



## THE HISTORIC INDIAN PUEBLOS OF LA JUNTA DE LOS RIOS

By J. CHARLES KELLEY

(Concluded)

### San Bernardino:

In 1582 the Espejo expedition left the Río Conchos in the vicinity of the settlement of San Juan and went three leagues, apparently on a well established trail, to the Río Grande at a point five leagues above La Junta. Near this spot they found the Otomoaco *ranchería* which they named San Bernardino. Luxán noted that the *ranchería* "resembled a pueblo as it was composed of flat roofed houses, half under and half above the ground." It was located on the river near pools and near the mountains. There was a cross here erected by Rodríguez the year before. Apparently, but not certainly, the pueblo was located on the western bank of the Río Grande.

This pueblo was noted indirectly in the records of the Mendoza-López *entrada* of 1683, where reference is made to the first pueblo encountered *en route* from El Paso. This pueblo was six leagues up the Río Grande from La Junta and had a church of grass (probably a *jacal* structure) which had just been constructed. There is no further notice of the pueblo in the records inspected but in 1747 Ydoiaga noted at about this location on the western bank of the Río Grande the site of an abandoned pueblo of the Tecolotes nation. This ruined pueblo, said Ydoiaga, had been abandoned because of the unsuitability of the land for farming and the proximity of the warlike Apaches. Along the Río Grande for some distance to the north he noted small abandoned *rancherías* of the Tecolotes, who at one time had occupied the entire area, cultivating small plots of land here and there along the river and moving with the shifting of the river lowlands that were suitable for farming.

Fray Lorenzo Saabedra, Custodian of the mission at San Francisco pueblo in 1747-48 also referred to the former Tecolote town, although he himself had not visited it. He had been

told by Fray Andrés Varo that it was located seven or eight leagues up the Río Grande from San Francisco.<sup>53</sup>

About twelve miles above La Junta and on the western edge of the Río Grande lowland is the archaeological site called Chihuahua E7-2. This is located near the site of old Mimbres pueblo about a mile from the present Río Grande terminus of the short-cut road from San Juan on the Río Conchos. The site consists of a relatively small burned rock midden surrounded by scattered camp debris. The midden lies directly on the edge of the low terrace of the Río Grande and erosion has destroyed an unknown area of the site. In this vicinity there are a few small farms and a hamlet of a few houses is located nearby. Extensive agriculture is not practiced however, and the adjacent Río Grande lowland is covered with a thick *mesquital*, sure sign of repeated flooding. Artifacts from Chihuahua E7-2 include recent pottery and crockery types, undoubtedly associated with some recent *jacal* and adobe ruins on the site, and other potsherds which in type run the gamut of the Bravo Valley Aspect occupation from La Junta through Concepción foci and into the Conchos Focus. The lack of extensive pottery collections attributable to the latter period would seem to indicate that the site was abandoned early in the historic period only to be reoccupied and again abandoned in very recent times.

The location of Chihuahua E7-2 relative to San Juan, San Francisco, and the Río Grande terminus of the cut-off trail from San Juan, suggests that this may be the site of the old pueblo of San Bernardino. This conclusion is verified by the local ecological conditions, and the indicated span of occupation of the site, which appears to have been inhabited from well before 1582 (probably *circa* 1200-1400 A.D.) until the early historic period, say 1700 A.D. Finally, no other archaeological sites have been found in this general vicinity, although reconnaissance of this area was hurried and inadequate. Unless other more promising possibilities are revealed by future investigations, Chihuahua E7-2 is probably to be identified with San Bernardino.

53. "Informe del p<sup>o</sup> Custodio de esta Mision," *Archivo General de Indias, Audiencia de Mexico* (57-59), 1746-1747, 89-2-3. Dunn Transcripts, p. 290. Archives Collection, The University of Texas.

Who were the Tecolotes of San Bernardino and what became of them? The Espejo records identified the people of the Mesquite-San Juan settlements as Otomoacos and noted that the people of San Bernardino were similar to them in speech and custom, although differing at least in language from the Indians of San Francisco at the river junction. The San Bernardino Otomoacos were intermarried with those of Mesquite-San Juan. Other Otomoacos were found living along the Río Grande for many leagues above San Bernardino. These Indians had no pueblos, however, and seem to have been dispersed in small groups along the upper river. This would seem to identify all of these people and those of San Juan-Mesquite as belonging to the same group. In view of the later tribal distinctions between the various pueblos it seems more probable that they represent a linguistic group, rather than an ethnic group. At any rate the Tecolotes who prior to 1747 lived in small groups along the Río Grande above San Bernardino, moving their small fields with the shifting of the river channel, appear to be identical in distribution and culture with the Otomoacos of 1582.

San Bernardino and the scattered Tecolotes *rancherías*, then, appear to represent an old occupation of the Río Grande above La Junta. These Indians, in all probability, still lived there in 1715, inasmuch as Trasvina Retis did not include Tecolotes in his list of tribes found in other La Junta pueblos at that time. But by 1747 the Tecolotes had abandoned not only San Bernardino but all of the up-stream area as well. Ydoiaga in 1747 found in the new settlement of Santa Cruz, on the Río Conchos above Cuchillo Parado, not only Cholomes (from Coyame) and Conejos (from Cuchillo Parado) but also 71 Tecolotes Indians. Ydoiaga states explicitly that these Tecolotes came from the Río Grande (Río Puerco o del Norte) above La Junta. Later at San Francisco he found 50 more Tecolotes living with the people of that town [Julimes, Oposmes, or Abriaches]. Fray Saabedra also noted that the Tecolotes had deserted their own pueblo and gone to live at San Francisco and other La Junta towns. Perhaps the abandonment of the Tecolote region had occurred quite recently, as Ydoiaga stated, because of both Apache pressure and the poverty of their lands.

## Nuestra Señora de Aranzazu:

At San Francisco de la Junta in 1715, Trásvina Retis sent Indian envoys to take the census of the pueblo of the Conejos Indians which he named Nuestra Señora de Aranzazu. This pueblo was located on the northwestern bank of the Río Conchos and on the western bank of the Río Grande about one and one half leagues from San Francisco. It had a population of 71 Indians of the Conejos nation. It should be noted that Trásvina Retis did not visit this pueblo himself; his knowledge of its location was therefore derived from information given him through an interpreter—by the Indians.

It may be that Aranzazu is to be identified with San Bernardino—which is not mentioned in the 1715 account—and that the apparent discrepancy in distance from San Francisco is an error. Certainly, no town was noted at this point by any of the earlier or later expeditions. But other consideration suggests that this is not the case and that actually Aranzazu was a temporary pueblo founded around 1700 and abandoned before 1747. Thus, it was a pueblo of Conejos Indians, yet Ydoiaga identified the ruins of Bernardino as a former pueblo of the Tecolotes Indians. Significantly Ydoiaga found 77 Mesquite Indians at Mesquite pueblo in 1747 (Trásvina Retis counted 80 Mesquite in 1715) and an additional 78 refugees, including 40 Conejos. These Conejos refugees may represent the survivors of Aranzazu. However, the Indians of Cuchillo Parado, whom Trásvina Retis identified as Conejos, increased in numbers from 44 in 1715 to 120 in 1747 when they joined in the new settlement project at Santa Cruz. Some of the Cuchillo Parado people of the latter period may have been Cholomes but it is also possible that the sudden increase in the population of this town resulted from the addition of Conejos refugees from Aranzazu. This would be in keeping with the general pattern already identified in Tecolote movements of the same period—some of the refugees from the Río Grande going to the old established La Junta pueblos on the lower Conchos, others to the newly established refugee town on the Conchos above Cuchillo Parado. Thus the disappearance of the Conejos may

be accounted for. Their possible origin is indicated below in discussions of San Juan Evangelista.

No archaeological site has been identified with Aranzazu. Today there is a scattering of small farm hamlets along the western bank of the Río Grande for four or five miles above La Junta. If Aranzazu was inhabited for only a short period of time it seems probable that the comparatively meagre archaeological remains that might have accumulated could well lie hidden beneath the houses of the contemporary hamlets. Indeed at the small hamlet of Ejido Paradero, located about five miles above La Junta, fire hearths were visible eroding from between the houses but no specimens were recovered which would enable identification of the period or culture represented.

## San Juan Evangelista:

From Santo Tomás, identified as the San Francisco pueblo of later accounts, the Espejo party in 1582 traveled half a league to a pueblo situated on the opposite (eastern) bank of the Río del Norte (Río Grande). In Luxán's own words, "The pueblo was on a high ridge with many flat roofed houses; below were many other houses forming a sort of suburb." Rodríguez had been there the year before because the Spaniards found a cross which he had erected. This cross was placed in a neatly kept plaza. The pueblo was named San Juan Evangelista. San Juan Evangelista never again appears in the documentary sources that have been inspected. It was not included in the list of La Junta pueblos visited by either Trásvina Retis or Ydoiaga. Apparently it was abandoned between 1582 and 1715.

San Francisco itself lies on a high gravel mesa. Approximately one half league across the Río Conchos is another high gravel mesa on which modern Ojinaga is situated, the former site of Guadalupe pueblo. Modern Ojinaga is in plain view from San Francisco and both Trásvina Retis and Rubín de Celis commented that Guadalupe was likewise visible from there. Is it possible that the Espejo expedition confused the Río Conchos with the Río Grande and actually crossed the former stream to Guadalupe? This would explain the

mysterious disappearance of San Juan Evangelista from the records, and would leave the name as an early one for the town later called Guadalupe.

However, Luxán in other statements clearly distinguishes between the Conchos, the Río Grande above La Junta, and the joined streams below the junction. Furthermore, the Spaniards subsequently went "farther on" to another pueblo, Santiago, which was described as the largest and most influential of all the La Junta pueblos, and from there they returned to San Francisco. This latter pueblo may have been either San Cristóbal or perhaps Guadalupe since other accounts speak of this pueblo as the largest of all the La Junta towns and it was the one chosen for the location of the *presidio*. In either event, San Juan Evangelista must have been another pueblo and should not be confused with Guadalupe.

Across the Río Grande from San Francisco there are several high gravel mesas adjacent to the river lowland. All of these were explored and an archaeological site (Shafter 7:3 [57B7-3]; the Loma Alta Site) was found on only one of them. Shafter 7:3 occupies the top of a high horseshoe-shaped mesa approximately the same distance across the Río Grande from San Francisco as Ojinaga is across the Río Conchos. An old channel of the Río Grande came very close to the foot of the mesa and on the low terrace at its foot is another archaeological site of the Bravo Valley Aspect, Shafter 7:5 (57B7-5). Shafter 7:3 (57B7-3) occupies the top and talus slope of the high mesa; Shafter 7:5 (57B7-5) lies below it and on the direct route from San Francisco. The two probably represent the site of San Juan Evangelista and the "suburb" at its foot, respectively. The distance, location, and combination of sites fits closely with the Luxán description and the only other possibility, an identification with Guadalupe, has already been excluded.

Shafter 7:3 (57B7-3) has been partially excavated. It was first occupied during the La Junta Focus (*circa* 1200-1400 A.D.), perhaps temporarily abandoned at its close, and occupied again throughout most of the Concepción Focus (*circa* 1400-1700 A.D.). The house rows lying along the river edge of the mesa and along the talus slope were built and

occupied during the Concepción Focus. Lying on the floor of one room at the time of abandonment was an iron knife or sword. A few potsherds showing Spanish glazing were likewise recorded. No other signs of historic contact were found and the great quantities of Conchos and Capote redware pottery found in Conchos Focus components, as well as objects of direct Spanish origin, were lacking. After abandonment the houses were partially refilled by wash and wind action but no other village refuse was introduced into them. In part at least these last occupied houses were grouped around an interior plaza which appears to have been kept remarkably clear of debris. Thus Shafter 7:3 (57B7-3) had a neatly kept plaza; it was occupied at the very beginning of historic contact but abandoned before the beginning of the mission period, in all probability before the founding of missions in 1683. All of these items fit with the known facts regarding San Juan Evangelista and verify the identification of Shafter 7:3 (57B7-3) with that pueblo.

Who were the Indians of San Juan Evangelista and where did they go following the abandonment of that town? The Espejo documents do not identify the "nation" represented. Archaeology and the later historic record probably provide the answer however. About two miles southeast of Shafter 7:3 (57B7-3) on the eroded edge of the low terrace bordering the lowlands of the northeastern bank of the Río Grande lies an archaeological site labeled Shafter 7:4 (57B7-4). Erosion has almost completely destroyed the site, so that the floors of former houses occupy the top of small knolls. Scattered over the eroded surface are thousands of potsherds and other artifacts. The principal pottery types represented include Chinati and Capote Plainwares, Capote Red-on-brown, Chinati Neck-banded, and Chinati Striated Neck.

A number of sherds of Conchos Plainware and Conchos Red-on-brown were found, as were intrusive sherds of Spanish and Mexican Maiolica and a sherd identified as early Colonial Aztec from the Valley of Mexico. Other artifacts also are diagnostic of various foci of the Bravo Valley Aspect.

Regardless of the large number of potsherds found, the amount of hearthstone and other refuse visible indicates that Shafter 7:4 (57B7-4) was occupied for a very short period of time. This is in accord with the evidence of the pottery types found, which indicate that the site was occupied at the very beginning of the mission period, the Conchos Focus, and perhaps at the very end of the Concepción Focus. All the evidence seems to indicate that the site was occupied from shortly prior to 1683 to about 1700 or shortly thereafter, and that its initial settlement corresponds with the final abandonment of Shafter 7:3 (57B7-3/San Juan Evangelista) a short distance away.

There seems to have been a general tendency caused by increasing Apache pressure, and perhaps arising from ecological factors as well, for the outlying La Junta settlements, especially those to the north and east, to move to a more central location adjoining La Junta itself. The Spanish missionaries encouraged this movement for their own convenience and attempted whenever possible to induce the Indians to settle on the southwestern side of the Río Grande. Taking this tendency into account with the known archaeological and historical data, the following hypothetical reconstruction of the history of San Juan Evangelista may be advanced.

San Juan Evangelista was originally established in its mesa-top site sometime between 1200 and 1400 A.D. It may have been temporarily abandoned about 1400 but if so it was quickly reoccupied. It was visited by Rodríguez and Espejo in 1581 and 1582 and continued in existence for some time thereafter. Probably about 1683, or shortly before, the mesa-top site was abandoned and the people moved to the new, and more conveniently located, site of Shafter 7:4 (57B7-4) on the low terrace, a few miles away, possibly at the urging of the Spanish priests in 1683. Perhaps the new site was not satisfactory—there is no modern occupation there—or perhaps continued Apache raids endangered the town's existence. At any rate the people moved to the relatively well protected and centrally located western side of the river a short distance above San Francisco, where shortly after 1700

they founded the pueblo of Conejo Indians which Trasvina Retis called Nuestra Señora de Aranzazu in 1715. Perhaps at the same time some of the refugees went to Cuchillo Parado where Trasvina Retis found them that year. The subsequent history of the Conejos has already been described. Between 1715 and 1747 continued Apache pressure and perhaps other factors caused them to move again, some of them going to their relatives at Cuchillo Parado and joining with them in a move to a new site at Santa Cruz, others settling with their closer friends and relatives at Mesquite pueblo.

This hypothesis identifies the occupants of San Juan Evangelista as the Conejo Indians of the later records and neatly accounts for the disappearance of one historic town and the beginning of another, as well as providing occupants for the undocumented site of Shafter 7:4. It should be noted that the Conejos were listed among the La Junta Indian groups as early as 1684 and again in 1693, during the postulated period of occupation of Shafter 7:4 (57B7-4), although the Conejos pueblo of Aranzazu was not noted until 1715. It is in keeping with general trends at La Junta and is paralleled by the case of the Cibolo who, as described below, are thought to have abandoned their pueblo in the Chinati Mountains at about the same time because of similar factors, and to have moved to Puliques, where they joined with the Puliques and Pescados Indians to form a strengthened town in a new location. This hypothesis cannot be regarded as proven but its probability rating seems high.

Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe (Presidio del Norte, Ojinaga, Santiago(?)):

As noted above, the Espejo group after leaving San Juan Evangelista went "farther on" to the largest pueblo of all those visited. This pueblo also had a Cacique "whom all other caciques respected." The people of this pueblo were "all farmers as the river is very appropriate for it, because it forms many damp islands and bays." This pueblo, which the Spaniards named Santiago, was apparently located down the Río Grande from the San Francisco-San Juan Evangelista axis but no other data as to its location are given. As

stated elsewhere, Guadalupe was described by some later explorers as the largest of the La Junta towns. The general location of Santiago, its size and local prominence, and the fact that the Spaniards returned directly to San Francisco [Santo Tomás] after visiting it suggest that Santiago perhaps should be identified with Guadalupe pueblo as located and described by later commentators. But there are objections to this identification. The Spaniards were on the northeastern side of the Río Grande when they went "farther on" to Santiago. There is no indication that the Río Grande was recrossed at this point and San Cristóbal pueblo farther down the Río Grande on the Texas bank is perhaps as likely a candidate for identification with Santiago as is Guadalupe. So the question of identity of Santiago with either Guadalupe or San Cristóbal must await the accumulation of additional data.

Although Guadalupe, if it existed then, may have been visited by all of the earlier expeditions including that of Mendoza, there is no certain description of it prior to the *Trasvina Retis entrada* of 1715. *Trasvina Retis* could see the pueblos and fields located on the other side of the Río Conchos from San Francisco, and after having a raft constructed for the purpose he crossed the river and visited "the pueblo of the Polacmes and Sibulas [Cibolos]," which was named *Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe*.<sup>54</sup> This was the largest of the eight pueblos of La Junta and had five hundred and fifty in-

54. In an earlier draft of this paper the writer inferred from the documentary text and other considerations that *Trasvina Retis* had crossed the Río Grande rather than the Río Conchos in going from San Francisco to Guadalupe. This in turn led to the identification of Shafter 7:1, here identified with San Cristóbal, with Guadalupe and several consequent identifications now regarded as erroneous. Both Castañeda and Daniels have similarly concluded that *Trasvina Retis* crossed the Río Grande rather than the Conchos and have placed the Guadalupe of 1715 on the northeastern bank of the Río Grande. It is therefore important to investigate the evidence for the various interpretations.

*Trasvina Retis* identified Guadalupe as the largest of the pueblos. Luxán had likewise identified Santiago as the largest pueblo of the 1582 period. The two were therefore assumed to be identical, and since Santiago appeared to be located on the northeastern bank it was thought that Guadalupe likewise belonged there. Furthermore on the northeastern bank a few miles below San Francisco and San Juan Evangelista the archaeological site Shafter 7:1, largest known Bravo Valley Aspect site, had been located. On the southwestern side of the Río Grande and the southeastern side of the Río Conchos there were no known archaeological sites, large or small, above Puliques. Shafter 7:1 (57B7-1) had been occupied over the appropriate span of years. It seemed clear therefore that *Trasvina Retis* had crossed the Río Grande and that Shafter 7:1

habitants. It was well built and had two plazas, one for the Cibolos and one for the Polacmes, who apparently lived in different sections of the village. These two groups had recently united for better defense against the enemy. There is some reason for believing that *Trasvina Retis* was in error in placing the Cibolos at Guadalupe, however.

Rábago y Terán in 1747 found Guadalupe located near the junction of the Río Grande and the Río Conchos about five or six leagues down the latter stream from Mesquite-San Juan, on the western bank of the Río Grande above Cristóbal (located on the eastern bank) and Puliques, and

was Guadalupe. The same reasoning may or may not have been used by Castañeda and Daniels, inasmuch as they do not make their underlying logic explicit.

When the Ydoaga account came to the writer's attention it was at once clear that this explorer had gone to Guadalupe by crossing the Río Conchos from San Francisco and that at that time, at least, Guadalupe occupied the site of modern Ojinaga. The Rubín de Celis account verified this location, and Celis like *Trasvina Retis* was able to see Guadalupe from San Francisco. It was also clear from the Ydoaga account that Shafter 7:1 (57B7-1) was San Cristóbal, which had likewise been in existence in 1715. Then if the former interpretation was correct, Guadalupe had moved across the river and Cristóbal had moved to its former location. But a very large archaeological site might be hidden under modern Ojinaga and there was no specific identification of Santiago with Guadalupe or location of Santiago on the northeastern bank of the Río Grande for that matter. It was at once apparent that economy of hypothesis, if nothing else, made it necessary to place the Guadalupe pueblo of 1715 at the site where it was found in 1747 and 1761, unless there was a specific statement in the *Trasvina Retis* document to the contrary.

Reexamination of that document shows that *Trasvina Retis* nowhere states that he crossed the *Río Grande* to reach Guadalupe. On June 2, 1715, *Trasvina Retis* made an inspection tour of the valleys of the Río Grande and the Río Conchos adjacent to San Francisco. He notes that "The many fields . . . which they have in the valleys of these rivers, and the crops they are getting ready to plant on the banks of the Río del Norte [Río Grande] . . . I saw and examined today while passing through the said valleys . . . there are many groves of trees . . . on the banks of the river. . . . To visit the pueblos and their crops on the other bank, which could already be seen in major part, I ordered the said Indian governors to make a raft . . . today they should count the Indians in this Pueblo . . . and in that of the Conejo nation which is on this bank on the edge of the river that comes from the north . . . [the Río Grande]. . . ." On June 3 he stated, ". . . I went down to cross over to the other side. The priests, the captains, and I crossed over on the raft and the soldiers went on horseback. Without accident we arrived at the Pueblo of the Polacmes and Sibulas. . . . About a league farther down, on the banks of La Junta de los Ríos [the combined Río Grande-Río Conchos below La Junta] there are three [other] pueblos . . . in the afternoon, I returned to the Real de San Francisco. . . ." (Italics by present writer).

In all of this there is explicit only that *Trasvina Retis* could see Guadalupe from San Francisco and that he reached it by crossing a river. If there is any indication as to whether that river was the Río Grande or the Río Conchos, it would seem to be that it was the latter rather than the former. In any event, it seems logical that if neither river is explicitly identified, then the obvious conclusion is that it was the Río Conchos, which all the later explorers crossed to reach Guadalupe from San Francisco. It seems clear that the writer, Castañeda, and Daniels were all mistaken in inferring that the river crossed was the Río Grande.

below San Francisco. Guadalupe had a church, a *padre* (Fray Francisco Sanchez), an Indian governor, and a plaza big enough to serve as a camp ground for the Spaniards.<sup>55</sup> The Indians themselves identified their pueblo as Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe. The *padre* informed the Spaniards that the Indians were not interested in learning Spanish or the gospel and that they were constantly attempting to persuade him to leave the pueblo.

Vidaurre in 1747 noted only that Guadalupe was situated on the southwestern side of the Río Grande above Puliques and across the Río Conchos from San Francisco. Ydoiaga in the same year crossed two arms of the Río Conchos just above the point where they joined the Río Grande and came to Guadalupe at a distance of one league from San Francisco. The pueblo was also situated three short leagues above Puliques and on the same side of the river, and above Cristóbal, which was located halfway between the other pueblos on the northern bank of the Río Grande. Ydoiaga counted 172 Indians here, but does not identify their tribal affiliations.<sup>56</sup>

55. Originally the expedition at full force included Rábago y Terán and 66 soldiers, 10 Indian auxiliaries, 428 horses, and over 99 mules. This party had been reduced somewhat by the hardships of the journey and certainly the horses were not all stabled in the plaza. Nevertheless the Guadalupe plaza must have been fairly large to accommodate the central camp of such a large party.

56. It will be recalled that only 32 years before, in 1715, Trasvina Retis counted 550 Indians in this pueblo. Where did the other 378 inhabitants go? In 1715 the Cibolos lived in Guadalupe, in 1747 they lived at Puliques. But at this time there were only 96 Cibolos at the latter pueblo, leaving some 282 Indians still unaccounted for. Perhaps there is an explanation for this. Ydoiaga noted that the Indians of Puliques, Pescados, and San Cristóbal came to meet him at Guadalupe but that he did not count them there, but rather in their own pueblos later. By his count all of these groups plus the people of Guadalupe totaled 597 Indians, which is very close to the 550 observed at Guadalupe by Trasvina Retis. If we project the 1747 population of Guadalupe (172) into 1715 and add to it the population of the Puliques, Conchos, and San Cristóbal pueblos as counted by Trasvina Retis (359), the total population for all of those towns becomes 531 people, which is even closer to the 550 people which he reported at Guadalupe. It seems probable that Trasvina Retis, like Ydoiaga, was met at Guadalupe by the Indians of all these towns, but unlike Ydoiaga he assumed that they were all residents and counted them as such. Then, without visiting the other pueblos, he had scouts bring back the population figures for the other towns, never realizing that he was duplicating in large measure the count he had already made. If we assume this to be true then the 1715 population of Guadalupe may be determined approximately by subtracting the count given for the other pueblos in the group (359) from the count of all the towns (550) made at Guadalupe. This gives a figure of 191 for the 1715 population of Guadalupe which compares favorably with the 172 Indians counted there by Ydoiaga in 1747 and the 194 population cited by Tamerón y Romerál in 1765.

But some qualifications are necessary. The 1747 count included the Polacmes of

There was a resident priest and the Indians appeared to be contented and well subjugated.

Rubín de Celis did not visit Guadalupe in 1751 but he was able to see the pueblo from San Francisco. He noted that it was situated on a hill which fronted on the opposite bank of the Río Conchos, and that it did not differ appreciably from San Francisco except that its church had been completed. He did not cross to the other bank to visit the pueblo because the Río Conchos was in flood. The *padre* however was anxious to return to Guadalupe because the following day was the feast day of the titular saint of the pueblo; consequently he had himself carried across on the shoulders of the Indians.

Tamerón y Romerál stated in 1765, "In order to go from San Francisco to Guadalupe, distant about one half league, one crosses the Río Conchos . . . this pueblo of Guadalupe has at the present seventy six families with one hundred and ninety four persons." One league to the south down the joined rivers was the pueblo of Cristóbal.

Lafora's map of 1771 shows the La Junta mission of Guadalupe in approximately the present location of Ojinaga, Chihuahua, as described in the earlier accounts. O'Connor in 1773 did not mention Guadalupe pueblo by name, and the writer has been unable to find other late references to the pueblo. But if the name passed from existence, the town itself did not. It became known by variants of the name "Presidio del Norte," and as such retained its identity through a further change of name to "Ojinaga," and today exists as the largest town in the vicinity. According to Robles in 1937 it had a population of 1,536 inhabitants.

Guadalupe, the Puliques of San Jose (San Antonio), the Poxalmas of San Cristóbal, and the "Conchos" of San Antonio de Padua. If the Cibolos were not included in the Guadalupe population, where were they at this time? As will be pointed out later, the best guess is that the "Conchos" of Padua (87 of them) were actually the "Cibolos" (totaling 96) of Puliques in 1747. Also, the 1747 count included 60 Pescados Indians who had only recently arrived at Puliques. Since these Indians were not there in 1715, the count for 1747 should not include them either, thus reducing the total count for this group of pueblos in that year to 537 persons as compared to the 550 persons tabulated in the earlier count. The near identity of these two figures suggests that the hypothesis is probably correct, that Trasvina Retis was in error, and that the Cibolos had indeed just arrived at La Junta but that they had moved directly to the neighborhood of Puliques, where they had reoccupied a former site of that pueblo (archaeological site 57B8-1), as discussed below. This hypothesis harmonizes well with the account actually given by the Cibolos of their movements.

As stated in several connections in the preceding discussions, the identity of Guadalupe with Ojinaga and its location on the site of that modern pueblo, seem quite certain. Rábago y Terán, Vidaurre, Ydoiaga, Rubín de Celis, Tamerón y Romerál, and Lafora all agree as to its location, and their description places it conclusively on the site of modern Ojinaga, located on the high gravel mesa southwest of the Río Grande and southeast of the Río Conchos, approximately two miles southeast of San Francisco. Only the testimony of Trasvina Retis can be interpreted to place it elsewhere and the description of this writer also places it equally well in the location described by the others.<sup>57</sup> Only one bit of evidence is lacking. No archaeological site has been discovered on the present site of Ojinaga. This is not surprising in view of the fact that continued building operations, the development of a much larger town than formerly existed there, the accumulation of great masses of modern refuse, and, perhaps most important of all, the modern Mexican block-building type of architecture, would serve to hide such vestiges of the former site as may survive. A similar situation has been noted in modern Julimes and San Juan. Nevertheless, careful observation should someday bring to light within the city limits of modern Ojinaga archaeological remnants of the former pueblo of Guadalupe.

#### Presidio del Norte (Guadalupe, Ojinaga) :

As early as the decade of Trasvina Retis' visit to La Junta, some Spaniards had urged that a *presidio* be built there in order to halt the depredations of hostile Indians and protect the priests and settlers. But the mission was not actually established until the second *entrada* of Rubín de Celis in 1759-1760. The new *presidio* was established near Guadalupe pueblo on the site of modern Ojinaga.<sup>58</sup>

57. Nevertheless, both Castañeda (*op. cit.* [note 29] and Daniels (*op. cit.* [note 3]) place Guadalupe on the northeastern or Texas bank of the Río Grande in 1715, apparently relying on the interpretation they give the ambiguous statement of Trasvina Retis, and adopt the expedient of moving the pueblo bodily across the river to get it to the spot it obviously occupied in 1747 and later. This is against all reason and conflicts with other data. Their further site identifications are warped by this original error, which as has been noted previously was at one time made by the present writer also!

58. The writer does not have access to the documents of this *entrada*. Castañeda (*op. cit.* [note 29]) is the source for the statement.

Castañeda, who has seen the documents of the expedition, says that the *presidio* was constructed on the northeastern or Texas bank of the Río Grande near Puliques. This must be an erroneous interpretation for several reasons.

First of all, Puliques was located on the southwestern or Mexican bank of the river and not on the Texas side. Secondly, other sources indicate conclusively that the *presidio* was built in the environs of Guadalupe pueblo, on the Mexican bank of the Río Grande, and not near Puliques at all. Thus Lezaún, who was part of the expedition that founded the *presidio*, wrote in January, 1760:<sup>59</sup>

Our entrance (this was the third) was accomplished by promising the Indians that the *presidio* should be placed at a distance of ten leagues from the settlement [Guadalupe] as is ordered by the señor viceroy, so that they should not suffer damage to their fields and pueblos; but all has failed . . . the promise has not been kept nor has the *presidio* been placed where it was ordered. It is being constructed at a distance of three squares [*quadras*] from the mission of Guadalupe, whereby the Indians are much disturbed; and not the least cause of their exasperation is the damage that their crops and their sheep, cattle, mules, and horses suffer at the hands of the captain and soldiers of the *presidio*.

This is clear enough and is reinforced by the statement of Tamerón y Romerál in 1765, previously quoted in part: "In order to go from San Francisco to Guadalupe, distant about one half league, one crosses the Río Conchos, *in between* ["en la mediana"] *stands* [queda ya"] *the presidio de Belén* . . ." (italics by present writer). And O'Connor in 1773 followed up the southwest bank of the Río Grande to "the deserted *presidio de las Juntas*." The final clincher is the Lafora map of 1771 which shows the *presidio* located adjacent to Guadalupe on the southwest.

According to Tamerón y Romerál, in 1765 there were 50 families with 133 persons, plus five attached Spanish countrymen, at the *presidio*. The *presidio* itself, but not the pueblo, was abandoned and moved to Julimes in 1767 but

59. "Letter of Father Fray Juan Sanz de Lezaún of January 15, 1760, to Reverend Father Fray Juan Bravo . . ." quoted in "Report of the Reverend Father Provincial, Fray Pedro Serrano, to the Most Excellent Señor Viceroy, the Marquis of Cruillas, in regard to the Custodia of New Mexico. In the year 1761." *Archivo General de Mexico, Historia*, vol. 25. Translation in Hackett, *Historical Documents* . . . vol. III, pp. 479-501. See pp. 498-499 from Lezaún's letter.



was reestablished at La Junta, apparently in its old location, in 1773, where it remained until modern times. From this time on the *presidio* name was used for the pueblo as well, the name Guadalupe was at first relegated to the mission only, and finally this name was likewise changed. Major Emory visited "Presidio del Norte" in 1852 and described it as "a miserably built mud town, situated upon a gravelly hill overlooking the junction of the Conchos and the Río Bravo [the Río Grande] . . . about 800 inhabitants . . . the church located within the walls of the presidio or fort."<sup>60</sup>

The archives of the present Catholic Church at Ojinaga (El Templo de Nuestro Padre Jesús Nasareno) were examined briefly in 1949. Some of the documents in the oldest record book ("Matrimonios de 1798-1842,") date back to the decade of 1770-80. None of the records use the name Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe for either the mission or the town, and the patron saint is now Nuestro Padre Jesús hence the mission may have been renamed in 1773 when the *presidio* was reestablished. The oldest name noted for the town in these records was "El Real Presidio de Señor Santiago de la Junta de los Ríos." By 1795 the name had been shortened to "El Real Presidio de Santiago del Norte," shortly thereafter to "El Presidio de Santiago del Norte." This was soon reduced to "El Presidio del Norte," which continued in use until November, 1865, when the pueblo name was officially changed to "Ojinaga," after Manuel Ojinaga, a leader in the fight against the French, and Governor of Chihuahua. It retains that name today, while modern Presidio, Texas, first established by Anglo-American traders in the 1840's as a suburb of Presidio del Norte on the northeast bank of the Río Grande, retains the older name.

There can be little question that Guadalupe-Presidio-Ojinaga represent successively more recent names applied to the town that remained throughout in the same location. But what became of the Polacme Indians who alone occupied Guadalupe until 1760? Their fate was the same as that of the other La Junta Indians. Some of them joined the Apache

60. "Presidio del Norte," in Emory, *op. cit.* [note 40], p. 84.

or fled to other regions. Probably the great majority of them simply mingled with the invading Spaniards and survive in the hybrid population of today. Significantly, the archives of the late 18th century carry numerous petitions from soldiers stationed at the *presidio* asking permission to marry "women of the town."

Puliques (Señor San José de los Puliques; San Antonio de los Puliques; Pulicos):

Puliques is not identifiable with any specific pueblo of the *entradas* prior to 1715, but the records of the Mendoza-López *entrada* do refer to a La Junta Indian group by that name, and probably a mission was established among this tribe at that time. Trasvina Retis while at Guadalupe pueblo in 1715 listed three other pueblos, including Señor San José de los Puliques, which were situated on the banks of the joined rivers below Guadalupe. At that time there were 92 Puliques Indians at the pueblo of that name.

All of the *entradas* of 1747 took note of Puliques. Vidaurre's party reached the Río Grande at a point midway between Puliques and Guadalupe on the southwestern side of the Río Grande,<sup>61</sup> but other than a brief reference to the location of the pueblo no data are given.

Ydoiaga was more specific in his description. He went three short leagues down the southwest bank of the Río Grande, leaving the pueblo of San Cristóbal behind midway of the journey and on the opposite bank. This locates Puliques well enough and corresponds with the modern location of the town. Ydoiaga also notes that Puliques was located at the lower end of a great stretch of fertile but regularly flooded lowland that extended all the way up the river to Guadalupe, which fits the physiographic location of the modern town. At this time Puliques had 271 inhabitants; however, 156 of these occupants were refugees, including 96 Cibolos and 60 Pescados Indians, who had settled at the pueblo in relatively recent times, leaving only 115 native

61. A large "draw" runs northward past the southwestern end of the Sierra de la Cruz and enters the Río Grande about five miles below Ojinaga. The road from Mulatto to Ojinaga follows this draw to the river valley and it is probable that Vidaurre did likewise and camped near the mouth of the draw.

Puliques Indians in the town, as compared to 92 found there by Trasvina Retis in 1715.<sup>62</sup>

References to Puliques made by Rábago y Terán, leader of another 1747 expedition, are somewhat ambiguous and have led to misinterpretations of the location of the pueblo. On the 19th of December this explorer traveled nine leagues down the Río Grande to a pueblo located on the northeastern bank of the river. This pueblo, which was deserted and in ruins, was said to be the ancient mission of "San Antonio de los Puliques," inhabited years before by the Tapalcomes Indians. Castañeda has apparently interpreted this to mean that Puliques pueblo was located on the American bank of the Río Grande, and so places it in all of his discussions of the La Junta pueblos. But as Ydoiaga's account of this same ruin brings out, this was actually the Mission of Tapalcomes where the Pescados Indians had *formerly* lived before they came to live with the Puliques Indians at San Antonio de Puliques. That Rábago y Terán was not speaking of the 1747 Puliques pueblo is made clear later in his journal where he remarks that he moved his camp to a new location a league and a half down the joined river from Guadalupe *in the immediate vicinity and in sight of both San Antonio de los Puliques and San Cristóbal*. Thus, the pueblo was located close to Cristóbal and not much over a league and a half below Guadalupe, not nine leagues as in the case of the ruined town.

Rubín de Celis did not visit Puliques in his 1751 *entrada* but Tamerón y Romerál in 1765 listed it as a *visita* of San Cristóbal. The latter writer placed the town on the Río Grande two leagues below Cristóbal and three leagues from Guadalupe, but said that it had been abandoned. In 1773, O'Connor came to the Río Grande from the Sierra Rica pass

62. The Pescados refugees appear to be recent additions to the pueblo. This seems indicated both by the accounts which they gave and by the fact that they were not listed among the tribes of La Junta by Trasvina Retis, who did not visit the Redford region from which this group came to Puliques. The Cibolos, on the other hand, were listed as La Junta peoples in 1715, and before, and Trasvina Retis thought that they had joined Guadalupe pueblo at that date. But the story which they told Ydoiaga does not mention this and it seems probable, as previously discussed, that Trasvina Retis was mistaken. Perhaps the Cibolos in 1715 were living in a site immediately adjacent to Pulicos as discussed below. To further confuse matters, Fray Saabedra (*op. cit.*) said that the Cibolos lived at San Cristóbal, not Puliques, in 1747.

along the same route followed by Vidaurre in 1747. According to his account he reached the Río Grande "near the abandoned [*desamparado*] pueblo formerly occupied by the northerners called the Puliques." Four leagues on up the Río Grande was the abandoned *presidio*, which, as has been noted, was located near Guadalupe pueblo.

All this gives a very clear picture of the general location of Puliques on the southwestern bank of the Río Grande some three leagues below Guadalupe and one half to two leagues below Cristóbal, and at the lower end of an extensive area of valley lowland.<sup>63</sup> Today there is a small Mexican hamlet located on the high mesas of the southwestern bank of the Río Grande about six or seven miles below Ojinaga (Guadalupe) and about three miles from Shafter 7:1 (Cristóbal) at the lower end of the extensive Presidio lowland farming area. This hamlet is called *Pulicos* and is said to be the place where the *padres* gathered the last of the Indians in order to instruct them more easily. According to Robles, in 1937 it had a population of 209 inhabitants. Inhabitants of modern Pulicos claim at least four generations residence of their own families in the pueblo and state that in the oldest remembered generation there were Indians living in the town. They point out the location of the old mission church which was torn down a generation ago but even the identity of the patron saint has been lost. On the mesa slope at the edge of the village there are burned stones, flint chips, and other debris of occupation. Some of the artifacts recovered belong to the Concepción Focus occupation, others apparently to both recent and Conchos Focus occupations.

Apparently, therefore, Pulicos has been in its present location for some time and must certainly be identifiable with the Puliques pueblo of the historical records. If so, the period of abandonment must have been short and if the

63. It should be noted, however, that Lafora's map of 1771 shows two missions located on the Texas side of the Río Grande, presumably representing the locations of Cristóbal and Puliques, inasmuch as Guadalupe and San Francisco are shown in approximately the proper positions. But one of these missions is located directly across the Río Grande from the mouth of the Río Conchos, in the mouth of Cibola Creek, while the other one is located farther down stream. Lafora's map of the La Junta pueblos was drawn from hearsay, not based on an actual inspection, however, and the location given cannot be correct if the descriptions given above are accepted.

local traditions are correct the town was reoccupied by survivors of the general Indian population who became Mexicanized in the last century. But no archaeological signs were found of the long occupation indicated for some of the other pueblos, and it seems possible that the La Junta Focus occupation of Puliques may not have been in this spot but at the large archaeological site of Loma Paloma (57B8-1) directly across the river.

#### Tapalcolmes:

As mentioned above, Rábago y Terán in 1747 described a ruined pueblo located on the Río Grande below Puliques. He reached this pueblo by marching nine leagues down the southwestern side of the Río Grande, in part through open land and at other times through hills and canyons. The party came to a spacious valley, at the lower end of which the Río Grande entered a canyon. Here they crossed to the northeastern bank and a half league back up the river the Spaniards saw the old walls of demolished houses. These were said to be the remains of the ancient mission, named San Antonio de los Puliques, where the Tapalcolmes Indians had lived many years before.

Ydoiaga, in the same year, learned at San Antonio de Puliques that the 60 Pescados Indians at that town had lived not many years before on the lower river, moving their small fields of corn and calabashes from place to place, as they wished and as determined by the shifting of the river lowlands where they sowed. Out of fear of the Apache, since there were too few of them for a proper defense, the Pescados had joined the Puliques. They seemed quite content at San Antonio, and were especially proud of the new lands of the Río Grande lowland that had been assigned them for their fields.

Ydoiaga marched 11 leagues to the south following more or less along the southwest bank of the river. He came to a small valley at the lower end of which the river entered a canyon formed by the mountains closing in on each side. This valley was shaped like a box, with the greatest width at the lower end, and though smaller than the lowland areas



SITES 5702-6:7-8-9  
(Unidentified)

(Unidentified)  
SITES 5702-1-2

← RIO BRAVO

0 1/2 IN  
MILES

ARRIAGO BAYO NUEVO

PUEBLOS OF THE REDFORD VALLEY

PLS. 7

above was fairly large. In the middle of this valley and at the edge of the river on the north bank he found the ancient pueblo called Tapacolmes. Here stood the adobe walls of the former church or chapel; nearby the Pescado Indians had lived in *rancherías*, planting their crops of corn and calabashes in the moist river lowlands. The Indians who lived here, said Ydoiaga, were the same ones who had incorporated themselves with the Puliques and the Cibolos at San Antonio de los Puliques out of fear of the Apache. In the same valley, on a nearby arroyo which came down from the Sierra de la Mula, the Spaniards found the *jacaes* of an Apache deer hunter who traded peacefully at San Antonio de los Puliques.

The valley located down the Río Grande from Puliques is unquestionably the Redford valley. At its lower end the Río Grande goes into the Cañon Colorado and midway of the valley an arroyo, sometimes known as the Arroyo Bayo Nuevo, which heads in the Sierra de la Mula, enters the river. Directly across the "Vado Rojo" from the mouth of this arroyo and directly on the northern bank of the river lies the old Mexican hamlet of Polvo adjacent to its modern successor, Redford. Polvo was established in the middle 19th century, but it is situated on a large ruin mound of the Bravo Valley Aspect, Site 57D2-3, which occupies the gravel mesa at this point. The writer excavated at this site in 1948, and in 1949 directed the excavations of a University of Texas Anthropological Field School there.<sup>64</sup> This site is the largest Bravo Valley site in the area and the only one which shows signs of historic occupation. It lies in the middle of the Redford valley, on the northern bank of the river, and directly at the water's edge. It was occupied during the La Junta Focus, the Concepción Focus, and perhaps at the very beginning of the Conchos Focus, judging by surface finds and the results of the excavation to date. Across the Río Grande from Polvo and a short distance up the Arroyo Bayo Nuevo is a modern Mexican hamlet called Tapacolmes. The history

64. See Kelley, "Notes on Julimes . . ." [note 41], for a description of the restricted 1948 excavations. The excavations of the 1949 field school will be reported in a forthcoming paper by Wm. J. Shackelford.

of this town is not known but the evidence in general points to the identity of Site 57D2-3 with the Tapalcolmes pueblo of 1747.

Although not mentioned in any of the earlier reports, Tapalcolmes must have been occupied as late as 1683, perhaps 1715 or later, since it was in existence late enough to have a mission established there.<sup>65</sup> Inasmuch as Trasvina Retis did not visit the Redford valley in 1715, and since the Pescados were not included in his list of La Junta tribes, the pueblo may still have been in existence at that late date. The lack of extensive Conchos Focus debris at the site however would seem to indicate that it must have been abandoned shortly after 1715 at the latest; this conclusion is borne out by the ruinous condition of the pueblo in 1747.

#### San Antonio de Padua:

In 1715, apparently while at Guadalupe pueblo, Trasvina Retis wrote: "About a league farther down on the banks of La Junta de los Rios, there are three pueblos close together, and in the same form as the rest. The first is that of the Puliques . . . and the next is that of the Conchos which I named San Antonio de Padua and which has eighty-seven people, young and old; the last one . . . was named San Cristóbal. . . ." Interpretation of this vague and ambiguous statement must be largely guesswork. Certainly Puliques was located about a league below Guadalupe on the southwest bank of the joined rivers. But Cristóbal was *not* located farther down the river than Puliques, much less third in order down the river, no matter how close together the three pueblos may have been. Obviously, Trasvina Retis meant something totally different than sheer distance away from Guadalupe in listing the three pueblos in order. Examination of possible sites for the location of third pueblo, that of San Antonio de Padua, may be helpful in this interpretation.

<sup>65</sup> According to Sauer, (*op. cit.* [note 49], p. 64) the Topacolme were included in a list of tribes ruled by a Mamite Indian chieftain in 1684. Included in the list were other La Junta groups such as Oposme, Cacalotito, Mesquite, Conejo, Polacme, Posalme, and Julime. Sauer quotes Marin in 1693 as listing *Topacolme* together with Conejo, Mesquite, Cacalote, Posalme, Polacme, and Oposme, among the tribes of the La Junta region.

There are no known archaeological sites of the Bravo Valley Aspect between Puliques and Guadalupe. Beyond Puliques, continuing down the river on the Mexican side, one does not find another archaeological site for many miles. Hence, Padua must have been located on the Texas side of the river. Below Cristóbal, at the southeastern edge of modern Presidio, Texas, several archaeological sites have been identified on the northeastern bank of the river. Only one of these represents a large enough site located within the Presidio valley and close to Puliques and Cristóbal to be acceptable as the site of Padua. This is 57B8-1, the Loma Paloma site, located on a high gravel mesa almost directly across the river east of Puliques, slightly over a mile from the latter pueblo, and about three miles down the river from Cristóbal.

The Loma Paloma site has extensive refuse deposits and some surface indications of pithouse locations. Surface collections and artifacts obtained by amateur archaeologists digging in this site indicate that it was occupied primarily during the La Junta Focus (*circa* 1200-1400 A.D.). There are some indications of a short lived occupation during the Concepción Focus, and abundant evidence of occupation either very late in the Conchos Focus or in the recent Alamitos Focus (modern Mexican occupation) or both.

If 57B8-1 is accepted as the former site of Padua, and it is the only known candidate that meets any of the prerequisites for the identification, we may reinterpret Trasvina Retis's account as follows: "About a league farther down [the southwest bank] of the joined rivers [the Río Grande] . . . [is one of] the three pueblos [located] close together . . . The first is that of the Puliques . . . and the next [located across the Río Grande about a half a league to the east] is that of the Conchos . . . San Antonio de Padua . . . [returning up the river about one league toward Guadalupe one comes to] the last one. . . named San Cristóbal." This interpretation makes sense and probably is the correct one.

But the status of San Antonio de Padua as a pueblo still remains obscure. No such pueblo was mentioned by either earlier or later explorers and the Conchos Indians were nor-

mally found far up the Río Conchos from La Junta. Inasmuch as Trasvina Retis appears to have based his description of these three pueblos largely on hearsay, and to have been confused in general about their people, the following guess interpretation of the status of Padua may be ventured, with the injunction that lack of evidence for this particular guess makes it tenable only as one of several alternative hypotheses.

Site 57B8-1 was occupied throughout the La Junta Focus. Shortly after the beginning of the Concepción Focus, say around 1450 A.D., the river channel shifted toward the southeast and the site was then left so far from the river that the pueblo was speedily moved to the southwest bank. There a new pueblo was established, the one which was later known as Puliques. It will be recalled that there was only a very shallow archaeological occupation indicated for the latter pueblo, and that this occupation apparently began during the Concepción Focus, or at about the time Site 57B8-1 was abandoned. Furthermore, the lands of Puliques pueblo lay on both sides of the river, and hence included the farm lands that must have once supported the people of 57B8-1.

Continuing the hypothesis, it may be inferred that shortly before 1715 the Cibolo deserted their pueblo in the Chinati Mountains and joined the La Junta towns on the river. Trasvina Retis noted that they had done so in 1715 and said that they had joined the Polacmes at Guadalupe pueblo for defense against the Apache. But analysis of Trasvina Retis' statements, discussed above, points out that he is probably erroneous in the latter statement. But if so, where and who were the Cibolo in the confused 1715 census? Their own account in 1747 mentioned only their incorporation with the Puliques at San Antonio, and if the interpretation of Trasvina Retis' statistics given in earlier discussions is correct then the Cibolo either were not counted or else they were the "Concho" of San Antonio de Padua. If the latter inference is correct, the Cibolo may have joined the Puliques just before 1715 and been assigned the old lands and village site of the Puliques just across the Río Grande at 57B8-1. Later,

as friendship deepened between Cibolo and Puliques, the former may have moved to the more convenient location of Puliques itself, where both groups were then joined by the refugee Pescado from the lower river.

The hypothesis given above fits the known archaeological picture and would explain such puzzling historical data as the sudden and inexplicable appearance and disappearance of the Padua pueblo of 1715, and the question of the whereabouts of the Cibolo in the same year. An alternate interpretation would explain the "Conchos" Indians of Padua as late surviving occupants of the original pueblo at 57B8-1 who after 1715 abandoned the site to join their relatives on the upper Conchos or elsewhere. Still other alternatives are possible and none can at present be verified or disproven.

#### San Cristóbal (Santiago?) :

As pointed out in previous discussions, one of the group of pueblos located close together on the banks of the Río Grande below Guadalupe in 1715 was San Cristóbal. According to Trasvina Retis, San Cristóbal was occupied at that time by the Poxalmas Indians and had a total population of 180 persons. This Cristóbal pueblo is perhaps identifiable with the earlier Santiago pueblo of the Espejo *entrada*, of 1582, although as discussed elsewhere Santiago alternately may have been the Guadalupe pueblo of later explorers. Santiago, as described by the Espejo party, was the largest of the La Junta pueblos and was settled by Indians all of whom were farmers. The river lowlands near Santiago were very appropriate for farming, since there were very many damp islands and sloughs. Although the people lived in a pueblo they also had many flat roofed houses in their fields where they lived at harvest time. The "cacique" of Santiago, called "Q. Bisise," was respected by all the other caciques of the La Junta pueblos.

San Cristóbal pueblo is located with some exactitude by the records of the 1747 *entradas*. Thus, Ydoiaga marched three leagues down the southwestern bank of the Río Grande from Guadalupe to Puliques. He states that on this march he "left the pueblo of San Cristóbal on the northern bank

for the return trip." On the return trip he marched seven leagues up the southwest bank of the Río Grande from the Arroyo de la Mula, or Bayo Nuevo, near Tapalcolmes. Between Puliques and Guadalupe he crossed to north bank of the Río Grande and came to San Cristóbal pueblo. Cristóbal was situated directly on the river bank but nevertheless it was elevated enough to escape even the highest floods. There was much nearby farm land but it differed greatly in the amount of flood water that it received in any one year. Hence, the amount of land the Indians planted in maize and wheat varied from year to year. In the best years they harvested enough wheat and maize to last the entire pueblo throughout the year and had some left to trade to the Apaches for deer skins. In bad years they did not have enough grain to feed themselves and were forced to supplement their farm products with fish, herbs, *tunas* (prickly pear fruit), and other wild plants. There were 154 Indians living in San Cristóbal at this time.

The Spaniards asked the Indians why they did not move their pueblo to the other side of the river where it would be easier for the priests to minister to them. The Indians replied that the *padres* had already proposed that they move their pueblo to the Guadalupe side of the river, but that they had refused. There was no place suitable for building a pueblo along the entire southwestern river front between Guadalupe and Puliques. All through this area of land on the southwest was low and easily flooded; the hills on that side were too far from the river to allow using them as building sites.

Rábago y Terán in the same year returned from an inspection tour of the Redford valley by marching up the northwest bank of the Río Grande from Tapalcolmes pueblo. Toward the end of this return journey up the river he came to the "Pueblo and Mission of San Cristóbal, populated, but without a minister. . . ." At this point he crossed to the other bank of the river and returned to his camp at Guadalupe pueblo, apparently only a short distance away. Later he moved his camp eastward one and one half leagues to a

new site located near and in sight of both San Cristóbal and Puliques.

Vidaurre did not cross to the northern bank of the Río Grande and hence missed Cristóbal. Rubín de Celis did not go down stream from the actual river junction and also missed visiting the town. Tamerón y Romeral in 1765, however, listed San Cristóbal among the La Junta pueblos and located it about one league below Guadalupe on the banks of the joined rivers.<sup>66</sup> At this time Cristóbal had 34 families of Indians, numbering 117 persons, and Puliques was a *visita* of the San Cristóbal mission.

The only archaeological site of any size between La Junta and Site 57B8-1 (Padua; located at the lower end of the valley near the mouth of Alamito Creek) on the northeastern bank of the Río Grande is the Millington Site (Shafter 7:1/ Site 57B7-1). This site is located at the very edge of the low terrace of the Río Grande about three and a half miles below Ojinaga and two and one half to three miles above Pulicos. An old channel of the Río Grande swung by the site and the lowlands there are made up of many "moist islands and bays." In location and physiographic situation the Millington Site conforms to the descriptions of San Cristóbal pueblo as well as the Santiago pueblo of Luxán.

Much of the Millington Site was excavated by Donald J. Lehmer and the writer in 1938-39 as a cooperative project of the Sul Ross College and the School of American Research. The final report on these excavations has not yet been completed, but the general prehistory of the pueblo may be summarized here. The site had a very heavy occupation during the La Junta Focus and, judging from the number of mutually intersecting houses of this focus found in the investigations, was occupied throughout the 1200-1400 period. Fewer houses of the Concepción and Conchos foci were found, but these were much larger and much pottery assign-

66. The phraseology here appears somewhat ambiguous. Tamerón y Romeral stated: "Este pueblo de indios dista como una legua de Guadalupe río abajo que ya van juntos de esta banda del sur. . . ." Does this mean that he believed Cristóbal to be located on the southern bank of the river? If so, and if correct, the Spaniards must have succeeded in getting the pueblo moved as they had earlier requested.

able to these foci has been recovered. One Spanish coin was found with a date in the 1750's together with numerous other European artifacts. The exact date of abandonment of the pueblo is not clear from the archaeological record, but it probably fell within the last quarter of the 18th century. The historical records provide no information regarding the disappearance of the Indians of Cristóbal. They may have joined other pueblos and become mixed into the modern Mexican population, or they may have died off or become incorporated in the growing Apache ethnic group.

#### The Cibolo Pueblo:

The Cibolo apparently were not originally members of the La Junta ethnic group. Thus, reports of the Parral Investigations in 1688 referred to "the Cibolos Indians who come from the direction of the east to trade and bargain with [the Julimes] as friends, which they are."<sup>67</sup> The Cibolo, and the Jumano with whom they consistently associated in the late 17th century, were apparently trading and bison-hunting Indians from the Plains who had found a ready market for their wares as well as a source of agricultural products and European goods in the La Junta towns. They apparently lived part of the year, principally the winter months, at La Junta but were not considered full-fledged members of the valley towns at that time. About the end of the century the Jumano seemed to have merged with the Apache, and the Cibolo at approximately the same time appear as new pueblo-dwelling recruits to the La Junta population.

In 1715 Trasvina Retis referred to the Cibolo as a nation who had recently joined Guadalupe pueblo for protection against the Apache. As pointed out in earlier discussions this was probably inaccurate. Other accounts speak of the Cibolo as having joined Puliques pueblo instead of Guadalupe, although for the same reason. In this paper the theory has been advanced that the Cibolo first reoccupied the abandoned site of 57B8-1 where the Puliques are thought to have

67. "Declaration of Juan Salaisas," Hackett, *Historical Documents* . . . , vol. II, pp. 237-239.

formerly lived and then later moved across the river to San Antonio de Puliques itself. At any rate Ydoiaga found 96 Cibolo there in 1747 and was told that they had come there from an ancient pueblo of their own in the mountains to the north. They seemed to have had some especial affiliation with the peoples of Puliques and Cristóbal, because earlier reports refer to the "Cibolas of Puliques and San Cristóbal," and Fray Saabedra spoke of the Cibolos having joined the people of Cristóbal pueblo.

Information that Ydoiaga received at Puliques regarding the former Cibolo pueblo is of some interest. He had asked for data regarding springs or other waterholes in the region surrounding La Junta. He was told that "they knew of only one large [spring] which lay to the north of there where in ancient times [*antiguamente*] the *ranchería* of the Cibolos, who now are in this pueblo, where they have retired before the blows given them by the Apache, was located. The flow of this spring is great and it runs over plenty of land, but by an arroyo constricted inconveniently by mountains on both sides. This site had been deserted since the Cibolo had left there but [Ydoiaga] could see [the spring] if he wished to go and record it."

Later, after completing his inspection of the Redford valley and San Cristóbal, Ydoiaga availed himself of this offer. Led by Cibolo guides he left Cristóbal and marched north nine leagues over rough stony land to a gorge lacking wood and water but with good grass. The next day he marched to the northeast and after three leagues arrived at an arroyo which ran from north to south in a canyon formed by high mountains. This arroyo had a heavy flow of water and in the canyon there was a sapling thicket (*Vosque de Palizada*). Marching up this canyon for one league, since that was the only trail, the party came to its source at the foot of a high mountain which could be seen to the northeast. Here the flow of two springs united in a cane thicket to form the better part of the water of the stream they had been following. There was also a small area of alluvial fill along the stream. This was suitable for small scale agriculture but its small size and roughness together with the re-



strictions imposed by the surrounding mountains and the repeated overflows of the arroyo, attested by sand bars, detracted considerably from its desirability as a pueblo site.

On a rocky hill in the middle of the alluvial flat they saw the old walls of one of the houses of the Cibolo *ranchería*. Nearby they could also see signs of a former irrigation project by means of which the Indians had removed water from the arroyo for use on their fields. The Cibolo said that their ancestors (*parientes*, actually "relatives") had deserted their pueblo because of the blows of the Apache and because of the persuasions of Fray Gregorio Osorio. Since that time the site had remained deserted. Ydoiaga then returned to San Francisco, marching four leagues south the first day, without water but through good pasture, and then nine more leagues in the same direction on the second day.

Thus, the Cibolo *ranchería* was situated near a large spring at the head of a canyon some thirteen leagues north or slightly northeast of both Cristóbal and San Francisco and at the southwestern flank of a high mountain. There are two possible identifications for this site, and a third less probable one. Perhaps the most probable location would be the present site of Shafter, Texas, located in the Chinati Mountains near the head of Cibola Creek about 20 miles north of Presidio. Here there are springs producing a steady flow of water, through a canyon. There is also a large mountain on the northeast and a restricted area of alluvial farm land along the stream. The town of Shafter itself occupies in part a rocky promontory at the edge of this alluvial flat. The only difficulty is that Shafter does not appear to be far enough from La Junta. The roughness of the intervening territory might have made the Spaniards overestimate the distance however. No archaeological site is recorded here but one may lie beneath the modern town. By stretching the specified distances slightly one arrives at the springs of San Esteban, located near the head of Alamito Creek. Here too there was a heavy spring-fed flow of water along a canyon but, aside from the wall of the canyon, the only high mountain arising to the northeast would be the peaks of the Davis Mountains ten miles or more away. This was an important

and well known location on the early Indian trails from La Junta to the north, later on pioneer trails as well, and reputedly there are Indian paintings on the cliff of San Esteban.

A third possible location might be on one of the upper branches of Ciénega Creek in the eastern edge of the Chinati Mountains. This area is not personally known to the writer and cannot be evaluated. On the whole, perhaps, Shafter is the best alternative as the location of the Cibolo pueblo, or *ranchería*.

When did the Cibolo move to La Junta? They were there in 1715 according to Trasvina Retis. Furthermore, they told Ydoiaga in 1747 that the persuasions of Fray Gregorio Osorio had been one factor in the decision of their *parientes* to move to La Junta. Fray Osorio was one of the priests whom Trasvina Retis escorted to La Junta in 1715. Either the move of the Cibolo to La Junta was only then occurring, perhaps accounting for the confusion of Trasvina Retis as to their location, or else Fray Osorio had been at La Junta previous to 1715, if the account of the Cibolo is to be accepted as fact. In any event it seems probable that the Cibolo moved to La Junta shortly after the beginning of the 18th century, and not before then.

#### Other Pueblos:

There were many more pueblos than those here discussed in existence in the La Junta valley during the La Junta Focus, *circa* 1200-1400 A.D., both above and below La Junta. Fewer sites are known for the prehistoric portion of the Concepción Focus, but again many are known that did not survive into the historic period. Since all of these sites were abandoned before the beginning of the historic period and since their occupants cannot be identified with historic La Junta Indian groups they do not fall within the scope of this paper.

\* \* \* \* \*

The author is indebted to the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States Section, Mr. L. M. Lawson, Commissioner, for the aerial photographs which illustrate the study and for aerial photographs on which the map is based.