

Isleta Aboriginal Lands

Peter Whiteley, Elizabeth Brandt,

Henry Walt and Michael Adler

1999

Preamble

The purpose of this report is to summarize the results of research to date into Isleta's aboriginal use, occupancy, and control of lands constituting its aboriginal territory. Research is ongoing as of the present and the current document does not purport to be an exhaustive account of the cultural, historical, and archaeological data pertaining to Isleta's Aboriginal Area.

Research Methodology

Research into Isleta pueblo's aboriginal territory was conducted by several scholars: Dr. Elizabeth Brandt, Dr. Henry Walt, Dr. Michael Adler, and Dr. Peter Whiteley. Research covered several aspects of Isleta's aboriginal land use through successive time periods: prehistoric, historic, and the "ethnographic present" (that period most indicatively associated with Isleta traditional culture as it has been described by anthropologists, i.e., approximately the 1850's to the present).

The prehistory of the Isleta aboriginal area was an important background to establish the depth and breadth of Isleta's historic patterns of land use and occupancy, but was not an overriding focus of the research. No excavations or formal surveys were conducted per se: a great deal of work by archaeologists previously (notably including Dr. Walt, whose archaeological study of the "Rio Abajo" area is a standard source in the field) was determined to be a largely adequate resource to show the long-term continuity of Isletan use of its aboriginal area. Dr. Adler, a specialist in the archaeology of the Southwest, who has also worked extensively at the Northern Tiwa Pueblo of Picuris, surveyed the archaeological literature and other sources, including personal contacts with works in progress by other archaeologists with expertise in the area. Dr Adler provided the majority of the archaeological analysis of the pertinent archaeological record, and also supervised the mapping of the area. Dr. Walt consulted on this aspect of the research, but brought his existing knowledge to bear principally upon the ethnographic research at the Pueblo and at archives containing ethnographic records.

Drs. Brandt and Walt jointly and separately conducted the ethnographic research with thirteen elders from Isleta identified by the Pueblo Governor and Lieutenant Governor as especially knowledgeable, between May 1996 and the present. Elders

participated in field trips with Drs. Brandt and Walt to numerous sites within the Isleta aboriginal area. Elders were interviewed on site, and in the pueblo as well. Questions were usually asked in English in which all the elders are fluent. Dr. Brandt is currently the pre-eminent authority on Southern Tiwa linguistics and ethnology, and clarified some matters which elders discussed together in Southern Tiwa. Dr. Walt conducted interviews during field trips and in the pueblo in English. Field trips ranged from a single day to several days. Some of the more important field trips included the following sites: the villages in the Salinas Basin (Pueblo Blanco, Pueblo Colorado, Abo, Gran Quivira); Three Rivers; the Capitan North Rock Art Site; Carlsbad Caverns; Pottery Mound; the Hummingbird Site; Petroglyph Park; Rainbow Village; Santa Rosa; Puerto de Luna area; Estancia; Knife Mountain; Sierra Blanca mountains; Hueco Tanks and Ysleta del Sur in Texas. Drs. Walt and Brandt both individually and together also visited some sites unaccompanied in the field, including Antelope Springs, Carnuel, and Tijeras Canyon.

After Isleta use sites were identified, they were entered into a database, which includes: site number, Laboratory of Anthropology Number (the official registrar of archaeological sites in the state of New Mexico), the Isleta name of the site (with English translation), cardinal direction from the pueblo, date recorded, specific use, additional comments, and, when available, a graphic image. Over the course of the research, the database has been continuously updated as new information becomes available. Since many sites of significance are today archaeological sites, a search of site files was conducted at the Laboratory of Anthropology in Santa Fe, which maintains computerized files on all recorded archaeological sites in the State of New Mexico. Because the Isleta Tribe is very concerned with disclosure of culturally significant and sacred sites and wishes to protect these sites from potential desecration and damage, exact site location data was not included. Data found in manuscript or published sources (below) bearing upon a site were also entered into the appropriate site record. Very often, site names and descriptions provided by Isleta elders were found to have been identically recorded in ethnographic records as much as 120 years previously, lending important confirmation to the accuracy of the Isletan oral tradition. Terms in the Isleta language (Southern Tiwa) were transcribed in notes using phonetic transcription (in typed texts, some substitutions were made to accommodate cross-platform transfers of data).

Drs. Brandt and Walt attempted to locate, examine, and copy all ethnographic and some ethnohistoric records relating to Isleta, both in the published literature and in known archives of significance. Several archival collections were particularly pertinent and were examined, analyzed, and copied directly at the archival repository. These included several sets of papers as follows:

1) The papers of ethnographer, journalist, and photographer Charles Lummis.

Lummis lived at the Pueblo of Isleta from 1888-1892, compiled his own dictionary of the Isleta language, and recorded many stories and songs in the native language with interlinear translations in Spanish and English. The bulk of Lummis's materials are at the Southwest Museum in Los Angeles. Drs. Brandt and Walt conducted several research trips to the Museum. Additional Lummis materials are also housed at the University of Arizona, where they were consulted.

2) The Papers of Elsie Clews Parsons at the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia. Parsons's (1932) account is the principal ethnographic monograph on Isleta pueblo. She based this on several months of intensive research; additionally she wrote several articles and books pertaining to Isleta (1920, 1921, 1928, 1939). Parsons was one of the most important early ethnographers of the Southwest. She was a folklorist, sociologist, and anthropologist, was known for her comparative work on Southwestern Indian folklore and culture, and achieved the highest standing in both the discipline of anthropology and in folklore studies.

3) The National Anthropological Archives at the Smithsonian in Washington, D.C., was researched for several collections, including: (i) the manuscripts of John P. Harrington and Carobeth Tucker Harrington who collected vocabulary, stories, ethnographic materials, and wrote a grammar of the Isleta language; (ii) the papers of Esther Goldfrank, who worked with Isletans and shared her work with Elsie Clews Parsons (Goldfrank (1962) edited and published the landmark study *Isleta Paintings*; (iii) papers of early ethnographers Albert S. Gatschet, Francis Klett, George Mooney, George Gibbs, John R. Bartlett, John G. Bourke, and Frederick W. Hodge, which included ancillary linguistic and ethnographic data.

Additionally, Drs. Brandt and Walt researched ethnographic and ethnohistoric materials at the Heard Museum in Phoenix, the University of Arizona Library in Tucson, and the Center for Southwest Research at the University of New Mexico. Other ethnologists and linguists who had worked at Isleta such as M. Estellie Smith and William Leap were also personally contacted by Dr. Brandt.

Dr. Whiteley, a Southwest anthropologist and ethnohistorian who has worked most extensively at the Hopi pueblos and in multiple archives, conducted most of the historic and ethnohistoric research at a series of archives and in the published literature. The historical record of Isleta includes documentary accounts from the 16th century forward. The principal period focused upon to date has been 1540-1880. For the Spanish and Mexican periods (1540-1846), the majority of the research was conducted in person at the Center for Southwest Research at the University of New Mexico, which since the early 20th century has sought out and copied a great deal of material pertaining to the history of New Mexico from archives in Spain (notably the Archivo General de Indias in Seville), Mexico (notably the Archivo General de la Nación in the Biblioteca Nacional in Mexico City), and the United States (notably the Spanish Archives of New Mexico in Santa Fe, and the Bancroft Library, Berkeley). Prominent Southwest history scholars France V. Scholes and Lansing Bloom collected the majority of these materials. Dr. Whiteley researched the extensive Scholes collection and numerous other collections housed at the Center for Southwest Research (including the Doris Duke American Indian oral history project collection, the Land Grant records of New Mexico, the Sophie D. Aberle Collection, the Ritch collection, the Bancroft Library collection, among others). Other archives directly examined by Dr. Whiteley include the New Mexico State University Library (for microfilm records of the Archdiocese of Durango), the Museum of New Mexico Fray Angelico Chavez History Library (several minor collections), and the New Mexico State Archives (Valencia County Records and others) in Santa Fe. Additionally Dr. Whiteley interviewed Southwest historians: Dr. Donald Cutter (who directly provided some documentary materials for the project), Dr. Ward Allen Minge, Dr. Rick Hendricks, and Dr. Joseph Sandoval; and received some archival material from Dr. John Kessell.

For the U.S. period, Dr. Whiteley has to date focused principally on a collection of documents assembled from several Record Groups of the National Archives by Isleta pueblo within the last 20 years (housed at Ussery and Parrish, Albuquerque); published microfilm records of the New Mexico Superintendency of Indian Affairs and the Pueblo Agency from the later 19th century; and Annual Reports of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. On-line searches in several electronic research engines led to materials at other institutions (Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History, Peabody Museum Library [Harvard University], American Museum of Natural History, and Milwaukee Public Museum), which were contacted by telephone and which supplied copies of pertinent materials. Other archives with pertinent materials have also been identified but not yet systematically searched.

The experts' contributions to the present report are as follows:

- 1) Drs. Brandt and Whiteley were the principal contributors to the first section on *Isleta Culture and Society*.
- 2) Dr. Walt authored the section on *Geography and Environment of Isleta Aboriginal Lands*.
- 3) Dr. Whiteley wrote the brief section on *Pueblo Orientation to the Landscape*.
- 4) Drs. Walt and Brandt were the principal contributors to the section on *Isleta Use and Occupancy of its Aboriginal Territory*.
- 5) Dr. Adler was the principal author of the section on *The Archaeological Background of Isleta Aboriginal Lands*, with significant input from Dr. Walt.
- 6) Dr. Whiteley was the author of the section *Isleta in History*.

Dr. Whiteley was also responsible for editing and synthesizing the reports of the other experts into the overall document.

Appendix A includes the curricula vitae of the experts.

Isleta Culture and Society

Introduction

Isleta is a Pueblo Indian town with a resident population of almost 5,000 persons located 13 miles south of present-day Albuquerque, New Mexico, on the west bank of the Rio Grande. It is one of the three largest Indian pueblos in New Mexico, and usually *the* largest Rio Grande pueblo since before the beginning of the American regime (1846).¹ Since the early 18th century, Isleta has been the southernmost Indian pueblo in New Mexico, with large areas of land to the south and the east that are completely removed from the territory of any of the other Pueblos. The reservation has a land area of 211,002 acres. The name Isleta, Spanish for 'islet,' refers to the fact that the Rio Grande has changed course over many years; at one time it (and a tributary stream) encircled the village. It is shown on maps as early as 1602 (Map 1, where it is named "Mesilla"), and appears prominently on a map of the late 17th century (Map 2). While today the village is on the west bank, there are both ancient and modern settlements on both sides of the river. Some of these settlements date from Pueblo III times (i.e., the 1300's). The Isleta name for the village is *Shiehwiiib-ag*, referring to a 'hwib' stick, which is used in a game; the name is said to refer to the knife-like shape of the higher ground upon which the central village is built (Lummis in Harrington 1916:528).

The people of Isleta belong to the Tigua (Tiwa) nation as the Spanish called them and they speak a language known as Southern Tiwa (Trager 1967). They also speak English and some older people speak Spanish as well. Southern Tiwa is also spoken at the Pueblo of Sandia, although with a different dialect.

Archaeological and oral historical evidence suggests that Isleta grew from processes of migration and aggregation of smaller settlements from within Isleta's aboriginal territory. Many small settlements were located in the drainages of the Manzano Mountains and as far south as the Los Pinos Mountains: this is confirmed by written records in historic times. Isleta was the "mother-ship" and ritual and administrative center to these outlying settlements. Isleta had close ties with villages in Tijeras Canyon, in the Piro area to the south along the Rio Grande, and with the eastern

Tiwa and Tompiro villages to the east of the Manzano Mountains. When these villages began to be abandoned in the 1670's, the survivors fled to Isleta, some establishing villages on the east side of the Rio Grande. Isletan oral tradition states that the founders of these villages were once from the Isleta area and then returned to the mother village when conditions deteriorated in the outlying areas. Although these villages no longer had resident populations after the Pueblo Revolt of 1680, they continued to be utilized by the people of Isleta for religious and secular purposes. Offerings continue to be placed in those sites by Isletans – just as other Pueblo peoples treat their earlier village sites as shrines. The areas around these villages are also used for hunting grounds into the present. They are prominent in oral tradition, especially story and song.

As a leading town in the region and the southernmost Pueblo in New Mexico since post-Pueblo Revolt times (1680), Isleta has absorbed migrants from other communities throughout its existence. It has served as a regional capital for smaller farming settlements and residential areas and maintained an extensive hunting area to the east and south with ongoing Plains-Pueblo trade relationships through the 19th and early 20th centuries. Despite smallpox epidemics, droughts, and raiding by nomadic Indians, Isleta has maintained a population size close to the two largest New Mexico pueblos, Zuni and Laguna, which lie away from the Rio Grande to the west.

During the late 1870's, Isleta accepted an influx of religious refugees from Laguna pueblo who settled in an area south of the main village known as Oraibi. Today there are residential suburbs of Isleta known as Oraibi, T'aykabede, and Chical. Isleta continues to grow and new residential areas have been built in the last two years.

Isleta Among the Pueblos

Isleta is a Pueblo² culture. "Pueblo" is a Spanish term that identifies commonalities seen through European eyes, but the sense of unity is borne out in Pueblo

¹ In the late 19th century, Isleta and Santo Domingo sometimes alternated as slightly larger than the other, but by 1900, Isleta was consistently the largest.

² "Pueblo" with upper-case 'P' is conventionally used by anthropologists to refer to the people, i.e., Pueblo Indians, the Pueblos, Pueblo culture, Pueblo history, the Pueblo world, etc. Lower-case 'p' conventionally refers to the town, i.e. Isleta pueblo, the pueblos above Albuquerque etc. Occasionally, upper-case 'P' is used to refer to a town. Federal government and Tribal terms often use upper-case 'P' to refer to the official entity, e.g., the Pueblo of Isleta, Santo Domingo Pueblo, Pueblo of Zuni, etc.

thought too. A shared history, some common cultural beliefs, social ideas, religious practices, a long-term presence within the Southwest dating back millennia, and striking differences with non-Pueblo native peoples -- all mark a core of Pueblo family resemblances.

Pueblo cultures do, however, exhibit some significant differences among themselves, perhaps the most salient being language. The modern Pueblos include six different languages: Hopi, Zuni, Keresan, Tiwa, Tewa, and Towa. Tiwa is one branch of the Kiowa-Tanoan language family, which, among the Pueblo Indians, also includes the Tewa and Towa languages. Northern Tiwa is spoken at the pueblos of Taos and Picuris. The eastern Tiwa towns of the Saline Province across the Manzano Mountain range likely spoke other dialects of Southern Tiwa; this may account for some dialect diversity within Isleta Southern Tiwa today, since Isleta absorbed migrants from those areas. The Isletas maintain that the languages known as Piro, spoken in historic times along the Rio Grande to the south of Isleta, and Tompiro, another language of the Saline Province, were other closely related varieties of Southern Tiwa. Most linguists believe Piro and Tompiro are close to Tiwa in the Kiowa-Tanoan language family (Trager 1967, Brandt 1979). (Map 3; Map 4).

Table 1: Pueblos in the Twentieth Century

Western:

Hopi (12 villages)

Zuni

Acoma

Laguna

Eastern:

Southern Tiwa:

Isleta
Sandia

Tewa:

Tesuque
Pojoaque
Nambe
San Ildefonso
Santa Clara
San Juan

Northern Tiwa:

Picuris
Taos

Transitional:

Towa:

Jemez

Keresan:

Santa Ana
Zia
San Felipe
Santo Domingo
Cochiti

At the time of the first Spanish exploration in 1540, the Rio Grande pueblos numbered around sixty (Bandelier 1929-30:173). Over the years, many were abandoned, and the Pueblos consolidated into the currently existing towns. Population estimates vary between 20,000 and 60,000 (e.g. Kessell 1989:134). At the southern end, there were around eight major Piro pueblos (Bandelier 1929-30), lying between San Marcial (near Fort Craig) and La Joya (near the confluence of the Rio Puerco and the Rio Grande). These included the sites of the modern towns San Antonio (originally San Antonio de Senecú, a Piro town), Socorro (originally Piro Pilabó), and La Joya (Piro Seelocú, or Sevilleta) (e.g., Bandelier 1892, 1929-30, Schroeder 1979). All the Piro pueblos were abandoned in the years surrounding the Pueblo Revolt of 1680. They later either became part of the population of Isleta or migrated to the south of El Paso.

Northeast from La Joya across the Manzano Mountains in the “Saline Province,” so named after the salt lakes of the Estancia Basin, were several Tiwa and Tompiro pueblos. All were depopulated in the 1670’s; the ruins of several (Gran Quivira, Abó, Quarái) are now included in the Salinas Mission National Monument (Brandt 1997). These also merged with Isleta, which continued to use their land, or departed south beyond El Paso. Moving north up the Rio Grande from La Joya, Isleta pueblo, with its outlying settlements, is the southernmost occupied pueblo in the present, with the largest population of any of the Rio Grande pueblos. Isleta and Sandia (which lies north of Albuquerque) have been the only two southern Tiwa pueblos since the eighteenth century. At the time of Spanish exploration, between twelve and sixteen Southern Tiwa pueblos were recorded along the river between modern Los Lunas and Bernalillo; through Tijeras Canyon to the east into the Saline Province an additional seven Tiwa pueblos were mentioned. The Saline Province included several eastern Tiwa towns (notably Chilili, Tajiique, and Quarái), and Tompiro towns (especially Abó, Tenabó, and Las Humanas [=Gran Quivira]), all with close ties to Isleta. The names “Quarái,” “Abó,” “Tenabó,” and probably “Las Humanas” derive from the Southern Tiwa language.³

³ “Jumanos” (= “Humanas”) is a term applied to hunting-gathering Indians, who spoke a Tanoan language and who were living on the Arkansas River in the 17th century, but were subsequently forced far to the south by Apaches. Las Humanas Pueblo was named after this tribe or for a mesa close by that the Spanish named after them (“Mesa de los Jumanes”). “Jumano/Humana” is a term of unclear origin to anthropologists and historians. Isleta tradition (Joe Zuni) asserts that it derives from the Southern Tiwa term for hunting, as in the lexically similar *Xumahu*, the hunt chief. Linguistically, this is a highly plausible interpretation, and the presence of Isletan hunting areas (below) in this direction adds further confirmation (see also Hickerson 1994). Although the initial sounds are

Between Sandia and Santa Fe are found several Keresan pueblos, while up the Jemez River is Jemez pueblo, the only "Towa" pueblo at present. The Tewa and northern Tiwa villages all lie to the north of Santa Fe (Map 5).

Anthropologists have produced various interpretations of Pueblo similarities and variations, including differences based on language and geography. There is a generally agreed classification that divides Eastern Pueblo and Western, with some transitional pueblos in between (e.g., Dozier 1970, Eggan 1950). In the Eastern Pueblos, important social groups usually assigned at birth are not clans but "moieties" - involving a dual division of the entire society. Among the Tewa, where these have been described the best (Ortiz 1969), the moieties, termed Winter and Summer, are the principal corporate groups governing Pueblo life. Isleta conforms to the Eastern pattern in its moieties, termed Red Eyes (Summer) and Black Eyes (Winter), each "in charge of ritual requirements for the Pueblo as a whole during its own season" (Ellis 1979:358).

Whether Eastern, Western, or transitional, Pueblo social organization comes in layers, with one pattern of social groups and activities intersecting with another. In part, this probably derives from their long histories and the composition of the modern Pueblos from amalgamations of earlier discrete villages, each of which brought in its own ritual and social prerogatives. But the sheer complexity of Pueblo social and cultural forms belies their reduced population size in the 19th century -- reduced since European colonization -- and is part of the reason for the long-term fascination they have held for anthropologists.

At Isleta, in addition to moieties, the prominent social group beyond the family is the so-called Corn Group (in everyday parlance these are termed "clans" by Isleta people, although they do not conform to the anthropological sense of that term):

The most basic organization other than the family into which a child receives membership is the Corn group or one of its parts.... The five directionally oriented Corn

represented by different letters in Spanish and in Southern Tiwa, they both represent the same sound [x], the velar fricative. Mr. Zuni suggests that it derives from *xumnánu*, *xumna*, 'clothes' in formal speech, referring to hides; *xumnahude* means a person who hunted (hides) for clothes, referring to these bison-hunting people (Brandt Field Notes May 19, 1999).

groups and their components are White Corn (east), also known as Day people; Black Corn (north) with Poplar and Magpie components; Yellow Corn (west); Blue Corn (south) with Water bubbling and Cane components; All-colors Corn (above-middle-down direction), with Corn, Eagle, Buzzard or Goose, and *sícu* components. A Corn group with components has no single leader, but as the chiefs of those components are in charge of the fetishes and alternate in handling the ceremonies of the group each is spoken of as a Corn chief or Father....

The Corn groups have five major responsibilities: (1) Baptism of a child with ritually blessed water during the first solstice ceremony after his birth, the conferring of name selected by father's sister, and presentation to him of a perfect ear of corn to protect him against harm during his first year. (2) Provision of "medicine" water for each member, and those of other groups if they wish, to sip for purification and new strength. (3) A Corn Father as escort to a member of a curing society when he goes to society meetings. (4) Holding a four-day retreat in the home of their leader for officers and a few members during the full moon before the summer and winter solstices....

(5) Performance of rituals by Corn Father to insure that the spirit of the dead reaches that specific locality of the afterworld where his own group centers (Ellis 1979:356-57).

Isleta also contains several specialized internal moiety groups, that organize large ceremonies in the spring and fall, among other things. The "Town Fathers," a curing society, was also an important social component in the past. When Laguna pueblo traditionalists migrated to Isleta in the 1870's they introduced an additional curing society, now termed at Isleta the "Laguna Fathers." Curing practices were addressed to individual afflictions and also purification of fields for planting and of livestock.

Isleta also has specialized societies pertaining to war, hunting, and sacred clowning. Florence Ellis (1979:358) argued that the dual clowning/fertility societies (Kwirena and Koshare) common elsewhere among the Eastern Pueblos fell victim to Spanish missionary zeal at Isleta, and were replaced by two groups annually appointed by the chief of the Black Eyes moiety. These two groups continue to perform actively in Isleta ceremonies. *Xúmpa*, the Warriors or Scalp society, carried out major governmental responsibilities in association with the Town Chief (*cacique*, as the Spanish termed that office for all the Pueblos). The Warriors' society was lead by two priests representing the twin war gods (deities among all the Pueblos):

The war or bow priest and the head of *xúmpa*, who would have been the war chief, were responsible for village security in relation to law and order and for control of witches inside the Pueblo, as well as for security of the outer boundaries of lands used and claimed by the Pueblo. After dangers from invaders disappeared, the war chief sent his assistants on horseback to check Isleta's lands for trespass by foreign herds of sheep or cattle (Ellis 1979:361-62).

The Warriors society was composed especially of men who had taken a Navajo scalp in war, and as with some other predominantly male Isleta societies, had an auxiliary women's group with specialized functions (ibid). During the first days of the U.S. occupation of New Mexico, a War

Society performance was witnessed by soldiers at Isleta, with three fresh Navajo scalps (e.g. Hughes 1848:151-52, see below). Another important Isleta priest-chief was the hunt chief,

Xumahu:

His responsibilities were ritually assuring reproduction of wild animals, providing good luck for individual hunters by means of a ceremony and the loan of small animal fetishes, and making prayer sticks to be buried in the mountains with an offering of cornmeal, turquoise, and coral beads for game animals. He also directed periodic communal hunts in which an area was surrounded except for one open side through which beaters drove game into the circle. His assistant, pledged into that position by being cured from some ailment, became his successor through appointment by the town chief (Ellis 1979:362).

In addition to its traditional leadership, Isleta has long also had a group known to historians as the “Spanish officials.” Among these is a Governor who now serves a two-year term and two Lieutenant Governors. The Governor is currently elected by popular vote, as are the members of the Tribal Council, a more modern political organization. There are also annually selected War Captains who have responsibility for policing traditional and ceremonial functions and protecting matters of traditional concern. The tribe holds a Governor’s feast around the time of the Summer Solstice and celebrates its feast day of San Agustín on August 28th.

In sum, Isleta social organization reflects some pan-Pueblo principles, and also contains its own discrete traditions.

Pueblo Religion and the Limits of Outside Knowledge

Isleta religion is not the subject of this report, but in major ways, as for all the Pueblos, religion fundamentally guides Isleta senses of the landscape and its uses. A great deal of traditional Pueblo religion is timed and attuned according to seasonal cycles, and faunal and floral periodicities. In many ways, Pueblo religion is a religion of the environment. An annual “cycle of works” by the religious societies is devoted to ensuring beneficial environmental and climatic conditions – for agriculture, hunting, gathering, etc. Concerns with health, the human life-cycle, the spirits of the dead (commonly associated with “Kachinas,” a complex concept that links human life forms with those of animal and plant species, and weather forms), and fertility are central in Pueblo religion, including Isleta (e.g., Parsons 1939, Whiteley 1989).

Isleta's Winter and Summer moiety societies, and its concentration on such seasonally coded ceremonies as the Evergreen ceremony, reflect these patterns of environmental interest. Isleta had evidently lost its Kachina ceremonies (although it retained the related Turtle Dance) until they were reintroduced by the Laguna migrants in the 1870's. But 17th century documents make it clear that Isleta did have Kachina ceremonies at that point (see below). In common with the other pueblos, Isleta also has an annual feast day, featuring traditional dance performances on the patron saint's day of the pueblo.

Despite intense interest by anthropologists for more than a century, Pueblo religion is only sketchily known, and at some pueblos, like Isleta, scarcely known by outsiders at all. This is the direct result of strict canons of religious secrecy. Religious knowledge is always considered a privilege acquired through birth or aptitude observed over the long term by incumbent priests. Such knowledge involves extended, specialized religious training, and is very tightly controlled within narrow circles. This pattern appears to be very old, but it was certainly strengthened in response to Spanish colonization and Franciscan missionization. All the eastern Pueblos became Catholics, at least nominally, and many continue to worship actively in this faith. At the same time, the aboriginal religion has persisted strongly in many pueblos, including Isleta, into the late twentieth century. Pueblo anthropologist Edward Dozier refers to this joint religious interest as "compartmentalization," where the two traditions are maintained in parallel but with little syncretic mixing. It is the well-known strength of Pueblo religion and its fiercely conservative effect on tradition that have enabled the Pueblos to retain probably more of their aboriginal customs than any other Native North American people.

So, while intensely interested in the outcome of the present case, Isleta elders repeatedly emphasized that they were not willing to compromise religious values, even where aspects of religious knowledge might strengthen demonstrations of aboriginal interest in the Isleta Aboriginal Area. Outside knowledge of these appears in the works of earlier anthropologists, and where relevant to the claim, these receive reference below. And to an increasing extent, Isleta elders were willing to identify land areas religiously used, if not the specific activities in those areas.

Geography and Environment of Isleta Aboriginal Lands

It is important to re-emphasize that Isleta is not only one of the largest Pueblos, but the southernmost Pueblo, opening a large area for aboriginal use. The environmental variety of the area made different parts useful for different purposes, and the general aridity required (and requires) large areas of land for subsistence.

Physiographic Provinces

The landscape of Isleta's aboriginal territory is very varied. Broken by mountains, mesas, river valleys, basins, and other diverse landforms, this terrain encompasses dramatic variations in elevation. The greatest local relief in New Mexico can be found between Sierra Blanca at 12,003 feet and the adjacent Tularosa basin, 7,600 feet below (Hawley 1986:26). Sierra Blanca is the highest point in Isleta's lands. The lowest elevation is 2,900 feet at a point where the Pecos River leaves New Mexico.

There are two physiographic provinces found within the Isleta Aboriginal Area: the "Basin and Range," and the "Great Plains." The Basin and Range province is a northern extension of the vast Chihuahuan Basin of Northern Mexico. It is semi-arid, with isolated fault-block mountain ranges, alternating with desert plains, often within closed basins. Isolated cinder cones, basalt flows, and fault scarps are scattered throughout the lowland landscape (Eidenbach 1999). From west to east, the region is dominated by the broad expanse of the Rio Grande River Valley; and the Sacramento uplift, the massive mountain range east of the Estancia and Tularosa basins (Snead 1979; Hawley 1986). The eastern slopes of the Sacramento uplift descend gradually to the Pecos River valley, which marks the western margin of the Great Plains.

The Estancia, Tularosa, Jornada del Muerto, and Hueco Basins lie at the southern end of the Rocky Mountains. All four are "closed" basins—no rivers or other watercourses carry water out of them. Alkali flats, dry lake beds, salt lakes, and/or sand dunes alternate across these basin floors. At the center of the Estancia Basin are a number of salt lakes or ponds (hence the name Las Salinas in Spanish, and the Saline Province). These are known to the people of Isleta as the "Seven Salt Lakes", and are found over an area, oval in shape, that is roughly 100 square miles. The salt lakes are the last traces of a much larger body of water that thousands of years ago once filled the Estancia Basin (Kramer 1976:22). To the south, the famous White Sands are vast,

white dune fields occupying the lowest part of the central Tularosa Basin. Substantial mountain ranges border all four basins on one or more sides, and isolated ranges, such as the Jarilla Mountains near Orogrande, rise abruptly from the desert floor itself.

The Manzano Mountains and Sandia Mountains are a part of the same fault-block formation. This mountain range separates the Rio Grande Valley from the Estancia Basin to the east. The highest point in this range is Sandia Crest at 10,682 feet. The Sacramento and Sierra Blanca Mountains border the Tularosa and Hueco basins on the east, rising to a height of 12,000 ft. These steep mountains form the boundary between the southwestern Basin and Range and the Pecos River Valley to the east.

The San Andres and Organ Mountains along the west side of the Tularosa and Hueco basins look over the infamous Jornada del Muerto ('day's journey of the dead man' – named for its waterless and raider-filled passage) basin, which borders the Rio Grande River Valley. The Oscura Mountains rise abruptly from the northern Tularosa Basin floor and merge with Chupadera Mesa, closing the basin to the north. The Franklin Mountains lie to the south, marking "the Pass of the North" at El Paso, Texas.

The Great Plains Province section which occupies the eastern third of New Mexico includes the Canadian River drainage, the Pecos River Valley and the Llano Estacado, or "Staked Plains" (Sebastian and Larralde 1989:4). The Canadian River Valley flows east through the northeast corner of the Isleta Aboriginal Area. Topographically, the Canadian River Valley consists of undulating plains and isolated remnants of High Plains found as small mesas (Sebastian and Larralde 1989:4). The Canadian River is separated from the Llano Estacado by an escarpment known as the Caprock, and farther south as the Mescalero Ridge (Reeves 1972). The Llano Estacado, at the southwestern corner of the American Great Plains, perhaps gets its name from the resemblance of the Caprock cliffs to a stockade or "estacada" (Eidenbach 1999). This is an extensive and unbroken flat landscape interrupted only slightly by shallow drainages and playa lakes (Sebastian and Larralde 1989:4).

The Pecos River Valley is drained on the west by large tributaries in the Capitan, Sierra Blanca, Sacramento and Guadalupe Mountains. In general, the Pecos River Valley has low, undulating topography with low-lying hills and valleys (Sebastian and Larralde 1989:4).

Temperature and Rainfall

Temperature varies as widely from place to place and time to time in New Mexico as it does anywhere in the United States (Bennett 1986:37). For instance, within the Isleta Aboriginal Area, the average highest temperature in Carlsbad is 106.9, whereas it is only 91.9 in Ruidoso (below Sierra Blanca). Average lowest temperature for Carlsbad is 0.8, whereas it is -12.9 in Ruidoso. New Mexico is also one of the driest states with 90% of its land surface averaging less than 20 inches per year (Bennett 1986:42). New Mexico's inland location accounts in part for this dryness. Moist air must travel over large, dry landmasses before reaching New Mexico, either from the west coast of the United States or Mexico. More than 45% of the regions' precipitation occurs during the summer wet season, from July to September. Variation in precipitation is dependent in part on elevation, as is temperature. For example, Albuquerque (which lies at 5,000 feet) receives from 4.1 to 11 inches of rain per year, as opposed to Ruidoso (at 7,000 feet) which receives 12.3 to 34.8 inches per year (Bennett 1986:42). Winter is the driest season with February often the driest month.

The complex topography of southeastern New Mexico also creates rain shadows, dramatic differences in sunlight and shadow and other factors determining temperature and rainfall. The frost-free season varies somewhat from north to south, but is primarily dependent on elevation. Carlsbad has an average of 220 days whereas the lower slopes of the Sacramento Mountains average only 160 frost-free days (Sebastian and Larralde 1989:11).

Irrigation was only possible in areas adjacent to major rivers and irrigation-works and ditches were often destroyed by high runoffs. Springs and seeps were major sources of water for humans and these were often as much as ninety miles apart. In some areas, spring-fed farming was possible. The green of vegetation and trees is only a thin fringe along rivers, streams, and high elevation mountaintops. In the Basin and Range Province, seasonal lakes formed by rains and runoff known as playas were important habitat for migrating birds and game animals.

Flora

The plants of the Isleta Aboriginal Area are highly diverse. This too is principally a function of elevation, although geologic diversity, complex topography and precipitation differences certainly have an effect (Martin 1986:67). Four major elevational zones are

commonly distinguished: 1) Forest and 2) Woodland dominate mountain elevations, bordered by 3) Grassland along the piedmont, with 4) Desert scrub occupying lowland basins and river valleys (Brown and Lowe 1980). Narrow zones of Riparian vegetation border perennial waterways, and small areas of Alpine Tundra occupy high, exposed terrain on Sierra Blanca Peak.

Virtually all Desert scrub areas are dominated by creosote, mesquite, saltbush, cactus, and yucca. Minor areas of sagebrush and tarbush also occur, especially in the northern portion of the region. This desert scrub community extends southward, deep into Mexico (Eidenbach 1999).

Desert shrubs—mesquite, creosote, sagebrush— mixed with sparse grasses, tumbleweeds, yucca, and cactus are the most common plants in the basins. The appearance of these plants reflect the harsh, dry environment where sharp spines or the production of bitter, pungent chemicals protect against predators. The creosote, or greasewood, flourishes here, producing a natural herbicide that keeps other plants, including members of its own species, from growing nearby (Eidenbach 1999).

Grasslands bordering basins and mountain margins are more diverse (Eidenbach 1999). Semidesert Grassland is dominant throughout the region, with smaller, often isolated areas of Plains Grassland along the eastern foot slopes of the Sacramentos, the margins of the plains, and in the north. To the east, along the margins of the plains, Semidesert Grasslands predominate, gradually giving way to Plains Grasslands further east.

The basin desert scrub gradually gives way to semi-arid pinon-juniper woodlands along the lower mountain slopes. Higher on the mountain slopes, woodlands are replaced by evergreen forest. The highest, most exposed mountain ridges in the Sierra Blanca Mountains, are covered by alpine plants and occasional miniature evergreen trees. Great Basin Conifer Woodland occupies all of the mountain uplands except the high slopes of the Manzano-Sandia and Sacramento-Sierra Blanca-Capitan chains. Pinon, juniper, and oak dominate these woodlands, interspersed with open grassland or scrubland, depending on elevation (Eidenbach 1999). High altitude forest occurs throughout the high uplands of the Manzano Mountains and Sacramento uplift. Middle slopes are typically Petran (or Rocky Mountain) Montane Conifer Forest, dominated by ponderosa, white fir, douglas fir, oak, and other shrubs, while Petran Sub-Alpine Conifer Forest dominated by douglas fir, and englemann spruce occupies the high slopes and

ridgelines. Aspen occurs throughout both forest zones, usually in large, distinct stands which represent secondary succession following fires (Eidenbach 1999).

Riparian vegetation originally dominated by cottonwood, has been invaded extensively by tamarisk. Cottonwood bosques or woodlands are a natural feature of the Rio Grande floodplain. Plants common here include several species of willow, ash-leaved maple, alder and birch. To the south are sycamore, New Mexico olive, and walnut (Martin 1986:67). Upland riparian areas include walnut, ash, cherry, hackberry, and now include many introduced species as well.

Unusual or rare plant communities occur in several places, including Interior Chaparral Scrub and Madran Evergreen Woodland in the Organ Mountains; and the unique communities associated with the gypsum dunes, salt flats, and relic lakeshore gyplands within the White Sands. Other unusual associations are evident within the several lava, or basalt flows scattered in the region.

Fauna

The basin and range landscape that makes up the majority of the Isleta Aboriginal Area has the effect of isolating the mountain ranges from each other, and further creating environmentally-unique “islands” projecting above the surrounding basin lowlands. For instance, mule deer can be found throughout the uplands in New Mexico, but the Sierra Blanca – Sacramento range is the only locale west of the Mississippi where White Tail deer can be found.

Even under these severe conditions, well-adapted animal life is prevalent. Road-runners, hawks, songbirds and occasional eagles; coyotes, bears, bobcats, mountain lions, kit foxes, rabbits, prairie dogs, antelope, and mule deer range throughout the region. In the past, into the 19th century, bison were present west of the Pecos River. Smaller, and more dangerous life — rattlesnakes, scorpions, all manner of beetles, lizards, ants, and spiders, are also common (Eidenbach 1999).

Pueblo Orientation to the Landscape

Isleta oral traditions describe migrations from the north and the south into the current area of their dwelling. In common with all the Tanoan pueblos, the predominant migration narrative depicts their origins at a place of emergence from the earth to the north. Led by the hunt chief and the War Twins, they emerged from beneath a lake, Ship'aphun'ai [= the 'sipapu' of other Tanoan pueblos], or 'place of the black tears' (literally, 'eye-water-black-to-be'), which lies near the headwaters of the Rio Grande in southern Colorado. From there they migrated southwards along the river with other Pueblo peoples, founding villages along the way (cf. Pueblo Transcripts 1967-70, r 8 Tape 703, Rosinda Lucero). They moved over a large area, and went far to the south (in Isleta oral tradition the southern area into Mexico is associated with the "South clan" or Blue Corn group), before returning to settle at Isleta (Tucker n.d.:2; Brandt field notes). The emergence is of paramount sacred significance, and is still re-enacted at Isleta liturgically in twice-yearly ritual dramas, in early March (the Grand March of the emergence) and in the Fall (the Evergreen or Harvest Dance); emergence songs are especially sacred and must be performed without alteration.

Anthropologist Alfonso Ortiz, a Tewa from San Juan pueblo, has presented the most cogent account of Pueblo world-view and orientation to the land, which speaks directly to Isleta's interest in its aboriginal claim. Ortiz lists a series of general points about Pueblo world-view:

The first generalization that can be made about the Pueblos is that they all set careful limits to the boundaries of their world and order everything within it. These boundaries are not the same but, more important, the principles of setting boundaries are since all use phenomena in the four cardinal directions, either mountains or bodies of water, usually both, to set them. In pre-Newtonian fashion, all believe that the universe consists of three cosmic levels, with some applying the principal of classification by fours to postulate multiple underworld levels, either four or a multiple of four. All peoples try to bring their definitions of group space somehow into line with their cosmologies, but the Pueblos are unusually precise about it....

All the Pueblos also have a well-elaborated conception of the middle or center of the cosmos, represented by a *sipapu* [symbolic place of emergence of humankind from the world below, represented in kivas, and in other shrines], an earth navel, or the entire village. Usually there are many different centers because sacred space can be recreated again and again without ever exhausting its reality.... Among the Pueblos, the center is

the point of intersection of the six directions [the cardinal points plus the zenith and the nadir], with a seventh being the center itself (Ortiz 1972).

In sum, the nature of Isleta interest in its claim is more than simply economic or pragmatically associated with the history of its subsistence practices. This is a sacred landscape, charged with metaphysical principles and associations. The hunt chief, for example, is not just in charge of animals, but is associated with a deep-seated sense of Isleta's human presence in the world.

Isleta Use and Occupancy of its Aboriginal Territory

The Isleta Economy

Following the transition to agriculture over the last 4,000 years, Puebloan peoples retained a mixed economy that took advantage of multiple resources. Since the Southwest is such an arid environment, agriculture – based on maize, beans, and squash, “the three sisters” - did not replace existing modes of adaptation nearly so much as it did for most of Europe (when domesticated crops and livestock began to spread there from the Near East 5,000 years ago). Droughts, frost, hailstorms, and frequent floods along the rivers (e.g., Ellis and Baca 1957; Scurlock 1998:33-38) prevented a singular reliance on agricultural crops. Hunting of numerous species of fauna, and gathering continued to play a major role in Pueblo economies. Pueblo environmental knowledge is correspondingly encompassing, testifying to their multiple usages of a long-occupied region.

Isleta is typical of this pattern. Its economy combined agriculture with hunting and gathering. After the Spanish arrived, herding livestock was added, as were some new plants to the crops regularly raised (maize, beans, squash, and cotton), including wheat, chiles and garden vegetables. Isleta also added fruit trees and grapes (Ellis 1979:355); in 1890, for example, there were 60 acres of fruit trees, mainly peaches, plums, and apricots (ibid:356).

Farming

The wide expanse of the Rio Grande’s floodplain through Isleta allowed for most fields to be irrigated. Fields were watered by four ditches that had their origins in pre-Spanish times (ibid:355). As a matter of convenience, most fields were planted close to Isleta and its satellite villages. However, fields were planted in a diversity of settings and elevations to take full advantage of the opportunities these varied settings provided. Because frequent flooding of the Rio Grande often destroyed the irrigation system or the crops were destroyed by bad weather, like hailstorms (Pablo Abeita letter to Lummis, Southwest Museum), pests, or other problems, Isletans also utilized dry farming in farming villages and farm sites away from the main village. Many crops are grown along the floodplain of the Rio Grande to the north and south of the village (Juan Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999; Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999): those mentioned by Isleta elders were corn, wheat, chile, squash, garden vegetables, beans, fruit trees, fodder for livestock,

cotton, and grapes. Crops were regularly harvested too on lands directly north of the Reservation, on what is now Kirtland Air Force Base, especially below Coyote Springs, an Isleta community farming area (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999). The lands around Coyote Springs had agricultural fields long ago as well, when ancestral Isleta villages were still inhabited in the area (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). Peach tree orchards were planted well up Hell's Canyon, east into the Manzano Mountains. Fields were planted along the foothills of the Manzano Mountains as well as higher up the slopes. Isleta farmers planted around Mosca Peak, White Rock Canyon, Little Creek Canyon, Willow Creek, as well as near the summit of Bosque Peak (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999; Juan Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). The high altitude planting area at Bosque Peak and the nearby Aspen Circle in the Manzano Mountains was cultivated into the 1930's by Isletans, where they harvested beans and potatoes (Juan B. Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). These upland areas are relatively well-watered and take advantage of the lateral drainages leading out of the mountains and into the Rio Grande. These same drainages were planted closer in to Isleta as well.

The lands around Ranchitos and Chical were important croplands with corn, beans, chili, vegetables and fodder (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999). The Chical area was especially subject to massive flooding; major floods leading to temporary population relocations, for example, were described in the late 19th and early 20th centuries (Ellis and Baca (1957:passim). The alternation between drought and flood on the Rio Grande meant that agriculture close to its banks was always very precarious for the Pueblo of Isleta. This produced agricultural strategies which dispersed fields in wide areas away from the river and in higher elevation fields which could survive flooding. It also meant that hunting was critical for survival, as agriculture might fail in any given year. Crops might not be planted due to floods, drought, hailstorms, pests, or might be destroyed by these causes. The pattern of multiple field site types and locations is very widespread among the other Pueblos for similar reasons.

Elevation between lowland fields along the Rio Grande and the top of Bosque Peak varies approximately between 4,800 and 10,000 feet. Another traditional Isleta farming area lies in Tijeras Canyon of the Manzano and Sandia Mountains. The perennial creek running through the canyon supported Isleta fields of corn and squash (Juan Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). To the east of the Manzano Mountains, Isletans used to plant up high on perennial creeks running through to the east side (Juan B. Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). Isleta farmers also used to plant further out to the west in the Rio Puerco (Juan B. Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999).

In 1900, a comparative table of Pueblo cultivated lands and produce noted Isleta's acreage planted (3,510) as the highest of all the Rio Grande Pueblos, and second only to Zuni (5,201 acres) among the Pueblos as a whole. Correspondingly, Isleta produced by far the largest number of bushels of wheat and corn (31,815 bushels) among the Rio Grande Pueblos, and only slightly less than Zuni (34,488 bushels) (Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs 1900:293).

In some years Isleta farms, vineyards, and orchards produced well enough to provide a surplus for trade. Abert in 1846 (Abert 1848; Galvin 1966), Bourke in 1881 (Bloom 1938) and Poore in 1890 (Donaldson 1893) all commented on the abundance of grape vineyards at Isleta, as did Spanish era chroniclers of the 18th century. In the 19th century, vineyards and orchards were planted along the Rio Grande north and south of the present reservation boundaries. Into the 20th century, there were Isleta orchards to the west of Los Lentos at Los Charcos (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). Peaches and grapes were traded at Ft. Sumner in the 19th century (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999) and at least as far west as Gallup (Poore 1893). In 1869, Isletans brought dried fruit to Ft. Stanton to trade (Kautz 1869).

Small garden plots were also planted during long-term hunting and trading trips to the east as far as Oklahoma. On these trips small plots would be sown to supplement hunting and trading goods over multi-month or multi-year periods away from Isleta.

Hunting

Large-game hunting at Isleta traditionally took place during the fall and winter months. From small parties of two or three men to large communal hunts of several hundred people, all were ritually-sanctioned by the hunt chief and integral to subsistence activities that shifted from agriculture to hunting and gathering during the non-growing seasons (cf. Ortiz 1969, and Hill 1983, on similar seasonal cycles at San Juan and Santa Clara respectively). Small game, especially rabbits, were hunted year-round with a cycle of communal hunts, some ritually important.

Although communal hunts did occasionally involve multi-pueblo parties (notably with Sandia), the number and variety of Isletan hunting related sites on the plains and prairie to the east and south of the village indicate Isletan predominance in these areas. The hunt and activities surrounding hunting are ritually elaborate and emphasized at Isleta. Defined hunting territories, hunting shrines, hunting camps, hunting trails, and other hunting-related landmarks stretches well into the Llano Estacado of Eastern New Mexico and beyond. The prominent role of hunting at Isleta is clearly evident in oral testimony and the ethnohistoric record. The ritual prominence of the hunt is manifested in the landscape as hunting shrines, sacred springs, caves, and other locations that are visited, described in songs, or appealed to and invoked in prayer.

All the animals with which the Tée-wahn (the Tiwa-speaking people of Isleta) are familiar – the buffalo (which they used to hunt on the vast plains to the eastward), the bear, deer, antelope, mountain lion, badger, wild turkey, fox, eagle, crow, buzzard, rabbit, and so on – appear in their legends and fairy tales, as well as in their religious ceremonials and beliefs (in the Isleta story ‘The Coyote’) (Lummis 1976 [1894]:222).

It is difficult for us to realize the importance which the Indian attaches to all matters connected to game. ----- a hunt of any sort is a very religious affair, whether it be a simple foray of two or three men, or one of the great communal hunts in which many hundreds are engaged. One of their chief branches of medicine-men are those who have absolute control of all matters pertaining to game. These are named, in the language of the Tigua Pueblos, the Hóo-mah-koon (“those who have death in their arms”⁴). According to their folk-lore the Hóo-mah-koon were created just after mankind emerged from the bowels of the earth, and were the first of all branches of medicine, except only the Káh-pee-oo-nin --” (Lummis 1891:210-211).

The *Xumahu* or hunt chief was responsible for wild game and its reproduction, providing success for hunters, and making offerings for game animals (Ellis 1979:362). Game animals

⁴ According to Isleta elders, a more precise rendering is “the animal I have killed I carry in my arms.”

most frequently mentioned are rabbit, antelope, deer, and bison (which were commonly hunted up to the turn of the 20th century). A wide range of other animals and birds were also hunted. Starlings were trapped with horsehair. Geese and ducks were hunted to the south. Eagles were hunted for feathers, but not eaten. Eagles were also kept at Isleta. Turkeys were eaten and the feathers were used. Blue jays were hunted on special occasions. Sparrows, Turtles, Quail, Pheasant, Doves, as well as other small game animals were also either snared, shot or captured. Macaws were also traded from Mexico in the past (Joe Zuni 7 & 9, 1999).

Hunting remains an important economic, social and ritual activity at Isleta.

Extensive hunting areas have been described through oral testimony, ethnohistoric records, and previously-recorded traditional songs. These areas of the hunt surround Isleta north and south within the Rio Grande, extend west into Cibola County, but primarily stretch out to the east and south. Hunting territory to the east encompassed the Manzano Mountains, and stretched far to the east over extended portions of eastern and southeastern New Mexico and beyond. These expansive eastern and southern hunting ranges are marked by Isletan trails, hunting shrines, named hunting territories, and a variety of other named Isletan landmarks that point to their use and dominant presence. Moreover, Isletans also hunted beyond their aboriginal area: hunting trips to Oklahoma, for example, have been noted. The hunting areas described as part of Isleta's aboriginal territory, then, are of central economic and cultural interest; they do not encompass all Isleta hunting.

Large game was hunted in the fall and winter months. Antelope were hunted throughout lands described as Isleta hunting territory except for the uplands of the Manzanos and other mountainous regions within this territory. Deer were also commonly found throughout much of upland Isleta hunting grounds that included the mesas, wooded hills and mountains. Deer hunting areas mentioned by Isleta elders as important are found in the Manzano Mountains, the Gallinas Mountains, the Guadalupe Mountains, and Sierra Blanca (Joe Zuni 7 & 9, 1999). Bison were found to the east of the Manzanos, although by the 19th century were found in far greater numbers to the east of the Pecos River, on the Llano Estacado into the Panhandle of Texas and Oklahoma.

Cottontails, jackrabbits and other small game were hunted year-round with a cycle of communal hunts beginning in April (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). Communal rabbit hunts took place east of the Manzano Mountains around Moriarty, in the Estancia Valley, and south to

Corona (Juan Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). Rabbit hunts also occurred in the Rio Grande Valley south of Isleta as far as Socorro (Juan Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999).

Isleta hunting territory began in close to the village. Hunters went west to what is now Cibola County (Juan Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999), closer in to the Rio Puerco and environs, and south in and around Ladron Peak (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999). In the Rio Grande Valley, antelope and other large game were widely hunted, to the south at least as far as the Los Pinos Mountains (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). From there they hunted as far north and west through Los Padillas. Nearby, in the Manzano Mountains, Isletans hunted deer, other large game, birds, and small game (Juan B. Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999).

The above-mentioned hunting regions were and are important hunting territories for the people of Isleta as a result of a number of factors; their proximity to the Pueblo, proximity to plentiful, perennial sources of water, and the ecological diversity of these landscapes, in particular throughout the uplands of the Manzano Mountains. However, a far more extensive and bountiful hunting region lay to the east on the vast, open grassland plains east of the Manzano Mountains. As noted by Bandelier, one of the great advantages of the Saline Pueblos (when these pueblos were inhabited) on the east side of the mountains was their ready access to game. Available nearby were vast herds of antelope, and bison as well as turkey, bear and deer in the mountains to the west (Bandelier 1892:266).

According to both current oral testimony and 19th century ethnographies, there are six Isleta sacred hunting shrines with extensive traditional hunting territories surrounding them to the east of the Manzano Mountains (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). These six shrines are named together in song as the shrines of the hunt chief, or *Xumahu* (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). These named areas do not account for all the eastern hunting regions, but their association with each other and with the *Xumahu* through song and ritual make them of primary importance to Isleta. Bandelier noted three of the six Isleta sacred hunting areas in 1891:

There are three traditionally sacred places east of the Salt Lagunes of the Manzano and their very border. At the north, is "T'a-vay" (Antelope Water), "Ou ay" [Seven Salt Lakes] in the middle, and "Carfar-ay," [Wolf Cave] in the south (Bandelier 1966-76:v.4,167).

These same areas were identified by Isleta elders, who were unaware of Bandelier's research. These are shrines that refer to the *Xumahu*. In addition to these hunting domains,

elders named the remaining three as Tall Grass Village (*Ta hi teuy*), Knife Mountain (*Shiabienay*), and Wolf Mountain (*Kar bien ay*) (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). The six traditional hunting areas extend to the northeast as far as the Canadian River (which was also the location of a trail to bison hunting areas further east), and also spread to the east as far as the present town of Portales (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999).

In the sacred songs of Hóo-mah-koon of the Pueblo of Isleta, where I lived for four years, it is declared that they came here first from the town of the Wolf's Den, (this is K'ar-pharay – the sacred hunting shrine of Wolf Cave) one of the picturesque ruins in the great plains east of the Manzano Mountains (Lummis 1891:211).

Although Lummis misrendered the meaning of the word slightly in describing it as a town or village, he was correct in saying it is where the *Xumahu* is from (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999). The “truths” of the *Xumahu* also reside in the other five shrines associated to the east with Wolf Cave (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999). It is again mentioned by Lummis as follows “These hoó-mah-koon (killed and taken in arms) are supposed to have originated in [a Pueblo] east of the Manzanos called Kahr-fáhr-ai (Wolf hole town) or Kahr-fahr-too-ee, don't know what town it was. They always mention it repeatedly in their prayers” (Lummis notes, MS Box 1, Southwest Museum). It is also described by Bandelier (1892:255): “Tiwas talk of ancient pueblo of ‘Car-far-ay’ to the east of Saline Lakes.” The location of this site is to the east of Salt Lakes. Wolf Cave is also a spiritual place where the leader of the wolves lives. People went to Wolf Cave shrine to pray for game on the Plains. Hunters did not hunt wolves because they are guardians of wild game. Hunters ask for help in obtaining hunting skills or traits similar to those of the wolf. One elder gave the analogy that the Wolf is somewhat like a patron saint or sacred protector (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999). This ritual association of hunting powers with the propitiation of predatory animals is a widespread feature of Native American hunting beliefs. This particular shrine is where Isletans go to make offerings or ‘pay’ for game. It is not at all a real town, but a place where the truths live (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999).

The *Xumahu* gave permission to hunt wherever Isleta hunters wished to go. Whether it was nearby in the Manzanos or beyond the Pecos River, hunters were required to go to the war chief who in turn came to the *Xumahu* for permission and blessings (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999). This is an ancient practice: Mimbres bowls at the Southwest Museum resemble bowls

used by the *Xumahu* in the past for blessings. Animals portrayed on these bowls represent aspects of the *Xumahu* (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999; Celestino Lucero September 14, 1999).

Wolf Cave and Mountain remain extremely important Isleta hunting shrines. All six shrines of the *Xumahu* and associated hunting areas continue to be mentioned in song. Another of the six hunting areas is 'aow ay', referring to a salt lake. This hunting area includes the Seven Salt Lakes. Knife Mountain 'shiabienay' is within the fifth hunting area, to the east of present-day Estancia. Shiabienay is also a landmark used by hunters for long distances surrounding this promontory. The sixth traditional hunting region encompasses an extensive area including both Antelope Spring and Santa Rosa, collectively known as 't'a p'ay' (Antelope Water). Antelope Spring was also an important camping area for hunters. It is where rabbit hunters camped on their way to hunting areas in the Estancia Basin (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). Santa Rosa was not only hunting territory, but an important shrine remains in the area for Isleta and other Tiwa Pueblos. Hunters would stop here and offer prayer and forgiveness for taking a life (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999).

Wolf Mountain, *Kar bien ay*, is one of the six sacred Isleta hunting areas northeast of the Seven Salt Lakes. It is also a specific shrine site as well, to where Isletan hunters pray. It is a low hill with a gypsum cap, numerous cairns on top and several fragments of glaze-painted pottery on its slopes that date to the late prehistoric and early historic periods (A.D. 1450-1700).

The acreage encompassed by the six traditional hunting areas associated with the shrines of the *Xumahu* is extensive. Within the boundaries of these broad hunting territories are a number of other, specific hunting locations that have also been discussed and recorded during oral testimony. These include: much of Guadalupe County; the Tajique area in proximity to the uplands of the Manzano Mountains (Juan B. Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999); to the east of Willard (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999) and the Seven Salt Lakes; Moriarty where antelope were hunted (Juan B. Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999); Pino Mesa to the east of Estancia (Juan B. Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999); the Puerta de Luna hunting area to the south of Puerto de Luna (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999); the uplands around the Tompiro ruins of Tenabó where deer, antelope, and turkeys were hunted (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999); Chupadera Mesa which extends down to the Tularosa Basin (Joe Zuni September 8, 1999); and the landscape surrounding the Pecos River (Juan Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). To the north, these hunting territories reached the Canadian River (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999).

Named in a song called “Going out to Hunt Antelope,” a hunting song recorded by Charles F. Lummis between 1897 and 1904 (Tape 1, side A, #10 [80.03.20] Southwest Museum) are two locations in the Estancia Valley, the “Seven Salt Lake Plains” and the “Gallo Mesa Plains.” These are named as places where Isletans went to hunt. This song is still sung at Isleta (Juan B. Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999).

The six traditional hunting areas described above do not, however, take into account all traditional Isletan hunting areas to the east of the Manzano Mountains. These hunting domains include the lands around Tucumcari, a gathering place for hunters from a number of Pueblos and Southern Plains groups. Hunters meeting here would cooperate in large game drives and hunts to the south through Portales and surrounding grasslands, further to the south near Roswell, and through White Sands (Juan B. Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999) and the Sacramento Mountains that include Sierra Blanca and much of Lincoln County. Antelope were also hunted in the Piñon Mountains, south of the town of Piñon in the Guadalupe Mountains, and in the area to the west and south of Orogrande near White Sands Missile Range (Joe Zuni September 8, 1999). Tucumcari is a gathering place, camping location and hunting area mentioned in Isleta hunting songs (Juan Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). This was also recorded by the Harringtons in 1920:

Indians here (Isleta) used to go far off to the east to hunt buffaloes. They used to go beyond tukukari (this is Tucumcari), which is now a railroad station. It is a Comanche name and the Indians here knew it long before there was any railroad there. (Harrington Archive vol.4, reel 36 Southwest, Isleta, Piro, Isleta del Sur/ Notes and Drafts, frame 255 1920, National Anthropological Archives).

Sierra Blanca is named in several Isleta hunting songs (Juan B. Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999 & Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). In these songs the hunting area is described as the plain through to White Mountain (Sierra Blanca). On the east side of the Sierra Blancas, Isletans hunted antelope and buffalo (Juan Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). Large scale game drives, in which a sizeable number of hunters were required, took place in the past through the Corona area, south through what is White Oaks now is and on south into the Sierra Blanca and Three Rivers area (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). Directly north of White Oaks are the Jicarilla Mountains. These are mentioned in association with hunting by Parsons (1932:452), in the story ‘White Arrow-Point’ (Story 46) “One time, about 12 years ago (1913), my father-in-law was on an antelope hunt in the Jicarilla

Mountains.” Isletans in the present also mentioned hunting “over toward Acoma and beyond to the west” and also to the south on the Plains of San Augustine (Ben Lucero).

(Map 7)

According to oral testimony and historic ethnographic sources, Isletans hunted bison and antelope beyond the Pecos River on the Llano Estacado (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). These hunting ranges spread further east into the Texas panhandle (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999) and north through parts of Oklahoma. Specifically named in Oklahoma were hunting areas in the vicinity of Anadarko, Ft. Sill, and the Osage country to the north (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). In a Comanche song sung at Isleta, Quanah Parker (a famous Comanche leader) is mentioned, as is the Sun River ‘t^har peyła pa’ay’ on the Plains (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). Bandelier noted in 1892 the following information about buffalo hunting in Oklahoma (i.e., his “Indian Territory”): “At Isleta, the buffalo is called, EU-RU. The name of the place EAST (Indian Territory perhaps) or NORTHEAST from Isleta, where they hunted buffalo is: UIU-UIU-BAAM” (Bandelier 1892:103). Hunters, often with their families would depart for extended hunting trips to Oklahoma in the fall, often staying for three or four months (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). Sometimes extended hunting trips as far east as the Oklahoma hunting grounds would last for a year or longer. Hunting camps with hunters and families would stay in one place long enough to allow for planting gardens of squash, melons, and pumpkins (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). People went on these trips in the fall. The last of these long-distance hunting treks took place just before the turn of the 20th century. People from Isleta returned from the last of these hunts by train (Juan B. Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). Another traditional hunting area to the east was in the Texas Panhandle in and around a wide area surrounding Amarillo and south into the Midland-Odessa area (Juan B. Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). A trail to this hunting area passed through Encino on its way almost due east. A hunting shrine to the east of Tucumcari was on the western fringes of this hunting region. A hunting song recorded by Lummis in 1891 also describes hunting far to the east. The song includes the following lines; “Yonder in the wee-ow-weew-bahn, [In Indian Territory](Lummis’s notation), there stay the buffalo, Commander of beasts, Him we are driving, Hither from yonder, With him as prey, We are arriving... ‘’ (Lummis 1891:214). Buffalo bones were left because they were too heavy. Some deer bones were dried and taken. Hides were also dried (Juan B. Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). One story mentions Pablo Abeita, grandfather of Juan B. Abeita, meeting Comanches in Oklahoma. Upon meeting them the Isletans including

Pablo Abeita were not sure if they were friendly, but were able to converse with them in Spanish. They befriended the Comanches and were taken to their homes. There is a song at Isleta about this trip (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). Hunters went in buggies, wagons, or horseback and they would process meat as dried jerky, then move on with their dried meat to another camp and process more game.

Among many of the pueblos, rabbit hunts are organized events often involving large numbers of community members. These events normally take place in the fall or winter. At Isleta, however, small game hunts start in April and continue through the summer until September (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). Rabbit hunts continue through the fall and winter. Men, women and children participated in ritual rabbit hunts at Isleta. In and around Willard near the Seven Salt Lakes is a traditional rabbit hunting area. According to oral testimony, Isletans reoccupied Quarái during the Revolt years, and from here organized rabbit hunts to the east around Willard (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). Willard remained a camping area for hunters and an antelope hunting area after Isleta was resettled in the 18th century. The Estancia Valley remained an Isletan rabbit hunting area until the late 1950's when fear of the plague ended these community rituals in this area (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). In the first half of the 20th century, rabbit hunters would cross over the Manzanos and camp at Antelope Springs, hunting south to the Willard and Corona area (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). Rabbit hunts in the Estancia Valley were associated with a specific fall and winter ceremonies. The last rabbit hunt in the area was around 1956 (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). These hunts were held in conjunction with a dance held in late February. They would kill up to 100 rabbits. Tradition still prescribes that at least one jackrabbit and one cottontail are taken as offerings from these hunts to the Cacique house in thanks to the Cacique and *Xumahu* (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999).

Other rabbit hunting areas are to the south of Isleta. These include areas within and to the east of Belen (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999), in the vicinity of Los Chaves on the west side of the Rio Grande between Belen and Los Lunas, around Los Lunas prison farm, and near Tomé Hill (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999). Today, rabbit hunts are confined to the reservation. Hunts are conducted to the west of the village, towards the Rio Puerco (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999).

Charles Lummis' notes confirm oral history of Isleta rabbit hunting. For instance, among his notes;

37 years ago today at Isleta, still one-armed, took Dorothea out horseback on a Round Hunt [rabbit hunt] with 200 Indians, in the fashion described in “A New Mexico David”. No one else was permitted a gun and they did their vast execution with boomerangs and clubs, but with a single gun I killed 3 or 4 rabbits. (Wednesday, May 12, 1926)

35 years ago today, another rabbit hunt [at Isleta], this time with 300 “other Indians” – a ‘grand Round Hunt [rabbit hunt], with about 35 miles riding’ (Monday, May 17, 1926)(University of Arizona, Lummi Archive [MS 297]1926, box #1, biographical materials, Journals [1911 – 1928]).

Lummi published several versions of this (including Lummi 1889 and in Lummi 1891). Another Isletan rabbit hunt story, ‘A Grand Rabbit Hunt’ (Southwest Museum, Lummi Collection, undated notebook, ca.1889-1890) was published in an unidentified newspaper. Other published sources on Isleta rabbit hunts that confirm current oral history include the American Indian Oral History Project’s Pueblo Transcripts from the 1960’s. Parsons (1932:332-336) notes a formal rabbit hunt associated with the Pinitu dance performed September 25 to October 5. Several winter and summer rabbit hunt activities are illustrated in *Isleta Paintings* (Goldfrank 1962:154-156). The illustrations are dated February 13, 1939, April 6, 1937, and June 15, 1936, all dates associated with communal rabbit hunts. It is clear that communal rabbit hunts at Isleta are a well established and on-going traditional communal affair. Dances associated with these hunts are important social/ceremonial events in the yearly cycle at Isleta. These hunts are documented from the 1880’s into the 1930’s. (See attached copies from *Isleta Paintings*).

Herding

Isleta held sizeable flocks of sheep during the 19th century, as evidenced by documents recording specific herds from the 1880's, and the counts of sheep stolen by Navajos on several occasions from the 1850's and 1860's. But exact counts are impossible to determine since Isleta refused to give their numbers to Pueblo Agents, fearing intrusion upon their rights (Santo Domingo Pueblo was the only other pueblo to resist these counts). In 1881, during a dispute between Isleta and Col. Francisco Chavez, a very powerful New Mexico politician, over watering rights to an area on the Rio Puerco called Los Quilites, several Isleta stockherds were mentioned. It was noted that Isleta Governor Bautista Lucero watered his herd of 4,000 sheep there; and while, this was the largest Isleta herd mentioned in that document, there were several other Isleta herders recorded there too (Thomas to Chavez, 7-18-1881, MLSPIA, M941, r 5). On several occasions in the 1850's and 1860's (see Historical section), Isleta sustained stock thefts of more than two thousand head of sheep each time; some of these followed in rapid succession, suggesting that Isleta's stockherds were significant. Isleta warriors often tracked down raiders, recovered their stock, and killed or wounded the thieves. Cattle and horses too were recorded as objects of theft from 1850 forward. Especially before there were fences, Isletans maintained widely scattered flocks and herds. In the 19th century, sheep were the primary livestock owned by Isletans, along with cattle, goats, horses, and burros. Isleta clearly had very sizeable cattle herds. In December 1850, it was recorded that Apaches stole 100 cattle from Isleta (Abel 1915:284). In 1871, in an engagement south of the Canadian River on the Staked Plains close to the Texas-New Mexico border, the U.S. army fought with a trading train from Isleta to the Comanches, and captured twenty-two Isletans, along with their 700 head of cattle, 57 burros, and ten ponies. That Isletans had 700 cattle for *trade* in 1871 suggests very significant herds indeed (LRHQDNM 1865-1890, M1088, r 14, May-June 1871: passim). In 1900, Isleta was recorded as having 3,500 sheep, 502 goats, 498 cattle, 1,389 horses, and some burros, mules, and fowl (Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs 1900:294). At that point, Isleta ranked third in the total numbers of sheep possessed among the Pueblos (and first among the Rio Grande pueblos); it ranked fourth among the Pueblos in total numbers of cattle (and second among the Rio Grande pueblos); and first among the Pueblos in total numbers of horses (ahead even of the livestock-dominated pueblos of Zuni and Laguna). Sheep and goats were gradually replaced by

cattle into the 20th century, notably during the 1930's with the establishment of a Tribal cattle herd (Sophie Aberle Papers UNM MSS 509, Box 5 folder 1b, Box 5a folder 7, Box 6 folder 14, Box 16 folder 20).

In the 19th and early 20th centuries, stock was widely dispersed over high altitude and lower elevation terrains, wherever fodder could be found – west to the Rio Puerco, and east into the Estancia Basin. In Laguna Pueblo's Indian claims case, for example, Lagunas reported that they did not use the Estancia Valley, since this was Isleta's traditional area, where Isleta regularly kept its sheep-herds, notably in the lambing season (Ellis 1974).

In the 19th and early 20th centuries grasses and other fodder were not especially difficult to find. The determining factor for grazing was water. Summer pasturage tended to be in higher elevations, whereas winter herds were kept at lower altitudes. In either case, water was not easy to find.

Within the Rio Grande Valley, livestock were grazed as far south as Las Cruces and Socorro village (Juan Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). Sheep and goats were kept on what is now Kirtland Air Force Base and Tijeras Canyon. On Kirtland AFB, the pastures around Coyote Springs, and Sol se Mete Canyon were favored well into the 20th century (Juan B. Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). Cattle and sheep were also herded nearby and to the west in the Rio Puerco. The Manzano Mountains were also extensively used for grazing sheep and goats (Juan B. Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999).

Further afield and beyond the Rio Grande, sheep, goats, cattle and horses were kept in the Estancia Valley and the Salt Lakes, to the east of the Manzano Mountains (Juan Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). People tending stock in the Estancia Valley would stay for extended periods, but return to Isleta for dances and other ritual occasions (Juan B. Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). Stock was also returned to Isleta for three or four months during the winter since it is colder near Estancia than it is in the Rio Grande Valley. The Knife Mountain region to the east of the Salt Lakes was also a grazing area for sheep (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). This is another locale where shepherds would stay for six months to a year with their flocks. Isleta-owned sheep and goats could also be found in the area of Pueblo Blanco and east throughout the Gallinas Mountains (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). Further east, flocks were sent into the Corona area and along the Pecos River (Juan Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999).

Isleta sheep were also grazed as far south as the Tularosa Basin and the western slopes of the Sacramento Mountains, notably in Mule Canyon (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). The Tularosa Basin and surrounding upland valleys were used by Isletans because of the heavy use by Hispanos of the Estancia Basin for sheep herding. This forced Isletans south into the Tularosa Basin to graze their stock (Juan B. Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). Sheep were taken to the northern slopes of the Capitan Mountains along Macho Canyon and Macho Springs (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). Isletans would also take sheep with them when they traveled on trading trips to the Zuni and Hopi villages (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999), where they were traded.

Somewhat less information is recorded about the historic presence of cattle. Indications of 19th century stock thefts, however, depict Isleta cattle on the Rio Puerco, and probably also in the Manzanos. Navajos stole Isleta cattle from the Rio Puerco in one raid recorded from 1850, and in the 1960's Tony Lucero remembered that his grandfather participated in a campaign to the Sierra Blanca to recover cattle stolen by Mescaleros (Pueblo Transcripts 1967-70, r 7, tape 113, Tony Lucero). Tony Lucero also reported later Isleta cattle-herding in mountain ranges to the west and in the Manzanos (Pueblo Transcripts 1967-70, r 7, item 7; r 7 tape 112, Tony Lucero), where there was a community pasture. But cattle were herded "all over" until the mid-1950's when lease permits were required (ibid; tape 495, pt 4; Rosinda Lucero). Horses were also kept in mountain pastures to the east. (ibid; tape 602, Jose Trujillo). Burros too were kept to the east of the pueblo.

Plant Gathering

Wild plants harvested by Isleta are distributed over a wide and diverse landscape. Through the many centuries of experience on these lands, the people of Isleta have acquired an impressive knowledge of an array of plants. As this knowledge developed into understanding of medicinal and other properties, they were adopted into Isleta subsistence, ritual, and medical practices. These patterns became integral to the Isleta way of life, incorporated into the seasonal round of traveling across the landscape, and into the ritual cycle of works. This knowledge has taken centuries of familiarity with this landscape. The people of Isleta have amassed plant knowledge over a vast landscape that incorporates lands that include but go far beyond the Aboriginal area.

The entire Isleta Aboriginal territory has been used for the collecting of plants, for food, medicine, or ritual purposes. Isletans use many species of plants as food, as seasonings, as medicines, ceremonially, for building materials, for basketry, for weaving, for footwear, for pesticides, as dyes, paints, binding materials such as gums, for string, for play, as shampoos and soaps, tobaccos, cosmetics, deodorants, and a host of other uses such as handles, brooms, and utensils. Researching Isleta ethnobotany in 1931, Volney Jones (1931:48) found 103 species on the Reservation that were utilized and that the Isleta people were knowledgeable about more. Isleta also provided some plants to their Tiwa relatives at Taos: Parsons noted that people at Taos had requested medicine roots, pigments and wristlets of hide from Isleta relatives (Parsons 1936:12).

Several plant-gathering sites were mentioned specifically by Isleta elders during research for the present case. At Coyote Springs are a number of medicine plants near both the Coyote and G Springs areas. Herbs, medicine plants, red paint, brooms (of mountain mahogany) and piñon nuts were once collected in the vicinity of Coyote Springs. Mud from the vicinity was also collected. On the east side of Manzano Mountains, wild potatoes, salt, celery, carrots, and grass grains were collected. The Seven Salt Lakes and the entire Estancia Basin were important plant collecting areas (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). The Salt Trail is also known as the Sand Trail, and Isleta is *Bah hli pa dleh*, referencing a plant used for making arrows (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999).

The Bingham area, between San Antonio and Carrizozo, is important because certain herbs are easier to collect here than they are closer to Isleta, due to less stubborn roots (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). Utilized by Isleta are plants for the treatment of tuberculosis, gallstones and kidney problems (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). Joe Zuni estimates there to be seven plants still collected far to the south by Isleta (July 7 & 9, 1999). In the past, east range grasses, such as Indian rice grass (*Oryzopsis hymenoides*), were extremely deep (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). Wild teas, yucca, juniper, wild potatoes, greens, wild onion, asparagus, tree barks and many medicinal herbs were among the many plants traditionally collected. Evergreens for ritual needs were collected from west slopes of Manzanos (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999).

On the north side of Petroglyph National Monument, Isletans collected the root of 'po dli,' Burdock (*Arctium minus*), used for toothache and stomach. It is also an antidote for poison oak. The leaves retain coolness (Celestino Lucero September 14, 1999).

Other locales for plant collecting in the south include Piñon in the Sacramento Mountains, to the east of Orogrande, the northeast parts of what is now Ft. Bliss, Carlsbad, and the Guadalupe Mountains (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). There are instances where plants are collected in a certain locale for the required potency of its medicinal properties (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999). For instance, a medicinal herb may be found in a dry region to the south in a setting that has made it far more powerful than it would be otherwise. In a case such as this, where plants are growing close to Isleta and are widely distributed as well, they may still be harvested far from home if the higher potency is required (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999).

The Sierra Blanca area (although probably referring to the Guadalupe Mountains to the south) was mentioned in the 1960's as the area where Isletans went to gather peyote, which was used widely by Isleta medicine-men (Pueblo Transcript r 7, tape 495, pt 4 Rosinda Lucero). By the 1960's, peyote was obtained from Mescalero Apaches, but before this, Isletans went down to collect it themselves. Another medicinally important plant, name unknown, was gathered from the north of Feather Cave; this plant, which has a purple flower, is used to clean the blood; it was noted as very rare to the north and near Isleta.

Seven Rivers, east side of Guadalupe Mountains, between Artesia and Carlsbad, was a medicinal herb gathering area. Seven Rivers (Joe Zuni, July 7 & 9, 1999) has medicinal plants and a places where these herbs can be found that are not found closer to Isleta. It was the focus of a larger plant harvesting region that included far more of the eastern slopes of the Guadalupe

Mountains. This area was last regularly visited during the first half of the 20th century, when most access was lost due to fencing (Joe Zuni, July 7 & 9, 1999). Ritually-smoked tobacco was collected from other locales in the Guadalupe Mountains. Other areas specially noted for collecting plants were Carlsbad Caverns, the Organ Mountains, and “from the Hueco Mountains to Alamogordo.”

During a field visit made by the research team to the southern area of Isleta aboriginal lands near Carlsbad, Celestino Lucero identified numerous plants Isletans use (Celestino Lucero September 14, 1999). His knowledge is based on trips he made to the area as a boy to collect plants with his father and grandfather. Several of these plants do not occur close to Isleta pueblo itself, reflecting the wide-ranging Isleta use of plants throughout the aboriginal area. Mr. Lucero does not know most of the English names for these plants, only their Tiwa names. The plants in the area he identified as used by Isleta included the following (the Tiwa name is given first, followed by English name and/or scientific classification):

Thruh xu - Agarita (*Mahonia trifoliata*)

A dye for moccasins, and is used for rashes. Agarita has a southern distribution into the Texas desert [Dodge 1985:79].

Isbienpheu - “Bananas”(Agave *Lechugilla*)

This has a southern distribution, in the Texas and southern New Mexican Chihuahuan desert far into Mexico [Dodge 1985:97, Lamb 1989:3].

Padla - Beargrass (*Nolina erumpens*)

A shampoo that won't fade wool or turn hair white. It is also used for baskets.

Xu'arnapa - Cenizo (*Leucophyllum frutescens*)

Used as a tea for ulcers and fever. Southeastern distribution confined to the far SE corner of New Mexico on into Texas [Moore 1989:26-27]. Cenizo is a Texas and Mexican Chihuahuan plant, taking over for creosote to the south. The Guadalupe Mountains and Carlsbad are the northern extremity of its range (Spellenberg 1998:756).

'Chotle' is a yellow flower. It is a kind of Snakeweed that also grows at Three Rivers, New Mexico.

Nachubar - Creosote (*Larrea tridentata*).

Boiled for menstrual cramps and for stomachaches. The range follows up a very narrow course up the Rio Grande almost to Isleta, actually to Isleta, but otherwise it appears in the Organ Mountains and the Guadalupes in New Mexico and then in southwestern New Mexico (Lamb 1989: 34-35).

Aela - Desert Willow or Desert Catalpa (*Chilopsis linearis*)

The leaves, when ground and made into a paste, are used for toothache. Specifically, the paste is bitten and applied inside and outside of cheek for pain. It occurs in the Texas –New Mexico desert below 4,000 ft. (Dodge 1985:49).

Li - Grama Grass (*Bouteloua* sp.)

The seeds are ground for flour to make tortillas.

Mapiru - Mesquite (*Prosopis glandulosa*).

This is a medicine for strokes.

Peh she hu - Mexican Buckeye (*Ungnadia speciosa*)

The seed is ground, boiled and used as an emetic (it is, in fact, a poison). It has a southern distribution. This small tree ranges into Mexico [Brockman 1968:226]. The Buckeye's distribution in New Mexico is confined only to the Organ Mountains and Guadalupe Mountains [Lamb 1989:140].

Ude tekina - Mountain Laurel (*Sophora secundiflora*) (mescalbean)

The seeds are boiled, strained and poured over the eyes as a medicine. It is confined to the Southern New Mexican – Texas desert [Brockman 1968:190]. Lamb (1989:82) shows a distribution within New Mexico confined only to the Guadalupe Mountains. Celestino Lucero has also seen it growing at Hueco Tanks, Texas.

Ta ad lei - Mullein (*Verbascum* sp.).

This is a small, round leaved variety. Mullein is used as a tobacco. (Corroborated by V. Jones 1931:44). The species seen at Carlsbad is also used as a wrap for cuts.

Phahla - Narrow leaf yucca (*Yucca* sp.).

A soap and shampoo from the roots of this plant prevents hair loss and maintains color.

Nightshade (*Solanum eleagnifolium*)

The ground seeds are used for sores and bites. Leaves are cut open and put on cuts to pull out infection. Flowers are inhaled to eliminate sneezing. (Texas desert)

Xu - One Seed Juniper (*Juniperus monosperma*).

The branches are boiled for cramps associated with colds. The berries are also made into jelly. Two kinds of the, low altitude, One Seed Juniper are recognized, that extend south into the Carlsbad area: one kind is for male use, the other for women. Their Tiwa names are *kweudaxu* and *sinhua*.

Peppergrass (*Lepidum* sp.)

Seeds are ground for seasoning. Rare in the north.

Liphebua - Prickly Pear (*Opuntia* sp.)

The pulp from the pads is used as a dressing for reducing pain and healing wounds. The pulp is also rubbed on warts. The needles are a food.

The Tiwa name is applied to a number of different varieties.

Xuhe - Redberry Juniper (*Juniperus pinchotii*).

The leaves when boiled, strained and ingested warm as a tea are good for a persistent cough. The range of the Redberry Juniper includes Trans-Pecos Texas, across the very southern edges of New Mexico, into Southern Arizona (Little 1998:314).

Strawberry cactus (*Echinocereus* sp.) (Dodge 1985:128)

It is used as food and water in emergencies. It grows sparsely on range land near Isleta. When the top is cut off, the inside almost tastes like watermelon rind.

Kuta - Threadleaf Groundsel (*Senecio douglassii* var. *longilobus*) (Spellenberg 1998:387).

A tea made of the boiled leaves is used to ease stomach ulcers.

Te'edte - Tree Tobacco (*Nicotiniana glauca*)

A tobacco that grows below 3000 ft. Its distribution extends south and southwest, from southern New Mexico into Arizona and California (Lamb 1989:89). Mr. Lucero pointed it out during a field trip to Hueco Tanks and Carlsbad Caverns.

Verbena (*Verbena bipinnatifida*).

The roots are boiled, strained, and drunk to open arteries.

*Mapiru**-Whitethorn Acacia (*Acacia constricta*)

It is used as a tea good for stomach aches. It has a Southern distribution, from Texas to the southern Arizona desert. This Acacia has a decided southern distribution that extends as far north as central Socorro Country, up into the Guadalupe Mountains, and across other southern fragments of New Mexico (Lamb 1989:68-69).

[* this is the same as the name for Mesquite, and relates to their similar appearance]

Numerous plants were gathered in a wide range of locales. For example, the Isletans traditionally used several types of grasses from grasslands on the Plains and to the east and south of Isleta. These were harvested for their seeds, which are protein-rich and provide food resources in early summer when crops are not yet ready. Indian ricegrass (*Oryzopsis hymenoides*), dropseed (*Sporobolus* spp.), Side-Oats Grama grass (*Bouteloua curtipendula*), and Feather grass (*Stipa neomexicana*) were gathered. Fourwing Saltbush (*Atriplex canescens*), a shrub, was also utilized from a wide range of locales.

Mineral collecting

Salt was an extremely important resource and commonly harvested from the Seven Salt Lakes of the Estancia Basin. The importance of the Salt Lakes went well beyond the collecting of salt, however. This was an extremely sacred area as well, mentioned prominently in song and prayer as one of the six hunting shrines and hunting areas of the *Xumahu*, the Isleta hunt chief. The area was utilized for hunting and plant collecting as well. The seven salt lakes, *shup'awi a*, and the Salt Trail, *P'ali Xaypae*, that went to the salt lakes, were important to Isleta both ceremonially and economically. The lakes were an important resource from the pre-contact period onward. The proximity of the Salt Lakes to ancestral Tompiro and Tiwa villages also enhances their importance to Isleta. In the 19th and 20th centuries salt, would be packed on burros for the trip back to Isleta. People would throw deer antlers into the water and salt would stick to the antlers. This was done during the early spring, when the water was down and it was easier to gather the salt (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999).

Although people from Isleta used Seven Salt Lakes for much of their salt, and in many other ways, they also used the Zuni Salt Lake (outside the Isleta Aboriginal area) which apparently has less sand mixed in with the salt. The salt from Zuni is preferred for some things (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999)

Mica from Mica Mountain, to the west of Isleta village, was used for whitewash of inside walls, as window panes, and to treat corn to make posole. The mica takes the skin off the kernels. Mica Mountain is a white spot on the east side of a mesa we can see looking west from Pottery Mound (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999). Mica was also used for window panes. As an interior whitewash for walls, it gives a smooth, glossy, almost waterproof finish (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999). This is also a shrine area mentioned in Isleta songs (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999).

Clay for pottery making was collected just south of the village (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). Iron pyrite came from Hopi, Laguna (outside the Aboriginal Area) and the Manzano Mountains (Juan B. Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). Minerals for paint and other uses were collected to the east of the village in Hell's Canyon and west of the village near the Rio Puerco (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999).

Water was collected at Coyote Springs on Kirtland Air Force Base (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). The spring water is naturally carbonated and bubbles to the surface. According to recent samplings of the water here, it is now heavily laden with arsenic and also has some lead in it.

These tests began around 1988. In the past, however, before the spring was contaminated, Isleta people used the mineral waters for a number of ailments. The water from Coyote Spring was felt to be beneficial for arthritis. Joe Zuni remembers coming to the spring to collect water by the barrel full for his ailing grandmother (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). Isleta elders remember coming to Coyote spring for the water, which was collected by wagon in large wooden barrels. The area was closed to them in either 1939 or 1940, when the U.S. military took it over. At Coyote Springs (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999) are also a number of medicine plants and minerals traditionally collected by Isletans; notably a specific clay for a red paint, and a mud from the vicinity. A red rouge for face paint was also collected farther away, near the entrance to Hell's Canyon on the south side (Joe Zuni September 9, 1999).

Water was once collected as holy water from the Rio Grande, but because of pollution, water is collected elsewhere, including sites in the Manzano Mountains (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999).

Trade

As noted, the Isletans were not a sedentary people. In addition to extensive travel for hunting, gathering and religious purposes, Isletans also traveled long distances within and beyond their aboriginal territory to trade. In the 19th and early 20th centuries, surplus crops, fruit, grapes, dried vegetables and livestock were all widely traded, the continuation of a long-standing pattern. Isleta has long-standing and active trade relations with native peoples to the east, on the southern Plains of eastern New Mexico, West Texas, and Oklahoma. This is not surprising considering the historic trade fairs at Gran Quivira and a strong Isletan tradition of hunting in these areas. While on long-distance buffalo hunts to Oklahoma, Isletans would trade with Comanches and other southern Plains peoples during their extended stays (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). Isletans also traded with Comanches near Tucumcari; they took dried fruit and corn to trade for deer skins, buffalo hides, and well as plant dyes (Juan Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). Isleta trading to the Comanches is recorded also in historic documents and in Charles Lummis' 19th century ethnographic records. Isletans are also recorded widely trading to the south among Mexican Indians below El Paso area, and to the west as far as Zuni and Hopi (outside the

Aboriginal area). Often these trips involved multiple uses of the landscape en route. Isleta trading songs record many of these trips (e.g., Alan Lomax:1942, 6325 B (tape 5), Library of Congress). All of which confirms frequent, extensive travel by Isletans within and beyond their aboriginal territory.

Habitation sites

The distribution of habitation sites spread over the Aboriginal area shows that inhabitants gradually withdrew from the farther reaches of this region over the centuries, consolidating ultimately in the Isleta of today. Although inhabitants withdrew from fulltime occupation, the pattern of activities conducted over the Aboriginal area through the historic period and even into this century demonstrates that there was no real abandonment of the area. Rather, research shows that Isletans continued to travel over, live on, retain active knowledge of, have religious and ritual ties to, and draw from the resources of the Aboriginal area to make their living. The full Aboriginal area was, in this way, crucial to Isleta Pueblo's mode of subsistence – a method of survival traditionally based upon a mixed economy that was grounded in part on agriculture and significantly supplemented by the gathering of wild plants, hunting, herding and trading. These activities can be traced to the knowledge of the area's resources that was carried to Isleta from ancestral villages. This knowledge, along with an array of religious activities, resulted in Isletans continued and regular presence throughout the Aboriginal area.

Isleta elders consider historic Tiwa villages from Alameda Pueblo south to be ancestral to the mother village of Isleta (Juan B. Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). These include villages from Alameda on the north to Bernardo on the south. Historic and Protohistoric villages east of the Manzano Mountains are also ancestral in part since migrants from these Pueblos removed to Isleta. Mentioned specifically are Punta de Agua, Chililí, Tajique, Quarái, Abó, and Gran Quivira (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). The Isleta people consider the Tiwa, Tompiro and Piro people to be ancestral to Isleta (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999). It is a common pattern among the Pueblos to treat formerly inhabited villages as shrines (e.g., Fewkes 1906, entry on 'Shrines' in the Handbook of North American Indians).

In 1630 Benavides (Ayer 1916) recorded a number of smaller Pueblos clustered around Isleta. At the time, Isleta and Sandia clearly comprised the centers of two major Tiwa populations. Isleta was a regional capital with satellite, southern Tiwa villages that extended

north and south along the Rio Grande and to the east of the Manzanos. To the east, these ties connected the Pueblo with the Saline Tiwa Pueblos, notably Chililí, Tajique, Manzano, Torreón and Quarái. Spanish chroniclers of the era repeatedly commented on the abundance of buffalo and other game in the area east of the Manzanos. As noted by Bandelier, one of the great advantages of the Saline Pueblos on the east side of the Manzano Mountains (when these pueblos were inhabited) was their ready access to game. Available nearby were vast herds of antelope, bison as well as turkey, bear and deer in the mountains to the west (Bandelier 1892:266). Isleta and these Saline Pueblos likely comprised a political-economic symbiosis in which meat and other Plains-oriented goods were supplied to Isleta in exchange for agricultural products. Indeed, Isleta elders and religious leaders have repeatedly emphasized that Isleta served as a mother village to which people returned from other settlements for religious purposes (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). According to Isletan oral tradition these villages and farming settlements were founded by the mother village of Isleta (Joe Zuni September 9, 1999). This supports the assumption of political dependencies, given that political and ceremonial hierarchies are intertwined in Pueblo societies. All the other villages came to Isleta for advice, counseling, and direction with respect to the customs and traditions of the people (Juan Abeita September 9, 1999). Again, this is a widespread pattern throughout the Pueblos.

Various types of sites or locations demonstrate Isleta's historical connection to the lands of the Aboriginal area. These include ancestral villages, habitation sites, campsites, shrine sites, rock art sites, artifact scatters, and a system of landmarks and trails, among others. Village ruins and other permanent and temporary settlements are still widely preserved in Tribal memory through oral tradition. These sites have often continued to be used as campsites on resource gathering trips, and are regarded as sacred sites. Gran Quivira, for example, a Tompiro village, is known by the Isletans as *Tshya – parm-ay* or "Prayer Plume Town" (Bandelier 1966-76 V.4:141), or today as *Shiemay* (Joe Zuni September 9, 1999). The village is considered as ancestral by the Isletans and contemporary elders still tell of a traditional night ceremony held in February in which they jointly performed the *haunin* (or *xawnin*, according to current orthography) with Gran Quivira (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999); a painting of this dance is included in *Isleta Paintings* (Goldfrank 1962:274). The ruin of this village is today treated as a sacred site. Similarly, oral tradition indicates prehistoric affiliation with Jornada Mogollon (see below) era habitations and ritual rock art sites in the Three Rivers area (between Carrizozo and

Alamogordo), and this area has been continually used into the present as a plant collection and hunting area. Iconography near Abó and at Three Rivers shows specific and detailed patterns recognized and named by Isletans including representations of dances still performed today. Rock art associated with Piro settlements at Cerro Indio and Tajo are also associated with specific, currently relevant attributions.

Again, this concatenation of sacred significance with economic practices in the landscape – like gathering or hunting in the same vicinity – is a widely reported pattern among the Pueblos.

Ancestral Villages within the Isleta Aboriginal area:

It is common for Pueblo people to continue to use areas where they formerly had villages. This is widely known among all the contemporary Pueblos, and is specifically the case in Isleta's continuing use of lands surrounding the Saline Tiwa and Tompiro villages.

Saline Tiwa and Tompiro Villages

As described by Isleta people today, the historic villages to the east of the Manzanos that included the Tiwa and Tompiro-speaking Pueblos, were “our people” (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). Juan Abeita was told by his grandparents that Isletans lived in the Salinas villages (villages to the east of the Manzanos), but due to drought some moved to the mother village of Isleta. He heard the same about the Piro villages to the south of Isleta; that migrants from those villages made their way to Isleta as well (Juan Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). Other oral history sources report the same: “A group of people from Isleta lived out near the salt lakes before the Revolt period” (Joe Zuni, July 7 & 9, 1999).

Quarái

Several notations were made of Quarái in the records compiled for this case. For example, (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999) told a story that people from Gran Quivira and Quarái went to Isleta. Lummis (MS.1.1.901, Feb 22, 1909, Southwest Museum) noted that “Quarái was built as a Pueblo to live in by --- Tigua linguistic stock. ---- . some of the descendents of the people of Quarái still live in the Pueblo of Isleta to which they fled.” Stories such as these are corroborated by ethnohistoric accounts, some shreds of evidence from historic documents,

evidence from the archaeological record, and the identification of Tiwa-Piro-Tompiro rock art by the Land Claim Committee (Juan Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999, Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999 and Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). For example, Lummis presented the following story of the 'Accursed Lake':

– (the story “The Accursed Lake”, begins as follows) – ‘Away to the southeast of the Manzano Mountains, two days journey from my pueblo of Isleta, are the shallow salt lakes. For scores of miles their dazzling sheen is visible – a strange patch of silver on the vast brown plains. They are near the noblest ruins in our North America – the wondrous piles of massive masonry of Abó, Cuaray (Quarái), and the so-called “Gran Quivira” – --- --. -----. From that locality came, centuries ago, part of the people who then founded Isleta, and whose descendants dwell here to this day.’ 108-109

Another story, “The Ants that Pushed on the Sky”, begins:

‘A very ancient and characteristic story about the origin of Isleta is based on the historic fact that part of its founders came from east of the Manzano Mountains, from one of the prehistoric pueblos whose ruins are now barely visible in those broad plains. Once upon a time there lived in one of those villages (so runs the story) a young Indian named Kahp-too-óo-yoo, the Corn-stalk Young Man.’ 147

Lummis also recorded that in the years before the Pueblo Revolt, ‘Those who escaped death at Cuarái (Quarái), being Tiguas, fled to their brethren at Shee-e-huíb-bac, now Isleta, whose fathers all had come, according to their traditions, from Apache-erased pueblos of the Manzano plain’ (Lummis 1893:233-234). While the reason stated for the abandonment is over-simplified in Lummis’ account (drought and internal dissension were significant factors; see below), the point of importance here is that the Isletans continued to use those lands.

Punta del Agua, P’akunina ‘where the water ends’ is a small settlement east of Quarái and its Spanish name is undoubtedly a translation of the Tiwa name referring to the irrigation ditch there.

Chilili

The former Tiwa pueblo of Chililí stood on the west side of the creek that runs through the village. The remains of this pueblo are now built over, with only a few traces of the former chapel, which is on the east bank of the same creek. Chililí Pueblo was abandoned ca 1674 (Ivey 1988). Most of the inhabitants went from Chililí went to Isleta (Bandelier 1892:257).

This Isleta name for Chililí, T'oo-shi-tō-ai (Oriole), was recorded by Lummis with Isleta narrator, Vicente, 11/8/1891 (Lummis MS box 1, Southwest Museum).

Bandelier recorded an alternative Isleta name for Chililí: 'Shumnac' (Bandelier 1889-92[1984]:168).

Tajique

There are ruins of a Tiwa village here. Isletans once lived here and it remained a hunting area for Isletans (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999).

Lummis notes that "Tigua name of the ancient Pueblo of Tajique was Toosh-t'yáy-ai = prayer stick town - and the special kind of prayer stick used in the spring medicine making (Lummis MS box 1, Southwest Museum). This appears to be a sacred name, perhaps applied to a place after leaving the location as a mark of respect for the spirits their forefathers.

Torreón

Small ruins of Torreón (Bandelier 1892:259): a former Tiwa village here.

Manzano

There are Tiwa Pueblo ruins near here. Close to Manzano are ruins Isletans now call Pueblo Colorado. The ruins of Manzano Pueblo itself are on a hill, west of a morada.

Tompiro Towns

The Isleta elders (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999) feel that Piro and Tompiro were the same language as Tiwa, but a different dialect, much like the difference between Isleta and Taos or Picuris. The Piro at Isleta went to and came back from Punta del Agua and Gran Quivira (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999, Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999). Of the Tompiro towns within the Salinas province, Isleta feels most closely connected to Abó, and Gran Quivira. Abó petroglyphs south of the pueblo of Abó contain a number of pictographs considered to be sacred Isletan symbols. Similar ceremonies continue to be performed at Isleta today or were performed in living memory (Juan Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999).

Gran Quivira

Several ritual connections exist between Gran Quivira (Pueblo de los Humanas) and Isleta. There used to be a night ceremony in February where the Black Eyes and Red Eyes moieties used to rotate with people from Gran Quivira, Abó, and Quarái (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). Again such rotating ceremonial patterns are well known in the pueblos elsewhere; at Hopi for example. The 'Hailala' dance came from Abó, and the 'bathuhunin' came from Gran Quivira (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999); 'hailalas' was performed by the south clan (Corn Group) which still exists at Isleta, the last time this dance was performed was about 70 years ago. These dances used to alternate with Isletan Black Eye and Red Eye moiety dances. These were still performed into the 20th century (Joe Zuni). A third dance was from Abó and Gran Quivira, known as the 'haunin' ('thunders'); images of this dance appear on Abó/ Tenabó rock art. Women performing the hailala are illustrated in *Isleta Paintings* (Goldfrank 1962:274).

Abó

Similar ritual ties existed between Abó and Isleta. The *Haunin* were a group of dancers that originated from the people of Abó and Gran Quivira, and images of this dance appear on Abó/ Tenabó rock art. Some Isletans went to Abó and Gran Quivira and then some came back before the Revolt (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999)

Many symbols in Abó iconography appear in Isleta songs that refer to the living. Very few refer to past events or the deceased. Some pictures that were once here have been removed (petroglyphs on boulders removed by highway construction). Some of those that have been removed were Isletan in origin. Some petroglyphs represent the Evergreen Dance and dance costumes in this dance.

Southern Tiwa Villages on the Rio Grande

At the time of the first Spanish explorations, there were numerous southern Tiwa villages within the Isleta area. By 1680, Isleta was the only southern Tiwa village south of Alameda (north of modern Albuquerque). Isleta has ancestral interests in all southern Tiwa villages from Alameda pueblo on south. These were part of the migration to and consolidation of Isleta described above. They include:

- 1) on the north side base of Mesa de los Padillas, where there are extensive ruins

2) ruins at Ojo de la Cabra (Goat Spring) (Bandelier 1892:233).

3) There are more Isleta ruins to the west of Isleta, on the flanks of the volcanic heights.

Settlements to the south of Isleta included at least six villages, including:

4) Be-jui Tu-ay – Los Lentos, Rainbow Village. This site is under and near Los Lentos church. This was a sub-village of Isleta Pueblo. It was the second largest village after Isleta itself. (Pueblo Transcripts 1967-70, r 8, Tape #771, Joe Trujillo). People from Los Lentos went back and forth, and used to come to Isleta for ceremonies. Some current Isleta oral tradition is that Los Lentos included Piro people – a fact borne out in the 1790 census, one of the few to list specific Indian identities (Olmsted 1975; SANM II, #1092b, Census of Albuquerque Jurisdiction 10-22-1790). Isleta Tiwas and Piros resided here until some time in the 20th century when they moved to Isleta. There are still some Piro families at Isleta (Juan Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). Los Lentos Piro dances continue to be performed at Isleta. Most dances at Los Lentos were the same as those performed at Isleta (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). Los Lentos was mentioned by Bandelier as Be-jui Tu-ay, part of the southern flank of Tiwa settlement (Bandelier 1892:233). Bandelier also said that “Los Lentos” included Piros (Bandelier 1966-76, II:21). There is still a street name ‘Piro Lane’ in Los Lentos. Current Isleta people still have relatives in Los Lentos and people at Isleta named ‘Lentos’ or ‘Lente’ are descendants of people from Los Lentos. This was the southern boundary call of the Gutierrez Grant purchased by Isleta prior to 1808.

5) Wind Settles Place (hwan dlay). This is an ancestral Isletan site (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999 in the mouth of Tijeras Canyon: it is also known as Four Hills Pueblo (since it is adjacent to the Four Hills golf course). It is said that people from here went to “19th Hole Pueblo” located on the Isleta Golf Course, and then on to Yellow Earth Village to the east side the present village of Isleta. Lummis (1976 [1894]:12-21) records a cycle of stories “Antelope Boy” stories pertaining to Yellow Earth Village and White Earth Village.

6) Pure Tu-ay. This site was mentioned by Bandelier (1892:232) as being an ancestral Isleta village on Mesa de los Padillas. The site is on the northern rim of the mesa and is an L-shaped village with two components, including a PI-II (A.D. 900-1150) and a later Revolt-era (1680) phase that constitutes the majority of the roomblock. It is approximately 50 by 65 meters in size. The archaeological site is also mentioned by Fisher (1931) and Mera (1940); it is recorded by the Laboratory of Anthropology as site LA 489, and is acknowledged as ancestral to

Isleta. The majority of the pueblo was built during the 1600's and inhabited intermittently thereafter. This Isleta village is the subject of a story recorded by Lummis. The story is 'The Town of the Snake Girls', Pur'Tu-ay being the town in question (Lummis 1976 [1894]:130).

Piro villages

Piro descendants remain in Isleta. Some of these came from rebel Piros from the four remaining Piro villages in 1680 (Socorro, Senecú, Alamillo, and Sevilleta) who joined Isleta after the attempt at reconquest by Otermín in 1681.

For example, Forbes notes:

Later, a Tiwa chief took the Piros who had remained in their homeland northward to Isleta, perhaps because the Piros were exposed to raids by hostile Apaches and Spaniards from El Paso or because the Tiwas feared that an invading Spanish army might make use of Piro warriors against them. (Forbes 1994:186-7 – Declaration of Lucas, December 19, 1681, in Hackett 1937, II: 243)

“---and discovered that all of the Piro pueblos were abandoned. Senecú, Socorro, Alamillo, and Sevilleta had been deserted by the “apostate Piros” who had gone to join the rebel Tiwas at Isleta.” (Forbes 1994:187 – Record of the March, in Hackett 1937, II:183-207).

Shrines and Sacred Sites

Places of religious and ritual importance are found in a variety of settings over much of Isleta's traditional landscape. These include mountains, hills, mesas, lakes, rivers and other sources of water, caves, salt and other mineral sources, as well as other places with less distinguishable natural features such as ancestral villages and other Pueblos. Sacred sites, shrines and other religiously-sanctified locations formalize, substantiate and identify Isletan presence on the landscape in a way that no other activity does. Shrines can relate directly to subsistence activities in the surrounding landscape. This is the case for hunting shrines and shrines of the hunt chief. Other places of religious importance have a broader significance, perhaps referring to origin stories or places where ancestral spirits reside. In all cases, shrines and other types of sacred sites, have a set and formal place in Isletan cosmology, are prayed to during ongoing, cyclical ritual events, and are described in sacred songs.

Shrine sites in the Aboriginal area include hunting shrines (these appear in a variety of landscape features and include areas regarded as hunting areas or in one case, a game refuge), shrines at sites associated with Spiritual Beings, ancestral sites, mountain shrines, and shrines associated with caves and lakes. Mountains, hills, lakes, and caves figure prominently in the origin stories and cosmologies of Isleta. Mountains define and enclose the Pueblo world and important deities are associated with many of these (cf. Ortiz 1969, on the Tewa; and Parsons 1939 on all the Pueblos). Certain mountains are also associated with lakes. These lakes also possess deities that are believed to dwell within them. At the time of certain rituals, the lake-dwelling deities are called to and brought into the Pueblo. The importance of lakes, ponds and caves is drawn in part from their symbolic association with the underworld. Lakes, caves, springs, and other features are believed to be entrances to the underworld, from where the Pueblo people believe they once emerged and return after death.

Information concerning the existence, location and purpose of such sacred sites is closely guarded at Isleta, even among people within the Pueblo. Shrines, placenames, songs, and rituals are confined to specific societies and Corn Groups within Isleta. This information is strictly guarded and not shared between such societies. As a result, we have been able to record only a limited number of these for this project. Of those identified, many show a great antiquity and a

large number of the total are said to remain in use. A number of these locations were identified both in contemporary oral historical accounts as well as in songs and stories recorded in the 19th century. These shrines and religious places are called to by the people of Isleta both as fixed elements of the yearly cycle of religious practices and for the support they offer to the broad range of daily subsistence activities. They are maintained in the collective memory of the tribe through songs and stories still recounted in the Pueblo to this day. From a symbolic perspective, the shrines serve to link Isletans spiritually with the ancestral lands, while, from an archaeological perspective, the shrines can be seen to serve as markers of Isleta territory.

In the past, Isletans traveled to their shrines and sacred sites, cyclically and regularly. Today, because their travel to these places is restricted by both private ownership and lack of privacy, Isleta religious leaders travel to these shrines in a spiritual way through their songs and ceremonies. These spiritual visits are based on prior, regular visits when Isleta's landscape was free, open, and accessible (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999).

Mountain and Hill shrines

The Pueblo world has its landmarks, and within that world, there are particular sacred mountains. An important mountain shrine for Isleta is the Na-phíp'ien, Sandia Crest (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999; cf. Harrington 1920). To the south is 'hwan dlay' or Wind Settles Mountain (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999) as well as Edge of the Wind (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999). Eagle Feather Peak is on the map as Guadalupe Peak. It is on the Isleta reservation in the Manzano Mountains. Parsons recorded this as 'Shyubato' - White Eagle, (our Mountain), the home of the *iiwa* or kachina (1932:209). Parsons also calls this "White Eagle Mountain", where the dark kachina live. She goes on to say that Isletans go there to collect spruce for the spring crop dance (1939:265,547,812). Bosque Peak and Aspen Circle to the south of here are also shrines as in the nearby Maguinay (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999).

To the west is Mount Taylor, a sacred boundary marker to many Pueblos. For Isleta it marks the northwestern boundary of the Aboriginal territory: it is 'túwíe-'ai' (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999). Beyond that boundary, there are farther mountains of sacred significance to Isleta but which are not included in the Aboriginal area. Zuni Mountain is one of these; Parsons (1939:548,785) gives the name 'welima' for it, the same name noted today by present Isleta

elders (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). Parsons further describes it as home to the kachina. Another of the several shrines in the Zuni area recognized by Isleta is 'cadeshima', home to the Zuni rain gods (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). To the south of Isleta (within Isleta Aboriginal territory) is the mountain shrine of Ladron Peak (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999), which is a hunting area. The Ladrons (shirupiena, k'uapíriei) are mentioned in the mythology, like the other shrines mentioned (and see Harrington 1920:44).

Further south, within the Isleta Aboriginal area, is Place of the Bell, or Bell Mountain (Cerro de la Campana). This is just west of the White Sands Missile Range near the northwest corner of the range. It has a number of oval cobble structures near the top of the summit (Marshall and Walt 1984:101-102). It is a shrine mentioned in Isleta songs, and a story, "The Brave Bobtails" (Lummis 1976 [1894]:172). In the story, 'The Place of the Bell' is where Sun-Arrow and the youngest daughter of the Cacique ran the marrying-race (Lummis 1976 [1894]:171-172). Turturma Mesa is a shrine and a hunting refuge on the broad plain to the west of Abó Pass (Juan Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). Any game animals reaching the slopes of this butte are safe from Isleta hunters.

Near Isleta are Los Lunas Hill, Mica Mountain (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999), and Wind Mesa (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999), Black Mounds (Na thu Phoon), Grandfather Rock, and Pollen Mountain. Pollen Mountain is at the Petroglyph National Monument and is a spiritual place, still mentioned in song (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999). Standing Rock is a spiritual place where the "Trues" reside (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999). According to the Lummis folk story, "The Hungry Grandfathers", these are called 'T'ai-kar-nin' (Those-Who-Eat-People), aboriginal ogres who dwelt in caves on the Black Mountain called 'Ku-mai' hill. This is also referred to by Parsons (1932:412) and Harrington (1920 Harrington Archive vol. 4, reel 36, frame 420). Wind Mesa or Wawapú-'ai (Harrington (1920 p.43 of Isleta Language: Texts and Analytical Vocabulary) is "where the wind sounds."

To the east are Gallinas Peak and Sierra Blanca (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999), both hunting shrines. Gallinas Peak is mentioned in a song recorded by Lummis called "Going out to Hunt antelope (Lummis Tape 1, side A, #10, 80.03.20, Southwest Museum). Also to the east are the six hunting shrines of the *Xumahu* discussed below under 'Hunting Shrines'. Sierra Blanca too is mentioned as a shrine in Isleta songs (Juan Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999).

Cave shrines

Cave shrines include the important hunting shrine of Wolf Cave, home of the spirit of the *Xumahu* (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999). There are also cave shrines in the Ladron Mountains, Isleta Cave, Manzano Cave, and at Black Mesa west of the Pueblo (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999). Feather Cave is a Mogollon-era shrine with many ritual objects associated with Isleta.

Lake and spring shrines

Two small lakes near the Zuni ice cave (outside the Aboriginal area) are places where the spirits or truths reside (Juan B. Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). This is west of Acoma and close to the Isleta Zuni trail. A spring just south of Isleta is called Bamboo Springs Lake (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). This shrine is close to another spring called P'ahdłah, now called Carrizo Spring. This was once a camping place for travelers. As discussed in the hunting section the Seven Salt Lakes are highly important shrines. Also of note are Sunrise and Sunset Lakes, home of the truths of the east and west which correspond to the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans.

River shrines

The Rio Grande is a shrine where Isletans used to take holy water or water for blessings (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). The Isleta also consider other rivers across their traditional lands to be shrines. These include the Rio Puerco, the Pecos River and the Canadian River (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999). The Pecos River is known in Tiwa as 'xwioku peyła' (stone good river). The Canadian River is 'ta x'adi peyła' (wood beads river) (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). The wood beads referred to in this name has to do with the bark of a tree that grows along the Canadian River. It apparently breaks off into small 'beads' (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). There are songs about these trees with natural hishi beads. Isleta people used to make beads of these.

Hunting shrines

Hunting shrines or sacred sites relating to the hunt are found throughout Isletan hunting areas although, they are especially prevalent to the east of the Manzanos. Most prominent and important of the Isleta hunting shrines are the six shrines of the *Xumahu* (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). These are *karpharai*, *karbienai*, *auway*, *ta'pay*, *shiabienay*, and *tauwli teuay Xumahu* (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). The spirit or truths of the *Xumahu* reside in all of these shrines (Ben

Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999). Each of these is surrounded by extensive antelope hunting areas and all are prominently mentioned in traditional Isletan hunting songs. Wolf Cave, 'karpharai,' was recorded as a shrine by Lummis (1891:211) and Bandelier (1892:255).

To the south of Isleta is an antelope hunting area in a broad expanse of the Rio Grande Valley. In the center of this open expanse is *Turututu* Butte or *Turturma* (Juan B Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999), a game refuge and shrine. Hunted animals are not killed if they manage to reach the refuge of *Turturma*'s slopes.

Ancestral Village shrines

Many ancestral villages are considered shrines, because they are home to ancestral spirits (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999). Evidence for this comes also from shrine names for villages recorded by Lummis and Bandelier for Tajique and Gran Quivira, both referring to prayer plumes. Since the villages themselves have already been discussed, we will not reiterate those sites here.

Isleta trails

Trails led from Isleta in all directions. Many of these have recently been replaced by roads or blocked by fences and other obstructions. Traditional Isletan trails and routes precede all of these recent alterations to the landscape. Many of these were once foot trails, traveled by Isletans before the period of Spanish colonization. Pedestrian travelers crossed long distances on these routes. The extensiveness of Pueblo foot-travel is widely recorded (e.g., Nabokov 1981). During the historic period, foot travel was partly replaced by the horse, wagons, pack mules and burros. As this occurred, some traditional Isletan foot trails were transformed into wagon roads. In the late 19th and early 20 centuries, the railroad and car further transformed Isletan means of transport. Nineteenth century maps contain a number of identified Isletan trails either as trails or wagon roads.

Most trails were used by the people of Isleta for a variety of activities. Such routes were commonly taken by hunters, traders, travelers to other villages and communities, pilgrims to sacred sites, and people gathering plants or minerals within and beyond the Isleta Aboriginal area. To the west of Isleta was a trail to Hopi used for trade and hunting in the Rio Puerco and areas around Mt. Taylor. This trail passes through Mica Mountain, which was the first night's camping site. The second night would be spent at Laguna (Juan Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). The Hopi trail kept to the south through Zuni and well on to the west before turning north to avoid Navajos to the north (Juan Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). There were more direct routes to Hopi, passing to the north of Gallup, that became more heavily used toward the end of the 19th century. The northern route to Hopi went through Laguna, to the south of Mount Taylor, with a camping place at Tibido (Navajo for Buffalo Spring), and then went north of Blue Water (Juan B. Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999).

To the north of Isleta were undoubtedly trails to other Rio Grande Pueblos although these have long been obscured by historic tracks and roads utilizing similar routes. An Isletan trail through Tijeras Canyon led north on the east side of the Sandia Mountains and over to the Canadian River before turning east to Oklahoma and hunting areas elsewhere far to the east (Juan Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999).

To the south and following the Rio Grande as far as Bernardo was a trail to the Ladron Mountains (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999), a sacred place described in song and legend. This trail was both a pilgrimage route and a hunting trail. To the east of Belen is a hill through which the La Loma Alta trail passed on its way to Abó and Quarái (Juan B. Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). La Loma Alta (hill) is a promontory that marks the beginning of this wagon road/trail heading east into Manzano Mountains. Prior to its existence as a wagon road, this was likely a trail between Isleta and the Pre-Pueblo Revolt settlements of Abó and Quarái. This is also the case for the Priest Canyon Trail and others.

Trails to the east led into the Manzano Mountains through most canyons from Tijeras on the north to Abó in the south. These trails then proceeded east, northeast and southeast, to the salt lakes and beyond. Salt was collected at the Seven Salt Lakes (*shup'awi a*), in the Estancia Valley. Primary routes to the salt lakes include the Albuquerque Trail (a recent name), the Salt Trail, the Ojito Canyon Trail, and the Comanche Canyon trail (Juan Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). The Albuquerque Trail begins below Guadalupe Peak near White Rock Spring and joins the Salt Trail on the east side of the mountains in Fourth of July Canyon (Juan B. Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). The Salt Trail follows Ojito Canyon to the south of Guadalupe Peak on the west side. After joining together, this trail leads due east to the northern edges of the Salt Lakes (Juan Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). A trail to the south of these routes, in Comanche Canyon, also led to the salt lakes and was used for salt collection. The Comanche Canyon trail has also been described as a trading route (Juan Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). Another measure of the importance of the Seven Salt Lakes is the number of trails that lead to them from Isleta. Several of these trails, the Comanche, Ojito and Salt trails converge at Tajiique before proceeding east.

Other trails led into the Manzanos Mountains. These are Aspen Circle Trail that led to the planting areas on top of this peak as did the Ojito trail (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999), Trigo Canyon Trail (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999) which went to Manzano and Abó, and Cañon Monte de Abajo Trail. To the north of the salt trails was a route through Hell's Canyon (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999). Before this way was closed by fences and private ownership, it led to a spring on top of the mountain and on to Escabosa and the Chilili Grant (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999). From there this trail progressed east. In the later years of the Hell's Canyon Trail, Isleta people took it to a sawmill in Escabosa (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999).

Close to the salt lakes are a number of shrines, hunting areas, plant collecting areas, and grazing lands. Several of the salt trails continued on to the east of the Seven Salt Lakes. One of these was a hunting and trading trail that led east to Encino (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). Another followed southeast to Corona (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999) and on to the east and south. A trail passed close to Moriarty that was also known as the Wolf Mountain Trail to Wolf Mountain and hunting areas in the vicinity (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999).

A number of routes led to hunting areas beyond the Manzano Mountains, to the east, south, and west. Many of these were also used for trade or led to other villages. Hunting, as a major activity at Isleta however, involved the use of routes known primarily for leading to areas with plentiful and accessible game. Beginning to the north was a trail through Tijeras Canyon (Juan Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999) that followed a northerly course after passing to the east of the Sandia Mountains. This trail passed through San Miguel County and followed the Canadian River to a camping areas in Tucumcari, then continuing along the Canadian River into hunting areas in Oklahoma (Juan Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). People also took this route to trade with the Comanches and Kiowas. Upon returning from the Plains, hunters along this route used Guadalupe Peak in the Manzanos as a homecoming landmark (Juan Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). The Salt Lake – Encino trail led to the Texas Panhandle and Amarillo area which was another favored antelope and buffalo hunting region (Juan B. Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). The Corona trail led south to Sierra Blanca and the Tularosa Basin (Juan B. Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999).

Other trails through the Manzanos led south to Gran Quivira, Abó, and other Pre-Revolt Tompiro pueblos (Juan Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). The Priest Canyon Trail went from Tomé to Abó through the north-south trending Priest Canyon in the Manzano Mountains. Later a wagon road, it was preceded by a trail to the Pre-Revolt Pueblos of Abó and Quarái (Juan B. Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). This trail east just to the north of Abó. It was apparently named after a priest that used to go to Abó to hold mass (Juan B. Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999).

Hunting & traveling landmarks

Because hunting parties traveled so widely in their search for game, they relied upon a number of established landmarks to guide them. These led hunters to locales with plentiful game, springs and other sources of water, camping sites, and other places important to the hunt.

Landmarks are often shrine locations as well (Juan Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999). Hunting landmarks of the Isletans are either mountains, mesas, or other promontories visible over long distances. In the Rio Grande Valley, to the south of Isleta is Ladron Peak (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999), a hunting landmark, hunting area and shrine. On the the south side of Ladron peak is 'shiamay', another landmark and hunting region. On the northwest side of Ladron is 'shieroy', a further landmark and hunting area. These three landmarks served to orient hunters with relation to these three, closely spaced landmarks. Another landmark in the Rio Grande are the Los Pinos Mountains (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999), less prominent than the Ladrons, but visible for long distances nevertheless. To the east of the Manzano Mountains is Knife Mountain (Juan Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999), two small peaks to the east of Estancia that were visible over long distances of the flat plains they surrounded. Knife Mountain served as a hunting landmark and was the site of a trading post in later years. Gallo Mesa is a hunting landmark east of Pueblo Colorado (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). It is described in Harrington's notes as "Mt. way over on other side of and east of Chilili" (Harrington 1920:48). Further to the southeast, Sierra Blanca (Juan Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999) also served as a landmark for hunters as the highest peak in Southeastern New Mexico. In addition to the above-mentioned are a number of promontories along the Manzano-Sandia Mountain chain that served hunters as visual points of reference. Of particular note among these is Guadalupe Peak (Juan Abeita July 2 & 9, 1999), which served as a trail landmark for hunters on a trail through the Manzanos, and also indicated the direction of Isleta from this trail, i.e., just beyond and to the west.

Tomé Hill, *Tumey*, and the Tomé Church are both pilgrimage sites for Isletans, although the Catholic pilgrimage are more recent than the aboriginal ones. The Cerro de Tomé has had extensive use as a landmark, observation point, refuge area, shrine area, petroglyph site, and hunting area (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999).

Rock Art Sites

In their ritual and ceremonial paraphernalia, ritual personages, dance figures, ceremonial and dance costumes, Isleta elders continue to make use of familiar metaphors and commonly-used symbols that appear in historic Tiwa, Piro, Tompiro, and prehistoric Jornada Mogollon rock

art. Certain rock art symbols are the specific property of Corn Groups within the Pueblo or restricted to specific societies or descendants of migrants into the pueblo.

Several sites were highlighted by elders as containing rock art of ritual significance to Isleta, including: Three Rivers, Capitan North, Petroglyph National Monument, Los Lunas Hill, Tomé Hill, Ojito Canyon, Cerro Indio (San Acacia), Abó, Tenabó, Tajo (Socorro area), Black Mesa, Alamo Mountain, Frying Pan, Apache Creek, Willow Springs, Capitan, Cooke's Peak, Carlsbad Caverns, Feather Cave Shelters, Surrat Cave, Sandal Cave, Hueco Tanks, and the Hueco Mountains. One important image found throughout the Jornada Mogollon region (most of southeastern New Mexico and into Texas - see description below under Archaeology) and nowhere else - is a tear flowing from the right eye of a frontal mask. In Tiwa, the word for a tear is the same word for a spring and water, and is a cognate to *shi-pap*, the place of emergence. A number of other Jornada images that do not appear elsewhere and which are all associated with Isleta ritual imagery include: a particular stylized circle-and-dots design (see photo); a four-part image that distinctively combines a corn plant with a stepped altar plus a rainbow and an eagle; cat-eye masks; profile beaked mask with a tear; and the stillborn image (see photos). These occur from Los Lunas rock art site in the north, just south of Isleta to Hueco Tanks in the south, over to Three Rivers on the east, and west as far as Cook's Peak close to the Mimbres Valley.

The stillborn image (*ai yaya udheh*) is highly sacred to Isleta, and occurs in a variety of ritual contexts. It is recognized by horns and spots. In ritual dances, a performer of the stillborn figure, specifically associated with the Emergence, dances behind the *Liwan* in the Evergreen or harvest Dance to scare away evil spirits. A young person always portrays the stillborn in ceremonies. Mythologically, there are two versions of the origination of the stillborn. In the first, he was a mischievous child during the migrations, who went up the mountain side; he could not get down and started to cry. After four days he began to cry 'aiy, aiy'. The gods put up a pine tree for him to get down. To show his appreciation he was ordered to be a guardian of the dancers. (This all occurred before Isletans arrived at Isleta). The alternative story is that because he was bad, the men took him to the mountain, from where he was unable to get down. The stillborn originated as a *xumpa whilewei*, a hunt leader, who came out after the rest of the people emerged from the lake (the *xumpa whilewei* was the 'chief of the bows, one of the "little people"). Some still-born images do occur at other Pueblos, but nowhere do they have the prominence found at Isleta and in the Isleta Aboriginal area towards the south and east.

Some of the larger and more important rock art sites are Abó, Tenabó, Three Rivers, Capitan north, Hueco Tanks, and Petroglyph National Monument. Of these, the closest to Isleta are Abó and Tenabó, Tompiro Pueblos in the Abó Pass area on the southern fringes of the Manzano Mountains. The inhabitants of Tenabó left their village earlier than Abó. Abó was vacated prior to the Revolt of 1680. Most representations at Abó are important (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). These include masks and their details, full-length dance figures and details of their costumes. Full figured images were described as dance figures that either still exist at Isleta or are remembered as once having existed at Isleta. One of these is a figure of *Bathuhunen*, singers originally from Gran Quivira who performed with the *hailala* dancers from Abó (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). They are illustrated in Goldfrank, *Isleta Paintings* (1962:274). According to Joe Zuni, who learned of these dances from his father, the *Hailaa* dance came from Abó, the *Bathuhunen* came from Gran Quivira, and the *Haunin* came from Quarái. All were performed at Isleta during his father's lifetime. The *Hailala* alternated with the Evergreen dance in the wintertime (Joe Zuni July 7 & 9, 1999). Although reluctant to reveal all personages in these dances, Isleta elders noted the presence of others at Abó and Tenabó.

Of interest as well is a particular mask at Abó with a tear coming out of the right eye. In Tiwa, the word for eye is *ši*. *Ši* is also the word for spring. Tear translates to 'spring water' in Tiwa. If the tear comes from the right eye, it represents good, and the living (Ben Lucero July 1 & 8, 1999). What makes this especially interesting is the distribution of this particular image. It is confined to the southern part of New Mexico and is almost exclusively a Jornada Mogollon motif (i.e., found to the south of Isleta and east of the Rio Grande beyond the southern and eastern New Mexico borders with Texas). This image is also found within the same territory after the Mogollon period, namely in Piro, Tompiro and Tiwa sites of the late prehistoric and perhaps historic periods. Masks with right-eye tears are found at Abó, Tenabó, Cerro Indio, Tajo, Three Rivers, and Hueco Tanks.

Archaeological Background of Isleta Aboriginal Lands

Introduction

Some of the earliest remains of humankind in the New World are found in the eastern Southwest within or nearby the Isleta Aboriginal area. The earliest known people from the archaeological record are termed Paleoindians (literally “old Indians”) from more than 10,000 years ago. From that time on, there are indications of human presence in the Isleta area throughout the subsequent “Archaic” period (ca 5,500 B.C. to 200 A.D.), the Early Formative period (ca. 200 A.D. to 500 A.D.), and the succeeding Ancestral Puebloan periods (ca. 500 A.D. to the present). During the Late Archaic period (ca. 1800 B.C.), people in the Isleta area employed a mixed economy of maize agriculture and hunting-gathering. This marks the beginning of an agriculturally based tradition that emerged into a recognizable Puebloan way of life in the early centuries of the Christian era. This pattern contrasts markedly with the Southern Athapaskan peoples (Navajos, Mescalero Apaches et al), relative newcomers who began to arrive in the northern Southwest ca. 1500 A.D.

Prior to the 16th century, essentially the time before European contact, a substantial population of ancestral Pueblo peoples occupied the area immediately surrounding the modern village of Isleta. The ancestral Isleta community did not live within a single, bounded settlement, but rather in a substantial complex of villages in the region. Several significant village sites are known through oral history and archaeological research to comprise the social community that later gave rise to the larger, aggregated settlement of Isleta. Locally, villages such as Rainbow Village, White Earth Village, Yellow Earth Village, Valencia Pueblo, and others (see Table 2) were occupied by Pueblo peoples, many of whom later aggregated into the single large village of Isleta. Within the Middle Rio Grande Valley, Eastern Manzano Mountains and Tijeras Canyon areas, villages were made up of local Pueblo populations as well as migrants from outlying areas who moved into the Isleta area following a major regional coalition of populations during the 13th and 14th centuries.

During the period between AD 1350-1540 (“Classic Period”), favored settlement location in the Rio Grande area shifted. The earlier emphasis on occupation of upland area and locations on the escarpment overlooking the floodplain of the Rio Grande gave way to site relocation onto the floodplain and river banks of the Rio Grande. A large number of settlements and settlement

clusters have been recorded in the vicinity of Isleta, from Atrisco south to Los Padillas, many of which are listed in Table 2. As the process of population aggregation continued during the Classic Period, inhabitants of these settlements and settlement clusters moved to Isleta but retained land rights and ancestral ties to their former settlements.

Table 2: Principal Ancestral Pueblo Villages in the Isleta, Rio Grande, and Northern Manzano Settlement Clusters

Site Cluster Name	Site Name	LA Number	Occupation Span (Years AD)	Reference
Isleta North Group				
	Alameda Pueblo	LA 421	Glaze A-F (1325-1650+)	Fisher 1931, Mera 1940, Marshall and Walt 1985, Marshall and Marshall 1990
	Shipman Pueblo	LA 720	Glaze A-B (1325-1450)	Mera 1940, Marshall and Walt 1985, Marshall and Marshall 1990
	Leo Road Pueblo	LA 584	PIII-Glaze A-C (1150-1500)	Mera 1940, Marshall and Walt 1985, Marshall and Marshall 1990
	Amalia Pueblo	LA 719	Glaze A-D (1350-1525)	Mera 1940, Marshall and Walt 1985, Marshall and Marshall 1990
	Pajarito Pueblo	LA 723	PIII-Glaze A (1150-1400)	Mera 1940, Marshall and Marshall 1990
	Unnamed Pueblo	LA 579	Glaze A (1325-1425)	Mera 1940
	Unnamed Pueblo	LA 722	Glaze A (1325-1425)	Mera 1940
	Unnamed Pueblo	LA 582	Glaze A (1325-1425)	Mera 1940
Tijeras Canyon Group				
	Tijeras Pueblo		PIII-Glaze A (1150-1425)	Cordell Pers. Comm.
	Silva Site	LA 12924	Glaze E-F (1500-1650+)	Marshall and Walt 1985

Table 2, continued

	Four Hills Pueblo	LA 1877	PIII-Glaze A (1150-1425)	Mera 1940, Marshall and Walt 1985
Isleta Area Group				
	Isleta Pueblo	LA 724	Glaze F-Present (1500-present)	Mera 1940, Marshall and Walt 1985
	Pur-e-tuay Pueblo	LA 489	Pueblo II, Glaze E-F (900-1150, 1500-1650+)	Bandelier 1890-2, Mera 1940, Marshall and Walt 1985, Marshall and Marshall 1990
	Yellow Earth Village			Jojola pers. comm., Bandelier 1890-2
	White Earth Village			Jojola pers. comm., Bandelier 1890-2
	Charred Wood Village			Jojola pers. comm.
Los Lentos Group				
	Rainbow Village	LA 81	Glaze A-F (1325-1650+)	Bandelier 1890-2, Mera 1940, Marshall and Walt 1985, Marshall and Marshall 1990
	Los Lentos Pueblo	LA 951	Glaze A-E (1325-1600)	Mera 1940, Marshall and Walt 1985, Marshall and Marshall 1990
	Valencia Pueblo	LA 953	Glaze A-E (1325-1600)	Mera 1940, Marshall and Walt 1985, Marshall and Marshall 1990, Baldwin 1983
	Prison Pueblo	LA 88332	Glaze A-C (1325-1500)	Marshall and Marshall 1990
	Eldorado Pueblo	LA 88306	Glaze A (1325-1425)	Marshall and Marshall 1990
Tome Group				
	Celedonio Pueblo	LA 954	PIII-Glaze A (1150-1425)	Mera 1940, Marshall and Walt 1985
	Tome ¹	LA 957	PIII-Glaze A (1150-1425)	Museum of New Mexico site card, 1930s
	Pueblo Ladera ²	LA 50259	Glaze A-B (1325-1450)	Marshall and Walt 1985, Marshall and Marshall 1990, Marshall and Walt 1985
	Ladera del Sur	LA 50257	Glaze A-F (1325-1650+)	Marshall and Walt 1985, Marshall and Marshall 1990
	La Constancia Pueblo	LA 50250	PIII-Glaze A (1150-1425)	Marshall and Walt 1985, Marshall and Marshall 1990
Belen Group				
	Los Arroyos Pueblo	LA 88330	Glaze A (1325-1425)	Marshall and Marshall 1990
	Apple Orchard Site	LA 88331	Glaze A (1325-1425)	Marshall and Marshall 1990
	San Isidro North	LA 88311	Glaze A (1325-1425)	Marshall and Marshall 1990

Table 2, continued

	Los Pueblitos Site	LA 88310	Glaze A (1325-1425)	Marshall and Marshall 1990
	Rio Communities Site	LA 50252- LA 50255	PIII-Glaze A (1150-1425)	Marshall and Walt 1985
	Pueblo Trujillo	LA	PIII-Glaze A (1150-1425)	Marshall and Walt 1985
Group Name	Site Name	LA Number	Occupation Period	Reference
Casa Colorado Group				
	Pueblo Campo Santo	LA 50250	PIII-Glaze A (1150-1425)	Marshall and Walt 1985
	Casa Colorado Pueblo	LA 50249	PIII-Glaze A (1150-1425)	Marshall and Walt 1985, Marshall and Marshall 1990
	Abo Confluence Pueblo	LA 50241	PIII, Glaze A-F (1150-1650+)	Marshall and Walt 1985, Marshall and Marshall 1990
	Abeytas Pueblo	LA 780	Glaze A-C (1325-1500)	Mera 1940, Marshall and Walt 1985, Marshall and Marshall 1990
East Manzano Group				
	Tajique	LA 381	Glaze A-F (1325-1650+)	Mera 1940
	Chilili	LA 874	Glaze A-F (1324-1650+)	Mera 1940
	Torreón			
	Manzano	LA 383	Glaze F (1525-1650+)	Mera 1940
	Milborn Ranch Site	LA 371- 372	Glaze E-F (1500-1650+)	
	Quarai	LA 95	PIII-Glaze A, Glaze E-F (1150-1425, 1500-1650+)	Mera 1940

NOTES

¹ LA 957 (Tomé) is sometimes identified solely as a Spanish settlement. The site, however, has traces of 14th-century ceramics documented by personnel from the Laboratory of Anthropology in the SE corner of the Tomé plaza, associated with later ceramics. Thus, Tomé was in all probability an ancestral Tiwa village prior to Spanish occupation of the site.

² A reexamination of ceramic artifacts from Pueblo Ladera (LA 50259) revealed that late Glaze (C-E) ceramic materials are present at the site, a fact overlooked by earlier surveys. This may place the initial occupation of the site at ca. AD 1450.

The Classic Period aggregation at and around Isleta was also a product of regional populations immigrating to the area from outside the Rio Grande Valley. Archaeological and oral historical data provide strong links between Isleta and a number of non-local regions, including the Salinas Pueblos, the Piro Pueblo area, and the Jornada Mogollon region of south-central and southeastern New Mexico. Significant amounts of ceramics from the Rio Grande and points as far south as Chihuahua, Mexico, indicate widespread exchange networks linking the Jornada Mogollon settlements to neighboring population centers. El Paso phase (1200-1450 A.D.) pueblos were vacated by AD 1450, and there were no occupied pueblos in southeastern New Mexico by the time of the Spanish entry.

Eastern Jornada Mogollon populations of the Corona, Lincoln, and northern portions of the El Paso subarea migrated elsewhere by about A.D. 1450. Archaeological material evidence supports strong ties between these subareas and village occupations in the Salinas-Tompiro areas. Villages of the Corona subarea Jornada Mogollon extended throughout the Santa Rosa area of the Pecos drainage, throughout the Estancia Basin, the Gallinas Mountains, and Chupadero Mesa (Montgomery and Bowman 1989, Tainter and Levine 1987). Lincoln subarea villages extended along the Sacramento Mountains into the Middle Pecos River and the Tularosa Basin (Kelley 1984). El Paso subarea sites are found in desert lowlands occupying the southern Tularosa Basin, Jornada del Muerto and Lower Rio Grande Valleys (Lehmer 1948). These subareas of the Jornada Mogollon originally occupied a wide expanse of southeastern New Mexico included in the Isleta Aboriginal Area.

Many population centers of the Jornada Mogollon seem to have begun to shift to the north and west during the late 14th and early 15th centuries. This shift contributed to the growth of later Southern Tiwa, Piro, and Tompiro settlements. Archaeological evidence also suggests that there was a concentration of ancestral Isleta villages in the immediate vicinity of the modern pueblo, from Atrisco south to Los Lunas during the period from 1350-1540 A.D. (Fisher 1931, Mera 1940, Marshall and Walt 1985, Marshall and Marshall 1990). This complex of villages appears to have formed a socio-political nucleus with Isleta at the center. They included Isleta (LA 724), Rainbow Village (LA 81), Shipman Pueblo (LA 720), Amalia Pueblo (LA 719), Pajarito Pueblo (LA 723), Los Lentos Pueblo (LA 951), Valencia Pueblo (LA 953), Pure Teuay, Yellow Earth Village, White Earth Village, Charred Wood Village and others.

Isleta Village Formation in Regional Perspective

The growth of Isleta as a regional center is not unique in the Pueblo world, and is actually quite similar to that documented for Zuni Pueblo (Halona:wa). Between AD 1250-1540, Zuni peoples occupied as many as 37 large settlements distributed throughout the drainage of the Zuni River. At Spanish contact in 1540, the Zuni people lived in six or seven very large pueblos located in the lower reaches of the Zuni river drainage. By the end of the 17th century, all of the Zuni were aggregated into a single settlement at what is present day Zuni Pueblo. Similarly, ancestral settlement in the Isleta area comprised a significant number of large villages between the 14th and 16th centuries. A variety of factors influenced the move to fewer, larger settlements in this and other areas of the ancestral Pueblo world, including the need for defense, increasing use of riverine lowlands for irrigation farming, and Spanish concentration. While some areas ceased to be used for habitation, the use of the landscape for subsistence and ceremonial purposes continued largely unabated.

In sum, Isleta's present community is derived in part from local populations, and also from migrant populations originating outside of the immediate locality. Archaeological and oral historical data provide strong links between Isleta and a number of areas within the claim, including the Salinas Pueblos, the Piro Pueblo area, and the Jornada Mogollon region of southeastern New Mexico. The Jornada Mogollon subareas most closely linked to Isleta, spatially and temporally, are the Corona and Lincoln subareas of the early 13th and 14th centuries, and to a lesser degree, the El Paso subarea to the south. Each of these represents a localized manifestation of the Jornada Mogollon tradition. Villages from these subareas are of mostly adobe construction situated around central plazas. The abandonment of these villages in the late 14th and 15th centuries corresponded with the movement of many of these populations north and west into the Southern Tiwa, Piro, and Tompiro areas. Jornada Mogollon ceramics are found in the early occupation layers underlying many later Tiwa, Piro, and Tompiro villages. Some elements of Late Jornada Mogollon culture and Piro-Tompiro populations were absorbed outside the ancestral Isleta community as well, but from an archaeological point of view, it is clear that Isleta has strong ties to major sections of the Jornada Mogollon tradition.

Material Support for Prehistoric Isleta Land Use Strategies on the Regional Level

The links between Jornada Mogollon occupation, subsequent migration, and integration of migrants into extant pueblos are supported by patterned archaeological evidence. The most common line of evidence used in this respect comes from ceramics, and to a lesser extent, lithic materials.

Earlier this century one of the foremost ceramic analysts in Southwestern archaeology, Anna Shepard (1942), established lines of contact between the Albuquerque/Los Lunas area and sites to the south and southeast. Analysis of temper from ceramics indicates that materials from the Isleta locale show up in the Salinas Pueblos and down into the Piro area, and ceramics made to the south and east are found in ancestral Isleta sites. The overriding pattern is that the primary exchange and interaction ties to Isleta came from areas to the south and east of the settlement, including much of what is now southeastern New Mexico. There is a strong representation of ceramics believed to have been made in the Salinas region to the east, the Piro and ancestral Piro region to the south, and the Mogollon region to the south and east. This is supported by distributions in Table 3, which provides a general overview of types, presence/absence, and in some cases, ceramic counts, for local sites. Table 4 details the chronological ages of various ceramic types found in the region.

Ceramic information regarding Isleta and surrounding communities beginning ca. 1300 is available (Mera 1940, Marshall and Walt 1985 and others) and a detailed study of selected communities has been completed by the Isleta research team. All of these villages manufactured Rio Grande Glazewares and brown to gray plain utility wares. However, clues to prehistoric Isleta ancestry may be found in the earliest horizons of the ancestral community cluster that date to the transition from Pueblo III to Pueblo IV periods (ca. 1250-1350 A.D.). It was during this transitional stage that earlier whitewares and brownwares were replaced by painted glazeware styles and other unpainted plainwares. For a short time, both whitewares and glazewares were being produced. An examination of this early transitional period by the Isleta research team and others (Mera 1935 and 1940) has revealed significant ties between ceramics in the ancestral Isleta community cluster and those of the greater Jornada Mogollon area of southeastern New Mexico. Jornada ceramic types found in the Isleta area include painted whitewares such as Chupadero Black-on-White, Casa Colorado Black-on-White, and Elmendorf Black-on-White. Jornada plain brownwares at Isleta villages include Corona Brownware, El Paso Brownware,

Jornada Brownware, and Pitoche Brownware. Chupadero Black-on-White is a widespread and long lasting Jornada ceramic type. The primary production centers for this type were in the Sierra Blanca and Salinas/Estancia Basin areas (Clark 1999). Centers of production for this ceramic type in the Salinas area were at Gran Quivira and Quarai (Potter n.d.), both of which later became major Tompiro and Tiwa villages. The above-mentioned ceramic types are also found throughout sites of the Corona, Lincoln and El Paso subareas of the Jornada Mogollon.

The distribution of Chupadero Black-and-White shows one other interesting characteristic, a significant drop-off to the west and north of Isleta. It is found in very few Puebloan settlements in the northern Rio Grande or Western New Mexico. Clark suggests this reflects the absence of social interaction between villages in these areas and the Jornada Mogollon (Clark 1999). In other words, a boundary of some type existed to the north and west of Albuquerque and the Isleta community, linking Isleta more intensely to the Jornada Mogollon, and less so to Pueblos in the Northern Rio Grande and Western New Mexico.

The similarity of southern and eastern ceramic wares to those in the Isleta community cluster give evidence to a long-standing exchange and land-use relationship between Isleta and various locations within the claim area. The archaeological and ethnohistoric evidence suggests exchange partnerships that moved durable goods (such as ceramics), foodstuffs and less durable materials, and even marriage partners. The total area comprises what archaeologists refer to as a regional alliance. Due to the frequency of climatic and environmental fluctuations in the American Southwest, ancestral food-producing peoples had to maintain ties with groups outside of their immediate locale in case they needed to exchange food or, in some cases, emigrate, in order to make it through lean periods.

This pattern of regional interaction has been documented by other scholars. For example, in her study of prehistoric ceramic exchange in the Mountainair region, Allison Rautman (1993) found that non-local ceramics in the Mountainair region (part of the larger Mogollon-Anasazi archaeological culture area), tended to come from areas to the north and west, including the Albuquerque region. Rautman explains that this long-standing exchange pattern derives from an ecological rationale. The most adaptive strategy, Rautman argues, was for Ancestral Pueblo peoples to maintain exchange ties with people who live in areas that are ecologically complementary to their own homelands. In other words, one wants trade partners in areas that are ecologically and climatically different from one's homeland, since it is more likely that these

areas will not experience climatic or environmental downturns concurrent with downturns in one's own region. Such patterns indicate that regional sociopolitical alliances were part of the prehistoric social landscape among the Ancestral Pueblo of the Greater Southwest. Rautman found that the central Rio Grande has climatic and environmental conditions that are complementary to, but still significantly different from, those areas in what is today southeastern New Mexico. Rautman's research indicates a great time depth for land use patterns linking Isleta to south-eastern New Mexico. Prehistoric patterns of regional interaction and material (ceramic) exchange complement the findings of the present report. Isleta's ethnohistorically and historically documented emphasis on use of lands to the south and east of present-day Isleta reflects a long-standing, ecologically strategic land-use pattern utilized for the past several centuries.

The material ties between Isleta and the areas to the south and east continued into historic ceramic traditions. Historic Isleta Pueblo ceramics made after the Pueblo Revolt of 1680 are unlike any others found in pueblos of the Rio Grande Valley. They show distinct ties to a southern ceramic tradition known as "Valle Bajo Brownware" (Marshall 1997, Peterson 1994). A recent study of ceramic materials collected from the 18th and early 19th century middens at Isleta Pueblo reveal a ceramic assemblage analogous to the greater Valle Bajo Brownware industry, a tradition of south-central New Mexico and northern Mexico. This tradition is characterized by the manufacture of polished plainware vessels with red banded decoration, and by the production of sand tempered plain tan-gray and orange-red vessels. Isleta ceramic production shows ties to the south and southeast, the continuation of regional association and interaction than can be traced back to the prehistoric era.

In conclusion, these ceramic patterns reflect wide-ranging processes of exchange. In isolation, ceramic patterns can not prove Isleta's ancestral origins and composition. But the combination of ceramic patterns with the larger frame of archaeological evidence for the Pueblo period supports the idea that Isleta was part of a marked interaction sphere oriented towards other pueblos in the east and south. Inferentially, in conjunction with the ethnographic and historic record, this confirms the view that Isleta was at the heart of a multi-community polity which contracted to one town during the Spanish period, but maintained its ties to its aboriginal sites and territory thereafter.

Table 3 here

Table 4. Estimated Dates of Isleta Area Ceramic Types (All dates are A.D.)**Black on White: (Middle Rio Grande)**

Piedra	700-900	<i>(Hawley 1936:28; Mera 1940)</i>
Socorro	1075-1250	<i>(Lambert 1954:48)</i>
Casa Colorado	1075-1250	<i>(Mera 1940)</i>
Puerco	1075-1200	<i>(Pecos)</i>
Chupadero	1175-1500	<i>(Pecos)</i>
Exuberant	PII (900-1100?)	<i>(Mera 1940)</i>
Tularosa	1200-1325	<i>(Stuart and Gauthier 1984:431)</i>
Cebolleta	1200-1325	<i>(Stuart and Gauthier 1984:414)</i>
Reserve	1200-1325	<i>(Stuart and Gauthier 1984:414)</i>

Black-on-white (Northern Rio Grande)

Red Mesa	850-1125	<i>(Breternitz 1966:90)</i>
Kwahe'e	1050-1250	<i>(Pecos)</i>
Mesa Verde	1200-1300	<i>(Pecos)</i>
Santa Fe	1175-1350	<i>(Smiley, Stubbs and Bannister 1953; Habicht-Mauche 1993)</i>
Galisteo	1300-1400	<i>(Warren and Mathien 1985)</i>

White Mountain Red Wares

Wingate	1100-1200	<i>(Pecos)</i>
St. Johns	1175-1300	<i>(Pecos)</i>
Heshotauthla	1300-1375	<i>(Pecos)</i>

Rio Grande Glaze Wares (Middle and Upper Rio Grande)*Glaze I/A*

Los Padillas	1275-1350	<i>(Pecos)</i>
San Clemente	1315-1425	<i>(Habicht-Mauche 1993; Schaafsma 1995)</i>

Wallace	1315-1425	<i>(No Dates Available, Northern Rio Grande Counter part to Zuni Type Kwakina)</i>
Arenal	1315-1425	<i>(ESCS 1966:I-5)</i>
Agua Fria	1315-1425	<i>(ESCS 1966:I-1; Warren 1979; Habicht-Mauche 1993; Schaafsma 1995)</i>
Cieneguilla	1325-1425	<i>(Pecos)</i>

Glaze II/B

Largo	1400-1450	<i>(Nelson 1997; Snow 1982)</i>
-------	-----------	---------------------------------

Glaze III/C

Espinosa	1425-1500	<i>(Mera 1940; Nelson 1997; Schaafsma 1995; Snow 1982; Sundt 1987)</i>
Kuaua	?	<i>(Mera 1933)</i>

Glaze IV/D

San Lazaro	1490-1525	<i>(Nelson 1997; Schaafsma 1995)</i>
------------	-----------	--------------------------------------

Glaze V/E

Puaray	1515-1650	<i>(Nelson 1997; Schaafsma 1995; Warren 1979)</i>
--------	-----------	---

Glaze VI/F

Kotyiti	1650-1750	<i>(ESCS 1966:VI)</i>
---------	-----------	-----------------------

Biscuit Wares (Jemez Area, Upper Rio Grande)

Wiyo	1250-1350	<i>(Olinger 1987:2)</i>
Biscuit A	1350-1425	<i>(Olinger 1987:2)</i>
Biscuit B	1425-1475	<i>(Olinger 1987:2)</i>
Sankawi	1515-1650+	<i>(Olinger 1987:2)</i>

Other Wares

Lino Gray	500-900	<i>(Pecos)</i>
Kana'a	700-1100	<i>(Pecos)</i>
Jeddito (Hopi)	1230-1400	<i>(Breternitz 1966:325)</i>

Historic Wares

Puname Poly	1625-1750	<i>(Harlow 1973:28)</i>
Ashivi	1700-1770	<i>(Pecos)</i>
Acoma		Historic
Tewa Poly	1650-1750	<i>(Pecos)</i>
San Juan Red	1600-1875	<i>(Adler 1997:128a)</i>

Isleta in History

Introduction

The documentary record of Isleta history, which begins with the first Spanish explorations of 1540, supports the accounts of land use recorded in Isleta oral history. The discussion of Isleta history below is divided into five periods. The first period examines the record from the first Spanish explorations up to the time of the Pueblo Revolt of 1680. During this period Isleta settlement patterns were transformed: outlying Isleta communities migrated into the capital at Isleta pueblo, as a result of Spanish colonial pressures, and for defense. The second period discusses the Pueblo Revolt of 1680 and its aftermath up to 1710. Throwing off the yoke of Spanish oppression, the Pueblos united to drive the Spanish from their lands. In the aftermath, there was a general disorganization and scattering of Pueblo peoples, including the Isletans, especially during two decades of Spanish reconquest from 1692 on. The Isletans sought refuge in other Pueblos for their own defense, and then returned to the mother village, both at their own behest and with Spanish encouragement to do so.

The third historic period examines the situation of Isleta during the 18th century and up to the close of the Spanish colonial regime in 1821. Throughout this period, the Pueblos enjoyed the benefits of their Revolt; the Spanish ceased to oppress and exploit the Pueblos as they had prior to the Revolt. Isleta was rebuilt and resumed use of its aboriginal lands. It became prosperous, with large flocks of sheep, and it successfully defended its lands against occasional raiders. During the fourth period, 1821-1846, that of the Mexican regime, the Pueblos were in principle regarded as full citizens, but in practice the administration of Mexican policy in the remote frontier province of New Mexico maintained the same structures of relations with the Pueblos as the Spanish regime had previously.

Finally, following the U.S. take-over in 1846, the American period involved a time of great loss for the Pueblos in general and Isleta in particular. Though local U.S. officials tried to protect Pueblo lands and resources from encroachment by settlers, they were flummoxed by a remote, uncomprehending administration in Washington D.C. that effectively undermined that protection, especially in that there was a signal failure to establish clear lines of authority and policy. The several actions of the U.S. Army, the Territorial Legislature, and finally the U.S. Supreme Court combined to eviscerate legal protections of Pueblo lands and rights that were in

theory guaranteed both by the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo and the Trade and Intercourse laws. The New Mexico Superintendency of Indian Affairs, with dilatory support from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in Washington, attempted to follow the Trade and Intercourse laws with regard to the Pueblos; thus producing a direct conflict with policies enacted especially by the New Mexico Territorial legislature. In 1867, the Territorial Supreme Court (at the encouragement of a Territorial administration that was notoriously corrupt throughout the latter 19th century, for example in the form of the "Santa Fe Ring") formally vacated the protection of Pueblo sovereignty - with the clear intention to appropriate Pueblo lands. Tragically, this decision was confirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court in the landmark Joseph case of 1876 (U.S. v. Joseph, 94 U.S. 614 [1877]), in spite of opposition by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The resultant policy, highly deleterious to Pueblo interests, was finally reversed in the Sandoval case of 1913, but by that point the Pueblos had already sustained great losses of aboriginal lands over a sixty-five year period since Guadalupe Hidalgo. This was so in spite of repeated public efforts on the part of Pueblos, in which Isleta took the leading role, to protect their land.

Spanish Exploration and Colonization to 1680

Francisco Vasquez de Coronado was the first Spanish conquistador to travel throughout the Pueblo provinces in 1540-142. He arrived first at the Province of "Cibola," later known as Zuñi, which then consisted of six towns. He sent emissaries west to "Tusayan," later called the Provincia de Moqui (the Hopi province), consisting of seven towns, and east towards "Tiguex" via Acuco (=Acoma, one town). Tiguex (pronounced "Teewesh") consisted of twelve-sixteen towns along the river, and seven in the mountains to the east. To the south it was bounded by Tutahaco (the Piro villages⁵) and to the north by Quirix (the Keresan villages of the Rio Grande

⁵ Adolph Bandelier, one of the most informed analysts of Spanish documents on the early period in New Mexico, changed his opinion on Tutahaco. In 1892, he argued this may have referred to a group of southern Tiwa villages including Isleta. But he later argued (in a posthumous publication in 1929-30) that "Tutahaco" of the Coronado documents referred to the Piro area, concluding that Coronado's "Tiguex" included Isleta and its surrounding satellite villages.

and Jemez River). Tiguex is identical with “Tiwa” the term that the Tiwa Pueblos refer to themselves. Tiguex province was the home of Isleta, although Coronado’s chroniclers do not give it that name at the time. Pedro de Castañeda gives a description of the province:

Tiguex is a province of twelve villages on the banks of a large, mighty river; some villages on one side and some on the other. It is a spacious valley two leagues wide, and a very high, rough, snow-covered mountain chain lies east of it. There are seven villages in the ridges at the foot of this - four on the plain and three situated on the skirts of the mountain (Winship 1964 [1896]:263).

The twelve villages stretched from the site of modern Bernalillo in the north to modern Los Lunas in the south. The seven villages in the “snowy mountains” (ibid:275) are likely those Tiwa villages known archaeologically in the Sandia Mountains (notably in Tijeras Canyon) and on the east side of the Manzano mountains (notably Chilili, Tajique, and Quarai). Castañeda notes that of these seven villages, four were located at the foot of the mountains, and the three others on the heights (Bandelier 1892:222, n 2). Another chronicler of the expedition, Hernan de Alvarado adds a brief description of Tiwa life:

This river [Rio Grande]...runs through a very broad valley [meadow properly] dotted with cornfields. There are some lanes [groves] of trees. There are twelve villages. The houses are of earth and two-storied. The people appear to be good, and land-tillers rather than warlike; they have much food in the shape of maize, beans and melons [squash] and fowl in great abundance. They dress in cotton, cowhides and mantles of fowls’ feathers;⁶ their hair is cut (in Bandelier 1929:309-310).

The expedition chroniclers provide further descriptions of Southern Tiwa Pueblo culture, including the presence of large kivas, house-building techniques, use of cornmeal and prayer-sticks in religious worship, marriage customs, methods of processing corn, dress, and so on. All conform with patterns known as actively persistent in the 19th and 20th century. In short, Tiwas are identified as firmly established in the Isleta area from the earliest Spanish exploration forward. The continuity with Pueblo and pre-Pueblo archaeology suggests a long-term presence dating back several thousand years.

Coronado made war on Tiguex in the vicinity of Bernalillo, destroying pueblos in a siege and driving others away to the mountains. When New Mexico was colonized in 1598, Spain’s

⁶. By cow-hides is meant buffalo robes. The fowls refer to the abundant turkeys present during the time and kept at the pueblos.

brutal policies and introduction of hitherto unknown diseases (smallpox, influenza, measles, etc.) diminished the native population. In several instances former provinces of multiple towns were reduced to a single one, as the result of direct policy of population concentration (*reducción*). For the Tiwas: “At an early date in the annals of Spanish domination the number of villages was reduced...through the consolidation of the smaller settlements with larger ones, for the security of their inhabitants, as well as to congregate them about the missions” (Bandelier 1892:220).

The other factors in this reduction were precipitous population declines (e.g. Dobyns 1983, Ramenofsky 1987) and increased warfare with Apacheans. Of Castañeda’s nineteen Tiguex and mountain pueblos in 1540, only four remained in 1680: Isleta, Sandia, Puaray, and Alameda. Similar patterns prevailed with the Piro (fourteen villages in 1630; four in 1680 [Bandelier 1892, II:249]), at Zuni (six villages reduced to one by 1700), Jemez, Zia, and so on. It is to these historical trends (explored more specifically below) that we must look to see why Isleta is the center and heir of a province rather than simply a singular Pueblo village.

The next Spanish explorations of New Mexico occurred in the 1580’s. These identify individual Pueblo towns, but in many instances historians have disputed the interpretation of the names assigned (e.g., Hammond and Rey 1966, Schroeder 1979, Barrett 1997). Explorers frequently gave the pueblos they encountered Spanish or Mexican-Indian names, which only lasted as long as the particular expedition; the next expedition would devise new names. Nonetheless, it is clear from the explorations of the 1580’s that Tiguex remains a large, populous province with numerous villages. Isleta and its related village Bejui-tu-ay (Rainbow Village), later termed Los Lentos, now inside the town of Los Lunas, do seem to be identified. The expedition moved from south to north up the Rio Grande from the Piro villages into Tiguex:

The first pueblo discovered was Caxtole (fifteen houses) located upon the east bank of the river fronting a large pueblo of one hundred houses named Piguina-Quatengo. The latter pueblo has been identified with the Tigua pueblo of San Clemente, located on the present site of Los Lunas, and the only Tigua ruin discovered south of Isleta. Above Caxtole they discovered Mexicaltingo, a pueblo of forty houses; and next, Tomatlan, a large pueblo of 170 houses. This was undoubtedly the large pueblo of 250 houses mentioned by Luxan, which, he says, was six leagues below the Puaray pueblo group. Fronting Tomatlan, on the west bank of the river, was another large pueblo of 123 houses. This pueblo, named Taxomulco, was probably Isleta, which now stands on the old site (Mecham 1926:276).

Mecham and Bandelier tend to agree on the identification of villages in the Hernan Gallegos report of the Rodriguez-Chamuscado expedition, but subsequent historians (Hammond and Rey 1966, Schroeder 1979) have cast doubt on specific interpretations, while supporting the general idea that the Isleta area contained around six related Tiwa villages (Mecham 1926:276-77). Hammond and Rey (1966:103) suggest that Isleta was identified by the name Piquinaguatengo or Chiquinagua. In any event, Isleta appears to be at the center of a southern Tiguex province group, while the "Puaray group" of ca. twelve towns, including Sandia and Alameda, was separated by a space of six leagues (ca. fifteen miles) along the river to the north.

The Rodriguez-Chamuscado expedition also encountered the eastern Tiwa towns, and gave them names east of the "Sierra Morena" (the Manzano mountains), remarking favorably on the "famous salines":

In the vicinity of these salines we discovered five pueblos. The first had one hundred and twenty-five houses two stories high. We named it Zacatula. The second, containing two hundred houses of two and three stories, we gave the name of La Mesa. The fourth had ninety-five houses of two and three stories; we called it La Hoya. The fifth contained sixty-five houses two and three stories high. We named it Franca Vila (Hammond and Rey 1966:107).

These villages have been equated with the Tiwa villages of Chililí, Tajique, Manzano, and Quarái. The expedition also heard about three other large towns to the south around the salines: Abó, Tenabó, and Tabira seem identified here (these are generally regarded as Tompiro towns). The expedition left two missionary priests at "Puala" which has been interpreted to refer to Puaray, one of the main towns of the Tiguex Province. At some point after the expedition returned to Mexico, these priests were put to death. When the Espejo expedition passed into this area, terming the whole Tiguex province "Puala," they encountered deserted villages around the Isleta area; most of the inhabitants had fled to the mountains fearing reprisals over the death of the friars. Espejo termed two pueblos (possibly Isleta and Los Lentos) Los Despoblados (the Deserted Ones), after this event. (Map 8)

After several false starts, the first New Mexico colony was founded by Don Juan de Oñate, whose party of colonists arrived from Mexico in 1598. Oñate assigned missionary priests among different sectors of the Province of Nuevo Mexico. Fray Juan de Claros was given responsibility for the southern Tiwas, but is doubted he accomplished much, since his duties also included the Hopi and Zuni provinces; it is thought he returned to Mexico by 1601. Oñate was

accompanied by the Royal Cosmographer, Enrico Martinez, who in 1602 produced what is regarded as the first geographically reliable map of the area. Isleta appears designated in the vicinity of the town the Oñate documents called Mesilla (see Map 1).⁷

Serious consideration was given to abandoning the colony, owing to the lack of anticipated mineral wealth, but in 1609 Viceroy Velasco decided to maintain New Mexico as a mission province (Scholes 1937:20). More Franciscan priests were sent from Mexico and the missionary field was expanded southward from Santa Fe. In August 1612, another party of missionary priests arrived at the then southernmost mission at Sandia pueblo. Among these was Fray Juan de Salas, who was assigned to the new mission at "San Antonio de la Isleta." Within a year Salas had established a friary in the pueblo and begun work - with forced labor from the Isletans - on the large church, that was completed by 1629 (Hodge, Hammond, and Rey 1945 [Benavides 1634]). These early years of the mission include the earliest references located so far to the pueblo of "Isleta" by that name (i.e. "el pueblo de la Ysleta"⁸). The first formal mention of the built friary ("el convento de la Ysleta") is August 12th, 1613, but earlier references to Salas's guardianship suggest he may have started the mission shortly after his arrival in August 1612 (AGN Inquisición 316 ff 149-184v; Relación Verdadera of Father Francisco Perez Guerta, 1617).⁹

The civil and ecclesiastical forces in New Mexico were at odds throughout the period until the Pueblo Revolt of 1680. That opposition was at times severe, and exacerbated pressure on the Pueblos. The state exacted forced tribute and labor via the *encomienda* and *repartimiento* laws. The *encomienda* system awarded soldiers lands near the pueblos, with the produce divided between the King and the individual grantee - the "*encomendero*." *Repartimiento* gave the *encomendero* the right to employ Indian labor on the land. Legally, the *encomendero* was not

⁷ Schroeder (1979:243) also infers this possibility. Oñate's Mesilla is not to be confused with modern Mesilla adjacent to Las Cruces.

⁸ Spellings of Spanish words were various. "Ysleta" and "Isleta" were interchangeable during this period. The Tiwas who relocated to El Paso during the Pueblo Revolt of 1680-82 use the now archaic "Ysleta" spelling (i.e., Ysleta del Sur [Isleta of the south]) in order to distinguish themselves from the mother pueblo which only uses the "Isleta" spelling today.

⁹ Hodge, Hammond and Rey (1945:256) indicate both the original church and monastery were built by Salas within a year after his arrival in 1612. Salas served as guardian at Isleta until 1630, when he was made *custos* (custodian) of the Province. He continued to be based at Isleta during his first term as custodian (1630-32) (Hodge, Hammond, and Rey 1945:256).

permitted to live on the land, but in the far-flung colony of New Mexico, this law was seldom upheld, resulting in extensive encroachments onto Pueblo lands, and friction with the missions that competed for Pueblo labor (Spicer 1962:159, Scholes 1942:passim). The first record so far located of the Isleta encomendero is in 1678 when the encomienda was awarded to Juan Dominguez de Mendoza, the brother of Tomé Dominguez de Mendoza, an influential military leader (Scholes Collection, MSS 360, Box 11, folder 1, Dominguez de Mendoza, Juan, Encomienda of Isleta, 1678 –transl). In view of the fact that Juan Dominguez de Mendoza had been *alcalde mayor*¹⁰ [sheriff] of the Isleta area since the late 1650's, it is possible that he held the encomienda at that time. In any event, as the 1641 document indicates, the presence of fourteen *estancias* around Isleta, and the size of the mission, very likely means that there was an active encomendero during this period and probably a good deal earlier.¹¹

The church levied forced labor in building and maintaining the missions. Unlike the Jesuits in Sonora, who took the route of conversion by persuasion, the Franciscans in New Mexico pursued their goals by force, especially after 1650 (see below), violently punishing

¹⁰ John Kessell provides a definition of the *alcalde mayor*:

In New Mexico, the *alcalde mayor*...who presided over local affairs in one of the colony's six or eight districts, or *jurisdicciones*, served unsalaried and at the governor's pleasure. He administered petty justice, settled minor disputes over land and water, supervised the use of Indian labor, rallied the local militia, and helped the friars maintain discipline in the missions -- any or all of which could be turned to his own profit and that of the governor. An *alcalde mayor* could be the missionary's best friend or his worst enemy. In the Salinas missions, the friars branded Nicolás de Aguilar the Attila of New Mexico (Kessell 1987:177).

¹¹ Here as elsewhere, the historical record is limited by the available documents. These are scattered and relatively sparse for the 17th century for various reasons, not least of which was the Pueblo Revolt, during which many records were deliberately destroyed. A large fire at the National Archives (Biblioteca Nacional) in Mexico City in 1856 undoubtedly destroyed others of relevance.

Indians who failed to attend mass (ibid.). The state, in the form of the governors objected to the whippings and worse forms of brutality:

Numerous cases of severe punishment of Indians by the missionaries were brought up in the various investigations which took place in New Mexico between 1626 and 1680. The civil authorities charged that this was a major cause of the growing unrest. Numerous instances of arbitrary and unjust treatment of Indians by missionaries were proven; in addition there were instances of sexual misconduct and other misbehavior on the part of the missionaries.

In their turn the missionaries charged, and in numerous instances produced substantiating evidence, that governors and their aides had not only physically abused Indians but had also been guilty of setting bad examples to the Indians by their own sexual license and immoral behavior. Investigators from Mexico City, sent up to examine the charges, were often greatly depressed at finding much evidence of blasphemous, licentious, superstitious, cruel, and unjust actions on the part of civil officials. Thus, there was corruption among both church and state officials (Spicer 1962:159-60).

The competition for control of the province was already in evidence by August 1613, when the Isleta mission was a site of controversy between the Governor Pedro de Peralta and the Franciscan Prelate, Father Isidro Ordoñez. En route to Mexico City to protest Ordoñez's autocratic measures towards natives and colonists, Governor Peralta was arrested by Ordoñez at Isleta, where he had gone to secure signatures of a petition against the governor. Ordoñez had the support of some soldiers, and after that he had sole charge of the New Mexico colony - civil and religious - for nine months (Scholes 1937:33-34). What this suggests is that Isleta quickly became a center of ecclesiastical and civil authority in New Mexico.

Moreover, the pueblos became subject to the policy of *reducción* - concentration into one place, for civil and religious control, and as a means for defense against nomadic raiders who had already begun to make their presence felt in the fledgling colony. Oñate had reneged on his promise to the Pueblos to help them in their battles with these raiders, but when Peralta arrived to reinvigorate the New Mexico colony in 1609, he carried specific instructions regarding defense of the province from Apaches and Navajos:

The pueblos were to be concentrated into fewer and larger villages, as a means of assisting the missionary program and to enable them the better to withstand attack by the Apaches.... The instructions also contained provisions concerning the granting of encomiendas, the maintenance of a minimum number of Spanish colonists, and instruction of the Indians in the Spanish language (Scholes 1937:20-21).

This policy of concentration seems to have been explicitly enacted against the southern Tiwas. In 1617, Father Esteban de Perea, the guardian at Sandia mission since 1610, wrote of bringing down the Tiwas, who had fled to the mountains for fear of the Spanish, and concentrating them at Sandia. He refers to other priests who had worked to the same effect with the southern Tiwas (AGN Inquisición 318 f489, 11-29-1617). It may be inferred that the diminution in number of Tiwa pueblos from those counted by Oñate and the earlier exploring expeditions was the direct result of this policy begun in 1610. Isleta and Sandia become the two major missionary and civil centers in New Mexico south of Santo Domingo; the other southern Tiwa villages along the river and up into Tijeras Canyon disappear from the historical record. The complexion of Isleta conforms to the view from Isleta oral historians that the pueblo was the mother village which absorbed migrants from other Tiwa pueblos during this period and subsequently.

Further references to San Antonio de la Isleta in 1621 and 1622 firmly indicate the presence of a flourishing mission by this point (AGN Inquisición 356. f 260v, Testimony of Fray Geronimo de Zarate, Guardian of Jemez, to Fray Alonso de Benavides, 1626). By this point missions had also been opened and work begun on large church buildings in the Tiwa Saline Pueblo at Chililí and in the Tompiro pueblo at Abó. Fray Alonso de Benavides produced the most complete 17th century account of the New Mexico missions in 1630 (with a revisions in 1634). Although regarded as prone to exaggeration, Benavides includes significant information for the period. Describing the Tiwa nation (his descriptions following a northward trajectory from the Piro nation to the south), he notes:

Seven leagues farther up this same river, there begins the nation of the Tioas [Tiwas], composed of fifteen or sixteen pueblos, in which there must be some seven thousand souls in a district of twelve or thirteen leagues. They are all baptized. There are two convents [friaries], that of San Francisco de Sandia... and also the convent of San Antonio de la Isleta. These two churches and convents are very spacious and attractive.¹²

¹² The Spanish phrase here is "muy costosas, y curiosas" (Ayer 1916:22). Father Forrestal's translation states "very costly and quite ornate" (1954:20), indicating their centrality in the missionary program and the ecclesiastical administration of New Mexico. This corroborates the interpretation that Isleta was a principal seat of Tiwa conversion and reduction, drawing upon other Tiwa settlements in the region.

Fathers Fray Esteban de Perea and Fray Juan de Salas have worked a great deal in this province and nation, both in congregating these Indians in pueblos and in converting them to our holy Catholic faith, as they were great sorcerers, superstitious and very belligerent. Today they have them very docile, all baptized and well instructed, not only in their living and all kinds of crafts but also in things spiritual (Hodge, Hammond and Rey 1945:64-65).

Benavides's reading of Tiwa responses to conversion is overly optimistic, as later events bear out. Perhaps most important is his record of the several pueblos of southern Tiwas on the Rio Grande and the friars' "congregating them in pueblos," again reflecting the policy of concentration. It may be inferred that Isleta was already sheltering migrants from other Tiwa pueblos in the region. The same seems true on the eastern side of the Manzano Mountains for the Tiwa pueblo of Chililí especially, where missionary work began ca. 1613 too. Benavides records 10,000 souls in the "Tompira" nation (in which he includes the Manzano Tiwa pueblos), noting fourteen or fifteen pueblos in all and six convents and churches (Hodge, Hammond, and Rey 1945:65). Scholes (MSS 360, Box 9, Folder 19: Mission Chronology) indicates the the Quarái mission was founded by 1628, and the Tajique friary in the 1630's.

The next substantive account of the Southern Tiwa missions occurs in ca. 1641:¹³

The pueblo of Chililí has a very fine church and *convento*[friary], choir and organ; in this pueblo there have assembled many people from the other pueblos; there are 250 souls under its administration.

Again, this would indicate that Chililí, like Isleta, was used as center for concentrating other Tiwa pueblos in the vicinity.

The pueblo of Tajique has a very good church and convento, choir and organ, and there are 484 souls under its administration.

The pueblo of Cuarac [Quarái] has a very good church, an organ and choir, and very good provision for public worship; there are 658 souls under its administration.

¹³ The account is dated 1664, though internal references indicate its descriptions refer to the early 1640's (Scholes 1929; Hodge, Hammond and Rey 1945:256).

The pueblo of Abó has a church and convento, organ and choir, and provision for public worship. It has two *visitas* [parishes], the one for the Jumanos, the other is Tabirá. It has 1,580 souls under its administration.

The pueblo of Isleta has a very fine church and convento; it has very good music and organ; there are fourteen estancias [ranches] under cultivation. In this pueblo is kept the Blessed Sacrament. The pueblo has 750 souls under its administration (Scholes 1929:48-49).

The other three southern Tiwa pueblos, all of which seem to have been substantially larger in the 16th century accounts of the area were by now diminished. Sandia and Puaray together recorded 640 souls; Alameda had 400 souls. As for the Piro pueblos, they had only one church (at Socorro, with *visitas* at Alamillo and Sevilleta) and the total population was listed as 400, suggesting a precipitous population decline since the late 16th century (Scholes 1929:50). The Saline Tiwa pueblos' population was recorded as 1,392 in total. And the other Saline pueblos (possibly including nomadic "Jumano" Indians of the area) accounted for 1,580 souls. The substantial size of the Saline Province pueblos is salient, in view of their subsequent relocations to Isleta. The total Spanish population of New Mexico remained low, and in 1680 amounted to 2,350 (Spicer 1962:162).

Opposition to the colony mounted at several pueblos and several friars were killed during the 1630's. Jemez staged a minor revolt in the 1640's; several leaders were hanged, some were whipped, and others put to forced servitude. Shortly thereafter a more general plot of insurrection arose, inferably centered at Isleta:

[I]n the time of Señor General Hernando de Ugarte de la Concha [Governor of New Mexico, 1649-52] there were hanged as traitors and confederates of the Apaches some Tiguas [Tiwa] Indians of La Isleta and of the pueblos of La Alameda, San Felipe, Cochití, and Jemez, nine from the said pueblos being hanged (declaration of Juan Dominguez de Mendoza, lieutenant general of the cavalry, 12-20-1681, in Hackett and Shelby 1942, II: 266).

As Scholes (1937:195-96) notes of this event: "These abortive movements were important danger signals, but unfortunately, they were not heeded. The forces which produced the explosion of 1680 were already at work."

In the 1650's the conflict between church and state intensified, ending in the trial by the Inquisition in Mexico City of Governor Bernardo López de Mendizábal. The trial documents

reveal the extent to which the indigenous Pueblo economy was transformed by labor for the missions and the state, notably in the establishment of large mission livestock herds. These were the origins of Isleta's stockherds that grew throughout the 18th and 19th centuries. The priests had expanded the commercial enterprise of the missions, storing great quantities of maize produced by Indian labor, and using Pueblo herders to raise large numbers of livestock for sale to the markets in Mexico (Scholes 1942:27). This clearly had a direct impact on Isleta: "Tomé Dominguez de Mendoza, who was then serving as alcalde mayor [sheriff] of the Isleta area, later testified that in August 1659, López sent him an order that the Indians should not labor for the friars unless they were paid" (ibid: 27).

Around this time, an Isleta shepherd working for the mission, sought permission from the governor to quit his post. López agreed but did not appoint a successor. The priests complained that this resulted in the loss of 400 head of livestock from the Isleta mission herd - an index of the size of the operation. Similar actions resulted in the loss of 1350 head from Chililí and Tajique, 400 head from Quarái, and 1347 head from Abó and Pueblo de los Humanas (Scholes 1942:111). López replied that the Indians of Isleta were forced to work, under pain of frequently enacted violence, in the friary workshop and herding other stockherds for the priests (ibid: 53). But Governor López was no better: he expanded his business operations with forced Pueblo labor "on a large scale" (Scholes 1942:47), frequently unpaid. Pueblo laborers worked on accumulating large stores of pinyon nuts and salt, buffalo hides, deer skins, manufacturing leather clothing, cloth, building oxcarts, etc. etc. (ibid: 48-49), much of which was exported to Mexico. Trade with the Plains Indians was deliberately expanded in this period:

A sort of annual fair had long been held at Pecos where the Apaches exchanged buffalo hides, meat, and lard, for cloth and maize. The pueblo of the Jumanos [=Humanas] east of Abó was a base for trade with the Apaches of the Siete Ríos area. The profits of this primitive exchange of local goods were supplemented by specially organized expeditions sent out to the Apache ranges, and Governor López did not neglect this opportunity to extend his business operations. The outstanding Pueblo leader in the eastern area was Don Esteban Clemente, who exercised some form of leadership over the Tiwa and Tompiro villages of the Salinas district, and he apparently made frequent visits to the Apaches of Siete Ríos area (Scholes 1942:50).

López's conflict with the church assumed religious proportions when he also openly condoned the resumption of public Kachina performances, including at Isleta. The Isletans petitioned Governor López during a visit in 1660 for permission to perform Kachina dances. He assented,

and they performed before him and other Spanish officials (testimony of Tomé Dominguez de Mendoza, May 21, 1661, in Hackett 1937, III:177-78; also testimony of Fray García de San Francisco, December 10, 1660; *ibid*:164). Although the descriptions are tainted with bias, the following is illustrative of Isleta insistence on its aboriginal religion even in this hostile atmosphere:

Among other injurious effects which were occasioned by this permission [of López] not the least was the experience of a certain person who entered an Indian council chamber under the ground near the convent of La Isleta, where he saw, in the month of may of the year '61, eleven figures, or diabolical masks, with which the Indians danced the *catzinas*, suspended in the manner in which, among Christians, the holy images are placed. Beneath one of these masks was the offering which these Indians are accustomed to make, it being a wreath of flowering grass, some feathers, and sort of short petticoat marked with black, having a border ornamented with beads. Thus this council chamber was a sort of house, or temple, of heathen idolatry, its presence within the pueblo and close to the west side of the church being entirely unsuspected (Hackett 1937, III:209).

From the same documents, López recorded in 1659 that Isletans were farming close to the mountains (inferably in Tijeras Canyon) but several of them were killed by Apaches. Isletans were also noted as farming in that year at Pajarito (AGN Inquisición. 594, pt 2. capítulo 172, cited in Joseph Sanchez 1996).

The 1660's saw an exacerbated period of turmoil especially in the Saline pueblos and among the Piros to the south of Isleta. A major drought set in ca. 1663 and lasted several years, during which Apache attacks also intensified. Thousands of Pueblo people perished in the drought "lying dead along the roads, in the ravines, and in their huts" (Vivian 1964, cited in Simmons 1979a:184). In 1665, Pedro de Aguila, an eastern Tiwa who had long served as interpreter to Juan de Salas in his conversion attempts to the Saline pueblos, petitioned to be named "governor-for-life" of the Tiwas of the Saline province, also referred to as the "Provincia de los Tiguas" in the Saline region (AGN. Indios 24, no. 63 Scholes Collection MSS 360). The petition was forwarded with a recommendation for approval to the Secretariat of Government and War in Mexico City. This document is useful on two counts: first, it unequivocally identifies the Tiwa nationality of the Manzano towns (a fact which has been contested by a minority of scholars, e.g. Schroeder 1964); secondly it shows the collectivity of this Tiwa group and their persistent independence from Spanish authority. As part of a general administrative policy, the Spanish civil government had imposed a series of petty officials on each of the pueblos. A

governor, often called *gobernadorcillo* ("little governor"), a *teniente* (lieutenant governor), a *capitan de guerra* (war-captain) a *mayordomo* (ditch-boss), a *fiscal* (who was the church's intermediary with the pueblo), all became annual appointees subject to the approval of the Governor of New Mexico. In time, the Pueblos adopted these offices as a means of controlling external relations, while maintaining the indigenous authorities of the type described for Isleta above. But Aguila's petition on behalf of the Saline Tiwas clearly represents a more encompassing authority than mere pueblo governorship - hence its presentation for approval to the Viceroy's office in Mexico City.

The drought produced strains on Pueblo resources that were already overtaxed by the exploitation of the civil and religious authorities. It also forced the Apaches into raiding for livestock, etc, although there is some evidence this had begun during López's administration (Scholes 1942:49-50). In 1668, Apaches began a series of devastating attacks on the Piro and Saline pueblos, and Spanish estancias. They "raided the Pueblo villages, burning and pillaging the dwellings, and carrying off dozens of captives, and stealing hundreds of cattle and other livestock" (Scholes 1937:401-02). As a result, on February 18th 1668, a Council of War was held, and the Governor Fernando de Villanueva authorized recruitment of fifty or sixty men by the friaries - undoubtedly including Isleta since it was closest to the embattled Piro pueblo of Sevilleta, which had prompted the action, for a two-month campaign against the Apaches. The governor issued an edict requisitioning grain from pueblo friary stocks at Jemez, Isleta, Zia, Socorro, Senecu, and Acoma (Edicts concerning a Council of war and Petition for Horses and Provisions for a campaign against the Apaches, 1668; Scholes Collection 360, Box 11, Folder 1).

At Las Humanas pueblo in the Saline province some four hundred and fifty people died of starvation in 1668, and the pueblo was attacked by Apaches in 1670, destroying the church and friary (Ivey 1988:230). The mission was closed ca. 1671, when Father Paredes moved the population first to Abó and then probably to Isleta in 1672 where he was appointed guardian there (ibid). Abó was abandoned in 1673 after the mission was attacked and burned. The priest moved from Abó to Senecu, but was killed in an uprising by Piro in Senecu in January 1675, but that pueblo too was destroyed by Apaches ca 1676-77. There may well have been pressures for revolt from within too. The Senecú revolt of 1675, and others farther north on the Rio Grande in that year, have been described as "Pueblo Indian revolts on a small scale" (Ivey 1988:229, citing Wilson 1985). Chililí and Quarái too were abandoned in 1676-7, the population moving to

Tajique (ibid: 233). Tajique was abandoned in 1677, and historians have concluded that most of the population removed to Isleta (Hodge, Hammond and Rey 1945:254). Tajique was reoccupied for a while when reinforcements came from Mexico, but was finally abandoned in 1679 or 1680 (Ivey 1988:234). Father Fray Francisco de Ayeta who led a wagon train from Mexico to bring aid to the afflicted province recounted the abandonments and the population sizes of the pueblos:

It is public knowledge that from the year 1672 until your Excellency adopted measures for saving that kingdom, six pueblos were depopulated—namely that of Cuarac [Quarái] with more than two hundred families, that of Los Humanas with more than five hundred, that of Abó with more than three hundred..., that of Chililí with more than one hundred, las Salinas [Tajique] with more than three hundred...and Senecú.... (Hackett 1937, III:298).

These abandonments account for the swell in Isleta's population to the 2,000 recorded by Vetancurt in 1680, almost three times its recorded figure for 1641 (Hodge, Hammond and Rey 1945:257). Isleta was thus reconfirmed as the mother-ship for the eastern Tiwas and the Tompiro and Piro villages too. The oral history evidence supports the idea of a confederation of Tiwa villages between Isleta and the Saline Tiwas especially, based on cultural identity and exchange of produce owing to the reciprocal economic opportunities of the respective areas:

The eastern portion of what was the Salinas area of the Tigua up to about 1674 was limited to a narrow strip along the eastern slope of the Manzano mountains, and included the pueblos [Chililí, Quarái, Tajique]..., possibly one near the present hamlet of Manzano, and in all probability others, since Chamuscado mentions the existence of eleven pueblos in this area in 1581. To the east of this range lay a country bountifully supplied with game, including buffalo, while round about the settlements were the saline lagoons from which this region derives its name and from which the Indians obtained salt for barter with tribes as far south as Parral in Chihuahua.

Yet the inhabitants were beset with many disadvantages. For the greater part their range was inhospitable desert, exposed to the nomadic and warlike Apache.... Most of these villagers of the Salinas fled to their kindred at Isleta on the Rio Grande, where they remained until 1680 (Hodge, Hammond and Rey 1945:254).

The Pueblo Revolt and its Aftermath: the Southern Tiwa Diaspora

The Pueblo Revolt of 1680 was a concerted effort to rid New Mexico of the Spanish. The Pueblos - from the Rio Grande all the way to Hopi - conspired together, using runners bearing knotted cords to indicate the planned date. Isleta was involved in the planning (Hackett and Shelby 1942:xvi). On August 10th, many Pueblos put to death their priests, and drove the colonists out. The Pueblos closely followed the retreating caravans, but refrained from massacring them. As the largest southern pueblo, proximate to a string of estancias from Bernalillo on down, Isleta soon became a gathering point for the fleeing colonists. For this reason, from the documentary records, Isleta appears not to have participated in the Revolt directly, and neither did the three remaining Piro pueblos to the south. But it is clear that there were differences of opinion within the pueblos. According to Isleta oral history some Isletans did indeed participate in the Revolt, while others did not (e.g., Pueblo Transcripts 1967-70, r 8, Tape 771, side 1, Tony Lucero).

The center of the Revolt in the south was at Sandia and its proximate Tiwa neighbors. They killed “many inhabitants of the valley, and robbed their estancias of horses, cattle, and other property, all of which they were collecting in...[Sandia]”(Hackett and Shelby 1942, v I:l). The remaining population went on August 11th to “Isleta, the large Tigua pueblo which did not take part in the general revolt against the Spaniards. The number of settlers who were finally able to assemble, including seven missionaries, was approximately fifteen hundred” (ibid:li). Cut off from communication with Santa Fe, warned by Indians of an impending attack by Pueblos from the north, beleaguered and beginning too to receive direct threats of violence from the Isletans, the Spanish moved southward on August 14th. In the Piro pueblos, they were joined by Piros who wanted to avoid attack by northern Pueblos for having remained loyal to the Spanish; in all some 317 Piros arrived at El Paso, having abandoned their pueblos before the revolt because of Apache raids (Hackett and Shelby 1942:cx). There were also some Tiwas present with the refugees (see below).

Meanwhile, Governor Otermín’s force remained besieged in Santa Fe by the Tanos, Tewas, and northern Tiwas until August 21. Then leaving the city in close formation they made their way to Isleta, which was found deserted, the inhabitants having fled in fear of the retreating army. After the Spanish retreat to El Paso, communications with the Pueblos did not entirely

cease. In September 1680, Alonso Shimitihua, a Spanish-speaking Isletan, attempted with two other Tiwas and a Jemez to enter back into New Mexico. At Isleta, the first inhabited pueblo they reached, an Indian captain from Alameda came in riding on horseback with a large retinue. "The Isletans lined up in two files and fired their weapons to demonstrate their great veneration for the captain, who immediately thereafter ordered Shimitihua and his three companions bound and taken to Alameda" (Jane Sanchez 1983:134). This passage points up an alliance between the Tiwas of Alameda and Isleta in the Revolt period. At Santo Domingo, Baltasar, one of the other Isleta delegates with Shimitihua, proposed a concerted attack on El Paso:

Baltasar announced that the Tiwas and Piros who fled the province with the Spaniards had not ordered him to return to New Mexico to urge the Pueblos to surrender; rather he had come to ask the Indians of New Mexico to join these Tiwas and Piros in another revolt against the Spaniards, "for they wanted to have done with them and all return to New Mexico." Baltasar also revealed that his brother, Joseph, had remained in El Paso to incite the Mansos [non-Pueblo Indians living near El Paso] to join in the uprising, but Joseph had not yet succeeded in carrying out his design because a few Indians opposed the plan. One of these Baltasar alleged, was Francisco, current governor of the Isletans... (Jane Sanchez 1983:135).

Clearly some Isletans were sympathetic to the Spanish, while others, including some of those who had removed to El Paso, were active in the ongoing resistance.

In 1681, Governor Otermín made an attempt to reconquer. His force included 146 Spanish soldiers and 112 Pueblo soldiers, including 54 Piros and 30 Southern Tiwas (Hackett and Shelby 1942:II:200-201). Isleta was the first substantially inhabited pueblo he reached on December 5th (Hackett and Shelby 1942:203-5); the remnant population of the other Piro pueblos had left to join Isleta (ibid: I:cxxx-cxxxii). Otermín's attack on Isleta was resisted briefly, but soon the Isletans sued for peace. The Isleta population included Piros from Socorro, Alamillo, and Sevilleta, and other Pueblos from elsewhere (ibid: I:cxxxii). In any event:

Otermín then gave orders that the men, women, and children of the pueblo as well as some outsiders from the Piros pueblos of Socorro, Alamillo, and Sevilleta, and from other pueblos, numbering in all more than five hundred persons, should assemble in the plaza. For the destruction of the crosses in the pueblo, the burning of the monastery and the church, and the conversion of the latter into a corral for some cows, which he ordered driven to the open country at once, Otermín severely reprimanded the Indians (ibid:cxxxii).

It seems likely that numerous Isletans escaped, prior to Otermín's victory, given Vetancurt's figure of 2,000 Isletans in 1680. The next day, Father Ayeta baptized 511 in Isleta, though how many were Isleta Tiwas is not clear; interestingly, "he did so through an interpreter because of the presence of so many representatives from other nations" (ibid:cxxxiv).

After a brief foray to the north, Otermín returned to Isleta, to find that 126 out of the 511 counted earlier had already left to join the rebels: as one contemporary commentator put it, "it would not have been remarkable if all of them had fled" (Hackett and Shelby 1942:II:394). On January 1st 1682, Otermín resolved to return to El Paso, and to take the remaining Isletans (numbering 385) with him as captives (Hackett and Shelby 1942, II: 357, 393-94). He proceeded to burn Isleta, beginning personally with the large round kiva in the central plaza, and destroying all the produce so that the rebels could not take advantage of it (ibid:358). The 385 (which likely included Piros, and perhaps other Pueblos) reached El Paso with Otermín and became the founding core of Ysleta del Sur (ibid:I:ccix). They continued to resist Spanish rule, and maintained contact with their kin to the north. In July 1683, Otermín went to the camp of Isletans at "San Antonio de Isleta"¹⁴ to investigate a report of Tiwa insurrection by "the Christian Indians who had been brought from New Mexico against their will" (Jane Sanchez 1983:144).

The Revolt thus enforced a diaspora of the Isletans: some were scattered to the north among the Keresans, others to the south near El Paso, and still others went up to the mountains, possibly re-occupying pueblos on the east side of the Manzanos. According to current oral traditions at Isleta, as well as Isleta oral histories recorded in the 1960's, some Isletans established fugitive communities in the mountains and others lived near the current town of Corona before returning to Isleta (Pueblo Transcripts 1967-70 r 7, Tape 115, side 1, Tony Lucero). Others mention that Isletans went fifteen miles east of Belen to "Sholi Abou" after the revolt (e.g. Pueblo Transcripts 1967-70, r 7, Tape 692, Rosinda Lucero). In 1685, an Isleta man at El Paso named Lucas decamped and went north to the New Mexico pueblos. Questioned by Governor Cruzate upon his return, Lucas described meeting with "captains" from six pueblos included Isleta (the others were Alameda, Sandia, Puaray, Alamillo, and San Ildefonso),

¹⁴ The name changed several times - San Antonio de Isleta, Sacramento de la Ysleta, Corpus Christi de la Ysleta, and finally Ysleta del Sur (Isleta of the south) (Houser 1979).

suggesting that there was some persistent social integrity to the rebel Isleta community that remained (AGN Provincias Internas, 37, No. 4).

At some point after this, many Isletans removed to Hopi (Parsons 1932:204), and also to Acoma and Zuni (Pueblo Transcripts 1967-70, r 7, Tape 116 Tony Lucero). When De Vargas reconquered New Mexico in 1692, he found Isleta abandoned (Espinosa 1940:186), and there is no mention of Isletans present at the pueblo until 1710. De Vargas intended to repopulate Isleta with the Tiwas from Isleta del Sur who at that point were still living in “rundown shacks” (Kessell, Hendricks, and Dodge, 1995:114), but this was not accomplished during his tenure as Governor, and never formally. All of the southern Tiwa towns remained depopulated; “the majority of the tribe” fled to Hopi (Bandelier 1892, II:234). Some Southern Tiwas built a village on Second Mesa, known as Payupki (“River [=Rio Grande] people’s village” in Hopi. After they were persuaded to return to the Rio Grande in 1742, they refounded Sandia pueblo (also known to Hopis as “Payupki”), but stayed for six years at Isleta (Menchero report, 1744, in Hackett 1937, III:405-06). Tiwas were noted coming from Hopi in 1702 (Bancroft Reel I Doc 14, 2-25-1702) and in 1708, where a reference seems to indicate¹⁵ they had removed from Hopi to Zuni (SANM II, #141, Viceroy[Duke of Albuquerque] to Governor [Marques de la Peñuela], 7-7-1708). In 1708, a document records the Spanish execution of six Tiwas at Hopi (SANM II, #145, 7-7-1708).

The Spanish were nervous about attacks by Apaches and Navajos on the resettled colonies, and a desire to “reduce” the Pueblos again emerged during this period, both to control the Pueblo populace and in order to have them serve as the first line of defense against attacks by nomadic Indians. The first Southern Tiwa town to be restored was Alameda, ca. 1705. Shortly afterwards, the town of Albuquerque was founded to the south. A contemporary record notes that the road from Albuquerque to the “sandbanks of the old pueblo of Isleta” was very dangerous (SANM II, #129, Cuervo y Valdez, 12-29-1706), indicating that Isleta was not yet re-inhabited.

New missions were founded in 1705/6, including at Alameda (Hackett 1937, III:370). On January 7th 1706 the Alameda church was still very small and lacking “everything” (ibid.):

¹⁵ The document is badly faded and marked.

In the mission of La Alameda, which is a new mission of the Indians of the Tiwa nation, distant from the town of Santa Fe twenty-five leagues and five leagues from Bernalillo... There are in this mission about fifty Christian persons, children and adults, and others are now coming down from the pueblos of the rebels (AGN Provincias Internas vol 36, Exp 2, Declaration of Father Fray Juan Alavarez, 1-12-1706 p31, Scholes transcription; our translation; see also Hackett 1937, III:375-76).

The only other Southern Tiwa mission recorded at this time was at Ysleta del Sur, where the priest was Fray Juan de la Peña (AGN Provincias Internas vol 36, Exp 2, Declaration of Father Fray Juan Alvarez, 1-12-1706 p 33, Scholes transcription).

When Father Peña arrived in New Mexico (El Paso was not considered part of the Province) in 1708 or 1709, he determined to gather up the dispersed Isletans and restore them to the old pueblo, and it is quite likely he brought some Tiwas from Ysleta del Sur with him.

According to Escalante:

In addition to the Tigua Indians who, along with some Tano and Jémez Indians, were in Moqui [Hopi], and in addition to those whom Otermín took out and settled at El Paso del Río del Norte [El Paso], a number of families of the same Tigua nation had remained scattered in different pueblos and others among the Apaches. As soon as Father Fray Juan de la Peña became prelate of this Custody [of San Pablo, i.e. = New Mexico] he dedicated himself to collecting them from the pueblos and to getting the others away from the infidels. And when he had assembled them he placed them on the site of Isleta. He gave them cattle for their maintenance and grains to plant the first year. And having thus provided for their support, he re-established and re-founded the old pueblo and mission of San Agustín de la Isleta with the consent and aid of the governor at the beginning of January, 1710 (text from Escalante *Extracto de Noticias*, from *Documentos para Servir a la Historia del Nuevo Mexico, 1538-1778* 1962:441; translation here follows Adams and Chavez 1956:203, n.2, with minor modifications).

While there has been a good deal of confusion among historians and anthropologists about Isleta's refounding, this description written in 1778, is clarifying. Further, a document located in Biblioteca Nacional (the National Archives of Mexico) makes it unequivocal:

On 8 January 1710 in the Pueblo of San Agustín de la Ysleta located in the meadow of the Río [Grande] del Norte, I, Roque Madrid, Alcalde Mayor and War captain of the Pueblo and of its jurisdiction, certify and attest in true proof that the new mission is populated with fifty families and consists of 237 people, adults and children, and those families are of the Tigua nation some of which have been congregated from the Province and rancherías of the Navajos (who are pagan Indians), where they were captives, as well as others who lived in the pueblos of this kingdom [New Mexico] suffering poverty and discomfort because of being among strangers. Today they are together living pleasantly in their homes that they have repaired and because of having the main acequia [ditch]

clean and running so as to facilitate irrigation of their crops and in seeing their smallholdings free and defended from their enemies.

Madrid records Father Peña's re-gathering of the Southern Tiwas from the other pueblos:

[he] found those Tigua Indians scattered amidst them and living with great hardship and poverty because of being outsiders. But since they had had no other refuge they were received into those pueblos ever since the time of the general revolt of the year [16]80. With all of them being consoled by the kindness of the gentle prelate and the fatherly concern of his project, with great determination he took them away and brought them from those missions to this one, their Pueblo of Isleta, this being a great service to both Majesties [God and King] and of great utility to the Kingdom because of it being at its extreme limits and a principal frontier to protect and strengthen that jurisdiction and to contain the barbarian nations of the Chilmos, the Gilas, and the Faraones.¹⁶ His Reverend Paternity [Peña] developed this mission with so much care that there has been placed in my care as syndic of its monastery 500 head of minor livestock [sheep and goats], 80 of major livestock [cattle], and six teams of oxen with their plow-shares and other gear for the needs of that mission and monastery. And for sustenance of its residents I have placed 200 fanegas [bushels] of supplies.... (Declaration of Roque Madrid, January 8th, 1710, AGN Provincias Internas vol 36 f 322-322v; translation by Donald Cutter).

It is very likely that those at Isleta included the fifty individuals noted at Alameda in 1706.¹⁷ In January 1710 (i.e., the same month as Isleta is officially refounded), the Alameda grant was given to a soldier, with the notation that it was "uncultivated and depopulated" with two ruined pueblos close by, suggesting that its cessation as a pueblo is coincident with Isleta's refounding (1-2-1710, petition of Francisco Montes Vigil, to Governor Marques de la Peñuela,

¹⁶ Chilmos and Gilas are identified with bands of those who became known subsequently as the Chiricahua Apaches. Chilmos were Gila Apaches of the Sierra Chilmo (location not known, presumably west of the Rio Grande). Faraones (those of the Pharaoh - i.e., infidels) were partly ancestral to the Mescalero.

¹⁷ This is Pueblo historian Joe Sando's opinion too (1992:252). Sando states that Alameda had been refounded for Tiwas from Hopi in 1702. In 1708, Sando continues, Fray Juan de la Peña moved the Tiwas from Alameda to Isleta where in that same year the church of San Agustín was dedicated. Sando's account largely agrees with the facts stated here, except for dates. Sando unfortunately does not cite any documents.

for grant of the Alameda tract: SANM I:#1029). In short, it may be inferred that some Isleta Southern Tiwas were present in the vicinity, and appear to have relocated to Isleta in 1709.

Escalante (above) errs with regard to re-establishment of the old mission of San *Agustín* de la Isleta, however. The relocated Tiwas at El Paso, took with them, so to speak, their patron saint of Saint Anthony of Padua. Saint Augustine was the new patron assigned to Isleta, presumably by Father Peña, but the church was evidently built on the same site as before:

The bulk of the historical and archaeological evidence indicates that Isleta was refounded at its former site, so it is quite likely that the church...—which is the one in existence today—dates from 1613, with, of course, extensive repairs and rebuilding, and has one of the best claims to be the oldest church in New Mexico (Adams and Chavez 1956:203, n2).

Following the resettlement of Isleta, it continued to receive return migrants from Hopi. In 1716, Governor Felix Martinez conducted a campaign against Hopi and brought back 5 Isletans from Oraibi (Bloom 1931:170). On the campaign, Martinez had taken five other Isleta men as soldiers from Isleta, a military involvement that grew throughout the 18th and 19th centuries (e.g., Jones 1966). In 1728, those at the Pueblo of the Tiwas (Payupki) expressed a desire to return to the Rio Grande (Bancroft Doc 22, 1728). It is possible others continued to return from Ysleta del Sur, Hopi, and elsewhere.

1710-1821: Pueblo-Spanish Accommodation

Throughout the 18th century, Isleta appears in the documentary record of the civil and ecclesiastical authorities. It was a bastion against Apache attacks, and became a center from which campaigns against nomadic Indians were launched. Its mission remained active, teaching Spanish, catechizing and incorporating the Indians into the market system as before with the introduction of goods imported from Mexico, but missionary efforts went into decline as the century moved forward.

Over the course of the 18th century the colonists and Pueblos developed a system of greater mutual accommodation than prior to the Revolt. This was manifest economically, politically, and socially. The abolition of the *encomienda* system enabled the Pueblos to regain a measure of independence, and while there were some continuing abuses by exploitative *alcaldes*, that ceased to be the rule. As Simmons puts it:

Although some of the smaller Pueblos experienced privations after 1700, the majority began to recover a measure of prosperity. Agriculture flourished, particularly the raising of maize, wheat, and vegetables.... Pedro Fermin de Mendinueta... wrote in 1773 that “the pueblos are the storehouses of all kinds of grain especially corn. Thither come the Spanish citizens to make purchases, as well as the governor when grain is needed...for the troops.”... The Rio Grande villagers, having abundant water available for irrigation concentrated on raising cotton, and their textile products were bartered for goods not produced at home...(Simmons 1979a:190).

Politically, the Pueblos were kept in wardship status to the Spanish Crown, and did not exercise formal political authority. But there was a gradual convergence between Hispanos and Pueblos in their joint opposition to intensifying raids by nomadic Indians. The Comanches first appeared in New Mexico from the north in the early 1700’s and exerted pressure upon Apaches and Navajos. Comanche acquisition of horses and guns from Louisiana via the Pawnees made them formidably powerful (e.g. Thomas 1932). The Spanish settlements in this remote frontier province received little aid, and they came to rely on the Pueblos to furnish most of the soldiers in campaigns against the nomadic Indians.

There was still religious oppression, however. For example, an edict went out in 1714 banning the building of kivas; Isleta was inspected and did not have one at that point [Bancroft Reel I Doc 18, 1714; SANM I, #1117, 1714]. There were “witchcraft” trials at Isleta noted in 1730 and 1733, again suggesting both religious oppression and the persistence of traditional religion (SANM II #356, 1730; SANM II #381, 1733). In the second instance the accused was the cacique (religious leader, “town chief”) of the pueblo and two others. “Witchcraft” in this context often referred to “idolatrous” practices that went against the precepts of the Franciscans. But although present, religious oppression never assumed the grotesque proportions of the Inquisition in the previous century. From documents listing the presence of missionaries (e.g., Biblioteca Nacional de Mexico Legajos 9-10: passim, UNM CSWR), San Agustín de la Isleta appears to have been a continuously active mission throughout the 18th century, but the zeal of earlier Franciscans like Juan de Salas was diminishing, the missions were gradually secularizing, and were no longer the private fiefdoms they had become prior to the Revolt. As Simmons puts it:

By 1800 the Pueblo Indians had gained a secure and comfortable place in provincial New Mexican society. Throughout the previous 50 years the number of Franciscan missionaries had declined, and those remaining at their posts performed a minimum of

ecclesiastical duties in a perfunctory manner. As long as the Indians conformed superficially to a few outward practices of Christianity, the friars seldom meddled with other aspects of village life (Simmons 1979a:191)

Aspects of Native religion were permitted, and in 1776, for example, Dominguez deplored the fact the missionaries could not prevent “scalp dances” occurring in the open in the pueblos (ibid.).

Small settlements gradually grew up in the vicinity of Isleta in the 18th century including Tomé, Atrisco, Los Padillas, San Clemente, and Belen, as well as one of the three major towns formally established after the Revolt, Albuquerque (in 1706; the other two were both to the north - Santa Fe, and Santa Cruz de la Cañada [part of present Española]). The Albuquerque judicial district, based only twelve miles north of Isleta, was a significant civic presence in Isleta’s arena. Tomé and Belen were established in 1739 and 1740 as “genizaro” towns “by forty families in a great union, as if they were all of the same nation, all owing to the zeal of the father missionary of Isleta” (Menchero report of 1744, quoted in Hackett 1937, III:402). “Genizaros” were formerly enslaved Plains Indians or Apaches who had become Hispanicized and lived in pueblos (Chavez 1979). In 1776, Tomé counted seventy Spanish residents, while Belen contained 38 families of genizaros and Spaniards (Kinnaird 1958:89). Tomé and Belen continued under the missionary custody of Isleta (ibid:405; file “Indians - Pueblo of Isleta,” Angelico Chavez History Library, Palace of the Governors, Museum of New Mexico, Santa Fe).

Throughout the 18th century, Isleta thus served as an important administrative center, militarily, judicially (local crimes were tried there by the alcalde of Albuquerque, beginning at least in the 1730’s), and ecclesiastically. Ecclesiastically, the jurisdiction of San Agustín de la Isleta in 1801 included from Pajarito in the north down to Los Lentos in the south, with several settlements of Spanish in between (Report on the mission of San Agustín de la Isleta, 6-12-1801, Padre Ignacio Sanchez, Archives of the Archdiocese of Durango, R 205). San Clemente, which became known as Los Lentos, became a mixed settlement of Spanish and Indians, but in time, the population became predominantly Isletans (census of 1790). This was built at the old Tiwa pueblo of Bejui-tu-ay, and Isletan presence there clearly represents an interest in maintaining rights in the area.

Some of the Spanish settlements involved grant lands which were placed adjacent to Isleta’s grant. The first recorded mention of the Pueblo de Isleta grant is 1733 (Gonzales Bas 4-

18-1733, UNM MSS 16BC Indian Affairs). The standard Pueblo grant was one league in every direction from the church.¹⁸ It was explicitly understood under Spanish law, however, that lands beyond this league were also available for common usage, especially for pasturage, hunting, timber, and quarrying.¹⁹ In this way, the Spanish implicitly acknowledged the rights of Indians to pursue their traditional economic practices. Spanish law regarded these activities taking place away from the pueblo as in “commons,” but Pueblo customs maintained aboriginal use rights according to their own ways. The four square leagues, then, was not intended as a barrier to the exercise of Pueblo use and occupancy beyond them.

Isletans also attempted to regain control of aboriginal areas beyond the grant, by purchase, where there were other grants in question. In 1750, they purchased the Diego de Padilla grant, known as “Lo de Padilla” (Brayer 1939:64). And at some point prior to 1808 they acquired all of the Antonio Gutierrez and Joaquin Sedillo grants, which were first assigned prior to 1734 (ibid:61; see also Pueblo Indians Collection, Isleta folder, State Records Center and Archives, Santa Fe). A 19th century dispute over a section of the grants to the south of the pueblo hinged on a shift in the river bed at the Bosque de los Piños; Isleta lost that dispute, but continues to regard the loss as based on chicanery.

The combined resistance of Spanish and Pueblos to nomadic attacks prominently featured Isleta soldiers. Isleta participated in many campaigns against Apaches and Navajos into the American period (Jones 1966:passim). At the same time, these hostilities were intermittent and there were also good relations with certain bands, involving trade and exchange, especially. Large annual fairs were held:

At fixed periods during the late summer and fall, the Pueblos and surrounding tribes submitted to truces so that trading fairs might be held. The largest and best known of these was conducted in Taos with the Comanche, but lesser fairs took place... [at a number of pueblos]. During the truce periods, the nomads pitched their camps adjacent to the Pueblos and exchanged slaves, buffalo hides, buckskins, jerked meat and horses for the agricultural and manufactured products of the villagers (Simmons 1979a:189).

¹⁸ “One league” varied somewhat over time and in different parts of the Spanish empire. In New Mexico, it was generally between 2.5 to 3 miles.

¹⁹ Applicable Spanish law (e.g., *Recopilacion de Leyes de los Reynos de las Indias*, 1774) did not recognize aboriginal religious use beyond the league, and saw no need to demarcate traditional hunting areas either.

The Saline pueblos had served as a major trading location for the southern Tiwa alliance in the 17th century. Pueblo of the Humanas (Gran Quivira) was probably formed by the economic intersection of Plains nomads and Pueblo agriculturalists, which was not limited to the local area but was actively extended to Isleta. Jumanos Indians in the 1620's were noted as coming in a large body annually to visit Isleta in the late summers on such trading expeditions, where they were set aside a special area to lodge while in the pueblo (Hickerson 1994:95-96, 99). From later known Isleta practice, inferably such trading visits were reciprocal, involving Isleta traders and hunters going into the Saline pueblos and beyond. After the Saline pueblos were abandoned in the 1670's, the Tiwas at Isleta went to trade in the Plains, on the Pecos River and beyond. When the Comanches and Plains Apaches effectively displaced the Jumanos southward to the Conchos River in the 18th century, Isleta trade visits to the Plains were to the Comanches and probably also to the Mescaleros. Trading trips noted in the oral histories and in 19th century U.S. documents indicate good relations with Comanches and Apaches at different junctures. Isleta thus conforms to the pattern Simmons identifies regarding cyclic (even annual) hostilities and peace, and Isletans were not impeded from access to their aboriginal lands by the intermittent warfare.

In 1715, "Salinero Faraon" Apaches (i.e. Faraon Apaches from around the Salines, probably referring to some Mescalero ancestors) came from the Sandía Mountains into Isleta in order to make peace - but only, they insisted, with the Isletans, not with the Spanish (SANM II, #224, 1715). In 1744, attacks by Faraon Apaches were made in the Rio Abajo district (including Albuquerque, Bernalillo and neighboring pueblos). A campaign was launched to the Ladron and Magdalena mountains from Isleta, containing thirty settlers from Albuquerque and La Cañada, and 100 Indians from Isleta, the Keresan pueblos and Jemez (ibid:119). Another major campaign against Gila Apaches was launched from Isleta in 1747. In 1753, Faraon Apaches attacked Isleta, attempting to steal the pueblo's horse herd; they killed one Isleta man (Thomas 1940:141). Moreover, Isleta soldiers were increasingly organized; Isleta and several other pueblos had their own military units: Isleta's was singled out in 1754 for its "brave warriors." As Jones (1966:173) points out: "[L]ater in the [18th] century, after Comanche pressures had forced most of the resisting Apaches southward, Isleta became the leading rendezvous for the majority of the campaigns against the southern Apaches...."

In the early 1770's, several attacks were launched in the Isleta vicinity by Apaches and Comanches; twenty four persons were killed in the three incidents between 1771 and 1775; most of these were Spanish or mestizos, but some were Indians of Isleta (Book of the Dead, San Agustín de la Ysleta, 1726-1776, Burials-10 (Box 7), Archives of the Archdiocese of Santa Fe). By 1788, Isleta's military unit included ninety-two men (AGN, Provincias Internas 65, pt 2, Exped 7; Military Census of Auxiliaries, 1788). In 1791, fourteen Isletans, riding bareback, pursued Natage (Mescalero) Apaches who had raided Belen and Tomé into the Manzano mountains; they recovered a number of stolen animals and killed four Apaches, bringing their heads back to present to the Governor (SANM II, #1129, 7-2-1791, Governor de la Concha to the Viceroy).

A temporary alliance between Apaches and Navajos produced a series of attacks in the 1790s. Isleta was listed among a group of missions in 1795 that experienced continual incursions of Apaches "Gileños, Faraones, Natagès, Lipanes, and Nabajoes;"²⁰ Comanches too were listed as a danger, having caused many deaths in 1778 (SANM, 1621-1821, rl 021, f 535-41). Attacks were again noted upon Isleta between December 1795 to May 1796 (SANM II, #1366). In 1801, the missionary reported the continual "incursions, robberies, and betrayals" on Isleta, especially preventing the growth of Isleta's stockherds (Report on the mission of San Agustín de la Isleta, 6-12-1801, Padre Ignacio Sanchez, Archives of the Archdiocese of Durango, R 205). In 1819, Bernardo Xiron, the Governor of Isleta, accepted an order to post guards against a force of Navajos moving to the Rio Abajo (SANM II#2791, 2-1-1819, Governor Melgares Circular to alcaldes and governors). Although the Spanish had negotiated formal peace in the 1780's with Comanches, Utes, Navajos, and Jicarilla Apaches, this in fact held for varying periods. With the Comanches it lasted longest, until 1821. An 1808 report noted a party of fourteen Isletans under the command of a genizaro named Francisco going out to meet the Comanches, who were reported in the Sierra Blanca and Capitan Mountains (SANM II, #2187, Comandante Dionisio del Valle to Governor Manrique, 11-29-1808). Isletans today regard their historic enemies principally as the Navajos: Isleta war society songs are reportedly all in Navajo, and to become a member of the War society a Navajo scalp had to be taken. This indicates a pattern of relations

²⁰ Gileños become Chiricahuas; Faraones and Natagès are later identified as Mescalero bands; Lipanes and Navajos are the other two groups mentioned.

with Comanches and Apaches which was more amicable through time, involving reciprocal trading and visiting. The 1808 report was not of a hostile campaign, rather it was to learn the intentions of Anglo-Americans farther east from the Comanches. As we have noted, there are indications of Isleta hostilities with Faraon Apaches, and Isletans recall a battle with Comanches in Comanche Canyon (commemoratively named) on the west side of the Manzano Mountains, but these did not prevent Isleta's movements within its age-old aboriginal lands. Although somewhat formalized within the terms of the Spanish regime, major Isleta participation in Spanish campaigns reflects a continuation of Isleta's ancestral defense of the resources and territory within in its aboriginal area.

Brief indications of Isleta land use occur in the documentary record. Father Trigo wrote a report of the New Mexico missions in 1754. Of Isleta he reported:

The Indians of the mission are brave warriors, so much so that they give the father plenty of opposition with their witchcraft and idolatry. They do not, however, fail to provide the minister with a gardener for his garden, in which they plant vegetables, water-melons, and cantaloupes. They also provide every week with a bell-ringer, a porter, three boy students of the doctrine to care for the cell, three sacristans, a cook, and the women needed for grinding the wheat. They sow for their minster five fanegas of this grain, as well as one almud²¹ of corn, from crops the minister is supplied, with the added expectation of obventions from eight or ten settlers for other necessities; for the sons of this mission make up the obventions by labor, and the minister, inasmuch as the mission has no vineyard, always supervises it gladly (Hackett 1937, III:462).

Among other things, this is an indication of the persistence of Isleta religious belief, however biased the priest's account. Bishop Tamarón y Romeral visited the New Mexico missions in 1760 and produced a brief account of each:

La Isleta

This pueblo of Tigua Indians has San Agustín for its patron saint. It had a Franciscan parish priest....It is called Isleta because it is very close to the Rio Grande del Norte, and when the river is in flood one branch surrounds it. It is not inundated because it stands on a little mound.

It has 107 families of Indians, with 304 persons, and 210 families of settlers, including those of the place of Belén, with 620 persons.²²

* * * *

²¹ An almud is a variable measure; here it refers to the product of a small field.

²² The editor here footnotes some alternative figures from the 1750 census, and adds "A note in another hand says: "The number of Indians here will be about 600."" (Adams 1954:71).

The people of Isleta have good lands, with irrigation from the river. They sow wheat, maize, and other grains. They have some fruit trees, which usually fail to bear because of the frost. Vine-stocks have been planted which were already bearing grapes (Adams 1954:70-71).

In his summary economic survey of the pueblo in 1801, Father Ignacio Sanchez noted the planting of crops, including maize, wheat, beans, chile, cotton and several fruits. While not giving figures he also noted the presence of livestock: horses, mules, cattle, sheep, goats, and oxen. Cotton and wool were woven into cloth. He noted too certain Isleta gathering activities: including wood from the mountains to the east; nopal cacti; two types of flowers for dyes; honey; and piedra alumbre (mica), inferably from the area around Hidden Mountain (Report on the mission of San Agustín de la Isleta, 6-12-1801, Padre Ignacio Sanchez, Archives of the Archdiocese of Durango, R 205).

While relations with the Spanish had improved since the 17th century, the situation of economic exploitation in use of Indian lands and labor did not vanish completely. In the early 1770's, friars again protested the high-handed profiteering of the *alcaldes*:

At the mission of La Isleta, I witness such tyranny with regard to labor by the Indians, that, while the preceding *alcalde* of the six pueblos [Jemez and the Eastern Keres pueblos] had a farm - he and his lieutenant - and drove the Indians to their houses to plant without their receiving a mouthful from the *alcalde*, although they had to spend a whole day on the road with their picks on their shoulders, and although his farm and that of his lieutenant were large, yet that of the *alcalde* [of Isleta], Don Francisco Trevol, is larger, for it produces a crop of two hundred fanegas [bushels] of maize, so that the entire pueblo will have to supply fertilizer for the farm.

Work begins in January or February, and in October they fence in (the field) until the maize tops...have grown. All through October and November, he kept the women (grinding) at the *metate*, and in my time from fifteen to eighteen *fanegas* of wheat and many more of corn were ground for the journey out, besides eighty strings of chile, which is equivalent in work to eighty (*fanegas*) of maize.

* * * *

While little enough has been said it is sufficient to illustrate that what the Indians receive from the *alcaldes* is ill-treatment and punishment, for I have never seen them do them justice or defend them from their enemies, either in their persons or their property (Hackett 1937, III:505, report of the governance of the missions of Jemez and Isleta, ca 1773).

In 1776, the most detailed report of the New Mexico missions of the 18th century, appeared, written by Fray Francisco Atanasio Dominguez, Commissary Visitor, who spent

fourteen months in New Mexico from March 1876. Dominguez describes Isleta as “the first one in this interior branch of the Custody, because it is the mouth or entrance of the kingdom” (Adams and Chavez 1956:202). Isletans furnished all labor for the mission gardens, which include “a large amount of green vegetables,” vinestocks (but not sufficient for making wine), cotton, maize and wheat plots, and peach trees: “the pueblo takes care of everything, including depositing the harvest in the convent [=friary] storerooms” (ibid:205). More than this, Isletans gave significant amounts to the church in obventions - of both livestock and crops – attesting to their prosperity. Father Junco, missionary at the time of Dominguez’s first description was removed for profiteering from Isleta labor and and merchandise (ibid:206). Dominguez proceeded to describe the pueblo:

The little rise on which the pueblo stands is ... small ... and it lies on the very meadow of the Río [Grande] del Norte, which sometimes overflows its bed up above the pueblo when it is very high and forms a very wide branch at a distance from it. This cuts off the settled part as if it were an island, which is doubtless the reason why it was named Isleta.... This Isleta is about a musket shot and a half from the aforesaid river. It enjoys a very fine and pleasant view on all directions, especially downstream to the south, where a sierra, which is some 20 leagues to the south can be seen. They call it the Sierra de la Magdalena.

The pueblo consists of three beautiful blocks of dwellings, separated from one another at the corners, which are located in front of the church and convent, and form a very large plaza there to the south of them. Outside the plaza at various distances all around there are some twenty houses which would be as large as one block, or tenement, of the plaza if they were all together. Everything is of adobe, very prettily designed and much in the Spanish manner...

* * * * *

Its Lands and Fruits: The Indians of this pueblo have arable lands of every quality for a league upstream, a league downstream, and as far on either side as such lands extend. ...[T]hey are irrigated from the aforementioned river, and from all of them they get very copious crops of everything planted. There are many orchards of fruit trees as well as vinestocks, and they usually make a little wine.

The natives are Tiguas, like those of Sandia,...Picuris and Taos, all of whom use substantially the same language, although in a different manner and with distinctive pronunciation (Adams and Chavez 1956:207).

Dominguez also noted that they spoke some limited Spanish. His census counted 454 persons in 114 families.

In 1819, the “sons of Isleta” were commanded to procure gypsum for the Palace of the Governors in Santa Fe. According to oral histories, Isletans usually went to Mount Taylor for

gypsum, and it may be inferred they went there on this occasion, reflecting a time-honored practice (SANM II, #2786, 1-22-1819, Josef de la Peña to Governor Melgares).

Population figures become more frequent as the 18th century progresses. From the 237 reported at Isleta in 1710, there are fluctuating increases and decreases. The purview included in the censuses is also variable. As noted, San Clemente, which was later known as Los Lentos, altered in its composition from a Spanish village to an Indian pueblo. Isletans refer to it as Bejuituay, Rainbow Village. For the first two decades after the U.S. took over the area, it was considered an Indian pueblo and administered by the New Mexico Superintendency of Indian Affairs; it seems to have contained a mixture of Spanish settlers and Isletans throughout the period. The census takers in the 18th century did not always include its Indian population from the counts. The first reasonably detailed census of Isleta itself, with names, appears in 1750 (Olmsted 1981, and see Table 5 – Isleta Population).

In 1790, another more detailed census appeared, and this identified ethnicity according to the “casta” system employed by the Spanish (e.g., Bustamante 1991). Los Lentos included more than half its population as Indios (of Isleta), and most of the remainder as mestizos (mixed) of one designation or another (Olmsted 1975; SANM II, #1092b, Census of Albuquerque Jurisdiction 10-22-1790). At Isleta, the total was 395, with a few families indicated as migrants from Ysleta del Sur or Senecu del Sur - an indication that return migration by Tiwas and Pirois was still occurring more than one hundred years after Otermín’s relocation of Isletans to El Paso. Los Lentos included 106 people, most Isleta Indians (Olmsted 1975; SANM II, #1092b, Census of Albuquerque Jurisdiction 10-22-1790). A terrible smallpox epidemic in 1780-81 took more than 5,000 Pueblo lives, although it is not known how many perished at Isleta (Simmons 1979a:193). In 1819, 78 named Isleta farmers and 17 from Los Lentos gave supplies to aid the famine-afflicted Zunis in the form of maize, wheat, and chile (SANM II, #2858, 11-14/11-23-1819, Albuquerque Jurisdiction Inhabitants). Many of the names recorded in this partial census are identical with current Isleta surnames.

In 1820, 513 Indians were recorded at San Agustín de la Ysleta, which also reported 2,324 Spanish and mestizos: a major increase since 1800. Belen included 63 Indians (ethnicity not specified) and 2,103 Spanish and mestizos. It is likely that some Indians were being reclassified during this period, as a result both of assimilation and the impending Plan of Iguala (1821) which sought to make Indians into citizens (SANM II, #2950, Census of the Missions of

the Custody of San Pablo, 1820). Again, Los Lentos, which the detailed census of 1790 shows contained numerous Indians, is simply lumped with the larger non-Native population here, although it certainly maintained a strong Isleta social and cultural focus at this time. Overall Pueblo population declined also, from over 12,000 in 1750 to under 10,000 in 1800 (Weber 1982:57).

In 1827, the military commandant of New Mexico, Col. Don Antonio Narbona took a census, which “proves the real ignorance concerning the true extent and population of New Mexico until” that time (Carroll and Haggard 1942:89). He recorded a total of 1,407 at “Isleta, Indian pueblo” (ibid:88). There were 713 males, and 694 females. Of the men, 291 were employed as farmers, 96 as craftsmen, 103 as day laborers, 4 as merchants, and he also included the one priest. Since the Mexican regime had conferred citizenship on the Pueblos, it is probable these figures do not distinguish between Pueblo Indians and Spanish and Hispanicized mestizos living at Pajarito, Los Padillas, and Los Lentos. It is noteworthy, however, that an 1822 jurisdictional survey of Isleta (SANM I, #1368, Pueblo of Isleta, 1822), records the sparsity of population in these three areas in contrast to the pueblo itself.

Table 5: Isleta Population at Various Dates

1641	750 (Scholes 1929)
1680	2000 (Vetancurt 1971 [1697-98])
1710	237 (Madrid 1-8-1710)
1744	80 families (Menchero report 1744; Hackett 1937, III:405)
1749	250 (San Agustín de la Isleta) 498 Isleta del Sur (Indians) (BNM Legajo 9, Doc 7)
1750	429 (Olmsted 1981); San Clemente [=Los Lentes] 95
1750	500 (Kelly 1940: BNM Leg 8, Doc 81, folio 1)
ca.1750	500 (BNM Legajo 9, Doc 9)
1752	318 (85 families) (General Census of NM, 1752, cited in Simmons 1979a:185)
1760	304 (107 families) (Tamarón y Romeral, 1760 [Adams1954:70-71])
1776	454 (114 families) (Dominguez, 1776, Adams and Chavez 1956:207)
1788	2,103 persons in 441 families (Mission of San Agustín de la Isleta, i.e. probably includes non-Indians in the parish) (BNM Legajo 10, Doc 85)
1789	383 (75 warriors) (Census of Governor Fernando de la Concha, cited in Simmons 1979a:185)
1790	395 (Isleta); 106 (Los Lentes) (SANM II, #1092B, 1790 General Census of Albuquerque area)
1792	2,126 persons; 456 families; indicates all are Tiguas (probably includes others under its parochial control, however, who are not Isletans) (BNM Legajo 10, Doc 83, 1792)
1793	410 (Simmons 1979a:185, citing Bancroft 1889)
1793	478 persons; 108 families (Isleta); two plazas of vezinos (Spanish) were noted one league to the south and one league to the north of the pueblo; the former is likely Los Lentes; both together contained 337 persons in 58 families (BNM 10, Doc 70, State of the Missions, 1794)

1794	460 Isletans; 396 (Spanish and mestizos) (Catholic Church Records of New Mexico, CSWR Collection MSS 22SC, UNM)
1799	479 Isleta; 458 vezinos; 296 Ysleta del Sur (Indios Tiguas); (BNM 10, Doc 74, 1799 Census)
1800	Same figures presented as 1799 (SANM II:#1518A, Census of NM, 11-24-1800)
1801	439 Isleta; 420 (Spanish and mestizos) (Archives of the Archdiocese of Durango R 205 f 605, 6-12-1801)
1805	568 (Isleta); 127 Los Lentos (SANM II, #1830)
1810	498 (New Mexico census, cited in Simmons 1979a:185)
1820	513 (San Agustín de la Ysleta); The Isleta jurisdiction also counted 2,324 Spanish and mestizos - a significant increase since 1800; Belen included 63 Indians (ethnicity not specified) and 2,103 Spanish and mestizos; it is very possible that some Indians are being reclassified during this period [see above re: Plan of Iguala] ²³ (SANM II, #2950, Census of the Missions of the Custody of San Pablo, 1820)
1821	511 (San Agustín de la Ysleta); 2313 Spanish and mestizos in the jurisdiction (SANM II, #3094, New Mexico missions census 12-31-1821)
1827	1,407 (Narbona, in Carroll and Haggard 1942:88)
1849	833 - Isleta and Sandia combined (Territorial census of those over age five years (Abel 1915:39); [in 1850 census, Sandia was listed at 400, in 1851, at 241]
1850	450 (Isleta); 250 (Los Lentos) (Schoolcraft 1851, I:519)
1851	751 (Isleta); 210 Lentis (in the list of twenty New Mexico pueblos) (Calhoun 2-16-1851, Abel 1915:294)
1863	786 (Isleta) (Ward 1864:343).
1870	768 persons (214 Indian families); plus 12 citizens on Isleta lands (Army 1967 [1870]:58)

²³ As early as 1749, this process seems to be under way:

A 1749 census shows 570 Indians living in Santa Fe and 200 in Albuquerque....An undetermined number of these were Pueblos in the process of assimilating Spanish ways (Simmons 1979a:193).

1871	768 persons (289 children). The total population of the 19 New Mexico pueblos was listed as 7,683, giving Isleta exactly ten per cent of all the New Mexico pueblos. (UP Doc 74, Army to CIA Walker, 12-7-1872)
1882	1,081 (Agent Thomas to CIA Price 2-15-1882, MLSP1A, M941, r 5)
1890	1,059 (11 th Census of the U.S.; in Donaldson 1893:94)
1900	1,021 (Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs 1900:292)
1930	1,036 (Parsons 1932:209)
1940-42	1,304 (Dozier 1970:122)
1948-50	1,470 (Dozier 1970:122)
1964	2,331 (Dozier 1970:122)
1970	2,527 (Simmons 1979a:221)
1979	3,172 enrolled members of the Isleta Tribe (Census Office, Pueblo of Isleta)
1989	3,677 enrolled members of the Isleta Tribe (Census Office, Pueblo of Isleta)
1998	4,892 enrolled members of the Isleta Tribe (Census Office, Pueblo of Isleta)

Isleta Under Mexican Rule, 1821-46

The Mexican war of independence from Spain 1820-21 did not produce immediate changes in the lives of the Pueblos, despite formal attempts to equalize relationships between colonists and Indians. But there were some long-term effects of major import with regard to Pueblo land. In 1821, prior to the formal transition, the Plan of Iguala made all inhabitants of New Spain (Mexico) citizens, without regard to race or origin. This was upheld in Mexico's formal declaration of independence on September 28, 1821. In the short-term, Pueblo Indians ceased to be enumerated as "Indios" in censuses as distinct from "vecinos" or "Espanoles y otras clases" the terms of distinction from the prior censuses. Mexico's constitution of 1824 made the northern provinces Territories rather than States with fewer rights of formal autonomy. Yet, Pueblo citizenship laid the foundations for many subsequent troubles with regard to Pueblo land rights that lasted until the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in the Sandoval case of 1913 (U.S. v. Sandoval, 231 U.S. 28 [1913]), an important antecedent of Isleta's present aboriginal claim. As Brayer notes:

The importance of these acts lies in the fact that apparently the Indians were to be considered as citizens. The seriousness of the situation is immediately evident. If the Indians are citizens in a broad sense, then they are able to sell, trade, or otherwise alienate their lands without consent of any authority as required during the Spanish period. This is exactly the stand taken by the territorial courts of New Mexico and the supreme court of the United States for almost half a century after New Mexico became a part of the United States (Brayer 1939:17).

Pueblo citizenship, however, proved hollow under Mexico, and the central Mexican authorities continued to treat the Pueblos under the same wardship status operant under the Spanish monarchy. Legal protections were in practice extended to communal Pueblo ownership of their lands. But the laws in the remote frontier territory of New Mexico were haphazardly applied:

...a laxity in the enforcement of existing regulations with regard to the Pueblo Indians led to a great many cases of illegal alienation of lands. This was not due to any change in the organic law, but was the result of careless and corrupt petty officials who administered the law. The local alcaldes were the chief offenders in this regard. Owning land themselves and desirous of obtaining more, it was not uncommon for these minor

officials to act in collusion with neighboring settlers to obtain land from the Indians without consent of the higher authorities (Brayer 1939:19).

Brayer emphasizes the illegality, under Mexican law, of these appropriations, but also notes “the failure of the Mexican government to take action left the problem up to the United States after 1846” (ibid). In short, the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo of 1848 did not extinguish Pueblo land rights illegally abrogated during the Mexican period.

Pressed for good agricultural land, the expanding colonial populace in New Mexico was limited by the Pueblo land grants, and the acknowledgement of Pueblo-based common areas beyond the grant boundaries. Effective disestablishment of the Crown’s protection of the Pueblo grants, and Pueblo formal purchases of grant lands beyond the grants (like the Lo de Padilla, Gutierrez, and Sedillo grants for Isleta) opened the way for encroachment. Isleta took cases of land conflict to the Mexican territorial court in 1826, over the boundaries of its land, and most prominently again in the Ojo de la Cabra dispute from 1843-46, which was not finally resolved until the 1890’s. The Ojo de la Cabra (“Goat Spring”) was the site of an old Isleta Tiwa settlement, and is today a part of the Isleta reservation. Don Juan Otero was from one of New Mexico’s most powerful aristocratic families, in a system still largely governed by the patronage such *ricos* (the wealthy upper echelon) commanded:

In 1845, Don Juan Otero petitioned the departmental assembly for a grant to the spring and to the tract of land surrounding it. The assembly apparently granted the petition, for on March 27, 1845, the Indians filed a protest to such a grant and requested the governor to lay their protest before the department assembly.

The Valencia county prefect first indicated that the spring had been commonly used by people from Isleta, Pajarito, Valencia, and Los Padillas. Then he made a second report acknowledging that the spring had been part of the acknowledged commons of Isleta pueblo. The assembly revoked Otero’s grant, and so he appealed to the Supreme Court in Mexico City, which sided with him (Otero). But:

when presented for confirmation to the United States Court of Private Land Claims on December 29, 1898, the court rejected the claim based on the Mexican grant. The case was then appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States which dismissed the action on January 18, 1899. Thus ended the Ojo de la Cabra dispute in favor of Isleta pueblo (Brayer 1939:60).

The back-and-forth decision by the Mexican courts reflected the patterns of influence Otero was able to command. This was so, even in spite of findings by the (Mexican) District Court that Otero had made a completely fraudulent claim:

However, these frauds, as well as the occupation of the land before the grant thereof was solicited by Señor Otero, and his duplicity in having made it (his request for the land) after its occupation, are manifest in the statement of his attorney. It caused a general commotion among the Indians of the pueblo of San Agustín de la Ysleta, as appears from the petitions, and therefore the committee believes that the radical means to quiet the spirit of vengeance already engendered among the natives of Ysleta is the annulment of that monstrous, erroneous grant.... (SANM I, #1382, 9-27-1845, WPA translation, vol 26:67-74).

Isleta had gone out and uprooted poplar trees Otero had planted and threatened to defend the site by armed force (ibid). Although this site is within the current Isleta reservation and not a subject of the present case, it is of particular interest owing to the basis on which Isleta made its claim before the Mexican authorities. This entailed a combination of aboriginal use rights and understood Spanish privileges respecting those rights, in part guaranteed by Isleta's military contributions to the Spanish state. In one of Isleta's petitions for example, the Pueblo's delegate, Jesus Maria Abeitia, noted that the area:

has been held, considered and recognized, and enjoyed in quiet and peaceable possession by all the residents and inhabitants of the pueblo of Ysleta as public lands which belong to it as its own, naturally and according to the civil law by deed and by right....

* * * * *

...[the] indisputable proprietorship of the most worthy pueblo of Ysleta, which, without exaggeration, has been, and is, the center and fortress for the defense of its neighboring villages in the repeated incursions of the barbarous Apaches and Navajos and even of the internal wars of the same country....

* * * * *

It has been a fully accepted custom in this Department, with the force of law, since the time of our forefathers, for the site of El Ojo de la Cabra, which has been deceitfully snatched from the most ancient pueblo of Ysleta by the greediness and ambition of the Señor Otero, to be designated as commons belonging to our pueblo in order to pasture its animals without its losing the status of a public commons (SANM I, #1381, 3-27-1845, WPA translation, vol 26:19-26).

In a later hearing, the (Mexican) District court noted that Isleta delegates had relied on an aboriginal standard as well:

The latter [the natives of the pueblo of Ysleta] declared that at the place of El Ojo de la Cabra there had been an Indian pueblo, (the inhabitants of) which, with the agreement of

the one who was governor of this country at the very beginning of the last century, were annexed to their pueblo of Ysleta and within their league for the convenience of leaving El Ojo de la Cabra for common pastures and watering places, and that said place could not be used for any other purpose. They cited the place where they said the ruins of said pueblo remained, and cited the ancient traditions that this transaction was thus agreed to and adjusted (SANM I, #7383, 4-29-1846, WPA translation vol 26:118-24).

Thus in 1846, the very year that the United States army formally took possession of New Mexico, Isleta clearly continued to operate with a sense of aboriginal rights to its territory. The same was true with the other Pueblos as well. When General Kearney's army reached Santa Fe in August 1846, the Pueblo governors came to call upon him. Of the meeting, Lieut. W.H. Emory recorded:

Their interview was long and interesting. They narrated what is a tradition with them, that the white man would come from the far east and release them from the bonds and shackles which the Spaniards had imposed, not in the name, but in a worse form than slavery.... Three hundred years of oppression and injustice have failed to extinguish in this race the recollection that they were once the peaceable and inoffensive masters of the country (U.S. Army Corps of Topographical Engineers 1951:58).

In 1875, Isleta was still having problems with encroachment at Ojo de la Cabra, where Miguel Otero tried to build a house, and also at Mesitas Coloradas (MLSPIA, M941, r1).

Under Mexican rule, the missions continued their decline, so that by 1826, only nine Franciscans remained in New Mexico, and by 1832, only five of New Mexico's missions had resident priests. By 1840 these had all died. The lacuna in priestly presence, saw the open re-appearance of Pueblo religious ritual. During the Bishop of Durango's 1833 visitation:

[he] found the state of the missionary program deplorable. Mission structures everywhere were shabby and in disrepair, vessels and vestments were worn out, and the friars were unable or unwilling to enforce ecclesiastical discipline so that many Pueblos had relapsed into idolatry.

...the Pueblos by the decade of the 1830s had begun to relax policies of secrecy and present publicly rituals that had continued, hidden but uninterrupted, throughout the period of Spanish censure. Once again ceremonies were given in the plazas and open to observation by non-Indians, making clear that the rich and active religious life of the Pueblos, far from having been extirpated, retained a vital and pervasive role in native culture (Simmons 1979b:206).

Again the indication, which squares with Isleta oral history and ethnography, is that aboriginal Pueblo religious beliefs, with their central focus on environmental conditions and

resource use, remained very much alive. In 1845 the Bishop of Durango sent one friar to New Mexico to try to restore the Franciscan order. He made his headquarters at Isleta, but he too had perished by 1848.

In 1832, Antonio Barreiro, commissioned as legal advisor to the newly created (Mexican) District Court of New Mexico, presented a general description of the Pueblos, of natural resources, and economic practices, which provide a significant benchmark on the eve of the transition to American rule. For this reason, his account is worth quoting at some length:

All these pueblos, notwithstanding the sway which Religion has over them, cannot forget certain teachings which have been handed down to them by tradition and which they are careful scrupulously to teach to their descendants; whence arises the adoration which they pay to the sun, to the moon and to other heavenly bodies, the regard which have for fire, &c. &c.

In many of the pueblos named they work every kind of jars or pots for house use, and these Indians in general are given to husbandry [i.e. agriculture and stock herding], to hunting and fishing; they make saddle-trees, tan hides, mill flour, and make other products; some of them can read and write, and they all have a ready speech, quick judgment, and an uncultivated but persuasive eloquence. In their decisions they are dilatory, in everything they act by common agreement, and in their dealings they are exceedingly virtuous and truthful. The said pueblos have different idioms but they speak Spanish. Rarely does hunger assail them because their foresight leads them to work with prudence. They put an extreme value on eagles; there is scarcely a pueblo but has one or more of them, which they catch alive at the cost of great effort. With the feathers of these birds they construct their best arrows which they use in war and sell at a high price to the Gentiles [nomadic Indians] for horses and other valuable effects (Bloom 1928:87-88).

Barreiro's remarks on Pueblo hunting intersect with his more general account of game in New Mexico, and may be taken as an indirect index of Pueblo buffalo hunting recorded both in Isleta oral history and directly by U.S. accounts in subsequent decades:

The buffalo ...is found in these parts in incredible abundance. This class of animals goes in herds. Their meat is of the most delicious taste....

* * * * *

The inhabitants of this country hunt the buffalo in the months of June and October. Accordingly in the latter month, after gathering their harvest, they assemble in caravans and set out in different directions. In October, they aim to hunt buffalo cows, since that is the season when they are found to be very fat and the bulls are thin; and in June they hunt the bulls, for the same reason applies inversely. The weapons suited in this chase are the lances, arrows and the musket, but this last is used to little advantage.

Some hunters are extremely dextrous and kill twelve, fifteen and more head in a single chase....

* * * * *

The hunt is made on swift horses, trained for the purpose. At the very lowest estimate ten or twelve thousand head are killed annually, and if to this slaughter be added that made by the numberless swarms of natives who subsist off the buffalo herds [i.e. Plains Indians], one can appreciate how prolific that herd is, in that it suffers no lessening, for at any time it is to be seen over the plains in vast droves, forming a horizon which the vision fails to comprehend (Bloom 1928:90-91).

Barreiro's optimism with regard to the bison proved ill-founded in subsequent decades (see below). He also comments on the abundance of mule deer, mountain sheep, and turkeys in the wooded areas. Of hunting and fishing in general, he notes:

Parti-colored deer, gray, and long-tail abound; also bear of all colors, rabbits and hares, partridge, quail, crane, duck, geese and other fine game.

In the streams trout are taken, eel, catfish, stickleback, shoal-fish, mud-turtle and tortoise, all savory and the last named as heavy as two pounds (ibid:94).

He fails to note the abundance also of beavers, which had begun to attract American fur-trappers in increasing numbers in the 1820's. He comments too on the "many thousands of sheep" (ibid:93), and lists forest products and fruits, and minerals (ibid:94-95), many of which are known ethnographically to be harvested by Isletans. And not least, in terms of Isleta's gathering throughout their aboriginal area:

Medicinal herbs.—There are herbs of extraordinary virtue for the curing of all kinds of sickness. The Pueblo Indians and Gentiles understand them perfectly and apply them with great skill. To a man equipped with botanical knowledge the plants referred to would afford sufficient material for a long study and perhaps for useful discoveries (ibid:94).

Throughout the period since the reconquest, Spanish settlement patterns had been confined by the presence of nomadic raiders. The principal areas of settlement were around Santa Fe, Santa Cruz, and Albuquerque, with strings of smaller ranches, small "plazas" in between especially from Bernalillo south to Belen. But Belen was functionally the most southerly limit of Spanish settlement. Some settlements had been made to the west around Mount Taylor in the late 18th century, but these had been largely abandoned as a result of nomadic raids (principally Navajo). Towards the close of the Spanish regime and especially following the transition to Mexican rule, a series of efforts to expand settlements - in all directions occurred:

[N]uevomexicanos continued an expansionist trend of the late colonial period. They planted new settlements in the north such as Rio Colorado (1842), beyond Taos, and south along the Rio Grande at Casa Colorado (1823), near today's Socorro, and still farther south at Doña Ana (1843), near present Las Cruces just north of El Paso. Moving westward out of the Rio Grande, they reoccupied Cubero beyond Laguna Pueblo on the edge of Navajo country (1833), and pushed settlements such as Las Vegas (1835) and Chilili eastward over the edge of the mountains to the edge of the Great Plains (Weber 1982:228).

On the eve of transition to American rule, Governor Manuel Armijo inaugurated a flurry of new land grants in New Mexico, anticipating the takeover (Weber 1982:190):

Manuel Armijo, as governor of New Mexico during most of the period from 1837 to 1846, approved an extraordinary number of land grants.... One historian has calculated that between 1837 and 1846 Armijo gave away over half of the 31,000,000 acres of lands granted by all New Mexico officials under Spain and Mexico....

* * * * *

...Armijo appears to have granted lands to encourage private enterprise to create a barrier against Indians, Texans, and norteamericanos (Weber 1982:190-91).

The most infamous of these was the Maxwell (originally Beaubien-Miranda) land grant, which was the subject of extensive litigation subsequently. Taos pueblo and its missionary priest protested the encroachment onto Taos' traditional lands created by the grant, and the complicity of the soon-to-be first U.S. governor of New Mexico, Charles Bent (ibid:193). Bent's murder and the siege of Taos pueblo in 1847 were in part responses to this policy abusive of Pueblo land rights.

The American Period, 1846-1880

This section is not intended to be a comprehensive survey of Isleta following takeover by the United States in 1846, but rather to provide salient background for Isleta's exercise of aboriginal use and occupancy in that period. Of especial concern is Isleta's capacity to exercise its traditional use-rights in view of U.S. policies in the years subsequent to the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo up to approximately 1880.

General Stephen Watts Kearney with his Army of the West reached Santa Fe in August 1846, and took control of the territory of New Mexico without resistance. Governor Manuel Armijo had received Kearney's representatives shortly before and he elected to simply concede

(Keleher 1952). The frontier territory of New Mexico had received so little aid from Mexico City during the regime that it was now radically impoverished (e.g., Gregg 1970 [1844]:89; Hughes 1848:91), particularly as a result of raids by nomadic Indians. Cooke (1964 [1878]:48) recorded the loss of massive quantities of sheep between 1832 and 1846 to Navajo, Apache, and Comanche thefts, including one *rico* (wealthy stockowner) who had lost 250,000 head. The impending arrival of the Americans, forecast for so long, came as no surprise, and was welcomed by some.

Rumors of a gathering army of resistance to American rule in Albuquerque compelled General Kearney to march south, with 725 men (Hughes 1848:100). The rumors were quelled but the party continued south camping nearby Isleta (three miles north of Peralta) on September 6th 1846 (ibid:112), although the pueblo is not directly mentioned. That there was indeed resistance to the American regime was borne out in the events of January 1847, when the new Governor Charles Bent and several other American officials were assassinated in Taos, by a combined force of Pueblo and Mexican insurgents. This resulted in a series of battles in the Taos area, before the U.S. army was able to re-establish control. Thereafter the military ruled New Mexico until 1851, when James S. Calhoun, who had served since 1849 as Superintendent of Indian Affairs for New Mexico, and was also President Zachary Taylor's "agent in Santa Fe" (Lamar 1966:74), was appointed civil Governor:

The Taos rebellion of 1847...marked the failure of the first civil government of New Mexico. For the next four years the region was ruled by military commanders so preoccupied with Indian troubles or by nature so autocratic that they showed scant regard for civil rights or the chaotic luxury of elections (Lamar 1966:70).

As soon as Kearney had reached Santa Fe, he learned of the devastating effects of Navajo and other raids on the province. He immediately launched expeditions to negotiate treaties of peace with Navajos and Apaches. One month after his arrival, Kearney sent two detachments to the northwest and to the west of the territory, accompanied by Pueblo volunteers. Kearney himself proceeded on towards California on September 25th, but even during his departure from Santa Fe, the army train was hounded by Navajo warriors, who raided settlements from Albuquerque on south (ibid:23). Kearney then ordered out Col. Alexander Doniphan from Santa Fe with a large troop to negotiate with Navajos at Ojo del Oso (modern Fort Wingate):

On October 26, 1846, the very day Doniphan left Santa Fe for the Navajo country, the Navajos staged a spectacular raid south of Albuquerque, killing a number of people and driving off 5,000 sheep within 20 miles of the town. Livestock owners in the Rio Grande Valley drove their herds to the mountains. The valley was in a stage of siege and alarm. "Voluntarios" from the settlements hurried to an appointed rendezvous, and started for the Navajo country ahead of Doniphan, armed with muskets and escopetas (a firelock, a gun), with cartridge boxes buckled around their waists (Kelcher 1952:120).

Isleta is not specifically mentioned in this account, but it is very likely that it was one of the places raided, and it may very well have participated in the campaign. Six days later, Doniphan divided his troop; one command, under Capt. Walton, spent the night of November 2nd encamped by Isleta:

Now during the night there was a great shouting and yelling, and the firing of guns and ringing of bells, and also singing and dancing among the Pueblos of Isleta. Certain of the soldiers, thinking perhaps an attack was meditated by these people on our camp during the night, volunteered to go and learn what might be the occasion of so much noise and tumult. When they arrived there they beheld various lights about the streets and squares, and groups of men and maidens, fantastically dressed and tattooed, dancing and singing with great merriment. On approaching a little nearer, they beheld on the tops of three tall lances or javelins, the scalps of three Navajo warriors, the long, straight, black hair sweeping in the wind. The Pueblos were celebrating a war dance. The men, inquiring how these scalps were obtained, received this account from the Pueblos:

"About three days ago a party of Navajos, between whom and us there are continual wars, descended from the mountains and seized one of our women, five of our children, and a great number of sheep and cattle, and mules, and having killed eight Mexicans and Pueblos, went off with their booty. These facts being reported to Capt. Burgwin, while on his way to Valverde, Lieut. Grier with about sixty men was detached to go in pursuit of this marauding party of Navajos, themselves numbering seventy. Lieutenant Grier, having pursued them about two days, (most of his men however having given over the pursuit on account of their horses failing,) came up with them in a cañon of the mountains, charged upon them, killing and scalping three of them, rescuing the captives, and recovering the stock."....It was thus the Pueblos of Isleta obtained the trophies which they were proudly displaying at the war dance (Hughes 1848:151-52).

Hughes neglected to mention Isleta warriors with the U.S. party, but it seems more than likely they played a major role, as they had in reprisal campaigns throughout the 18th and 19th centuries, and as they continued to do subsequently. The enmities between Isleta and the Navajo are clearly revealed in this account, and form an important part of the context in Isleta's exercise of its aboriginal use rights at this juncture.

Another of Kearney's party, Lt. James W. Abert, made some of the most accurate and thorough records of the period. He stopped at Isleta on October 29th, 1846, noting in passing the very large vineyards, the abundance of grapes, and Isletans at work distilling them in vats (Galvin 1966:52). At Isleta, "we entered some of the houses of the Indians, who had numbers of buffalo robes, which they offered to trade" (Abert 1848:100). The fact that Isleta possessed a surplus of buffalo robes is a good indication of the extent of both Isleta buffalo hunting and/or trading (probably with Comanches) for the robes. Abert visited the ruins of the Saline pueblos, producing the first known images (in watercolor) of the old missions of Quarái and Abó. Passing through Isleta again on December 19th, Abert recorded an antelope in the pueblo that had been wounded, but was now tame (ibid:72): this is an evident reflection of Isleta antelope-hunting.

In the first four decades of U.S. control over New Mexico, the problems posed by hostile nomadic Indians precluded much attention to the needs of the Pueblos. Accordingly, while the records of the Superintendency of Indian Affairs for New Mexico and the Pueblo Agency for this period contain some details of Isleta's circumstances and land use, the majority of the government's energies on Indian Affairs in New Mexico were spent negotiating or warring with Apaches, Navajos, and Utes. Protection of Pueblo interests - although enjoined under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo - was, practically speaking, conspicuous by its absence from the federal government's concerns. The government's concentration on controlling nomadic Indians and the need for internal territorial order—with an oft-lamented lack of adequate manpower—conspired against the Pueblos' ability to protect their interests:

Official preoccupation with Navajos, Apaches, and Utes penalized the peaceable Pueblos, sedentary agriculturalists since prehistoric times. For some ten thousand Pueblos scattered among twenty²⁴ mud villages down the Rio Grande valley from Taos to Isleta and westward to Acoma, Zuni, and the Hopi towns perched on their three mesas, this was the beginning of several generations of official neglect. The Pueblos suffered from the incursions of the nomadic tribes as much as the Hispanics and Anglos and for thirty years sided with them in the wars with other Indians. Such cooperation did gain U.S. recognition of their land "grants" from the king of Spain. But legal title did not discourage illegal encroachment on their irrigated farm lands. The Pueblos quickly discovered that the Americans could not protect them from Apache, Navajo, and Ute raiders and would not protect them from Hispanic and Anglo squatters. As a Zuñi elder

²⁴ Utley confuses the number of pueblos, but "twenty" is a significant number in any event. As other documents from the 1850's show, the "twenty" did not include Hopi. However, it did include Los Lentes, which continued to be treated as an Indian pueblo, and entitled to administration by the New Mexico Superintendency of Indian Affairs, throughout the 1850's and 1860's.

later remarked resignedly, perhaps if the Pueblos stole like the Navajos they might get something from the Americans (Utley 1984:58).

Confirming this historian's view, in 1869, Lt. George Ford, Special Agent for the Pueblos, noted that, while Congress had made appropriations for the Pueblos since 1856, these were only distributed in 1857, and they had received nothing since then, specifically mentioning agricultural implements and schools:

They see the old enemies of themselves and the whites, the Navajos and Apaches, thriving under the lavish expenditures of the same Government they look to for aid, while they receive nothing (UP Doc 115, Annual report of Special Agent, Pueblo Indians, for 1869, by Geo. E. Ford, 1st Lieut., U.S.Army, to Maj. W. Clinton, 9-8-1869).

In his first report of November 1846, Governor Charles Bent had earnestly recommended the appointment of Indian agents and subagents as “absolutely necessary” for the nomadic Indians of the territory (Schoolcraft 1851, I:245). He particularly noted the importance of protecting Pueblo interests in order to ensure their amity towards the U.S. (ibid 245-46). At this early stage Bent also reported that the Pueblos, having been citizens of Mexico were also citizens of the United States. However, in the same communication he explicitly recognized that the Trade and Intercourse laws (of 1834) were “amply sufficient as applied to the Indians referred to in this communication” and he solicited “full and particular instructions in reference to the application of these laws in the regulation of the various Indian tribes above mentioned” (ibid:246).

Bent's recommendations—none sufficiently acted upon—are echoed repeatedly over the next several decades of U.S. dealings with the Indians of New Mexico. Instead of the several agents and subagents for the nomadic Indians, James S. Calhoun was appointed sole Indian agent (or Superintendent of Indian Affairs) for New Mexico in 1849, to cover some 40,000 Indians in modern New Mexico and Arizona, Pueblo and non-Pueblo alike. The “citizenship” of the Pueblos—a dubious official privilege that, Calhoun noted, “has had no practical operation” (7-29-1849, in Abel 1915:18), remained moot in the Mexican regime because of continuing protections of wardship—became even more equivocal after the U.S. takeover.

Conflict and confusion over the disposition of Pueblo administration began early and persisted for many years. Despite the Mexican citizenship statute, in 1847 the “General Assembly “ of the Territory of New Mexico” enacted the following:

That the inhabitants within the Territory of New Mexico known by the name of Pueblo Indians, and living in Towns or Villages built on lands granted to such Indians by the laws of Spain or Mexico, and conceding to such inhabitants certain land and privileges, to be used for the common benefit, are severally hereby created and constituted, bodies politic and corporate, and shall be known in law by the name of “Pueblo de (naming it)” and by that name they and their successors shall have perpetual successions, sue and be sued &c. &c. (in Calhoun 7-29-1849, Abel 1915:19).

Yet Calhoun insisted on appropriate Federal protections for the Pueblos:

The protection of these Indians, in their persons and property, is of great importance. In addition to the obligation which the government of the United States has assumed for their protection, it may be suggested, as a matter of government economy, their property should be protected, and their industry properly stimulated and directed. These people can raise immense quantities of corn and wheat, and have large herds of sheep and goats—the grazing for cattle, generally, is superior, and the reason why they have so few of the cow kind, is to be found in the ease with which they may be driven off by the Navajos, and others (Calhoun 10-4-1849, in Abel 1915:40).

Pueblo soldiers had already been enlisted in a campaign against Navajos, and Calhoun coupled his recommendations for a Pueblo treaty to this service (*ibid*: 37-40). Shortly afterwards, however, the Pueblos were officially prohibited by the U.S. military from making reprisal attacks (as were Mexicans) against Apaches, Navajos and others, seriously inhibiting their capacity to protect themselves: “thus it is, they lose their women and children, and stock, and are remediless” (*ibid*: 72-3). The government thus explicitly failed in its obligation to protect Pueblo land and resource rights—both in terms of judicial decisions conceded by default in the local power vacuum to Hispanic *alcaldes*, and in terms of the denial to the Pueblos of their military capacity to defend themselves. This situation did not occur in the Mexican regime of 1821-46, but was a direct result of U.S. policy thereafter (Abel 1915: *passim*). Calhoun proposed a commission to examine Pueblo land tenure in view of the encroachments and expropriations occurring (*ibid*:86-87). Again, it is an irony of history that the substance of Calhoun’s proposal, in a modified form, is what led more than seventy years later to the Pueblo Lands Act of 1924, and to the Indian Claims Commission itself. If Calhoun’s recommendations had been followed at the time, much unnecessary litigation and legislation might have been avoided. He continued to forward substantive proposals to protect the Pueblos:

Pardon me for again urging the instituting of a Judicial Commission for the immediate adjustment of all Indian titles to land—The Pueblos have been wronged in this

matter, and are annoyed by the Judicial tribunals of this territory. I hesitate not to say, the Judges and Alcaldes should be instructed to suspend all civil actions in their courts against the Pueblo Indians (Calhoun 4-15-1850, in Abel 1915:187).

The judges and alcaldes received no such order, however.

On March 30th, 1850, Calhoun proposed eight Pueblo Agency divisions (not including Hopi), with sub-agents at every pueblo. His District 5 comprised “Isletta” and “Leutis” (a misspelling for Lentas, i.e. Los Lentas). Los Lentas continued to be treated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs as an Isleta Indian pueblo into the late 1860’s. Los Lentas was enumerated in Bureau lists of Indian pueblos that counted “twenty.” In 1852, Pueblo Indians from Los Lentas made a formal complaint to Indian Agent John Greiner about the former Mexican Governor Manuel Armijo for “unjust treatment” (Abel 1916:190-91). And Los Lentas was explicitly included in plans for a smallpox vaccination instituted at all the Pueblos in July 1854 (Smith to Meriwether, 7-29-1854, M234, r 547).

Commissioner Brown finally responded to Calhoun’s recommendations for a treaty with all the Pueblos. But he had no funds to establish agents at each pueblo, and cited a “lack of requisite information” to defer any decision on Pueblo agents (Brown 4-24-1850, in Abel 1915:190-94). A treaty - “Between the United States of America and certain Indian Pueblos, or Towns” was duly signed on July 16th 1850, providing for the protection of the Pueblos under the Trade and Intercourse laws (Paragraph 3), and for their own autonomous government within their own towns (Paragraph 5). With regard to Pueblo lands:

4. The Government of the United States will, at its earliest convenience, afford to the contracting Pueblos, its protecting power and influence; will adjust and settle, in the most practicable manner, the boundaries of each Pueblo, which shall never be diminished, but may be enlarged whenever the Government of the United States shall deem it advisable (ibid).

Eleven of the twenty New Mexico pueblos (Isleta and Los Lentas were not included among the signatories, simply because of their distance from the capital) signed the treaty, although it was clearly Calhoun’s intention to carry the news to the remainder and have them sign it too. Formal government relationships with the Pueblos, including Isleta, were determined by this treaty. As with other treaties negotiated with New Mexico Indians in the 1850’s, this

treaty was never ratified by Congress; but, on the ground, it was used and understood as the standard governing federal obligations to the Pueblos.

Despite this Pueblo treaty, other Territorial forces sought to impose citizenship on the Pueblos. If the Pueblos were citizens, they could own land individually, and more importantly sell it. Unscrupulous Euro-Americans were highly desirous of gaining legal access to the Pueblo grants. In 1867, Chief Justice of the Territory John P. Slough certified Pueblo citizenship, producing a battle with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and his local representatives. In 1876, the Supreme Court of the United States upheld Slough's view in *U.S. vs. Joseph*, "in which it was held that the Pueblo Indians had a complete title to their lands and could therefore dispose of them to whomsoever they pleased" (Brayer 1939:23). The court found that the Pueblo Indians "were not Indians in the true sense of the term and hence the Indian laws of the United States were not applicable to them" (ibid.). The decision placed the protection of Pueblo land and resources in serious jeopardy. As Brayer notes, "The situation remained unchanged for many years, during which the attorneys for the government and the Indians made valiant attempts to convince the courts that they - the courts - were fundamentally in error" (ibid.) Throughout the period from 1848 to 1913, the territorial courts (backed by the U.S. Supreme Court) and the Federal government were "constantly at odds" over Pueblo land rights (ibid:24). Only when New Mexico desired statehood in 1912 was Congress able to insist on a provision granting it the right to determine the disposition of Indian lands in New Mexico. The following year, in *U.S. vs. Sandoval*, the Supreme Court reversed its decision in *Joseph*, finding that the Pueblo Indians were indeed Indians subject to the Indian laws, and held their lands in common, as guaranteed by the Royal Spanish grants and their continuance under Mexico, and in the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo; all titles to lands claimed to have been purchased from Pueblo Indians were held to be invalid (Brayer 1939:24-25). In the interim, despite repeated protests by Indian Agents and Isleta leaders, extensive encroachments and appropriations of Isleta lands occurred – illegally.

Meanwhile, in 1850, depredations on Pueblo and settlers' livestock continued, and the military's policy of prohibiting Pueblo reprisals and rescues lapsed. In May 1850, fifty Apaches drove off several hundred head of cattle from "a place about 10 miles east of Peralta" - inferably on Isleta lands; one herder was killed, others were wounded, captives were taken (Calhoun 5-10-1850, in Abel 1915:196). In response to Calhoun's subsequent inquiry, Francisco Sarracino, the prefect of Valencia county, reported on a series of raids on livestock from June to December,

1850, including almost ten thousand sheep on only two occasions by Navajos (Sarracino to Calhoun 1-29-1851, in Abel 1915:283). On December 31st, it was learned that Apaches had stolen more than 100 head of cattle from the pueblo of Isleta:

I immediately ordered out forty men who started on the 1st of January under the command of Ambrosio Beita [a principal Isleta leader, later Isleta's governor – see photograph], following up the trail, they overtook the Indians on the morning of the 6th in the Telares Mountains, they made an attack on them, recovered the stolen property, wounded two of their number, and took from them four saddled animals and other spoil.

Col, this is all the information I can give you at present in regard to the incursions of these Indians. The depredations they have committed on the lives and property of the inhabitants of this district are so numerous and of so frequent occurrence, that it would take considerable time to collect the information of past injuries (ibid: 284).

Calhoun noted another stock raid on Isleta in January 1851, and reported to the Commissioner the exponential increase in livestock theft by nomadic Indian raiders - from ca. 14,000 for the year of 1846 up to 58,000 for the year 1850. The fledgling American territory was in danger of being abandoned by the new settlers (Calhoun 2-16-1851, in Abel 1915:294).

The Pueblo Treaty of July 1850 did little to protect the Pueblos from encroachment. Six months later Calhoun noted the Pueblos were “excessively annoyed by the Mexicans, and others—The encroachments upon their rights and priviledges (sic) are innumerable—We have promised them protection; and yet, there is a daily addition to the outrages perpetrated.... (Calhoun 2-16-1851, in Abel 1915:293).

Depite the turmoil Calhoun was embroiled in (and his forthright willingness to report it), his duties were expanded, when he was named Governor of the Territory of New Mexico in January 1851 (Abel 1915:296). One of his first acts was to call upon the citizens and Pueblos to form volunteer militia to protect themselves against ever-increasing raids by Navajos and Apaches (ibid:299). He sent this to the caciques of all the pueblos (ibid:300-302). The same month, he noted that every single pueblo within one hundred miles of Santa Fe had sent in a deputation to complain of encroachments (Calhoun 3-31-1851, Abel 1915:307). In June, another series came in, reporting anxiously that a faction of Anglo and Hispanic New Mexicans told them all the Pueblos “were to be driven from their Pueblos, and their lands and property taken from them” (Calhoun 6-30-1851, in Abel 1915:362). Calhoun took this, quite rightly, as a serious attempt to promote Pueblo insurrection (ibid:368-70, 370-75)). At the same time, Navajo raids continued unabated, even occurring inside Isleta pueblo itself:

On the 25th of the month the Navajoes entered the Pueblo of Isleta, and drove off a large number of animals. Isleta is an Indian Pueblo on the west bank of the Rio del Norte, in the midst of a heavy population, about twelve miles south of the military post of Albuquerque,— during the past year the Navajoes have been more successful in their depredations than at any former period—these outrages should be stoped [sic] (Calhoun 6-30-1851, in Abel 1915:364).

In another letter to Commissioner Luke Lea, Calhoun averred to the same raid: “Are these things never to be remedied? Give me the authority and the *means*, and I will remedy it” (Annual Reports of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs 1851:460). This raid on Isleta also prompted a memorial to President Millard Fillmore from the New Mexico Territorial Legislature, complaining of the ineffectuality of the regular troops, and supporting Calhoun’s recommendation for local militia groups (Abel 1915:365-68).

And so it persisted for the rest of Calhoun’s term, when in April 1852, on his deathbed, he was shipped back to the States. He had worked valiantly to protect Pueblo rights, from the torrent of encroachments and raids upon them unleashed since the U.S. takeover. He was unable to resolve the vexed question of their ambiguous status before U.S. law, though he continued to promote the argument that the Trade and Intercourse laws should apply. Newly appointed Indian agent E.H. Wingfield wrote to the Commissioner on his behalf in February 1852:

The Pueblo Indians occupy a truly anomalous position in the country. They are regarded as *quasi* corporations liable to sue and be sued in our courts. From these circumstances, it will be evident to you that this race should be regarded by us either as Indians, or like ourselves as citizens of the United States -- & entitled to all the privileges springing from that relation. But as the latter position would be obnoxious to their own wishes—the Government should view them as Indians in all future legislation. As they are often involved in serious difficulties arising from constant trespasses on their domain, by citizens of the United States—it is but due to them that an appropriation should be made by our Government to compensate in some measure, for the frequent depredations and injuries which they have sustained (Wingfield to Lea 2-6-1852, in Abel 1915:470-71).

This question of compensation for depredations and encroachments was consistent with damages claims the government had agreed to pay to citizens who lost property at the hands of hostile Indians.

In December 1858, Isleta again lost a large number of livestock. Ambrosio Abeita, justice of the peace of the pueblo, wrote to the Superintendent to report the loss of 2,250 head of livestock (presumably sheep) stolen from the Ceja (ridge) of the Rio Puerco to the west of the

pueblo, while the shepherd was killed (RNMSIA, T-21, r1, 12-7-1858); he also recounted the theft of seven horses the previous August from the same location. Following the sheep theft, Isleta sent out a party of 28 Isleta warriors, accompanied by 6 friendly Navajos, in pursuit of the fleeing thieves, but they did not succeed in catching them (ibid). A letter to the Santa Fe Gazette of September 2nd 1862 recounted further Navajo depredations on Isletans 12-15 miles from Chilili on the main pass through the Manzano mountains. This gives an interesting insight into Isleta trading trips to the Comanches:

About the 26th ultimo a party of Pueblos from Isleta set out on a trading expedition to the Comanches. When they got into the Cañon del Infierno (literally rendered the Valley of Hell) [Hell Canyon], they found themselves in a Hell of a fix...surrounded by Navajos who succeeded in killing one Pueblo and wounding five, carrying off 16 of their burros....The Pueblos report some two Navajos killed by them (RNMSIA, T-21, 9-2-1860, r 4).

That these traders had sixteen burros stolen is some indication of the size of the party and the seriousness of the trade, and this confirms Isleta oral history regarding trading and raiding.

Isleta apparently defended its aboriginal territory against others too. In 1859, Luciano Pino and perhaps his brother Matias, settlers in the new Hispanic settlements in the Manzanos, were killed by Indians in the Canyon de Abó. The details of the events are disputed (Foote 1989:13). But Federico Cisneros, the oldest surviving resident at Abó in the 1980's (born in 1894), whose family had been involved in the original resettlement of Abó, insisted that the killers were "rebellious Tiwas" (Foote 1989:13). If so, this may be an indication of continued Isleta demonstrations of interest in the area and protest against those it considered were trespassing on its lands.

At the height of the Civil War, and shortly after the Navajo round-up had been commenced by General James Carleton, the most direct reversal yet of the 1850 policy preventing Pueblo reprisals came into play. In the Isleta area, the Navajos had moved in to raid while the U.S. army was campaigning against Apaches:

Taking advantage of a situation in which New Mexico and California troops were employed in fighting Apaches in the southern part of New Mexico, segments of the Navajo tribe conducted frequent and daring raids in 1863 along the Rio Grande, from near Santa Fe on the north to Socorro on the south. With apparent recklessness and utter disregard for consequences, the Navajos ransacked ranches in the vicinity of Bernalillo, Albuquerque, Los Padillas and other river settlements, terrorizing the inhabitants, and driving off many hundreds of head of livestock. Ranging a long distance from their

usual haunts, the Navajos on one foray in 1863, stole 1,600 sheep from grazing grounds almost within sight of Fort Craig (Keleher 1952:296-97).

In August, 1863, after repeatedly seeking permission from the Pueblo Agent, Ramon Luna, a combined force from Isleta, Laguna, and Acoma were allowed to launch a campaign against Navajos who had stolen their livestock (8-28-1863, Luna to Steck, RNMSIA, T-21, r5). The results of the expedition were reported on October 5th 1863:

The expedition lost two men killed and their commander wounded, of Navajoes they killed twenty-two. Brought in Fifty-one (51) prisoners Twelve hundred sheep and Forty mules and horses among them some mules with the mark of the Government (Luna to Steck, 10-5-1863, RNMSIA, T-21, r5).

Since the party recovered U.S. army mules, and since their campaign aided the U.S. military, Superintendent Steck recommended that the Pueblo campaigners be compensated to the tune of \$10 per man (Steck to Carleton 10-15-1863, RNMSIA, T-21, r 5). The correspondence consistently places Isleta first in the list (before Laguna and Acoma), perhaps indicating that the greatest participation came from there and/or that the commander was an Isleta.

Again in 1868, even while they were incarcerated at Fort Sumner, Navajos descended upon Isleta livestock, inferably in the Estancia Valley. Two years later, Agent Ward submitted a claim from the Isletans for compensation:

I have the honor to submit, herewith, a claim from the Pueblo Indians of Isleta in the territory of New Mexico: for two thousand three hundred and seventy eight sheep (2,378) alleged to have been stolen from them, by the Navajo Indians from the reservation at the Bosque Redondo, N. Mex.

In support of the claim, I have respectfully to inform you, that the depredation referred to was reported to me by the Indians of Isleta (whilst I was their agent) a few days after its occurrence: and the same was by me reported to the Department in my report dated January 3rd, 1868 - Please see that paper, now in the files, of your office.(UP Doc 100. Ward to Wm J. Cady, Acting CIA, 8-16-1870).

Ward, with more than twenty years experience among the Pueblos, emphatically recommended the claim be compensated, and received strong support from Territorial Representative, J. Francisco Chaves. Compensation, however, was denied by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (in UP Doc 94, Ward to Cady, 9-8-1870), with the suggestion that only Congress could decide on compensation, but with nice bureaucratic evasion, simply returned the request to Agent Ward.

Again, this event reveals a variety of features surrounding the Isleta political-economy in the years subsequent to the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo: 1) in terms of the government's extension of protections (it was legally required under the Treaty that New Mexicans be compensated for such losses); 2) in terms of the substantial size of Isleta's livestock holdings, in spite of repeated raids mentioned from 1850 forward; and 3) in terms of the active threats posed to Isleta property and territory by nomadic raiders, here under the official protection of the U.S. government at the Bosque Redondo Reserve.

The question of surveying the Pueblo grants was raised in 1856. The specially appointed Surveyor General requested from the Pueblo Agent, H.G. Meyers, copies of the grants themselves. Meyers proposed a visit to the Rio Abajo pueblos to seek information on the grants, suggesting that in the process he could take the census of those pueblos. He mentioned by name Isleta ("Istaletta") and Los Lentos ("Lentiz"). Again Los Lentos continued to be officially recognized as an Indian pueblo (Meyers to Meriwether 6-23-1856, RNMSIA, T-21, r 2). Isleta's grant had gone missing so an oral report was taken from Isleta Governor Ambrosio Abeita, with Pedro Apodaca and Jose Chirino, *principales* (Pueblo leaders) (SANM I, roll 7, Grants to Pueblo Indians). Their testimony was that Isleta's land grant went from the "espinazo de la sierra," the backbone of the mountaintop of the Manzanos on the east, to the "ceja," cliffs, of the Rio Puerco on the west. On the north and south it was bounded by private land grants, the three southern ones - Lo de Padilla and Sedillo-Gutierrez, which the pueblo had purchased during the Spanish period, and Los Padillas on the north. Congress confirmed Isleta's grant on December 22nd, 1858, and the following year in October, a survey was made by John Garretson (Brayer 1939:58). Four years later, patents for the Pueblo land grants were ready for issue by the General Land Office to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs (Commissioner Edwards to Acting Commissioner Mix, 9-15-1863, RNMSIA, T-21, r5). Superintendent of Indian Affairs for New Mexico, Dr. Michael Steck, indicated that the Pueblos were "severally created and constituted bodies corporate and politic" (i.e., proceeding according to a Territorial statute of 1847), and thus the patents should be issued under that description. Steck still counted twenty New Mexico pueblos (i.e. including Los Lentos) for which patents should be written (Steck to Dole, 10-10-1863, RNMSIA, T-21, r5). Fifteen patents were in fact issued to the pueblos in August 1865 (Ward to Delgado 8-26-1865, RNMSIA, T-21, r 6). Agent Ward reported that the pueblos very much appreciated receiving the patents - all written only in English - and would rely upon them

to adjust encroachment disputes. In an ironic demonstration of the distance between the federal government and its Pueblo charges, Ward was forced to point out (and request funds for) the need to translate the patents into Spanish, “as not one of the Indians understand, read, or write one word of the English language, neither can the people by whom they are surrounded” (ibid).

Isleta’s patent did not include the area to the east up to the crest of the Manzano Mountains, and it took until 1933 for the Pueblo to regain this, in spite of their oral testimony. Absent from the patents distributed was one for Los Lentos, the aboriginal Isleta town of Bejuituay, which was a satellite Isleta community. Despite this exclusion, in 1868 Los Lentos was still regarded as under the jurisdiction of the Superintendent of Indian Affairs for New Mexico, since he (J.M. Gallegos) implicitly included it in his listing of the “twenty New Mexico pueblos” in communication with the Commissioner (Gallegos to Taylor 12-30-1868, RNMSIA, T21, r 8).

Although Pueblo Agent John Ward (1864:335) described Isleta and Santo Domingo as “decidedly the most prosperous on the banks of the Rio Grande, and in respect to property are better off than any other within the Superintendency,” Isletans were not impervious to hardship. 1865 proved a very hard year for Isleta. There was a plague of insects on the crops, late frosts froze the fruit trees, and worst of all the Rio Grande produced a major flood, once more encircling the pueblo to render it into the islet for which the Spanish had named it. Other pueblos suffered from these conditions, but Isleta was by far the worst hit. Some insight into contemporary economic conditions emerges from Agent Ward’s summation of the circumstances:

The wheat crop is an entire failure; resulting from attacks of the myriads of insects, of different kinds...; and from the effects of the overflow of the Rio Grande which has washed away many of the fields.

The corn crop, although not entirely destroyed, has suffered much from the evils before alluded to and perhaps not more than one half of the average year’s crop will be saved.

The River, which at the Pueblo runs about north and south, broke in several miles above, taking a circuit course by the foot of the hills on the west side of the Pueblo, thence running until it emptied into the main channel a short distance below the Pueblo, which, being located on the west bank of the river, became entirely isolated.

That portion of the river which flowed between the Pueblo and the hills to the west, swept away many of the vineyards and orchards for which this Pueblo has always been celebrated, and from which their owners usually derived a considerable profit. Thus many families have also been deprived of that portion of the means of subsistence. So

that in the whole, it can be safely said that the majority if not the entire population has greatly suffered.

This will be more particularly the case after they raise what little may be left to them, and the grain and other products diminish in quantity as the fall and winter months advance, or in other words until next season (Ward to Delgado, 8-6-1865, RNMSIA, T-21, r 6).

Ward recommended that the pueblo be granted aid to sustain them through the year. This was an unusual set of circumstances, but it underscores the widespread pattern in the Pueblo economy requiring reliance on multiple diverse resources. Prior to the damming of the Rio Grande, agriculture in this region was always a precarious undertaking, and frequent floods or lack of precipitation prevented a complete reliance on crop production (cf. Scurlock 1998). Hence the hunting, gathering and trading components of the Isleta economy were not merely supplemental to an agricultural base, they were a critical component of that base, and when agricultural resources failed, were used to offset crop losses.

The year 1867 brought to a head the legal ambiguity of Pueblo land and civil rights. Over the next several years, the Pueblos became very concerned that their lands were being appropriated and that they had lost the privileges guaranteed by the Spanish crown and upheld by the Mexican government. Most of their concerns, and the documentary record of them, refer to land rights inside the Pueblo grants, but the import of these circumstances for the exercise of Pueblo rights to their aboriginal lands beyond the grant boundaries is clear: if the government failed - which it repeatedly did - to protect Pueblo use and occupancy rights within their grant lands, so much the more did it fail to protect those rights beyond the grants. Several Pueblo delegations were sent to Washington to meet with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the President; the first two, in 1868 and 1869, were composed of Isleta leaders acting as representatives for all the Pueblos, and Isleta leaders were included too among subsequent trips. The Indian Bureau continued to operate under the premise that the Trade and Intercourse laws were governing with regard to the Pueblos; that the Pueblos could not sell their lands or any portion thereof (e.g., Taylor to Norton 4-13-1867, RNMSIA, T-21, r 7). But in August 1867, Chief Justice of New Mexico Territory Slough, in *U.S. vs. Benigno Ortiz*, made a landmark decision, effectively reaffirming the citizenship of the Pueblos, and their rights to be taxed, serve on juries, and dispose of their landholdings through sale (opinion printed in *The Santa Fe New Mexican*, 8-3-1867).

While the Indian Affairs Office sought to apply the Intercourse laws, other federal offices pushed the Pueblo citizenship angle. The Commissioner of the Internal Revenue decided on December 13, 1867, that the Pueblos were liable to taxation (UP Doc 136, Agent Ward to CIA N.G. Taylor, 4-3-1868). It was this ruling that was partly what prompted the visit to Washington by Isleta leaders (UP Doc 117, Alejandro Padilla, Gov. of Isleta, Simon Suni, Principal, and Jose del Socorro Hixina, Teniente, and Delegates from Pueblo of Isleta, to Clinton, n.d). In April 1868, accompanied by Special Agent John Ward, Alejandro Padilla and Ambrosio Abeita spent about two months in Washington, as representatives of all the Pueblos.

Alejandro Padilla and Ambrosio Abeita, delegates for the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico, [are in the capital] upon business relating to the affairs of their people....

The subject of their grievances as to the judicial decision of the Chief Justice of the Territory of New Mexico, which they apprehend will break them up as a distinct people and do away with their ancient customs and rights as well as tend to deprive them of their lands has been regarded with special interest. The matter in question however having been taken up by the Supreme Court of the U.S. by an appeal what their status in the respect referred to will be in the future must be considered in connection with the decision of that tribunal. Meanwhile all proper protection should be afforded them in their possession of their property and in the observance of the usages [sic] of life to which they are accustomed.... (UP Doc 8, 5-7-1868, Chas. E. Mix, Acting CIA to Luther E. Webb, Superintendent).

In 1869, the Supreme Court of the Territory, presided over by Justice C.J. Watts, confirmed Judge Slough's decision, extending the prior opinion on the status of the Pueblos. Judge Watts confirmed that the Pueblos were citizens under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, and denied the application of the Trade and Intercourse laws to the Pueblos:

PUEBLO INDIANS NOT SUBJECT TO INTERCOURSE ACT OF 1834--The pueblo Indians of New Mexico are not within the provisions of the Intercourse Act of 1834, not being tribal Indians, and are not subject to the jurisdiction of the Indian department of the United States government (U.S. v. Lucero, 1 N.M. 422 [1869]).

Word of these court decisions had spread like wildfire through the Pueblos:

There has been much trouble, however, in consequence of a decision by the late Chief Justice of the Territory (Judge Slough) placing these Indians on the footing of citizens, and allowing them to sue and be sued, vote, hold office, etc. They are continually imposed upon and harassed by vexatious prosecutors brought before the native alcaldes (justices of the peace) who generally decide in favor of the Mexicans and against the Indians no matter how meritorious may be the case of the latter. These alcaldes are elected by the Mexicans (the Indians not being allowed to vote) and as a

consequence the prejudice that has always existed between the two races, shows itself in their judicial proceedings (UP Doc 124, Pueblo Agent Cooper to Wm Clinton, S.I.A.,NM, 9-8-1869).

Again in December 1869, Juan Andres Abeita and Juan Reyes Lucero, two Isleta leaders, journeyed to Washington to represent all the Pueblos on this matter. They received the President's promise that they would not be taxed or have their rights abrogated (UP Doc 106, CIA Parker to Juan Andres Abeita and Juan Reyes Lucero, delegates from Indians of Isleta Pueblo, "now in Washington DC as Delegates of all the Pueblo towns of New Mexico," 12-23-1869). Nonetheless, ten years later the question of taxing Isleta remained on the table, and local Territorial authorities pushed the Slough/Watts decision as a means of expropriating Pueblo land rights (MLSPIA: passim).

In 1872, several pueblos sought to visit the President in Washington to protest the failure to protect their lands and resources. Again, as the largest Rio Grande pueblo, Isleta was at the head of the Pueblo representatives. Agent W.F.M. Army refused their request, suggesting he would go himself to represent their interests. So the Pueblos protested to Territorial Delegate to Congress J.M.Gallegos. Isleta sent a letter, and another letter was signed by governors from San Juan, Nambe, Tesuque, Santa Clara, Picuris, and San Ildefonso. Isleta's petition to Gallegos reads as follows:

Dear Sir, I, Ambrosio Abeita and others, members of the Pueblo of Ysleta in the County of Bernalillo - respectfully make known our protestation and complaint to the Great Father in Washington.

This is our case - we have a Special Agent for all the Pueblos of our tribe (in the city of Santa Fe) called Army. We understand his duty to be for the good and benefit of all the Pueblos, not only of our persons, but of our rights and property when attacked or when the Judicial Courts take cognizance of our affairs, but the said Army abandons us to defend ourselves against the penalties of the Courts.

Our immemorial customs have been that the Principals and authorities of the Pueblos regulate their domestic difficulties occurring in each Pueblo...

Sir, now we ask the Great Father to be better protected in our rights and that no white persons shall live in our Pueblos without the previous consent and approval of the authorities....

And now all the Principals - officials and the rest of the sons of the Pueblos have become alarmed - lest the Agent Army should further deprive the authorities of their desires and domestic rights for the good of our people.

We now ask the Great Father at Washington for some legal orders to regulate and direct us.

We desire the greatest health and felicity to the Great Father and all the Officials at Washington.

We are your most ob't servants.

Ambrosio Abeita, Governor of the Pueblo

Juan Rey Montolla

Juan Domingo Abieta

Francisco Xiron[t]

Alejandro Padilla

and six others of the Principals (head men) of the Pueblo (UP Doc 123, Jose Manuel Gallegos, Delegate from New Mexico, U.S. House of Representatives, to Secretary of the Interior Columbus Delano, 5-27-1872).

Pueblo Agency documents indicate Isleta hunting and trading trips to the Comanches in the 1860's and 1870's, confirming oral history reports from Isleta. In 1868, at the Pueblos' urging, Special Agent Ward protested a military prohibition enacted several years previously on these trips. The Commissioner responded favorably, authorizing the Pueblos to resume trading trips to the Comanches (UP Doc 132, Ward to CIA N.G. Taylor, 7-15-1868). But the following year, the prohibition was reimposed (UP Doc 116, Cooper to Clinton, Monthly report for Sept 1869, 9-30-1869). It evidently remained so until 1871. In May of that year, a U.S. army troop from Fort Bascom fought with a group of Isletans on the Staked Plains south of the Canadian River close to the Texas-New Mexico border. The Isletans were on a trading trip to the Comanches. The army captured twenty-two Isletans, along with their 700 head of cattle, 57 burros, and ten ponies. The Isletans were imprisoned by the Army for more than one month. The troops destroyed 250 of the cattle on the spot, and drove the rest to Fort Bascom and then Fort Union, where many more died or were slaughtered for the benefit of the troops (LRHQDNM 1865-1890, M1088, r 14, May-June 1871: passim). The Isletans were evidently never compensated for this major loss of property, and indeed were placed on trial in Santa Fe for having violated the prohibition against trading with the Comanches:

During the last month I attended the Court at Santa Fe to see that the twenty-one Indians at Isleta Village were punished for trading with the Comanches, in violation of law, but the evidence not being sufficient they were

not indicted by the Grand Jury (UP Doc 88, Agent W.F.M. Army's report for July 1871 to Nathaniel Pope, 7-31-1871).

That they were not indicted must be counted a blessing, but that they were ever imprisoned or brought to trial are at best matters of questionable legality, given the ambivalent status the Pueblos held under U.S. law during the period. But that the Isletans were never compensated for the loss of 700 cattle seems a gross negligence, and one that epitomized the Government's overall relationship to the Pueblo during this period. These events also directly indicate Isleta's persistent use within its aboriginal area (in direct resistance to opposition by the military).

Isleta hunting in the Plains clearly persisted too. In 1871, Governor Vicente Jiron sent an Isleta petition to New Mexico Superintendent of Indian Affairs Nathaniel Pope, seeking permission to hunt buffalo:

I as Governor of the Pueblo of Isleta come in the name of all the Indians who live in this Pueblo to present to you this petition that you will do us the favor to concede us the licence to go and hunt buffalo.

Because this is the only recourse we have here, by which we are able to live in winter: if it were not for this, many poor families who have neither flocks nor cattle to kill, at this time would die of hunger.

Therefore, Sir, I together with the whole Pueblo, again pray, that you will allow us the licence to be able to go to hunt buffalo, to have meat to eat in the wintertime (9-27-1871, Vicente Jiron to Nathaniel Pope, RNMSIA, T-21, r 14).

In the winter of 1877/78, the teacher at Isleta, Henry Carson, wrote to Pueblo Agent Benjamin Thomas reporting that a party of Isletans had been attacked and robbed (apparently by whites) while "in the Buffalo country" (Thomas to Carson 3-15-1878, MLSPIA, M941, r2). Six months later, Thomas reported, after another period banning Pueblo trips to the Plains:

They [the Pueblos] are very urgent to be again allowed to go to the plains to procure buffalo meat and robes, and as these articles are valuable to them, and I have very little fear that the privilege will again be abused, I respectfully recommend that the order referred to [banning such trips] be revoked and that I be authorized to issue passes to small parties of Indians (Thomas to CIA E.A. Hayt, 10-11-1878, MLSPIA, M941, r2).

Clearly, Isletans were implicitly included in this request. Current Isleta oral history indicates the last buffalo hunt as occurring around the turn of the 20th century.

In sum, Isleta during the American period continued to exercise its interests in its aboriginal area, as is abundantly clear from the ethnohistoric and ethnographic records. As frequently the largest Rio Grande pueblo of all, it continued to protect its resources. But it did so under great pressures, some caused directly and others exacerbated by the U.S. presence. There is no question that Navajo raids on Isleta people in their aboriginal lands increased during the American period, leading to loss of life and livestock. Successive encroachments onto the Isleta's pueblo grant were ineffectively addressed, especially in view of the double-bind of Pueblo citizenship that emerged in the conflict between the undermanned Bureau of Indian Affairs and the courts and legislature of the Territory of New Mexico. When even non-Indians began to raid Isleta livestock herds with impunity in the 1880's (Thomas to Owen, 3-16-1882, MLSPIA, M 941, r 5), the U.S. government's ineffectuality in protecting Isleta interests reached a new nadir. And when the Supreme Court rejected the Pueblos' protection by the Trade and Intercourse laws in 1876, Isleta's rights to exercise its interests in its aboriginal area were further undermined.

Conclusions

Isleta pueblo is the largest Rio Grande pueblo and has been so, throughout much of the last two centuries. Since the early 1700's it has been the southernmost New Mexico pueblo, with access to large areas to the south and east unimpeded by other Indian pueblos. Its population is composed of Southern Tiwas from historic Southern Tiwa villages, including Alameda on south, eastern Southern Tiwas from the Manzano pueblos, who moved to Isleta in the 1670's, Tompiros from the Saline pueblos, who likewise moved to Isleta in the 1670's, and Piros, who moved to Isleta throughout the historic period, especially since the late 17th century. Reverse migrations from Ysleta del Sur and of the relocated Piros south of El Paso have also added to Isleta's population since the 18th century. Isleta was a capital for the eastern Southern Tiwas and the Saline pueblos, and may have also held this role for the Piro towns. As such Isleta's aboriginal area included the interests of the local successor populations of those pueblos, especially following their migration to Isleta.

The traditional Isleta economy involves multiple uses of the landscape (agriculture, hunting, gathering, and later livestock herding), as an ecologically adaptive strategy in the face of harsh and widely dispersed resources throughout its aboriginal territory. Isletans have also used their territory for religious pilgrimages, and for collecting medicinal plants, and minerals. They consistently defended their territory militarily throughout the Spanish and Mexican periods, and into the U.S. period insofar as they were permitted to do so by U.S. authorities. Those authorities, however, operated with contradictory and ambiguous laws with regard to the Pueblos, for more than six decades following the U.S. takeover, resulting in the undermining of Isleta's capacity to defend its territory, either by military or judicial remedy. In the decades following the U.S. takeover, Isletans repeatedly, and most prominently of all the Pueblos, protested these circumstances to the highest U.S. authorities, including the President, without much success. The alienation and deterioration of Isleta aboriginal lands in many instances occurred as a direct result of U.S. policy, either in that its ambiguities failed to protect Isleta rights, or in that it provided no real avenue of redress for Isleta land complaints.

Appendixes:

- A) Curricula Vitae of the Experts.
- B) Statements of Ben Lucero, Joe Zuni, Juan Abeita
- C) Index to land use areas and locations referred to on Maps 6a-6g(ii), organized by reference number
- D) Index to land use areas and locations referred to on Maps 6a-6g(ii), organized by area/location

References Cited

Statements of Isleta Elders:

Juan Abeita, July 2 and 9, 1999

Ben Lucero, July 1 and 8, 1999

Celestino Lucero, September 14, 1999

Joe Zuni, July 7, 8, 9, and September 8, 1999

Published and Semi-published Works

Abbreviations: NMHR: New Mexico Historical Review
UNM: University of New Mexico

Abel, Annie H., 1915, ed., *The Official Correspondence of James S. Calhoun, While Indian Agent at Santa Fe and Superintendent of Indian Affairs in New Mexico*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Abel, Annie H., 1916, The Journal of John Greiner. *Old Santa Fe*, vol III, no 11., pp 189-243

Abert, J.W., 1848, An Examination of New Mexico in the Years 1846-47. *Senate Exec. Doc. no. 23, 20th Cong., 1st session*. Washington.

Adams, Eleanor B., 1954, *Bishop Tamarón's Visitation of New Mexico, 1760*. New Mexico Historical Society Publications in History no XV. UNM Press. Albuquerque.

Adler, Michael and Herbert Dick, eds., 1999, *Picuris Pueblo through Time: Eight Centuries of Change at a Northern Rio Grande Pueblo*. Clements Center for Southwest Studies, Southern Methodist University.

Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1851. Washington D.C.

Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1900. Washington D.C.

Army, W.F.M., 1967 [1870], *Indian Agent in New Mexico: the Journal of Special Agent W.F.M. Army, 1870*. Introduction and Notes by Lawrence R. Murphy. Santa Fe: Stagecoach Press.

Ayer, Mrs. Edward, 1916, *The Memorial of Fray Alonso de Benavides, 1630*, annotated by F.W. Hodge, and C.F. Lummis. [Horn and Wallace reprint, Albuquerque.]

Baldwin, Stuart J., 1983, A Tentative Occupation Sequence for Abo Pass, central New Mexico.
COAS: *New Mexico Archaeology and History* 1 (2):12-28.

Bancroft, Hubert Howe, 1889, *History of Arizona and New Mexico, 1530-1888*. The History Co. San Francisco.

Bandelier, Adolph F., 1892, *Final Report of Investigations among the Indians of the Southwestern United States, carried on mainly in the years from 1880 to 1885*. Vol 2. Papers of the Archaeological Institute of America, American Series, IV. Cambridge: University Press.

Bandelier, Adolph F., 1929-30, Documentary History of the Rio Grande Pueblos, New Mexico, 1536-1581. *NMHR* 4-5.

Bandelier, Adolph F., 1966-76, *The Southwestern Journals of Adolph F. Bandelier*. Edited by Charles Lange, Carroll Riley, and Elizabeth Lange. UNM Press. Albuquerque.

Bandelier, Adolph F., 1969, *A History of the Southwest: a Study of the Civilization and Conversion of the Indians in the Southwestern United States and Northwestern Mexico from the Earliest Times to 1700*. Ernest J. Burrus, S.J., ed. 2 vols with maps and illustrations supplement. Studi e Testi 257. Città del Vaticano. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana.

Barrett, Elinore M., 1997, The Geography of the Rio Grande Pueblos Revealed by Spanish Explorers, 1540-1598. *Latin American Institute Research Paper*, series 30. UNM. Albuquerque.

Bennett, Iven, 1986, Maximum and Minimum Temperatures, & Annual Precipitation. In *New Mexico in Maps* 2nd. Edition, edited by Jerry L. Williams. UNM Press. Albuquerque.

Bloom, Lansing B., 1928, Barreiro's Obreada sobre Nuevo-Mexico. *NMHR* 3:1.

Bloom, Lansing B., 1931, A Campaign Against the Moqui Pueblos, annotated by Ralph Twitchell, and edited by Bloom. *NMHR* 6:2.

Bloom, Lansing, 1938, Bourke on the Southwest, XIII: Chapter XXIV - In the Tigua country. *NMHR* 13:192-209.

Bolton, Herbert E., 1916, *Spanish Exploration in the Southwest 1542-1706*. Scribner's. New York

Brandt, Elizabeth, 1979, Sandia Pueblo. From *Handbook of North American Indians, vol 9, The Southwest*, Alfonso Ortiz, ed. Smithsonian Institution. Washington D.C.

Brandt, Elizabeth, 1997, *Salinas Pueblo Missions National Monument Cultural Affiliation Study*. National Park Service. Santa Fe.

Brayer, Herbert O., 1939, The Pueblo Indian Land Grants of the "Rio Abajo," New Mexico. *UNM Bulletin* #334.

Breternitz, David, 1966, An Appraisal of Tree-Ring Dated Pottery in the Southwest. Anthropological Papers of Eighth Southwestern Ceramic Seminar, 1966, *Rio Grande Glazes*. Ms. on file Museum of New Mexico, Santa Fe.

Brockman, Frank C., 1968, *Trees of North America: A Field Guide to the Major Native and Introduced Species North of Mexico*. Golden Press, NY.

Bustamante, Adrian, 1991, "The Matter was Never Resolved": The Casta System in Colonial New Mexico, 1693-1823. *NMHR*, April 1991.

Carroll, H. Bailey and J Villasana Haggard, 1942, *Three New Mexico Chronicles* [Pino 1812, Barreiro 1832, Escudero 1849]. Quivira Society. Albuquerque.

Chavez, Fray Angelico, 1979, Genizaros. *From Handbook of North American Indians, vol 9, The Southwest*, Alfonso Ortiz, ed. Smithsonian Institution. Washington DC.

Clark, Tiffany C., 1999, Understanding Prehistoric Ceramic Commodities: An Analysis of the Spatial and Temporal Distribution of Chupadero Black-on-White. Paper Presented at the 64th Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology. Chicago.

Cooke, Philip St. George, 1964 [1878], *The Conquest of New Mexico and California in 1846-1848*. Chicago: Rio Grande Press.

Cordell, Linda, Personal communication (to Dr. Adler), 8-1-1998.

Dobyns, Henry, 1983, *Their Number Become Thinned: Native American Population Dynamics in Eastern North America*. University of Tennessee Press. Knoxville.

Documentos para Servir a la Historia del Nuevo Mexico, 1538-1778. Colección Chimalistac de Libros y Documentos acerca de la Nueva Espana, 13. Ediciones Jose Porrua Turanzas. Madrid, 1962.

Dodge, Natt N., 1985, *Flowers of the Southwest Deserts*. Southwest Parks and Monuments, Tucson.

Dozier, Edward, 1970, *The Pueblo Indians of North America*. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

- Eggan, Frederick, 1950, *Social Organization of the Western Pueblos*. University of Chicago Press.
- Eggan, Frederick, 1979, Pueblos: Introduction. From *Handbook of North American Indians, vol 9, The Southwest*, Alfonso Ortiz, ed. Smithsonian Institution. Washington D.C.
- Eidenbach, Peter L., 1999, *The Regional Landscape: South Central New Mexico*. MS
- Ellis, Florence Hawley, 1974, *Anthropology of Laguna Pueblo Land Claims*. Pueblo Indians III. Garland. New York.
- Ellis, Florence Hawley, 1979, Isleta Pueblo. From *Handbook of North American Indians, vol 9, The Southwest*, Alfonso Ortiz, ed. Smithsonian Institution. Washington D.C.
- Ellis, Florence Hawley and Edwin Baca, 1957, The Apuntes of Father J. B. Ralliere. NMHR:10-35.
- Espinosa, J.M., 1940, *First expedition of Vargas into New Mexico, 1692*. UNM Press. Albuquerque.
- Fewkes, Jesse Walter, 1906, Shrines. *Handbook of American Indians. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 30*, pt. 2. Washington D.C.
- Fisher, Reginald G., 1931, Survey of the Pueblo Plateau Santa Fe Sub-Quadrangle A. *University of New Mexico, Anthropological Series*, Report Vol. 1 No. 1.
- Foote, Cheryl D., 1989, *The Hispanic Reoccupation of Abo and Quarai: an Oral History Project for Salinas National Monument*. MS. Natural Resources Library, U.S. Dept. of the Interior. Washington, D.C.
- Forrestal, Peter P., ed. and trans., 1954, *Benavides' Memorial of 1630*. American Academy of Franciscan History. Washington, D.C.
- Galvin, John, ed., 1966, *Western America in 1846-47: the Original Travel Diary of Lieutenant J.W. Abert, who mapped New Mexico for the United States Army*. San Francisco: John Howell.
- Goldfrank, Esther, 1962, Isleta Paintings. *Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 181*. Washington, D.C.
- Gregg, Josiah, 1970 [1844], *Commerce of the Prairies*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Habicht-Mauche, Judith A., 1993, The Pottery from Arroyo Hondo Pueblo, New Mexico: Tribalization and Trade in the Northern Rio Grande. *Arroyo Hondo Archaeological Series 8(1)*. School of American Research Press, Santa Fe.

- Hackett, Charles Wilson, 1937, *Historical Documents Relating to New Mexico, Nueva Vizcaya, and Approaches Thereto, to 1773, vol III*. Carnegie Institution. Washington, D.C.
- Hackett, Charles Wilson and Charmion Clair Shelby, 1942, *Revolt of the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico and Otermín's Attempted Reconquest 1680-82*. UNM Press: Albuquerque.
- Hammond, George P. and Agapito Rey, 1953, *Don Juan de Oñate, Colonizer of New Mexico, 1595-1628*. UNM Press, Albuquerque.
- Hammond, George P. and Agapito Rey, 1966, *The Rediscovery of New Mexico, 1580-1594: the Explorations of Chamuscado, Espejo, Castaño de Sosa, Morlete, and Leyva de Bonilla and Humana*. UNM Press Albuquerque.
- Harlow, Francis H., 1973, *Matte-Paint Pottery of the Tewa, Keres and Zuni Pueblos*. Museum of New Mexico Press, Santa Fe.
- Harrington, John P, 1916, The Ethnogeography of the Tewa Indians. 29th Annual report of the Bureau of American Ethnology, 29-636. Washington, D.C.
- Hawley, Florence M., 1936, *Field Manual of Prehistory Southwestern Pottery Types*. University of New Mexico Bulletin No. 291. UNM Press. Albuquerque.
- Hawley, John W., 1986, Physiographic Provinces. In *New Mexico in Maps*, 2nd. Edition, edited by Jerry L. Williams. UNM Press.
- Hickerson, Nancy Parrott, 1994, *The Jumanos: Hunters and Traders of the South Plains*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Hill, W.W., 1982, *Ethnography of Santa Clara Pueblo*. Edited by Charles Lange. UNM Press. Albuquerque.
- Hodge, Frederick Webb, George P. Hammond, and Agapito Rey, 1945, *Fray Alonso de Benavides revised Memorial of 1634*. UNM Press. Albuquerque.
- Houser, Nicholas P., 1979, Tigua Pueblo. From *Handbook of North American Indians, vol 9, The Southwest*, Alfonso Ortiz, ed. Smithsonian Institution. Washington D.C.
- Hughes, John T., 1848, *Doniphan's Expedition: Containing an Account of the Conquest of New Mexico etc...* J.A. and U.P. James. Cincinnati.
- Ivey, James, 1988, In the Midst of Loneliness: the Architectural History of the Salinas Missions. Salinas Pueblo Missions National Monument Historic structure report. *Southwest Cultural Resources Center, Professional Report no. 15*. Santa Fe: National Park Service.

- Jojola, Ted, Personal communication (to Dr. Adler), 11-14-1997.
- Jones, Oakah, 1966, *Pueblo Warriors and Spanish Conquest*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Jones, Volney, 1931, *The Ethnobotany of the Isleta Indians*. M.A.Thesis. UNM.
- Keleher, William, 1952, *Turmoil in New Mexico*. UNM Press. Albuquerque.
- Kelly, Henry W., 1940, *The Franciscan Missions of New Mexico, 1740-1760*. *NMHR* 15:4.
- Kelley, Jane Holden, 1984, *The Archaeology of the Sierra Blanca Region of Southeastern New Mexico*. Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan Anthropology Papers No. 74. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.
- Kessell, John L., 1987, *Kiva, Cross and Crown: the Pecos Indians and New Mexico, 1540-1840*. UNM P. Albuquerque.
- Kessell, John L., 1989, Spaniards and Pueblos: from Crusading Intolerance to Pragmatic Accommodation. In *Columbian Consequences, vol I: Archaeological and Historical Perspectives on the Spanish Borderlands West*, David Hurst Thomas, ed., pp127-138. WashingtonDC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Kessell, John L., Rick Hendricks and Meredith Dodge, 1995, *To the Royal Crown Restored: the Journals of Don Diego de Vargas, New Mexico 1692-94*. UNM Press Albuquerque.
- Kinnaird, Lawrence, 1958, *The Frontiers of New Spain, Nicolas de Lafora's Description*. U. Cal. Press. Berkeley.
- Kramer, Paul M., 1976, *New Mexico's Ancient Salt Trade*. *El Palacio*, 82:22-30.
- Krause, Fritz, 1907, *Die Pueblo-Indianer: eine historisch-ethnographische Studie*. Nova Acta, Abh. der Kaiserl. Leop.-Carol. Deutschen Akademie der Naturforscher, Band LXXXVII, Nr. 1. Halle. Leipzig.
- Lamar, Howard R., 1966, *The Far Southwest, 1846-1912: a Territorial History*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Lamb, Samuel H., 1989, *Woody Plants of the Southwest*. Sunstone Press, Santa Fe.
- Lambert, Marjorie E., 1954, *Paa-ko*. School of American Research No. 19. School of American Research Press, Santa Fe.

- Lehmer, Donald J., 1948, The Jornada Branch of the Mogollon. *University of Arizona Bulletin* No. 17, University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- Little, Elbert L., 1998, National Audubon Society Field Guide to North American Trees: Western Region. Alfred Knopf, NY.
- Lummis, Charles F., 1891, *A New Mexico David, and Other Stories and Sketches of the Southwest*. Scribner's New York.
- Lummis, Charles F., 1893, *The Land of Poco Tiempo*. Scribner's. New York.
- Lummis, Charles F., 1976 [1894], *The Man Who Married the Moon*. AMS Press. New York.
- Marshall, Michael P., 1997, The Valle Bajo Ceramic Tradition. In *A Presidio Community on the Rio Grande: Phase III Testing and Historical Research at San Elizario, Texas*. Vol. 2, edited by Bradley J. Vierra, June-el Piper, and Richard C. Chapman. Office of Contract Archaeology, University of New Mexico.
- Marshall, Michael P. and Christina L. Marshall, 1990, The 1989-1990 Middle Rio Grande Acequia Archaeological Survey Project. Complete Archaeological Service Associates Report No. 90-60. Prepared for the Bureau of Reclamation, Upper Colorado Region.
- Marshall, Michael P., And Christina L. Marshall, 1993, Archaeological Excavations at Three sites within the Proposed Rio Bravo Blvd. and Paseo del Volcan Corridors, Bernalillo County, New Mexico. *Cibola Research Report 97*. Cibola Research, Corrales. Ms. on file, Archaeological Records Management Section, Historic Preservation Division, Santa Fe.
- Marshall, Michael P. and Henry J. Walt, 1985, *Rio Abajo: Prehistory and History of a Rio Grande Province*. Historic Preservation Division, Santa Fe.
- Martin, William C., 1986, Vegetation. In *New Mexico in Maps* 2nd. Edition, edited by Jerry L. Williams, UNM Press.
- Mecham, J. Lloyd, 1926, The Second Spanish Expedition to New Mexico: an Account of the Chamuscado-Rodriguez Entrada of 1581-2. *NMHR* 1:3.
- Mera, H. P., 1933, A Proposed Revision of the Rio Grande Glaze Paint Sequence. *Laboratory of Anthropology Technical Series Bulletin No. 5*. Santa Fe, New Mexico.
- Mera, H. P., 1940, Ceramic Clues to the Prehistory of North Central New Mexico. *Laboratory of Anthropology Technical Series. Bulletin 8*. Edwards Brothers, Inc., Ann Arbor.

Mera, H.P., 1940, Population Changes in the Rio Grande Glaze-Paint Area. *Laboratory of Anthropology, Technical Series, Bulletin 9*. Santa Fe.

Montgomery, John and Kathleen Bowman, 1989, *Archaeological Reconnaissance of the Chupadero Arroyo Drainage, Central New Mexico*. Agency for Conservation Archaeology, Eastern New Mexico University, Portales, New Mexico.

Nabokov, Peter, 1981, *Indian Running*. Capra. Santa Barbara.

Nelson, Kit, 1997, Pottery and Chronology: Determining the Sequence of Occupation at Pueblo Blanco, New Mexico using the Site-Use Model. M.A. Thesis. Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, Illinois.

Olinger, Bart, 1987, Pottery Studies Using X-Ray Florescence, Part 1, An Introduction, Nambe Pueblo as an Example. *Pottery Southwest* 14(1):1-2.

Olmsted, Virginia, 1975, *Spanish and Mexican Colonial Censuses of New Mexico: 1790, 1823, 1845*. New Mexico Genealogical Society, Inc. Albuquerque.

Olmsted, Virginia, 1981, *Spanish and Mexican Censuses of New Mexico: 1750-1830*. New Mexico Genealogical Society, Inc. Albuquerque.

Ortiz, Alfonso, 1969, *The Tewa World: Space, Time, Being and Becoming in a Pueblo Society*. University of Chicago Press.

Ortiz, Alfonso, 1972, Ritual Drama and the Pueblo World view. In *New Perspectives on the Pueblos*, edited by Alfonso Ortiz. UNM Press. Albuquerque.

Parsons, Elsie Clews, 1920, Notes on Isleta, Santa Ana, and Acoma. *American Anthropologist* 22:56--69.

Parsons, Elsie Clews, 1921, Further Notes on Isleta. *American Anthropologist* 23:149-69

Parsons, Elsie Clews, 1928, The Laguna migration to Isleta. *American Anthropologist*, n.s., 30: 602-613.

Parsons, Elsie Clews, 1932, Isleta, New Mexico. *47th Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology for the Years 1929-30*, pp 193-466. Washington, D.C.

Parsons, Elsie Clews, 1936, Taos Pueblo. *General Series in Anthropology*, 2. Measha, WI.

Parsons, Elsie Clews, 1939, *Pueblo Indian Religion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pecos Archaeological Survey, 1995, *Pecos Archaeological Survey 1995 Ceramic Typology Field Manual*. Ms. on file Bandelier National Monument Archaeology Division.

Peterson, John A. and David O. Brown, 1994, *El Valle Bajo: The Culture History of the Lower Rio Grande Valley of El Paso, Vol. 2: Lower Valley History*. Archeological Research, Inc., El Paso, and Hicks and Company, Austin.

Poore, Henry R., 1893, Report on the Condition of 15 Pueblos of New Mexico in 1890. In *Moqui Pueblo Indians of Arizona and Pueblo Indians of New Mexico*, by Thomas Donaldson. Extra Census Bulletin. 11th Census of the United States. U.S Government Printing Office.

Potter, James M., no date, The Chupadero to Tabira Transition in the Salinas Region of the American Southwest. Manuscript.

Comment [DEAB1]: complete citation

Ramenofsky, Ann F., 1987, *Vectors of Death: the Archaeology of European Contact*. UNM Press. Albuquerque.

Rautman, A.E., 1993, Resource Variability, Risk, and the Structure of Social Networks: An Example from the Prehistoric Southwest. *American Antiquity* 58:402-424.

Reeves, C.C., Jr., 1972, Tertiary-Quaternary Stratigraphy and Geomorphology of West Texas and Southeastern New Mexico. In *Guidebook of East-Central New Mexico*, edited by V.C. Kelley and F.D. Trauger, pp.108-117. New Mexico Geological Society 23rd Field Conference. NM Bureau of Mines and Minerals, UNM Dept of Geology.

Sanchez, Jane, 1983, Spanish-Indian Relations during the Otermín Administration, 1677-83. *NMHR* 58:2.

Sanchez, Joseph, 1996, *Between Two Rivers: a History of the Atrisco Land Grant* (ms.). UNM Spanish Colonial Research Center, National Park Service (copy courtesy of Joseph Sanchez).

Sando, Joe, 1992, *Pueblo Nations: Eight Centuries of Pueblo Indian History*. Clear Light. Santa Fe.

The New Mexican (Santa Fe), 8-31-1867, Opinion of Territorial Supreme Court Justice J.C. Watts in U.S. v. Lucero.

Schaafsma, Curtis F., 1995, The Chronology of Las Madres Pueblo. In *Of Pots and Rocks: Papers in Honor of A. Helene Warren*, edited by Meliha S. Duran and David T. Kirkpatrick, pp. 155-166. The Archaeological Society of New Mexico: 21. Archaeological Society of New Mexico, Santa Fe.

- Scholes, France V., 1928, Manuscripts for the History of New Mexico in the National Library in Mexico City. *NMHR* 3:3.
- Scholes, France V., 1929, Documents for the History of the New Mexico Missions in the Seventeenth Century. *NMHR* 4:1.
- Scholes, France V., 1937, *Church and State in New Mexico 1610-1650*. Historical Society of New Mexico Publications in History vol VII. UNM Press. Albuquerque.
- Scholes, France V., 1942, *Troublous Times in New Mexico, 1659-1670*. Historical Society of New Mexico Publications in History vol XI. UNM Press Albuquerque.
- Schoolcraft, Henry R., 1851, *Historical and Statistical Information on the History, Conditions, and Prospects, of the Indian Tribes of the United States.*, vol I. Lippincott Grambo. Philadelphia.
- Schroeder, Albert H., 1964, The Language of the Saline Pueblos: Piro or Tiwa? *NMHR* 39:235-49.
- Schroeder, Albert H., 1979, Pueblos Abandoned in Historic Times. In *Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 9: Southwest*, edited by Alfonso Ortiz, pp. 236-254. Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C.
- Scurlock, Daniel, 1998, From the Rio to the Sierra: an Environmental History of the Middle Rio Grande Basin. *U.S. Forest Service General Technical Report RMRS GTR-5*. Albuquerque.
- Sebastian, Lynne, & Signa Larralde, 1989, *Living on the Land: 11,000 Years of Human Adaptation in Southeastern New Mexico*. Cultural Resource Series No.6, USDI Bureau of Land Management.
- Shepard, Anna O., 1942, Rio Grande Glaze Paint Ware: A Study Illustrating the Place of Ceramic Technological Analysis in Archaeological Research. *Carnegie Institution Contributions to American Anthropology and History* 39:132-262. Carnegie Institution of Washington, Washington D.C.
- Siguenza y Gongora, Carlos de, 1932 [1695], *The Mercurio Volante of Don Carlos de Siguenza y Gongora; an account of the first expedition of Don Diego de Vargas into New Mexico in 1692*; translated, with introduction and notes, by Irving Albert Leonard. Los Angeles, The Quivira Society, 1932.
- Simmons, Marc, 1979a, History of Pueblo-Spanish Relations to 1821. In *Handbook of North American Indians vol 9, The Southwest*, Alfonso Ortiz, ed, 178-193. Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution.

- Simmons, Marc, 1979b, History of the Pueblos Since 1821. In *Handbook of North American Indians vol 9, The Southwest*, Alfonso Ortiz, ed, 206-223. Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution.
- Smiley, Terah L. Stanley A. Stubbs, and Bryan Bannister, 1953, *A Foundation for the Dating of Some Late Archaeological Sites in the Rio Grande Area New Mexico: Based on Studies in Tree-Ring Methods and Pottery Analyses*, Vol. XXIV No. 3. University of Arizona Press, Tucson
- Snead, R.E., 1981, Landforms. In *New Mexico in Maps*, edited by Jerry L. Williams & Paul E. McAllister, UNM Press.
- Snow, David H., 1982, Rio Grande Glaze, Matte-Paint, and Plainware Traditions. In *Southwestern Ceramics: A Comparative Review*, edited by A. H. Schroeder. The Arizona Archaeologist, No. 15. Arizona Archaeological Society, Inc., Tucson.
- Spellenberg, Richard, 1998, National Audubon Society Field Guide to North American Wildflowers: Western Region. Alfred Knopf, NY.
- Spicer, Edward, 1962: *Cycles of Conquest: the Impact of Spain, Mexico, and the United States on the Indians of the Southwest, 1533-1960*. University of Arizona Press. Tucson.
- Stuart, David E., and Rory P. Gauthier, 1984, *Prehistoric New Mexico: Background for Survey*. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
- Sundt, William M., 1987, Pottery of Central New Mexico and Its Role as Key to Both Time and Space. In *Secrets of a City: Papers on Albuquerque Area Archaeology In Honor of Richard A. Bice*, edited by Anne B. Poore and John Montgomery, pp. 116-147. Papers of the Archaeological Society of New Mexico, No. 13. Ancient City Press. Santa Fe.
- Tainter, Joseph A., and Frances Levine, 1987, *Cultural Resources Overview Central New Mexico*. USDA Forest Service Southwestern Region, Albuquerque.
- Thomas, Alfred B., 1932, *Forgotten Frontiers: Study of the Spanish Indian Policy of Don Juan Bautista de Anza, Governor of New Mexico 1777-1787 (From the Original Documents in the Archives of Spain, Mexico, and New Mexico)*. University of Oklahoma Press. Norman, OK.
- Thomas, Alfred B., 1940, *The Plains Indians and New Mexico, 1751-1778: a Collection of Documents Illustrative of the History of the Eastern Frontier of New Mexico*. UNM Press. Albuquerque.
- Trager, George, 1967, The Tanoan Settlement of the Rio Grande Area: a Possible Chronology. In *Studies in Southwestern Ethnolinguistics: Meaning and History in the*

Languages of the American Southwest. Dell Hymes and William Bittle, eds. Mouton. The Hague.

Twitchell, Ralph E., 1914, *The Spanish Archives of New Mexico*, 2 vols. The Torch Press.

U.S. v. Lucero, 1 N.M. 422 (1869).

U.S. v. Joseph, 94 U.S. 614 (1877).

U.S. v. Sandoval, 231 U.S. 28 (1913).

U.S. Army Corps of Topographical Engineers, 1951 [1846], *Lieutenant Emory Reports: a Reprint of Lieutenant W.H. Emory's Notes of a Military Reconnaissance*. Ross Calvin, ed. UNM Press. Albuquerque.

Utey, Robert M., 1984, *The Indian Frontier of the American West, 1846-1890*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Vetancurt, Agustín de, 1971 [1697-98], *Teatro mexicano; descripción breve de los sucesos ejemplares, históricos y religiosos del Nuevo Mundo de las Indias. Crónica de la Provincia del Santo Evangelio de Mexico. Menologio franciscano de los varones más señalados, que con sus vidas ejemplares, perfección religiosa, ciencia, predicación evangelica en su vida, ilustraron la Provincia del Santo Evangelio de Mexico*. Mexico: Porrúa.

Vivian, R. Gordon, 1964, Excavations in a 17th Century Jumano Pueblo, Gran Quivira. *U.S. National Park Service Archaeological Series*, 8. Washington.

Ward, John, 1864, "No. 72" [Report of the Pueblo Agency]. In *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1864*. Washington D.C.

Warren, A. H., 1979, The Glaze Paint Wares of the Upper Middle Rio Grande. In *Archaeological Investigations in the Cochiti Reservoir, New Mexico. Volume 4: Adaptive Change in the Northern Rio Grande Valley*, edited by Jan V. Biella and Richard C. Chapman, pp. 187-216. Office of Contract Archaeology, Department of Anthropology, New Mexico.

Weber, David J., 1982, *The Mexican Frontier, 1821-1846: the American Southwest under Mexico*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Whiteley, Peter, 1989, Southwest Indian Religions. In *Native American Religions: North America*, Lawrence E. Sullivan, ed., 45-64. MacMillan. New York.

Winship, George Parker, 1964 [1896], *The Coronado Expedition, 1540-42*. Rio Grande Press. Chicago.

Archival Manuscript References

Abbreviations:

AGN: Archivo General de la Nación (Mexico City)
AGN Inq: Archivo General de la Nación Records of the Inquisition
ARCIA: Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs
BNM: Biblioteca Nacional de Mexico
CIA: Commissioner of Indian Affairs
LRHQDNM: Letters Received by Headquarters, District of New Mexico (Record Group 393, National Archives and Records Service Microfilm no. M1088)
MLSPIA: Miscellaneous Letters Sent by the Pueblo Indian Agency (RG 75, NARS Microfilm M941)
RNMSIA: Records of the New Mexico Superintendency of Indian Affairs (RG 75, NARS Microfilm T-21)
SANM: Spanish Archives of New Mexico (especially referring to the collections annotated in Twitchell 1912)
UP Doc: Copy of Document from the National Archives housed at Ussery and Parrish (attorneys to the Pueblo of Isleta)
Scholes trscr: transcription by France V. Scholes
transc: transcription
transl: translation

National Anthropological Archives. Washington, D.C.

John Peabody Harrington Papers:

vol 4, Reel 36, Southwest, Isleta, Piro, Isleta del Sur Notes and drafts, 1920.
1920, Isleta Language, Texts and Analysis

Carobeth Tucker, n.d., Southern Tiwa Kachinas. Mss. 2306.

Southwest Museum, Los Angeles.

Charles Fletcher Lummis Papers:

MS 1.1.901, February 22, 1909
Notes, Manuscript Box 1.
Tape 1, Side A, #10 [80.03.20]
Undated Notebook, ca. 1889-90

University of Arizona Library

Charles Fletcher Lummis Papers

Library of Congress, Washington D.C.

August V. Kautz Papers, LC MS:

Box 1: 1869 word list recorded at Ft Stanton by Isleta traders;
Kautz diary, 1869

Alan Lomax Collection, 1942. 6325B, Tape 5

UNM Center for Southwest Research, Albuquerque.

Archivo General de la Nación (Mexico) Documents photostats and transcriptions

AGN. Indios 24, no. 63 tr. [1665 petition from "Pedro de Aguila yndio natural de las provincias de la nueva Mexico de la nacion de los Tiguas en la jurisdiccion de las salinas..." for the Tiwas of that region to be able to name their own governor.

AGN Inquisición. 316, f 149-174, ff 149-184v; *Relación Verdadera* of Father Francisco Perez Guerta, 1617.

AGN Inquisición. 318, f489, Letter from Padre Fray Esteban de Perea to Gutierrez de Quiros.

AGN Inquisición. 356. f 260v. Testimony of Fray Geronimo de Zarate, Guardian of Jemez, to Fray Alonso de Benavides, 1626

AGN Inquisición. 356, f260v, and f300. Notes Fr. Juan de Salas, guardian del Convento de San Antonio de la Isleta in 1621-22, and Fr. Francisco Fente, guardian de Abó.

AGN Inquisición. 594, pt 2. capitulo 172 (Primera Audiencia de don Bernardo Lopez de Mendizabal, ano de 1663), docs. [Scholes: 594, 2, Exp 1, f228v ff].

AGN Provincias Internas, 36, Exped. 1 and 2, trscr, 1697-1708.

AGN Provincias Internas, 37, No. 4., Autos concerning aid for the settlement of el Paso del Norte, revolts of Indians there, and "removal of the Post of El Paso de Rio del Norte to that of Ysleta," 1684-85. Testimony of Isletan Lucas, 2-12-1685.

AGN Provincias Internas, 65, part 2, Expediente 7. Military census of auxiliaries, May 1788.

Biblioteca Nacional de Mexico Documents photostats

Biblioteca Nacional de Mexico Legajo 9, Doc 7. Census of missions, 1749.

Biblioteca Nacional de Mexico Legajo 9, Doc 9. Census of missions, etc., ca 1751.

Biblioteca Nacional de Mexico, New Mexico Archives, Leg. 10, doc 70. State of the missions, 1794.

Biblioteca Nacional de Mexico, New Mexico Archives, Leg. 10, doc 74. 1799 Census.

Biblioteca Nacional de Mexico, Manuscritos para la Historia de Nuevo Mexico, Legajo 10, Exp 83. Transcribed population figures, inc. Isleta, 1792, 1794, 1801-2, 1817.

Biblioteca Nacional de Mexico, New Mexico Archives, Leg. 10, doc 85: Missions, missionaries, and population figures, 1788.

Spanish Archives of New Mexico I. Microfilm Roll 7 Grants to Pueblo Indians. Report Q Pueblo of Isleta, 11-8-1856.

Spanish Archives of New Mexico Photostats:

Series I (#s from Twitchell 1914):

#1117 A 1714 note, after inspection, that there are no kivas in Isleta. R 6, F 148.

#1029 Town of Alameda Grant to Fr.co Montes Vigil, 1710. R 22, Fs 1-46, passim

#1368 Statement re: Isleta lands, jurisdiction etc, 1822. R 6, F 1714-15.

#1381 Isleta Protest, re Ojo de la Cabra, 3-27-1845. R 6, Fs 1770-79.

#1382 Ojo de la Cabra Grant, 1845. R 6, Fs 1780-87.

Series II:

[no #] Mission inventories and pop figs, 1795. SANM, Santa Fe, Reel 21, frames 535-41.

#129 Cuervo y Valdes order re: dangerous conditions between Albuquerque and Pueblo of Isleta. SANM Series II, R 3, Fs 1121-22.

#141 Viceroy[Duke of Albuquerque] to Governor [Marques de la Peñuela, re: escort to Zuni, 1708.

#145 Execution of six Tiwas at Hopi 1707/08 (dated July 7, 1708).

#224 Campaign against the Apaches, 1715.

#356 Release of goods of an Isleta man, Phelipe, who died in prison while on a charge of witchcraft, 1730.

#381 Witchcraft trial at Isleta of the Cacique and two others charged with bewitching one Vicente Garcia, 1733.

#1092B General Census of Albuquerque, 1790.

#1366 Apache hostilities, Navajo uprising, Navajo-Gileno Apache alliance; Apache attacks on, inter alia, Isleta, 1796.

#1518A Census of New Mexico, 1800.

#1830 Census of NM, 1805. General figures for Isleta.

#2187 Valle, Dionisio. Re: Comanche report of Anglo-Americans trying to negotiate with Indians, 1808.

#2786 De la Pena, Josef. Re: Isletas collecting gypsum for windows of the Governor's Palace, 1819.

#2791 Melgares, Facundo (Gov). Navajos moving toward Rio Abajo; hopes to "punish" them," 1819.

#2858 De La Pena, Josef. Re: aid by citizens of Albuquerque vicinity to Zuni; census, 1819.

#2950 Melgares, Facundo (Gov). Census of missions and pueblos, 1820

#3094 Rubin de Celis, Jose. Census, 1821.

W.P.A. Translations of the Spanish Archives of New Mexico.

SANM I:

- # 1368 Pueblo of Isleta, 1822, WPA vol 21:149-51
- # 1381 Isleta Protest, 1845, WPA vol 26:19-26
- # 1382 Ojo de la Cabra grant, WPA vol 26:67-74
- # 1029 Alameda grant, 1710, WPA vol 3:90-93
- # 7383 Ojo de la Cabra, Apr1846, WPA vol26:118-24

Archives of the Archdiocese of Santa Fe.

Reel 35, Book of the Dead, San Agustín de la Ysleta, 1726-1776, Burials-10 (Box 7).

Bancroft Library Documents (Microfilms)

Reel I:

Doc 14 2-25-1702. Visitation of various pueblos.

Doc 18. 1714. Warning re: alcaldes and friars to check whether pueblos building new estufas.

Doc 22 1728 Tigua pueblo at Hopi is ready and willing to return to ancestral sites.

Indian Affairs CSWR MSS 16BC.

Folder 7. 1733 Isleta land grant survey (Gonzales Bas).

Catholic Church Records of New Mexico, CSWR MSS 22SC.

Scholes Collection MSS 360:

Box 9, Folder 8, "Apache Raids, NM, 1668-71."

Box 11, Folder 1, 1668 Campaign against Apaches. Scholes translations of contemporary documents, inc. Governor's edict re: requirement of Isleta to furnish grain.

Box 11 folder 1 "Dominguez de Mendoza, Juan, - Encomienda of Isleta, 1678" - transl.

Box 11 folder 1 "Dominguez de Mendoza, Juan, - Alcalde Mayor, Sandia & Isleta, 1659" - transl.

Sophie D. Aberle Collection MSS 509.

Box 5, folder 1. Notes and statistics re: Isleta cattle herd, 1943.

Box 5A, folder 7. Re: trust indenture between John Collier [CIA] and Pueblo of Isleta, 1939: re: organization of Isleta cattle-herd, and grazing regulations.

Box 6, folder 14. List and note on Isleta livestock, 1958, and suggested liquidation of cattle herd.

Box 16, folder 20. Notes on Isleta cattle herd, 1969-78.

Pueblo Transcripts. American Indian Oral History Collection.

Roll 7:

Item #7 Field notes by Don Stewart, 1969.

Tape 112. Tony Lucero.

Tape 113. Tony Lucero.

Tape 115, side 1. Tony Lucero

Tape 116. Tony Lucero.

Tape 495, part 4. Rosinda Lucero.

Tape 602. JT (Jose Trujillo).

Roll 8:

Tape 692. Rosinda Lucero.

Tape 703. Rosinda Lucero

Tape 705. Rosinda Lucero

Tape 709. Rosinda Lucero.

Tape 771, side 2. Tony Lucero.

Tape 771, side 1. Tony Lucero.

New Mexico State University Library, Las Cruces. Rio Grande Historical Collections and University Archives.

Archivos Historicos del Arzobispado de Durango, Mexico.

Reel 205. Expediente sobre las misiones de Nuevo Mexico, 1800/1801.

State Records Center and Archives, Santa Fe.

Pueblo Indians Collection. Isleta folder. Summary of historic land issues and cases pertaining to Isleta, inc. Padilla - 1718, 1733, 1768; Sedillo 1734, 1769; Ojo de la Cabra, 1846.

Fray Angelico Chavez History Library, Palace of the Governors, Museum of New Mexico, Santa Fe.

File "Indians - Pueblo of Isleta."

Biblioteca Nacional de Mexico, Mexico City

AGN Provincias Internas, vol 36, f 322-322v. Testimony of Roque Madrid, Alcalde Mayor of Isleta Pueblo, January 8, 1710. [Copy and translation courtesy of Dr. Donald Cutter]

National Archives (Washington D.C.) Microfilm Records.

Microfilm Series T-21: Records of the New Mexico Superintendency of Indian Affairs (RNMSLA)

Roll 1. Ambrosio Abeita and other Principales of Isleta to "Nuestro Patron de Yndios," 12-7-1858

Roll 2. A.G. Mayers, Pueblo Agent, to Superintendent David Meriwether, NM, 6-23-1856.

Roll 4. Letter to the Santa Fe Gazette, 9-2-1860.

Roll 5. Ramon Luna, Pueblo Agent to Superintendent Michael Steck, 8-28-1863.

Commissioner J.M. Edwards, General Land Office, to Charles Mix, Acting CIA, 9-15-1863

Ramon Luna, Pueblo Agent to Superintendent Michael Steck, 10-5-1863.

Superintendent Michael Steck to CIA William Dole, 10-10-1863

Superintendent Michael Steck to General James Carleton, Commander, District of New Mexico, 10-15-1863

Roll 6. John Ward, Pueblo Agent, to Superintendent Felipe Delgado, 8-6-1865.

John Ward, Pueblo Agent, to Superintendent Felipe Delgado, 8-26-1865.

Roll 7. CIA N.G. Taylor to Superintendent A.B. Norton, 4-13-1867.

Roll 8. Superintendent J.M. Gallegos to CIA N.G. Taylor, 12-30-1868.

Roll 14. Vicente Jiron, Governor of Isleta, to Superintendent Nathaniel Pope, 9-27-1871.

Microfilm Series M941: Miscellaneous letters Sent by the Pueblo Indian Agency 1874-1891:

Roll 2. Benjamin M. Thomas, Pueblo Agent to H.C. Carson, U.S. Indian teacher, Isleta, 3-15-1878

Benjamin M. Thomas, Pueblo Agent to CIA E.A. Hayt, 10-11-1878

Roll 5. Benjamin M. Thomas, U.S. Indian Agent to Acting Assistant Adjutant General, District of NM, 2-15-1882

Benjamin M. Thomas, U.S. Indian Agent to A.R. Owen, Attorney 2nd District, Albuquerque, 3-16-1882.

Microfilm Series M234: Correspondence of the Office of Indian Affairs (Central Office) and Related Records.

Roll 547 Rev. L. Smith (Special Agent to vaccinate the Pueblo Indians) to David Meriwether, Governor of New Mexico and Superintendent of Indian Affairs, 7-29-1854.

Microfilm Series M1088: Letters Received by Headquarters, District of New Mexico, 1865-90

Roll 14. Correspondence relating to the U.S. Army's capture and military imprisonment of 22 Isleta Indians and impounding and destruction of their livestock, while on a trading trip to the Comanches, May-June 1871.

Ussery and Parrish Documents of materials copied from the National Archives

UP Doc #:

Doc 8: Benjamin Thomas, Pueblo Agent, to R.F. Weilbrod [?], Denver and Rio Grande Railroad, 3-15-80.

Doc 74: [includes] letter to F.A. Walker, CIA, (probably) from W.F.M. Army, 12-7-1872

Doc 88: Report of Pueblo Agent W.F.M. Army for July 1871 to Nathaniel Pope, Superintendent of Indian Affairs, NM, 7-31-1871.

Doc 94: John Ward, Pueblo Agent, to William J. Cady, Acting CIA, 9-8-1870.

Doc 100: John Ward, Pueblo Agent, to William J. Cady, Acting CIA, 8-16-1870

Doc 106: Ely S. Parker, CIA, to Juan Andres Abeita and Juan Reyes Lucero, delegates from Indians of Isleta Pueblo, "now in Washington DC as Delegates of all the Pueblo towns of New Mexico," 12-23-1869.

Doc 115: George E. Ford, 1st Lieut., U.S.Army, Special Indian Agent, to Maj. William Clinton, Superintendent of Indian Affairs, NM, Annual Report of Pueblo Indians for 1869, 9-8-1869.

Doc 116: Charles L. Cooper, 1st Lieut., U.S.Army, Agent for the Pueblo Indians, to Major William Clinton, Superintendent of Indian Affairs, NM, Monthly report for September 1869, 9-30-1869.

Doc 117: Alejandro Padilla, Governor of Isleta, Simon Sune, Principal, and Jose del Socorro Hixina, Teniente, and Delegates from Pueblo of Isleta, to Superintendent Major William Clinton, n.d., (ca. mid-late 1869).

Doc 123: J.M. Gallegos, Territorial Delegate from New Mexico, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC, to Columbus Delano, Secretary of the Interior, 5-27-1872.

Doc 124: Lt. Charles L. Cooper, Pueblo Agent, to Major William Clinton, Superintendent of Indian Affairs, NM, first annual report, 9-8-1869.

Doc 132: John Ward, Special Agent for Pueblos, Santa Fe, to N.G. Taylor, CIA, 7-15-1868.

Doc 136: John Ward, Special Agent for Pueblos (while on visit to Washington D.C. with Isleta leaders), to N.G. Taylor, CIA, 4-3-1868