For more than two hundred years, the Pueblo of Laguna has contended with its more recent non-Native neighbors over the ownership and use of land and water in the Río San José watershed of west-central New Mexico. The latest and longest running dispute of this kind is the legal case titled State of New Mexico, ex. rel., State Engineer v. Kerr-McGee Corporation, et al. In July 2010, legal counsel for the Pueblo of Laguna asked me to serve as an expert witness historian for this case. Over the years I have had the opportunity to take a fresh look at the surviving documentary record covering the Spanish colonial and Mexican periods, with special reference to ancestral Western Keresan usage and occupation of the Río San José watershed and adjacent areas, including Mount Taylor, Bluewater Creek, Paguate Creek, Water Canyon, Encinal Canyon, Acoma Creek, Largo Canyon and other tributaries, and the main stem of the Río San José and the lands through which they run (see fig. 1).

Together with his collaborator and wife Shirley Cushing Flint (also a historian), Richard Flint has been engaged in research on the Coronado Expedition and the early Spanish colonial period in the American Southwest and northwest Mexico for the last 30-plus years. Their ground-breaking documentary research leads the field of current Coronado Expedition research. They are currently writing a book to be called A Most Splendid Company: The Inner Workings of the Coronado Exposition to Tierra Nueva.

Since 2010, Dr. Flint has served as an expert witness for the Pueblo of Laguna in State of New Mexico, ex. rel., State Engineer v. Kerr-McGee Corporation, et al. and is currently doing similar work for Kewa Pueblo, formerly known as Santo Domingo Pueblo. He gratefully thanks the Pueblo of Laguna for granting permission to publish in this article results of research performed in preparation for depositions and eventual trial testimony, as well as complementary presentations and articles by colleagues also engaged in research into the history and prehistory of the Pueblo of Laguna.
In conjunction with new multidisciplinary research carried on by my colleagues T. J. Ferguson, Barbara J. Mills, Gary Huckleberry, Tammy Rittenour, Christopher Banet, and David Killick, the study yielded significant new data and reinterpretation of previously existing data that call for reformulation of the history of Western Keresan presence in, and exploitation of, the Río San José watershed, as it has been told by some professional historians and anthropologists. These new perspectives have important implications for the history of Pueblo peoples and New Mexico more generally: we—as a group—requested and received permission from the Pueblo of Laguna to publish some of our findings.1 This article concentrates on new perspectives deriving from documentary historical research, but it also refers in summary form to crucial conclusions from archaeological and geotechnical research. In-depth exposition of my colleagues’ individual research and conclusions is being published by them separately in journals in their respective fields.

For decades the information and conclusions provided by historians and anthropologists about the antiquity of Laguna Pueblo and its practice of ditch irrigation agriculture have been confusing, even contradictory. Perhaps no better example of this situation exists than two chapters in a single, ostensibly
authoritative book—*Southwest*, volume 9 of the Smithsonian Institution’s *Handbook of North American Indians*. The first of those chapters is “History of Pueblo-Spanish Relations to 1821” by well-known and well-respected historian Marc Simmons. The other is titled simply “Laguna Pueblo” by nearly legendary anthropologist-archaeologist Florence Hawley Ellis.

Simmons, while discussing the Spanish reconquest of New Mexico in the 1690s, states that after the major fighting ended, “Homeless Keresans received temporary shelter at Acoma, but about 1697 these moved northeast to a large lake and established the Pueblo of Laguna, whose formal founding dates from July 4, 1699, when submission was made to the Spanish governor.” Meanwhile, about 150 pages later in the same volume, Ellis, synthesizing traditional Laguna history and archaeological evidence, recounts migrations of ancestral Pueblo peoples: “[A] party of Lagunas-to-be established the fourteenth-century village of Punyana on the western edge of the lake on the [Río] San José, where the contingent that had stopped at Acoma later joined them. Population was under 300. Some Rio Grande [Pueblo] families came seeking new homes, and it was decided to move the village to a knoll of rock above the river on the east side of the lake. Thus [modern] Laguna was born.”

These two quotes exemplify a divide among scholars. On the one hand, some, including Simmons, hold that Laguna did not come into existence until after the Pueblo Revolt/Pueblo-Spanish War of the 1680s and 1690s; on the other, there are those, including Ellis, who adduce evidence that the ancestors of modern Laguna Pueblo were living and farming in the Río San José–Mount Taylor area of New Mexico long before Europeans arrived in the Americas. The two camps of scholars do not segregate strictly along disciplinary lines, as might appear from the Simmons-Ellis example. Take, for instance, the case of anthropologist Edward Dozier and historian Myra Ellen Jenkins. Dozier maintains that “A number of Keresan Indians, however, moved west after the revolt, apparently in an attempt to get farther away from Spanish domination, and founded Laguna.” Jenkins, on the contrary, is persuaded by Ellis’s archaeological work which, “based upon concentrated research in Laguna sites and pottery types, reveals that the basic ancestry of modern Laguna lies in a group which had a separate identity long before the Spanish occupation.”

It is in the hope of helping to resolve this historical impasse that my colleagues and I have been especially anxious to publish our recent work. All too often the work of scholars dealing with Pueblo land and water use has remained unavailable to their professional fellows and the general public, buried in massive court files, until long after the cases for which it was produced as expert testimony were concluded.
Incompleteness of the Documentary Record: The Expeditions of the Sixteenth Century

It is important at the beginning to emphasize the incompleteness and non-comprehensive nature of the surviving Spanish documentary record dealing with the reino y provincia de Nuevo México, especially for the period prior to the Pueblo-Spanish War of 1680–1696. The fragmentary nature of that record is particularly apparent in areas, such as the Río San José watershed, peripheral to the Río Grande Valley, which was the almost exclusive focus of Hispanic settlement until late in the Spanish colonial period. Sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Spanish documents provide important information about the Pueblos of those times and about their settlements and agricultural activities, but they are subject to misuse by assuming that the information they contain is complete and exhaustive, although it is neither.

It has been commonly assumed by historians and others that because no pueblo has been readily correlated with modern Laguna in the surviving Coronado, Chamuscado-Rodríguez, Espejo, and Castaño de Sosa expedition documents then no such pueblo or distinct people existed during the period between 1540 and 1591 when those expeditions were present in New Mexico.6 The primary argument employed by these scholars—who have generally disregarded or discounted Laguna traditional history—has been that the Laguna Pueblo is not named in Spanish colonial documents before the late 1690s.

However, archaeological investigations have shown Laguna, and other pueblos, to have been occupied during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries although the pueblos were not mentioned in the surviving Spanish documentary record of those times. Modern archaeological, historical, and geographic research has been able to identify some of the most glaring omissions. A number of attempts have been made by modern scholars to correlate pueblos named—or mentioned without names—in the surviving documents deriving from the Coronado and other expeditions with known archaeological sites dating from the sixteenth century.7 Probably the most candid and sound appraisal of these attempts was made by anthropologist Carroll L. Riley, when he wrote in 1995 that “there are uncertainties in all of these figures. . . . In many cases definite identification of pueblos are not made; it is not always clear [from the documents] if given settlements were occupied, temporarily deserted, or in ruin.”8

Nonetheless, it is obvious from the work of these scholars that far more pueblos are archaeologically known to have existed during the sixteenth century than are accounted for in the documents that survive from the sixteenth-century expeditions into New Mexico. As geographer Elinore Barrett has shown in concise tables, the Coronado Expedition documents mention only four of the twelve known sixteenth-century Piro pueblos of the southern Rio Grande, only four of
the nine known sixteenth-century Tompiro pueblos of the greater Estancia Basin, only three of the nine known sixteenth-century Jemez pueblos of the upper Jemez River area, only six of the twelve known sixteenth-century Tewa pueblos of the Española Basin, and only one of the two known sixteenth-century Northern Tiwa pueblos of the upper Rio Grande, as well as only one pueblo in the greater Río San José region.9

Thus, it is wholly unjustified to conclude that Laguna Pueblo or its immediate antecedents did not exist during the sixteenth and most of the seventeenth centuries simply because they are not mentioned in that noncomprehensive, nonexhaustive documentary record.10 Based solely on that documentary record, the data are insufficient to draw definitive conclusions about the residence of the people of Laguna Pueblo or any of the many other pueblos that are absent from mention in extant Spanish colonial documents. However, there is evidence that even in the spotty documentary record, Spanish colonial observers—although they often did not realize it—witnessed aspects of ancestral Keresan occupation of and practice of irrigation agriculture on lands of the modern Laguna Pueblo. When combined with the most recent archaeological and geotechnical research, there is strong documentary evidence of continuous residential and agricultural presence of the ancestors of the people of Laguna Pueblo in their homeland in the Río San José watershed since before the coming of Europeans to the American Southwest.

Legal and Administrative Proceedings: The “Cruzate” Grants

Since the U.S. annexation of Nuevo México in the mid-1840s, the Indian Pueblos of the former Mexican and Spanish territory have been repeatedly engaged in administrative and judicial proceedings focused on their rights to land and water. The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, which formally ended the U.S.-Mexican War in 1848, specified that “Mexicans [including Native Americans] who . . . shall not preserve the character of citizens of the Mexican republic . . . shall be incorporated into the Union of the United States, and be admitted at the proper time . . . to enjoyment of all the rights of citizens of the United States, according to the principles of the constitution; and in the mean time shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty and property.”11 In 1854 Congress created the Office of the Surveyor General of New Mexico, which was charged with “investigat[ing] Spanish and Mexican land grant claims in the territory and to recommend, through the Secretary of the Interior, congressional approval or rejection of the claims.”12 Subsequent congressional instructions to the territorial surveyor general specified that he was to “recognize land grants ‘precisely as México would have done’” and to “base his conclusions about the validity
of land grant claims on the ‘laws, usages, and customs’ of Spain and Mexico.” Furthermore, the surveyor general was “to presume that the existence of a city, town, or village at the time of the Treaty was clear evidence of a grant” and was to “make a report in regard to all pueblos existing in the Territory, showing the extent and locality of each, stating the number of inhabitants in the said pueblos, respectively, and the nature of their titles to the land.”

In compliance with these charges, the Office of the Surveyor General and its successor, the Court of Private Land Claims, acted under instructions issued by the Secretary of the Interior “to prepare a faithful report of all the land titles in New Mexico which had their origin before the United States succeeded to the sovereignty of the country.” As part of this process, during the 1850s hand-written documents were presented before the surveyor general that were claimed to be original Spanish grants to nine New Mexico pueblos, including the Pueblo of Laguna. The texts of the documents indicated their production to have been during September 1689 under the authority of Gov. Domingo Jironza Petriz de Cruzate. However, in 1891, a witness before the Court of Private Land Claims named Will M. Tipton, who was said to have specialized knowledge as a handwriting expert, declared that these so-called “Cruzate grants,” including the grant to the Pueblo of Laguna, were “spurious.”

After scrutinizing the parallel texts of the series of “Cruzate grants,” Tipton listed several oddities about the documents: 1) the same handwriting was used in the text of the grants and the “signatures” authenticating them, 2) Governor Jironza’s name and that of his secretary are misspelled, 3) an allegedly incorrect founding date of the Laguna Pueblo is used, 4) a seemingly anachronistic place name is included in the boundary calls of the Acoma Pueblo grant, and 5) the Laguna grant includes an excerpt from a pamphlet written in the 1830s. The paper-and-ink “Cruzate” documents are clearly not genuine original instruments from 1689.

Nevertheless, after all the attention that has been paid to physical aspects of the “Cruzate grants” (paper, ink, misspelling, etc.), there remain more complex questions: 1) are the “Cruzate grants” copies or even copies of copies of 1689 originals, whether official or informal, 2) do the “Cruzate grants” contain accurate information, and 3) did Governor Jironza issue official statements outlining territorial boundaries for pueblos in New Mexico?

In 1985 historian Charles Cutter addressed points relevant to the issue of whether the “Cruzate grants” are copies of authentic originals. Years later as part of my involvement as an expert witness in State of New Mexico, ex. rel. State Engineer v. Kerr-McGee Corporation, et al., I also examined the “Cruzate grants” and independently observed some of the same characteristics of the texts that Cutter had previously, as well as other details that Cutter did not cite in 1985. During my
decades of transcribing and translating Spanish manuscript documents, I have become very familiar with the common errors made by copyist scribes when hand-written duplicates were made, as was routine practice in notarial and governmental offices throughout the Spanish colonial period. Instances of those sorts of copying errors appear frequently in the “Cruzate grants.”

I provide here a few of the plentiful examples of copying-type errors present in the “Cruzate grants.” Obvious copying errors appear in the “Acoma B” grant document, including these on folio 1v:

Preguntado, Que Como **ciendo ciendo** Vecinos la lagu- / na Y Acoma Peleaban tanto Y que por que se mudo / al Peñol siendo unos YndioS tan Avila(n)tos havian / deJado su Pueblo Y responde que se havian mudado al / Peñol los Acomas **siendo unos Yndios tan Abila(n)ta/- / dos havian deJado su Pueblo Y Responde que se havian / mudado al Peñol loS Acomas por las muchaS / guerras que unos Y otros Puevlos tenian Y esto / Responde.19

In the passage above, repeated words and phrases are shown underlined and in boldface. Such inadvertent repetition is typically made by a copyist who has lost his place while reading the exemplar from which he is copying. Here is another similar copying error in part of the text from the Laguna “Cruzate grant.” Again, repeated words are shown underlined and in boldface:

dijo el Confesante que Se llama Bartolome / de ojeda Y que eS natural de la provinzia de la nu- / eva Mexico en el Pueblo de Zia, Y que tendra de / edad Veinte Y Uno o Veinte Y dos años poco / maS poco menoS Y que no ha tenido maS oficio / que el ejercicio de la guerra Y que Save como se / halla la laguna, **Y que fue Y que fue** Apostata / en el Reyno del la nueva Mexico Y esto Resp- / onde.20

The only plausible explanation of errors such as these is erroneous repetition by a copyist.

Even the often cited incorrect surname of the secretary of government and war (that is, official recorder of government records), shown on the “Cruzate grants” as “Guitara” instead of the actual name of “Guevara,” appears to be an ordinary copying error, similar to ones made frequently by scribes unable to distinguish the orthography of another scribe. In this case, two commonly mistaken letters are involved: “e” and “i” are often indistinguishable in Spanish manuscript documents, as are “v” and “t.” Thus, even a seventeenth-century copyist could easily have read “Guitara” for “Guevara.”21 Such a copying error becomes even more likely for a copyist living at a significantly later period and who was unfamiliar with the names of earlier secretaries.
The “Cruzate grants,” each with a unique text, contain many instances of such copying errors, making it all but certain that each of the “Cruzate grants,” as we know them, is a copy of a unique exemplar. Someone copied the “Cruzate grants” from a series of precursors. The antiquity of those precursors remains to be determined, but it is clear that the documents we have were copied from others.

It is also clear that the “Cruzate grants” contain at least some historically accurate information. It is correct, as each of the “Cruzate grants” states, that a man from Zia Pueblo named Bartolomé de Ojeda was taken prisoner by a Spanish colonial force under Governor Jironza and transported to El Paso, where he was interrogated by the governor.22 Ojeda provided information “about different topics,” two of which are covered in Silvestre Vélez de Escalante’s summaries of and excerpts from the testimony which he made in the 1770s and together are known as the “Extracto de Noticias”: “1) The general condition of the apostates [and] 2) the manner in which they had taken the friars’ lives during the uprising.”23 A nineteenth-century English translation (made, according to Cutter, by Samuel Ellison, and preserved at the Huntington Library) of an apparently no longer extant Spanish document appears to represent a further record of some of Ojeda’s testimony of 1689 in El Paso.24 In comparison to the “Extracto de Noticias,” the document contains different, complementary testimony—statements of the same general type as the “Extracto de Noticias” but expanded. The Huntington Library document includes boundary calls for Laguna Pueblo “possessions,” virtually identical to those in the Laguna “Cruzate grant.”25 There is no way to assess the authenticity of the Spanish document Ellison apparently translated, since it is no longer known to exist. Even without the information contained in the Huntington Library document, however, it is evident from the “Extracto de Noticias” that Ojeda was questioned in 1689 about the New Mexico pueblos, as stated in each of the “Cruzate grants.”

It has not yet been shown that Governor Jironza actually prepared pueblo grant documents in El Paso in 1689, incorporating information from Ojeda’s testimony. A “royal cédula [directive] of 1684, appointing Domingo Jironza Petriz de Cruzate as Governor and Captain-General of New Mexico,” however, “gave him the right to make both Spanish and Indian land grants.”26 In fact it went so far as to require Jironza to amparar (aid) the Indians who estan atentados de paz (are behaving peacefully), “forming congregaciones and settlements of Indians who left [in war] from time to time in those camping places [that are] suitable . . . indicating the lands that may be necessary and [their] boundaries and markers for each pueblo” (haciendo Congregaciones y poblaciones de los yndios que Salieron En Una y (h)otra (h)ocasion que fueren nesesarias En los paraJes mas a proposito . . . Señalando las tierras que hubieren menester y
terminos y linderos (h)a Cada pueblo). This is exactly the kind of information provided by each of the “Cruzate grants,” giving further reason to expect that Jironza, during his second term, may have prepared documents like those referred to in the cédula of 1684.

Some detractors of the modern usefulness of the “Cruzate grants” raise the objection that they contain anachronistic elements—specifically the use of “Cubero” and “Paguate” as place names. The usage of “Cubero” in 1689 in New Mexico would antedate by almost a decade the arrival in the province of the governor of that surname, presumably the namesake of the “cerro de cuvero” referred to in the Acoma “B” grant document. Likewise, use of “Paguate” in 1689, as in the Laguna grant document, would anticipate a man of that name by decades. Although that is true, it is also true that copies of a document from 1689 made after the arrival of Gov. Pedro Rodríguez Cubero in New Mexico or after the events of the “Paguate purchase” would likely have been “updated” by the scribe/copyist to reflect the latest place name usage. Scribes frequently made such emendation in copies without noting it and without compromising the accuracy of the copies (according to the standards of the day).

I provide the following example of such updated copying in another Spanish colonial document. In fray Alonso de Benavides’s Memorial of 1630, the friar included material borrowed virtually word-for-word from an earlier work by fray Bartolomé de las Casas. In one of those borrowed passages Las Casas had referred to the New Mexico river known today as the Rio Grande by the name Río Espíritu Santo. By the time Benavides was writing, however, the river was known instead as the Río Bravo, so while borrowing the remainder of the passage from Las Casas, Benavides updated the river’s name to Río Bravo.

The available information indicates that 1) the “Cruzate grants” are copies of other, precursor documents, 2) the “Cruzate grants” contain at least some accurate historical information in agreement with the “Extracto de Noticias” of the 1770s, and 3) it was mandated at the time of his appointment that, as appropriate, Governor Jironza issue documents outlining territorial boundaries for pueblos in New Mexico.

Period of Establishment of the Pueblo of Laguna

Tipton, in attempting to bolster his pronouncement that all the “Cruzate grants” are not authentic, stated that “it is a well-established historical fact that the Pueblo of Laguna was not in existence at that date and was not founded until ten years later [than the ostensible date of the document, 1689].” Tipton’s claim that a founding of Laguna in 1699 is “a well-established historical fact” rests on two documentary sources.
The first of those is the record of Gov. Pedro Rodríguez Cubero’s inspection of Zuni, Acoma, and Laguna in July 1699, at which time San José was named as the patron of the Catholic mission at Laguna. Historians—since Hubert Howe Bancroft in the late nineteenth century—who refer to Cubero’s supposed 1699 “recognition” of Laguna, give citations that direct one only to each other, but lead ultimately to the “Sesto Cuaderno” of fray Silvestre Vélez de Escalante’s “Extracto de Noticias.” As quoted correctly by Adolph Bandelier, the appropriate passage reads:

On the 30th of June in the following year [1699], Cubero went with the father vice-custodio to take possession of these three pueblos [Laguna, Acoma, and Zuni]. On the fourth day of July the Queres of the new pueblo rendered obedience. Cubero named it Lord San José de la Laguna (Dia 30 de Junio del año siguiente pasó Cubero con el padre vice-custodia á tomar posesion de estos tres pueblos; dia 4 de Julio dieron la obediencia los Que- res del nuevo pueblo, que Cubero nombró Señor San José de la Laguna). This is the continuation of a passage that is discussed in detail below under the heading “Ojeda Testimony from the ‘Extracto de Noticias.’” Suffice it to say that at this point the quoted material does not make any statement about when the Pueblo of Laguna was founded. Instead it dates only to when the people of the pueblo rendered obedience to the king of Spain following the Pueblo-Spanish War. It is clear from the passage, though, that the pueblo did not come into existence on 4 July 1699, but was already a functioning community.

The other documentary source upon which Tipton rested his claim about the “founding” of Laguna Pueblo is a written statement, based on second-hand information, made by fray Juan Sanz de Lezaún in 1760. It states that in the 1690s the “Reverend Father Miranda, a very apostolic man, went throughout all the land, even to the most rugged sierras, collecting the wandering sheep of numerous nations. With them he founded a mission called Señor San José de la Laguna.” Setting aside for the moment the reliability of this report, it should be noted that it provides information about the founding of the Catholic mission at Laguna and not about the pueblo itself.

The earliest known evidence of Sanz de Lezaún being in New Mexico comes from 1748. He was not present in New Mexico in the 1690s and did not witness the supposed founding of the mission that he reports, nor did his tenure in the Custodia of the Conversion of Saint Paul (New Mexico) overlap with that of Miranda. A preferable source of information about Laguna in the early 1700s, is another document in the Bandelier-Hackett series, one written by fray Juan Álvarez in 1706, many years closer to the events reported by Sanz Lezaún. Not only is the document contemporaneous with the early days of the San José de
la Laguna mission, but its author was in New Mexico at the time and knew fray Antonio de Miranda and, in fact, was fray Antonio’s superior.

The portion of the Álvarez report dealing with the “mission of La Laguna” relates significantly that the pueblo was “composed of . . . Queres Indians.”36 It does not speak about the founding of the pueblo and provides no date for such an event. There is also no talk here of “wandering sheep of various nations,” as in Sanz de Lezaún’s fuzzy and much later statement. Rather, the people of Laguna are reported in 1706 simply as Queres. Thus, the oldest friar’s report concerning San José de la Laguna is silent about the age of the Pueblo of Laguna and specifically does not make any claim about its population being a recent aggregation of people from different linguistic and cultural stocks.

Ojeda Testimony from the “Extracto de Noticias”

Also there exists documentary record of a settlement at Laguna having come to the notice of Spanish colonial officials years before 1699, the date maintained by some historians as the year of the pueblo’s founding. As mentioned earlier, Bartolomé de Ojeda had been taken as a prisoner to El Paso and testified before Spanish authorities there in 1689. In his testimony, copied almost a hundred years later by fray Silvestre Vélez de Escalante, Ojeda had this to say about Laguna: “[The people] of the peñol of Acoma were divided, some on the peñol and others had come to the laguna and settled there with others from Zia and Santa Ana” (Los del peñol de Acoma estaban divididos, unos en el peñol, y otros se habían venido a La Laguna y establecido allí con otros de Zía y Santa Ana).37 The Spanish verbal phrase translated here as “had settled” is “se habían establecido,” deriving from establecerse, meaning in this case “to take up residence as a citizen.” It is worth pointing out that he did not use the common verb poblar, meaning “to found a settlement.”38 The significance of the use of establecerse in the “Extracto de Noticias” is that the people from Acoma, Zia, and Santa Ana are not said to have founded (había fundado/poblado) a settlement at the lake, but rather to “have taken up residence as citizens” at an already existing community at the lake. Ojeda’s sentence points to Laguna’s existing before people from Acoma, Zia, and Santa Ana moved there to take up residence in the 1680s. The disaffected residents of Acoma, Zia, and Santa Ana thus moved to an already extant pueblo or settlement at Laguna.39

Poor Translation: Documents of the Espejo Expedition

Establishing the period of the original settlement of Keresan-speaking Puebloan ancestors of the Laguna people in the area occupied by the six villages of the
modern Laguna Pueblo does not hinge on whether or not the “Cruzate grants” are in some sense authentic or whether the documents prepared by Rodríguez Cubero, Sanz de Lezaún, and Álvarez discussed above have been accurately interpreted in the past. Nor does Bartolomé de Ojeda’s testimony from 1689 stand alone as documentary confirmation of Laguna traditional history that the ancestors of the modern Laguna people have been present in the Río San José–Mount Taylor area for many hundreds of years.

There exists other significant evidence—documentary, archaeological, and ethnographic—that indicates that people ancestral to modern Laguna Pueblo lived and farmed along the Río San José in the sixteenth century in much the same area as do people of that pueblo today. A brief report on the travels of a detachment of the Coronado Expedition in 1540 refers to “a very fine lake, at which there are trees like those of Castilla,” seen after visiting Acoma on the way from the Zuni area to the Rio Grande.40 This may have been the lake known later to have existed in the immediate vicinity of Laguna Pueblo, but the lack of further detail makes it difficult to say so with certainty.

The third Spanish-led expedition into what is now New Mexico, however, not only saw but also interacted with sedentary agricultural Natives in the area of modern Laguna Pueblo. Diego Pérez de Luxán, alguacil mayor, or chief constable, of the expedition of 1582–1583 led by Antonio de Espejo, recounted two related experiences of the expedition as it traveled between the pueblos of Zia and Acoma in 1583. In early March, about four leagues—approximately 14.6 straight-line miles—north or northeast of la laguna (the lake) on today’s Río San José for which the modern Pueblo of Laguna was named, the expeditionaries encountered a group of Natives at a cienega (marsh) the Spaniards called “la cienega deseada de el pinal” (the longed for marsh of the pine forest).41 The expeditionaries identified the Natives, who brought them corn tortillas, as indios serranos (mountain Indians). 42 The fact that these Indios Serranos supplied corn tortillas to the expeditionaries is highly suggestive that they were agriculturalists (Puebloans) and not nomadic hunters (Apaches), who would more likely have supplied meat or other animal products to the expeditionaries. To suppose otherwise, as a number of historians have, would be to assume improbably that hunters gave away a food item that they themselves did not produce but rather had to trade for, and at a time of year when stocks of acquired plant products would be expected to be running low.43 It is much more likely that the Indios Serranos described here, only four leagues from la laguna, were identical with the Querechos seen later in the year in the same area and that, by whichever name, they were sedentary puebloan agriculturalists. The Espejo expeditionaries, however, did not recognize them as such.
Three months later, while returning from an extended journey to Zuni, the Hopi pueblos, and mineral sources in modern central Arizona, the Spaniards of the Espejo Expedition:

[214] came to the aforesaid Rio de Suni at the planted fields of Acoma on the fourth of June in the aforementioned year [1583], where we found the people of Acoma riled up
[a Native member of the expedition was killed, which is recounted at length].

Because of this death, the people of Acoma and the nearby Serranos rose up [against us]. Throughout night and day they shrieked at us from the hills. When we had come, as we did come, with the tents of the camp to the marsh of the Querechos and had witnessed the insolence of the Indians, it was decided to attack them at dawn on that morning, since the horsemen were already saddling/accoutering in order to attack them. Because the mountain range was very steep and adjacent to the camp, they [the Indians] [instead] attacked us at dawn with a shower of arrows and shrieking. That [approaching attack] having been perceived by the sentinel, we went to the horse herd in an instant, firing the arquebuses. For this reason they [the Indians] wounded no more than one horse belonging to the captain.

In this way, with shouting, they continued to have the best of us until it was daylight. [Then] half of the members of the company, along with all the servants, went to the ranchería [of the Indians] and set fire to the ranchos, as well as cut their field [215] of corn to the ground. [The field was] very beautiful. [That was] something that they [the Indians] lamented greatly.

The next day the rest [of us] went to cut down another [field] of theirs that remained. It was cut down even though they [the Indians] defended it with many arrow shots from a very steep mountain range, at the foot of which was the planted field.

The following [day], Sunday, there were peace negotiations between us and the Querechos.44

From this passage three important things emerge: first, the terms “Querechos” and “Serranos” are used to refer to the same people; second, cornfields are associated with those Querechos/Serranos—in fact, the cornfields are said to be “theirs,” in other words, the Querechos/Serranos were agriculturalists; and third, these Querechos lived in ranchos (unimposing but fixed rural dwellings or shelters; including pole and mat or jacal structures, brush huts, ramadas, or possibly fieldhouses), not tents—as Plains Querechos used at that time on the
mesas or foothills bordering the valley or within the valley itself. It is my position that the “Querechos” encountered in the Río San José Valley in 1583 by the Espejo Expedition were Keres ancestors of the people of modern Laguna Pueblo. This is supported by the similar use of the cognate word “Cherechos” by officials of the Oñate colonizing expedition in 1598 to refer to the group of Keres pueblos that included Santo Domingo/Kewa.

Pérez de Luxán’s account of the expedition’s outbound/westward travel in March states that “many irrigated planted fields of corn, with their acequias and dams” existed in 1583 between the lake/laguna and a location called Río de San Martín, four leagues upstream/west of the lake. The location of these “many irrigated planted fields of corn, with their acequias and dams” has for decades been obscured by an unfortunate English translation of the original sixteenth-century document by the respected team of George Hammond and Agapito Rey. Throughout the Spanish original, daily entries by Pérez de Luxán open with the following phrase or a variant thereof: “salimos de el dicho paraxe.” Hammond and Rey in two separate published translations of this 1583 account, one from 1929 and the other from 1966, routinely translate the phrase as “We left the aforesaid place.” Thus, in each instance of its appearance in the Spanish original, Hammond and Rey misleadingly translated paraxe with the generic word “place.” Instead, as was standard practice at the time, Pérez de Luxán intended to signify “camping place.”

Thus, on 4 March 1583, when the Espejo Expedition arrived at its paraje, or camping place, it was said by Pérez de Luxán to be at “a large lake, into which a small river flows, which has its origin along the route to Zuni” (una laguna grande donde Entra un Rio pequeño que naze En el camino de suny). This description matches the lake that was later reported as on the Río San José adjacent to the principal village of Laguna. There the expeditionaries “learned that close to this [camping] place was a pueblo called Acoma” (supimos como Es- / taba cerca de este paraje Un pueblo que di- / cen acoma) indicating that there were Native people at the lake from whom they obtained this information. On 5 or 6 March, eight members of the expedition traveled from that paraje at the lake to Acoma (four leagues distant), leaving the rest of the party at the paraje. Upon return of the detachment from Acoma to the paraje at the lake, the entire expedition:

departed from the above-mentioned paraje [camping place at the lake] on the seventh of the aforesaid month and traveled four leagues upstream along a river that has its origin among some badlands and we found many irrigated fields for planting, with their ditches and dams, built as Spaniards would have, and we stopped at the aforesaid river, which paraje we called [paraje] of the Río de San Martín (salimos De el
Following Hammond and Rey’s faulty translation, it is all too easy to erroneously locate the starting point of the journey on 7 March at Acoma Pueblo. But Pérez de Luxán did not apply the term *paraje* to Acoma, so the referent of the “above-mentioned *paraje*” in the entry for 7 March is unequivocally the paraje at the lake, where about half the expeditionaries had been left during the side trip to Acoma.

If the same average minimum league equivalent that was determined earlier is now applied to the portion of the Río San José in which Pérez de Luxán reported many irrigated fields (3.65 miles/league), it can be seen that he is describing a stretch of riverside land running west from the lake for about 14.6 miles, that is from approximately the modern principal village of Laguna Pueblo to an area at least as far west as between the modern communities of Acomita and McCartys, thus embracing territory currently within the lands of both Laguna and Acoma pueblos. Furthermore, because multiple dams are referred to by Pérez de Luxán (he uses the plural *presas*), the fields must have been located in two or more clusters between “una laguna grande” (the former lake just west of the modern principal village of Laguna Pueblo) and today’s McCartys, occupying land of both Laguna and Acoma pueblos, as they exist today. (Somewhat more than half of that distance—7.9 miles—is included within land of the modern Pueblo of Laguna.) Pérez de Luxán’s description is consistent with ditch-irrigated fields occupying much of the riverside land between the principal Laguna village and McCartys in the 1580s.

**Crossing Disciplinary Divides: Punyana and Other Pre-Colonial Laguna Settlements**

The remains of “a pueblo of about 140 rooms on what was then the southwestern shore of the lake” adjacent to the modern principal village of Laguna Pueblo have been known to archaeologists for many decades. Ceramic evidence firmly dates occupation of this settlement at between about AD 1300 and somewhat later than AD 1400. In the Keresan language of Laguna that “first Laguna village” is called Punyana. According to archaeologist Florence Hawley Ellis, “Sometime in the 1400’s, to judge by the presence of late Pinnawa Polychrome variants and affinis-Hawikuh Glaze-on-White [ceramics] in some of the trash
mounds on Laguna’s south side, the people moved across the lake, even as their legend recalls.76

Alfred Dittert, in discussing what he has called the “Acoma culture province” (but which includes land of the modern Pueblo of Laguna), has this to say about Keresan usage of lands adjacent to the Río San José in the late pre-colonial period:

By A.D. 1500, many tinajas exhibit increased capacity through the construction of masonry walls to impound more water. Garden systems were constructed to trap snow and precipitation in one basin so that it could be directed onto garden plots when needed. Adjacent to many tributaries to the Río San Jose from a point near present-day Grants eastward to Mesita [within modern Laguna land] are ruins of temporary habitations where there is a potential for floodwater irrigation. The present surface of the land at the margins of the Río San José has been worked so long that it was not possible to determine if canals were being built in the A.D. 1400s. River conditions at that time should have been such that only small ditches would have been necessary to move water.57

Dittert’s data show continuity of occupation and agricultural use of Río San José lands by Keresan ancestors of modern Laguna and Acoma pueblos from late pre-colonial times into the colonial era.

Recent re-analysis by Barbara Mills of ceramics collected by Ellis from trenches excavated through trash mounds at today’s principal Laguna village has revealed the presence of “distinctly Laguna ceramics [that] were made in the area prior to the Pueblo Revolt of 1680.”58 More specifically “the signature [diabase] paste recipe used by some Laguna potters was established by 1630.”59 That the use of diabase temper distinguishes some Laguna ceramics from those of other Pueblo peoples is thoroughly demonstrated by Matthew Pailes, David Killick, Barbara Mills, and T. J. Ferguson in a forthcoming paper.60 Its use by Laguna potters precedes by at least seventy years the commonly reported, but clearly erroneous, date of “establishment” of the Pueblo of Laguna discussed earlier. As Mills has concluded, “The incorporation of this new temper type in the late prehistoric/early historic period is particularly interesting because it fits with the migration pathways recorded in the traditional [Laguna] histories.”61

Crossing Disciplinary Divides: Pre-1850 Reservoir at Laguna

Reports by Pérez de Luxán and Espejo suggest that the ditch-irrigated agriculture they observed in the Río San José drainage was the work of western Keresan Pueblo people. These people likely included ancestors of Laguna Pueblo, which correlates with findings from both archaeology and ethnography.
Recently the Pueblo of Laguna has sponsored geoarchaeological investigations to identify and date indigenous reservoirs on the pueblo’s lands. My colleagues Gary Huckleberry and T. J. Ferguson have reported the results of that research to date. One of the sites investigated was the former dam and reservoir just southwest of the pueblo’s principal village, which is known as the “pre-1850” dam and reservoir. Using the technique of optically stimulated luminescence (OSL), Huckleberry, Ferguson, and Tammy Rittenour were able to date sand in sediments in and just below lake deposits in the former reservoir. The dates obtained during their analysis “indicate that the dam was constructed sometime after AD 1370 and before AD 1750.” Their ultimate conclusions were that “the lake at Laguna Pueblo was associated with a human-constructed reservoir,” that “the area originally supported a natural wetland, but the Laguna people increased the amount of water stored at this location through the construction of a rock-and-earth dam,” and that “it is possible that it pre-dates the Spanish Entrada of 1540.” Thus, in the absence of evidence of discontinuity in ancestral Laguna settlement and agricultural use of the area, the lake that was seen and reported by Hernando de Alvarado in 1540 and by Diego Pérez de Luxán in 1583 is judged to have resulted from enhancement, construction, and maintenance of a dam structure by people of Laguna.

Nuanced Translation: Reservoir at Laguna in 1812

It was taken for granted during the late-Spanish colonial period that the lake at Laguna Pueblo had been constructed or reconditioned and expanded by the people of the pueblo as part of their community ditch irrigation infrastructure. Drawing on his years as alcalde mayor of the Alcaldía de Laguna (in the 1780s), Pedro Bautista Pino included a description of the lake at Laguna in a small book he published in 1812. At the time, Pino was serving as the delegate from Nuevo México to the Spanish cortes, or representative assembly, held in Cádiz in response to the occupation of much of Spain by French troops in 1808. The short book was written to provide information about the remote and little-known province of Nuevo México, as well as to outline its needs, to Pino’s fellow delegates from all over the Spanish Empire.

As historians Adrián Bustamante and Marc Simmons, translators of a recent edition of Pino’s Exposición sucinta y sencilla de la provincia del Nuevo México, have observed, “Pedro Bautista Pino’s Exposición, first published at Cadiz, Spain, in 1812, has long been recognized as a significant source of information on conditions and life in the Hispanic Southwest during the last years of the colonial regime.” One of Pino’s most fulsome descriptions reads as follows: “The [only] lake [laguna] of importance that there is in the province is the one
located 34 leagues from the capital [Santa Fe] and that gives its name to the pueblo in its proximity [Laguna]. It has a circumference of 2,000 varas. Its sweet water arises from a large, flowing spring 8 leagues away, and from other smaller ones. All together, they join to form that very deep reservoir [tanque] of which the residents avail themselves to irrigate a large part of their fields."\(^{64}\)

In the passage translated here, the lake is called both a Laguna—a generic term—and a tanque—a term with much more specific implications as to its purpose and the circumstances in which it came to exist. Laguna applies to any land-locked or nearly land-locked body of water, either fresh or salt, either natural or artificial. Tanque, which Pino specifically used, on the other hand, refers especially and explicitly to a constructed reservoir used to store irrigation water. Pino emphasizes the laguna/tanque’s intended role in an irrigation system by observing that “the residents avail themselves [of it] to irrigate a large part of their fields.”\(^{64}\)

That a tanque is typically a constructed feature devised for the purpose of irrigation is apparent in the etymology of the word. It comes ultimately from the Spanish word estanque, meaning “Balsa construida para recoger el agua, con fines utilitarios, como proveer al riego” (A reservoir constructed to gather water for utilitarian purposes such as to provide irrigation). Estanque derives from the verb estancar, meaning “to impound.”\(^{65}\) Tanque, a shortened version of estanque, migrated from Spanish to Portuguese to East Indian vernacular to English and finally back into Spanish in the eighteenth century.\(^{66}\) I have thus rendered tanque simply as “reservoir.”\(^{67}\)

Pino’s description of the lake confirms Huckleberry and Ferguson’s scientific conclusion that “the Laguna people increased the amount of water stored at this location through the construction of a rock-and-earth dam.” Further, Pino pointedly identifies the lake as a ditch-irrigation feature. It was part of a Laguna agricultural tradition that, as has been indicated above, stretches back in time to the sixteenth century, if not earlier.

Conclusion

There is compelling documentary evidence that two distinct Keresan populations (Acoma and Laguna/Querecho) conducted irrigation agriculture in the Río San José Valley during the 1580s. Archaeological evidence argues that the Laguna people have been living and farming in the Río San José watershed without significant interruption since the 1300s. Both documentary and archaeological evidence show that the former lake on the Río San José adjacent to the modern principal village of Laguna was an irrigation feature constructed and maintained by the people of Laguna sometime before 1780 and possibly as early
as the sixteenth century. Taken together these newly available conclusions mean that the history of the Pueblo of Laguna in the Río San José–Mount Taylor area began, as the people of Laguna have maintained, long before the commonly cited date of 1699 and that they engaged in significant hydraulic engineering, creating and maintaining a system of dams, reservoirs, and ditches to supply irrigation water to crops.
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