

7-1-1957

## The Apuntes of Father J. B. Ralliere

Florence Hawley Ellis

Edwin Baca

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

---

### Recommended Citation

Ellis, Florence Hawley and Edwin Baca. "The Apuntes of Father J. B. Ralliere." *New Mexico Historical Review* 32, 3 (1957). <https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nmhr/vol32/iss3/11>

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).

## THE APUNTES OF FATHER J. B. RALLIERE

BY FLORENCE HAWLEY ELLIS AND EDWIN BACA

(Concluded)

### DOCUMENT OF THE CHURCH OF TOMÉ AND ITS CEMETERY

The problem of ownership of the Campo Santo in front of the church of Tomé — whether by church or by grantees and their heirs — arose in part as a result of the question of control of burial plots, after the Otero-Ralliere battle. But, in general, the difficulty was a product of the times rather than primarily a clash between pastor and parishioners. Father Ralliere comes to this bitter struggle in the last section of his notes.

The *campo santo* always had been considered as of the church. In a paragraph appended at the end of the document covering the original Grant of Tomé,<sup>20</sup> mention is made of the square of thirty varas on which houses were to be built, and the break in the east side of the square where a church and dwelling for the Father Minister were to stand. By 1760 "A decent church has already been built . . . with a transept and three altars . . . dedicated to the Immaculate Conception. There is a house for the parish priest who is the one of the Villa of Albuquerque."<sup>21</sup> In the pre-American days of New Mexico, possession of a written title to this land was not felt necessary by the Church. Many of the people of the state had lost or never had had a title to the lands which in fact were their own private property. Occupation rather than papers constituted ownership.

But times and conditions changed. People who came in after the American occupation wanted land, and many were less than scrupulous about their means of obtaining it. In some cases the acquisition came through legal if not ethical background. Land was traded for a barrel of whisky, acquired through forged title, or purchased for a fraction of its worth. The United States had agreed to honor all old land

20. Archives of New Mexico, No. 956 (Unpublished portion).

21. Eleanor B. Adams, "Bishop Tamaron's Visitation of New Mexico," *New Mexico Hist. Rev.*, vol. 28, no. 3 (1954), p. 201.

titles which could be proved to have existed at the time of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. But when the time came for examination of those titles, some "grant lands" appeared to be without grants. Others were found to have been conferred more than once, in different periods by different magistrates to different families. Sometimes they had been sold, subsequently, by heirs of both grantees! When titles were lost, the area concerned was open to new occupants. Soon the Spanish-speaking populace awoke to find that much of their land had disappeared, through one mechanism or another, into the hands of Anglo-Americans and other Spanish-Americans intent on making the most of this period of transition and confusion. They discovered that having a *paper* to a piece of land was the important point, and — sore from losses — became suspicious of everyone.

Before this period no one had worried about whether the Church as a legal entity ought to have actual written title to the lands set aside in the old grant for its use. Under the new regime, some of the churchmen felt that such a paper of title properly should exist and they advised Father Ralliere to suggest that the Archbishop ask the Board of Trustees for it. The Archbishop did so. The Board considered the matter and, with one exception, all the members voted to give the deed. The problem was temporarily tabled, probably because of the single dissenting vote. Unfortunately, just at this time certain of the Tomé parishioners, land conscious, chanced to be annoyed because several members of Ralliere's large household recently had married and Ralliere had given them gifts of acreages purchased by himself from the descendants of grantees. Moreover, one of these household members was unpopular per se in the community because he was the official collector of first fruits due from each parishioner to the church — and on occasion was known to have appropriated a bagful of wheat to spend on drinks for himself before he reached home! Hearing that the Trustees might give acquiescence to placing the title of church lands in the official ownership of the Church, a small group of the disgruntled Spanish-Americans rushed to defend their "rights" against all "foreigners," making but slightly veiled

insinuations that the Church might be looking to something which would make for profit, refusing to "sell their dead" — in giving title to the cemetery —, and even verbally accusing Father Ralliere as a "landlord."

The matter was argued with emotion. Finally a paper actually was drawn up and sent to Archbishop Pitaval, but it was far from what the Church felt proper and the language in which the Archbishop rejected it is reported to have been more emphatic than clerical. There were other meetings, letters, arguments. Father Ralliere suffered, taking too personally an event which was not primarily of his own making.

The eventual outcome was a paper of title drawn on lines close to, if not exactly duplicating, those originally suggested by the Church. By this the Trustees gave title to the ground upon which the church stood; the land between church and highway, where subsidiary buildings, including the parsonage, had been erected in 1872; the *campo santo* in front of the church; and the plaza. The road surrounding the plaza and known as *El Calvario* (the scene of the Holy Week processions relating to Christ's crucifixion) likewise was named in this deed, but because the county since has worked upon this road it now is considered a public highway.

The church had wanted the land of the other *campo santo*, a larger cemetery marked with a myriad of tall wooden crosses, located on the road to the big spring, Ojuelos, at the opening of Comanche Canyon. This land was not named in the deed, and the question of exact ownership of the plot since has come up as a technicality pertaining to whether it is open for burial of any Catholic or must be reserved for the bodies of descendants of original grant-holders.

Father Ralliere began his account of these events on August 7, 1909, and continued his chronicle as new points arose. In his *Documento de la Iglesia de Tomé y Campo Santo* he is as honestly outspoken as in his youth, but the pain with which the seventy-seven year old pastor viewed the lack of complete faith of the villagers in Mother Church and her representatives is apparent.]

In January, 1909, I made it known to Archbishop Pitaval

that there existed no document [deed to church-used land]. He in turn told Don Jesus C. Sanchez, member of the legislature, to see that it be made and given. On the first Saturday of April, the eve of Palm Sunday, there was a meeting of the Board of Trustees: Jesus C. Sanchez, Ramon Chavez, Daniel Lucero, Teofilo Baca, Matias Romero, José Martin Gallegos, Elias Romero, Antonio Moya, Feliciano Montañó. This was the third day of April. I did not go to the meeting, knowing that they did not want to give the deed — neither the people nor the Trustees —. But I wrote a note. I simply could not close the church during Holy Week.<sup>22</sup>

In the next regular meeting on the first Saturday of July (July 3) nothing was arranged. At an extraordinary session held at my school on the 7th of July Pablo Rubi<sup>23</sup> presented a protest against [the church petition for a deed], signed by 132 names. On the 19th of June at the Jubilee of St. Michael's College the Archbishop gave me a letter advising me not to become involved in this business — to end my days in peace.<sup>24</sup> But it was already too late. When it became obvious that war was declared, I had no recourse but to close the church on Saturday, July 10, at which time I took out the Most Blessed Sacrament with hymns and mass for the dead, since then continuing to say mass in my schoolhouse. The Archbishop had written to me on the third day of May: Tell them that if they do not obey I can not permit a pastor to reside there nor can they use for religious services the property of others.

22. If he did not actually witness the opposition of the parishioners to giving the deed, he could legitimately postpone carrying out the threat he contemplated—closing the church—until after Holy Week. Although his fight was upon a point of conscience, conscience would not permit such an extreme move.

23. Pablo Rubi was one of the first graduates of Father Ralliere's personally conducted school and went out from it to teach in Valencia County. Father Ralliere, as Supt. of Schools for the County, became so incensed because no funds could be obtained to pay these teachers—even after they had taught for some months—that he resigned his superintendency. Lack of funds to cash the teachers' vouchers was state wide, as recounted by Sister Blandina Segale in *The End of the Santa Fe Trail*, 1948, pp. 259-60.

24. The Archbishop knew that Father Ralliere was not of a temperament to phlegmatically watch a battle but probably hoped that by encouragement of a side-line role he might possibly save the elderly pastor from grief and exhaustion. Although Ralliere had first called attention to lack of actual church ownership of the Tomé church lands, the call for the deed had come from the Archbishop, not from the local pastor, but the latter was too outraged by the refusal of people whom he had so long served to stand aside and await the outcome. The schoolhouse where he said mass during this period was one he had built and where he had kept school himself for the benefit of the community before—and after—public schools were available.

Pablo Rubi with Anastacio Montoya, Miguel Chavez, Camilo Barela, Juan Vallejos, Jesus M. Maldonado, Teofilo Aragon, as agents of the town, wrote to the Archbishop, who sent a long letter, July 13, to the town (people) reproaching them for ingratitude and approving that which I had done. Pablo Rubi never read this to the people.

On the 6th day of August Pablo Rubi called the people together. I sent for Father Picard and Father Docher.<sup>25</sup> There were about 200 persons in the meeting and upon the motion of José Baca they selected Pablo Rubi, Antonio Montoya and Bernardino Cedillo to arrange the business of the document (draw up the deed). The president of the meeting was Ignacio Salazar, the secretary, Camilo Barela. Today is the 7th, Saturday, I am awaiting the result. I thought I would say mass here Sunday but I went to Peralta. They are mad because in Valencia I said I would sign against Salazar. [The next three words are illegible.]

Father Picard thought to obtain the document with [made out to include] the plaza. During the day of July 7 I presented to them the plan without the plaza and without the square [campo santo?] They do not want to sell their dead —.

On the 21st of August Pablo Rubi, Anastacio Montoya, Bernardino Cedillo, and Camila Barela came with a document giving the church the plaza. They did not want to sign a paper abrogating the protest. In the end they signed an allegation giving the document according to law should they or the Board of Trustees of the place have this power, and we embraced. Thus the [matter of] the list [signed protest] was concluded.

August 22 — mass in the church<sup>26</sup> (since July 2 I had not given mass there.) I said at mass that Pablo Rubi, etc. had sent the document to be signed. But I do not know that it [deed to the lands] will be given. [Two words illegible.] Before mass Pablo said that the Board of Trustees met on the 23rd to formulate the document. They were united and

25. Father Docher, stationed in the Isleta church, was Ralliere's closest ecclesiastical neighbor to the north. Father Picard was stationed in Belen.

26. In this paragraph and that following, French and Spanish are mingled. The final phrase "*ni crepir*" does not translate well in this place.

they decided to draw up the document if the others would sign it. Pablo has written me of their intention to sign on the 27th. But Ramon Chavez has made them afraid —. I had written to Fidel; the answer has arrived saying that there was nothing but for the Board of Trustees to ignore the deed of Pablo Rubi.

August 31. Pablo Rubi, B. Cedillo, A. Montoya, Ramon Chaves, Teolio Aragon, B. Cedillo did not come with my document. Before this they talked of the candles, bells, and public proclamations to announce a meeting for Monday September 6.

September 6. I do not want to go to hell.<sup>27</sup> If I could find some faces at this meeting . . . they would applaud the stupidities of Bernardino- of [name illegible] of T [illegible] and nothing of Jesus Sanchez. Pablo and Anastacio hoped to claim from their document some bells, candles.<sup>28</sup> They don't want any of my document. It was finished. How disgusting!

On Oct. 2 they gave me the document signed by Bernardino Cedillo, Pablo Rubi, Anastacio Montoya, approved by Jesus Sanchez and Daniel Lucero.

[The protest presented to the Fide Comisars or Board of Trustees by the group aroused through the efforts of Pablo Rubi was signed by 132 of the Tomé people who claimed land in the grant — although eighteen reconsidered and removed their names. The paper appears, copied in Father Ralliere's handwriting, as a part of his record on the unhappy subject.]

#### PROTEST

Tomé, N. M. July 3, 1909. Before the Board of Trustees of the Tomé land grant, we the undersigned, all being owners of interest in the Tomé grant, have the honor to protest [present] the following protest against the giving of the parish and cemetery, and so we have acted in anticipation and we are prepared to make protocol a protest against the disposition of said properties and the reason for doing it this way is that those who know say that in the proximate term before this a petition was made proto-

27. Written in French and too dim, in part, to be legible.

28. As part of the clarification and separation between church and private property. Ralliere felt their primary consideration should be the church.

col to you asking the transference of said properties to the church and to Archbishop Pitaval. Although we know that at that time one of your votes was against this transfer and no resolution whatsoever was passed to dispose of said properties, nevertheless the petition was moved by you that this matter should remain in your good office for reconsideration at the present regular term. We do not know with what foundation nor with what reason [you intended reconsidering it] wherefore we are taking precautions that in one way or another our rights shall be advanced. And so we have come to make the following protest: In the first place we hold that said properties — as mentioned, improved and cultivated — are known to be properties belonging to the people of Tomé. Never have these been placed under the priest, and the government of the different Boards of Trustees — no matter of whom composed — has managed them just as any other type of common land.

That said property of parish and cemetery should be considered always in charge of the parish pastor until such time as the people should determine otherwise, and to relegate, even when it should be in your power, the right to dispose of these properties, we the undersigned do object. We make known our objection to the giving of said properties [to the church] and we sign here, from one to 132 — July 3, 1909.

[The names in *italics* are those who changed their mind after signing the document. In the manuscript they are crossed out]

Luis Ylicio<sup>29</sup>  
 Vicente Maldonado  
 Jose Chavez  
 Jose Baca y Barela  
 Jesus M. Maldonado  
 Nabor Maldonado  
 Jesus M<sup>a</sup> Sanchez  
 Eduardo Sanchez  
 Tomas B. Sanchez  
 Henriques Sanchez  
 Teofilo Aragon  
 Anastasio Montoya

F<sup>co</sup> Salazar 20  
 Laureano Jaramillo  
 Felis Chavez  
 Doroteo Chavez  
*F<sup>co</sup> Baca de Savedra*  
 [?] *Lucero*  
 Adolfo Vallejos  
 Candelario Salas  
*Juana Chavez de Baca*  
 Pablo Serna  
 J<sup>e</sup> Torrez  
 Rafael Aragon

29. Some names written in full here are abbreviated in the ms.

Antonio Salazar	Fulgencio Jaramillo
Mariano Turrieta	Clemente Romero
Venseslao Chavez	Manuel Otero
Macedonio Gurule	Pablo Rubi
<i>Piedad Campos</i>	<i>Celestino Marquez</i>
<i>Manuel Baca</i>	Juan S. Baca
Juan Lujan y Chavez	J <sup>e</sup> Moya
<i>Rebecca Baca de Marquez</i>	Narciso Baca
Octaviano Baca	J <sup>e</sup> Zamora
Primitivo Baca	A Romero
<i>Eulalia B. Barela</i>	<i>Doroteo Baca</i>
Juan Perea	Teofilo Lujan
Ruperto Perea	Ramon Chavez y Lujan
Ruperto Baca	Feliciano Montaña
Eliseo Barela	<i>Trinidad Gabaldon</i>
Antonio Baca y Campos	<i>Eselsa Maez</i>
Jose M. Zamora	<i>Eliseo Romero</i>
J <sup>e</sup> Ignacio Chavira	Tranquilino Romero
Tomaceno Gallego	Jose La Paz Romero
Dolores Chaves de Moya	Casmiro Barela
Norberta	Juan Chavez y Romero
<i>Hipolite Savedra</i>	F <sup>co</sup> Padilla
<i>Juan Lucero</i>	Benigno Chavez
F <sup>co</sup> Vallejos	Esequiel Chavez
<i>Diega Baca</i>	Vicente Romero
Dionisio Cedillo	Alcario Lucero
Jesus Chavez	Jesus Vallejos
Juan Torres	Ant <sup>o</sup> Sanchez
Teles Aragon	Desiderio Sanchez
Manuel Salazar y G.	Estanislao Chavez
Santos Barela	Agustin Villa
<i>Desiderio Baca</i>	Juan Otero
Rosendo Jaramillo	Juan A. Marquez
Juan Lujan y Sanchez	J <sup>e</sup> Cedillo
M <sup>A</sup> Sanchez	Eduvigen Marquez
Juan R. Salazar	Benigno Gonzalez
J <sup>e</sup> Montaña	J <sup>e</sup> C. Chavez
<i>Jorge Lucero</i>	Placido Montoya
F <sup>co</sup> Marquez	Adolfo Otero
Miguel Chavez	Benito Marquez
F <sup>co</sup> Rubi	Pitacio Padilla
F <sup>co</sup> Gurule	Ecelsa Ylicio
David Grule	J <sup>e</sup> Lucero 2 <sup>o</sup>
Juliana Aragon de	J <sup>e</sup> M <sup>o</sup> Lucero
Ramon Gurule	<i>Melcor Jaramillo</i>
F <sup>co</sup> Chavez y Benavidez	F <sup>co</sup> Barela
Juan Vallejos	J <sup>e</sup> G. Barela
Simon Marquez	Donaciano Ylicio
Matias Romero	Catalino Montaña
Vicente Barela	Pedro Ylicio
Casimiro Barela	Juan Zamora
<i>Jeronimo Rael</i>	Camilo Barela
Miguel Castillo	J <sup>e</sup> A. Vallejos
Manuel Serna	

[Archbishop Pitaval, perhaps hearing that the letter he had directed to the people of Tomé through Pablo Rubi, never had been given to them, wrote another, which Father Ralliere read aloud from the altar and copied into his personal notes. The Archbishop intended to chasten the rebels for their lack of loyalty to church and priest not only through expression of his official displeasure but also through threatening to remove parish headquarters from Tomé to Peralta, where a group led by the eighteen-year old wife of Remigio Chavez eagerly offered to feed and house the elderly *padre*. The problem of Tomé — as seen by its own villagers — was not concerned primarily with Father Ralliere but with distrust of the honesty and loyalty of the Church itself — towards them — now that it was in the hands of the conquering land-hungry Gringos. This term formerly was used by native villagers to cover all non-Spanish speaking people of the state but now has been replaced by the less derogatory word “Anglo”; both denote outsiders and reflect some suspicion but varying in degree. Father Ralliere, although primarily devoted to the welfare of his parishioners for so many years, always would remain a representative of the Church under the new regime, a problem with which Machebeuf had struggled painfully in Albuquerque, bailiwick of the rebellious and troublesome Mexican priest, Gallegos, whom Lamy had temporarily deposed.<sup>30</sup> Father Ralliere stood to gain nothing, personally, in the dispute over whom should hold title to the church-used land, but the fact that he threw himself into the dispute (contrary to orders of the Archbishop) provided food for suspicion to men whose distrust of all “foreigners” had been well nourished in the preceding fifty years.

The letter of the archbishop, presumably written originally with precision and care, appears with a few imperfections in the Ralliere copy]

Santa Fe, N. M., July 13, 1909  
To the Faithful to Tomé, N. M.

Dear Brothers. With information given me by your pastor, Rev. J.B.R. I have come to understand very well the differ-

<sup>30</sup>. Howlett, *op. cit.*, pp. 191-194.

ence which exists between some of you and your pastor with respect to the title of the Church of Tomé and at the same time I have been informed of the determination of the Rev. pastor to resent that which you have done, not that the steps you have taken should have any injustice in law and the figures of law since with document or without the property of the Church of Tomé always will be of the Church and not of any individual or person or lost to you. Neither shall said property ever be sold by me nor by my successors, for the reason that the Catholic Churches, the Santos, etc. of a community, when they have not been purchased with private funds of the pastor, always are recognized as property of the Church and dedicated to the service of God and for the good of the community and the title of rights to the management and protection of same to the ordinary — or be it said — to the Bishop of the Church. The Board of Trustees will act as absolute guardian of the church. The Board of Trustees will assume the management, care, and protection of the property to the end of equal protection for all the members of the community and not with the object of placing it upon the market for speculation. Considering all these things, my dear Brothers, free of suspicions and with good intentions you can ~~do no less than to admit that you have acted precipitately and without reason that would justify your conduct on the matter.~~ Now with respect to the legitimate resentment of your legitimate pastor motivated by the insubordination and rebellion of yourselves, it rests upon me to tell you that neither he nor I ever expected demonstrations of hostility coming from you. The more so since there exist all the reasons in the world for you to treat your old pastor with more love and with the greatest respect possible, the more so for his advanced age, a matter which in itself should be sufficient to make you treat him as any respectable old man should be treated, but the more so considering the sacred duty imposed upon you by gratitude in the last days of your beloved father. All in unison should in justice try to sweeten with good conduct the little of life which is left to him instead of making more bitter his last journey. Is it good to thus return his good services? Has he not been a true father to you in spirit-

ual and in temporal things for more than 50 years? Ask yourselves this question — Why is Father R. so poor? Your conduct, my dear Brothers, would justify my action in changing the parish head from the plaza (village) of Tomé to another plaza (village) near Tomé but this I will not do out of consideration for Father R. whose many years and the best of his life have been spent working here as minister of God among yourselves, and also to give you the opportunity to reconsider your conduct and so that as good and obedient children you desist from acting as you have to your good pastor and at the same time I am hoping that in the coming time you will be reconciliated with the Rev. Father R. who no doubt will receive you as his sons and change his resolution of closing the church — all of which should he do it — understand — would receive my approbation as long as these matters do not return to a normal state. I await you. My paternal solicitude and my ardent wishes are that you will not persist in the error.

I subscribe myself to you

Attentively  
ArB. J. B. Pitaval

[The stand of Paul Rubi against giving a deed of grant land to the church at this time was that of a patriot opposing foreigners, not that of an anti-Catholic opposing religion. But in the end he lost both cause and followers, and his opponents tell that after a few months he was struck with a great headache, his eyes burst, and he went blind. A year later his wife suffered a headache and one eye burst. Man and wife lived, however, to become famous as leaders of the *velarios* or wakes for the dead, and upon their own deaths their bodies were interred in the *campo santo* within the grant boundaries — which they had successfully managed to save from the church.

The only other Ralliere notes for 1909 are on a separate page, written much larger than anything preceding them, but in a strong clear hand. They are on two unrelated subjects, both briefly stated. The first, written in French]:

M<sup>ss</sup> (word illegible) J. B. Pitaval consecrated July 25, 1902  
 named archbishop January, 1909

Received the pallium August 18, 1909

[The second is in Spanish, an old memory of early days in Tomé]

On the day of Sept. 17, 1863 the Indians wounded us at Gregorio Salas [ranch?] in the [word misspelled or illegible] of Comanche Canyon. We were 28 in number between men, women, and children. I came ahead with Jose Baca to [the spring] Ojoelos to get the carriage from Don Manuel Chavez [whose ranch was there].

[Thus the *Apuntes* close. But in 1911 Benjamin M. Reed, the native Santa Fe Lawyer who made history of the state his avocation, wrote to Father Ralliere concerning certain churchmen of the early American period.<sup>31</sup> This was the year of Ralliere's retirement. In two of Ralliere's answering letters, we see the aging father as peppery an individualist as ever]

Tomé 29 June 1911

Mr. Benjamin M. Reed

As much as I have been with Father Damaso Taladri [Taladrid—the Spanish priest who had worked in Africa, was met by Lamy in Rome, and brought over here by him] I do not remember his history. He was in Santa Fe Dec. 2, 1856 when I was ordained, after which he went to Taos. Later to Isleta where I found him when I went to Tomé, but he left after June 1858, I believe for Mora. Later he was chaplain for the volunteers [American army?].

The last time I saw him was in 1866. He was going to Las Cruces.

Father Taladrid must have come in 1854 when Monseigneur (M<sup>sl</sup>?) Lamy went to Rome<sup>32</sup> with Father Eulogio Ortiz.<sup>33</sup> It seems to me that he was a religious in a convent of Sicily. He spoke Italian well.

31. In his *Illustrated History of New Mexico*, Santa Fe, 1912, Reed refers to him as "the oldest priest of New Mexico" (p. 513).

32. Salpointe, *op. cit.*, p. 207.

33. In 1854 Rev. Eulogio Ortiz, a native New Mexican, received his priestly orders from Bishop Lamy after having studied in the Seminary of Durango. He was the first native New Mexican to make the trip to Rome.

I know more of the life of Father Picard<sup>34</sup> and of Father Palaco.

Later I will send a list of the different shipments of fathers [those who crossed the ocean together in coming to the United States], in their succession.

At your disposition —

J. B. Ralliere

[On back of page]

I have a list of all the priests who have died in New Mexico  
A list of the transients (or fugitives) and deserters.

Tomé 18 August 1911

Mr. B. Read

You have asked me if in my list of the dead Fathers of New Mexico I have put Father Domergue.

I answer that my list is not complete, I did not know him, but at this time I believe that he went to Isleta, that he was very scrupulous and that he returned to France.

As for Father Juillard, He was very talkative, very useless, he rode a horse with his arms open (out from the body) like wings. He went to France and he returned.

He is on my list. He came with Father (Lamy) with Equillon,<sup>35</sup> etc. This Father Juillard was curate of Sandia. When here he was in charge and he was sent into tears because he saw the Indians bathing themselves entirely naked in the irrigation ditch. He was curate of Belen in the time of the disputes over the church. He was replaced by Father Paulet who expected to fight and succeed. After this Father Juillard was curate of Arroyo Hondo and when I came, he fitted me for a lieutenant (aid) but I did not like him for a curate.

Now no can take a bath in the acequia. There is no water.

34. Father Juan Picard.

35. Rev. Peter Equillon was the first to respond to Lamy's plea for clergy for New Mexico, on his first trip to France on this quest. Equillon remained in Santa Fe for a year to complete the training of some seminarians in theology as preparation for their ordination. Between 1855 and 1858 he was pastor of Socorro, after which he became parish priest of the cathedral and Vicar General of the diocese. He died in 1892.

Rev. Anthony Juillard was second to answer Lamy's call. Salpointe calls him "a zealous priest, who remained only a few years in the diocese owing to bad health, and returned to France, where he died in 1888." His opinion obviously did not agree with that of Ralliere. Salpointe, *op. cit.*, p. 207.

The Rio (Grand) is almost dry and it has not rained for a month.

[The page is left unfinished, apparently so that he could add more later if he chose. The next page — and there may be one missing in between — goes on with some comments upon Padre Fray Benigno Cardenas, a former priest, unfrocked in Mexico, who came to Tomé before Lamy and his workers came into New Mexico. Still wearing the garb of his order, he appeared as a missionary and enlisted the support and friendship of Nicolas Valencia who administered the parish of Belen. Their conduct so annoyed the priests of surrounding parishes that complaint was made to Vicar Ortiz in Santa Fe, who — when his warnings were not heeded — passed word of the trouble on to Bishop Zubiria of Durango. The latter came to New Mexico, excommunicated Cardenas, suspended Valencia from priestly duties, and had his edict read in the churches. Cardenas immediately announced himself a Protestant, and with the few followers who remained with him built a chapel in Valencia and conducted services which originally were of no sect. Soon the Methodists, who were beginning work in New Mexico about that time, accepted Cardenas and his group. Diatribes against the once-priest and the schism he created were published in Catholic circles, and tales of the behavior of this strange man continue in the Tomé area today. Father Ralliere had a few new bits of the strange tale to offer]

Cardenas seduced from the true doctrine (or perverted) in Peralta Jose Maria Chaves, alias Gabilon.

At the entrance of the Texans he did much harm to the neighbors of Don Juan Jose Sanchez; he took from them almost forty mules and he made them give something "to boot."

But he left with the Texans in 1862. Thanks to God.

There are now some [a family of] Montoyas, protestants, who have a chapel and there are services from time to time.

A Methodist minister married a bride who lacked three months of 15 years. She confessed and I gave earthly pardon.

I accused also Thomas Harwood, Bishop of the Methodists, because he married a bride [from my church mem-

bers] two years and a day of fifteen years. They fined him. And God killed the boy who married her.

The history of Cardenas may interest you.

Here I speak of Estevan Zamora. I mean Estevan Zamora my sacristan for many years before he died eight years ago at 77. They put him in jail because he did not want to deliver the religious equipment for the daughter of Miguel Chavez of Tomé to be married to a Montoya of Peralta by Father Cardenas.

Father Salvador Personé gave a mission at Peralta in 1892 and he related the history of Father Cardenas and Barbarita, the housekeeper of Father Benito Cardenas, was listening. She had two daughters. [Horried by the story] she brought them and put them in a place of shelter in the United States. Their mother did not see them again.

[The remainder of the letter, long forgotten among old papers, is blotted with rain — the sentences thus missing so may words as to be illegible. But his conclusion is clear and strong, like the life which now lay mostly behind him]

Those who know say that when he [Lamy] visited the church he showed that he felt pleasure, free as in his own house. For a decade mine has been too formal.

He desired success like that in the life of Monsigneur Macheboef — he who brought me to this country.

The first time that I saw Monsigneur Lamy was in the Seminary of Mont Ferrand in 1854 and I hope to see him again soon.

I am going on 78 years of age.  
Goodby

J. B. Ralliere