

4-1-2017

The Language of Pecos: A Historical and An Ethnohistorical Enigma

David H. Snow

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

Recommended Citation

Snow, David H.. "The Language of Pecos: A Historical and An Ethnohistorical Enigma." *New Mexico Historical Review* 92, 2 (). <https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nmhr/vol92/iss2/5>

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 disc@unm.edu.

The Language of Pecos

An Historical and Ethnohistorical Enigma



DAVID H. SNOW

Eric Wolf has suggested that perhaps ethnohistory “has been so called to separate it from ‘real’ history, the study of the supposedly civilized.” Native peoples and their cultures, nevertheless, are the contemporary products of an historical past.¹ What is evident from ethnohistorical study, Wolf continues, “is that the subjects of the two kinds of history are the same. The more ethnohistory we know, the more clearly ‘their’ history and ‘our’ history emerge as part of the same history.” This claim is particularly true in New Mexico. Native Americans continue to seek redress for lands and water losses through legal actions, and their efforts reflect and affect the ‘histories’ of all of us.²

Officially merged with the Pueblo of Jemez in 1936 by an Act of Congress, the descendants of the last Pecos people decided to abandon their pueblo from 1838 to 1840. This decision continues to play a role in “our” contemporary history. Eight years ago the Pueblo of Jemez, on behalf of its Pecos descendants, sought return of land at Terrero located some distance up the Pecos River from today’s Pecos Village, land managed by the State Department of Game and Fish. The Wildlife Management Area in question is the most popular camping and fishing

The author wishes to thank Michael Bletzer for initial review and comment; Hayward Franklin for assisting with the map; and the anonymous reviewers for insightful and thoughtful comments. David H. Snow, former research archaeologist with the Laboratory of Anthropology in Santa Fe and retired from active field archaeology, continues to focus his research into the frequent troublous transitions from Southwestern prehistory through the early historic and ethnographic present experienced by Pueblo and other Native American peoples, their encounters with and reactions to the many changes to their lifeways resulting from their contacts with non-Native peoples.

locality on the upper Pecos River. On the property is a cave that has considerable religious significance for Pecos descendants, a reminder that “their” history also is “our” history.³

The few Pecos survivors who migrated to Jemez Pueblo, it is commonly believed, reflected the mutual intelligibility of the Jemez Towa and the Pecos languages. Belief in the similarity, if not the sameness, of the two languages, is conventionally cited as the *raison d'être* that led Pecos survivors to relocate to Jemez. My article examines the evidence compiled by ethnographers and historians that underlies the notion that Pecos was a Towa language, or a closely related dialect thereof. Much of the evidence cited and repeated now for more than a century is little more than a repetition of “whatever stories [are] found in old books.”⁴

The “sounds” in the names of seventeenth-century Pecos Pueblo adults heard and recorded at baptisms held by Franciscan priests between 1694–1700 constitute a potentially significant body of Pecos language material, regardless of the Spanish orthography in which they were written.⁵ The failure of the Franciscans to distinguish such critical, diagnostic sounds, such as aspiration, glottal stops, vowel tone, length, and nasalization, for example, makes difficult identifying specific Pecos sounds for comparison with Towa. I argue that what the priests wrote constitute reasonably careful efforts to record the various unfamiliar combinations of sounds (phonemes and words) they heard. I am not a linguist but the recorded entries warrant a closer investigation of the traditional belief that the Pecos language was a dialect of Jemez Towa. Beyond their apparently common Tanoan language heritage, the relationship of Pecos language sounds and words to Jemez Towa is not clear from the Jemez evidence cited here. This article argues for a closer relationship to Tewa on the basis of the /r/ sound common to both Pecos and Tewa and in its absence in Towa except in loan words from Spanish.

A Question of “*uno ore*”?

The few purported words collected by ethnologists gave rise to the long-held belief that the Pecos language is a dialect of Jemez Towa. The extent of any formal linguistic training of those early investigators is questionable. The linguistic evidence proffered, now more than a century ago, is unconvincing, and the unsubstantiated claims of equally untrained observers are little more than hearsay. The lack of a sufficient body of Pecos words for comparison with Jemez Towa has left the issue “in limbo.”⁶ The late-seventeenth-century Pecos names recorded in baptismal entries and in the subsequent Spanish colonial census of 1750 provide sounds (words) that suggest the Pecos language might have been more closely related to Tano-Tewa (Southern Tewa). Alternatively, perhaps, it was a separate Tanoan language.

In May of 1694, Vargas observed that the Jemez “are friendly with the Pecos nation and their [Pecos] language is very close to that of the Jemez.”¹⁰ Vargas failed to provide evidence for this observation, however, and few accounts of contact between Jemez and Pecos appear in surviving ecclesiastical and civil documents. Juan de Ye, governor of Pecos in 1694, asked that “a venerable former governor of the Jemez” be allowed to live at Pecos, one who “could be used to counter the propaganda of the rebellious Tewas and bring the Jemez back down from the mesas.”¹¹ Vargas gathered a force of 150 Keres, Jemez, and Pecos warriors to assist with his siege of Black Mesa in 1693, but nothing in the record indicates that Pecos and Jemez were otherwise related in any way.¹² Factions from both Jemez and Pecos had previously indicated their allegiance to the returning Spaniards during the reconquest, as did their allied Keres people from Santo Domingo. Church and civil records from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries fail to mention that linguistic relationships or other ties played a role in those alliances. There are no additional materials suggesting close or more than casual contacts or relations between the two peoples prior to roughly 1838–1840.

Following a two-month tour of the pueblo missions in 1760, Bishop Tamarón wrote that the Indians of Jemez “speak the Pecos language.”¹³ Following his brief visits sometime between 13 May and early July of 1776, the commissary visitor, Fray Francisco Atanasio Dominguez, inventoried the Jemez and Pecos missions. At Jemez he wrote that “the language they use (in this respect, but in no other, they conform with Pecos)”; at Pecos he wrote that “their native tongue [agrees] *uno ore* [as one in speech] with Jemez (as I said there).”¹⁴ It is not unreasonable to expect that similar observations might have been made by non-mission, secular personnel during the more than two hundred years of colonial administration.

Reflecting on the brief visits these church officials made to the pueblos, one has to wonder at the accuracy of their statements. They had presumably never studied or much less heard Pueblo languages. Might not the Franciscans, in fact, have read Benavides’s early accounts? Were Jemez and Pecos languages in the colonial era merely dialects as closely related as those of the Tewa, or Taos and Picuris Tiwa, or did the sounds of their common Tanoan language heritage prompt such statements to the untrained ear? How closely, or not, might the two languages have been related some three hundred and more years ago? Perhaps the geographical positions of Jemez and Pecos pueblos—separated by a block of Keres-speaking pueblos—and the prevailing assumption that Pecos spoke a Tanoan language gave rise to the perceived similarities. Might it not, however, simply be that more or less similar combinations of sounds that the priests heard impressed upon them the belief that the two were “*uno ore*”?

Discussing the New Mexican mission field as early as 1730, the bishop of Durango charged that “none of the missionaries knew the native languages.”¹⁵

Historian John Kessell further notes, “Every time a missionary mastered a few words of one language, the superiors transferred him somewhere else.” Bishop Tamarón, cited above, complained that the colony’s friars “excused themselves” from learning Pueblo languages, “claiming that they could not learn those languages.” He pointed out that “the failure of the Indians to confess except at the point of death is more noticeable, because they do not know the Spanish language and the missionaries do not know those of the Indians.”¹⁶ At Pecos, Fray Juan José Toledo (1750–1753) “strained mightily to transliterate the difficult Pecos names . . . like Extehahuotziri, Sejunpaguai, Guaguirachuro, Huozohuchiriy, and Timihuotzuguori.”¹⁷ If any of them attempted to compile a simple word list or vocabulary, it has not come to light.

Previous Linguistic Research

According to Paul Kroskrity, a linguistic anthropologist, “Linguists possess no definitive criteria for distinguishing the distance that separates dialects of the same language from the distance between discrete [but closely related] languages.”¹⁸ Alfred V. Kidder’s belief that the language of Pecos was the “same, or very nearly the same” as that spoken at Jemez Pueblo, was based largely on the historical opinions cited above.¹⁹ He continues, “Of the extent of dialectic difference between the two we are ignorant, but I think, from the historical references, it was probably not great.” Anthropologists, archaeologists, and historians continue to share this opinion.²⁰ Linguist George Trager expresses some doubt that Pecos was, in fact, a Tanoan language, although linguist Lyle Campbell believes Pecos clearly was “a Tanoan language,” noting that “the scant Pecos material remembered by descendants of Pecos at Jemez is not sufficiently clear to demonstrate a Towa identity.”²¹ Kenneth Hale and David Harris suggest that “although phrases remembered by Pecos descendents [*sic*] at Jemez, while unquestionably Tanoan, do not clearly identify it as Towa.”²² More recently, Logan Dean Sutton, a linguist, remarks that the move to Jemez by Pecos survivors “suggests that the language was indeed either a dialect of Towa or a closely related language.”²³

Based on his own field notes from Jemez, Hodge observed that the Pecos language contained “dialectic variations” from that of Jemez.²⁴ Harrington expressed the opinion that Jemez Towa and Pecos were as “closely related as Danish and Swedish,” implying a greater or lesser degree of difference in dialects. Discussing a short word list of Tano (Southern Tewa) at Santo Domingo Pueblo, ethnolinguist John P. Harrington further remarked that “the Galisteo [Tano or Tewa] language was probably more like the northern Rio Grande Tewa than the Pecos language was like Jemez.” He observed that “The difference in

language testifies that the Jemez and Pecos had been separated for several centuries *before the coming of the Europeans*.”²⁵

Based on interviews with two Pecos survivors at Jemez in 1902, Edgar Lee Hewett in 1904 remarked that differences between Pecos and Jemez languages “are greater than the writer had been led to expect.” The Pecos dialect, he said, was “much modified by the Tano,” and, with curious insight, “probably also by the Piro” (an extinct language, possibly related to Southern Tiwa, but Hewett failed to further elucidate this supposition). Hewett said that “Jemez tradition holds that their dialect grew out of the Pecos in combination with their own Ta-tsa-a” (Jemez Towa), and he suggested there might have been an “earlier and greater accession from the Pecos tribe in prehistoric times.”²⁶ Harrington observed, nevertheless, that neither of the oral traditions of the two pueblos claim that Jemez and Pecos were once “one people.”²⁷ The process by which Jemez and Pecos speech might have come to reflect merely dialectical differences remains obscure, and yet presents an interesting historical, anthropological, and linguistic issue that has yet to be systematically investigated and reconciled.

Traditional Jemez and Pecos accounts of their ancestral migrations might well be correct, but at first glance they appear incompatible. Jemez traditions claim that their ancestors came down to their present location from the north (a pan-Tanoan “origin” and migration account).²⁸ Archaeologists traditionally have looked to the Gallina culture area (Fig. 1) for ancestral Jemez origins and placed fourteenth-century migrants at their historic location.²⁹ Others, such as Michael Elliot and Jeremy Kulisheck, have questioned this assertion.³⁰ A Jemez native of Pecos descent and Pueblo historian, the late Joe Sando noted the “many [Jemez] references . . . to Stone Lake on today’s Jicarilla Apache Reservation,” as well as shrines in the vicinity of Largo Canyon and in the Gallina-Cuba region.³¹ Multivariate analysis of cranial traits from the Largo-Gallina and Jemez human remains concluded that “the Pecos population does not seem to be genetically similar to the known Towa populations.”³²

Whatever their ancestry, recent re-analysis of human remains and associated ceramics recovered at Pecos Pueblo concludes: “The transition from the initial [late prehistoric] black-on-white ceramic ware to Glaze 1 ware was accompanied by a significant change in the composition of the population at Pecos Pueblo . . . a period of assimilation of people.”³³ They suggest that this finding “supports the idea” of an immigration to Pecos in the early fourteenth century. On the basis of “discrete skeletal traits” as indicators of “biological ancestry,” James Mackey concluded that Pecos was “possibly a Tewa or Tano pueblo.”³⁴ The absence of imported prehistoric Jemez pottery at Pecos and the significant quantity of northern (Tewa) pottery there does not bode well for significant Pecos-Jemez relationships prior to European contact.³⁵

In one of two interviews with Adolph Bandelier, Agustín Cota, a Pecos immigrant to Jemez, related that Pecos people “came into their valley from the south or southeast, gradually moving up [presumably, upriver], and that Tshiquite [Pecos Pueblo] was the last village built and occupied by them.”³⁶ Hewett’s account, also obtained from Cota, says those who lived on the site of Pecos Pueblo “came from the north,” while others there came from the west and “were of Jemez stock.”³⁷ Those Pecos people “from the southern end of the territory of Pecos,” Cota told Hewett, “were said to have come from the direction of the so-called Mesa Jumanes [de los Jumanos, or Chupadero Mesa] and Manzano Mountains,” that is, the region of the Tompiro and easternmost Southern Tiwa Pueblos.³⁸ These accounts suggest the possibility that Pecos, as well as Jemez, comprised diverse language groups throughout their histories.³⁹

The somewhat vague migrations-to-Pecos accounts might well have included people from pueblo-like remains of peoples of unknown linguistic affiliation from the central Pecos River Valley and adjacent Sierra Blanca range, and as far west as the San Andres Mountains. Those areas were abandoned by the mid-fifteenth century and earlier (Fig. 1).⁴⁰ The efforts of archaeologists and linguists to account for the geographical distribution at contact of the different Tanoan language speech communities, and the time-depth of their separation from a parent (Proto-Tanoan) language, nevertheless, have defied satisfactory explanation.⁴¹

In apparent confirmation of the historical references cited above, Bandelier met Mariano Ruiz, a man who migrated from Jemez to Pecos with his family in 1837 and was adopted into the “Pecos tribe.”⁴² Ruiz told Bandelier that “the Pecos and Jemez speak the same language,” but he did “not recollect anything about their [Pecos] language beyond that it is the same as that of Jemez.” Ruiz also “claimed positively that the Piro are part of the Jemez,” an interesting tale that Hewett later echoed.⁴³

In spite of the opinions that the Franciscans and others expressed, more recent comments from Jemez people suggest that the two languages might not have been mutually intelligible, at least not without considerable difficulty. Frances Levine, a former director of the New Mexico History Museum and Palace of the Governors, cited a study in 1994, which noted “several instances in which a Jémez elder of Pecos descent spoke a language unfamiliar to his Jémez counterparts.”⁴⁴ Sando expressed some doubt concerning the presumed “linguistic similarity,” believing it debatable. He said that “what few words are known of the Pecos language sound more like Tewa than Towa.” Sando also recalled the “old saying” at Jemez that “someone was just like a Pecos, fumbling for words.”⁴⁵ In a letter to Kidder, Harrington wrote that “the Pecos language was just enough different from the Jémez language not to be at all of it [*sic*] understood without

familiarity,” and he admitted to Kidder “his own weakness in understanding the Pecos language.”⁴⁶

From the perspective of a linguist, a dialect generally differs from a standard form of the language, but the quantitative differences in morphology, vocabulary, pronunciation, and idioms that distinguish one dialect from a related speech community or language, is left unclear. Harrington noted, “No two of the pueblos have the same dialect. . . . The degree of linguistic diversity varies greatly.”⁴⁷ Trager suggested that Arizona Tewa was possibly Tano (Southern Tewa), “and therefore a separate language.”⁴⁸ Both Kroskirty and Dozier suggested that Arizona Tewa “ancestors” were either Tanos or Southern Tewa.⁴⁹ Arizona Tewa and the dialect spoken at Ohkay Owinge (formerly San Juan Pueblo) remain mutually intelligible after a minimum of three hundred years.⁵⁰

Peckham and Olinger cited the recollection of a Santa Clara Pueblo member who remarked, “Oh, yes, other Tewa people always make fun of Santa Clara because they speak funny.”⁵¹ Traditional oral history suggests Santa Clara Tewa reflects the migration of some Southern Tewa (Tano) people from the Galisteo Basin during late prehistory.⁵² One Northern Tewa speaker reported that the language formerly spoken at historic Galisteo Pueblo (Southern Tewa or Tano) “was very like ours, but not the same.”⁵³ Members of San Juan Pueblo also informed Bandelier that the Tanos “spoke the language of the Tewas.”⁵⁴

Inter-Pueblo relations span many centuries during which esoteric ritual, ceremonies, and more mundane information, as well as foodstuffs, material culture, and people moved about the landscape. Such interactions imply a moderate degree, at least, of inter-Pueblo mutual-linguistic ability.⁵⁵ For example, Esteban Clemente, a member of Abó Pueblo during the seventeenth century, spoke Spanish and six native languages fluently.⁵⁶ A “sorcerer” from San Felipe Pueblo, whom Spanish officials interrogated concerning the cause of the Pueblo Revolt of 1680, spoke both Keres and Tewa.⁵⁷ (It is doubtful, certainly, that cooperation among Pueblo leaders in fomenting the Pueblo Revolt was conducted entirely, if at all, in Spanish!) Nevertheless, the “protector-general of the Indians native to its pueblos” mentioned in 1706 those “chiefs and captains . . . who were skilled in our Castilian tongue,” and were identified, among others, as don Cristóbal Corís of Santo Domingo, don Luis Conitzu of Jemes, and don Felipe Chistoe of Pecos.⁵⁸

Leaving Pecos

Previous “accessions” of Pecos people to Jemez in prehistory, as Hewett speculated, might have resulted from a variety of reasons during the Spanish colonial period and the subsequent Mexican regime, including flight to avoid disease

and hostilities, witchcraft, divisiveness, factionalism, out-marriage, and, ultimately, disenfranchisement of traditional lands.⁵⁹ Rather than joining their rebellious (and presumed linguistic) relatives at Jemez, the dissident faction at Pecos sought permission to settle the abandoned Pueblo of Pojoaque at some point between 1700 and 1707. Jemez, at the time, was “still in insurrection.”⁶⁰ It is unknown whether the request was denied or the dissident Pecos faction was among the *chusma* (rabble) resettled at Pojoaque by Governor Cuervo y Valdez in 1706.

In December of 1694, Pecos Governor Juan de Ye informed Governor de Vargas that he had learned from one of “his relatives from Cochiti Pueblo” of a plot against the Spaniards.⁶¹ How that relationship came about is left unexplained. In 1785 a daughter of Catalina Pecos, of Nambe Pueblo, received her baptism at Pojoaque Pueblo, and in 1786, a daughter of Antonio Chama was also baptized there.⁶² Chama was a Pecos surname, and Sando claimed that members of the Pecos family at Cochiti “today tell of their ancestors coming to Cochiti from Pojoaque.” Two children bearing their father’s “Pecos” surname were baptized at Cochiti in 1852, and Chama surnames (Chamaa, Chamas, Chama) are identified there in 1736, 1737, and in the 1830s.⁶³

Additional Tano refugees from the Pueblos of Pecos and Galisteo also appear in contemporary documents and related sources. The Spanish colonial census of 1750 at Galisteo Pueblo lists Francisco Peco, and in 1775, Comanches killed a Pecos Indian (presumably a resident) at Sandia Pueblo. After 1782 burial entries at Galisteo Pueblo recorded resident Pecos Indians.⁶⁴ Lieutenant Simpson was informed in 1849 that at least one Pecos individual lived at Santo Domingo, and several Galisteo “Tanos” resided there and at Cochiti prior to the final abandonment of their own pueblo in 1790.⁶⁵ While at Santo Domingo in 1880, an “old man” informed Bandelier that he remembered as “a boy, when the Pecos Indians passed through Cochiti on their way to Jemez.” A Cochiti tale tells of a faction that left Pecos and “came down to Santo Domingo.” “All the Pecos Indians who are left,” according to this account, “live in Santo Domingo.”⁶⁶

Members of Jemez Pueblo informed Harrington that the last Pecos survivors went initially to Sandia Pueblo where “their welcome was short-lived”; several subsequently made their way from Sandia to Santo Domingo while others went on to Jemez.⁶⁷ During his sojourn in New Mexico from 1831 to 1832, Albert Pike remarked that Santo Domingo and Pecos “all speak the same language.” Pike noted that there were “not more than fifteen or twenty men” left at Pecos Pueblo during his stay.⁶⁸ The claim to a common language shared by the two pueblos, nevertheless, was subsequently related in 1849 to Richard Kern, who was informed by Jemez Pueblo’s former governor, “a Pecos native,” that Pecos and Jemez “have different customs but the same [Tanoan?] language.”⁶⁹

By 1826 nine families representing about forty people remained in Pecos. The disintegration of Pecos Pueblo as a viable community has been thoroughly examined by Kessell and Levine.⁷⁰ Clearly it was a long, drawn-out process, over a century or more, the result of continuous raiding and deaths instigated by Comanches and various epidemics. The anthropological literature since Bandelier's early investigations has discussed the final exodus of a small, variously and unreliably reported number of Pecos survivors, including their names and the legacies of the Pecos culture they might have carried with them.

Bandelier collected the names of nine adult Pecos Indians still living at Jemez in 1887. Along with their children, they numbered twenty-one individuals. He was told that those who "went to Jemez in 1839-40 were six men and three women. The children had all died of mountain-fever." Hodge was told that only five remaining individuals left Pecos.⁷¹ Mariano Ruiz told Bandelier that "the last five Pecos [Indians were] Antonio [Toya] (gobernador) [and then still living at Pecos], Gregorio, Goya [*sic*, Toya?], Juan Domingo, and Francisco." According to Ruiz, Jemez officials took them to Jemez Pueblo. Ruiz also told Bandelier that a former interpreter of the Territorial Superintendent of Indian Affairs (ca. 1871) informed him that "in 1840 there were fourteen left in all [in Pecos Pueblo]," and they requested Gov. Manuel Armijo that they be allowed to go to Jemez at the invitation of "their friends and parientes [relatives]" at Jemez Pueblo. Kessell, however, was unable to locate such a request in the Mexican Archives for 1840. Parsons's informant listed twenty Pecos migrants to Jemez while Hewett had the names of seventeen migrants.⁷²

The use of the Spanish term *parientes* (relatives) for Pecos people at Jemez appears to reinforce the belief in the mutually intelligible Jemez and Pecos language or dialects. Alternatively, of course, it might also support Hewett's speculation of earlier accessions of Pecos people into Jemez. Such invitations are not without precedence in the Pueblo world, but no one has suggested, for example, that the invitation to rebellious Tano-Tewas to move to Hopi was for the reason that they spoke a Hopi dialect, or likewise, that Laguna Keres dissidents came to Isleta since they spoke Tiwa.⁷³ At least two entries in the Mexican census of 1830 at Jemez Pueblo suggest the possibility that Pecos "relatives" resided at Jemez prior to the departure of the last migrants during 1838-1840.⁷⁴ As noted, Chama was a family name at Pecos.⁷⁵ The Jemez census of 1830 lists Gertrudis Chama, age 30, and her husband, Juan Diego Chimal, age 50. Teresa (no surname), wife of Diego Sando, is subsequently identified in the Mexican census of 1845 at Jemez as Teresa Chama, age 40, wife of Diego Sando, age 50. Among the names of Pecos migrants to Jemez that Ruiz provided to Bandelier were three other individuals with the Chama surname. Also among them was one individual identified as "Gregorio" (no surname), "married to Armenta." In the

Mexican census of 1845 is “Gregoria [*sic*] M[ale] 62, Wid’er.” Armenta is unlisted in the censuses of 1830 or 1845 at Jemez, but most of the names recorded in the earlier census are Native names rather than Spanish.⁷⁶

Cicuye and “Tamos”

In the summer of 1540 at Zuni’s Hawikuh Pueblo, the expeditionary forces under Francisco Vásquez de Coronado were informed of a pueblo “a quien nombra-ban cicuye” (they called Cicuye) whose ambassadors had arrived at Hawikuh to meet the Spaniards.⁷⁷ It is not contextually clear whether Cicuye, the name applied by the expedition to Pecos Pueblo, was a native term in Zuni, Pecos, or yet another language. Harrington thought it was a corruption from Tiwa.⁷⁸ In search of bison half a century later, Antonio de Espejo’s expedition of 1582–1583 found itself in the province of the “Atamues” in Pérez de Luxan’s narrative. However, Espejo’s own account of the expedition has “Tamos” for this same province. That province lay eastward of the Rio Grande and the province of “Quires.” In “Tamos” the members of the expedition visited two “bellicose” pueblos, and ultimately traveled on to a third “very large” pueblo *of that same province of “Tamos”*; Pérez de Luxan provided its name as “Siqui,” a form closely resembling “Cicuye” of the earlier expedition.⁷⁹

From the second of those two “bellicose” pueblos, Pérez de Luxan’s account reads: “We went the entire way [to Siqui] through a forest of pines, mostly juniper and white pines.” Similar to before at Siqui, they were refused provisions, but captured two of the inhabitants to direct the bison hunt. Following a march of six leagues from Siqui, they camped for the night by the Rio de las Bacas, which was undoubtedly the Pecos River. “Siqui” almost certainly was Pecos Pueblo. Espejo’s own account of the “province” included that third “very large” pueblo (of “Siqui”) of the “Tamos.” There seems little doubt that “Tamos” and “Atamues” were those pueblos of the Galisteo Basin and nearby Pecos Pueblo.⁸⁰

During the late summer of 1598, Juan de Oñate, having just previously visited the Tano pueblos of San Cristóbal and Galisteo, wrote that “we went to the great pueblo of Pecos, which Espejo calls the province of Tamos.”⁸¹ These three pueblos almost certainly were the same ones identified as those three “large” pueblos of the Tamos/Atamues province described in 1582. The estimate of seven leagues from the second of the two bellicose villages to Siqui is roughly seventeen miles (as the crow flies) between the ruins of Galisteo Pueblo and Pecos Pueblo. Seventeenth-century Spaniards knew and recognized Galisteo, San Cristóbal, and San Lázaro as Tano pueblos, and they were recorded as such in Oñate’s account and subsequent accounts of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Although Spaniards, whose familiarity with Pueblo languages cannot have been great, believed Pecos (Cicuye/Siqui) to be a pueblo of the Tano province, this assumption does not necessarily mean that Southern, or Tano-Tewa, was the language of the inhabitants of Pecos. The word “Tano” derives from Northern Tewa, meaning “down country people.” Pérez de Luxan’s account of the expedition clearly distinguishes among the various language groups they encountered: “Tiguas,” “Quires,” “Suny” (for Zuni), and “Tamos.” “Tano” derives from the northern Tewa pueblos, and it might well have been a self-designation of the people of those three pueblos, for the expedition apparently did not reach those northern settlements (from Tewa, *t^hnu’u*, [live down country people]).⁸² If Pecos comprised one of the Tano province communities, it is reasonable to conclude that the language of at least some of its inhabitants was also Tano, or Southern Tewa. Kessell listed Antonio de los Angeles, a governor of Pecos in the 1740s, as “a Tano” (but followed this label with a question mark), and it is certainly possible that the inhabitants of the pueblo spoke more than one dialect or language.⁸³

The “Sounds” of Pecos (?) at Jemez

Jemez Towa has been studied by linguists only sporadically and incompletely. Harrington recorded a small number of Jemez place names and features in Towa. Parsons documented some 540 native Jemez Pueblo personal names and other terms with approximate English translations, but her inconsistent spelling and random use of diacritical marks renders them of questionable value for comparative purposes. Yumitani’s dissertation has been the most extensive work on the subject. There is no way to assess the degree and kinds of change in Towa over the past nearly four-hundred years; nor to examine what extent additional changes might have occurred between 1925 and Yumitani’s study. For example, Yumitani noted “archaic” words in Parsons’s study that were no longer known in 1998, possibly those referring to esoteric ritual terms.⁸⁴ Yumitani also noted several instances in which changes were evident in word formation since Parsons’s study from 1925.

The sound represented by /r/ occurs in Jemez Towa, but only in Spanish loan words. It is common, however, to both Tewa and Southern Tiwa languages (and to Spanish, of course, as well as to Keres).⁸⁵ The sound is present in the Spanish term *pero* (but) rather than in the English name of “Mary.” The *San Juan Pueblo Tewa Dictionary* uses /d/ for the same “tap” or “flap” written as /r/ in the *Santa Clara Tewa Dictionary* and by Harrington, who used an inverted /r/ to represent this tap, a character I am unable to reproduce.⁸⁶ This letter or “sound” *does not occur* in any of the thirty Jemez personal names recorded from colonial documents in the seventeenth century and appears in only three from

the Spanish colonial census at Jemez in 1750.⁸⁷ The sound representation of /r/ does not occur in the limited number of Jemez Towa words supplied by Harrington, but it occurs twice in Parsons's list of Jemez names. For example, "Sürni" and "Ora'bi" are both apparently borrowed words. The Mexican census at Jemez Pueblo in 1830 lists nine names with /r/, possibly reflecting earlier Pecos migrants. Nine names with that letter occur in native names from the Jemez census of 1845.⁸⁸

Harrington's compendium includes only six "Pecos" words: the Pecos word, *he' ' wâ,* means Jemez Pueblo, which in the Jemez language is *hęwă*; the Pecos word *ɸwijiăă* means "fly" and is also the personal name of Agustín Pecos. According to Harrington, it is the same word in both languages. For Santa Clara Pueblo, he provided the Pecos term *giowak-ă'*, which is a cognate with *giowă* in Towa, signifying "up-country." He obtained the Pecos word *kăkoră* for the former pueblo by combining *kă-* "stone" (Jemez *kšă'ă*), *ko* "on top" (Jemez *kšo*), and *-ră* (locative, Jemez *-lă*).⁸⁹ Harrington and his Pecos informant rendered this phrase as "at the stone on top." Both individuals expressed puzzlement as to what the word actually referenced. Consulting his field notes from 1895, Hodge heard this as phrase as *kòkă -o-ro-*, somewhat differently than Harrington.⁹⁰ Harrington recorded a Towa term for Pecos Pueblo with a locative suffix */lă/* (where Pecos has */ră/*), expressing "to" or "at."⁹¹ He was unable, however, to explain the other morphemes in the Jemez term, as he noted in his letter to Kidder. Both Harrington and Hodge heard the initial /r/ of the locative.

The initial *kă-* in Harrington's rendering of the Pecos word for Pecos Pueblo reflects the fact that only Towa uses the vowel /a/ here for "rock," suggesting that the Pecos and Jemez words were the same. Tewa, for example, has *k'ũ ~ k'uu*, Southern Tiwa has *kò*, which was precisely heard and rendered by Hodge, and Taos Tiwa has *k'ũă*. If Hodge heard correctly, one might argue for Pecos as more closely aligned formerly with Southern Tiwa (and see also the above commentary on possible Piro associations by Hewett and Ruiz).

Nevertheless, these few sounds and words are hardly sufficient to determine the degree of linguistic differences between Pecos and Jemez Towa, as Campbell pointed out. Parsons identified as Pecos words (or "possibly Comanche or Pecos"): *mahöö*, and *mywah*, but provided no Jemez equivalents if they are not, in fact, Jemez Towa words. Parsons also provided Jemez and Pecos renderings of the question, "How many of you came [from Pecos]?" She provided the Jemez phrase as *kòtăă dopoăă* and the Pecos equivalent as *kyuudyă kyapoăă*.⁹² The initial *kò-* of the Jemez word is possibly the same as that heard by Hodge (above) in the Pecos word for the pueblo. Both the phonetics and morphophonemics are clearly different, but Parsons did not attempt to parse the differences. According to Sando, several of the Pecos surnames in Kessell's exhaustive study,

such as *Sidepovi*, *Pousoi*, and *Quanimas*, sounded “more Tewa than Towa.” The *-povi* ending is clearly Tewa for flower.⁹³

In 1849 Richard Kern obtained the name of a former governor at Jemez, a man of Pecos descent, and provided his name (presumably in the Pecos language) as *Wash-U-Hos-te* (Big White Bead).⁹⁴ That individual is not identified among the last seventeen or twenty Pecos individuals who arrived at Jemez from Pecos from 1838 to 1840. We have no way of knowing what Kern thought he heard or the identity of his informant. Several Jemez surnames in the census of 1830 have the initial *hua-* (Spanish has /*ˈgwa-*/, lacking [w] in the alphabet, but a letter common to all Tanoan languages). Nothing remotely resembling Kern’s rendition of the man’s name is evident there from 1830 to 1845.

Barring differences in how the words were heard and their spelling, Hodge’s “clan” names obtained from Pecos individuals at Jemez appear to be identical with the same Jemez words in Parsons’s and Yumitani’s orthographies. It is possible that Hodge and Hewett heard Jemez Towa words for presumably equivalent Pecos nouns from their Pecos informants. The unwary reader is left to assume no appreciable difference between the two languages or dialects as a result of this potential misunderstanding. Both Hodge and Hewett clearly assumed that what they heard were Pecos words, but do not explicitly make that case. They do not explain how the words were elicited and under what circumstances they were derived, or to what extent the informants understood their queries. The differences in orthography and diacritical marks of Hodge, Hewett, and Parsons might merely reflect the different ways in which they heard and wrote the individual sounds as opposed to dialectical differences in language.

The Pecos “r” dialect?

Parsons listed the names with English translations of seventeen immigrants to Jemez. Her orthography, however, is rendered considerably different from Hewett’s for the same names he obtained from Agustín Pecos.⁹⁵ Neither of the two lists state that the names were specifically asked for and provided in the Pecos language. It is clear in several cases that the compound names are composed of words in Jemez Towa. For example, Parsons’s word-final *-wagi* (“Tsugi-wagi”) is Jemez Towa for “altar,” a frequent female name-ending at Jemez.⁹⁶ No similar name-final sounds appear in the Pecos list of women’s names, and no *-guagi-* is found. Among the Pecos immigrants was the word “Pohweh,” which Parsons translated as “girl” in Tewa. It was clearly *povi* or *pobi* (blossom or flower) in Santa Clara and Ohkay Owingeh Tewa. Parsons wrote “Sesawhia,” which was said to have been Agustín Pecos’s name (Parsons translated *-whia* as Jemez, “row?,” also spelling it *wiya*). Hewett’s list has “Da-lur” and Parsons has

“Dalöh,” but Parsons did not comment on Hewett’s insertion of the /r/ sound. Where Parsons has “Hopèh” (Hopi), Hewett heard “Hur-ba,” and it is possible that both of Hewett’s renderings were both, in fact, Pecos forms.

Commenting on the seventeen names listed by Parsons and Hewett, Sando remarked that *Shetö* (“*Shi-to-ne*” in Hewett’s and Parsons’s lists) “must have been of Pecos origin, since the name has no meaning in Jemez.”⁹⁷ Where Parsons has “Tso-waki” and Hewett has “Zu-wa-ng,” Sando has “Zer-wakin,” and he provided the names of several of the Pecos descendants at Jemez: “Ellr-kuo-se,” “Stia-ber,” and “Pa-her,” presumably in the Pecos language, since Towa lacks the /r/ sound. If, however, these words contain Jemez Towa “sounds,” Yumitani’s claim that /r/ is a loan from Spanish might be in error. Some morphemes and words in the Pecos baptismal lists have possible cognates in Tewa, but I realize such comparisons are a risky venture.⁹⁸

I suggest that Hodge and Harrington heard and rendered a considerable significance in the final morpheme of the Pecos name for Pecos Pueblo, the locative /-rǎ/. The Pecos language names provided by Sando also reflect the /r/ sound, one that occurs only in Spanish loan words at Jemez, as noted. A brief list of Isleta Tiwa reveals /r/ in 26.2 percent of the words recorded. Santa Clara and San Juan Tewa dictionary entries (more than 1600 words altogether) contain a combined 18 percent with /r ~ d/.⁹⁹ Slightly more than 21 percent of native Pecos names recorded from baptismal entries during 1694 to 1700 contain /r/, a sound quite familiar to the Franciscans. The Spanish colonial census of 1750 at Pecos listed 246 of the adult Pecos personal names with the /r/ sound.

Hojjer and Dozier noted in Santa Clara Tewa that “in certain prefixed syllables, d may alternate with r. The precise conditions under which this alteration occurs have not yet been determined.”¹⁰⁰ The combination of /d/ + v final occurs in 21 Pecos male names, but none in women’s names. The priests either heard or wrote the compound /r/ + v in 45 male names and in 70 female names. Whether these phenomena are suggestive of confusion in distinguishing these sounds by different priests, I cannot say. In the *Santa Clara Tewa Dictionary*, 70 words end either in /d/ or /r/ + v final, and in the *San Juan’s Tewa Dictionary*, /d/ + v final occurs 85 times. Parsons heard and recorded /r/ + v final in 75 names at Jemez. The census at Pecos in 1750 recorded /r/ in 19 names, and in Jemez but once; in that same census, /r/ occurred in all but 4 Tewa names, and in 49 Jemez names.

The word-initial /r/ occurs only twice in the Pecos list, both in a woman’s name (Cecelia Lambi and Maria Luguó), and appears four times elsewhere within a name. The /r/ occurs in Towa only initially in Spanish loan words and occurs elsewhere in Towa, only if the following word begins with a vowel-initial pronominal prefix.¹⁰¹ Harrington noted that in Towa, “The sound of r is heard in some words of foreign origin,” but was recorded by Parsons in 21.6 percent of

the 541 names, a frequency similar to that of /r/ in the Pecos names.¹⁰² Parsons's Jemez names frequently end with a final /-1 /+v, most often as /-li/, just as Pecos names and many Tewa words end in /-ri/ ~ /di/, suggesting the possibility that Jemez, /-li/, and Tewa, Tano, and Pecos /-ri/ ~ /di/ are all cognate morphemes. Jemez, *dél'ĩ*; Taos, *líl*; Isleta, *di'ru*; and Rio Grande Tewa, *di*—all are cognate terms for “chicken.” Note that Jemez and Taos (Northern Tiwa) /1/ is the same as Isleta (Southern Tiwa) /r/. Although /1/ and /r/ are allophonic in some Native American languages, the consistency with which several generations of Spaniards heard /r/ rather than /1 / in Pecos names (and none in Towa names) is a telling factor, which suggests that Pecos, Isleta, and Tewa share the same phoneme that is absent in Taos and Jemez Towa.¹⁰³ Similar phonemic shifts are also likely to exist, which would further substantiate these dialectic groups.

The extant linguistic data simply are not sufficiently clear for identification of the Pecos language. The frequent occurrence of /r/ in Pecos words from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, as in Tewa and Southern Tiwa, nevertheless, suggests that Pecos differed in some (perhaps a significant number) respects, from Jemez Towa. Whether the frequent /r/ sound in Pecos names indicates a dialectical affinity with Tano-Tewa, or reflects a different Tanoan “language” altogether is an open question that requires further linguistic research and analysis.

Notes

1. Eric R. Wolf, *Europe and the People Without History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982), 19. See also various articles in *The New History: The 1980s and Beyond*, ed. Theodore K. Rabb and Robert I. Rotberg (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1982).

2. Kurt F. Anschuetz and Thomas Merlan, “More Than a Scenic Mountain Landscape: Valles Caldera National Preserve Land Use History,” Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-196 (Fort Collins, Colo.: United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, 2007); and Jeffrey M. Widner, “Valles Caldera: Preserving the ‘Yellowstone of the Southwest,’” *Journal of the Southwest* 57, no. 4 (2015): 583–608.

3. As a youngster attending LaSalle summer camp some distance up river from Pecos Village, I recall outings to a large cave opening at the mouth of Holy Ghost Canyon called locally “Bishop's Cave,” opposite Terrero. Local legend, perhaps recalling a Pecos story, had it that the cave passed through the mountains to a similar cave behind Nambe Falls, below which lie both Nambe and Pojoaque Pueblos. Jemez requested the return because Pecos descendants there hold sacred that “cave that they used to do their pilgrimages . . . and initiations.” See “Pueblo Seeks to Save Cave,” *Albuquerque (N.Mex.) Journal*, 24 May 2008. Pecos dissidents' request to resettle the abandoned Pueblo of Pojoaque (see page 1), perhaps, is a reminder of former close ties between Pecos and the northern Tewa (rather than Towa) relatives.

Missed by previous historians of Pecos Pueblo and its (mis)fortunes is an interesting journal entry for 18 September 1852 by Indian Agent John Greiner: "Juan Antonio from Jemez also came in today bringing with him part of the documents of Old Pecos dated 1689 which he says is the original." See Annie Heloise Abel, "The Journal of John Greiner, Edited, with Notes and Introduction," *Old Santa Fe* 3, no. 11 (1916): 189–243, 241 (quoted). Possibly, this was Juan Antonio Sando, age twenty-nine in the census of 1845; the old documents most likely were one of the alleged Cruzate Grants of 1689. See Virginia Langham Olmsted, trans. and comp., *New Mexico Spanish and Mexican Colonial Censuses, 1790, 1823, 1845* (Albuquerque: New Mexico Genealogical Society, 1979), 182. Brayer reviewed the evidence against the apparently spurious Cruzate documents purporting to grant title to eleven pueblos. Pecos is not included among them. See Herbert O. Brayer, "Pueblo Indian Land Grants of the 'Rio Abajo,' New Mexico," *The University of New Mexico Bulletin*, Whole Number 334, Historical Series, vol. 1, no. 1 (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1938), 14n18.

For the Pecos Pueblo official merger with Jemez Pueblo, see Frances Levine, *Our Prayers Are in This Place: Pecos Pueblo Identity Over the Centuries* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1999), 156–57.

4. R. G. Collingwood, *The Idea of History* (1946; repr., New York: Oxford University Press, 1970), v.

5. John L. Kessell, *Kiva, Cross, and Crown: The Pecos Indians and New Mexico, 1540–1840* (Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, 1979), 536–37. I have used Xeroxed copies of the hand written note cards compiled by John Kessell from the original Pecos baptisms (1694–1700) from the microfilm copies at the New Mexico State Records Center and Archives. See Fray Angélico Chavez, *Archives of the Archdiocese of Santa Fe, 1678–1900* (Washington, D.C.: Academy of American Franciscan History, 1957), 205; and Notes from Pecos Baptisms (1694–1700), fr. 21–75, r. 28, box 20, John Kessell, *The Pueblo de Los Pecos: A Documentary History, 1540–1838*, collection no. 2001-044, New Mexico State Records Center and Archives, Santa Fe, New Mexico [hereafter NMSRCA]. Included are thirteen non-native Pecos individuals identified by the priests as Apache, Queres, Zuni, Picuri, Piru, Ute, and three with possible Spanish nicknames: Bufa ~ clown [Tewa ~ Kossa?], Sinco ~ cinco, and Zapo ~ frog. A number of the Pecos names were entered two (or more) times over the six-year period during which baptisms were recorded by six different priests, as couples bore more than one child during that period. As a result, different priests heard and recorded the same names slightly differently over the period indicated.

6. Lyle Campbell, *American Indian Languages: The Historical Linguistics of Native America*, bk. 4, Oxford Studies in Anthropological Linguistics (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 139.

7. Peter P. Forrestal and Cyprian J. Lynch, OFM, *Benavides' Memorial of 1630* (Washington, D.C.: Academy of American Franciscan History, 1954), 23.

8. Frederick Webb Hodge, George P. Hammond, and Agapito Rey, *Fray Alonso de Benavides' Revised Memorial of 1634* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1945), 67, 273.

9. Kessell, *Kiva, Cross, and Crown*, 162.

10. John L. Kessell, Rick Hendricks, and Meredith Dodge, eds. *Blood on the Boulders: The Journals of Don Diego de Vargas, New Mexico, 1694–97* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1998), 241.

11. Kessell, *Kiva, Cross, and Crown*, 267.
12. Kessel et al., *Blood on the Boulders*, 378.
13. Eleanor B. Adams, "Bishop Tamaron's Visitation of New Mexico, 1760," *New Mexico Historical Review* 38, nos. 3/4 (1953): 192–221, 291–315.
14. Eleanor B. Adams and Fray Angélico Chavez, trans. and annot., *Missions of New Mexico, 1776* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1956), 181, 214. Emphasis provided by Adams and Chavez.
15. Charles Wilson Hackett, ed. and annot., *Historical Documents relating to New Mexico, Nueva Vizcaya, and Approaches Thereto, to 1773*, Carnegie Institution of Washington Publication, vol. 3, no. 330, Papers of the Division of Historical Research (Baltimore, Md.: Lord Baltimore Press, 1937), 136, 163; and Kessell, *Kiva, Cross, and Crown*, 327.
16. Adams, "Bishop Tamaron's Visitation of New Mexico," 206–207; and Kessell, *Kiva, Cross, and Crown*, 332–33.
17. Kessell, *Kiva, Cross, and Crown*, 330.
18. Paul V. Kroskrity, *Language, History, and Identity: Ethnolinguistic Studies of the Arizona Tewa* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1993), 57.
19. Alfred V. Kidder, *Pecos, New Mexico: Archaeological Notes* (Andover, Mass.: Phillips Academy, 1958), 320.
20. *Ibid.* For examples of this repeated opinion, see Elinore M. Barrett, *Conquest and Catastrophe: Changing Rio Grande Pueblo Settlement Patterns in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2002), 130n143; Patricia Capone, "Pecos Pueblo: The Natural, Cultural, and Historical Settings," in *Pecos Pueblo Revisited: The Biological and Social Context*, ed. Michèle E. Morgan (Cambridge, Mass.: Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, 2010), 12–13; Richard Flint, *No Settlement, No Conquest: A History of the Coronado Entrada* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2008), 142; Richard I. Ford, Albert H. Schroeder, and Stewart Peckham, "Three Perspectives on Puebloan Prehistory," in *New Perspectives on the Pueblos*, ed. Alfonso Ortiz (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1972), 22–40; Frederick W. Hodge, "Pueblo Indian Clans," *American Anthropologist* 9/10 (1896): 345–52; Frederick W. Hodge, ed., *Handbook of North American Indians North of Mexico, Part 2*, Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 30 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1910), 220–21; Kessell, *Kiva, Cross, and Crown*, 5, 332–33; Elsie Clews Parsons, *The Pueblo of Jemez* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1925), ix; Carroll L. Riley, *The Kachina and the Cross: Indians and Spaniards in the Early Southwest* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1999), 25; Albert H. Schroeder, "Pecos Pueblo," in *Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 9: Southwest*, ed. Alfonso Ortiz (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1979), 430–37; and Logan Dean Sutton, "Kiowa-Tanoan: A Synchronic and Diachronic Study" (PhD diss., University of New Mexico, 2014).
21. George L. Trager, "The Tanoan Settlement of the Rio Grande Area: A Possible Chronology," in *Studies in Southwestern Ethnolinguistics*, ed. D. H. Hymes and W. E. Bittle (The Hague: Mouton, 1967), 335–50; and Lyle Campbell, *American Indian Languages: The Historical Linguistics of Native America*, Oxford Studies in Anthropological Linguistics 4 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 139.
22. Kenneth Hale and David Harris, "Historical Linguistics and Archeology," in Ortiz, *Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 9: Southwest*, 171.

23. Sutton, "Kiowa-Tanoan: A Synchronic and Diachronic Study," 5–6.
24. Hodge, "Pueblo Indian Clans," 345–52; and Hodge, *Handbook of North American Indians North of Mexico, Part 2*, 220.
25. John P. Harrington, "The Ethnogeography of the Tewa Indians," *Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology, 1907–1908* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1916), 477–78, 484. Emphasis added.
26. Edgar Lee Hewett, "Studies in the Extinct Pueblo of Pecos," *American Anthropologist*, n.s. 6/4 (1904): 432.
27. Harrington, "The Ethnogeography of the Tewa Indians," 478.
28. See Tessie Naranjo, "Thoughts on Migration by Santa Clara Pueblo," *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 14 (1995): 248; Elsie Clews Parsons, "Isleta, New Mexico," *Forty-seventh Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology, 1929–1930* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1932), 360; and Joe Sando, *Nee Hemish: A History of Jemez Pueblo* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1982), 7–8.
29. Florence Hawley Ellis, *A Reconstruction of the Basic Jemez Pattern of Social Organization, with Comparisons to Other Tanoan Social Structures*, University of New Mexico Publications in Anthropology, no. 11 (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1964); Ford, Schroeder, and Peckham, "Three Perspectives on Puebloan Prehistory"; and Regge N. Wiseman, "On the Relationship between the Largo-Gallina and the Jemez," in *Texas and Points West: Papers in Honor of John A. Hedrick and Carrol P. Hedrick*, ed. R. N. Wiseman, T. C. O'Laughlin, and C. T. Snow (Albuquerque: The Archaeological Society of New Mexico, 2007).
30. Michael L. Elliot, "Coalition Period Adaptations in the Jemez Region: Origins of the Jemez Phenomenon" (paper, presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, Seattle, Wash. 1998); and Jeremy Kulisheck and Michael L. Elliot, "A Proposed Late Prehistoric and Early Historic Phase Sequence for the Jemez Plateau, North-Central New Mexico, USA" (paper, presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, Salt Lake City, Utah, 2005).
31. Joe Sando, "Jemez Pueblo," in Ortiz, *Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 9: Southwest*, 418–29; and Joe Sando, *Nee Hemish*. Sando's claim to his Pecos ancestry is attested by the Pecos burial entry, "Bernabé Sando, viudo, ca. 80," 14 November 1728, Pecos Burials, M-18, fr. 595, r. 28, microcopy, box 12, NMSRCA, transcribed by John Kessel; and Chavez, *Archives of the Archdiocese of Santa Fe, 1678–1900*, 223–34.
32. James Mackey, "A Multivariate Osteological Approach to Towa Culture History," *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 46 (1977): 477–82, esp. 481.
33. Michèle E. Morgan, "A Reassessment of the Human Remains from the Upper Pecos Valley: Formerly Curated at the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University" in Morgan, *Pecos Pueblo Revisited: The Biological and Social Context*, 162.
34. James Mackey, "Appendix G: Arroyo Hondo Populations Affinities," in *The Arroyo Hondo Skeletal and Mortuary Remains*, ed. A. M. Palkovich (Santa Fe, N.Mex.: School of American Research Press, 1980), 176; and Mackey, "A Multivariate Osteological Approach to Towa Culture History."
35. Alfred V. Kidder and Charles Avery Amsden, "The Dull-Paint Wares," in *The Pottery of Pecos*, vol. 1 (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1931).
36. *The Southwestern Journals of Adolph F. Bandelier, 1885–1888*, ed. and annot., Charles H. Lange, Elizabeth M. Lange, and Carroll L. Riley (Albuquerque: University

of New Mexico Press, 1975), 274; and Adolph F. Bandelier, *Final Report of Investigations Among the Indians of the Southwestern United States, Carried on Mainly in the Years From 1880–1885*, Papers of the Archaeological Institute of America, American Series 4, Part 2 (Cambridge, Mass.: Archaeological Institute of America, 1892), 130.

37. Edgar L. Hewett, “Studies on the Extinct Pueblo of Pecos,” *American Anthropologist* 6, no. 4 (1904): 434–35.

38. Monica L. Murrell and Phillip H. Shelley, “Geoarchaeology of a Late Prehistoric Water Storage Feature at Pueblo Oso Negro, Chupadera Basin, New Mexico,” *The Kiva* 75, no. 1 (2009): 11–34.

39. Parsons, *The Pueblo of Jemez*; and Ellis, *A Reconstruction of the Basic Jemez Pattern of Social Organization*.

40. Linda S. Cordell and Maxine McBrinn, *Archaeology of the Southwest*, 3d ed. (Walnut Creek, Calif.: Left Coast Press, 2012), 221; Jane Holden Kelley, *The Archaeology of the Sierra Blanca Region of Southeastern New Mexico*, Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1984); John D. Speth, *Life on the Periphery: Economic Change in Late Prehistoric Southeastern New Mexico*, Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 2004); and Katherine Spielmann, “The Sociopolitical Context of Pecos,” in Morgan, *Pecos Pueblo Revisited*, 19–27.

41. For example, see J. L. Boyer, J. L. Moore, S. A. Lakatos, N. J. Akins, C. D. Wilson, and E. Blinman, “Remodeling Immigration: A Northern Rio Grande Perspective on Depopulation, Migration, and Donation-Side Models” in *Leaving Mesa Verde: Peril and Change in the Thirteenth-Century Southwest*, ed. Timothy A. Kohler, Mark D. Varien, and Aaron M. Wright, *Amerind Studies in Archaeology* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2010), 285–323;

Irvine Davis, “Linguistic Clues to Northern Rio Grande Prehistory,” *El Palacio* 66 (1959): 73–84; Ford, Schroeder, and Peckham, “Three Perspectives on Puebloan Prehistory”; Scott G. Ortman, *Winds from the North: Tewa Origins and Historical Anthropology* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2012); Stewart Peckham and Bart Olinger, “Postulated Movements of the Tano or Southern Tewa A.D. 1300–1700,” in *Clues to the Past: Papers in Honor of William M. Sundt*, ed. M. S. Duran and D. T. Kirkpatrick (Albuquerque: Archaeological Society of New Mexico, 1990), 203–216; and Trager, “The Tanoan Settlement of the Rio Grande Area.”

42. *The Southwestern Journals of Adolph F. Bandelier, 1880–1882*, ed. and annot., Charles H. Lange and Carroll L. Riley (Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico Press, 1966), 77, 79. Mariano Ruiz does not appear in the Spanish Colonial census of 1830. The Ruiz family was identified in the 1920s as a “Mexicanized Pecos family.” See Hall, *Four Leagues of Pecos*, 225; and Frances Levine, “Surviving Extinction: The Legacy of Pecos Pueblo,” in *Identity, Feasting, and the Archaeology of the Greater Southwest*, ed. Barbara J. Mills (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 2004), 101. Mariano Ruiz is said to have been an assistant to the Jemez mission church sacristan. *The Southwestern Journals of Adolph F. Bandelier, 1883–1884*, ed. and annot. Charles H. Lange and Carroll L. Riley, vol. 2 (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1970), 172. By whom he might have been adopted is unknown.

43. Bandelier, *The Southwestern Journals of Adolph F. Bandelier, 1885–1888*, 226; and Hewett, “Studies on the Extinct Pueblo of Pecos.”

44. Levine, *Our Prayers Are in This Place*, 76. Accent supplied by Levine.
45. Sando, *Nee Hemish*, 149, 150. I gave the list of Pecos names to Joe Sando, asking him to go through it for any resemblance to Jemez Towa words. Upon returning the list to me, he said that the names made “no sense” to him at all in Towa; perhaps, because of the Spanish orthography. Sando also cited Chama surnamed individuals in his genealogy (additional genealogical detail concerning the Pecos immigrants can be found in Parsons’s end charts of 1925).
46. John P. Harrington to Alfred V. Kidder, 22 February 1958, quoted in Levine, *Our Prayers Are in This Place*, 76, 183.
47. John P. Harrington, “An Introductory Paper on the Tiwa Language, Dialect of Taos, New Mexico,” *American Anthropologist* 12, no. 1 (1910): 12.
48. Trager, “The Tanoan Settlement of the Rio Grande Area,” 337.
49. Paul V. Kroskrity, *Language, History, and Identity: Ethnolinguistic Studies of the Arizona Tewa*, 67, 184; Edward P. Dozier, “Tewa II: Verb Structure,” *International Journal of American Linguistics* 19 (1953): 118–127; David H. Snow, “Pahos to Muy’ovi: Mytho- and Real History in Traditional Accounts of the Tano-Tewa Migrations to Hopi,” in *History and Archaeology: Connecting the Dots: Papers in Honor of David H. Snow*, ed. Emily J. Brown, C. J. Condie, and Helen K. Crotty (Albuquerque: Archaeological Society of New Mexico, 2016), 239–50; and Sutton, “Kiowa-Tanoan: A Synchronic and Diachronic Study,” 1168.
50. Kroskrity, *Language, History, and Identity*.
51. Peckham and Olinger, “Postulated Movements of the Tano or Southern Tewa A.D. 1300–1700,” 211.
52. Tessie Naranjo, “Thoughts on Migration by Santa Clara Pueblo,” 247–50; and Peckham and Olinger, “Postulated Movements of the Tano or Southern Tewa A.D. 1300–1700.”
53. Harrington, “The Ethnogeography of the Tewa Indians,” 481, 484.
54. Bandelier, *The Southwestern Journals of Adolph F. Bandelier, 1880–1882*, 172.
55. Cordell and McBrinn, *Archaeology of the Southwest*, 31; Ford, Schroeder, and Peckham, “Three Perspectives on Puebloan Prehistory”; and Peter M. Whiteley and David H. Snow, “Pueblo-tiwa Names: Hybrid Transmission in the Sprachbund,” *Journal of the Southwest* 57, no. 4 (2015): 525–82.
56. Hackett, *Historical Documents Relating to New Mexico, Nueva Vizcaya, and Approaches Thereto, to 1773*, 165.
57. Charles W. Hackett and Charmion C. Shelby, *Revolt of the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico and Otermin’s Attempted Reconquest, 1680–1682* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1942), 245.
58. Hackett, *Historical Documents Relating to New Mexico, Nueva Vizcaya, and Approaches Thereto, to 1773*, 369.
59. For example, see G. Emlen Hall, *Four Leagues of Pecos: A Legal History of the Pecos Grant, 1800–1933* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1984).
60. Kessell, *Kiva, Cross, and Crown*, 295; and Hackett, *Historical Documents relating to New Mexico, Nueva Vizcaya, and Approaches Thereto, to 1773*, 376.
61. John L. Kessell, Rick Hendricks, and Meredith Dodge, eds., *To the Royal Crown Restored: The Journals of Don Diego de Vargas, New Mexico, 1692–94* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1995), 473.

62. Chavez, *Archives of the Archdiocese of Santa Fe, 1678–1900*, 224; and B-23 Pojoaque Baptisms, frs. 24 and 36, microfilm, box 29, Archives of the Archdiocese of Santa Fe, 1779–1839, NMSRCA, transcribed by R. Rodriguez, M. Robbeloth, and J. Riddle (in possession of the author).

63. Levine, *Our Prayers Are in This Place*, 111–14; Kessell, *Kiva, Cross, and Crown*, 457–58; Sando, *Nee Hemish*, 144; and Margaret Leonard Windham and Evelyn Lujan Baca, comp., *New Mexico Baptisms San Buenaventura de Cochiti Church, 1736–1873* (Albuquerque: New Mexico Genealogical Society, 2000). See also Charles H. Lange, *Cochiti: A New Mexico Pueblo, Past and Present* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1959), appendices 11–17, for the numerous Pecos surnamed individuals at Cochiti Pueblo.

64. For the census, see Olmsted, *Spanish and Mexican Censuses of New Mexico: 1750 to 1830*. For the Pecos Indian killed at Sandia Pueblo, see Chavez, *Archives of the Archdiocese of Santa Fe, 1678–1900*, 232.

65. Kessell, *Kiva, Cross, and Crown*, 458; and Jessica Betterly, “Interethnic Relations in the Pueblo of Cochiti and in the Surrounding Spanish Communities” (student paper, Department of Anthropology, The Colorado College, Colorado Springs, 1988).

66. Bandelier, *The Southwestern Journals of Adolph F. Bandelier, 1880–1882*, 119; and Ruth Benedict, *Tales of the Cochiti Indians* (1931; repr., Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1982), 16.

67. Harrington, “The Ethnogeography of the Tewa Indians”, 477–78.

68. Albert Pike, *Prose Sketches and Poems Written in the Western Country*, ed. David J. Weber (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1967), 152. Pike’s observation reflects local knowledge of Galisteo Pueblo Tano-Tewa refugees having removed to Santo Domingo Pueblo, ca. 1790, and likely, earlier. Among them undoubtedly were refugees from Pecos Pueblo. Lt. Amiel Weeks Whipple encountered, on the Canadian River of eastern New Mexico or west Texas, “Indians from the pueblo of Santo Domingo.” He was told they were known as “Teguas; but they called themselves *Kiä-o-a-me*, or *Kiä-wo-mi*.” This clearly was an effort to spell the current name, Kewa, of Santo Domingo Pueblo. Subsequently, his party encountered another party of Pueblo Indians in the vicinity “who said they were of the *Co-chi-te-miä* pueblo,” clearly a reference to Cochiti Pueblo, Indians also called by the Nuevomexicanos “Teguas.” See A. W. Whipple, Thomas Eubank, and William W. Turner, “Report on the Indian Tribes,” in *Reports of Explorations and Surveys to Ascertain the Most Practicable and Economical Route for a Railroad from the Mississippi to the Pacific Ocean, 1853–4*, War Department, 33d Cong., Sess. 2, House Executive Document 91 (Washington, D.C., 1855–56), 90.

69. David J. Weber, *Richard H. Kern: Expeditionary Artist in the Far Southwest, 1848–1853* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1985), 81.

70. Ellis, *A Reconstruction of the Basic Jemez Pattern of Social Organization*, 59; and Kessell, *Kiva, Cross, and Crown*; and Levine, *Our Prayers Are in This Place*.

71. Bandelier, *The Southwestern Journals of Adolph F. Bandelier, 1885–1888*, 275; and Harrington, “The Ethnogeography of the Tewa Indians,” 477.

72. Bandelier, *The Southwestern Journals of Adolph F. Bandelier, 1880–1882*, 84, 124–25; Kessell, *Kiva, Cross, and Crown*, 554; Parsons, *The Pueblo of Jemez*, 130; and Hewett, “Studies on the Extinct Pueblo of Pecos.”

73. Snow, “Pahos to Muy’ovi.”

74. Olmsted, *Spanish and Mexican Censuses of New Mexico, 1750 to 1830*, 271–72.

75. Levine, *Our Prayers Are in This Place*.
76. Olmsted, *New Mexico Spanish and Mexican Colonial Censuses, 1790, 1823, 1845*, 181.
77. George Parker Winship, ed. and trans., *The Coronado Expedition, 1540–1542*, Fourteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology of the Smithsonian Institution for 1892–1893, Part 1 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1896), 430, 490.
78. Harrington, “The Ethnogeography of the Tewa Indians,” 475.
79. Hammond and Rey, *Fray Alonso de Benavides’ Revised Memorial of 1634*, 228–29, 206. Italics are author’s emphasis.
80. *Ibid.*, 206–207.
81. *Ibid.*, 321.
82. Harrington, “The Ethnogeography of the Tewa Indians,” 104.
83. Kessell, *Kiva, Cross, and Crown*, 494.
84. Harrington, *The Ethnogeography of the Tewa Indians*; Parsons, *The Pueblo of Jemez*; Yukihiko Yumitani, “A Phonology and Morphology of Jemez Towa,” (PhD diss., University of Kansas, 1998), 21, additional references therein; and Kenneth Hale, “Jemez and Kiowa Correspondences in Reference to Kiowa-Tanoan,” *International Journal of American Linguistics* 28, no. 1 (1962): 1–5.
85. Yumitani, “A Phonology and Morphology of Jemez Towa.”
86. Harrington, “The Ethnogeography of the Tewa Indians.”
87. Olmsted, *New Mexico Spanish and Mexican Colonial Censuses, 1790, 1823, 1845*, 57. The initial “R” in “Maria Rebabussulu” in that list most likely was misread from the original entry.
88. Harrington, “The Ethnogeography of the Tewa Indians”; and Parsons, *The Pueblo of Jemez*, 34–36.
89. Harrington, “The Ethnogeography of the Tewa Indians,” 242, 474, 477–78.
90. Hodge, ed., *Handbook of North American Indians North of Mexico*, 221. This possibly might more appropriately be rendered: “over at stone, on top of,” since Pecos Pueblo is situated on the lower toe of a prominent sandstone mesa overlooking Glorieta Creek. Hodge rendered the same (presumably) Pecos form, as *Kòkă-o-ro*, the (glottalized) “k” and initial vowel sounds having been heard differently by the two men. Both forms, nevertheless, contain the tap, /r/ rather than the /l/ of Towa.
91. Harrington, “The Ethnogeography of the Tewa Indians,” 473.
92. Parsons, *The Pueblo of Jemez*, 130.
93. Kessell, *Kiva, Cross, and Crown*, 494–95; and Sando, *Nee Hemish*, 149.
94. Weber, *Richard H. Kern*, 81, 83 fig. 35.
95. Parsons, *The Pueblo of Jemez*, 131–32.
96. Twenty-three female names end in “-wagi” in Parsons’s list in Parsons, *The Pueblo of Jemez*, 32, 34–42.
97. Sando, *Nee Hemish*, 151–52.
98. Tewa *a:ts’ari* ~ *q?ts’adi* (Santa Clara ~ Ohkay Owinge), “to kick,” might be reflected in the frequent Pecos female name-ending, *-stari* (14 times in female and but twice in male names). Parsons’s retelling of the San Juan tale of “Trial of Magic” inserted her informant’s Tewa phrase, “(*umbi kwijyo*),” meaning “your old woman” (wife). Rio Grande Tewa, *umbi* ~ *n’vi* (Ohkay ~ Santa Clara, “your” singular). Towa has *uwađ* ~ “your” (singular; see

Yumitani, "A Phonology and Morphology of Jemez Towa," 22). Pecos baptismal names contain *-umbi-* in 18 instances (12 males and 8 females), presumably cognate with the Tewa forms, though use of a pronominal form in personal names, if this were in fact the case here, is unusual and would appear to differ significantly from the recorded Tanoan personal names. David French and Katherine French (1996) observed that Native American Indian names "conform to the phonology of the language in which they are embedded, they may be analyzable in terms of semantics, syntax, or morphology . . . or they may not." See David H. French and Katherine S. French, "Personal Names," in *Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 17: Languages*, ed. Ives Goddard (Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1996), 200–221; and Parsons, *Tewa Tales* (1926; repr., Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1994), 91.

99. Ortman, *Winds from the North*, 376–85; Esther Martinez, *San Juan Pueblo Tewa Dictionary* (San Juan Pueblo, N. Mex.: San Juan Pueblo Bilingual Program, 1982); Santa Clara Pueblo, *Santa Clara Pueblo Tewa Dictionary* (Santa Clara Pueblo, N. Mex.: 1977); and Harry Hoijer and Edward P. Dozier, "The Phonemes of Tewa, Santa Clara Dialect," *International Journal of American Linguistics* 15, no. 3 (1949): 139–44.

100. Hoijer and Dozier, "The Phonemes of Tewa," 140.

101. Yumitani, "A Phonology and Morphology of Jemez Towa," 13, 23–24.

102. Harrington, "The Ethnogeography of the Tewa Indians," 39.

103. Jane Hill, personal communication with the author, 24 June 2016.