

7-1-1989

Another Look at Dating the Scholes Manuscript: A Research Note

James E. Ivey

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

Recommended Citation

Ivey, James E.. "Another Look at Dating the Scholes Manuscript: A Research Note." *New Mexico Historical Review* 64, 3 (1989). <https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nmhr/vol64/iss3/6>

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.

Another Look at Dating the Scholes Manuscript: A Research Note

JAMES E. IVEY

In 1929 France Scholes published translations of several documents that he thought would be useful for historians of colonial New Mexico. One, a listing of churches and conventos at various pueblos, Scholes assumed dated from about 1629.¹ The document had an interminable title, beginning with the words "Certification of the notices which exist concerning the Custodia of New Mexico." It will be called the Certification in the remainder of this essay. The Certification has become important because it is the only concise listing of missions in New Mexico for the period between Fray Alonso de Benavides' descriptions written in 1630 (based on his observations in New Mexico from 1622 to 1629 with added information current to mid-1632) and a second list prepared in 1663.² Many of the assumptions Borderlands historians

James E. Ivey is a historian with the Southwest Regional Office of the National Park Service. He lives in Santa Fe.

1. France Scholes, "Documents for the History of the New Mexican Missions in the Seventeenth Century," *New Mexico Historical Review*, 4 (January 1929), 45-51.

2. Fray Alonso de Benavides left New Mexico in September 1629. He wrote the first version of his *Memorial* after arriving in Madrid, Spain, in August 1630. Mrs. Edward E. Ayer, trans., *The Memorial of Fray Alonso De Benavides, 1630* (Chicago: Edward E. Ayer, 1960), 188-90, n. 3. Benavides received at least one update concerning events in New Mexico since his departure that carried his knowledge up to at least February 1632. He incorporated the new information into his *Memorial* of 1634. See James Ivey, *In the Midst of a Loneliness: The Architectural History of the Salinas Missions* [Southwest Cultural Resources Center, Professional Papers No. 15] (Santa Fe: National Park Service, 1988), 401-3. The 1663 listing of missions is in Scholes, "Documents," 52-57.

make about development of New Mexico's mission system depend on this document.

Scholes reexamined the document in 1944. Based on interpretation of several details contained in descriptions of various pueblos, he concluded that its date must be between 1639 and 1642. He reasoned that the document referred to Las Humanas and Tabira as visitas of Abó, and therefore must date between 1632 and 1659, the only period when this arrangement existed.³ In addition, the document mentioned the killing of a friar at Taos, placing the document after 1639. Moreover, the document stated that Zuñi's friar had been killed and the province punished, but was still without a reestablished convento. Scholes considered this state to have lasted until no later than about 1644, and perhaps no later than 1642. Hence the estimated date of 1641.⁴

The obvious weak point in this determination was the date of the reestablishment of the missions in the province of Zuñi. Scholes was unsure of when this occurred but felt that it had happened by the end of the tenure of governor Alonso Pacheco de Herredia in 1644.⁵

In 1984 Stuart J. Baldwin published a short note suggesting a revised dating of the manuscript.⁶ He noted weakness in the case for a circa 1642 reestablishment date of the Zuñi missions and the complete lack in the available documents of any corroborating indication of missionary activity at those pueblos until the late 1650s. This, he argued, returned us to the original period of 1639–1659 as the window within which the document could have been prepared.

Baldwin suggested that evidence within the document itself implied that it had been written about 1656. Baldwin based his argument on the description of Abó, where the document made a specific mention of an organ in the church. He connected this with a statement by Fray Juan Ramirez, custodian of the province, that as of 1659 a "fine

3. In fact, the establishment of visita status for Las Humanas probably did not occur until 1634. See Ivey, *Loneliness*, 170, n. 25.

4. France V. Scholes, "Correction," *New Mexico Historical Review*, 19 (July 1944), 243–46.

5. Scholes cited a document stating this, but then added that the document was a forgery. He nevertheless considered the general events described in the document to be based on truth.

6. Stuart J. Baldwin, "A Reconsideration of the Dating of a Seventeenth-Century New Mexican Document," *New Mexico Historical Review*, 59 (October 1984), 411–13. John L. Kessell referred to Baldwin's suggested date of 1656 for the Certification in the preface to the paperbound reprint of *Kiva, Cross, and Crown: The Pecos Indians and New Mexico 1540–1840* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1982), ix. It was Kessell's reference that attracted the author's attention to Baldwin's article.

organ" had been bought for Abó.⁷ Baldwin suggested that the organ had arrived on the supply train of 1656, and that the Certification had been prepared subsequently to accompany the returning supply train in 1657. Recent archaeological work indicates, however, that the church was rebuilt sometime between 1645 and 1651, implying that the recent organ purchase mentioned in 1659 was the purchase of a new organ to upgrade equipment for a new, larger church building.⁸ The earlier church could easily have had a smaller, less desirable organ. The new organ at Abó in 1659, then, was not necessarily the same organ as that mentioned in the Certification, and Baldwin's dating is therefore no more certain than Scholes'.

So far, the Certification has been redated twice, both times making use of specific statements in the document. In each case, however, only one or two bits of evidence have been used. Baldwin, for example, does not explain the reference in the Certification to the death of a friar at Taos and the lack of a mission there, as does Scholes in his argument concerning the preparation date. To best date the document, as much of the internal evidence as possible should be taken into account. The following pieces of evidence found in the document offer some hints about when it was written.

1. The Certification states that Hawikuh and Zuñi had revolted, killed ministers, destroyed churches, and were without resident ministers. This was a condition that began in 1632 and could have lasted until the late 1650s. The date of the return of missionaries to Zuñi is presently unknown.

2. Taos was in revolt after killing a minister and destroying a church. A military expedition had been sent, and some Taos Indians had been defeated, but no mission had been reestablished. According to Scholes, the expedition against the Taos Indians occurred about 1640–1642.⁹ The reestablishment of a mission at Taos is presently undated, but occurred before 1659.¹⁰

3. The church at San Marcos Pueblo in the Galisteo basin had been

7. Fray Juan Ramirez to the Viceroy of New Spain, September 8, 1659, in Charles Wilson Hackett, trans., *Historical Documents Relating to New Mexico, Nueva Vizcaya, and Approaches Thereto, to 1773* (3 vols., Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Institution, 1937), 3: 192. Kessell notes that the Spanish term *organó* could mean a choir trained in plainsong, rather than a musical instrument. See Kessell, *Kiva, Cross, and Crown*, 169–70. The Ramirez letter, however, makes explicit reference to the purchase of the organ with the profits of the mission's enterprise, making it clear that an object was meant, not a choir.

8. Ivey, *Loneliness*, 66–91, 313–15.

9. Scholes, "Correction," 244–45.

10. France V. Scholes and Lansing B. Bloom, "Friar Personnel and Mission Chronology, 1598–1629, Part 2," *New Mexico Historical Review*, 20 (January 1945), 75.

built, but the convento was still unfinished. The mission was established between 1634 and 1638.¹¹ If construction was proceeding normally, the entire complex should have been finished about six years after establishment, or about 1642, but the completion date could easily have been delayed by adversity.

4. The church and convento at Alameda Pueblo were complete. The Franciscans established a mission there about 1629. A missionary is listed as late as 1635, but afterwards the mission was usually a visita of Sandia. A new church was built there about 1662–1663. When the mission became a visita is unknown.¹²

5. Sevilleta and Alamillo were visitas of Socorro. Scholes states that the two switch between being visitas and independent missions during the 1600s, but does not say when these two conditions were in effect. He does say, however, that Alamillo had missionaries to 1638 and after 1659.¹³

6. The mission of San Antonio de Senecú was not listed. Its absence may indicate that it was neither a mission nor a visita at the time the Certification was written. Senecú may have not had a resident missionary between 1638 and about 1642. In 1638 Fray Antonio de Arteaga and lay brother Fray Garcia de San Francisco, who founded the mission, left Senecú. Soon thereafter they went to Mexico, and not much later Fray Garcia received ordination as a priest and returned to Senecú. He could not have returned until the next supply train, about 1641, but the date of his return and whether another priest was stationed at Senecú during his absence is not clear.¹⁴

7. A mission listed as "San P.o" had been established. Subsequently, the pueblo was depopulated but at the time of the Certification was being inhabited again. Scholes does not hazard a guess as to which pueblo this might have been. Since the Certification considered "San P.o" to be sufficient identification, the abbreviation must be for one of the few saints' names beginning with "P." San Pablo and San Pedro come to mind, but no mission of either name is presently known. Benavides, however, does refer to a pueblo called San Pedro, the saint's name applied to Paaco. Archaeology has yet to reveal a church and convento at this pueblo, but much of the site remains unexplored. It

11. *Ibid.*, 65.

12. *Ibid.*, 64; Frederick Webb Hodge, George P. Hammond, and Agapito Rey, eds., *Fray Alonso de Benavides' Revised Memorial of 1634* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1945), 257, n. 75; Hackett, *Historical Documents*, 255.

13. Scholes and Bloom, "Friar Personnel, Part 2," p. 81.

14. *Ibid.*, 80.

is possible, therefore, that "San P.o" refers to a church and convento at Paaco.¹⁵

8. No mission to the Manso Indians near El Paso is mentioned. The Manso mission had at least a temporary church by 1656.¹⁶

9. Only one mission to the Jemez was listed. Both San José de Giusewa and San Diego de Jemez had been established by 1629, but San José de Giusewa apparently was abandoned by 1640. The history of the Jemez missions is as unknown as any other between 1639 and 1659. The only evidence for the abandonment of San José de Giusewa by 1639 is a document quoted by Lansing Bloom. This document refers to "el convento de los Hemes," which Bloom construes to mean that there was only one mission establishment to the Jemez Indians by 1639. Scholes quotes a document dated 1640 that also refers to a mission at "hemes." Such statements only demonstrate the existence of a mission at Jemez Pueblo or among the various pueblos of the Jemez Indians. They say nothing about whether the mission at Giusewa had been closed. It is possible that the mission at Giusewa continued in operation some time after 1639, and the absence of an explicit reference to San José contributes little to the datable information.¹⁷

10. The mission at the Hopi village of Moxainavi was listed as a visita of Shongopavi. By 1663 Moxainavi had been made a mission in its own right, with a visita. The period during which Moxainavi was a visita is not presently known.¹⁸

11. The Certification lists Santa Clara as a cabecera with San Juan as its visita. Scholes makes no mention of this arrangement but implies that during most of the second half of the century Santa Clara was a visita of San Ildefonso. When Santa Clara was reduced to a visita is presently unknown, but the Certification was written before this happened.¹⁹

12. Cochiti was a visita of Santo Domingo in the Certification, but

15. Hodge, Hammond, and Rey, *Revised Memorial*, 244, n. 55. See reference to the pueblo as "San P. . . ." without noting the superscript "o," in Scholes, "Documents," 50.

16. France V. Scholes, "The Supply Service of the New Mexico Missions in the Seventeenth Century, 1631-1664, Part 2," *New Mexico Historical Review*, 5 (April 1930), 194.

17. Lansing B. Bloom and Lynn B. Mitchell, "The Chapter Elections in 1672," *New Mexico Historical Review*, 13 (January 1938), 92, n. 21; France Scholes, "Notes on the Jemez Missions in the Seventeenth Century," *El Palacio*, 44 (October 1938), 94; Scholes and Bloom, "Friar Personnel, Part 2," p. 77; Scholes, "Notes," 98, n. 29.

18. There is no mention of Moxainavi's period as a cabecera. See Scholes and Bloom, "Friar Personnel, Part 2," p. 82.

19. France V. Scholes and Lansing B. Bloom, "Friar Personnel and Mission Chronology, 1598-1629, Part 1," *New Mexico Historical Review*, 19 (October 1944), 332-33.

by 1663 had been a mission in its own right, with a convento, and then returned to a visita of Santo Domingo. The period when Cochiti was a full mission is unknown, but the Certification was written at a time when it was not.²⁰

13. Chilili was a mission in its own right (about 1662 it was made a visita of Tajique), and the Certification states that "in this pueblo there have been assembled many people from the other pueblos." The event to which this remark refers is presently unknown.

14. The Certification states that Santa Clara had "eight estancias under cultivation, and their serving people." Sandia had an unstated number of estancias under cultivation, and Isleta had fourteen. By 1663, San Ildefonso (the mission that assumed administration of Santa Clara) had six estancias, San Marcos had three, Sandia had about thirty, Isleta still had fourteen, Socorro had two, and Santa Fe and Nambé had "several" each. The increase from a total of something more than twenty-two in the Certification to more than fifty-five in 1663 implies that more than six years had passed between the two listings. A curious aspect of these references to estancias is that the phrasing indicates that the estancias belonged to the missions. It would be easier to believe that they were owned and operated by lay people for whom the mission had spiritual responsibility, but the facts do not support this. Estancias owned by civilians, for example, are known to have existed in the area of Tajique and Quarai during the late 1650s and early 1660s but are not listed in the 1663 document. It appears that the principal missions in the central Rio Grande Valley operated huge ranching and farming complexes. The implications are far-reaching and fascinating. If the estancias did, indeed, belong to the missions, they would form the "breadbasket" of the province.

This analysis shows that the Certification does not neatly disclose its date of composition by internal evidence. The failure, however, is on our part, rather than because of a lack of internal detail. Although several clear conditions exist in the document that should permit an easy dating, we do not know anything about them. This lack of information, of course, impedes our efficiency in arriving at a date. References to conditions at the Zuñi pueblos and at Taos, however, as though they were recent events along with the unfinished condition of San Marcos and several other references, imply that "about 1641" fits the

20. This statement is based on the reference to the convento of San Buenaventura at Cochiti in the 1663 list; Scholes, "Documents," 54. See also Scholes and Bloom, "Friar Personnel, Part 1," p. 334. Cochiti became a separate convento by about 1637. Hodge, Hammond, and Rey, *Revised Memorial*, 262, n. 77.

Certification more comfortably than "about 1656." Therefore, Scholes' dating, as suggested in his "Correction," should continue to be used.

Modern scholarship simply does not yet know enough about Franciscan New Mexico between 1638 and 1659 to make use of the clues the document offers. Instead, the Certification is a signpost pointing towards events and relationships in the province of New Mexico that await discovery.

History of the Hispanic Southwest



Myth and the History of the Hispanic Southwest. By David J. Weber. (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1988. xii + 179 pp. Notes, index. \$27.50)