, Problems and Prospects”, in *The Taíno Settlement at Guayguata: Excavations in St Mary Parish, Jamaica*, BAR International Series 2407 (Oxford: Archaeopress, 2012), 7.
  52. Aarons, “The Jamaican Taíno”, 14.
  53. The Pelican cohoba stand also has a terminus modelled date of AD 1280–1303, based on a Bayesian model for the growth rate of *Guaiacum* sp. For further discussion see Fiona Brock, Joanna Ostapkowicz, Christopher Bronk Ramsey, Alex Wiedenhoef, and Caroline Cartwright, “Paired Dating of Pith and Outer Edge (Terminus) Samples from Pre-Hispanic Caribbean Wooden Sculptures”, *Radiocarbon* 54, nos. 3–4 (2012): 677–88, Table 1.
  54. In 2001, as part of an assessment of the carvings by the National Gallery of Jamaica, Beta-Analytic ran dates on the three Aboukir carvings and the duho, and the date for the duho resulted in the range of AD 994–1160 (95.4% confidence) – see Marijn Manuela, “Condition and Analysis Report of Four Taíno Carvings at the National Gallery of Jamaica” (New York: The Sherman Fairchild Center for Objects Conservation, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2001). This, however, was in contrast to the date ranges achieved most recently on both the duho’s wood and resin samples (AD 1440–1523) – see Ostapkowicz et al., “Chronologies”, Table 1. This discrepancy may be down to the previous sampling location, which was towards the inside of the bole used to carve the duho, or contamination issues.
  55. For further discussion, see Ostapkowicz et al., “Chronologies”; Ostapkowicz et al., “‘Treasures’”.
  56. Aarons, “Jamaican Taíno”, 11.
  57. Joanna Ostapkowicz, “‘Gods . . . Adorned with the Embroiderer’s Needle’: The Materials, Making and Meaning of a Taíno Cotton Reliquary”, *Journal of Latin American Antiquity* 23, no. 3 (2012): 300–26.
  58. Joanna Ostapkowicz, C.B. Ramsey, A.C. Wiedenhoef, F. Brock, T. Higham, and S.M. Wilson, “‘This Relic of Antiquity’: Fifth to Fifteenth Century Wood Carvings from the Southern Lesser Antilles”, in *Communities in Contact: Essays in Archaeology, Ethnohistory and Ethnography of the Amerindian Circum-Caribbean*, ed. Corinne L. Hofman and Anne van Duijvenbode (Lieden: Sidestone Press, 2011), 137–70.
  59. Pané, *Account of the Antiquities of the Indians*, 5; Stevens-Arroyo, *Cave of the Jagua*, 137.
  60. Manuel A. García Arévalo, “The Bat and the Owl: Nocturnal Images of Death”, in *Taíno: Pre-Columbian Art and Culture from the Caribbean*, ed. Fatima Bercht, Estrellita Brodsky, John Alan Farmer, and Dicey Taylor (New York: Monacelli Press, 1997), 112–23.
  61. Frederick Ober, *Aborigines of the West Indies* (Worcester: Hamilton Press, 1894).
  62. Fewkes, *Aborigines*, 195, 199.
  63. Pané, *Account*, 25.



**Table 2: AMS radiocarbon and wood and resin ID results for nine Jamaican sculptures**

Table summarising fifteen AMS radiocarbon results from nine Jamaican carvings.<sup>a</sup> The Oxford Radiocarbon Accelerator Unit lab numbers (OxA) are provided alongside the material and sample site (e.g., terminus: sapwood or outer growth rings, to indicate when tree was felled and likely carved; resins: when the carving was finished, or re-used).<sup>b</sup> The table also includes one date on the Aboukir cemí [6.2] run by Beta Analytic from a previous study on behalf of the National Gallery of Jamaica.<sup>c</sup> Dates BP and calibrations at 95.4% are listed, the most likely calibration ranges highlighted in bold. All dates are calibrated using the IntCal09 dataset<sup>d</sup> and OxCal v4.2.2.<sup>e</sup> The wood and resin identifications for artefacts 1–3 were carried out, respectively, by Dr Caroline Cartwright and Dr Rebecca Stacey, both of the British Museum’s Scientific Research Laboratory. The wood identifications for artefacts 4–9 were carried out by Dr Alex Wiedenhoef, USDA Forest Service, and the resin identifications were done by Dr Erica Ribechini, University of Pisa, Italy.

	Artefact	Provenance	Institution/Donor/Accession	Material/OxA	<sup>14</sup> C BP	Calibrated date range
1.1	Canopy/cohoba stand	Near the summit of ‘Spots’ Carpenter’s Mountain, Manchester	British Museum, London; UK; Am1977, Q.1	<i>Guaiaicum</i> sp. (terminus: outer edge) OxA-21113	943 ± 26	AD <b>1028–1156 (95%)</b>
1.2				Resin (ID pending) OxA-21114	455 ± 25	AD <b>1416–1464 (95%)</b>
2.1	Cemí (‘Birdman’)	Near the summit of ‘Spots’ Carpenter’s Mountain, Manchester	British Museum, London, UK; Am1977, Q.2	<i>Guaiaicum</i> sp. (terminus: sapwood) OxA-21146	941 ± 25	AD <b>1029–1156 (95.4%)</b>
2.2				Resin (ID pending) OxA-21147	345 ± 24	AD <b>1466–1635 (95.4%)</b>
3.1	Cemí (‘anthropomorph’)	Near the summit of ‘Spots’ Carpenter’s Mountain, Manchester	British Museum, London, UK; Am1977, Q.3	<i>Guaiaicum</i> sp. (terminus: L foot) OxA-21142	718 ± 26	AD <b>1256–1300 (91.6%)</b> AD 1368–1382 (3.8%)
3.2				Resin (Burseraceae) OxA-21143	432 ± 24	AD <b>1426–1487 (95.4%)</b>
4	Small anthropomorph [Fig. 2]	Jamaica (St James or St Elizabeth?)	British Museum, London, UK; AM1997, Q.793	<i>Guaiaicum</i> sp. (terminus date) OxA-21153	757 ± 25	AD <b>1224–1282 (95.4%)</b>
5.1	Cohoba stand (‘pelican’) [Fig. 6]	Aboukir, St Ann, Jamaica	National Gallery of Jamaica, Kingston, Jamaica; accession #1994-037, object ID #1994-162	<i>Guaiaicum</i> sp., <sup>f</sup> terminus; OxA-23004	646 ± 22	AD <b>1285–1320 (41%)</b> ; AD <b>1350–1392 (54.4%)</b>
5.2				Resin (ID pending); OxA-21055	536 ± 24	AD 1322–1348 (18.7%); AD <b>1391–1436 (76.7%)</b>
6.1	Cemí [Fig. 6]	Aboukir, St Ann, Jamaica	National Gallery of Jamaica, Kingston, Jamaica; accession #1994-037, object ID #1994-160	<i>Protium</i> or <i>Bursera</i> sp., resin; OxA-21053	634 ± 28	AD <b>1286–1330 (39.7%)</b> ; AD <b>1339–1397 (55.7%)</b>
6.2				<i>Swietenia</i> sp., <sup>g</sup> terminus?; Beta-153380	690 ± 40	AD <b>1257–1325 (62.2%)</b> AD <b>1344–1394 (33.2%)</b>
7	Duho (high-back) [Fig. 3]	Cambridge Hill, St Thomas, Jamaica	Institute of Jamaica, Kingston, Jamaica AR 60	<i>Guaiaicum</i> sp., terminus; OxA-21058	615 ± 24	AD <b>1295–1400 (95.4%)</b>
8	Spoon [Figs. 6–7]	Aboukir, St Ann, Jamaica	National Gallery of Jamaica, Kingston, Jamaica; accession #1994-037, object ID #1994-161	<i>Guaiaicum</i> sp., <sup>h</sup> terminus; OxA-21052	600 ± 24	AD <b>1299–1370 (72.7%)</b> ; AD 1380–1407 (22.7%)
9.1	Duho (high-back) [Figs. 4–5]	Hellshire Hills, St Catherine, Jamaica	National Gallery of Jamaica, Kingston, Jamaica; accession #1999-005, object ID #1999-219	<i>Guaiaicum</i> sp., terminus (sapwood); OxA-21056	384 ± 24	AD <b>1445–1523 (71.7%)</b> ; AD 1574–1625 (23.7%)
9.2				<i>Protium</i> or <i>Bursera</i> sp., resin; OxA-21057	396 ± 24	AD <b>1440–1520 (81%)</b> ; AD 1592–1620 (14.4%)

- a. Dates for artefacts 1–3, the Carpenter’s Mountain group, have been discussed in detail in part 1 of this article published in the previous issue of *Jamaica Journal* (vol. 35, no. 3).  
 b. See Ostapkowicz et al., “Birdmen, Cemís and Duhos” and Ostapkowicz et al., “Chronologies in Wood and Resin” for further details.  
 c. Manuels, “Condition and Analysis Report”;

- Allsworth-Jones, *Pre-Columbian Jamaica*, 24, 98–99.  
 d. P.J. Reimer et al., “IntCal09 and Marine09 Radiocarbon Age Calibration Curves, 0–50,000 years cal BP”, *Radiocarbon* 51, no. 4 (2009), 1111–50.  
 e. Bronk Ramsey, OxCal Program, V. 4.2.2, Radiocarbon Accelerator Unit, University of Oxford, 2013, c14.arch.ox.ac.uk/oxcalhelp/hlp\_contents.html (14 July 2013).

- f. Previously identified as *Swietenia mahogany*, *Cedrela odorata* or *Calophyllum calaba* (Saunders and Gray, “Zemís, Trees and Symbolic Landscapes”, 804).  
 g. Previously identified as *Ceiba pentendara* (ibid., 802).  
 h. Previously identified as *Hibiscus tiliaceus* or *Hibiscus elatus* (ibid., 804); *Brya ebenus* or *Lonchocarpus patens* (Aarons, “The Jamaican Taíno”, 13).

**Table 3: Jamaican pre-colonial carvings: Extant collections and archival references to carvings, in order of documentation/recovery**

The three archival references to recovered carvings are noted in italics to distinguish them from the nine extant carvings. The numbers appearing in square brackets after the title cross-reference with Tables 1–2.

	Artefact/ Provenance	Year collected	Institution/Donor/ Accession	Collection history/References
1	'Pagod' (cemí), Guanaboa, St Catherine	Pre-1734	British Museum, London Sir Hans Sloane	<i>Sloane's Miscellanies, no. 1686: "An image of a heathen pagod [idol], found in a cave at Guanaboa [St Catherine], supposed to have been sev'ill hundred years buried in that place. Said to have come from Jamaica through the hands of Rev. Mr. Scott"</i>
2-3	Anthropomorphic cemí [4], Jamaica <i>Archival reference to a second sculpture recovered from same cave</i>	Pre-1757	British Museum, London; James Theobald; AM1997, Q.793?	Book of donations, 20 May 1757, no. 2108: "A wooden image brought from Jamaica and supposed to be an American idol: presented by James Theobald, Esq. (some years ago given to me by a gentleman who has a considerable estate on the island of Jamaica, in searching a deep cave in the hills for runaway slaves <i>found two of these figures</i> at inner end)". See more detailed description in letter dated 5 May 1757 from Theobald to Lord Macclesfield, transcribed in full above.
4-6	Carpenter's Mountain carvings [1-3], 'Spots', Carpenters Mountain, Vere	1792	British Museum, London; Isaac Alves Rebello; AM1977, Q.1-3	Society of Antiquaries of London, Minute Book, vol. 27, 11 April 1799: "Our worthy member Isaac Alves Rebello Esq. exhibited to the society three figures, supposed Indian Deities, in wood, found in June 1792, in a natural cave, near the summit of a mountain, called Spot's in Carpenters Mountain, in the parish of Vere, in the island of Jamaica, by a surveyor in measuring the land: they were discovered placed with their Faces, one of which is that of a Bird, towards the East. The society returned thanks to Mr Rebello for this highly curious and very interesting Exhibition."
7-9	Aboukir carvings [5-6; 8]; Cave, Aboukir	1940s	National Gallery of Jamaica, Kingston; via Mr Clayton and JNHT; accession #1994-037, object ID #1994-160-162	The carvings were known since the 1940s, when an Aboukir local recovered them from a small cave, to which he subsequently returned them. In 1972, Mr Clayton, another Aboukir resident, collected the sculptures and brought them to his home, where they remained for the next twenty years. Ownership was transferred to the Jamaica National Heritage Trust (JNHT) in 1992, and they have been on display at the National Gallery of Jamaica ever since.
10	<i>Small cemí, New Seville Great House gate, St Ann</i>	1940s	?	<i>Aarons, "The Jamaican Taíno", p. 15: "[A wooden carving] was reportedly located ... in a shallow cave immediately in front of the present New Seville Great House gate, St Ann ... in the 1940s a child at play fell into this cave and came out holding a small wooden figure about twelve inches high, apparently made of lignum vitae and with a 'hideous doll-face'. It was eventually mislaid in the overseer's house at Seville. I had heard this story earlier from Captain Charles Cotter in 1975 and I do not doubt its veracity. The object has not been seen for some fifty years but it appears to have been similar to the known pieces. It too was found in a cave, also within a twenty-mile radius of Aboukir, near the large Taíno site of Maima which featured prominently in Jamaica's proto-historic period."</i>
11	Cambridge Hill duho [7]; Cambridge Hill cave	1946	Institute of Jamaica; C.B. Lewis; AR 60	The small seat was found in 1946, during C.B. Lewis's excavations at the Cambridge Hill cave, in association with some forty burials and several complete ceramic vessels.
12	Hellshire Hills duho [9], St Catherine	1990s	National Gallery of Jamaica; accession #1999-005, object ID #1999-219	Large anthropomorphic duho recovered from a cave in the Hellshire Hills of the parish of St Catherine.