



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

**Hispaniola - hell or home? : Decolonizing grand narratives about intercultural interactions at Concepción de la Vega (1494-1564)**  
Kulstad, P.M.

**Citation**

Kulstad, P. M. (2019, October 8). *Hispaniola - hell or home? : Decolonizing grand narratives about intercultural interactions at Concepción de la Vega (1494-1564)*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/80958>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/80958>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/80958> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

**Author:** Kulstad, P.M.

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

**Issue Date:** 2019-10-08

## 2 THEORY AND METHODOLOGY

### 2.1 Introduction

Current Dominican archaeological practice is divided into two distinct fields, Pre-Historical and Historical, although methodologically they are quite similar (*sensu* Deetz 1977). Both fields share a base in the Boasian tradition, and in Latin American Social Archaeology; and both prioritize links to current-day populations (Samson 2010, 27). These traditions consider Archaeology to be one of the four fields of Anthropology (Deetz 1977; Samson 2010, 27; Ulloa-Hung 2016, 218), and as such, attempts to answer socially motivated questions. Theoretically, however, these traditions rise from different paradigms. Dominican Pre-Historical archaeology has been influenced by two major traditions, the Cultural-Historical (*sensu* Rouse 1939,1977) and Latin American Social Archaeology (*sensu* Vargas-Arenas 1990). Dominican Historical archaeology has been mostly undertaken under the direction of restoration architects (González 1984; Pérez-Montás 1984, 1998; Prieto and Gautier 1992; Roca-Pezzoti 1984), using the historical archaeology paradigm and methodologies pioneered by Jose María Cruxent and Kathleen Deagan, in both the country and in the circum-Caribbean area (Deagan 1983, 1995b, Deagan and Cruxent 2002a, 2002b).

As expressed in Chapter 1, this research concerns the previously excavated, but unanalyzed, archaeological material stored at the Concepción archaeological site. This was due to requirements from Dominican governmental authorities, which expressed an interest in identifying how much information can be obtained from such data. The use of previously excavated material is a concern in the Caribbean and elsewhere (Chou 1994; Curet 1992a; Curet et al. 1994; Duff 1996; Halekoh and Vach 2004; Pestle et al. 2013, 14; Scwaiger and Opitz 2003; Stark and Curet 1994), specially when dealing with collections without absolute dating. In the case of the present collection, the use of artificial, rather than natural, has created a mix of proveniences. Instead of using artifact TPQ for diacronic organization, the chronology of environmental interventions of the landscape will function to link artifact deposition to specific historical time periods.

The present research, then, will be more in keeping with new trends in archaeological research (Lettany 2018; Silliman 2016, 809), focusing more on problem solving - particularly the answering of the main 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?” In an effort to answer this question, the research has been focused on artifact use, as opposed to artifact manufacture (Pestle et al. 2013, 4).

This chapter outlines the theoretical framework and methodology used to organize this dissertation (a summary of this can be seen in Table 2-1). The first part of this chapter will describe the theoretical framework, based on the Archaeological

Processual-Plus Approach, and the second part will cover the methodology, namely the identification of artifact deposition patterns that can signal interactive cultural processes. More specifically, the following will present how to identify and interpret intercultural interactions at Concepción through the Historical Archaeology paradigm.

## **2.2 Theoretical Framework**

As stated above, this research is based on the previously excavated, unanalyzed, archaeological material stored at the Concepción archaeological site. Given that these materials were excavated following a Dominican Historical Archaeology paradigm, both in theory and methodology, this dissertation has continued in the same vein, and has analyzed materials accordingly. For this reason, a discussion of Dominican Pre-Historical Archaeology theoretical frameworks (i.e. Cultural-Historical and Latin American Social Archaeology) is beyond the scope of this dissertation.

Additionally, given the excavation biases and limitations (discussed in more detail in the next chapter), there has to be room for possibility of uncertainty/falsehood of conclusions (Deagan and Scardaville 1985, 34). Elsewhere in the Caribbean, particularly in the Bahamas, Mary Jane Berman (2014, 4, 7) has suggested the use of a Processual-Plus approach when dealing with similar issues.

To understand the Processual-Plus approach, it is necessary to briefly review the main North American archaeological paradigms of the 20th century. Berman (2014) identifies four distinct paradigms - Classificatory- Descriptive, Classificatory-Historical, Processual and Post-Processual. The Classificatory-Descriptive paradigm rose around the 1880s (Berman 2014, 4), with the archaeological discipline. During this period, focus was on description and classification of archaeological assemblages, mostly for collections (museums and probably private) (Berman 2014, 4). The Classificatory-Historical paradigm, lasting from circa 1940 to 1960, also described and classified artifacts, but additionally identified cultures, usually through cultural chronologies based on the artifact assemblages (Berman 2014, 4; Trigger 2007). The Processual (also known as Explanatory) paradigm, dominated North American archaeology in the 1960s and 1970s (Berman 2014, 4). This approach relies on law-like behaviors, hypothesis testing, and deductive reasoning, but seen from Positivism, rather than Marxist historical materialism (Berman 2014, 4; Samson 2010, 30). Processual research in the United States prioritized the use of settlement organization, settlement patterns, trade, social organization, and environmental adaptations as material correlates (Berman 2014, 4; Trigger 2007, 442-443). The Post-processual approach emerged in the late 1970s and 1980s as a critique of Processualism's limited scope of investigation, particularly with regards to identity (Berman 2014, 6; Hodder 1985; Trigger 2007, 444). Post-processualism is particularly known for the application of critical theory to research (Berman 2014, 6; Potter 1994). The split between those following Processualism and

those practicing Post-processualism increased as the century ended, not only in the United States, but in Britain as well (Hegmon 2003, 216-217).

However, with the advent of the 21st century, these schools of thought began to be less distinct, particularly in practice. In places like The Bahamas, most archaeologists embraced the differing focuses of all different paradigms at different points of their research, with the understanding that the differences were not incompatible (Berman 2014,6).

In the United States, the gap between Processualism and Post-processualism was blurred, with the research of postprocessual topics, such as culture, agency, religion, gender, ethnicity, and identity, using processual methodology (Berman 2014, 7; Hegmon 2003, 216-217. This new paradigm is known as the Processual-plus approach (Berman 2014, 4).

Processual-plus is not one unified theory (Hegmon 2003, 216-217), but rather is an approach that identifies the most suitable paradigm to answer the research questions (Berman 2014, 7). The scientific method is used, but more inductively than deductively (Berman 2014, 6-7). Critical theory, particularly archaeology's connection to contemporary political, cultural, and social contexts, is an important part of the Processual-plus paradigm (Berman 2014, 7; Hegmon 2003, 230; Trigger 2007), even when it is not the focus of the research. Examples of the Processual-plus approach on Hispaniola include the research done by the University of Florida at the sites of Puerto Real and En Bas Saline in Haiti (Deagan 1995a, 1995b), and at La Isabela and Concepción in the Dominican Republic (Deagan and Cruxent 2002a, 2002b; Woods 1998; Cohen 1997b).

In many ways the Processual-Plus paradigm owes its existence to the rise of an archaeological focus on gender in the 1980s, a large portion of it in an effort to understand gender interactions after the European arrival in the Americas (Hegmon 2003, 218). This research noticed biases and ambiguities in the research scope within Processual archaeology, while recognizing the value of its knowledge production and research organization (Hegmon 2003, 218). More specifically, these were noticed while conducting Historical Archaeology.

Historical archaeology and prehistoric archaeology share the same methodology for creating excavation grids, trenches and test pits (Deetz 1977, 19), but differ in the variety of other sources used to help interpret the data obtained. An example of this can be found in context dating. Thanks to historical documents such as manufacturing catalogues, ceramic types can be used to date historical contexts, sometimes to a 10-15 year range, as opposed to Pre-Historic Archaeology which must rely on dating techniques such as radiocarbon dating, with a much wider range (Deetz 1977, 18-19).

The sub-discipline of Historical Archaeology was recognized as such in the late 1960s (Orser 2001, 621) and it has been defined in many different ways since the 1970s (Orser 2001, 625). Some definitions are more temporal, as in Spain, where it is

referred to as Modern Archaeology (Ramírez 2017), while other are more theoretical, defining it as the study of the rise of Capitalism (Funari 1999; Orser 1996; South 1977). Both of these definitions are inherently problematic in assuming an “improvement” in the economics of the studied spaces. A more accurate definition is Historical Archaeology as the study of European colonization starting in the 15th century (Deetz 1977, 5; Politis 2003, 128; Potter 1994, 138). The definition used in this dissertation is the study of the spread of European culture via interactions in colonial settings through data gathered from various sources, or avenues of inquiry (Deagan 1982; Deagan and Cruxent 2002b, 4; Deetz 1977; Jamieson 2004, 432; Little 1996, 45; Hodder 1986; Jamieson 2004, 432; Wiley 1989, 1993). These various avenues of inquiry (strands of evidence or disciplines) build a more complete picture of an event. Historical Archaeology gives all sources equal weight, rather than choosing one avenue over another, i.e. it is not dialectic (Deagan and Cruxent 2002b, 4; Jamieson 2004, 432; Little 1996, 45; McGuire and Paynter 1991; Scott 1994, 3; Silliman 2010, 42; Singleton 1998). These avenues can include historical documents, architectural ruins, material culture, oral history and/or social memory (Amores-Carredano and Chisvert-Jiménez 1993, 270; Carver 2002; Kern 1996; Pedrotta and Gómez-Romero 1998; Politis 2003, 127).

Historical archaeology deals with a variety of social phenomena (Politis 2003, 128), both tangible and intangible. Tangible phenomena include urban settlements (Shavelzon 1999; Andrade-Lima 1999; Fusco-Zambetogliris 1995; Vargas et al. 1998; Veloz-Maggiolo et al. 1992; Rovira 2001; Matos-Moctezuma 1993); military settlements (Albuquerque 1996; Gómez-Romero 1999); and religious missions (Curbelo 1999; Graham 1998; Kern 1996; McEwan 2001). Intangible phenomena include the lifeways of different peoples living in these places, with a particular interest, in recent times, on Afro-American peoples and post-contact Indigenous peoples of the Caribbean, and their apparent “invisibility” in the archaeological record (Deagan 2004; Hofman et al. 2012; Politis 2003, 128).

Like other archaeologists, historical archaeologists use material culture people have left behind, in the ground, as a form of evidence about issues (archaeological-social stratification; inter-ethnic relations, relations outside official policy; diet; kinship and marriage patterns; or residential patterning) in past lifeways (Deagan and Scardaville 1985, 34; Jamieson 2004, 433). These issues can be addressed at different scales of analysis, such as regional, site, building and/or artifact (Sluyter 2001, 423).

Historical archaeology’s distinction is its use of various “avenues of inquiry” (Deagan and Cruxent 2002b, 4; Jamieson 2004, 432; Little 1996, 45; McGuire and Paynter 1991; Scott 1994, 3; Silliman 2010, 42; Singleton 1998) or “strands of evidence” (Collingwood 1946; Hodder 1986; Jamieson 2004, 432; Wiley 1989, 1993). These various avenues of inquiry allow for more interpretative flexibility and better understanding of lifeways and interactions at a particular site (Deagan and Cruxent 2002b, 4; Scott 1994; McGuire and Paynter 1991; Singleton 1998; Silliman 2010, 42).

This is based on the fact that not all materials used/manufactured by people are preserved in the ground (wood and/or cloth objects), nor are all materials “important” enough to be recorded in documents (utilitarian ceramics) (Jamieson 2004, 433).

These avenues can include archaeology, history, zooarchaeology, ethnobotany, economics, architecture, and oral history, depending on the research question(s) to be answered (Deagan and Scardaville 1985, 33). Although each avenue offers pieces to the overall puzzle, and overlapping happens in less places than expected, it is useful to use paradigms within these disciplines that are compatible with archaeology.

In the case of traditional History, for example, historians are often focus on military, political, diplomatic events that are too specific for anthropological/ archaeological interests (Deagan and Scardaville 1985, 34-35). In fact, one of the main trends within Historical Archaeology has been its critique of the modern historical focus on the elite, powerful and overwhelmingly male members of society (Orser 2001, 625; Scott 1994, 3; Little 1996, 45). Meanwhile, a large portion of data about nonelite lifeways can come from the material culture found at an archaeological site, particularly the use of certain artifacts in a particular space and context (Potter 1992, 117; Silliman 2009, 214).

However, if history is approached as a process (known as *Longue Durée*), rather than a chronicle of events, as is done within the French *Annales* School of Social History, the historical discipline can be of great use (Braudel 1990; Deagan and Scardaville 1985, 35). Chapters 4 will organize events according to their relation to settlement patterns, while Chapter 5 will identify demographical and economic activities in the historical record.

Likewise, the use of anthropological data, such as oral history, can add information about both the site’s historical trajectory (González-Tennant 2014, 45; Meskell 2005; Schmidt 1997, 2006; Schmidt and Walz 2007) as well as, in the present case, the excavation itself. Additionally, these interviews can both give insight into local community needs and perspectives, and show respect to its current inhabitants (Franklin 1997; González-Tennant 2014, 43, 44; McDavid 1997; Potter 1991). This is especially important in those communities that may have been forgotten by traditional history, and allows for the addition of another avenue of inquiry in such cases (Brown 1973; Christman 2010; Purser 1992; Schuyler 1974, 1977).

Although this dissertation is focusing on the use of the material culture related to Concepción, as discussed in Chapter 1, it is important to assess the political, economic and social contexts where all these cultural items were produced. An item’s biography records its intended use, its actual use, and its final use, as per suggested by Rice (2015, 417). Intended use is the one for which the object was manufactured (Potter 1994, 122). Actual use may be the same as the intended use, or could also be a secondary, or recycled, use (Silliman 2009, 211). Finally, the recovery context gives final

use: mortuary, storage room, firepit, construction fill, or discard (midden) (Rice 2015, 417).

The lack of concordance between the intended use and actual use material culture is a central element of Spanish-American colonial life - the interplay between the Conceptual and the Material. This is known as the “play of tropes” (Fernández 1991). Conceptual processes represent the “ideal,” intended process that exists in the mind (Sluyter 2001, 425). These are often manifested in the colonial-administrative policies, and often recorded in historical documents (Silliman 2010, 42). The Material processes deal with praxis (Sluyter 2001; Vargas-Arenas 1990). This includes not only the material record, but the associated actions related to these processes. The lack of concordance can be a sign of macro and microscale resistance within the society.

Colonial administrative policies were the manifestation of control and domination (Deagan 2011, 55; Rothchild 2015, 183). These policies included classification structures created to explain where different individuals are located in relation to power. The most prevalent method of domination in Spanish colonies was cultural separatism, particularly between a united “Spanish” identity and those considered non-Spanish (Rodríguez-Alegría 2005, 553). Manifestations of “Spanishness” denoted elite status (Voss 2008, 862; Deagan 1983, 104).

It was believed that the use of prestige items taught people to behave in a certain way, guiding behavior and shaping society (Card 2013a, 3; Gonzalez-Tennant 2014, 42; Potter 1994, 127, 142). This reciprocal interaction with societal structures is known as recursivity (Potter 1994, 122). Recursivity may have played a role in the religious education offered to the sons of *caciques* (Indigenous chiefs) at the Monasterio de San Francisco.

Recursivity can also be implanted through the use and distribution of space (Tilley 1984, 137). Bourdieu promoted the idea that certain opinions and actions were influenced by particular settings (*habitus*) (Bourdieu 1990, 53; Gonzalez-Tennant 2014, 4; Orser 2007). Examples of this are the various settlement patterns imposed by the Spanish (including the Ibero-American Grid Town Plan), imposing cultural separatism on the landscape of Hispaniola (see Chapters 5, 6, 7).

As stated above, the lack of concordance of actual artifact use can be a sign of macro and microscale resistance/agency by the non-elite and non-dominant. To understand this agency, it is necessary to “delink” artifacts from their use in the power structure (in cultural separatism), as suggested by Decoloniality theory. Decoloniality is a subset of Critical Theory, emerging from Latin America, and pioneered by Walter Mignolo (2011). It proposes “delinking” Latin American discourse from the sources of colonial power (Mignolo 2011, xxvii). This would also mean looking at other interactions that are not economic/labor related, such as those of cohabitation or *mestizaje*. Also, it means looking at important roles played by those not in power in colonial society, as well as their material culture (McEwan 1992, 106; Rodríguez-Alegría 2005, 554).



As opposed to past, more traditional approaches, which focus on binary categories, Decoloniality brings the complexity and ambiguity of colonial lifeways to the fore (González-Tennant 2014, 44; Liebmann 2008, 5, 2013, 3; Silliman 2010, 49; Voss 2008, 861). This does not imply a rejection of the status quo, but it is rather an acknowledgement that artifacts and interactions may be functioning at more than one level at a time (Potter 1994, 126; Silliman 2010, 39). Fernando Ortiz (1940,1947) has identified this as a counterpoint, a relationship between voices and/or instruments that is, at once, harmonically interdependent, and independent in rhythm and contour.

This is related to the way in which Dominican social studies teachers describe Dominican culture - it is a merengue song played by several instruments at once - drums (representing Africa), accordion (representing Europe), and guira (representing Indigenous peoples). If one is missing, it is not a merengue (Con-Aguilar et al. 2017; sensu Mieses-Burgos 1943). Additionally, Decoloniality within Historical Archaeology advocates for the prioritization of the voice of the colonized (Liebmann and Murphy 2011a; Mignolo 1999, 239). Too often, within the coloniality of power, interactions occur between people who travel and arrive, and others who are stationary and receive, with priority given to the travelers (Mignolo 1999, 239). This priority can reach a point where the “stationary receivers” (and their culture) are objects of discussion, and yet they themselves are not invited to participate in the debate (Mignolo 1999, 241).

The narratives produced from this perspective are more localized and are known as “Small Narratives” (Carvajal-Lopez 2016a, 23). Small Narratives narrate specific processes that occur at a particular time and place (Carvajal-Lopez 2016a, 23), at a smaller scale than Grand Narratives. Due to its early colonization, a Small Narrative about Concepción will necessarily have to deal with social differentiation, given the concerns with cultural separatism, and the failures of implementation, caused by both freedom of purchase (Jamieson 2004, 445), marronage (Price 1979, 3; Weik 1997, 81) and intermarriage (Deagan 1996, 153; Jamieson 2004, 445)(Discussed in Chapters 5 and 7).

### **2.3 Research Methodology**

As stated above, in the Processual-plus approach, processual methodology is often used to answer Post-Processual queries (Berman 2014, 7; Hegmon 2003, 216-217). Given that the archaeological assemblage to be studied has several biases and limitations related to absolute dating (discussed in Chapter 3), other approaches will be used to answer the research questions. More specifically, the methodology will focus on interaction on the spatial (horizontal) landscape as opposed to (vertical) chronology.

In 2014, the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America identified archaeology’s most important scientific challenges in the 21st century, according to its members (Kintigh et al. 2014). These challenges fall quite firmly within

the Processual Plus Approach (Berman 2014). These challenges focused on the dynamics of cultural processes, and how humans affect and are affected, culturally by natural environments (Kintigh et al. 2014). Twenty-five grand challenges were identified, and divided into five main categories:

- Emergence, communities, and complexity
- Resilience, persistence, transformation, and collapse
- Movement, mobility, and migration
- Cognition, behavior, and identity
- Human–environment interactions

The research in this dissertation falls within the scope of the fourth category - Cognition, behavior, and identity. Through this category, our overarching objective - how archaeological analysis can help elicit the environmental, sociocultural, and biophysical intercultural interactions manifested in different sources of information (avenues of inquiry) related to public spaces at the Concepción site - can best be met.

Interactions can be defined in various ways, particularly in archaeology. Interactions can be seen as embodiment of the organization of labor and production (Samson 2010, 29-30; Veloz- Maggiolo 1972, 2003; Vargas-Arenas 1990). A more inclusive definition is “the exchange of materials, ideas, beliefs, and information between members of different corporate groups” (Odess 1998, 417), Although, for the most part, this dissertation will be using this last definition, because of the focus on intercultural interactions, biophysical interactions (mestizaje) will also be discussed.

Lifeways and deathways in Spanish-American colonial cities of the 16th century were structured by these different types of interaction (Ewen 1991; Deagan 1995a, 1995b, 1996, 2004, 622), often occurring simultaneously (sensu Ortiz 1940; 1947). This dissertation will use the “pattern” Processual approach, which assumes that the artifact distribution pattern on the landscape is a result of actions stemming from ideas and values shared by a group of people (Binford 1977, 30; Cordell and Plog 1979; Pestle et al. 2013, 2). The adherence and/or deviance from these patterned approaches can help identify agency within the site.

Pioneered by Stanley South (1977) in British-American archaeological sites, this Pattern approach assumes that human lifeways and deathways follow an organized design, and are not random or capricious (Deagan 1996, 154; Harris 1974, 4).

Based on this idea, South devised a classification system for organizing the artifacts found within each pattern according to their use, their relation to structures, and their position in the landscape (South 1977, 1978). These patterns serve as material correlates (Deagan 1981; Deagan 1983) for activities and cultural processes undertaken within a particular landscape. These patterns include the Brunswick Pattern of Refuse Disposal, which identifies patterns in midden locations; and the Carolina Pattern and Frontier Patterns which have inverse architecture to kitchen artifact

relationship (South 1978, 223). More specifically, the Carolina Pattern has a high amount of kitchen artifacts to architecture artifacts ratio, denoting a domestic area (South 1978, 229), while the Frontier Pattern has a higher amount of architecture artifacts, interpreted as being partly caused by the frequent rebuilding/construction at forts (South 1977). This approach also assumes that if similar artifact distribution patterns are found, the related activities/behaviors can be extrapolated to the new location (South 1977).

Kathleen Deagan (1983) later adapted South's methodology to study 18th century material culture deposits in St. Augustine, Florida. However, she had to modify South's patterns after noticing that the distribution patterns of discarded artifacts in domestic areas at these sites were different from those at Anglo-American sites. Deagan (1983, 1996) proposed that *mestizaje*, or intermarriage between men and women of different origins at Spanish American sites, 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 the women in 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 would facilitate the identification of such areas within a domestic structure. A lack of non-European items would suggest a space more occupied by men (Deagan 2002a, 34). Also, high status areas should have more European artifacts because of the uneven power relations between colonizer and colonized (Voss 2008, 862; Deagan 1983, 104). Additionally, the St. Augustine Pattern postulates that trash pits and middens should be found behind the structure, in the patio, in an effort to mitigate the smell of decomposing trash inside the home (Deagan 1981, 2017; Jamieson 2004, 432).

Charles Ewen (2000) applied the St. Augustine Pattern to 16th century Puerto Real site in northern Hispaniola (modern-day Haiti). As Deagan did before him (1983), he modified the patterning model to the 16th century temporal context, naming it the Spanish Colonial Pattern. Ewen (2000, 39) suggested five points that confirm the Spanish Colonial Pattern:

- Food preparation activities, as represented in the archaeological assemblage, should show an admixture of European and locally manufactured wares.
- Status-related artifacts should be almost exclusively European in manufacture.
- Structures, while employing locally-available construction materials, will be Hispanic in architectural style and layout.
- The diet of the colonist should show an admixture of the Iberian barnyard complex of peninsular Spain and the mixed hunting-farming strategies of the Indigenous peoples.

- The material and faunal assemblage should reflect the combination of several ideas into one congruent object of thought to create a proposed Spanish colonial pattern (known as crystallization process) through time.

### **2.3.1 Praxis**

The second part of the chapter presented the processual methodology to be used in this research, namely the “Pattern” Processual approach. It included a discussion of the application of the Pattern approach in the Circum-Caribbean, and how it will be analyzed at the Site, Building/Structure and Artifact scale. A first methodological step was the compilation of previous research conducted at the site in the various avenues of inquiry. This included maps, blueprints, excavation reports, archaeological classification forms, and previous archaeological reports. A previous compilation attempt, mostly focusing on historical data, with some archaeological interpretation, is found in Kulstad 2008. The process of compiling the existing archaeological data is presented in Chapter 3. A list of the artifacts found at the Concepción site, based on Deagan and Cruxent 2002a (Appendix 7), is found in Table 2-2. Informal interviews were conducted of several La Vega Park guides (Hipólito Abreu, Frank Coste, Fabio Pimentel, and Francisco Polanco) who had worked in the 1976-1995 excavations and remembered pertinent information. Additionally, our Dominican government counterpart, Archaeologist Frank Coste, is a member of the family that owns the land surrounding the heritage area. Their information helped fill in incomplete excavation information since most of the Principal Investigators are either dead or out of the country.

The next step was to identify the environmental, sociocultural, and biophysical intercultural interactions found in historical documents. This was particularly important with regards to settlement patterns’ use of the landscape, but other interactions, such as biophysical (disease), and sociocultural (resistance) are also highlighted.

Archaeologically, this dissertation strongly focuses on researching artifact use in deposition contexts, with the belief that a large portion of artifacts excavated at the site were found in primary use locations due to their deposition during a cataclysmic event (the earthquake of 1562). This is important because artifacts found in use-locations often give more information than those found in discard (midden) locations (Jamieson 2004, 432). Additionally, there will be a more pronounced focus on landscape, rather than stratigraphic, distribution of artifacts.

A first step in this process that a series of artifacts were identified and plotted as material correlates of activities where interactions could have occurred. These were identified through historical data and previous classifications at similar circum-Caribbean sites (see Deagan and Cruxent 2002a, Appendix 7). These plotted artifacts would serve two purposes: identification of their actual, particular use; and the identification of the area on the landscape in which they were used. The landscape information can be obtained through the artifact’s provenience (Rice 2015).

The plan is to analyze three variables related to artifacts - presence/absence of particular artifacts, relative percentages between artifacts, and artifact context on the spatial (horizontal) axis. Artifact context is made up of its biography, its provenience, and its relation to other artifacts found in close proximity. As stated above, an artifact's biography records its intended use, its actual use, and its final use (Rice 2015, 417). Their uses are often found in written records. It is also important to note the amount and variety within the artifact context.

The artifacts were plotted onto adapted site maps, based on those used in previous excavations (González 1983; Woods 1998). The resulting distribution maps were used to identify the spatial organization of various activity areas. The spatial relationship between all of these types of areas gives information about lifeways and deathways at the site (Siegel and Roe 1986, 111-112). The areas of interest were identified as possible perishable/non-perishable structures, middens, fill, interior/exterior areas, burials, and those related to activities (food preparation, food consumption, hospital, religion, military).

Meanwhile, interaction between archaeological elements can vary depending on the scale of analysis (Sluyter 2001, 423). For this reason, archaeological data about Concepción was analyzed at three levels for this dissertation: Site, Structure, and Artifacts. Given that most anthropologists/archaeologists see their discipline as comparative, comparison will play an important role in this multi-scalar interpretation (Handler 2009, 628).

At the site scale, the St. Augustine Pattern assumes that Spanish American colonial settlements will be laid out in the Ibero-American Grid Town Plan (Cohen 1997; Deagan 1995b; Deagan and Cruxent 2002a; Ewen 2000; Woods 1998). This standardized settlement model was implemented by the Spanish Crown to quickly populate their possessions in the New World (Brewer-Carías 2007, 53). This model laid out cities and towns in a grid pattern, radiating from a central plaza and intersecting at right angles to form an orderly, rectangular defined space. The main plaza would be surrounded by the Church, administration offices and military headquarters, and elite residences, forming the town's physical and social center (Charlton and Fournier 2011, 127; Rodríguez-Alegría 2005, 558; Voss 2008, 870). This patterning was confirmed to be present in 16th century Puerto Real (Ewen 2000). However, at La Isabela, founded only two years previous to the settlement of Concepción at the Concepción site, was found to have an organic, medieval, layout after excavation (Deagan and Cruxent 2002a, 87). This will be discussed in more detail in Chapters 4 and 6.

Little research has been done at a non-domestic building level in the Caribbean, in spite of the activity areas which can be identified when verifying the Ibero-American Grid Town Plan. The study of non-domestic buildings has mostly been undertaken by preservation architects, especially in the Dominican Republic (Pérez-Montás 1984, 1998, 2001; Prieto and Gautier 1992; Roca-Pezzoti 1984).

Most of the archaeological research at the Building/structure scale both before and after contact with Europeans, which has focused more on domestic structures (Curet 1992b; Samson 2010; Deagan 1983, among others. Domestic material culture has been used to study status and ethnicity in the Spanish colonies since they reflect how people imagined their place, and that of others, in society (Jamieson 2004, 431, 433). As stated above, the St. Augustine Pattern was developed to explain the distribution of artifacts within domestic structures of the 18th century settlement (Deagan 1983). Of note, however, is the identification of a backyard refuse pattern particular to Spanish colonial sites (Deagan 1981; Jamieson 2004, 432). This refuse pattern stems from the knowledge that urban properties in Spanish cities were divided by walls, fences, or hedges, and garbage was discarded in the patio or rear yard. This allows for a way to link the archaeological material to a particular property (Deagan 1981; Jamieson 2004, 432).

Unlike the lack of research at the Building scale, research at the Artifact scale has been more prolific in Caribbean Historical Archaeology. Although for comparative purposes it is useful to use similar criteria and classification schemes when studying archaeological assemblages, it is important to note that artifact names and classifications are not intrinsic (Card 2013a; Deagan 2013, 269; Hauser 2013; Potter 1992, 118-119). They are imposed by the researcher for the purpose of answering specific questions asked in the research (Binford 1965, 206; Potter 1992, 119; Silliman 2009, 211). It is especially dangerous to equate the finding of particular artifact types with particular cultural activities without considering artifact context (Loren 2000, 90; Silliman 2010, 36). For example, equating the existence of blue beads with the presence of African enslaved peoples (DeCorse 1989; Silliman 2010, 39), or equating changes in ceramic style with ethnic, political, and social evolutions and revolutions (Pestle et al. 2013, 15).

Chapter 6 presents a description of the artifacts selected to be plotted, listed in Table 2-3. The names of the European artifacts follow the nomenclature of the Florida Museum of Natural History codebook and the DAACS Ceramic Catalogue Manual. The American made ceramics were classified according to three main attributes, in order of application: paste type, surface treatment, and decoration. The names used for these ceramics were based on decorative features, and in no way reflect the identity or cultural norms of the people that may have used them. This is marked opposition to the Caribbean Cultural Historical school ( see Keegan and Hofman 2017, 21; Meggers 1996; Rouse 1939).

This multi-scalar comparison will recognize commensurability (likeness) and incommensurability (differences) between sites (Handler 2009, 628). It is important to note that there must be commensurability in terms of scale (Deagan 2013, 266), but also in terms of excavation methodology (Deagan 2017). Evidence recovered at the Building scale should not be extrapolated to be applicable to the Site and or Artifact

scale. Similarly, data excavated using arbitrary stratigraphy should not be compared to natural stratigraphy excavations on a temporal scale. Most importantly, special care must be taken when comparing findings of these non-domestic, public, sites to what has been found in domestic archaeological sites.

## **2.4 Conclusion**

The purpose of this chapter has been to outline the theoretical framework and methodology used to organize this dissertation, following a Processual-Plus Approach within Historical Archaeology, which attempts to answer postprocessual questions through processual methodology.

This research concerns the previously excavated, but unanalyzed, archaeological material stored at the Concepción archaeological site, due to requirements from Dominican governmental authorities. The material was analyzed under the same paradigm under which it was excavated, namely the Dominican Historical Archaeology approach. This has been mostly undertaken in the country under the direction of restoration architects (González 1984; Pérez-Montás 1984, 1998; Prieto and Gautier 1992; Roca-Pezzoti 1984), using the historical archaeology paradigms and methodologies pioneered in the Circum-Caribbean region by José María Cruxent and Kathleen Deagan (Deagan 1983, 1995b, Deagan and Cruxent 2002a, 2002b).

The first part of this chapter presented the theoretical framework, which focused more on problem solving, rather than on chronological seriation. This included an overview of the Historical Archaeology approach. More specifically, it presented how the research questions will be answered (see Chapter 1). To answer these questions, the research has been focused on artifact use, as opposed to artifact manufacture, given the “invisibility” of certain cultural groups in the historical record. This section also included a discussion regarding the “play of tropes.”

The second part of the chapter presented the methodology and praxis to be used in this research, namely the “Pattern” Processual approach. It included a discussion of the application of the Pattern approach in the Circum-Caribbean, and how it will be analyzed at the Site, Building/Structure and Artifact scale.

The chapters to follow will present the data obtained from these analyses. First, however, it is important to present a summary of the archaeological interventions that have been undertaken at the Concepción site.