Hispaniola - hell or home? : Decolonizing grand narratives about intercultural interactions at Concepción de la Vega (1494-1564)

Kulstad, P.M.

1 INTRODUCTION CHAPTER

1.1 Introduction

As more Caribbean territories become independent, the questioning of colonial discourse has permeated many disciplines in the region, and archaeology is no exception. This is particularly true in the sub-discipline of historical archaeology, which has examined “official history” and found that it did not include the lifeways of the ordinary citizens, a group which, in turn is quite present in the archaeological record (Scott 1994, 3; Little 1996, 45). However, in recent years, historical archaeology itself has been questioned with regards to downplaying the severity of Caribbean colonial encounters (Silliman 2005, 55). The question still remains on how intercultural interactions occurred in the Caribbean, and particularly at Concepción de la Vega, one of the first settlements on Hispaniola.

This dissertation will attempt to better understand these colonial intercultural interactions by analyzing two prevalent discourses (or Grand Narratives) on the matter, one coming from history and the other from archaeology, through a Decolonial, Post-Processual, approach. The first Grand Narrative is based on historical chronicles highlighting the conflicts between different peoples on Hispaniola, resulting in a “hellish” experience for all (Las Casas 1945, 1992, 1994; Morison 1942).

The second Grand Narrative, Benign Culture Change, is based on archaeological research about the origins of household (home) patterns and processes in the Spanish-American colonial period (Spanish Colonial Pattern). First applied to 18th century St. Augustine, Florida (Deagan 1996, 154), and identified as the St. Augustine Pattern (Voss 2008). It was later modified and applied to 16th century Spanish colonial sites in the Caribbean (Ewen 2000), and became known as the Spanish Colonial Pattern. Both of these have been questioned with regards to their portrayal of Caribbean colonial encounters (Guitar 1998; Voss 2008), being either too severe (Juderías 1971; Voss 2015, 354), or not enough (Silliman 2005, 55).

Meanwhile other alternative methods have been suggested to describe early colonial lifeways, including the Decolonial approach (Mignolo 1999, 2011). Decolonization of these narratives does not mean that the events did not occur, or that the raw data related to events does not exist, but rather that their interpretation, their narration, needs to be critically analyzed and reinterpreted (Voss 2015, 353). The Decolonial approach suggests the reanalysis of primary data, and the presentation of data from the colonized’s point of view (Liebmann and Murphy 2011a; Mignolo 1999, 239). It uses data from various avenues of inquiry (strands of evidence, discipline) to build a more complete picture of an event, giving all sources equal weight, rather than choosing one avenue over another (Deagan and Cruxent 2002b, 4; Jamieson 2004,

432; Little 1996, 45; McGuire and Paynter 1991; Scott 1994, 3; Silliman 2010, 42; Singleton 1998).

It also suggests the creation of narratives that cover shorter time periods and are more site-specific (Carvajal-López 2016a, 23). These discourses are known as “Small Narratives.” One such effort to reveal Small Narratives comes from the NEXUS 1492 synergy project financed by the European Research Council, which addresses intercultural Amerindian-European-African dynamics at multiple temporal and spatial scales across the historical divide of 1492 (Hofman et al. 2012; Keegan and Hofman 2017, 246-247).

The archaeological material to be studied is the previously excavated, but unanalyzed, archaeological material excavated from 1976- 1995, and stored at the Concepción archaeological site. This was due to requirements from Dominican governmental authorities, which expressed an interest in identifying how much information about the site’s lifeways can be obtained from this material. Previous attempts at understanding lifeway aspects at Concepción de la Vega have focused on archaeological material obtained from surveys (Deagan and Cruxent 2002a; Kulstad 2008; Pérez-Montás 1984).

The research presented here focuses on the use of all artifacts (not just ceramics) as opposed to artifact manufacture chaine opératoire (Pestle et al. 2013, 4). It will focus particularly on use in nondomestic areas. This will be more in keeping with new trends in archaeological research (Lettany 2018; Pestle et al. 2013, 4; Silliman 2016, 809), focusing more on problem solving, as opposed to a more chronological or typological approach. More specifically, the research will attempt to answer the following questions:

- What environmental, sociocultural, and biophysical intercultural interactions that occurred at Concepción de la Vega in the early colonial period, contributed in the formation of today’s multicultural Dominican society?

- How is this evidenced in the various avenues of inquiry (ethnological, historical, archaeological, architectural, etc.) available?

- What are the Grand Narratives related to Concepción de la Vega?

- Can a Small Narrative present a decolonized version of what occurred at Concepción de la Vega?

It must be noted that the research presented here builds on the investigations undertaken by the author from 1997-2008, and compiled in an MA thesis presented, at the Center for Latin American Studies at the University of Florida (Kulstad 2008). This thesis’ major focus was on the compilation of historical data related to Concepción de la Vega, and updated versions of this information is presented in Chapters 4 and 5 below.

This dissertation has a more archaeological focus, particularly focusing on the interactions (environmental, sociocultural, and biophysical) as presented in the archaeological record.

1.2 Grand Narratives about the Colonization of Hispaniola

In postmodern and critical theory, Grand Narratives are narratives that aim to legitimize particular historical meaning, experiences or knowledge, often with the purpose of accruing political power, and controlling perceptions of the world (Lyotard 1984; Voss 2015, 354, 356). Most Grand Narratives are written from the perspective of those coming to a particular place, as opposed to those who are stationary and receiving those who arrive (Mignolo 1999, 239). They eclipse all other possible narrations pertaining to a particular place and/or time (Voss 2015, 354).

The danger of these Grand Narratives is that they are often mistaken as reality, rather than a subjective representation which is modified according to the audience, and circumstances, in which they are told (Voss 2015, 353). Grand Narratives of colonization, especially ones related to Spanish and Portuguese Americas, began circulating soon after 1492 (Voss 2015, 354).

1.2.1 Hell in Hispaniola

The first Grand Narrative is often referred to as “Hell in Hispaniola,” especially in non-Spanish history books. The phrase itself was popularized as the name of a chapter in Samuel Eliot Morison’s book, Admiral of the Ocean Sea: a life of Christopher Columbus (1942). It describes the early Spanish colonial period on the island of Hispaniola during which the brutal Spanish conquest and search for gold vanquished the Indigenous populations of the island. This Grand Narrative is largely based on data culled from the official government chronicles and policies of the period “re-discovered” by Spanish scholar Martín Fernández de Navarrete, when compiling information related to the 400th Anniversary of the “Discovery of America.” American writer and diplomat, Washington Irving, in Spain at the time, also had access to the data. He proceeded to write a biography about Columbus in the “romantic history” style (Irving 1828a, 1828b, 1828c, 1829), making it more accessible to the public, but unfortunately mixing research data with fictional elements (See Chapter 4). Irving’s romantic history style undoubtedly influenced the way history related to Columbus was presented. Particularly important is the designation of all Indigenous people as “Indians,” and no mention of the name they used for themselves, or for their island (Keegan and Hofman 2017).

Concepción de la Vega plays a small, but important, role in this narrative, particularly in Dominican textbooks of the period (García 1906). On March 24th, 1495, a great battle occurred between the Spanish and the local “Indians,” on the Santo Cerro [Holy Hill], close to Concepción fort in the Cibao Valley (Anghiera in Parry and Keith 1984b, 210-11; Charlevoix 1730, 108; Columbus 1959, 148-49; Deagan and Cruxent

2002b, 61; Didiez-Burgos 1971, 41-42; Floyd 1973, 30-31; Kulstad 2008, 40; Las Casas 1985, vol.1, 413; Sauer 1966, 89; Wilson 1990b, 90-91). Columbus's troops numbered about 200 Spanish men with some Indian allies from the north coast (Charlevoix 1730, 108; Deagan and Cruxent 2002b, 61; Kulstad 2008, 40; Wilson 1990a). The Indigenous forces that fought against Columbus were substantial, numbering from 5,000 to 100,000, depending on the source consulted (Cassá 1978, 33; Las Casas 1985, vol.1, 413; Wilson 1990a). During this fierce battle, many Indians were killed and subjugated by Spanish firepower, horses and war hounds, but could not be defeated (Anghiera in Parry and Keith 1984b, 210-11; Charlevoix 1730, 108; Columbus 1959, 148-49; Deagan and Cruxent 2002b, 61; Didiez-Burgos 1971, 41-42; Floyd 1973, 30-31; Guitar 2002; Kulstad 2008, 40; Las Casas 1985, vol.1, 413; Sauer 1966, 89; Wilson 1990b, 90-91). Finally, when the Spaniards were at the point of being defeated, the Virgen de las Mercedes [Virgin of Mercy] appeared on a cross that their leader, Christopher Columbus, had planted on the ground. The Indians fighting against Columbus tried to burn down the cross, but were unable to do so. The Spanish rallied around the Virgin and were able to beat the attackers, in spite of the great difference in numbers (Charlevoix 1730, 399; Didiez-Burgos 1971, 29; García 1906, 34; Kulstad 2008, 40; Rueda 1988, 78). The Spanish claimed this event was the start of the Spanish way of life not only at Concepción, but in all of Hispaniola (Guitar 2002; Kulstad 2008) (Fig. 1).

According to the Hell on Hispaniola Narrative, the defeat at the Santo Cerro meant that the Indigenous people of the island were obliged to pay a tribute in gold to the Spanish - a hawksbell full of gold every three months. The hard work in the gold mines caused the death of most of the Indians soon afterwards. An attempt to save the Indigenous peoples of the Americas by Bartolomé de Las Casas involved bringing in Africans as substitute slaves (Abreu 2015; Coste 2015). According to this narrative, the hard work and Old World diseases killed all of Hispaniola's original inhabitants, leaving the current population to be mostly mulatto - i.e. a mix of only Europeans and Africans (Albert-Batista 2010; Stevens-Acevedo 2004, 149).

This narrative is linked to another, wider reaching, Grand Narrative, namely the Leyenda Negra [Black Legend], which presents Iberian (Spain and Portugal) colonization of the New World as barbaric and violent, a product of violent and barbarian men (Voss 2015, 354). The Leyenda Negra narrative is largely based on the writings of Father Bartolomé de Las Casas, known as the Defender of the Indians (Pérez-Fernández 2010). Las Casas wrote several first-hand accounts of the events happening during the colonization, mostly focusing on exposing the mistreatment of the Indigenous people by the Spaniards, including the Brevísima relación de la destrucción de las Indias (1945, 1992, 1994), Historia de las Indias (1951, 1985), and the Apologética Historia Sumaria (1958, 1967). Unfortunately, soon after his death, his writings were used against Spain as early as the Dutch independence movement

(Pérez-Fernández 2010, 341), and were used as one of the justifications for non-Iberian colonization (Pérez-Fernández 2010).

In the 19th century, around the time of the 400th Anniversary in 1892, a counter-narrative to the Leyenda Negra emerged, known as the Leyenda Blanca/Verdad Histórica, which highlighted the positive contributions Iberian culture had given the Americas, as well as arguing that Iberian colonial policies and practices had treated Indigenous people better than the ones from other European peoples (Juderías 1971; Voss 2015, 354).

1.2.2 Home on Hispaniola: Grand Narrative of Benign Culture Change

With the advent of the discussions between those in favor or against the Leyenda Negra and the Leyenda Blanca, some suggested that the use of other disciplines, such as archaeology, to settle the argument (Rangassamy 2013, 7; Deetz 1977). However, a first question that must be asked is why it is necessary to examine this period from an archaeological perspective, given the relatively extensive historical research available about colonization of Hispaniola during this time period. Colonial historians (Moya-Pons 1974, 1978, 1983, 1987, 2008; Morales-Padrón 1974; Chocano-Mena 2000; Didiez-Burgos 1971, 41-42; Floyd 1973; Sauer 1966, 89; Stevens-Arroyo 1993; Wilson 1990b, 90-91; Mira-Caballos 1997, 2007, 2017) have written extensively about the period, many basing their work on various first-hand sources such as Las Casas (1985, 1994), Fernández de Oviedo (1959, 1988), Girolamo Benzoni (1992, 2008), and Pané (1974, 1990, 1999).

The answer lies within an inherent flaw in the discourse used in the written texts being produced during this period (Rangassamy 2013, 7). These chronicles were not objective, but rather were written with a persuasive purpose in mind (Deagan and Cruxent 2002b, 4; Jamieson 2004, 433; Keegan and Hofman 2017, 243; Kulstad 2008, 16; Rangassamy 2013, 15; Sauer 1966, 29). An example of this are Bartolomé de Las Casas' (1945, 1951, 1955, 1958, 1967, 1984, 1985, 1994) writings, meant to persuade Charles V to abolish the Indian labor system (Jamieson 2004, 433; Rangassamy 2013, 15). Additionally, historical accounts of the early contact/colonial period in the Americas concentrated on recording events which dealt with Spanish elites, usually related to the Church and government (Deagan and Cruxent 2002b, 4; Keegan and Hofman 2017, 243; Kulstad 2008, 16), rather than giving a complete view of everyday life of all members of society.

The problem is aggravated when these same documents are taken to be ethnohistorical accounts of the events which occurred in that period, or even in the precontact eras (Cook and Borah 1971; Keegan and Hofman 2017, 243, 248; Sauer 1966). It is often forgotten that Spanish chroniclers had no historical or anthropological training, and were writing from a Medieval European mindset, fraught with particular

political and religious mores (Deagan and Scardaville 1985, 34; Keegan and Hofman 2017, 243).

Unlike documentary sources, archaeology presents a more "tangible" representation of past societies. It studies small, ephemeral things (Deetz 1977), as well as long-term processes, through the material assemblage left behind in the ground (Gonzalez-Ruibal 2015, viii; Jamieson 2004, 433). This data can be used to create a more complete picture of the inhabitants of a particular community (Deagan and Cruxent 2002b, 4; Kulstad 2008, 17; McGuire and Paynter 1991; Scott 1994, 3; Singleton 1998). It can inform about foodways, material possessions, architecture, and urban planning, and most especially interactions between peoples (Deetz and Dethlefson 1967; Deagan 1987, 2002a; Kulstad 2008, 17; South 1977), the contributions of all members of the society, not just those of the dominant social, political and economic group, can be examined (Kulstad 2008, 17; Little 1996, 45; Scott 1994, 3). This critique, in fact, has been one of the main trends in Historical Archaeology (Orser 2001, 625; Scott 1994, 3; Little 1996, 45).

One important way of recognizing interactions in the archaeological record is through the spatial distribution patterns of the material assemblage left in the ground to study ethnicity, race, and status (Jamieson 2004, 433). Pioneered by Stanley South (1977) in British-American archaeological sites, this patterning approach assumes that human lifeways and deathways follow an organized design (Deagan 1996, 154; Harris 1974, 4). These patterns serve as material correlates (Deagan 1981; Deagan 1983) for activities and cultural processes undertaken within a particular landscape. (This is described in greater detail in Chapter 2).

Kathleen Deagan (1983) studied the patterns of 18th century material culture deposits in St. Augustine, Florida. However, she had to modify South's pattern models after noticing that refuse distribution patterns of domestic areas at these sites were different from those at Anglo-American sites (Deagan 1983, 1996). She proposed that the presence of Indigenous women in the households due to intermarriage between men and women of different origins, was the main cause behind these differences. Since few European women travelled to the Americas in the early colonial period, there was an unequal distribution of people of different origins by gender (Deagan 2004), making women in early Spanish colonial settlements predominantly non-European. This was reflected in the larger abundance of non-European artifacts found within parts of the household space, such as kitchens, where more women would be found in everyday life (Deagan 1983). This artifact distribution pattern is known as the St. Augustine Pattern.

Charles Ewen (2000) applied the St. Augustine Pattern to 16th century Puerto Real site in northern Hispaniola (modern-day Haiti). He modified the patterning model to the 16th century temporal context, naming it the Spanish Colonial Pattern. This pattern will be discussed in more detail in Chapters 2, 4 and 6.

However, in spite of the apparent objective nature of archaeological research, a Grand Narrative has risen within the discipline, based in part on the St. Augustine Pattern (Voss 2015, 356). Known as the Grand Narrative of Benign Culture Change (Voss 2015, 356), this archaeological narrative presents and highlights non-violent cultural and genetic mixing, often forgetting the unequal power relationships that are part of colonialism dynamics (Voss 2015, 354). This narrative has particularly prevalent in the last 50 years, amongst English-speaking scholars of both the Caribbean and the rest of the Americas (Voss 2015, 354). Additionally, the narrative promotes a more generic approach, applying “colonialism” to all times and places (Gosden 2004), as opposed to the events consequent to the encounter in 1492 on Hispaniola (Senatore and Funari 2015, 1). It could be argued that this approach is complementary to the Leyenda Blanca/Verdad Histórica.

1.3 16th Century Concepción de la Vega

It is important to remember that Hispaniola was the sole focus of European colonization for nearly 20 years (Deagan 1996, 134,136), and many of the early Spanish documentary accounts focus on life there (Keegan and Hofman 2017, 248). However, very few large scale, systematic archaeological excavations have been undertaken at early colonial sites, with the exceptions of Deagan (1995a, 1995b, 1999); Deagan and Cruxent (2002a, 2002b); Hofman et al. (2014), Ortega and Fondeur (1978, 1982), and Hoogland and Samson (2007); Samson (2010).

Concepción was chosen as a study site because it is one of the earliest and most affluent Spanish settlements in the Americas, and it offers the opportunity to assess some of the earliest Spanish, Amerindian and African entanglements and interactions in the Americas. Additionally, the archaaeological site represents a tightly dated context (1495 to 1564) with no large, subsequent, occupation until the 20th century.

It must be noted that the name "Concepción de la Vega” first referred to the fort established on, or around, December 8th, 1494, day of the Vírgen de la Concepción – the Virgin of Conception (Concepción 1981; Kulstad 2008, 38; Torres-Petitón 1988, 2009). The location of this first site has yet to be archaeologically confirmed.

After a battle against a coalition of Amerindians from the island around April 1495 (Wilson 1990b, 90-91), the settlement was moved to the site known as locally as “La Vega Vieja”. Its inhabitants remained there until 1564, when they moved again, to the present-day location of the modern provincial capital of La Vega, 8 km to the south., due to a devastating earthquake. To differentiate time periods and locations, I have designated events and locations pre-1564, as related to “Concepción,” in following with previous usage (see Kulstad 2008). Events and locations related to the modern city of Concepción de la Vega are designated as related to “La Vega.”

Several attempts have been made to identify both the location of the first Concepción fort (Coste 2015), and the extent of the city of Concepción between 1494

and 1464 (Deagan 1999; Gonzalez and Pimentel 1990; Roca-Pezzoti 1984), with varying degrees of success (Kulstad 2008, 94-97). However, three important sections of the La Vega Vieja/Concepción site - the Franciscan monastery, the Fort, and the cistern, or aljibe - were consolidated into a National Park and are under the jurisdiction of the Dominican Ministry of Culture (Duval 2017).

As is common with many historical archaeology sites in the Dominican Republic, the Concepción site was not considered to be an archaeological site until close to the second half of the 20th century. Before then, it was considered to be a historical monument, more in tune with architecture and history than archaeology. This is especially evident in the writings of Narciso Alberti Bosch ([1912] 2011), who lived in La Vega and is considered to be one of the pioneers of systematic archaeological work in the country (Hayward et al. 2009, 92; Samson 2010, 28).

The site was also included in all of the major military recognizance reports written about the area by other colonial powers. These include Pedro Francisco Charlevoix's Historia de la Isla Española o de Santo Domingo (1730, 379). This report, written for French General Napoleon, is based on the missionary work done by Father Jean Bautista Le Pers on the island in the first decade of the 18th century (1700-1710). It is also mentioned in David Dixon Porter's report on the new country of the Dominican Republic (1978 [1846], 193), and in Samuel Hazard's investigation on the possible annexation of the country to the United States (Hazard 1974 [1873], 311).

None of the chroniclers mentioned above recorded digging at the site, or receiving objects obtained from there. However, there is little doubt that looting occurred at the site, especially since architectural material was recycled in posterior buildings. A case in point was the use of bricks from the site by architect Onofre de Lora to reconstruct the Santo Cerro Church in 1886 (Palm 1955a, 47-48). It is said the parish priest asked each member to bring a brick for the construction as penitence, at the architect's recommendation (Abreu 2015).

Yet, it was with the commemoration of the 400th anniversary of Columbus's arrival in 1892 that specific interventions that could be considered archaeological were undertaken at the site, particularly by foreign dilettantes (Mañón Arredondo et al. 1971, 10; Samson 2010, 27). These are described in detail in Chapter 3.

In the next year, Fr. Nouel of La Vega, later Monsegnior, and eventually president of the country, created a group with national personalities to protect and restore the La Vega Vieja ruins (González 1978). In spite of Nouel's efforts, bricks continued to be taken from the site to be used to construct new homes around the area (González 1978). A new effort to clean and restore the site was undertaken by the Despradel family, prominent La Vega historians in 1917, with limited results until the area was declared a National Park in 1976 (González 1978).

1.4 Terminology

Before continuing, it is important to define certain terminology to be used in this dissertation, particularly the one referring to social/cultural differentiation categories (See Tables 1-1, 1-2, 1-3, 1-4). As will be explained in more detail in Chapter 5, peoples have been divided according to three main geographic origins: American, African and European (sensu Voss 2005). Due to an emphasis on peoples from Concepción de la Vega in particular, and Hispaniola in general, these terms may not be applicable elsewhere.

The classification of Indigenous peoples is perhaps the most complicated. Firstly, the word "Indigenous" will always be capitalized as a sign of respect (Joseph and Joseph 2017). Due to reasons better explained in Chapter 5, the Pre-contact Indigenous peoples mentioned in this document will be denominated as "Indigenous people(s) from…" identifying their place of origin. This is in accordance to the social classification system used by the Europeans/Castilians during this period on Hispaniola, as opposed to the prevalent Cultural-Historical archaeological terminology currently used in the region (See discussion in Chapter 5). Unfortunately, the chronicles do not document the names used by the Indigenous social, political or ceremonial communities to name themselves (Keegan and Hofman 2017, 12), so no official name exists.

The general category denominating post-contact Indigenous peoples used here is "Indio." When Columbus arrived to the Caribbean he mistakenly named the people he found there "Indios," or those from India, believing he had arrived in Asia (Keegan and Hofman 2017, 12; Morison 1942). Although Valcárcel-Rojas (2016), and others (Ulloa-Hung 2016, 214; Valcárcel and Pérez-Concepción 2014) have limited the term "Indio" to those Indigenous peoples who left their precontact lifeways behind and became a part of colonial society, not enough is known about the lifeways of these peoples at Concepción to make this distinction, prompting this more general definition.

More specific terms will be used to denominate particular social ranks. The *Indios* from Hispaniola were divided into two: the *Nitaíno* (elites) and the *Naborías* (non-elite). *Perpetual Naborías* is a blanket term used to describe all *Indios* brought from outside of Hispaniola for a particular type of enslaved labor.

Due to the variety of territories (both in Europe and around the world) under "The Crown" during this period (see Chapters 4 and 5), the peoples from this continent have been denominated as "Europeans/…" with their place of origin following. When place of origin is unknown, the term "European/UID" will be used.

People of African descent will be classified according to terminology commonly used in Afro-Dominican research (see Deive 1989; Franco 1975; CUNY DSI 2015). *Libertos* were free Africans who either came from Spain as free persons, or managed to gain their freedom while on the island (Deive 1989; Franco 1975; Kulstad 2008, 179). Ladinos were enslaved peoples of African ancestry, brought from Spain, who already

knew Spanish language, religion and culture because they had resided in Spain for at least a year (CUNY DSI 2015; Deive 1989, 20; Franco 1975; Kulstad 2008, 179). *Bozales* were enslaved peoples brought directly from Africa (Kulstad 2008, 2013b; CUNY DSI 2015).

Other terms used here relating to peoples include:

- *Resistant Indios*: *Indios* who had been part of the European establishment, but rebelled against it. Enriquillo was the best known.

- *Cimarrones*: (later known as Maroons), African ex-slaves who had managed to escape their masters (Deive 1989; Franco 1975; Kulstad 2008, 179). It must be noted that this term only includes those of African descent.

- *Roldán followers*: Non-elite artisans who rebelled against Christopher Columbus and went to live in Indigenous villages.

- *Primeros Pobladores*: Roldán followers who were re-integrated into society, receiving benefits previously reserved for elite members of society.

Artifact and site nomenclature in Chapters 1-5 is based on the terms used by the investigators who undertook the original interventions/excavations/classifications. Particularly, Indigenous ceramics will be referred to as either, “Indigenous ceramics,” “Decorated Indigenous ceramics,” “Undecorated Indigenous ceramics,” and rarely, “Chicoid” and/or “Mellacoid” ceramics. This classification is based on their decorative features, with no implied cultural norms, or expressions of identity, unlike what is done in the Caribbean Cultural Historical School (see Keegan and Hofman 2017, 21; Meggers 1996; Rouse 1939). Explained in more detail in Chapter 6, this is mainly due to a difficulty in placing them chronologically before or after 1492.

1.5 Summary of Chapters

Theory and Methodology will be discussed in detail in Chapter 2. That chapter will present how to identify and interpret intercultural interactions at Concepción through the Historical Archaeology paradigm. The first part of the chapter will describe the theoretical framework, based on the Archaeological Processual-Plus Approach, and the second part will cover the methodology, namely a qualitative study of interactive cultural processes.

Chapter 3 - Archaeology of Archaeology - compiles the archaeological and architectural interventions at Concepción in chronological order. The archaeology and architectural avenues of inquiry will be presented first, since they are the ones more closely linked to the Concepción archaeological site itself. This chapter will attempt to recreate archaeological documents as much as possible. Its emphasis will be on the Dominican Parks Service excavations undertaken in from 1976 to 1995.

Chapter 4 will present a chronology of military, political and diplomatic events which affected intercultural interactions at Concepción during our period of study (1494-1564). Data will be culled from the historical, sociological and anthropological avenues of inquiry, and highlight primary historical sources related to the colonial policies. Unlike Chapter 3, this chapter will deal with pertinent events at a global scale, consequence of the Columbian Exchange. An attempt will be made, however, to organize the data according to the pertinent environmental/landscape interactions which have transformed the Concepción local landscape.

Chapter 5 will focus on biophysical and sociocultural intercultural interactions, and how these affected the classification and social differentiation within Concepción. It also discusses the terminology used to identify different peoples present at Concepción during the period covered in this research, including division of people by geographic origin, gender, enslaved/free, elite/non-elite, clergy/laity. It will also discuss the labor activities where interactions could have occurred.

Chapter 6 presents the archaeological analysis of the artifacts and artifact distribution patterns at the two previously excavated areas of the Concepción site, namely the Fort campus (Fig. 2) and the Monasterio de San Francisco campus (Fig. 3) to identify those that could inform about intercultural interactions. As mentioned before, interaction can vary depending on the scale of analysis (Sluyter 2001, 423). For this reason, archaeological data about Concepción will be analyzed at three levels for this dissertation: Site, Structure, and Artifacts.

Chapter 7 will compile and interpret the results presented in the previous chapters. This interpretation will focus on re-interpreting the intercultural interactions that occurred there during our period of study (1494-1564). More specifically, it will answer the main research question: What environmental, sociocultural, and biophysical intercultural interactions that occurred at Concepción in the early colonial period, contributed in the formation of today's multicultural Dominican society?

Finally, Chapter 8 will answer the subquestions:

- How are the different types environmental, sociocultural, and biophysical intercultural interactions evidenced in the various avenues of inquiry (ethnological, historical, archaeological, architectural, etc.) available?

- What are the Grand Narratives related to Concepción de la Vega?

- Can a Small Narrative present a decolonized version of what occurred at Concepción de la Vega?

This chapter will analyze how the data compiled in the previous chapters compares to the Grand Narratives presented above, and present an optional Small Narrative related specifically to Concepción, and more in tune with the findings. Suggestions for future research will also be included.