

7-1-1944

## A Correction

France V. Scholes

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nmhr>

---

### Recommended Citation

Scholes, France V.. "A Correction." *New Mexico Historical Review* 19, 3 (1944).  
<https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nmhr/vol19/iss3/5>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in *New Mexico Historical Review* by an authorized editor of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact [amywinter@unm.edu](mailto:amywinter@unm.edu), [lsloane@salud.unm.edu](mailto:lsloane@salud.unm.edu), [sarahrk@unm.edu](mailto:sarahrk@unm.edu).

## CORRECTION

By FRANCE V. SCHOLES

IN THE January number of the *Review* for 1929 I published a report listing the Franciscan convents in New Mexico and the *visitas* and number of Indians administered by each convent. This report, found in Archivo General de Indias, Audiencia de México, legajo 306 (60-3-6), forms part of a series of papers relating to a petition of Fray Antonio de Aristoi, *procurador* of the Franciscan Province of the Holy Gospel of Mexico, that forty friars be sent to New Spain for service in the said province and its two *custodias* of New Mexico and Tampico.

The preamble to the New Mexico report reads as follows:

Certificacion de las noticias que hay de la Custodia del nuebo Mex.<sup>co</sup> perteneciente a la Prou.<sup>a</sup> del S.<sup>to</sup> Euang.<sup>o</sup> de Mex.<sup>co</sup>; el estado que tienen las conversiones, Yglesias, Conv.<sup>tos</sup> y culto diuino, que abajo iran señalados por relacion y noticia q dio de aquella Custodia el P.<sup>e</sup> Predicador fr. Geronimo de Zarate Salmeron, Ministro exemplar en aquella Custodia. Remitida al muy R.<sup>do</sup> P.<sup>e</sup> fr. Fran.<sup>co</sup> de Apodaca, P.<sup>e</sup> de la Prou.<sup>a</sup> de Cantabria y Comiss.<sup>o</sup> gen.<sup>l</sup> de las de nueva España, desde el año de 1538 hasta el año de 1626 años.

On the basis of the foregoing statement, I expressed the opinion, in my brief introduction, that the report "seems to have been part of or supplementary to the *Relation* of Fray Gerónimo de Zárate Salmerón." I also stated that inasmuch as the printed text of Salmerón's *Relation* does not contain such a list of convents, "the *Relation* as we have had it is not complete."

Despite the express reference to Salmerón in the preamble as quoted above, I was obviously in error in regarding the report as a hitherto missing part of Salmerón's well-known treatise. This is clear from the internal evidence of the report itself. In the first place, the report mentions the killing of one of the friars of the "province of Zuñi," un-

doubtedly a reference to the murder of Fray Francisco de Letrado in 1632. Second, it records the fact that the Indians of Taos had revolted, killed their minister, and destroyed a handsome church. This would appear to be a reference to events of 1639, when Fray Pedro de Miranda was killed at Taos.<sup>1</sup> Inasmuch as Salmerón wrote his report, or at least presented the completed draft to the Commissary General of New Spain, in 1629, it is evident that the convent list recording events of 1632 and 1639 could not have formed part of his work.

When was the report actually written? The document as we have it is in the form of a copy dated at Madrid, May 24, 1664, and signed by Fray Bartolomé Márquez, "Secretary General of the Indies," and based on "the original which is in the Archive of the Secretariat of the Indies." That is, the original was apparently on file in the central archive of the Franciscan Order for the Indies. This means that it must have antedated 1664. Evidence of this is also found in the fact that the report records the pueblo of the Jumanos (the pueblo of "Gran Quivira," now usually called Las Humanas) and Tabirá as *visitas* of Abó. Since we know that as early as 1659-1660 a separate convent for Las Humanas had been established, with Tabirá as a *visita*,<sup>2</sup> the report was obviously written prior to 1659. On the other hand, it could not have been earlier than 1639, since it mentions the killing of the friar at Taos.

The Taos entry of the report also states that six hundred souls of this "province" had been "reduced," implying that action had already been taken to restore authority in that area. In a decree of Governor Juan Flores de Sierra y Valdez, dated July 16, 1641, we learn that soon after his arrival in New Mexico in the spring of 1641 he had "subdued" the Indians of Taos.<sup>3</sup> Consequently the statement about the reduction of six hundred souls may be a reference

1. Cf. Scholes, *Church and State in New Mexico, 1610-1650* (Albuquerque, 1937), 137.

2. Scholes and Mera, *Some Aspects of the Jumano Problem* (Washington, 1940), 281; Scholes, *Troublous Times in New Mexico, 1659-1670* (Albuquerque, 1942), 54-55.

3. Decree of Flores, Santa Fé, July 16, 1641. Archivo General de Indias, Patronato 244, exp. 7.

to Flores' campaign. It should be noted, however, that the report does not indicate that the Taos convent had been reestablished.

The entry for the "province of Zuñi" records that the Indians there had been severely punished for killing their friar. This may refer to the military expedition sent to Zuñi in 1632 after the death of Letrado.<sup>4</sup> The entry also adds that "in this province there are 1200 Indians who have asked for ministers once more," but as in the case of Taos there is no mention that missionary work at Zuñi had actually been resumed. Although the exact date when the Zuñi missions were reestablished is not known, it was probably between 1642 and 1644.<sup>5</sup>

All this seems to indicate that the convent list was written in 1641. Other evidence that it was compiled in that year is found in a letter of the Franciscan Commissary General of New Spain to the Commissary General of the Indies, dated at Mexico, March 12, 1642. The letter states that the mission supply caravan had now returned to Mexico. This is clearly a reference to the caravan that arrived in New Mexico in the spring of 1641 and set out again for New Spain in the following autumn. The Commissary General goes on to say: "that the custodia has the convents which Your Reverence will see in the *memoria* which is enclosed with this [letter]."<sup>6</sup> This suggests that he had just received a report from New Mexico brought in the recently arrived caravan.

Finally, we have testimony given in New Mexico in 1644 to the effect that there were then twenty-eight doctrinas, with their churches and convents, in the province, besides other churches and visitas.<sup>7</sup> The report under dis-

7. Testimony of Alférez Alonso Varela, Santo Domingo, August 11, 1644. *Ibid.* cussion lists twenty-four convents, not including Senecú,

4. Cf. Hodge, *History of Hawikúh* (Los Angeles, 1937), 92.

5. A document in the *Servicios Personales* of Juan Domínguez de Mendoza (Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid, MS. 192588) refers to an expedition to Zuñi sent out after the arrival of Governor Alonso Pacheco de Herredia in 1642. Although this document, as it stands, is apparently a forgery, I am also of the opinion that the reference to Zuñi records an event that actually occurred in the time of Pacheco (1642-1644), although the circumstances as related in the document may not be entirely trustworthy.

6. Prada to Maldonado, Mexico, March 12, 1642. A. G. I., Patronato 244, exp. 7.

Taos, and the Zuñi area. Senecú undoubtedly had a convent at this time, so that the number of convents actually must have been twenty-five. If the Taos convent and two more at Zuñi (Hawikúh and Hálona) were reestablished between 1641 and 1644, as seems likely, then we should have twenty-eight in 1644, as the testimony of that year indicates.

Everything considered, I believe that the report I published in 1929 was compiled in 1641 and describes the state of affairs in that year. In any case its date probably is not later than 1644. Why the preamble mentions Salmerón's treatise is a question for which I have no answer.

A re-translation of the report will be included in my forthcoming volume on Don Juan Domínguez de Mendoza in the Coronado Historical Series. I wish to take advantage of the present occasion, however, to make corrections in the population figures in the translation as published in the *Review*. At that time I misread the figures for the population served by the convent of Santa Clara, giving 993 instead of 553, which is the correct figure. Consequently the total should be 19,741, instead of 20,181. The manuscript gives the total as 19,951, but this is due to mistakes of addition in the original.

It may be noted that in 1643 Governor Alonso Pacheco de Heredia reported that in forty-three pueblos he had counted 19,870 Indians.<sup>8</sup> The mission report mentions forty-three towns not counting those at the "province of Zuñi," credited with 1200 Indians.

---

8. Pacheco to the viceroy, August 6, 1643. *Ibid.*