

SELECTED ESSAYS FROM THE 1986 AND 1987

SAN ANTONIO MISSIONS

RESEARCH CONFERENCES

SAN ANTONIO MISSIONS NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS



Cover Design

by

Imelda Wegwerth

National Park Service

San Antonio Missions National Historical Park

**SELECTED ESSAYS FROM THE 1986 AND 1987
SAN ANTONIO MISSIONS
RESEARCH CONFERENCES**

Edited

by

ARTHUR R. GÓMEZ

Park Historian

San Antonio Missions National Historical Park

1989

LEBCO Graphics

San Antonio, Texas

CONTENTS

Editor's Preface iii

**SELECTED PRESENTATIONS MADE AT THE
1986 AND 1987 MISSION RESEARCH CONFERENCES**

National Park Service Quincentenary Update 1
Joseph P. Sanchez, Ph.D.

An Introduction to Archeological Studies of South 4
Texas Indian Groups of the 14th to 18th Centuries A.D.
Thomas H. Hester, Ph.D.

Ethnohistory and Archeology 11
Kathleen Gilmore

Coahuiltecan Ethnohistory: A Critical Review 18
Joseph M. Garant

Cultural Continuity in South Texas 24
Juanita Elizondo Garza

Food and Nutrition Among the Inhabitants 29
of The San Antonio Missions
Anne Fox

San Antonio Mission Trade 33
Michael Capps

Monclova Viejo: A Presidio of the Line 40
John Stockley

The Forgotten Fortress: Presidio La Bahia 44
John Collins

The Battle of Medina, August 18, 1813 48
Robert H. Thonhoff

EDITOR'S PREFACE

In the summer of 1982, nearly one year before San Antonio Missions National Historical Park became fully operational, the National Park Service cosponsored the first Mission Research Conference. The stated objective of the conference, held annually from 1982 through 1987, was "to enlarge the National Park Service's informational base on the missions, and to preserve the knowledge for future generations of Americans."

Historically, the San Antonio Missions Research Conference was the culmination of earlier efforts to lend a scholarly dimension to an already established celebration known as La Semana de Las Misiones. The initial La Semana celebration, a joint venture of the Old Spanish Missions of the Archdiocese of San Antonio and the Institute for Intercultural Studies and Research at Our Lady of the Lake University, took place on August 6, 1978. The occasion was intended to mark the anniversary of the death of Fray Antonio Margil de Jesus, founder of Mission San José. As the years progressed, however, the week-long event served to commemorate the lasting spiritual and cultural contributions of all the Franciscan friars, a legacy gracefully epitomized by the eighteenth-century Spanish missions of San Antonio.

With the enthusiastic support of José Cisneros, the first park superintendent, the staff of San Antonio Missions National Historical Park soon became active participants in the La Semana celebration. Park Historian Gilberto R. Cruz, a perennial contributor to earlier gatherings, became the principal facilitator of the National Park Service's involvement in subsequent conferences. Dr. Cruz, along with Maria Carolina Flores, C.D.P., of Our Lady of the Lake University, Msgr. Balthasar J. Janacek, former Director of Old Spanish Missions of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of San Antonio, and a handful of local scholars, administrators, and general patrons of the Spanish Colonial missions, sponsored six successful conferences.

What follows is a collection of selected essays presented at the conferences held during the summers of 1986 and 1987. This is the last in a series of National Park Service publications that commemorate the Mission Research Conference. Unfortunately, mechanical difficulties resulting from an attempt to record the speakers at the time of their presentations preclude the inclusion of all papers presented during these two gatherings. It is hoped, however, that the essays contained herein are a balanced representation of the general topics discussed during those sessions. Inasmuch as I did not assume my current position as historian for San Antonio Missions until October 1987, I did not personally attend the conferences represented in this publication. For this reason, all editorial changes were intended strictly for style and readability rather than historical content. Each author presumably is a recognized expert in his or her respective field; therefore, I elected to make no alterations to their basic statements. All factual information put forth in

this series of papers is the sole responsibility of the various presenters.

The opening essay is, as the title suggests, a National Park Service regional update on the impending 500-year celebration of Columbus' voyages to America. Dr. Joseph P. Sanchez, director of the Spanish Colonial Research Center in Albuquerque, New Mexico, elaborates on the agency's past contributions as well as its plans for forthcoming events through 1992.

The following four essays address the archeology of the native inhabitants of South Texas before European contact and the earliest ethnohistoric observations of those same tribes shortly after the arrival of the Spanish explorers. In an informative and well-documented essay, Dr. Thomas R. Hester, former director of the Center for Archaeological Research, University of Texas at San Antonio, discusses recent excavations in South Texas and along the Rio Grande border that have revealed valuable information regarding the lifeways of Late Prehistoric period Indians, or as Dr. Hester explains, those native peoples who occupied the region 300 to 400 years before the arrival of the first Europeans.

Archeologist Kathleen Gilmore, a faculty member at North Texas State University at the time of her presentation in 1987, offers a comparative analysis between archeology and ethnohistory in the investigation of early human activity in Texas. Scholars, Gilmore asserts, must be aware of existing bias among the early Spanish observers of the Texas Indians. The hard evidence derived from archeological investigation often provides valuable data unavailable to researchers solely dependent upon existing historical documentation. Gilmore shows how one discipline often compliments the other. Joseph M. Garant's critical assessment, on the other hand, is clearly less tolerant of ethnohistorical accounts of South Texas Indians than professor Gilmore's article.

In a sensitive, thought-provoking presentation, Juanita Elizondo Garza cites ethnohistory as one method by which to examine cultural similarities between the present inhabitants of South Texas and those of the past. Garza offers an intriguing approach to increasing our understanding of early cultures. Her use of prose and detailed explanations of religious and social activities among the Coahuilteicans, for example, lend an often ignored human dimension to the study of the early occupation of the region.

The following two essays by Anne Fox, research associate for the Center for Archaeological Research (UTSA) and former curator of exhibits at Mission San José State Historical Park, and Mike Capps, a former interpretive park ranger with San Antonio Missions National Historical Park, provide new insights into the daily lives of the mission Indians. Based upon her extensive experience in field archeology associated with the San Antonio missions, Anne Fox focuses on the subject of the dietary habits of the mission Indians, which she compares to those of the Spanish friars. In a related topic, Mike Capp's article details the dependency of the missions upon their trade links to the

outside world. As the Texas missionaries adapted to their frontier environment, Capps observes, an interdependent relationship between the more established urban centers of northern Mexico and the sparsely populated settlements located near the Rio Grande evolved. In time, the San Antonio missions became major suppliers of agricultural products and livestock, which they exchanged for manufactured goods.

The next series of presentations provide the reader with a broader historical context in which to place mission activity in South Texas. Amateur archeologist John Stockley, for example, focuses his interests across the Rio Grande border. His detailed discussion of Presidio Monclova Viejo emphasizes the importance of the military presence on the northern frontier in enabling the missionary effort to succeed. In a similar vein, John Collins, director for Presidio La Bahía, documents the military significance of the Spanish Colonial fortress throughout the course of Texas history. The contributions that the presidio near Goliad rendered to the Texas legacy, Collins argues, must not be diminished in the shadow of more celebrated events such as those associated with the Alamo.

In the concluding essay, noted Texas historian Robert H. Thonhoff contributes a thoughtful piece on the Battle of Medina, 1813. Although not specifically relevant to the mission era, the essay is a reminder that history is an on-going process. Thonhoff's article ably demonstrates that the missions of San Antonio continued to figure prominently in the events of the late colonial period even though most had been secularized and all but abandoned.

In closing, I wish to extend my personal gratitude to all of the contributors--past and present--who dedicated their time and energy toward the enhancement of our knowledge of the San Antonio Missions.

Arthur R. Gómez, Ph.D
June 9, 1989

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE QUINCENTENNARY UPDATE

by

Joseph P. Sanchez, Ph.D.

The Spanish Colonial Research Center is a joint project between the National Park Service and the University of Mexico. The Center was established to assist the National Park Service in its preparation for the Columbus Quincentennial in 1992. The Center's mission, to collect and analyze Spanish Colonial documents, will result in long-lasting benefits to the National Park Service. Much of the data base will be used to upgrade exhibits, publications and audio-visual scripts at NPS sites as well as training for NPS personnel. In addition to the development of the documentary data base, the Center has cooperated with the Spanish Ministry of Culture in Madrid on a two-year research project, and has exchanged ideas with the Spanish National Commission on the Quincentennial (Madrid) and the Committee for 'Expo 92' (World Fair) in Sevilla. In June 1988 the Center, working with the University of New Mexico and the Fundación Xavier de Salas (Trujillo), will cosponsor a symposium entitled "Primer Encuentro entre Extremadura y Nuevo México" at Trujillo. The symposium is funded by the Comité Conjunto Hispano-Norteamericano in Madrid.

The Center was established as a servicewide research program in 1986 on the University of New Mexico campus, Albuquerque, New Mexico. Organizationally, the Center receives its direction from the National Park Service Columbus Quincentennial Task Force administered by Jerry Rogers, Associate Director, Cultural Resources, Washington, D.C. Administratively, the Center coordinates NPS Quincentennial research requirements through John Cook, Regional Director, Southwest Region, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

As the only unit of the National Park Service that exclusively addresses the research needs of Spanish Colonial Heritage sites and other affiliated areas, the Center also works closely and cooperates with the Office of the Vice President for Community and International Programs at the University. A Memorandum of Understanding, signed in the summer of 1987, enables the Center to coordinate its research activities with UNM faculty and students. In association with the University, the Center provides additional opportunities for national and international scholarly exchanges.

Materials in the Center's collection date from the Age of Discovery. The collection includes documents useful for research regarding Columbus' second voyage, and his discovery of the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico. Furthermore, the documentation covers a chronological period from 1492 through the early 1800s. The distinctive writing styles of Spanish colonials and historical situations within these various time frames present a challenge for researchers of Spanish Colonial California, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, Louisiana and Florida.

Documents in the Center's collection are representative of

Spain's 328-year administration of the empire's northern frontiers. They are primarily from the archives in Sevilla, Simancas, and Madrid, Spain, as well as those located in Mexico City. These depositories contain millions of Spanish Colonial documents. For instance, the archive in Sevilla houses approximately 40 million pages of documents, and another 30 million pages are housed at the archive in Simancas. The oldest archive, at Simancas, contains documents related to the early history of the Americas. The Archivo General de Simancas was founded soon after Columbus' third expedition. The archive is comprised of the various files from secretaries or counsels who advised the king of the empire's administration. For the sake of improved record keeping, it was decided to house all documents in one place.

Mexico City's national archive is estimated to house several million pages of documents. This does not take into account documentation from various provincial archives, such as those in Sonora, Chihuahua, or Coahuila. Another large number of documents exist in the other states and in private collectors' archives throughout Mexico. They contain records of the Spanish Colonial administration of natural resources. These documents reveal that Spanish explorers recorded on their maps, plans, sketches, diaries, and correspondence information regarding land, climate, resources and people.

The term "colonialism" is given a new meaning in light of these revealing records. Colonialism in the United States is usually defined from the English point of view. It is assumed that English colonialism spawned democracy, however democracy is the antithesis of colonialism. Yet, English colonialism must be viewed in its proper perspective. This can be accomplished by examining the history of British expansion from the Caribbean to India. Likewise, modern-day French colonialism in Algeria offers the history student one of the most tragic examples of colonialism. Today, the vestigial colonialism of the South African situation is analogous. Present-day western civilization is still overshadowed by colonialism in more ways than realized. Our world is perceived in terms of a colonial and neocolonial approach. Spanish colonialism is misconstrued in many ways, primarily because of the cruelty of conquest associated solely with the Iberian expansion. Yet, French, English, German and Portuguese colonialism did not differ much from Spanish colonialism. However, existing documents on Spanish administration in the Americas inspire a completely different impression.

Maps, plans, sketches and other documentation in Spanish Colonial archives are an asset for exploring the past. Aside from physical and topographical land features, documents reveal locations of many natural resources, as well as the locations of native populations. Colonials, exploiting raw resources, found this knowledge invaluable in meeting their needs for a cheap labor force. As a result, a colonial-native relationship was formed wherever Spaniards settled. Valuable insight is gained from these documents on colonial-native relationships, and the exploitation of raw resources.

Spanish Colonial maps reveal where rivers, mountains, pasturage land, salt deposit zones, and minerals are located. Rather than communicating place names and the shortest route from point A to point B, Spanish Colonials seemed preoccupied with conveying relevant information related to natural resources, and with locating low-cost native labor forces.

The knowledge acquired from the cartographical collection at the Center reveals the extent of Spanish Colonial interests in North America. For example, an 1819 map depicting all lands north of Santa Fe--northern New Mexico and Colorado--indicates the range of the Spanish Colonial sphere of activity in the northern edge of the empire. A particularly interesting physical feature included on the 1819 map is the Yellowstone River. Also, attached to the map are a series of documents describing the Yellowstone country, and an 1819 plan proposed by Facundo Melgares of Santa Fe to lead an expedition to the Yellowstone country as soon as the "weather warmed a bit."

Similar documents are also available for many areas of North America. Georgia and Florida are just two examples. Other examples include the Caribbean, the lower South, the Southwest to California, and the far north to Alaska. All of these areas were part of Spanish domain.

The Spanish Colonial archives also contain documents related to the American Revolution. Documentation includes interviews by Spanish officers with American officers in order to determine the status of the American cause. Letters reveal interviews with George Washington in his tent headquarters as well as those held with British commanders at their headquarters.

Spaniards also mapped out many strategic areas during the American Revolution. These include maps of various revolutionary battle sites. Some examples of mapped areas are, Philadelphia, Charleston, and Boston. Therefore, it seems reasonable that National Park Service American Revolutionary sites could unite with Columbus Quincentennial efforts in a way that would permit a unique type of interpretation. After all, the French are interpreted at English Colonial sites, so why not examine the Spanish efforts along those lines. Besides these records of Spanish Colonial ventures in North America, there are also maps, plans, and sketches on the American Westward Movement that the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial would find very interesting. Indeed, plans of the fortification of St. Louis, Arkansas Post and New Orleans offer a view to the past which can assist archeologists as well as historians in their Quincentenary research projects.

The Spanish Colonial Research Center with its growing collection of 20,000 pages of microfilmed documents, transcriptions and translations is project-oriented. Its site-specific research is aimed at preparing the National Park Service for the Quincentenary in 1992.

**AN INTRODUCTION TO ARCHEOLOGICAL STUDIES OF SOUTH TEXAS
INDIAN GROUPS OF THE 14TH TO 18TH CENTURIES A.D.**

by

Thomas R. Hester, Ph.D.

My objective in this brief presentation this afternoon is to provide you with an introduction to archeological studies of South Texas Indian groups of the 14th to the 18th centuries A.D. Although we know that Indian groups occupied South Texas for more than 11,000 years (Hester 1980), one of the critical areas for research is what archeologists call the Late Prehistoric period--the last three or four hundred years prior to the arrival of the Spanish in southern Texas and northeastern Mexico.

In the space of about a century after the mission era began, the native groups of southern Texas disappeared as a cultural entity and largely as a biological entity. The Spanish took, from an anthropological perspective at least, precious few notes on these Indian groups and indeed they are recognized as one of the most poorly known Indian cultures in North America. We know some basic facts: 1) that they were hunting and gathering peoples and 2) that they were organized into rather small autonomous or independent groups. But we have very limited precise information on their social organization, the size of their population, their ceremonies, their mortuary or burial practices, and so forth.

Researchers from the University of Texas at San Antonio have excavated living quarters of the Indians at missions in San Antonio and in Guerrero, Coahuila. It is apparent that little of their native technologies and practices survived beyond 1760, from what we can see in the archeological record. During the mission era, most of the native Indians became extinct, the victims of what Professor T. N. Campbell (University of Texas, Austin) describes as periodic epidemics, disputes with other Indian groups, especially the intrusive Apache, punitive dispersion by the Spaniards to work at distant localities, high infant mortality rate, and a "general demoralization" (cf. Campbell 1983).

Remnants were absorbed into Spanish towns around the missions with some of the Indian families given small parcels of land. We really do not even know what to call these people. They gave the Spanish literally hundreds of names for their multitude of local groups. Professor Campbell has worked for the last 25 years trying to sort through the various renditions and meanings of these names, to try to pin down the geographic location of the people these names represent, and to try to extract what has turned out to be, most unfortunately, very meager cultural information (cf. Campbell and Campbell 1985).

In the mid-19th century, the term "Coahuiltecan" began to be applied, but this was long after the native groups were gone. In the 20th century linguists researching the word lists from the missions at first lumped all the groups into what they called the Coahuiltecan linguistic stock. More recent studies by Dr. Ives

Goddard (1979) of the Smithsonian suggest that six or more additional Indian languages were present in early historic South Texas.

If we apply archeological methods to the study of the Coahuiltecos, to their deposits dating to the 14th through the 18th centuries, what are some of the kinds of information that we might expect to obtain? We can certainly gain information on subsistence or diet, on settlement patterns both within their camps and between and among camps, on the size of the group, and on outside contacts or trade that they had with other Indian groups. We can also get an idea of the kind of diversity that may have existed in Indian lifeways in different parts of southern Texas and northeastern Mexico prior to the missionization process. Were, for example, the Indians of the missions the cultural and genetic descendants of 11,000 years of native tradition in southern Texas and northeastern Mexico? Or were some of them rather recent intruders, perhaps following the buffalo into the area in the 14th and 15th centuries and staying on to live in the region as bison populations fluctuated back to the north? These and other issues are raised through the archeological study of the Late Prehistoric sites in the region.

The first slide shows you South Texas. This is a map from W. W. Newcomb's study (Tunnell and Newcomb 1969) of the Lipan Apache at mission San Lorenzo, which shows that people called Coahuiltecans and coastal-adapted versions of these people called Karankawa, occupied southern Texas and northeastern Mexico at the time of the mission era. As yet unresolved is the timing of the Lipan or Plains Apache and their movement into the South Texas region. Dr. Newcomb thinks it was perhaps in the 1760s. Professor Campbell thinks it was probably somewhat earlier, maybe in the 17th century. Campbell has hypothesized that perhaps one reason that the culture of the hunting and gathering peoples of South Texas fell apart in the mission period so quickly, is that it had already been impacted by the Apache groups moving off of the Edwards Plateau (cf. Campbell and Campbell 1981).

Today, I'll just talk very briefly about a few sites that have been studied in South Texas in the last eleven or twelve years. By South Texas today I will mean the interior, what is today the "brush country." We do not have time to look at some very interesting Late Prehistoric developments on the Texas Coast, such as the Rockport Complex and the Brownsville Complex (Hester 1980); rather, we will look at sites within the interior.

Though there were doubtless thousands of these sites, they lie very near the surface. The archeological principal of stratigraphy will tell you that the most recent remains are going to be at the top of the archeological site, and because of this they have been damaged and destroyed by erosion, brush clearing, farming, and urban expansion. So, while they are comparatively recent in age, they are quite fragile and easily destroyed. This makes archeological work at these sites even more imperative. The sites have to be dug with specific kinds of techniques, for example, plotting materials in place to gain maximum information

about the people who left these objects behind. They were not just objects--they left all of their garbage behind--but that's what the archeologist is interested in. Plotting these patterns tells us a great deal about the way they organized their daily life within the campsite itself.

With the aid of a few slides, I am going to briefly review a few of the important Late Prehistoric sites or areas where a number of these sites have been studied. In the course of this presentation, I will note some of the new data and research problems that have been generated.

First, let us look at the central part of southern Texas below San Antonio, the Jim Wells County area and also Live Oak and McMullen Counties. A lot of archeological work has been done there over the last decade, especially at the site known as the Hinojosa site (41JW8) excavated by Steve Black (1986), and with radiocarbon dates of A.D. 1350 to 1400. At 41JW8, and at some other sites I'll mention, we have what archeologists have termed the Toyah Horizon. This is not an Indian name, but rather an archeological label applied some years ago.

What this represents is a time--around 1300 to 1400 A.D.--when buffalo moved into southern Texas. In addition to hunting these animals, there was a development--or an introduction of--a distinctive set of tools and traits that can be identified with this period: specific kinds of arrow points, beveled knives, plainware pottery, large numbers of bison bone in the sites, and so forth. This slide is an example from site 41MC222 in McMullen County (Hall, Hester, and Black 1986). It shows the bison bone, pottery and some of the kinds of the tools found at this bison-butchering site. This site dates after 1400 A.D. Some of the beveled knives (Turner and Hester 1985) were of the type Plains Indians used in bison butchering in historic times. Early Spanish explorers reported that they sharpened the edge of the knives with their teeth! The pottery is usually pretty broken up, but occasionally enough is found so that it can be restored and we can get some idea of vessel form and function.

The Hinojosa site also has these kinds of materials--the Toyah Horizon--and these are just a few slides of the excavation that took place in 1982. But within this particular site, which was in a field just below the surface, were cooking areas where animal bones had been processed, and where tools had been made. Through opening up a fairly large area of the site, with careful archeological techniques, Black and his crew were able to learn quite a bit about the way of life.

Here's a slide of a cooking hearth; there was not much rock in the area, so they gathered up some lumps of caliche from the creek nearby to use as cooking stones. Scattered mussel shell and bison bones are near the hearth. In this slide you can see excavation of the living area--note that there are a lot of land snails. Land snails were collected as a food source; the Coahuiltecan probably didn't know it but given the tiny amount of meat, there is a lot of protein in these snails. They collected them by the hundreds and thousands.

You don't find great quantities of complete bison bone lying around in these sites; they are not like the kill sites on the Plains. These are campsites where the hunters had killed a bison somewhere, field dressed it, and brought some of the meat and bone back. Next, they would bash up the bone to get to the marrow, and they also used the bone to make tools. The next slide shows the archeologists plotting several cooking areas with associated debris and these probably represent small family groups in this campsite (see Black 1986).

At site 41LK201, a site in Live Oak County now under the waters of Choke Canyon Lake, we have excavated another Toyah Horizon site that dates to the 15th and 16th centuries A.D. (Highley 1986). Again, we opened up a large area just below the surface. You can do this to plot patterns of materials on the site, how they were used, where the Indians were using the tools and resharpening them. I am sure the Indians would be terribly amused at the archeologist taking this much time to expose their trash heaps! This slide shows a collection of river mussels; the clam shells that are in the muddy bottoms of the Frio River were collected as a food resource and also sometimes used as tools.

This slide shows a bone tool of some sort that dates to this period, perhaps a hide working tool (Highley 1986: Fig. 36). There is a large bison bone joint articulated in the lower left corner of the slide and one of the beveled knives that were used in bison butchering. And you can see just to the lower right of this slide, this finely made perforator; this is the kind of stone tool they would use for working hides and making garments of various sorts, and perhaps also drilling shell to make ornaments.

In contrast, we should look at the Zavala County study area with sites studied on the Chaparrosa Ranch and along Tortugas Creek near Crystal City (Hester and Hill 1975). Here we have a complex of sites dating between the 15th into the 18th centuries. This is in an area where several groups known to the Spanish lived, and where some may have left to go into the missions of San Bernardo and San Juan Bautista at present-day Guerrero (c.f. Campbell 1979). The sites are located right along the present stream channels. Excavations yield lots of arrow points of different styles, some perforators and bone tube beads that they used as ornaments. Occasionally pottery is found, although pottery is not very common in this particular area. A lot of animal bone from deer hunting is found, but also a lot of smaller game such as rabbits, turkeys, rats, and snakes.

There also is one site, 41ZV155, that has the traits of the Toyah Horizon, like the other sites that we talked about to the east. Are these two or more different kinds of life ways operating in the area contemporaneously, or do they reflect different ways of using different resource concentrations in the South Texas environment at different times within the Late Prehistoric? There is one Spanish account (Weddle 1968) of a military patrol looking for some Indians from San Juan Bautista and coming upon a camp in Webb County where the populace was (except for one old

woman) out hunting rats. Yet in 1675 del Bosque's account of some of the areas apparently around Chaparrosa Creek, describe abundant resources in terms of water and wildlife. So, the Late Prehistoric is a very short period of time, it is hard to separate a lot of the sites vertically through time, and we have to also consider how they are distributed across the landscape and whether that represents the different ways in which they were using the environment.

These slides show another aspect of the Chaparrosa Ranch excavations. They are of a Late Prehistoric site (Montgomery 1978) with several cooking hearths--not very fancy, just enough to get a fire going and to keep it controlled. This slide shows some of the kinds of tiny arrow points from this very late period.

Another aspect of Late Prehistoric South Texas Indian culture, that I can note in closing, is trade. We know from the Cabeza de Vaca account in the early 16th century about trade systems that were operating between the coastal and interior South Texas Indian groups (Covey 1972). However, sometimes their trade items came from much farther away. At several Late Prehistoric sites in South Texas, small pieces of obsidian (black volcanic glass) have been found. Indeed, one specimen excavated from a Late Prehistoric site in the Choke Canyon Lake area, and as well as others from some surface sites, have been linked by a nuclear chemistry to the Malad obsidian source in southeastern Idaho (Hester et al. 1986). From data in northern Texas and in Oklahoma, it appears that this Idaho obsidian was one of several kinds of trade goods that moved in a north-south trade network in the Plains and into Texas, as far as southern Texas.

In closing, let me say that I fear that little else will ever be learned about the South Texas mission Indians from historic research unless some yet unknown Spanish documents surface. Only limited but very critical information can still be obtained from what remains of the Indian quarters at the missions. Sometimes luck is not on our side. At the Guerrero missions, where we dug in 1975 and 1976, a Pemex bulldozer operator later destroyed most of mission San Juan Bautista, including many of the then unexcavated mission Indian areas. He spent a brief time in the Piedras Negras jail for this offense, but archeologists interested in this period lost a lot of information on the mission Indians that can never be replaced.

It is only with the archeology of the Late Prehistoric sites of the type I have noted here this afternoon that we can still have considerable expectations of learning what the South Texas Indians were like at the time the missionization process began.

REFERENCES CITED

Black, Stephen L.

- 1936 The Clemente and Herminia Hinojosa Site, 41 JW 8: A Toyah Horizon Campsite in Southern Texas. Special Report 18. Center for Archaeological Research, The University of Texas at San Antonio.

Campbell, T. N.

- 1975 The Payaya Indians of Southern Texas. Special Publication 1. Southern Texas Archeological Association, San Antonio.
- 1979 Ethnohistoric Notes on Indian Groups Associated with Three Spanish Missions at Guerrero, Coahuila. Archaeology and History of the San Juan Bautista Mission Area, Coahuila and Texas 3. Center for Archaeological Research, The University of Texas at San Antonio.
- 1983 Coahuilteicans and Their Neighbors. Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 10, Southwest, ed. by A. Ortiz, pp. 343-58. Smithsonian Institution, Washington.

Campbell, T. N. and T. J. Campbell

- 1981 Historic Indian Groups of the Choke Canyon Reservoir and Surrounding Area, Southern Texas. Choke Canyon Series I. Center for Archaeological Research, The University of Texas at San Antonio.
- 1985 Indian Groups Associated with Spanish Missions of the San Antonio Missions National Historical Park. Special Report 16. Center for Archaeological Research, The University of Texas at San Antonio.

Goddard, Ives

- 1979 The Languages of South Texas and the Lower Rio Grande. In Languages of Native America: Historical and Comparative Assessment, ed. by L. Campbell and M. Mithun, pp. 355-89. University of Texas Press, Austin.

Hall, Grant D., Thomas R. Hester and Stephen L. Black

- 1986 The Prehistoric Sites at Choke Canyon Reservoir, Southern Texas: Results of Phase II Archaeological Investigations. Choke Canyon Series 10. Center

for Archaeological Research, The University of Texas at San Antonio.

Hester, Thomas R.

- 1980 Digging into South Texas Prehistory. Corona Press, San Antonio.

Hester, T. R., F. Asaro, H. Michel, F. Stross and F. Nelson

- 1986 Trace Element and Geologic Sources Studies of An Obsidian Artifact from Site 41 LK 51, Live Oak County, Texas. In Hall, Hester and Black, 510-23.

Hester, Thomas R. and T. C. Hill, Jr.

- 1975 Some Aspects of Late Prehistoric and Protohistoric Archaeology in Southern Texas. Special Report 1. Center for Archaeological Research, The University of Texas at San Antonio.

Highley, Cheryl Lynn

- 1986 Archaeological Investigations at 41 Lk 201, Choke Canyon Reservoir, Southern Texas. Choke Canyon Series 11. Center for Archaeological Research, The University of Texas at San Antonio.

Montgomery, John L.

- 1978 The Mariposa Site: A Late Prehistoric Site on the Rio Grande Plain of Texas. Studies in the Archeology of Chaparrosa Ranch, Vol. 2. Special Report 6. Center for Archaeological Research, The University of Texas at San Antonio.

Tunnell, Curtis D. and W. W. Newcomb, Jr.

- 1969 A Lipan Apache Mission, San Lorenzo de la Santa Cruz, 1762-1771. Bulletin 14, Texas Memorial Museum, Austin.

Turner, Ellen Sue and Thomas R. Hester

- 1985 A Field Guide to Stone Artifacts of Texas Indians. Texas Monthly Press, Austin.

Weddle, Robert S.

- 1968 San Juan Bautista: Gateway to Spanish Texas. University of Texas, Austin.

ETHNOHISTORY AND ARCHEOLOGY

by

Kathleen Gilmore

Ethnohistory is a relatively new method or discipline (the Society for Ethnohistory being established in 1954) for the study of non-literate societies from an anthropological point of view through the use of related manuscripts and documents. This view point distinguishes the method from the regular historical approach (Wedel 1981:2), and consists, in part, of the study of culture history, reconstruction of lifeways, and the explanation of cultural process.

Bruce Trigger (1986:165) states, "Ethnohistorians seek to understand the changes that have occurred in native societies for the earliest recorded European contact until the present." He would prefer to omit the non-literate designation as ethnocentric and confine the term "ethnohistory" to the labelling of "a set of techniques that are necessary for studying native history."

Ethnohistory developed as a part of ethnology and ethnography (ibid:171). Ethnology is the study and interpretation of cultural data, whereas ethnography is the mere recording of cultural data. Ethnohistory had its impetus from archeologists such as Duncan Strong, Waldo Wedel, and Julian Steward, who espoused the Direct Historical Approach in the 1940s to interpret late prehistoric sites on the Great Plains.

The Direct Historical Approach proceeds from the known to the unknown; that is, if it was recorded historically, that certain Indians were living in the vicinity of prehistoric sites, then the remains from these sites may have been left by the ancestors of those Indians, and could thus be interpreted within that framework. Archeologists, moreover, had been using historical documents to help interpret their findings since Clark Wissler's and Alanson Skinner's work in the early 1900s (Baerreis 1961). Fred Eggan (1952:69) wrote in 1952, ". . . the potential values of ethno-historical research, combined with the direct historical approach to archaeology, offer so much in the way of rewards that they should be strongly encouraged." Archeologists and ethnohistorians now recognize that the findings of each are nearly essential to the other. Francis Jennings, in fact, entitled an article in 1982, "A Growing Partnership: Historians, Anthropologists and American Indian History." (Most of us archeologists in the United States consider ourselves anthropological archeologists).

Let me give you an example of how a partnership of this sort can help alleviate historical misinterpretations. The late eminent historian, H.E. Bolton, using a sort of historical ethnographic approach, stated that the Karankawa group of Indians who lived on the Gulf Coast of Texas, and for whom Mission Rosario in Goliad County was established, "represented the lowest grade of native society in Texas" (Bolton 1962:282). But the

very things that the padres described as despicable, and as "stinking", were part of the Karankawas adaptive strategies to a harsh environment (Gilmore 1984:7). This coastal climate, as we all know, is humid and burning hot in the summer, and cold and damp in the winter. Clothing in the summer in such an environment does not contribute to cooling the body. In a dry climate where perspiration to cool the body evaporates too quickly, clothes help maintain the moisture which then cools the body--witness the clothes of the Arabs. But the naked body of the Karankawa, who were on or near the water much of the time, would be subject to severe sunburn and would be fair game for biting insects. Somewhere and sometime along the way, they learned alligator grease was not only effective against sunburn, but also was an insect repellent. They also ate alligator meat, which has a musky odor and taste. If you want to try this prescription for sunburn and insect repellent, you should decide first if you want to live a hermit's life on the beach, because you too would be a "stinking" person, and this is not accepted in our culture.

Another thing Bolton did not take into consideration was the material culture of the Karankawas. They made a strong, relatively thin, fired pottery, that archeologists call "Rockport Ware." The coastal Indians decorated the pottery with asphalt in circles, dots, and dashes. But asphalt was also used to cover the interior of some vessels, thereby making the vessel waterproof. Thus the Karankawas were the only Indians in Texas who had waterproof vessels. Even some of the Pueblo Indians of West Texas, who used lead glaze to decorate their pottery did not use it for waterproofing. The Karankawa method of pottery making represents a relatively sophisticated technology that was hardly expected from people at the "lowest grade of human society." Yes, ethnohistorians need archeologists and archeologists need ethnohistorians. Most archeological problems, however, call for a multi-disciplinary approach, using not only ethnohistory but also history, ethnology, geology, and ecology.

What are the methods of ethnohistory and what are the pitfalls? The methods are hard to describe and harder to teach--it takes doing. But, we can look at the pitfalls. First, we must realize that we are using information about a specific group of people that has been collected by a culture alien to their own. Ethnocentrism, therefore, caused early observers to believe that there were only two ways to live: the right way (the way of the dominant society) and the wrong way.

We also need to know the context in which a document was written. For example, much of the information about native peoples in Texas was contained in the periodic reports of the Spanish missionaries. Did they exaggerate their accomplishments to obtain more funding? Or did they minimize them to get a transfer? Are they recording their own observations about the natives or is it merely hearsay? Were the Spanish records reflective of true Indian life, or documents of what the missionaries hoped to accomplish through their own teaching?

We are indeed appreciative of the missionary fathers. They

were men of dedication as well as keen observers, although most of their observations were colored by their cultural bias. We would know much less about the original inhabitants of Texas without the information they left us. There are other sources, of course, among them are the journal of Cabeza de Vaca (Hodge and Lewis 1971) and that of the LaSalle expedition (H. Joutel 1962). In addition, there are the diaries of the Spanish expeditions into the interior. But, for mission history, and much of Native American history and ethnohistory in Texas, the principal sources are those of the Franciscan fathers.

In using documents, if there are two or more concerning the same subject matter, these can be compared and the information most in agreement may be accurate. Documents about the same subject matter at different times can indicate changes in the native culture. All the foregoing means the source material must be read very carefully and critically, paying attention to minute details and clues. It takes doing. If translated material is used, in some cases another translation for comparison may be desirable. The ethnohistorian must also be alert to possible copying and/or printing errors.

T. N. Campbell, Professor Emeritus at the University of Texas at Austin, has done some notable ethnohistorical work concerning Texas Indians (Campbell 1975, 1977), especially with the Coahuilteco-speaking groups. In addition to other documents, he stresses the use of the Mission records--baptismal, marriage, and burial (Ibid. 24). In his study of the Juanca Indians, he was able to identify 18 other names as actually referring to the Juanca. He was also able to identify the area of their home territory. In his study of the Payaya Indians (1975), the most numerous group at Valero Mission, Campbell identified their home territory and suggested strategies for identifying their sites archeologically (ibid:18). For example, Father Espinosa noted that the Indians gathered pecans; some they ate immediately, but some were also stored in large amounts (apparently unshelled) in underground pits. Careful excavation of an archeological site in the Payaya territory might reveal such pits.

Campbell and Campbell (1981), in a study of the Indians of the Choke Canyon area, reexamined the accounts of Cabeza de Vaca's journey across Texas through documents for ethnographic information. They concluded that Cabeza de Vaca was the only true ethnographer of southern Texas, and that quantitatively his cultural information "exceeds that of all his successors" (ibid:-65). Their interpretation of Cabeza's route, moreover, agrees with that of Alex Krieger's (Krieger 1961 as cited in Campbell & Campbell 1981:73). The route, continuing south to the Rio Grande instead of westward across Texas to the vicinity of El Paso fits the description of the terrain and Indian cultures far better in northern Mexico than the trans-Texas route (ibid:65). The authors noted their regret that most Texas history books teach the trans-Texas route.

Ethnohistorians also use maps, drawings, and paintings. Two well known paintings in this part of the country are the painting

of the attack on Mission San Sabá in 1758 and the Segressor hide paintings (now in Santa Fe) of the Villasur massacre in 1720 in Nebraska. A pictorial map, drawn in 1691 during the Terán Expedition of a Kadohadacho settlement on the Red River in northeastern Texas, has been interpreted many times and in many ways by both ethnohistorians and archeologists and others.

A recent interpretation of the map (Gilmore 1987) led us to reexamine a burial at a site in Bowie County, excavated by A. T. Jackson in 1932, which had two lead balls just below the rib cage. These lead balls, of European origin, were the only European artifacts found in Jackson's excavations. Jackson's records gave no indication of the dead man's ethnic identity. The assumption has been that the man was a Kadohadacho (Caddo for short) Indian. By carefully reading Joutel's diary for this part of his trip, we got some other ideas. Henri Joutel, you recall, was a member of LaSalle's colony near Matagorda Bay. After LaSalle's murder near the Trinity River, Joutel and six others finally started their return to France, by way of Canada in June 1687. When the party reached the Caddo village on the Red River one of their groups went to bathe in the creek and drowned. According to Joutel's account, the body was buried on a rise near the chief's cottage. Therefore, we believe the remains that Jackson excavated in 1932 to be those of the drowned Frenchman.

We have additional archeological support besides the lead balls. The burial was on a small mound not far from a posthole pattern. The Terán map shows a low rise near the chief's house. A bioarcheological investigation (Gilmore 1987) reveals that the cranial measurements are well within the measurements typical of Europeans. Sadly, all our research could not determine us whether the Frenchman actually drowned or was murdered with the two shots.

Mildred Wedel has made important contributions to the ethnohistory of Caddoan speakers (1979, 1981). In her study of Plains Caddoan origins (1979, :83) she notes that the ethnohistoric approach "can contribute information on the location and settlement pattern. . . when they were first contacted by Europeans. . . , on population at that time. . . , on the earliest named socio-political divisions, and finally on the physical appearance of these Indians as described by their European visitors."

In Wedel's ethnohistoric study of the archeological site of Deer Creek, Oklahoma, it was her intent "to determine the Indian occupants of the site, its time of occupation, and the nature of the activity carried on there by Frenchmen" (1981:2). To do this she supplemented the ethnohistorical findings with additional information from anthropological, historical, and archeological data. She found the Deer Creek Site was not an official French trading post; rather, it was the site of Wichita speakers who had close interaction with the French. Using archeological methods to investigate many large crude stone hide scrapers on the surface of the site, Wedel determined the Deer Creek site may have been a hide processing station. This would have to be

validated with an archeological excavation. Wedel fixes the zenith of French-Wichita cooperative activity at the Deer Creek site from ca. 1747 to 1752. Sometime around 1757, this Indian group moved south, where they occupied both sides of the Red River in the Spanish Fort area.

The Wichita Indians were the subject of another important ethnohistorical study coauthored by W. W. Newcomb and W. T. Field. Part of a larger project concerning the archeology and ethnohistory of the Wichitas (Bell et al. 1967), the book, the authors insist, was only a pilot study. There is a great deal more buried in the archives to learn about the Wichitas. In part, Newcomb and Field undertook the study to help archeologists with descriptions and locations of the Spanish Fort site on the Red River. Spanish Fort, an important Indian settlement area throughout the 18th century, was the site where the Wichitas defeated the Spanish under the command of Col. Parilla, who had sought to punish them for their attack on Mission San Saba. The ethnohistorical study estimated the Wichita population at the time of their first contact with Europeans to about 15,000 to 30,000. That figure diminished to about 10,000 by the mid-18th century.

In studying the ethnohistory of missions, James Axtell (1982) has wondered what criteria can be used in judging the success or failure of a missionary program. He proposes that neither historians nor ethnohistorians have not handled this interpretive problem well. Axtell says traditional approaches use an unarticulated set of assumptions by which to judge the problem from the missionaries' perspective. Most often, this results in a numbers game, Axtell argues, in which researchers count baptisms, marriages, apostates, and so forth. For this reason, Axtell proposes to study the question from the Indians' point of view.

One way to approach this question, Axtell suggests, is to ask, Why did the Indians convert to Christianity? In the English colonies, Axtell believes, a need for ethnic survival and revitalization in part prompted conversion. The Indians of these Protestant missions accepted Christianity and made an overlay onto their own religion. This practice was especially true when disease and poverty were taking their toll on the population and the Indians sought to revitalize their numbers. From this viewpoint, the missions experienced a measure of success.

Can we apply Axtell's thoughts to the Texas missions? The English were invading Indian territory as were the Spaniards in Texas. Were the two nations converting the Indians to Christianity for the same purpose? From the European viewpoint the purpose was the same, to "save Indian souls" and assimilate them into European society. Yet politically the Texas missions, along with nearby presidios, acted as buffers against French aggression from their establishment in East Texas in 1690, until 1763 when Spain acquired Louisiana from France. As defensive buffers, the missions were again successful.

From the Indian perspective, however, what happened in Texas

and what prompted them to become Christians should prove to be an interesting line of research. We do know many Indian groups became extinct, others joined stronger groups, some wandered off to Mexico, others went to reservations, principally in Oklahoma. But do we know whether any of their descendants live in the area of the old missions? It might be difficult to show a revitalization effort when it might not have occurred. But have we read the documents carefully for clues concerning the desire for ethnic survival and revitalization? Yet one wonders about the Indians of Ranchería Grande in Central Texas where decimated bands from Mexico, South Texas, and other places came together. When they asked for missions on the San Gabriel River were they seeking revitalization and hope---besides food and tobacco?

There are many more avenues of research for ethnohistorians and other scholars, there are many more documents to discover.

References Cited

- Axtell, James. 1982. Some Thoughts on the Ethnohistory of Missions. Ethnohistory 29:35-41.
- Baerreis, D. A. 1961. The Ethnohistoric Approach and Archeology. Ethnohistory 8:49-77.
- Bolton, H. E. 1962. Texas in the Middle Eighteenth Century. Russell and Russell, Inc., New York.
- Campbell, T. N. 1975. The Payaya Indians of Southern Texas. Southern Archaeological Assoc., Spec. Pub. No. 1.
- Campbell, T. N. 1977. Ethnic Identities of Extinct Coahuiltecan Populations: Case of the Juanca Indians. The Perch Sellard Series. No. 26, Texas Memorial Museum.
- Campbell, T. N. and T. J. Campbell. 1981. Historic Indian Groups of the Choke Canyon Reservoir and Surrounding Area, Southern Texas. Choke Canyon Series I. Center for Archaeological Research, University of Texas at San Antonio.
- Gilmore, Kathleen. 1987. "Was it Murder? An archaeological Vignette to History." Manuscript in possession of author.
- Gilmore, Kathleen. 1984. The Indians of Mission Rosario, In The Scope of Historical Archeology, eds. D. G. Orr and G. G. Crozier., Temple Univ., Philadelphia.
- Ferguson, Don. 1980. Trail of the Spanish Bit. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.
- Hodge, F. E. W. and Lewis, T. H., eds. 1971. Spanish Explorers in the Southern United States, 1528-1543. New York: Barnes and Noble.

- Jennings, Francis. 1982. A Growing Partnership: Historians, Anthropologists and American Indian History. Ethnohistory 29(1):21-34.
- Newcomb, W. W. and W. T. Field. 1967. An Ethnohistoric Investigation of the Wichita Indians in the Southern Plains. In A Pilot Study of Wichita Indian Archaeology and Ethnohistory. R. E. Bell, E. B. Jelks, and W. W. Newcomb. Washington, D.C.: National Science Foundation.
- Trigger, Bruce. 1982. Ethnohistory: Problems and Prospects. Ethnohistory 29(1):1-19.
- Trigger, Bruce G. 1986. Natives and Newcomers, Canada's "Heroic Age" Reconsidered. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Wedel, M.M. 1979. The Ethnohistoric Approach to Plains Caddoan Origins. Nebraska History (2):183-196.
- Wedel, Mildred Mott. 1981. A Wichita Village Sometimes Called Ferdinandia: An Ethnohistoric View. Oklahoma: Oklahoma Historical Society, Anthropology Series.

COAHUILTECAN ETHNOHISTORY: A CRITICAL REVIEW

by

Joseph M. Garant

The people who belonged to the Coahuiltecan stock are very important to us in that historically they have been considered one of the primary groups inhabiting the South Texas area. For reasons which will become clear, the Coahuiltecanos are one of the most misunderstood of all culture groups in North America.

As we have already seen, ethnohistory is a discipline that allows the scholar to consult the archives and gather whatever anthropological information is available on any culture that has been documented in part or in whole. Ethnohistory has been used with great success to reconstruct the lifeways of extinct groups such as the Hurons. While these reconstructions are quite difficult and time consuming, they are useful if the group in question has been sufficiently documented. In the case of the native groups of southern Texas and northeastern Mexico, however, little documentary data is available.

In exploring the documents, it soon becomes obvious that there is meager information dealing specifically with native groups. For this reason, not much is known about the Indians of the region. Several explanations account for this shortage of data. First, few early observers had the specialized knowledge that enabled them to discern the differences between the native groups. We must remember that ethnography, as a discipline was not established until the late 1800s.

Second are the factors that affected the native groups themselves. As an example, disease dramatically reduced the Indian population. Native peoples had no resistance to European-introduced diseases such as measles and smallpox. The possibility exists, however, that these diseases actually preceded the arrival of colonists in southern Texas by several decades. In fact, the diary of the Bosques-Larios expedition of 1675 into the southwest Texas area notes the fact that the Indian groups encountered had already suffered from smallpox.

About the same time that the Spanish colonists first set foot in this part of northeastern Mexico and southern Texas in the latter 1600s, other native groups had been introduced to the horse. The horse revolutionized the Indians' way of life, affording them a greater degree of mobility. Because of the horse, the Apaches and the Comanches were able to extend their raiding ventures deep into this region. Consequently, the native inhabitants of Texas and northern Mexico were adversely affected.

Finally, native assimilation into Spanish Colonial society is another factor that explains the shortage of documents that detail the lifeways of native peoples. Since these native groups had died out by the early nineteenth century, we must rely on whatever information can be gained from the accounts of other observers. Unfortunately, we do not have the luxury to go out and conduct an ethnographic study of these groups.

While we have seen that a shortage of information exists in the documents, a number of early studies attempted to recreate the lifeways of these groups. These early studies treated the native inhabitants of this region as one homogeneous group based on the erroneous belief that they spoke the same language and practiced the same general culture. Recent work shows that there is not enough evidence in the documents to allow for such a standard interpretation as those Ruecking and Newcomb advanced.

Since these studies showed southern Texas and northeastern Mexico as being populated by the Coahuilteicans, it may be of some value for us to explore the history of the original scholarship that first coined the term. In 1864 Orozco y Berra conducted a study that explored both the linguistic and the ethnographic record. He had to rely on documentary evidence, as most of the native groups had died out by this time. He decided to name the language "Coahuilteco" because he believed that it was the most common language spoken among the natives of Coahuila, Nuevo León, and southern Texas. While this is not necessarily the case, the Spanish missionaries left behind documents that certainly indicated this was true.

In 1690, and again in 1691, Damién Mazanet, in company with Governor Domingo Terán de los Ríos, explored the area of southern Texas between Candela, Coahuila, and the vicinity of San Antonio. Mazanet noted the names of thirty-nine Indian groups. He also noted that a single language was spoken in this entire region. Then, in 1760 Fray Bartolomé García of Mission San Francisco de la Espada prepared a manual for the administration of church ritual in the Coahuilteco language. This manual listed the names of eighteen Indian groups at missions in southern Texas and in northeastern Coahuila who spoke dialects of Coahuilteco. The compiler noted that four of the groups had a limited knowledge of the language, as only the young people spoke it. This suggests that there were at least two different languages native to the groups listed. Goddard's recent work indicates that there were at least seven unrelated languages spoken in the South Texas area: Tonkawa, Coahuilteco, Karankawa, Comecrudan, Cotoname, Solano, and Aranama.

If this is true, why did the missionaries not mention the presence of these other languages? It may be that the location and founding process of the missions was in part responsible. The route taken during the establishment of the missions may simply have passed through an area in which Coahuiltecan stock was prevalent. The missionaries began their work in the area of eastern Coahuila. Missions San Bernardo and San Juan Bautista were established near the present town of Guerrero, Coahuila, in 1699. By this time, other missions had been established and removed from the area of East Texas. In 1716, however, the East Texas missions were reactivated. This created the need for a half-way point between the missions of East Texas and those on the Río Grande. As a result, in 1718 the Franciscans founded Mission San Antonio de Valero in what is today San Antonio.

Thus the earliest establishment of missions in the region

followed a route from near Eagle Pass, Texas, through San Antonio, into East Texas. This being the case, the missionaries completely by-passed most of southern Texas and northeastern Mexico, where languages other than Coahuilteco were spoken. This probably accounts for the fact that the Indians they met along the way spoke only a common tongue.

This is not to say that the southern Texas-northeastern Mexico area was ignored. In 1746 José de Escandón organized a special colonization effort. Nuevo Santander occupied what today is Texas below the Nueces River into eastern Tamaulipas below Laredo to about the area of Río Soto la Marina. By October 1755 Escandón had founded twenty-three settlements with a combined population of six thousand colonists in Nuevo Santander. Many of these settlements still exist today. Along with these settlements, Escandón helped to establish fifteen missions. Yet, we do not note in the documents the same attention to this area that Father García gave to the eastern Coahuila-Texas region. The problem, it appears, lies within the documents; therefore, we cannot blame early scholars for concluding that the native groups of this region spoke the same dialect and practiced the same general culture.

The earliest available document in the study of the South Texas Indians dates to the 16th century. Cabeza de Vaca's journal of his travels through southern Texas in the 1530s is especially valuable. Not only is this the earliest known account, but the author lived with the indigenous tribes for an extended period and witnessed their lifeways firsthand. The region of northeast Mexico was not colonized until the 1590s. Moreover, documents pertaining to this period fail to shed much light on the native inhabitants. Alonso de León's "Historia de Nuevo León," written in 1649, remains another good source for the study of the Indians of northeastern Mexico. In his capacity as a soldier, de León made numerous contacts with the native groups of the northern frontier.

Now that we have discussed the basic literature, and we understand the problems involved in the reconstruction of Coahuiltecos, we still must determine: who were these people? Generally speaking, the Coahuiltecos occupied southern Texas below the Edwards Plateau to the coast as well as parts of the Mexican states of Coahuila, Nuevo León, and Tamaulipas east of the Sierra Madre Oriental. The Coahuiltecos primarily occupied the coastal plains, an entire area made up of flat to gently rolling terrain (although several isolated mortant drainages). The climate is generally semiarid. While rainfall is not sparse, it is often sporadic and undependable.

The area is not well-suited to agriculture of any kind, especially native agriculture. The southern Texas-northeast Mexico region was, for the most part, marginal, and thus an extremely difficult area in which to make a living. The natives of this region, therefore, followed a hunting and gathering existence. They hunted as a food source deer and occasionally bison as well as smaller game animals, such as armadillos,

javelinas, rabbits, rodents, and snakes. Wild plants, containing edible foodstuffs, included the agave, prickly pear, acorns, pecans, mesquite bean pods, and various roots and tubers. Fish was also available in perennial streams while the coastal region yielded a variety of shellfish.

Although a few documents deal specifically with the native inhabitants of this region, a general breakdown of Coahuiltecan lifeways based solely upon existing documents would not only be impractical but inaccurate. One approach, then, would be to examine the sources pertinent to Texas in addition to those specific to the region of northeastern Mexico. As we have seen, the earliest available source is Alvar Nuñez Cabeza de Vaca's journal. This is an important document since it deals with the Texas region prior to European colonization. It also predates all other material relating to the Spanish exploration of Texas by about 140 years.

According to Cabeza de Vaca, the native peoples varied physically in body build and in skin pigmentation. Yet, he does not detail their physical characteristics. The men, and possibly the women, were tattooed for the purpose of denoting tribal affiliation. Cabeza de Vaca found that these people had great physical stamina, since the men could run after a deer for an entire day without resting and showing any apparent signs of fatigue. What little clothing the Indians wore consisted primarily of a loincloth, sandals, and, in inclement weather, a cloak or robe. They decorated loincloths with animal teeth, seeds, and other ornaments. Their sandals were made of fibers obtained from sotol and other agaves. They fashioned robes from rabbit and coyote skins.

The natives that Cabeza de Vaca described lived in small family enclaves. These bands were patrilineal. At certain times of the year, several bands would get together for a communal hunt. Each band had a headman or chief. This position was not inherited; therefore, the headmen were men recognized either as exceptional hunters or outstanding warriors.

Little is known about child-rearing practices among the Coahuilteicans. We have learned, however, that after giving birth, the woman placed the placenta on a cactus. Conversely, if the child was stillborn, she buried the placenta. Among some groups, a deformed child was buried whether it was living or dead. Similarly, one member of a set of twins was buried. If a woman died giving birth, the baby, no matter what its physical condition, was also buried. According to Cabeza de Vaca, the Mariames cast their daughters away at birth. This was done so that no outside group, considered to be the enemy, might marry the daughter and create more enemies. Occasionally, male children were killed in response to a bad omen.

The prospective groom and the daughter's parents arranged marriages. The male gave the female's family gifts of meat, hides, and other valuables. If they accepted his offer, the family invited him to a feast. If no invitation was given, it was a signal of rejection. Apparently, there was no marriage

ceremony; the woman simply went to live with her new husband. Marriage could only take place between members of different bands. Cabeza de Vaca claimed that the prize required for the woman of an enemy band was a bow and two arrows. If the suitor did not happen to have a bow, a net, a fathom in length and width would do.

Little is mentioned in the journal about native handicrafts. Pottery is not mentioned at all. Cabeza de Vaca does discuss the use of baskets and of woven bags. The Coahuiltecan made nets, which may have been used to carry bulky foodstuffs. As far as weapons are concerned, only the bow and arrow are detailed. They also used small shields made of bison hides.

With regards the native inhabitants of northeastern Mexico, we find ourselves almost exclusively dependent upon one primary source. Alonso de León's history, however, does shed some light on the lifeways of the Coahuiltecan. According to de León, groups identified themselves by either painting designs or tattooing patterns on the face and body. These patterns consisted of broad lines that were either straight or wavy. The men plucked the hair from their forehead, leaving a bald spot. They inserted ornaments made of bones, sticks, and feathers, into holes pierced in the nose, the ears, and the lips. The Coahuiltecan also practiced scarification.

There appears to be more variety between bands as far as differences in clothing and decoration was concerned. Men wore little clothing, carrying only a skin robe over the shoulder. Women wore only a small apron or skirt. These Indians wore sandals only when traveling through thorny terrain.

The circular and bell-shaped houses were made of cane or grass with very low entrances. Eight to ten individuals lived in a house. A hearth was located in the center of the structure. People slept on a deer skin spread across the floor and used a bundle of grass as a pillow. Up to fifteen houses made up the settlement. When the inhabitants abandoned a settlement, they removed none of the material culture.

Alonso de León described two weapons indigenous to the area. One, the bow and arrow, and the other, a curved wooden club that he described as "being shaped like a Japanese sword." This appears to have been a multipurpose tool, serving as a cane or staff in walking, a hoe, and a probe to pry animals out of their dens.

The Coahuiltecan of northeast Mexico also used textiles for various purposes. Apparently, they employed tumplines to carry heavy loads. They also use small sacks of matting as well as baskets for storage use.

According to de León, the natives interred their dead in the open, either planting prickly pear over the spot or making a fence to keep animals away. At times, they cremated their dead and buried the ashes. While mourning the dead, women pulled out their front hair and cut off the rest.

In view of the problems existing within the documents, it is difficult for the scholar to establish the exact territory for

most of these groups. More complicating this is the fact that encampments were often shared by two or more different groups. According to Cabeza de Vaca, some groups had exclusive territories during the winter season. Yet in the summer months, they shared areas with other groups that were rich in foodstuffs.

Some studies have attempted to estimate the population of the South Texas and the northeast Mexico region. This is an impractical exercise considering the limitations of the documentation. Recorded population figures for the northern part of Coahuiltecan territory are fairly abundant. Nevertheless, we must consider that by the time these figures were recorded, many groups had been displaced from their original territory by Apaches, Comanches, and Spaniards. These figures, moreover, include people from outside groups. The largest statistic ever recorded for a single band is 512 in 1674, from Guequisal in northern Coahuila. This figure may have included remnants of other groups. Most figures indicate, however, that very few groups had populations of more than 400 individuals. In 1953 Ruecking compiled a list of 614 bands that he categorized as Coahuiltecan. He believed that these groups averaged 140 members. This being the case, he arrived at a total estimated population of approximately 86,000. One problem that Ruecking did not consider was that his grouping was not all linked to a specific year. He assumed that all of these Indians coexisted at the same time, when in fact they did not.

As illustrated above, there are serious problems with the existing resources that are needed to reconstruct the native lifeways of the peoples of southern Texas and northeastern Mexico. Not only do the documents contain meager details, but the information gained can lead an unwary researcher to inaccurate conclusions.

CULTURAL CONTINUITY IN SOUTH TEXAS

by

Juanita Elizondo Garza

Among the Texas Indians who joined mission settlements in the San Antonio area were the Coahuiltecans. This Indian group is among the least known of Texas Indians, at least by the general public, often misunderstood, if not generally ignored. Yet the Coahuiltecans are among the earliest known people of Texas and among the last native survivors. This past year, a reminder from our ancient past in Texas surfaced in an Indian site uncovered south of Mission, Texas, on the Río Grande. The site has been tentatively dated as 12,000 years old and has been labeled as Coahuiltecan. Although some purists may disagree on the label, it is still evidence of human continuity in South Texas way beyond pre-Columbian times and Western institutions. By 1846 some of the early Texan cultures, such as the Coahuiltecan, were still visible, as they are today.

Certainly, if only because of this long span in continuity our Indian ancestors merit our attention. Cultural continuity is of value to present Texans in that it gives us a measure of our historical past, but most important, a sense of identity, of community, and of cultural pride. These are aspects with powerful implications and of extreme value to contemporary Texans. For South Texans, especially today's Tejanos. But, also because all people benefit from cultural awareness, it is imperative to look into the past and rediscover the valuable heritage that ancient ancestors left us. Answers as to why Texans do this or that, in this manner or the other, during a specific time or season can be traced through cultural continuity.

Whether we are aware of it or not there is continuity in our daily lives that comes from a powerful historical past, giving us an identity, an essence that links us to ancient Texans--Tejanos, who in pre-Columbian times, lived, loved, and pursued happiness in very different ways than today, but who left a strong and lasting heritage. Among those who left their imprint in Texas are the Coahuiltecans.

In pre-Columbian America, and up to the nineteenth century, Coahuiltecans extended from present-day San Antonio to Saltillo and Parras in Coahuila and along the Gulf coast from Corpus Christi to Tampico. They were a nomadic people who lived in small communities, bands of some 6 to 10 families. They acknowledged kinship or alliances with other related groups, together forming some 200 bands. They traded among their own groups and with other unrelated neighbors. Their industry consisted mainly of worked shells, flints and arrowheads, scrapers for digging, occasional trading of extra hides, baskets or woven mats. In exchange, Coahuiltecans received cultivated foods and materials not available to them, such as metals, molcajetes, metates, and other trade items of pottery or ornaments.

Sources of cultivated products were southern neighbors, the Huastec, and relatives in central Texas who were sedentary.

Through the Huastec, Coahuiltecs had early agricultural knowledge but did not use it to a great extent. They scattered seeds, but did not cultivate the plants; they simply gathered the fruits if there was a yield. They may have passed on southern goods and knowledge into central Texas without using techniques or information.

Today, we may speculate as to why the Coahuiltecs did not utilize agricultural knowledge for themselves. The environment may have been a factor since at that time the area was a sea of deep-rooted grasses. But they still played an important role in setting the tone for what South Texas was to become.

Essentially, Coahuiltecs lived off the fruits of the land. They were extremely resourceful in the use of the environment for their own needs. As hunters and gatherers, their knowledge and use of the environment was specialized. Staples consisted of mesquite beans and cacti, supplemented by all other edible native flora and fauna. They dug roots and grubs, hunted the abundance of the land, air, and waterways, adding necessary protein to diets.

Division of labor for this society is considered to have been fairly equal between the sexes. Every adult Coahuiltec shared the responsibility of providing food for the group. Food preparation was communal and consisted mostly of various dishes of mesquite flour. Males kept mesquite thickets cleared of grass to make the gathering easier. They provided meats from the hunt and fishing. Coahuiltec males were expert in spear fishing as well as with bow and arrow. Besides food preparation, women dried and preserved them because nourishment was less burdensome to carry in this form, an important feature for nomads. Females sewed hides for clothing, blankets, and shelters which they helped carry to the different yearly campsites.

Even child care was an equally shared responsibility. Coahuiltec parents took great care of their off-spring, probably because of high infant mortality. Children were taught to run and jump as soon as they could walk to make them healthy and robust adults, accustomed to long-distance travel. Infants were nursed into late childhood to give them additional nourishment to ensure survival beyond adolescence. Parents became so engrossed in the rearing of children that although divorce was acceptable in this culture it was less common among couples with children. Procreation and bringing off-spring to adulthood was of more concern than couple compatibility.

Today, we may call Coahuiltec marriages "arranged" because a union was often sought when it would benefit a group as an alliance with powerful neighbors or to bring solidarity between existing relations. Contracts were not rigidly binding and remained fairly monogamous. Leaders or shamans who could afford more than one wife were the exception to monogamy. Couples separated when one became dissatisfied in the union; each going his or her own way with or without a new partner.

In religion and care of the community sexual division of duties was also equal. Elder women, as well as men, could be

shamans charged with the many rituals and ceremonials that maintained harmony and balance between the physical and spiritual worlds. Spaniards called shaman curandero/curandera when to the Indian, he/she was actually priest, healer, custodian of the past, and pillar of the community revered as the representative of the gods.

Among a shaman's many functions was to serve as guardian against destructive forces that wrecked good health and fortune. He/she used herbs, the laying of hands, and rituals for health-care delivery and spiritual well-being. Young limbs were rubbed with ointments to increase strength, and specific prayers and rituals removed evil spirits from ailing bodies. Shamans purified campsites to guard against evil spirits by burning branches; the smoke, according to local belief, would banish the spirits of death and disease from an area. But if these preventive measures proved insufficient, camps were abandoned and established elsewhere. Shamans also purified burial grounds at designated areas outside encampments.

The shaman had to maintain a harmonious balance between the group and the spirit world. This includes their acknowledged deities. Because food production depended on the benevolence of spirit deities--forces not under human control--Coahuiltecos tried to manipulate those unseen entities through the medium of the shaman. Shamans presided at rituals called mitotes which were held to manipulate and appease benevolent gods. Mitotes were held before a harvest to ensure a good season, to offer thanksgiving after a bountiful crop, and to perform rites of passage. These ritualistic festivals began with the telling of the past--the history of the group. Histories were oral, rich, descriptive recitations depicting details of battles and valorous deeds of brave ancestors, passing from one generation to the next. An example of such a tale can be found in Fray Vicente Santa María's account in the 1700s:

Fuimos gritando a la guerra	Shouting we went to war
al modo de leones bravos,	in the manner of brave lions,
a los crueles enemigos	to the cruel enemy
la dura muerte llevamos.	we gave harsh death.
La cuerda, el arco, la flecha,	The string, the bow, the arrow,
nuestro vigor, nuestros tiros,	our vigor, our charges
los hacen temblar de miedo	make them tremble with fear,
y lo publican a gritos.	making it known through the screams.

Con nuestras caras festivas,	With our gay faces,
dejamos el triunfo a espaldas,	we leave victory behind us,
y nuestras mujeres ya	and our women no longer
no lloraban por venganza	cry for vengeance.
Con ellas, y nuestro gozo	They, and our joy
coronarán el festejo	will crown our celebration
los raptos de la embriaguez,	with the rapture of
y los encantos del sueño.	intoxication and the delight of sleep.

Mitotes were not just solemn ceremonies of recitations. They were convivial social events involving neighbors and other related groups. Music and dancing followed the recitation with other amusements for every one. Wrestling matches, races, and ball games continued for several days. These occasions also served to trade and exchange goods, to create or cement alliances, and even to contract desired marriages.

All these aspects--nomadic life, strong family ties, religious and community life--may appear simple in comparison to modern patterns, but the reverse is true. Coahuiltecan culture is extremely complex, rich diverse and vibrant. Present Tejano culture is rooted in our ancient past. Many modern cultural expressions come from this past. There is a continuum that stretches back into time and space, so invisibly woven that it is difficult to separate the Indian from later cultural developments. As each group interacts, modifying, altering, accepting, adapting or rejecting new patterns emerge yet many remain, albeit, in new form but still live in many ways.

This nomadic hunting and gathering society maintained ancestral traditions until the mid-nineteenth century when permanent settlement was completed. There is no doubt that the European conquest of the Americas made the most enormous impact upon native populations but it came by various means, some of which ultimately allowed Indian culture to survive.

The Coahuiltecan left many values from which modern Texans can draw strength. They left us an identity and a sense of our place in history. These are essential in projecting for the future. Indian ancestors left us strong family values and a sense of concern and care for community well-being. Each band was a community with ties among other groups guarded by alliances or trade contacts. Community building is in our past and should continue to be part of our future.

Indian roots are also evident in the religious practices of the area. The symbols may have changed but promesas to the Christian Deity and His saints, floral tributes to ancestors, ensalmes (purification rites requested of the clergy although not part of Catholic tradition), and blessings of homes aspects of the deep religious legacy of the Indians of South Texas.

For centuries, Coahuiltecan co-existed with cultures different than their own. They traded with sedentary Huastecs and central Texans. In our modern world, where different cultures are rapidly coming together, we can certainly appreciate that others have lived diverse, yet, peaceful life-styles.

Coahuiltecan moved constantly but not haphazardly; they knew the territory without possessing modern maps; they understood how much the environment could provide without the scientific data of demographic or ecological studies; they used the environment wisely, planning nomadic wanderings to maintain an ecological balance. Because they did these things, Coahuiltecan did not accumulate material possessions and, therefore, left very little for us to know of their existence. Still, the lessons are explicit in what the Indians did not do--they did not waste.

Their resourcefulness in the use of the land is a lesson that is still part of our culture in South Texas, and one that can be maintained. In the use of nopalitos, tunas, quelite, verdolaga, flor de pita, dried shrimp and meats, atoles, and caldos we can rediscover that natural foods are healthier and less expensive.

Our ancestors in South Texas were a tenacious people. They were an independent and self-sufficient people with perseverance, fortitude, and tremendous courage to carry on. They survived in an environment that controlled their way of life but they lived for thousands of years because they kept their traditions. There is cultural continuity in South Texas, but we must accept this knowledge and give credit to those who preceded us. It is our legacy to continue this vibrantly rich heritage which has been bequeathed us. It is time we look deeply into South Texas roots and find the values from which we can build a better future.

FOOD AND NUTRITION AMONG THE INHABITANTS OF THE SAN ANTONIO MISSIONS

by

Anne Fox

This paper was created for an interesting seminar on food practices in Texas and was put together for the Texas State Historical Association meeting this spring. Various presenters dealt with different time periods, and it really was fun and exciting to get at the history of Texas in a different way. As I was preparing it, I kept thinking that the paper should be given at this meeting rather than at the Texas Historical Association gathering. So, I determined at that time to bring it to you. My apologies to anyone in attendance at the Texas Historical Association conference who may have already heard this presentation.

What did they eat at the missions? My first interest in this subject was a direct result of an assignment received soon after I reported for work at Mission San José in the early 1970s. We were planning an interpretive exhibit for the mission, and Father Marion Habig had just arrived from Chicago to help us by researching the Spanish documents that were then available. I naively asked Father Habig to tell us what the Indians were eating at the missions, thinking it would all be spelled out in detail for anyone with an ability to read the documents.

Father Habig came back in a day or two rather puzzled to report that he could find very little in the documents on that subject. One account did mention in passing that the Indians ate atole in the morning and pozole for a later meal. According to various dictionaries and cookbooks we then consulted, atole is a thin gruel or drink made, primarily, from cornmeal. Pozole is a soup or stew, traditionally made with meat and corn to which other ingredients such as beans and lentils may be added. This seemed like a pretty dull and uninteresting diet to use to persuade Indians to embrace mission life, but perhaps it was better than mesquite beans and an occasional rat or opossum that probably made up their diet in the wild.

Did the Franciscans share the same menu? If not, we wondered, how did their diet differ? At the time we were too busy to go into it more deeply and for several years there was no further discussion on the subject. However, as we began to do more research at the missions, the question resurfaced and we began to see that there were a number of other ways to arrive at the answer. Gradually, from the Spanish documents, a picture emerged. Archeological investigations at the missions gave us additional details that were not found in the documents.

What I bring you today is what I have been able to make of all these bits and pieces of information gained from various sources. One of the most fascinating aspects of mission research is the amount of information available in the Spanish documents. We now have reports of official regular inspections; we have complete inventories made at the time of an administrative change from one Franciscan college to another; we have letters and

diaries of the Franciscans and instructions for the administration of the missions, both of which contain valuable information. Finally, the shipping lists for the annual pack trains from Mexico tell us what items the missionaries imported.

When we first began to study the documents in our search for details on mission life, only a few had been translated into English. Our persistent questioning, however, spurred translators to do more. As the number of fascinating details contained in the documents were revealed, we were inspired to do our own translations. A number of archeologists began to glean their information directly from the documents, turning to translators for help as we needed it. While none of us pretend to be professional translators, we found that we, too, can use the documents. With practice and a good dictionary, we uncovered much of the information we wanted to learn.

Regarding the diet of the Franciscans, the documents make clear that they retained their familiar cuisine despite frontier conditions. Inventories of storeroom contents list chocolate, sugar, flour, rice, shrimp, saffron, almonds, cinnamon, cloves and other spices. According to one account at Mission Concepción, a Indian woman was appointed each week to make tortillas for the missionaries. The friars also hired a Spanish woman from the mission community to make rolls and bread.

According to the inventories, the convento kitchen contained numerous metal kettles and skillets. Also listed among the ceramic pots, jars, and bowls, were copper water jugs used to make the traditional hot chocolate drink that was popular all through Mexico in the 18th century. One cell of the convento contained a cupboard or shelf that stored cups for the chocolate, ceramic plates from Puebla, copper plates, utensils, crystal tumblers, and wine glasses. In addition, table cloths and napkins were listed. Perhaps, the friars used the fanciest of these items only when visitors arrived.

In contrast, Indian kitchens were each furnished with a few copper kettles and pots, a metate (grinding stone for preparing corn, and an iron comal (griddle) for making tortillas. There is no mention in the documents of ceramic vessels or other objects issued to the Indians for their personal use. Archeological research, however, suggests they did have access to such items.

How did the Indians' diet differ from that of the Franciscan's, and how did they prepare it? We have yet to find recipes included in the documents. But there are many descriptions of what foods were produced at the missions as well as an indication of special foods used on rare occasions. The basic ingredients of the Indian diet were beef, corn, beans, and when available, piloncillo or brown sugar. The missionaries doled out these food items to the Indians on a regular basis. However, we have also documented that the mission Indians harvested lentils, sweet potatoes, melons, peaches, along with other fruits and vegetables. Obviously, the mission community's diet consisted of various foods besides atole and pozole.

Since comales were distributed to all households, we can

infer that the missionaries taught tortilla making to newcomers, which eventually became adopted throughout the mission community. An intriguing set of instructions for the administration of Mission Concepción in the 18th century gives us the first hint that life was not all atole and pozole. It mentions numerous celebrations at which special treats were allowed, for example, a glass of wine on feast days, or bunuelos and sweets at Christmas.

Also mentioned is the occasional distribution of hot chocolate to the Indians. The shipping lists included two grades of chocolate, fine and ordinary. They indicate that the fine grade was intended for use in the missionary quarters while the ordinary grade went to the community. Indians were sometimes issued pots for making the chocolate. Based upon the amounts being brought into Texas, it appears that the drink was not consumed on a daily basis; rather, it was reserved for special occasions. Thus we now have a better understanding of the diet of the mission Indians. While based essentially upon beef and corn, there were a variety of ingredients included in pozole. In addition, melons, peaches, and other nutritious fruits and vegetables helped to enhance the meal.

Let us visualize an Indian family in their mission home. The copper pot of pozole is bubbling over the fire. How do they eat it? The documents give us no clues. At this point, archeological investigation fills a gap left in the historical record. By far the most numerous among the ceramic fragments recovered at Spanish sites in South Texas are sherds of unglazed bowls and pots made of local clay. For want of a better name, we call it Goliad ware after the location where it was first recorded. It is obvious that the mission Indians made it because it is identical to the pottery they made before entering the missions. The Spanish never mention this ware, perhaps because they consider it of no particular value--the way we might think of paper plates or styrofoam cups. Evidently, these bowls and pots were used for cooking and serving food, along with a few similarly-shaped glazed vessels that were brought from Mexico. Since no spoons or forks were distributed to the Indians, we can assume that they used their fingers or tortillas to eat with. Rather than be served individually, the family probably ate from one or two common containers.

Another topic where archeology provides information not found in the written record has to do with the varieties of meat that went into the stew pot. From the analysis of animal bones from mission trash heaps, we find that they varied their meat diet with deer, javelina, opossum, rabbit, wild turkey, ground squirrel, turtles, and fish. Most of these creatures were found not far from the safety of the mission walls. No doubt they also included wild plants and roots similar to those they ate before coming to the missions. One missionary remarks on the fact that women had the habit of going out in the evening to gather cactus, tunas, berries, and other edible plants.

Thus we see that the staple dish that the padres called pozole was probably an adaptation of the Indian diet before they

entered the missions. The only real change was the addition of beef, corn, and other food items that the Spanish introduced. Making and eating tortillas, however, may have been a new idea, although we know they had long been accustomed to using a grinding stone (metate) for food preparation.

Turning again to the Franciscan diet, archeology provides us with another interesting bit of information. When the inventories list plates, we tend to think of dinner plates such as the design we use today. Excavations reveal, however, that these were more like soup plates. They had a central depression sometimes more than an inch deep. Such vessels imply that the European diet, which also consisted primarily of soups and stews, did not differ too much from that of the Indians. Although the flavoring may have been different, and there were also traditional Mexican side dishes, the basic ingredients still consisted of beef, pork, corn, beans, and lentils.

Where does this leave us? We find that the diet in the missions was based upon soups or stews made up of meat and vegetables that were in season. The friars distributed treats of hot chocolate and wine during festive occasions, especially during Christmas. Evidently, the Franciscans encouraged the Indians to continue their traditional eating habits while living at the missions. In addition, the Spaniards introduced staples such as beef and corn; products raised in abundance near the missions. In this way, the Indians gradually became accustomed to Spanish eating habits without the shock of sudden change. The staple diet, and the promise of its continuation as long as they stayed, must have been a potent argument for the Indians to remain at the missions.

SAN ANTONIO MISSION TRADE

by

Michael Capps

The San Antonio missions played a critical role in the extension of the Spanish frontier into Texas. The missions were educational centers designed to make the Indians productive citizens of the empire. Franciscan missionaries taught the Indians the fundamentals of the Catholic religion while introducing them into Hispanic society. Beyond that, the friars trained the Indian neophytes in vocational skills, training that contributed in large measure to the economic development of the region.

The systems of ranching and agriculture established in 18th century Texas formed the basis for the future economy of San Antonio and the remainder of South Texas for the next one hundred years. Industries such as weaving, iron working, carpentry, and masonry--all introduced to the mission Indians of San Antonio--were crucial to survival on the frontier. One of three fundamental colonizing institutions on Spain's northern borderlands, the missions developed an economy that provided military and civilian settlements with food and supplies. In return, they received needed goods and materials from the interior regions of New Spain. This system of trade became an integral feature of the frontier economy for the remainder of the Spanish colonial period.

After the missions were established between 1718 and 1731, one of the principal tasks of the missionaries was to establish a stable economy. This required construction of a primary acequia or irrigation system for effective agricultural production, and the establishment of ranches. From the beginning, the Franciscans designed the mission agricultural system to produce a surplus. They exchanged the surplus meat and agricultural products with presidial troops and civilian inhabitants for goods normally inaccessible to the missions. Fray Mariano Francisco de los Dolores y Viana reported in 1762 that the produce from the missions was either sold or traded. Similarly, Fray José Francisco López, then in charge of Mission San Antonio de Valero, stated in 1785 that the mission ranches had become so successful, in fact, that the income from the sale of animal by-products paid for a number of mission expenses.¹

Frontier economic independence, however, took time to develop, and in earlier years the missions relied heavily upon goods imported from Mexico. For this reason, perhaps, the annual supply mule train, which originated in Saltillo and Monclova, was extended to Texas to bolster the mission economy. These pack trains became the major means by which Mexican staples reached San Antonio. At their point of origin in Coahuila, Mexico, a syndic or agent, who bought the supplies on consignment, arranged for the caravans to transport them to the Texas frontier. The Franciscan Order, however, apparently was responsible to supply

luxury items such as chocolate, gun powder, and spices to their brethren in the northern borderlands. Surpluses were sold through the Apostolic Colleges for bills of exchange; these were then used to buy clothing, saddles, household utensils, agricultural implements, tobacco, beads, bridles, medicines, and church supplies. In later years, the agents paid the missionaries to use their mules to ship wool, wine, and hides to Mexico.²

The arrival of the pack trains to the Texas missions was a notable event. Generally, the local missionary assumed control of all supplies, and assumed responsibility for their apportionment within the mission community. In most cases, the Indians received a ration of piloncillo or brown sugar. Village officials, such as the alcalde and the fiscal, were given white cloth from Puebla to make the familiar shirts, pants, and other articles of clothing worn on a daily basis. The remainder of the men in the community were distributed hats, sandals, and knives. The women, meanwhile, received baskets containing beads, colorful ribbons, rosaries, and when available, hair brushes. During periods of inclement weather, the missionary also made available flannel cloth from Puebla for shirts as well as woolen stockings. In addition to clothing items, spurs, bridles, saddles, iron works, griddles, kettles, and copper water pots were distributed when the need arose.³

The extent of trade activity between San Antonio and Mexico becomes apparent through examination of translated Spanish documents and recent archeological evidence uncovered at the mission sites. Pottery was among the most common import items. Spanish freighters brought vessels in great quantities produced in Mexico City and neighboring pottery-making centers at Puebla, Guanajuato, and San Luis Potosí to replace items broken in everyday use. Most copper and brass articles were also made in Mexico and transported to the frontier.

The Franciscans also imported copper in sheets for use in tool making and patch repair. Archeological investigations have uncovered glass beads from Venice, Italy, at Mission San Juan Capistrano and Rancho de las Cabras, a ranching enterprise associated with Mission San Francisco de la Espada. Raw materials such as bituminous coal and iron, used in the mission forges, were probably imported from Mexico since there is no record to suggest that the Spanish mined these elements in South Texas. Finally, San Antonio residents conducted trade with the coastal region as it appears that marine shells and salt were commodities that soon found their way into the interior.

The principal route for the movement of supplies to and from Spain's northern frontier was the Camino Real, a trail blazed by Domingo Terán in 1690. The road originated in Mexico, passing through Monclova and Saltillo, Coahuila, the sources for most of the supplies transported to the San Antonio missions. From Saltillo, the route proceeded in a northeasterly direction to Mission San Juan Bautista on the banks of the Río Grande, then on to San Antonio, and from there to Nacogdoches in East Texas. An alternate trail crossed the Río Grande at Laredo, then connected

with the missions of Rosario and Espíritu Santo. The trail intersected the main road at the Trinity River. While other roads, such as those between San Antonio and Mission Espíritu Santo, were in use at this time, Spanish freighters regarded the Camino Real as the most widely-used commercial highway through Texas.⁴

As the missions became more independent, they developed economic resources that made them competitive in the marketplace. In time, the missions became a source of supply for neighboring military outposts on the frontier as well as burgeoning civilian communities. By 1740 the civilian settlers of Bexar bought corn from the mission granaries to supplement the crops that they had harvested. The Franciscans used the proceeds of these sales to buy provisions for the mission Indians. In 1762 Fr. José Gaspar de Solís reported that Mission San José furnished surplus grains to the presidios of San Antonio, La Bahía, Orcoquisac, and Los Adaes. The Franciscans also traded horses and goats to the presidial troops in exchange for needed supplies. According to one source, the mission farms of San Antonio were reportedly the most profitable in the entire province of Texas in 1772.⁵

In addition to supplying ranch and agricultural products, the Texas missions also strengthened the local economy through the instruction and provision of valuable human resources. Mission Indians, trained in vocational skills such as carpentry, ironwork, masonry, tailoring, and brick making, became a principal source of labor on the sparsely populated frontier. In addition, mission-produced items--bricks, tiles, blankets, clothing, furniture, iron tools, and soap--were valued commodities that the Franciscans frequently exported to the neighboring communities.

The economic interaction between the missions, the presidio, and the village of San Fernando de Béxar was vital to the survival of each entity on the northern frontier. When the Canary Island immigrants, who arrived in San Antonio on March 9, 1731, attempted to establish a monopoly on the sale of grain to the presidio, for example, Fr. Benito Fernández de Santa Ana protested: "The missions have no other means of getting supplies if they are deprived of trading their produce. The annual donations that the King our Lord gives to the missionaries are to be used for the welfare of the Indians." True, indeed, as Fr. José Francisco López reported in 1785: "The wealth of these missions is derived from the cultivation of corn, beans, chile, pimento, and fruits such as watermelons, cantaloupes, pumpkins, and garden produce, as well as the breeding of sheep, goats, and cattle."⁶

Other missions in Texas looked to San Antonio as a supply base. Mission Santa Cruz de San Sabá, Mission Nuestra Señora del Espíritu Santo de Zuñiga, and the Zacatecan missions of East Texas all received their supplies via San Antonio. As early as 1722 the San Antonio missions shipped Indian-made adobe bricks to East Texas. In 1755 Mission San Sabá bought 300 head of cattle from mission San José, and in 1760 purchased 600 bushels of corn from mission San Francisco de la Espada. Corn and other agricul-

tural products were transported to Mission Espíritu Santo on a regular basis. During his visit to San Antonio in 1768, Fr. Solís reported a mule train that left Mission San José with a shipment of supplies for the newly established Spanish mission, Nuestra Señora del Refugio.⁷

For specialized tasks, such as blacksmithing and saddle-making, the Franciscans often commissioned soldiers from the nearby presidio or artisans from the local community. Payment for the work was generally in kind, the amount determined by the resident missionary.

Ranching soon developed as the most profitable economic activity of the San Antonio missions. Each mission had a ranch where the friars raised sheep, goats, and cattle to supply mission residents with meat, wool, milk, cheese, tallow, and leather. In time, livestock became the principal commodity of exchange on the northern frontier. By the 1760s mission herds numbered in the thousands, more than was needed for basic subsistence. For this reason, the Franciscans sold or traded the surplus livestock to neighboring presidios and civilian settlements. This economic exchange proved beneficial to the economy of South Texas in general as well as to the San Antonio missions in particular.

As the herds grew in size, it became obvious that the ranching trade should be extended beyond the local area. In response, emissaries from Bexar established contacts with French leaders in Louisiana, who expressed an interest in developing a trade with Spanish Texas. Lacking a sufficient supply of domesticated animals, military commanders in French Louisiana hoped to exchange animal pelts and European-made goods for needed supplies and livestock. Although Spanish law forbade direct trade with the colonies of foreign nations (the Crown even restricted trade between the Spanish provinces), the availability of quality European merchandise at a reasonable rate of exchange encouraged Spanish Texans to engage in the illicit trade.⁸

The cattle industry became a significant enterprise in Texas, and by the time Louisiana was ceded to Spain an inter-colonial trade network was already well established. While there is no evidence to document that the Franciscans engaged directly in this trafficking, it seems reasonable to assume that a most of the domesticated livestock was procured from ranches located in the vicinity of San Antonio. The missions operated the largest ranches in Texas at the time and it was common practice to sell or trade surplus livestock to private citizens. With France's cession of Louisiana to Spain in 1763, hope that interprovincial trade would become legalized increased. Louisiana, however, was assigned to the captaincy-general of Cuba; therefore, its jurisdiction remained separated from the viceroyalty of New Spain. As a consequence, the cattle trade remained illegal.⁹

While inhabitants of the Spanish provinces acknowledged that the cattle trade was illicit, Texas and Louisiana continued their commercial relationship. Eventually, some of the restrictions were removed, making the trade more open. In June 1779 Louisiana

Governor Bernardo de Gálvez, for whom the present Texas port city of Galveston was named, directed Francisco García to purchase 2,000 head of cattle from the San Antonio missions for exportation to the eastern province. Between 1779 and 1782 other requests followed during which time more than 9,000 head of cattle were rounded up on mission ranches from San Antonio de Béxar to La Bahía and trailed to Louisiana. The cattle trade increased to the point that Texas cattle were being driven to Louisiana at the rate of 15,000 to 20,000 annually.¹⁰

In addition to engaging in the Louisiana trade, the missions supplied cattle for drives southward into Nuevo León and Coahuila. In addition, the residents of Béxar were frequent visitors to the trade fairs in Saltillo, where they exchanged livestock, hides, and tallow for goods and supplies in demand at home.

As the mission ranches broadened their contacts and the expanded the trade network, the San Antonio missions enjoyed a period of unequalled economic prosperity. In the process, the missions assured the survival of new and struggling military and civilian communities along the Río Grande frontier. Their trade activities with Mexico and Louisiana, moreover, made the San Antonio missions an integral component of the entire regional economy. Their contribution to frontier commercial development not only stimulated growth, but also reinforced the interdependence between the various institutions of frontier society.

With the advent of the 19th century, however, changes adversely affected the mission economy. Political upheaval, which started in 1810 and culminated with Mexico's independence from Spain in 1821, caused serious disruptions in the colonial trade pattern. The mule supply trains from the interior of Mexico became sporadic and undependable. By 1820 the government-sponsored caravans ceased altogether as privately owned supply trains replaced them. The missions, meanwhile, were fully secularized enabling local merchants the opportunity to monopolize all commercial activity on the Texas frontier. With the departure of the last Franciscan friar from San Antonio in 1824, the direct contribution of the missions in the economic development of San Antonio effectively came to an end.¹¹

In the main, the economic contributions of the San Antonio missions were long-lasting. The trade network that the Franciscans endeavored to establish during the zenith of the mission era were preserved in large measure by the private merchants of Béxar, which continued in its capacity as an important trade center in Texas. Contacts with outside areas of the American Southwest in later decades served to strengthen the regional economy as a whole. As a result, the trade activities that enabled the San Antonio missions to survive as a Spanish colony on the northern frontier became a part of the Texas legacy in later centuries.

NOTES

1. Mardith Schuetz, The History and Archeology of Mission San Juan Capistrano: Documentation and Description of the Structures. Vol. I (Austin, 1968), 50; Fr. Jose Francisco Lopez, "The Texas Missions in 1785," in Ernest Wallace and David M. Vigness, eds., Documents of Texas History (Austin, 1963), 34.
2. Dolores y Viana account in Scheutz, History and Archeology of San Juan, 50; James E. Ivey, "Economic History of the Missions," unpublished essay (San Antonio Missions National Historical Park, San Antonio, 1982), 182.
3. Benedict Leutenegger, trans. and ed., Guidelines for a Texas Mission (San Antonio, 1976), 23-30.
4. For a complete description of the Spanish road system in Texas see J. W. Williams, Old Texas Trails (Austin, 1979).
5. Carlos Castañeda, Our Catholic Heritage in Texas, Vol. 3., The Mission Era: The Missions at Work, 1731-1761 (1939; reprint, New York, 1976), 90; Captain Toribio Urrutia to viceroy, December 17, 1740, The San José Papers, Pt. I, translations compiled and edited by Marion A. Habig, O.F.M., 80-81 (San Antonio, 1978); Castañeda, Our Catholic Heritage in Texas, Vol. 4, The Mission Era: The Passing of the Missions, 1762-1782, 14.
6. Sandra L. Myres, "The Spanish Cattle Kingdom in the Province of Texas," Texana IV (Fall 1966): 237; Captain Rafael Martínez Pacheco to viceroy, November 8, 1772, Habig, San Jose Papers, Pt. I, 185-86; Schuetz, History and Archeology of San Juan, Vol. I, 51; Benedict Leutenegger, ed. and trans., Letters and Memorials of the Father Presidente Fray Benito Fernández de Santa Ana, 1736-1754 (San Antonio, 1981), 38; López, "The Texas Missions in 1785," 34.
7. Schuetz, History and Archeology of an Juan, Vol. I, 51; Fr. Ildefonso Marmolejo, "Inventory and Report of Mission San José, October 4, 1755," Habig, San Jose Papers, Pt. 1, 127, 143; Castaneda, Our Catholic Heritage in Texas, Vol. 4, 25, 151; Fr. José M. Garza to Governor Muñoz, March 7, 1793, Habig, San José Papers, Pt. 2, 67-69.
8. On the extent of the mission ranches see Jack Jackson, Los Mesteños: Spanish Ranching in Texas, 1721-1821 (College Station, 1986) 35-49; Leutenegger, Guidelines for a Texas Mission, 25; Myres, The Ranch in Spanish Texas (El Paso, 1969), 43-48.
9. Odie B. Faulk, A Successful Failure: The Saga of Texas (Austin, 1965), 100-48; Robert Thonhoff, The Texas Connection (Austin, 1981), 1-18.

10. Faulk, A Successful Failure, 148-49; Thonhoff, The Texas Connection, 19-34.

11. Myres, The Ranch in Spanish Texas, 49; Ivey, "Economic History of the Missions," 188-89.

**MONCLOVA VIEJO:
A PRESIDIO OF THE LINE**

by

John Stockely

Pursuant to the recommendation of the Marquis de Rubí after a survey of the northern frontier of New Spain, the reglamento of 1772 was issued in the name of King Carlos III. This Reglamento required the establishment of what was hoped to be an impregnable cordon of seventeen presidios stretching from near the Gulf of Mexico to the Gulf of California. Briefly stated, it was the role of these presidios to protect settlers and missionaries already on the scene from hostile Indians as well as to facilitate the establishment of new towns and villages. At this time the northern frontier of New Spain was sparsely populated with the provinces of Coahuila and Texas having a combined Hispanized population of only about 7,000.

Some of the presidios called for in the Reglamento of 1772, such as those at San Antonio de Bexar, San Juan Bautista, and Janos, were already well established. Others, like San Saba and our subject, Monclova Viejo, were in existence, but were removed to new sites closer to the Río Grande. There is some confusion among scholars about the actual location of some of these presidios. Alfred Barnaby Thomas, for example, concluded that the Reglamento reestablished the presidio at Santa Rosa (present Ciudad Muzquíz, Coahuila) on the Río San Diego, where it was renamed Aguaverde. Max L. Moorhead, on the other hand, said that it was Presidio San Saba that the law relocated to the Rio San Diego. To add to the confusion, Sidney Brinckerhoff and Odie Faulk, argued that San Sabá was renamed Aguaverde, and that Presidio Santa Rosa was relocated somewhere between Aguaverde and Monclova Viejo, where no presidio had existed previously.

Monclova Viejo is somewhat unique in that it has remained relatively undamaged from pot hunters and vandals, whereas Aguaverde--despite so much disagreement about its location--has been virtually obliterated. This is not to say that Monclova Viejo is not in ruins. It is, but its present state results from more than two hundred years of abandonment to the elements, pot hunting, and some cannibalism of its masonry for building purposes. Fortunately, the Aguirre family, who currently own the site realize its importance and are determined to protect it. Furthermore, they are not opposed to an extensive investigation of the site. This author owes a great debt to Dr. Raymundo Aguirre, Ph.D., who acted as genial host and guide during my last visit to Monclova Viejo. Raymundo, who holds a degree in range management from the University of Arizona, has initiated conservation practices on the land around Monclova Viejo that will protect parts of the site, especially some of the pre-historic components that date as far back as 5,000 to 6,000 years.

The ruins of Presidio Monclova Viejo are situated on an

elevation about fifteen meters above and one hundred fifty meters north of the present course of the Río San Rodrigo. This spot is about three kilometers west of the confluence of the Río Grande, twenty kilometers upstream from present Piedras Negras, Coahuila. The slope from the south wall to the San Rodrigo is not steep, being only about thirty degrees. To the north, the land is level for about one kilometer, then it slopes gently toward the Arroyo Blanco, an intermittent stream that flows into the San Rodrigo about one kilometer east of the site. The San Rodrigo is a perennial spring-fed stream that rises in the Sierras Del Burro about one hundred kilometers west of the site. Flow varies with the season and weather but always affords clear, clean water with good sized bass and catfish.

In modern times the ranch land of northeastern Mexico was drastically overgrazed, and it is only in the past few years that good land management practices have begun to pay off. Improved grass cover has resulted in the reappearance of wildlife, such as white-tailed deer, javelina, and quail. Reports of early explorers indicated that the terrain was much more open with significant stands of brush and trees found only along the streams. Today, the hills and flats are covered with a variety of bushes: cenizo, black-brush, guajillo, guayacan, and mesquite. Along the river are found healthy stands of sycamore, fresno, cottonwood, and live oak. As late as the 1950s, large cypress trees grew within sight of the presidio, but died during a severe drought later in the decade. Other vegetation common to the area includes numerous varieties of cacti, such as prickly pear, petaya, tasajillo, and yucca.

Max Moorhead and other scholars have made much of the fact that the designs of the "presidios on the line" were centuries behind comparable European fortifications from the standpoint of military engineering. Yet, to stand atop its masonry walls and survey the layout of Presidio Monclova Viejo, with the strategically placed bastions, one can appreciate the skill--if not the artistry--of those who labored under extreme conditions and danger to build the ancient fortress. In fact, the designs of the presidios, which were all somewhat distinct because of their adaptation to local terrain and the availability of construction materials, served the Spanish well; no presidio ever fell to hostile action.

Presidio Monclova Viejo is laid out in a one hundred thirty-two meter square. Large diamond-shaped bastions are located on the northwest and the southwest corners. Allowing for musket coverage from all points on these two positions, the bastions were the only parts of the presidio built of limestone. Little of this fabric is left, however, because lime burners, whose kilns operated in the vicinity of the fortress as late as twenty years ago, cannibalized most of the limestone. The main walls were built of shaped sandstone and an aggregate of pebbles naturally cemented with caliche. Individually, neither of these substances appear durable and they crumble easily in one's hand. Combined, these materials helped to shape walls that have retain-

ed their structural integrity for more than 200 years.

More remarkable is the fact that these stones are bonded by a mortar made of plain pasture mud, which is still doing its job. The walls are about two and one-half to three meters high, laid up in three courses. The outside courses are shaped stone with a core of rubble, measuring a few centimeters less than one meter thick and topped with equally wide capstones. Gates approximately seven meters wide are located midway along the north and south walls. As mentioned, the stones are bonded with a mud mortar. The fact that the presidio was built atop a large concentration of hearth sites dating to the Archaic period, and that there is an occupied ranch house less than three hundred yards from the site, indicate that people of different cultures considered the area around Presidio Monclova Viejo a suitable place to live.

Any substantial interior buildings appear to have been erected exclusively along the east wall. The structures seem to have been built of adobe bricks that have long since "melted" into mounds, some of which are two meters above ground level in height. Enough of these walls survive to enable us to determine that some of the buildings were well constructed of two courses of adobe bound with a grayish-colored mortar. A circular depression in the northeast quadrant may represent either a cistern or a well. The site is littered with household refuse-- typical of most 18th century Spanish Colonial sites--containing majolica pottery shards, bits of iron, and burned animal bones. The heaviest concentration of this refuse is in the northeast bastion.

The Reglamento of 1772 specified that the presidial garrison consist of a captain, a lieutenant, an ensign, a chaplain, a sergeant, two corporals, forty privates, and ten Indian scouts. The Reglamento also ordered each soldier to maintain six serviceable horses, one colt, and a mule. This meant that a normal presidial contingent required forage for nearly three hundred animals. In this part of the country, even in the best weather conditions, twelve to fifteen acres of range are needed to support a single animal; therefore, such a sizeable remuda would have demanded that the garrison spend a great deal of its time guarding the herds.

The principal assignment of Monclova Viejo was to protect the mission inhabitants and the villagers of San Fernando de Austria (present Zaragoza, Coahuila), located a days ride southwest of the presidio. Nearby were several shallow crossings on the Río Grande that Comanches, and Lipan and Mescalero Apaches favored in their raids as far south as present Saltillo. To date, there is no documented evidence the Indians ever attacked Monclova Viejo, but there are numerous accounts of the soldiers who were stationed there engaging the enemy. That the presidio itself was never attacked does not mean that neighboring ranches and settlers escaped depredations; the lives of all residents of the Río Grande frontier were in jeopardy.

The Reglamento made provisions for the soldier's families

whom they were encouraged to bring with them. It would seem that the women of the presidios must have been a cut or two above the camp followers of other armies in that the Reglamento instructed the chaplain to prevent any lewd behavior or cohabitation. Rudyard Kipling, writing about the soldier's life in the British Army once said: "Men who live in barracks don't grow into plaster saints." We can assume that the presidial garrisons had their share of rogues and scoundrels, and that not all the women were pure and chaste. However, they were all--men, women, and children--pioneers in the truest sense. They deserve better treatment from chroniclers and historians. If any person now living can trace his or her ancestry to these hardy souls, they have every right to be proud.

There is some confusion as to when Monclova Viejo was abandoned. We know that Inspector General Teodoro de Croix recommended the abandonment of Monclova Viejo and Aguaverde in 1781. Later sources, however, report activity near a place referred to as "Monclova Viejo" well into the nineteenth century. Both Kickapoo and Seminole Indians occupied land in this area in 1850, and documents pertaining to the land grant refer to the Colonia Militar de Monclova Viejo. Colonel Randall MacKenzie reported seeing the "lights of Monclova" to the south of Remolino, where he led his famous raid in 1873. These and other citations regarding Monclova Viejo may be referring to the nearby towns of San Isidro and El Moral, located about one kilometer apart on the banks of the Rio Grande. Between the two towns is a hill known as "loma del Moral." It is near this hill that Mexican historian Vito Alessio Robles noted in his book, Coahuila y Texas en la Epoca Colonial, the location of a military garrison called the Colonia Militar de Monclova Viejo. With regards the original site, however, this author has found no artifacts that do not conform to the eighteenth century, the period when Monclova Viejo was a "presidio of the line."

The ruins of Monclova Viejo deserve in-depth archeological and archival research. Hopefully, trained archeologists, using up-to-date instruments, will map the site in the near future. With the appropriate permission of the Mexican government, test excavations would perhaps reveal the location of the soldier's jacales, thus allowing us a glimpse into their daily life. Any archeological investigation, however, should be undertaken with only a few highly trained professionals who are willing to use discretion and maintain a low profile. Furthermore, the complexities of Mexican and international law must be fully understood as well as respected before such an undertaking. Although the site is protected behind two locked gates, "treasure hunters" are determined in their pursuits. This statement was evident at Mission San Juan Bautista near present Guerrero, Coahuila, where treasure seekers bulldozed the site. It was the author's sad duty to report the damage to the presidio to the Mexican government and the Center for Archaeological Research in San Antonio. Incidents such as this should never happen again.

THE FORGOTTEN FORTRESS:
PRESIDIO LA BAHIA

by

John Collins

When first contacted about the possibility of a presentation at the annual Mission Research Conference, I had some trepidation. First, my work involves a Spanish Colonial military site, not a mission. Second, this year's theme is partly focused on the native peoples of the Spanish Colonial mission period. I am a Comanche tribal member. We were never Hispanicized or missionized; therefore, both my work and my background seem to be contrapuntal to the current theme of the conference.

With only fifteen minutes to present a capsulized version of the history of Presidio La Bahía, I must be succinct but not so much as to diminish the important events surrounding the history of the Spanish fortress. To begin, I must point out that the presidio is a European fortification; therefore, La Bahía is not a mission. Furthermore, La Bahía never served as a mission, regardless of the fact that the popular name used to describe the historic site in recent years has been "Mission" La Bahía. The word "presidio" is taken from the Latin "praesidium," meaning "a place to garrison." Spain erected castillos, fortalezas, fuertes, and presidios as military institutions in the Western Hemisphere.

Presidio La Bahía acted as a base of military operations for a three-hundred-square-mile area of the Provincia de las Tejas. After the withdrawal of the French threat in Louisiana in 1763, Spain ordered the realignment of defensive fortifications that evolved into a cordon of presidios extending from La Bahía, the eastern anchor, to the Altar valley in Sonora, Mexico, on the west.

Two major Reglamentos, promulgated after lengthy inspections of the borderlands of New Spain in 1729 and 1772, effectively drew the "imaginary line" that represented Spanish efforts to colonize, Christianize, and Europeanize among the "Indios Nortenos." This alignment of European defense fortifications beginning near the Gulf of Mexico, proved to be among the last vestiges of the Spanish Colonial military presence in what is today the American Southwest.

For a military perspective, let me point out that La Bahía witnessed armed conflict more than a century before the celebrated "Battle of the Alamo" in 1836. In fact, Presidio La Bahía is the oldest fort in the continental United States west of the Mississippi River.

La Bahía is also the only fortification in North America to have participated in six separate national revolutions or wars of independence. In this respect, the better known military sites of Quebec, Canada, Fort Ticonderoga, New York, Boston, Massachusetts, or even Castillo de San Marcos in St. Augustine, Florida--two hundred years older than La Bahía--have not experienced the

turmoil that this presidio has confronted.

One need only consult Dr. Elizabeth John's masterful work, Storms Brewed in Other Men's Worlds, to document the involvement of La Bahia regarding Spanish-Indian relations on the Río Grande frontier. The military garrison effectively protected the civil settlement of La Bahía, and the three nearby missions, Rosario, Refugio, and Espíritu Santo.

My Comanche ancestors campaigned as far south as La Bahía and periodically called upon the military settlement for tribute. Spanish refusal to comply, resulted in forceful methods of exacting the tribute the Indians believed was equitable for peaceful Spanish existence in the Comanchería. Other native peoples of the Province of Texas became involved in the patriotic defense of their ancestral homelands against Spanish intrusion.

The military jurisdiction of Presidio La Bahía encompassed three hundred square miles of the eastern portion of the province of Texas and defense of the Gulf Coast. This was a staggering responsibility for a sparsely garrisoned, poorly equipped frontier institution isolated from the viceroyalty of New Spain by extreme distances.

During the years of the American revolution against England, the Interior Provinces and Spanish Louisiana were called upon to assist the American colonists. Thus the presence of Presidio La Bahia gives the present Texas community of Goliad the distinction of being one of the only settlements west of the Mississippi River to have actively participated in the American Revolution. The provincial governor of Spanish Louisiana at the time of the American Revolution, Don Bernardo de Gálvez, with the assistance of a military contingent from Presidio La Bahía, defeated the British at Baton Rouge and Manchac, Louisiana, Natchez, Mississippi, Mobile, Alabama, and finally at the Battle of Pensacola in Florida.

As the Spanish Colonial period in Texas drew to conclusion in the early decades of the nineteenth century, Fr. Miguel Hidalgo y Castillo announced in 1810 his "Grito de Dolores," which ushered in an era of internecine revolt. In response, the San Antonio rebel, Juan Bautista de las Casas, brought the war for Mexican independence to La Bahía. During this tumultuous period, rebels attempted on no less than four occasions to wrest Texas away from the Spanish Crown.

The most notable of these insurrections was the Gutiérrez-Magee Expedition of 1812, which left an indelible military legacy at La Bahía. In that year, the presidio was the scene of what was to become the longest siege in American military history. The incident began with the fall of La Bahía to the Spanish and American filibusters on November 7, 1812. For 104 days afterward, a bloody conflict consumed the ancient Spanish fortress before Royalist forces, after two unsuccessful attempts to oust the rebels, retreated to San Antonio on February 19, 1813. In later years, Presidio La Bahía, again the military objective of American filibusters under the command of Dr. James Long, fell to the enemy on the eve of Mexico's independence from Spain in 1821.

This brings us to the focal point of my presentation. Because this year marks the sesquicentennial of Texas' independence from the mother country, Goliad is hardly sharing the spotlight with other sites made famous by the Texas Revolution. Still, Goliad as a pivotal point in the Texas Revolution is unrivaled militarily. In fact, the ancient Spanish fortress had always been considered strategically important to Texas.

Goliad was the scene of the first offensive action of the Texas Revolution. On October 2, 1835, the insurrection against the military dictatorship of Antonio López de Santa Anna began near Gonzales. The rebellion, however, was purely a defensive reaction to the offensive maneuvers of the Centralist Army, ordered to retrieve a cannon in possession of the Gonzales colonists.

On October 9, 1835, a band of Texas colonists from Brazoria, Navidad, Victoria, and Refugio marched into the sleepy military town of Goliad and captured the Mexican fortress. Capt. George Collinworth and Benjamin Rush Milam, recently escaped from a Matamoros prison, led the first offensive action of the Texas Revolution.

In November of the same year, the Texians campaigned along the Nueces River, where they captured Fort Lipantitlan (near San Patricio) from the Centralists. At the time, the Texians hailed the event as a major victory because it severed the Mexican Army's last line of communication between San Antonio and Matamoros.

Capt. Philip Dimmitt assumed command of the presidio at Goliad shortly after its occupation in October 1835. Under his able leadership, a number of significant events occurred. First, it was Dimmitt who personally designed the Federalist flag of 1824. Dimmitt, too, hosted the ousted administration of the last constitutional government of Coahuila-Texas in November 1835 including its fugitive governor, Agustín Viesca.

More important, the Texians signed the first Declaration of Texas Independence from Mexico, a document that pre-dated by some seventy-two days the more famous document penned at the Washington-on-the-Brazos Convention, on December 20, 1835. Again, Captain Dimmitt designed a second flag, known as the first flag of Texas Independence, which he hoisted above the quadrangle.

But Goliad's fame--or perhaps more correctly, what Goliad has been forgotten for--is derived from what Texas historians have called the "Goliad Massacre." On Palm Sunday, March 27, 1836, three weeks to the day after the fall of the Alamo, General Santa Anna ordered the execution of the entire rebel garrison under the command of Col. James Walker Fannin.

In fact, the most significant loss of life during the Texas Revolution was at Goliad. More than twice the number of men died at Goliad than at the Alamo or San Jacinto combined. That these men died for the same cause of Texas independence as did those at the Alamo and San Jacinto has been forgotten. These heroes now rest silently, their contributions obscured in the shadow of the more celebrated events of the Texas Revolution.

Clearly, an in-depth examination of the tragic events that took place at Goliad in the spring of 1836 is warranted if Americans are ever to gain broader insight and a greater appreciation for Goliad's place in Texas history.

THE BATTLE OF MEDINA
AUGUST 18, 1813

by

Robert H. Thonhoff

In the vernacular of my friend, Henry Wolff, Jr., journalist for the Victoria, Texas, Advocate, "Texas has lost a battlefield out there somewhere, and Ted Schwarz and Bob Thonhoff think they've found it."

Not only has a battlefield been lost and forgotten out there somewhere, but the same can almost be said for one of the flags of Texas--the Green Flag. The Green Flag of liberty, which floated over the first Republic of Texas from April 6 to August 18, 1813, vanished so completely from the Texas scene that it is not even counted today as one of the flags that waved over Texas.

The years 1987 and 1988 will mark the 175th anniversary of the Gutiérrez-Magee filibuster expedition into Texas. That invasion crossed into Spanish Texas on August 7, 1812, and it ended with one of the most disastrous battles ever fought in America: The Battle of Medina on August 18, 1813. During this period, as revolution raged in Mexico, the United States was engaged in war with England, and Napoleon was on the rampage in Europe. Texas, meanwhile, was caught up "in the middle of things."

The Battle of Medina was the biggest and bloodiest battle ever fought in Texas. Using those two descriptive adjectives, it may well have been the "biggest" and "bloodiest" battle ever to take place west of the Mississippi River in what is now the United States of America.

In marking the eighty-seventh anniversary of that fight, an article in the August 19, 1900, edition of The Galveston Daily News (only about three weeks before the hurricane that devastated Galveston) stated:

It was the bloodiest battle ever fought in Texas, but ninety Americans escaping death More lives were lost than in all the battles and sieges of the war of the second Republic [of Texas] on both sides put together.

This grim encounter, which eclipsed the Alamo, Goliad, and San Jacinto together in its death toll, was the battle of el encinal de Medina, fought August 18, 1813, some ten to twelve miles below the Medina River in present northern Atascosa County.

The so-called Battle of Medina is little remembered, its battleground forgotten, its dead unknown, and its survivors unhonored. Yet, the outcome of this grisly fight influenced the destinies of no less than five sovereign nations: Mexico, Spain, France, England, and the United States.

No historical event of the American Southwest, however, has suffered more distortion of fact than has the Battle of Medina. Misnamed, misplaced, and misrepresented for far too long, the so-

called Battle of Medina needs to be reexamined and placed into proper historical perspective.

In this report, I shall be pursuing information found in the book entitled: Forgotten Battlefield of the First Texas Revolution: The Battle of Medina, August 18, 1813 (Austin, 1985). Ted Schwarz is listed as the author and I am the editor and annotator.

First, I would like to relate how I became involved with this book. Ted Schwarz was my good friend and history colleague. He would come visit me at my home in Fashing, Texas--not many people have even heard of, much less seen, Fashing, Texas, which, by the way, is in eastern Atascosa County. This was back in the 1970s, and we had a number of occasions after that time to visit and talk about the so-called "Battle of Medina." We both agreed that this epochal battle occurred in present northern Atascosa County and not on the west bank of the Medina River in Bexar County as is generally acknowledged.

Ted and I continued to see each other at the annual meetings of the Texas Historical Association until 1977. He had taken a special interest in my book with Robert S. Weddle entitled: Drama & Conflict: The Texas Saga of 1776 (Austin, 1976). He especially liked the information on the Rancho de Atascoso, which belonged to Mission San Jose, and its descriptions of the lower Camino Real and the Laredo Road. I missed seeing Ted and his dear wife, Illene, for the next couple of years. At the 1980 meeting I was saddened to learn that Ted had died on March 17, 1977, and that Illene had also died exactly one year later. Ted had a manuscript tentatively entitled "The Guns of Medina," which was the product of over a half century of interest and research. Unfortunately, he did not live to see it published.

Through our connections with the Texas State Historical Association, Ted's stepson, Captain Edward L. Kimbrell, then living in Seattle, Washington, learned of me, my friendship with Ted, my interest in his book, and my knowledge of the subject. Captain Kimbrell, a retired Alaskan ship captain, contacted me and asked me if I would consider guiding Ted's manuscript to publication. After a thorough study of the manuscript and research materials, and several on-site inspections of the battlefield area--armed with maps and diary accounts that Ted didn't have--I agreed to edit and annotate his work and to seek a publisher.

Fortunately, Ed Eakin of Eakin Press agreed to publish the book. I gave the book its current title, and introduced it at an autograph party at Center Pharmacy in Pleasanton, Texas, on January 4, 1986. Since that time, I am pleased to say that the book has been well received. It has had some very favorable reviews, and it won the Presidio La Bahia Award for 1986.

Essentially, the book relates the story of the Gutiérrez-Magee filibuster expedition into Texas in the years 1812-1813, a generally forgotten period of Texas history. It describes the revolutionary stirrings in Mexico, beginning with Padre Hidalgo's "Grito de Dolores," on September 16, 1810. Further, it discusses

the grandiose schemes of Napoleon, and the ambitions of the United States government under President James Madison and Secretary of State James Monroe. It also describes the so-called Neutral Ground, which separated New Spain and the United States, where restless men along the border eagerly grasped the opportunity for adventure and profit under the guise of an American-provoked filibuster expedition into Texas.

In addition, it was an explosive background for the not-so-clandestine efforts of both Napoleonic and American agents to give direction to the revolutionary struggle that spread from central Mexico to the Louisiana border. It was the setting for the short-lived Casas uprising in San Fernando on January 22, 1811. Also, it marked the arrival of Jose Bernardo Maximiliano Gutiérrez de Lara on the Louisiana-Texas frontier. It was a time for the betrayal of the resolute Hidalgo at the Wells of Bejón and his subsequent execution in Chihuahua. Finally, it was the setting for the Gutiérrez-Magee filibuster expedition from its organization in the Neutral Ground in the summer of 1812 to its crushing defeat by royalist forces in el encinal de Medina on August 18, 1813.

By June 1812 Natchitoches was agog with speculative talk about world events. Diplomatic intrigue and duplicity was rampant. Aided and abetted by American agents, Gutiérrez joined his political talents with the military experience of a West Point graduate, Lieutenant Augustus Magee, and on August 7 advanced a small party of their Republican Army of the North across the Sabine River into Texas. By August 12 they had taken Nacogdoches.

On September 13 the Republican Army of the North--numbering about 300 Americans and nearly 100 Mexicans and Tejanos--departed Nacogdoches for the Villa de Trinidad de Salcedo, where they planned to wait until cooler weather before advancing any farther. By October Trinidad, too, was in their possession, and the liberty army enlarged to about 600.

On October 18 the army left Trinidad and eventually turned toward La Bahía. As it approached the citadel there on November 7 about 200 royalists surrendered on first summons, many of them joining the ranks of the Republican Army. In the meantime, Spanish governors Manuel Maria de Salcedo of Texas and Simón de Herrera of Nuevo León arrived at Presidio La Bahía with a large royalist force to begin a four-month long siege of the fortress. (It is my understanding that this is the longest siege ever to take place in what is now the United States of America). After a number of skirmishes and one furious battle, the Royalist Army broke camp and retreated toward Béxar on February 19.

Colonel Augustus Magee did not live to savor the victory at La Bahía, for he died on February 8. With Magee dead, command of the troops fell to Samuel Kemper, who led the Republican Army of about 900 men toward Béxar.

At about eleven o'clock, on the morning of March 29 the republicans were marching on the lower or mission road, which is located on the east side of Salado Creek about five leagues south

of Béxar. They were expecting to find food and take up quarters for the night at Espada mission, when their flankers discovered an enemy ambush on the upper road. The combined forces of governors Salcedo and Herrera, consisting of some 1,200 men and six cannon, staged the ambush. A brief but bloody battle ensued. The result was a complete rout of the royalists and the capture of most of their arms, ammunition, artillery, and about 1,500 head of horses and mules. Referred to as the Battle of Salado in contemporary accounts, this encounter of March 29, 1813, is more commonly known as the Battle of Rosillo--in order to distinguish it from the second Battle of Salado of 1842.

The visitors spent the night at Espada mission, about eight miles down the river from San Antonio, and the next day they advanced five miles to take quarters at Mission Concepción.

On April 1 Kemper marched his troops in battle formation into San Antonio. As the rebels approached, Governor Salcedo sent out three envoys carrying a flag of truce. After several proposals, Salcedo and Herrera surrendered unconditionally. On the evening of April 3 Salcedo, Herrera, and twelve other prisoners were escorted out of Bexar under a guard of sixty mounted men, only to be brutally murdered near the Rosillo battle site. The murders of Salcedo and Herrera removed the last vestiges of Spanish rule from the Province of Texas, and the rebel government was unopposed from the Sabine to the Río Grande.

In San Fernando de Béxar, a declaration of independence, "shaking off the yoke of European domination," was adopted on April 6, 1813--the province assuming the name of the State of Texas for the first time. A green flag became its official banner. The declaration provided for the formation of a provisional government and a constitution. Bernardo Gutiérrez became president of the Junta de Gobierno.

The new Texas republic had gained a new government, but at a price that would eventually destroy it. Disgusted with the murders of the Spanish officers and grievously disappointed at having been excluded from the new government, Kemper and several other American officers took furloughs on April 20 to return to Natchitoches. A great many seasoned volunteers also went home, only to be replaced by adventurous recruits who were streaming into Béxar. With the American leaders gone, discipline lapsed. Still, the army's strength shot up to over 1,500 men, mostly new recruits, but discord was rampant.

While Gutiérrez was busy bringing order to his new Republican State, Jose Álvarez de Toledo appeared on the Texas scene with an entourage of ten men and a printing press used to publish the Gaceta de Texas, the first newspaper in Texas. With propaganda fueled by international intrigue and duplicity (similar to the present Iran-Contra affair), it would not be long before "General" Toledo would depose Gutiérrez as the leader of the Republicans.

Spain struck back, however. In one bold stroke, the "weak monument of Texas independence" was brought down. Marching up from Mexico the newly-appointed Commandant-General of the Eastern

Interior Provinces, Don Joaquin de Arredondo, was ordained to snatch Texas from nascent republicanism--but not before his own forces made some ill-timed moves. Meanwhile, intrigue divided the leadership, and personal jealousy destroyed the military clout of the Republican Army.

General Arredondo had ordered Lieutenant Colonel Ygnacio Elizondo with about 1,500 men to proceed to San Antonio to observe the enemy but not to engage them in battle. Elizondo disobeyed his orders and met the republican forces on Alazan Creek, about a half league northwest of Bexar. On the morning of June 20, 1813, about one thousand republicans under Major Henry Perry met and defeated Elizondo's forces in a pitched battle known as the Battle of Alazan. Twenty-nine republicans were killed, and the royalist losses were estimated to be 350 killed with about 130 prisoners taken, of whom 52 were wounded.

Meanwhile, General Arredondo and his Royalist Army continued their march northward from Nuevo Santander to crush the rebellion. Elizondo was ordered to join him on the Laredo Road near the Nueces River.

While all this was happening, "General" Toledo arrived in San Antonio on August 1, 1813. United States agent William Shaler had prepared the way for Toledo to succeed Gutiérrez, who was removed from command, and on August 6 Gutiérrez left with his family for Natchitoches.

Rancor ran deep among the Tejano troops of the Republican Army. In their view Toledo was a foreigner and a traitor--a gauchupin who deserved no obedience. The instigator of this disaffection was Colonel Miguel Menchaca, scion of one of the oldest and most prominent families of Texas. But time was short. Scouts had reported that Arredondo was on his way along the Laredo Road toward San Antonio.

Toledo tried to ameliorate internal relations and reorganize the Republican Army, which now numbered about 1,300 men. Included were some 400 Americans, approximately 800 Mexicans and Tejanos, and 100 Indians, mostly Lipan Apaches.

Arredondo's forces numbered 1,830 men; the stage was set for a clash. Toledo decided to march southward to spare San Antonio from the inevitability of battle.

On August 13 the Republican Army of the North marched out of San Antonio. The Washington Regiment of American Volunteers marched at the head of the column, followed by 500 Mexican infantrymen, mostly prisoners and deserters from the enemy ranks, including some captives taken in the Alazan fight. The munitions train, escorted by a section of artillery, fell behind the Madison Regiment, followed by about 300 mounted civilians under Colonel Menchaca, and the Indian allies bringing up the rear. They moved out from San Antonio, "cheered with the sound of martial music and salutations of the ladies."

On August 18, 1813, the two opposing forces clashed in the biggest and bloodiest battle ever fought on Texas soil. Arredondo's Royalist Army was the victor; Toledo's Republican Army was vanquished. With gruesome finality, this battle ended the first

war of independence in Texas, and the Green Flag of liberty, which floated over the first Republic of Texas from April 6 to August 18, 1813, vanished completely from Texas history.

Neither time nor space permit me to go into the details of the Battle of Medina. I invite you to read my book for a detailed account of the battle; however, I would like to review some of its highlights.

Toledo knew that Arredondo was on the Laredo Road, and he selected a spot about five miles south of the Medina River, near Gallinas Creek for an ambush. Arredondo, suspicious of an ambush, crossed the Laredo Road over to the nearby lower portion of the Camino Real where he camped about 1-1/2 leagues north of the Atascosa River on the night of August 17. Arredondo did not know the whereabouts of the republicans, so he sent out some scouts and cavalry with strict orders not to engage the enemy, rather to fall back in a retreat along the "camino que cortaba" (shortcut) between the Laredo Road and the lower Camino Real, only a few miles apart in this sandy, forested region known as el encinal de Medina.

At mid-morning, a lone rider, Alférez Francisco López happened upon the deployed republicans. Some nervous soldiers fired upon López, missing him, but giving away their location. López galloped back to the royalist encampment. Meanwhile, a detachment of royalist cavalry appeared on the scene. At this point, the republicans disobeyed their orders, broke ranks, and pursued the cavalry, which had retreated along the shortcut route.

Arredondo's main force learned of the action and prepared their own reception for the republicans. The General hurriedly deployed his forces along a ridge that skirted the south bank of Galvan Creek, where his troops cut brush and constructed a temporary breastworks.

On this very hot day in August, Toledo's forces pursued Arredondo's cavalry--thinking it was his main army--for several hours through very deep sand and thick oak. The horses and mules gave out for want of water, and the men, also without water, had to push and pull the mounted cannon through the difficult sand.

When the republican line crossed the Galvan, just about forty steps from Arredondo's concealed position on top of the ridge, the battle ensued. Arredondo trained his cannon on the enemy flanks, he sent in the cavalry while the infantry held the line. At about three in the afternoon, the republicans broke ranks and scattered for their lives. Arredondo's troops pursued after them and a dreadful slaughter resulted. More than half of those who did not fall in battle fell into retreat. Many were cut and quartered and there remains hung in the trees. Pursuit of the rebels continued to San Antonio and even as far as Nacogdoches. Of the ninety Americans that escaped, the names of only about twenty are known. Upwards of 800 rebels were killed on the main battlefield, their bones left to bleach on the hot sand until they were eventually gathered and interred in a common grave in 1822. Arredondo's losses totaled 55 killed, 178 wounded, and two missing. After the battle, Arredondo had his men

gather up all articles of use.

Just as the War with Mexico (1846-1848) was a training ground for many men who became military leaders during the Civil War, so was this Medina battleground a training experience for many of the men who fought in the Texas Revolution twenty-three years later. Among those who received some of their basic training--especially in the disposition of prisoners--was a young lieutenant named Antonio López de Santa Anna.

So much for the battle. The main thrust of my book is to pinpoint the location of the battle, which up to this point has been generally lost and forgotten.

History, Napoleon once said, is a fable agreed upon. Nothing better illustrates this axiom than the collective opinion that has evolved around the location of the Medina battleground. Most contemporary historians have given the impression that the engagement took place on the Medina River. The Handbook of Texas--that bible of information--lists it as "The Battle of the Medina River."

A more recent example about which I speak can be found in this month's issue of Texas Highways magazine (August 1987), which also calls the event "the battle of the Medina River," where 1,400 republican soldiers "fought 17 hours on the west bank of the Medina."

The most profound inference that a researcher might make from contemporary Spanish and other documents is that nowhere is there any mention of the Medina River as the place of battle.

Mattie Austin Hatcher, an eager young historian, seems to have been the one who led off in the propagation of the erroneous assumption that the battle had been fought on the Medina River. In her 1907 translation of Arredondo's report, she took translator's license and rendered the phrase "en los campos de Medina" to mean "in the country near the Medina," or "on the Medina." Furthermore, she translated as "on the Medina" such unrelated phrases as "en el arenal de Medina" and "en el encinal de Medina." I am not here to fault Dr. Hatcher, whose works I appreciate; rather, I think that one of the functions of history is to prove, improve, or disprove what has been written. In her youthful zeal to write her doctoral dissertation, she simply was unaware of the existence of the great blackjack oak forest that was commonly referred to a century ago as el encinal de Medina. Nor did she seem to have more than a preliminary understanding of the terrain below the Medina River; therefore, she focused upon the only landmark familiar to her--the Medina River. In effect, she contorted her translation to conform to the limited topography that she knew.

The idea that the Medina battleground was near the river is a twentieth century phenomenon. Throughout the nineteenth century, the battle took place in the encinal and was not associated with the river.

I shall cite several cases in point, the first by William McLane, a survivor of the battle who later wrote about it. He described the march out of San Antonio, the encampment at a small

stream four or five miles southwest of the Medina River, the deployment of troops, Toledo's troubles, the initial engagement with the enemy, and the pursuit after them for about four miles through heavy post oak and sand under an extremely hot Texas sun.

The maps of Stephen F. Austin, especially the one drawn in 1822, show that Toledo met his defeat midway between the Medina and the Atascosa Rivers.

Naturalist Jean Louis Berlandier passed by the Medina battleground during his journey through Texas in 1828. He tells about arriving at the field of the Battle of Medina in a forest of oaks about four leagues from a previous campsite near the Atascosa River. He vividly describes the clash between the two armies and the bloodbath that followed in the encinal.

Two interesting pieces of corroborative information have come to me since the publication of my book. An archivist sent me a document dated November 23, 1836, by one Martin Allen who had petitioned for a league of land for his service in the Gutiérrez-Magee expedition. Allen mentioned that he lost his father, brother, and a nephew "at the battle of the Madeena [sic] 18 miles W. of San Antonio." Again, this would place the battle site in northern Atascosa County.

Another piece of evidence is an article about Atascosa County written by Thomas R. Brite and found in the Texas Almanac of 1861. The author, an early settler of Atascosa County said:

It was in the Northern part of this county where the battle was fought between Generals Arredondo and Toledo, in August, I think, 1813, which resulted in the defeat of the latter, who commanded the Mexican forces; the former commanded the Spanish troops.

Interestingly, this same article appeared in the May 6, 1873, issue of The Western Stock Journal, published in Pleasanton, Texas.

Yes, Texas has lost a battlefield out there somewhere, and Ted Schwarz and I think we have found it. The geographical, topographical, cartographical, and historical records all indicate that the so-called "Battle of Medina"--more correctly la batalla del encinal de Medina (the Battle of the Encinal of Medina)--was fought near Galvan Creek about four miles northwest of Leming, Texas, in present Atascosa County. It was not fought on the Medina River some twelve miles distant in Bexar County.

As the proof of the pudding is in the eating, so the proof of this statement will be in the finding of the "hard evidence" of the battlefield. I have spent many a weekend with friends with metal detectors probing the deep blackjack sand of the area. Spanish diarists called it terra arenosa summate (enormously deep sand), which ranges in depth from a few feet to twenty or thirty feet. Local residents call it "sugar sand." This deep sand, I believe, has stymied my search for cannonballs and musketballs, which are bound to be out there by the wheelbarrow full. Such solid objects, longtime residents of the area advise me, tend to gravitate downward and finally come to rest on the clay bottom.

After lying in the "sugar sand" for nearly 175 years, these battlefield artifacts have had plenty of time to gravitate downward. Our metal detectors have been able to reach down only sixteen to eighteen inches at most. Something is needed that can detect at least eight to ten feet deep.

