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ABSTRACT

Klinton Burgio-Ericson: Living in the Purísima Concepción: Architectural Form, Cultural Negotiation, and Everyday Practice in a Seventeenth-Century New Mexico Mission among the Zuni Indians
(Under the direction of Eduardo de Jesus Douglas)

This dissertation is an interdisciplinary case study of Spanish mission architecture and material culture among Pueblo Indian communities of Early Modern New Mexico. The domestic quarters (conventos) of seventeenth-century missions were intimate arenas of encounter and cultural negotiation, where Native American laborers lived and worked with Franciscan friars, comprising heterogeneous mission communities. Missionaries established the Purísima Concepción outside the Zuni town of Hawikku (Hawikuh) Pueblo in 1629, where it was destroyed in a 1672 Apache raid. In 1919, Frederick Webb Hodge and Jesse L. Nusbaum of the Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition excavated the ruins, producing collections which eventually become part of the National Museum of the American Indian (NMAI) but remain largely unpublished. As one of the few systematically excavated seventeenth-century New Mexico missions, the Purísima Concepción is a vital resource for understanding everyday mission life.

Interpreting the Purisima Concepción’s archaeological remains with primary sources, Zuni oral traditions, and comparative analysis, this dissertation reconstructs the everyday built environment of Hawikku’s convento, rich with materials of labor and cultural concepts of gender. The cloister design at the adobe mission’s core was an architectural form with monastic
and vernacular precedents, which missionaries employed as an architectural rhetorical statement communicating aspirations of orderly acculturation. In contrast, artifacts related to everyday culinary practices of food preparation and consumption mixed cultural traditions, manifesting Native agency, Pueblo cosmology, and the overlooked role of women in shaping mission community experiences. Through Native participants and material culture such as culturally hybrid ceramics including soup plates, candle holders, and a unique salt cellar made by Zuni and Hopi artists (sometimes described as colonowares), Pueblo concepts of gender and cosmology interpenetrated the missionaries’ patriarchal Christianity. The result was a hybrid environment combining both Spanish and Pueblo cultural systems.

Focusing on intercultural relations, everyday life, and Indigenous agency, this dissertation explores a particular example of the multi-vocality of art’s history in the Americas. It shifts scholarly attention from mission churches and Spanish colonial power, to the domestic spaces of conventos and the meaning of missions as rhetorical constructions negotiated among participants of the mission community.
To the people of Hawikku, and their descendants of Zuni Pueblo,  
in the hopes that this work may honor you.

And to my travel agent, who made it possible.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

After eight years of work, I cannot possibly do justice to all the people who have made this dissertation possible. I am deeply humbled by the support I have received as a guest in many houses, both literally and figuratively.

First and foremost, I owe my greatest appreciation to the community of Zuni Pueblo, and the many Zunis who have entertained my interests in their history and culture. I thank Governors Arlen Quetawki, Val R. Panteah, Sr., and the Tribal Councils serving with them, for their attention, support, and insightful feedback. Former Councilman Gerald Hooee has been especially helpful discussing Zuni history, and initially planning the 2016 Recovering Voices Community Research Visit to Smithsonian Institution (SI). Octavious Seowtewa took up leadership of that group, which additionally included Zuni Cultural Resources Advisory Team (ZCRAT) members Raylan Edaakie, Eldred Quam, and Curtis Quam, who also have continued to share their knowledge with me. I especially appreciate Octavious’s leadership and openness towards outside institutions and researchers, guiding us in appropriate protection and use of Zuni cultural heritage.

Jim Enote took early interest in my work, making the A:shiwi A:wan Museum and Heritage Center available to photograph key artifacts, and has continued to offer guidance, feedback, and intellectual dialogue as work has progressed. Tom Kennedy of the Zuni Pueblo Department of Tourism initially convinced me of Hawikku’s importance not only for Zunis, but U.S. history in general, and has enthusiastically supported my research. His office and tour guide Kenny Bowekaty aided access and photography of Hawikku and other important sites.
Kurt Dongoske of the Zuni Cultural Resources Enterprise and Tribal Historic Preservation Office offered useful feedback, and I appreciate the interest of Codi Hooee and the Zuni Public Library, ensuring that my research will be available for community use in the future.

During repeated visits to the pueblo, I have been blessed by the hospitality of families welcoming me into their lives, sharing the beauty of Zuni culture, and helping me to better understand it. Ruth and Presley Haskey and family warmly welcomed me into their home and community events, while collaborating on historical research, reading drafts of dissertation chapters, and providing crucial feedback on many aspects of Zuni culture, worldview, and cuisine. Curtis Quam has been a reliable friend and collaborator in my work and museum-based projects. Eldred and Marilyn Quam provided feedback and advice as research progressed. I also thank Missy Yatsattie for her openness, interest, and willingness to share her family’s history as keepers of the Santo Nino.

Many other Zuni community members provided additional feedback and critique, shaping my research and conclusions, including: Miranda Belarde-Lewis, Malcolm Bowekaty, Margaret Eriacho, Kirby Gchachu, Sara Kostelecky, Hayes Lewis, Dan Simplicio, and Edward Wemytewa. Roger Thomas, Loren Thomas, and staff of the Inn at Halona facilitated my visits to the pueblo, providing a quiet place for study and blue-corn pancakes.

The UNC-Chapel Hill Department of Art has been home since 2007, and I am so thankful for this time shared with colleagues and supportive faculty. Eduardo Douglas has been all I could ask as a dissertation advisor, career support, and guide through the academy. Bernie Herman has likewise been steadfastly supportive, as well as my methodological inspiration in thinking through this material. My other dissertation committee members, Vin Steponaitis, Sara Galletti, and Lyneise Williams, each provided invaluable insight and patient attendance to my
manuscript, as well as career assistance. Although not ultimately among my dissertation committee members, I am also indebted to Louis Nelson and Ross Barrett for their insights and willingness to participate. Together, Lyneise Williams and Carol Magee developed my ethical consciousness and interdisciplinary anthropological approach, as well as vital teaching skills. Among other faculty contributing to my development, I thank also Glaire Anderson, Cary Levine, Mary Sheriff, Daniel Sherman, Mary Sturgeon, and Dorothy Verkerk.

The greatest privilege of graduate school has been spending my time in sustained thought about history and the making of things. A close second has been sharing it with a cadre of brilliant colleagues who have challenged and interrogated my own thinking through our classes, teaching, and everyday life. Among these friends, I would especially thank Erin Corrales-Diaz, Joanna Gohmann, and Liz Fox, each of whom has read and responded to dissertation sections as well as offering vital feedback on innumerable applications, interviews, and presentations. I also would not have been able to complete this work without the Spanish instruction, conversations, and patient teaching of Christian Yen and Amanda Black, as well as Chapel Hill’s CHICLE Language Institute.

I am humbled by the financial and institutional support that made this project possible, especially from Smithsonian Institution and Peter Buck, who provided the means for my core research among the collections of the National Museum of the American Indian (NMAI), the National Museum of Natural History (NMNH), and the National Anthropological Archives (NAA). Gwyn Isaac has been a constant support, generous collaborator, and insightful friend from the beginning, and I could not have accomplished this work without her. Dave Hunt facilitated collections access and CT-scanning of Hawikku artifacts. Many other members of the NMNH Department of Anthropology aided my research, helped take on new projects, and
generally made me feel welcome. I thank Judith Andrews, Sarah Baburi, Laurie Burgess, Maggie Dittemore, Bill Merrill, Felicia Pickering, Melissa Powell, Esther Rimer, David Rosenthal, Mary Sangrey, Dennis Stanford, Brandee Worsham, and Karen Yairi. Likewise, staff at the NAA were wonderful to work with, and I especially appreciate the ongoing assistance of Gina Rappaport and Daisy Njoku.

At NMAI, my first debt of gratitude is to former Photo Archivist Heather Shannon, without whose encouragement and guidance I would never have received an SI Research Fellowship. I appreciate Cecile Ganteaume, Tori Cramer, and Pat Nietfeld for entertaining my initial interest in the collection. Collections staff made the Hawikku materials available and I enjoyed the many hours of discussion as we worked together, especially Veronica Quiguango and Maria Martinez, but also Tom Evans, Tony Williams, and Lisa Anderson. I am likewise thankful for access to archives, photos, and photo permissions provided by Michael Pahn, Rachel Menyuk, and Nathan Sowry. While at the NMAI, I enjoyed the interest and conversations of museum staff and associates, including Cynthia Chavez Lamar, Antonio Curet, Kelly McHugh, and Elayne Silversmith, as well as Risa Arbolino, Emily Hayflick, Emil Her Many Horses, Joe Horse Capture, Emily Kaplan, Keevin Lewis, Ann McMullen, Stephanie Riley, and Chris Turner. I look forward to continuing these conversations and working together in the future.

Other SI staff assisted my research in various ways. At the National Museum of American History, Steve Velasquez opened his office, curatorial files, and library to me, and I also appreciated the interest of Barbara Clark Smith. The SI Archives were useful thanks to Heidi Stover and Mary Markey. Finally, I appreciated dialoguing with staff and research fellows at the Smithsonian American Art Museum (SAAM), and Amelia Goerlitz for inviting my participation.
The Crystal Bridges Museum of American Art was instrumental in the completion of my dissertation manuscript, with funding provided by the Tysons Scholar of American Art fellowship. I appreciated the warm welcome and interest on the part of Alice Walton, Rod Bigelow, and Sandy Edwards, but especially Margi Conrads. The curatorial staff was wonderful, especially Mindy Besaw and Ali Demorotski, and I enjoyed learning from fellow residents and interlocutors Garland Taylor, Jen Padgett, Jen Camp, Michael Gaudio, and Craig Lee. Finally, I am thankful to Raven Cook for her uncompromising example in developing art historic narratives focusing on the experiences of people of color, and her friendship in challenging me as an art historian.

Many other organizations supported portions of my research and writing process. I am very grateful for the Henry Luce Foundation/ACLS Dissertation Fellowship in American Art, which funded the first year of my SI research. The UNC-Chapel Hill Graduate School was instrumental in its completion, providing Tuition Incentive Scholarships each semester, as well as an Off-Campus Dissertation Research Fellowship, a Dissertation Completion Fellowship, and Travel Fund grants, and I appreciate Julie Montaigne’s willingness to accommodate my circumstances in scheduling these awards. The Academy of American Franciscan History provided a generous fellowship and I thank Jeffrey Burns for waiting patiently for the final manuscript. The Newberry Consortium in American Indian Studies Graduate Student Fellowship funded two months of research, and I appreciate Scott Stevens for his help. The Charles E. Peterson Fellowship of the Buildings of the United States and the Athenaeum of Philadelphia incidentally funded research during the summer of 2013, while introducing me to helpful comparative materials in the colonial mid-Atlantic.
Through a New Mexico State History Scholar Fellowship, the Historical Society of New Mexico and Office of the State Historian allowed me to begin archival research at UNM’s Center for Southwest Research (CSWR). I appreciate the help of Rick Hendricks, Rob Martinez, Thomas Shumaker, and Bonnie Coleman from the Office of the State Historian, and those who welcomed me to the CSWR, including Paulita Aguilar, Audra Bellmore, Nancy Brown-Martinez, Christopher Geherin, Tomas Jaehn, Sarah Kostelecky, and Ann Massmann.

I began dissertation research at the Braun Research Library of the Autry National Center, and I have always appreciated the warm hospitality that I received, launching my work with a Visiting Scholar Research Fellowship. I thank Marva Felchlin, Liza Posas, Marilyn Van Winkle, Manola Madrid, and Angel Diaz, as well as the rest of the museum’s staff who made my stay so welcoming. Before beginning my dissertation, UNC-CH’s Institute for the Study of the Americas supported a summer in Mexico City to develop Spanish proficiency, visit mission sites, and explore museum collections. This Pre-Dissertation Field Research Grant, and a Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowship, provided the foundation on which my research developed, and I appreciate the assistance of Beatriz Riefkohl Muniz and Shelley Clarke. While in Mexico, I received the gracious hospitality and support of Queta Rodríguez Zapata, Quezni Domínguez Rodríguez, Luis Enrique Domínguez Rodríguez, Marcos Paz Rodríguez-Navas, and Lorena Acosta Colsa, facilitated by Samantha Earnhardt. Finally, I have been thankful to receive funding for various conferences, including Graduate Student Travel Funds from the UNC-Chapel Hill Department of Art, the UNC-Chapel Hill Medieval and Early Modern Studies Program, and the Latrobe Chapter of the Society of Architectural Historians, from which Jaime Jacobs, Karen Kingsley, Elizabeth Milnarik, and Patricia Waddy were especially supportive.
In addition to these sources of funding and institutions, various archives and collections provided research opportunities. In Tucson, I have counted on the help of Amy Rule and Mary Graham at the Arizona State Museum Archives. At the Western Archaeology and Conservation Center, Brenda McLain, Khaleel Saba, and Matthew Smith facilitated my study of NPS records, while student worker Sharlot Hart located two of the crucial unaccessioned Zuni mission field notebooks for me.

In Santa Fe, the staff of the New Mexico Historic Preservation Division, the Laboratory of Anthropology, and the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture have supported my work in numerous ways. As a researcher, Dedie Snow has been among my greatest allies, supporters, and friends. She has read chapter drafts, provided critical feedback, tracked down historical data, and connected me with like-minded scholars, affirming my credibility as a New Mexico historian, for which I am so grateful. Additionally, Bridget Barela, Gretchen Brock, Diane Bird, Allison Colborne, Janet Dombrowski, Kim Suina Melwani, Steven Moffson, and Jeff Pappas have all been of great assistance. Jake Barrow and Jean Bowley provided access to the Cornerstones Community Partnerships’ archives. Finally, I must thank the Luneros for engaging with me and my work, including Robin Gavin, John Kessell, and Will Wroth, in addition to others already mentioned. To Jake Ivey and Lee Goodwin, I owe a special “Thank You,” not only for creating the intellectual foundation on which my work builds, but also for the generosity of their home and friendship on visits to Santa Fe.

At the American Museum of Natural History, David Hurst Thomas has been generous with his time and information, while Anibal Rodriguez facilitated my visit to collections. The staff of Cornell’s library likewise assisted me in accessing the Hendricks-Hodge materials in their Rare and Manuscript collections. In the mid-Atlantic, I was interested in comparative
examples of hybrid ceramics from the colonial period, and while I did not include this material in the final draft of my dissertation, Dee Deroche was especially helpful in thinking through these ideas. Other assistance came from the Virginia Department of Historic Resources, including Mike Barber, Quatro Hubbard, Lauren Leake, Michael Pulice, Jolene Smith, Marc Wagner, and I also consulted with Steve Davis, Jeff Hantman, and Chris Stevenson on these topics.

Many other people have taken an interest in my research and supported it in various ways. I deeply appreciate the interest of María del Carmen Diez González and her willingness to share her work on Franciscan architecture in Extremadura, as well as to Alejandro Corchado for helping make her acquaintance, and staff at the Biblioteca Central of the Universidad de Extremadura for references. I am likewise thankful to Manuel Paláez del Rosal for helping me obtain important sources, and for inviting my participation in the 2017 Congreso Internacional: El Franciscanismo Hacia América y Oriente, and subsequent publication. In Morocco, I am ever appreciative of Kaouta Boujnane’s friendship, facilitation of visits to her country, discussions of Moroccan culture, and help obtaining images of comparative materials.

Several people shared information and connections to get my dissertation process started, including Lynne Sebastian and Chris Wilson. Others have facilitated access to particular sites in New Mexico, including the friars of St. Michael’s Mission in Arizona; Father Larry Bernard, formerly at Laguna Pueblo; Joanne Sandoval at the Santuario de Chimayo; Ricky-Ray Martínez and family at Las Trampas; and Marina Ochoa of the Archdiocese of Santa Fe Archives. Emily Umberger and Deni Seymour have visited comparative sites with me in New Mexico and Arizona, but more importantly, I appreciate their mentorship, and willingness to bring me into their own research, as well as hospitality during my travels.
Karen Barzman pushed me to develop my ideas about spatiality, food, and women’s roles in the mission community in preparation for her 2015 CAA panel. Emily Talley, Patti Bell, and Kathy Fiero generously shared ongoing research projects about Jesse Nusbaum. Other scholars have contributed to my work through conversation, feedback, or sharing their own research, including: Roger Anyon, Tracy Brown, Trish Capone, Chip Colwell, David Craven, Ed Crocker, Emily Cubbon Ditto, T.J. Ferguson, Bunny Fontana, Gene Friedman, Erik Gustafson, Mark Harlan, Dave Hill, Jess Horton, Keith Kintigh, Steve LeBlanc, Matthew Liebmann, Mike Marshall, Clay Mathers, Barbara Mills, Anna Sermon, Brenda Shears, David Snow, Heather Trigg, and Jim Trott. Additionally, I thank the institutions, museums, archives, and individuals who have given permission for the images comprising my argument.

Finally, I appreciate so much the patience of friends and family, even when it was not clear why this project should be take so long. Along the way, many of you have given me places to stay as well as friendship and thought-provoking conversation, including: Grandma Burgio and Uncle Marc; Steve Duncan and Meri Knoll-Duncan; Kelly Hutton; Michael and Ming-Wai Merschat; Eugenio, Maricel, Laia, and Lael Nalian; Sadye Paez; and Anna and Trevor Schmidt. I thank my parents Kevin and Sandi Ericson for their continued interest in my progress and indulging unexpected requests such as collecting corn pollen, and John and Barbara Burgio for their encouragement. I likewise thank my Swiss family for their ongoing interest in my work: Hans Peter, Jeanette, Katherin, and Konrad Merz and Andreas Staub (who humored me in the hunt for Swiss Rauküchen). I appreciate so much the many friends and communities who have shared parts of this road with me, including the activist community of Northwest Arkansas, who have reaffirmed to me my goals as a revisionist scholar, as well as our many friends in Washington, DC and North Carolina. Most of all, I thank Laurel Burgio-Ericson for her
patience, love, support, advice, and passionate spirit along this winding road, which I would not have traveled with anyone else.

I apologize to anyone whom I may have unintentionally overlooked in this accounting. While I have listened to and learned from many, I alone am responsible for this dissertation’s content and arguments, as well as any errors it may contain.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES..................................................................................................................xxi

LIST OF FIGURES...............................................................................................................xxii

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.................................................................................................lviii

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION..............................................................................................1

  Thesis and Overview........................................................................................................4

  Methodological Framework..............................................................................................8

  The Presence of the Past ................................................................................................11

  Endnotes.........................................................................................................................17

CHAPTER 2: WRITING NEW MEXICO’S MISSIONS..........................................................22

  Territorial-Period Accounts............................................................................................24

  Statehood and the Rhetoric of Tri-Ethnic Harmony.......................................................29

  “Poor New Mexico”: Scholes, Kubler, and Montgomery............................................34

  Refining Perspectives since the Mid-Twentieth Century..............................................46

    Expanding Data..........................................................................................................46

    Rethinking State Bias.................................................................................................47

    James E. Ivey...............................................................................................................50

    Considering Agency.....................................................................................................54

  Conclusions....................................................................................................................60

  Endnotes.........................................................................................................................62
CHAPTER 3: READING MISSION COMMUNITIES .................................................. 84
    Franciscans in Spain and New Spain ....................................................... 85
    Defining Mission Communities .............................................................. 94
    The Composition of the Mission Community ......................................... 101
    Conclusions .................................................................................................. 120
    Endnotes .................................................................................................... 124

CHAPTER 4: THE HISTORY AND CULTURE OF HAWIKKU PUEBLO ............ 142
    Origins and Pre-Hispanic History ............................................................. 143
    Spanish Entradas (1538-1629) ................................................................. 151
    The Town and Architectural Tradition of Hawikku Pueblo ....................... 155
    Missionization (1629-1680) ..................................................................... 164
    Zuni Missions after the Pueblo Revolt (1680-1917) .................................. 178
    Endnotes .................................................................................................... 183

CHAPTER 5: HAWIKKU PUEBLO AND MISSION AS ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES ..... 203
    The Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition ...................................... 205
        Zuni Resistance to Excavating Hawikku ............................................... 208
        Timeline and Objectives of the Hawikku Excavations ............................ 214
    Hodge’s Excavation Methods .................................................................... 219
        Vertical-Face Trenching ......................................................................... 220
        Room Clearing ....................................................................................... 221
        Arbitrary-Level Stratigraphic Trenching ............................................... 223
        Analysis ................................................................................................ 223
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ESTABLISHMENT PHASE OF THE HAWIKKU MISSION</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perea’s Description</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Sub-Foundational Rooms</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Place on the Margin</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>FORMAL CONSTRUCTION OF THE PURÍSIMA CONCEPCIÓN</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building the Purísima Concepción</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Formal Mission Plan</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liturgical Spaces</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convento</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ALTERATIONS TO THE PURÍSIMA CONCEPCIÓN</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alterations to Liturgical Spaces</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southwestern Expansion</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eastern Extension and Renovations</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Alterations</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CLOISTERS AS FRANCISCAN PLACEMAKING IN NEW MEXICO</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Zuni Mission Design</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Cloister Form in Seventeenth-Century New Mexico</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development and Transmission of the Franciscan Cloister Form</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medieval Symbolism and the Cloister Form</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhetorical Construction of New Mexico <em>Conventos</em></td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perea as Millenarian</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benavides, the Pragmatist</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Endnotes</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>FOOD PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION IN THE HAWIKKU <em>CONVENTO</em></td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European Nutritional Theory and Mission Cuisine</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spaces of Food Production</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender and Culinary Labor outside the Kitchen</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spaces and Materiality of Food Consumption in the <em>Convento</em></td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Meetings and Dining in the <em>Trascelda</em></td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Portería</em> Alms for the Needy</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refectory Meals and the Mission Community</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Endnotes</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>CONCLUSIONS</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1 - Selected References to Mission Personnel in Mexican Missions………………… 549
Table 3.2 – New Mexico Mission Personnel Described in Primary Sources……………………550
Table 9.1 – Convento Designs among Pre-Pueblo Revolt New Mexico Missions…………….561
Table 9.2 – Comparison of Known New Mexico Cloister-Plan Conventos……………………573
Table 10.1 – New Mexico Mission Food Disbursements (1672)………………………………..579
Table 10.2 – Convento Refectories and Furnishings in Domínguez…………………………580
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1 – Friars in Refectory ........................................................................................................... 585
Figure 1.2 – Kitchen Showing “Turn” and Cooking Estufa ................................................................. 586
Figure 1.3 – Map of the U.S. Southwest ............................................................................................... 587
Figure 1.4 – Excavated apse of the Purísima Concepción, Hawikku (N04695) .............................. 588
Figure 1.5 – Mission excavation in progress (N05812) ................................................................. 588
Figure 1.6 – Plan of the ruins of Hawikku ........................................................................................... 589
Figure 1.7 – Photomontage of the Hawikku Pueblo ruins, 2011 ..................................................... 589
Figure 2.1 – Buffalo Dance, Pueblo of Zuñi, N.M. ........................................................................ 590
Figure 2.2 – Women Grinding Corn, Zuni Pueblo ........................................................................ 590
Figure 2.3 – Old Mission Church, Zuni Pueblo, N.M. View from the Plaza ................................. 591
Figure 2.4 – Façade and southeastern side of the Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe Mission, Zuni Pueblo, NM ............................................................... 591
Figure 2.5 – Southeastern side of the Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe Mission ......................... 592
Figure 2.6 – Mindeleff map of the Hawikku site ........................................................................ 592
Figure 2.7 – Mindeleff plans of the Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe Mission Church ............... 593
Figure 2.8 – Reconstructed kiva at Alcove House, Frijoles Canyon, NM ..................................... 593
Figure 2.9 – Façade portales of the Palace of the Governors, Santa Fe, NM ............................... 594
Figure 2.10 – Fine Arts Museum, southern corner, Santa Fe, NM ................................................. 594
Figure 2.11 – Plan of San Bernardo mission, Awatovi Pueblo, AZ ................................................ 595
Figure 2.12 – San Bernardo mission site, Awatovi Pueblo, AZ ....................................................... 595
Figure 2.13 – Façade of the Franciscan mission of Santa Barbara, CA ........................................... 596
Figure 2.14 – Franciscan mission of Santa Barbara, CA……………………………………596
Figure 2.15 – Highlighted plan of San Bernardo mission, Awatovi Pueblo, AZ…………597
Figure 2.16 – Plan of San Luis Gonzaga, Baja California, Mexico………………………597
Figure 2.17 – Plan of Los Santos Ángeles, Guavavi, AZ…………………………………598
Figure 2.18 – Panorama of the ruins of Los Santos Ángeles, Guavavi, AZ………………598
Figure 2.19 – Plan of San Francisco de la Espada, San Antonio, TX……………………..599
Figure 2.20 – Plan of San Francisco de la Espada, San Antonio, TX……………………..600
Figure 2.21 – Partially restored *convento* kiva, Quarai Pueblo, NM………………….600
Figure 2.22 – Partially restored *convento* kiva, Abó Pueblo, NM………………………601
Figure 2.23 – Plan of San Gabriel, Cholula, State of Puebla, Mexico………………….601
Figure 2.24 – *Capilla Real* interior, San Gabriel, Cholula, Mexico…………………….602
Figure 3.1 – Exterior, House of the Santo Niño, Zuni Pueblo, NM………………………….602
Figure 3.2 – Benedictine cloister, Saint-Trophîme, Arles, France……………………….603
Figure 3.3 – Benedictine dormitory, Saint-Trophîme, Arles, France…………………..603
Figure 3.4 – Large Cloister, Santa Croce, Florence, Italy…………………………………604
Figure 3.5 – Large cell, San Francisco, Belvís de Monroy, Extremadura, Spain………..604
Figure 3.6 – Cell, San Miguel Arcangel, Huejotzingo, Mexico…………………………605
Figure 3.7 – Cloisters and Pazzi Chapel, Santa Croce, Florence, Italy………………….605
Figure 3.8 – Peña family chapel, San Francisco, Cáceres, Extremadura, Spain………..606
Figure 3.9 – Cells, San Marcos, Florence, Italy, with frescos by Fra Angelico………….606
Figure 3.10 – Mudéjar cloister, Nuestra Señora de Santa María
de la Rábida, Andalucía, Spain……………………………………………………607
Figure 3.11 – Purísima Concepción del Palancar, Pedroso de Acim,
Extremadura, Spain…………………………………………………………………607

xxiii
Figure 3.12 – San Antonio de Padua, Garrovillas de Alconétar, Extremadura, Spain     .608
Figure 3.13 – Convento, San Francisco del Berrocal, Belvís de Monroy, Extremadura, Spain     .608
Figure 3.14 – San Miguel, Huejotzingo, State of Puebla, Mexico                .609
Figure 3.15 – Portería, Nuestra Señora de Santa María de la Rábida, Andalucía, Spain     .609
Figure 3.16 – Portería, San Francisco, Cáceres, Extremadura, Spain     .610
Figure 3.17 – Portería, San Bernardino de Sienna, Xochimilco, Distrito Federal, Mexico     .610
Figure 3.18 – Portería, San Andrés Calpan, State of Puebla, Mexico     .611
Figure 3.19 – Portería, San Esteban del Rey, Acoma Pueblo, NM     .611
Figure 3.20 – Portería, Nuestra Señora de la Purísima Concepción, Quarai Pueblo, NM     .612
Figure 3.21 – Portería, San Buenaventura, Las Humanas Pueblo, NM     .612
Figure 3.22 – Mount Airy, Richmond County, VA     .613
Figure 4.1 – The Hawikku site from its access road to the northeast     .613
Figure 4.2 – The Hawikku site with interpretive trails in 2015     .614
Figure 4.3 – Hawikku Pueblo ruins, looking northeast     .614
Figure 4.4 – “Museum Rock” with sherds and lithics at the Hawikku site     .615
Figure 4.5 – Assorted sherds and lithics on the Hawikku site     .615
Figure 4.6 – Dowa Yalanne Mesa, Zuni Pueblo, NM     .616
Figure 4.7 – Map of Zuni Reservation and settlement sites     .616
Figure 4.8 – Oñate’s 1604-1605 inscription at El Morro, NM     .617
Figure 4.9 – Douar Ait-Imgeur, High Atlas Mountains, Morocco     .617
Figure 4.10 – Plan of the ruins of Hawikku Pueblo     .618
Figure 4.11 – Plan of Hawikku’s Block A     .619
Figure 4.12 – Plan of Hawikku’s Block B………………………………………………..620
Figure 4.13 – Plan of Hawikku’s Block C………………………………………………621
Figure 4.14 – Plan of Hawikku’s Block D………………………………………………622
Figure 4.15 – Plan of Hawikku’s Block E………………………………………………623
Figure 4.16 – Plan of Hawikku’s Block F………………………………………………624
Figure 4.17 – Detail plan of Hawikku’s Block F………………………………………625
Figure 4.18 – Alignments from Housing Block C, Hawikku Pueblo………………626
Figure 4.19 – Remains of late-phase masonry walls, Hawikku Pueblo……………626
Figure 4.20 – Plan of Hawikku’s Block C, construction sequence highlighted…………627
Figure 4.21 – Room 244 (Block C) with mud-plaster finish, Hawikku Pueblo (N06874)…628
Figure 4.22 – Room 180 (Block F) with domestic features, Hawikku Pueblo (N06814)…628
Figure 4.23 – Framing system, Room 220 (Block C), Hawikku Pueblo (N06853)……629
Figure 4.24 – Possible canale, from Room 232 (Block E), Hawikku Pueblo (N06863)…..629
Figure 4.25 – Remnants of a rooftop hatchway, Hawikku Pueblo……………………630
Figure 4.26 – Rooftop ladders and hatchways, Halona Pueblo, 1879…………………630
Figure 4.27 – Post-and-lintel porch structure, adjacent to Room 117 (Block C), Hawikku Pueblo (N06796)……………………………………………………631
Figure 4.28 – Open-air workspace between domestic rooms, Room 140 (Block D), Hawikku Pueblo (N04685)…………………………………………………………631
Figure 4.29 – Room 375 (Block B), Hawikku Pueblo (N07578/N07579)………………632
Figure 4.30 – Zuni utility ware jars (ollas) from Hawikku Pueblo……………………632
Figure 4.31 – Matsaki Polychrome jars from Hawikku Pueblo…………………………633
Figure 4.32– Matsaki Polychrome ladles from Hawikku Pueblo…………………………633
Figure 4.33 – Zuni six-directional cosmos, drawn by Lorenzo Chaves…………………634
Figure 4.34 – Diagram of the six-directional Zuni cosmos ........................................634
Figure 4.35 – Rooftop ladders and hatchways, Zuni Pueblo, NM, 1879........................635
Figure 4.36 – Kiva with ladder, Zuni Pueblo, NM.........................................................635
Figure 4.37 – Problematic inscription from 1620 or 1629 at El Morro, NM..............636
Figure 4.38 – Governor Silva Nieto’s 1629 inscription at El Morro, NM....................637
Figure 4.39 – Inscription of the 1632 punitive expedition, El Morro, NM.................637
Figure 4.40 – Governor de Vargas’s 1692 inscription, El Morro, NM......................638
Figure 4.41 – Interior of the Church of San Miguel [sic], Pueblo of Zuni, N.M., 1851, by Richard H. Kern.................................................................638
Figure 4.42 – Stereograph detail of Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe Mission Church, Zuni Pueblo, NM.............................................................639
Figure 4.43 – Figure of San Miguel, from the altarpiece of Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe Mission Church, Zuni Pueblo, NM.................................639
Figure 4.44 – Figure of San Rafael, from the altarpiece of Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe Mission Church, Zuni Pueblo, NM.................................640
Figure 4.45 – Pueblo de Zuñí, New Mexico, by Richard H. Kern..............................640
Figure 4.46 – Cemetery of Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe Mission, Zuni Pueblo, NM.................641
Figure 4.47 – Façade, Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe Mission Church, prior to restoration in 1966, Zuni Pueblo, NM.............................................641
Figure 4.48 – Ruins of the Purísima Concepción site, looking southeast.................642
Figure 4.49 – Ruins of the Purísima Concepción site, looking west........................642
Figure 4.50 – Ruins of the Purísima Concepción site, looking southeast..................643
Figure 4.51 – Ruins of the Purísima Concepción site, looking southwest...............643
Figure 4.52 – Adobe House built from bricks scavenged from the Hawikku Church, Ojo Caliente, NM (N07420)..............................644
Figure 5.1 – Halona Plaza, Zuni Pueblo, NM..............................................................644
Figure 5.2 – “Hawikku: Echoes from Our Ancestors,” exhibit, A:shiwi A:wan Museum and Heritage Center, Zuni Pueblo, NM…………………………… 645

Figure 5.3 – Detail of Mindeleff Map of Hawikku, showing the mission ruins……………… 645

Figure 5.4 – Nineteenth-century sherds from Hawikku Pueblo, NM………………………… 646

Figure 5.5 – In the Monastery (Frederick W. Hodge), by Zahrah Preble, 1923…………… 646

Figure 5.6 – Untitled (George Gustav Heye and Frederick W. Hodge in Zuni Pueblo)……… 647

Figure 5.7 – Modern Masonry House Called the Cushing House, A. C. Vroman, 1899……… 647

Figure 5.8 – Portrait of Gaialito, Jesse L. Nusbaum……………………………………………… 648

Figure 5.9 – Camp Scene. View Looking West, 1918…………………………………………… 648

Figure 5.10 – Untitled photographs of Frederick W. Hodge with Jesse L. Nusbaum (left) and Aileen Nusbaum (right)…………………………………………………………. 649

Figure 5.11 – Plan of the circular kivas west of Hawikku, NM……………………………… 649

Figure 5.12 – Plaza Trench (N07428)………………………………………………………………….. 650

Figure 5.13 – Roof of the square kiva in the Hawikku Pueblo plaza (N07441)……………. 650

Figure 5.14 – Owen Cattell and Donald A. Cadzow filming “Ninita” weaving, 1923……… 651

Figure 5.15 – “Church and Monastery” field notebook by Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919………. 651

Figure 5.16 – Frederick W. Hodge and workmen excavating a vertical-face trench………. 652

Figure 5.17 – Frederick Webb Hodge and assistants excavate deposit in 1923………………. 652

Figure 5.18 – Western side of the Hawikku promontory, with backdirt and trench from cemetery excavations still in place……………………………………………………………. 653

Figure 5.19 – Detail of map combining surveyed plans and burial sites on the western side of Hawikku Pueblo……………………………………………………………………………….. 653

Figure 5.20 – Room clearing in progress, Block C (N06888)……………………………………… 654

Figure 5.21 – Room clearing in progress, Block B (N07472)……………………………………… 654

Figure 5.22 – Cleared domestic space, Room 203, Block C (N06833) …………………… 655
Figure 5.23 – Remnants of Hodge’s plaza trench, 2014.................................655
Figure 5.24 – Cross-section illustration of Nacoochee Mound, White County, GA..........656
Figure 5.25 – *View of Pueblo Ruins, One of the Seven Cities of Cibola*,  
A. C. Vroman, 1899.................................................................656
Figure 5.26 – Portraits of Tilina and Kanta, by Jesse L. Nusbaum...............................657
Figure 5.27 – Section of fill in the Hawikku church nave (N04701)..............................657
Figure 5.28 – *Sotocoro* posts with pedestals and fill, Hawikku church (N05752)..........658
Figure 5.29 – *Entrance to Church, Hawikuh* [Hawikku], by Zahrah Preble c. 1923.......658
Figure 5.30 – Altar deconstruction in progress (P11804).........................................659
Figure 5.31 – Altar deconstruction in progress (P11809).........................................659
Figure 5.32 – Plan of the Purísima Concepción *convento* excavations in progress,  
by Jesse L. Nusbaum...............................................................660
Figure 5.33 – Excavation sketch of the Purísima Concepción mission, showing ongoing  
excavations on October 6, 1919.....................................................660
Figure 5.34 – Panorama of the excavated ruins of the Purísima Concepción mission,  
from the southeast (N07211/N07213)..................................................661
Figure 5.35 – Site of the Hawikku mission, looking southeast, with backdirt berms.......662
Figure 5.36 – Excavation sketch of the Purísima Concepción church, October 10, 1919...662
Figure 5.37 – Excavation sketch of the Hawikku *convento* service patio,  
October 10, 1919.................................................................663
Figure 5.38 – Stratigraphic sketch of test pit in the service patio.................................663
Figure 5.39 – Completion of the excavation of Room 32/272 in 1920 (N06776)...............664
Figure 5.40 – Hawikku Site Map for Block B, probably by Ed Coffin.........................664
Figure 5.41 – Detail of Block F and Purisima Concepción ruins, from “Base Map  
to Scale of Contour Map”.............................................................665
Figure 5.42 – Plan of the Purísima Concepción mission, by Louis Schellbach with  
annotations by Watson Smith..........................................................665
Figure 5.43 – Plan of the Purísima Concepción mission, as published…………………666
Figure 5.44 – Legal pad drawing of plan of the Purísima Concepción church………………667
Figure 5.45 – Convento patio pit, from “Church and Monastery,” 142…………………667
Figure 5.46 – Church and Monastery of Hawikuh [Hawikku], Edward S. Curtis…………668
Figure 5.47 – Monastery-Hawikuh [Hawikku], by Zahrah Preble, 1923…………………668
Figure 5.48 – Hodge beneath the ramada in the Hawikuh camp, note the jumble of broken pottery awaiting repair. What a job!, by Zahrah Preble, 1923………669
Figure 5.49 – Hawikku artifacts boxed for shipment, 1919 (N08957)……………………669
Figure 5.50 – Ranges containing Hawikku’s artifacts at the NMAI CRC, 2016……………670
Figure 6.1 – Hawikku Site, from southeast, 2015…………………………………………670
Figure 6.2 – Sub-foundational Room 35 (N05810)……………………………………671
Figure 6.3 – Detail plan of sub-foundational rooms (Block F)………………………………671
Figure 6.4 – Detail of N05750, showing sub-foundational features……………………672
Figure 6.5 – Sub-foundational Room 33 (N05809)……………………………………672
Figure 6.6 – Excavation sketch of Room 33………………………………………………673
Figure 6.7 – Room 33 assemblage, traditionally styled ceramic artifacts…………………673
Figure 6.8 – Room 33 assemblage, deep bowl with flat bottom (096985.000)……………674
Figure 6.9 – Room 33 assemblage, hybrid ceramic vessels……………………………674
Figure 6.10 – Profiles of complete soup plates from Room 33…………………………675
Figure 6.11 – Profiles of San Bernardo hybrid ceramic sherds, Room 33…………………675
Figure 6.12 – Map of sites in the Hopi area………………………………………………676
Figure 6.13 – Sikyatki Polychrome Jar……………………………………………………676
Figure 6.14- Hawikku mission from the northern corner, with Room 32 in the foreground (N05750)…………………………………………………………677
Figure 6.15 – Slumping pit of the unfilled Room 32 in 2014……………………..677
Figure 6.16 – Spanish botilla from Room 32 (096961.000)……………………..678
Figure 6.16 – Excavation sketch of the plan and profile of Rooms 33 and 34, from “Church and Monastery,” 133………………………………………..678
Figure 6.17 – Ceremonial pathway out of the central dance plaza, Zuni Pueblo, 2017……679
Figure 7.1 – Facade, San José y San Miguel de Aguayo, San Antonio, TX…………..679
Figure 7.2 – Exterior, San Juan Capistrano, San Antonio, TX………………………680
Figure 7.3 – Exterior, San Esteban, Acoma Pueblo, NM……………………………680
Figure 7.4 – Detail of cours ed mud walls, Great House of Casa Grande, AZ………………681
Figure 7.5 – Adobe brick from the Purísima Concepción (093634.000)………………681
Figure 7.6 – Adobe brick from the Purísima Concepción (093634.001)………………682
Figure 7.7 – Wooden digging stick from Zuni Pueblo (120788.000)…………………682
Figure 7.8 – Digging stick impressions in adobe bricks from Hawikku mission………..683
Figure 7.9 – Examples of English-bond masonry from Hawikku mission……………..683
Figure 7.10– Deconstructed foundation of the high altar of the Purísima Concepción (N05751)…………………………………………………………….684
Figure 7.11 – Example of Flemish bond pattern, Vauter’s Church, Essex County, VA…..684
Figure 7.12 – Reconstructed adobe walls and earthen roof, modelled after the village of Abu Hamid, Jordan Museum, Ammon……………………….685
Figure 7.13 – Rooftops, Aït-Ben-Haddou, Ouarzazate Province, Morocco……………..685
Figure 7.14– Interior, earthen roof, Kasbah Aït Ougrame, Aït-Ben-Haddou, Ouarzazate Province, Morocco……………………………………686
Figure 7.15 – Apse of the Purísima Concepción mission (N04697)…………………..686
Figure 7.16 – Detail of rotted wood, Room 9 of the Hawikku convento (N05773)……..687
Figure 7.17 – Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe mission and Cathedral of Ciudad Juárez………………………………………………………………………687
Figure 7.18 – Interior, Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe Mission, Ciudad Juárez, Chihuahua State, Mexico…………………………………………………688

Figure 7.19 – Carved viga from Oraibi, AZ, reused in the Antelope Kiva………………… 688

Figure 7.20 – Drawing of carved viga from the Hawikku mission…………………………… 689

Figure 7.21 – Architectural panel with carved ornament, from the Pecos mission………689

Figure 7.22 – Ceiling of the Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe Mission, Ciudad Juarez, Chihuahua State, Mexico…………………………………………………690

Figure 7.23 – Carved wooden cornice and corbels, Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe Mission, Ciudad Juarez, Chihuahua State, Mexico…………………690

Figure 7.24 – Painted roof beam from Zuni Pueblo (124525.000)……………………………691

Figure 7.25 – Fragment of painted wood from the Hawikku convento (095685.000)……………………………………………………………………………691

Figure 7.26 – Detail of windows from the Halona mission……………………………………692

Figure 7.27 – Remnant of door with pintle hinge, Halona Mission…………………………692

Figure 7.28 – Wooden frame and shutter from Zuni Pueblo (120776.000)…………………………693

Figure 7.29 – Fragments of iron nails, Purísima Concepción mission church (095611.000)………………………………………………………………………693

Figure 7.30 – Fragments of iron nails, Hawikku convento (095671.000)………………694

Figure 7.31 – Iron hook from the Purísima Concepción mission church (095614.000)…..694

Figure 7.32 – Iron bolt with conical head from the Purísima Concepción mission church (095615.000)……………………………………………………695

Figure 7.33 – Long-iron object, possibly a strap hinge (095616.000)…………………………695

Figure 7.34 – Iron eyelets from the Hawikku convento (095670.000)…………………………696

Figure 7.35 – Unidentified iron fragment, Purísima Concepción mission church (095612.000)………………………………………………………………………696

Figure 7.36 – Choir loft and sotocoro of the Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe Mission, Ciudad Juárez, Chihuahua, State, Mexico……………………………………697
Figure 7.37 – Details of carved columns supporting choir loft, Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe Mission, Ciudad Juárez, Chihuahua State, Mexico…………697

Figure 7.38 – Sotocoro and mural painting, San Xavier del Bac, Tohono O’odham San Xavier Indian Reservation, AZ…………………………………….698

Figure 7.39 – Details of original mission fireplaces, Hawikku convento……………698

Figure 7.40 – Kitchen hearth, Purísima Concepción, El Palancar, Extremadura, Spain……699

Figure 7.41 – Spanish-style corner fireplaces in pueblos of northern New Mexico, Hooded Fireplace and Frances Canyon Ruins………………………………699

Figure 7.42 – Plan of roof levels and fireplace flues, Hawikku mission…………………700

Figure 7.43 – Details of secondary mission-phase fireplaces with slab linings, Hawikku convento…………………………………………………………..700

Figure 7.44 – Details of post-mission spur-wall fireplaces, Hawikku convento…………701

Figure 7.45 – Atrium of the Purísima Concepción mission (N06777)…………………………701

Figure 7.46 – Plan of the initial construction of formal phase of the Purísima Concepción mission of Hawikku Pueblo………………………………………………….702

Figure 7.47 – Atrium space today, looking northeast………………………………………703

Figure 7.48 – View of façade of the Purísima Concepción (N05745)……………………………703

Figure 7.49 – Pre-Hispanic temple remains beneath Nuestra Señora de los Remedios, Cholula, State of Puebla, Mexico………………………………………704

Figure 7.50 – Façade, San Luis Obispo, Tlalmanalco, Morelos State, Mexico………………704

Figure 7.51 – Plan of Santa Maria degli Angeli and Porziuncola, Assisi, Italy……………705

Figure 7.52 – Exterior, Purísima Concepción of El Palancar, Extremadura, Spain…………705

Figure 7.53 – Plan of liturgical spaces of the Purísima Concepción, Hawikku………………706

Figure 7.54 – Hawikuh Polychrome bowl with feathered gourd (096983.000)………………706

Figure 7.55 – Conjectural reconstruction of the Purísima Concepción of Hawikku façade, by Ross G. Montgomery…………………………………………………707

Figure 7.56 – Façade, Nuestra Señora de la Asunción, Zia Pueblo…………………………707
Figure 7.57 – Balcony, Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe Mission, Zuni Pueblo, NM ……….. 708

Figure 7.58 – Doorway, San Esteban Mission Church, Acoma Pueblo, NM …………….. 708

Figure 7.59 – Interior, San Esteban del Rey church, looking towards the choir ………….. 709

Figure 7.60 – Painted beam and latillas, from the choir loft, Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe Mission, Zuni Pueblo, NM ……………………………………… 709

Figure 7.61 – Sanctuary end, Purísima Concepción church (N04699) ………………….. 710

Figure 7.62 – Inaccurate drawing of mural paintings, from Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, The Excavation, 27 ……………………………………… 710

Figure 7.63 – Reconstruction drawing of nave mural pattern …………………………… 711

Figure 7.64 – Detail of nave murals, along epistle side subsidiary altar, Purísima Concepción church (N04698) ……………………………………… 711

Figure 7.65 – Detail of nave murals, along epistle side subsidiary altar, Purísima Concepción church (N04699) ……………………………………… 712

Figure 7.66 – Detail of nave murals, along epistle side Purísima Concepción church (N04701) …………………………………………………………… 712

Figure 7.67 – Detail of nave murals, on the epistle side of the sotocoro, Purísima Concepción church (N05808) ……………………………………… 713

Figure 7.68 – Sanctuary of the Purísima Concepción (N04693) ……………………….. 713

Figure 7.69 – Original altar of the Purísima Concepción (N04692) …………………….. 714

Figure 7.70 – Sanctuary of the Purísima Concepción (N04694) ……………………….. 714

Figure 7.71 – Gospel-side newel post in situ, Purísima Concepción (N04700) ………… 715

Figure 7.72 – Profile drawing of the Gospel-side newel post by Jesse L. Nusbaum …………………………………………………………………. 715

Figure 7.73 – Ground selenite pieces, Hawikku Pueblo (124817.000) ………………… 716

Figure 7.74 – Cut pieces of mica from the altar and stairs of the Purísima Concepción … 716

Figure 7.75 – Apse and altar, Purísima Concepción mission church (N04696) ………… 717
Figure 7.76 – Sketch of artifacts from the sanctuary step, by Jesse L. Nusbaum.............717
Figure 7.77 – Fragments of small wooden cross with selenite ornament (094026.000)......718
Figure 7.78 – Charred remnants of wooden picture frame (093989.000)......................718
Figure 7.79 – Ground sandstone slab from in front of the altar (095610.000)..............719
Figure 7.80 – Details of ground, broken slabs from the Purísima Concepción sanctuary…719
Figure 7.81 – Large Hawikuh Polychrome bowl from the altar steps (095641.000)........720
Figure 7.82 – Small buff-colored Plainware bowl (095639.000)............................720
Figure 7.83 – Small red-colored Plainware bowl (095640.000)............................721
Figure 7.84 – Partially excavated sanctuary steps and nave floor (N04698)..............721
Figure 7.85 – Detail of sherds and wooden artifacts on the sanctuary steps (N04698)......722
Figure 7.86 – Pair of wooden processional candlesticks from
Zuni Pueblo mission (188578.000)........................................722
Figure 7.87 – Cut copper ornament from the Purísima Concepción
mission church (095666.000).................................................723
Figure 7.88 – Fragment of cast bronze from the Purísima Concepción
mission church (095628.000).................................................723
Figure 7.89 – Melted glass from the Purísima Concepción church (095627.000)........724
Figure 7.90 – Wooden cross from the Purísima Concepción church (094024.000)......724
Figure 7.91 – Iron table knife from the Purísima Concepción church (095613.000)......725
Figure 7.92 – Purísima Concepción baptistery (N05805).....................................725
Figure 7.93 – Purísima Concepción baptistery (N05806).....................................726
Figure 7.94 – Purísima Concepción baptistery (N05807).....................................726
Figure 7.95 – View through the sotocoro entryway to the Purísima
Concepción baptistery (N05808)..............................................727
Figure 7.96 – Detail of the pedestal of the Purísima Concepción baptistery font
(N05807).............................................................................727
Figure 7.97 – Unornamented baptismal font (096962.000)………………………………………728
Figure 7.98 – Ceramic font, from the Hospital de San Lázaro, Seville, Spain…………………728
Figure 7.99 – Purísima Concepción sacristy (Room 21, N05788)…………………………729
Figure 7.100 – Looking through the sacristy doorway into Room 21 (N05789)………………729
Figure 7.101 – Detail of sill from the sacristy doorway (N05789)……………………………..730
Figure 7.102 – Detail of sill into sacristy (N05791)………………………………………………730
Figure 7.103 – Looking northwest at the sacristy (Room 21 with burnt timbers (N05791)……………………………………………………………………………731
Figure 7.104 – Partially excavated sacristy (Room 21, N05787)……………………………731
Figure 7.105 – Charred remnant of carved wooden cornice from the Purísima Concepción sacristy (095667.000)……………………………………………………………732
Figure 7.106 – Painted and carved cornice in the main cloister at the convento of Santa María de las Ángeles, Churubusco, Mexico……………………………………732
Figure 7.107 – Details of burnt roofing timbers from Room 21…………………………………733
Figure 7.108 – Detail of a painted dado in the Purísima Concepción sacristy (Room 21, N05791)………………………………………………………………………………733
Figure 7.109 – Detail sketch of painted border from the sacristy doorway, by Jesse L. Nusbaum………………………………………………………………………………………734
Figure 7.110 – Detail of uncollected artifacts from Room 21 (N05786)…………………………734
Figure 7.111 – Burnt wooden ornamental pieces from the Purísima Concepción sacristies (095677.000/095677.001)……………………………………………………………735
Figure 7.112 – Burnt wooden artifacts from the Purísima Concepción (093992.000/095675.000/095674.000/095676.000)……………………………………………………………735
Figure 7.113 – Burnt wooden planks from the Purísima Concepción (095679.000/095683.000)………………………………………………………………………………………736
Figure 7.114 – Burnt wooden fragments with grooved rails, probably from furniture (095678.000)………………………………………………………………………………736
Figure 7.115 – Burnt fragment of a wooden disc-like form (095678.000)……………………737
Figure 7.116 – Red-colored Plainware soup plate, from the Purísima Concepción mission sacristy (Room 21, 096969.000)……………………………………737

Figure 7.117 – Brown-colored Plainware candle holder, from the Purísima Concepción mission sacristy (Room 21, 096972.000)……………………………………738

Figure 7.118 – Large Hawikuh Polychrome jar, from the Purísima Concepción mission sacristy (Room 21, 096987.000)……………………………………738

Figure 7.119 – Large Hawikuh Polychrome jar, from the Purísima Concepción mission sacristy (Room 21, 096988.000)……………………………………739

Figure 7.120 – Detail of sacristy (Room 21) with ceramic candle holder visible on wall in the background (N05789)……………………………………739

Figure 7.121 – Benedictine Plan of St. Gall……………………………………………….740

Figure 7.122 – Panorama of the front range of the Purísima Concepción convento (N05746, N05748)…………………………………………………………741

Figure 7.123 – Open patio of the San Esteban Mission convento, 1976……………742

Figure 7.124 – Circular pit from southeastern corner of patio, Purísima Concepción convento (N07210)…………………………………………………………742

Figure 7.125 – Matsaki Polychrome sink, from the patio courtyard (096960.000)….743

Figure 7.126 – Front range of the Purísima Concepción convento (N05811)…………743

Figure 7.127 – View of the side range of the Purísima Concepción convento (N05739)….744

Figure 7.128 – View of the back range of the Purísima Concepción convento (N05738)…744

Figure 7.129 – Ambulatory corridors of the San Esteban convento, Acoma Pueblo……745

Figure 7.130 – Excavation of southwest ambulatory corridor in progress (N05740)……745

Figure 7.131 – Charred remnant of furniture leg from Room 10 (095669.000)………746

Figure 7.132 – Red-colored Plainware candle holder from Room 11 (096974.000)………..746

Figure 7.133 – Convento stairwell (Room 29) with sandstone paving (N05800)…………747

Figure 7.134 – Excavation of convento stairway of Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe Mission, Zuni Pueblo, NM…………………………………………………747
Figure 7.135 – Excavation sketch of the convento stairway, Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe Mission, Zuni Pueblo, NM……………………………………………….748

Figure 7.136 – Excavation of convento north corner, Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe Mission, Zuni Pueblo, NM……………………………………………….748

Figure 7.137 – Southeastern side of Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe mission, during 2015 Harvest Dance, Zuni Pueblo, NM…………………………………….749

Figure 7.138 – Red and white mural paint from the convento dados of the Hawikku mission (095690.000/095689.000).…………………………………….749

Figure 7.139 – Red-colored Plainware canteen, from the Purísima Concepción portería (Room 36, 096977.000)…………………………………………….750

Figure 7.140 – Hawikuh Polychrome bowl, from the Purísima Concepción portería (096984.000)……………………………………………………………750

Figure 7.141 – Grooved ax, from the Purísima Concepción portería (095653.000)……….751

Figure 7.142 – Grooved ax, from the Purísima Concepción portería (095654.000)……….751

Figure 7.143 – Friar’s cell (Room 22) from the Hawikku convento (N05792)………… 752

Figure 7.144 – Detail of trascelda doorway and window, blocked up (N05792)……….752

Figure 7.145 – Painted sherd from Room 22 (detail of N05792)………………………….753

Figure 7.146 – Lizard-like petroglyphs, El Morro National Monument, NM…………….753

Figure 7.147 – Stages of construction and alteration, Room 2/3/4/19……………………….754

Figure 7.148 – Part of the celda, Room 2, looking south (N05763)……………………….755

Figure 7.149 – Room 19, looking southwest towards blocked-up door (N05783)……….755

Figure 7.150 – Post-mission occupation of Room 3, with blocked-up window at the far end (N05765)……………………………………………………….756

Figure 7.151 – Sketch of Room 19 Plan, by Jesse L. Nusbaum…………………………….756

Figure 7.152 – Unplastered Zuni smoke hoods…………………………………………….757

Figure 7.153 – Fogon-style heath with slab-lined flue, San José mission, Laguna Pueblo, NM………………………………………………………………….757
Figure 7.154 – Rooms 7 and 9, side range, Hawikku convento (N05771)………………..758

Figure 7.155 – View of Hawikku convento, looking west, with Room 9 in the foreground (N05737)…………………………………………………………..758

Figure 7.156 – Room 9A, looking northeast (N05772)……………………………………..759

Figure 7.157 – Room 9B, looking south, with post-mission partition (N05775)…………..759

Figure 7.158 – Detail of Room 9 post-mission partition wall with artifacts on top (N05773)……………………………………………………………………..760

Figure 7.159 – Fragment of a polychromed ceramic candle holder with helical base, from Room 373, level 1 (109227.000-2)………………………………………..760

Figure 7.160 – Sandstone mortar, post-mission phase of Room 9 (095645.000)…………..761

Figure 7.161 – Convento kitchen (Room 13) of the Purísima Concepción (N05777)……..761

Figure 7.162 – Doorway and sill of the convento kitchen (N05776)………………………….762

Figure 7.163 – Detail of doorway sill and convento kitchen (N05779)………………………..762

Figure 7.164 – Southwest range of the convento (N05741)………………………………..763

Figure 7.165 – Ambulatory doorway to Room 14/17/18 (N05781)…………………………..763

Figure 7.166 – Detail of ambulatory doorway to Room 14/17/18, with ground hole in the slab (N05781)…………………………………………………………………..764

Figure 7.167 – Spatial arrangement of the Purísima Concepción……………………………..765

Figure 8.1 – Plan of the Purísima Concepción, with alterations and additions………………..766

Figure 8.2 – Plan of the Purísima Concepción, with alterations highlighted…………………..767

Figure 8.3 – Purísima Concepción mission site in 2011, looking southwest through the nave……………………………………………………………………..768

Figure 8.4 – Remains of the retaining wall in 2011, Purísima Concepción mission………..768

Figure 8.5 – Remains of the retaining wall in 2011, Purísima Concepción mission………..769

Figure 8.6 – Detail of the retaining wall, showing two wythes of its construction, Purísima Concepción mission…………………………………………………..769
Figure 8.7 – Panorama of the Purísima Concepción ruins, 1919 (N05747, N05749)……770

Figure 8.8 – Floor and entryway of sacristy addition (Room 25), Purísima Concepción mission (N05786)……………………………………………………………771

Figure 8.9 – Sacristy addition and antesacristy (Rooms 25 and 21), Purísima Concepción mission (N05742)……………………………………………………………771

Figure 8.10 – Detail of fire-damaged viga section from the ceiling of the sacristy addition (Room 25, N05803)……………………………………………………………772

Figure 8.11 - Raised platform at the southwest end of the sacristy addition (Room 25, N05799)………………………………………………………………………772

Figure 8.12 – Pit at the southwest end of Room 25 with burnt wooden artifacts (N05797)………………………………………………………………………………773

Figure 8.13 – Sketch of plan and cross-section of Room 25, by Jesse L. Nusbaum………………773

Figure 8.14 – Ross G. Montgomery’s speculative, inaccurate reconstruction of Room 25 with a full-scale retablo………………………………………………………774

Figure 8.15 – Wooden sacristy cabinets, Cathedral of Mexico City……………………………774

Figure 8.16 – Wooden sacristy cabinets, Nuestra Señora del Carmen, Colegio de San Ángel, Distrito Federal, Mexico……………………………………………………775

Figure 8.17 – Wooden slab with cut mortices from Room 25 (095684.000)………………775

Figure 8.18 – Wooden picture frame and charcoal in the pit behind the dais of Room 25 (N05798)……………………………………………………………………776

Figure 8.19 – Wooden picture frame, from the pit behind the dais of Room 25 (095681.000)……………………………………………………………………………776

Figure 8.20 – Details of painted mural remnants in Room 25 (N05804)……………………777

Figure 8.21 – Detail of doorway and bonding seam of the northwest wall of the Purísima Concepción sacristy extension (Room 25, N05738)…………………777

Figure 8.22 – Northern corner of Purísima Concepción sacristy extension (Room 25) showing mural painting and doorway to Room 30 (N05803)…………………778

Figure 8.23 – Northwestern wall of the sacristy extension (Room 25) showing mural painting and doorway to Room 30 (N05803)…………………778
Figure 8.24 – Grooved actinolite ax from Room 25 (095652.000)……………….779
Figure 8.25 – Burnt Hawikuh Polychrome jar, from Room 25 (096989.000)……………779
Figure 8.26 – Polychrome candle holder from Room 25 (096971.000)…………………780
Figure 8.27 – Lusterware soup plate, from Room 25 (096965.000)………………………780
Figure 8.28 – Charred artifacts on the floor of Room 30 (N05801)……………………781
Figure 8.29 – Charred artifacts on the floor of Room 30 (N05802)………………………781
Figure 8.30 – Sketch of the artifact assemblage of Room 30, by Jesse L. Nusbaum………782
Figure 8.31 – Charred wooden candlestick, from Room 30 (095668.000)…………………782
Figure 8.32 – Charred wooden column and sketch of the column, from Room 30
(095642.000)………………………………………………………………………….783
Figure 8.33 – Red-colored Plainware candle holder, from Room 30 (096973.000)………784
Figure 8.34 – San Bernardo Polychrome Saltcellar from Room 30 (096970.000)…………784
Figure 8.35 – Red-colored Plainware bowl with round bottom, from Room 30
(096978.000)…………………………………………………………………………….785
Figure 8.36 – Cylindrical marble base with central drilled hole, conical insert,
and woven covering, from Room 30 (095682.000)……………………………………785
Figure 8.37 – Detail of the service patio area, looking southwest (N04697)………………786
Figure 8.38 – Looking southwest from the apse of the Purísima Concepción, with
raised stone alignments of the service patio (N04704)………………………………786
Figure 8.39 – Detail of panorama showing the partially excavated back walls of
the service patio (N07211-N07213)…………………………………………………787
Figure 8.40 – Crushed fragment of small copper bell, from the service patio area
(096955.000)…………………………………………………………………………….787
Figure 8.41 – Ceramic fragments from the service patio area (096958.000/096957.000)
………………………………………………………………………………………………788
Figure 8.42 – Two grooved groundstone axes from the service patio area (095649.000)…788
Figure 8.43 – Two brown-colored Plainware spoons from the service patio area
(096959.000)..................................................................................789

Figure 8.44 – Overgrown mount of the Purísima Concepción mission site prior to
evacuations in 1917 (N01913).................................................................789

Figure 8.45 – Grinding Room (Room 5), eastern addition to the convento (N05769).......790

Figure 8.46 – Storage or residential room (Room 6), eastern addition to the convento
(N05770)................................................................................................790

Figure 8.47 – Southeastern side of the Purísima Concepción site, with the remains
of a berm of backdirt and hypothetical eastern addition.........................791

Figure 8.48 – Stairwell to the eastern addition (Room 1) with post-mission
occupations (N05761)...........................................................................791

Figure 8.49 – Stairwell to the eastern addition (Room 1) with post-mission
occupations (N05757)...........................................................................792

Figure 8.50 – Detail of English-bond partition wall, inserted into Room 7 to create
Room 1 stairwell space...........................................................................792

Figure 8.51 – Profile drawing of the Room 1 stairwell, by Jesse L. Nusbaum.........793

Figure 8.52 – Stairwell to the eastern addition (Room 1) with post-mission
occupation fireplace (N05760)..............................................................793

Figure 8.53 – Detail of Room 19 renovation fireplace and door jamb (N05783).........794

Figure 8.54 – Detail of artifacts on the walls between Rooms 4, 18, and 8 (N05744).....794

Figure 8.55 – View of the eastern corner and southeastern range of the
Hawikku convento (N05743)..................................................................795

Figure 8.56 – View of the eastern corner and southeastern range of the
Hawikku convento (N05744)..................................................................795

Figure 8.57 – Rooms 17 and 18 in the foreground, with excavations or Room 21
in the background (N05813)..................................................................796

Figure 8.58 – Room 18, looking southeast (N05782).........................................796

Figure 8.59 – San Esteban, Acoma Pueblo, with church and two-story convento.........797

Figure 8.60 – Portería with carved wooden posts, San Ildefonso mission, 1889.........797
Figure 8.61 – Plaza del Cerro, Chimayo, NM…………………………………………………………798

Figure 8.62 – Spatial arrangement of the Purísima Concepción, after renovations and additions………………………………………………………………………………799

Figure 9.1 – The Conquest of Tunis, by Wilhem Pannemakere……………………………800

Figure 9.2 – Forma y Levantado de La Ciudad de Mexico por la correspondencia de los numeros se halan en esta copie loss conuentos y cosas enalados, by Juan Gómez de Trasmonte……………………………………800

Figure 9.3 – Pueblo of Zuni, Plan of Middle Village…………………………………………………………801

Figure 9.4 – Zuni Pueblo from the north……………………………………………………………………801

Figure 9.5 – South side of Zuni Pueblo……………………………………………………………………802

Figure 9.6 – Façade and camposanto of Zuni Pueblo’s mission……………………………………802

Figure 9.7 – Excavation of the convento of the Zuni Pueblo mission……………………………………803

Figure 9.8 – Excavation of the church nave, Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe, Zuni Pueblo, NM…………………………………………………………………………803

Figure 9.9 – Plan of Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe, Zuni Pueblo, NM, at the time of excavations in 1966, and the original archaeological remains……………………………………804

Figure 9.10 – Comparison of the Hawikku and Halona mission plans……………………805

Figure 9.11 – Comparison of the Kechiba:wa Pueblo visita chapel, San Bernardo (Awatovi, AZ), and San Carlos Borromeo (Carmel, CA)…………………………………………………………806

Figure 9.12 – Arial view of Zuni Pueblo, detail of mission excavations in progress…………807

Figure 9.13 – Choir loft and nave, prior to excavation, Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe, Zuni Pueblo, NM………………………………………………………………………………807

Figure 9.14 – Plan of Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe, Zuni Pueblo, NM…………………………808

Figure 9.15 – Excavation of the nave and apse, Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe, Zuni Pueblo, NM………………………………………………………………………………809

Figure 9.16 – Detail of choir loft construction, Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe, Zuni Pueblo, NM………………………………………………………………………………809
Figure 9.17 – Blocked-up doorway to the sacristy, Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe, Zuni Pueblo, NM………………………………………………………………………810

Figure 9.18 – Doorway from the sotocoro to the baptistery, looking southeast into the church, Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe, Zuni Pueblo, NM………………….810

Figure 9.19 – Excavated plan of the convento, Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe, Zuni Pueblo, NM………………………………………………………………………811

Figure 9.20 – Detail of the façade and remnants of the convento, Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe, Zuni Pueblo, after Richard H. Kern’s sketch…………………………811

Figure 9.21 – Details of the stairwell tower, Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe, Zuni Pueblo, NM………………………………………………………………………812

Figure 9.22 – Halona convento during excavations, looking northeast…………………812

Figure 9.23 – Excavation of the friar’s cell in the east corner of the convento during excavations, Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe, Zuni Pueblo, NM…………………813

Figure 9.24 – East corner of the convento during excavations, Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe, Zuni Pueblo, NM……………………………………………………813

Figure 9.25 – Detail of Test Pit 5, with foundations, Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe, Zuni Pueblo, NM……………………………………………………………………814

Figure 9.26 – Ohhewa kiva with ladders, Zuni Pueblo, NM…………………………….814

Figure 9.27 – South corner of the convento during excavations, Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe, Zuni Pueblo, NM……………………………………………………815

Figure 9.28 – Façade of San Carlos del Río Carmel, Monterrey, CA……………………815

Figure 9.29 – Baptistery of the unfinished church of San Buenaventura, Las Humanas Pueblo, NM………………………………………………………………………816

Figure 9.30 – Alignment of the Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe Church towards the summer solstice sunrise, Zuni Pueblo, NM………………………………………816

Figure 9.31 – Comparison of the Hawikku and Halona mission plans, illustrating the process of doubling the square……………………………………………………817

Figure 9.32 – Plan of the San Esteban del Rey mission, Acoma Pueblo, NM………….817

Figure 9.33 – Plan of the San Esteban convento, Acoma Pueblo, NM…………………818
Figure 9.34 – Patio looking southeast, San Esteban, Acoma Pueblo, NM

Figure 9.35 – View of convento of San Esteban, looking north, Acoma Pueblo, NM

Figure 9.36 – North stratigraphic test pit, San Esteban, Acoma Pueblo, NM

Figure 9.37 – Plan view of features of south stratigraphic test area, patio of San Esteban, Acoma Pueblo, NM

Figure 9.38 – Plan of San Guillermo, Totolapan, Morelos, Mexico

Figure 9.39 – Acoma convento with latrine in southwest corner

Figure 9.40 – Illustrations of horsemen from mural paintings of the ambulatory of San Esteban, Acoma Pueblo, NM

Figure 9.41 – Illustrations of animals and rainbow from mural paintings of the ambulatory of San Esteban, Acoma Pueblo, NM

Figure 9.42 – Illustrations of rainbow borders from mural paintings of the ambulatory of San Esteban, Acoma Pueblo, NM

Figure 9.43 – Illustrations of rainbow borders from mural paintings of the ambulatory of San Esteban, Acoma Pueblo, NM

Figure 9.44 – Plan of San Gregorio mission, Abó Pueblo, NM, as constructed c. 1630

Figure 9.45 – Plan of San Gregorio mission, Abó Pueblo, NM, as constructed c. 1658

Figure 9.46 – Splayed patio window, San Gregorio mission, Abó Pueblo, NM

Figure 9.47 – Plan of Nuestra Señora de la Purísima Concepción Mission, Quarai Pueblo, NM, c. 1632

Figure 9.48 – Plan of Nuestra Señora de la Purísima Concepción Mission, Quarai Pueblo, NM, after renovations, c. 1670

Figure 9.49 – Continuous back hallway of the Quarai Pueblo convento

Figure 9.50 – Cloister patio and convento kiva, Quarai Pueblo, NM

Figure 9.51 – Rounded corner revetment, from the renovation of the Quarai convento

Figure 9.52 – Plan of the San Buenaventura Mission, Las Humanas Pueblo, NM, c. 1670
Figure 9.53 – Convento of San Buenaventura Mission, looking north………………………………………828
Figure 9.54 – North ambulatory corridor of San Buenaventura Mission convento……………………828
Figure 9.55 – Plan of the initial construction of Nuestra Señora de las Ángeles mission and convento, Pecos Pueblo, c. mid-1620 to 1621…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………829
Figure 9.56 – Convento alterations and completed church by Fray Andrés Juárez, Pecos mission, NM, c. 1621-1634…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………829
Figure 9.57 – Plan illustrating Fray Andrés Juárez’s alterations to the convento of the Pecos mission, c. 1630s……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………830
Figure 9.58 – Stabilized ruins of the Pecos mission, with the convento patio………………830
Figure 9.59 – Stabilized ruins of the Pecos mission, with the convento kiva………………831
Figure 9.60 – Interior and detail of the Pecos convento kiva……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………831
Figure 9.61 – Plan of San Marcos church and convento……………………………………………………832
Figure 9.62 – Plan of the San Cristobál Mission, Galisteo Basin, NM…………………………832
Figure 9.63 – Reconstructed plan of the San José mission, Giusewa Pueblo, NM…………………833
Figure 9.64 – Panorama of the San José mission site, Giusewa Pueblo, NM…………………………833
Figure 9.65 – Aerial view of the Awatovi Pueblo site………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………834
Figure 9.66 – Standing ruins of the Awatovi site, remnants of the San Bernardo mission, 1882………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………834
Figure 9.67 – Plan of San Antonio de Padua, Casas Grandes, Chihuahua, Mexico………………835
Figure 9.68 – Plan of San Francisco convento, Saint Augustine, FL………………………………835
Figure 9.69 – Plan of Santa Catalina de Guale, St. Catherine’s Island, GA………………………………836
Figure 9.70 – Reconstruction of the Apalachee settlement and mission of San Luis de Talimali, FL………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………836
Figure 9.71 – Plan of San Francisco de Belvís de Monroy, Extremadura, Spain………………837
Figure 9.72 – Two-story, single-range addition to the conventual house of San Francisco de Belvís de Monroy, Extremadura, Spain…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………837
Figure 9.73 – Plan of church and single-range *convento*, San José y San Miguel de Aguayo, San Antonio, TX.................................................................838

Figure 9.74 – Photomontage of the church and *convento*, San José y San Miguel de Aguayo, San Antonio, TX.................................................................838

Figure 9.75 – Plan of the church and *convento* of the Purísima Concepción de Acuña, San Antonio, TX.................................................................839

Figure 9.76 – Church and *convento* of the Purísima Concepción de Acuña, San Antonio, TX.................................................................839

Figure 9.77 – Plan of San Carlos Borromeo del Río Carmelo, Carmel, CA.............840

Figure 9.78 – Restored single-range *convento* of San Carlos Borromeo del Río Carmelo, Carmel, CA.................................................................840

Figure 9.79 – Plan of church and *convento*, San Fernando Rey de España in Mission Hills, CA........................................................................841

Figure 9.80 – Photomontage of the *convento* of San Fernando Rey de España in Mission Hills, CA........................................................................841

Figure 9.81 – Plan of the Purísima Concepción de María Santísima, Lompoc, CA........842

Figure 9.82 – Photomontage of the *convento* of the Purísima Concepción de María Santísima, Lompoc, CA.................................................................842

Figure 9.83 – Plan and isometric reconstruction of the Benedictine monastery of Lorsch, Germany.................................................................842

Figure 9.84 – *Convento* of Santo Domingo de Silos, Burgos, Castile-León, Spain........843

Figure 9.85 – Gothic cloister, *convento* of San Francisco, Cáceres, Extremadura, Spain........................................................................843

Figure 9.86 – Isabelleine-style cloister, San Juan de los Reyes, Toledo, Castile-La Mancha, Spain........................................................................844

Figure 9.87 – Renaissance cloister, *convento* of San Francisco, Cáceres, Extremadura, Spain........................................................................844

Figure 9.88 – Cloister, San Antonio de Padua, Garrovillas de Alconétar, Extremadura, Spain........................................................................845

Figure 9.89 – Patio elevation, *convento* of San Francisco, Trujillo, Extremadura, Spain....845
Figure 9.90 – Patio of San Francisco del Berrocal, Belvís de Monroy, Extremadura, Spain……………………………………………………………………..846

Figure 9.91 – Patio and second story of the convento of the Purísima Concepción of El Palancar, Extremadura, Spain…………………………………………………………..846

Figure 9.92 – Plan of the sixteenth-century construction of the conventito of Purísima Concepción, El Palancar, Extremadura, Spain……………………………………………………847

Figure 9.93 – First stage and residence c. 1524-1530, San Miguel, Huejotzingo, State of Puebla, Mexico………………………………………………………………………………847

Figure 9.94 – Second stage compound of San Miguel c. 1530-1545, Huejotzingo, State of Puebla, Mexico……………………………………………………………………………848

Figure 9.95 – Plan of San Andrés Calpan, State of Puebla, Mexico…………………………………………………………………………………………………….………………849

Figure 9.96 – Façade, portería, and open chapel, San Andrés Calpan, State of Puebla, Mexico……………………………………………………………………………………………849

Figure 9.97 – Plan of church and convento of San Miguel, Huejotzingo, State of Puebla, Mexico…………………………………………………………………………………………850

Figure 9.98 – Convento patio, San Miguel, Huejotzingo, State of Puebla, Mexico……………………………………………………………………………………………………..850

Figure 9.99 – Convento patio, San Bernardino de Sienna, Xochimilco, Distrito Federal, Mexico…………………………………………………………………………………………851

Figure 9.100 – Detail of Jerusalem, from the Madaba Mosaic Map, Church of St. George, Madaba, Jordan………………………………………………………………………………851

Figure 9.101 – Details plans of Jerusalem, the Uppsala Map and Gesta Francorum…………………852

Figure 9.102 – Hereford mappa mundi……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………852

Figure 9.103 – Ebstorf mappa mundi……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………853

Figure 9.104 – The Noble Sanctuary (Haram al-Sharifi), Jerusalem…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………853

Figure 9.105 – Dome of the Rock (Qubbat as-Sakhrah), Jerusalem…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………854

Figure 9.106 – Al-Aqsa Mosque, Jerusalem……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………854

Figure 9.107 – Plan of the New Temple, following Ezekiel, by Nicolaus de Lyra…………………855
Figure 9.108 – Detail of Jerusalem with the Dome of the Rock, Chiesa di Santa Maria degli Angioli, Lugano, Switzerland........................................855

Figure 9.109 – Heavily City of Jerusalem, by Juan Gerson, sotocoro paintings of the Asunción de Nuestra Señora Mission, Tecamachalco, State of Puebla, Mexico..........................................................856

Figure 9.110 – John’s vision of celestial Jerusalem, by Adriaen Collaert after Maarten de Vos.................................................................856

Figure 9.111 – Expulsion from the Garden of Eden, façade of the Cathedral of Orvieto, Umbria, Italy........................................................................857

Figure 9.112 – God brings Adam and Eve into the Garden of Eden, by Ludolphus of Saxonia, from Leven Ihesu Christi.................................857

Figure 9.113 – Topography of Paradise, by Athanasius Kircher, from Arca Noe........858

Figure 9.114 – The Immaculate Conception flanked by Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus, San Miguel Arcángel, Huejotzingo, State of Puebla, Mexico.......858

Figure 9.115 – Plan of cloister-form patio, Nuestra Señora de la Natividad, Tepoztlán, Morelos State, Mexico.........................................................859

Figure 9.116 – Patio garden, Nuestra Señora de la Natividad, Tepoztlán, Morelos State, Mexico.................................................................859

Figure 9.117 – Cloister-plan convento, Asunción de Nuestra Señora, Tlaxcala, Mexico…860

Figure 9.118 – Cloister-plan convento, San Luis Obispo, Tlalmanalco, Mexico........860

Figure 9.119 – Fountain and water tank, San Francisco del Berrocal, Belvis de Monroy, Extremadura, Spain.....................................................861

Figure 9.120 – “La Conchita” fountain, San Miguel Arcángel, Huejotzingo, State of Puebla, Mexico.................................................................861

Figure 9.121 – Interior of the Great Mosque, Cordoba, Andalucía, Spain.......................862

Figure 9.122 – Interior, restored kiva, Pecos Pueblo, NM........................................862

Figure 9.123 – Large, square kiva, Homol’ovi II, Winslow, AZ.............................863

Figure 9.124 – Possible convento kiva, San Ysidro church, Las Humanas Pueblo, NM.....863
Figure 9.125 – Convento of Santa María de los Ángeles, Hornachuelos, Córdoba, engraved by Pedro de Villafranca…………………………..864

Figure 9.126 – Atrial crosses, from San Agustín, Acolman and San Gabriel, Cholula, Mexico………………………………………………………865

Figure 9.127 – Atrial cross, Asunción de Nuestra Señora, Tlaxcala, Mexico………….865

Figure 9.129 – Sandstone slab with “IIRI” pecked into it (093637.000)……………………..866

Figure 10.1 – Zuni heritage corn in different colors………………………………………..866

Figure 10.2 – Carving of a Zuni Corn Maiden, by Marilyn Quam………………………867

Figure 10.3 – Bi-faced carving of a Zuni Corn Maiden……………………………………867

Figure 10.4 – Zuni corn field near Ojo Caliente (N05603)………………………………868

Figure 10.5 – Ornamental designs representing corn plants from Hawikku bowls…………868

Figure 10.6 – Detail of the Hawikku mission kitchen plan (Room 13)……………………869

Figure 10.7 – Detail of the work bench and hearth from the Hawikku Mission kitchen (N05777)……………………………………………………….869

Figure 10.8 – Detail of the convento kitchen workbench and firebox (N05738)……………870

Figure 10.9 – Detail of the convento kitchen firebox (N05780)……………………………870

Figure 10.10 – Smoke hood, home of Maria Cimarron, Acoma Pueblo, NM……………871

Figure 10.11 – Hooded fireplace in a Cochiti house…………………………………………871

Figure 10.12 – Example of a Medieval European “black kitchen,” Palace of Jindřichův Hradec, South Bohemia, Czech Republic……………872

Figure 10.13 – Fireplaces in the castle of Belvís de Monroy, Extremadura, Spain……….872

Figure 10.14 – Cross-section of typical smoke bay and chimney in the region of Badajoz, Extremadura, Spain……………………………………….873

Figure 10.15 – Monumental chimney stacks, main plaza, Garrovillas, Extremadura, Spain…………………………………………………………..873

Figure 10.16 – Typical Extremaduran smoke bay, house in Albuquerque, Badajoz, Spain…………………………………………………………….874
Figure 10.17 – Open hearth, kitchen, San Agustín, Acolman, Mexico…………………874
Figure 10.18 – Kitchen of San Miguel Arcangel, Huejotzingo, Mexico………………875
Figure 10.19 – Open kitchen hearth of the Huejotzingo mission……………………875
Figure 10.20 – Convento kitchen of Santa María de las Ángeles, Churubusco, Distrito Federal, Mexico……………………………………876
Figure 10.21 – Raised cooking range, convent of Santa Rosa, Puebla, Mexico……… 876
Figure 10.22 – Raised cooking range, convento kitchen of Santa Barbara, CA………877
Figure 10.23 – Bronze pestel from Hawikku (093986.000)…………………………..877
Figure 10.24 – Cross-section diagram of kitchen cooking stations at Hawikku mission…..878
Figure 10.25 – Cross-section diagram of the Hawikku convento kitchen…………….878
Figure 10.26 – Zuni corn wafer bread………………………………………………….879
Figure 10.27 – Detail of greased surface of a stone griddle from Hawikku mission (093664.000)……………………………………………………879
Figure 10.28 – “Baking ‘wewe’ bread, Pueblo of Zuni, N.M., ” by A. C. Vroman……..880
Figure 10.29 – Modern hearth for baking Zuni corn wafer bread……………………880
Figure 10.30 – Fragmented double griddle stone (093665.000)…………………………881
Figure 10.31 – Details of griddle stone during mission excavations (N05794/N05792)…………………………………………………………881
Figure 10.32 – Top and bottom, stone griddle from Hawikku mission (093664.000)……882
Figure 10.33 – Detail of interior of kitchen bin from the Hawikku mission (N05777)……882
Figure 10.34 – Details of embedded round timbers in the kitchen bin………………….883
Figure 10.35 – Hawikku Room 194, with narrow bins along the end wall (N06828)……883
Figure 10.36 – Hawikku Room 214, with a narrow bin (N06846)………………………..884
Figure 10.37 - Interior of Milling Room: Bins with Corn, Squash, Pots, Baskets, and Metal Cookware, in Zuni Pueblo, by William Henry Jackson……… 884
Figure 10.38 – Hawikku Room 151, with narrow bin of low curbing (N05821)................. 885
Figure 10.39 – Sketch plan of Hawikku Room 243, from the field notes.................... 885
Figure 10.40 – Corn grinding in stone bins, c. 1900............................................... 886
Figure 10.41 – Large sherd of Hawikku Polychrome jar from Room 10 (096981.000)..... 886
Figure 10.42 – Metate from mission ambulatory (Room 15, 093638.000).................. 887
Figure 10.43 – Metate (093638.000) with mano (093671.000)................................. 887
Figure 10.44 – Stone maul from mission ambulatory (095648.000)......................... 888
Figure 10.45 – Stone straightener or abrader (095650.000).................................. 888
Figure 10.46 - Cross-section of a Zuni Hepalokia pit oven.................................... 889
Figure 10.47 – A Man Scraping Chocolate, anonymous Spanish artist, c. 1680-1780...... 889
Figure 10.48 – Antonio de Pereda, detail from Still life with an Ebony Chest, 1652...... 890
Figure 10.49 – Francisco de Zurbarán, Still Life with Bowl of Chocolate, or Breakfast with Chocolate, 1640................................................................. 890
Figure 10.50 – Majolica hollowware sherds from the Hawikku excavations ............. 891
Figure 10.51 – Asian porcelain sherds from the Hawikku excavations.................... 891
Figure 10.52 – Refectory font, San Jerónimo de Yuste, Extremadura, Spain............. 892
Figure 10.53 – Interior, Upper Room Chapel or Cenacle, Mount Zion, Jerusalem...... 892
Figure 10.54 – Cistercian refectory, Abbey of Royaumont, Cal-d’Oise, France........ 893
Figure 10.55 – Refectory, Santa Croce, Florence, Italy.......................................... 893
Figure 10.56 – Old Refectory, San Marco, Florence, Italy.................................... 894
Figure 10.57 – Last Supper mural painting by Tadeo Gaddi, from the refectory of Santa Croce, Florence, Italy................................................................. 894
Figure 10.58 – Last Supper mural painting by Domenico Ghirlandaio, from the small refectory of San Marco, Florence, Italy.................................................. 895
Figure 10.59 – *The Miraculous Supper of Saint Dominic*, fresco by Giovanni Antonio Sogliani, Old Refectory of San Marco, Florence, Italy…………………… 895

Figure 10.60 - *Institution of the Eucharist*, by Fra Angelico and assistants, in Cell 35, San Marco, Florence, Italy……………………………………… 896

Figure 10.61 – *Crucifix with the Tree of Life*, mural painting by Tadeo Gaddi, from the refectory of Santa Croce, Florence, Italy………………………… 896

Figure 10.62 – Detail from the altarpiece of *St. John Gualbert Enthroned with Four Stories of His Life*, by Giovanni del Biondo, c. 1370……………… 897

Figure 10.63 – *Mary Magdalene, Anointing the Feet of Christ*, by Giovanni da Milano, Rinuccini Chapel, Santa Croce, Florence, Italy………………… 897

Figure 10.64 – *The Miracle of Saint Hugh*, Francisco de Zurbarán, 1629………………… 898

Figure 10.65 – New Refectory, San Jerónimo de Yuste, Extremadura, Spain…………… 898

Figure 10.66 – Old Refectory, Nuestra Señora de Santa María de la Rábida, Andalucía, Spain……………………………………………………………… 899

Figure 10.67 – Refectory seating, Nuestra Señora de Santa María de la Rábida, Andalucía, Spain……………………………………………………………… 899

Figure 10.68 – Refectory, Purísima Concepción of El Palancar, Extremadura, Spain………. 900

Figure 10.69 – *Saint Benedict Feeds the Monks, Scene 31 from the Life of Saint Benedict*, fresco by Il Sodoma, 1505-1508, Abbey of Monte Oliveto Maggiore, south of Asciano, Italy……………………………. 900

Figure 10.70 – Refectory pulpits, from Nuestra Señora de Santa María de la Rábida, Andalucía, Spain, and San Jerónimo de Yuste, Extremadura, Spain……………………………………………………………. 901

Figure 10.71 – New Refectory, San Francisco de Belvís de Monroy, Extremadura, Spain……………………………………………………………………… 901

Figure 10.72 – *Thomas Aquinas with Louis IX*, Niklaus Manuel, c. 1500-1525……………… 902

Figure 10.73 – Refectory, San Agustín, Acolman, Mexico……………………………………… 902

Figure 10.74 – Refectory, San Miguel Arcangel, Huejotzingo, Mexico………………………… 903

Figure 10.75 – *Sala de Profundis*, San Miguel Arcangel, Huejotzingo, Mexico……………… 903
Figure 10.76 – Plan of the mission of San Miguel Arcangel, Huejotzingo, Mexico...........904

Figure 10.77 – *Refectory of the Barefoot Carmelite Convent*, Anonymous, 1600s...........904

Figure 10.78 – Imported soup plates from the Hawikku excavations.........................905

Figure 10.79 – Detail of *Saint Benedict Feeds the Monks, Scene 31 from the Life of Saint Benedict*, fresco by Il Sodoma, 1505-1508, Abbey of Monte Oliveto Maggiore, south of Asciano, Italy.................................905

Figure 10.80 – Bottom and top of a small copper dish (124544.000)..........................906

Figure 10.81 – Ornamental glassware fragments from Hawikku
(109218.000/086594.000-1)..........................................................906

Figure 10.82 – Selected utilitarian glassware fragments from Hawikku.......................907

Figure 10.83 – San Bernardo Polychrome soup plates, from Room 33
(096968.000/096967.000)...............................................................908

Figure 10.84 – San Bernardo Polychrome Soup plate sherds
(110281.001-1/109431.001 [sherd box 2/5]-1)...................................908

Figure 10.85 – Detail of the central fleury cross motif, from San Bernardo Polychrome soup plate (096968.000)...............................................................909

Figure 10.86 – Red-colored Plainware soup plates with flat bottoms
(096969.000/093752.000)...............................................................909

Figure 10.87 – Fragments of pharmaceutical jars or *albarelos*
(074890.000/109431.000)...............................................................910

Figure 10.88 – Hybrid cups from Hawikku (067667.000/086501.000-1)..................910

Figure 10.89 – Assorted candle holders from Hawikku (101676.000-2
/096973.000/096972.000/096974.000)............................................911

Figure 11.1 – Three-dimensional cross-section of the Purísima Concepción *salero* (096970.000)...............................................................911

Figure 11.2 – San Bernardo Polychrome Saltcellar or *salero* (096970.000)...............912

Figure 11.3 – Upside-down sketch of the Hawikku *salero.......................................912

Figure 11.4 – Spanish majolica *saleros..........................913
Figure 11.5 – Japanese porcelain *Salt Cellar*, Edo Period, c. 1680.................................913

Figure 11.6 – Conical Majolica *Saleros*, Mexico, both c. 1825.................................914

Figure 11.7 – Detail of a table setting with *salero*, from *The Three Temptations of Christ*, by Pascual Pérez, 1721.................................................................914

Figure 11.8 – Broken hollowware sherd with hourglass shape (101178.000-1)..............915

Figure 11.9 – Zuni Polychrome terraced bowl, c. 1875...............................................915

Figure 11.10 – Zuni directional ceramic motifs..............................................................916

Figure 11.11 – Religious medal of the Immaculate Conception and Holy Name (124534.000)........................................................................................................916

Figure 11.12 – Design of a painted star ceiling, south of Cuba, NM...............................917

Figure 11.13 – Four-pointed star petroglyph from the Village of the Great Kivas.........917

Figure 11.14 – Carved *sotocoro* corbel, Zuni Pueblo mission......................................918

Figure 11.15 – Majolica sherds with bobbin lace fan patterns from Hawikku..............918

Figure 11.16 – San Bernardo Polychrome soup plate rim sherd with bobbin-lace fan pattern (109431.001 [3 of 5]-3).........................................................919

Figure 11.17 – Nave mural paintings, San José mission, Laguna Pueblo, NM...............919

Figure 11.18 – Adult and juvenile golden eagle tail feathers.........................................920

Figure 11.19 – Shalako pictographic panel, Village of the Great Kivas, NM.................920

Figure 11.20 – Turkey feather...........................................................................................921

Figure 11.21 – Jars with radiant tail feather motifs, Sikyatki site, AZ.............................921

Figure 11.22 – *Saliera of Francis I*, Benvenuto Cellini, gold with enamel, 1543..........922

Figure 11.23 – Sapo-Portugues ivory salt cellars............................................................922

Figure 11.24 – Details of salt cellars from Renaissance frescos, Florence, Italy.............923

Figure 11.25 – Detail of *Last Supper after da Vinci*, by Giacomo Raffaelli, mosaic, 1809-1814.........................................................................................923
Figure 11.26 – *La Cena de San Benito*, Juan Andrés Rizi, oil on canvas, 1630 .......................... 924

Figure 11.27 – Panorama of the Zuni Salt Lake, c. 1930s-1950s .................................................. 924

Figure 11.28 – Sample of salt from the Zuni Salt Lake, collected 1921(108767.000) ........ 925

Figure 12.1 – Plan of the Purísima Concepción Mission site during its reoccupation phase .......................................................... 926

Figure 12.2 – Extent of fire damage to the Purísima Concepción Mission ......................... 927

Figure 12.3 – Spatial use of the reoccupied Purisima Concepción Mission site ............... 928

Figure 12.4 – Filled doorway from the sacristy into the ambulatory (N05784) ................. 929

Figure 12.5 – Post-mission occupation level of Room 22-A (N05794) ......................... 929

Figure 12.6 – Shallow, rectangular mortar (095644.000) .................................................... 930

Figure 12.7 – Post-mission occupation level of Room 22-B (N05793) .......................... 930

Figure 12.8 – Detail of artifacts on the wall between Room 19 and the northeast ambulatory corridor (N05783) ................................................. 931

Figure 12.9 – Room 3 looking southwest (N05767) ............................................................ 931

Figure 12.10 – Final, post-mission occupation level of Rooms 3 and 2 (N05764) ............ 932

Figure 12.11 – Late post-mission occupation spur-wall fireplace, Room 3 (N05766) .... 932

Figure 12.12 – Shallow, circular mortar, from Room 3 (095643.000) .............................. 933

Figure 12.13 – Detail of ceramic sherds and an abrasion stone on the partition wall between Rooms 2 and 3 (N05763) .............................................. 933

Figure 12.14 – Pecked stone mortar or basin, above Room 3 (detail of N05743) ............. 934

Figure 12.15 – Artifacts on the walls of the excavated *convento* rooms (detail of N05746) .......................................................... 934

Figure 12.16 – Room 4, looking southwest (N05768) ......................................................... 935

Figure 12.17 – Room 1 stairwell, looking northwest (N05759) .......................................... 935

Figure 12.18 – Inset fireplace with scoria mortar, Room 1 (N05756) ................................. 936
Figure 12.19 – Scoria mortar from Room 1 (095646.000)…………………………………….. 936
Figure 12.20 – Spur wall fireplace, Room 1 (N05755)……………………………………….. 937
Figure 12.21 – Abrasion and percussion stone from Room 1 (095657.002)………………..937
Figure 12.22 – Artifacts from Room 1 (details of N05760 and N05761)…………………938
Figure 12.23 – Matsaki Polychrome bowl sherd, from Room 7-B (096952.000)………….938
Figure 12.24 – Profile drawing of the post-mission partition of Room 9…………………..939
Figure 12.25 – Excavation of Room 9-B in progress, looking southwest (N05774)……….939
Figure 12.26 – Artifacts on the walls of Rooms 9 and 13 (detail of N05738)………………940
Figure 12.27 – Artifacts on the walls of Rooms 9 and the ambulatory
   (detail of N05778)………………………………………………………………….940
Figure 12.28 – Artifacts on the walls of Rooms 9 and the ambulatory
   (detail of N05778)………………………………………………………………….941
Figure 12.29 – Kitchen (Room 13), looking northeast (N05778)…………………………941
Figure 12.30 – Kitchen (Room 13) in the process of excavation (detail of N05775)……….942
Figure 12.31 – Room 14/17/18 (detail of N05747-N05749)……………………………….942
Figure 12.32 – Post-mission occupation Room 20 (N05785)………………………………943
Figure 12.33 – Plan drawing of Room 20, with floor assemblage…………………………943
Figure 12.34 – Utility ware cooking jar, Room 20 (096991.000)……………………………944
Figure 12.35 – Utility ware cooking jar, Room 20 (096953.000)……………………………944
Figure 12.36 – White on black ladle, Room 20 (096976.000)……………………………..945
Figure 12.37 – Plainware ladle, Room 20 (096975.000)…………………………………945
Figure 12.38 – Scoria shaft abrader, from Room 20 (095655.000)…………………………946
Figure 12.39 – Large Plainware jar with concave base, from Room 20 (096990.000)……946
Figure 12.40 – Natural stone concretion, from Room 20 (095656.000)……………………947
Figure 12.41 – Brown-colored Plainware pitcher, from Room 20 (096980.000)……………947

Figure 12.42 – Post-mission occupation Room 24, looking northeast (N05795)……………948

Figure 12.43 – Plan drawing of Room 30, with post-mission floor assemblage……………948

Figure 12.44 – Brown-colored utility ware jar, from Room 30 (096994.000)…………… 949

Figure 12.45 – Brown-colored miniature jar, from Room 30 (096964.000)……………949

Figure 12.46 – Small red-colored Plainware bowl or large ladle, from Room 30 (096963.000)………………………………………………………………………………949

Figure 12.47 – Large brown-colored Plainware canteen, from Room 30 (096982.000)…..950
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAMHC</td>
<td>A:shiwi A:wan Museum and Heritage Center, Zuni Pueblo, NM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMNH</td>
<td>American Museum of Natural History, New York City, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRL</td>
<td>Braun Research Library, The Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRML</td>
<td>Cornell Rare and Manuscript Collection, Ithaca, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Center, National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution, Suitland, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWR</td>
<td>Center for Southwest Research, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWH</td>
<td>Frederick Webb Hodge Manuscript Collection, Braun Research Library, The Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHAE</td>
<td>Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition papers, Cornell Rare and Manuscript Collection, Ithaca, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAI</td>
<td>Museum of the American Indian-Heye Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAA</td>
<td>National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Suitland, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMAI</td>
<td>National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WACC</td>
<td>Western Archaeology and Conservation Center, Tucson, AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZCRAT</td>
<td>Zuni Cultural Resources Advisory Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The history of cultural encounters between Indigenous Pueblo communities of New Mexico and the Spanish missionaries who sought to convert them to Christianity is an emotionally laden past, challenging historians not only with partial evidence, but also questions of how to effectively incorporate the voices of descendent communities, oral traditions, and attention to Native agency. New Mexico’s missionization begins with the arrival of Juan de Oñate in 1598, along with Spanish colonists, eight Franciscan priests, and two lay brothers, initiating the organized evangelization and exploitation of the region’s Native peoples.\(^1\)

Although the Spanish built a parish church for colonists at the rechristened Tewa pueblo of San Gabriel del Yungue, their initial evangelization efforts sputtered.\(^2\) In 1608, the Crown took over governance of the colony and sponsorship of its missions. By the mid-1620s, missionaries were spreading out to other pueblos among the arid mesas and plateaus beyond the central valley of New Mexico’s Rio Grande. Under the direction of Custodians Estévan de Perea and Alonso de Benavides, the evangelization campaign grew significantly during the 1620s, with personnel quadrupling and the number of establishments expanding from ten in 1617 to twenty-three in 1630.\(^3\)

Perea was personally responsible for much of this expansion, rigorously defending Franciscan prerogatives and making multiple trips to Mexico City for supplies and new recruits.\(^4\) The ambitious Benavides also contributed significantly to these efforts, but is more important for his thorough descriptions of New Mexico’s missionization, rosy accounts that present Franciscan
endeavors as a divine campaign, first in a *Memorial* to King Philip IV (1630), and in a revised *Memorial* (1634) to Pope Urban VIII. In each, Benavides concludes by describing daily life in New Mexico’s missions and particularly their residencies known as *conventos*. In 1634, he painted a glowing picture of well-ordered mission communities, in which Native laborers lived together with Franciscan missionaries, working together in a manner comparable to European monastic communities:

> [...] most of the [conventos] have only one religious each [and] more than twenty Indians, devoted to the service of the church, live with him in the [convento]. They take turns in relieving one another as porters, sextons, cooks, bell-ringers, gardeners, refectioners, and in other tasks. They perform their duties with as much circumspection and care as if they were friars. At eventide they say their prayers together, with much devotion, in front of some image.

As Benavides indicates, New Mexico *conventos* were not merely Spanish residences, but also domestic establishments for entire mission communities of persons living and working together. The Franciscans were an active mendicant order, meaning they did not take vows of seclusion, and in New Mexico they lived surrounded by Native laborers who kept each mission establishment operational. In his 1630 *Memorial*, Benavides describes a similar social setting by writing that,

> [...] they live in such sort that it appears they are in a [religious] community [...] and the [conventos are] with so much concert that they appear rather sanctuaries than the house of one lone fraile [...] who with so much gratefulness, love, and good-will commend your majesty to God, in that so distant corner, and in that primitive church.

Civil officials corroborated Benavides’s description of friars living together with resident groups of Pueblo people in New Mexico missions, but as I will discuss, historians of New Mexico have rarely taken these statements seriously and considered how the presence of Indians within *conventos* might reshape understanding of the missions’ significance.
Perhaps thinking of earlier orders such as the Benedictines, who lived in cloistered seclusion behind monastic walls, New Mexico historians have often downplayed the significance of Native peoples in mission *conventos*, or denies their presence altogether. Ross G. Montgomery’s hypothetical reconstructions of the San Bernardo mission at the Hopi pueblo of Awatovi are strikingly illustrative (figure 1.1). In one, Montgomery depicts four robed and tonsured Franciscan friars dining together in the *convento* refectory, with one standing at a lectern and three seated in reflection along the outside of the long wooden table. Nowhere are the cooks, refectoners, and other members of the mission community whom Benavides describes. Instead, Montgomery multiplies the single friar of the distant Hopi outpost and imagines a monastic community in segregated isolation from its Native surroundings.

Another illustration (figure 1.2) depicts the San Bernardo kitchen as a friar prepares food for himself at a raised cooking range, while a male Hopi servant in loin cloth tentatively enters the scene at lower right, water bucket in hand. Built into the wall behind the friar, Montgomery depicts a “turn” for passing food from the kitchen to the refectory secluded within, despite a lack of evidence for either turns or cloistered seclusion in seventeenth-century New Mexico. These illustrations are imaginary visions of daily life within Franciscan missions directly at odds with Benavides’s descriptions. While few historians go to Montgomery’s extreme in erasing the presence of Native laborers from the *convento*, many marginalize the importance of these Indians, saying that they were few in number, did not live in the mission, or were fully converted and of no historic significance.
**Thesis and Overview**

This dissertation starts from the presumption that Benavides’s description is basically accurate: the missions of New Mexico were workplaces and sometimes residences for communities of Native Pueblo people who spent much of their time with the friars in the *convento*, and that this close proximity is an essential factor in understanding the significance of missions as built environments. Benavides claims much higher rates of conversion than were probably the case, and obscures the violence and coercion of colonial life to garner greater support for the missions and his personal ambition to become their bishop. Nevertheless, his description provides an introduction to daily life in the *convento*, which other primary sources and the archaeological record confirm, as I will demonstrate in the following chapters. New Mexico’s missions were vital arenas in which Indigenous and European cultures interacted through the negotiations of individuals in the course of everyday life, and material adaptations were an expression of these intimate encounters. The architectural form of the mission itself belonged to a long progression of Spanish vernacular and monastic practices, which friars mobilized to instill an aspirational sense of order among the diverse participants of mission communities. Meanwhile, artifacts related to everyday practices such as food preparation and consumption exhibit a profound mixing of cultural traditions that manifest Native agency and particularly the overlooked role of women in shaping mission community experiences.

Focusing on the Purísima Concepción mission of the Zuni pueblo of Hawikku in western New Mexico, this dissertation is a case study of cultural negotiations and their expression through the built environment (figure 1.3).[^9] Zuni Indians (*Shiwi* as they call themselves in their language) had existed as a distinct linguistic community for millennia, and were the first pueblo whom Spanish expeditions contacted in the years of 1539 to 1540.[^10] Franciscans established the
Hawikku mission in 1629, and several episodes of resistance and destruction followed, with the first mission burning in 1632, and a mid-century re-establishment again destroyed in 1672 (figure 1.4). Hawikku’s residents left their town at the start of the Pueblo Revolt in 1680, when Native communities united to expel the Spanish from New Mexico for a period of twelve years, during which many pueblos moved to more secure locations. Hawikku’s buildings gradually deteriorated until the Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition began excavations in 1917 (figures 1.5-1.7). Under the direction of Frederick Webb Hodge, this joint effort of Smithsonian’s National Museum and the Museum of the American Indian- Heye Foundation (MAI) worked at Hawikku until 1923, documenting and recovering tens of thousands of artifacts and hundreds of Zuni ancestral remains. Although Hodge reported specific aspects of his work, the excavation as a whole did not reach publication until 1966. A study of the artifacts associated with the mission has never been written. While the excavation of the Purísima Concepción was primitive by today’s standards, destroying far more information than it recovered, this ruined structure is one of the few seventeenth-century missions in New Mexico for which artifacts or material culture can be directly connected to architectural spaces. It is therefore a critical source for understanding daily life in New Mexico prior to the Pueblo Revolt, and this dissertation published many of these artifacts for the first time.

Hawikku’s special place in New Mexico history lends an unusually broad relevance to my research. Interactions and conflicts over the mission are an important chapter of Zuni history, with oral accounts and artifacts passed down to present generations. The site is also emblematic of Zuni’s prominent place in wider state and national histories. It was here that Europeans, Africans, and Pueblo Indians first made contact in 1539, with the arrival of an enslaved North African named Estevan, and Franciscan Marcos de Niza in tow. The following
year, Francisco Vásquez de Coronado and his men stormed the town upon their arrival.

Hawikku’s story thus belongs alongside other national origin narratives such as much later events at Roanoke, Jamestown, and Plymouth.

In an increasingly complex and socially mixed society, Hawikku’s stories are more relevant than ever, speaking to the tensions that continue to mark interracial relations within the United States, but also to the creativity by which people have responded to these hardships. As U.S. demographics shift increasingly towards a plurality or even Latino/a majority, and as Native peoples continue asserting their sovereignty on the national stage, Hawikku has never been more important. Focusing on cultural encounter, my project participates in a new wave of American art history seeking to recapture the fundamental heterogeneity, contentiousness, and fluidity of American artistic production.14 Furthermore, it fills in a missing chapter of one of the largest excavations in American archaeological history. Finally, my research belongs to the history of Latin American art, as the ultimate expression of Iberian vernacular architectural traditions, translated to central Mexico and Borderlands regions such as the U.S. Southwest. Pueblo missions should not be divorced from their earlier Latin American precedents, despite the national and linguistic boundaries separating them today. Colonial New Mexico forms a particularly rich intersection of modern worlds; far from being a provincial backwater or regional concern, its “in-between” status amplifies its significance.

My dissertation comprises three sections. The first traces the background of New Mexico missions in scholarship, in primary documents, and the Purísima Concepción mission as a historic and archaeological site. In Chapter Two, I outline previous historical approaches to missions in New Mexico, focusing on authors’ treatment of Indigenous presence, while summarizing the biases and assumptions that have shaped the field. Chapter Three develops my
concept of the “mission community,” defining it and drawing on primary sources to describe actors and roles in seventeenth-century examples. Chapter Four turns to Hawikku as a place, compiling its chronology and history from Zuni oral accounts, Spanish documents, and archeological excavations. In Chapter Five, I scrutinize the history of archaeology at Hawikku, assessing the methods of the Hendricks-Hodge Expedition, and paying special attention to the mission’s excavation in 1919.

In my second section, Chapters Six to Eight, I reconstruct the structural history of the Purísima Concepción in three phases: its establishment, its formal construction, and mission-period alterations to its fabric. These chapters analyze the excavation notes and photographs to describe the Purísima Concepción’s architectural spaces and artifacts.

Finally, in my third section, I interpret cultural concepts and interactions implicated in the remains of the Hawikku mission, drawing upon its architecture, artifacts, primary sources, and comparison to other sites throughout the Early Modern Spanish and Franciscan worlds. In Chapter Nine, I consider the design of the Purísima Concepción convento together with that of its sister establishment at Halona Pueblo as architectural rhetorical statements by Franciscan friars, revising the cloister form of European monasticism to express visions of acculturation that were very different from actual practices within the Zuni missions. I interpret a specific set of these everyday practices in Chapter Ten, focusing on mission rooms as everyday workspaces for the production and consumption of food, emphasizing Pueblo cultural contributions and the vital role of women in the construction and sustenance of Hawikku’s mission community. While friars might have sought to assert their authority through food-based interactions, the labor of Native participants, as well as the culturally mixed cuisine and vessels for serving it, insinuated Pueblo perspectives in the heart of the mission’s dining spaces. Through this culinary lens, I
bring an innovative approach to the mission’s domestic areas, based in a presumption of
Indigenous agency, deciphering underlying metaphors, and recognition of the *convento* as an
expressive material environment.

**Methodological Framework**

A project of this nature is necessarily interdisciplinary, and I draw equally on
anthropology, archaeology, history, and material culture studies as well as my training in art
history. I start from the supposition that art is the human behavior of expressing meaning
through materials, rather than any culturally biased hierarchy focusing on certain media or
qualities of execution, which are usually Eurocentric. Furthermore, I am interested in
considering the entire material environment of architecture, landscape, objects, two-dimensional
representation, and bodily performance within the purview of art history.

The built environment frames my interpretation, but activities and materials of everyday
life within its spaces contribute to making architecture meaningful. Architectural history has
typically focused on designers and their intentions, but these considerations do not exhaust a
building’s significance. People’s reception of architecture is a form of interpretation through
which it acquires additional meaning. Use is a creative act in its own right, and occupation of a
building requires a constant renegotiation of its spaces, as users encounter and contest the
designer’s intentions. These consumers thus employ the creations of others for their own
purposes, altering and recontextualizing them as elements in new expressive compositions and
artifact assemblages. The built environment structures and limits the choices or agency of its
users, but users also reshape it through their actions, and meaning arises through this dialectical relationship, at once forming people’s choices, and being formed by them.  

Architectural spaces are structures of social interaction, but also compositional frames for the assemblage of objects that users find meaningful and useful in their daily lives. In speaking of domestic interiors and their material culture, Robert St. George argues that objects play a crucial role in expressing meaning within architectural spaces:

[…] furnishings, as constructed objects, attributed things, emblems of an adherent realm of myth and cosmos, fit together to shape the interior spaces of domestic dwellings. Interiors are what the walls of dwelling houses define. But, unlike the totally empty floor plans published in many studies […] domestic interiors are social spaces that shape human interaction according to the furnishings a given room contains.

Although St. George is speaking about furnishings in private homes, his words are relevant to missions such as the Purísima Concepción, whose *conventos* were dwelling and working spaces for the participants in mission communities. St. George calls attention to the dialectical role that material culture plays in constructing human subjectivity, but also as a means of creative, improvisational expression. Artifacts serve practical purposes but also communicate the ideas, associations, and values of their producers and consumers. Distributed in architectural spaces, artifacts are not simply functional tools, but rather acts of speech expressed through materials, which participate in the larger discourses by which people make sense of their worlds. Their meaning overruns simple utility to engage more symbolic and imaginative levels of sense making, based in cultural metaphors that invest their environment with order. The configuration of objects and architectural spaces comprising the mission *convento* provides glimpses of its significance for users as well as designers.

In documents, missionaries emphasized the propriety of behavior within their establishments and were cautious about disclosing the infiltration of Native practices and
perspectives. These friars emphasize liturgical functions rather than daily life, and historians have followed their focus on churches, overlooking the convento’s potential for illuminating everyday practices in the seventeenth century. Liturgical life was intertwined with all other parts of daily life for mission communities; in practice they were inseparable. The chanting of liturgical hours structured daily routine, while mission labor supported the continuance of the liturgy, ostensibly justifying the friars’ labor demands. The physical spaces and materials of the church and convento ran together, and members of the mission community worked in both. One cannot readily separate New Mexico’s missions into modern rubrics of sacred and secular spaces, and conventos were inseparable from churches. For the limited purposes of this dissertation, however, I will focus on everyday functions taking place in the convento, writing to historians’ silence about these spaces, while leaving analysis of liturgical functions and artifacts for the future.

I use an interdisciplinary approach to make the most of the available information, and envision a diverse audience including art historians of Latin America, Native America, and the United States; archaeologists, anthropologists, and historians of the U.S. Southwest; people with a regional interest in New Mexico; and Zuni community members, scholars, and tribal historians. With this broad readership in mind, I hope to present my research in a way that will be useful for specialists, but also accessible to interested non-academics. I strive for clarity and the elimination of jargon as much as possible, and confine detailed discussion, support, and specific data to my notes, which are intentionally thorough to facilitate further scholarship and compile as much of the record of Zuni-related scholarship as possible.
The Presence of the Past

While I describe the people living in and connected to the mission as a community, I must clarify this was not necessarily a voluntary, peaceable, or unified gathering. Rather, the convento represented an intimate arena of daily encounters, potentially including flashes of common purpose, but much more often conflict, opposition, friction, hardship, resistance, coercion, misunderstandings, and intentional ambiguities. Relationships within the mission community, and between missions and pueblos were often not peaceable. Hawikku’s history is notable for its violent episodes. Unlike Rio Grande pueblos, Zunis lived far from the centers of Spanish power, and missionaries largely remained present through the tolerance of Indigenous community leaders. As I will argue in Chapter Four, factions within Zuni society found it advantageous to ally themselves with the Spanish, and Zuni leaders had to balance the natural desire to resist Spanish impositions with the risk of bloody retaliations. While some friars negotiated this context successfully, others overstepped the limits of the pueblo’s tolerance, encountering active resistance and defense of Zuni ways of life.

After initial success establishing a mission at Hawikku, the overly zealous Fray Francisco Letrado quickly antagonized the pueblo’s people by disrupting a traditional religious ceremony, demanding their attendance at mass instead. In response, Zunis killed Letrado and burned the Hawikku church, while the pueblo’s residents left their homes for a secure retreat atop the mesa of Dowa Yalanne. Another friar, Martín de Arvide, died five days later on a nearby road. Difficult years in the late 1660s and early 1670s led to further violence, as Franciscan campaigns to eradicate Native religious practices accelerated. Harsh punishments increased hostility and a severe drought from 1667 to 1672 led to crop failures and famine, even as Apache raids increased pressure on limited resources. An Apache raid quickly followed the arrival of another zealous
friar to Hawikku in 1672, violently killing him and burning the mission again. There are suggestions that Zunis may have collaborated with the raiders, who seem to have specifically targeted the mission. Zunis again participated in the 1680 Pueblo Revolt, killing Halona Pueblo’s resident friar and burning its mission. Even after the Spanish returned, violent incidences continued to punctuate interactions in the Zuni region.

While it has not been my project to conduct new ethnographies, oral traditions provide valuable insight into Zuni views of their past, and access to episodes and perspectives not present in Spanish documents. To this day, Hawikku and its mission bring up an unsettling, traumatic past for many Zunis, with accounts telling of suffering, starvation, brutality, and the lengths to which their ancestors were forced to go in order to survive. These stories sit uneasily with their cultural values emphasizing the importance of having right thoughts and a good heart in order that one’s prayers will be effective. Anger interferes with and distracts from this mindfulness. Zuni families have varied in their approaches to the sufferings of the past, but all speak carefully about Hawikku out of respect for their forebears and a desire to avoid sensationalizing their suffering.

In 2016, I participated in a community collaboration between Smithsonian Institution’s Recovering Voices Program and the Zuni Cultural Resources Advisory Team (ZCRAT), bringing a group of educators and religious leaders to assess Smithsonian collections of Zuni material culture for educational purposes and future research. During this visit, discussions turned to several artifacts from the Spanish missions, providing a Zuni voice in contrast to the documents of Spanish Franciscans, and pointing to the different ways Zuni families have handled the painful mission history. Some have passed along traumatic stories so they will not be forgotten. For example, Octavius Seowtewa says,
[There is] a lot of sad oral history of just having people suffer, just to make the church […] the Zuni people were forced to do things that even today, we don’t want to talk about. That was like a memory that was put in the back of our minds, and the people’s minds, because it was so sad and it was so tragic that they did not want to talk about it. And that’s why my late father [Alex Seowtewa] always talked about this because […] he didn’t want to forget about that cruel history that we have with the Catholic church and the Spanish people coming in.

If some families have emphasized the importance of remembering ancestral trauma and survival in the face of these hardships, others focus on transmitting positive aspects of their history, emphasizing good memories, cultural perseverance, and the persistence of a worldview focused on the blessings of life in order to avoid carrying anger and negative energy into the future. Curtis Quam says,

A lot of us are trying to find more of a Zuni perspective on […] that time period and there is really no carrying on of a lot of that negative energy, and I think that is how we cope and just deal with tragic events that come up within lifetimes. Sometimes the best way is to not remember. Not really forgetting, but I think [our ancestors] thought about us in the future not wanting to hold any type of anger from that. They did the best they could in the situations that they were given, and held on, and I think one thing that they wanted us to focus and keep carrying on is our view of life, our ceremonies, our way of life. And fortunately that’s what we still have today. It’s not all the way from what they had, but we still carry on a big part of our culture, and a big part of our ceremonial process and observances of our calendar year, and I think that’s what they wanted us to focus on. Because if you hold on to a lot of the pain that they went through […] it’s at times hard to move forward, for anybody. You hear about traumatic things that happen either in your life or a family members’ [life], sometimes it is hard to move on, and you just kind of hold on to that and a lot of those emotions and feelings might distract from what’s important. So that might be one way they coped with keeping the culture going […]. This is just remembering who we are.

Raylan Edaakie reiterates that his family did not pass on stories of Hawikku’s mission years:

I guess that’s very true, ‘cuz what Curtis said that any negative things that happened to our relatives a long time ago, for me I never heard about it. I think it was more of the things that would keep us going, like the religious culture part that was taught to us, that’s why I don’t really have any knowledge of [the missions…. Our ancestors] really talked about the happy things in their lives, and not the stressful, emotional part of their lives. So that’s what I’m telling Octavius, that all these years, even with my elders and my parents, they never really talked about the suffering that they dealt with, you know with the church and the Spanish. I guess it varies from family to family […] For me, I’d rather
just move forward and carry on the traditions and the culture that needs to be held, and to be carried on to our children.

Edaakie’s conflation of Zuni ancestors who lived under Spanish colonial authority with more recent generations exemplifies Zuni concepts of time as cyclical, with the past remaining present in the here and now. The ZCRAT team members knew and discussed Hawikku’s chronological history, but often talked about it as a recent memory and ongoing process with effects continuing in the present. Curtis Quam compared missionization to assimilationist policies that sent Native children to boarding schools in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries to strip them of their Indigenous identities:

A lot of the times when the Catholic church got involved it was mostly a brainwashing kind of experience. We read now about the boarding school experience and how they were getting brainwashed into not speaking their language, not practicing their culture, and even changing their identity, physically on how they look. You see the Carlisle Pennsylvania Indian School […] before and after pictures of a lot of these Native kids… They took a before picture in their Native clothing, and an after [picture] where they cut their hair and put on what they thought was civilized clothing, and that experience is traumatic. Only they can really understand all that. We’ve been through a lot throughout the years as a people.

Eldred Quam made the connection between past and present even more explicitly, saying,

When you look at this stuff that happened a long time, as you can recall it today, they’re still doing the same, but in a political way. To me, it hasn’t changed. It’s still continuing, and what our ancestors and our grandfathers were telling us, about what happened a long time ago, is being reflected today in a political way […]

Finally, Seowtewa also made similar connections to current political issues,

[…] talking] about the pain and hardship that the Catholic religion brought into Zuni. In a way it’s a little better with the Catholic church [today], but now we have the [Zuni Christian Reformed Mission] and the LDS Church coming in, and once you become a convert in those two churches, they strictly forbid the Zuni people to participate in their culture. In a way it’s still the same, but the Catholic church, the Catholic religion were the first people to put that type of hardship on our people […] You know, it’s a miracle that we’re still here. And maybe because of the prayers that our ancestors did, that we were not decimated, that we still survive.
To these modern Zuni perspectives, Spanish missionization and the hardships that it created for Pueblo communities are not isolated in the past, but rather continue to reverberate in present-day experiences and political disputes. As a historian, on the other hand, I have been trained to focus on the particularities of events in the past and to avoid conflating or over-generalizing as I interpret them. My study of Hawikku’s mission period thus occupies an unsettled place in respect to modern Zuni perspectives, since I am not in a position to speak on current tribal and community issues properly belonging to the Zuni people, but which they see as directly connected to the colonial past that I research. This dissertation brings up a topic that many Zuni families have chosen not to discuss, while other families pass on stories acknowledging the suffering and persistence of their ancestors. As much as has been possible and appropriate, I have tried to listen, learn, and work collaboratively with the present-day Zuni community. I anchor my discussion in the insights that I have gained through this dialogue, but I do not speak for Zuni people and this dissertation’s interpretations are strictly my own.²⁸

As the members of the ZCRAT team made clear in their discussion of mission artifacts, the colonial period casts long shadows across Hawikku’s churned ruins. Even stories that say nothing about the Spanish represent Hawikku as a place of starvation and suffering, such as Frank Hamilton Cushing’s version of the Zuni folk tale which he entitles “The Origin of the Dragonfly and of the Corn Priests,” in which famine forces the pueblo’s residents to seek refuge among Hopis towns further west.²⁹ Yet, in keeping with those Zunis who emphasize positive histories, amongst the archaeological remnants and cast-off bits of everyday life at Hawikku are the traces of a landscape filled with Zuni vitality and cultural expression. Although Cushing describes it as a place of starvation, it was also home to the heroic young boy at the center of his telling, who models Zuni values of piety, self-restraint, kindness, perseverance, familial
responsibility, and making do with limited means, eventually becoming leader of the restored community. Likewise, Hawikku was a place where Zuni women cared for their families by making the pots necessary for daily life, by building their adobe-plastered houses, and by kneeling together to grind maize.

From my study of its archaeological remains, I believe that there is room to understand moments of creative exchange and material negotiation within the Hawikku mission from this perspective, emphasizing Zuni perseverance and cultural vitality, as reshaping aspects of mission life in spite of Spanish pressures to acculturate. From this standpoint, the Purísima Concepción was not simply a “tangible projection of an alien sensibility,” as George Kubler described New Mexico missions, comparing them to empty seashells whose hardened form continues to evoke their absent (Spanish) makers.\textsuperscript{30} Spanish missions \textit{were} foreign intrusions wrought by coercion and the threat of violence to assert Spanish ideology in the midst of Pueblo communities, but it was Indian hands that built and maintained them. Through the conscious and habitual actions of Zuni workers in Hawikku’s mission community, traces of Pueblo cosmology, belief, and everyday practice infiltrated the material culture of the Purísima Concepción.\textsuperscript{31} I believe that these interactions are crucial to understanding the processes of missionization, cultural negotiation, and resistance in colonial New Mexico. One must keep both the trauma of these experiences and the vibrancy of cultural perseverance in mind to avoid uncritical narratives of triumphalism or subjugation, which have all too often been the staples of mission historiography.
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28 Director of the A:shiwi A:wan Museum and Heritage Center Jim Enote has described the difference between consultation, in which outsiders come to the pueblo seeking information with largely one-sided benefits; and collaboration in which researchers and community members work together to negotiate a research program as equals, the interests of both parties shaping the process, and both benefitting through a good-faith relationship of trust (interview with the author, September 24, 2015). He describes an ideal research collaboration as follows:

[...] a higher order than many may be concerned with and [it] implies that collaboration involves reaching out and enlightening on equal terms: to decentralize power and leadership and share problem solving. We will not oppose one another; rather we will enable one another and allow objects and people to speak [...] see “Museum Collaboration Manifesto,” 2014, collection of the author.

A dissertation project such as this one inevitably falls short of Enote’s collaborative ideal, since it began as my individual initiative aimed at meeting the demands of an academic institution and the critical analysis of a select committee of scholars. Zuni initiatives and desires did not shape it from the start as in a truly collaborative project, but I have benefited immensely from the participation and support of Zunis who were willing to work with me, and have subsequently shaped my interpretations. For me, this dissertation is an opportunity to develop the relationships and trust that will allow development of more thoroughly collaborative research designs in the years to come.
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Tsim D. Schneider and Lee M. Panich argue that missions were Indigenous places as well as being Spanish places, and should be understood within Indigenous cultural and historical contexts; see “Native Agency at the Margins of Empire: Indigenous Landscapes, Spanish Missions, and Contested Histories,” in Indigenous Landscapes and Spanish Missions: New Perspectives from Archaeology and Ethnohistory, ed. Panich and Scheider (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2014), 7.
Pre-contact Zuni people did not make use of a formal written language, relying instead upon oral transmission of origin accounts, migration stories, religious knowledge, folk tales, and other forms of history which continue to this day, as well as mnemonic symbols such as rock art that often serve as signs to recall specific stories. They were what Triloki Nath Pandey calls a “memory culture,” devoting energy to mouth-to-mouth learning as a means of preserving and passing on knowledge. As existing today, Zuni knowledge systems focus on human beings and relationships, and the context in which information sharing occurs is as important as the information itself. The situation in which stories are told or prayers are taught, the social protocols guiding these interactions, and the authority and competence of the person passing on the information all shape the meaning of oral histories. While some Zuni ritual talks and prayers must be repeated word for word, many other accounts are performances in which the storyteller interactively reshapes the narrative to address the particular needs of the moment and relate to the modern world.¹ Scholarly studies of Zuni oral accounts reaffirm that they contain diverse information about the Zuni landscape, geography, celestial observations, ceremonial practices, religious ideas, and historical happenings as “an independent source of historical information” transmitting Zuni culture to new generations and contributing to assessment of archaeological data.²
Written history debuted in the Pueblo world as a way of knowing and remembering the past with the arrival of Spanish colonists. In contrast to the performative and contextual elements which convey meaning in oral histories, written documents provide an unchanging record of colonial-era events, many of which have been lost during subsequent centuries, and all incorporating the biased perspectives of their authors. Exploration and historical research took on new importance as tools for comprehending the Southwest under U.S. Territorial government from 1846 until 1912. Like the authors of Spanish and Mexican records before them, Anglo-American historians had their own prejudices and motivations that shaped their interpretations of the past, as well as subsequent conceptions of pueblo missions.

In this chapter, I consider representations of New Mexico missions appearing in nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholarship, and contextualize the historical evidence that I rely upon in subsequent chapters. Several recurring topics emerge from this overview. One of these vital points is determining the significance of New Mexico’s missions, with scholars differing on their importance and relationship to Spanish and Indigenous building traditions. Some see the flat-roofed adobe structures as essentially Indigenous, while others interpret them as provincial emulations of more sophisticated Spanish architecture elsewhere. A related question is how to evaluate the impact of design factors such as the distant location, arid environment, limited resources, Franciscan ideals of poverty, and Native resistance. Were the style and design of New Mexico missions functional reactions to an impoverished frontier setting, or did these buildings encode specific rhetorical messages and connotations that were meaningful within their original socio-cultural contexts? As I will point out, earlier studies typically relied upon poverty, functionality, and environmental determinism to explain the style of New Mexico missions, and limited their study according to present-day state boundaries.
Understanding contributions of Pueblo people to Spanish missions is another vital point about which scholars have differed. This question is essentially about agency—the ability of a person to make choices and pursue their own interests—and whether Indians were able to exercise agency in mission design, construction, ornamentation, and use. Did they contribute to the meaning of mission sites, or were they essentially coerced laborers enacting the will of guardian friars? Answering this question requires studying the residential spaces of missions, where the majority of social interactions took place. Rarely have historians made more than passing mention of mission *conventos*, or recognized the importance of co-resident groups of Native and Spanish people in shaping the meaning of missions as a whole, what I describe as the “mission community.” In the everyday practices and intimate interactions of *convento* life, Pueblo people were the most thoroughly exposed to European ideas but also more likely to experience a degree of agency in shaping the mission’s material environment. A primary objective of my research is to recover glimpses of that vernacular world and its complexities.

**Territorial-Period Accounts**

In 1846, the U.S. forces of General Stephen W. Kearny invaded Mexican territory, and Colonel Sterling Price subsequently occupied New Mexico as a northern front in the war between the United States and Mexico.³ War furnished a pretense for seizing vast areas of northern Mexico all the way to the Pacific, a key tenet in the emerging discourse of Manifest Destiny, which held that the U.S. and its ruling elites of northern-European descent were racially superior and divinely appointed to conquer the continent.⁴ Arizona and New Mexico would ultimately become states in 1912, with the intervening years known as the Territorial Period.
During this period, numerous military, surveying, and scientific expeditions made their way through the Southwest, producing expedition reports and introducing the U.S. public to these newly acquired territories. The Corp of Topographical Engineers oversaw exploration of the region between 1843 and 1863, including production of drawings, watercolors, and textual descriptions of missions in publications found in libraries throughout the U.S.5 Under the direction of James Harvey Simpson, surveys for a transcontinental railroad route also passed through western New Mexico, with expedition artists and brothers Richard and Edward Kern sketching missions in Santo Domingo, Jemez, Zuni, and Laguna Pueblos.6 Richard’s illustrations in the 1852 Sitgreaves Expedition publications are particularly valuable representations of Zuni life and architecture (figures 2.1-2.2).7

During the 1870s, technological developments facilitated field photography, and Timothy H. O’Sullivan set forth with U.S. Geological Surveys of George M. Wheeler, exploring lands west of the hundredth meridian (1871 to 1874). O’Sullivan photographed pre-contact sites, pueblos, and colonial churches in New Mexico with large-scale, stand-alone treatment in the subsequent publications (figure 2.3). John K. Hillers accompanied the Stevenson expedition for Smithsonian Institution’s Bureau of Ethnology (known as the Bureau of American Ethnology or BAE after 1897) to New Mexico from 1879 to 1880, producing revealing images of Zuni Pueblo’s mission falling slowly into disrepair (figures 2.4-2.5). O’Sullivan and Hillers’s work reached a wide audience through stereographic reproductions, but beyond images, these expeditions produced few details about New Mexico’s former missions.8

As closely related, emergent disciplines in the later nineteenth century, U.S. anthropologists and archaeologists came to view the Southwest as an “internal exotic” location for testing and developing concepts of cultural diversity, and generated new interest in Spanish
missions as a byproduct. These anthropologists sought greater scientific rigor, distancing themselves from earlier speculations by seeking the origins, “typical” examples, and developmental history of specific Native cultures. Many found what seemed to be an objective methodological foundation in the evolutionary theory of Lewis Henry Morgan, who believed human societies universally passed through the same stages of developmental progression, though some might potentially remain stuck in earlier, more primitive states.

For evolutionary anthropologists, identifying cultural origins and remains were crucial for fitting modern Native American societies into their models. Artifacts and architecture manifested culture in ways that anthropologists could describe and measure, producing ostensibly objective data. They also saw “traditional” materials as endangered and rapidly disappearing resources, rushing to collect as much as possible for their institutions. This acquisitive competition was a symptom of their underlying and false belief that Native cultures were doomed to succumb to Anglo-American society. They believed that it was their duty to “rescue” Native cultures through scientific documentation and collection before they completely disappeared, even if Native peoples themselves objected.

One of the first expeditions to document Native American cultural development in the Southwest was that of Colonel James Stevenson for the Bureau of Ethnology in 1879. When his party stopped at Zuni Pueblo, the young Frank Hamilton Cushing decided to remain, learning Zuni cultural practices and beliefs first hand over four years as the first anthropologist to practice methods of “participant observation.” In the same years, brothers Victor and Cosmos Mindeleff worked throughout western New Mexico and Arizona, collecting specimens, documenting Pueblo architecture, and surveying Native ruins for the Bureau of Ethnology 1881 to 1889. They used their photos and measurements to make models of the western pueblos for
the National Museum.\textsuperscript{15} While Cushing and the Mindeleffs were not interested specifically in missions, they furnish valuable descriptions, oral histories, measurements, photographs, and comparative architectural details for understanding mission architecture, including Zuni Pueblo and the Hawikku and Kechiba:wa sites (figures 2.6-2.7). For the Mindeleffs, missions’ form and construction exemplified an intrusive architectural style amongst Pueblo constructions, with the arid climate and defensive requirements as primary stylistic factors.\textsuperscript{16}

After a hiatus in Washington, DC, Cushing returned to direct the interdisciplinary Hemenway Southwestern Expedition in 1886, the first professional archaeological project in the region.\textsuperscript{17} The expedition began in Arizona Territory along the Salt River, continued to Zuni Pueblo and nearby sites, where Cushing’s crew expanded his home in hopes of founding a base for ongoing Southwestern anthropological research, and concluded at the Hopi Mesas in Arizona. Cushing romantically cast himself as a scientist-explorer, going out into the nation’s “unknown” peripheries, in order to return and incorporate them into the national fabric by introduction to eastern audiences through his reports. His approach was intensely personal; Cushing believed four years among the Zuni equipped him with an insider’s perspective, allowing him to intuitively understand Native traces on the landscape as if connecting to his own ancestors. He organized the Hemenway expedition as a “reconnaissance,” alternating between wider mapping and periodic stops for in-depth excavation. This rhythm allowed for improvisatory responses to sites that felt significant, but resulted in an ad hoc process as Cushing jumped from one inspiration to the next.\textsuperscript{18}

A major premise underlying the work the Mindeleff and Hemenway expeditions was the idea that Pueblo origin and migration accounts had factual bases, and ethnologists could link these oral histories to specific archaeological sites, establishing an evolutionary trajectory.
according to Morgan’s models. Neither expedition focused on the colonial period, but both visited mission sites and their publications stimulated interest in the story of Spanish contact with Pueblo peoples, particularly for Cushing’s field secretary, Frederick Webb Hodge. Adolph Bandelier, the first trained historian of the Southwest, was also associated with the Hemenway Expedition. He visited and documented many of the pueblos and began the first organized efforts to compile primary sources as a historical record of the territory. Among other accomplishments was a 1,400-page manuscript history of missions in northern Mexico and the U.S. Southwest for Pope Leo XVIII’s 1888 Golden Jubilee. This document disappeared into Vatican archives and has yet to be fully published; thus, it had little direct effect on mission historiography, although Bandelier discusses mission history in many other publications.

As anthropologists initiated study of Southwestern pueblos, a growing travel literature appeared in the popular press, through such publications as Harner’s New Monthly Magazine, circulating popular mythology and misinformation that propelled imaginative speculations by early visitors. The completion of the Atchison, Topeka, Santa Fe Railroad line in 1879-1880 made New Mexico more readily available to tourists. New Mexico’s architectural traditions, seemingly so different from the buildings of the eastern U.S., became a means of romanticizing the problematic past and featured prominently in photographic collections of the late nineteenth century. Through publications such as Charles Lummis’s The Land of Poco Tiempo, quintessentially romanticizing New Mexico as a land of enchantment, as well as his magazine The Land of Sunshine (later Out West), and railroad advertisements, missions became associated with cliff dwellings and pueblos in a the popular Anglo-American imagination.

As Cushing’s scientist-explorer persona suggests, anthropologists and academics were part of this romanticization. Some struck a duel posture combining academic research and
touristic boosterism, as for example in an unpublished “little book” from the 1890s by Walter Hough. Focusing on Isleta, Laguna, Acoma, Zuni, and Hopi Pueblos, Hough provides a guide for tourists leaving the railroad on short side-visits, based in the aesthetics of the “picturesque,” or selective views emphasizing diverse terrain, varied textures, and contrasting colors as William Gilpin theorized. Hough betrays a desire to experience pueblos as “unmodified” by Euro-American culture, directly contradicting federal assimilationist policy then in effect, which sought to recondition Indians and replace their culture with Anglo norms.

Hough was particularly fond of the Hopi Pueblos, judging them to be the “most primitive,” and “a picture of the ancient life as true as may be found in this day.” In his estimation, missions represented inherently foreign introductions, under whose “mild and judicious” sway the Pueblos communities lived and divided their attentions between Christian and traditional religious expressions. Hough’s picturesque impulse and desire to keep Pueblo people separated from modernity were common, not only among tourists, but also the Anglo-American artists who began to arrive in New Mexico by the end of the nineteenth century.

Statehood and the Rhetoric of Tri-Ethnic Harmony

Anglo-American prejudices against New Mexico’s Spanish-speaking Catholic population delayed its entry into statehood until 1912. Many Anglos believed pseudo-scientific ideas that racial intermixing among Mexicans had led to degeneration. New Mexico’s boosters sought to counteract racial prejudice through a “tri-culturalist” rhetoric postulating that Anglo-Americans, “Spanish-Americans” (rather than “Mexicans”), and Indians lived harmoniously in New Mexico as three distinct and un-mixed races. Tri-cultural harmony became a foundational mythology in
the territory and later state, representing a partial truth that fostered cultural productivity but also sanitized historical realities of violence, cultural exchange, and intermarriage.  

Among the first New Mexicans to voice the rhetoric of tri-cultural harmony was L. Bradford Prince, a strong advocate for statehood as chief-justice in the territorial Supreme Court (1878 to 1882), territorial Governor (1889 to 1893), and delegate to New Mexico’s 1911 state constitutional convention. In his *Historical Sketches of New Mexico from the Earliest Records to the American Occupation* (1883), Prince dedicated his work to the “People of New Mexico, Three-fold in origin and language, but now one in nationality, in purpose, and in destiny [...]” Prince continued to promote tri-ethnic harmony in later publications, compiling New Mexico’s history and popularizing it as a tourist destination.

Drawing on Lummis and author Helen Hunt Jackson, who had spurred interest in California’s missions, Prince featured colonial religious architecture in his *Spanish Mission Churches of New Mexico* (1915). Immediately following statehood, this book was a victory lap parading the new state’s rich antiquities. He argues New Mexico’s colonial churches are “far more interesting” and “superior” to California’s mission churches in terms of antiquity, varied history, and architectural form. Representing Franciscan evangelization as a virtuous effort that corrupt civil officials and Mexican rule had undermined, Prince’s book is a generalized guide for “the tourist, the antiquarian, and the religious enthusiast,” complete with touring routes and itineraries for exploring pueblos and their feast days.

To Prince, the colonial period was a triumph of Spaniards and self-sacrificing friars who brought about the “civilization” of savages with minimal conflict. He acknowledges Native labor built the missions, following Benavides in attributing wall construction and plastering to Pueblo women and children. Going further in a paper at the nineteenth International Congress
of Americanists in Washington, DC (1915), Prince describes the Salinas missions with their thick walls of unshaped stone as “essentially aboriginal” in style, but he seems to have lacked a framework for conceptualizing mixtures of Spanish and Pueblo cultures. Prince readily appreciated seemingly “pure” Native artforms—dances, religious ceremonials, pottery, and weaving—but was critical of mixed artistic styles and cultural traditions. Within his segregationist logic of tri-ethnic harmony, Indians were better off sticking to the things they did well, than in trying to be Spanish. Ultimately, Prince ascribed all agency to the missionaries, and imagined their living quarters as exclusively Spanish spaces. He had relatively little to say about New Mexico conventos, but his every mention describes them as residences for individual friars, or as stopover for traveling brethren at larger conventos. Although he had read the primary sources, he could not imagine conventos as spaces of cultural exchange.

Despite limitations, Prince’s Spanish Mission Churches was the first scholarly survey published of the region’s religious architecture. Directly resulting from his personal history and commitment to statehood, Prince only selected buildings within the state boundaries he had helped to create, prioritizing twentieth-century concerns over more pertinent colonial boundaries. This “state bias” underlies an enduring tendency to treat New Mexico missions as isolated and regionally distinct phenomena, rather than considering their relationship to missions elsewhere in New Spain. It has remained in force among later scholars, with reinforcement from state research funding and twentieth-century architectural developments. The revivalist architecture known as the “Santa Fe style” that Edgar L. Hewitt and staff developed at the Museum of New Mexico strengthened this perception of regional uniqueness. Incorporating flat roofs, projecting beams, and planar walls, the Santa Fe style was an “invented tradition” exuding authenticity while disguising its modern nature beneath historically derived details.
Hewett’s young staff member Jesse L. Nusbaum was partly responsible for the codification of these architectural features. Because he published little and spread his contributions broadly across the fields of photography, architecture, design, and anthropology, Nusbaum remains underappreciated in Southwestern history. Born in Greeley, CO in 1887, he grew up working for his father who was a contractor and ran a local brickyard. Nusbaum taught himself photography and participated in summer field surveys of Mesa Verde and the Pajarito Plateau for Hewett and the School of American Archaeology in 1907. With 1909’s opening of the Museum of New Mexico, Hewett hired Nusbaum as Superintendent of Construction, where he would play a critical role in the development of Santa Fe revivalist architecture, as well as excavating and restoring a number of important monuments such as the Alcove House kiva in Frijoles Canyon of Bandelier National Monument (c. 1910; figure 2.8). Nusbaum employed his photographic skills in a survey of surviving Spanish architectural features around Santa Fe, which become the basis of his “New-Old Santa” exhibit with Sylvanus Morley at the Palace of the Governors (1912), defining and canonizing components of the Santa Fe style.

Nusbaum promoted this style through constructions for Hewett; he was largely responsible for the restoration of the Palace of the Governors (1909 to 1913, figure 2.9), construction of the Painted Desert pseudo-pueblo at the Panama-California Exposition in San Diego (1914), and the New Mexico Fine Arts Museum (1915 to 1916, figure 2.10). Rapp, Rapp, and Hendrickson, the architectural firm which designed the Fine Arts Museum, combined an eclectic mix of bell towers and façade designs from New Mexico missions, drawing heavily on the Arts and Crafts movement and the picturesque ideals of touristic boosterism. Although this early phase of the Santa Fe style generated relatively little theoretical writing, its buildings comprise material statements about the relationship of the modern Southwest to a triumphalist...
vision of the colonial past, with Hewitt’s museum as a key mediator. Nusbaum gained further experience in Spanish mission architecture in 1915, when he excavated and stabilized parts of Pecos Pueblo’s Nuestra Senora de los Ángeles mission. Soon thereafter, the Society for the Preservation and Restoration of New Mexico’s Mission Churches undertook substantial restorations of iconic colonial churches in Acoma, Zia, Las Trampas, and Chimayo in the 1920s.

It was not until 1943 that Hewett published an extensive treatment of New Mexico’s “Mission Monuments” with coauthor Reginald G. Fisher, in a book that was quickly surpassed by works of George Kubler and Ross G. Montgomery (see below). Hewett had been part of the public acquisition of several seventeenth-century missions and overseen their excavation. Although Hewett and Fischer outline a triumphal history of Franciscanism from Italy to New Mexico, they focus on the significance of missions to state history as the primary source of the Santa Fe Style, which they see as a Southwestern renaissance and New Mexico’s “chief cultural asset.” They treat the Pueblo Indians as leaderless, peaceful peoples who were merely waiting through the centuries for the arrival of Christianity. Hewett and Fischer seem to see the Franciscans as a cloistered order living apart from Native laborers, and fixate on the picturesque qualities and romance of the mostly ruined six “archaic” missions.

Herbert Eugene Bolton’s work stands in contradistinction to framing of missions as a unique part of New Mexico’s state identity. With a seminal 1917 essay entitled “The Mission as a Frontier Institution in the Spanish American Colonies,” Bolton became the leading figure for the Borderlands group of textually-based historians. Although they have received justifiable criticism for their Spanish-centric focus and uncritical use of sources, the Borderlands approach drew comparisons across geographic regions and has inspired more recent transnational research.
Despite the notable efforts of the Borderlands school, the New Mexico state bias was well suited to the interests of a broad class of state boosters, and remained a recurrent tendency in subsequent mission studies.\textsuperscript{56} Partly to counteract this regionalism, my interpretive chapters draw comparisons from the wider Franciscan world of Iberia, central Mexico, and the rest of the northern Borderlands.

\textbf{“Poor New Mexico”: Scholes, Kubler, and Montgomery}

An early and persistent explanation of the determining factors in the style of New Mexico mission architecture has been what Robin Farwell Gavin describes as the outmoded “poor New Mexico” mythology of a static and socially-simple provincial culture.\textsuperscript{57} James E. Ivey and David Hurst Thomas call this the narrative of the “poverty-stricken frontier,” representing Spanish borderlands settlements as isolated, ignorant, and uncivilized. These unexamined stereotypes were based in the prejudices of early Anglo immigrants, some of who justified taking land from New Mexicans whom they saw as racially inferior and incapable of properly developing its resources. Such Anglos perceived traditional adobe architecture as perpetually decaying, dirty, and primitive.\textsuperscript{58} “Poor New Mexico” mythology appears in mission history tied to what Ivey calls the “mission in the wilderness concept,” imagining Franciscan friars living alone in great isolation and simplicity.\textsuperscript{59} Ivey and Thomas implicate France V. Scholes for impressing this mythology on the historiography of New Mexico missions.\textsuperscript{60}

As a professor of history for the University of New Mexico, Scholes spent much of his life locating and photographing primary sources in Spanish and Mexican archives.\textsuperscript{61} Bolton had challenged Scholes to work on seventeenth-century New Mexico, and Scholes successfully
demonstrated it was possible to reconstruct regional history before the Pueblo Revolt. Scholes published numerous translations and essays, along with two books on New Mexico’s social and political history prior to 1670. He saw the seventeenth century as a period of conflict between civil and religious authorities over jurisdictional power, at times verging on outright civil war. Scholes believed pueblos were caught between these factions, with control of Indian labor being a primary flashpoint.

In his analysis, Scholes notes potential political biases of sources, but uncritically accepts their descriptions of everyday life at the missions. He approaches Franciscan documents as trustworthy and disinterested, accepting depictions of isolated mission life at face value, without considering these tropes were also constructed with particular rhetorical objectives. From the documents, Scholes reconstructs colonial New Mexico as,

[…] an isolated, poverty ridden frontier province […] where the very simplicity of political, social, and economic conditions permitted [jurisdictional conflicts] to assume a greater relative importance than would have been the case if life had been more varied and complex.

Many subsequent scholars follow Scholes in depicting missions as isolated and poor, as well as reiterating the friars’ supposed success in converting pueblos and eradicating Native practices. These uncritical narratives view colonial documents as accurate, neutral observations, focusing on verifying their content rather than analyzing their rhetorical constructs.

The “poor New Mexico” trope is tacitly Eurocentric. Among pueblos making up the majority of the seventeenth-century population, the region was both cosmological center and heartland of Pueblo cultural expression, not an isolated frontier. Furthermore, Scholes focuses on conflict, rather than periods of cooperation between colonial authorities that were the most important for mission history, although they produced less of a paper trail. Between the years 1625 and 1632, and again between 1640 and 1659, civil and religious authorities cooperated
better, and these were the periods of greatest mission expansion and construction (see dates in Table 9.1). Despite his shortfalls, Scholes accurately recognized the importance of Indigenous labor for daily functions at the missions, with groups including women and children staffing each mission in exchange for exemption from tribute obligations.69

The “poor New Mexico” narrative underlies many assumptions of causality and meaning in missions, as in George Kubler’s The Religious Architecture of New Mexico (1940). This volume came from Kubler’s doctoral work under French art historian Henri Focillon at a time when art historians generally ignored northern New Spain.70 Focillon conceptualized artistic forms as ideas existing in the mind of artists, which find external expression in the organization of matter. This conception shaped Kubler’s own interest in processes of formal development, as did modernist architecture.71 In discussing New Mexico missions, Kubler focused on formal characteristics such as the manipulation of space, mass, materials, interrelated solids and voids, lighting, and optical effects. Modernist aesthetics are evident in his praise for the “coherent, organized architectural form” of the missions, and the “massive forms of [their] clean, simple style of building.”72

Following Focillon, Kubler expected an organic pattern of stylistic development from archaic origins to classical clarity and an eventual formal decline, but this pattern did not fit the evidence he found in New Mexico.73 Unable to detect his anticipated trajectory, Kubler fell back on the “poor New Mexico” narrative, arguing its missions represent a “stylistic end term” like self-replicating, cloned tissue on which the environment, climate, and isolation played strong conditioning roles.74 Rather than considering whether New Mexico missions could have extended earlier Iberian vernacular traditions, Kubler believed that seventeenth-century New Mexico architecture began as untrained experiments by friars attempting to adapt Baroque
European forms to the available materials and Pueblo building techniques. He saw the roof
structures and walls as essentially Puebloan in style but scaled up to enclose larger spaces, along
with Spanish towers; doors and windows; ornamental style; and hardware. Kubler attributes
the construction of mission walls and plastering to Native women, and believes that some traits
of New Mexico missions arose from traditional Pueblo labor divisions. He also recognizes the
role of Indigenous workers in the functioning of mission *conventos*, with one or two friars
relying upon Native labor to meet the needs of their table and altar. Kubler believes these staffs
numbered between six to twelve workers, including women to grind corn, but that “few of them
lived in the *convento* itself.” Kubler echoes Prince’s triumphalism, seeing Franciscans as “an
overwhelming influence for good,” achieving an “especially brilliant missionary performance.”

Social history was unimportant to Kubler’s analysis; his primary interest lay in missions
as a formal architectural type. In contrast to organic trajectories positing cycles of development
and decline, he argues New Mexico missions exhibit only “erratic minor variations from a frozen
and immobile type,” occurring in “the provincial outpost in the state of chemical purity.”
Kubler’s analysis is not without nuance, but his adoption of a format separating the formal
history of the type in general from the particular histories of specific structures exaggerates their
similarities. He overstated the durability of adobe as a medium, and was unaware of the
complicated structural chronology of many mission sites, leading him to treat the missions as
essentially interchangeable. Finally, although Kubler mentions *conventos*, his formal analysis
is largely confined to the church structures themselves.

Kubler’s forceful impact on the study of architectural history in New Mexico inhibited
the development of new ideas for many years. Reviewers praised his book for treating as high
art a group of buildings that had received little previous attention. More than one commentator
declared it to be the definitive work on the subject, even in 1993 when Marc Treib noted that it “remained the classical study.”

In many cases, historians of art and architecture simply deferred to Kubler’s study. Ironically, the effect of his work echoed his thesis, with most authors unwilling to further develop the initial interpretive form of his introduction.

As Kubler was writing, the most significant excavation of a New Mexico mission to date was taking place on Antelope Mesa in Arizona. From 1935 to 1939, the Peabody Museum sponsored a major interdisciplinary expedition to the ancestral Hopi site of Awatovi Pueblo, under the direction of J. O. Brew. Brew began excavating Awatovi’s seventeenth-century San Bernardo mission in 1937 (figures 2.11-2.12). Finding it more extensive than he had anticipated, he invited ecclesiastic architect Ross G. Montgomery to participate, with the resulting publication appearing in 1949. For mission historiography, Montgomery’s “analytic restoration” remains the most important component of the site publication, leading Ivey and Thomas to place him on par with Kubler as the “father of Southwestern mission archaeology.”

Montgomery was an architect by training and a Protestant convert to Catholicism. He specialized in revival styles that emphasized “historically correct” allusions to California and New Mexico mission periods as well as Lombard-Romanesque style. Over the course of his career, he enjoyed a very productive partnership with the Los Angeles-San Diego Bishop John J. Cantwell during a period of expansion and reconstruction within the diocese. Montgomery also participated in historical restoration, most notably at the Franciscan missions of San Luis Rey de Francia from 1922-1924, where friars provided the primary labor, and Santa Barbara, where he designed St. Anthony’s Seminary and numerous other buildings, and subsequently oversaw restoration of earthquake damage in 1925 (figures 2.13-2.14). As an architect,
Montgomery seems to belong more to the stylistic eclecticism of the nineteenth century, with a focus on surface ornament and decorative elements, than to modernism with its focus on form.

Montgomery’s experiences made him an expert in the twentieth-century Catholic architecture of California, and he had working relations with members of California’s secular clergy, as well as members of the Franciscan and Carmelite orders. Through these patrons, he understood the needs of contemporary clergy, while he also expanded his awareness of ecclesiastic architectural history through an extensive personal library and travels to Italy. Montgomery was not trained as an archaeologist or historian, however, and his interpretation of San Bernardo betrays these limitations. As an architect, Montgomery was most intimately familiar with the needs and intentions of his patrons. He was also an advocate for his own status as architect, seeking control of projects that he designed. Montgomery was concerned about the functionality of buildings, but he followed an essentially top-down approach to architectural interpretation. To him, the significance of a building lay with the intentions of its designers, and he expected missions to follow the norms of their founding orders and the liturgy of the Roman Rite as a rule, which he understood through the filter of modern California.

Montgomery relied upon twentieth-century sources for his understanding of mission liturgical regulations, believing them to have been essentially the same during the seventeenth-century and the primary determining factors in mission design. Although he acknowledges the conjectural nature of his interpretation, his penchant for control and top-down conception of cultural processes led to a tone of certainty obscuring his underlying speculation and problematic use of sources. At times, primary sources and archaeological remains directly contradicted Montgomery’s conceptions of the Roman Rite and Franciscan profession, compelling him to explain away the discrepancies or ignore them entirely. While on site at Awatovi, he seems to
have exerted a forceful interpretative voice to which Brew deferred, which unfortunately biased the ongoing excavation and its subsequent interpretation.\textsuperscript{95}

Uncritically triumphalist in his view of the Franciscan evangelization campaign, Montgomery unapologetically sympathizes with the friars, adopting what he imagines to have been their perspective and having little interest in Native points of view which he termed “idolatrous savagery.” Montgomery saw New Mexico’s Franciscans as a direct, undifferentiated extension of their founder St. Francis, with identical motives and virtues.\textsuperscript{96} To his mind, the missionization of New Mexico was a systematic and orderly achievement that should excite great admiration, with the friars exhibiting “a burning religious zeal, a remarkable singleness and purity of purpose.”\textsuperscript{97} He saw Franciscans as patient, lacking in ostentation, and above all motivated by the salvation of Indian souls in a gentle paternalism.\textsuperscript{98} Montgomery blames Spanish civil officials and especially the system of encomienda for exploiting of Native labor, and sees the Pueblo Revolt as an almost-inexplicable interruption of a serene Hopi-Franciscan pastoral.\textsuperscript{99}

Montgomery’s emphasis on church doctrine, everyday use, and pragmatic responses to environmental limitations sharply contrast Kubler’s formalist paradigm.\textsuperscript{100} Montgomery was especially critical of Kubler, accusing him of “modernistic preciosity” for his focus on aesthetics and form rather than utilitarian considerations.\textsuperscript{101} Thinking of decorative surface treatments rather than the expressive potential of architectural space, Montgomery saw the friars as essentially conservative, untrained builders, “without any flair for self-expression” or “studied and sensuous forms,” possessing instead a “simplicity, a similar naïve primitive quality of artlessness that is definitely Franciscan.”\textsuperscript{102} Montgomery is partly correct in seeing New Mexico missions as essentially vernacular in style, comparing them to antecedents in Spain and Northern
Italy. He is wrong, however, in assuming everyday architectural expressions lack recognizable stylistic characteristics amenable to comparative analysis. With architectural training and focus on surface ornament applied to an underlying structure, his conception of art was not conducive to thinking about the formal and aesthetic qualities of an essentially vernacular building tradition. To his estimation, the missions were unintentional in design, lacking both style and meaning, and attempts to employ modern art historical analysis with them were simply misguided, for the friars “knew nothing of our Neo-aesthetics and cared less. They were pragmatists—not patrons of the arts.”

Montgomery’s idealism is clearly mistaken, for many friars were familiar with artistic developments in Europe and Mexico, both living in and visiting elaborately ornamented establishments, and overseeing work themselves. The values of simplicity and poverty that Montgomery takes at face value had actually been objects of contested interpretation from the earliest years of the Order, subject to the whims of patronage and fluctuating between increasing sophistication and reactionary asceticism. Montgomery idealized Franciscan missionaries, rather than studying the evidence of their actual practices over time. His thinking becomes circular when glorification of the Franciscans becomes an explanatory principle for interpreting Awatovi’s remains and reinforcing his own iteration of the “Mission in the Wilderness” paradigm. He “presupposes a rigorous kind architecture, with all ornamental embellishments reduced to a minimum,” and his idealism of the friars is clear in passages such as the following:

At remote Aguatubi [sic], in the seventeenth century, the Religious were few in number, sometimes perhaps but one or two. Austerely appared, possessing little more than what was rudimentary to existence, dogged by hostile conservatives [traditional Hopi religious practitioners], obstructed by a barbarism hardly more than savage, they lived precariously. Moreover, they had little skill at building. This lack of training was coincident with a limited range of tools and construction materials, with available labor of but an indifferent sort.
In this passage, Montgomery ascribes savage primitivity to the Hopis, following his general dismissal of the Hopi region as a “savage setting” with “primitive” towns. Although he recognizes the “print of an Indian hand” in the mission walls and roof, and occasionally acknowledges the possibility of Hopi resistance, he generally attributes all creative agency to the “poor earnest friars,” rather than their “careless Indian helpers.”

Montgomery doggedly insists the Franciscans of New Mexico lived in cloistered seclusion, dividing their _conventos_ into external work rooms and internal residential rooms, with enclosure doors preventing women and Native laity from accessing the inner sanctum. Describing Awatovi’s _convento_, he writes that no women were allowed “within the confines of a monastic enclosure” and that “their enclosure door […] is only one of several, but the area confined within these is the sacred precinct of a religious world set apart,” and finally that the friars lived “shielded from external affairs by closed entranceways and barriers of stone.” He describes the _convento_ as the “friary sanctum,” and sees the friar(s) as comprising “their own community” in contradistinction to “their Moqui [Hopi] charges.”

Why was Montgomery convinced that New Mexico Franciscans lived in cloistered seclusion? He offers almost no documentary support, and had read numerous accounts by friars such as Thomas Gage, Joaquín de Jesús Ruiz, and Benavides attesting to Native men and women inside Franciscan _conventos_. Montgomery misinterprets or very selectively avoids passages that contradict his beliefs, willfully dodging the obvious conclusion that friars did not live alone. Montgomery (and Brew following his lead) seems to conceive of Franciscan missionaries like monks of other regular orders, even though the mendicant friars did not take vows of seclusion and had a long history of contact with laity as I will describe in Chapter Three.
Montgomery and Brew’s belief in an enclosed claustral residence complicated their interpretation of the mission’s archaeological remains. If missionaries were really such simple, austere monks of solitude, as Montgomery said, why did they need such a large residence? Brew interprets the *convento*’s size aspirationally, as a hope that other friars would eventually arrive to fill it:

There can be no doubt that the building never served its full function, as envisaged by the builders […] staffs were merely nominal […] we must visualize a limited number of Franciscans, perhaps at times only one, rattling around in a house ambitiously conceived and built to hold a larger number.115

Brew is incorrect in this presumption, for the number of friars in the colony was contractually fixed at a maximum of sixty-six, and the Franciscans never appear to have pursued more since they could rarely fulfill their quota.116 For his part, Montgomery posits excess rooms were for Spanish visitors, namely colonial officials and traveling friars.117

The enclosure hypothesis presents other interpretive problems at Awatovi. Five rooms with adobe benches flanked a central hallway connecting the sacristies to the *convento* (figure 2.15), rooms which Brew and Montgomery saw as classrooms and workspaces for Native converts.118 Yet they found no doorways into these rooms except through the central hallway between the *convento* and sacristy. One must therefore posit that Hopis entered either through the restricted spaces of the sacristy, or through the *convento*. This contradiction to the enclosure hypothesis is manifest in both Brew and Montgomery’s plan illustrations, but neither acknowledges it.119

The kitchen presents another problem, for Franciscans clearly attested to Indigenous workers in the kitchen (compare to figure 1.2). Hopis had reused a room at the southern corner of the *convento* after the mission period, but it preserved a twenty centimeter (7.87”) high platform along its southeastern wall. Heavy burning and smoke stains on the wall indicate that a
large mission-period hearth once existed there, probably as the mission kitchen. Its position at
the corner of the convento quadrangle allowed Brew and Montgomery to interpret it as outside of
the enclosure of the claustral doors, so that Native cooks would not have broken the convento’s
hypothetic seclusion. This theory raised the question of how food reached the refectory for
consumption, however, since there was no direct passage between the kitchen and the long room
adjacent. Montgomery confidently declares that a wooden turn or lazy susan was set in the wall,
as visible in his illustration. As Brew describes it,

This was a device permitting dishes to be passed from the kitchen into the refectory at the
same time preserving enclosure […] the construction was such at that any servants
working in the kitchen who were not members of the Order at no time during the process
could obtain even a glimpse of the refectory. Thus the enclosure was preserved.

In spite of the authors’ certainty, there is no material or textual evidence for the existence of, nor
need for such an elaborate solution in seventeenth-century New Mexico. It is a hypothetical
solution to an imaginary problem, for New Mexico missions such as Awatovi were not cloistered
enclosures.

The discussion of labor and everyday tasks at the Hopi mission eventually forces
Montgomery to reluctantly acknowledge the existence of “several trustworthy Native neophytes”
who “inevitably lived outside of the enclosure, although permitted entry in the performance of
their respective duties.” While the mission labor force might include women as laborers, he
insists that they “indeed, would not be privileged to enter the friary, other than such extern rooms
as were contiguous.” He also accepts the possibility of Native specialists producing crafts in
the mission convento, but only men and only during the day, after which they retired to homes in
the pueblo. In support of this revised position, Montgomery relies primarily on eighteenth-
century sources which describe smaller, more regularized rotating labor staffs, or on seventeenth-
century documents which he misinterprets to minimalize the numbers and presence of Native labor in the _convento_ spaces.¹²⁵

The unfounded belief that mission _conventos_ were primarily Spanish spaces with little or no Native presence existed before Montgomery. Prince had believed this to be the case, and while Kubler and Scholes accepted that Native laborers in the mission, they felt few if any Indians slept there. Brew’s description of the _convento_ as a structure of enclosure and seclusion is understandable; he was ignorant of Catholic monastic traditions and may not have been aware of distinctions between mendicant Franciscans, and cloistered orders such as the Benedictines, Cistercians, or Carthusians. Montgomery’s insistence is less excusable, since he had read the relevant primary sources, and worked with Franciscans in restoring California _conventos_.¹²⁶ Montgomery seems to have ignored evidence for Native laborers living and working within missions, reinforcing the triumphalist narrative of heroic friars alone in their wilderness missions and minimalizing the labor demands that missions placed on local Pueblo communities. His staunch advocacy of claustral segregation by race and gender circumvent seventeenth-century accusations of avarice and sexual predation against Franciscan friars, portraying a level of virtue that may not have always been the reality.

Awatovi is the most thorough and systematic mission excavations to reach publication, and Montgomery was a major contributor in that effort. His use of material evidence and primary documents to interpret a particular mission went beyond preceding efforts and was a landmark in the field. His triumphalist narrative, unjustified certainty, and uncritical attitude towards Spanish sources mar his conclusions, however, especially in his fervent denial of Native presence in the everyday life and spaces of the _convento_.

45
Refining Perspectives Since the Mid-Twentieth Century

a. Expanding Data

During the mid-twentieth century, most scholarship on New Mexico mission architecture was strictly descriptive and deferred to Kubler and Montgomery, but excavations and restorations incrementally prepared the stage for rethinking many prior assumptions. Early mission excavations had focused on stabilizing sites for public use, without research design, good organization, or systematic record keeping, limiting their value.127 While shoddy excavations continued occasionally after the 1940s, most subsequent work was more professional, with useful documentation.

Significant excavations occurred at Abó, Quarai, Tabirá, San Gabriel del Yungue-Ouinge, Las Humanas, and San Miguel and La Castrense in Santa Fe.128 Excavations and restoration of Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe in Zuni Pueblo took place in 1967 under the direction of Louis R. Caywood.129 The missions at Pecos Pueblo had suffered decades of sporadic, poorly documented excavation, but in 1969, Alden Hayes began consolidating their sketchy data with his own excavations, published in 1974 as The Four Churches of Pecos.130 Restorations provided further new information, having occurred at Acoma’s San Esteban del Rey under the Committee for the Reconstruction and Preservation of New Mexico Mission Churches (1924 to 1929), and the National Parks Service and tribal government (1970s).131 Together with these projects, John L. Kessel’s The Missions of New Mexico Since 1776 traces the history of twenty-nine exemplars of Spanish colonial architecture from the time of Dominguez’s 1776 visitation into the twentieth century.132 Combining primary documents and visual analysis,
Kessel provides a valuable compendium of mission representations, showing the mutability of adobe mission architecture over time.

Taken together, their mission excavations indicated that large formal mission churches with *conventos* were rarely the initial constructions at a site, and that mission establishments typically developed over time. The various mid-century publications expanded structural knowledge, but lacked a synthesizing, comparative framework, while having little to say about the material culture of missions. Adding to this body of knowledge during the second half of the twentieth century, additional research gradually became available about missions of Northern Mexico, including some originally part of the *Custodia* of New Mexico, and others such as San Antonio de Padua of Casas Grandes in present-day Chihuahua, which were very similar in form to those of New Mexico, but had separate administration.133 Much of this work is in Spanish, and students of New Mexico rarely incorporate comparisons to Northern and Central Mexico, despite the rich potential of more comparative studies for better understanding missionization throughout the greater region.

b. Rethinking State Bias

The 1992 Columbian Quincentenary provided occasion to reassess the profound legacy of colonial encounters between European and Native American societies, and its pan-American repercussions fostered a climate conducive to comparative frameworks, incorporating New Mexico in discussions of Spanish missionization more generally. To mark the Quincentenary, the Society for American Archaeology sponsored a three volume collaboration entitled *Columbian Consequences*. Edited by David Hurst Thomas, this project explored the ramifications of Columbian encounters in the Spanish Borderlands and from a Pan-American
Thomas describes the guiding philosophy as “Cubist,” seeking a more thorough understanding of the past through juxtaposition of multiple perspectives, rather than a singular claim about “the way it really was.” Through such Quincentenary projects scholars generally began to treat missions as contested institutions with different meanings for Native communities than for their missionary designers.

*Columbian Consequences* set the tone for the next quarter century, combining a broadly comparative Borderlands framework with a critical awareness of bias and recognition of Native agency in shaping colonial society. A year later, an edited volume on missions in Spanish Florida consolidated archaeological data from that region, including comparisons between the Florida mission model and those of the Southwest (both New Mexico and Sonora). In contrast to the conjoined churches and multi-room *conventos* of New Mexico, Florida missions employed smaller, free-standing structures without regular plans, separating the church, kitchen, and small residence (see Chapter Nine). Thomas has continued the interregional comparative approach of *Columbian Consequences*, directing excavations in both regions at the Guale mission of Santa Catalina in present-day Georgia, and San Marcos in New Mexico’s Galisteo Basin.

Although Kubler compared New Mexico missions to sixteenth century Mexican predecessors, state bias and nationalistic frameworks have impeded more extensive analysis of connections between these phases of colonization. In *Theaters of Conversion: Religious Architecture and Indian Artisans in Colonial Mexico*, Samuel Y. Edgerton frames New Mexico as an extension of Mexican evangelism, arguing Native parishioners were active participants in the negotiation and dissemination of European visual culture, comprising a sixteenth century “Indian Renaissance.” These exchanges were not based in social equality however, and Edgerton introduces the concept of “expedient selection” to describe the intentional deployment...
of certain elements from the European Christian artistic heritage to appeal to Indians by “reassuring resemblances” to elements of Native culture. Edgerton concludes with two chapters about New Mexico, presenting architectural characteristics he interprets as expedient selections among seventeenth-century missions.

More recently, an international exhibition and catalog entitled The Arts of the Missions of Northern New Spain, 1600-1821 brought together Spanish mission material culture from throughout northern New Spain, including Mexico, the U.S. Southwest, and California. Among its essays, David J. Webster sets the tone, arguing that fear, anxiety, and coercion shaped mission contexts and were constant background factors even during times of peace. Armed coercion, drought, famine, raids, and disease drove Native people together at Spanish reducciones, when they might otherwise have remained independent. Friars used punitive measures to force compliance, but themselves lived in fear of revolts and their own culpability for the fate of Indian souls. For all involved, the colonial enterprise was an anxious and fearful engagement, occasionally flaring into outright brutality, and always overshadowed by the threat of violence.

In her contribution focused on the role of material culture in mission functions, Clara Bargellini argues that liturgical items necessary for sacraments and services were more important than the images that we typically treat as art today. The survival of particular images may hint at local culture and Indigenous reception rather than ideological impositions by the Spanish, in which it is possible to discern multiple levels of accommodation, ambiguity, and hidden meaning. Ultimately, Bargellini sees the mission enterprise as an internally contradictory effort, seeking worldly conquest through agents hoping for spiritual transcendence, a paradox evident in the friars’ treatment of Native peoples.
c. James E. Ivey

James E. Ivey’s work over the past three decades merits special consideration, as it touches on almost every aspect of mission architecture. With a background in historic archaeology and long association with the National Parks Service (NPS), Ivey has thoroughly analyzed numerous Southwestern mission sites and their archaeological histories. In addition to Texas missions, he wrote definitive architectural histories for the Pecos and Salinas missions.\textsuperscript{146} Sorting through the spotty publications and field notes of preceding work at these sites, Ivey also consulted the material remains, conducted new excavations, and drew upon early photographs in his intensive reanalysis of their structural development. Other essays and unpublished papers address the Zuni and Jemez missions; New Mexico \textit{estancias}; architectural comparisons across the Spanish borderlands; hybrid ceramics; and liturgical and everyday practices at the missions.\textsuperscript{147} Ivey compares New Mexico missions to other Borderland sites and adopts Montgomery’s position that pragmatism was the primary factor in their designs, but also explores aesthetics as a demonstrable element.\textsuperscript{148}

Rather than seeing New Mexico missions as static “end term[s]” following Kubler, Ivey treats them in a site-specific manner, identify individual stages of development dependent upon local economic conditions.\textsuperscript{149} Initial establishments were temporary occupations of newly erected or repurposed buildings in Native vernacular styles. Once established, a missionary could begin construction of a larger interim church, planned for the liturgy and community size, but in vernacular styles without façade ornament. The ultimate goal was usually the construction of a carefully designed and fully equipped formal church. Outside of New Mexico, master masons built formal churches with cut-stone ornament and vaulted roofs; however, New Mexico friars never employed master masons nor cut-stone vaulted structures, preferring instead to
enlarge of interim churches. The final mission structure only became possible with sufficient economic development, and temporary or interim churches often became permanent where this did not happen.

Ivey emphasizes the role of missions as economic centers and reorganizers of Pueblo labor, countering inaccurate portrayals of humble friars only concerned with the salvation of souls. Ivey argues missions were “integral and important component[s] of the economy of New Spain,” as critical nodes in local economic systems where friars could not completely determine economic production. Instead, there was a hierarchy among the missions, in which the preexisting wealth and political influence of local pueblos were the primary variables in establishing their relative rank. Ivey’s treatment of missions as economic centers turns attention to the often overlooked architecture of productivity, including outbuildings, fields, workshops, hydraulic systems, and storage facilities that were essential to the everyday functions of these institutions.

Ivey builds upon Kubler’s comparison of seventeenth-century New Mexico missions to later examples in California, bringing together all missions of the northern Borderlands (Jesuit and Franciscan) in a cohesive formal narrative. From the sixteenth century, according to his interpretation, Franciscans typically employed a double-courtyard convento attached to the nave of the church and based on Benedictine precedents, with one courtyard as living quarters and the other forming a service patio, all located near existing pueblos or new congregations of formerly mobile Indians. After their 1572 arrival in Mexico, Jesuits employed what Ivey judges to be a more pragmatic plan, with buildings scattered around the sides of a broad rectangular plaza (figure 2.16), although much remains unknown about Jesuit missions. From the 1690s until the 1760s, Franciscans in Texas, Arizona, and Sonora shifted to fortified village plans, where
Indians lived self-sufficiently within a protective, enclosing wall (figures 2.17-2.18). By the mid-eighteenth century, these defensive configurations had developed into three-courtyard plans in Texas and Arizona, with a larger third courtyard or plaza attached to the mission complex as the Native residence (figure 2.19). When Apache threats diminished in the 1780s, Franciscans at some sites began removing internal divisions, yielding large open plazas (figure 2.20).^{152} Meanwhile, in California, the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1767 allowed Franciscans to take over many of their missions and adopt plaza arrangements, so that Franciscan mission plans in Alta California diverged from elsewhere in northern New Spain.

Regarding Indigenous contributions to the architectural style of New Mexico missions, Ivey rejects Kubler’s attributions to Native building traditions, although he believes Pueblo influence was strong in other aspects of mission life.^{153} According to Ivey, missionaries pragmatically selected materials and techniques that varied from site to site, and while Native expertise “undoubtedly affected” the vernacular and interim stages of construction, formal churches of Northern New Spain most resembled traditional European buildings.^{154} Ivey argues all characteristics of New Mexico missions had earlier Spanish precedents, and their style properly belongs to a long tradition of Mediterranean vernacular construction with ancient roots. With comparable climates and materials, but different cultural needs and lifestyles, the pueblos of New Mexico and ancient Iberia developed similar architectural systems that nevertheless differed in many details.^{155} Ivey suggests Kubler may have been unaware of the long Spanish tradition of trabeated roof construction when he wrote his dissertation, and that Kubler did not recognize New Mexico structures were essentially “standard frontier mission[s],” which friars pragmatically employed when no master masons were available.^{156} Going further, Ivey has shown the high degree of sophistication which the vernacular type had developed. Its roofing
system was carefully scaled as a “wall and beam” adaptation of post-and-lintel architecture. Whereas Montgomery expected poor and expedient roof construction, Ivey shows wood elements were laboriously squared and carved with ornamental patterns before placement using specialized lifting systems and scaffolding.\textsuperscript{157} New Mexico’s missions emerge from Ivey’s analysis as anything but primitive.\textsuperscript{158}

His firsthand knowledge of mission archeology also led to Ivey’s provocative interpretation of the subterranean kivas sometimes located within New Mexico \textit{conventos} (figures 2.21-2.22).\textsuperscript{159} Kivas were semi-subterranean ceremonial chambers for traditional Pueblo religious observances.\textsuperscript{160} According to Ivey, \textit{convento} kivas or “Christian kivas” were stylistically indistinguishable from other Pueblo kivas, but Pueblo builders constructed them under the friars’ supervision in \textit{convento} patios or near missions to serve as transitional spaces for learning Christianity.\textsuperscript{161} Franciscans had a long history of adapting non-Christian architectural forms for evangelism, reworking Mesoamerican open-air temples as open chapels and atriums, and building sanctuaries in the hypostyle mosque plan, such as at Cholula’s \textit{Capilla Real} (figures 2.23-2.24).\textsuperscript{162}

A more particularized view of the Franciscans emerges from Ivey’s analysis, recognizing that their evangelization strategies changed over time. They were not monolithic and their tactics varied according to local conditions and ideological developments. He suggests that 1610 to 1645 was a period when New Mexico friars were more inclined to experiment with \textit{convento} kivas, while after the midcentury their perceptions changed and they more actively suppressed kivas.\textsuperscript{163} Not all missions had \textit{convento} kivas, and some friars may have rejected this strategy of acculturation, or \textit{convento} kivas may have been poorly suited to local conditions at some pueblos.\textsuperscript{164} These chronological, geographic, and ideological variables need further analysis as
more data becomes available, but Ivey breaks up overly simplistic conceptions of Franciscan missionaries as monolithic and unchanging throughout the colonial period.

Finally, Ivey refines perception of everyday life within mission *conventos*, countering many of Montgomery’s missteps. In his analysis of the Salinas missions, Ivey recognizes that laity had access to parts of the *conventos*, and that the Franciscans did not live in seclusion. Pueblo parishioners entered the *convento* for lessons and work, while some such as the sacristan probably lived there full time.\(^{165}\) He acknowledges records of women entering *conventos* for cooking and baking, and that mission staffs increased in size as the seventeenth century progressed, reaching perhaps as many as seventy people.\(^{166}\) Within this environment of close contact and interaction, doors and locks did not protect monastic seclusion as Montgomery insists, but rather provided security from outsiders, kept out winter drafts, and controlled access to supplies and liturgical items.\(^{167}\) As a whole, Ivey significantly expands the basic data of New Mexico missions, and has had an impact on the field comparable to those of Kubler and Montgomery.

d. Considering Agency

Along with rethinking New Mexico missions, the past fifty years have seen historians, anthropologists, and activists assert new perspectives on the agency of Native Americans in the colonial past. Early historians typically treated Spanish and Indians as monolithic entities. Those such as Prince or Montgomery who saw Spanish missionization positively wrote triumphant histories, while others believed anti-Spanish Black Legend narratives, which Protestant countries had promulgated since the sixteenth century.\(^{168}\) Both models treat Native peoples (and often the Spanish) as simple, cohesive groups of unified purpose, typically only
attributing the Spanish with an ability to affect history, while reducing Indians to passive recipients of Spanish actions.\textsuperscript{169}

Paradigms ascribing all agency to European colonists began breaking down as historians became more cognizant that Indians were not of a single mind, and their communities were often divided over how to react towards Europeans. Recognition of factional dynamics within Native communities implicitly signals an awareness that groups within those Indigenous political systems were exercising agency, seeking to shape events in the ways they deemed most beneficial.\textsuperscript{170} The rise of post-colonial studies in the late 1970s challenged disciplines such as history, anthropology, and art history to think more critically about the consequences of colonialism, its legacy of violence, and Native perspectives of the past. These trends accelerated as the Quincentenary approached, but more importantly, the impetus for recognizing Native agency in colonial historical arose through the advocacy of Native communities and scholars themselves.

By the 1950s, Pueblo intellectuals were attaining status as anthropologists and historians, working within the academy but asserting their own perspectives. During the detrimental period of federal termination policy (1953 to 1968), anthropologist Edward P. Dozier (Santa Clara Pueblo) strongly criticized the government’s stance, while also making lasting contributions to his field.\textsuperscript{171} Alfonso Ortiz was an anthropologist from Ohkay Owingeh Pueblo (formerly known as San Juan), who edited two volumes of the \textit{Handbook of American Indians}, while his treatment of Tewa cosmology and socio-cultural structure remains a classic in Southwestern anthropology. Ortiz presents Tewa pueblos as active agents in the colonial process, creatively integrating a limited number of Spanish colonial concepts into an otherwise Indigenous world view.\textsuperscript{172} Edmund J. Ladd (Zuni) was another Pueblo anthropologist with significant contributions to
scholarship, having grown up unusually aware of the field from living with his grandmother Margaret Lewis, host to numerous important anthropologists. Ladd went on to write about Zuni social organization and economy, critique Cushing’s publications, and assist in tribal court cases and repatriation efforts.173

In history, Joe S. Sando (Jemez) wrote about New Mexico’s past from a Pueblo perspective, incorporating oral traditions.174 Writing of the 1680 Pueblo Revolt, Sando marginalizes the Spanish and emphasizes the agency of Pueblo Indians, telling a story of persistent Spanish infractions of Pueblo values and communities, and Indians acting as deliberative agents in a difficult situation, ultimately determining to expel the Spanish by ultimatum and force. He portrays the Revolt as carefully planned and coordinated, rather than a bloodthirsty eruption of vengeance.175 Sando describes this event as the “first successful American revolution against a foreign colonial power,” insinuating Native resistance as central to U.S. nationalist foundation accounts, rather than antagonistic and peripheral.176

Each of these Pueblo scholars asserted Indigenous agency in explaining the past. Increasingly during the 1960s, Native authors throughout the country contributed to critiques of federal policies, Eurocentric histories, and academic practices that reinforced the colonized status of Indian cultures. Among them was Vine Deloria, Jr.’s witty censure of anthropology as a colonial discipline that uses Native people for its own purposes, while others such as Jack Forbes took up issues of Indigenous education and countering Eurocentric histories.177 At the same time, grassroots organization and activists increasingly acted to resist oppressive socio-political conditions.

Numerous midcentury federal Indian policies detrimentally affected Native communities, including systematic efforts to terminate the special trust status of federally recognized tribes, to
transfer jurisdiction of reservations to state governments, and to relocate reservation Indians to cities, isolating them without means find and keep jobs.\textsuperscript{178} Grassroots efforts arose to meet the needs of relocated urban Indians and advocate for Native issues.\textsuperscript{179} In the 1960s, the increasing number of Native college students and professionals able to participate in activism fueled these efforts, as did the birth of Native American/American Indian Studies (NAS/AIS) programs in many universities.\textsuperscript{180} By the late sixties, this potent mix of oppressive conditions and burgeoning activist networks caught national attention through occupations and protests culminating in the 1973 armed standoff between federal agents, Ogallala Lakota community members and officials, and American Indian Movement (AIM) activists at Wounded Knee, SD. While protestors garnered prominent attention for Indian issues on the national stage, they often failed to achieve their direct goals, and poor tactics as well as federal prosecution in the mid-seventies effectively impeded the movement.\textsuperscript{181}

Despite setbacks among activists, tribal governments made significant gains in self-determination during the subsequent years, and while some authors persisted in treating Indians as powerless victims, scholars were increasingly aware of Indigenous agency and responsive to Native perspectives.\textsuperscript{182} Criticism of museums and efforts such as Zuni repatriation petitions also led to institutional reforms. Passage of the North American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) in 1990 affirmed the rights of descendants and tribes to Native human remains, funerary materials, and sacred objects. All institutions receiving federal funds were required to inventory their collections, providing tribes the opportunity to claim specific objects and ancestral remains.\textsuperscript{183} Although NAGPRA initially caused handwringing among museums and anthropologists, it has had a healthy effect on the field and relations with Native peoples. It established dialogues between tribes and institutions, changed the power dynamic and tone of
those relationships, and facilitated collaboration. In response, scholars have revised their objectives and methods, and new research approaches have become possible.\textsuperscript{184} The year before NAGPRA’s passage, the National Museum of the American Indian (NMAI) Act was another important symbolic act stimulating debate about the representation and place of Native peoples in institutional knowledge.\textsuperscript{185} The Columbian Quincentenary energized these debates, leading to vigorous critique, reassessment of historical narratives, and the rise of “encounter” as a framework for thinking about colonial interactions as mutually constitutive and reciprocal, rather than one-direction impositions of European power.\textsuperscript{186}

By the time of \textit{Columbian Consequences}, scholars readily claimed revisionist goals of incorporating Native voices and exploring Indigenous agency in the past, although these were not always realized. The Pueblo Revolt is a particularly powerful illustration of Native agency in action, when warriors coordinated simultaneous attacks on missions and Spanish officials across the colony, successfully expelling them for twelve years. Studies of the Pueblo revolt and other acts of resistance have proliferated in recent decades, as part of a surge in resistance studies emerging from the Quincentennial ferment.

Resistance has been a flexible research paradigm, producing an entire “cottage industry of resistance studies,” and generating new perspectives on the mission period.\textsuperscript{187} It has also received criticism, both methodological and personal.\textsuperscript{188} Sceptics find resistance to be vague and overused as an analytic concept, and accuse it of skewing data towards conflict while overlooking equally important human behaviors such as altruism, cooperation, reciprocity, and creative imagination. Poorly executed resistance studies oversimplify the past and stereotype their subjects through weak contextualization or “ethnographic thinness.”\textsuperscript{189}
Recent expansions on earlier resistance studies have incorporated a more nuanced conceptual framework, suggesting maturation in response to these earlier criticisms. Most important is acknowledgment that resistance is not the only meaningful form of agency: the choices of Indigenous agents included an entire spectrum of actions beyond a simple binary of revolutionary heroes and subservient victims. Matthew Liebmann and Melissa S. Murphy thus describe the colonial landscape as a “a patchwork of domination, resistance, accommodation, and negotiation, as Indigenous peoples exerted a variety of strategies in their attempts to adapt to the colonizing and evangelizing efforts of the Spanish.”

I believe that “active negotiation” is a useful paradigm for understanding the interactions of Indigenous people and Spanish colonists, leaving conceptual space for the agency of each parties and encompassing a broad spectrum of strategic responses between cooperation and resistance. Negotiations have the potential to break down in the bloodshed, achieve mutually satisfactory resolutions, or more likely produce any of an infinite number of less satisfactory compromises in between these extremes. Negotiations need not imply a formal, equitable, or conscious decision-making process between two equally empowered parties; negotiation just as readily suggests road metaphors, in which agents find their way through the difficulties and obstacles arising in their path, navigating the minefield of colonial interactions. The paradigm of active negotiation evokes both military and road metaphors, making it especially appropriate to New Mexico’s colonial context. Ultimately, Indigenous responses to Spanish invasion and occupation most often fell on a spectrum between complete acceptance and outright rejection, with degrees of integration, ambivalence, and strategic resistance depending upon local contexts. As William L. Merrill aptly puts it, Native peoples “combined accommodation to the degree
necessary with resistance to the degree possible,” and I would add, they did so with great
creative ingenuity. 191

Conclusions

The study of New Mexico missions is a largely academic and written cultural
phenomenon in contrast to Pueblo “memory culture,” and several vital points emerge from its
review. Defining the style of New Mexico missions is one such nexus, about which little
consensus exists. Are they essentially Indigenous in style or Spanish imports? Ivey has the most
recent, if not last word, aptly arguing that New Mexico missions extend older Iberian vernacular
traditions, although one should not lose sight of their uniquely appropriate technological and
stylistic “fit” to the Pueblo context. The style of Pueblo mission architecture was more than
reflexive habit, and I would argue is better understood as a conscious “expedient selection” in
Edgerton’s terminology, a meaningful design choice from among many potential options in
Iberian architecture. A broadly transatlantic study of Iberian vernacular precedents and their
development among Mexico and New Mexico architectural types remains to be written.

Another vital point of disagreement is the relative importance of utility and aesthetics as
design factors, which Montgomery and Kubler respectively emphasize based in their different
professions and perceptions of the Franciscan order. While these are not necessarily mutually
exclusive concepts, Montgomery refused to consider aesthetics as part of his idealized, simplistic
vision of Franciscan culture. The appropriate geographic context for framing New Mexico’s
missions has been another point of disagreement, with nationalistic, linguistic, and state biases
exerting ahistorical influences over the historiographic topography. Are New Mexico missions
best understood locally, regionally, or in comparison to other colonial buildings throughout New Spain? On this point, the Borderlands model and resistance studies find common ground, both tending to construe the field broadly, and in my analysis I too will seek comparative examples from throughout the Franciscan and Pueblo worlds.

Questions of agency and the asymmetry of power are recurrent points of disagreement in the study of colonial history. How did social and material relationships constitute colonial authority? How was agency exercised? What are we as latter-day cultural outsiders to make of these relationships? Often inextricable from strands of ethical or moral judgements, at its extreme this problem yields the widely divergent narratives of the Black Legend and Pro-Spanish triumphalism, but is also part of more moderate positions.

Finally, the role of the convento and Native persons within it remain poorly understood. Authors have widely assumed that conventos were essentially Spanish spaces, and Pueblo Indians were either excluded altogether or voiceless servants within them. As I will argue in the following chapters, primary sources and material evidence indicate that Native people were important everyday actors in seventeenth-century conventos and especially at Hawikku’s Purísima Concepción. Missionization was a fluid and variable process at each colonial site, producing what Mark T. Lycett describes as new forms of emergent communities or “transformed places,” with characteristics both similar to and distinct from their antecedent cultures. Mission conventos were the architectural context for some of the most intimate encounters between Pueblo Indians and Spanish friars, and this negotiated setting transformed the meaning of even seemingly direct translations of European cultural traditions.
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16 Mindeleff, A Study, 224. The author even refers to mission structures and materials as being of “Spanish manufacture,” as if the friars had manufactured them with their own hands, instead of the Zuni and Hopi laborers as was actually the case (124, 149).

17 Boston philanthropist Mary Hemenway funded this research from 1886 until her death in 1894, with Cushing directing operations from 1886 to 1889, and Jesse Walter Fewkes thereafter, see Fowler, “The Formative Years,” 17-18; Green, “Introduction,” 13. Cushing published nothing of the expedition except for his “Preliminary Notes on the Origin, Working Hypothesis, and Primary Researches of the Hemenway Southwestern Archaeological Expedition,” in Congres International des Americanistes, Berlin, 1888 (Berlin: 1890), 151-194. Recently, the Southwest Center Series has published Cushing’s notes and justification for the expedition as Curtis M. Hinsley and David R. Wilcox, eds., The Lost Itinerary of Frank Hamilton Cushing (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2002), with related material appearing in Hinsley and Wilcox, eds., The Southwest in the American Imagination: The Writings of Sylvester Baxter, 1881-1889 (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1996). Under Fewkes, the Journal of American Ethnology and Anthropology published some of the expedition’s multi-disciplinary research during the 1890s; see volumes I-IV.


24 Hough was curator at the National Museum, member of the 1894-1896 Hemenway expeditions, and later leader of the 1901-1905 Museum-Gates Expeditions to New Mexico and Arizona. For his “little book,” see Walter Hough, undated, untiiled manuscript (“Hasty Tour of the Realm of the Housebuilders”), Div. of Ethnology, Manuscript, and Pamphlet File, Box 80, Folder 851, “Southwest 1,” NAA. Hough’s manuscript lacks a title and date, but it is clearly intended as a travel guide for lay persons reaching New Mexico by railroad. He refers to it as a “little book” in the introduction (1), and as a “hasty tour of the realm of the housebuilders” in its conclusion (100), which I have adopted as a provisional title for the manuscript. Internal evidence suggests that it was written sometime between 1897 and 1901; Hough included a typed insert dated to 1897, and his text represents a familiarity with both Victor Mindeleff’s 1891 publication and the route of the Hemenway expedition that Hough participated in. Hough describes the Zuni mission as “now in ruins and abandoned by priest and worshipper many years ago” (29), but it was reroofed between 1901 and 1905, making it likely that it was written prior to 1901. For a critique of scholarly implication in touristic boosterism, and the implication of both in the colonial project of asserting power over Native peoples, see Lomayumtewa C. Ishii, “Hopi Culture a Matter of Representation,” in Native Historians Write Back: Decolonizing American Indian History, ed. Susan A. Miller and James Riding In (Lubbock: Texas Tech University Press, 2011), 58.

25 Speaking of Laguna Pueblo, for example, Hough appreciates its “novel,” “strange-looking” appearance “like the nest of a mud wasp,” but dislikes the general monotony of the earth-toned adobe houses, from which the whitewashed mission, blue sky, and green fields provided some relief (Hough, “Hasty Tour,” 16). At Zuni, “the variety of the houses and the slight irregularities of the ground give some relief from monotony,” a qualitative judgement according to picturesque terms, which he follows with a descriptive passage even more romantic in tone, writing that, “over all hangs a glamour of enchantment and the magnificent scene [of the Zuni valley] is wrapped in a mysterious haze and a profusion of beautiful colorings” (30-31). Finally, Hough found that the unevenness of the Hopi mesas and the houses built upon them produces a “great improvement in the picturesqueness of the skyline” (43).

26 In Hough’s estimation (“Hasty Tour,” 12), the Pueblo culture of Isleta was diluted through Mexican influences and its nearness to Albuquerque, while Laguna appears “not greatly modified” (15), and the Zunis were “little changed by contact with Europeans” (28).

27 Ibid., 43. He writes that among the Hopi, visitors “will not have serious difficulty in leaving out of view the innovations [of modernity] and receiving a clear idea of the pueblo life as it was in the old time” (51). Never-the-less, Hough expected that this ostensibly primitive scene would not long endure, because Hopis were “becoming progressive and [yearn] for the things of the white man with growing longing” (43-44). Hough desires that the Pueblo Indians remain unchanged and isolated from modernity, and does not recognize their agency and freedom of choice, even as his text seeks to provide guidance to the tourists who would become part of rapid cultural changes in the Southwest.

28 Ibid., 23-24. Strangely, he even says that the adobe missions imparted a “modern appearance” to the surrounding pueblos (9), perhaps thinking of the Neo-gothic architectural trim that had been added to numerous mission churches such as that of Isleta during Bishop Lamy’s tenure.

29 Artists further exacerbated local inter-ethnic tensions by romanticizing the pueblos and denigrating their Hispano neighbors. Their efforts to oppose federal assimilationist policy were valuable contributions, but they also tried to
deny Indians the potential benefits of modernization. See John Ott, “Reform in Redface: The Taos Society of Artists Plays Indian,” American Art 23, no. 2 (Summer 2009): 87-88, 92-100. While a few professional artists such as Worthington Whittredge and Leon Trousset had visited New Mexico earlier, the 1898 arrival of Ernest Blumenshein and Bert Greer Phillips in Taos was a particularly significant event, as the two went on to become founders and promoters of the Taos Society of Artists. Subsequent migrations of artists would continue to settle in Taos, as well as Santa Fe and other locations. See Komanecy, “Spanish Missions,” 179; William H. Truettner, ed., The West as America: Reinterpreting Images of the Frontier, 1820-1920 (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991); Charles C. Eldrige, Julie Schimmel, and William H. Truettner, Art in New Mexico, 1900-1945: Paths to Taos and Santa Fe (New York: Abbeville Press, 1986); and Emily Ballew Neff, The Modern West: American Landscapes 1890-1950 (New Haven: Yale University Press with The Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, 2006), 129-199.

30 Wilson, The Myth of Santa Fe, 80-81.

31 Ibid., 72-74. Writing in the 1890s, Lummis (The Land, 3) describes three “races” as well, by which he meant the Pueblo Indians, Mexicans (or Spanish-Americans, whom he describes pejoratively as the “in-bred and isolation-shrunken descendants of the Castilian world-finders”), and the Navajos, seeing Anglo-Americans as too small a group to be consequential as a “type.” Prince had a “broad and abiding interest” in New Mexico’s history, and in addition to his political posts, he served as the Vice-President (1880-1884) and then President of the Historical Society of New Mexico (1884-1922), playing an important role in the acquisition of Historical Society collections which now comprise significant components of the Museum of International Folk Art, the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture, and the Palace of the Governors/New Mexico History Museum; see Michael Stevenson, “The Museum and Collections of the Historical Society of New Mexico, 1859-1977,” in Telling New Mexico: A New History, ed. Marta Weigle (Santa Fe: Museum of New Mexico Press, 2009), 247-255.

32 L. Bradford Prince, Historical Sketches of New Mexico from the Earliest Records to the American Occupation (Kansas City: Ramsey, Millett, and Hudson, 1883). Describing these three peoples as the Pueblos, Mexicans, and Americans, it is clear that by Mexican Prince meant Spaniards rather than Mexicans who he elsewhere denigrates.


34 Prince, Spanish Mission Churches, 7, 24.


36 For instances of these rhetorical constructions, see ibid., 20-21, 24, 27, or 32.

37 Ibid., 49.


39 In a telling example, Prince (Spanish Mission Churches, 138) discusses the juxtaposition of locally produced murals and imported religious paintings then visible at the mission church of San Buenaventura of Cochiti Pueblo, saying that, “nothing could be more incongruous than the impressive features of touching scenes painted by master hands and the crude efforts of Indians entirely untrained in art.”

40 In noting the Pueblo-style painting of the dust mantle above the altarpiece of Laguna Pueblo’s San Jose mission (ibid., 209), he explains by saying that:

This curious combination of Christianity and paganism is found in some other Pueblo churches, and is in evidence in many of the ceremonial dances which are held on Christian saint’s days and it shows the attempt to engraft the new religion upon the old without too much friction, practiced by some missionaries, in contrast with the system practiced by others and insisting upon the complete eradication of the old.
The territories of the Spanish colony of New Mexico and the Franciscan ecclesiastic region known as the *Custodia de la Conversión de San Pablo del Nuevo México* were not exactly coterminous, both being larger than the U.S. state of New Mexico, and including significant parts of present-day Arizona, Texas, and Chihuahua. The southern boundary of the civil colony of *Nuevo México* was the Rio Grande at El Paso del Norte, while the Franciscan *Custodia* began further south in the Valley of Santa Barbara (near present day Parral in the Mexican state of Chihuahua) in the seventeenth century, although these southern territories were later to become part of other religious jurisdictions. The civil territory and *Custodia* extended indefinitely in the other directions, but the existence of hostile groups of nomadic Comanche, Ute, Navajo, and Apaches effectively limited seventeenth-century colonial expansion beyond the Salinas Pueblos to the east, beyond Taos Pueblo to the north, and beyond the Hopi Mesas to the west. See Ross Gordon Montgomery, “San Bernardo de Aguatubi, an Analytical Restoration,” in *Franciscan Awatovi: The Excavation and Conjectural Reconstruction of a 17th-Century Spanish Mission Establishment at a Hopi Indian Town in Northeastern Arizona*, by Ross Gordon Montgomery, Watson Smith, and John Otis Brew (Cambridge, MA: Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, 1949), 118-120.

The present day state of New Mexico includes the heart of the colonial territories, along the Rio Grande River, but it excludes the pueblos and missions of the Hopi Mesas in present-day Arizona, and the southern missions in Texas and Chihuahua. The mission of Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe del Paso del Norte (in present-day Juarez City) was begun in 1662 and finished in 1668. Fray García de San Francisco ventured further south along the Rio Bravo, but serious efforts to establish missions did not begin until after the Pueblo Revolt, when several missions were also established for refugee congregations along the north bank of the Rio Grande in present-day Texas. See Zacarías Márquez Terrazas, *Misiones de Chihuahua, Siglos XVII y XVIII* (Chihuahua: Secretaría de Educación Pública, 2004), 47-57.


Wilson (The Myth of Santa Fe, 8, 72-74) argues that the mythology of tri-ethnic harmony was an essential component in the adoption of the Santa Fe style, whitewashing historical realities of cultural negotiation that were a very real part of colonial life in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Two biographical research projects currently underway focus on Nusbaum. Kathy Fiero and Patti Bell are in the midst of completing a biography of Nusbaum, while his step-granddaughter Emily M. Talley is undertaking her own biography. These efforts will provide needed insight into Nusbaum’s life and his manifold contributions to the modern Southwest. I greatly appreciate the willingness of these authors to share their preliminary findings with me. For Nusbaum’s participation in expeditions to Mayan sites in Guatemala and the Yucatan Peninsula, see Lynn Adkins, *Jesse L. Nusbaum: A Transitional Period Archaeological Photographer in the Maya Region of Guatemala, Honduras, and Mexico* (master’s thesis, University of New Mexico, 1985), 2. Adkins incorrectly asserts that Nusbaum no longer worked as a photographer after 1918. The full story of his photographic contributions remains to be told. For his work in the design of interiors and furniture, see Penelope Hunter-Stiebel, “Furnishing the Santa Fe Style: An Investigation in Two Parts, Part I: The Unexpected Designer Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1887-1975,” *El Palacio* 118, no. 1 (Spring 2013): 62-64. Nusbaum’s contributions later in life were more structural and administrative than in field work itself. His relatively few publications include Jesse L. Nusbaum, with A. V. Kidder, and S. J. Guernsey, *A Basket-Maker Cave in Kane County, Utah* (New York: Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation, 1922); and Jesse L. Nusbaum, *Re-Excavation of Step House Cave, Mesa Verde National Park* (Mesa Verde National Park, CO: Mesa Verde Museum Association, 1981), published posthumously.


49 Hewett described the missions as the “noble monuments of the Franciscan order,” and praised the friars by noting that, “the heroic Fathers who built these structures [notably not the Indian laborers] so well that they have withstood the destructive forces of from two to three centuries were men who have had few equals.” Quoted in Kate Wingert-Playdon, *John Gaw Meem at Acoma: The Restoration of San Esteban del Rey Mission* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2012), 31; see also Edgar L. Hewett and Reginald G. Fisher, *Mission Monuments of New Mexico* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press and the School of American Research, 1943), 197-199.


52 The process of public acquisition in which Hewett was involved took place from 1909 until 1937. The first mission to become a public site was Las Humanas Pueblo, which was nominated as Gran Quivira National Monument in 1909, and where Hewett had overseen excavations from 1923 to 1926, see Ivey, *In the Midst*, 4, 332-334; Hewett and Fisher, *Mission Monuments*, 201-203, 235-237. Hewett’s School of American Archaeology had conducted a field school at Quarai in 1913, but the University of New Mexico lost title to the site in 1916, and it was not until 1932 that the Museum of New Mexico successfully repurchased the land, with Hewett overseeing excavations that began in 1934. It became a state monument in 1935; see Ivey, *In the Midst*, 4, 315-326; Hewett and Fisher, *Mission Monuments*, 202-203, 208-217. In 1937, the University of New Mexico obtained ownership of the Ábo site, dividing its possession with the Museum of New Mexico and the School of American Research, with excavations beginning in 1938; see Ivey, *In the Midst*, 4, 301; Hewett and Fisher, *Mission Monuments*, 202-203, 217-224. Quarai and Ábo remained state monument until 1981, when they were added to the National Monument, which was renamed Salinas National Monument in 1988; Ivey, *In the Midst*, 4-5. Other mission sites also entered public purview during this time. Hewett oversaw excavations at Giusewa (along with Hodge, Kenneth Chapman, and Nusbaum) in 1910, a site which the Museum of New Mexico acquired in 1921, and which became a state monument in 1935. See Hewett and Fisher, *Mission Monuments*, 201-203, 230-235; Michael L. Elliott, *Pueblo at the Hot Place: The Archaeology of Giusewa Pueblo and San José de los Jémez Mission* (Santa Fe: Museum of New Mexico Press, 1993), 14-18; Robin Elizabeth Farwell, *An Architectural History of the Seventeenth-Century Mission Church of San Jose de Giusewa, Jemez State Monument, N.M.* (master’s thesis, University of New Mexico, 1991), 40-41. Finally, Hewett had surveyed the Pecos site in 1904 and sent Nusbaum to excavate and stabilize the mission structure in 1915. In the 1920s, the state worked to obtain the divided properties containing the site, to be managed by tripartite agreement between the University, the School of American Research, and the Museum of New Mexico.

53 Hewett and Fischer, *Mission Monuments*, 16, 20, 197-199. Hewett and Fischer also reference the context of World War II, specifically criticizing historians’ focus on totalitarian leaders and exultation of violent conquest. Instead, they emphasize the everyday people who “pioneered the western wilderness,” perpetuating a highly romanticized narrative of Franciscan missionaries’ heroism in New Mexico. The authors failed to recognize any parallels between the will to power of European conquerors and the American “pioneers” who occupied Indigenous lands, exploited Native labor, and suppressed their religions (23, 237-239). As examples of their romancing of New Mexico’s seventeenth-century missionization, they write that the mission ruins are “memorials of heroic men of a heroic age, outposts of one of the most vital movements in the history of civilization” (27), and as “the terminus of a trail conceived in exalted vision, blazed in almost superhuman courage and endurance, consecrated with the blood of countless martyrs, and marking at the end a victorious and lasting achievement” (28).

54 Ibid., 19, 40. Hewett and Fisher seem uncertain about whether the missionaries were cloistered (44), and describe the mission community in terms of weekly rotations of laborers (*semaneros*), who among other things “kept house for the missionary” (112).


56 Many treatments of New Mexico’s missions retain characteristics of guidebooks, participating in the state’s still important tourism industry, even as they take a more scholarly tone. Hough’s “Little Book” is an early example, but he is not alone in using a touristic approach to New Mexico pueblos and missions; a similar tack marks Hewett and Wayne I. Mauzy’s 1940 contribution to the *Handbooks of Archaeological History* series entitled *Landmarks of New Mexico*, and the provision of a guide to New Mexico missions remains an underlying objective in Marc Treib’s 1993 *Sanctuaries of Spanish New Mexico*. See Edgar L. Hewett and Wayne I. Mauzy, *Landmarks of New Mexico* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press and the School of American Research, 1940); and Marc Treib, *Sanctuaries of Spanish New Mexico* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), xii.


60 Ivey and Thomas, “‘The Feeling.’” 206-207, 210-211.


63 France V. Scholes, *Church and State in New Mexico* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1937); Scholes, *Troublesome Times*.

64 Scholes, *Church and State*, 15-17.
Ibid., 12, 194-195.

Ivey and Thomas, “‘The Feeling,’” 210-211.

Scholes, *Church and State*, 193. Scholes continues in his *Troublous Times* (6), describing the general character of the “provincial society” thus: “Ignorance, superstition, and moral laxness characterized the life of the Hispanic community, and the governors—and even the clergy—often set an evil example for the humbler members of the colony.”


Scholes, *Church and State*, 13-14; Scholes, *Troublous Times*, 25-28, 53-60. Scholes also recognizes that missions played an important economic role in the colony, with large herds on Indian grant land that consumed Indian labor in herding and processing (*Church and State*, 13-14, 17, 130-131; *Troublous Times*, 25-28). He appears to have believed that this exploitation of the Natives was both necessary and inevitable in the colonial context (*Church and State*, 89).

Kubler studied under Henri Focillon from 1935 to 1940, and drew upon his advisor’s interest in folk art and his own childhood experiences in Spain, Mexico, and the U.S. Southwest in selecting his research topic, see Thomas F. Reese, “Editor’s Introduction,” in *Studies in Ancient American and European Art: The Collected Essays of George Kubler*, ed. Thomas F. Reese (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985), xviii.


Ibid., xxi, 132-133. Other features such as high sills in the doorways and the use of ladders were also traits of Pueblo architecture; ibid., 49. Despite Kubler’s seemingly clear attribution of stylistic aspects to both Pueblo and Spanish building traditions, at times he vacillates between the possibilities. The building techniques were essentially Pueblo, adopted “in toto, confining technique to the lowest common denomination in the area” (39), while at the same time they remained “tangible projection[s] of an alien sensibility” that he compares to seashells that embrace and evoke their absent makers (137). He believed that the friars were too isolated to coerce labor and that the missions were built voluntarily, and yet passive resistance by the work force was a determining factor in the architectural style of the missions (6-7, 38). He believed that other aspects such as the emplacement of missions in relationship to the pueblos, and the continuation of Pueblo occupation were both products of “mutual respect” (17-18). His work does not resolve these apparent inconsistencies.

Ibid., 7, 38.

Ibid., 73. According to Kubler, these workers included two to three sacristans, two boys who worked as personal servants to the friars, a bell ringer, a cook, a porter, and a gardener in addition to the milling women. In his discussion of Spanish missions in Mexico, Kubler likewise believed that Native presence in the cloisters was limited and was not considered in *convento* design and ornamentation; see George Kubler, *Mexican Architecture of the Sixteenth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1948), 365-366, 381. Richard England Phillips describes this as “Kubler’s outmoded view of the private monastic cloister.” See Phillips, *Processions through Paradise: A Liturgical and Social Interpretation of the Ritual Function and Symbolic Signification of the Cloister in the Sixteenth-Century Monasteries of Central Mexico* (PhD diss.: University of Texas, 1993), 4, 11.

Kubler (The Religious Architecture, 25-26) cites research from the University of New Mexico which had determined that adobe weathered at a rate of one inch every twenty years, and he felt that in some parts of the state, a wall could go fifty or sixty years “and suffer no irreparable damage, providing the erosion at ground level is not allowed to undermine the foundation.” Kubler acknowledges that in practice the results are much more variable, and largely depend upon local weather, the security of the roof, and regular maintenance. Reviewer Rexford Newcomb was the first to call attention to this shortfall in Kubler’s work. Newcomb saw the book as a much awaited addition to the study of Spanish missions, as well as a valuable source for contemporary architects working in the Santa Fe style, but cautioned against Kubler’s conclusion, noting that adobe is such a mutable material that “it may well be that the character of the original structures on these sites has been so completely obliterated or altered as to make it impossible to determine their original forms,” making it hard to accept the thesis of a frozen architectural type. He asserts that evolution was identifiable, and that it led to the production of churches unlike those anywhere else; see Rexford Newcomb, “Review of The Religious Architecture of New Mexico in the Colonial Period and Since the American Occupation by George Kubler,” The Journal of the American Society of Architectural Historians 1, no. 2 (April 1941): 25-29. Marc Treib adds significantly to this critique, being more attuned to structural considerations and issues of conservation than Kubler, in particular the impact of moisture on adobe (Sanctuaries, 31). The processes of construction and maintenance in adobe architecture require continued engagement of the community. In contrast to Kubler’s characterization of missions as static in design and durable in fabric, Treib argues that adobe structures are highly mutable, and photographic history reveals significant changes in individual structures even in recent years. In an extreme case, the church of San Lorenzo at Picuris Pueblo appeared to be in good condition in 1981, but had collapsed five years later, probably due to the destructive effects of a coating of concrete plaster (186-187). In Treib’s analysis, missions emerge as buildings in process rather than unchanging forms, highly responsive to the harsh conditions of their environment. Winds erode the upper surfaces, creating the appearance of organic irregularity. Water erodes the walls and acts on the weak areas like the parapets and roofs. The wooden beams that supported the roof are particularly vulnerable to deterioration, and introducing moisture to the walls. Colonial builders seem to have regarded these structural weaknesses and deterioration as a natural part of the construction process (35-38), which required yearly repair and regular vigilance to survive. Differing from Kubler’s assessment that adobe buildings could stand for many decades without significant deterioration, Treib argues that the wall structures were much more tentative, requiring continual maintenance of the plaster coating on the walls and roofs to postpone the inevitable collapse (40). For the archaeology to which Kubler did not have access, and his inability to distinguish between architecture of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, see Ivey, “George Kubler,” 59-61, 213.


In 1974, E. Boyd wrote that, “Kubler’s work has not been improved upon nor displaced by other authors in a generation,” and recommends that it should be read intact as the basic reference to which she only added scattered notes. See Popular Arts of Spanish New Mexico (Santa Fe: Museum of New Mexico Press), 45. Kubler’s thesis was so thoroughly engrained at that point that Boyd basically reiterated it in her own interpretation of domestic architecture in colonial New Mexico, describing the Spanish houses as unchanging “flies in amber,” conditioned by the arid environment and isolation (2). Bainbridge Bunting also followed Kubler’s argument in Of Earth and Timbers Made: New Mexico Architecture (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1974). In his Early Architecture in New Mexico, Bunting’s treatment of mission architecture essentially summarizes Kubler’s book; see
Early Architecture in New Mexico (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1976), 53-59. Bunting explains that Kubler’s was the “sole authoritative study” on New Mexico mission architecture, and that his text “leaves nothing to add” (Early Architecture, 117). Marc Treib’s more recent work (Sanctuaries) also follows largely in Kubler’s shadow, although he does not see the missions as baroque in style, and adds more recent data to his survey.

84 The name of this ancestral Pueblo site has been variously transliterated. Brew and others use “Awatovi,” while Montgomery uses the Spanish spelling “Aguatubi.” This excavation was sponsored by William Claflin, Raymond Emerson, Henry S. Morgan, and Philip R. Allen, and included 21 nearby sites as well parts of the Awatovi site itself, producing approximately 11,700 stone and bone artifacts, 8,500 complete ceramic vessels, and hundreds of thousands of pot sherds; Melinda Elliott, Great Excavations: Tales of Early Southwestern Archaeology, 1888-1939 (Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, 1995), 167-177. It was especially notable for the more than two hundred kiva paintings that it uncovered, and is the most thorough excavation of a New Mexico mission published to this day. See Ross Gordon Montgomery, Watson Smith, and John Otis Brew, Franciscan Awatovi: The Excavation and Conjectural Reconstruction of a 17th-Century Spanish Mission Establishment at a Hopi Indian Town in Northeastern Arizona (Cambridge, MA: Peabody Museum, 1949); Watson Smith, Gray Corrugated Pottery from Awatovi and Other Jeddito Sites in Northeastern Arizona (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1978); Watson Smith, Kiva Mural Decorations at Awatovi and Kawaika-a (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1952); Watson Smith, Painted Ceramics of the Western Mound at Awatovi (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1971); Watson Smith, Prehistoric Kivas of Antelope Mesa, Northeastern Arizona (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1972); Stanley J. Olsen and Richard Page Wheeler Bones from Awatovi, Northeastern Arizona (Cambridge: Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, 1978); and Richard B. Woodbury, Prehistoric Stone Implements of Northeastern Arizona (Cambridge, Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, 1954). Unfortunately, parts of these excavations remains unpublished, such as the mission-period ceramics, domestic architecture, smaller sites, ethnobotanical work, and a final report synthesizing the project; see Elliott, Great Excavations, 184-185.

Montgomery acknowledges from the beginning that his Protestant background and familiarity with small churches in the rural mountain states had shaped his expectations, and was surprised to discover the extent of Awatovi’s mission complex; see J. O. Brew, “Introduction,” in Montgomery, Smith, and Brew, Franciscan Awatovi, xix. Brew relied upon Scholes in writing his site history, and while his use of the available sources is thorough, he does not appear to have read widely among the primary documents beyond those passages which directly referenced the Hopi missions. For his interpretation of the structure, he seems to have relied primarily on Montgomery’s knowledge and articulation later in the volume, describing (“Introduction,” xix) Montgomery’s arrival on the site by saying that “the feeling of working completely in the dark disappeared.” Never-the-less, Brew is careful to differentiate his more conservative treatment of the material remains as a “factual” representation of “the actual results of our own digging” from Montgomery’s “conjectural reconstruction,” in which the architect speculatively fills in missing information based on his knowledge of Catholicism in California; J. O. Brew, “The Excavation of Franciscan Awatovi,” in Montgomery, Smith, and Brew, Franciscan Awatovi, 51.

85 Ivey and Thomas, “‘The Feeling,’” 208.

87 Jim Beardsley, Ross Gordon Montgomery: The Chronicle of an Architect’s Southern California Experience (Graduate Thesis Project, UCLA, 2005), 26, 31, 79, 133 n. 81. Montgomery’s faith is relevant because it enabled him to work more easily with his ecclesiastic patron in Bishop Cantwell, who preferred to hire loyal Catholics, and because his reverence of the church may inform his similarly reverent interpretation of New Mexico mission and the role of Spanish friars in the life of the Pueblo community.

88 Beardsley, Ross Gordon Montgomery, 21-25, 31, 35, 51-52, 84-86. For a full list of known projects in which he participated, see Appendix A, 124-125.

89 Ibid., 39-40, 45-51.

90 Ibid., 59.

91 Ibid., 47-48, 94, 108. Indeed, control is a recurring motif in Montgomery’s biography and seems to have been characteristic of his personality (ibid., 114).
Montgomery, “San Bernardo,” 173. His primary liturgical sources appear to have been Louis Stercky’s *Manual de Liturgie et Cérémonial Selon le Rit. Romain*, 2 vols. (Paris: Congrégation du Saint-Esprit, 1935). In addition, Montgomery consulted with secular parish priest Daniel Collins and two Franciscans, Marian A. Habig and Joseph Thomson in his interpretation of the mission remains, who may have contributed to his prescriptive approach (Montgomery, “San Bernardo,” 111). Collins had been a priest in the St. James and Redondo Beach parishes. While I have not found any information about Thomson, Habig authored several publications on missions in colonial Texas, a selection of writings from Fray Antonio Margil from 1690-1724, and various liturgical manuals. See Barnabas Diekemper, O.F.M., "HABIG, MARION ALPHONSE,” in *Handbook of Texas Online*, Texas State Historical Association, http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/hafe (accessed April 22, 2015). Finally, he appears to have drawn heavily on the historiography of California missions, and particularly the work of Hubert Bancroft and Zephyrin Engelhardt. Ivey (“George Kubler,” 84-85) argues that Montgomery’s work “retained a strong California viewpoint and this imprint continues today among those who use his work uncritically.”

Frederick Webb Hodge was another critical influence on Montgomery’s perspective, having become director of the Los Angeles Southwest Museum of the American Indian in 1932 (Fowler, *A Laboratory*, 304). Montgomery and his wife Elvina were supporters of the museum in the 1930s, and it was through museum employee and Awatovi volunteer Charles Amsden that Montgomery was introduced to Brew and the excavations. See Elliott, *Great Excavations*, 174; Beardsley, *Ross Gordon Montgomery*, 99. Despite their age differences, the Monteghys and the Hodges were “all very close friends,” with both families living in Los Angeles and visiting one another. After Montgomery’s work on the site, Hodge himself visited the Awatovi excavations during the 1939 field season, and had looked over Montgomery’s drawings for the plan of the mission and discussed his findings there; Frederick Webb Hodge to Jesse L. Nusbaum, August 24, 1939, Papers of Jesse Logan Nusbaum, Box 3, “Hodge—Southwest Museum,” NAA. While Hodge never published his thoughts on the Hawikku mission and its interpretation, it is likely that they would have been consonant with those of Montgomery, and may have influenced the latter’s interpretation of Awatovi.

Montgomery (“San Bernardo,” 12) described his purpose to “resurrect the bones” of the mission and to “recapture the life that once pervaded them.” He believed that his restoration was based on the “reasonable deductions of an experienced builder, a fair acquaintance with ecclesiastical matters, and by the clear implications of the written chronicles […]” (ibid., 127). He acknowledges that other observers might interpret the archaeological remains differently, but with a tone of superiority that admits only minor possibility of divergence from his restorations:

> The writer […] makes no claim that the restoration as conceived is the only feasible solution in all its details. Other architects, if familiar with the subject matter and engaged on this program, would each have visualized a restoration with various architectural departures of minor importance; and until our present store of valid facts should be increased, the writer would accept such restorations, with their minor variations, as being as sound as his own (emphasis added, ibid., 114).

Throughout his essay, Montgomery employs a rhetoric of certainty that undermines his more appropriate statements of epistemological caution.

Examples include his assertion that the Franciscans would never have carried or used weapons since their vocation forbade it (Montgomery, “San Bernardo,” 152), despite documentation that New Mexico missions were well armed and that the friars frequently threatened to take up arms against civil governors who opposed them. See “Opinion of the cabildo of the villa of Santa Fe in New Mexico in regard to affairs of the religious. Santa Fe, February 14, 1639,” in *Historical Documents Relating to New Mexico, Nueva Vizcaya, and Approaches Thereto, to 1773*, Vol. III, ed. and trans., Charles Wilson Hackett (Washington, DC: Carnegie Institution, 1937), 71. Montgomery (“San Bernardo,” 186) argues that it was against liturgical regulations for a lay brother to administer last rites and that it would not have happened, despite primary sources attesting to this in the case of the death of Fray Francisco de Porras, see Hodge, Hammond, and Rey, *Fray Alonso*, 299-300. Regarding the remains of a friar found buried beneath the Awatovi high altar, Montgomery insists that it was against church regulations for anyone to be buried beneath an altar unless the Holy See had elevated them to blessed or saintly status (“San Bernardo,” 178). He constructs an ad hoc speculative explanation for this burial, but the practice of burying friars beneath mission altars is further attested at the missions of Zuni and Hawikku. While the mission at Awatovi left no materials evidence for the existence of a communion rail, Montgomery insists that “one existed nonetheless.”
preferring his own expectations to the material record (ibid., 182). Moreover, he asserts that once a church was dedicated, it could not be used for any other purpose than the liturgy (ibid., 191), despite having read primary documents such as those by Fray Joaquín de Jesús Ruiz, which indicate that the interiors of New Mexico churches were also intended and used for religious instruction of children and unmarried women, at least in the eighteenth century. See Ruiz, “Observations on the Administration of the New Mexico Mission. 1776,” in Eleanor B. Adams and Fray Angelico Chávez, trans., The Missions of New Mexico, 1776 (1956; repr. Albuquerque: Sunstone Press, 2012), 310.

95 Brew’s deferential attitude seems to derive from several successful predictions about the missions that Montgomery made upon his arrival on site. For instance, Montgomery correctly predicted a baptistery near the front of the church and to its Gospel side, but neither Brew nor Montgomery seemed to consider it significant that this room was clearly a later construction and that there must have been different, earlier arrangements for baptism. Subsequent research has indicated that designated baptistery rooms affixed to the side of the church only debut in New Mexico after 1640, prior to which baptismal fonts stood beneath the choir within the church structure. Fixtures for these earlier fonts have been found at other missions, but it appears that excavators did not look for or take note of whether such features were present at Awatovi, where they would now be expected. For baptismal arrangements, see Chapter 9, n.26, below. Likewise, Montgomery was certain that the kiva beneath the altar was clear evidence of superposition, or the expression of dominance by locating a Christian structure on top of an Indigenous religious structure (“San Bernardo,” 134-137). He adduces and explains his theory with great certainty, providing an appendix with comparative data primarily comprising missions built atop pre-contact temple pyramids in Mexico, but also early churches on the site of Roman temples and Islamic mosques around the Mediterranean world (ibid., 265-272). Brew unreservedly accepts Montgomery’s theory (ibid., 65-66). In fact, the altar was located only over one corner of the kiva, and the excavation publications are misleading in their representation of the relationship of these two structures. James E. Ivey has subsequently argued that Awatovi’s kiva and altar were not a case of superposition at all, but rather an example of friars negotiating to use an area on the outskirts of the pueblo, which happened to contain the remains of a number of old kivas which were unused or no longer important, see James E. Ivey, “Convento Kivas in the Missions of New Mexico,” New Mexico Historical Review 73, n. 2 (1998): 130-132.

96 Montgomery, “San Bernardo,” 112-113, 219. He says that one cannot understand “the real significance” of New Mexico missions without being psychologically in the shoes of the friars (ibid., 153). In contrast, he describes Pueblo peoples in dismissively racist terms as “proto-barbaric at the best; savage at the worst” (ibid., 297).

97 Ibid., 239. At times he borders on the purely Romantic, as when he imagines the “rabelaisian Christian humor and lusty deep-chested ‘monk’ of the friar Tuck variety” whom he believes dramatize the superiority of Christianity by filling in a Hopi kiva with garbage (137).

98 Ibid., 133. In one of his more telling passages (216-217), Montgomery writes that,

the Indian’s workaday lot was not a hard one; the friar did not exploit him perfidiously. Every inducement was placed before the neophyte to exert himself to a life of virtue, faith, and good works, thereby making himself as heir to the kingdom of heaven. To evangelize the aborigine, to save his soul for God, was the quintessence of all reasons for the operation of the mission system. Agricultural development, stock-raising, and the employment of Native labor, in whatever capacity were purely means to this end.

Furthermore,

[...] it was quite comprehensible, in fact, that to attract converts, a wise and zealous missionary would deliberately set up a benign rule within his domain, to contrast with the undoubted injustices wreaked on the Indians by the Spanish laymen, particularly in the encomiendas.

In his representation, missions were benign paternal institutions which won the hearts of Pueblo Indians:

The friars considered their neophytes little more than children and treated them with gentleness and firmness combined. But as the Indians became acquainted with and learned to love the ceremonies of the Church, their attendance at services required less solicitation. Discipline was therefore mitigated and the friars wisely left their converts to their own initiative with only occasion admonitions.

73
He further reiterates Franciscan paternalism when he describes “the Native’s impressionable mind” and “their simple hearts,” to whom he believes Christian ceremonies were more appealing than traditional kiva rituals and dances, ultimately taking the inflated claims of friars like Benavides at face value (219). Montgomery does not consider Pueblo resistance and the Revolt of 1680 to be meaningful expressions of agency, nor does he think the oral traditions and perspectives of contemporary Hopis to offer valid historical insight, at least not in comparison to the virtues of his own “historical criticism” (200, n. 195).

99 Ibid., 217, 232.

100 Because of these interests, Ivey and Thomas (“‘The Feeling,’” 208, 210) describe Montgomery, rather than Kubler, as the “patron saint” of southwestern mission archaeology.

101 Montgomery, “Review of The Religious Architecture,” 272. For example, Kubler (The Religious Architecture, 61) argues that New Mexico missions exhibited a theatrical polarity between the open, unarticulated space of the nave and the brightly illuminated density of the sanctuary, and goes on to speculate that the frequent irregularities and subtly converging naves were intended to create the perspectival illusion of greater depth (69). Montgomery (“San Bernardo,” 150) dismisses this “esotericism,” attributing these variations instead to “bad workmanship.”

102 Montgomery, “San Bernardo,” 147, 150.

103 Montgomery (ibid., 153) writes that “such comparisons, though, cannot be made with a yardstick, nor by initially segregating the converted iglesias into ‘styles’ of pedantic manufacture.” He has a similar attitude towards the art of the santero painters, of which he writes, “they would have had no historical value at the time and Vargas and his men were not surrealists. They knew nothing of intellectual primitivism, the neo-plasticists, or the suprematists” (194), essentially arguing that any aesthetic interest in New Mexico santos is ahistorical and misplaced.

104 Ibid., 153.

105 For example, Montgomery (“San Bernardo,” 154) states authoritatively that “the friars had taken the vow of poverty and their rule forbade a luxurious existence. They asked for little and were satisfied with bare subsistence and elemental shelter.” He does not consider what would have been a luxurious existence within the context of seventeenth-century New Spain, nor whether friars consistently lived up to this ideal in practice.

106 For example, Montgomery doubts the existence of a transverse clearstory window at Awatovi, though without compelling reason (“San Bernardo,” 160). He believes that the vigas or supporting beams of the ceiling were rarely hewn square, that they were spaced irregularly, and their ends projected through the wall to save the labor of carefully cutting them (ibid., 158). Furthermore, he argues that ornamental carving or painting of vigas were “things unheard of” in Awatovi. He essentially assumes the most rudimentary treatment possible within the parameters of the Spanish colonial style, despite the fact that there is ample evidence that these elements were more carefully prepared in mission churches throughout the colony, and indeed for surviving remnants of squared and ornately carved church vigas reused in the roofs of Hopi kivas (Mindeleff, A Study, 119-120; figure 7.19). Montgomery attempts to explain away Mindeleff’s evidence with the implausible ad hoc speculation that perhaps a Rio Grande immigrant of bored friar whittled the beams into an ornamental form during idle hours (“San Bernardo,” 163). Similar circular logic pertains to the assertion that supporting posts were unhewn and that the engineering of wooden elements was often insufficient (151-162), and that the mission at Awatovi was unlikely to have had a second story (223-224). In contrast to Montgomery, Ivey (“George Kubler,” 185) argues based on material evidence that vigas were squared in every known seventeenth century instance, although in an earlier discussion he says that convento vigas were rounded while church vigas square (In the Midst, 122 n. 12).


108 Ibid., 200, 120.

109 Ibid., 113, 228. When Montgomery encounters sophisticated craftsmanship, he automatically interprets the artifact as an import, while taking crude craftsmanship as an index of local, presumably Native production by “the
immature hand of a humble creator” (144, 181). In painting the walls of the mission, he believes that the friars controlled the process, initiating and overseeing the painting, while giving latitude to the limitations of their artists, who “although under the surveillance of the fathers were ordinarily permitted remarkable freedom of exposure. The Franciscans […] usually fostered the development of quasi-Indigenous religious art movements where latent Native talent was available,” but the results were “usually barbaric to a degree” (168). Montgomery implicitly acknowledges the potential of Hopis to resist the friars through their passive-aggressive refusal to work (132, 157). He believes that “nearly all” participants in pueblo religious rituals during the mission period “had never progressed further than through rudimentary catechetical instructions at the most, and were not actual members of the church” (ibid., 219). In this unsupported rhetorical maneuver, he creates a false dichotomy by separating the pueblo into two distinct camps, of fully converted parishioners and recalcitrant practitioners of the traditional religion, despite explicit documentary evidence to the contrary and practices of participating in both religious traditions that continue to this day among the Rio Grande Pueblos.

Montgomery, “San Bernardo,” 202. In his contribution, Brew (“The Excavation,” 80, 78) follows Montgomery’s lead, imagining the mission convento as divided between internal and external spaces, asserting that “no one could pass beyond that door, according to regulations, save members of the order and invited guests.”


Montgomery’s only apparent justification (“San Bernardo,” 185) is a passage purportedly from a 1224 Papal Bull of Honorius III, in which the Franciscans were allowed private altars and devotions, “because they wish to avoid the noise of the masses to live by preference in hidden seclusion, in order the better to cultivate the spirit of prayer in holy servitude.” This passage does not really address the question of seclusion, however, for the early friars of the 1220s were just in the midst of establishing urban houses for the first time, shifting from rural hermitic retreats to cities following St. Francis’s withdrawal from leadership (1219/1220). The earliest urban friars often sheltered in private houses of town residents or empty buildings at first, followed by “private and provisional dwellings of poor quality and in unfavorable locations.” See Jens Röhrkasten, “The Early Franciscans and the towns and cities,” in Robeson, The Cambridge Companion to Francis, 178, 180-185. The 1224 Bull dates from this period, allowing friars to begin developing their conventual houses with altars, but not necessarily implying that they lived their lives in claustral seclusion. It seems to be instead a limited dispensation for private or portable altars outside those publically available in established churches. I have not been able to identify with certainty the Bull to which Montgomery is referring, and it may be that he means Honorius III’s 1222 Bulls Devotionis vestrae and Quia populares; see Bruzelius, Preaching, 22.

It is possible that popular conceptions and twentieth century practices in California informed his perspective. In an invitation to the people of Southern California to visit the opening of the Montgomery’s restored Mission San Luis Rey de Francia in 1924, the cloister was described as a space “to which women have heretofore not been permitted to enter. They will, however, be welcome at the opening on Sunday.” See “Renovated Mission to Open Today,” The Los Angeles Times, August 31, 1924, pg. C 12; quoted in Beardsley, Ross Gordon Montgomery, 39.

Phillips (Processions, 142) argues that the same misunderstanding pertains to historians of sixteenth-century Mexico’s missions.

Brew, “The Excavation,” 80, 84. John McAndrew likewise wondered at the disparity between the small number of friars and the expansive size of sixteenth-century missions in Mexico; see The Open-Air Churches of Sixteenth-Century Mexico (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965), 206-207.

Scholes, Troublous Times, 10. The maximum was increased by four in 1657 to staff the newly founded missions among Manso and Suma Indians around El Paso del Norte.


Like the convento, the sacristy spaces may not have been altogether restricted, for the tracks of a wandering dog appeared in the puddled adobe floor from one of its renovations; see Brew, “The Excavation,” 70.
Most notably, Montgomery (ibid., 189) misunderstands complaints that friars made against Governor Mendizábal when he prohibited pueblo community members from working in the mission. Montgomery saw these complaints as exceptional requests made by friars who could not keep up with the labor of their hypothetically secluded lives in the mission. In fact, they were just the opposite. The complaining friars depended upon daily labor in the mission, and the Governor was attempting to impose upon the Franciscans as part of a running jurisdictional conflict. The friars in this document were requesting that the governor relent and allow matters to go back to the normal state of a fully staffed mission community.


*Kessell, The Missions.*


135 David Hurst Thomas, “A Retrospective Look at *Columbian Consequences,*” *American Antiquity* 57, no. 4 (Oct. 1992), 614. Emphasis in the original. Seeking diversity, the project drew upon a variety of disciplines, and included Latin and Native American authors as well as members of Catholic Religious orders. Despite these progressive intentions, however, the final result remained biased towards, white, Anglo, and male scholars (ibid., 615).

136 During the same period, other authors continued to work in the Borderlands tradition by focusing on Spanish cultural traditions, without necessarily addressing the Indigenous agency as a significant research question. See for example, Mardith Scheutz, “Pre-Euclidean Geometry in the Design of Mission Churches of the Spanish Borderlands,” *Journal of the Southwest* 48, no. 4 (Winter 2006), 331-619; and Gloria Fraser Gifford, *Sanctuaries of Earth, Stone, and Light: The Churches of Northern New Spain, 1530-1821* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2007).


139 Edgerton, Theaters, 2.

140 Edgerton, Theaters, 292. Among other authors to draw comparisons between New Mexico missions and Mexican precedents are Robin Elizabeth Farwell (An Architectural History).


144 Ibid., 75.

145 Ibid., 89-91.

146 Ivey, In the Midst; and Ivey, The Spanish Colonial Architecture. For his work in Texas, see Ivey, Presidios of the Big Bend Area (Santa Fe: Southwest Cultural Resources Center, 1990); “Of Various Magnificence: The Architectural History of the San Antonio Missions,” unpublished manuscript at the Santa Fe Support Office, Intermountain Region, National Park Service; Ivey, Archaeological Testing at Rancho de las Cabras, 41 WN 30, Wilson County, Texas: Second Season (San Antonio: University of Texas at San Antonio, Center for Archaeological Research, 1983); and Ivey, “The Presidio of San Antonio de Béxar: Historical and Archaeological Research,” Historical Archaeology 38, no. 3 (2004): 106-120. Ivey has also coauthored with Anne A. Fox, Archaeological Survey and Testing at Rancho de las Cabras, Wilson County, Texas (San Antonio: University of Texas at San Antonio, Center for Archaeological Research, 1983); and Archaeological Investigations at Mission Concepción and Mission Parkway Texas (San Antonio: University of Texas at San Antonio, Center for Archaeological Research, 1999).


Ivey, “Missions as Architectural Patrons,” 119.

Ivey, “Missions as Architectural Patrons,” 53-54; Ivey, In the Midst, 36; Ivey, “George Kubler,” 57. Ivey was not the first to attribute New Mexico missions to Spanish vernacular traditions, but he has gone further in developing his interpretation. Rexford Newcomb described New Mexico missions as “a new architectural vernacular,” see Spanish Colonial Architecture in the United States (New York: J. J. Augustin, 1937), 29-31. Montgomery (“San Bernardo,” 150) had also seen connections to Italian vernacular churches. Harold E. Wethey compares New Mexico missions to Andean chapels, saying that they represent an essentially similar expression of provincial architecture, with adobe walls, recessed balcony porches, simple roofs (although pitched with gabled ends in South America), espadañas, towers, and picturesque charm; see Colonial Architecture and Sculpture in Peru (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949), 109-110. Mardith Schuetz-Miller (“Pre-Euclidean Geometry,” 517-518) connects New Mexico missions with Spanish Visigothic churches from before the arrival of Islam in 711 CE, and ultimately to North African and Syrian prototypes.


Ivey, “George Kubler,” 153-154, 157-158, 163; Ivey, In the Midst, 52-53, 170-176. In a structural analysis of the roofing system of the formal missions at Abó and Quarai, Ivey and William R. Gafford calculated the liable load of the roof and the adequacy of its support system, concluding that the roofing spans were very close to what would be required by modern building codes for the same span and load. The complexity of the Salinas roofing systems and the appropriateness of the structures to their environmental loads lead the authors to argue that New Mexico’s friars had received some training and preparation, and probably had some kind of “rule-of-thumb” guidelines to help in the design process. They further conclude that the corbels beneath vigas in the wide spans of the church were not merely decorative, but played an important structural role in preventing the deflection or bowing of the vigas at the center where their load would be heaviest. See William R. Gafford and James E. Ivey, “Appendix 2: Seventeenth Century Mission Church Roof Beams, A Structural Analysis,” in Ivey, In the Midst, 389-398.

Ivey, In the Midst, xiv.

Ivey identifies convento kivas at Abó, Quarai, Pecos, Awatovi, and possibly at San Isidro of Las Humanas, Giusewa, San Lazarro, and the San Luis Obispo visita of Sevilleta


Ivey, In the Midst, 59, 415-421; Ivey, “Cross-Cultural Exchange,” 59. It is notable that early authors followed Montgomery in attributing these kivas to reverse superpositioning on the part of Pueblo Indians during the Revolt, as a means to reassert kachina religion as superior to Christianity. More recently, Matthew J. Liebmann has followed the same line of reasoning without acknowledging Ivey’s reinterpretation; see “Signs of Power and Resistance: The (Re)Creation of Christian Imagery and Identities in the Pueblo Revolt Era,” in Preucel, Archaeologies, 138. It is unclear if Liebmann still maintains his reading, since his more recent Revolt: An Archaeological History of Pueblo Resistance and Revitalization in 17th Century New Mexico (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2012) seems contradictory on this point (36, 76). There are a number of problems with seeing these kivas as superpositioning by either the friars or revolutionaries. According to colonial documents, the local populations of Abo and Quarai had abandoned the Salinas missions in the decade before the Pueblo Revolt due to
drought and harassment by Plains tribes, and there is no evidence that they returned once the Spanish had left. There was no resident population to build the kivas during the Pueblo Revolt, and it seems unlikely that the refugees would have ventured back to their former missions simply to make a political point. The kivas at Abo and Quarai were built within the artificial platform of the mission, and are unlike other kivas in the region, with a higher roof more akin to Spanish proxemics at Abo, and Quarai’s *convento* kiva being the only example of a rectangular kiva among the Salinas Pueblos; see Ivey, *In the Midst*, 415-417. Most compellingly, the *convento* kivas at the mission of Pecos Pueblo was built of the same black adobe bricks in purple-red mortar as the earliest phase of the mission, datable to 1620-1640. Furthermore, diagnostic ceramics found on the floor of the kiva and in the fire pit suggest a dating as early as the 1630s. The fill ceramics indicate that the kiva fell out of use and was filled between 1625 and 1700; see Ivey, “Convento Kivas,” 138-140.

162 Ivey, “Cross-Cultural Exchange,” 59-60; Ivey, “Convento Kivas,” 121-125. Although Ivey’s theory has not received universal endorsement, a number of authors have built upon it. See Scheutz, “Pre-Euclidean Geometry,” 519; and Edgerton, *Theaters*, 271-297.

163 Ivey, “Cross-Cultural Exchange,” 59-60; Ivey, *In the Midst*, 59 n. 4, 420; and Ivey, “Convento Kivas,” 144-145. I would argue that kiva suppression may have begun earlier. When Lopez de Mendizábal ordered the Pueblos to recommence their traditional kachina dances as part of his struggle against the Franciscans, some pueblos such as Isleta had not performed the dances within the living memory of many community members, and had to rely on elders who could still remember the rituals to embody kachina figures. See “Deposition of Tomé Domínguez, Retired Sargento Mayor, Isleta, May 21, 1661,” in Hackett, *Documents*, III, 178-179; and “Declaration of Francisco Valencia, Isleta, May 24, 1661,” in Hackett, *Documents*, III, 180.


165 Ibid., 218-219, 221.

166 Ibid., 43, 152-153.

167 The black legend presented the Spanish as ignorant, brutal conquerors. Michael V. Wilcox draws attention to the fact that aspects of black legend were based in internal Spanish sources and actual incidents, which Protestant countries in Europe spread for their own political purposes; see *The Pueblo Revolt and the Mythology of Conquest: An Indigenous Archaeology of Contact* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009), 39-42.

168 Matthew J. Liebmann and Melissa S. Murphy, “Rethinking the Archaeology of ‘Rebels, Backsliders, and Idolaters,’” in Liebmann and Murphy, *Enduring Conquests*, 6.


employed in the construction of the missions, the maintenance of crops and herds, and in staffing the conventos, arguing that the buildings stand as “constant reminders of the output of Indian labor.” (48-49, 67). Dozier argues that the Pueblo Indians were coerced into manifesting the outward appearance of conversion through force, but that they understood little of its deeper values (50, 55).

172 Alfonso Ortiz, ed., *Handbook of North American Indians: vol. 9, Southwest* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institute, 1979); and *Handbook of North American Indians: vol. 10, Southwest* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institute, 1983). Ortiz provided essays on San Juan and Tesuque Pueblos for the ninth volume, and other Native authors in his edited project include Joe S. Sando (Jemez), Edmund J. Ladd (Zuni), Velma Garcia-Mason (Acoma), LaVerne Masayesva Jeanne (Hopi), Kenneth Yazzie Begishie (Navajo), Gloria J. Emerson (Navajo), Douglas F. Mitchell (Navajo), Sally Giff Pablo (River Pima/Papago), Ruth Roessel (Navajo), Veronica E. Tiller (Jicarilla), and Marshall Tome (Navajo), suggesting that Ortiz made a conscious effort to recruit Native authors to the project.

Alfonso Ortiz, *The Tewa World: Space, Time, Being and Becoming in a Pueblo Society* (1969; repr. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972). In contrast to Dozier’s assessment, Ortiz effectively marginalizes the influence of Spanish colonialism on Tewa culture, describing its confinement to the middle level of a tripartite political organization, for which the moiety chiefs appoint officials to one year terms. Ortiz argues that Tewa society exercised creative agency in how it adapted Spanish introductions by reconciling new categories of officialdom, as well as religious concepts such as the saints, to their traditional conceptual system (Ortiz, 62-69).


Joe S. Sando, “The Pueblo Revolt,” in Ortiz, *Handbook, vol. 9*, 194-197. Sando writes that the Indian leaders first gave the Spanish an opportunity to leave in peace, and only attacked if the Spanish seemed determined to stay. The warriors ultimately allowing Governor Otermín and the last colonists to pass under observation but unharassed from the land. Sando concludes with an account of the prayers, pious thanksgiving, and cleansing that took place as warriors returned to their home communities.


American history, rather than treated as the alien other of colonial narratives; further, they were agents in resisting colonization and shaping American history and modern culture of the U.S.


179 Examples of such grass-roots advocacy include the development of Native clubs and meeting houses in relocation cities (Smith and Warrior, Like a Hurricane, 9-10) the National Indian Youth Council (established in 1961, 40-43), “fish-in” protests of the Pacific Northwest during the mid-1960’s (44-46), and the American Indian Movement, founded in Minneapolis in 1968 (99). See also Jack D. Forbes, “Alcatraz: Symbol and Reality,” (California History 63, no. 1 [Spring 1983]: 24-25), where the author notes the importance of Six Nations protests of New York state projects in the mid-1950s, militant resistance to land claims settlements in Nevada and California during the 1960s, the development of the United Native Americans organization in 1968 San Francisco, and efforts to found an Indian university in California that had been ongoing since 1961-1962.


181 Ibid., 26, 77, 270, 274-279.

182 Practical gains in self-determination included the passage of the Indian Education Act, the American Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act, and the American Indian Religious Freedom Act. Meanwhile, tribes such as the Taos and Yakima Indians successfully achieved the return of sacred sites, and a general rapport had developed between Indian leadership and legislators; see Margaret Connell Szasz, “American Indians and Outsiders: A Crucial Dialogue of the Columbian Quincentenary,” Montana: The Magazine of Western History 42, no. 4 (Autumn 1992): 58.

183 Canby, American Indian Law, 385-387.


185 For the founding of the NMAI and critical responses, see Amy Lonetree and Amanda J. Cobb-Greetham, eds., The National Museum of the American Indian: Critical Conversations (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2008).


187 This fluorescence of resistance studies has been so prevalent that in summarizing it, Liebmann and Murphy (“Rethinking the Archaeology,” 7) wryly comment that “indeed, in the landscape of twenty-first century anthropology, resistance dominates.” Similarly, Michael F. Brown (“On Resisting Resistance,” American Anthropologist 98, no. 4 [Dec. 1996]: 729) writes that “If there is any hegemony today, it is the theoretical hegemony of resistance.” In the region of New Mexico, one of the most important contributions has been Robert W. Preucel’s 2002 edited volume (Archaeologies), and subsequent publications by its authors. See for example, Liebmann, Revolt; and Wilcox, The Pueblo Revolt.

188 Liebmann and Murphy, “Rethinking the Archaeology,” 9.

resistance framework can have a homogenizing effect on past actors, reducing their agency and individuality through the assumption of social unanimity; see Ian Hodder, “The ‘Social’ in Archaeological Theory: A Historical and Contemporary Perspective,” in A Companion to Social Archeology, ed. L. Meskell and R. W. Preucel (London: Blackwell, 2004), 32; Liebmann and Murphy, “Rethinking the Archaeology,” 9. I would add that the same critique of stereotyped homogenization also applies to the treatment of the hegemonic, the privileged, and the oppressed in some studies of resistance. In the realm of ethnography, Michael F. Brown (“On Resisting Resistance,” 733) argues that an overdetermined expectation of resistance violates the foundational rule of letting “our interlocutors show us their social world in ways that make sense to them,” and notes that myopic approaches to resistance may sometimes have the effect of “moral leveling,” in which alleged resistance of relatively privileged actors is falsely equated to the survival efforts of profoundly oppressed peoples. At a personal level, critics have described the study of resistance as a romantic, post-modern response to the failure of meta-narratives, shifting the hope of social revolution from the grand but unrealized goals of Marxism to the realm of the everyday where its applicability becomes unfalsifiable and seemingly inevitable. A rhetoric of resistance allows authors to adopt high-minded self-importance over relatively trivial accomplishments and avoid thinking critically about their own implication in social hierarchies as part of the ivory tower. See Brown, “On Resisting Resistance,” 729-730; Lila Abu-Lughod, “The Romance of Resistance: Tracing Transformations of Power through Bedouin Women,” American Ethnologist 17, no. 1 (1990): 41-55; Liebmann and Murphy, “Rethinking the Archaeology,” 9. Specifically in the context of New Mexico, critics have claimed that recent studies of resistance add nothing significant to the field, ignore equivalent efforts by earlier scholars, cherry pick primary sources, and ignore historical factors which may have been of equal or greater importance than Indigenous resistance in shaping the success of the Pueblo Revolt, suggesting that resistance studies are a form of wishful thinking that fail to look “their colonial past straight in the eye.” See John L. Kessell, review of The Pueblo Revolt and the Mythology of Conquest: An Indigenous Archaeology of Contact by Michael V. Wilcox, The Western Historical Quarterly 42, no. 2 (Summer 2011): 234; and Ramón A Gutiérrez, review of The Pueblo Revolt, and the Mythology of Conquest by Michael V. Wilcox, Pacific Historical Review 80, no. 3 (August 2011): 469-470. While some of these critiques are essentially ad hominem and fail to adequately address the arguments of their targets, I would add that problematic interpretations of the archaeological record, reductive binaries in which Indians can only act as heroic revolutionaries or servile colonial subjects, and equally reductive stereotypes of the Spanish who effectively become straw men of oppression are evident flaws in some of the initial studies of the Pueblo Revolt as resistance. On the other hand, critics of resistance studies sometimes appear committed to the status quo and unwilling to challenge the constitutive role that reactionary scholarship has played in society.

190 Liebmann and Murphy, “Rethinking the Archaeology,” 9.


192 Writing from the perspective of resistance studies and landscape formation, Mark T. Lycett argues that missions were “the single most important location of colonial and Indigenous contact and the context in which colonialism as a historic process of disruption, incorporation, and transformation was located.” See Lycett, “Transformations of Place: Occupational History and Differential Persistence in Seventeenth-Century New Mexico,” in Preucel, Archaeologies, 62-63.
CHAPTER 3: READING MISSION COMMUNITIES

On the south side of Zuni Pueblo’s historic center, overlooking the remaining trickle of the Zuni River, is the House of the Santo Niño (figure 3.1). The façade of this one-story structure is unremarkable aside from a green sign bearing its name. A note welcomes pilgrims coming to pay respects to a sculptural figure known as Santo Niño to Catholics, and as Sandu or Santu among Zunis. The Santo Niño is a worn polychromed wood statue (bulto) of a standing Christ child, which Franciscan missionaries brought to New Mexico, perhaps in the seventeenth century. Local Catholics venerate the figure as a male representation of Jesus, while many Zunis have incorporated it into their own belief system as the daughter of the sun and a spiritual mother.¹ She stands on a tabletop in the front room, in a mirrored and painted wooden niche. Her robes change regularly and she wears ornate jewelry by a Zuni artist. The female caretaker of the Santo Niño inherits the house matrilineally, as well as the care of its figure.

Affiliated with the Santo Niño are a group known as the Sakisda:kwe, whose name derives from the Spanish term for sacristans, the church officials who cared for missions’ liturgical materials. In seventeenth-century New Mexico, local Indigenous converts filled these positions, and today’s Sakisda:kwe trace their lineage to the mission sacristans. According to oral traditions, these ancestors protected the Santo Niño by moving her from Hawikku to Halona prior to 1672, protecting her during the Pueblo Revolt, and finally installing her in the present home as Halona’s mission declined.² Today, Santo Niño and the Sakisda:kwe are Zuni cultural features harkening back to the workers who were once an essential part of mission life at Halona and Hawikku. Symbols and objects in the Sakisda:kwe’s care are relics of colonial interactions
in and around the *convento*. They are independent, material evidence supporting the existence of a mission community as Benavides describes.

This chapter provides an overview of the Franciscan Order, arguing Montgomery’s theory of cloistered seclusion is not historically accurate, and analyzes the mission community from Spanish primary sources, concentrating on the diverse roles of Native participants. Despite a lack of detailed sources, colonial documents provide useful glimpses of the staffing and roles in mission *conventos*. New Mexico’s friars rarely described mission communities explicitly, but make passing references to Native participants in reporting other events. Consolidating these scattered statements yields a composite picture of New Mexico mission communities to guide my interpretation of Hawikku’s archaeological remains. While not all community roles would have been filled at all times in all Pueblos, these primary sources indicate what authors considered normal among New Mexico’s mendicant houses.

**Franciscans in Spain and New Spain**

Francis of Assisi was born Pietro de Bordone in 1181/82, the son of a middle class merchant, who experienced war and imprisonment early in life. A series of dreams and deeply affecting interpersonal encounters led him to become a wandering preacher, focused on poverty and literal imitation of Christ. His rapidly growing followers received official approval from Pope Innocent III in 1209, and they began sending missionaries beyond Italy to Europe and the Holy Land in 1217. The movement found broad popular support and expanded quickly throughout Europe. Francis articulated his vision through the *Earlier Rule* of 1221 and the *Later Rule* which received Papal confirmation in 1223 (also known as the *Regula bullata*).
As with other mendicant orders in the late medieval period, the Franciscans were distinct from their monastic predecessors. A brief comparison to the Benedictine Order illustrates this point. Growing out of Benedict of Nursia’s sixth-century monastic establishments, Benedictines were the predominant European monastic order by the ninth century. Benedict’s Rule was a detailed document governing every aspect of a monk’s life, and they memorized and studied the Rule regularly.⁷ Among its most important principles was stabilitas loci, requiring each monk to spend his life in a single monastery.⁸ The focus of monastic life was the claustrum, an enclosed precinct where monks lived communally according to the Rule, apart from laity and the serfs who served monastic estates.⁹ Cloisters were typically square or rectangular, with an open central patio, surrounding arcaded walkways, and the monastery’s rooms around the perimeter, including a shared dormitory (figures 3.2-3.3). The word claustrum originally meant a barrier securing a precinct in general, but in the Benedictine context, its meaning broadened to encompass the entire cloister structure as focus and limit of monastic life.¹⁰ Although Benedictines initially kept fields to support their monasteries, by the tenth century they had passed this labor onto tenant farmers outside the cloister, and lay brethren served their practical needs.¹¹

In contrast to Benedictines, Franciscans were not monks, and they did not live in seclusion from the secular world.¹² Instead of taking a vow of stabilitas loci, they were expected to live an unsettled life, “as pilgrims and strangers in this world,” like the early apostles and Christ himself.¹³ Preaching was a primary objective of their itineracy, through which Franciscans readily engaged the lay public. Likewise, friars rejected possessions and embraced poverty, meaning they had to seek patronage and beg to meet their material needs.¹⁴ Although Franciscans were expected to maintain an internal religious life of reflection, many of their
actions were directed outward into the everyday world. The order initially focused on Europe’s urban centers, situating residences or conventual houses near city walls, but not within towns themselves.\textsuperscript{15}

Francis expected preaching and evangelization would cause his followers to live among non-Christians, by which he predominantly meant Muslims, and his \textit{Earlier Rule} provides two ways of doing so: by living as confrontational preachers, or as submissive servants.\textsuperscript{16} Primary documents make it clear New Mexico missionaries often chose the road of confrontation, but it is important to note Francis not only acknowledged that his followers might live among non-believers, but he institutionalized the practice and equated their residence as servants among non-Christians to the communion of mendicant brothers within the religious community.\textsuperscript{17} In practice, early Franciscan missionaries and preachers often sheltered in private homes or empty buildings that lay patrons offered to them.\textsuperscript{18}

As among Benedictines, the cloister remained a potent symbol for Franciscans, but with their different lifestyle, its meaning shifted. An anonymous allegory from the movement’s early years illustrates their new perspective, presenting Francis in a sacred conversation with his beloved Lady Poverty. When she asks to see their cloister, Francis and his brethren take her to a hilltop and point out all the world below, declaring paradoxically that, “This, Lady, is our enclosure.”\textsuperscript{19} Nevertheless, in practice Franciscans often adopted cloistered plans similar to those of monastic precedents (figures 3.4).\textsuperscript{20} Adapting the model of the Carthusian Order, each Franciscan slept in an individual cell, which was his private space for work, devotion, and contemplation (figure 3.5-3.6).\textsuperscript{21}

While individual friars gained privacy, their establishments became more public. Churches were open to laity who used them as meeting spaces, schools, safe deposits, and
locations for conducting business.\textsuperscript{22} Rooms in Franciscan establishments such as chapter houses and dining rooms (refectories) were also accessible to laity, at least certain individuals and on certain occasions. Wealthy patrons who sustained the Order financed chapels and other constructions, purchasing rights not only to burial, but also access during life. Furthermore, leading laity from the community might meet with the brethren in the cloister’s semi-public spaces, sharing meals, discussion, and study.\textsuperscript{23}

The example of the Pazzi Chapel (c. 1429-1459, continuing to the 1470s; figure 3.7) in Florence’s Santa Croce makes readily evident the accessibility of Franciscan cloisters to laity. With its celebrated design by Filippo Brunelleschi, it served as Chapter House for the friars’ meetings, and as a burial chapel for the Pazzi family.\textsuperscript{24} It was located on the eastern side of an inner cloister, perpendicular to the nave of the church and cattycorner to the large refectory. This location was readily accessible to friars, but required Pazzi family members to enter the cloister through the church nave, or cross two cloisters from the street. This arrangement makes clear that seclusion from laity was neither expected nor possible in these spaces. Similar family chapels occurred in Iberian cloisters, such as the Peña chapel inside the gothic cloister of the San Francisco convento in Cáceres, Spain (finished 1491; figure 3.8).\textsuperscript{25}

Literature on mendicant architecture rarely discusses laity in the cloister, but records describe important lay persons passing time alongside Franciscan and Dominican friars. Louis IX gravitated towards Franciscans, often dining with them and sometimes bringing family members with him to the refectory.\textsuperscript{26} Cosimo dei Medici had a similar relationship with the Dominicans of San Marco in Florence, living for days or weeks together with them (figure 3.9).\textsuperscript{27} Christopher Columbus stayed in the Franciscan convento of Nuestra Señora de Santa María de la Rábida (figure 3.10) in Andalucía four times, leaving his son Diego with the friars.\textsuperscript{28} Notable
conquistadors also stayed in la Rábida’s *convento*, including Hernán Cortés and Francisco Pizarro, whose paths crossed while guests of the friars in 1528.²⁹

These examples are exceptional individuals from upper social strata, some of whom were members of the Franciscan third order of avowed laity, such as Columbus and Louis IX, but they illustrate my point that laity were not necessarily excluded from mendicant conventual houses. Laity were excluded from hermitages and houses of recollection where friars lived in seclusion pursuing contemplative lives, such as Pedro de Alcántara’s Purísima Concepción del Palancar outside of Pedroso de Acim in Extremadura (b. 1559; fig. 3.11), but these were a specific class of friary and distinct from normal conventual houses.³⁰ Historians such as Montgomery are therefore incorrect in assuming New Mexico missionaries lived in cloistered seclusion, for they did not do so elsewhere, except in dedicated houses of retreat.

Franciscanism found an early foothold in Iberia, with a burst of thirteenth-century foundations and a second pulse occurred under fifteenth-century Observant reforms.³¹ Initially, foundations occurred in two very different contexts: the cosmopolitan urban centers of Christian kingdoms in the north, and in the wake of the *Reconquista* in Southern Iberia, where they were implicated in seizing territory from and converting Muslim populations. For their assistance in these wars, Franciscans received distributions or *repartimientos* of captured land and economic benefits to build new *conventos*.³² The entanglement of Spanish Franciscans as colonizing instruments remained part of their institutional DNA as the order spread through the Americas to distant settlements such as Hawikku.

As an order, the Franciscans were not monolithic, and various factions argued over the proper interpretation of Francis’s *Rules* even during his lifetime. Academically inclined friars (congregationists) wanted more liberal interpretations, while others were focused on absolute
embodiments of poverty (spiritualists). An end time, millenarian strain of Franciscanism developed through these spiritualists, as Gerard di Borgo San Donnino adapted the apocalyptic ideas of Gioacchino da Fiore (Joachim of Fiore), ideas which continued to affect Franciscans long after Pope Clement V suppressed the spiritualist sect in 1312. Other reforms based in the literal emulation of Francis and Christ recurred throughout history, most notably the Observant reforms calling for austere adherence to poverty during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, against defenders of the status quo known as Conventuals. Beginning in central Italy, this movement quickly spread to Iberia, which held a special prominence in Observant ascendancy. Royal courts propelled their reforms, and Ferdinand and Isabella were especially strong supporters. In 1517, Pope Leo X reorganized the Franciscans into two formal branches: Observants became the main body of the Order (Friars Minor of the Regular Observance), while the Friars Minor Conventual retained certain Papal dispensations as a separate body.

In the midst of these reforms, even more radical approaches germinated in small, isolated conventos where friars attempted to live in strictest possible conformity with the Rules, going beyond even Observants. Several of these challenges to Franciscan institutionalization occurred in southern Iberia, along the border of Extremadura with Andalucía and Portugal. Extremaduran advocates of strict observance eventually formed their own province, San Gabriel de la Descalcez, under prominent leadership by Pedro de Alcántara, but in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, the relationship of strictly observant friars to the rest of the order was still in flux. Significantly, the first twelve Franciscan missionaries to central Mexico came from Extremaduran strict observance, as did one of the foundational figures of New Mexico’s missionization, Estévan de Perea.
Among other things, Observant reformers criticized lay access to and labor within conventual houses. In Spain, they disapproved of Franciscans allowing women to be guests in their _conventos_, and workers in their kitchens, indicating that these practices were then taking place. Friar Giovanni da Capistrano (John of Capistrano) addressed similar concerns in his influential 1443 commentary on the Franciscan Rule. To prevent rumors and sexual temptation, Capistrano forbade contact with women except in the company of another friar. He was also vigilant against same-sex sexual relations, forbidding not only women but also boys and adolescents from Observant conventual houses, as well as friars’ attendance at festivals and other entertainments. Capistrano felt friars should dine without secular company in the refectory, although he made allowance for advantageous social, political, or ecclesiastic meetings. On the whole, he advocated reducing lay encounters except during preaching, mendicancy, and confession. Observant conventual houses did not necessarily put all his rules into practices, however, as the residency of and Diego Columbus at Observant la Rábida barely forty years after his commentary illustrates.

The makeup of support staff in Spanish Franciscan _conventos_ is not readily apparent, and more research is needed. Friars likely did some work, since manual labor was part of the _Rules_. They received food and donations from neighboring communities and the aristocracy. Within _conventos_, at least in some cases, a service staff also lived and worked together with them, typically a combination of lay brothers, servants, and children whose parents had donated them to the service of the _convento_ to become friars themselves (_donados_). For example, by the eighteenth century, the Observant _convento_ of San Antonio de Padua at Garrovillas de Alconétar housed twenty-two friars, three lay brothers, three _donados_, and three servants (figure 3.12).
Although beyond the scope of this dissertation, I believe further research will reveal other lay servants and laborers as part of conventual life among Iberian Franciscans.

American colonization spurred rapid expansion of the Order, based in Reconquista precedents, but developing new practices among the remnants of Indigenous Mesoamerica. Formal evangelization by the Franciscan began with Leo X’s 1521 authorization (Alias felicis), and after advance scouts in 1521 and 1523, twelve missionaries known as the doce received their charge at the strictly observant convento of San Francisco outside Belvís de Monroy (figure 3.13), arriving in Mexico in 1524. Other religious orders soon followed, with the Dominicans arriving in 1526-1528, the Augustinians in 1533, and others later in the sixteenth century.46

Built by Native laborers under the direction of Spanish masons, craftsmen, and friars, mission establishments (doctrinas) such as the Observant Franciscan convento of San Miguel in Huejotzingo required large staffs to meet the daily needs of two to five resident friars and guests (figures 3.14).47 As with Spain, little research is available about these workforces, but it appears lay brothers of lower social background acted as overseers.48 In many cases, however, Native workers within the convento furnished the actual labor. Indians were certainly allowed inside Mexican conventos for processions through the cloisters and other activities related to their religious fraternities (cofradias).49 Native laborers included liturgical participants such as sacristans, singers, musicians, and bell ringers, but also everyday workers such as gardeners, doormen, sweepers, cooks, and messengers (Table 3.1). Among the mission workforce were children of Indigenous nobility, who lived in the conventos where friars raised and trained them to participate in liturgical services as acolytes and choristers.50 It also appears likely Native women participated in convento processions, and may have also worked for the mission.51 Friars
used *convento* spaces for teaching, processions, and lay devotions, making it is clear that
Franciscan *conventos* in Mexico did not exclude laity nor Native people.  

English Dominican friar and traveler Thomas Gage offers a colorful anecdote from his 1625 visit to the Huejotzingo *convento*, pointing to the comfort of New Spanish Franciscans interacting with Native laborers within their *conventos*. Describing dinner in the refectory, Gage writes that the Franciscans,

> [...] entertained us gallantly, and made shew unto us of the dexterity of their Indians in music. Those fat friars wanted not like the rest all provision necessary for the body. But their greatest glory and boasting to us was the education which they had given to some of the children of the town, especially such as served them in their cloister, whom they had brought up to dancing after the Spanish fashion at the sound of the *guitarra*. And this a dozen of them (the biggest not being above fourteen years of age) performed excellently for our better entertainment that night; we were there till midnight, singing both Spanish and Indian tunes, capering and dancing with their castanets, or knockers on their fingers, with such dexterity as not only did delight but amaze and astonish us.

In his admittedly critical view of Mexican missions, Gage presents a picture of *convento* life far removed from the austere ideals of Capistrano’s 1443 commentary.

Mission construction peaked in central Mexico during the third quarter of the sixteenth century, after which secular clergy gained increasing power and pushed for secularization. In theory, mendicant *doctrinas* were transitional institutions, to be turned over to secular priests after successful evangelization of the local population, becoming ordinary parish churches within the diocesan hierarchy. New Spanish mendicants reacted to this process of secularization by expanding establishments in the cities, which functioned akin to mendicant conventual houses in Europe, and by founding new *doctrinas* at the margins of Spanish influence. The late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were therefore a period of Franciscan expansion in the Borderlands of New Mexico and Florida, where they retained prominence they had lost in Central Mexico.
Defining Mission Communities

Primary sources indicate New Mexico’s Franciscan missions were the focal point of mixed communities of Native and Spanish persons, connected through ties to the mission establishment. By describing them as a “community,” I mean to emphasize their links to a common place, not that their participants were all unified, or shared the same interests, behaviors, and perspectives. On the contrary, they were mixed gatherings, often having in common nothing more than involvement in mission tasks. Most mission community participants probably did not voluntarily choose to be part of the mission, and many may not have believed in Christianity nor supported the Franciscans’ evangelization campaign.

A few clarifications on this terminology are necessary. The mission community describes a network of people directly engaged in the mission’s daily operations, and does not necessarily include the entire population of the nearby pueblo, which often included factions hostile to the Spanish. It was not a monastic community, where a group of clerics voluntarily took common vows governing their behavior as they attempted to live together according to those ideals, often in a confined enclosure. I will return to this distinction between mission communities and the monastic communities in Chapter Nine.

Although “community” often suggests a sense of common purpose or shared identity, I want to stress that these implications did not pertain to mission communities in seventeenth century New Mexico. Mission community members did not necessarily agree, accept Christian ideas, or want to be part of convento life. While the word “community” might suggest a degree of equality and transcendence of social differences, this was not the case since social hierarchy and authority were very much a part of everyday life within mission communities. They were not examples of what William H. Isbell describes as “natural” communities, meaning static,
cohesive social units in which everyone shares a common perspective.\textsuperscript{56} Anthropologists have increasingly criticized such overly simplistic ideas, proposing new theories to account for the complex realities of human interactions.\textsuperscript{57} Isbell argues that “imagined communities” really comprise individuals, each pursuing their own strategic goals, and emerging as fluid, volatile social groupings that frequently change and are full of internal factions.\textsuperscript{58}

Other anthropological theorists place a stronger emphasis on the territorial basis of communities.\textsuperscript{59} Mark D. Varien and James M. Potter argue that place is essential for community formation, which they describe as active creations with diverse participants rarely agreeing completely or acting in a unified manner. Most importantly, Varien and Potter believe place and physical closeness are the necessary conditions tying these individuals together in a group that one can call “community.” For them, communities are explicitly spatial, tied to the locations in which participants regularly interact.\textsuperscript{60} This is essentially my understanding of the mission: a physical location and built environment to which choice and coercion linked mission community members. The architectural structure of the mission, together with outlying workspaces such as farms, gardens, and corrals are the primary factors bringing individuals together as mission communities, rather than any shared sense of identity or purpose.

Going further, physical locations and landscapes are factors in shaping individuals and communities through a social dynamic that anthropologists call “structuration,” or the recursive relationship of individual agency to social structure. Agency describes an individual’s ability to make choices and pursue his or her own objectives, leading to the rich variability of human expression as individuals act out particular needs and interests. In contrast, structure describes the rules and resources available to these actors, which limit their ability to exercise agency but also provide a framework allowing self-expression, similar to how the rules of grammar enable
speakers to make themselves understood by an audience sharing the same linguistic framework. Community is thus a construction arising out of the relations among people who are active agents, as they contest and coalesce around different ideas in particular times and places, entangled through the process of structuration. Not all of their actions come from conscious, intentional decisions, and agency is also visible in unthinking choices following patterns of activity familiar from growing up in a particular environment.

The mission community was not a homogenous unit of people with common interests and behaviors, but rather a diverse mix of persons with a common tie to the mission as a physical presence in their landscape. The mission community included native laborers, both male and female, as well as the resident priests, lay brothers, soldiers, and occasional travelers. The tenure of participants in the mission community varied, with some people being more or less permanent residents, and others passing through on a rotational or short-term basis. These participants probably held different conceptions of the missionaries’ evangelistic goals.

The architectural spaces of New Mexico missions are essential to my conception of their communities as the place of intersection linking together various actors, perspectives, and motives. Mission architecture played a role in structuration, with walls, openings, spaces, and artifacts encouraging some forms of interaction while resisting others. In the course of enacting these possibilities, individual mission community participants also altered their material environment, reshaping the future possibilities that the mission structure could allow. Although Spanish friars were responsible for the mission’s initial design, its use eventually produced a hybrid environment as the various agencies of mission community members modified it.
As I move beyond theory to New Mexico’s particular history, I want to be clear that many of the Native participants in mission communities were not there voluntarily. Various Pueblo oral histories describe the construction of missions by coerced or enslaved Indian workforces. For the Spanish, slavery was a specific institution to which converted pueblos were not legally subject, so long as they complied with Spanish governance. Theoretically, converted Indians could not be enslaved if they obeyed the authorities, but in practice this was a Catch-22: failure to comply with Spanish labor demands could be construed as resistance to Spanish rule, legitimizing the use of force. Natives who rebelled, committed crimes, or attacked Spanish communities could be legally enslaved, and slavers took broad advantage in punishing revolt and raiding mobile peoples such as the Navajos and Apaches. Capturing men, women, and children from these groups was a major part of New Mexico’s economy, especially in the eighteenth century, and well into the 1800s.

In spite of their theoretical exemption from slavery, a number of legal means also existed for the exploitation of Pueblo labor. Early explorers relied upon the goodwill of Pueblo towns or simply took supplies by force. With colonial establishment in 1598, formal systems developed to replace outright extortion, at least theoretically. Encomienda was a primary institution in seventeenth-century New Mexico, in which the Governor granted Spanish colonists rights to a certain amount of Indian labor, in the form of tribute materials from a specific region, pueblo, or group of households. This tribute was supposed to comprise a cotton manta (or tanned buckskin or buffalo robe) collected in May and one fanega of maize (between 38.1-63.5 kg/1.5 and 2.5 bu.) collected in October, from each household in the grant. In exchange, grant recipients (encomenderos) provided military support for the colonial government. In a region lacking a cash economy, access to Native labor though encomienda was one of the only ways for colonists
to gain wealth and status, and encomenderos often arranged alternative payments of direct tribute labor, and took up residence near pueblos despite the prohibition of such practices. The practice and abuse of encomienda was an instigating factor in the Pueblo Revolt, along with suppression of Pueblo religious expression and cultural revitalization among Native communities, and the civil government discontinued encomienda after the reconquest.

The Spanish government also benefited directly from Native labor, collecting tribute from communities not part of encomiendas, and through the parallel institution of repartamiento, or direct drafts of Pueblo labor. Beneficiaries of these drafts were supposed to feed the workers and pay them wages in the form of additional foodstuffs, but abuses and non-payment were not uncommon. Much of this labor went to construction projects in Santa Fe, as well as fieldwork, and the accumulation of commodities for personal profit by unscrupulous officials.

While rooted in medieval Iberia and the early colonization of the Caribbean, encomienda and repartamiento flourished in central Mexico, where there were well-established Pre-Hispanic systems of ritualized tribute labor. Colonial institutions built on these existing forms in Mexico, but parallel practices did not exist among the New Mexico pueblos, where social systems were based on expectations of reciprocity instead. What the Spanish saw as profitable and necessary social institutions were unfamiliar forms of coercion for Pueblo peoples newly subject to them, little different from enslavement. To some extent, Zunis were spared the worst Spanish labor demands because of their distance from Santa Fe and the tenuousness of colonial rule in the western regions.

The means by which friars obtained labor to build and sustain their missions were less explicit, but not necessarily less coercive than encomienda and repartamiento. The Franciscans were a mendicant order, meaning that they took vows of poverty, and were dependent on
begging, donations, and patronage for support. The ideal of poverty created practical problems. How could the Order obtain facilities to pursue other church-mandated objectives such as study, preaching, and evangelization if they could own no property? The official compromise was that the papacy owned all real property and valuable possessions that Franciscans used, such as their churches, *conventos*, liturgical materials, and art. In New Mexico, these properties and Pueblo labor were theoretically free donations of the Crown and missionized communities.

In practice, the position of these Indigenous “donors” was much more complicated, and donation was a necessary fiction to comply with Franciscan ideals in a political environment where implied force and factional alliances were the real drivers of property accrual. Despite being close-knit societies, pueblos often had internal disagreements about how to deal with outsiders such as Spanish missionaries, a factional dynamic which continues as a fact of life in modern Pueblo communities. Where friars successfully established missions, it was almost always through a divide-and-conquer tactic, obtaining support from a group within the pueblo which was willing to cooperate for strategic reasons. Among supplies Benavides brought to New Mexico were trade goods such as rosaries, iron hoes, knives, macaw feathers, small bells, and glass beads to help establish and reward supportive Pueblo factions. Cooperating with the Spanish increased access to practical resources such as livestock, seeds, and food alms that friars distributed during hard times. Spanish and Pueblo strategic interests sometimes aligned as conflicts with mobile groups of Indians increased. Labor at the missions also had advantages, since full-time mission workers were not subject to the tribute obligations of other Pueblo households.

While some labor may have been voluntary, or exchanged for trade goods, the work of mission construction was too much for any single subgroup within the pueblo, and was likely
coerced to some degree. Kubler argues that this labor must have been voluntary, because single friars living among large Pueblo towns did not have the power to compel Indian populations to work for them.\textsuperscript{80} His argument appears wishfully naïve, however, since it fails to recognize the general atmosphere of fear and lasting impression that early, violent outbursts by the Spanish must have left on Pueblo communities.\textsuperscript{81}

Tragic examples of disproportionate violence during early Spanish \textit{entradas} are numerous: Coronado’s assaults on Zuni and Hopi towns, and his genocidal war against the Tigeux Pueblos; Espejo’s execution of prisoners and burning of a Tigua Pueblo called Puala for mocking and refusing to feed his expedition; Zaldíbar’s punitive massacre of Acoma along with Oñate’s brutal punishment of survivors; and Oñate’s similarly destructive massacre and burning of three Tompiro Pueblos and Las Humanas prior to 1601, when more than 900 Indians died and soldiers took 200 prisoners.\textsuperscript{82} These stunning acts established a reputation for unpredictable explosions of violence, wildly out of proportion to the triggering events, which allowed succeeding Spanish colonists a wide field of action without directly engaging in acts of violence themselves.

Despite the non-violent exemplars of Jesus and Francis, by the early modern period Franciscans were not averse to using force to suppress traditional Indian religions and coerce Christian conversion. In Mexico, friars such as Jerónimo de Mendieta and Toribio de Benevente (Motolinía) advocated force to shatter Native priesthoods initially, after which they believed more paternal relationships would supplant violence.\textsuperscript{83} Benefiting from the reverberations of Spanish violence and their own willingness to compel obedience, New Mexico friars arrived among pueblos in militant style, with armed escorts, shows of force, and rituals in which soldiers demonstrated subservience to the missionaries.\textsuperscript{84} When encountering Franciscan demands for
space, labor, and cooperation, Pueblo leaders had to carefully weigh these impositions against the risk of disproportionately violent retaliations if they refused. In this atmosphere of fear and implied violence, the Franciscans may not have needed overt coercion; the mere presence of Spanish soldiers and the history of violence were threat enough. Finally, among the Zuni pueblos, cultural values of tolerance, hospitality, and conflict avoidance may have mitigated initial resistance, if these present-day principles were also part of seventeenth-century Zuni culture.\textsuperscript{85}

The Native people passing through and living in missions were not necessarily there of their own free will. Friars pressured the pueblos and used their authority to coerce attendance at mass and catechism. In some pueblos, an administrator known as the \textit{alcalde mayor} assigned Indians to work for resident missionaries, but Franciscans appear to have obtained labor independently from these officials as well.\textsuperscript{86} Indians who disobeyed missionaries could receive punishments of beatings and whippings. Although exceptional in the documentary record, some friars also resorted to unsanctioned tortures. Inquisitional records reveal friars who often behaved as if entitled to the Indians’ service, taking umbrage and pressing charges when civil officials denied the laborers that they took for granted, despite Benavides’s rosy picture of mission communities as voluntary “sanctuaries.”

\textbf{The Composition of the Mission Community}

Despite extensive Spanish bureaucracy, there are relatively few primary sources providing insight into the daily life of New Mexico’s seventeenth-century \textit{conventos}. During the Pueblo Revolt, revolutionaries burnt the missions and Spanish buildings housing documents.\textsuperscript{87}
The few surviving sources reflect the biases of their Spanish authors, but attentive reading can still glean clues about everyday mission life. The accounts and correspondences of former Custodians Alonso de Benavides and Estévan de Perea are the richest texts for understanding both the rhetoric and actual practices of missions during the rapid expansion of the 1620s and 1630s. Records of frequent disputes among New Mexico’s mutually dependent but fiercely competitive civil and religious authorities are another important source of information. These testimonies often hint incidentally at mission life despite the aggressively partisan agendas and scandalous accusations on both sides.

Beyond seventeenth-century New Mexico, several eighteenth-century accounts provide comparative examples, although Spanish strategies changed after the Pueblo Revolt, as missions became smaller and authorities less mindful of traditional religious practices among the Indians. Several visitation reports with scattered references to mission labor relations came from the Diocese of Durango’s attempts to assert ecclesiastic authority over New Mexico. Responding to negative reports, Fray Manuel de San Juan Nepomuceno y Trigo’s report (1754) goes into detail about the mission labor system at that time. He describes voluntary organization of workers in weekly rotations, a systematic labor arrangement that remained the case in Fray Francisco Atanasio Domínguez’s detailed reports in 1776 (Table 3.2). Finally, the most detailed account of everyday life in a particular eighteenth-century New Mexico mission is that of Fray Joaquín de Jesús Ruiz, guardian of the Jemez mission at the time of Domínguez’s visit.

These primary sources attest to large staffs of Pueblo laborers in New Mexico’s missions, who together with the missionaries constituted “mission communities.” By this term, I mean all persons living or working within the spaces of convento, as well as those tied to it through
training, labor, hospitality, or other roles, who became entangled with the mission for varied reasons. Some community members may have sought alliances with missionaries as a practical response to the Spanish presence, while fear, need, and coercion compelled others to work in the convento. It was a heterogeneous mix of people of varying degrees of agency, from voluntary to fully coerced, with many situational compromises in between. Despite the different and inequitable conditions of participants, they all used the spaces of the mission and actively shaped its significance.

From Benavides’s description, several general roles emerge, including gate keepers (porteros), sacristans, cooks, bell-ringers, gardeners, and servers in the dining room or refectory (refitoleros). This list is consistent with other sources (Table 3.2), such as the Santa Fe cabildo’s 1639 report accusing friars of using too much labor, between thirty to forty Indians in each mission. According to the cabildo, Native laborers maintained mission herds and fields, and served as gate keepers, cooks, woodcutters, and millers. They specify that some of the cooks were women, as also may have been the grain grinders, since this was traditionally a female job among the pueblos. In 1648, Governor Luis de Guzmán y Figueroa estimated the typical number of adult, fulltime laborers at each mission who were exempt from tribute obligations. They included an interpreter, sacristan, head singer (cantor mayor), bell ringer, organist, herdsman, cook, gate keeper, and a stable hand (caballo pisque). In 1660, the Quarai mission employed at least twenty singers and sacristans, as well as other cooks and servants. At the high end of estimates, each mission had as many as seventy fulltime Native workers, including men women, and children occupied as acolytes, sacristans, singers, servants, stable-hands, cooks, shepherds, and farmhands, as alcalde mayor for the Salinas jurisdiction Nicolás de Aguilar claimed in 1664.
Examining these various roles in greater detail, it is evident that Native people fulfilled numerous tasks pertained to the Christian liturgies. Prosecutors (*fiscales* or *fiscales mayors*) were critical agents of colonial authority within the mission community and pueblo at large. The Spanish charged these Native officials with punishing Indians who violated friars’ rules, the most common infraction being absence from mass, for which *fiscales* might whip offenders.  

Reliance on *fiscales* buffered friars from the less savory aspects of their power, while implicating pueblo community members in the enforcement of colonial system. In a letter attributed to Benavides, the author compares *fiscales* to the other governing parties in the pueblos: *caciques* (chiefs), chief captains, governors, and *alcaldes*. He argues that all should be free from tribute obligations. According to the friar, these officials were unable to maintain their own fields, relying upon help during their time in office and unable to provide tribute. It appears they relied upon kin to maintain households and fields apart from the mission. A 1620 viceregal decree describes *fiscales* as elected officials, similar to governors and *alcaldes*, but most mission documents treat them essentially as agents of the missionaries. By the late eighteenth century, each mission had a chief *fiscal mayor* and three to four subordinate *fiscales* serving in weekly rotations that allowed time to tend to their own affairs (Table 3.2). *Fiscales* were agents of social and religious control, but also intermediaries between the Spanish and the Pueblo populace. This position furnished some ability to manipulate the mission system, as for example when Ruiz accused *fiscales* of facilitating theft during the harvest season.

Sacristans (*Sacristanes*) were men and boys who cared for the mission’s liturgical items, assisted the liturgy, and oversaw general cleanliness in the church. In the eighteenth century, missions had eight to ten *sacristanes* working in pairs on a weekly rotation, and as with the *fiscales*, Domínguez distinguishes between head *sacristanes mayores*, and subordinate
sacristanes (sometimes called sacristancitos or sacristancillos). These distinctions in rank and age seem to reflect seventeenth-century practice, for Benavides writes that sacristanes (i.e. mayores) were in charge of obtaining, teaching, and preparing boys for church service, at least a dozen of whom helped with mass and prayers (i.e. subordinate sacristanes). 105 Head sacristan was a position of responsibility; they supervised the mission and its equipment when the guardian friar was not present. Sacristanes at visita chapels were the primary on-site authority since the ministering priest was only present on occasions. 106

Sacristanes assisted during the mission liturgy, both as acolytes and musicians, while wearing special, often brilliantly colored cassocks. 107 When not thus engaged, subordinate sacristanes worked around the mission in tasks such as plastering and whitewashing the adobe walls, traditionally jobs for women in Pueblo societies. 108 In Zuni, the position of sacristan appears to have remained important even after the last Franciscan priests left by 1824, purportedly developing into the present-day Sakisda:kwe who keep liturgical vestments, sculptures, missals, and other mission materials. 109

Choristers or singers (cantores) worked closely with the sacristanes, and were usually young boys although adult cantores also appear in documents. They performed a style known as organ chant, accompanying the three major liturgical hours observed in New Mexico. Cantores dressed as acolytes during services, when they stood in the choir loft above the entryway to the church, and sang accompaniments to the priest standing in front, where the altar was located. 110 Some friars, including Roque de Figueredo, founder of the Hawikku’s mission, were talented musicians and taught organ chant as well as harmony and “plain” music to their singers. 111 By the eighteenth century, Ruiz claimed that all but one of Jemez’s six cantores could read Latin and a bit of Spanish, singing the words of masses and other observances from boards, cards, and
Mission inventories also include organs, bassoons, flageolets, cornets, trumpets, and “all musical instruments,” which accompanied cantores from the choir loft.

According to Benavides, cantores worked in weekly rotations. He further implies they worked part time or periodically when he says choir singers and church assistants paid tribute but were exempt from labor drafts. Tribute obligations were calculated by household rather than individual, so adult cantores and sacristanes probably maintained homes within the pueblo when not working at the mission. In the eighteenth century, Ruiz says cantores arrived with sacristanes at the start of the week, and head singers may have rotated weekly. While cantores may have been younger, the subordinate sacristanes were probably adolescent in age, and Ruiz frequently tries to control their access to female participants in the mission community, preventing flirtation and sexual behavior. These young males were so ubiquitous that at times they are simply described as collective “mission boys.” For example, when Governor Peñalosa arrested Custodian Alonzo de Posadas in 1663, other friars met to formulate a response, accompanied by an anonymous group of “some of the boys of the [convento]” of Santa Fe.

Access to and control of Indian labor was a flashpoint during Governor Bernardo López de Mendizábal tenure (1658-1660), particularly the use of cantores and sacristanes for the feast of San Buenaventura at Las Humanas Pueblo. Guardians of nearby Salinas missions at Abó, Tajique, and Quarai customarily brought as many as twenty cantores and sacristanes each to Las Humanas to join the celebration, but through his alcalde mayor Aguilar, Mendizábal refused to allow Indian musicians to make the trip. This conflict attests that sacristanes and cantores collectively numbered at least twenty for each of the Salinas sites in the mid-seventeenth century, and they played multiple roles in the liturgical theater of the missions.
While working, *cantores* were required to be on hand and available throughout the day, and like *sacristanes* probably lived at the mission permanently or in rotations. Benavides indicates that mission community members took turns in a number of other tasks such as ringing the bell, while in the eighteenth century Ruiz sought constant employment of the mission boys. He believed their presence at the mission prevented mischief, but it also allowed him to avoid relying on adults, whom he distrusted. He put mission boys to work repairing cells, husking and shelling corn, moving and storing supplies of firewood and fodder, and maintaining the fires which warmed the *convento*.118

Resident friars relied upon Indian boys as personal servants, who may have been *sacristanes* and *cantores*, or discrete positions in addition to those roles.119 These youths seem to have lived fulltime in the *convento* during their service.120 They kept fires burning, and performed culinary tasks such as preparing hot chocolate for the friars.121 In the eighteenth century, they cleaned the cells and other rooms of the *convento*, cared for stables, and carried messages, tasks which earlier friars may have assigned to them as well.122 New Mexico’s Franciscans regarded personal servants as indispensable, habitually employing multiple youths in the role.123 Of all mission community participants, these boys are most consistently described as sleeping in the *convento*, and in the eighteenth century, Ruiz felt it necessary to keep them close to compel their service.124

Working so intimately with guardian friars could be hazardous, as in the case of the volatile Fray Salvador de Guerra. Guerra was at Awatovi’s mission in the mid-1660s, where Hopi and Spanish leaders denounced him for defrauding the Indians, keeping Pueblo women as concubines, torturing and starving Indians, and punishing disobedient Hopis by soaking them with oil or turpentine and lighting them on fire, resulting in burns and death.125 Guerra admitted
to beating Hopi boys, girls, and adults, as well as “larding” them with turpentine. The Provincial Custodian found this brutal “guardian” guilty of arrogance, disobedience, revealing secrets of the order, and harassing the Indians, and as a result, stripped him of some ecclesiastical privileges and ordered him to Mexico for further punishment.\textsuperscript{126} Instead, in what appears to have been an egregious miscarriage of justice, Guerra remained in New Mexico, becoming guardian at Isleta Pueblo, and then notary for the Order in Santa Fe. As notary, Guerra had a (presumably) Hopi boy named Juan as personal servant, “attend[ing] his cell.” For unknown reasons, Guerra became enraged with Juan and wanted to execute him by hanging. The boy fled and was caught among the Hopis, where Fray Pedro Manso de Valdés held him prisoner in Awatovi’s \textit{convento}. Despite Guerra’s anger, Manso de Valdés found the boy innocent and released him.\textsuperscript{127}

Translators were essential staff within missions. A few friars were accomplished linguists and learned local languages, such as Francisco de Escobar, who was purportedly so adept that he could pick up new languages “immediately” and retain them to converse upon subsequent visits. Likewise, Perea was accomplished in the Tiwa language of Sandía Pueblo while guardian there, but had to rely upon interpreters when visiting unfamiliar pueblos, such as Hawikku in 1629.\textsuperscript{128} Many other friars were newly arrived or never learned the languages of the people to whom they ministered, a situation that administration aggravated by frequently moving friars from one mission to another.\textsuperscript{129} Reliance on translators was a problem when it came to confession, and parishioners feared indiscrete translators would gossip about private revelations.\textsuperscript{130} As with \textit{fiscales}, the mediating role of translators put them in a powerful position, and they were among leaders of the Pueblo Revolt, leveraging knowledge of languages and cultural practices to maximum impact.\textsuperscript{131}
Two recurrent roles without detailed description are the door keeper (portero) and the bell ringer (campanero). The portero kept watch on the entryway and waiting room or portería of the mission. Although the mission conventos were not cloistered, they were like any residence equipped to control the ingress of outsiders. Porterías were typically projecting porches or recessed vestibules, open on the front to allow free access to their waiting space that often had bench seating, while a locked interior door halted further ingress until the portero allowed entry into the convento. As a structural form, porterías had European precedents such as the mudéjar gothic-style example of Nuestra Señora de Santa María de La Rábida (Observant, c. 1400s; figure 3.15) or the Renaissance porch of the Observant convento of San Francisco in Cáceres, Extremadura (c. 1561-1571; figure 3.16). Porterías were widely adopted in sixteenth-century Mexico, where they were also places for distributing alms to the poor, hospitals for sick and dying Natives, and sometimes housed open-air chapels (figures 3.17-3.18). Recessed vestibules predominated in New Mexico, often with benches around three walls (figures 3.19-3.21). The attentions of the portero to this entryway provided security against theft and unregulated access to the convento, and his job remained important throughout the colonial period.

According to primary sources, the position of bell ringer (campanero) was equally important to the that of the portero. He kept the mission on schedule and called the pueblo to worship by ringing one or more bronze bells, which were Royal donations, projecting the voice of each mission over its neighboring pueblo and throughout the landscape. Their sound regulated routines of labor, worship, and classes, calling parishioners to obligatory church services. Bells might also ring for events of great importance, rejoicing, mourning, or warning of danger. Their regulatory role and symbolic prominence resulted in widespread hatred among Pueblo
Indians, who attacked and destroyed many mission bells during the Pueblo Revolt. They hung in
towers or openings in the church façade, or on a pole frame at ground level near the entrance.\textsuperscript{136}
The \textit{campanero} kept track of the time by solar observations, and signaled particular activities by
ringing the bell with some form of hand-held clapper or stone. If he had other obligations, they
are not described in colonial documents.

In addition to evangelism, missions were critical economic centers directing large
agricultural operations and introducing new materials from outside the Pueblo world.\textsuperscript{137} The
Crown supported missions with basic tools and supplies, but friars sought to raise funds for
costly artwork, gold and silver liturgical vessels, and musical instruments as part of ritual theater
to impress native converts and other missionaries.\textsuperscript{138} They raised large herds of cattle, sheep,
and horses for sale in Mexico. These animals lived on Pueblo lands and required Native
caretakers, usually called \textit{pastores} of sheep, swine, horses, or chickens. Such entrepreneurship
was difficult to reconcile with Franciscan simplicity and poverty, as critics were quick to point
out. Benavides presents mission livestock husbandry as educational and charitable contributions,
training Indians and raising meat for feeding the mission community and the poor.\textsuperscript{139}

Civil authorities often objected to the size of mission herds and the resources they
consumed. For example, Aguilar accuses Fray Diego de Santander of overextended the water
resources of Las Humanas Pueblo with a herds of 700 sheep, 20 oxen, and 20-30 horses.\textsuperscript{140}
Franciscans contested these numbers, arguing herds of a certain size were necessary due to their
growth cycle and inevitable losses from poor health, harsh climate, and predation. Captain
Andrés Hurtado was sympathetic to the friars, testifying that at least 400 ewes were necessary to
maintain a herd that would not drop below fifty animals.\textsuperscript{141} Fray Nicolás de Freitas quoted
similar numbers: the mission herds of Las Humanas were around 400 smaller animals, and 6 to 8
plow-oxen, with Indian workers watering and caring for them. Seventeenth-century sources do not explain how pueblo labor was apportioned for these tasks, but their size would seem to suggest the use of full-time herdsman. By the eighteenth century, arrangements varied, with some caretakers on temporary rotations, and other missions having full-time shepherds, herdsmen, and chicken-keepers, the latter often women.

Wherever possible, missions maintained fields of corn, wheat, and vegetable staples to supply mission kitchens and sell as cash crops. Wheat was a priority, since it was necessary for Eucharistic wafers, and flour was difficult to keep and transport over long distances. From their harvests, friars stored reserves against famine, as occurred in the 1670s. Mission inventories from 1672 included itemized accounts for the dispersal of grains such as corn, wheat, and beans during the drought of 1667 to 1672 (See Chapter 10 and Table 10.1). The Zuni missions of Hawikku and Halona produced limited amounts of maize, wheat, and beans, although the drought had severely curtailed their crops in these years. A more important staple for the Zuni missions were large herds of cattle and sheep, and the friar had as many as 70 cattle and 200 sheep butchered per year for the needs of each pueblo, culled from their substantially larger herds that supplied the mission community and Spanish military expeditions through the region.

The mission fields may well have included land in the vicinity of the pueblo, but in many cases also included estancias, land holdings remote from the pueblo land grant, and operated as private farms for the benefit of the mission. These fields required agricultural laborers to plant, maintain, and harvest. Wheat was grown in plowed fields relying upon draft animals, while corn was grown in the traditional manner of small hills or clusters in unplowed dryland, floodwater, and irrigated fields. It seems likely that field laborers living in the pueblo or
fieldhouses rather than the *convento*, but they were integral to the mission’s success, and probably passed through the *convento* at various times of the year.

By the eighteenth century, Ruiz had a careful system of managing Pueblo labor because of his constant fear of theft. Natives of Jemez Pueblo harvested his wheat and corn crops, bringing the grain to the service entry of the mission on the north side, near the threshing floor, where they processed wheat in a single day to prevent any from sitting unattended overnight. Workers put grain in a granary on the second floor of the *convento*, and placed maize on the roof for mission boys to husk when sufficiently dry. Although no surviving records attest to harvest practices among the Zuni missions, both *conventos* had stairways leading to their rooftops, providing expansive, secure locations for drying foodstuffs.

Franciscan missionaries initiated a host of other economic activities, including hunting and gathering, craft production, and some rudimentary industrial efforts. *Alcde mayor* Aguilar objected to the friars’ economic initiatives such as hunting prairie chickens, gathering of pine nuts, weaving, painting, and making stockings. If Aguilar’s testimony is accurate, the friars probably intended these products for sale in mining regions to the south. Other activities included salt collecting, tanning hides, and possibly smelting. Finally, missions produced crafts as part of their educational programs, which may have served in the local mission or for sale elsewhere, although the precise nature of these craft products is unclear.

Domestic laborers, such as cooks, water carriers, tortilla makers, and grain grinders were critical for the daily functioning of missions. The arduous task of grinding was never complete, since corn was central to most meals, and cooking also required specialized knowledge. Securing domestic laborers was among the first concern of missionaries at Hawikku, and while they initially worked voluntarily, Zuni assistants quickly balking at the uncompensated labor.
Domestic tasks were numerous, and included gathering firewood, carrying water, grinding grain, preparing food, and presumably cleaning up afterwards. In some cases, bakers were distinct from cooks, and were probably in charge of grinding as well, but all these roles were part of the kitchen staff.\(^{153}\)

When documents specify these laborers’ gender, they are almost always women. Regulations excluded women from European monasteries and conventual houses, and often tried to curtail the practice in the Americas, but friars in New Mexico found native women to be essential members of the mission community.\(^{154}\) The *convento* could not function effectively without their labor and knowledge. In 1660, Governor Mendizábal forbade native cooks and wood gatherers from working for Fray Diego de Parraga, guardian of Tajique mission. As a result, Parraga had to perform these tasks alone, reportedly cooking badly because he had always depended on servants and did not know how to do it himself.\(^{155}\) Parraga was elderly, and without the mission’s wood gatherers, he began burning wooden crosses for fuel.\(^{156}\) The missionary of neighboring Chililí was also forced to collect his own wood and learn to cook.\(^{157}\)

From these disputes comes the exceedingly rare testimony of a seventeenth-century Pueblo woman, Isabel Vaca of Tajique, who cooked for the mission’s three friars and gave testimony against *alcalde mayor* Aguilar for preventing her from working.\(^{158}\) She maintained a residence separate from the mission and her testimony is entirely sympathetic to the friars, berating Aguilar for his “cruelty” in preventing Indians from gathering wood for the missionaries, forcing the sickly and elderly men to collect their own firewood in the snow.\(^{159}\) Vaca’s testimony was recorded at the head mission in Santo Domingo, so the friars may have used it as a mouthpiece for their own interests or handpicked Vaca for her sympathetic perspective. It is notable, however, that Vaca makes no effort to conceal her employment in the
mission. In making a case against Aguilar, the Franciscans considered such labor arrangements unremarkable and part of proper order, with which the *alcalde mayor* had interfered.

In addition to kitchen labors, women were the traditional builders and plasterers of adobe houses, and this role appears to have continued in mission construction. According to Benavides, men provided the materials, built the roofs, and fashioned the woodwork, but women constructed the walls, work pertaining to earth that was understood as feminine material derived from the earth mother. Women also produced pottery and swept churches.\(^\text{160}\)

Women’s presence and labor in New Mexico’s mission *conventos* may have been almost as old as the colony itself. In 1598, a skirmish erupted between Acoma Pueblo and some of Oñate’s men, resulting in the death of Juan de Zaldivar. The Spanish responded by burning the pueblo, killing an estimated 600 to 800 Acomas, and taking 70 men and 500 women and children captive. In addition to the enslavement and mutilation of adult captives, Oñate “gave” the captive girls under age twelve to the Franciscans, at that time six priests and two lay brothers.\(^\text{161}\) The documents do not specify how many girls Oñate entrusted to them, but it was more than eight Franciscans could manage, and Captain Gaspar Pérez de Villagrá Alcalá testified to taking sixty or seventy of them to Mexico, where they were distributed to established convents.\(^\text{162}\)

The records are unclear on how many girls the Franciscans initially took in, and whether the friars sent all of them south or if some of their trusts remained among the new mission establishments. The situation seems analogous to the purchase of starving children later in the seventeenth century, however. One primary source claims unconverted mobile group families would offer captive children and even their own offspring to missionaries for “a little meat or flour” during the famine of 1659. Purportedly, friars saw opportunity in the purchase of these victims of hardship and violence, “rescuing” them for catechism and baptism to become “gentle,
peaceable Christians.” Since colonial documents do not describe what became of the children in either of these cases, it seems plausible that they may have contributed to mission labor as part of their process of acculturation. Although seemingly young by modern standards, ethnographic comparisons indicate Pueblo girls began participation in household chores at a young age, undertaking tasks such as grinding grain by age eight. Although speculative, friars might have benefited from the presence of Native girls such as the Acoma captives in early missions, for even at their young age many already knew how to perform basic domestic tasks.

On the other hand, Benavides makes no mention of women in the convento, using masculine nouns for all mission community members in the 1620s, as did Governor Guzman in 1648. Their use of gender may accurately reflect their observations, or it may obscure practices of which they feared royal and papal authorities would have disapproved. Women were certainly working in missions by 1639, according to the Santa Fe cabildo report, and the practice was widespread by the 1660s and continued through the eighteenth century.

By that time, Ruiz described a regimented system for governing women’s labor and interactions in the mission, betraying a profound anxiety about their presence (see Chapter 10). Fearing disorder, he abstained from hitting women on their first offense, punishing them with a stern warning, but ordering corporal punishments by the fiscales for subsequent problems. Ruiz’s willingness to use mediated violence points to the darker legacy of the mission era.

Working in the convento left women and children vulnerable to male advances; accusations by civil authorities and pueblo oral histories both point to sexual improprieties between Pueblo women and Franciscan friars. During his Inquisition, Governor Mendizábal claimed that friars were “all living in concubinage, and that the pueblos were full of [their] children.” Some of the more sordid accusations are unreliable hearsay. As an example, Mendizábal claims to have...
heard that Fray Luis Martinez raped and murdered a woman in his Taos cell, burying her body under the *convento* floor, and then asking Fray Juan Lobato to help cover the crime by reburying her in the church. He likewise relied on hearsay when accusing Fray Alonzo de Posadas and another friar named Velasco of raping Hopi women.\(^\text{168}\) While such events may have happened, the accounts are too biased to instill much confidence in their accuracy, and many claims simply lack enough information for evaluation.\(^\text{169}\)

Other allegations are more reliable, however, with support from multiple sources and sometimes testimony from the accused themselves.\(^\text{170}\) Friars were often alleged to use catechism and confession as opportunities for sexual activity. Fray Diego de Parraga was a frequent target of these accusations, although Aguilar used questionable methods to gain testimony against him, which was later recanted. On the other hand, Parraga himself purportedly confessed to enjoying sexual relations with the wife of his *cantor* Francisco Mutra (or Muza) for three years, and having fathered a daughter by her. This affair came to light when her husband walked to Santa Fe himself to complain, risking his tribute-free status as a mission singer.\(^\text{171}\) In the context of these salacious allegations vice-custodian García de San Francisco issued a rearguard order forbidding women from entering *conventos*, contrary to what was otherwise a clearly established practice by that time.\(^\text{172}\)

As with Guerra’s abuses among the Hopi, some victims of sexual violence complained directly to colonial authorities, such as in 1638 when Taos individuals accused Fray Nicolás Hidalgo of heinous treatment and abuses.\(^\text{173}\) He was alleged to punish disobedient men by twisting their penises, genital mutilation, and anal rape. Likewise, Taos women accused him of sexually abusing them. Isabel Yantula said that he had strangled her husband, raped her, and raised the resulting child as his own within the Taos *convento*, and Margita Tultamu made a
comparable claim.\textsuperscript{174} These disgusting accusations are too common to be easily dismissed, but one must read cautiously, for the civil officials were often similarly accused. Both Mendizábal and Aguilar were implicated in rapes and sexual improprieties themselves.\textsuperscript{175} Rarely did the legal proceedings address the underlying factuality of these accusations, focusing instead on jurisdictional disputes. All parties seem to have been more concerned with winning power struggles than achieving justice for victims of sexual violence.

Adding to the difficulty of interpreting such accounts is the almost uniform treatment of women as objects of male action. Ruiz is an exception in his concern for what he saw as women’s lascivious influence; most Spanish authors suppress women’s agency in describing sexual interactions. They see men as the only viable sexual actors, in contrast to Pueblo traditions in which women controlled their own bodies.\textsuperscript{176} Not all accusations were of forcible rape, and while sexual relationships may have violated friars’ vows of celibacy, Native women were not under the same restrictions. It is possible that some women may have pursued relationships with friars and civil officials for their own purposes, and within their own moral frameworks. Everyday life within the mission community may therefore have included consensual sexual relations, with the result that familial metaphors of mission life may have occasionally become literal.\textsuperscript{177} Zuni elder and Head Rain Priest (\textit{K’ykwe Mossi}) Mecalita Wytsalucy seems to have hinted at this possibility in recounting the story of an Apache raid on the Hawikku mission, which killed the missionary, and took his Zuni wife and her sister captive (see Chapter Four).\textsuperscript{178}

The contested context of many sexual accusations and the chauvinistic culture of the Spanish make it difficult to know the truthfulness of specific allegations. Yet, there can be no doubt that many colonial women were subjected to sexual violence, and that authorities
considered these claims to be credible possibilities. Furthermore, Pueblo oral histories lend credence to such charges, attesting to community memories of friars using lessons, sacraments, and labor assignments to access Native women and girls for sex, contributing to the resentment that fueled the Pueblo Revolt.179

While Native workers comprised most of the mission community, Spanish were also among its participants. Each mission typically had only one or two friars, especially distant outposts such as the Zuni pueblos.180 The guardian was warden or administrator of a particular convento.181 Rarely there might be an additional friar or lay brother to assist him, but the maximum number of Franciscans in the Custody was set at sixty-six, and in practice this number was rarely filled.182 Especially important missions such as Franciscan headquarters at Santo Domingo or the parish church in Santa Fe might have additional friars filling specific offices, such as the head administrator of the Franciscan Custody (Custodio), the Commissary of the Inquisition, the Commissary of the Santa Cruzada, and the notary.183

Mission communities might also include Spanish or Mexican lay brothers and a handful of Spanish soldiers to protect the priest and threaten violence, should the pueblo resist him. Friars sometimes brought Native servants and craftsmen from Mexico to launch the mission efforts and teach new skills.184 These Mexican Indians represent another level of cultural encounter. Pueblo communities had long traded with Mesoamerica, but Coronado’s arrival in 1539 with at least 1,300 indios amigos or Mexican auxiliaries was the start of a new intensity of interaction between Pueblo and Mexican Indians.185

Conventos were expected to provide hospitality for guests and visiting officials, such as when the Santa Fe cabildo visited Santo Domingo during a conflict with the Franciscans in 1639. They found the Custodian unwilling to receive them, forcing the officials to sleep in a kiva of the
pueblo. Conventos hosted Governors, alcaldes mayores, and other Spanish colonists. In addition, when authorities required Indians to travel, they also could stay in conventos along the way, “which charitably entertain them…” In some cases, the Spanish built structures specifically for visiting officials, making convento stays unnecessary. Known as casas reales, they most often stood near the mission and roadway. Even where casas reales existed, the civil government imposed on mission hospitality in other ways. When military expeditions were necessary, for example, the Governor would ask missions to support them with grain, livestock, and horses.

Another form of mission “hospitality” was the use of convento rooms to imprison violators of church law, who were often political opponents and civil officers. But might also include problematic friars and Indians. In 1613, Perea served as jailer for Governor Pedro de Peralta, who was chained in a guarded cell for nine to ten months in the Sandía and Zia conventos. The Custodian also imprisoned alcalde ordinario Juan de Escarramad for two months in Santo Domingo’s convento, along with Andrés Juárez, a friar who tired of the affair. During August 1662, Governor Mendizábal and his wife were likewise imprisoned in windowless cells with narrow doors of Santo Domingo’s convento, along with Andrés Juárez, a friar who tired of the affair. As part of their conflict with Mendizábal, friars also imprisoned officials Nicolás de Aguilar and Diego Romero in Isleta Pueblo’s convento, one locked in a cell on the first floor, and the other in a guarded cell upstairs. Later, the Franciscans moved them to Santo Domingo and held them for months with other Mendizábal supporters in adjacent, windowless cells prepared for this purpose.

As with Juárez, troublesome friars could be imprisoned in mission conventos. In 1661, the agitated and possibly mentally ill Fray Miguel Sacristán committed suicide by hanging himself while held at Santo Domingo convento. Convento cells also detained ordinary
colonists and Indians. Franciscans arrested and held itinerant German merchant Bernardo Gruber for selling magical spells in 1668, holding him in the Abó convento, while Juan, the Native boy of Salvador de Guerra’s ire was imprisoned in the convento at Awatovi during investigation. The head mission at Santo Domingo played a prominent role as prison, but other less-prominent establishments such as the Zuni missions may also have imprisoned local detainees who do not appear in colonial documents.

**Conclusions**

New Mexico mission conventos were architectural focal points for social networks entangling a diverse mix of people with varying cultural backgrounds, motives, and degrees of agency. The majority of mission community participants were local Pueblo Indians, with Spanish friars acting as a powerful minority directing everyday life in the conventos. Native community members were translators, door keepers, bell ringers, fiscales, sacristans, singers, personal servants, cooks, grain grinders, woodcutters, herders, field hands, and water carriers. They were both male and female, from childhood to at least middle age, and participated in the mission community for various reasons, both strategic and coerced.

While Native laity played an essential role in the mission community, this is not to say all Pueblo people had equal access to convento spaces at any given time. Conventos were domestic architecture, with controlled and regulated access like any home. The cloister-form plan was well-suited to this purpose, with few external openings in the exterior walls of rooms arranged around the inner patio. Doorways did not serve to preserve friars’ seclusion, but rather controlled access to prevent theft and keep out drafts. The Crown provided every new mission
with a latch for the main church door and a couple of padlocks, but not enough locks for every room in the *convento*.\(^{198}\) The two padlocks of the Royal contract were only enough to secure the sacristy and one other room, most likely a storeroom, presuming inner latches controlled external doorways such as in the *portería*.\(^{199}\) The guardian friar had reason to control access to rooms with essential resources such as food, weapons, and liturgical items, but daily labor would have required more fluid spatial integration elsewhere.

The *portería* controlled access through the *convento’s* formal entryway, where visitors addressed the door keeper and waited for admittance. It seems implausible that full-time residents and rotating laborers would have waited at the *portería* every time they needed in or out, and most missions also had a back entry through the service patio or stable. In all likelihood the service entry was the main ingress for girls bringing water, woodcutters with their loads, herders and gardeners delivering foodstuffs, cooks discarding scraps, and other everyday comings and goings.

Although not directly related, plantation houses in the Antebellum Anglo-American South make an informative comparison, with their own forms of spatially linked, forcibly created communities comprising the planter’s family, overseers, journeymen, and enslaved black laborers. Grand houses such as Mount Airy in Richmond County, VA (c. 1760, figure 3.22) articulated a hierarchal, processional landscape with the planter at its apex. White visitors to Mount Airy passed through a series of social barriers, including a curving approach framing views of the house, multiple terraces, a forecourt, stairs, loggia, and reception hall, which together affirmed the centrality of owner John Tayloe and the visitor’s status relative to him. Because white planters believed enslaved Africans were unperceptive of such abstract spatial hierarchies, and because their job tasks required it, enslaved black house laborers used
alternative routes circumventing the house’s formality. They moved through its spaces similarly to the planter’s family members, undercutting the legitimizing hierarchy encoded in the architecture. Similar to the formal approach of plantations, Spanish and Native visitors to the Purísima Concepción *convento* probably entered through the forecourt of the atrium and the *portería’s* controlled transition. This “social lock” enforced the guardian friar’s authority with a degree of ceremony, while visitors waited. In contrast, mission community workers seem to have gone about tasks unimpeded by these architectural transitions, although behavioral norms and daily schedules structured their lives in other ways.

Primary sources describe mission communities as fairly transitory. While Benavides implies laborers lived full-time in the *convento*, other documents indicate many workers did not reside there, arriving only as their tasks required. For example, Isabel Vaca of Tajique clearly maintained a separate residence but came to the mission to cook. In the eighteenth century most mission community members worked in weekly rotations (see Table 3.2). The changing demands of agricultural and seasonal cycles also affected the composition of mission communities at any given time. Winter woodcutting, planting, harvest, lambing and other periodic tasks brought other people temporarily into the *convento*. Likewise, structural repairs may have been seasonal, based on the availability of water for mixing adobe and plaster. Finally, the liturgical cycle placed greater demand on the mission community during Lent and Holy Week, when processions, changing diets, and annual rites of examination, confession, and communion took place.

If most Indians participating in the mission community were loosely or periodically tied to it, others had more stable relationships to the *convento*, working and even residing there. Door keepers, bell ringers, sacristans, and the young male servants appear most often in
documents as full-time laborers and residents. Likewise, frequent allegations of concubinage may indicate that women or offspring resided in some mission conventos, although this was not necessarily an accepted scenario, and official documents stridently deny it.

Together, participants in the mission community followed a daily routine of religious devotions interspersed with lessons and labor, under the regulation of the mission’s ringing bell. Spanish friars directed many of the mission community’s activities, but were not the sole persons of consequence in these establishments. Previous studies of New Mexico’s missions have largely overlooked the complex makeup and social dynamics of mission communities, assuming incorrectly that conventos were essentially Spanish spaces. The reduction of Native participants to mute, forced laborers of no essential consequence, or denial of their existence altogether is a clear misinterpretation of mission life. Treating mission community members as if they were simply coerced marginalizes historic factions of Native people who strategically allied with the Spanish, erasing their agency and casting them as less authentically Indian in a false dichotomy between shameful capitulation and heroic resistance. Combined with the evidence of primary sources, the archaeology of conventos such as Hawikku’s Purísima Concepción offers glimpses instead of the “patchwork” interactions that characterized everyday life in seventeenth-century New Mexico during the periods between revolts.
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93 Francisco Atanasio Domínguez, The Missions of New Mexico, 1776: A Description by Fray Francisco Atanasio Domínguez with Other Contemporary Documents, trans. and ann. by Eleanor B. Adams and Fray Angélico Chávez (1956; repr., Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2012); and Francisco Atanasio, Domínguez, “Copy of
Spanish transcription of Biblioteca Nacional de México (BNM), Legajo 10. No. 86 and No. 43, Visit of Fray Atanasio Domínguez to New Mexico, 1776. Mss. 867 Box 13, folder 25 a/b, CSWR. Together, Trigo and Domínguez present mission labor as voluntary donations by local pueblos in weekly rotations, contrasting secular accusations of excessive labor coercion. The context is relevant since Domínguez was explicitly ordered not to expose Franciscan faults, and Trigo’s account was a direct retort to negative perceptions. For Domínguez’s charge, see Anonymous, “Instructions which the Father Visitor of New Mexico, Fray Francisco Atanasio Domínguez, shall carry out,” in Adams and Chávez, The Missions of New Mexico, xx-xxi. It should also be noted that the Franciscans had long considered revealing their internal secrets and faults to outsiders as a punishable offence (Carmody, The Franciscan Story, 366), and Domínguez’s charge to this effect may have been a rote reminder of this regulation rather than an anticipation that he would find problematic behavior in New Mexico.
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There were comparable developments at San Esteban Rey Mission in Acoma Pueblo, which lost its resident priest by 1782, when the population became too small to support a full-time priest and Acoma became a visita of the mission at Laguna Pueblo. Following the priest’s retreat, the pueblo took over supervision of the mission’s physical maintenance, with Acoma clan leaders playing an important role. Today, a group of Acomas known as the gangashtii care for the physical structure itself, including the task of organizing communal replastering. A group of sacristans continues to maintain the sanctuary, altar and altarpiece. The Acoma field chiefs also play a role in the mission’s maintenance and have an office in the corner of the convento. The Acoma church is used for community dances, and Mass is said there on special feast days, while a room in the convento is used the rest of the time. See Ward Alan Minge, *Acoma: Pueblo in the Sky*, rev. ed. (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2002), 166; Wingert-Playdon, *John Gaw Meem*, 22; Edna Heatherington Bergman, “Historic Structures Report Mission San Esteban Rey Pueblo of Acoma, New Mexico,” prepared by Chanell Graham Architecture/Pacheco & Graham Architects, SR 23, New Mexico Historic Preservation Division, Santa Fe, iv, 8-9, 22-23.
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For the San Buenaventura conflict, see “Hearing of May 11, 1664. Sante Fe,” in Hackett, *Historical Documents*, vol. III, 247. This account is also of interest because it occurred at Santa Fe’s parish church, which served the local Spanish population, rather than an Indian pueblo, so the origins and ethnic identity of these particular “mission boys” is unknown.

For example, see “Declaration of Fray Nicolás Enríquez,” 247, in which these boys were present early in the morning.
121 “Deposition of Nicolás de Aguilar,” 173. Aguilar does not specifically state that it was the friar’s personal servant who would have been making the chocolate, but the context of his statement makes it clear that the friar is cooking chocolate because Aguilar has denied him Native service. Ruiz makes explicit the connection between the preparation of chocolate and the friar’s personal servants who were *sacristanes* in this case; see “Observations,” 311.
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123 For example, in his conflict with the Franciscans, Governor Mendizábal sought to limit or prevent the friars from keeping personal servants, forcing one of the religious, Fray Nicolás de Chávez to petition the Governor to allow the maintenance of two personal servant boys for himself; see “Declaration of Fray Nicolás de Chávez, Mexico, September 18, 1660,” in Hackett, *Historical Documents*, vol. III, 153. Chávez appears to have been guardian of San Marcos Pueblo in the Galisteo Basin. Mendizábal extracted three hundred wool fleeces from the friar in payment for this privilege.
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130 “Testimony of Fray Nicolás de Freitas, Mexico, January 24, 1661,” in Hackett, *Historical Documents*, vol. III, 163; for other friars relying upon translators, see “Hearing of February 21, 1661,” 136. Mission translators are the only mission community members to appear regularly in episcopal descriptions. As a sacrament, confession proceeded participation in communion. In the seventeenth century, Spanish Christians typically only received the Eucharist once a year, during the Lenten season following a period of self-examination, full verbal confession, and completion of their penitence; see Melvin, *Building Colonial Cities*, 125. Converted Indians might not receive communion at all, since the clergy doubted their comprehension of the underlying theological significance. According to Ivey (“Ahijados,” 8-10), only Indians who had received regular confession for four of five years might be allowed to participate in communion. The exclusion of Native parishioners from communion did not exclude them from confession, however.

131 Liebmann, *Revolt*, 54-55.


134 Fray Salvador de Guerra makes explicit the metaphor of bells as the anthropomorphic voice of the mission, writing of his hope that the mobile Suma Indians near El Paso del Norte (present-day Ciudad Juarez) would “like the
rest, come to see themselves subjected to the voice of the two bells which this conversion now has.” See France V. Scholes, “Documents for the History of the New Mexican Missions in the Seventeenth Century, Part III,” New Mexico Historical Review 4, no. 2 (Apr. 1929): 197. The Spanish reads, “[...] fe congreesen y llegeren aberse sujetos a las Vozes de dos Campanas que oi tiene efta Comersion [...]” (Salvador de Guerra, 1668, “Biblioteca Nacional de Mexico Legajo 1, Parte 2, Documento 30, Testimonio del estado que tiene la conversión de los Mansos y dedicación de su iglesia,” Mss. 867, vol. 118B, CSWR, 2).

135 Giffords, Sanctuaries of Earth, 211-212.

136 Ivey, In the Midst, 42; Treib, Sanctuaries, 56; Boyd, Popular Arts, 64; Giffords, Sanctuaries, 142. Bells in New Mexico were long-waisted and slender in form, with a heavy crown by which they could be lashed to a supporting yoke. They did not swing freely and many had no clappers. Even those with clappers were rung by hand, striking the clapper or a stone against the lip of the bell; see Boyd, Popular Arts, 266; Giffords, Sanctuaries, 268; Adams and Chávez, “Glossary,” 352.

137 Ivey, “Missions as Architectural Patrons,” 95.

138 As an ally of the Franciscans, Captain Huratado argued that the sale of mission sheep herds was necessary to purchase the church decorations, and that native parishoners were influenced by the “decency, ornamentation, and ritual of the church; see “Declaration of Captain Andrés Hurtado, Santa Fe, September, 1661,” in Hackett, Historical Documents, Vol. III, 188-189.
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143 If Dominguez’s account is accurate, temporary rotations seem to have been a little more prevalent among the Rio Grande missions, while the western missions tended to have full-time herdspeople, though in many cases, the particular arrangements are simply not clear. See Table 3.2. Although husbandry at Jemez was supposedly by rotation, Ruiz (“Observations,” 313) notes that he employs two boys as keepers for the mission’s swine. From his description, it is unclear if these boys were among the cantores or sacristanes, if they represented additional full time residential positions, or if they were merely rotational positions held by boys from the pueblo.

144 Jeffrey M. Pilcher, Que Viván Los Tamales!: Food and the Making of Mexican Identity (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1998), 35. While there has been some question of whether wheat was grown in any substantial amounts in pre-Revol New Mexico, there are sufficient documents to demonstrate that missions at least grew enough wheat for their own use and for distribution to local pueblos as alms. See “Copy of Letter from Fray Miguel de Sacristán,” Hackett, Historical Documents, vol. III, 149; and France V. Scholes and Eleanor B. Adams, trans., ca. 1952, “Translation of Biblioteca Nacional de Mexico Legajo 1, Parte 2, Documento 34, Memorias por los custodies...” (Mss. 867, Box 13, Folder 8, CSWR).
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By 1663, more than sixty mission estancias are documented, but not all missions possessed estancias. The size, location, process of acquisition, and operation of these properties remain unknown; see Ivey, “The Greatest Misfortune,” 79. For references to these fields, see “Copy of Letter from Fray Miguel de Sacristán,” 149; “Declaration of Captain Andrés Hurtado,” 190; “Hearing of June 16, 1663,” 203; Benavides, Fray Alonso de Benavides’ Revised Memorial, 102.


“Hearing of May 11, 1663,” 144. Activities probably included hunting and tanning of hides, which along with pine nuts were primary exports; see “Declaration of Captain Andrés Hurtado,” 190-192.

The civil government often initiated similar profiteering ventures and was directly competing with the missions to coerce free labor from the Pueblos; see “Declaration of Captain Andrés Hurtado,” 188, 190-192; and Ann F. Ramenofsky, C. David Vaughan, and Michael N. Spilde, “Seventeenth-Century Metal Production at San Marcos Pueblo, North-Central New Mexico the San Marcos smelting site,” Historical Archaeology 42, no. 4 (2008): 105-131. Smelting may also have taken place at Hawikku, although the extent and purpose is presently unknown (Keith Kintigh, personal communication, March 7, 2014), with some pieces of slag evident on the site and one piece preserved in the NMAI collections (086428.000). Perea’s Relacion also includes an ambiguous description of silver smelting somewhere in New Mexico, which may be an addition by an editor of the text (Bloom, “Fray Estevan,” 211). Interestingly, the Spanish never seem to have made any attempt at profiting from the Zuni Salt Lake as they had the Salinas salt flats in eastern New Mexico. It is not until the territorial period and statehood that this sacred site is mentioned as an economic resource and commoditized.
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Francis’s Rules do not explicitly exclude women from the friars’ places of residence. Instead, they have requirements of chastity and injunctions against lustful glances, questionable associations, travel alone with women, eating from the same dish as women, or entering into women’s convents except with special permission. Franciscans who did have sexual relations were to be excluded from the Order; see Francis, “The Earlier Rule,” 63, 72-73; and Francis, “The Later Rule,” 106. Similarly, in an apocryphal anecdote, thirteenth century Italian Franciscan Salimbene de Adam attributes Francis with advising that Franciscan friars should not been seen to be accompanied by women, to avoid public misinterpretation; see Salimbene de Adam, The Chronicle of Salimbene de Adam, ed. and trans. Joseph L. Baird, Giuseppe Baglivi, and John Robert Kane (Birmingham, NY: Medieval and Renaissance Texts, 1986), 60; Anette Kehnel, “Francis and the Historiographic Tradition in the Order,” in Robson, The Cambridge Companion, 109. Since Francis’s followers were initially itinerant and often stayed in homes provided by laity, it would have been impracticable to avoid all interactions with women, and explicit exclusions of women from cloisters nonsensical since the friars were not yet making regular use of cloistered spaces or designated conventos. According to the critiques of Observant reformers in Spain, Franciscan houses there had fallen into the habit of allowing women guests to stay in the conventos, and used women to oversee conventual kitchens; see Ámez Prieto, La Provincia de San Miguel, 22. In Italy, Giovanni da Capestrano implied a similar critique in his 1443 commentary on the Franciscan Rule, not only forbidding unaccompanied contact with women, but also prohibiting their presence in Observant conventual houses; Carmody, The Franciscan Story, 354.

“Paragraphs from Letters of Religious in Las Salinas,” in Hackett, *Historical Documents*, vol. III, 137. The gravity of this situation is probably exaggerated in an attempt to smear the reputation of civil officials. In 1655, Parraga had ordered processional crosses be made for every person in the pueblo, totaling some 500-600 crosses. These were to be carried in processions every Friday during Lent and on Holy Thursday, and must have represented a significant outlay in labor and resources; see “Hearing of May 11, 1663,” 141. Yet, by the time of the labor restrictions, the surfeit of crosses had become a burden, and they were described as being everywhere, even in the privies; see “Hearing of May 11, 1663,” 141. Parraga probably found it easy to burn some of these crosses to clear up clutter and obtain fuel, while scoring rhetorical points against the civil government all at once.


“Declaration of Isabel Vaca,” 132-133.


Presumably Villagrá meant women’s religious houses and not conventos in the sense of friaries. See Minge, *Acoma, 15, 208 n. 11. According to Minge, Acoma oral traditions support Villagrá’s claim to have taken girls south to Mexico, an account which does not appear in any other primary sources. See also Frederick Webb Hodge, “Forward,” in *A History of New Mexico, by Gaspar Pérez de Villagrá Alcala—1610*, trans. Gilberto Espinosa (Los Angeles: The Quivira Society, 1933), 32. Hodge cites Henry Raup Wagner; see *The Spanish Southwest, 1542-1794: An Annotated Bibliography, 2 vols. (Albuquerque: Quivira Society, 1937). According to Hodge, Villagrá testified in Mexico City of having taken sixty or seventy Acoma girls on Oñate’s orders from New Mexico to Mexico City, presenting them to the Viceroy and distributing them amongst convents there.

“Declaration of Captain Andrés Hurtado,” 192.


Scholes, Troubles Times, 7; Riley, The Kachina and the Cross, 117, 171. Sometimes these accusations are by implication, as for instance when Mendizábal found that the women bakers of the Galisteo mission were unusually pretty for their role, and ordered that older women should fulfill the task of producing the mission breads instead; see “Hearing of June 16, 1663,” 205.

“Hearing of June 16, 1663,” 202. Other tangential accounts of Franciscan friars founding families exist, such as the disputed Pajarito hacienda, which a missionary allegedly carved out of the Isleta Pueblo land grant for his family and passed on to his children, in violation of Franciscan principles of celibacy and poverty both. See Barrett, The Spanish Colonial, 25.

“Reply of Mendizábal,” 216-218. These hearsay accounts led translator Charles Wilson Hackett to judge Mendizábal’s testimony as compromised in its exaggeration, malice, and frequent contradictions. Other hearsay accusations include discussion between Governor Diego de Peñalosa and three other friars in Awatovi of Custodian Alonzo de Posadas’s purported sexual improprieties, murder, and miscarriages of justice; see “Hearing of July 3, 1665” (of Diego de Peñalosa),” in Hackett, Historical Documents, vol. III, 259-260. Likewise, the notorious Fray Salvador de Guerra was accused of concubinage during his time among the Hopi, based on hearsay; see “Declaration of Juan Domínguez Romero,” 234.

For example, Fray Nicolás de Freitas was accused of having illicit relations with pueblo women (“Deposition of Nicolás de Aguilar,” 174); likewise, Fray Nicolás de Villa was accused of sexual relations with the women of Sandia Pueblo (“Ratification by Miguel de Noriega, Santa Fe, September 22, 1661,” in Hackett, Historical Documents, vol. III, 180.

Liebmann, Revolt, 37-38.

“Excommunication Fulminated against Nicolás de Aguilar on May 29, 1660,” in Hackett, Historical Documents, vol. III, 167; “Deposition of Nicolás de Aguilar,” 169-170; “Hearing of June 16, 1663,” 202; “Reply of Mendizábal,” 214-215. Parraga was accused of having raped another woman who came to the convento seeking alms, having maintained sexual relations with as many as forty women in the Pueblo, and for having beaten an interpreter named Pedro Chuza for not procuring sexual partners for him (“Deposition of Nicolás de Aguilar,” 170). For the friars’ counterclaims of Aguilar’s suspect methods of investigation, locking the women up in the community house under armed guard, see “Deposition of Nicolás de Aguilar,” 174. For the recantation of these accusations, see “Hearing of February 21, 1661,” 134-135. For a summary of the Parraga case, see Scholes, Troubles Times, 74-75. For other accusations of using sacraments as sexual encounters, see “Hearing of May 10 [1663, Mendizábal],” in Hackett, Historical Documents, vol. III, 196-197. Another very plausible case involves the guardian friar of Alamillo Pueblo, about whose affairs a Franciscan deponent and Governor Mendizábal agree; see “Testimony of Fray Nicolás de Freitas,” 159; “Reply of Mendizábal,” 215-216.

Scholes, Troubles Times, 59, 86, n. 45.

For the complaints against Hidalgo, see Luis de Rosas, 1638, “Inquisición, Legajo 388, Carta del Governador don Luis de Rosas al fiscal sobre las quejas de los indios Taos contra Fray Nicolás Hidalgo, guardian de Taos,” Mss. 867, Vol. 48, CSWR; Francisco de Anaya Almazín, 1638, “Inquisición, Legajo 388, Carta Francisco de Anaya Almazín sobre la queja de los indios Taos contra Fray Nicolás Hidalgo,” Mss. 867, Vol. 48, CSWR.

Yantula’s child was then four years old, while Tultama’s was one year old. See Ramón A. Gutiérrez, When Jesus Came, the Corn Mothers Went Away: Marriage, Sexuality, and Power in New Mexico, 1500-1846 (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991), 76, 209-210. Gutiérrez also describes the case of a man named Gaspar Reyes, who purportedly made similar accusations of mutilation and forcible sodomy against a “Fray Pedro” in 1606. Gutiérrez cites documents from the Archivo General de la Nacion in Mexico City, in the Inquisition documents, toma 338, expediente 22, folios 440-442; and for the 1606 account, toma 368, folios 140-142. The Reyes account is

In my own assessment, mistakes or intentionally false statements are readily identifiable in Gutiérrez’s work, if one takes the time to parse his opaque citations. For instance, he has Fray Nicolás de Freitas reporting “matter of factly that ‘all the pueblos are full of friars’ children’ and that many of his brothers had concubines” (Gutiérrez, *When Jesus Came*, 123). In fact, it was the Franciscans’ enemy Governor Mendizábal who made this comment during his trial before the inquisition; see “Hearing of June 16, 1663,” 202. In the document that Gutiérrez cites for this paragraph, Fray Freitas says exactly the opposite, denying that the friars had been involved in any sexual misconduct and accusing Mendizábal of concocting evidence by threatening potential witnesses; see “Hearing of February 21, 1661,” 134-136. By placing Mendizábal’s words in Freitas’s mouth, Gutierrez creates the impression that sexual impropriety was widespread and accepted among the Franciscans, in fact when they vigorously contested this assertion. Although sexual abuses clearly did occur, Gutiérrez’s miscasting of quotations creates a false sense of normalcy and even intentionality. While I cannot say whether such errors resulted from sloppiness, confusion of references, or intentional falsification, they result in an egregious misinterpretation of the historical record.


180 Benavides, *Fray Alonso de Benavides’ Revised Memorial*, 100.

See Chapter 2, n. 116.

“Report to the Viceroy by the Cabildo,” 67; Ivey, In the Midst, 30-31.

Benavides, Fray Alonso de Benavides’ Revised Memorial, 67, 69-70.


“Report to the Viceroy by the Cabildo,” 62-63.


“Declaration of Captain Andrés Hurtado,” 190.

Ivey, In the Midst, 66. No building with clear evidence of use as a casa real was found during excavations at Hawikku, although one pueblo block remains entirely unexcavated and numerous rooms in Block F were also not excavated. Situated adjacent to the mission on the flank of the ridge, these blocks would seem to be the most plausible locations for a casa real, if one had ever been constructed since no documentary evidence for one exists.


Scholes, Church and State, 34-36.

Scholes, Troublous Times, 142; “Reply of Mendizábal,” 226.


Scholes, Troublous Times, 129-130, 141.

Scholes, Troublous Times, 4-5. There seems to be more to this story than is revealed in primary sources, which contradict each other on numerous points. Sacristán had been involved in the misuse of sacraments and cover-up of an affair of the Governor Juan Manso de Contreras (1656-1659), the younger brother of Franciscan administrator Thomás Manso. Accounts differ both on where he was guardian (Santa Fe or Jemez Pueblo), and where he was imprisoned and committed suicide (Santo Domingo or Jemez Pueblo); see “Deposition of Toribio de la Huerta, Mexico, July 6, 1663,” in Hackett, Historical Documents, vol. III, 228; “Declaration of Juan Domínguez Romero,” 229.

Gruber was later transferred to the hacienda of Francisco Ortega in the Sandia jurisdiction, from whence he escaped two years later and died on his flight towards El Paso del Norte; see Scholes, Troublous Times, 252; and assorted documents recounting the case in Hackett, Historical Documents, vol. III, 271-277. For Juan, see “Declaration of Fray Nicolás Enríquez,” 246.

Ivey, In the Midst, 43.

Prior to the Royal contract, when Benavides came with twelve other friars in 1625, they had twelve dozen “flemish padlocks,” enough for each newly assigned friar to take a dozen within him to secure parts of the convento in which he would live; see “Supplies for Benavides,” 119. The 1630 contract specified that every friar in the province would receive a padlock (“candado que llaman de friale”) with each triennial wagon caravan, and each friar arriving for the first time would receive a latch for the main church door, and only two small locks; see France

199 Ivey (*In the Midst*, 109, 153-154, 199) argues that during the famine of 1667 to 1672, storerooms at the Salinas missions were reinforced or new, more secure spaces constructed for critical food supplies. These security measures included blocking up or decreasing the size of window opening; small crawl-through entries or vertical hatchway entries from upper-floor *convento* rooms; construction of two-story storerooms with extra-thick masonry walls; and the use of massive doors to prevent illicit ingress.


201 See Benavides, *Fray Alonso de Benavides’ Revised Memorial*, 100-101. Among the eighteenth-century sources, Domínguez rarely discusses the quartering arrangements of the mission servants, but for Nambe Pueblo, he specifies that only the *sacristanes* slept in the mission with the friar, and that the other servants returned to their houses in the Pueblo; see Domínguez, *The Missions*, 56. Nambe was the first Pueblo *convento* that he visited, so it is unclear if this arrangement was exceptional, or if it was the unstated norm that the other missions followed as well. Fray Ruiz (“Observations,” 311) likewise specifies that only the young *sacristanes* slept in the mission, though he relies heavily on these boys along with his youthful *cantores*, and from his assertion that “the Father minster does not let go of their hands until they are men,” it appears that the mission boys lived alongside Ruiz full time for a number of years, rather spending time at the *convento* on a rotational basis.
CHAPTER 4: THE HISTORY AND CULTURE OF HAWIKKU PUEBLO

Today, one can visit Hawikku on official tours from Zuni Pueblo, driving southwest and turning onto a dirt road leading to the fenced archaeological site (figure 4.1).¹ A ridge of red sandstone and scruffy junipers rises to the north, overlooking the broad expanse of patchy grass range of the Plumasano wash with its meandering arroyo draining west towards the Zuni River. Low bluish hills and mesas define the far horizons (figure 1.7). Up the wash to the southeast, clumps of cottonwood trees mark the farming village of Ojo Caliente, beyond which are the ruins of Kechiba:wa. Hawikku’s low promontory presides over this sweeping valley of subtle contrasts. At first glance, it is merely an empty hill of sandstone rubble and weedy growth, with recent interpretative trails encircling its mound ed surface (figure 4.2).

On closer inspection, the mass of crumbling building materials, shattered rainbow of pottery sherds, and slivers of sharp stone flakes testify to a once thriving town of 600 to 1,000 residents in the mid-sixteenth century (figures 4.3-4.5).² The site remains sacred to Zunis, with ancestral remains mingled in the soil, that have only been disturbed during the Hendricks-Hodge archaeological excavations. Here Coronado and his force of Spanish expeditioners and Mexican Indians arrived in 1540. They described it as a cold grassland plateau, with sparse forage and none of the evergreen scrub now studding the horizon, and a walled town of flat-roofed, whitewashed houses clustered together on the hilltop.³

Had the Zunis not evacuated in anticipation of the attack, these invaders would have seen smoke rising from hundreds of hearths, and heard the bustle of families about their everyday business. There was the buzz of stone against stone as women ground maize for flatbreads that
Coronado later described as the best tortillas that he had ever seen. Their singing in time to the stones mingled with sounds of dogs and turkeys, the only domesticated animals among pre-Hispanic pueblos. Coronado’s scouts might have seen men out hunting, attending growing corn fields, or placing feathered sticks bearing their prayers at shrines tucked away in the landscape. Had they come at the right time, there would have been dancing in the town plaza, or muffled and invisible within the subterranean ceremonial chambers.

These are images and sounds to keep in mind when reconstructing Hawikku’s past. As colonial pressures mounted in the 1600s, Zunis ultimately sought refuge together on Dowa Yalanne and emerged as a single community, for whose descendants Hawikku remained an important non-residential site, infused with the presence of their ancestors. This chapter outlines Hawikku’s history from origin accounts through the flourishing of Zuni culture and its encounter with sixteenth-century Spanish explorers, until the twentieth century, situating it through primary sources, Zuni oral history, and archaeological evidence. Together these references establish the chronological framework for interpreting the Purísima Concepción’s archaeological remains.

**Origins and Pre-Hispanic History**

Zuni origin accounts describe their ancestors’ emergence from the underworld, transformation into human forms, development of cultural institutions, and migration in search of a home at the world’s “middle place.” Zunis in general know this sacred account, the *chimiky’anakona bena:we*, while religious groups maintain detailed esoteric versions as memorized and formally recited religious prayers (*dewusu bena:we*). They have passed these
prayers down through the generations, teaching them to both young and old members of the religious societies, so that these traditions will continue to endure.⁷ Each religious society has its own version of the origin account, explaining how particular groups and cultural institutions came to be. There is therefore no single, authoritative version, and most esoteric forms are unavailable to the uninitiated.⁸

The general parameters and landmarks of migration accounts provide a glimpse of the Zunis’ conceptualization of their place and ancestral history across the Southwestern landscape. These accounts may be understood literally and reference identifiable locations that Zunis continue to visit and use, but they also communicate a great deal of information through metaphor and symbolism.⁹ They contain specific religious information, and express identity and rootedness in the particularities of landscape that may share general parallels with other pueblos, but are uniquely Zuni. Finally, they are a source of meditation and creativity for contemporary Zunis traversing the landscape, making art, and engaging scholarly discourses such as anthropology and archaeology.

Zuni accounts describe the cosmos as layered, with their ancestors ascending through four underworld levels to emerge onto this terrestrial plane. The accounts generally locate the place of emergence, chimik’yana’kya dey’a, at Ribbon Falls in the bottom of the Grand Canyon. Upon emergence, these ancestors did not have the form of humans today, possessing mossy bodies, webbed hands and feet, tails, and misplaced genitals. When the Zunis first came into this world, their slime was washed away and their bodies were reshaped into human forms at the edge of the Grand Canyon. They were told to seek a home at the “middle place,” or center of the cosmos. As they traveled, they built towns and rested before moving on again, and each stopping place along the route became a sacred shrine, which Zunis continue to commemorate in prayers
and offerings. To describe the endurance of these ancestral settlements, they use the term meaning “four years” (a:widen – debikywayinanne) in the archaic Zuni language, which can mean four days, months, years, decades, or centuries, before each onward move in the search for the middle place.  

The migrating ancestors underwent several divisions, with one group heading south to the land of everlasting sunshine, another taking a northeasterly route, and the main group continuing eastward, ultimately reuniting at present-day Zuni Pueblo. As these migrations took place, Zunis acquired their clan identities and cultural practices. Accounts describe the arrival of a giant water strider, who indicated the location of the middle place by putting one foot on each of four world oceans, while also touching the zenith and nadir. With the water strider spread out to the critical points of the Zuni cosmos, its heart was at the very center of the universe, resting at the present-day location of Halona:Idiwana or Zuni Pueblo today. Here the Zunis settled, and Halona remains the focal point of their cultural expression. These migration narratives map networks of meaning across the landscape, recalling and connecting Zunis to their past, while also providing historical ground for present-day practices and institutions.

Anthropologists and archaeologists have their own narratives of Zuni origins, drawing on linguistic, archaeological, and ethnographic data. Perhaps most critical is the uniqueness of the Zuni language, which linguists describe as an isolate, meaning no known language resembles it through descent from a common linguistic ancestor. If there once were other languages related to Zuni, they no longer survive or have been separate for so long that this affiliation is no longer discernable. Linguistic isolation does not mean ancestral Zuni-speakers did not interact with other people; rather, they maintained their separate and cohesive linguistic identity over millennia despite interactions and without major splits forming radiant or related languages.
From this linguistic perspective, there have probably been distinct Zuni speakers in the Southwest for at least seven or eight thousand years. This ancient uniqueness places the origins of an identifiable Zuni-speaking linguistic community near the beginning of the archaeological Archaic Period (roughly 8,500/8,000 to 1,500 BP), suggesting the Zuni language originated among Paleoindian or early Archaic hunter-gatherers, and has survived ever since. Many surrounding linguistic groups are of the Uto-Aztecan family, languages which may have entered the Southwest around 4,000 to 3,500 years ago with maize agriculture. From this evidence, some anthropologists have hypothesized that ancestral Zunis were a relic group of hunter-gatherers who maintained Archaic lifeways until well after the introduction of Uto-Aztecan languages and maize, although they eventually adopted agriculture and were part of a regional exchange network by the thirteenth century, facilitating the spread of kachina ceremonialism.

Early anthropologists such as Cushing and the Mindeleffs took oral histories as their starting point, attempting to connect archaeological sites with Zuni migrations. Subsequently, cultural anthropology took a taxonomic turn using artifacts to identify the chronology and distribution of “culturally patterned forms through space.” From this paradigm emerged a new theory of Zuni origins, hypothesizing a connection between Zuni ancestors and the Mogollon cultural tradition of the highlands in southwestern New Mexico and southeastern Arizona. Although this “Mogollon-Zuni problem” was of little concern to the New Archaeology of the 1970s, a recent resurgence of interest in pre-Hispanic population movements gives new impulse to investigating possible Mogollon connections.

David A. Gregory and David R. Wilcox propose that Middle-Archaic or earlier Zuni-speaking hunter-gatherers remained isolated and culturally distinct in the Mogollon highlands, on what they describe as “Islands in the Sky.” According to this hypothesis, Uto-Aztecan speaking
migrants introduced maize agriculture, washing around “islands” of persistent high-altitude
settlements of Mogollon-Ancestral Zuni people, perhaps in the area of Baldy Mountain in Colfax
County, New Mexico. Although the holdouts eventually adopted maize themselves, Gregory
and Wilcox suggest that they maintained distinct, coherent traditions of ceremonial architecture
and material culture for over a thousand years, and eventually migrated north with their unique
language to the historic Zuni region.17

Despite efforts to spur interdisciplinary consideration of the Mogollon theory of Zuni
origins, consensus remains elusive.18 Other archaeologists are skeptical, countering that
Mogollon land use patterns were neither exclusively high-altitude, nor isolated from other
Southwestern cultures and events. The purported montane character, distinctive material culture,
and diagnostic architectural traits are all questionable, and sites around the Zuni region do not
show clear evidence of receiving significant inbound Mogollon migrations.19 Furthermore,
while Zuni migration accounts describe one constituent group coming by a southern route
through the vicinity of the Mogollon region, the general theory presents an apparent
contradiction with Zuni oral histories that locate their emergence and migration route to the
west.20 From an archaeological perspective, it appears Zuni culture is best understood in a broad
regional framework of complex group movements and integrations leading to the present-day
Zuni people, rather than a unidirectional migration such as the Mogollon theory.21

Regardless of how Zuni ancestors came to the upper drainage of the Little Colorado
River known as the Cibola Region, the archaeological evidence points to an increasing
population and process of aggregation that yielded familiar pueblo settlement forms by the
1400s.22 By around 650 to 700 CE, there were campsites and pithouses along major tributaries
in the Cibola region. Houses were dug into the ground with wooden, earth-covered roofs, above-
ground storage structures, and grinding stones associated with Cibola Whiteware ceramics. The region’s population become more sedentary, perhaps spending part of the year near their farms and adopting a mobile lifestyle at other times. Starting around 900 CE, the population transitioned to above-ground pueblo houses, many associated with kivas and the Cibola Whiteware and Whitemountain Redware ceramics. In the early Pueblo II period (950/1000-1150 CE) there was a dispersed, relatively low population spread among thousands of small sites (averaging about six rooms each) without any clear clustering across the Cibola region. At least parts of this population participated in the Chacoan regional system, as evident in outlier sites such as Village of the Great Kivas, K’ya:duttana, and Allantown, along with others exhibiting finely crafted, banded masonry typical of Chaco.23

The Pueblo III period (c. 1150-1275 CE) saw an increasing population, the first evidence of clustered settlements, and more kivas suggesting greater need for social integration, while the manufacture and trade of St. Johns Polychrome ceramics was an important cultural characteristic. By the early 1200s, this population was distributed in small to medium pueblo settlements of between two to fifty rooms, although larger sites existed. The Hinkson site had as many as 400 rooms occupied at one time, and many smaller pueblos were close together, forming clusters of buildings totaling 100 to 500 rooms, often around large kivas or post-Chacoan Great Houses. This was also the time of the first plaza-oriented pueblos. Agricultural practices shifted from dryland dune cultivation to greater emphasis on gridded fields positioned to benefit from concentrated runoff. In general, it was a period of population consolidation, aggregated residential structures, and clustered communities concentrated in the eastern, higher-altitude parts of the Cibola region around El Morro. These developments set the stage for rapid change beginning around 1275.24
During the transition from the Pueblo III to Pueblo IV period (c. 1275-1300 CE), communities throughout the Cibola region transformed themselves from clustered settlements to about 40 large, concentrated towns where residents living together in a single architectural structure. As some areas depopulated, people concentrated in these pueblos of 200 to 1,400 rooms, especially in the eastern highlands. Many had formal designs, indicating a degree of centralized planning and coordination. They were typically circular or rectangular, around central enclosed plazas. “Ladder” construction plans were common, with builders working together to raise long, parallel walls, between which abutting partitions subdivided individual houses. While their architectural forms suggest social centralization or consensus, the short lifespan of many of these communities—only twenty-five years or so—may indicate larger-scale instability across the region. If the number of rooms directly correlates to the number of people, population peaked in the Cibola region around this time, with about 9,300 people in the late 1200s, leveling off after that to about 6,500 people. The shift towards nucleation and higher altitudes was rapid, with concentrated settlements beginning to appear around 1250, and becoming an almost universal pattern by 1300; this transformation thus took place within the lived experience of a single generation. Large, nucleated towns dominated the Cibola region through the Pueblo IV period, and by 1400 many western areas were depopulated, with pueblos concentrated along the Zuni River, the Hopi Mesas, and around Acoma.

The Pueblo III to Pueblo IV transition also saw a major development in ceramic production on the Colorado Plateau, with thirteenth-century experimentation in glaze paints leading to distinct, relatively consistent recipes, and the divergence of White Mountain glazewares to the west, and Zuni glazewares in the east. Ceramics assemblages from the Pueblo IV period suggest that the Zuni region was relatively insular, with little evidence for
external trade except with Acoma. This apparent self-containment does not necessarily mean that there was no population movement or immigration, but it suggests anyone coming to the region during this period was rapidly assimilated to the ancestral Zuni culture.\textsuperscript{30}

By 1400, the population had shifted west to lower elevations, in large, stable pueblos along the Zuni River Valley, including Hawikku, Kechiba:wa, Kwa’kin’a, Halona:wa North, Mats’a:kyia, and Kyaki:ma, as well as Binna:wa and Cholo:wa (figure 4.6). An important factor in this population shift was the change from floodwater agriculture reliant upon the varied terrain of higher-altitude eastern areas, to riverine and spring-based irrigation, for which the richer soils and flatter terrain of the western river valley were better suited.\textsuperscript{31} These towns exhibited much greater stability than their predecessors, and six or seven remained in place when the Spanish arrived. All but Binna:wa and Cholo:wa were viable, independent communities into the seventeenth century, perhaps as late as the Pueblo Revolt, and Halona:wa remains occupied today as Zuni Pueblo.\textsuperscript{32}

Unfortunately, the foundations of these towns are not well known. Halona:wa North appears to have been founded by the 1350s, based on ceramics and dendrochronological evidence, and Hawikku by 1400, if not earlier.\textsuperscript{33} The towns comprised multiple housing blocks around open plazas, with rectangular kivas. Hawikku may have been preeminent in political and ritual matters, but the Spanish noted two principle towns: Mats’a:kyia in an eastern cluster, and Hawikku leading a western cluster. Material culture indicates significant interaction between these communities, as well as increased trade materials from the west such as Salado Polychrome, Hopi ceramics, and obsidian, while Rio Grande material culture remained rare.\textsuperscript{34}
Spanish *Entradas* (1538-1629)

Hawikku retains special significance as a site of first contact in what is now the United States. The story began with Pánfilo de Narváez’s failed expedition to Florida in 1527, which lost all but a few men to a series of catastrophes. Four survived, including Álvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca and an enslaved North African named Estevanico or Esteban. They slowly walked back to Spanish settlements in Mexico, making contact in Sinaloa in 1536, after trekking through Texas, part of southern New Mexico, and north Mexico, hearing rumors of settled towns to the north.

Viceroy Antonio de Mendoza sent Franciscan Marcos de Niza to investigate in 1538, with Esteban as a guide. They followed the west coast of Mexico to the Sonoran River, turning north to cross into eastern Arizona. With Esteban scouting ahead, de Niza received reports of seven cities in a region called Cíbola with turquoise ornamenting their stone walls, as well as other kingdoms and large populations. De Niza probably never reached the Cíbolan towns which were in fact Zuni communities; instead messengers intercepted him with the news of his guide’s demise. Esteban had presented himself as a priest or shaman, with feathers, bells, and a gourd rattle. This appearance aroused Zuni suspicions when he reached what is generally believed to have been Hawikku, and his strange attire and actions did not agree with their understanding of religious priests. They may have objected to his purported demands for food and women, but it seems his claims to be an advance scout for a heavily armed expedition were most alarming. From travel and trade with the south, Zunis had heard of Spanish slavers and their depredations in west Mexico. They executed Esteban and perhaps some of his Native companions, but his memory remains important in Zuni ceremonialism and in African-American
history as a bold explorer and participant in the first encounter between Pueblo Indians and the peoples of Europe and Africa.

De Niza claimed Cíbola for Spain as “El Nuevo Reino del San Francisco,” and returned to Mexico with second-hand accounts of places he had never seen. These gained embellishment and stoked Spanish expectation of large, walled cities rich in gold and silver. Adding to the fervor were pre-Hispanic traditions attributing the origins of Mesoamerican peoples such as the Mexica to northern “Chichimeca” regions, accounts which conditioned would-be conquistadors to expect the grandeur of Tenochtitlan. Combined with Iberian mythologies of Antillia, the supposed overseas refuge of seven fantastically wealthy cities founded by seven Christian bishops fleeing eighth-century Moorish invaders, the result was a potent mix of grand expectations for the lands to the north. De Niza seemed to confirm these hopes, enflaming Spaniards for whom the unknown Borderlands offered more opportunity than central Mexico.

In 1540, the young governor of Nueva Galicia, Francisco Vásquez de Coronado, set out for Cíbola with de Niza’s guidance, 350 soldiers, and at least 1,200 to 1,300 Native allies from central Mexico. Coronado followed the same route across Sonora and north along Arizona’s San Pedro River, crossing a wide despoblado or unsettled area that left his troops urgently hungry by the time they arrived at Hawikku. Zunis had scouted the expedition and braced for their arrival by removing valuables from the pueblo, sending their women, children, and elders to refuge on top of the steep mesa of Dowa Yalanne (figure 4.7), and preparing for battle.

The first skirmish was in a canyon southwest of the Zuni towns near the juncture of the Zuni and Colorado Rivers. The Spanish prevailed and continued to Hawikku, which completely disappointed their inflated expectations. Approaching the town, Coronado sent his maestre de campo and two Franciscan lay brothers to proclaim three times the Requerimiento, a
legal statement of Spanish origin accounts, cosmological interpretation, and belief that the Christian God had delegated spiritual and temporal authority to the Pope and Spanish king. This document demands that the receiving community submit to Spanish rule and religion, threatening total war if they resist:

I will attack you mightily. I will make war [against] you everywhere and in every way I can. And I will subject you to the yoke and obedience of the Church and His Majesty. I will take your wives and children and I will make them slaves. As such, I will sell and dispose of them as His Majesty will order. I will take your property. I will do all the harm and damage to you that I can, [treating you] as vassals who do not obey and who refuse to accept their Lord and resist and oppose him.\(^{47}\)

Coming with the acquiescence, and perhaps from the mouths of Franciscan friars Luis de Úbeda and Daniel, one could hardly imagine a more forceful, coercive declaration. Although many of the specific details were presumably lost in translation, the intent of the army arrayed against the Zunis must have been self evident.

For their part, Zuni leaders signaled that the Spanish were not to pass, drawing lines on the ground in front of them and striking Úbeda with an arrow. Zuni scholar Edmund J. Ladd suggests the Spanish party may have interrupted a religious pilgrimage, and the Bow Priests who protect against intrusion had drawn cornmeal lines across the path to signal a temporary prohibition of entry.\(^{48}\) Ignoring these warnings the Spanish attacked, killing as many as forty Zunis in an open-ground engagement and besieging the town. The invaders outnumbered the 200 to 600 Zuni defenders, who nonetheless repulsed their initial attack and wounded Coronado in the process. Suffering another twenty-some casualties and many wounded, the defenders retreated, leaving Hawikku to the Spanish and their auxiliaries, where they lived in vacated Zuni homes, ate Zuni stores, and explored nearby settlements for four months before departing to the Rio Grande valley.\(^{49}\) There they occupied Tiguex Pueblos until eventually turning back to
Mexico in 1542. Coronado’s forces again passed through the Zuni region on their return, leaving behind a number of Mexican Indians who preferred to stay with the Zunis.  

After the tumultuous encounters of the mid-sixteenth century, contact between Zunis and Spanish was sporadic. The Chamuscado-Rodríguez expedition briefly visited (1581 to 1582), with chronicler Hernán Gallegos describing the people as “Suni” for the first time, as well as noting their domestic architecture, which he found “amazing” for its stone masonry, ladders ascending to rooftop terraces, and spacious whitewashed domiciles. This lower-impact group of three Franciscans, nine soldiers, and nineteen Native laborers was smaller and briefer than Coronado’s entrada. A subsequent expedition under Antonio de Espejo and the Franciscan Bernardino Beltrán entered New Mexico in 1582 to aid two friars whom the Chamuscado-Rodríguez expedition had left behind, as well as to prospect for minerals. They arrived in Cibola in 1583, where members would stay for two and half months, lodging at Mats’a:kyaa, Halona:wa North, and Hawikku. They were happy to discover Christianized Mexican Indians still living among the Zunis after abandoning Coronado in 1542. Altogether, the smaller, peaceful, and shorter stays of the Chamuscado-Rodríguez and Espejo expeditions were unlikely to have impacted communities as much as Coronado had. It is also apparent that Zunis were strategically preparing for possible Spanish interlopers during this period by raising additional crops.

Juan de Oñate arrived to colonize New Mexico in 1598, appropriating and renaming a Tewa town as San Gabriel. While Oñate’s arrival had profound effects on pueblos along the Rio Grande and at Acoma, his impact on Zuni was less dramatic. He arrived among the Zuni pueblos in November 1598, staying a total of about twenty-five days, mostly in Hawikku. Oñate noted the descendants of Mexican Indians still living there, and the incorporation of some
“Mexican” (presumably Nahuatl) words into Zuni usage. Each town had standing crosses, which Zunis venerated with offerings of prayer meal, painted prayer sticks, and feathers.\textsuperscript{56} While in Hawikku, Oñate conducted the ritual of colonization known as the “Act of Obedience and Vassalage,” sometime between November 3 and 8, 1598.\textsuperscript{57} Like the \textit{Requerimiento}, this was a justification of Spanish colonization based in the Spanish Crown and Roman Papacy’s claims of temporal and spiritual authority, represented by Oñate and the Franciscans. It required Zunis to freely obey, and promised the King would “maintain them in justice and peace and defend them against their enemies and assist them in many things of their politics and economic life, as would be explained to them more at length later.” If Zunis went back on this promise, “they would be punished as transgressors of the commands of their king and natural master.”\textsuperscript{58}

This ritualized “Act of Obedience and Vassalage” ostensibly subjected Zunis to the Spanish Crown and to its representative authorities. In practice, however, Oñate only returned once, while searching for a water route across the continent (1604-1605), when he left the first dated inscription on the rock wall of El Morro, east of Zuni (figure 4.8).\textsuperscript{59} After this expedition, the difficulties of consolidating colonial rule effectively limited Spanish civil and religious institutions to the Rio Grande area until the 1620s, and no formal expeditions to Zuni are noted for a quarter century.\textsuperscript{60}

\textbf{The Town and Architectural Tradition of Hawikku Pueblo}

With its patronizing tone, the 1598 “Act of Obedience and Vassalage” promised the Crown’s assistance in the political and economic lives of the Zuni people, an interference for which they had little need. By that time, their lifeways, beliefs, political relations, and economic
systems were well established and suited to the place in which they lived. Zuni land use focused on a core residential area and farmlands along the Zuni River and its tributary drainages. Around this nucleus were larger sustaining areas for hunting, collection of plants and minerals, and eventually the grazing of domesticated livestock once they obtained these animals. A network of shrines and sacred locales scattered throughout the landscape instilled it with meaning through prayers, offerings, pilgrimages, and other practices.\textsuperscript{61}

At the center of this system were towns such as Hawikku Pueblo. In the sixteenth century, it had between 120 and 200 houses with shared walls of stone in mud mortar around a central plaza, in an architectural style that developed with nucleated towns in the Pueblo IV, but reached further back in time to Ancestral Pueblo settlements such as Chaco Canyon and Mesa Verde to which Zunis can claim ancestral connections. Its flat, terraced rooftops rose four to five stories, although the convex bulge of the ridge may have exaggerated its height.\textsuperscript{62} Coronado called it “Granada” for its similarity to the flat-roofed architecture typical of the mountains around the last Islamic territory in Iberia. Similar villages surviving in the Alpujarras region of Andalucía and in parts of North Africa such as Morocco’s High Atlas Mountains give a sense for what came to mind when Spanish explorers saw Hawikku for the first time (Figure 4.9).\textsuperscript{63} Ladders rose from ground level to rooftops, where hatchways let into individual apartments. Spanish observers describe subterranean chambers in the plaza and on the outskirts of town, which they likened to stoves (estufas) for their use in gatherings during the winter season. Many apparently failed to recognize the religious significance of these kivas.\textsuperscript{64}

Twentieth-century excavations largely confirmed early Spanish observations, revealing houses aggregated in seven distinct blocks, five bunched around an irregular, elongate plaza on the hilltop (figure 4.10-15). Two more housing blocks, possibly dating to the seventeenth
The main entrance to the town, which Coronado’s men found to be narrow and well defended, was probably an opening between house blocks at the top of the relatively gentle southwestern slope. There may have been as many as 800 to 1,060 rooms in the Pueblo, although not all would have all been occupied at once.

Individual rooms were rectangular, inconsistently oriented, and generally added as accretions to existing buildings. Blocks A and C exhibit traces of more intentional planning. The houses of the northern Block A shared a common back wall, and each household occupied a single file of rooms built out from it, with no openings through their party walls, anticipating similar linear arrangement in seventeenth-century Acoma.

Hawikku’s Block A probably represents a coherent, preconceived plan, while the houses of Block C appear to be a series of four separate, individually planned construction phases, added adjacent to each other to form a long alignment of houses enclosing the plaza’s western side. Within each unit, individual houses appear to have been single-file arrangements similar to Block A.

The other housing blocks were additive masses that grew over time without any overall plan, although it is possible to identify distinct construction phases by masonry types and bonding.

Hawikku’s walls were predominantly sandstone blocks in adobe mortar with rough ashlar courses. Earlier walls had a neater style of small, carefully shaped blocks with abundant reddish adobe mortar. Later walls had more expedient construction of larger blocks, less mortar, and less attention to corner bonding and breaking the vertical joints between courses. Mud plaster finished the walls and would have concealed variations in the masonry, often painted or whitewashed inside and out.

Internal or lower-level storage rooms usually had no floor features, while upper-level working and living quarters had small, slab-lined rectangular hearths set near the center of their packed earth floors. Other features included narrow internal
doorways between rooms, adobe benches for storage and sleeping, and bins of various forms (figures 4.22).

Hawikku’s builders spanned the narrow dimension of their rooms with rounded log beams set in the wall to create floors and roofs. Pairs of long, smaller-diameter poles lay crossways over these beams with their ends anchored in the side walls. Over these narrowly spaced purlins were closely bunched sticks supporting matting of grass or brush, over which tamped earth sealed the surface (figure 4.23). Lower-level ceilings were the floors of upper-level rooms, and rainspouts of stone slabs (canales) set in parapets drained the flat rooftops (figure 4.24). Hatches in the roofs provided ventilation for hearths and physical passage by means of ladders. Many hatchways had ring-shaped sills or frames of thin sandstone slabs (figure 4.25). According to Coronado, Zuni ladders had rungs between two supporting rails similar to those in use among Spaniards. Together, these flat roofs, ladders, and hatchways formed an architectural system quite similar to that still in use in nineteenth-century Zuni Pueblo (figure 4.26). Spanish accounts describe the rooftops as spaces that town residents used in common, comprising primary domestic working areas along with wooden arbors or ramadas.

Traditionally, western Pueblo societies have been matrilineal, with a clearly gendered divisions of labor and activities based on principles of complementarity, understanding men and women’s distinct roles to be interdependent and equal in value or status. Archaeological evidence indicates the idea of gender complementarity is an ancient feature of Pueblo culture, although there have been considerable variations in its expression over time. At Zuni, women built and owned the houses while men moved from the house of their mother to the house of their wife upon marriage, and back if a separation later occurred. Within the complementary division of labor, women conducted much of the work pertaining to earth such as building and
plastering the adobe walls of their homes, and pottery production, since these materials came from the feminine earth mother.\textsuperscript{79} Women presided over the home, property, and many tasks related to earth and food production within the town, while men worked primarily out of the house, in kivas and outside of town where they hunted, farmed, and conducted religious observations.\textsuperscript{80}

As the division of labor suggests, Zuni lifeways and materials forms were intimately linked to their conception of the cosmos and their place within it. Nineteenth and early twentieth-century ethnographic documentation provides a wealth of information about how Zunis thought about their world at that time, as do contemporary oral histories and perspectives. While one must use these sources cautiously due to the limitations and inaccuracies that often arise through documentation, as well as the effects of cultural change through time, it is my position that ethnographic data and contemporary culture can be valuable sources for interpreting the past, when used carefully and not simply projected backwards.\textsuperscript{81} Ethnographic analogy provides a relevant point of comparison for thinking about colonial Hawikku’s ritual architecture, social structure, and world view.

Other important limits on the interpretation of Zuni cultural history are restrictions on the circulation of some kinds of information. Zuni philosophy conceives of knowledge as transformative and powerful. Religious or esoteric information is carefully controlled through a system of ownership, constraints, and initiation that ensures its responsible use and protects the community from its misuse or dilution.\textsuperscript{82} In contrast to the free flow of information that is an ideal (if not always a reality) of the western academic tradition, esoteric knowledge for Zunis is powerful and potentially dangerous, and therefore not appropriate for sharing. With these
boundaries and limitations in mind, several points will provide a general outline for thinking about Hawikku’s material record without drifting into subjects to which I have no right or access.

Within Zuni conceptions, the cosmos is animate and tied to human beings through reciprocity; the observance of particular offerings, prayers, and rituals is necessary to receive the blessings that make life possible for Zunis, and which also benefit the rest of humanity. Among the animating beings that make up this world are persons such as the Sun Father and War Gods (Ahayu:da), but also the spirits of divine ancestors known as kokko, which non-Zunis often call kachinas after the Hopi word katsina (plural katsinim). Religious practices include personal offerings, rituals within restricted societies, and public events typically taking the form of dancing in the town plazas and renovated homes that host annual Sha’lak’o dances. Unlike many of the Rio Grande Pueblos, which continue to have Catholic feast days and santos integrated into religious activities, Zunis did not accept Catholic influences into traditional religious practices throughout the history of Spanish intrusions, and to this day the church remains separate from and uninvolved in expressions of Zuni religion.⁸³

Knowledge about tribal history and religion is compartmentalized among a number of clans, kiva groups, and religious societies. Clan membership is an essential component of an individual’s identity in this matrilineal society. In addition, all Zuni boys are initiated into the Kachina Society and are members of one of six kivas. Finally, medicine societies and priesthhoods are responsible for even more specialized knowledge. Each kiva or religious society leader is in charge of ritual knowledge and materials, and their associations oversee ceremonial practices including both private rituals and public performances.⁸⁴ Archaeological evidence and early documents make it clear that at least some aspects of this system were already well established in the sixteenth century, while Zuni oral histories describe how clan divisions and
religious societies developed their particular responsibilities as the ancestors emerged and journeyed towards the Middle Place.

It is likely that Hawikku held a position of ritual importance among the sixteenth-century Zuni towns, and Spanish observers describe it as head or chief among them. Other descriptions and ethnographic accounts suggest groups of elder religious leaders governed the affiliated communities, with councils similar to the Bow Priests as their active agents. Spanish observers were probably mistaken in attributing individual leadership to particular Zuni “chiefs,” but still Hawikku might have had a special role as a center for ritual activities within the larger theocratic system of governance. Pre-Hispanic burials at Hawikku included mortuary assemblages suggestive of war leaders who may have been precursors of Bow Priests, as well as other burials suggesting both men and women held ceremonial positions. Burial practices also indicate that Hawikku’s society was not entirely homogenous. The majority of burials described in the excavation notes were inhumations of complete bodies (679 total), while a smaller but sizable group comprised burnt remains in cremation vessels (317), different ways of treating the dead that may have correlated to social or cultural distinctions. Although it may not be possible to recover the precise identities of specific social components, oral traditions of divergent migration routes, archaeological evidence of varied material culture patterns, and indications of factionalism in primary sources all hint at a degree of diversity within Hawikku’s population.

Despite Hawikku’s ritual significance, Hodge had a surprisingly difficult time finding kivas among the its remains, uncovering only two examples. The earlier was a pair of round chambers within a walled precinct with Chaco-style masonry on the plain southwest of the pueblo, a remnant of early use of the site prior to the Pueblo IV period. A later rectangular kiva was located in the town’s long plaza, roughly 6.4 by 4.3 meters (21’ by 14’), with a flat
earthen ceiling over large roof beams, and a central hatchway for entry.\(^90\) This kiva may have been among those that the Spanish suppressed, leading to its decommission and filling.\(^91\) Later kivas may have been above ground and integrated into the housing blocks, making them difficult to identify.\(^92\)

Zuni beliefs about the world were not isolated to ritual spaces, but closely integrated into everyday practices, including the houses and cuisine that were part of women’s sphere of authority. Hawikku’s residents performed cooking tasks indoors and outdoors on rooftops and beneath wooden arbors (figures 4.27-4.28).\(^93\) Interior cooking occurred alongside other living functions, comprising an interlocking system of built forms, material technologies, and social practices.\(^94\) Fireplaces were typically shallow, rectangular pits with sandstone slabs along the sides, located near the center of the room (figure 4.29).\(^95\) Smoke escaped through ceiling openings and hatches. The fireplace’s narrow width and raised curbing allowed cooking pots to sit directly over hot embers, and about half of the fireplaces had a pair of stones set alongside the curbing to support other pots or slab-shaped stone griddles.\(^96\) The rectangular form of the fireplaces was especially suited for long periods of boiling with culinary ash, a treatment necessary to bring out the nutritional value of a high-maize diet.\(^97\) Household ceramics included round-bottomed bowls and jars, both unornamented utility wares and beautifully painted, hand-burnished polychrome pots fulfilling a variety of ceremonial and everyday uses (figures 4.30-4.31).\(^98\) Households gathered and ate from communal pots, using flat bread or gourd and ceramic ladles (figure 4.32) to scoop helpings of porridges, gruels, and stews typical of a diet based on corn, beans, and squash. Wild game and gathered plants such as pine nuts were also important components of the Zuni diet, as may have been domesticated turkeys and the fine granular salt that the Spanish habitually admired.\(^99\)
Together, these traditional materials and foodways formed a set of interlocking, mutually-dependent technologies. The rooftop hatchways provided access and security through retractable ladders, and ventilated smoke from the sunken hearths, which corresponded to floor-based cooking and dining practices, while rounded ceramics fit the narrow fireboxes, potstones, and adobe benches. This coherent system of accommodating forms and practices expressed Zuni cultural values and the subordination of individual family members to the collective household unit. Ethnographic accounts indicate that a complex of ritual activities accompanied cooking and meals, with domestic spaces expressing aspects of Zuni cosmology.\(^{100}\)

Zunis traditionally conceive of the world as layered, with four cardinal directions to the terrestrial level, and a central axis mundi extending from nadir to zenith connecting the various levels (Figure 4.33-4.34).\(^{101}\) Descriptions of kivas in ethnographic accounts allude to the encoding of this layered cosmology in the form of the kiva chamber, and the arrangement of Hawikku’s domestic spaces point to similar connotations, with the sunken fireplace conceptually set in the underworld, and the ladder connecting to the zenith and ancestral spirits. Ladders projecting through the hatchways or “sky holes” as Cushing described them, allude to the idea of ancestral emergence.\(^{102}\) Rooftop opening and ladders mediated between households and the rest of the community, and Zuni stories are full of neighbors appearing at the opening and dropping in on family meals. Documented prayers frequently use a phrase translated as “ladder descending children” to describe living Zunis in general, placing them in relationship to the spirit beings above and outside the home, whom the prayers address.\(^{103}\) Other ethnographic accounts describe deceased Zuni ancestors as living “under the ladders,” and Kokko as descending and ascending ladders from their place under the sacred lake known as Kołuwala:wa or “Zuni Heaven.”\(^{104}\) In these examples, the ladder carries cosmological implications and stands as a
metonymic symbol representing the entire Zuni community.\textsuperscript{105} The exaggerated prominence of ladders and their sculptural crosspieces were distinctive architectural features of Zuni Pueblo in the nineteenth century, indicating their continued symbolic importance (figure 4.35). Beyond the mere utility of controlling access, ladders were significant markers of identity and place in the Zuni worldview, and remain part of their kivas today (figures 4.36, 9.26).

**Missionization (1629-1680)**

Following the arrival of Governor Francisco Manuel de Silva Nieto and newly named Custodian Estevan de Perea’s return to New Mexico in June 1629, the Franciscans held their Pentecost chapter meeting, assigning the new friars to *doctrinas*.\textsuperscript{106} Afterwards, Perea and Silva Nieto set out for the western pueblos with 30 soldiers and 400 horses. After stopping at Acoma, where Fray Juan Ramírez remained to establish San Esteban del Rey, the expedition continued to Zuni territory, arriving around July 25\textsuperscript{th} or 26\textsuperscript{th}. Upon entry to Hawikku, the soldiers and Governor made a show of venerating the Franciscans, falling to their knees and kissing the friars’ feet, with martial displays to follow that included hoisting the Standard of the Cross, firing harquebuses, and “skirmishing and caracoling of the horses.”\textsuperscript{107} They meant this war-like theater to impress deference and obedience upon the Zunis. The apparent subordination of Spanish soldiers to the missionaries carried the implicit threat that it was dangerous for the Zunis to resist the friars—that missionaries could command their coercive force—at a time when the violence of earlier encounters was still living memory. As the expedition departed, perhaps around July 29, 1629, Fray Roque de Figueredo remained as guardian of the new establishment, along with Fray Agustín de Cuellar, lay brother Francisco de la Madre de Dios, and three soldiers (figure
The Governor, Custodian Perea, and their entourage returned to the Rio Grande, while Fray Francisco de Porras and two others continued to the Hopi Mesas, accompanied by twelve soldiers (“more for piety” than coercion, Perea assures readers). Although documents make no mention of it, the Governor was apparently forced to hurry back to Zuni, perhaps to quell resistance and renew the coercive threat of Spanish military force, for on August 5, 1629 he signed his name at El Morro (figure 4.38).

Perea’s *Relacion* is a vital document for interpreting early missionization at Hawikku. As Custodian, the author was both authority over and witness to the mission’s foundation, and his matter-of-fact tone seems to vouchsafe his accuracy. Yet a subtle rhetorical structure informs his account, couching the significance of New Mexico’s evangelization in Biblical metaphor and Franciscan tradition, meriting both rhetorical and descriptive interpretation. Perea starts his journey in Mexico City, accompanying a group of twenty-one friars through the hardships of northern Chihuahua during the Lenten season, arriving in El Paso where local Indians received them with gifts of food on Palm Sunday. The parallels between their voyage and Christ’s entry to Jerusalem would appear coincidental if not for the details which follow. After resting their animals for three days, the expedition sets off with one friar dying along the road, events suggestive of Christ’s Passion. Perea then describes the group arriving in Santa Fe on Easter of the Holy Ghost, or Pentecost (June 19, 1629). In fact, the caravan probably arrived sooner, as the accompanying Governor Silva Nieto was in Santa Fe a month and half earlier (May 1, 1629), likely making the timing of Perea’s Pentecost arrival a literary indulgence.

Perea reshapes the timeline of actual events in conformity to his rhetorical model, casting the Franciscans’ actions in parallel to gospel narratives, and building towards apostolic events that tacitly authorize their campaign as an extension of the early church. Arriving on Pentecost
echoes that key event when the Holy Spirit came upon Christ’s first disciples, empowering them to speak in tongues and evangelize throughout the world. Similarly, Perea’s friars receive their mission assignments through the Chapter Meeting that was part of the Pentecost observations, in conformity with Franciscan customs. The apostolic metaphor of the Franciscans as an extension of the first disciples was built into the Order’s practices, as was the literal imitation of Christ himself. Perea takes up this metaphor through the structure of his narrative, implying the divine sanction of Pentecost, and subsequently following the missionaries to Acoma, Zuni, and Hopi as apostolic exemplars.

In the Franciscan pattern, Perea presents the friars as sacrificial emulations of Christ, “votive offerings” who were “already disposed and offered unto God.” At both Acoma and Zuni he says they received festive, triumphant receptions again recalling Christ’s entry into Jerusalem. As a contrast, Perea’s description of the Hopi mission is charged with cosmic struggle. To explain Hopi resistance to Christianity, he believes diabolical forces preceded Porras’s arrival, misleading and turning the community against him. Counteracting this intransigence, Perea evokes and rewrites the vigil in the Garden of Gethsemane. Instead of falling asleep during Christ’s hour of need as had the first disciples, the soldiers accompanying Porras miraculously stay awake and vigilant against betrayal for three nights and four days. Their vigil ends when the friars were “animated by valorous impulse which heaven communicates to its Evangelizing messengers,” and went forth to preach through the streets of Awatovi in emulation of the first apostles.

After an initially warm reception, Figueredo began to experience similar resistance at Hawikku. Describing his travails allows Perea to evince shades of the upper room setting of the Last Supper and Pentecost, describing the first mission of Zuni as a house, purchased for that
purpose, where Figueredo anxiously and prayerfully awaited his demise at the hands of hostile Zunis. Ultimately he receives instead an emissary from another Zuni town, entreating Figueredo to found a mission there, and promising to protect the Franciscans. Perea describes the Zunis as Gentiles, and ultimately posits Figueredo as a new Paul, the divinely appointed preacher to Gentiles and prototypal itinerant missionary of the early church. Whatever the actual events of these seventeenth-century encounters with Pueblo peoples, Perea reshapes them in terms resonant with early Christianity and the divine commission to evangelize throughout the world, representing the work of the Franciscans as the latest chapter in the unfolding of God’s plan for creation through a series of typological parallels reverberating through Biblical stories.\textsuperscript{114} His rhetoric ultimately stamps New Mexico missionaries with the authority and moral capital of the early church, crediting them with a vast spiritual harvest.

Unlike Benavides, who describes Hawikku’s first mission as “adorned and tidy” without ever having visited the Zuni region, Perea’s account merits close analysis of its description as well as its rhetoric. He had personally seen the town, was present at Figueredo’s initial installment, and wrote with its memory in mind.\textsuperscript{115} According to him, the first establishment was “a house […] bought for lodging of the religious, and at once the first Church of that province, where the next day was celebrated the first Mass.”\textsuperscript{116} Perea claims that Zunis were initially receptive to the missionaries, “bringing them water, wood, and what was necessary.”\textsuperscript{117} This state of affairs did not last long, however. Soon Zunis refused further unreciprocated labor, and at night the friars heard “a great din of dances, drums, and [shell trumpets], which among them is a signal of war.”\textsuperscript{118} Perea describes Figueredo listening to these sounds from the “retreat” of his house, beseeching God out of fear that the Zunis would kill him. At midnight, two tall, armed warriors entered his cell and the friar fell to his knees expecting death. Instead, the Zunis
signaled peace, and Figueredo called for his Native interpreter who was sleeping within earshot. The warriors conveyed interest in Christianity and wished that he would come preach at their Pueblo about five leagues distant, promising to subdue Hawikku’s hostility. Figueredo would teach the leaders of the two communities for some days, and then perform a spectacle of baptism and mass on a platform in Hawikku’s plaza on August 28, 1629. He baptized town leaders and eight children born to Christianized Indians who had fled Spanish camps to live among the Zunis.\(^{119}\)

Scholars generally believe the warriors were from Halona:wa. Benavides affirms that there were two Zuni Pueblos with churches and conventos in place by 1630, presumably Hawikku and Halona, which together served as the basis of Zuni missionization throughout the seventeenth century.\(^{120}\) Zunis were not new to Christianity when Figueredo arrived; their communities had long sheltered Christianized Indians who no longer wished to live under the Spanish social order, and who likely gave Zuni leaders strategic insights into dealing with the colonizers. When Coronado returned through Cíbola in 1542, Zunis followed for two or three days, scavenging remnants and entreating the indios amigos to abandon their Spanish ally, leading to the integration of Christianized Indians into Zuni communities.\(^{121}\)

Forty-one years later, the 1583 Espejo expedition found some of these Christianized Indians from central Mexico and Guadalajara at both Hawikku and Halona. Among Halona’s residents were three who proved especially helpful: Andrés of Cuyuacán (Coyoacán), Gaspar of México, and Antón of Guadalajara. They provided an entourage of 150 Zunis, including 80 warriors ostensibly to protect the expeditioners during their visit to Hopi pueblos.\(^{122}\) When Oñate arrived in 1598, the Coronado generation had passed on, but he met two sons of the Nahua man Gaspar, one named Alonso. Along with other Zunis they used a few Nahuatl words, but
could not understand the language as a whole. These peripheral observations from primary sources hint at a hospitable and tolerant stance by Zuni communities towards other Native people seeking refuge from Spanish society, but who did not necessarily give up all vestiges of Christianity. Some, like Andrés, Gaspar, and Antón seem to have attained relative high standing among the Zuni, able to mobilize a substantial expeditionary force to accompany Espejo.

Despite their preference for living apart from the Spanish, descendants and associates of already Christianized Indians living in Zuni communities may have formed the basis of factions more open to working with missionaries. Ward Alan Minge interprets the initial Zuni missionization in explicitly factional terms. According to him, Perea’s account betrays a situation where many Zunis did not welcome the Spanish nor want Christianity. Figueredo made contact with a friendly faction from another town, but the oppositional faction would predominate and destroy his mission a few years later. The profession of one leader from Hawikku, whom Figueredo baptized and christened Agustín, is telling. After his sacrament, “Don Agustín” declared that “he had had himself baptized, and that he had not died, but rather felt himself in great rejoicing and courage in his heart, wherewith he judged that he was more valiant than before.” Rather than submitting to the Christian interpretation of baptism as a symbolic death and rebirth, Agustín reframes the sacrament as an ordeal over which he prevails, demonstrating and increasing his courage as a Zuni man. In the slippage between Zuni and Spanish systems of thought, a paradigmatic Christian symbol takes on a new, and different Indigenous meaning.

Relations between the Spanish and Zunis remained strained, with the missions drawing on pueblo labor and supplies, while tensions arose over the continued practice of traditional Zuni religion. Figueredo seems to have negotiated this fraught context successfully, relying upon the
support of his sympathizers, natural enthusiasm, linguistic aptitude, and an apparently diplomatic attitude. Benavides, who like Perea knew Figueredo personally, describes him as fervent in his evangelistic desire, but also learned, serious, and highly respected in Mexico. Along with his companions, he purportedly learned the Zuni language rapidly and used his musical skills to teach Pueblo musicians and perform himself, enhancing the spectacle of Christian rituals.

Figueroedo may have moved to Halona by 1632, when a zealous new friar named Francisco Letrado arrived at Hawikku. Letrado seems to have quickly transgressed the limits of Zuni tolerance with an aggressive, confrontational demeanor, sharply contrasting the apparently more diplomatic Figueredo. Benavides describes Letrado as having,

[...] such an ardent desire to win martyrdom by preaching our holy Catholic faith that he always exposed himself to unmistakable dangers. It was necessary to restrain him, for his absence would be seriously felt since we were so short of ministers.

On the Quinquagesima Sunday (fifty days before Easter Sunday, three days before the start of Lent) of February 22, 1632, Letrado was upset to find Zunis not attending Mass. Going out to search, he interrupted a traditional religious observance when he berated and goaded the Zunis into a hostile reaction. Letrado purportedly fell to his knees holding a painted image of Christ as warriors shot him with arrows, or possibly bludgeoned him to death with clubs. Soldiers were subsequently unable to recover his body, reporting that the Zunis had taken and scalped it. Another friar, Martín de Arvide died on the road west of Hawikku, where he was headed to evangelize an unidentified Native group somewhere in present-day Arizona that Spanish called “Zipias.” During this revolt, Zunis burnt Hawikku’s provisional church and convento and retreated to Dowa Yalanne, while Figueredo abandoned the Halona mission and escaped with his life. When word reached Santa Fe, the new Governor Francisco de la Mora Ceballos dispatched a punitive expedition under Thomás de Albizu, which left an inscription at
El Morro on March 23, 1632 (figure 4.39), but its impact on the Zuni refugees at Dowa Yalanne is unknown. Without citing sources, Hodge says that the soldiers and accompanying friars were admitted to Dowa Yalanne, where the Zunis promised to obey Spanish rule, but there are also hints of possible violence or coercion.\(^\text{132}\)

The reestablishment date of Hawikku’s mission is unknown because no colonial documents referencing this process have yet surfaced. The Franciscans elected new missionaries to Zuni in 1635, about the time that Zunis descended from Dowa Yalanne, but Governor Francisco Martínez de Baeza refused to provide soldiers to escort the friars and project force among the restive pueblos.\(^\text{133}\) The Zuni missions were not yet reestablished by 1636, and probably not until after 1643.\(^\text{134}\) From 1637 to 1643, New Mexico was rife with partisanship bordering on outright civil war between Franciscans and the civil government; it is unlikely the vulnerable Zuni missions could have been revived during this time.\(^\text{135}\) A 1650s lull in factional strife among the Spanish allowed for mission expansions across New Mexico, and seems the most plausible period for the reestablishment and formal construction of Hawikku’s mission.\(^\text{136}\)

Certain documents hint at the missions’ reestablishment. During the inquisitional trials stemming from Mendizábal’s governorship, the former alcalde mayor to Zuni and Hopi pueblos Captain Diego de Truxillo testified that on his arrival in Zuni territory, he found the Indians no longer attending catechism lessons, ringing the church bells, or showing up for choir. Deposed on September 22, 1661, Truxillo’s statement implies that at least one of the pueblos had a complete mission church with bell by about 1660. Mendizábal encouraged pueblo resistance to the friars, a situation which Zunis found “very sweet, very pleasant, and very much in accord with their desires.”\(^\text{137}\) It seems likely that if mission construction were still ongoing in 1660, Truxillo would have noted the work stoppage as part of his deposition.\(^\text{138}\) Succeeding Governor
Diego de Peñalosa (1661-1664) traveled to Zuni in spring of 1662, ostensibly to correct Mendizábal’s “abuses” that had resulted in Zuni nonattendance.\textsuperscript{139} The so-called \textit{Peñalosa Map} (1665) marks a small circle for Hawikku, and a more prominent filled square for Halona, indicating a shift in importance from the former to the latter by the mid-seventeenth century. It appears that following reestablishment, the relative status of the two Zuni missions reversed, and after 1661 sources consistently describe Halona as the more prominent mission.

The identity of the friar or friars who refounded the Zuni missions is not recorded, but one possible connection is Fray “Francisco” (Fernando) de Velasco, whom Aguilar accused of extracting excessive tributes of cloth and other goods from Zuni and Hopi communities in 1655, along with the infamous Salvador de Guerra at Shongopavi. Aguilar was unsure of Velasco’s specific assignment, but believed it to be Zuni. According to him, the Indians’ complaints against Velasco and Guerra were the cause of the latter’s brutal “larding” and burning of Hopis.\textsuperscript{140} Aguilar or the court scribe may have been mistaken about the friar’s first name; he was probably Fray Fernando de Velasco, a native of Cadiz born around 1620, who took his vows in Mexico City in 1650, and is documented at Tajique and Chilili from 1659 to 1661, Acoma in 1667, Socorro in 1671 to 1672, and who died in the Pueblo revolt as guardian of Pecos Pueblo.\textsuperscript{141} However tentative, Aguilar’s accusation is the earliest documented mention and only name now associated with the reestablishment phase of the Zuni missions, and it is possible that he served there sometime during his undocumented years between 1650 and 1659.

By 1664, Fray Nicolás Enríquez could say that the Franciscans were accustomed to making visitations of the Zuni and Hopi Provinces, as he himself had done with Custodian Alonzo de Posadas (in office from 1661 to 1665). They visited Hawikku, although Enríquez says nothing about the mission, simply noting the hazardous road from there to Awatowi,
purportedly “the most dangerous part of [the] kingdom.”¹⁴² In a summary of New Mexico’s missions from 1663 to 1666, Fray Domingo Cardoso advocated for more missionaries, noting that a single priest served Zuni during that time. The unnamed friar lived at Halona, and administered sacraments there and at Hawikku as well as two visitas. Cardoso also names these establishments for the first time, referring to Halona as Nuestra Señora de la Candelaria, and Hawikku as the Purísima Concepción.¹⁴³

In 1669, Fray Juan Galdo arrived as missionary to the Zuni Province, describing himself as sole guardian of Halona’s mission from 1671 to 1672, during which Hawikku was under his charge as a visita, as well as visitas at Kwa’kin’a and “Quiana” (probably Kechiba:wa). From this statement, it would appear that at least one other Franciscan was working among the Zuni from 1669 to 1671. In a curious mixing of titles, Galdo names the Halona mission as “Nuestra Señora de la Pura y Limpia Concepción,” and calls Hawikku’s mission the “Purificación.”

Galdo’s inventories of the Zuni missions provide the only sketchy description of these buildings in the seventeenth century, and his accounts of distributions to the Zuni communities during famine offer clues to their economic activities.¹⁴⁴ Based on statements by Cardoso and Galdo, Hodge believed that Hawikku served as a visita for “a number of years,” but visita status is only documented for the years 1663 to 1665, and 1672.¹⁴⁵ Whether it was a visita or had a guardian priest in other years is unknown, but the archaeological remains indicate more intensive use than these documents suggest. The late 1660s and early 1670s were a difficult time throughout New Mexico as a result of conflicts with the Apaches, unrest among the pueblos, and famine.¹⁴⁶ According to one Zuni oral tradition, during this time sacristans moved the sculpture of the Santo Niño from Hawikku’s mission to Halona out of concern for its safety in the deteriorating situation at the more exposed western town.¹⁴⁷
Sometime after September 19, 1672, another Franciscan arrived in the Zuni Province to take over guardianship of Hawikku’s mission, where he would soon die. Historians have long called him “Fray Pedro de Avila y Ayala,” but Ivey argues this name conflates two Franciscans killed separately in the early 1670s: Hawikku’s Pedro de Ayala, and another friar named Gil de Avila, who died at Senecú Pueblo in 1675. The date of the Hawikku attack is likewise problematic, with the chronicler Vetancurt putting it in 1670, which is impossible for the mission could not have been rebuilt to match Galdo’s dated description of 1672. Instead, the attack probably took place a few short weeks after his inventory, on October seventh of that year.\(^\text{148}\)

According to Vetancurt, a group of Indians attacked the mission, knowing that a certain Bartolomé de Cisneros (probably a soldier) was not around. The friar reportedly went to the mission church where he embraced the cross and image of Mary, but the raiders pulled him outside by force. They stripped Ayala nude and killed him at the foot of a cross standing in the mission atrium, shooting him with arrows and using the mission bell to crush his skull. In Vetancurt’s telling, these events take on a heavily symbolic tone, with the warriors effectively cutting out the tongue of the mission (the bell) and turning it to their own purposes as a weapon to silence the mission’s other voice (Ayala).

From the Spanish accounts, it appears Galdo came upon the scene the next day, and it is probably through him that the episode is recorded. As part of their attack, warriors vandalized the church and torched it. Galdo found the mission in ashes except for a statue of Mary, purportedly unharmed, which he took back to Halona along with Ayala’s body and presumably any other sacred materials he recovered.\(^\text{149}\) Casualties also included a number of Christianized Zuni men, women, and children. Although Zuni oral traditions have alleged White Mountain Apaches were responsible for this raid, Hodge suggests Zuni complicity.\(^\text{150}\) The raiders appear
to have known when the mission would be undefended, suggesting someone in the community provided inside information. Perhaps they were from an anti-Spanish faction, or simply opposed the increased oversight and labor that came with the arrival of a new guardian friar and shift from *visita* status.¹⁵¹ Mecalita Wytsalucy’s story similarly describes an Apache attack with Zuni instigation, while other reports indicate a general increase in resistance to missionaries during this time, along with revival of traditional religious practices among Zuni towns and other pueblos.¹⁵²

Wytsalucy seems to recount the same attack on Hawikku’s mission, although as oral histories often do, his story may conflate multiple events.¹⁵³ According to him, Hawikku’s Rain Priests declared a work day to help with crops at neighboring Chalo:wa. While the men were away, one of the Zuni Sun Priests informed the Apaches who attacked. They raided the mission where the priest was, but also killed Hawikku’s women and children, and burned their stores of corn. According to this version, the friar ran to the mission roof seeking escape, where the raiders caught him, threw him down, and killed him. The priest was married to a Zuni woman, and the raiders took her and her sister captive from the mission. The rest of the story follows the sisters, one of whom dies of loneliness, and the other who eventually escapes her captors and returns to find Hawikku’s menfolk living at the town of Kechiba:wa. After the raid, they had been without food and sought refuge with their neighbors, where they began building the stone walls of a new church. Together they decided that the area was no longer secure, and moved to Halona for safety.

Franciscans seem to have abandoned Hawikku’s mission after 1672.¹⁵⁴ In contrast to Wytsalucy’s account, the archaeological evidence shows that many residents of the pueblo remained, and some of them appropriated and substantially reworked the mission’s ruins to
create livestock corrals and new domestic spaces (Appendix 1). The partially standing walls of the *convento* were an invitation to appropriate remaining supplies, tools, and materials for reuse. Consequently, excavators found Spanish artifacts throughout the Pueblo ruins. While some may have been trade goods, it seems likely that many came from the wrecked mission.

Halona’s mission, on the other hand, remained staffed and functional until the Pueblo Revolt of 1680. Zunis participated as the pueblos secretly built alliances together and planned their war of independence that would kill 401 Spanish civilians and 21 friars, forcing the remaining colonists back to El Paso del Norte. Colonial documents indicate Zunis killed the guardian friar of Halona, Juan de Bal/Val, burning the mission, and congregating again on Dowa Yalanne for security in case of retaliation. This aggregated refuge settlement brought together the Zuni people from all the remaining towns for the years 1680 until at least 1692, and possibly later. Archaeological remnants point to a period of social experimentation as Zunis reorganized their previously affiliated towns into a single community.

Although initial reports indicate that all Spanish among the Zuni died, these were never actively confirmed and may not have been entirely true. Vetancurt cryptically claims that an unnamed friar was stationed at Hawikku and escaped the Revolt alive, but says nothing of what became of him. It would be easy to dismiss this statement if not for a parallel oral tradition among the Zuni and Laguna communities with extensive documentation going back as early as 1857. According to these accounts, Zunis spared the life of one friar who was ministering to them, on the condition that he adopt Zuni dress and practices. Cushing records his name as “Juan Grey-robed-father-of-us” or Juan Grey Robe, as he is commonly called. He lived in the refuge community on Dowa Yalanne. When Governor Diego de Vargas Zapata Luján Ponce de León Contreras arrived in force, Juan Grey Robe entreated him with a note on buckskin or a
white stone that averted the impending attack. According to many accounts, Juan Grey Robe did not reveal himself to Vargas, but remained with the Zuni. If indeed there was a Spanish friar living amongst the Zuni, perhaps even taking a Zuni wife, chroniclers might have been as disinclined to acknowledge him, as he seems to have been about revealing himself.¹⁶⁰

Following Vetancurt, Cushing and others have assumed that Juan Grey Robe must have been stationed at Hawikku, but in a comparative analysis of the testimonies, Andrew Wiget argues that this was unlikely, proposing instead that he was actually Juan de Bal of Halona, whose death the Spanish had only assumed.¹⁶¹ Comparing Zuni oral accounts and the Vargas records, Wiget argues these stories reveal a refuge community “deeply divided over its attitudes towards Catholicism [and] the Spanish.” He believes the most plausible interpretation for reconciling the various historical testimonies is that “a sizable minority at Zuni became strong Catholic converts, and became a powerful faction that was impossible to destroy in the post-Hawikuh [sic] consolidation of Zuni villages into one and in the prevailing spirit of oppositional identity.”¹⁶²

Wiget’s interpretation fits with other incidences in Zuni history when factions within the population sought alliance with the Spanish, and finds support in Vargas’s discovery of active Catholic worship and curation of liturgical materials on Dowa Yalanne. Upon reaching the mesa community, Vargas saw a standing cross in the center of the plaza. After ritually repossessing the Province and baptizing 294 Zunis, he was led to a second-story room, in which there was an actively maintained altar with tallow candles lit and pieces of vestment wrapping several large crucifixes, an oil painting of John the Baptist, four silver chalices, a silver monstrance, two bells (presumably the large mission bells), smaller liturgical bells, brass candlesticks, and more than a dozen Catholic books.¹⁶³ Oral histories of the Santo Niño parallel this account; however, if so
Zunis apparently preserved her apart from the Vargas altar. Although the Zuni communities joined the Pueblo Revolt and destroyed their mission, there remained a minority faction within the population which retained materials and practices connected to Spanish Catholicism, and possibly included their adopted former missionary.

Zuni Missions After the Pueblo Revolt

During their time atop the mesa, residents of formerly distinct Zuni towns forged a new identity as a single community, in which a minority maintained vestiges of Catholicism. From 1680 onward, Zuni history focuses first on Dowa Yalanne and then Zuni Pueblo, rebuilt around the Halona:wa North site. Zunis would continue to visit the Hawikku site for a variety of purposes, but never reoccupied it as a resident town, and slowly it fell into ruin. After several failed attempts, the Spanish successfully reentered New Mexico in 1692 under Governor Vargas, whose “ritual repossession” of the region included brief visits to the western pueblos and seemed to secure Zuni allegiance, as described in another inscription at El Morro (figure 4.40). Subsequent years were tumultuous, however, and the people remained on Dowa Yalanne until around 1699. Zunis continued to risk reprisal, since they had participated in an another attempted uprising in 1696, and Apache raids still threatened. As a result, Governor Pedro Rodrígues Cubero found Zunis still living on the mesa in mid-1699, when he convinced them to resume habitation along on the river.

The following year, new alcalde mayor Joseph Naranjo reestablished Spanish presence in Zuni Pueblo with a detachment of soldiers, and Fray Juan de Garaycoechea reopened the Halona mission as Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe. Relationships remained strained. In 1703, Zunis
killed three Spaniards inside the rebuilt church, followed by another retreat to the mesa, although they spared the friar and mission. Garaycoechea withdrew until 1705, when Zunis returned to Middle Village.\textsuperscript{168} Relations moderated through the remainder of the eighteenth century, as Zunis and Spanish faced the common threat of Apache and Navajo raids.\textsuperscript{169} Zuni remained the largest of the Pueblos, its population fluctuating between 660 and 2,000 residents, and distance from Spanish settlements allowed residents to avoid confrontation as they adopted those aspects of European culture which they found useful, while passively resisting others.\textsuperscript{170} During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Zunis founded farming villages near outlying water sources, among which they dispersed for the growing season, returning to the main pueblo during the winter months from November to March.\textsuperscript{171}

Sporadic notations point to Franciscan missionaries’ ongoing efforts. In 1730, Bishop Benito Crespo says that a single friar administered not only Zuni, but Acoma and Laguna as well.\textsuperscript{172} In 1744, Zuni had two ministering friars, but was back to a single guardian by 1749, and the next episcopal visitor, Bishop Pedro Tamarón y Romeral found the Pueblo too remote to visit in 1760.\textsuperscript{173} He notes that the town remained resistant to Catholicism, but confirmed and catechized Zunis who visited him in Laguna, and who later returned with twenty more community members to meet him in Isleta for similar sacraments.\textsuperscript{174} The fact that these individuals twice sought out the Bishop suggests a small but active Catholic faction remained part of the Pueblo in the mid-eighteenth century.

Zuni had no missionary from 1770 to 1773, a status that briefly changed with Fray Silvestre Vélez de Escalante’s arrival in January 1775. He remained until mid-1776, and then joined Domínguez in seeking an overland route to California.\textsuperscript{175} Although brief, this period produced Don Bernardo Miera y Pacheco’s altarpiece for the Halona mission, comprising a large
painting of the Virgin of Guadalupe; framing estípite-shaped columns; painted roundels of Saints Dominic and Francis; a relief of the Eternal Father; and sculptures of the Christ child and Archangels Miguel and Gabriel (figures 4.41-4.44).\textsuperscript{176} Domínguez writes the most detailed description of the Zuni mission, its convento, and furnishings, an important key in interpreting archeological remains uncovered in 1966.\textsuperscript{177}

In many ways, the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries were difficult times for Zuni, with corrupt alcaldes mayores extorting the community, along with drought and continued raiding. New Mexico’s government used assignment to the distant pueblo as punishment for disobedient officers, and it became a periodically occupied hardship post for Franciscans, who were typically elderly or new arrivals.\textsuperscript{178} In 1790, there had been two Franciscans stationed at Halona: Friars Mariano Saldivar and Mariano Sánches, but the mission again lacked a minister in 1806, 1810, and around 1819 to 1820.\textsuperscript{179} Perhaps the last resident missionary, Fray Antonio Cacho abandoned Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe on July 8, 1821 out of fear of impending war with Navajos.\textsuperscript{180}

After Mexican independence, distant New Mexico was a low priority for the new government. Zuni had no resident priest by 1824, and Franciscans visited only occasionally from then on, with their official mission to New Mexico ending by 1833-1834 when the Bishop of Durango took over jurisdiction. In theory, he assigned parish priests to the former missions, but this transition rarely occurred in practice.\textsuperscript{181} Priests who did visit Zuni often performed marathons of multiple baptisms and sacraments for the isolated community.\textsuperscript{182} In 1846, the United States invaded New Mexico as part of the larger Mexican-American War. U.S. military and exploratory expeditions often stopped in the pueblo for supplies.\textsuperscript{183} When the Doniphan Expedition arrived in 1846, they reported Zunis had expelled their priests some years earlier.\textsuperscript{184}
In the following years, Catholic priests visited periodically from Santa Fe, Gallup, Cebolleta, and St. Johns, AZ, saying mass at the House of the Santo Niño, and eventually at the house of BIA Superintendent (and Catholic) R. J. Bauman in Black Rock.\textsuperscript{185}

The gradual retraction of the Zuni convento in the nineteenth century reflects the mission’s declining importance after the departure of resident friars. First, the side and back ranges were torn down and probably reused as building material (figure 7.24). Concurrently, the front range and rooms along the church were reworked to maintain viability on a smaller scale. This was the state that expedition artist Kern drew during his 1851 visit, subsequently reproduced as a lithograph (figures 4.45, 9.20). By the time of the 1879 Stevenson expedition, the front range was also gone, leaving only the sacristy, northwest ambulatory, stairwell, and part of the portería standing alongside the church (figures 2.3-2.5).\textsuperscript{186}

Even these convento remnants were gone by the 1890s, and the church itself in bad shape with its roof and northwest wall collapsing. It presented a conundrum to the community, which was reluctant to make any alterations despite the danger its crumbling remnants posed. During his time in Zuni from 1879 to 1883, Cushing urged Pueblo elders to repair or tear down the church, to which they responded that the ruins were a sacred place to their ancestors. They made a direct analogy between human remains and the mission walls, saying that they would not renovate the ruins,

\begin{quote}
for it was the missa-house [place of mass] of our fathers who are dead, and dead is the missa-house! May the fathers be made to live again by the adding of meat to their bones? How, then, may the missa-house be made alive again by the adding of mud to its walls? […] It was well that the wind and rain wore it away, as time wasted away their fathers’ bones.\textsuperscript{187}
\end{quote}

Zunis were reluctant to interfere with the course of natural deterioration, and saw the mission ruins as sacred, analogous to ancestral remains, and a means of connecting with their forbearers.
Today, the community continues to hold the mission cemetery in reverence as a protected space left alone and unmaintained through the course of the year (figure 4.46).

Despite the reluctance that Cushing recounts, a Yaqui/Mexican man adopted into the Zuni community named Jesus Eriacho restored the church around 1901. He collected vigas that turned out to be too short to span the nave, so Eriacho tore down the church’s north and west walls, and reconstructed them inside the original foundations, resulting in a narrower nave and a wider alley west of the church. Despite these alterations, the church was soon dilapidated, and Eriacho’s roof collapsed by 1927 (figure 4.47).

The decline of Hawikku’s abandoned mission was even more extensive. Without attention, its walls began to melt away during the Revolt era. Zunis initially reconfigured many rooms as residences, while others became sheep corrals, a function that probably continued for some time (Appendix 1). They removed artifacts and useful materials such as wooden beams. By the 1880s, all that remained was a litter of stone slabs and the eroding stumps of its façade towers and sanctuary, looking more like geological formations than architecture (figures 4.48-4.51). Alongside these evocative ruins, the disintegrated convento was nothing more than a brushy mound in which walls were difficult to identify. Even the adobe church walls were gone by the 1900s. Zunis from Ojo Caliente removed the remaining above-grade bricks to reuse at their farming village (figure 4.52). The resulting rock-strewn, weed-covered mound was so indecipherable that when George Gustav Heye arrived on the scene in 1919, he and Hodge argued over where the church’s entrance and altar could even be found.
Non-Zunis may visit Hawikku through tours that the Zuni Pueblo Department of Tourism organizes; see website (http://www.zunitourism.com/tours.htm) for information. The Hawikku site is numbered LA 37 in the New Mexico Laboratory of Anthropology system.
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97 The form of the rectangular firebox is connected to the increased utilization of maize in studies at Grasshopper Pueblo. The rectangular box allows wood to be fed to the fire, and air can reach the embers around the curve of the bottom of the pot, an arrangement well-suited to the long period of boiling necessary for the process of nixtamalization; Lowell, “The Fires of Grasshopper,” 461-462.

98 Utility wares are alternatively known as roughwares (see Dwight P. Lanmon and Francis H. Harlow, The Pottery of Zuni [Santa Fe: Museum of New Mexico Press, 2008], 407-40) or gray and blackwares (see T. J. Ferguson and Barbara J. Mills, Archaeological Investigations at Zuni Pueblo, New Mexico, 1977-1980 [Zuni Pueblo: Zuni Archaeological Program, 1982, 300-305). They are relatively poorly understood because of their low survival rate and lack of interest on the part of collectors. For Zuni polychromes, see Richard B. Woodbury and Nathalie F. S. Woodbury, “Appendix II: Decorative Pottery of the Zuni Area,” in Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, The Excavation, 302-334; Kintigh, Settlement, Subsistence, and Society, 12-20; Ferguson and Mills, Archaeological Investigations at Zuni Pueblo, 282-305; and Lanmon and Harlow, The Pottery of Zuni.

99 For primary sources describing aspects of Zuni cuisine during the initial Spanish entradas, see Coronado, “Letter to the Viceroy, August 3, 1540,” 259-260; Anonymous, “Traslado de las Nuevas,” 293; Anonymous, “Relación del Suceso,” 498; Casteñeda de Nájera, “The Relación,” 378-507, 417-418; Jaramillo, “Juan Jaramillo’s Narrative,” 508-524, 513; Oñate, “Expedition to the South Sea,” 395; Valverde y Mercado, “Investigation,” 660; Salmeron, Relaciones, 64. For secondary discussion, see Hardin, Gifts of Mother Earth, 24; Hart, “Historic Zuni Land Use,” 10-11; Lois Ellen Frank with Walter Whitewater and Sam Etheridge, Foods of the Southwest Indian Nations (Berkeley: Ten Speed Press, 2002), 29-31. For ethnographic accounts of Zuni foodways in late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, see Cushing, Zuni Breadstuff; and Stevenson, The Zuni Indian, 361-369. A recent project of Zuni A:shiwi Publishing and the AAMHC collects Zuni recipes and oral history regarding traditional foods; see Rita Edaakie, Idonapshe, Let’s Eat: Traditional Zuni Foods (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, Zuni A:shiwi Publishing, and the A:shiwi A:wan Museum, 1999). Regarding Zuni dining practices, it remains an open question whether pre-contact Zunis used individual serving bowls. Bowls of various sizes exist, and it is possible that smaller bowls were individual serving vessels, but wear-use studies remain inconclusive on this question; see Patricia L. Crown, “Ceramic Use-Wear in the American Southwest,” in Inscriptions: Papers in Honor of Richard and Nathalie Woodbury, ed. Regge N. Wiseman, Thomas C. O’Laughlin, and Cordelia T. Snow (Albuquerque: The Archaeological Society of New Mexico, 2005), 59-60. Margaret A. Hardin and Barbara J. Mills study wear in historic Zuni vessels and conclude that small bowls were used for individual servings, while medium bowls were for communal eating, and largest bowls seem to have received the highest rate of damage as bread bowls; see Hardin and Mills, “The Society and Historical Context of Short-Term Stylistic Replacement: A Zuni Case Study,” Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory 7, no. 3 (Sept. 2000): 148. Their selection of bowls might reflect the adoption of aspects of Spanish dining norms, but in a study of pre-contact White Mountain Redwares from Arizona, Scott Van Keuren also concluded that smaller bowls may have been individual serving vessels; see Van Keuren, “Crafting

100 Ritual activities occurred during the gathering of materials, as part of tasks such as corn grinding, and in prayers to the spirits of ancestors accompanying food; Stevenson, *The Zuñi Indians*, 354-361, 369; Ruth L. Bunzel, “Zuni Ritual Poetry,” in Bunzel, *Zuñi Ceremonialism*, 621-623; Ladd, *Zuni Ethno-Orihitology*, 24, 28.


103 See for example Bunzel, “Zuni Ritual Poetry,” 634, 646, 664-666, 691, 697, 764, 780. Even though Zuni domestic architecture is drastically different today, many of these conceptual patterns and the poetic implications of this cosmological modeling of the domestic space remain part of present-day Zuni thought.


105 The deterioration of ladders could also be a metaphor for the decline of a community; Cushing, *Zuni Breadstuff*, 87.

106 Perea brought with him nineteen priests and two lay brothers, but one priest (Fray Martín Gonzalez) died along the way; see Bloom, “Fray Estevan,” 214, 222, 224-226. Perea had first arrived in New Mexico in 1609, and served Commissary for New Mexico from 1614-1617, Custodian from 1617-1621, and again from 1629-1630. He returned to Mexico during the period of Benevides’s office as Custodian, taking the latter’s place on his return with the wagon train of 1629 (214-216).


108 Bloom, “Fray Estevan,” 229. The date of the Governor’s departure is based on his inscription at El Morro on July 29, 1629. This inscription is problematic. Slater (*El Morro*, 71) transcribes it as follows:

[...] capma, gen1, de los pro2, del nubo mex3, Por el Rey nro, S’ Paso por aqui de buelta de los pue Blos de Zuñi a los, 29 de Julio del año de 1620 y los puso en paz a su pedima, pi Diendole Su favor como vasallos de su mag4 y de nuevo dieron la obediencia todo lo que hizo con el agasax e sero y prudencia como tan christianismo y gran caballero, tam particu lar y gallardo soldado de inacabable y loada memori [...]Which he translates as follow:

[...] Captain-General of the Provinces of New Mexico for the King our Lord. He passed by here in returning from the pueblos of Zuni on the 29th of July of the year 1620, and he put them at peace at their petition, praying his favor as vassals of His Majesty, and anew they gave obedience—all of which he did
with clemency and zeal and prudence, as a most Christian and great gentleman, a most extraordinary and gallant soldier of imperishable and praised memory (8).

Hodge appears to have interpreted the “1620” as “1629,” which fits better with the known history of New Mexico. 1620 fell during the Governorship of Juan Álvarez de Eulate who is not known to have sent an expedition to Zuni and fought often with the Franciscans. Hodge saw the inscriptions in 1912 when they were not quite as eroded, but his casts in the collections of Smithsonian Institution did not shed any light on this apparent contradiction. Figueredo was notable for his exception linguistic and musical skills. He was respected within the Order, and had previously held the position of Definidor or counselor in Mexico, as well as having years of experience preaching in the Indigenous Mexican languages of Nahuatl and Matlatzinca. He was purported to quickly learn any difficult language. He was also skilled in teaching music, including ecclesiastic chant, counterpoint, and plain singing, as well as musical instruments such as organ, bassoon, and cornet (Bloom, “Fray Estevan,” 229). He may have accompanied Oñate on his entrada to New Mexico and written an account of that endeavor in 1604; Cesàreo Fernández Duro, Don Diego de Peñalosa y su descubrimiento del Reino de Quivira (Madrid: Manuel Tello, 1882), 131. If Figueredo had indeed done so, he must have returned subsequently to Mexico, from whence he came in joining Perea’s 1628 caravan; Hodge, History, 88.

109 Perea’s account does not mention this return; Bloom, “Fray Estevan,” 229. See also Hodge, History, 87-88; Slater, El Morro, 9.


111 Ibid., 225.

112 Ibid., 225, 227; the Spanish reads, “fupliendo fus devotos afectos, la falta de votivas ofrendas, y donativos cultos,” and “aunque ya difpuefta la fuya, y ofrecida a Dios.” From Estevan de Perea, “Verdadera relación, de la grandiosa conversión qve ha avido en el Nuevo Mexico,” in Western Americana, 1550-1900: Frontier History of the Trans-Mississippi West (New Haven: Research Publications, 1975), microfilm reel 417, no. 4226, 578v, 579r.


114 It is not surprising to find Perea imposing Apostolic and Christological patterns on the events of missionization, as he had originally professed as a Discalced Franciscan in Extremadura’s Province of San Gabriel, although he later associated with the Observant Franciscan Holy Gospel Province upon his arrival in Mexico; see Kraemer, “San Pedro,” 74. The Discalced Franciscans of Extremadura (followers of Pedro de Alcántara also known as Alcantrines) were among the most literal and strictly observant of the Franciscans.


116 Bloom, “Fray Estevan,” 228-229; the Spanish reads, “Comprofe una cafa para alvergue de los Religiofos, y luego fue la primera Yglefia de aquella Provincia, dode el otro dia fe celebrò la primera miffa […].” Perea, “Verdadera relación,” 579v. It should be noted that previous expeditions had also performed mass among the Zuni pueblos.


121 Flint, No Settlement, 191-192; Casteñeda de Nájera, “The Relación,” 428, 489; Carroll L. Riley speculates that it may have been as many as 200 Indians who remained behind with the Zunis, but I have seen no direct evidence for this precise number; see Riley, Rio del Norte: People of the Upper Rio Grande from Earliest Times to the Pueblo Revolt (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1995), 213-214. Adopting Mexican Indians might have been a strategic response to the tragic losses that Hawikku’s residents experienced during Coronado’s initial assault, in which they lost as much as a third of their fighting-age men.


123 Much the same happened in the late nineteenth century, when Yaqui captive and community member Jesus Eriacho was a key intermediary with Catholic missionaries and member of the pro-Catholic faction in the establishment of the San Antonio mission (1922); see Pandey, Factionalism, 134-138, 150-159. As a member of the lineage against which Eriacho’s faction developed, Cushing’s patron Patricio Pino saw the weakening of Zuni self-government, factionalized councils, and weakened leaders as a consequence of Spanish colonization; see Zuni Breadstuff, 151.


125 Bloom, “Fray Estevan,” 234. The Spanish reads,

El cacique ma principal llamado ya don Aguftin, acabado de baptizerfe volvió al pueblo co fingular efpiritu, y hizo una gran exortacion, animando a los prefentes a recibir tan buena ley, y tan buen Dios; y para que falieffen de fu error, echaffen de ver, que el fe avia baptizado, y q no fe avia muerto, antes fe fentia con tan gran regozijo, y aliento en el coraçon que fe juzgava por mas valiente que primero […] (Perea, “Verdadera relación,” 581v).

126 Benavides, Fray Alonso de Benavides’ Revised Memorial, 74-75.

127 Native to the town of Talavera de la Reina in Castille, Letrado was disappointed to find that Mexico already Christianized when he arrived, and went north with Perea to New Mexico in 1628. Letrado was first assigned to Las Humanas Pueblo, where he established a convento and built the first church, but soon asked to move on to other unconverted communities. See Vetancurt, Teatro Mexicano, vol. IV, 41; Bloom, “Fray Estevan,” 226; Ivey, In the Midst, 21, 38.

128 Benavides, Fray Alonso de Benavides’ Revised Memorial, 77. The Spanish reads:

Con tan grande felo de recibir martirio por la predicación de nra Santa fe católica, que fe ponía fiempre a evidentes peligros y era menifter irle ala mano, por la falta que nos podía hafe adonde tanta ni caffidad y de miniftros […] (Alonso de Benavides, 1634, “Propaganda Fide, Congregasiono Generali-Scitture Antiche, Relación y memorial escritos por Alonso de Benavides,” Mss. 841 Vol. Vol. 115C, CSWR, 242).

Benavides knew Letrado personally, but his description also conforms to the rhetorical trope of zealous friars killed in their duties, and this passage fits with his larger purpose of drumming up support, funding, and new recruits for the province. He paints a situation in which lack of sufficient personnel compelled individuals to restrain themselves from the fullest embodiment of the Franciscan charism of sacrificing their bodies in literal imitation of Christ and Francis.

129 Benavides and Vetancurt’s accounts are the primary sources for Letrado’s death, and do not agree on all points; see Vetancurt, Teatro Mexicano, vol. III, 275; Vetancurt, Teatro Mexicano, vol. IV, 41-42; and Benavides, Fray Alonso de Benavides’ Revised Memorial, 77-80. Both wrote second hand, Benavides from Europe two years later,
and Vetancurt well after the fact in 1694 in Mexico City, from Franciscan records. Presumably the Spanish soldiers were the primary source for this information, speaking to Zunis on the scene after the fact, along with Figueredo and Cuellar who survived. Both sources date the friar’s death to Sunday, February 22, 1632, fifty days before Easter, which fell on April 11, 1632. Vetancurt writes that,

Un Domingo de Quaresma, viendo que tardaban en venir a Missa, salió a buscarlos, encontró con algunos Idolatrías, y encendiendo en fervor les empeñó a predicar, y viendo se conjuraban a quitarle la vida, con un Cristo pintado en un Cruz que traía al cuello para su defensa, puesto de rodillos encomendándose al Señor murio predicando, flechado no fue hallado su cuerpo de los Soldados Christianos, porque los Barbaros se lo llevaron quitándole de la cabeza la piel para sus bayles gentílicos[…] (Teatro Mexicano, vol. III, 42).

The author goes on to say that soldiers looking for a relic of the martyr found his Franciscan chord which fell miraculously from the air into their hands, and that they cut it into portions to share amongst themselves. Benavides’s account is simpler (Benavides, Fray Alonso de Benavides’ Revised Memorial, 77-78), stating that when the friar summoned the converted and baptized Zunis to Mass, they rose up and attacked him en masse, bludgeoning him to death with clubs and inflicting other unnamed injuries:

[…] llamando a los indios convertidos y baptizados para que oyesen missa la amotinaro todos contra el y en tropa le embistieran y con macanas le hisieron pedacos la cabeza porque no les predicase mas la palabra del Señor y executaron en el muchas crueldades […] (1634, “Propaganda Fide,” 241r).

Twenty-nine years later Miguel de Noriega mentions in his Declaration that Letrado’s death was known to have come about because he summoned the Zuni to Mass “on a day of festival,” in other words, during their Indigenous religious observations (“Declaration of Miguel de Noriega, May, 1661,” 184). Noriega mistakenly lists Letrado’s first name as “Bartolomé” rather than Francisco. This independent testimony would seem to confirm Vetancurt’s more particular narrative of Letrado going out and interrupting a group of traditional religious practitioners rather than Benavides’s general mob of hostility. See also Hodge, History, 91-97; Crampton, The Zunis, 33-34; Benavides, Fray Alonso de Benavides’ Revised Memorial, 77-78; Hodge, Hammond, and Rey, Fray Alonso de Benavides, 292, 300-302, n. 107.

130 Arvide was a native of the Puerto de San Sebastian, which Vetancurt (Teatro Mexicano, Vol. IV, 62-63) places in Cantabria, but this was probably San Sebastian in Basque country. Vetancurt describes one of Arvide’s companions as a countryman of Arvide, from the town of Ambibia, another town in Basque Country. Arvide had professed in Mexico City in 1612, and began work in New Mexico residing in the convento at Picuris Pueblo, later moving with Benavides’ permission to congregate the Jeméz Indians after their initial revolt. On his way to the Zipias, Arvide stayed with Letrado in the Hawikku convento, purportedly prophesying that Letrado would be martyred there, and Arvide martyred on the road, which came to pass when Zunis attacked the traveling party on the night of February 27, 1632. Arvide was traveling with two soldiers, five Christianized Indians, and a mestizo servant named Lorenzo. The warriors first killed the soldiers and had left Arvide half alive, fearing to kill him outright. According to Vetancurt, Lorenzo finished the job in an attempt to appeal to the warriors, cutting off the friar’s right hand and scalping him, for which the Spanish later hung Lorenzo.

131 Perhaps Figueredo’s more culturally sensitive and conciliatory attitude contributed to his survival. He reappears in the documentary record in the 1638, when Juan de Prada consulted him as an expert in the missionization and conditions of New Mexico; see Prada, “Petition, September 26, 1638,” 106. In 1649 Figueredo was living and writing in the Franciscan convento of Tlaxcala, in central Mexico; Vetancurt, Teatro Mexicano, vol. IV, 97. Hodge (History, 90) suggests that perhaps Figueredo’s three years working among the Zunis “may have won somewhat of their affection through personal interest in their welfare and by his teachings,” which newly arrived Letrado and stranger Arvide did not share. Fray Agustín de Cuellar also survived his time among the Zuni, and later testified about Letrado’s death; see Hodge, Hammond, and Rey, Fray Alonso, 301, n. 107.

133 Scholes, Church and State, 108-109.

134 Hodge, History, 95; Bandelier, “An Outline,” 101. The 1643 date seems to come from the fact that the Zuni missions are unmentioned in a 1642 inventory of the New Mexico Missions; see Scholes, “Documents of the New Mexico Missions,” 48; and France V. Scholes, “Notes on the Jémez Missions in the Seventeenth Century,” El Palacio 44 (1938): 95. Although there is no evidence for an expedition for refounding the Zuni missions, there are numerous inscriptions at El Morro between 1632 and 1660, including the 1636 signatures of an armed expedition by civil officials Sargent-Major and Captain Juan de Archuleta, with ayudante Diego Martín Barba and alferes named Agustín de Ynojos; another 1636 inscription by Garsya; an incomplete inscription from 1640 (possibly Juan de Godoy); an incomplete inscription from 1641 by Bartolomé Romero, who might have been Fray Bartolomé Romero, a longtime missionary to the Hopis during this time, especially since part of his inscription is in Latin (although there was also a civil official by the same name); the 1646 inscription of Juan del Castillo along with multiple other anonymous inscriptions from that year, and the incomplete inscription of Juan de Archuleta dating to either the 1630s or 1650s. Another undated inscription appears to also belong to a Franciscan missionary, “EL PÉZQVERR[…]” while undated inscriptions of Luys Pacheco and Antonio de Zalas probably also belong to this period. See Slater, El Morro, 10, 59-60, 64, 69-70.

135 See Chapter 3, n. 89.

136 For the “burst of construction” at a number of missions around 1655, including Abó, Quarai, and possibly Pecos and Awatovi, see Ivey, “Un Templo,” 20; Ivey, In the Midst, 31.

137 “Declaration of Captain Diego de Truxillo, Santa Fe, September 22, 1661,” in Hackett, Historical Documents, vol. III, 181. It should be noted that Truxillo was an opponent of Mendizábal, who had removed him from his post as alcalde mayor of the Zuni and Hopi provinces. His was later reappointed to the post under the succeeding Governor Peñalosa; Scholes, Troubles Times, 68-69, 109; Minge, “Zuni in Spanish,” 35-36.

138 Reinforcing the disruptiveness of Mendizábal’s policies is the “Hearing of June 16, 1663,” (210) where it is claimed that the Governor’s hostility towards the Franciscans was felt as far away as the Zuni and Hopi towns.

139 “Hearing of July 3, 1665,” 258-259; Scholes, Troubles Times, 129.

140 “Hearing of May 11, 1663,” 141. Andrew Wiget (“Father Juan Greybeard,” 471), does not believe much should be made of Aguilar’s accusation, because of the charged, factional context and the frequency of this sort of allegation. For his part, Governor Mendizábal seems to put Velasco among the Hopi, leveling a hearsay accusation that the friar so disdained Spanish colonists that he ordered a man named Bartolomé de Ledesma to deliver his wife to friar at a “villa,” presumably for the friar’s sexual enjoyment. Mendizábal had not seen this order himself, and no witnesses were adduced to support this accusation made as part of answering all Inquisition charges against him by making counter-accusations against the Franciscans; see “Reply of Mendizábal,” 218. A friar named Francisco de Velasco was among the early missionaries to arrive in New Mexico during Oñate’s rule; see Gaspar Pérez de Villagrá, Historia de la Nueva México, 1610: A Critical and Annotated Spanish/English Edition, trans. and ann. Miguel Enciónas, Alfred Rodríguez, and Joseph P. Sánchez (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2004), 187. He was a cousin of Oñate, whom he joined at San Gabriel in 1600, and accompanied to Quivira in 1601; see Hammond, Hodge, and Rey, Fray Alonso, 203, n. 13. Velasco wrote a Memorial in 1609, making the case for continued support of the colony at a critical time when it was near abandonment; see Francisco de Velasco, “Memorial of Fray Francisco de Velasco, April 9, 1609,” in Hammond and Rey, Don Juan de Oñate, 1093-1097. He reappears in Mexico City as lector jubilado and provincial of the Provincia de Santa Evangelio from 1629-1634; Hammond, Hodge, and Rey, Fray Alonso, 203, n. 13. Presumably this is unlikely to be the same Velasco that Aguilar places at Zuni in 1655, who would have been at least in his seventies by that time.

141 Kessell, Kiva, Cross, and Crown, 227-228; for Socorro, see Scholes and Adams, “Inventories,” 31-34.

142 “Declaration of Fray Nicolás Enríquez,” 245-246.

143 Scholes, “Documents,” 56.
See France V. Scholes, 1672, “Biblioteca Nacional de México, Legajo 1, partes 1 + 2, Documentos 34; Transcription of ‘Inventario de los bienes y gastos de las misiones de Nuevo México,’” Mss. 867 Box 13, folder 8, CSWR, 27; and Table 10.1.

Hodge, History, 96.

Ivey, “The Greatest Misfortune,” 76; Scholes, Troublous Times, 253; Kessell, Kiva, Cross, and Crown, 217-222; Kessell, Pueblos, Spaniards, and the Kingdom, 103-112; Crampton, The Zunis, 36-37.

Missy Yatsattie, personal communication, September 24, 2015.

The confusion about the identity of the Hawikku friar who died comes from two seventeenth century sources. In a petition dated May 10, 1679, Fray Francisco Ayeta describes Fray Pedro de Ayala from Campeche as assigned to the Salinas mission at Abó, saying that Ayala had been stripped and had his head crushed by warclubs, with dead lambs arranged around his body in a tableau similar to that which Vetancurt would later describe at Hawikku; Francisco de Ayeta, “Petition [of Father Fray Francisco de Ayeta. Mexico, May 10, 1679],” in Hackett, Historical Documents, vol. III, 298; for the Spanish see P. Otto Maas, Misiones de Nuevo México (Madrid: Hijos de T. Minuesa de los Ríos, 1929), 52. Vetancurt later described “Pedro de Avila y Ayala” as coming to Mexico City from Yucatan in 1668, passing from there to New Mexico where he was eventually assigned to Hawikku, and died in a raid by having his head crushed with the mission bell, with dead lambs arranged around his naked body; Vetancurt, Teatro Mexicano, vol. IV, 286. Ivey (“Greatest Misfortune,” 96-97) believes that Ayeta confused two friars, each of whom had died prior to Ayeta’s 1775 arrival in New Mexico. Fray Alonso Gil de Avila (or “Davila”) was the guardian of Abó’s mission from 1672-1673, at which time the missionaries and Christianized Indians abandoned the pueblo and moved to Senecú Pueblo, where he died in an uprising in January 1675; Ivey, In the Midst, 231-233. Ayeta mistakenly conflated Ayala and Avila, placing the former’s death at Abó in 1672, perhaps with details from the latter’s death which actually took place three years later. Writing a decade and a half later from Mexico City, and probably drawing on Ayeta, Vetancurt further conflated the two friars as one, calling him “Pedro the Avila y Ayala” and placing his death in Hawikku, which scholars subsequently followed. See Francisco Antonio de la Rosa Figueroa, 1764, Bezero general, menologico y chronologico de todos los Religiosos que de las tres Parcialidades conviene á saber Padres de España, Hijos de Provincia, y Criollos ha avido en esta S. 36, Proc. 37 del S. 38º Evang. 39º, Ayer Ms. 1088, Newberry Library Special Collections, Chicago, IL, 314-315; Bandelier, “An Outline,” 106-107; Bandelier, Final Report, Part II, 338; Hodge, History, 99; Crampton, The Zunis, 36; Kubler, The Religious Architecture, 96. Likewise, Vetancurt confused the date, giving it as 1670, but Galdo’s 1772 manuscript inventory clearly contradicts this date, and as first-hand knowledge directly transmitted in manuscript from the hand of the guardian friar, it must take precedence over Vetancurt’s later, second-hand account. Another source close to the facts is Don Martin de Solís-Miranda’s Paracer del Fiscal from September 5, 1676, which gives the date of October 7, 1672 for the death of Pedro de Ayala, an account entirely supporting Ivey’s interpretation of the record; see Bandelier, “An Outline,” 107-108, n. 1. In his Final Report of Investigations, Bandelier (338, n. 3) transcribes a section of the original document, which reads:

Y lo que es mas que despues de haber muerto muchos christianos sin reserbar á los Párvulos [párulos] pasaron á dar muerta al Pe. Fr. Pedro de Ayala, ministro en el pueblo de Auico [Hawikku] en el día 7 de Octubre del año passado de 672.

From this document it would appear that members of the pro-Spanish faction at Hawikku may also have been targeted during this raid, including children (los Párvulos). Eleanor B. Adams and Fray Angelico Chávez (The Missions of New Mexico, 197) used the conflated name Avila y Ayala, but did not believe that the friar would have been killed only a few weeks after his arrival in the fall of 1672. They adduce a marginal note in the manuscript of Fray Vélez de Escalante’s Extracto de Noticias, in which someone wrote that “The Apaches attacked Tahuicú de Zuni in the year 1673. They captured almost all the women and children; They killed many Indians and Father Fray Pedro de Ayala; they burned the church; etc.” Escalante had studied documents in Santa Fe in the years 1776 to 1779, some of which no longer exist, and his work contains a great deal of information about New Mexico from 1678 to 1717; Kessell, Kiva, Cross, and Crown, 534 n. 2. On the basis of the Escalante marginal note, Adams and Chávez justify their dating of the Hawikku mission’s destruction to 1673; see also Kessell, Kiva, Cross, and Crown, 213, 216. The Escalante marginal note should not be dismissed out of hand, as it may draw on sources which have now been lost; however, I believe that it remains problematic, since it comes from an unknown author at an
unknown date, at least a century after the events in question, and relying upon unknown sources. The note reinforces Solis-Miranda’s account and Zuni oral history suggesting that there may have been other casualties from the Hawikku raid, but archaeological remains make clear that the town was not decimated to the extent that this marginal author seems to suggest. Of all the sources, Solis-Miranda seems to be the most reliable, getting the friar’s name correct, and writing very close to the date in question. In conclusion, I follow Ivey in accepting this date and name for the friar. As to Adams and Chávez’s suggestion that the few weeks of Ayala’s tenure in Hawikku were not enough to instigate an attempt to kill him, I would argue that it is equally possible that his arrival was in fact the triggering event. If the residents of Hawikku had preferred the lighter colonial footprint that came with visita status, Ayala’s arrival as full-time resident and guardian in the fall of 1672 would have been cause for alarm. Anti-Spanish factions within the Pueblo may have begun looking for an opportunity to do away with the interloper, perhaps through Apache allies. When his bodyguard Cisneros was not around, they took the opportunity to strike. Ayeta later conflated this account with others of the death of Avila, and an attack in Senecú in 1675, producing the garbled record that has endured in subsequent scholarship.

149 Vetancurt, Teatro Mexicano, vol. IV, 286.

150 Hodge, History, 99, 126 n. 213. Cushing (“Zuni Origin Myths,” 329) likewise suggests that at least some Zunis may have been complicit in the attack.

151 Pueblo Indians struck up similar alliances with Apaches and Navajos during the Pueblo Revolt; see Preucel, “Writing the Pueblo Revolt,” 3, 22; Curtis F. Schaafsma, “Pueblo and Apachean Alliance Formation in the Seventeenth Century,” in Preucel, Archaeologies of the Pueblo Revolt, 198-211; Brugge, “Pueblo Fractionalism,” 191-200. T. J. Ferguson even speculates that on some occasions, Zuni warriors may even have dressed as mobile Apache or Navajo raiders to stage attacks on the Spanish; see “Dowa Yalanne,” 37.


153 Wytsalucy told this story to Tribal Archivist Rose Wyaco in 1988, as part of NEA funded oral history recording project under the direction of the Zuni Archives Program and Andrew Wiget of New Mexico State University. It was published in Shears and Wyaco, “Hawikku,” 21-22. A couple of discrepancies between Wytsalucy and the evidence from Spanish documents and archaeology may point to the conflation of more than one account, telling of multiple raids, one destroying the mission, and another taking the wife (perhaps a concubine from the Spanish perspective) of the priest captive. This is not to say that Wytsalucy’s story was unfounded or inaccurate, but merely that it underwent the conflations, mixings, and thematic selections typical of all oral histories in the process of transmission and retelling. These discrepancies include as follows: 1). In Wytsalucy’s telling, the work day at Cholo:wa occurs for the purposes of planting crops, implying an event in the springtime, while Spanish documents point to the 1672 raid occurring in early October. 2). Ayeta apparently died within a few short weeks or months of his arrival in Hawikku. While he might plausibly have had obtained a sexual partner within this time, it seems a short time in which to arrange a marriage. 3). The archaeological evidence clearly demonstrates that Zunis continued to reside in Hawikku after its destruction, although in Wytsalucy’s version they abandon the community. 4). Wytsalucy’s version seems to depict Hawikku’s houses as totally burnt and devastated in the attack. While houses and storage rooms in the town were definitely burned in what looks like an attack near the end of its settlement history, the majority of the town did not exhibit this kind of destruction when excavated. 5). According to archaeologists, Cholo:wa was no longer occupied by the mid- to late-seventeenth century, making the story’s work-day pretext less plausible, although it is possible that Zunis would have maintained Cholo:wa’s fields even after residents relocated to other pueblos. In sum, the conflation of multiple stories about two different raids on the pueblo seems to be the most economic means of resolving these differences. The story of the women’s abduction may very well belong to a different attack than the raid which burnt the mission and killed Ayala. Other discrepancies, such as the amount of destruction, might well have gained in proportions over time and retellings, even though based in the same basic set of facts. The Solis-Miranda account and after-the-fact Escalante marginal note seems to suggest that rumors of a similar scale of destruction circulated amongst the colonists; see n.148, above. For archaeological assessment of Cholo:wa, see Kintigh, Settlement, Subsistence, and Society, 68.

154 This is the Spanish sense of abandonment; see Ivey, “Greatest Misfortune,” 89. Presumably Galdo was responsible for collecting what could be salvaged from the mission and reporting the death of Ayala. Typically, the
friars would remove the bell, sacred altar vessels, records, altar stone, and perhaps some of the liturgical vestments, though the burnt condition of the Hawikku mission probably prevented much of this salvage. No traces of silver or a formal altar stone were found during the excavations, so presumably they were collected, along with the miraculously blistered sculpture.

155 Juan de Bal [Val] was born in a town called El Bal or Val in Castille, and came to Mexico in 1671. Little is known about him, other than the assumption that he must have still been fairly young at the time of the revolt, since he had only professed nine years earlier. See “List and Memorial of the Religious whom the Indians of New Mexico Killed [1680],” in Hackett, Historical Documents, vol. III, 338; Vetancurt, Teatro Mexicano, vol. IV, 275; Crampton, The Zunis, 37-38; Wiget, “Father Juan Greyrobe,” 471. Perhaps he was from today’s Val de San Lorenzo, in Castilla y Leon.


157 “Letter of the very reverend father procurator and visitador general of the holy custodia of the provinces of New Mexico, Fray Francisco Ayeta, [to the viceroy. El Paso, August 31, 1680],” in Hackett and Shelby, Revolt of the Pueblo Indians, 50; “Letter from Father Fray Antonio de Sierra to the father visitador. [Fray Cristóbal, September 4, 1680],” in Hackett and Shelby, Revolt of the Pueblo Indians, 60; “Auto [of Antonio de Otermin. Fray Cristóbal, September 13, 1680],” in Hackett and Shelby, Revolt of the Pueblo Indians, 113; Wiget, “Father Juan Greyrobe,” 473. In fact, the Vargas expedition found two Spanish women with children living among the Zunis on Dowa Yalanne, see Wiget, “Father Juan Greyrobe,” 472; and Diego de Vargas, By Force of Arms: The Journals of Don Diego de Vargas, New Mexico, 1691-1693, ed. John Kessell and Rick Hendricks (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1992), 583-584.
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An even more cryptic note occurs in Vetancurt’s Menalogia (Teatro Mexicano, vol. IV, 275). In what may be in inadvertent revelation of a second Zuni friar, or confusion of the relationship between Juan de Bal and the unnamed friar who escaped, Vetancurt writes that the casualties of the revolt included, “En el de la Concepcion de Alona [possibly conflating the missions of Hawikku and Halona] el venerable padre fray Juan de Val, ambos de Castille […]” (emphasis added). Who was the other part of this “both” (ambos)? Perhaps this is simply a mistake, or perhaps it reveals a more intentional effort to write out of history the disgraced friar who renounced his habit and joined the apostate rebels, as the chronicler unintentionally reveals a slippage between the Juan that was to be remembered (de B/Val) with the Juan to be forgotten (Grey Robe). Or perhaps, as Wiget (“Father Juan Greyrobe,” 476) suggests, these were one and the same person. Vetancurt might have come upon some word of the surviving friar but was confused about his relationship to Juan de Bal whom Ayeta had declared martyred.


Wiget, “Father Juan Greyrobe,” 476. In any case, the archaeological remains of the Hawikku mission do not support an interpretation of a third occupation as a mission, following the 1672 destruction. If Juan Grey Robe had been stationed at Hawikku, he must have been living in another structure, similar to the original establishment phase mission.
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puede ofrecer esta pobre tierra” (Domínguez, “Copy of Spanish Transcription,” 330). In other words, in Domínguez’s disdainful estimation, it would be nothing more than a collateral altarpiece elsewhere.
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189 A year after their initial visit, Heye would gloat over his correct predictions, writing in one of his few mentions of the mission that, “Pep” [Herman Pepper] and I have been much amused at your experience with the church especially after the ‘call-down’ you gave me last year when I suggested the altar was at the end in which you found it. I believe that this church will tell a great deal of the history of Hawikuh, and I consider it one of the most important parts of the work.” Emphasis in original, see Heye to Hodge, June 21, 1919, MS.7.HHE.1.12 “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Corr., 1919,” FWH. Heye had apparently guessed that the altar would be found in the southwestern end of the ruins, and received Hodge’s “call down” or derision as a result. Hodge replied to Heye by supposing that got his idea about the altar’s location, “from the fact that I mentioned once that Mindeleff thought the northern end of the building was the altar end. There has been no clue to which was the altar end until we excavated the building, as there is no rule for the orientation of the Franciscan churches of New Mexico”; Hodge to Heye, June 26, 1919, “MAI Records” B193.18, NMAI Archives, Suitland, MD. See also, Hodge to Heye, June 15, 1919, “MAI
Records” B193.18, NMAI Archives; and Hodge to Nusbaum, June 19, 1919, “Geo. Heye-Heye Museum Am. Indian,” Box 3, Papers of Jesse Logan Nusbaum, NAA.
CHAPTER 5: HAWIKKU PUEBLO AND MISSION AS ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES

In 2002, an exhibition entitled “Hawikku: Echoes from Our Ancestors” opened at the A:shiwi A:wan Museum and Heritage Center (AAMHC) in Zuni Pueblo. Displayed in a restored trading post overlooking Halona Plaza (figure 5.1), standing over ancestral ruins of the Halona:wa South Pueblo, and adjacent to the former site of Cushing’s Hemenway House, the exhibition reverberates with Zuni history. In collaboration with the NMAI, this exhibit returned a selection of the artifacts that Hodge had excavated from Hawikku to the descendent community. Today, visitors to the AAMHC pass a mural representing Zuni origins and wander through exhibits of Hawikku’s pre-Hispanic artifacts, mission period remains (figure 5.2), and subsequent appropriation by anthropologists and archaeologists in the early twentieth century.

As part of this exhibition, AAMHC staff interviewed community elders, seeking their perspectives on Hawikku’s excavation. Among the responses, a ninety-three-year-old Zuni man said that “as a young boy, I remember seeing the wagons with lots of boxes, and then those wagons left. I always wondered, what was in those boxes, and where did it go?” With spare eloquence, his words voice childhood puzzlement over the massive expropriation of Zuni material culture that took place during a time of increasing outside pressure on the pueblo. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, federal assimilation policies sought to suppress Native cultural expressions while the railroad swept Zunis into new market dynamics and a cash economy. Anglo missionaries and soldiers actively interfered with tribal sovereignty, while
anthropologists and museums leveraged resources to gain unprecedented access to Zuni culture. In what was then a common practice, urban institutions removed the artifacts of Zuni history, making them readily available to non-Native publics in distant cities, while effectively inaccessible to their descendant community.

This chapter examines Hawikku’s history as an archaeological site, the associated personages, and institutional intersections through which the Purísima Concepción is known today. Its data, including photographs, field notes, and objects, are neither inevitable nor complete; these materials are the result of a particular confluence of tribal and national politics, anthropological methods, and individual personalities. This chapter contextualizes the Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition, tracing how researchers and community members created data, as well as the subsequent institutional history by which artifacts and documentation have come down to the present. Bruno Latour’s call for more thorough description of the full network of mediating objects and actors by which the history of science renders its subject of study influences my reconstruction of the Hawikku excavations. While I recognize that raw field notes and plans are not as informative as carefully synthesized analysis, this and succeeding chapters include many illustrations of the excavation documentation as part of representing the materiality of the scientific process as well as interpreting its results. Hawikku has engendered a history of incomplete analysis and missed opportunities resulting from the proclivities of the excavation’s leaders, their methodological limitations, and the subsequent institutional history of the MAI/NMAI.

The aspirations of Frederick Webb Hodge and George Gustav Heye frame this telling, but Jesse L. Nusbaum’s 1919 field season is of particular importance, when he excavated almost all of what is known of the Purísima Concepción. Nusbaum’s actions and documentation are the
primary lens through which the mission becomes visible, conditioning the interpretations and the
degree of certainty that Hawikku’s remnants can support. Winding into and out of view
throughout this account is the story of Zuni resistance to the disturbance of their ancestors, which
has been little told despite glimpses throughout the documentation attesting to it.

**The Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition**

In the last quarter of the nineteenth century, Anglo-American surveys and
anthropological expeditions began visiting Hawikku, generating a modest trail of artifacts and
documentation. The Mindeleff brothers were among the first Anglo-American researchers to
visit in 1885, producing a map with features not appearing in later studies, and photographs that
show the state of the mission ruins in the late-nineteenth century (figures 2.6, 5.3). In his
publication, Victor wrote little about the mission, but notes that the massive adobe walls of the
church survived in better condition than the thinner stone walls of the pueblo, and that remains of
single-story buildings and enclosures surrounded the church.⁵

The Hemenway Expedition visited Hawikku on multiple occasions in 1889-1890,
producing a photograph similar to the Mindeleff images (figure 4.51).⁶ Likewise, Bureau of
Ethnology/BAE researchers visited the ruins, collecting a few stone and ceramic artifacts.⁷ In
the early twentieth century, employees of the American Museum of Natural History (AMNH)
collected ceramic sherds from many sites in the region, including Zuni and Hawikku Pueblos.⁸
Altogether, early anthropologist visiting the Hawikku site provided documentation of its
conditions, possibly leaving behind a scatter of period artifacts as part of the site’s archaeological
remains (figure 5.4). Most important, the idea of excavating Hawikku originated during these early visits, coming to fruition in Hodge’s efforts from 1917 to 1923.

Hodge is the most important figure in Hawikku’s excavation history (figure 5.5). An Englishman who grew up in the United States, he attended college at what would be George Washington University, and became Cushing’s field secretary in 1886. He participated in Cushing’s excavations along the Salt River in Arizona (1886 to 1888), and at the Zuni sites of Halona:wa South and Heshotauthla (1888 to 1889), during which he often visited Hawikku. Of this time, Hodge would later say, “I just thought to myself, if the money could ever be arranged to have Hawikuh [sic] excavated, it would be the grandest thing.” He described it as “this pet project of mine […] which I had almost wept over years before when I first went down with the Hemenway Expedition. I saw this big ruin out here; oh, wouldn’t I like to dig in there.”

When Jesse Walter Fewkes took over the Hemenway Expedition, he soon relocated to Hopi sites in 1891. Hodge joined the BAE about this time, and assisted Fewkes at the Hopi ancestral ruins of Sikyatki a few years later. Hodge’s clerical skills made him valuable to the BAE, where he edited numerous reports; the *American Ethnologist* (1903 to 1916); and several encyclopedic projects. He rose in prominence to become the BAE’s “Ethnologist-in-Charge” in 1910, but had little opportunity for the “dirt archaeology” he preferred. He continued to think about Hawikku, and by 1912 had asked then-Lieutenant Governor Tsinaha (who also went by “Zuni Dick”) if he could excavate there. Tsinaha responded that,

> It is alright when you come next summer to dig in the old houses of Haw wee koo. You have my permission and undoubtedly that of the other headmen. I have not yet talked with the ‘cacique’ about it, but I think it is alright.

Tsinaha thus gave tentative approval without consulting other community leaders, but did not give permission to excavate burial grounds surrounding Hawikku.
George Gustave Heye’s acquisitive obsessions were the other driver of Hawikku’s excavation. He was a wealthy businessman who amassed an immense collection of Native material culture that would become the MAI and eventual core of Smithsonian Institution’s NMAI (figure 5.6). George H. Pepper introduced him to Hodge in 1904, and Hodge would go on to cultivate the tastes of this enthusiastic layman, who courted Hodge in turn to add credibility to his burgeoning museum in 1915.17 Heye’s pursuit of Native material culture was obsessive, relentless, indiscriminate, and wide-reaching.18 He bought collections, sponsored expeditions, and acquired material through dubious and illegal means, such as when his employees desecrated New Jersey’s Minisink Burying Ground in 1914. Hodge himself described Heye as simplistically acquisitive and disinterested in scientific data, saying that, “he didn’t care about any information after the collections were found […] Specimens were his great object in life. Information respecting them didn’t concern him.”19 When it came to studying the specimens in his collection, Hodge quotes Heye’s response as “Why bother about that? Costs money and what’s the use?” and notes the “devastating” impact this dismissive attitude had on MAI staff.20

With his collections scattered among warehouses and lofts in New York and the University of Pennsylvania Museum, Heye began founding a new museum in 1915, ultimately opening it in a building at Audubon Terrace in 1922. Due to his suspect collection practices and outsider status, he lacked credibility among establishment anthropologists. To counteract these negative perceptions, Heye offered Hodge the opportunity to pursue field excavations, co-opting his scholarly authority in the process.21

In the summer of 1915, Heye accompanied Hodge and Pepper to excavate Nacoochee Mound in White County, GA (9WH3).22 That fall, Heye headed west, meeting Hodge in Chicago and continuing by train to New Mexico. They visited Zuni for several days during the
week of October 17, 1915, taking “plenty of time to look the ruins over” (presumably Hawikku), as well as making ethnographic collections from Zuni Pueblo. Photographs document their visit, during which they may have stayed in the Hemenway House (figures 5.6-5.7), and several entries in NMAI’s catalogue confirm Heye’s visit to the Hawikku site during this trip.

a. Zuni Resistance to Excavating Hawikku

Upon returning from Zuni in 1915, Hodge applied for permission to excavate Hawikku on behalf of the MAI and U.S. National Museum. Assistant Secretary of the Interior Stephen T. Mather issued permission for 1916, with results to be published by the BAE and collections distributed between the museums. In contrast to Mather’s endorsement, Zuni community members were divided about digging at Hawikku, some supporting Hodge’s efforts, while others were resistant. It appears the Ethnologist-in-Charge eventually bullied his way to success.

Hodge’s proposal came at an increasingly fractious time in Zuni politics. Federal assimilationist policy, mismanagement of Zuni resources by the Department of the Interior, outside incursions on Zuni lands, and market forces pressed upon the community, exacerbating factional lines and eroding traditional social controls. Pandey notes that a personal rivalry between the influential Pino and Eriacho lineages, both of whom played key roles mediating between Zunis and outsiders, had become increasingly divisive by the 1890s. At the same time, newly arrived Anglos began to interfere with the Bow Priesthood, which had traditionally maintained order and suppressed individual pretensions as symptoms of witchcraft. The Bow Priests were frequently imprisoned and could no longer act against political fragmentation.

A personal rivalry between descendants of Lai-iu-ah-tsai-lu (known as Pedro Pino) and Jesus Eriacho crystalized into full-fledged political factionalism over the issue of Franciscan
requests to reestablish a mission at Zuni. From his arrival in 1906, Fray Anselm Weber had encountered resistance from members of what would become known as the Protestant faction of Zunis. Concurrently, a smaller faction with the support of Superintendent R. J. Bauman (himself a Roman Catholic) wanted to reestablish the mission, becoming known as the Catholics. These factional titles do not refer to specific religious beliefs, since most of the participants remained in the traditional Zuni religious system; rather, they refer to differing strategies of political alliance.

Federal policy encouraged cultural assimilation through Indian agents, missionaries, boarding schools, land allotments and religious suppression, seeking as Richard Henry Platt described, to “kill the Indian, and save the man.” Zunis resisted assimilation. According to tribal Governor William J. Lewis, the assimilationists “do not respect [Zuni] feelings or rights and treat them as animals or something that is to be driven.” One response to these external pressures was to cultivate Anglo allies, who then became embroiled in tribal politics. Anthropologists were working in a salvage paradigm to preserve as much information about Native customs as possible, and Zuni Protestants saw the attentions of Cushing, Stevenson, and Hodge as beneficial in maintaining cultural integrity against assimilation policy. Thus, they were more willing to share information, sell material culture, and support archaeological proposals. Catholics took a more conservative stance, opposing the release of information to researchers. As an outsider reading this history, it appears to me that both factions sincerely sought to protect and perpetuate Zuni culture, but sharply disagreed on the means to do so, and deeply distrusted one another’s motives.

These external pressures and internal factions directly inform the dispute over Hodge’s excavations, which overlap the years of the Catholic mission’s reestablishment. Through the
Hemenway Expedition, Hodge had existing relationships with members of the Protestant faction, and he aligned himself with their political interests.\textsuperscript{34} In 1912, the council of priests appointed Protestant faction member Tsinahe as Lieutenant Governor, to assist fellow Protestant Governor Lewis in attending the community’s needs and mediating with outsiders.\textsuperscript{35} Tsinahe’s quick invitation to come “dig the old houses of Haw wee kuh,” thus marks an initial moment of confidence among the Protestant faction.\textsuperscript{36} Margaret Lewis, wife of the Governor, followed with a letter seeking Hodge’s official support for expanding the reservation’s boundaries. Lewis also sought the replacement of Superintendent Bauman, stating that she feared he would eliminate Zuni dances and religious fraternities.\textsuperscript{37} These early letters ask often when Hodge would return to Zuni, and Zunis obviously had a high regard for his influence in Washington.\textsuperscript{38}

A tumultuous year followed Hodge and Heye’s 1915 visit, with Tsinahe’s dismissal from office and efforts to reestablish the mission increasing.\textsuperscript{39} In a carefully worded letter to Hodge, Governor Lewis claims to have no personal objections to Hawikku excavations and the money they would bring to the community, but felt obligated to represent the objections of the pueblo. First, Zunis remembered Cushing with suspicion and had an outstanding grievance over his Hemenway House (figure 5.7), which a trader named Douglas D. Graham had since purchased and turned it into a trading post.\textsuperscript{40} According to Lewis, Cushing had promised that, “if they would let him build at Halonawe [sic] that the house would go to the Zunis, but he did not keep his word and that it belongs to the Americans […]” Cushing’s treatment of the Hemenway house raised suspicions that Hodge might likewise, and take Hawikku’s ruins away from the Zuni people.\textsuperscript{41}

Lewis’s second objection was the general, shared belief among Zunis that ancestral remains should not be disturbed. As he puts it, “my people all say let the things stay buried.
They do not go and dig in the white man’s grave yard and why can not [white men] do the same[?]”42 This resistance to excavation is attested elsewhere. Ruth Bunzel reports Zunis expressed “a good deal of discomfort” about Hodge’s excavations, “with their feelings about the contamination of the dead, their fear of ruins, etc.,” and Hodge himself thanks the Zuni workmen, who “because they were staunch friends, were willing to sacrifice their age-old tabus [sic.] against disturbing the bones of their ancient ones and in this way helped to make the work a marked success.”43

In a pair of letters to Lewis and Tsinahe, Hodge responded peevishly to these objections, seemingly taking personal offence, saying that, “If the Zuñis do not want me, I shall not come to Zuñi any more,” even though his visits were not the issue.44 He discounts mistrust over the Hemenway House, asserting that its Anglo ownership was an unintended result of Cushing’s premature death. Zunis need not worry about the Hawikku ruins, for “every Zuñi man knows that when [Hodge] says he will give the Hawikuh house [ruins] to the Zuñis, he will do just what he says and that the Zunis would have the house as soon as the digging was finished.” He couples this reassurance with a veiled threat that he could ask to have the site removed from the reservation:

[...] the Government wants me to dig in the old Hawikuh houses and the Secretary of the Interior has given me permission to go ahead. As you know, if the Government wanted to do so, it could put Hawikuh outside of the reservation and then the Zuñis would not have anything more to do with it; but I do not ask the Government to do anything of that kind.45

Hodge insists on his respect for Zuni wishes while raising the possibility that their ancestral lands could be irrevocably lost and he would dig with impunity. This implied threat must have resonated strongly at a time when Zunis were entreating Washington for the return of more of their land, and were acutely aware of the federal government’s imperious power. It is unclear
whether Hodge actually had the political clout to give or take away the “Hawikuh House” as he implies, but coming from the DC-based “Ethnologist-in-Charge,” Zunis had to take his threat seriously.

Hodge discounted resistance as the opinions of “only the little men,” and the “young fellows who want to show their importance, and that the real substantial men of the tribe would have no objection if the matter were placed before them.” As an incentive, he offers good wages for Zuni participants, and personally promises to furnish Tsinahe with a new cane affirming his position as Lieutenant Governor, though it is unclear if he even still held this office.46 In pressing his case, Hodge petulantly says that,

I have always treated the Zuñis kindly and thought they regarded me as their friend. I never before asked a Zuñi to do anything for me without paying him for it, I have always talked straight with them. I have given them medicine when they were sick, and food when they were hungry, and when Capitan Lochi was shot, I stayed with him and did everything I could for him day and night. Now the only time I ask the Zunis to do me a favor they hunt around for an excuse for not doing it.47

Hodge’s ungracious response to Zuni concerns over what was more than a mere favor is an ugly blemish on his otherwise well-regarded reputation, as he strong-armed his way towards an acceptance if not approval of the ruin’s excavation. This acceptance was slow in coming, however, and as 1916 advanced the dispute over the Catholic mission exacerbated community divisions. In April, Hodge was waiting for a response, and wrote to another of his Zuni correspondents, Nina Hotina Cheama that, “it is foolish to stand in the way of digging up Hawikuh, as the Zuñis have no use for the old ruins.”48

Hodge had determined by the end of June that excavations would not be possible in 1919, but delayed sharing this news with Heye, who was wondering by August why he had not heard anything, and when Hodge would leave for Zuni.49 The anthropologist replied that obligations in Washington would keep him out of the field until September, to which Heye urged him to “make
a break” anyway.\textsuperscript{50} Hodge evidently feared that if he was unable to take to the field, Heye would give his dream project to fellow archaeologist Neil Judd, and only admitted the real problem in late August. In response, Heye urges Hodge to reapply for a 1917 permit, and writes that he,

\text{\text{\[\ldots\] would not consider, for a minute, starting the work there with Judd as I feel it imperatively necessary for you to go there and straighten out the matters with the Indians themselves, before we do anything. There is evidently some trouble at Zuni and all factions should feel perfectly contented before we go in there to do any work. If there is an ill feeling on the part of one of the clans it would not of course be dangerous to us but at the same time, they could cause us a very great deal of inconvenience.}^51\}

Correctly or not, Hodge and Heye understood the factional divisions in Zuni to be at least partly a clan dispute.

Throughout 1916, Tsinahe and other Zunis continued to wonder when the archaeologists would show up.\textsuperscript{52} I have not found an explicit permission from the Zunis, and it may be that Hodge simply proceeded without it. Zunis, such as an older man named Gaialito (figure 5.8), continued occasional resistance to the excavations. He objected to disturbing ancestral remains, becoming in Hodge’s words, “a little ugly about it.” Yet Gaialito eventually joined the efforts and became a trusted excavator.\textsuperscript{53}

Although Hodge was generally counted as popular among his Zuni workmen, his implication in tribal factionalism is also part of his legacy.\textsuperscript{54} In the end, Zunis opposed to the excavation of Hawikku were unable to halt the expedition, but this debate spurred more critical scrutiny of future attempts to work on ancestral sites.\textsuperscript{55} It also had lasting political ramifications as the Catholic faction soon mounted an effective resistance to Hodge’s associate Owen Cattell, when he attempted to film sacred \textit{Shalako} observances for the AMNH in December 1923.
b. Timeline and Objectives of the Hawikku Excavations

Hodge worked at Hawikku from 1917 until 1923, with funding almost exclusively from Harmon Hendricks, a founding trustee of the MAI. Ultimately his excavators would clear more than 370 pueblo rooms as well as the mission complex, uncovering about 1000 burials of Zuni ancestors, and conducting additional work at outlying sites such as Kechiba:wa. Finally, the expedition made ethnographic collections and documented contemporary Zuni cultural activities through photographs and film.

By 1917 Hodge had determined to begin excavations, with Heye’s enthusiastic support. He left for New Mexico in April to make arrangements and establish semi-permanent facilities known as Camp Harmon northwest of the site (figure 5.9), with excavations beginning by late May. Heye sent MAI employees Alanson Buck Skinner and Edwin F. Coffin to assist. The first year concentrated on burial grounds west of the Hawikku promontory. In that slope Hodge claimed to be “meeting with abundant success […] having] struck a rich cemetery and […] turning out some fine things.” This first year would ultimately uncover about 277 burials among those deposits, and the foundations of several rooms.

In 1918, Hodge left the BAE for the MAI, allowing Heye’s museum to take full control of the excavations. That field season continued to focus on Hawikku’s burial grounds, pushing the number of graves to about 1000, partly from the western cemetery, but especially north and northeast of the town. George and Thea Heye visited in early August, with George’s cavalier attitude on full display as he treated Zuni ancestral remains as personal prizes. He requested Hodge “save that good little cemetery for us so that we will have something to dig,” and that he “be sure to have some ‘skellies’ [burials] ready.” Heye seems to have believed factional
tensions in Zuni had diminished, and purchased engraved silver badges for tribal officials in hopes of further placating the community.\textsuperscript{64}

The 1919 field season was longest, and most important for my analysis, as Nusbaum excavated the Purísima Concepción (see below). Hodge arrived in the field on June fifth, dividing the workmen into teams, with two Zunis helping Nusbaum at the mission and the remainder starting in a refuse heap on the pueblo’s southeastern side and digging up into the rooms of Blocks E and D.\textsuperscript{65} As work progressed, the archaeologists took photos and mapped the individual rooms, and a clearer understanding of the site’s chronology emerged.\textsuperscript{66} They also conducted work at nearby Kechiba:wa.\textsuperscript{67} Burials were not a goal for 1919, but the archaeologists found additional graves to the northeast (numbers 1011 to 1256), under the mission church floor, and at Kechiba:wa. Notably Harmon Hendricks accompanied the Heyes on a visit in the first week of August.\textsuperscript{68} Clips of movie footage from their visit suggest it was the first season to use film as a medium of documentation.\textsuperscript{69} Hodge and Nusbaum left for collecting activities in Arizona and Utah on August 31, 1919, and only Nusbaum would return and finish the mission excavations by October 17, 1919.\textsuperscript{70}

In 1920, Hodge and Nusbaum arrived around June sixteenth.\textsuperscript{71} Work focused on clearing domestic spaces throughout the pueblo (Rooms 166 to 272). Heye hoped the houses would be “pretty well exploited” by the end of the year, but work was diverted when round kiva chambers of Chaco-style masonry were found on the plain to the southwest, at what Hodge called “Site I.”\textsuperscript{72} Efforts to produce ethnographic films also begun in 1920 at Thea’s initiative, who shipped a Movette camera and tripod to the crew for “some movies[…] of a dance at Zuni,” despite the fact people in Zuni and Ojo Caliente had been resistant to any pictures the previous year.\textsuperscript{73} Nusbaum continued as assistant, and although he is less visible in the field notes, Hodge credits
him with “practically all the photographs” that year. Some of his attention may have been diverted to courting Aileen Baehrens O’Bryan of Santa Fe (figure 5.10). Heye’s paternalism shows in his strong disapproval of this match. Nusbaum departed with Hodge on September 9, 1920 and would not return. He and Aileen married en route to Utah, where Jesse excavated the DuPont Cave that autumn. Aileen assisted him in the field and contracted pneumonia during a heavy snowstorm. Her hospitalization in New York City cost more than Nusbaum could afford and his relationship with Heye soured when he was forced to ask for a loan. Nusbaum soon found employment elsewhere as Superintendent of Mesa Verde National Park in May of 1921.

That year, Hodge arrived in New Mexico with assistants Coffin and Donald A. Cadzow by the twentieth of June. He continued at Site I, excavating a second kiva and the surrounding precinct (figure 5.11), as well as finding more burials on the northern side of the pueblo. Work continued on all of the room blocks except E, including at least rooms 261 through 344. The Heyes again visited, arriving on July 28 with a Dr. Fleming who attempted a medical study of Zunis based on blood tests. It is unclear when the 1921 season ended, but prior to returning, Hodge undertook a stratigraphic trenching project, which he had apparently conceived the previous year, yielding the most scientifically rigorous part of the excavations. His workmen cut through Hawikku’s plaza in uniform one-foot increments, collecting all painted sherds by level down to undisturbed soil (figure 5.12). This exercise established a series of painted ceramic types at Hawikku and their change through time. While trenching, the excavators came upon a square kiva, 2.13 m. (7’) below grade, its wooden ceiling still in place (figure 5.13).

The MAI sponsored no fieldwork at Hawikku in 1922 for unclear reasons, although Hodge claimed it was because of preparations for opening the new museum. He would later
say Heye wanted Hendricks’s money for something else, and put Hawikku on hold. Hodge continued to think about Hawikku and wrote to one of the workmen, Lorenzo Chaves, requesting a wood sample from the square kiva roof. Chaves replied after he and Awstie collected it from the kiva’s large, central beam, the first dendrochronology at the site.

In 1923, the MAI’s permit authorized a joint venture with Hodge continuing at Hawikku, and Samuel K. Lothrop working at Kechiba:wa for Louis C. G. Clarke and Cambridge’s University Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology. Hodge excavated burials south of Hawikku (numbers 1277 to 1331), continued working on Blocks B and D (rooms 421 to 444), and returned to rooms from previous seasons. The Clarke excavations included a site survey, trenching, and clearing of about ninety-five rooms (including a kiva), but the second expedition led to tensions with Hodge’s crew, and the Clarke Expedition ended by September. Hodge and Heye expected 1923 to be their last season at Hawikku, and by September were planning for disassembling Camp Harmon.

In retrospect, one of 1923’s most significant undertakings was Heye’s commission of Owen Cattell to produce ethnographic films of everyday tasks and religious observations (figure 5.14). Cattell left New York by the end of June, equipped with 5000 feet of film, ultimately shooting twice that amount, and developing and editing it upon his return in mid-September. Heye’s 1923 letters are full of happiness at Cattell’s accomplishments, which “will be of the greatest value,” part of what he felt sure would be “the start of a most important phase of our Museum work.”

Extending Thea’s 1920 desire to film Zuni dances, Cattell’s work conflicted with Zunis’ growing distaste for the anthropological gaze of Anglo interlopers, as Nusbaum noted in 1919. The community allowed Cattell’s filmmaking during the 1923 field season, but there were
suspicions Hodge had arranged to film sacred Shalako ceremonies that winter. The Catholics, who did not assist at Hawikku and had experienced setbacks from Hodge’s involvement in tribal issues, represented conservative resistance to further filming. Accounts vary, but as Cattell was filming, Zunis got in front of the camera to obscure proceedings and eventually confiscated it. As with other disputes, both factions were committed to protecting traditional expression of Zuni religion, but sharply disagreed on how to do so. As a result of the Shalako controversy, Protestants were discredited, and the Catholic faction took over tribal offices prohibiting any further recording of religious ceremonies. It was landmark in Zuni relations with outsiders, as the pueblo took an active role in shaping their representations among anthropologists. Even if Hodge had wanted to continue work at Hawikku after 1923, it would not have been possible following the political turmoil of the Shalako films.

Not unlike many early American excavations, the Hendricks-Hodge Expedition lacked an explicit, premeditated research design, but many objectives were clear. First and foremost was the acquisition of specimens in volume and variety, or as Nusbaum would put it, getting “that which [George] hollers for.” Heye paid lip service to Hodge’s scientific objectives, but seems to have had little understanding of archaeology except as a means of acquiring Native artifacts. While happy to receive as many ceramic pots as possible, he had no interest in unreconstructed sherds or bulky, repetitive artifacts such as ground stone. When it came to faunal and botanical remains, he allowed no more than small samples. He also used the expedition to expand his collection of ethnological materials from living Zunis. Hendricks joked in 1918, that if Hodge kept up his archaeological successes, they would have to “put up rubber sides to the Museum” to accommodate Heye’s endlessly expanding collection.
Hodge also relished the adventure of acquiring new specimens, but had a stronger appreciation for their informative, scientific value. He emphasized Hawikku’s potential to verify the historic record of Spanish encounters, and believed the site would illuminate the movement and interactions of pre-Hispanic Native peoples, based in a mistaken belief that two separate cultural groups had occupied it at different times. Hodge equated earlier black-on-white/red pottery types with an “ancient” settlement of Anasazi people different from Zunis, and did not pursue excavations to the lowest room levels and earliest deposits, meaning that Hawikku’s archaeological origins remain unknown. He believed that after those “ancient” occupants abandoned the site, ancestral Zunis reoccupied it with distinctive polychromed glazewares.¹⁰³

Hodge’s hypothesis of cultural discontinuity was probably incorrect, but his seriation of Hawikku’s ceramics was a major contribution, which only lacked Richard B. Woodbury and Nathalie F. S. Woodbury’s later efforts to modernize the series and its terminology.¹⁰⁴ In general, Hodge confined himself to descriptive writing, but acknowledged the largely untapped potential of Hawikku’s artifacts for exploring the symbolism and mental landscape of ancestral Zuni people and wider cultural development in the Southwest.¹⁰⁵

**Hodge’s Excavation Methods**

A basic understanding of the expedition’s techniques is essential for interpreting its results. Primary documents include eleven green notebooks by Hodge, Nusbaum, and Coffin, large map sheets, and over 1000 glass-plate photographic negatives and prints (figure 5.15).¹⁰⁶ Hawikku’s excavations were a product of their time, prior to the advent of absolute chronologies and regional ceramic seriations. Many techniques now common, such as tree-ring dating
(dendrochronology), pollen collection, and flotation sampling of fine botanical evidence had not yet been developed. Hodge’s crew rarely screened excavated material and discarded artifacts that were heavy or repetitive.\textsuperscript{107} After nearly a century, his techniques appear rudimentary, but even by the developments of his time, they were already somewhat outdated. Hodge employed three basic approaches depending on the context and objectives of each field season.

\textbf{a. Vertical Face Trenching}

In Hawikku’s cemeteries and ash heaps, Hodge relied upon vertical-face trenches, with Zuni workmen digging through the deposits from one end to the other.\textsuperscript{108} They began by excavating a trench downward, and then cutting into its side or vertical face with pick axes to loosen overburden and shovels to throw it behind them (figure 5.16). When they encountered an artifact or burial, they removed the overburden to expose the discovery and Hodge or his assistants stepped in to work on the remains with trowel and brush (figure 5.17). They wrote quick descriptions in the field notes, surveyed the location, and measured its depth below the surface. After collecting artifacts and remains in individual paper bags, trenching would begin again. The workmen usually spread backdirt away from the ruins using a horse-drawn scraper, but in the case of the western cemetery, the trench and piled backdirt remain visible where they left them to this day (figure 5.18).

This excavation method allowed identification and extraction of widely scattered deposits, but was less effective in documenting relationships between burials, artifacts, and their larger context. Survey coordinates produced a general map of horizontal relationships (figure 5.19), but finer details of associations among artifacts and remains are poorly recorded. Vertical control was deficient, with no information about the stratification of deposits, except their depth
beneath the variable surface level. The excavators’ rapid advance and lack of screening must have overlooked countless small sherds and artifacts.

This approach drew on Hodge’s prior experiences with the Hemenway and BAE expeditions. At Los Muertos in Arizona, Cushing had employed a mix of techniques that he worked out on the spot, beginning with transecting trenches through a mounded ruin, which he then expanded as a shallow vertical face trench.\(^\text{109}\) Sikyatki’s 1895 excavations were even more similar to Hodge’s vertical-face trenches at Hawikku. Fewkes describing the Sikyatki method as follows:

```
Having found the location of the graves by means of small prospecting holes sunk at random, the [Hopi] workmen were aligned and directed to excavate a single long, deep trench, removing all the earth as they advanced […] A shout that anyone had discovered a new grave in the trench was a signal for the others to stop work, gather around the place, light cigarettes, and watch me or my collaborators dig out the specimens with knives.\(^\text{110}\)
```

Hodge assisted at Sikyatki, and if one substitutes trowels for knives, this account could just as easily describe his work in Hawikku’s graveyards two decades later.

### b. Room Clearing

As excavations progressed from burial grounds to architectural spaces, Hodge “cleared” and defined each room individually. Based on wall alignments, he assigned a workman to each room, who removed fill with pick and spade until reaching the floor, placing any notable artifacts or sherds on top of a nearby wall or in a paper artifact bag.\(^\text{111}\) They scraped the excavated soil away or filled previously cleared rooms nearby to stabilize their fragile walls (figures 5.20-5.21).\(^\text{112}\) If a workman encountered human remains, architectural features, or significant artifacts, the archaeologists would usually step in to expose and document the finds. Once a
workmen reached the floor, he swept it clean for measurements and photographs (figure 5.22), after which he could remove the floor and begin again on the next occupation level.

Hodge had ample previous experience with room clearing as a technique at Los Muertos, Halona:wa South, and Heshotauthla. This method produced a basic stratigraphy of overlaid occupation levels, which Hodge found to be a “revelation” that could be “plainly read[...] like a book” after two years of trenching through graveyards without working stratigraphy. The result was a stratigraphic column of superimposed floor levels in each room, with artifacts batched according to the intervening spaces. This method defined wall arrangements and took advantage of the large workforce, uncovering a tremendous number of rooms and occupations levels in three and a half field seasons. It was less useful for the precise work of interpreting artifacts by their depositional contexts.

Hodge depended on untrained laborers to recognize floor levels and features as they dug, and they likely overlooked many less-distinct remains. The field notes are often ambiguous, attributing artifacts to general occupational levels, but not specifying whether they were on the floor or in the fill. This distinction matters, because artifacts on the floor were likely associated with the room’s use, but those in fill may reflect activities on the roof that spilled in during the ceiling’s collapse; they may have been introduced from elsewhere to fill the room with rubbish as foundation for new construction; or they may simply have washed in after the space lay in ruins. In some cases, notes specify an artifact’s vertical location, but many are impossible to accurately place. Horizontal controls were equally imprecise; the excavators surveyed and measured each room, but rarely noted the specific location of individual artifacts inside their walls. Few photographs show artifacts in place, and the archaeologists handled them
indifferently, focusing on ceramics that could be reconstructed or which had unique ornamental motifs, but failing to screen the fill for small pieces and discarding many sherds.

c. Arbitrary-Level Stratigraphic Trenching

With his 1921 trench across the main plaza, Hodge moved into new methodological territory. He had not initially planned this major undertaking, but responded to leading developments at other Southwestern sites. The trench stretched 22.86 meters long by 3.35 meters wide (75’ x 11’), and ultimately reaching 4.57 meters (15’) in depth (figures 5.12, 5.23). It transected the plaza in a roughly east-west direction in arbitrary 30 centimeter (12”) levels, from which Hodge collected all painted sherds by level.117 Through his previous experiences, he could already distinguish early and late ceramic types, but the arbitrary levels of the plaza trench allowed him to begin developing a formal, chronological study of their styles.118 Hodge worked out a statistical analysis of the trench deposits, and published an initial description of his ceramic series in 1923.119 Woodbury and Woodbury later correlated his descriptions to current terminology, establishing the formal types and chronology of ancestral Zuni ceramics.120

d. Analysis

Assessments of Hawikku’s excavation have been mixed. Brenda L. Shears calls Hodge’s techniques “sophisticated for the times” and Don D. Fowler compares them favorably.121 Analysis of the historic context, however, shows many of Hodge’s methods were already somewhat dated, and Heye’s influence was especially detrimental, prioritizing display specimens over contextual data. Gregory and Wilcox go so far as to describe it as a “largely botched” effort in light of the vast quantity of archaeological data lost in the excavation.122 Subsequent
researchers have also criticized Hodge’s failure to investigate Hawikku’s earliest levels, based in his misguided notion of cultural discontinuity. Central to assessing Hodge’s legacy is his use of stratigraphic methods. Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury incorrectly describe him as “a pioneer in the use of stratigraphic chronology in American archaeology.” It is more accurate to say he was an early, partial adopter of these techniques.123

Stratigraphic excavation is based on the law of superposition, the assumption that in normal conditions the oldest deposits will be the lowest, lying beneath progressively more recent levels. European archaeologists began applying stratigraphic methods as early as 1790, but with the exception of an excavation by Thomas Jefferson in 1785, it was not used in the Americas until Manuel Gamio’s 1911 work in the Valley of Mexico.124 Shortly thereafter, four young AMNH archaeologists deployed stratigraphic methods and pottery seriation in the Southwest. Nels Nelson learned stratigraphic techniques at Castillo Cave in France, and returned to apply them at San Cristóbal, NM in 1914, where he excavated a stratified section of ash heap ten feet deep in one foot unit levels, separating the sherds to generate a relative chronology.125 In 1916, Alfred L. Kroeber developed a chronological series of Zuni ceramics from surface collections, while Leslie Spier conducted stratigraphic trenching at five Zuni sites from 1916 to 1917.126 Another AMNH employee, Earl Morris joined Nelson to learn his techniques and applied them at Aztec Ruin (1916 to 1921).127

At the same time, A. V. Kidder independently developed stratigraphic excavation at Pecos. Kidder had learned the basic principles from Egyptologist George A. Reisner at Harvard around 1909, and corresponded with Nelson about San Cristóbal. Kidder began at Pecos in 1915, finding a situation almost identical to Hodge’s western slope at Hawikku two years later. Kidder trenched into a 250-foot-wide section of stratified midden 20 feet deep, and as he
advanced uphill paused to excavate stratigraphic columns by horizontal levels, collecting and separating the sherds to yield the first ceramic chronology for the Rio Grande area to be widely accepted by archaeologists.128

In the ash heaps and burial grounds surrounding Hawikku, Hodge encountered a similar situation, with burials and rubbish in deep deposits ascending the hillside. His notes reveal that at least twice he toyed with stratigraphic documentation, seemingly without clear plan or idea of the necessary information.129 Hodge knew that stratigraphic data and a working ceramic series were important, but either did not know how to achieve them in his early field season, or was unwilling to invest time recording the data. Although Kidder’s publication came after Hodge left for New Mexico in 1917, he should have known Nelson’s 1916 publication and Spier’s work nearby at Zuni sites. He could also have drawn on his own 1915 excavations with Heye and Pepper at Nacoochee Mound, which exhibited a clear understanding of superpositioning as an indicator of chronological succession, including the publication of a cross section with measured descriptions of each stratum (figure 5.24).130

From the work of his younger colleagues and his own experiences in Georgia, there is evidence that Hodge could have worked out an application of stratigraphic concepts to Hawikku from the start, but he appears to have been disinterested in exploring Hawikku’s stratigraphy. Instead he followed the decades-old methods of the Hemenway and Sikyatki excavations for the first four seasons. Perhaps Heye’s desire for large numbers of display specimens interfered with the slow work of excavating stratigraphic columns; or perhaps Hodge struggled in the field to figure out the techniques. In adopting a loose stratigraphy of layer-by-layer room clearing, he drew on some recent innovations but without the rigor of Nelson, Spier, or Kidder. Instead of
the objective, scientific ethos of their well-planned and published research designs, Hodge’s efforts followed the grand scale and romantic ad-hoc approach of his early days with Cushing.\textsuperscript{131}

Only in his fifth season (1921) did Hodge catch up to the field. His plaza trench yielded the first systematic, statistically viable ceramic stratigraphy for the site, replicating Spier’s small trenches from four years earlier at a massive scale. Two years later, Hodge would publish his ceramic series.\textsuperscript{132} Finally, his collection of tree-ring samples for dendrochronological dating (1922) aligned him with the other great innovation of the time: an absolute chronology based on wood samples.\textsuperscript{133} A. E. Douglass first collected tree-ring data to study climatic effects in 1904, and ten years later Wissler suggested its application to archaeology. Morris began adding archaeological samples to Douglass’s collection in 1916, and 1923 marked the first of three “Beam Expeditions” collecting hundreds of samples across the U.S. Southwest. By 1929, Douglass had completed his series, allowing absolute dating of regional ruins.\textsuperscript{134}

Thus, it was not until his final seasons at Hawikku that Hodge fully integrated current archaeological advancements, combining stratigraphic excavation techniques of Nelson, Spier, and Kidder with Kroeber’s seriation and Douglass’s dendrochronology. Had these developments infused Hodge’s methods from the start, Hawikku’s data would have been much improved, but work would have slowed, and the expedition could not have recovered the same volume of artifacts. Hodge was aware of recent archaeological innovations and eventually adopted them, but was not an innovator himself. Instead, it is the sheer scale of his excavations and unequalled artifact assemblage that make his work at Hawikku important. While Heye’s delight in acquiring specimens drove rapid, massive excavations, Hodge also deserves some of the blame. In contrast to the more exacting techniques then coming into practice, he initially elected to use
methods familiar from his early years, which were consonant with the romantic spirit of Cushing’s grand project, reliant upon the unfettered whim of the archaeologist-adventurer.

**Jesse L. Nusbaum and the Hawikku Mission**

The forgoing discussion of Hodge’s general excavation methodology helps to determine what inferences one can validly draw from the Hawikku results. Regarding the mission, it is not entirely accurate to say it was “thoroughly investigated using the best available scientific techniques of the day.” The results from the Purísima Concepción are the products of excavator Nusbaum’s personality and the particular pressures of the 1919 season. Weather, incorrect presumptions about the mission’s size, and an overly ambitious plan led to hurried, incomplete documentation and unexcavated remains. Reuse of mission adobes at Ojo Caliente (figures 4.52, 5.25) had left the layout of the ruins indecipherable when Hodge and Heye planned its excavation in 1918. The *convento* was a low mound of disorderly stone slabs and waist-high overgrowth hiding its true expanse, which would ultimately require extending the field season and further work in 1920. Despite declaring the mission’s importance, Hodge and Heye had little more to say about it, and it became a virtually independent excavation under Nusbaum’s direction.

After service in World War I, Nusbaum rejoined Heye’s staff in April of 1919, and participated in the next two years of excavations. Late in life, Nusbaum had the attentive seriousness of an experienced administrator, and was a charismatic, respected lecturer. In contrast, writings from his younger years reveal a good-humored prankster, gregarious storyteller, and vigorously creative person who tried his hand at anything. He remained lifelong
friends with Hodge, while Heye viewed “Jess” with great paternal fondness until their falling out in 1920. Nusbaum’s apparent easy friendship with the Zuni workmen is also evident in his warmly humanizing and intimate portraits of them, very unlike the typological coldness of other anthropological photographs of the era (figure 5.8, 5.26).

a. **Excavation Process and Timeline**

Nusbaum began on the mission by mid-June 1919, as Hodge continued digging on the hill above. With two Zuni excavators (Awsti and Ben) and occasional assistance from Ed Coffin, Nusbaum concentrated on the northeast end of the church, uncovering its portal 2.3 to 2.6 meters (7’ 6” to 8’ 6”) below grade. He then shifted to the southwest and the apse, which was about 3.0 meters deep (10’). The extent of excavations is visible in a photograph of Zuni workmen digging carefully around burnt beams at the front of the nave (figure 5.27), while the *sotocoro* posts and northwest excavation face appear in another photo (figure 5.28). The remainder of the nave fill was still mostly unexcavated in a 1923 image (figure 5.29), and presumably remains undisturbed.

By June 22, Hodge naively hoped to finish excavating the mission in a few days when he reassigned the crew to open an auto road to Kechiba:wa. Weather further interrupted their plans, as heavy rains began at Hawikku in July, forcing Nusbaum to suspend work on the low-lying site by the sixth. A week later, local arroyos were flooding and the floor of the church was standing in water, while rain continued every day. Not until the end of the month was it dry enough to dig again, when Nusbaum started on the *convento*. Rather than digging adjacent to the church, his workmen cleared rooms on the opposite side of the mound (Rooms 1-5). Notes on these rooms appear prior to the church burials, which were probably excavated when
Heye visited in early August. Photographs show George and Thea Heye, Harmon Hendricks, Hodge, and Nusbaum deconstructing the main altar (figures 5.30-5.31). After excavating forty burials in the church, Nusbaum returned to Kechiba:wa’s cemetery until August 23, when Hodge put the entire crew to work on the mission, expecting a month of work remaining in the convento, “a very large affair and quite complicated.”

By his August 31 departure with Nusbaum, Hodge reiterated the importance of the large convento, and had devised a new plan to complete its excavation. After their trip, Nusbaum would return to Camp Harmon, where the equipment would be in the care of Tsinahe, and remain with the workmen in an extended field season to complete work on the mission. Accordingly, he was back on site by September 16, finding that Coffin had failed to finish mapping the exposed convento, then visible as a three-sided building around a central patio (figure 5.32).

A month-long marathon of frenetic work followed, as his crew raced to complete the excavations, pack the artifacts, and break camp before funding and time ran out. Nusbaum describes going without shaving for weeks and working each evening by lamplight alongside the camp cook Nelda, wrapping and packing artifacts until midnight. A sense of his hurried mindset is evident in terse prose, writing that they, “sit in kitchen and works nights till it get so damned cold can’t keep from shivering—then off to bed.” As the temperatures dropped, rains and fog enveloped the site, and nighttime freezes forced him to wrap the car and drain its fluids daily. With daylight, he “work[ed] like a bastard,” skipping meals, and pitching in to dig until he had “blistered hell out of [his] hands swinging pick and shovel trying to hurry things along.”

In the first week back, Nusbaum repaired the car, finished Coffin’s mapping, developed his recent negatives, and tried to continue digging. A “fiesta” in nearby Ojo Caliente made it
difficult to get a full crew until the second week, when things sped up. Nusbaum employed two teams of horse-drawn scrapers to remove backdirt and overburden, and fully cleared the core of the convento except one room (the portería) and part of the ambulatory (figure 5.33). They deposited dirt in berms along the northeast and southeast sides of the mission, or pulled it away to the southwest edge of the service patio, where a mound of backdirt is visible in photographs and remains today (figure 5.34-5.35).

Nusbaum expected a few more days would clear the northwest side of the church, but then found the baptistery (describing it as a chapel), and rooms beneath the church’s foundations (figure 5.36). The crew trenched about a meter (3’) out from the retaining wall along the nave and did not fully excavate the spaces beneath. In a note from Friday, October 10, Nusbaum expected to finish the next day, clearing the portería and a “small portion rear end of the church.” Despite his optimism, he would not finish until October 17, when Zunis left to gather their crop of melons and squash before the harvest froze solid. Nusbaum had encountered further mission remains so extensive he could not continue. He writes of his perplexity discovering a lower level of Room 32, and even more when he tried to locate the outside walls of the convento, only to realize that it had more unexcavated rooms. In the “surprise of [his] life,” the foundations and lower walls of at least three more rooms extended southwest of the convento core, with practically all their adobe bricks removed and standing less than a foot high on the “same deep foundations” as the rest of the building (figure 5.37).

This revelation was too much; Nusbaum located the corners and walls of Rooms 37, 38, and 39 and ended the season. He did not clear these rooms, identify their features, or describe any artifacts from them. He did not clear the service patio southwest of the mission, only making a stratigraphic pit in its middle (which might have occurred in the following field season
of 1920), identifying the original floor 1.22 meters (4’) below grade, and an additional 1.07 meters (3’ 6”) of cultural debris below that (figure 5.38). Crucially, photographs indicate that Nusbaum never located the southeast exterior of the convento, despite a stub wall and stairway suggesting more rooms abutting the mission core in that direction. Today, this area lies just beyond the southeastern fence, and remains undisturbed, potentially making it a good candidate for non-destructive geophysical surveying in the future.

Nelda and Awste helped Nusbaum pack around an oil stove. He finally got to Gallup, sold the expedition car, and made his way east, knowing that he had not exhausted the mission site.153 Ultimately, Hodge would not finish its excavation either, leaving many parts of it (the nave, patios, atrium, and southeast side) basically undisturbed. During the 1920 field season, he sent a crew to trace and clear the outlying walls, and continue excavation of the sub-foundational Room 32/272, clearing its earlier occupation (figure 5.39).154 By July 11, 1920, Hodge considered all work on the mission complete, and Heye was happy the team could now “concentrate on the ruin proper,” which he considered a higher priority.155

b. Interpreting Nusbaum’s Excavation

The limitations of Hodge’s techniques apply also to Nusbaum’s mission excavation. Room clearing failed to record accurate stratigraphic and horizontal data for most artifacts, and destroyed or overlooked some floors and features. Nusbaum did not use screening, and many small artifacts were undoubtedly lost or redistributed.156 Numerous artifacts were insufficiently documented, or separated from their documentation, and some are no longer identified as coming from the mission at all. The conditions of the hurried excavation contributed to loss of information, and completing work on the mission in a single season was overly ambitious.
Perhaps Hodge doubted Heye would continue supporting work at an ostensibly non-Native structure. As at Awatovi almost two decades later, the archaeologists were unprepared for the large size of the mission, and did not allocate sufficient resources.\textsuperscript{157} Zuni reoccupation of the ruined structure added complexity (see Appendix 1), which took time to dissect, and in some cases, Nusbaum left the post-mission occupation in place, with mission components lying beneath, unexcavated and unknown.\textsuperscript{158}

Due to his rush and perhaps impatience, Nusbaum often did not record provenance information for artifacts, and even when he did it was only a room number without stratigraphic or contextual detail. NMAI’s collection has numerous artifacts from the “monastery” (as he called it) without any room provenance information, while Nusbaum’s field notes identify other artifacts that he did not collect.\textsuperscript{159} This sketchy documentation of mission artifacts is a constant interpretive challenge. The basic problems are identifying mission artifacts in the first place, and determining whether they were deposited during the mission period, or during post-mission fill and reoccupations. In response I follow some guiding presumption, which might not be necessary in a better documented site. In selecting items for study and eventual descriptive publication, I have been as inclusive as possible, while discriminating more carefully in interpreting specific spaces. It is important to extract what tentative information I can from this unrenewable resource rather than dismiss it because of the excavation’s flaws; therefore, these inferences are the best possible conclusions from an imperfect data set.

In attributing specific artifacts, if photographed in situ, I assume images illustrate the original place of discovery and deposition.\textsuperscript{160} I likewise generally assume that room designations in the NMAI catalog are correct, as they were based on information accompanying the artifacts as Nusbaum packed them. Because he occasionally notes finding specific artifacts in the fill and
not the floor, when Nusbaum specifies a particular occupation level I assume he found an association with that floor even if he rarely states so explicitly.\textsuperscript{161} If Nusbaum specifies a post-mission room number, I assume the artifact came from a post-mission occupation level.

In many cases, artifacts are identified with the “monastery” in general, but no specific room. One cannot be certain of their original context, although sometimes it is possible to triangulate between photographs, field notes, and the catalog to plausibly infer spaces and occupation levels. Occasionally artifacts’ appearance on walls in a series of photographs indicates roughly where and when they were found.\textsuperscript{162} In these cases, I assume that the excavator placed the artifact on the wall at the time of its discovery, and that it came from the immediate vicinity. Some rooms were not reoccupied, making it likely their artifacts belong to the mission period, especially those with traces of burning linking them to the mission’s destruction.\textsuperscript{163} In other more tentative cases, I suggest that construction materials from the post-mission occupation were most plausibly reused from the earlier mission phase.\textsuperscript{164}

In interpreting artifacts, I also rely on their technical and formal characteristics, assuming they derive from established Spanish and Pueblo cultural traditions of production. Spanish artifacts throughout Hawikku are most likely associated with the mission, and I will look to many of these in my analysis, even if they were not found within the mission structure itself. With no record of an \textit{encomienda} or \textit{casa real} at seventeenth-century Hawikku, I assume that these materials were introduced through the mission community. Some may have been trade goods, while others pertained to the mission’s use, but were reused and scattered after its destruction.

Associating locally produced artifacts which mix characteristics from Spanish and Indigenous traditions with the mission is more complicated. They occur throughout the Hawikku
site, and may have been from the mission, or from domestic settings as Zunis adapted practices of Spanish introduction. For instance, many hybrid ceramics such as soup plates exhibit patterns suggestive of coherent groups, perhaps as a set, or as the production of a single potter. Pieces of these sets from burnt mission spaces link the entire group to its orbit, and so it is likely that many of the hybrid ceramics from the pueblo originally came from the mission but were reused. Finally, NMAI’s catalog attributes many pueblo-style artifacts to the mission without specific stratigraphic information. I have not focused on these items because I cannot establish their chronological context with any confidence.

Nusbaum’s architectural documentation presents other challenges. The original plans of the site are probably large-scale maps in graphite on heavy-weight paper, which are stained and yellowed and lack contour lines or burial markings, now in Cornell’s Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections (figure 5.40). These are cut into irregular, puzzle-piece shapes; originally, they comprised separate sheets pieced together as the overall site map. Coffin began and Nusbaum finished a similar plan of the mission, but it may no longer exist, except as reflected in two drawings from publication preparations. Of these, perhaps the closest replication is a map of the entire settlement in graphite, with burial locations in ink but no topographic contour lines (figure 5.41). Someone added the mission’s gridded plan to the corner of this map by scaling and transferring it from the original, missing field plan; I think this is most likely the work of illustrator Louis Schellbach as he prepared publication illustrations. The other plan is Schellbach’s “Larger-scale plan of Church, Monastery, and Cemetery,” among Hodge’s papers when Nathalie F. S. Woodbury inventoried them in 1960. It was the basis of the published mission plan and source of my approximate measurements (figures 5.42-5.43). Unscaled sketches in notes and correspondences augment these plans, along with a single sheet
of worn legal paper measuring the church (figure 5.44). These plans provide spatial arrangements, and average dimensions, but these straight lines and right angles convey an inaccurate sense of precision, ignoring the variability of adobe’s organic aesthetic. Unlike surveyed plans, Nusbaum’s sketches are not to scale, and often present inaccurate bonding, since he seems to not have been trying to represent these details. Finally, there is a degree of variability among the measures recorded in notes, the legal pad sketch, Schellbach’s plan, and the published dimensions. While most of these variations differ by only a few inches, some are significant enough to matter, especially for studies of the mission’s proportions.

Nusbaum’s field notes are not as assiduous as those of Hodge, suggesting the spontaneity of his personality as he jumped from one idea to the next. They are inconsistent, with multiple pages devoted to some rooms while others receive barely a sentence, and many dimensions are lacking. The rush of the field season undoubtedly exacerbated these tendencies, but they were present from the beginning of the 1919 notes. The order of notes suggests Nusbaum did not keep daily records, but waited until he cleared several rooms to document them at once. Due to these delays, he likely underreported features encountered during excavations. Nusbaum also seems to have pre-labeled his notebook pages, creating confusion because sometimes his headings do not match the entry that he eventually made on the page. In publishing the plan, Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury did not note Nusbaum’s propensity to pre-label his pages, leading to misplacement of some architectural features in their version (figure 5.45).

Nusbaum’s photographs, of which about ninety exist, are his most thorough documentation of the mission site. They are consistently excellent, and high-resolution scans now make possible recognition of minute details, undocumented artifacts, and architectural features absent from the field notes. Close inspection of these images is the foundation for my
interpretation of the mission’s structural history. Photographs by other visitors to the site are helpful sources as well (figures 5.46-5.47).

The Afterlife of Hawikku’s Things

After six years’ intensive excavation, the disturbance of Hawikku’s ruins subsided. Parts remained exposed and unsupported masonry crumbled into piles, while loose backdirt blew around the promontory and accumulated in deep drifts. Sometime between assignment of grazing areas in 1934 and the 1960s, fences came to divide the rangeland, and protect most of the site. From photographs it appears Hodge never backfilled the mission. The mounds of removed earth remained in place, and the convento’s adobe walls rapidly disintegrated, melting and leveling until there was almost no visible remnant thirty years later. In the 1960s, Hawikku became the centerpiece of tribal development plans and renewed factional contention, as Governor Robert E. Lewis (son of Margaret and William J. Lewis) approached the NPS, proposing to turn it into a national landmark. This idea developed over the following decades as the Zuni-Cibola National Historical Park, a controversial idea which would have included several other ancestral ruins. After years of research and planning, Zuni tribal members voted against leasing their trust lands to the NPS, killing the idea.

In 2001 Jonathan Damp directed a remote sensing survey of Hawikku for the Zuni Cultural Resource Enterprise with a grant from the American Battlefield Protection Program. Damp used metal detectors to survey nineteen blocks or study units of the site, and conducted spot excavations for metal artifacts, which he mapped in a Geographic Information System (GIS) database, attempting to reconstruct the Coronado battleground and Zuni resistance. This survey
did not include the mission site, and while a few artifacts may come from the mission period, I have not included them in my project. Hawikku remained at risk for pot hunting and vandalism in the later twentieth century. In 2015, the Pueblo of Zuni built additional fencing and a locked gate to increase security, with new trails facilitating interpretive visits and limiting foot traffic during tours coordinated through the Zuni Pueblo Department of Tourism (figure 4.2).

Removed from their long interment, the Hawikku artifacts began new lives apart from the site through processes of collection, curation, research, and neglect, which also have ramifications for reconstructing life at Hawikku’s mission. Partial conservation occurred in the field. Among Camp Harmon’s tents was a brush-covered ramada with a barn door across sawhorses as a work station (figure 5.48). In the evenings, Hodge and Nusbaum reconstructed ceramic vessels here, gluing and clamping them together prior to shipment. As artifacts accumulated, they were packed in the wooden crates that the elderly Zuni gentleman had once seen going away on wagons (figure 5.49). These shipments went by railroad from Gallup to New York, where Heye enthusiastically unpacked them himself.

When he opened the crates, Heye laid out the artifacts on “an improvised table on the upper floor of [his] garage,” where he accessioned them with catalogue numbers and cards, while other museum employees conducted further cleaning and restoration. Hodge describes horror at finding these employees piling all the sherds together on the table, losing their field numbers and mixing them up in the wrong bags, compromising or destroying all the contextual information that he recorded in the field. Almost all Hawikku artifacts remained with the MAI, while many Kechiba:wa finds went to the Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology at Cambridge University in England. Heye retained a selection of Kechiba:wa artifacts, however, and sought trades with other museums as well. Human remains went to the National Museum in
Washington, DC, for Ales Hrdlicka’s analysis, and today reside at the NMNH’s Museum Services Center in Suitland, MD.

Hawikku’s extensive excavations have never been fully published. When Heye hired Hodge away from the National Museum, he claimed that Hodge would devote the majority of his time to Hawikku, but Heye never fully committed the resources necessary for Hodge to analyze and publish his results.\(^{186}\) Once the specimens were safely lodged in his museum, Heye seemingly lost interest and diverted attentions to new acquisitions. Hodge had a backlog of work editing Heye’s publications, and according to Nusbaum, the director expected employees to write on their own time without compensation.\(^{187}\) Hendricks had provided a fund to support the Hendricks-Hodge Expedition’s publication, and the MAI made some progress towards preparing the material.\(^{188}\) William Baakie made illustrations of 750 painted vessels, and in 1938 Louis Schellbach produced measured drawings of the Pueblo, its room blocks, and the mission from the original excavation plans.\(^{189}\)

A report of the Purísima Concepción mission was long planned, but never realized. Seeing Nusbaum’s enthusiasm, Hodge initially suggested a coauthored paper in the MAI’s *Indian Notes and Monographs* series, and Nusbaum was still planning to write an article while he remained at the MAI.\(^{190}\) Even after the 1920 falling out, Nusbaum continued discussing the “Monastery Paper,” hoping to begin it in early 1922, but this article never materialized.\(^{191}\) Hodge may also have considered writing about the mission.\(^{192}\)

The death of MAI benefactors (Jimmy Ford and Harmon Hendricks) within days of each other in 1928, followed by 1929’s stock market crash, resulted in massive austerity measures. Heye was dependent on donors for the museum’s operating expenses, and to cope with the new financial situation, he fired his research staff and curtailed publications.\(^{193}\) Hodge remained,
partly out of a sense of obligation to finish Hawikku’s publication, but became dissatisfied and jumped at the opportunity to become Director of Los Angeles’s Southwest Museum of the American Indian in 1931. Hodge moved in December of that year, leaving Heye after a bitter argument over his severance and taking Hawikku’s documentation with him. He would continue working on the Hawikku materials in bits and pieces, but duties at the Southwest Museum and continuing anger with Heye prevented its completion. In 1935, Frederick H. Douglas and the Mu Alpha Nu Anthropological Fraternity began a fund for anthropological studies in honor of Hodge, with the first volume being Hodge’s history of Hawikku Pueblo (1937). Two years later, Hodge published his excavation of Hawikku’s square kiva.

Even after his 1955 retirement, Hodge still aspired to publish Hawikku’s results, but realized he needed assistance and proposed the task to Watson Smith. Hodge passed away on September 29, 1956, and Smith would ask Richard B. and Nathalie F. S. Woodbury to assist him, since they were familiar with pre-contact Zuni ceramics. Hodge’s widow sold his papers to the Southwest Museum, but not before Nathalie went to Santa Fe and collected the Hawikku documentation, which remained MAI property.

With support from the MAI and new director Frederick J. Dockstader, Smith and his coauthors published the general report of the Hawikku excavations in 1966. This volume provides an overview of the expedition, the architecture of Hawikku Pueblo, its pottery, and its mortuary remains. The authors also included a twenty-seven-page section on Nusbaum’s excavation of the mission, with a historic overview of its establishment and description of its architecture, while Montgomery contributed his brief “Functional Interpretation.” These authors did not believe there was evidence for the mission’s construction sequence and did not resolve its chronological relationship to primary sources, proposing Nusbaum excavated the remains of a
destructive fire from either 1672 or 1680, with no identifiable remains of the 1629 to 1632 phase. They felt Hawikku’s mission closely resembled the situation at Awatovi, where Smith and Montgomery had previously worked, and refer readers to Awatovi’s publication because, “almost everything in Montgomery’s reconstruction of San Bernardo could be applied with equal appropriateness to La Purísima Concepción.” Although Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury acknowledge the possibility that “perhaps some […] Native neophytes” lived alongside the friars in the convento, Montgomery reiterates his misplaced belief that it was a cloistered space, restricted almost exclusively to the friars.

With the general publication of the site’s architecture, a great deal of work remained in the analysis of its material culture. Most important for my project, no report has ever been written for Spanish artifacts from the site, nor the objects coming from Nusbaum’s mission excavation. This dissertation research has initiated the project of studying and eventually publishing the mission period material culture of Hawikku. Smith and Dockstader discussed inclusion of the Spanish artifacts in the 1966 book, but decided against it. The report only notes that many Spanish and Mexican artifacts came from the site, which “would provide the substance for an extensive and rewarding study which hopefully may one day be undertaken by competent persons.” Speaking of the mission, they write that, “the field notes throughout are very meager in their description of both Indian and Spanish objects found in the excavations. These items[…] await careful study and reporting.”

The authors’ call for further research on Hawikku’s Spanish-colonial assemblage did not go unheeded, but remained unrealized. After the release of the Hawikku publication, Spanish-colonial historians E. Boyd and Richard E. Ahlborn proposed a coauthored study of Hawikku’s contact-era artifacts. Boyd was on the cusp of retirement, and saw it as her next undertaking,
but nothing came from this initiative. Almost a decade later, Brown University anthropology graduate student Steven M. Horvath, Jr. proposed a “systematic study” of the “European” artifacts from Hawikku, under the direction of James Deetz. While Smith and Woodbury both supported such a project in theory, they dissuaded Horvath from this research due to the MAI’s chaos at that time.

After its heyday in the 1920s, Heye had continued collecting, while allegedly maintaining the museum through illegal sales of its holdings. After his death in 1957, competent E. K. Burnett succeeded him as director, followed by a more problematic Dockstader. The latter was dismissed in 1975 and a court-ordered inventory of the collections began. At the time of Horvath’s proposal in 1976, the MAI was in disarray and its Hawikku collections remained “essentially unstudied,” partly because of the difficulty of working with its unindexed documentation. In an attempt to prepare the Hawikku collections for study, Brenda L. Shears undertook an M.A. thesis project to build a cross-referenced, searchable database of the Hendricks-Hodge Expedition materials (completed 1989). Larger forces delayed the full realization of her database’s potential, however, with the reorganization of the MAI as a core collection of the NMAI, delaying research while the full collection was inventoried and moved to the present Cultural Resources Center (CRC) in Suitland, MD. Shears’s index became an important predecessor of the present cataloging system.

In 1989, Congress legislated formation of the NMAI as part of Smithsonian Institution, appropriating the bankrupt MAI and its collections for exhibit spaces at a new museum on the mall in Washington, DC, and the George Gustav Heye Center in New York City’s Old Custom House. As settlement of a suit by the state of New York, the excavation documentation was transferred to Cornell University, including the original surveys of the Hawikku site and the field
During the 1990s, the MAI collection was cataloged, packed, and shipped from New York to its new home at the CRC (opened 1999), where Hawikku’s materials occupy more than two full ranges of movable shelving ten feet high (figure 5.50).

My research is part of the long institutional history of the MAI and NMAI. Although Hodge, Nusbaum, Smith, and the Woodburys all believed that a study of Spanish Colonial artifacts at Hawikku was needed, and Boyd, Ahlborn, Dockstader, and Horvath wanted to undertake it, this work was practically impossible at any time prior to 1999. Between 1931 and the late 1960s, the documentation was separated from the collection, first with Hodge and then his successor authors. There was little opportunity to write about the mission artifacts in these years. The poor organization and tumult of the MAI continued to militate against a comprehensive study. Shears’s organization and digitization of Hawikku’s material laid the groundwork for such a project, but the museum entered a new phase with the formation of the NMAI, and its collections were again largely inaccessible during their transit from New York to Washington, DC.

It has been almost a century since Nusbaum and his Zuni assistants began picking away at the Purísima Concepción, and much has changed in how we can imagine its mission period materials. Early, simplistic concepts of the mission as a fossilized foreign influence lodged within timeless Pueblo culture, or as witness to the virtues of a triumphant evangelization campaign that overcome the ignorance of primitive savages are now outmoded. Today, missions can appear as complex intersections of the sophisticated discursive constructions and creative responses that their heterogeneous communities of users produced. Likewise, artifacts of mixed cultural derivation which once poorly fit the preoccupations of early twentieth-century
anthropological paradigms are now more significant, as attention increasingly focuses on the agency of Native peoples and the cultural entanglements of the colonial world.

It has been a long road for the Hawikku artifacts as well. Jarred from their stratigraphic beds, boxed, carted, and shipped by train across the country, only to sleep on museum shelves organized by an alien taxonomy, some of them finally returned home. In late July 2001, a group of Zuni community members gathered at the Christian Reform Church to open shipping containers carrying seventy NMAI artifacts, comprising a “community collection,” set to become the “Hawikku: Echoes from the Past” exhibit. Writing for the tribal newsletter The Shiwi Messenger, Wells Mahkee Jr. described it as a day of celebration and more than a little awe, as well as a stormy day in the summer monsoon season. This was a fortuitous conjunction, because Zunis view storm clouds as manifestations of their ancestors returning with blessings of rain. In Mahkee’s description of that happy day, the dark, promising skies were a homecoming, welcoming back the spirits of ancient Zuni artists embodied in their Hawikku artifacts.215
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37 Margaret A. Lewis to Hodge, March 18, 1912, MS.7.E1C.1.112, “Lewis, Margaret A., Corresp. 1912-1918,” FWH. I have found no further information about this request and whether Hodge replied. Margaret Lewis was a Cherokee woman who married into Zuni Pueblo. She played a particularly important role as host to anthropologists, including Elsie Clews Parsons, A. L. Kroeber, Leslie Spier, and Franz Boas. See Pandey, “Anthropologists,” 329-331. The Lewis administration was particularly active in petitioning the federal government for an expanded land base in the early twentieth century; see Ferguson, Hart, and Seciwa, “Twentieth Century Zuni,” 115-116. I do not know whether Cushing actually produced a survey of Zuni lands, but Zunis clearly believed that it existed. A note from one of Hodge’s visits to Zuni in the 1890s says “Pahlowaliwa” (Ba:lawahdiwa or Patricio Pino, the former Governor in whose home Cushing had resided) believed that “Cushing has large map of Zuni resn [reservation] which Pablo wants together with pkge of papers done up in a piece of cloth- very precious to him,” Frederick Webb Hodge notebook, undated, between 1894-1899, “MAI Records, B.252.6,” NMAI Archives. The bundle of papers mentioned in this note is the personal archive of Ba:lawahdiwa’s father Lai-iu-ah-tsai-lu (Pedro Pino), which Cushing took and is now in the collection of his papers at the BRL; see E. Richard Hart, Pedro Pino: Governor of Zuni Pueblo, 1830-1878 (Utah State University Press, 2003), 16.


39 I have not found much information about Tsinahe’s dismissal from office. In his February 2, 1912 letter to Hodge he had described himself as Lieutenant Governor, but in an April 15, 1912 letter he says “my people made me Governor.” He describes himself as Governor again in a July 27, 1914 letter to Hodge. William J. Lewis writes to Hodge on January 1, 1916 (BRL) as Governor of Zuni, and clearly is embroiled in a dispute with Tsinahe, whom he accuses of keeping Hodge away from Lewis during his 1915 visit to the Pueblo, and says that “the whole Zuni tribe have it in for Dick for not doing the right thing.” It seems possible that Tsinahe was never made Governor, and was misrepresenting himself to Hodge. In a letter that Tsinahe dictated to Field Matron Anna Stagen a month after the July 27 letter, he says that he was “very much troubled in mind” due to his ouster, and what he calls the theft by his enemies of his cane of office. He requests that Hodge make him a new cane, with his name upon it, to replace the stolen (or revoked) symbol of office, which seems a strange request since the canes of office are not personal possessions, but rather transfer from one officeholder to the next. By April 12, 1916, Bauman had put Tsinahe “put in jail for nothing and kept [him] without food” (Hodge to Tsinahe, MS.7.E1C.1.184, “Tsnahey, Corresp. 1912-1918,” FWH; see also Heye to Hodge, April 27, 1916, MS.7.E1C.1.91, “Heye, George, Corresp. 1916,” FWH). Hodge intervened by writing to Commissioner of Indian Affairs Cato Sells, seeking better treatment and patience for Tsinahe; Hodge to Cato Sells, April 12, 1916, MS.7.E1C.1.164, “Sells, Cato, Corresp. 1916-1917,” FWH. Sells made an investigation into the situation, and found that Bauman had acted appropriately, but that complaints against a Mr. Griffin were justified; see Sells to Hodge, April 20, 1916, MS.7.E1C.1.164, “Sells, Cato, Corresp. 1916-1917,” FWH.

40 During Cushing’s first sojourn in Zuni, he had renovated a small structure on the Halona:wa South mound to live in; Anyon and Ferguson, “Hapadina Store,” 3-6; Mindeleff, A Study, 88; Burgio-Ericson, “A:shiwi A:wan Museum.” Upon his return with the Hemenway expedition, Cushing rebuilt and expanded the structure, envisioning it as the future “general archaeological headquarters for the whole Southwest” (Hodge, “Interview,” 51-52). The trading post changed hands several times, with trader Charles H. Kelsey purchasing it in 1906 and partnering with Albuquerque’s Ilfeld Trading Company to manage and stabilize the business, which remained the situation in 1916; Anyon and Ferguson, “Hapadina Store,” 3-5, 7.
Lewis to Hodge, January 1, 1916. The dilapidated remains of the Hemenway House would not revert to Zuni control until 1971, when it was removed from the trading post lease and was demolished; see Anyon and Ferguson, “Hapadina Store,” 18-19.

Lewis to Hodge, January 1, 1916.

Quoted in Pandey, “Anthropologists,” 331; Hodge, History, xvii.


Hodge to Lewis, February 15, 1916.

Hodge to Tsinahé, February 15, 1916, BRL.

Hodge to Lewis, February 15, 1916, BRL.


Heye to Hodge, August 9, 1916, MS.7.EIC.1.91, “Heye, George, Corresp. 1916,” FWH.

Heye to Hodge, August 26, 1916, MS.7.EIC.1.91, “Heye, George, Corresp. 1916,” FWH. The new application was made prior to Heye’s letter to Hodge of January 8, 1917 (MS.7.HHE.1.10, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Correspondence, 1917,” FWH).


Hodge, “Interview,” 146-147. Among the Zuni workmen, Gaialito stands out because of his age and his initial opposition to the excavations. I have found few biographical facts about him. He was a member of the Koyemshi or Mudhead group, and seems to have held himself somewhat apart from the rest of the workmen. Hodge recounts the story of a prank pulled on Gaialito’s son, who visited the ruins on his way to collect a fox skin needed for dance regalia. While the son was not paying attention, the workmen replaced the skin with fragments from a human skull excavated on the site. Hodge says that “none of them would ever tell me what happened after he got into the pueblo and the piece of the skull was revealed instead of the sacred fox skin. I would like to know, but I think that he violated some religious rule and didn’t want to discuss it” (“Interview,” 148).

Melinda Elliott recounts Hodge’s popularity (Great Excavations, 88), but as Pandey (“Anthropologists,” 331) more critically notes that “no anthropologist has been involved more directly in Zuni politics than F. W. Hodge,” making it unlikely that his popularity was universal in Zuni.

Kennedy and Simplicio, “First Contact,” 70.

Fowler, A Laboratory, 245-246. In 1917, it was a joint expedition of the MAI and the National Museum, although once Hodge resigned from the latter to work with Heye full time, responsibility for the excavations shifted primarily to the MAI.

Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, The Excavation, 2.

Heye to Hodge, January 18, 1917, MS.7.HHE.1.10, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Correspondences 1917,” FWH. Factional disputes continued during this time. One Protestant ally, Nina Hotina wrote to Thea Heye about...
her arrest, and Hodge was forced to intervene and get her released from jail; Heye to Hodge, April 16, 1917, MS.7.HHE.1.10 “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Correspondences 1917,” FWH. Hodge described this encounter saying that he had been speaking with Catholic sympathizer Bauman, who said, “By the way, I have had a young Zuni woman here in the jail for quite a while […] She made the mistake of marrying a Zuni according to the Christian faith then leaving him and marrying another Zuni according to the Zuni custom. Of course, we can’t stand for that kind of thing. I’ve had her here for several months now and I think she’s been punished enough.” Hodge took Nina back to the Pueblo, and purportedly rumors credited him with “thrashing” Bauman; see “Interview,” 155. Although Hodge does not specifically frame this as a factional dispute, it seems likely that it was part of the larger, ongoing struggle in the community.


60 Although Heye hoped to visit the site himself in mid-July, Hodge had advised against it and Heye did not see the work until the following year; Heye to Hodge, June 18, 1917, MS.7.HHE.1.10, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Correspondences 1917,” FWH; Heye to Hodge, June 17, 1917, MS.7.EIC.1.92, “Heye, George, Corresp. 1917,” FWH.

61 Hodge to Nusbaum, June 16, 1917, Papers of Jesse Logan Nusbaum, Box 3, “Geo. Heye-Heeye Museum Am. Indian,” NAA. As work proceeded, a discouraging amount of overburden had to be removed, weighing heavily on the Zuni workmen; Heye to Hodge, August 3, 1917, MS.7.HHE.1.10, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Correspondences 1917,” FWH.

62 They also completed excavating houses beneath the western cemetery (Rooms 1-15). Hodge arrived at the start of June, and work continued until late September. Heye to Hodge, June 3, 1918, MS.7.HHE.1.11, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Corr. 1918,” FWH. The last notice from the field was a telegram with the news that the team had recovered the 500th intact bowl from Hawikku’s excavation, with Heye’s acknowledgement dated September 19, 1918 (MS.7.HHE.1.11“Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Corr. 1918,” FWH).

63 Heye to Hodge, June 24, 1918, MS.7.HHE.1.11, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Corr. 1918,” FWH; Heye to Hodge, July 3, 1918, MS.7.HHE.1.11, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Corr. 1918,” FWH. At the end of the year, the human remains from Hawikku were sent to the National Museum for Ales Hrdlicka’s analysis, where they remain today at the National Museum of Natural History’s facilities in Suitland, MD; see Hrdlicka to Hodge, December 4, 1918, Papers of Ales Hrdlicka, “Correspondences, Frederick Webb Hodge, 1901, 1908-1939,” NAA; and Hrdlicka to Hodge, December 26, 1918, Papers of Ales Hrdlicka, “Correspondences, Frederick Webb Hodge, 1901, 1908-1939,” NAA. For contemporary Zuni reasons for not seeking repatriation of these ancestral remains, see Ferguson, Anyon, and Ladd, “Repatriation,” 257-259.

64 Heye to Hodge, June 10, 1918, MS.7.HHE.1.11, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Corr. 1918,” FWH; Heye to Hodge, June 11, 1918, MS.7.HHE.1.11, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Corr. 1918,” FWH. The badges that Heye ordered were of German silver and “like those given for 20 years’ service in the fire department.”

65 Hodge began the season with a stop in St. Joe, MO to look for more ethnological specimens, and once on site early work included an attempt to dig a well to supply Camp Harmon with water, which was ultimately unsuccessful, and the commencement of excavations around the southeastern house block of the pueblo. Hodge’s team worked primarily in Blocks E and B, which he speculated were the town’s oldest sections, clearing rooms numbered 100 through 164, which also included some spaces in Blocks A and C. See Hodge, “Interview,” 145-146; Hodge to Heye, June 6, 1919, MS.7.HHE.1.12, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Corr., 1919,” FWH; Heye to Hodge, June 18, 1919, MS.7.HHE.1.12, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Corr., 1919,” FWH; Hodge to Heye, June 22, 1919; Hodge to Heye, June 26, 1919; Heye to Hodge, July 10, 1919, MS.7.HHE.1.12, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Corr., 1919,” FWH.

66 Another important discovery among the rooms was a diversity of stone artifacts which had been otherwise underrepresented among burials; Hodge to Heye, July 2, 1919, “MAI Records,” B193.18, NMAI Archives.
Hodge to Heye, June 22, 1919; Hodge to Heye, July 9, 1919, “MAI Records,” B193.18, NMAI Archives.

Befitting his role bankrolling the project, the elder Hendricks received VIP treatment. A new, special tent was set up for him, complete with a private privy (painted and booby-trapped with pranks by Nusbaum and Hodge), well-stocked medicine cabinet, bottled water, ice delivered from Black Rock, chilled meals from a chef in Gallup, and special rental cars arranged for his comfort on the roughly four-hour drive from Gallup to the site; see Hodge to Heye, July 7, 1919, MS.7.HHE.1.12, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Corr., 1919,” FWH; Hodge to Heye, July 14, 1919, MS.7.HHE.1.12, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Corr., 1919,” FWH; Hodge to Heye, July 13, 1919, “MAI Records,” B193.18, NMAI Archives; Heye to Hodge, July 21, 1919, MS.7.HHE.1.12, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Corr., 1919,” FWH; and Nusbaum to Watson Smith, April 10, 1962, “MAI Records,” B.412.4, NMAI Archives. Hodge took the visitors to Kechiba:wa to uncover burials with their well-preserved ceramics, for he feared that they had “come to an end of the spectacular part of the Hawikuh diggings” by that point; Hodge to Heye, June 22, 1919. Among the highlights of the sponsors’ visit was a display of fireworks that Heye had sent specially from New York; Heye to Hodge, June 25, 1919, MS.7.HHE.1.12, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Corr., 1919,” FWH.

Heye to Hodge, August 11, 1919, MS.7.HHE.1.7, “Frederick W. Hodge/Harmon Hendricks Corresp. 1917-1923,” FWH; see also NMAI film montage with clips of Harmon Hendricks (Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition, Hawikuh and Kechipaun Excavation, digital video montage, #3104, NMAI), who only visited the site in 1919.

Hodge to Heye, August 25, 1919, “MAI Records,” B193.18, NMAI Archives. In addition to collections among the Havasupai, they ventured into southern Utah, collecting among the Ute and Paiute tribes and collecting information about archaeological sites in the caves and canyons from Mormon farmers and ranchers; Nusbaum, Kidder, and Guernsey, A Basket-Maker Cave, 15.


The kivas came to light when workman Kanta came across a human toe bone thrown up from a rabbit burrow. Coming to excavate the burial, Hodge encountered fine Chaco-style masonry, the first of two round kiva chambers, and seven burials; see Hodge, “Interview,” 151-152. Another burial was recovered from Site 2, also west of the pueblo. Other notable finds for the year included a lifesize ceramic effigy that Hodge called the “House Priestess,” and the recovery of an intact E-to-we or ettowe, a sacred fetish. See Heye to Hodge, July 29, 1920, MS.7.MAI.7.13, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Collection, 1920,” FWH; Heye to Hodge, July 24, 1920, MS.7.MAI.7.13, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Collection, 1920,” FWH; Heye to Hodge, August 2, 1920, MS.7.MAI.7.13, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Collection, 1920,” FWH.

Heye to Hodge, August 9, 1920, MS.7.MAI.7.13, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Collection, 1920,” FWH. I am unsure whether any film from this season survives. Nusbaum had gone around the Zuni communities attempting to produce new illustrations for a reissue of Cushing’s Zuni Breadstuffs, and he wrote to Hodge that “many [Zunis] didn’t care to have pictures taken at all—even at Ojo—many wouldn’t stand for it.” See Nusbaum to Hodge, October 17, 1919, MS.7.MAI.1.523, “Nusbaum, Jesse, Corresp. 1918-1931,” FWH.

Anonymous (probably Hodge), undated summary of work conducted in 1920, “MAI Records,” B193.18, NMAI Archives.

See for instance, Heye to Hodge (August 6, 1920, MS.7.MAI.7.13, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Collection, 1920,” FWH), where the director and boss writes, “What interests me most was what you wrote concerning Jess and Mrs. B. If you wrote this as a joke it is a very funny one and is greatly appreciated; but if you really mean it there is an awful tragedy looming up in Jess’s life and I sincerely hope somebody will wake him up again as Abe did once.” Again on August 9, 1920 he writes, “through some people we met here today, we were told Jess had married Mrs. Behrends [sic, Aileen was formerly married to Alfred Baeheens] in Santa Fe early in June. Do you know if it is true—If it is, tell him to be a man and write us.” See n. 77, below for Nusbaum and Aileen. Heye seems to have had some misogynistic tendencies, and did not like to have women in the camp unless they were Native cooks, or his own wife. He objected to respected anthropologist Elsie Parson Clews hosting a meeting at the Hawikku site, calling her “crazy in the head like a fish” (Heye to Hodge, July 3, 1919, MS.7.HHE.1.12, “Frederick
W. Hodge/George Heye Corr., 1919,” FWH, and when he heard that Hodge was playing host to Samuel Lothrop’s wife and the journalist Zarah Preble in 1923, he demanded their removal from the camp (Heye to Hodge, July 13, 1923, MS.7 HHE.1.15, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Correspondences, 1923,” FWH; Heye to Hodge, July 30, 1923, MS.7 HHE.1.15, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Correspondences, 1923,” FWH; and Heye to Hodge, August 6, 1923, MS.7 HHE.1.15, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Correspondences, 1923,” FWH). Hodge would later marry Preble.

76 Anonymous, undated summary of work conducted in 1920, “MAI Records,” B193.18, NMAI Archives.

77 See Nusbaum, A Basket-Maker Cave, 15. Heye to Nusbaum, September 20, 1920 (Papers of Jesse Logan Nusbaum, Box 3, “Geo. Heye-Heye Museum Am. Indian,” NAA) appears to discuss this expedition. For Nusbaum’s account of this marriage, expedition, and his departure from MAI, see Nusbaum to Smith, March 30, 1962, “MAI Records” B.412.4, NMAI Archives; Nusbaum, Tierra Dulce, 72-73. I appreciate the assistance of Emily Talley for discussing this part of Nusbaum’s biography with me, and the willingness of Patti Bell to share some of a collaborative research project with Kathy Fiero as part of a forthcoming biography of Nusbaum; see n. 75, above. According to Fiero and Bell (email message, July 7, 2016), Jesse and Aileen seem to have known one another socially since at least 1916. Aileen had been twice married, and was separated from her second husband Alfred Baehrens, with whom she had a son (Deric). By the end of July 1920, she and Jesse were courting, and they were married on September 21, 1920, in Greeley, CO.

78 Heye to Hodge, June 20, 1921, MS.7 HHE.1.14, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Collection, 1921,” FWH; Heye to Hodge, June 30, 1921, MS.7 HHE.1.14, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Collection, 1921,” FWH; and Nusbaum to Hodge, July 22, 1921, MS.7.MAI.1.523, “Nusbaum, Jesse, Corresp. 1918-1931,” FWH.

79 The field notes from 1921 and 1923 run together in notebook 8, so it is unclear where work left off between the seasons, with burials 1253-1307 and Rooms 350-420 in this ambiguous set.

80 Heye to Hodge, July 5, 1921, MS.7 HHE.1.14, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Collection, 1921,” FWH; Heye to Hodge, July 11, 1921, MS.7 HHE.1.14, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Collection, 1921,” FWH. They appear to have stayed about a week, for Heye next writes from Los Angeles on August 6, 1921 (MS.7 HHE.1.14, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Collection, 1921,” FWH).

81 The first written mention of a trench appears in a letter from Heye to Hodge dated July 11, 1920 (MS.7.MAI.7.13, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Collection, 1920,” FWH), in which the sponsor approves of the idea of a trench “from east to west at the ‘neck’ [presumably of the plaza].” Heye considered this option to be preferable to a more extensive trenching project that the men had apparently discussed in person, saying that a well-positioned, modest trenching effort “will show you as much if not more, than the more expensive trench would.”

82 Hodge did not collect unpainted utility ware sherds or painted sherds too small to readily identify. He initially worked out his conclusions in an unfinished paper entitled “The Plaza Trench and its Disclosures,” (eventually published in Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, The Excavation, 150-172), and published the series as part of his discussion of the artifacts from the circular kivas of Site I (Circular Kivas, 28-29). In the course of revising Hodge’s materials for the general publication of the Hawikku site, Woodbury and Woodbury updated Hodge’s terminology, correlating his descriptions to the terminology archaeologists use to describe pottery from the Cibola region; see Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, The Excavation, 45-52, 135-173; Woodbury and Woodbury, “Appendix II,” 302-336.

83 Hodge, “A Square Kiva.”

84 Hodge to Peter H. Goldsmith, June 3, 1922, Papers of Ales Hrdlicka, Correspondences, Box 31, “Frederick Webb Hodge, 1901, 1908-1939,” NAA.

85 Hodge (“Interview,” 172) considered this delay to have been a great mistake.

86 Lorenzo Chaves to Hodge, October 13, 1919, MS.7.MAI.1.122, “Chaves, Lorenzo, Corresp. 1921-1931,” FWH. Chaves writes that he “told Awstie about your favor he suddenly git busy hitch his horse to wagon with pick, shovel
and saw. We went down to Hawikuh and duggout at east end of biggest beam of the Ki wie sti nak. You remember the middle beam was the biggest we uncovered in the wall about 3 ft. which was done so carefully—discovering an absolutely clear surface.” In his publication about the kiva, Hodge describes sending a sample of the largest beam (presumably the sample that Chavez and Awstie collected in 1922) to Andrew Douglass for analysis, receiving a tentative date of 1250 CE for the cutting of the kiva beam. This sample may have been lost however, for in late 1928, Neil Judd wrote to Hodge to inquire about the kiva beams, which he had seen during a site visit in 1923. He was hoping to obtain sections from the beams as part of A. E. Douglass’s efforts to establish a complete series of tree ring samples and thus an absolute chronology for southwestern ruins. Judd hoped that samples from Hawikku might bridge the gap that still remained at that time between Douglass’s pre- and post-contact series. See Neil M. Judd to Hodge, December 10, 1928, Ms. 9065, Box 1, folder 5/15, “Hodge Correspondence, E and F,” CRML. Douglass reported four dates from Hawikku beams (1381, 1391, 1405, and 1480); see Douglass, Dating Pueblo Bonito and Other Ruins of the Southwest (Washington, DC: National Geographic Society, 1935), 53. Hodge was unsure whether any of these dates pertained to the kiva sample he had submitted, and the context of how Douglass obtained these samples, or where they came from in the Hawikku site, remains unknown. Ferguson (Historic Zuni Architecture, 43) writes that a reanalysis of the samples could not confirm these dates.

87 The MAI permit also granted permission for limited test excavations at the Zuni ruins of Binna:wa (also known as Pinnawa) and Mats’a:kya, although this work appears to not have been conducted. See F. M. Goodwin to Heye, March 23, 1923, “MAI Records,” B193.18, NMAI Archives; Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, The Excavation, 2. Lothrop was the first in the field, by June 17, while Hodge was in the field by June 26, 1923, and Clarke was due to arrive by the end of the month. See Heye to Hodge, June 26, 1923, MS.7 HHE.1.15; “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Correspondences, 1923,” FWH; “Ketchipauan- Record of Excavation,” 1923, “Folder 5, Ketchipuan - Diaries - Photocopies from Cambridge University,” HHAR, 1.


89 Heye to Hodge, September 7, 1923, MS.7 HHE.1.15; “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Correspondences, 1923,” FWH; Heye to Hodge, September 14, 1923, MS.7 HHE.1.15; “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Correspondences, 1923,” FWH. By September, Hendricks was also refusing to advance any more money towards the excavations.

90 Shears, The Hendricks-Hodge, 33. Funding for Cattell’s summer films came from James B. Ford, and he received assistance from Cadzow and Chaves. The films of religious events include a Rain Ceremony and Santo Nino observance.

91 Owen Cattell to Heye, June 25, 1923, MS.7 HHE.1.15, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Correspondences, 1923,” FWH; Cattell to Heye, August 26, 1923, MS.7 HHE.1.15, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Correspondences, 1923,” FWH; Heye to Hodge, September 2, 1923, MS.7 HHE.1.15, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Correspondences, 1923,” FWH. These films are now available for viewing, with permission, at the NMAI and AAMHC.

92 Heye to Hodge, July 13, 1923; and Heye to Hodge, July 24, 1923, MS.7 HHE.1.15, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Correspondences, 1923,” FWH.

93 Pandey, Factionalism, 167. Although the AMNH sponsored Cattell’s Shalako filming, Hodge had convinced Protestant Governor Lutario Luna and kiva leader Komosana that filming the ceremony would be instrumental in preventing federal suppressions of Zuni religious expression; Tisa Wenger, We Have a Religion: The 1920s Pueblo

94 Pandey, “Anthropologists,” 331-332; Pandey, Factionalism, 167-169. One account (Pandey Factionalism, 3) accuses Hodge of discrediting members of the Catholic faction, leading to their loss of the Governorship during his excavations. The object of contention was “a small figure of St. Francis,” which Zunis in the Catholic faction had believed and presented as an Indigenous creation. This was probably the Santo Nino, see Chapter 3, n. 1, above.

95 Pandey, Factionalism, 167. Reportedly it was Catholic faction members Leopoldo Eriacho and Nick Tumaka who took the camera. The film was later returned to Cattell, and the AMNH produced the film as “The Shalako Ceremonial at Zuni, New Mexico,” which Zunis find objectionable for its revelation of esoteric ceremonial scenes and misrepresentations arising through editing and inaccurate intertitles. A recent collaboration between the AMNH and the AAMHC entitled “The Shalako Film Remade” has re-appropriated Cattell’s film, adding new intertitles that correct the originals, editing out parts that should not be viewed by the public or non-initiated Zunis, and incorporating a Zuni-language voice-over to contextualize the scenes for tribal audiences. These efforts are oriented towards engaging the practice of filmmaking as part of anthropology, and assert Zuni control over the film. See AAMHC, “Shalako Film Remade,” http://ashiwi-museum.org/collaborations/shalako-film-remade/ (accessed June 23, 2016).

96 Wenger, We Have a Religion, 187.

97 AAMHC “Shalako Film,” Isaac, Mediating Knowledges, 78-79. It should be noted that Zuni resistance to visual documentation by anthropologists appears as early as Cushing’s residence in 1879, who recounts constant resistance and interference when he tried to draw Zuni religious ceremonies and kokko figures; see Frank Hamilton Cushing, “My Adventures in Zuñi,” in Zuñi: Selected Writings of Frank Hamilton Cushing, ed. Jesse Green (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1979), 60-61, 70-74, 84.

98 Hodge did return for a very brief day of excavations in 1928, visiting with his friends among the workmen, and excavating rooms 427, 442, and 443 in Block B. Cattell also returned to Zuni, during the Shalako performance of 1924. He came without a camera, and seems to have tried to make amends, meeting with the priests and bringing gifts of sea shells for them and the Catholics who had opposed him; see Warren Ondelacy to Hodge, December 14, 1924, MS.7.MAI.1.528, “Ondelacy, Warren, Correspondence, 1922-1931,” FWH.

99 Nusbaum to Hodge, July 22, 1921.

100 Heye to Hodge, September 4, 1917, MS.7.HHE.1.10, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Correspondence, 1917,” FWH.

101 For example, on July 23, 1918, Heye congratulated Hodge on obtaining the “medicine outfit” of Naiuchi, a Zuni Bow Priest in the late nineteenth century (MS.7.HHE.1.11, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Correspondence, 1918,” FWH). Heye reiterated his desire for ethnological materials on several occasions; Heye to Hodge, August 31, 1918, MS.7.HHE.1.11, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Correspondence, 1918,” FWH; Hodge to Hodge, September 16, 1918, MS.7.HHE.1.11, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Correspondence, 1918,” FWH; Hodge to Hodge, July 13, 1923; Hodge to Hodge, July 24, 1923; Hodge to Hodge, September 7, 1923; Hodge to Hodge, Monday [no date] 1923, MS.7 HHE.1.15, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Correspondences, 1923,” FWH.


103 Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, The Excavation, 6, 12-13, 137-141; Hodge, Circular Kivas, 27-29; Hodge, “The Plaza Trench,” 150-151; Kintigh, Settlement, Subsistence, and Society, 59-60; Watson Smith, 1984, “One Man’s Archaeology,” Arizona State Museum Archives, Tucson, AZ, 340. Today the earlier black-on-white/red wares are identified as several Pueblo III types, while the later glazewares are known as Heshotauthla Polychrome, Kwakina Polychrome, Pinawa Glaze-on-white, and Kechipauan Polychrome.

104 Hodge, “Interview,” 135; Woodbury and Woodbury, “Appendix II.”
Hodge, “Interview,” 231.

Elliott, Great Excavations, 85; Shears, The Hendricks-Hodge, 24-39, 132-155. Hodge’s notes are relatively thorough and meticulous for their time, a critical contribution to the expedition’s scientific value. As work progressed, the archaeologists (usually Coffin) plotted locations of each room and burial on the large map sheets from a number of survey stations around the site. Finally, general correspondences, later reminisces, and photos by visitors furnish additional information. The field notes are now in the collections of the Cornell Rare and Manuscript Collections (Archives 9170, Box 1) as are the original map sheets (Archives 9239 and 11929). Other primary materials can be located at the BRL; the NMAI Archives; the NAA Archives; and the Arizona State Museum Archives, Tucson, AZ.

See Smith, Woodbury, Woodbury, The Excavation, 261. Small box screens appear in a few photographs of the excavations in progress, apparently used only for sifting out small materials such as turquoise mosaic tiles when excavators encountered them.

For an overview of vertical-face techniques, see Hester, Shafer, and Feder, Field Methods, 87.


Fewkes, “Archaeological Expedition to Arizona,” 648. Fewkes attributed much of his success in the Sikyatki cemetery to Hodge’s work and advice (527).

For Hodge’s own description of this process, see “Interview,” 134-135. In letters to Heye (June 22, 1919; July 2, 1919), Hodge claimed to be bagging every sherd from each room separately, with a bag per room, but photographs and the NMAI collections suggest that this level of thoroughness did not remain the practice. Hodge continued to have a bag or more for each individual room, but unbagged piles of other sherds are visible in many of the excavation photographs.

Hodge to Heye, June 22, 1919.


Hodge to Heye, July 2, 1919. Speaking retrospectively, Hodge claimed to have seen similar stratigraphy at Halona:wa south; see “Interview,” 33.


Ibid., 135.


Shears, The Hendricks-Hodge, 69-71; Elliott Great Excavations, 91-92. Unfortunately, Hodge did not systematically define his terminology, and Heye may have compromised much of his sherd collection, purportedly emptying sherd bags and mixing them together, destroying their provenance information. Heye’s disinterest in ceramic sherds is well attested, and Samuel K. Lothrop notes that at one point Heye discarded seventy barrels of ceramic sherds from the museum without retaining any records; Carpenter, Two Essays, 89. Smith would later claim that Hodge himself was not very sensitive to the value of potsherds and places the blame for discarding potsherds at Hawikku on both Hodge and Heye; Smith, “One Man’s Archaeology,” 339.

Hodge, “The Plaza Trench”; see n. 82, above.


In an attempt dated June 19, 1917, he seems to have been overwhelmed by the complexity of the task, describing the strata generally as alternating “ashes, ashes and charcoal, drift sand, black kitchen refuse, throughout from base to top,” in all of which undecorated sherds from utility wares appeared. He notes the specific depth of individual ornamented sherds, measuring from the bottom of the excavation face a reference point which was itself unspecified; see Hodge, “Hawikuh 1, 1917,” Collection 9170, HHAE, 68-69. Lacking a descriptive system or ceramic series for the site, Hodge’s discussion of the sherds is too general to be useful, and cannot be connected to specific strata in the deposit. Without an established point of reference, sherds’ positions relative to each other are also ambiguous, as is their statistical representativeness. In 1918, Hodge attempted another stratigraphic sample of refuse deposits, focusing on a specific point in the vertical face, where he noted the thickness and basic composition of each strata (sand, charcoal, ash, etc.), measuring from the bottom of his cut. In this case, Hodge made no note of ceramics other than to say that there were very few sherds. He evidently sought to indicate the relative antiquity of burials that he recovered from the lower strata, in originally shallow graves. The description of the fifteen strata in the entire 3.15 m. (10’ 4”) section serves to show that the burials occurred fairly early in what would appear to have been a long occupational history, but is no use in constructing a more broadly applicable ceramic chronology. See Hodge, “Hawikuh 3, 1918,” Collection 9170, HHAE. This volume of field notes does not have numbered pages, but Hodge’s stratigraphic notes appear at the end of the volume.

The Nacoochee site featured an earthen mound superimposed over earlier mound constructions and burials, 5.25 m. (17’ 3”) high and covering an area almost 25 m. (82’ 9”) in diameter. The excavators began on the mound’s summit, removing a series of 1.22 m. (4’) deep sections from the eastern side until reaching the mound’s base. They gradually cut these stepped trenches through the mound, noting the location of burials and features by their depth
below the summit or outer slope; Heye, Hodge, and Pepper, *The Nacoochee Mound*, 4, 18, 31, 100. They did not excavate the entire mound, but concentrated on its eastern side, expanding out from their initial trench of arbitrary stratigraphic levels whenever they encountered human remains or artifacts along its sides; see Heye to Hodge, September 13, 1915, MS.7.EIC.1.90, “Heye, George, Corresp. 1915,” FWH. These strata illustrate phases of accretional construction, but the authors made no effort locate most artifacts, burials or features in relation to stratigraphic context, and identified no chronological succession among the pottery sherds (Heye, Hodge, and Pepper, *The Nacoochee Mound*, 27-28, 30-35, 56). The authors do not specify who was responsible for devising this excavation approach, but at least one stratigraphic section is specifically attributed to Pepper (34). Perhaps with his previous ties to the AMNH, Pepper was aware of the developments in stratigraphic excavation taking place there.

131 Elliott, *Great Excavations*, 83.


136 Despite arguing about its layout, Hodge and Heye agreed on the importance of the mission excavation. The archaeologist believed that “the church will tell a bigger story by the time we get through than I had supposed would be possible,” and Heye echoed his sentiment, saying that “this church will tell a great deal of the history of Hawikuh, and I consider it one of the most important parts of the work.” See Hodge to Heye, June 15, 1919; Heye to Hodge, June 21, 1919.

137 Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 40.

138 Adkins, *Jesse L. Nusbaum*, 10-11; Heye to Hodge, March 19, 1919, MS.7.MAI.1.294, “Corresp. 1919,” FWH; Heye to Nusbaum, April 12, 1919, Papers of Jesse Logan Nusbaum, Box 3, “Geo. Heye-Heye Museum Am. Indian,” NAA. Nusbaum’s first apparent association with Heye was through free-lance work in New Mexico, inspecting, buying, and shipping local collections for Heye’s burgeoning museum in 1916. It is clear that Heye was hoping to hire Nusbaum at that time; see Heye to Nusbaum, April 4, 1916. Heye formally hired Nusbaum on August 19, 1917 (to start October 1, 1917), but the employment was interrupted by his enlistment and deployment in June, 1918. Heye to Nusbaum, August 19, 1917, Papers of Jesse Logan Nusbaum, Box 3, “Geo. Heye-Heye Museum Am. Indian,” NAA; and Heye to Hodge, June 3, 1918. Nusbaum was not a participant in the 1917 field season as has been incorrectly stated elsewhere, except for delivering a vehicle to Gallup for Hodge. See Hodge to Nusbaum, May 15, 1917; Telegram from Hodge to Nusbaum, May 26, 1917, Papers of Jesse Logan Nusbaum, Box 3, “Geo. Heye-Heye Museum Am. Indian,” NAA; Hodge to Nusbaum, May 26, 1917. Nusbaum would go on to be appointed the first Superintendent of the Mesa Verde National Park in 1921, and would hold other positions such as the first Directorship of New Mexico’s Laboratory of Anthropology and the National Parks Service Senior Archaeologist before his retirement in 1957; see Adkins, *Jesse L. Nusbaum*, 11-12; Nusbaum, *Tierra Dulce*, 72-85.

139 Nusbaum, *Tierra Dulce*, 5.

140 Heye to Hodge, January 8, 1917. From a letter Hodge wrote to Heye (December 5, 1917, MS.7.HHE.1.10, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Correspondence, 1917,” FWH), it appears that Heye had hoped to hire Nusbaum to conduct a second excavation in 1917, among the ruins of Canyon de Chelly for which he had received a permit.

141 The Zuni workmen appear to have enjoyed Nusbaum’s pranks, calling him *O-ma-li* which Hodge translated as “tall locust,” aptly fitting his lanky, angular figure. See Heye to Hodge, June 15, 1919, NMAI Archives.

142 Hodge to Heye, June 15, 1919; Hodge to Heye, June 22, 1919; Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 7.
143 Hodge to Heye, June 22, 1919.

144 Hodge to Heye, July 6, 1919, “MAI Records,” B193.18, NMAI Archives.

145 Hodge to Heye, July 13, 1919.

146 Hodge to Heye, August 25, 1919. Nusbaum may have returned to the mission excavations from Kechiba:wa a few days earlier. A transcription of the 1919 field notes from Cornell’s Rare and Manuscript Collection (Digitized Folder #1, HHAE, 47) merges the list of 43 Kechiba:wa burials from the Church and Mission Field Notebook with additional burials #44-91 from elsewhere in the field notes. Burial #44’s excavation occurred on August 18, 1919, so Nusbaum may have returned to work on the mission at that time, taking his field notebook with him.

147 Hodge to Heye, August 31, 1919, “MAI Records,” B193.18, NMAI Archives.

148 Postcard from Nusbaum to Hodge, September 21, 1919, MS.7.MAI.1.523, “Nusbaum, Jesse, Corresp. 1918-1931,” FWH. He also found that Tsináhe had abandoned camp and returned to the pueblo.

149 Nusbaum to Heye and Hodge, October 6, 1919, Papers of Jesse Logan Nusbaum, Box 3, “Geo. Heye-Heye Museum Am. Indian,” NAA; Nusbaum to Hodge, October 17, 1919. Nusbaum’s letter dated October 6, 1919 in the NAA is really three letters that were apparently folded and mailed together, and written over the course of a week, starting on Monday October 6, and hurriedly finishing with an updated note to Hodge on Friday, October 10, 1919 before sending the letter off to New York.

150 Nusbaum to Hodge, September 21, 1919.

151 Nusbaum to Heye and Hodge, October 6, 1919. Up to that point Nusbaum had used the portería as a driveway for scrapers to remove fill from the interior of the convento.

152 Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 141; Nusbaum to Hodge, October 17, 1919.

153 At this point, Nusbaum wrote to Hodge that “There is a hellava lot of ruins about this place all covered over 5 ft. of earth that I never dreamed were there,” and that he had located the floor of Room 34 1.5 m. (5’) below the mission church, which rested on its walls, “so you can guess how deep you have to go to finish Hawikuh Fred.” Nusbaum to Heye and Hodge, October 6, 1919; Nusbaum to Hodge, October 17, 1919.

154 Heye to Hodge, June 24, 1920, MS.7.MAI.7.13, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Collection, 1920,” FWH, with a copy in the NMAI Archives; Anonymous, undated summary of work conducted in 1920, “MAI Records.”

155 Heye to Hodge, July 11, 1920.

156 Of Jesse’s work at the Palace of the Governors (1909-1910), Rosemary L. Nusbaum claims that “All debris was carefully screened for archaeological values ‘in situ,’ and then hauled to wherever fill was requested […];” see The City Different and the Palace (Santa Fe: Sunstone Press, 2006), 85-86. Cordelia Snow argues that Rosemary’s recollections are probably inaccurate, and that no screening took place during this work, and no collected materials are known to have come from these excavations. Cordelia Snow, email message to the author, May 21, 2017; and Cordelia Snow, “Archaeological Excavations at the Palace of the Governors, Santa Fe, New Mexico, 1884-1995,” Compadres: Newsletter of the Friends of the Palace of the Governors, Santa Fe, New Mexico 5, no. 3 (December 1996): 4.

157 Brew, “Introduction,” xix. At both sites, the mistaken presumption of Franciscan simplicity underlay this decision, although Nusbaum should have known to expect more from his previous work at the extensive Pecos mission.

158 Examples include Rooms 2/3/4/18 and 14/17/18.
For instance, Nusbaum collected sherds from the sub-foundational Room 34 at the end of the 1919 season, but without time to finish its exaction, he says that he bagged the pottery and stored it at Awsti’s house (“Church and Monastery,” 136). Whether he ever returned to collect it is unknown, but no ceramics appear in NMAI collections from Room 34; so these were effectively lost. In later letters, Nusbaum also described finding broken griddle stones in the mission kitchen (Room 13), but none of these were documented as collected; Nusbaum to Smith, April 10, 1962.

The one exception to this assumption are the manos in NMAI N05769, which were clearly rearranged and placed in these locations, rather than having been found in such an alignment. Shears (The Hendricks-Hodge, 30) appears to have been the first to suggest using Hawikku’s excavation photographs to identify the provenience of specific artifacts.

As an example of an artifact specifically identified with the fill, see the glazed Spanish botella from Room 32. Nusbaum (“Church and Monastery,” 132) writes that he found it “in mess of ashes- 15” above upper floor.”

Usually this is a form of negative evidence. For instance, NMAI 095657.002 (figure 12.21) appears in early photographs of the sequential excavation of Room 1 (N05755, N05757, N05759, N05760, N05761, N05763), and therefore belongs to the post-mission occupation of this space, and cannot be assumed to be a mission-period artifact.

For a full discussion of post-mission occupations at Hawikku, see Appendix 1.

For example, see the round hewe stone used as a paver in the floor of Room 22A (figure 10.31). No provenance for this piece is recorded in the NMAI catalog, but photos clearly show it in situ, and then removed as excavations progressed (figures 10.31, 12.5, 12.7). Such stones were highly valued, labor intensive creations and it is unlikely that a stone in good condition would be reused in paving unless its original user was no longer able to claim it. It seems most probable that Zunis reusing the mission ruins found it near at hand in the remains and reused it on site, and I have therefore included it as a mission-period artifact.

In using the term hybrid ceramics, I mean earthenware artifacts of mixed traditions of production typical of the colonial Americas, combining construction techniques and materials from non-European pottery traditions (often local and indigenous, but also imported from Africa or other parts of the Americas) with forms of European derivation. At Hawikku, hybrid ceramics included soup plates, bowls, cups, pharmaceutical jars, spoons, candle holders, and a salt cellar in ceramic wares associated with Zuni and Hopi Pueblos. Such culturally mixed artifacts are commonly found in colonial-era sites of New Mexico, but have received little scholarly attention. With early anthropological theory oriented towards distilling cultural “purity” in the evolutionary and culture-area paradigms, culturally hybrid materials fell through the cracks, just as they were not easily conceptualized within the segregational logic of New Mexico’s tri-ethnic popular mythology. While these artifacts appear as curiosities in many excavation publications, they have been the subject of only one comprehensive study to date: Shawn Lee Penman’s Colonowares as Evidence of Acculturation at Pecos Pueblo, New Mexico (PhD diss., University of New Mexico, 2002). A few other academic studies explore their micro-technical characteristics: see Patricia Hilton Capone, Mission Pueblo Ceramic Analyses: Implications for Protohistoric Interaction Networks and Cultural Dynamics (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1995); and Jennifer Boyd Dyer, Colonowares in the Western Spanish Borderlands: A Ceramic Technological Study (PhD diss., University of New Mexico, 2010). In the eastern U.S., Spanish Florida, and the Caribbean, these kinds of vessels are often described as colonoware/colono ware, but this terminology has never found consensus acceptance in New Mexico (Cordelia T. Snow, email messages to the author, 4/20/2014). See Ivey, no date, “Locally-Made Trade Wares,” who reviews the historiography of hybrid ceramics and terminology, proposing the label Europeanform Tradewares instead. After discussing the issue with a number of archaeologists in both New Mexico and the eastern U.S., I have decided to follow the advice of Jeffrey L. Hantman (email message to the author, July 14, 2014), and describe these vessels simply as hybrid, modifying the ware types to which they belong based on formal and technical characteristics. I use this term under advisement, since its simplistic usage has deservedly received criticism for reifying and homogenizing cultures; confusing biological and cultural mixing; diminishing the importance of cultural interactions other than European and Indigenous encounters; and trafficking in tacit political implications. See Carolyn Dean and Dana Leibsohn, “Hybridity and its Discontents: Considering Visual Culture in Colonial Spanish America,” Colonial Latin American Review 12, no. 1 (2003): 5-35. On the other hand, I would argue that without this concept, many important

166 “Maps of Hawikuh Ruins, [19–],” Archives 9239, CRML.

167 Hodge describes this map production as underway in a letter to Heye, dated July 2, 1919. Ed Coffin had not completed the map by his departure in June 21, 1919, forcing Nusbaum to take over the work upon his return to the site (Nusbaum to Hodge, September 21, 1919).

168 An ink drawing from the NMAI archives appears to be a version of the plan that Schellbach produced, with annotations by Smith in preparation for the 1966 publication; see NMAI Archives, oversize drawers, Folder 6, Drawer 7. This is the basis of the illustration which Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury (The Excavation of Hawikuh, fig. 20) eventually published, as well as many of their measurements. It should be noted that the Schellbach plan shows Room 30 at its ultimate, post-mission dimensions, longer than the mission-period size. The atrium’s length is truncated, and the circular pit from the patio is incorrectly drawn in Room 38. See Chapters 7 and 8, and Appendix 1. The published plan also ignores a number of important features, such as the wall alignments and posts of the service patio on the southwest side, which appear in the Mindeleff map and Nusbaum’s photographs. The plan also does not include the full scale of the atrium, and numerous architectural features such as doors, windows, and bonding patterns which Nusbaum overlooked.

169 Legal pad sketch of church plan, MAI Records, B.273.16, NMAI Archives. This sheet appears to have been drawn as a field note to be inserted in the main volume of notes, augmenting missing measurements, and must have been drawn sometime before early August, 1919, when the altar was deconstructed. The authorship of this plan is problematic. Based on the handwriting, it is definitely not by Hodge. The system of notation is closest to that which Coffin used, placing measure notations between angled points, but the author of the legal plan wrote with closed 4s and 7s that have an upper left serif. Comparison to Coffin’s handwriting shows that he wrote with open fours and 7s lacking serifs. Nusbaum put serifs on his 7s but wrote with open 4s. So its authorship remains uncertain, and may have been by someone else on the site.

170 In a letter to Erik K. Reed, Watson Smith (August 23, 1965, “Zuni, Hawikuh ARG 2 Fol. 18, May 5, 1965-Jul. 21, 1970s” folder, WACC) says that “all field notes on the pueblo were made by Hodge himself and are very detailed and lucid. The field notes on the Spanish establishment were made by Jess Nusbaum but are neither detailed nor lucid, but Schellbach made a very fine and detailed plan of the mission by which Nusbaum’s rather inadequate notes can be interpreted.”

171 Nusbaum’s tendency to wait before recording field notes is readily evident from the first page, where he starts not with the site in general, or the initial outlines of the church as the excavators encountered them. Instead, he starts with the fully excavated main altar, indicating that work was already well-progressed before he began taking notes.

172 For instance, after labeling the first page as the “Main Central Altar,” he apparently left a blank page and then labeled the subsequent pages as “Left Side Altar” and “Right Side Altar” even though his notes from the main altar ended up spilling onto the space designated for the left altar, for which he ultimately recorded no information; see Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 1-5. In other places, he simply left pages blank, evidently intending to fill them in later, such as the twenty-one empty pages that follow his description of the church portal.

173 The most notable example is a circular pit in the floor (N07210, figure 7.124). Nusbaum (“Church and Monastery,” 142) describes this pit on a page prelabeled “38,” followed by a subheading “Patio of Court,” which was not in the small room 38 adjacent to the service patio. Schellbach along with Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury therefore draw this pit incorrectly in room 38 of their published plan (figures 5.43, 5.45), even though Nusbaum only identified wall alignments and never excavated this space. In a later letter to Smith, Nusbaum explicitly confirms that this circular pit was in the patio or garth of the convento, not the service patio or Room 38 (April 10, 1962). Other obvious cases of pre-labeling occurred on the third page of the notes, labeled “Left Side Altar” but continuing the discussion of the main altar from the previous pages.
Hodge describes Nusbaum as his primary photographer throughout the 1919 and 1920 seasons, and notes that Nusbaum had brought and used his own camera with a wide-angle lens to produce these images; see “Interview,” 141; anonymous, undated summary of work conducted in 1920, “MAI Records,” NMAI Archives; Hodge to Heye, July 2, 1919.

A series of photographs showing the conditions of the site in 1963 are found in Watson Smith, July 7, 1963, “Hawikuh Photos,” B.272.8, NMAI Archives.

Zuni grazing lands were divided and fenced into individual range units in 1934; Ferguson, Historic Zuni Architecture, 37. Currently a few components of the Hawikku site, such as the round kivas, an unexcavated roomblock, and parts of the mission still fall outside these boundaries.

Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury (The Excavation, 125) attest that parts of the nave walls and strata of manure were still exposed and disintegrating during a site visit in 1963. Some later backfilling has probably taken place on the Hawikku site since the departure of the Hendricks-Hodge expedition. Hayes Lewis (personal communication, October 9, 2015) recalls that when he was younger, he and other Zuni youths would accompany Edmund J. Ladd to work on backfilling and stabilizing parts of the ruins.

The “Zuni-Cibola Complex” was nominated to the National Register of Historic Places in 1974, including the Village of the Great Kivas (LA 631), Yellow House Ruins (LA 493), Kechiba:wa (LA 8758), and Hawikku Pueblos (LA37). These were to comprise the National Historic Park, along with a visitor’s center near Zuni Pueblo. In 1988, Congress passed Public Law 100-567, the Zuni-Cibola National Historical Park Act, which authorized the NPS and BIA to negotiate a lease holder agreement for the establishment of the park. Always controversial, the park plans became an issue of strong disagreement within the community and between religious leaders and the Tribal Council in 1989, and the pueblo held a general referendum on the issue in 1990, ultimately rejecting the plan. Documentation of the planning process and ultimate failure of this initiative is available in the WACC archives.

Damp, The Battle of Hawikku. In my own analysis, many of Damp’s study units appear to be in locations where Hodge’s excavation crew trenched or discarded fill from elsewhere in their excavations. Because the Hendricks-Hodge Expedition did not screen its fill prior to discarding it, it seems likely that at least some of the small metal artifacts that Damp recovered were not in their original locations of deposition, but had been redistributed by Hodge’s earlier excavations. This calls into question some of Damp’s distribution analysis, although the concentration of metal artifacts that he identifies as the possible entrance to the town (96-98) does not appear to have been an area of fill dispersal, and his findings for this area are probably accurate.


Hodge tells the story of Nusbaum struggling to repair a warped ceramic vessel in the ramada; see “Interview,” 139-140.

Heye to Hodge, July 9, 1917, MS.7.HHE.1.10, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Correspondence, 1917,” FWH; Hodge, “Interview,” 168-169; Shears, The Hendricks-Hodge, 25; Carpenter, Two Essays, 25. The artifacts’ place in the accession series therefore furnishes the year of excavation for objects that are otherwise unprovenanced, and in some cases aids in connecting artifacts from 1919 to the mission context.


Possible trades include those discussed with the National Museum (Heye to Hodge, August 9, 1916); the Museum of New Mexico (Hodge to Heye, September 22, 1917, MS.7.HHE.1.10, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Correspondence, 1917,” FWH; Hodge to Heye, September 12, 1918, MS.7.HHE.1.11, “Frederick W. Hodge/George Heye Corr. 1918,” FWH); the Field Museum (Heye to Hodge, September 19, 1918); and the Amerind Foundation (Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, The Excavation, 135). Another letter from A. V. Kidder to
Louis Clarke (December 4, 1924, Folder 3, “Cambridge University - Correspondence between museums – Photocopies,” #9170, HHAE) indicates that the Philips Academy had received “a good lot from Hawikuh and Nusbaum from Kechipauan, so we are well fixed here for that region.” It does not appear that any of the discussed or possible trades involved materials from the Hawikku mission, and I have not attempted to trace any of these exchanges to see if they actually took place or what materials they involved.

186 Heye to Hodge, September 25, 1917, BRL.

187 Nusbaum to Smith, March 30, 1962. In 1919, Hodge expressed the desire to hire another editor to take on his work with the other publications, allowing him to focus entirely on compiling the results from Hawikku, lest its study “get farther and farther away” from him; Hodge to Heye, June 26, 1919. Heye instead suggest hiring an editorial clerk to assist with writing up the Hawikku research to date; Heye to Hodge, July 3, 1919. Hodge’s response conveys his concern that Heye would use this hire as an opportunity to take on another fieldworker instead of a dedicated clerk, and that it would be end up another position serving to expand the collections rather than someone focused entirely on the Hawikku publication; see Hodge to Heye, July 13, 1919. During his time at MAI, Hodge did produce a handful of articles summarizing the excavations and treating subject such as Hawikku’s bone work, turquoise work, pottery, circular kivas, and an ambiguous structure that he called the “snake-pens.” See Frederick W. Hodge, “Excavations at the Zuñi Pueblo of Hawikuh in 1917,” *Art and Archaeology* 7, no. 9 (1918): 367-369; “Hawikuh Bonework,” *Indian Notes and Monographs* 3, no. 3 (1920): 61-151; “Turquoise Work at Hawikuh,” *Leaflets of the Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation*, no. 2 (1921); “Recent Excavations at Hawikuh,” *El Palacio* 12, no. 1 (1922): 1-16; “Circular Kivas;” “Pottery of Hawikuh,” *Indian Notes* 1, no. 1 (1924): 8-15; “Excavations at Kechipauan, New Mexico,” *Indian Notes* 1, no. 1 (1924): 35-36; and “Snake-Pens at Hawikuh, New Mexico,” *Indian Notes* 1, no. 1 (1924): 111-119.

188 The exact dispensation of this fund amounting to $8,000.00 is unclear. Heye appears to have used it to keep up his operating costs rather than retaining it for Hodge’s publication (Carpenter, *Two Essays*, 86). Hodge believed that the total was more, in the area of $20,000, and that Heye would never allow for the publication, preferring to divert this money to the purchase of more specimens for his collection (Hodge to Nusbaum, October 2, 1931, MS.7.MAI.1.523, “Nusbaum, Jesse, Corresp. 1918-1931,” FWH). It turned out that the money had remained unspent, and the MAI ultimately used it to finance Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury’s publication of the site; see Smith, “One Man’s Archaeology,” 338.


190 Hodge to Heye, June 22, 1919. An envelope with the MAI’s return address now in the NAA originally contained “Nusbaum’s photos and letters pertaining to Hawikuh’s monastery” as noted in Heye’s script. A second notation in Hodge’s handwriting says that “these may be useful to Jess in preparing his article.” See undated envelope in Jesse Logan Nusbaum Papers, “Geo. Heye-Heye Museum Am. Indian,” NAA.

191 Telegram from Nusbaum to Hodge, January 24, 1922, MS.7.MAI.1.523, “Nusbaum, Jesse, Corresp. 1918-1931,” FWH.

192 Based upon a one page typed manuscript entitled “General Outline Monograph of the Monastery at Hawikuh,” which was with his papers at death. See Watson Smith, May 3, 1960, “Inventory and Description of Papers in the possession of Mrs. F. W. Hodge,” “MAI Records,” B194.07, NMAI Archives, 8; and Hodge, undated, “Excerpts.”


194 Hodge to Nusbaum, October 2, 1931; Hodge, “Interview,” 175-176.

195 Hodge to Nusbaum, December 27, 1931, MS.7.MAI.1.523, “Nusbaum, Jesse, Corresp. 1918-1931,” FWH. The normally genial Hodge writes:

The parting shot of George G. Heye was to ask me if I didn’t think it would be fair to deduct a fifth of my December salary because I was leaving on the 24th! After telling him what I think of him, which must have been heard across the court, he said, ‘All right, all right!’ and made out the check for the full amount. Did
you ever hear of such a skunk? After letting him know a few other things, I told him the very name ‘Heye Foundation’ stinks from coast to coast and that what was supposed to be a Museum had retrograded into nothing but a damned morgue. I was so angry that I don’t know what kept me from smashing him.

196 Smith, “One Man’s Archaeology,” 332.

197 Hodge, History.

198 Hodge, “A Square Kiva.”


200 Smith, “One Man’s Archaeology,” 337-338.

201 Smith, Woodbury, Woodbury, The Excavation, 101, 103. There probably was no mission at Hawikku in 1680; see Chapter 3.

202 Ibid., 103.

203 Ibid., 102; Ross Gordon Montgomery, “Functional Interpretations of the Church and Friary,” in Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, The Excavation, 132. Struggling to comprehend the Hawikku’s convento plan and the evidence that Native choristers passed through the cloister in order to gain access to the choir, Montgomery writes incorrectly that,

[…] a Franciscan garth normally was considered a ‘conventual enclosure.’ The cloister walks themselves were concealed by continuous masonry walls surrounding the garth and pierced only by a few high windows and by one or two doorways. Hence any movement in the cloister could not be observed from the roof. Nonetheless, a prospect of the garth per se would have been confined to the religious, to male visitors, few and far between, and to the occasional workman using the ladders to the roof or pottering around in the area.


Writing in retrospect, Smith would later say that,

> We did not deal with the various categories of Spanish artifacts, such as iron, glass, fabrics, tiles, etc. These objects remain in limbo at the Heye Museum, and would repay intensive study. If abundant, as alleged, this fact contrasts with the paucity of Spanish objects from Awatovi, which were disappointingly few. The reason is mysterious, because the two places had experienced almost parallel circumstances during the period of missionary occupation, and in other respects were closely similar. The puzzle remains to be resolved (Smith, “One Man’s Archaeology,” 341).

The finds from Awatovi’s mission, including its San Bernardo wares, remain mostly unpublished. Recognizing that they did not have identical histories, I would nevertheless hypothesize that like Hawikku, Awatovi’s *convento* was partly occupied by Hopi people, and that some of the “non-Spanish” artifacts that Smith mentions from that site actually represent its mission phase. The excavators at Awatovi may have misinterpreted their finds because of Montgomery’s avid but misplaced assertions that the friars lived in cloistered seclusion.
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CHAPTER 6: ESTABLISHMENT PHASE OF THE HAWIKKU MISSION

Among the many oral histories that ethnographers have published from Zuni informants, there is a notable absence of stories about the construction of the Spanish missions. The neighboring Acoma and Hopi have well-documented descriptions of the hardships their ancestors endured procuring mission roofing timbers, but recorded Zuni ethnographies say little about building the missions.\(^1\) Perhaps this absence results from a lack of interest by Anglo anthropologists in Spanish cultural influences, but it also comes from Zuni reluctance to dwell on the ordeals of their ancestors, avoiding sensationalizing or stirring up ghosts of their suffering.\(^2\)

In a 1995 interview, Alex Seowtewa hinted at these hardships, describing oral traditions about famines resulting from forced labor on mission construction, which took Zuni men away from their fields. With the added pressures of Navajo and Apache raids, he said, desperate food shortages and winter starvation set in, and incidences of cannibalism occurred as Zunis struggled for survival.\(^3\) During the 2016 ZCRAT visit to Smithsonian, Alex’s son Octavius Seowtewa further described the violence and coercion that Zunis remember as part of mission construction at Hawikku and Halona:

[…] thinking and listening to our ancestors talk about what their parents or their great grandfathers endured when they were building the churches […] they weren’t getting paid, it was actually forced labor. And the only way that they did the actual work was having their children taken away from them, and some of them their fingers, their hands chopped off, just to intimidate and put their parents to work.\(^4\)

He reiterates:

[…] having all the strict rules with the Catholic church, especially around that time, people were forced into […] building the churches. And they were actually punished by
severing arms or limbs of relatives in order for the family to work on the church. We
know that this happened, not only to Zuni, but Acoma and all the other places that they
still have the churches. That was forced labor and if people didn’t want to work, they
suffered the consequences. 5

Although avoiding further detail, such accounts offer a Zuni voice speaking to the hardships and
perseverance underlying the structural history of Hawikku’s mission. Buildings are more than
static arrangements of walls and roofs; they embody the cumulative experiences of the people
who were their builders and users, and they remain objects of memory for descendent
communities.

Structural history, the description of a building’s construction and alterations through
time, is an essential tool of architectural history and much needed for many New Mexico
missions. All too often, historians treat a mission’s date of foundation as its date of construction,
creating a false impression that large, formal mission complexes arose rapidly over the course of
a year. 6 The considerable labor embodied in the construction of a mission makes this scenario
unlikely; they could not plausibly be products of a single season’s labor, or even two or three
years. 7 Foundation trenches had to be dug, stone carried from distant sources, and fill
accumulated to level the site. Adobe bricks, mortar, and plaster required substantial amounts of
water, which might only be available at certain times of the year. Individual adobes and freshly
laid courses of bricks both required drying time to acquire strength and prevent deformation.
Timber had to be cured, transported, hewn, and carved into immense beams. 8 Indigenous
laborers needed to learn new technical skills and master unfamiliar tools. In theory, missionaries
would not have wanted to disrupt local agricultural cycles on which they and the pueblo both
depended, although Alex Seowtewa’s account indicates Hawikku’s mission construction might
have pushed Zunis beyond what their resources could support.
Construction of a fully realized mission church and *convento* was the work of years, and complete structures underwent further alterations and expansions. Missions were structural processes rather than static products. Purísima Concepción functioned as a mission for relatively few years: from 1629 to 1632, and again from some time prior to 1661 until 1672. In total, its mission period lasted little more than twenty years, depending upon the exact date of the mid-century re-establishment. Within that duration, three distinct structural phases are discernable through primary sources and archaeological remains. From 1629 to 1630, Figueredo and his companions created a provisional chapel and residency by altering existing pueblo structures. This establishment mission burned in 1632, with the death of Letrado. Sometime in the mid-seventeenth century, Zuni laborers and an unknown friar constructed a formal mission with a single nave church, baptistery, and cloister-plan *convento*. Following the completion of that core structure, additions and alterations occurred, comprising the mission’s third phase. After its destruction in 1672, Hawikku community members altered and reoccupied the ruins, a phase lasting until the Pueblo Revolt in 1680, with sporadic use continuing afterwards (see Appendix 1). This chapter describes the documentary evidence for the establishment phase of the Hawikku mission and a series of buried rooms on the site possibly associated with Figueredo’s period. Based on primary sources, Nusbaum’s field notes, Hendricks-Hodge Expedition correspondences, and excavation photographs, Chapter 7 will describe the structural history and spatial arrangements of the mission’s formal phase, and Chapter 8 interprets subsequent mission-period alterations.
Perea’s Description

Ivey demonstrates that establishment phase missions across northern New Spain were typically small, vernacular structures that missionaries used temporarily while they accumulated materials and social means for more ambitious construction projects. Establishment phase structures are often described as *jacal*, indicating a range of small, temporary constructions that included post-in-ground frames with pitched thatch roofs, and stone or adobe buildings with flat, earthen roofs.¹⁰ In New Mexico pueblos where archeologists have identified establishment phase structures, they appear to have been reused rooms and houses in the local Pueblo vernacular. Friars acquired these structures and began making modifications, cutting doorways through the walls, reconfiguring existing spaces, adding rooms, and introducing new reliance on adobe brick construction. Ivey identifies such establishment-phase mission structures at the pueblos of Las Humanas (Gran Quivira), Abó, Quarai, Pecos, Gíusewa, and Awatovi.¹¹

When Benavides claims there were two *conventos* and churches among the Zunis in 1630, only a year after initial evangelization, it is implausible that he refers to anything but a temporary, initial structure meeting the minimum requirements of church and residency.¹² Perea explicitly describes Hawikku’s first mission as a repurposed pueblo house: “A house was bought for lodging of the Religious, and at once [became] the first Church of that Province, where the next day was celebrated the first mass.”¹³ Benevides must be referring to this structure, perhaps with subsequent alterations.¹⁴

Perea provides little description of the first building, but one may infer several characteristics from his narrative. Hawikku’s initial mission was probably located at a distance from the town’s central plaza, an irregular elongated space running roughly parallel to the ridge on which it stood (figure 1.6). Shortly after the Governor’s departure, Figueredo began hearing a
“great din” of dances, drums, and shell trumpets at night, which he interpreted as an impending assault. According to Perea, it seems that Figueredo did not directly witness these performances from his new mission, as would have been likely if it stood near the ridgetop plaza. Perea knew the mission’s location relative to the pueblo firsthand as an eyewitness, and he describes the dances as audible but not visible to the missionary, whose residence must therefore not have been close to the plaza. It is likely Zunis sought to distance the Spanish by selling or assigning them a peripheral space on the slopes away from the town’s main ritual focus. They had followed a similar strategy when Esteban arrived in 1539, confining the North African in a large house outside of the pueblo.

The house which become the first mission included cooking facilities, for which Hawikku residents initially provided firewood, water, and “what was necessary.” Firewood was not much needed for heating in late August, and while it might have helped light the rooms, its primary purpose was probably for cooking. The house likely also included multiple rooms. When emissaries from a nearby pueblo visited Figueredo in the middle of the night, the friar had to call for his sleeping translator, who was not aware of the disturbance but lay within earshot, suggesting that he slept in a different space than the friar. The house was serving multiple functions, as “the first Church of that Province,” as well as mundane roles of sleeping and food preparation, for which more than one room was needed.

**The Sub-Foundational Rooms**

Hodge’s excavation of the pueblo reveals a pattern in which three to four adjoined rooms formed single households, with spaces close to the exterior serving as living and working
quarters, and internal rooms for storage. Internal doorways connected these rooms to each other, but not with adjacent households.\textsuperscript{19} When the missionaries obtained a “house,” it may have been one of these multi-room units with adobe plastered walls and floors, interior doorways between rooms, floor-level fireplaces, and benches typical of other Hawikku households. In publishing the mission site, Smith, Woodbury and Woodbury did not think it possible to identify a sequence of its construction. Several rooms beneath the foundation of the formal mission structure are consistent with Perea’s description, however, and artifacts such as soup plate fragments (see below) suggest an association with the earliest period of Franciscan occupation, the 1629 to 1632 establishment phase.

The formal mission complex which Nusbaum excavated sat on the outskirts of the pueblo, where the slope of the town’s promontory merges with the plains below (figure 6.1). The northwestern side of the mission is uphill, where a thick stone retaining wall built alongside the nave and baptistery is the only trace readily visible today. In excavating these remains, Nusbaum rarely dug below the formal mission floor, but he did clear several earlier rooms along the edge of the structure and beneath its foundations. Their positioning suggests that they were an extension of housing block F, descending the ridge’s flank to the location where the formal mission would eventually be built (figure 6.2). At the end of this block, partly-excavated Rooms 32-35 were located beneath where mission walls would later be built, and exhibited traces of alterations, adobe bricks, and Spanish-era artifacts.

Starting from the western corner of the formal church, Room 35 lay beneath the stone retaining wall and was originally part of a compound comprising additional, unexcavated rooms without any evident Spanish association (figure 6.3).\textsuperscript{20} The remaining sub-foundational rooms are more important for present purposes (figure 6.4). Lying northeast of Room 35, Nusbaum’s crew
only partly exposed Room 34 as they dug a meter-wide trench along the nave and retaining wall in early October 1919. It deeply underlay the wall and floor of the baptistery. Nusbaum describes no features in this room, of which he only excavated a small strip, but it evidently had a ceiling that was higher than typical elsewhere in the pueblo. Its north wall survived to a height of 2.31 meters (7’ 7”) without any visible beam sockets. The walls also appear to have been reworked at some point in their history, based on an intrusive corner and fill visible in the only photograph showing parts of the room, as well as the available plan drawings. These sketchy sources suggest Room 34 had an irregular plan or had been renovated to increase its size. Although the evidence is sparse and inconclusive, the unusual interior height and possible reconfiguration of its walls are consistent with other Spanish establishment-period construction practices.

To the northeast was Room 33, directly below the northern corner of the baptistery and retaining wall, with a floor approximately 46 centimeters (1’ 6”) below the level of the baptistery floor (figure 6.5-6.6). As the best documented of the sub-foundational rooms, its features were Pueblo in character but its artifact assemblage strongly points to Spanish contact or even occupation. Nusbaum described its walls as being of “Indian” construction, meaning uncut sandstone blocks in adobe mortar, with substantial remnants of mud plaster finish. The room had a rectangular hearth with stone slabs set flush to the floor. An earthen bench ran along the northwest wall, and had storage bins at each end. Also typical of the pueblo’s Native houses were artifacts of food production: a round-bottomed, utilitarian cooking jar; sherds from four Hawikuh Polychrome jars (a style dating c. 1630-1700 and generally considered to have developed when the Spanish arrived among Zuni towns); two sherds of unidentified types; and two sherds reworked as pottery scrapers (figure 6.7).
The remainder of Room 33’s assemblage is more unusual: hybrid ceramic vessels of traditional Pueblo materials and techniques but with forms of Euro-American derivation. A large white-colored Plainware bowl drawing on Zuni burnished-slip traditions may be among these vessels (figure 6.8). It is similar in size to other Zuni bowls from the time, but has a flat base rather than the more typical rounded bottom. Flat bottoms had existed earlier, especially with cups and pitchers, but are unusual in the Hawikku assemblage. If the bowl is ambiguous, mixing of cultural traditions is readily evident in a group of nine pieces of San Bernardo Ware, the largest such grouping found anywhere in the pueblo (figure 6.9).

San Bernardo Ware was a seventeenth-century development of the Hopi Yellow Ware tradition, produced among their pueblos on the southern margin of Black Mesa in present-day Arizona (figure 6.10). First appearing in the 1200s, Hopi Yellow Wares incorporated very fine clay, usually without visible temper, fired to higher temperatures using coal as fuel, producing distinctive yellow-colored vessels of high quality with red, brown, and black matte paint decoration, most notably in a type of known as the Sikyatki Polychrome Ware (ca. 1375-1385 to the 1620s figure 6.11). The Hopi Yellow Ware artistic tradition extended through the colonial period, and seventeenth-century artists often combined forms of Spanish introduction with their own technological and iconographic traditions, producing San Bernardo Plain and Polychrome wares (c. 1620s to 1700), which archaeologist J. O. Brew named after the Awatovi mission. The group of San Bernardo vessels from Room 33 includes a deep bowl with flame-like motifs around its exterior, a rim sherd from a cup or pitcher, and remains of seven soup plates with flat or annular ring bases, widely flaring rims, and stylized ornamentation (figures 6.12-6.13). Hybrid ceramics such as these San Bernardo soup plates do not appear to have developed prior to sustained contact between Spanish colonists and Pueblo communities. Although early
entradas carried ceramic vessels, it is unlikely that their short, often contested sojourns offered sufficient incentive for potters to develop new artistic forms. As friars began to missionize the pueblos, they brought with them wheel-thrown vessels from Mexico and Europe that provided formal models for the development of new cultural combinations in ceramic production. Sustained colonial interactions created economic incentives and social pressures to produce these wares. New Mexico archaeologists generally accept that hybrid ceramics did not develop among Rio Grande pueblos until Oñate’s 1598 colonization, and it seems unlikely that incentives for their production would have existed among the western pueblos until around 1629.

The San Bernardo vessels in Room 33, beneath the foundations of the formal mission, therefore provide critical chronological information. The room probably predates Hawikku’s missionization, but its use must have ended sometime between the establishment of the western missions in 1629, when production of these wares probably commenced, and the start of formal mission construction on the site in the 1650s. Unfortunately, Nusbaum does not specify whether the sherds were in situ on the floor or part of Room 33’s fill. They might therefore have been used in this room, or they might have come from elsewhere as rubbish. In either case, the assemblage must have arisen in the short period between 1629 and the early 1650s, and its uniquely coherent collection of San Bernardo wares most plausibly represents tableware remnants from the mission establishment phase. No other room at Hawikku contained so many hybrid wares, whose shapes imply new forms of social interaction that the Spanish introduced. This assemblage therefore associates Room 33 with the establishment mission, either directly as one of its architectural spaces, or by proximity as a recipient of fill from its destruction.

Circumstantial evidence suggests that Room 33 may have been burnt. Nusbaum does not mention burning, but may have overlooked it in his hurried notetaking at the frenzied end of the
1919 field season. The floor along the northeast wall appears discolored in photographs, similar to discolorations on the floors of burnt rooms in the convento (compare to figures 7.99-7.100, 7.103-7.104, 7.130). While inconclusive, the interior of the northeastern bin also appears blackened, and one can trace a slumping line of stratification in the excavation photograph which might indicate the remnants of a burnt, collapsed roof. Several of the ceramic vessels from the room show burnt discolorations that do not match on adjoining sherds, indicating that the vessels broke prior to burning, but their sherds were deposited nearby each other. While none of these points is conclusive by itself, when taken together they suggest the room may have been abandoned upon burning, consistent with primary source descriptions of the establishment phase mission’s destruction.

Probably abutting Room 33’s eastern corner was Room 32, another Pueblo-style domestic space with multiple occupations (figures 5.39). Originally a rectangular room running northeast to southwest, it underlay the eventual location of the mission atrium’s entryway. The atrium wall was built directly over the earlier room’s northwestern wall. The room showed multiple construction phases, with more refined “ancient” masonry supporting later, expediently built upper walls. A small, square hearth sat in the packed earth of its early floor level, which a new partition wall eventually subdivided. Later occupants filled in the space, cut down the upper courses of the partition, and placed a new, featureless floor 1.37 meters (4’ 6”) above the original (figure 6.14). There may have been a third floor level at the top of the stratigraphic column, but field notes are incoherent on this point, as well as about the depth of these layers relative to the rest of the site. Hodge and Nusbaum neglected to refill this room, and a slumping pit beneath the site’s wire fence marks its location today (figure 6.15).
Nusbaum collected several artifacts from Room 32, including two medium-sized, blackened utility jars that he found in the “upper room,” presumably at or above the second floor level, along with bone beads and “late polychrome” sherds (a term which Hodge normally used for what is now known as Matsaki Polychrome), roughly dating this room’s occupation between 1475 and the 1650s. Most notably, Nusbaum found a beautiful Spanish botilla or storage jar, glazed brownish-black inside and out, “like a wonderful piece of jet,” located in a “mess of ashes” 38 centimeters (15”) above the upper floor and 1.83 meters (6’) from the southern corner (NMAI 096961; figure 6.16). Because this room’s overall stratigraphic sequence remains unclear, the relative chronological positioning of this botilla is uncertain. In any case, the walls of the room were never totally buried, and remained visible above ground throughout the mission period. They were incorporated into a series of structural features mediating entry into the mission, and Zunis stepped over or through these remnants before entering the church (see Chapter 7).

Extending north of Room 32 were traces of a several walls that Nusbaum incompletely excavated, one of which was 27.94 centimeters (11”) wide and made of molded adobe bricks, sitting upon a 1.27 centimeter (0.5”) layer of ashes roughly 22.86 centimeters (9”) below the ground level at the time of the formal mission’s construction (figure 6.17). The materials and style of this wall connect it to the mission period, but prior to the completion of the formal mission whose construction superseded it. The early adobe wall most plausibly belongs to an establishment phase of the mission, either during the 1629 to 1630 period, or the initial return of missionaries to Hawikku in the mid-seventeenth century. The wall appears to have been taken down by the time of the atrium’s construction. As with broken adobe bricks comprising the fill of the raised sanctuary floor in the formal church, this feature hints at the existence of brick structures predating the formal mission (see Chapter 7).
A Place on the Margin

Although Nusbaum and Hodge overlooked their significance, as have later authors, the rooms beneath the formal mission are important clues in understanding the structural progression on the site. These partially excavated spaces correspond to Perea’s description of Hawikku’s first provisional mission: an already extant Zuni house situated away from the main plaza, out of direct sight but within reasonable hearing distance. From here, Figueredo could hear but not see the drums and dancing that Perea describes. It is a marginal location, consistent with historic Zuni practices of keeping foreigners on the outskirts of town, and included cooking facilities as part of a complex of connected rooms. Room 33 may have reached the end of its functional life by burning, paralleling Benavides’s description of the mission’s destruction in 1632. The circumstantial evidence from these sub-foundational rooms is consistent with expectations for an establishment-phase mission using existing vernacular structures, while traces of adobe walls indicate early Spanish activity there. Room 34 suggests reconfigurations typical of Spanish reuse with its longitudinal arrangement, and unusually high ceilings. Its walls appear to have been reworked from preexisting pueblo rooms to create a larger space, perhaps by removing partitions and reroofing.41

The location of these rooms underneath the formal mission is further circumstantial evidence associating them with the establishment phase mission. While not always the case, formal missions often stood on or near sites of their humble predecessors, avoided the need to negotiate a new location within the community and enshrining the memory of earlier evangelization efforts.42 Architectural histories of twentieth-century Zuni Pueblo indicate spatial configurations and settlement patterns exhibited remarkable conservatism, despite frequent changes to individual structures. The importance of maintaining specific ceremonial spaces and
pathways continues to structure the pueblo’s otherwise changing built environment to this day (figure 6.18, 9.3). If seventeenth-century Hawikku had a similarly conservative spatial organization, Franciscans returning to the town in the 1650s may have found it easier to rebuild on a location where they had been before, than demand a new site.

For Zuñis concerned about the return of the Spanish, this location may also have seemed a preferable arrangement, keeping outsiders away from their dance plaza, homes, and presumably ceremonial spaces such as kivas. Located on the flats below the town promontory, it would have been easy for Zuñis to keep a wary eye on the comings and goings of the mission from their elevated ridgetop position. Furthermore, this site conformed to the Franciscan practice of building on the outskirts of established towns, a custom going back to the earliest days of the order but not always followed in sixteenth-century Mexico. As I will argue below, the formal mission phase intentionally incorporated the remains of Room 32 as a visible entryway to the new church and convento, perhaps making explicit architectural reference to their predecessors’ first mission establishment there.

Finally, the hybrid ceramic assemblage of Room 33 is a critical chronological indicator linking the room to the mission’s establishment phase, either as a structural component in itself, or as a neighboring building. With its hearth, benches, bins, and ceramic assemblage, Room 33 might have been the first mission kitchen, standing near other rooms used as a chapel and quarters for the friars, lay brother, and any Native laborers who assisted them. Rooms 32 and 34 may also have belonged to this complex, and presumably other spaces beneath the church nave and atrium, which Nusbaum and his workmen did not uncover. These sub-foundational rooms lack unambiguous evidence such as an altar, longitudinal liturgical space, or extensive adobe bricks walls which would more clearly identify them as a Christian mission. Associating them
with the first mission of 1629 to 1632, however, is the most plausible interpretation of their location, features, and artifact assemblage. In the future, it might be possible for remote sensing tools to test this hypothesis by identifying additional structures beneath and around the formal mission foundations.
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27 Ibid., 134. The bench averaged 39.4 cm. (1’ 3.5’’) tall, and was 38.1 cm. (1’ 3’’) wide on its narrow, southwestern end. The bin on that end was smaller, with interior dimensions of 49.5 cm. long by 19.1 cm. wide by 12.7 cm. deep (1’ 7.5’’ by 7.5’’ by 5’’). Its curbing rose 5.1 cm. (2’’) above the rest of the bench. The northeastern bin was larger, with the last 1.32 m. (4’ 4’’) of the bench stepping out to a width of 0.74 m. (2’ 5’’) to accommodate it. This larger bin was 0.44 m. (1’ 5.5’’) deep and had inner dimensions of 0.33 m. wide by 0.44 m. long (2’ 1’’ by 1’ 5.5’’).

28 The cooking jar is NMAI 096992.000, the flat bottomed bowl is 096985.000, the Hawikuh Polychrome and unidentified sherds fall under numbers 096950.000 and 096953.000. Hawikuh Polychrome ware was painted with burnished brownish-red and white or buff slip, and ornaments painted with runny, irregular glaze, dating to c. 1630-1700. See Woodbury and Woodbury, “Appendix II,” 331-334; and in Lannon and Harlow, The Pottery, 91-105. The scrapers are NMAI 096948.000. One is probably made from a piece of Heshotauthla Polychrome Ware, with red slip on one side (the exterior?), and greenish glaze on white slipped ground on the other (the interior?). This pottery style dates to ca. 1300-1400, and was probably picked up from an ancestral site and reused in the colonial period. The other scraper has reddish/reddish-brown paint on buff-colored slip on one side and buff-colored slip with no paint on the other side. It could be a piece of Kechipauan Polychrome, if one assumes that this sherd is missing the typical glaze, or more likely it could be a piece of Matsaki polychrome (ca 1475-1680+). The room also contained a piece of petrified wood with one end abraded from use as a polishing stone (NMAI 096949.000).

29 This bowl is NMAI 096985.000, a flat-bottomed form commonly described as a bread bowl. It is 31.00 cm. in maximum diameter and 14.20 cm. in height, with a subtle pinkish-white burnished-slip finish. Because MAI staff fully reconstructed the vessel, it is not possible to clearly see the paste, but from abraded patches it appears to be pinkish-gray in color. The exterior has a heavily abraded ring on the bottom. I have adopted the term “Plainware” or simply “Plain” to describe the slipped and stone-burnished ceramics common at Hawikku. Whereas the study of ceramics would typically categorize these ceramics by color (“Buffware,” “Redware,” etc.), my own assessment of the Hawikku materials suggests that many of these vessels are related as a cohesive group, based on form, construction, and materials. Therefore, I describe them uniformly as Plainware with their slip color as the primary ornamental variable.

30 As archaeologists currently understand them, Jeddito Yellow Wares include several types, originating as Jeddito Black-on-orange in late 1200s, developing into Awatovi Black-on-yellow and Jeddito Black-on-yellow, with minor types including Antelope Black-on-straw, Bidahochi Polychrome, and Huckovi Black-on-orange, these latter types tending to shade into each other, making them difficult to distinguish. The Homolovi sites near Winslow, Arizona
contained related Winslow Orange Wares, which are similar enough to be classified as Hopi Yellow as well. Sikyatki Polychrome incorporated red paint in addition to black, along with flamboyantly curvilinear designs. The shift to these lighter-colored ceramics was part of a general trend across the southwest towards light tan or buff colored ceramic wares, evident in the Salado Polychromes; ceramics in the Acoma, Zuni, and upper reaches of the Little Colorado River; and pottery in what is now Northern Chihuahua (Steven A. LeBlanc and Lucia R. Henderson, *Symbols in Clay: Seeking Artists’ Identities in Hopi Yellow Ware Bowls* [Cambridge: Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, 2009], 16-17). For other studies of Hopi Yellow ceramics and/or their chronology, see Hannah Huse, *Identification of the Individual in Archaeology: A Case Study form the Prehistoric Hopi Site of Kawaika-a* (PhD diss., University of Colorado at Boulder, 1976); V. M. Lamotta, *Zooarchaeology and Chronology of Homol’ovi and other Pueblo IV Period Sites in the Central Little Colorado River Valley, Northern Arizona* (PhD diss., University of Arizona at Tucson, 2006); and P. D. Lyons, *Ancestral Hopi Migrations* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2003). Unfortunately, San Bernardo wares are virtually unstudied, with many of the characteristics of the Hopi Yellow Ware continuing to apply, but potters appear to have begun adding sand as temper; Capone, *Mission Pueblo Ceramic Analyses*, 107-108, 301; and Edwin L. Wade and Lea S. McChesney, *Historic Hopi Ceramics: The Thomas V. Keam Collection of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University* (Cambridge, MA: Peabody Museum Press, 1981), 6-7, 20. Brew (“The Excavation,” fig. 30) names the ware in the course of describing the Awatovi excavations, but provides no descriptive information. Wade and McChesney published their *Historic Hopi Ceramics* in 1981, but were able to include only a “minimal” number of the Awatovi historic wares because these materials were scattered and inaccessible within the Peabody museum’s storage facilities, making a complete study infeasible (548). Finally, Patricia Hilton Capone (*Mission Pueblo Ceramic Analyses*, 300-335) has conducted a pilot study applying optical petrography to the microscopic technical characteristics of San Bernardo Ware. To date, there is still no comprehensive study of the type that would synthesize these earlier efforts, examine the morphology and type collection, and define its characteristics.

31 The bowl is NMAI number 096979.000, the rim sherd is from 096951.000, and the plates are numbered 096950.000-1-5 (five sherds representing four individuals), 096966.000, 096967.000, and 096968.000.

32 The earliest soup plates in New Mexico may have arrived with Esteban. Hernando de Alcarón reported that a Native informant along what was probably the lower Gila River claimed that Esteban had carried with him four green-colored (probably glazed majolica) soup plates which “the lord of Cibola” had taken from the explorer and that the informant “had never seen that any other [people] there had them, except the lord.” See Flint, *No Settlement*, 89; Hernando de Alarcón, “Narrative of Alarcón’s Voyage,” in Flint and Flint, *Documents*, 197. The likelihood that Hopis had developed their own renditions of these forms prior to the arrival of missionaries in 1629 is scant. Spanish *entradas* had spent relatively little time among the Hopis. Under Coronado, brief expeditions by Pedro de Tovar and García López de Cárdenas both passed through Hopi towns. Tovar had supplies for a thirty-day excursion from Hawikku including travel time to and from Black Mesa. Cárdenas spent even less time, merely acquiring guides for his excursion to the Grand Canyon. In the spring of 1583, Espejo’s expedition briefly visited the Hopi Pueblos, leaving Hawikku by April 7 and returning by May 17. Oñate’s colonization expedition passed through in November 1598, and there is an obscure reference to a possible expedition by Fray Antonio Peinado to the Hopi in 1628. See Flint, *No Settlement*, 117-119; Brew, “The Excavation,” 3-8; Pérez de Luxán, *Expedition*, 90-108. This record of brief contact seems unlikely to have been sufficient stimulus for the production and mastery of Spanish ceramic forms among the Hopis prior to the establishment of missions in 1629.

33 Although missionaries abandoned Zuni pueblos from 1632 until the midcentury, Hopi missions remained occupied throughout this time. It is therefore possible that the Room 33 sherds represent an adoption of hybrid ceramics from the still-missionized Hopi Pueblos during the years between the abandonment of Hawikku’s first mission 1632 and the 1650s. That such a wholesale adoption of foreign cultural traits would occur in such a short period without outside pressure seems to be a less plausible explanation for this assemblage than a direct association with the first mission. The coherence and relatively large number of similar vessels, as well as the connection to the still missionized Hopi Pueblos by ceramic type likewise suggests that these pieces belong together and to the mission’s establishment phase.

34 Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 132. In his schematic drawings of each pueblo room, Edwin Coffin included this room labeled as 272, consistent with then ongoing excavation of the pueblo rooms, rather than with Nusbaum’s numbering of the mission rooms. See E. F. Coffin, “Hawikuh Room Plans I,” Collection 9170, HHAE, 39.
Nusbaum partially excavated this room in 1919, while Hodge returned to work on it in 1920; see Hodge, “Hawikuh 6, 1920, Rooms 248-272,” Collection 9170, HHAE, 6, 65.

Originally the room was 5.31 by 2.55 m. (17’5” by 8’5”) in maximum internal dimensions. The hearth was 27.94 cm. (11”) to a side; Coffin, “Hawikuh Room Plans I,” 39.

It does not appear possible to fully untangle the stratigraphic relationships of Room 32, which was excavated over two field seasons, first by Nusbaum, and then by Hodge. Nusbaum included absolute measures based on a spirit level on a tilting table, but probably wrote his field notes on page 132 at a different time that those of page 133 (Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery”). He may not have been aware of the deepest floor levels when he first started taking notes, or there may be errors between the two pages. When he continued the excavation notes on page 133, he had apparently excavated to the full depth, but some of his measures do not match between these two pages. On page 132 he describes the “lowest floor” as 0.66 cm. (2’ 2”) below a “secondary floor.” Yet on the following page, he describes the “lowest level” as 1.37 m. (4’ 6”) below the “upper floor.” From these conflicts it is unclear if there were two or three floor levels in the structure. Did Nusbaum clear an upper level (the “secondary floor”) and encounter another floor and believe it to be the “lowest floor” only to dig further and encounter a third floor 1.37 m. (4’ 6”) below it? Or were there only two floors, (the “secondary floor” is the “upper floor,” and the “lowest floor” and “lowest level” are the same), but he made an error in recording their measurements? Adding to the confusion, it seems uncertain how these levels relate to those of the rest of the mission, and different measures for the room in a field letter to Heye, where he describes the “upper floor” as 0.61 m. (2’) below the “church level” and the “lower floor” 1.52 m. (5’) deeper. What he actually means by “church level” is unclear (atrium level, foundation level, nave floor, or something else?), and these measures do not match those in his field notes, appearing to be rough estimates rather than precise measurements; see Nusbaum to Heye, October 8, 1919, Papers of Jesse Logan Nusbaum, Box 3, “Geo. Hey—Heye Museum Am. Indian” folder, Papers of Jesse Logan Nusbaum, NAA, 6.

Nusbaum’s spirit-level survey provides a series of relative depths which can be compared to the mission nave floor, baptistery floor, and the ground level in front of the façade, but it is unclear which floor he surveyed at the depth of 4.22 m. (13’ 10”, i.e. 0.97 m./38” below the nave level; Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 132). On page 133, he would seem to provide a key piece of data linking the two episodes of measurement when he says that the lowest level of Room 32 was 2.01 m. (6’ 7”) “below old level north and west chapel,” but this description is ambiguous. By “old level north and west chapel” does he mean the floor level of the baptistery, which he uses more or less like a base line? Or does he mean the original ground level north and west of the “chapel” (i.e. Room 31 Baptistery)? Or, does he mean the “old level” (i.e. ground level at the start of excavations) of Room 31? In any case, I have been unable to match this measure with other measures of the room. Much like Nusbaum’s “secondary floor,” I cannot make out what he meant; he was either referencing a measuring point that I cannot identify or he made a mistake in writing down his measurements. The inconsistencies in Nusbaum’s data for Room 32’s stratigraphy are compounded in comparison to Coffin and Hodge’s data from the 1920 field season. Coffin and Hodge provide no measures relative to the rest of the site, but only within the room itself. They both agree that a second floor was located 1.37 m. (4’ 6”) above the lowest floor (a measure that matches Nusbaum’s 133 notation that the “upper floor” was 1.37 m. (4’ 6”) above the “lowest level floor.” See Coffin, “Hawikuh Room Plans I,” 39; Hodge, “Hawikuh 6, 1920,” 65. Coffin describes the upper floor (what he calls the “first level” as rising 0.97 m. (3’ 2”) above this floor, and Hodge clarifies that the total depth of the excavated room is 2.34 (7’ 8”) to the top of the preserved northwestern wall underlying the atrium wall. From Nusbaum (“Church and Monastery,” 133) we know that the distance from the top of this wall to the top of the step in the atrium wall was 0.51 m. (1’ 8”). If Hodge’s measure is added to the height, the total relative depth of the lowest level of room 32 to the atrium wall step above would be 2.84 m. (9’ 4’); yet, Nusbaum explicitly gives the same measure 2.49 m. (8’ 2”). It is therefore impossible to be certain about the depths of the floor levels in room 32 relative either to the atrium wall or to the rest of the mission. Nor is it possible to know whether there were two or three floor levels- the inconsistencies in Nusbaum’s notes suggest the possibility that he removed a 0.66 m. (2’ 2”) thick level of fill (the “secondary floor”) above the other floor levels of which Hodge remained unaware. Or there may simply be mistakes in the recording of this data which make it incoherent. In any case, photographs make the following points evident:

1. Room 32 had at least two floor levels, the lowest of which was 1.37 m. (4’ 6”) below the next highest level, having a fireplace and later insertion of a partition wall.
2. Room 32’s walls remained intact above the atrium ground level. Despite being slightly askew to the orientation of the atrium wall, Room 32 was incorporated into the series of structural features mediating entry into the mission.

3. One could not enter the mission from the northwestern side without crossing over the remains of this room, and its walls would have been visible throughout the mission period.

37 Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, *The Excavation*, 120; Hodge, “Hawikuh 6,” 65. It should be noted that Hodge’s actual words are “the pottery from this house was all polychrome, with a few ancient strays,” from which Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury infer that he meant “late polychrome,” a term which Hodge normally used for a type now known as Matsaki Polychrome, roughly dating this room’s occupation between 1475 and the 1650s. Nusbaum’s earlier excavations had only recovered “few misc. sherds only found in upper room” in addition to the beads, *botilla*, and utility wares; see Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 132. For Matsaki Polychrome designation, see Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, *The Excavation*, 138-139; Woodbury and Woodbury, “Appendix II,” 326 (estimated date range from 1475 until the late 1600s); Lanmon and Harlow, *The Pottery*, 73. Other than the sherds of NMAI 096961, none of the noted Room 32 ceramic sherds are identifiable in the NMAI collections. Other artifacts, presumably pre-contact, from the earlier level of occupation excavated in 1920 included two expediently chipped chert blades (NMAI 101272.000), and two fragments of black on grey dipper handles (NMAI 101550.000). Photograph N05750 (figure 6.4) shows a crowd of ceramic sherds on top of the room’s southwest wall, and a longbone and round stone cobbles appear on the atrium wall.

38 Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 132; Nusbaum to Heye and Hodge, October 6, 1919; Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, *The Excavation*, 120. The remains in room 32 lacked the important, diagnostic neck, but an apparent match was found in the pueblo room 203 (Block C; NMAI 101620.000). In a letter to Heye, he further described the find spot for this jar as “in the corner of Indian room, upper level but still 0.46 m. (1’ 6”) below ground level in front of NW tower”; Nusbaum to Heye, October 8, 1919, 1. Matsaki Polychrome ware comprised vessels with burnished and crazed buff or orange-colored slip surface, with ornamentation painting in dark brown, black, or reddish-brown matte paints, and coarse paint. He designs often resemble those of Sikyatki Polychrome, but with different paste and less-refined painting. The ware is dated from c. 1475 until the late 1600s. See Woodbury and Woodbury, “Appendix II,” 325-330; Lanmon and Harlow, *The Pottery*, 73-89.

39 Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 133. Nusbaum’s profile drawing of the steps shows the ash level roughly even with the top of the atrium wall step, which was not the grade at the time of construction, since another step rose 0.23 m. (9”) above it. I take this rise to be roughly equivalent with the depth of fill which accumulated between the ash layer and the construction of the formal mission.

40 While missions were often constructed on top of middens, the old debris underneath the adobe wall at this location is inconclusive; it may belong to an old midden or to midden materials used to fill unexcavated rooms prior to construction. The ash layer is likewise inconclusive. While it might be tempting to associate it with the burning of the original mission, midden areas also accumulated deposits of ashes.

41 One other possible explanation for this larger room with a lower floor level (it was 1.12 m./3’ 8” below the floor of Room 33) with a high ceiling, is that it could have been a kiva. However, excavators did not find any of the floor features typical of a kiva, such as benches, niches, slab paving, a fireplace, a ventilation system, or a sipapu. Likewise, no Christian altar, religious paraphernalia, or Spanish-style artifacts were recovered. The scant architectural details are intriguing and suggestive of Spanish spatial preferences, but inconclusive.

42 Examples of other missions built on or near their predecessors include Ábo, Awatovi, Giusewa, Las Humanas, Pecos, Quarai, and San Miguel in Santa Fe, as well as Huejotzingo in Mexico. See Ivey, “George Kubler,” 133-148. Formal missions built over their humbler establishment-phase or interim predecessors include Giusewa, where the larger *convento* incorporated rooms and beams from a very early establishment-phase mission with beams dating from 1599; San Miguel in Santa Fe, where subsequent structures stood over the same foundations as the initial structure dated c. 1610-1640; and Huejotzingo in central Mexico, where the monumental formal mission church and dependencies were built around the remains of the establishment phase structures. See Ivey, no date, “Un Templo Grandioso,” 2-3; Stubbs and Ellis, *Archaeological Excavations at the Chapel of San Miguel*; and Córdova Tello, *El Convento de San Miguel*. At Ábo, the formal mission structure was an expansion of the interim mission church,
incorporating part of its original fabric (Ivey, *In the Midst*, 55-94). At other sites, formal missions were built nearby, but not on top of their establishment-phase predecessors. At Las Humanas, the formal mission and *convento* was built across an open plaza to the west of the establishment-phase *convento* and interim church (Ivey, *In the Midst*, 157-198). At Pecos, the formal mission structure was built to the south of the reworked roomblock which probably comprised the first *convento* (Ivey, *The Spanish Colonial Architecture*, 308-320). A similar situation pertained at Quarai, where the friars lived in the rooms of the pueblo and built nearby (Ivey, *In the Midst*, 111-145). At Awatovi, a larger, cruciform church was begun alongside its humbler single-nave predecessor, only to be abandoned for the practical expedient of maintaining the original church. Excavators of the site did not correctly identify the order of these remains; see Brew, “The Excavation,” 53-54, and Ivey, “George Kubler,” 146. At the end of the Pueblo Revolt period, many of the New Mexico missions were refounded and rebuilt on the same site as their seventeenth-century predecessors, incorporating what survived of their ruins.


44 I thank Kenny Bowekaty for pointing this out to me, during a visit to the site (Sept. 28, 2015). In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Zuni Pueblo posted a town crier on the highest level of the Pueblo, who shared news throughout the date, and played a role in monitoring the community, in addition to priests who used the housetops for announcements. See Elaine Thomas, *Prayer Warriors: Andrew and Effa Vander Wagen in Zuni* (Self-published, 1997), 129-130; Cushing, “My Adventures,” 53, 113, 117; Stevenson, *The Zuñi Indians*, 109, 354. If this practice has more ancient roots, it would have provided a town like Hawikku with ready means of keeping an eye on the Spanish below.
CHAPTER 7: FORMAL CONSTRUCTION OF THE PURÍSIMA CONCEPCIÓN

In describing the development of Spanish missions, Ivey argues most held the ultimate goal of constructing a formal compound comprising a large, permanent church and convento under the direction of a master mason, usually with cut stone ornament and vaulted roofs (figure 7.1). The expertise and economic means necessary for constructing formal mission churches were often lacking, however, and an interim phase typically followed initial establishment. Interim missions had modest churches sufficient for the local population, in contrast to small, ad hoc establishment-phase chapels. Interim churches were often of adobe or rough stone with flat roofs, lacking the permanence and monumentality of formal mission churches. Their ornament was minimal, usually without façade decoration, bell walls (espadañas), or towers. Some establishments never got to build formal churches, and missionaries simply added ornaments to the interim structure, making it a permanent worship site, as at San Juan Capistrano in San Antonio, TX (figures 7.2).¹

While Ivey’s structural progression occurred “over and over on the northern frontier,” New Mexico was something of a special case, where missionaries never hired master masons nor built vaulted structures, for reasons that have yet to be satisfactorily explained.² Some New Mexico missions do suggest qualities of formal establishments in their grand size, structural articulation, use of stone in mud mortar for permanency, and elaborate wood carving. Seventeenth-century New Mexico missions approximating some of these characteristics include Acoma, Sandía, Abó, Quarai, Las Humanas, Giusewa, Pecos, and El Paso del Norte (figures 7.3,
7.17-7.18, 7.59, 9.64). In cases such as Hawikku, more modest interim-style structures were accepted as final. Most of the remains that Nusbaum excavated belonged to this phase of construction, evidently planned as the final or permanent mission establishment at Hawikku, which I therefore describe as the “formal” mission, although it lacks the monumentality of other formal mission establishments. This chapter describes the architectural characteristics of the formal mission at Hawikku and its original design based on Nusbaum’s excavations. Chapter 8 discusses alterations and additions to this plan, while Appendix 1 covers post-mission appropriations of the ruined remnants.

**Building the Purísima Concepción**

The formal phase at Hawikku began with the mission’s reestablishment sometime in the mid-seventeenth century, with construction likely complete by 1661. It was a single-nave adobe church, baptistery, and cloister-form convento attached to the gospel (southeast) side of the nave. These core structures appear to have been a single, preplanned and cohesive design. Friars probably laid out such plans by means of stakes and measuring chords to translate the design, perhaps from a paper drawing, after which Pueblo laborers prepared wall foundations of sandstone slabs in mud mortar.

Nusbaum only exposed the foundations in a few places: along the church’s northwest side, when excavating burials in the nave, and in a test pit in the convento corridor. From that pit, he describes a “fine heavy foundation of well-laid rough stone” 1.17 meters wide and 1.32 meters deep (3’ 10” by 4’ 4”) beneath the convento wall. The church foundations of small, irregularly shaped laminate sandstone slabs in rough courses with mud mortar were 1.22 meters
(4’) thick and went down an indeterminate depth. Nusbaum did not photograph the foundations, but several images show the base of the retaining wall with similar, uncut but naturally faced sandstone slabs, no discernable cornerstone, and suggestions of grading or trenching to provide an even bed for the foundations (figures 6.3, 6.5). With foundations in place, workers filled the church subfloor with sand, and poured a mud or compacted earth floor within the forms of the first brick courses. Floors elsewhere in the mission were of packed earth, sandstone slabs in adobe mortar, or carefully laid mud-brick pavement.

All the mission walls were adobe brick in mud mortar. Mud construction techniques were widely used among the Native peoples of the Southwest prior to Spanish arrival. At sites such as Casa Grande in Arizona and pueblos along the Rio Grande, builders relied upon coursed or “puddled” wall construction, piling layers of mud 30 to 60 centimeters (1’ to 2’) thick to form walls as each course dried over time (figure 7.4). In contrast, modular adobe construction involves hand shaping or form molding of individual sun-dried bricks. This technique also predates Spanish arrival in the Pueblo world, occurring primarily at sites after 1150 to 1200 CE. Brick construction existed at sites within the pre-Hispanic Cibola region, but the majority of sixteenth century Zuni buildings were of stone in mud mortar. Spanish friars did not introduce the concept of modular adobe-brick construction to the pueblos, but rather its large-scale use as a replacement for local stone construction traditions.

The bricks of the Hawikku mission were elongated rectangles averaging 57.15 by 29.21 by 7.62 centimeters (22.5” by 11.5” by 3”), although Nusbaum describes sizes varying as much as an inch each way. Of the two bricks preserved at the NMAI (figures 7.5-7.6), neither exactly matches these dimensions, and some of the mission’s wall thicknesses could not have resulted from the measures Nusbaum specifies, so there was probably significant variation
among bricks. Spanish brickmakers often added vegetal tempers such as straw to help regulate drying and prevent cracking, but Hawikku’s bricks contained relatively few additives. Zuni brickmakers spread the reddish adobe mud into wooden forms, packing and smoothing it with traditional wooden digging sticks, their pointed ends leaving impressions in the brick surfaces (figures 7.7-7.8). When partly dry, they removed the molds and the bricks cured in the sun until ready. If Zuni construction was comparable to other New Mexico communities and adobe construction elsewhere in the world, brick making and wall construction occurred in dry months, when sudden rainstorms would not destabilize or erode the drying materials, while plastering took place after the rainy season, when water was readily available and damage could be expediently repaired. This seasonal construction cycle contributed to the slowness of the building process.

Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury describe Hawikku’s brick courses as even and carefully constructed, with broken or staggered joints to increase wall strength. The builders used thick layers of mud mortar in between, apparently employing English- and Flemish-bond patterns. English bond, using alternating courses of bricks laid endwise (headers) and lengthwise (stretcher) is evident in several convento walls (figure 7.9). Flemish bond, or the use of staggered courses in which headers alternate with pairs of stretchers laid side by side, appears in the apse wall behind the altar (figure 7.10), although the variable brick sizes did not yield diagonal alignments between courses typical of Flemish bond in more regular fired brick (figure 7.11). Wall thicknesses in the convento ranged from thin walls of single brick stretchers about 27.94 centimeters (11”) thick to wider external walls between 81 and 91 centimeters (2’ 8” to 3’) thick, while the main church walls were about 1.37 meters (4’ 6”) in width.
Although potentially quite durable, adobe walls are very susceptible to moisture, and the application and periodic renewal of a mud plaster finish is essential to their long-term integrity. Mud plaster evaporates moisture and accommodates the swelling and shrinkage of unfired bricks better than inflexible hard plasters such as cement stucco, which crack and trap water inside the walls.\(^\text{19}\) While the impermanence of mud plaster may seem counterintuitive, it contributed to the Franciscans’ social objectives. Regular mobilization of labor to re-plaster a church could potentially create a sense of community and common purpose around the building’s maintenance. As a modern example, after abandoning destructive cement stucco for an annually renewed mud-plaster finish at the parish church of Ranchos de Taos in 1979 to 1981, Father Michael O’Bryan said, “The link and bond between an adobe church and its people are strong and require commitment; we keep the church together and the church keeps us together.”\(^\text{20}\)

The social context of a twentieth-century Hispano-community parish differs substantially from seventeenth and eighteenth-century missionized pueblos, where coercion, resistance, and factionalism were complicating factors, and one cannot assume people shared a common Catholic identity. The endurance of Acoma’s San Esteban, however, shows Pueblo communities sometimes took up the maintenance of mission establishments as meaningful practices in their own cultural terms. Acoma lost its resident priest in 1782, after which the pueblo owned and oversaw the mission’s maintenance, dividing tasks between various community groups. It became a space for dances, a celestial observatory, and most importantly a symbol and physical connection linking Acomas with their ancestors.\(^\text{21}\) While some Acomas maintain Catholic identity alongside their traditional religious practices, their generations of labor on San Esteban reinforce their identity and continuity as an Indigenous community, more than signaling commitment to Christian ideology. At Halona, twentieth-century evidence suggests previous
generations of Zunis divided maintenance of the mission among the pueblo’s various neighborhoods.  

As with pre-Hispanic Zuni towns, Spanish adobe architecture relied upon terrado roofs, flat constructions of packed earth over wooden beams (vigas) embedded in the walls, a convergence of ancient building practices that had evolved on separate continents but arrived at similar conclusions about how to build in arid climates. Flat earthen roofs over heavy wooden beams and adobe walls had ancient roots as far back as Çatal Hüyük in Turkey (c. 8,000 to 6,000 BCE), and were widespread throughout the Mediterranean and Mesopotamian worlds (figure 7.12). In Iberia, adobe structures with terrado roofs continued Moorish Andalusi traditions even after Christians retook territory from Muslim control. This building style once existed throughout southern and eastern Iberia, but now is limited mostly to the Alpujarras region of Andalucía, where terrado roofs still exist, as in many parts of North Africa such as Morocco’s High Atlas Mountains (figure 4.9, 7.13-7.14). Ivey argues Spanish colonists adopted adobe walls and terrado roofs in many areas with low precipitation and extreme temperatures, especially where master masons were unavailable. One should also not understate the style’s compatibility with independently developed Pueblo architectural traditions as a design factor.

By the late sixteenth century, the flat-roofed mission church was a “fairly standardized,” even generic feature of frontier areas, part of an architectural style that did not require extensive training in new techniques, stone cutting, or vaulting. The Purísima Concepción’s roof burnt in 1672, but left charred remnants of vigas as evidence for its terrado roof (figures 5.27, 7.15). New Mexico’s terrado roofs normally included hewn and carved beams over sculptural corbels set in the walls on top of a wooden cornice that helped to distribute their weight. Over this structural framework stripped saplings (latillas) spanned between vigas, often in herringbone
patterns, with vegetal matting, layers of packed earth, and mud plaster sealing the building (figures 7.16, 7.22, 7.60, 9.16). The Spanish system was similar to but distinct from local building traditions, replacing the round beams, paired purlins, and stick infill of Zuni houses with the heavier, hewn vigas and latilla decking. Spanish Franciscans did not simply apply Indigenous building techniques to larger structures, they imported new practices that were nevertheless consonant with existing techniques and yielded many similar aesthetic effects.

The low slope of the flat roofs drained water towards the parapets and rainspouts (canales) of wood or stone, which directed it away from the building (figure 4.24). Missions in central Mexico and Iberian conventual houses were catchments designed to concentrate rainwater from the church and adjacent roofs, which they stored in cisterns and tanks, but adobe construction demanded the removal of water to prevent moisture’s detrimental effects. Hawikku’s church would have drained to the northwest, away from the convento, but creating problems as this water accumulated on the uphill side of the building. Excavations did not identify the additional measures needed to channel it away from the church.

The only surviving example of a seventeenth-century New Mexico mission ceiling is that of Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe in El Paso del Norte (1662-1668, today adjacent to the Cathedral of Ciudad Juarez, Chihuahua, figures 7.17-7.18), but remnants of early carved beams from Acoma and Oriabi testify to the ornamentation of vigas among the western pueblos (figure 7.19). Hawikku’s excavators did not collect any beams, which Hodge described as “too far gone to enable study of the ornamentation, excepting a single case,” which Nusbaum drew in the field (figure 7.20). The viga at Hawikku was square-hewn and about 30.48 centimeters (12”) tall, with a 2.54 centimeter (1”) bead cut along its top and bottom edges. Between these framing grooves were incised patterns of concentric diamonds with zig-zags and triangles in their
interstices. The design is quite similar to a fragment of trim from the seventeenth-century church at Pecos (figure 7.21), while the zig-zagging patterns of the nave ceiling at Ciudad Juarez give a sense of the richly textured impression these sculptural ceilings would have produced (figures 7.22-7.23). A similar ornamental repertoire of diamonds appeared on beams from a ceiling at the Halona mission (figure 7.24). Painted alignments of black diamonds with central dots filled their vertical faces between black borders, attesting to a focus on geometric abstraction and related patterns in colonial-era ceilings at Zuni Pueblo. A painted fragment of a black cross within a circle from the Hawikku mission comes from comparable ornamental woodwork within the Purísima Concepción convento (NMAI 095685; figure 7.25).

The mission’s few windows were probably simple in construction, spanned by wooden lintels set in the wall. Traces of a few openings survived in the convento, where ambulatory windows had squared, unframed openings. Exterior windows (figures 7.150, 12.10) had inwardly splayed or battered jambs, probably with wooden casings and bars or mullions for security, similar to windows visible on Halona’s mission in 1879 (figure 7.26). Whether Hawikku’s mission also had a raised transverse clerestory window to spotlight the main altar is unknown. Such horizontal skylights were distinctive aspects of New Mexico missions, but the Purísima Concepción lacked added buttressing or selenite glazing remnants in the upper nave, which might have pointed towards the existence of a transverse clerestory.

Openings with doors had wooden sills and frames of mortice-and-tenon joinery. Except for the main church portal which was doubled, these closures were probably single leaf doors swinging on wooden pintle hinges set in round sockets above and below (figure 7.27), a system requiring no metal hardware. None of Hawikku’s doors survived, but they were well developed examples of a technological system still modeled in an undated, small window frame and shutter
that Hodge collected from Zuni Pueblo in 1923 (figure 7.28). Eight openings in the mission’s original plan had closing doors, while the remaining openings had none to allow easy passage.

A handful of iron artifacts, often lacking specific provenance, hint at various other fixtures in the mission. They include fastening nails from both the church and convento (figures 7.29-7.30), an iron hook from the church (figure 7.31), and a heavy bolt with a faceted head (figure 7.32). A long, flat piece of iron from the church might be part of a strap hinge (figure 7.33), while eye hooks from the convento are probably eyelet hinges, in which a set of two eyelets or an eyelet and an iron pintle interlock to form the swinging parts, each hammered into the connecting pieces of wood (figure 7.34). Other pieces of iron are simply unidentifiable (figure 7.35).

Interior mission walls had coats of mud plaster to create an even surface, and finish layers of gypsum-based yeso or whitewash. Some convento rooms had red-painted dados along their lower walls, while more ornate mural paintings emulating the colorful tile finishes popular in Iberia embellished the liturgical spaces. Restorations of similar murals at Ciudad Juarez and the Franciscan mission of San Xavier del Bac in Tucson, AZ suggest how these murals might have looked in full color (figures 7.36-7.38).

The church and liturgical spaces were unheated, but several hearth arrangements occurred in the convento. A large, wall-length fireplace in the kitchen permitted preparation of large meals for the mission community (see Chapter 10). Other occupation rooms had corner fireplaces, built on top of their floors with slab fire backing and low adobe curbing in front (figure 7.39). Except for occasional slab linings and blackened traces of flues, the smokehoods and chimneys of these fireplaces did not survive. Examples of corner fireplaces in Extremadura and among the eighteenth-century pueblitos of northern New Mexico suggest how corner
fireplaces might have been constructed in the seventeenth century (figures 7.40-7.41). These examples have grooved wooden mantles anchored in adjacent walls to support mud-plastered wooden smokehoods. None of Hawikku’s mission-period fireplaces show evidence for embedded mantles, however, and the builders must have framed and supported their smokehoods differently. Perhaps vertical stone jambs sat on the curbing against the fire-backing slabs on either side of the hearth. A mantle of mud-plastered wood or stone could have spanned between the jambs to frame the fogon firebox. Flues were probably slender, rectangular slabs on end, plastered at right angles to the walls of the corner, forming a rectangular shaft connecting to the rooftop opening, where masonry would likely have supported a chimney of stacked broken pots. The original fireplaces were built on top of finished floors, with rounded adobe curbing enclosing the front, several located adjacent to one another, bunching their chimneys together on the rooftop (figure 7.42).

Perhaps the original fireplaces were inadequate for cold winters on the high Colorado Plateau. Residents subsequently added a number of additional fireplaces in a slightly different style, often in corners opposite the original fireplaces. Secondary fireplaces were typically rectangular, and inserted in pits or the space of removed brick pavers, with upright slabs framing a sunken firebox similar to those of Hawikku’s Indigenous homes (figure 7.43). After the end of the mission period, Zuni reoccupiers of the mission introduced spur-wall fireplaces with fireboxes similar to sunken hearths, but located against the wall in the middle of the room’s long axis (figure 7.44). An upright slab or masonry spur wall (paredcito) created an angle to support the smokehood and flue.
The Formal Mission Plan

Hawikku’s formal mission comprised a single-nave church; an attached convento in cloister form; and an atrium in front of the compound (figure 7.45). The atrium (known as a camposanto) was a large open churchyard and primary entryway to both the church and convento.

a. Liturgical Spaces

At Hawikku, the atrium was roughly 53.47 by 29.08 meters (172’ 5” by 95’ 5”) with an even surface suggesting leveling as part of site preparation (figure 7.46). A low stone wall with well-constructed masonry of small and medium sandstone pieces set in adobe mortar surrounded it. There were openings on three sides, with two near the front of the mission and a third roughly on axis with the church in the northeast wall. Hodge located the outside of the atrium in 1920, but conducted no work inside, and it is unknown whether the yard contained burials or other features. Presumably remote sensing surveys could provide more information about this area, which lies outside the site’s protective fence today (figure 7.47).

The topography of the northwest side of the mission, along with the arrangement of Block F, and a hardened ground surface at the western corner of the church suggest that a road or plaza may have been located immediately uphill from the compound. The arrangement of the northwest gate is likewise notable, suggesting intentional staging of the main entryway. At that location, the atrium wall served as a terrace or retaining wall for the higher grade along the mission’s northwest side. It also partly overlay Room 32’s northwest wall, which remained visible and as much as 50.8 centimeters (1’ 2”) above grade inside the atrium (figures 6.14, 7.48). A wide gap in the atrium wall framed a short flight of three steps leading from the higher
ground outside the mission to the lower level of the atrium yard. The third step’s tread was the top of Room 32’s remnant wall, above the filled room, which formed a dais or platform at the entry to the atrium. Zunis coming from the pueblo passed through the atrium wall and down the flight of steps, crossing the repurposed remains of the earlier house, and then stepping down to the level of the atrium and church entryway.

The incorporation of Room 32’s remnants appears intentional, and fits a pattern of Franciscan builders reusing parts of earlier structures in new constructions. Sometimes they deliberately included pre-Hispanic temples to signify the triumph of Christianity, a strategy known as superpositioning. This architectural rhetoric was common in sixteenth-century Mexico, where missions and sanctuaries often appear atop truncated remnants of Mesoamerican pyramids, such as Nuestra Señora de los Remedios on top of the monumental pyramid of Cholula, or less dramatically, the Franciscan mission of San Luis Obispo in Tlalmanalco, over the remnants of a former temple of Xochipili (figures 7.49-7.50). In other cases, Franciscan builders incorporated remnants into later structures as relics or reminders of their history. Perhaps most significant is the Porziuncola, Francis’s early chapel outside of Assisi, which became the centerpiece of the Renaissance basilica of Santa Maria degli Angeli (figure 7.51). Similar examples occurred in Iberia, such as at the Purísima Concepción of El Palancar in Extremadura, which encases the original hermitage of founding figure Pedro de Alcántara (1559-1561) within a larger seventeenth- to eighteenth-century Discalced Franciscan complex (figures 7.52, 9.91-9.92).

As I argue in Chapter 5, the sub-foundational rooms along the northwest side of Hawikku’s formal church seem to have been associated with the first mission efforts among the Zuni. The visible inclusion of Room 32 as an entryway dais may therefore be an intentional
reference to the earlier Franciscan history claiming the site. In addition to building over the site of the first Zuni mission and possibly incorporating its physical remnants in the sanctuary floor (see below), friars may have intended the architectural relic of Room 32 as a literal and symbolic gateway to the faith for Zunis attending mass, or religious processions going out from the church.

* * *

Hawikku’s formal church had a long, single nave and raised polygonal apse, with an intercardinal orientation that places the entryway to the northeast and the sanctuary to the southwest (figure 7.53). It had a “shouldered” plan, in which the elongated rectangular nave terminated in a perpendicular sanctuary wall at the southwest end, with a constricted opening into the almost rectangular chapel of the apse. This design created right-angle corners for subsidiary altars on either side of the sanctuary, and was common among New Mexico’s interim churches of the seventeenth century, as well as many other churches in Mexico, Spanish Florida, and elsewhere. The exterior of the church was approximately 34.14 meters long by 10.97 meters wide (112’ by 36’). A doorway from the nave opened to the sacristy and convento on the southeast side, known as the gospel or proper right side of the church. Another doorway gave access to the baptistery on the epistle (proper left) side of the church, just under the choir loft at its entrance.

After stepping through the atrium gate and Room 32 dais, Zunis coming to the church would have encountered its façade, with two large, projecting buttresses flanking a wooden balcony on posts above the recessed portal (figures 6.14, 7.48, 7.122). The larger eastern buttress housed a stairway (Room 29) facilitating movement within the convento and perhaps having a bell tower on top, while the epistle buttress was a solid mass of an unknown height. A
Hawikuh Polychrome bowl was found on the ground in the front of the church, with a band of alternating feathers and frets on its exterior, and a gourd with eagle feathers on its interior, similar to gourds still used in Zuni ritual today (figure 7.54). 51

The covered space beneath the balcony formed a shallow narthex with mud plastered and white-washed walls, while two earthfast posts flanking the entryway supported a balcony above (figures 5.29, 5.33, 5.36, 7.48). 52 In a romanticized illustration that was later simplified for publication, Montgomery attempted to reconstruct the appearance of the Purísima Concepción’s façade (figure 7.55). 53 No seventeenth-century balconies are known to survive, but the churches of Zia Pueblo and present day Zuni are good comparative examples (figures 7.56-7.57). The wide double doorway of the church was centered in the narthex wall, with the opening slightly splayed on the interior. 54 A badly-burnt wooden sill held the two leafs of the double door, each of which turned on a cylindrical pintle hinge set in a round socket at the ends of the sill, similar to the doorway of the old church in Zuni or Acoma’s San Esteban (figures 7.27, 7.58). 55

Passing through the portal, one stepped over the sill and down to the packed earthen floor. 56 As with other New Mexico mission churches, a wooden choir loft (coro) spanned the entryway interior, creating a sotocoro space beneath, like that of San Esteban (figure 7.59). 57 Two wooden posts supported the main transverse beam of the choir loft, with adobe pedestals on their entryway sides (figure 5.28). 58 Secondary vigas anchored in the façade wall spanned to the choir loft beam, supporting the choir floor of either hewn wooden planking or packed adobe over latilla decking such as Zuni Pueblo’s eighteenth-century choir loft (figure 7.60, 9.16). Entry to the coro was from the convento stairwell (Room 29), and the choir loft probably opened to the façade balcony through a central doorway. The sotocoro pedestals were 0.61 meter (2’) tall and wide, with flat surfaces, sub-rectangular plans, and mud plaster with whitewash finish. Although
no vessels were directly associated with these pedestals at excavation, they likely supported holy water fonts.\textsuperscript{59}

The nave interior was 24.69 meters (81’) long from the \textit{sotocoro} to sanctuary walls, and 8.08 meters (26.5’) wide.\textsuperscript{60} Its floor was a dense, clayey layer of packed earth approximately 30.48 centimeters (12”) thick over a substrate of loose, friable sand.\textsuperscript{61} Nusbaum left over half of the nave, in its central section, completely unexcavated. Any features which might have stood there, such as a pulpit or confessional, remain unknown. Several short, burnt timbers on the nave floor may have been part of its furnishing, perhaps supporting a communion rail or pulpit (figure 7.61).\textsuperscript{62}

The nave walls were plastered with mud and probably whitewashed prior to the painting of mural patterns similar to Spanish tiled wall coverings or revetments. These murals were not well preserved, and Nusbaum made no note of them or their colors, although remnants are visible in photographs. Adding to the difficulty of interpreting the nave murals is the inaccurate drawing that Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury published (figure 7.62).\textsuperscript{63} In a letter to Heye, Hodge describes finding a painted dado on the walls of the church, with “a certain star-like device […] composed of alternating feather designs similar to those found on pottery,” and selenite mosaics on risers in front of the altar.\textsuperscript{64} Based on details of photographs, there appears to have been a running border around the base of the wall, less than a foot high. Above that, the ornamental dado was gridded in a diamond pattern, with a star motif within each resulting rhomboid. Near the head of the nave, the motifs were carefully drawn eight-pointed stars, resulting from the rotation of a square around a central point (figures 7.63-7.66). Lines from the open circle at center to each of the star’s reentrant corners create a pattern of radiating kite shapes, with alternating light and dark colors in their sections and points. Perhaps these are what
Hodge meant in describing “alternating feather designs.” In the sotocoro, the mural execution was looser, missing the interstitial points to yield irregular four-pointed stars with concave sides (figure 7.67). The incised drawing of the pattern in the plaster prior to painting is clearly visible under the sotocoro.

The almost-rectangular polygonal apse of the Purísima Concepción housed its main altar and capilla mayor, raised approximately 1.22 meters (4’) above the nave floor (figure 7.68). A coursed adobe brick wall stood at the front of the apse, inset slightly from the plane of the sanctuary wall. The space behind it was filled with broken adobe bricks “placed at random, flat and on edge.” When Hodge and Nusbaum dug into this platform, they found a deposition of deer forelegs and the extended burial of a non-Native male, probably a Spanish friar. The apse walls had a simple mud-plaster finish, with no surviving traces of mural painting. Two layers of tightly fitting adobe bricks paved its platform, with a finish coat of mud plaster. Another layer of bricks formed a low base or predella, on which the narrow altar sat, with two rows of brick stretchers behind the altar creating space for a painted retablo altarpiece, which the missionaries may never have acquired (figures 7.10, 7.69). The original altar was a single row of adobe brick stretchers of unknown height, with a finish of white gypsum plaster.

A flight of seven steps projecting into the nave emphasized the high altar’s importance (figure 7.70). Each step was of earthen construction with a hewn wooden beam along the front edge and small stones as curbing at each end. The steps tapered as they went up and wooden newel posts were anchored in the top and bottom sills, supporting a railing on either side and across the front of the platform. Although charred, the newel posts were well-enough preserved to show their construction, carved with three bulging segments and rounded finials (figures 7.71-7.72). The posts were set in square mortices at either end of the hewn wooden sill
of the first step, and the side rails rested in mortices cut into the rounded segments of the
newels.\textsuperscript{71}

Hodge offhandedly referred to “selenite mosaics on the risers in front of the altar” similar
to the star-like patterns of the nave murals, with individual pieces of the translucent mineral cut
and affixed to the wooden risers.\textsuperscript{72} Nusbaum did not mention the mosaics in his field notes, but
later concurred, saying,

I found […] the shaped elements of split selenite that were mounted on the face of the
squared timber steps probably with piñon gum. These were arranged—in diamond
shaped elements—much in the pattern of the conventional Zuni Sun Flower pattern. At
the time of the finding, I told Hodge that when the front doors of the church were opened,
these selenite elements would reflect the light, and form a very conspicuous
embellishment. Hodge had found in a room in the pueblo, about a quart jar deposit of
identical selenite shaped elements, and he assumed that they were probably split and
fabricated by the related room owner.\textsuperscript{73}

Nusbaum apparently did not collect any of the selenite mosaic elements, but Hodge found
several pieces carefully ground into kite-shaped pieces in 1923, which might hint at what the
ornament of the church steps looked like (figure 7.73).\textsuperscript{74} A bag of mica fragments and several
other pieces, many in cut or abraded geometric forms, also came “from altar and stairs” and were
probably reflective inlay in the liturgical furniture (figure 7.74).

Simple lateral altars of adobe flanked either side of the stairway, each comprising two
courses of bricks stacked against the terminal wall, which was plastered prior to their
construction (figure 7.75). They may not have been part of the church’s initial construction, but
its “shouldered” plan anticipated their inclusion. These subsidiary altars were plastered,
whitewashed, and possibly painted in emulation of embroidered altar cloths, but photographs are
not clear enough to discern the pattern. Each had a predella platform of adobe bricks and a hewn
sill set in the floor along the front edge.\textsuperscript{75}
In the process of excavating the mission church, Nusbaum uncovered numerous artifacts, many of which cannot be connected to the mission period and may have been subsequent discards, but notes and photographs associate a few specific pieces with mission-period use. In particular, Nusbaum described a group of artifacts in front of the main altar that included a delicate wooden cross with selenite facing; a wooden picture frame with lapped corners and grooved faces probably ornamented with reflective mica or selenite; a “wafer thin” disc of copper; and the oxidized stain of a diamond-shaped piece of the same metal (figures 7.76-7.78). Together these objects sat on top of a carefully ground but fractured sandstone slab (figure 7.79). Nusbaum described this stone as a “kneeling stone,” but it probably had a different function, and may have been deposited with a sacred image and other artefacts during the 1672 raid. Nusbaum found the stone broken and askew to the rest of the sanctuary, suggesting it was not in its intended place. Furthermore, he found two other carefully ground but similarly fractured slabs near the sanctuary, one on the tread of the fourth step, and the other on the predella of the gospel-side altar (figure 7.80). He did not collect either of the other slabs, which seem remarkably similar to the stone from the apse floor.

The existence of three similar stones, each displaced and broken near the sanctuary during the mission’s destruction suggests they may have been symbolically important, perhaps tied to the three nearby altars. New Mexico altars were not formally consecrated. Instead, friars used small, portable altar stones called aras, which had a cavity for relics, and were consecrated by a bishop or his representative. To my knowledge, no seventeenth-century New Mexico aras survive. Hawikku’s three ground slabs do not meet orthodox requirements for altar stones, but their careful craftsmanship and depositional context raise the question whether
they might have been unconventional altar stones, pressed into service at Hawikku’s remote outpost.

Several ceramic artifacts also came from the sanctuary area. At the bottom of the stair was a large Hawikuh Polychrome bowl, broken and badly burnt (figure 7.81). Two small Plainware bowls, one red and one pink, came “from front of the small altar,” presumably one of the lateral altars (figures 7.82-7.83). Both show unusual wear patterns of erosion on their interiors. Perhaps they were holy water fonts that normally sat upon the two sotocoro pedestals, but were out of place and sitting near the lateral altars on the morning of the attack. The excavators piled additional unidentifiable sherds next to the epistle lateral altar (figure 7.65).

Most of Nusbaum’s photographs show the mission rooms cleared and swept, with few artifacts in situ. An image of the sanctuary stairs in the process of clearing hints at the wealth of information lost during the excavation process (figure 7.84). In addition to the smoothed sandstone slab are numerous ceramic sherds and burnt wooden remnants. Several of these charred pieces seem to belong to a small santo sculpture or bulto, with a single wooden block comprising the torso to which the artist affixed arms and legs (figure 7.85). It appears to have been a standing saint with upraised right arm; bits of the broken appendages lay scattered nearby when it was found. Another charred fragment next to the slab, suggests a broken wooden cylinder of a tabletop candle holder like one from Room 30 (see Chapter 8, figure 7.80, left detail), or a longer processional candlestick such as a carved pair from the Zuni mission (figure 7.86).

The NMAI catalog ascribes other artifacts to the church without specific provenance information, many of which cannot be tied to the mission period, and may have accumulated later. Some likely were part of the mission assemblage, however, including crumpled strips of
thin copper triangles, which may have decorated a niche or frame in the church (figure 7.87). A piece of cast bronze might have come from a small bell for use during the liturgy (figure 7.88). A fused piece of glass could be the remains of a liturgical vessel, warped and deformed in the intense heat of the burning church (figure 7.89). A large, well-crafted wooden cross with terraced finials and lapped joinery could have been a church ornament, but its unburnt state indicates that it was not exposed to the mission fire (figure 7.90). Finally, an iron table knife was almost certainly brought to Hawikku during the mission period, perhaps for use in the mission or as a trade good, but whether it was deposited prior to 1672 or later is unknowable (figure 7.91).

Fray Juan Galdo wrote his inventory just before Pedro de Ayala’s arrival in 1672, and it is perhaps the only eye-witness description of Hawikku’s formal mission to survive, providing additional clues to the church’s material environment. Galdo knew Hawikku’s ritual and ornamental fittings from experience, singling out “a very fine and beautiful image in the round” in the church, although he did not name the subject of the sculpture. Agustín de Vetancurt provides further clues to the sculpture’s identity, claiming that when Ayala took refuge in the church, he embraced both a cross and a figure of Mary. When Galdo arrived the next day, he searched the church ashes and recovered the Virgin’s polychromed wooden image, her painted skin purportedly unburnt except for some blistering as if she were alive. Hawikku’s church was dedicated to the Virgin of the Immaculate Conception, and the sculpture likely represented the mission’s patroness, who would have stood near the main altar.

In addition to the sculpture, Galdo described many painted canvases (“liencos”) adorning the altars, probably individual paintings rather than entire retablos. He mentions liturgical goods including a “very good” silver monstrance, three silver chalices, and three patens in the sacristy.
There were also “good” silk vestments, a green lamé choir cope, and an abundance of liturgical vestments known as albs and amices. Unlike other inventories from 1672, which often include long lists of liturgical items, candlesticks, vestments, altar clothes, rugs, musical instruments, and named artworks, Galdo only describes materials he would have used during mass, and only testifies that the three altars had numerous paintings; that a notable sculpture stood somewhere in the church; and that he stored the silver in the sacristy.

* * *

Two spaces attached to the church were also important to the mission’s ritual life. A wooden doorway passed through the epistle wall of the sotocoro to the baptistery on the mission’s northwest side, sitting above the sub-foundational remnants of Rooms 33 and 34. Another doorway in the gospel side of the nave led to the sacristy.

The baptistery (Room 31) was 8.10 by 4.80 meters (26’ 7” by 15’ 9”), with the baptismal font in the middle, surrounded by a rectangular curbing (figures 7.92-7.94). The walls were mud plastered and probably whitewashed, without murals. There may have been a window in the northeast wall looking out upon the atrium. The doorway to this room was slightly splayed as it passed through the thick sotocoro wall, with both jambs inclining to produce a wide lintel span across the passageway (figure 7.95). The southwestern jamb was smooth, while the northeast side was uneven, with part of its lowest brick course carved away to receive the door when it swung into the baptistery passageway. The door’s wooden frame was flush with the sotocoro wall, its hewn wooden sill with pintle socket still in place.

Low adobe curbing around a depression in the middle of the room set the baptismal font apart. An adobe brick platform stood in the rectangular basin, supporting the pedestal of the
font, roughly aligned with the entrance passageway (figure 7.96). The font pedestal was made of adobe bricks laid around an open central well, which stood at least 36 centimeters (1’ 2”) tall, but its upper layers were eroded away. Nusbaum found the sherds of an unusually large, orange-colored Plainware bowl in this room, which must have been the baptismal font, sitting atop the adobe pedestal (figure 7.97). Only a rim section survives, but this vessel probably had a drain in the bottom, allowing for the disposal of sacramental fluids through the hollow pedestal into a sump or drain beneath, similar to how earlier Iberian ceramic baptismal fonts functioned (figure 7.98). Alternating red and white diamonds were painted on the exterior of the adobe pedestal, with black outlines rather than the incised pattern of the nave murals. Montgomery believed baptismal participants stood within the framed depression around the font, while other observers remained along the walls. 

On the opposite side of the church, the sacristy (Room 21) was a crucial transition between the convento’s living quarters and the liturgical stage of the church (figure 7.99). It was almost square, with doors opening into both parts of the mission. The entryway from the church was “one of the best in the convento,” with two large stone slabs paving the raised passage through the thick nave wall (figures 7.100-7.102). A carved wooden sill sat on this paving, flush with the inside of the church wall. Its wooden jambs stood on either side with mortice and tenon joints, and the door swung on a pintle hinge at the southwest side. Its single leaf must have been about 1.14 meters (3’ 9”) wide, and a low carved stop on the nave side of the sill indicates it swung into the sacristy. Less elaborate, the ambulatory door had a wooden sill that the fire entirely consumed, but which had been set into the wall over slab paving. 

The packed earth floor of Room 21 was black from the mission fire, fed by wooden furniture around the room’s walls (figures 7.103-7.104). Sacristies in New Mexico typically
had higher ceilings than their adjoining conventos, reflecting ritual significance as the space where priests prepared for ecclesiastic functions, and where they stored the church furnishings, vestments, and sacred vessels. Hawikku’s sacristy ceiling must have been greater than 2.44 meters (8’) high, since no beam sockets were visible in the wall up to that level. Its elements probably had ornamental carving, but only a piece of a wooden cornice survives, cut from a quarter-round piece of timber and carved with alternating thick and thin vertical bars under a projecting corona-like band (figure 7.105). The pattern is reminiscent of the thick knots and thin interstices of the Franciscan knotted chord, but also resembles geometric cornices such as a painted example from the main cloister of the discalced Franciscan convento of Santa María de las Ángeles in Churubusco (figure 7.106). Other traces of the ceiling include what may be the remnant of a viga: a long, charred timber, hewn square with a bead along one side and what may be a joinery notch on the other. A shorter timber burnt on one end was probably a supporting corbel, with its unburnt half embedded in the wall (figure 7.107). If Hawikku’s sacristy was like other missions, the vigas ran perpendicular to the nave, one end embedded in the church wall and the other resting on Room 21’s southeast wall as support.

A painted dado ran around the lower sacristy walls, evoking Spanish tile revetments. It had a field of diamonds in alternating red and white pigment above an umber-colored border at the bottom. This pattern only survived in a few patches, but appears to have ran around the entire room (figure 7.108). The upper walls were not preserved, but in the church-sacristy doorway, an ornamental border survived at the top of the dado, at an unspecified height (figure 7.109). Bands of red and white surmounted the dado, with a 22.86 centimeters (9”) tall band of bluish-black diamonds above, red and white outlining each diamond and multi-colored flower in
the middle. The flowers had red centers and eight petals of alternating triangles and ovals, also in red, white, and umber paint.\textsuperscript{107}

Lacking a post-mission occupation, Room 21 contained plentiful charcoal from burnt furnishings of the mission period, most of which excavators disposed on site, although some remnants are probably among burnt but unprovenanced fragments in the NMAI collection (figures 7.110-7.115).\textsuperscript{108} Also notable were four ceramic artifacts: a red-colored Plainware soup plate; a brown-colored Plainware candle holder; and two large, complete Hawikuh Polychrome jars (figures 7.116-7.119). Nusbaum only says that these pieces came from the “southern portion” of the room, although the candle holder appears on the southeastern wall in one photograph (figure 7.120).\textsuperscript{109} As with pieces from the church, these artifacts testify to the use of Zuni pottery in the mission’s liturgical spaces, even if specific functions remain speculative.

b. \textit{Convento}

Hawikku’s original \textit{convento} was square, roughly 22.86 meters (75\textdegree) on each side, with a similarly square patio at its center open to the sky, and enclosed hallways or ambulatories around each side. Three ranges of rooms formed the perimeter of the residence to the northeast, southeast, and southwest. This structural arrangement is a version of the cloister form, which had deep roots in Classical domestic architecture around the Mediterranean. It characterized monastic architecture in Europe by the time of the Benedictines in the ninth century, appearing codified in the Plan of St. Gall (figure 7.121).\textsuperscript{110} The cloister form, as an architectural type distinct from cloistered lifestyles and practices, became a potent symbol by the seventeenth century, as I will describe in Chapter 9. From a strictly functional point of view, it provided ventilation and light to the mission rooms, with protective exterior walls and a series of
ambulatory walks and stairwells forming an efficient internal circulatory system, controlling
access from the outside while maximizing it for those inside.

The open patio was almost square, 11.58 meters (38’) wide along the church nave, and
extending 12.04 meters (39.5’) perpendicular to it (figure 7.122).\textsuperscript{111} Many of the patio walls
were poorly preserved and Nusbaum only excavated a small part of it.\textsuperscript{112} One entered the patio
through an opening from the ambulatory in the southeast wall, which lacked a frame except its
badly eroded adobe sill.\textsuperscript{113} Unlike the open arcade arches typical of European and Mexican
cloisters, the walls surrounding the Purísima Concepción’s patio were solid except for a few
openings to ventilate and light the ambulatory.\textsuperscript{114} Two windows were in the southwest wall, and
at least one on the northwest side.\textsuperscript{115} This patio was probably similar in appearance to that of the
larger \textit{convento} at Acoma, whose plan and walls go back to the seventeenth century, although the
structure has required regular repair and restoration (figure 7.123).

Unlike \textit{conventos} in Spain and Mexico, where cloisters played an important role in
concentrating and collecting rainwater for the resident community, the adobe walls of New
Mexico missions would soften and rapidly deteriorate if moisture from snowmelt or monsoon
rains was not efficiently removed. Hawikku’s patio must have had drains or other features
beneath the packed earth floor to accomplish this purpose, but excavations did not identify
them.\textsuperscript{116} The sole patio feature Nusbaum uncovered was a circular, mud-plastered pit in the
southern corner (figure 7.124), which was most likely a pit oven for Indigenous-styles of cooking
(see Chapter 10).\textsuperscript{117} Hawikku’s patio does not appear to have had the benches and paths
common to other missions, and its only documented artifact is a badly-fragmented but unique
splatter-painted basin with a drainage hole in its center (figure 7.125).\textsuperscript{118}
The four corridors of the ambulatory formed a larger, nearly square rectangle 17.07 meters (56’) along the church nave and 17.37 meters (57’) perpendicular to it (figures 5.46-5.47, 7.126-7.128). The hallway floors were packed earth, and they had terrado roofs similar to eighteenth-century spans at Acoma (figure 7.129). Light came through the patio’s open windows and door to illuminate these shaded walks in bright patches that slowly moved over the adobe plastered walls through the day or filtered diffusely into internal rooms. These dim, cool spaces must have been a relief from summer heat, but were likely quite chilly in the winter, even if more sheltered than typical cloister arcades.

Wooden doorways and unencumbered openings around the ambulatory perimeter accessed the mission’s living and working spaces, and these corridors must have been its most heavily trafficked spaces as members of the mission community went about daily activities. When the mission burned, the ambulatory corridors allowed fire to spread from the church and sacristy into the convento rooms (see Appendix I; figure 7.130). Nusbaum’s crew encountered several artifacts in the ambulatory walks likely deposited during the mission’s destruction, including a burnt furniture leg, perhaps from a bench or chair; a red-colored Plainware candle holder (figures 7.131-7.132); and various materials related to food preparation which I will discuss in Chapter 10.

The southeastern walk extended through the convento’s southern corner, forming a hallway between the side and back ranges (Room 12), leading to what would become the mission’s service patio. This passage had a partial paving of sandstone slabs sloping in from the walls towards its depressed center. As the point of access to the service patio and kitchen (Room 13, see below), this was a high-traffic working area, and the pavement counteracted damage from the wear and spills that it likely received. The service patio doorway preserved no trace of
a doorframe, but once construction had begun, two unbonded adobe piers were added to constrict the opening, with a large stone slab outside forming a step up from the hallway.  

In the opposite, northern corner of the convento another space extended from the ambulatory, with adobe and sandstone steps in a stairwell leading to the convento’s rooftop level (Room 29, figure 7.133). The stairwell was narrower than the ambulatory, and its thick walls comprised the mass of the gospel-side façade tower. The eight steps had large, carefully shaped sandstone treads, with the fourth step forming a wider landing. The tread of the eighth step was not preserved, but its location close to the exterior face of the buttress indicates the stair could only have risen one step further, or the eighth step may have been another landing. The total height of this stair was probably about 1.94 meters (6’ 4.5”).

Where did this stairway lead? Nusbaum believed it opened to the right, onto the rooftop of the portería, while Montgomery thought it turned left to the façade balcony and choir loft door. The remains of the Halona (Zuni Pueblo) mission offer means of resolving this question, for as I will argue in Chapter 9, these were sister missions built contemporaneously with a single shared plan. Halona had a similarly located stairwell, with wooden sills embedded in the church wall to reinforce each adobe step (figures 7.134-7.135, 9.14, 9.19-9.20). The stairwell was two stories tall, probably damaged during the Pueblo Revolt, but repaired and still visible in nineteenth-century photographs (figures 2.4-2.5, 9.21). An upper floor doorway on the southeast side led onto the rooftop of the convento’s front range, and a second, internal doorway to the choir loft remains partly visible today (figures 7.136-7.137). The twelve steps of the Halona stair rose to a landing about 3.18 meters (10’ 5.32”) above the ambulatory floor, lower than the height of the choir loft doorway. Although details of the stairwell’s internal arrangements are lost, a landing and additional steps, perhaps in wood, were necessary to turn the
corner from the archaeologically discovered steps to the upper-level doorways of Halona’s convento roof level and choir loft. A similar arrangement probably pertained at Hawikku, perhaps embedded in the unusually thick wall between the stairwell and portería. In ascending the Room 29 stairs, one probably reached a landing at the top of the steps that Nusbaum uncovered, and then turned right and climbed another flight to the upper level. This pathway led one to double back and arrive at another landing spanning between the choir loft door and the exit door onto the convento rooftop.

The ambulatory walks and extensions were the critical circulatory system of the convento. With inwardly oriented rooms behind mostly featureless exterior walls, the cloister form guarded against the exterior world, controlling access by restricting entry to two points, the portería and service patio doorway. This architectural arrangement understandably reinforced misguided assumptions of early scholars such as Montgomery that New Mexico missionaries lived in cloistered seclusion. In reality, it was a design solution for controlling access to the mission community’s residential spaces, which also corresponded to the Franciscans’ rhetorical needs. Once inside the convento, the ambulatory passageways tied together a highly integrated spatial design, where a person only needed to pass through one or two doors to reach any other internal space. It gave access to the rooftop level as a functional workspace as well. This fluid interconnectedness facilitated the labors of the mission community, but also assisted friars in their surveillance of activities by other mission community members.

* * *

Three ranges of rooms surrounded the ambulatory, with doorways opening into them from its corridors. The front range extended southeast from the Room 29 stairwell, with an
entryway waiting room (Room 36) immediately adjacent (figures 7.122, 7.126). It was a large, relatively featureless portería lacking the built-in benches that other missions had. Instead, a deep red-colored dado wrapped around its walls (figure 7.138). Perhaps movable wooden benches once provided seating, or maybe the friars anticipated primarily Indigenous visitors who would sit on the floor. The door to the convento’s interior was centered in the southwestern wall, with a wooden sill set flush with the inside of the portería wall (one socket is visible in figure 7.122). The jambs were spaced 1.63 meters (5’ 4”) apart and splaying farther on the ambulatory side, where slabs paved the opening. Presumably this arrangement supported a wooden, lockable door which had disappeared by the time of Nusbaum’s excavation, its width hinting that it probably was a double-leaf portal. The original arrangement of Room 36’s front (northeastern) side is unknown, since an enclosing wall and wooden doorway were inserted later (see Chapter 8). The portería probably burnt in the mission fire and contained a small assemblage including a red-colored Plainware canteen; a Hawikuh Polychrome bowl damaged in the fire and found near the middle of the room; and two battered stone ax heads (figures 7.139-7.142).

East of the portería, two adjoining rooms comprised the remainder of convento’s front range. Room 22, sandwiched in the middle, was the friar’s personal cell, complete with a large fireplace, window, and adobe bedstead. The long outer Room 2/3/4/19 had doors to the ambulatory and to the inner cell, as well as to the mission exterior, and was probably a multi-purpose antechamber to the friar’s living quarters. This arrangement of inner and outer residential rooms appears in several other seventeenth-century mission plans, and eighteenth-century sources describe it as a cohesive unit, with the outer space known as the celda, and the interior space the trascelda (the “inner” or “back” cell). While the trascelda was typically the friar’s personal room, Franciscans Domínguez and Ruiz indicate that the front celda had
numerous functions: mission community members slept there, prepared chocolate for guests, and gathered together for devotions and meals in the evening. Although attached to the friar’s chamber, their descriptions indicate celdas were anything but private spaces.

The Purísima Concepción’s trascelda (Room 22) was a rectangular room with no sill in the square-jamb doorways (figure 7.1). The room had a fireplace in its southern corner, opposite a raised bedstead of adobe brick with a mud plaster finish in the northern corner. Traces of an eroded ledge and poorly integrated stone fill in the wall between the bedstead and doorway indicate that a window opening once lit the room before being blocked up (figure 7.14). The trascelda’s large fireplace had two concentric arched curbs on the packed earthen floor. The inner ring was a simple rise in the floor defining the firebox, while the exterior arc of small stones plastered in adobe set the outer limits of the fireplace. Slabs lined the corner flue, affixed to the wall with adobe plaster, and a hood or chimney presumably directed smoke outside. Next to the kitchen (see Chapter 10), this was the most elaborate fireplace in the convento.

Nusbaum recorded no mission-period artifacts for this room, but a handful of ceramic sherds appear on the walls in photographs. Most notable is a piece from a small bowl with painted ornament similar to stars and stick figures common in regional rock art (figure 7.14-7.16). This sherd appears on the wall during the excavation of the mission period occupation level, and probably came from the trascelda or its fill. The bowl appears to present a figure type M. Jane Adams describes as an ancestral or a “raw being.” Ambiguously human and aquatic, Zunis often interpret these figures as dwellers of Kohwala:wa, a lakebed and underworld in eastern Arizona, also known as “Kachina Village” or “Zuni Heaven,” where Zuni spirits go after
Although common in rock art, they rarely occur on ceramics, and the appearance of this sherd in a mission context is surprising.

Adjacent to the trascelda, the celda or Room 2/3/4/19 has a complex structural history beginning in the mission period and continuing through several post-mission configurations (figure 7.147). Nusbaum never fully excavated it to the mission level. Initially, it was approximately 9.14 meters long by 4.34 meters wide on its northwestern side and 3.89 meters on its southeastern end (30’ by 14’ 3”/12’ 9”). The floor was originally adobe pavement, evenly laid with thick mortar between the brick pavers, visible in the foreground of several excavation photographs (figures 7.148-7.149).

Although two doorways ultimately opened into the celda from the ambulatory, I believe that the wider doorway in the western corner is most likely the original. Nusbaum found this opening in the process of excavating Room 19, but it was filled with soil and debris which he did not remove, and he made no record of it beyond indications in his sketch plan (figures 7.149, 7.151). Photographs suggest that its span was among the wider openings in the convento, and would have required a substantial lintel, while the jambs on either side show traces of whitewash. No sill or splay in the jambs is visible, and it is uncertain how this opening was finished. Later alterations indicate that if it had a door, which seems unlikely, it must have opened outwards into the ambulatory (see Chapter 8).

The narrow trascelda doorway was in the northern corner, and a door to the exterior opened through the northeast wall. Nusbaum says nothing about the exterior door’s sill, but draws it with inwardly splayed asymmetrical jambs, suggesting it may have had a wooden frame and inwardly swinging, single-leaf door for security. This opening was later blocked up (Chapter 8), and it was never fully excavated it to expose the sill, which may still be in place. A
narrow, inwardly splayed window was in the middle of the northeast wall, visible as a partly
blocked-up niche in what would later become Room 3 (figure 7.150).¹³⁹

Most likely, the carefully constructed fireplace in the eastern corner of Room 2B was the
original hearth for Room 2/3/4/19 (figures 7.39). The adobe brick floor beneath and traces of
plaster on the wall behind indicate the room was constructed, paved, and plastered prior to
adding the fireplace and flue. Low curbing of carefully plastered stone defined the hearth, with
its flattened upper surface a couple of inches above the floor. Unlike corner fireplaces that the
Mindeleffs recorded in Zuni Pueblo (figure 7.152), or corner fireplaces among Gobernador
District pueblos (figures 7.41), there is no evidence for wooden or stone mantels anchored in
the wall among Hawikku *convento* fireplaces. Instead, it appears that upright sandstone jambs
stood on either side of the fireplace, presumably supporting a stone or wooden mantel and flue
arrangement.¹⁴⁰ The superstructure was probably a flue of adobe bricks or stone slabs, or a
lightweight smokehood of mud-plastered wood, and may have been similar to the later *fogon*
fireplace in the *convento* of the San José mission at Laguna Pueblo (built c. 1700, figure
7.153).¹⁴¹ The charred wall plaster above the hearth suggests its flue location. This corner is
also notable for its exterior corner-guard buttress of stone rubble and mud mortar, apparently set
into the otherwise brick walls of the *convento* core, perhaps to protect the structure’s exposed
downhill corner from erosion (see Chapter 8).¹⁴²

The side range enclosed the *convento* core on the southeast, facing away from the pueblo
ridge and towards the open expanse of the Plumasano Wash. It originally comprised three
similarly-sized rooms, of which Room 1/7 was easternmost, abutting the *celda* wall (figure
7.154). It was originally 4.19 by about 3.73 meters (13’ 9” by 25’ 6”), with a splayed doorway
aligned to the axis of the northeastern ambulatory corridor. The opening had no sill and must
have been without a closing door, while splayed jambs helped admit light from the ambulatory and its small windows. The room had a packed earth floor, on which sat an original fireplace in the south corner, with two upright fire-backing slabs against the walls. Adobe curbing formed a quarter-circle arc in front, with the slabs and wall heavily blackened where a flue once rose to the ceiling.

Room 9 was a similar rectangular space, with a slightly splayed doorway from the ambulatory, a burnt-out sill, and presumably a wooden door swinging inward on a pintle hinge (figures 7.127, 7.155). Its doorway was on the southeast side of the corridor opposite the patio doorway. Room 9 had a packed earth floor and fireplaces in the eastern and western corners, both apparently from the mission period. The eastern fireplace sat on the floor with slabs adhered to the wall and lining the flue, while a mud-plastered curb defined its front side (figure 7.39, 7.156). The western fireplace is less clearly documented, appearing to have had at least one upright fire-backing slab, and another beneath the hearth. It too may have had adobe curbing, but little remained at the time of excavation (figure 7.157). Based on their similar construction, opposite locations, and existence on the same floor level, these fireplaces were probably used at the same time. Their chimneys clustered with those of Rooms 7 and 13 (see figure 7.42), and the reflected heat of two fires likely warmed the entire room, suggesting it was a regularly used living space needing a closing, lockable door. It might have served as guest room or workshop, either of which would have required warmth and locked security to protect belongings or tools. Photographs suggest numerous artifacts from either the mission period of 9A (the southeastern half of the space) or the post mission occupations of the entire room, including what appears to be a semi-cylindrical fragment of a ceramic candle holder, similar to a fragment from the first level of Room 373 in the pueblo (figures 7.158-7.159). Nusbaum only
documented one artifact from Room 9, however: a sandstone slab with two carefully ground mortar basins, one circular and one square, which came from the post-mission occupation (figure 7.160).147

The final space of the convento’s side range was Room 13, the mission kitchen (figure 7.161). It was 7.75 by 4.22 meters (25’ 5” by 13’ 10”), with a fireplace spanning the width of its northeast wall along with adobe benches on three sides and a large bin to the southwest (see Chapter 10 for further discussion of these features). The solid mass of a reentrant projection in the southern corner may have been another corner buttress to protect the structure, while stone slabs paved the workbench along the fire pit. Although Zunis incorporated these benches in their later occupation of this room (see Appendix 1), the displacement of a paving slab from the fireside bench into the fill of the later floor demonstrates it preexisted the post-mission occupation and was part of the room’s original arrangement. Erosion in the middle of the exterior wall might indicate the location of a window.

The doorway from the corridor into the kitchen preserved a carved wooden sill flush with the ambulatory wall (figures 7.162-7.163). It sat on a slab foundation, with a lip along the front edge as a stop for the door’s single swinging leaf on a 7.62 centimeter (3”) pintle pivot. The jambs had rectangular tenons set in the sill’s mortices, but there were also angled points which fit into cuts in the sill’s front side to create the appearance of a mitered casing, effectively disguising the doorway’s post-and-lintel construction.148 Although deteriorated, these remnants demonstrate the mission’s carpenters had achieved relatively sophisticated techniques for creating functional, aesthetic architectural elements that relied upon joinery and carving as substitutes for metal fittings.149 Nusbaum documented no artifacts from the kitchen, but piles of ceramic sherds, including a small painted bowl and several handstones appear in photographs.
Later in life, he recounted finding “broken piki baking slabs” or ground stone griddles in Room 13.¹⁵⁰

The *convento’s* back range included the service patio corridor (Room 12) and sacristy (Room 21) on either end. In-between was a single elongated space designated Room 14/17/18, which like the *celda* experienced significant reuse and reconfiguration. Nusbaum wrote very little about it, making interpretation more difficult (figure 7.164). It appears to have begun as a unified room, 9.68 by 4.42 meters (31’ 9” by 14’ 6”), the largest in the *convento*.¹⁵¹

Its wide opening from the southwest ambulatory had straight jambs and a wooden door, although framing elements largely disappeared in the fire (figure 7.165).¹⁵² The square sill was set flushly in the ambulatory wall on sandstone blocks, with large slab ramps on either side. One slab had a carefully ground hole and concentric ring, which may be an explicit example of superpositioning at Hawikku (figure 7.166). It appears to have been a kiva paving stone with the hole of a loom anchor. Among the pueblos, weaving was generally a male task, and many kivas had looms suspended between floor anchors and the roof beams.¹⁵³ It is unlikely the slab’s anchor had a functional purpose in the mission, but a friar may have reused a kiva slab as a readily visible symbol, attempting to assert triumph over traditional Pueblo religious practices, or even draw comparisons between work in the kiva and work in the mission community.¹⁵⁴

Little else was evident about Room 14/17/18’s original design. Whether it had a fireplace is uncertain, because Nusbaum did not excavate the northwest half (Rooms 17 and 18) down to the original mission floor level.¹⁵⁵ Since no fireplaces were part of the original floor in the other half (Room 14), I hypothesize this room was originally unheated, but locked to secure materials inside. Eighteenth-century descriptions of the Halona *convento* indicate rooms in the back range were secure storage, and Hawikku was probably similar.¹⁵⁶
Conclusions

Much information about the Purísima Concepción’s spatial arrangement and use was lost through destruction, reuse, and excavation, but two variables are notable:

Control of Access- Some rooms had wooden frames and doors, which presumably could be locked to control access, while other rooms had no doors or physical impediment to the comings and goings of mission community members.

Heating- Some rooms had fireplaces for cold weather, while others lacked any permanent heating accommodations. Presumably heated rooms were occupational spaces, while unheated rooms were used for limited periods of time, or for storage.

Mapping these variables onto the mission plan indicates clear differentiations in the use of space (figure 7.167). The mission’s liturgical spaces in the western part of the complex were locked and unheated. Controlling access to these rooms was a high priority for friars who feared Native users would desecrate sacred materials or appropriate them to unorthodox purposes.\textsuperscript{157} The comfort of worshippers was a low priority and lack of heating presented practical challenges. For example, priests had to remove holy water in the winter lest it freeze and damage the fonts. Likewise, some friars would not perform church baptisms during the winter, going instead to family homes for water baptisms, followed by oil anointment in the church when temperatures improved.\textsuperscript{158} Controlling access to storage rooms such as 14/17/18 ensured the mission community’s food security, but lack of heating again created problems, such as wine freezing in its casks during the winter.\textsuperscript{159}
The mission’s heated rooms clustered on its eastern sides with one or more fireplaces in each, serving as cooking, sleeping, eating, and working spaces. The kitchen and Room 9 had wooden doors to control access. Like storerooms, controlling access to the kitchen helped secure valuable resources and materials. The purpose of the heated and locking Room 9 is less clear. It may have been a storeroom for materials that could freeze, a workshop with valuable tools, a room for guest accommodations, or some other function requiring heat and security.

The residential spaces of Room 7 and the celda/trascelda were heated but without physical impediments to mission community members, although it is always possible that rules within the establishment created additional social barriers that are invisible archaeologically. The interior trascelda was clearly a sleeping space for the resident friar, with its distinct fireplace and adobe bedstead. Historians often interpret celdas as offices for the friars, and repositories for mission paperwork. Comparison to descriptions by eighteenth-century Franciscans Ruiz and Dominguez shows the celda’s open space had a wider range of functions, as a meeting space for devotions, a dining room for the mission community, sleeping quarters for the mission boys, and a work area for modest culinary tasks. With this range of activities in mind, the open doorways of the celda and trascelda make sense, allowing unhampered passage among the convento’s dwelling spaces. At the same time, open doorways enabled Hawikku’s friar to monitor the mission community and curtail behaviors he deemed unacceptable. He was able to maintain ready access to laborers, just as Figueredo had called for his interpreter in the middle of the night. Members of the mission community sleeping in the convento probably rested on mats on the floors of these heated rooms.

The application of primary sources to the physical remains of the Purísima Concepción thus lead to a very different picture than the cloistered segregation of mission historiography.
The *convento*’s heated and open living quarters were spaces of close and intimate interaction between resident Franciscans and the inner circle of the mission community, who had to negotiate between the natural desire to maintain their own cultural practices and the friars’ efforts to enforce Euro-American Christian norms of behavior.
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Hodge to Heye, June 22, 1919; Hodge to Heye, July 9, 1919. According to Hodge, a Zuni oral tradition relates that some old beams were salvaged in the seventeenth century, and taken for constructing the Zuni church, but Hodge found this unlikely given the burnt state of the remains; Hodge to Heye, June 15, 1919. I have heard a similar tradition, recounting that beams were salvaged and used to build the visita chapel at Kechibawa. While it may be that some timbers were salvaged from the nave, I would agree with Hodge that this seems unlikely. There would have been numerous beams of usable dimensions in the convento ruins, however, and these were likely reused in various ways. By comparison, Galdo (Scholes and Adams, Inventories, 35) described the roof of the Halona mission in 1672, saying that, “the nave of the church, which is beamed, is one of the good ones there are in this Holy Custody, if one allows that there are any good ones,” seeming to confirm a terrado roof at Halona as well.

For conventos as hydraulic catchments in Mexico and Iberia, see Laura Ledesma Gallegos, Tradición y expresión de los patios en los claustros novohispanos: Cuatro estudios de caso (Mexico City: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, 2009), 11, 50; and Carmen Díez González, “Paisaje y mística en la cuenca del Tajo,” in Paisajes modelados por el agua: entre el arte y la ingeniería, 295-312 (Mérida: Gobierno de Extremadura, 2012), 300. For excavated examples of hydraulic engineering to remove rainwater from an adobe mission in New Mexico, see Hayes, The Four Churches, 31; Brew, “The Excavation,” 84-85; and Ivey, In the Midst, 99.

For Acoma, see Wroth and Gavin, Converging Streams, 174, pl. 31

Hodge to Heye, June 22, 1919.

For the Pecos Beam, see Larry Frank and Skip Keith Miller, A Land So Remote, Volume 3: Wooden Artifacts of Frontier New Mexico, 1700s-1900s (Santa Fe: Red Crane Books, 2001), 162, fig. 220.

Hodge collected these beams from a Zuni house in 1923. The bottom sides of each beam are covered with opposed pairs of black-painted concentric semi-circles, separated by bars of four squares with dots at the center of each. None of these beams are dated, so whether they were contemporary with the Hawikku mission or post-date the Pueblo Revolt is unknown, although the latter is more likely. A motif of running diamonds with central dots similar to the ornament of their faces is known today as the “Zuni Eye” pattern, incorporated in woven kilts for ceremonial dances; Octavius Seowtewa, Recovering Voices Pueblo of Zuni, rv_Zuni_20160922_05, September 22, 2016.

Kubler (The Religious Architecture, 133-134) argues transverse clearstory windows are “diagnostic for the New Mexican style” and have no precedents elsewhere, although he postulates that previous experiments must have existed. Understanding of transverse clearstory windows has advanced somewhat since Kubler’s time, and although documentation is still forthcoming, antecedents to the New Mexico design are now recognized in Central Mexico and North Africa (Scheutz, “Pre-Euclidean Geometry,” 516-517; Ivey, “The Architectural Background,” 50. At least one example of a surviving transverse clearstory window in a sixteenth-century New Mexican mission is documented but not investigated at the little-known church of Nuestra Señora de la Asunción in Zoquiquipan in the state of Hidalgo; see Logan Wagner, Hal Box, and Susan Kline Morehead, Ancient Origins of the Mexican Plaza: From Primordial Sea to Public Space (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2013), 72-76, figure 3.19. It is now a parish church, but was originally a mission visita of the Augustinians in Meztitlán; see Gloria Espinosa Spínola, Arquitectura de la Conversión y Evangelización en la Nueva España durante el Siglo XVI (Almería: Universidad de Almería, 1998), 126; and McAndrew, The Open-Air Churches, 255-275. Gloria Espinosa Spínola interprets this structure as a sixteenth-century open chapel forming the apse with its barrel vault ceiling, and a nave added sometime in the seventeenth century with a flat roof, producing the difference in levels that allowed for the construction of a transverse clearstory window. This structure merits further research.

For eyelet hinges in New Mexico, see Boyd, Popular Arts, 250.

There are a number of unprovenanced metal pieces collected in 1919 and 1920, which might conceivably be from the mission. These include: NMAI 093958 (an iron staple collected 1919); NMAI 100924 (a fragment of an iron object, perhaps a pintle for a hinge, collected 1920); NMAI 093960 (an iron bolt with spherical head, collected 1919); NMAI 093967 (an unidentified flat circular iron object with short shank, collected 1919); NMAI 093956 (two fragments of iron hasps, collected 1919); NMAI 093969 (a fragment of iron spike, collected 1919); NMAI
093959 (an iron staple, perhaps a hinge from mission, collected 1919); NMAI 093955 (a fragment of an iron latch, collected 1919); NMAI 093988 (a fragment of a lead pipe, collected 1919); NMAI 093953 (a fragment of an iron hinge, collected 1919); and NMAI 093954 (a fragment of a cylindrical iron object, collected 1919). Other metal artifacts found throughout the Pueblo and cemetery excavations could have originated at the mission, and were almost certainly imported by the Spanish, but are beyond the scope of what I can report in this dissertation.


36 Pueblitos are small masonry settlements in the northern New Mexico lands of the Navaho Dinétah, mostly around Gobernador and Largo Canyons. These sites have variously been interpreted as ancestral Navajo refuges from Ute raiders and as destinations for Pueblo refugees, thought to have occurred during the Pueblo Revolt period. Dendrochronological dating reveals that they almost all belong to the eighteenth century after the Pueblo Revolt. A mix of Navaho Hogan and Pueblo masonry architecture, Spanish style corner fireplaces, metal artifacts, adoption of Spanish herd animals, and eighteenth-century Pueblo ceramics reflect a degree of cultural mixing at these sites. See Preucel, “Writing the Pueblo Revolt,” 16-17; Ronald H. Towner, “The Pueblito Phenomenon: A New Perspective on Post-Revolt Navajo Culture,” in *The Archaeology of Navajo Origins*, ed. Ronald H. Towner (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1996); Ronald H. Towner, *Defending the Dinétah: Pueblitos in the Ancestral Navajo Homeland* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2003); Robert W. Preucel, “Becoming Navajo: Refugees, Pueblitos, and Identity in the Dinétah” in Liebmann and Murphy, *Enduring Conquests*, 223-242; and Brooks, *Captives and Cousins*, 95-97. Even if they were primarily ancestral Navaho in character, some Pueblo people may still have sought refuge or been married into the Navaho population as captives from raiding, bringing cultural features such as corner fireplace and Pueblo pottery. Indeed, the greatest knowledge of eighteenth-century Zuni ceramics comes from Gobernador excavations; see Lannon and Harlow, *The Pottery*, 24, 41, 107-108.

37 Mission-period fireplaces of this sort existed in Rooms 2B, 19, 22A, 7A, and 9A. As an alternative reconstruction, it seems possible that the semi-circular arcs of sandstone found throughout the mission ruins were not fragments of hatchway sills, but rather part of fireplace structures. It seems possible to build a *fogon* fireplace with an arched wooden lintel at the front of the fireplace and one of these sandstone sections resting on top of it, laid flat with its front end resting on top of the lintel and its back ends set into the wall on top of the fire backing slabs. The inside of the arc would therefore form the damper opening by which smoke rose into the flue of paired slabs. This reconstruction is entirely speculative, but seems possible as an interpretation of the excavated remains.

38 Secondary fireplaces with sunken, slab-lined fireboxes existed in Rooms 2A, 5, possibly 9B, 17, and 18. The only secondary fireplace of the original style was found in Room 19; see Chapter 8.

39 Post-mission spur wall fireplaces were built in Rooms 1, 2, 3, 20, and 24, and remained in use at Zuni until the late nineteenth century. See Mindeleff, *A Study*, 167-180; Bunting, *Early Architecture*, 72-79.

40 Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 85. Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury (*The Excavation*, 100) incorrectly cite the dimensions as 5’ shorter each way, and reproduce the mission plan with the mission exhibit fairly high-quality masonry abutting the adobe brick of the mission (figures 5.39, 6.14, 7.45, 7.122). Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury (*The Excavation*, 110) describe the wall as 88.9 cm. (2’ 11”) wide, and say that no structures existed within the atrium, although this claim is speculative since no archaeological investigations have been made there.

41 The atrium wall was between 53.34 and 63.5 cm. in width (1’ 9” to 2’ 1”) and 68.58 cm. high (2’ 3”); see Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 112, 133; Coffin, “Hawikuh Room Plans I,” 39. In many places, only a few courses of the wall survived, but sections nearest the mission exhibit fairly high-quality masonry abutting the adobe brick of the mission (figures 5.39, 6.14, 7.45, 7.122). Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury (*The Excavation*, 110) describe the wall as 88.9 cm. (2’ 11”) wide, and say that no structures existed within the atrium, although this claim is speculative since no archaeological investigations have been made there.

42 Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 85, 112, 133. The southeast gate was 2.44 m. (8’) wide and located 2.36 m. (7’ 9”) out from the *convento* wall. The northwest gate was 1.93 m. (6’ 4”) wide and located over the filled remnant of Room 32 in front of the baptistery wall. The northeast opening was 2.59 m. (8’ 6”) wide, located 14.33 m. (47’) from the eastern corner of the atrium. This might have been the formal entry, but it is doubtful that it was the most regularly used entrance, being much further from the pueblo.
The hardened surface was found “on the level surrounding and above the stone [retaining] wall” at the western corner of the church, and 1.70 m. (5’ 7”) above the floor level of Room 35 (Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 138), making it 0.81 m. (2’ 8”) above the floor level of the church, but only 0.30 to 0.48 m. (1’ to 1’ 7”) above the foundation level of the retaining wall built along this side of the mission. In other words, it was roughly consistent with the mission-period ground level along the northwest side of the church and atrium, uphill and higher than the occupation levels of the church and atrium floors. Abó had a similarly located road on the side of the church opposite the church; see Ivey, In the Midst, 56-57, fig. 2.

The atrium level is taken as approximately the same as the level of the base of the front of the façade buttress, which was 40.64 cm. (16”) above the nave floor; see Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 132. I remain uncertain about the exact height of the top of the Room 32 wall remnants above the atrium and nave levels, due to contradictions in the field notes. See Chapter 6, n. 36, above.

The gap in the atrium wall was 1.93 meter (6’ 4”) wide, and formed a stepped entryway, 50.80 cm. (1’ 8”) above the remnant of Room 32’s wall alignment. A second step 22.86 cm. (9”) above the gateway indicates the exterior ground level during the mission period. See Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 133.

For superpositioning, see Chapter 2, n. 95, above.

Bruzelius, Preaching, 84, 104.

Ivey describes this the single-nave/single chapel or “shouldered” church form as a typical interim type for Northern New Spain; see Ivey, “Missions as Architectural Patrons,” 100-115; Ivey, “The Architectural Background,” 44-49; Ivey, “George Kubler,” 137-146. Examples of similar interim churches with “shouldered” designs in seventeenth-century New Mexico include: San Miguel de Analco in Santa Fe (Stubbs and Ellis, Archaeological Excavations at the Chapel of San Miguel, 2-7); San Bernardo of Awatovi Pueblo (Brew, “The Excavation,” 53-54; Ivey, “Convento Kivas,” 130-132; Ivey, “George Kubler,” 146); the early church of San Isidro at Las Humanas (Gran Quivira) Pueblo (Ivey, In the Midst, 162-176); San Gregorio, Abó Pueblo (Ivey, In the Midst, 62-63, 66-94); and Pecos Pueblo, where a small initial structure known as the “Lost” or Ortiz church had a polygonal apse opening from its perpendicular sanctuary wall (Ivey, The Spanish Colonial Architecture, 309-310; Ivey, “George Kubler,” 92-98; Stubbs, Ellis, and Dittert, Jr., “Lost Pecos Church,” 67-92). Subsequently, the large formal church of Nuestra Señora de los Angeles de Porciúncula of Pecos (begun as early as 1620 and finished by 1625) monumentalized the type, with a raised polygonal apse; see Ivey, The Spanish Colonial Architecture, 313-318. Elsewhere in New Spain, San Luis in present day Tallahassee evokes the interim shouldered type. A double row of columns supported its pitched roof, producing a central nave with side aisles, five bays long. The final pair of posts were walled off to form two small sacristy rooms at the head of the church and leaving a rectangular sanctuary chapel between. While the aisles and bays of the supporting posts were not present in most New Mexico churches, the basic form was much like the Zuni churches. See Shapiro and Vernon, “Archaeology at San Luis,” 177-177; John H. Hann and Bonnie G. McEwan, The Apalachee Indians and Mission San Luis (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1998), 86. Other variations appeared also in what is today Chihuahua. For example, the ex-Franciscan Santiago Babonoyaba, in Chihuahua’s southern municipality of Satevó (date uncertain), has a simple, single nave with a flat sanctuary wall forming a proscenium arch in front of the narrower polygonal apse (Clara Bargellini, “Mission Architecture and Art: Processes and Examples,” in Bargellini, Missions of Chihuahua, 131-133). Similar, though earlier, interim churches exist in central Mexico, with the church of San Francisco Tlahuelilpan (State of Hidalgo, c. 1560) as a good example. It has an ornate open chapel, but simple portal ornamentation, flat roof on carved corbels anticipating those of New Mexico, and squared apse opening from a perpendicular sanctuary wall and proscenium arch (Ivey, “The Architectural Background,” 44-45; Richard Perry, Mexico’s Fortress Monasteries [Santa Barbara, CA: Espadaña Press, 1992], 90-91). Other Mexican missions with similar plans but vaulted ceilings include San Francisco Tepeapulco (Hidalgo; Perry, Mexico’s Fortress Monasteries, 80) and San Andreas Calpan (Puebla; ibid., 104-107). Looking further afield, smaller monasteries of sixteenth and seventeenth-century Spain often had single nave churches with barrel vaults or simple crossing vaults, and narrow rectangular sanctuaries attached to the head of the church, with plans similar to the “shouldered” type, and vernacular construction like that of the interim missions of northern New Spain. Examples include the seventeenth-century observant Franciscan San Benito in Segura de León, and Discalced Franciscan establishments such as Nuestra Señora de Rocamador in Almendral (founded 1512), San Isidro de Loriana in La Nava de Santiago (founded 1551), and San Francisco in Belvís de Monroy (ca. 1509). See Ámez Prieto, La Provincia de San Miguel,
263-273; and Ámez Prieto, *La Provincia de San Gabriel*, 127-139, 187-194, 329-338. Scheutz (“Pre-Euclidean Geometry, 517-518) attributes this design to visigothic Spain, while Margarita Martínez del Sobral y Campa (Los Conventos Franciscanos Poblanos y El Numero de Oro [Mexico City: Gobierno del Estado de Puebla, INAH Centro Regional de Puebla, and Fundacion Fuad Abed Halabi, 1988], 42) attributes it to Mozarabic churches. In Tuscany, Gustafson (Tradition and Renewal, 60-61) says that transeptless single nave churches with attached single chapels were the most common formal type of Franciscan church, plans which also anticipate the “shouldered” interim churches of New Mexico.

49 Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, *The Excavation*, 100. My own measurement of Schellbach’s plan suggests that the church was 34.44 m. (113’) long on the exterior.

50 The gospel-side buttress and stairwell was roughly 4.42 m. (14’ 6”) wide, while the epistle-side buttress was 1.31 m. (4’ 3.6”) wide.

51 The NMAI catalog describes this bowl as from the “northeast front of church,” perhaps the area of the gospel façade tower.

52 The narthex was 7.54 by 2.13 meters (24’ 9” by 7”), and each post was 30.48 cm. (12”) square. Post measurements come from Nusbaum to Heye and Hodge, October 6, 1919. Montgomery (“Functional Interpretations,” 126) says this porch was “not properly a narthex,” or vestibule to the church, without explaining what he means or why. From the plan, it appears that the porch posts were not precisely centered. The southeast post was 2.36 M. (7’ 9") from the stairwell wall, while the northwest post was 2.13 M. (7’) from the buttress, with a 2.59 M. (8’ 6”) span between them. Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury (*The Excavation*, 106) have slightly different dimensions for the narthex, saying that it was 7.77 M. wide and 1.98 M. deep (25’ 6” by 6’ 6”), and that the southeast post was 2.44 M. (8”) and the northwest post 2.13 M. (7”) from their respective buttresses.

53 NMAI Archives Oversize folders, Drawer 6, folder 3, “The Excavation of Hawikuh, Negative Images and Autopos + Data Figures 1-35, figure 21; this figure was reproduced in simplified form as figure 21 in Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, *The Excavation*.

54 The doorway was 2.13 M. (7’) wide with an interior batter of roughly 15.24 cm. (6”) on each side. See Schellbach plan; and Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, *The Excavation*, 104-105.

55 The sill was 25.4 cm. (10”) wide, 17.78 cm. (7") thick, and set back 27.94 cm (11”) from the plane of the front wall; Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 7. Nusbaum did not note the pintle hinges, but Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury are confident of their existence (Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, *The Excavation*, 105), which is probably accurate and fits what Nusbaum seemed to have believed was the case when he described a double door (Nusbaum to Smith, March 30, 1962, 7). A pintle socket appears to be visible on the gospel side in photographs N05745 and N05750.

56 The nave floor was perhaps as much as 40.64 cm (16”) below the level of the atrium, measured from the base of the northwest buttress; see Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 132. This difference in levels is not immediately evident in any of the existing photographs, and it is not clear how the construction mediated the different levels, as no steps are noted. It is possible that sloped ground surfaces and fills were sufficient to account for this difference in relative heights.

57 The *sotocoro* space was 8.05 m. wide and 4.88 m. deep (26’ 5” by 16’), with the southeast post 2.59 m. (8’ 6") from the gospel wall, the northwest post 2.51 m. (8’ 3") from the epistle wall, and a space about 2.44 m. (8’) between them according to the Schellbach plan. Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury (*The Excavation*, 106) describe its dimensions as 4.27 (14’) deep, with insufficient intervals between the posts and walls to equal the width of the nave.

58 Nusbaum noted these pedestals were of adobe in his letter to Hodge and Heye dated October 6, 1919. From photographs, it appears possibly that they may have had sandstone slabs forming their upper surface, but Nusbaum makes no mention of any stone, and they may simply have been pieced of adobe bricks with their corners trimmed. The stratigraphy was quite deep in the *sotocoro* area; see NMAI Photo Negative N05752. The lower 0.61 to 0.91 m.
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(2 to 3") of fill had no definite layers, perhaps belonging to the initial phase of burning and subsequent deterioration and infill, with what appear to be some charred wooden elements. Above this level, clear strata in narrow alternating layers of light and dark begin. These belong to the period in which the church was periodically used as a corral. The upper part of the stratigraphic column is indistinct in photographs. Unlike the strata of the upper nave, which slumped noticeably toward the nave center, the strata in the sotocoro area appear to lie relatively evenly. No dimensions were recorded for the choir loft posts, but they appear similar in size and square cross-section to the façade balcony posts. The epistle-side post may have been doubled up or had another wooden feature adjacent to it, as there are some charred, indecipherable remains visible on its southeast side in NMAI photo negative N05752.

59 During the destruction of the mission, the choir-loft posts burnt down almost flush with the nave floor, and nothing remained of the balcony except assorted iron nails. The nails are visible in NMAI photo negative N5752, piled on the epistle-side pedestal. From this photo, it also appears Nusbaum left a witness block of stratification on the gospel side of the sotocoro, along with the central section of the nave.

60 Measurements based on the Schellbach’s “Larger-scale plan,” (see Chapter 5, n. 168, above). It should be noted that the sketch plan of the church on legal paper records a nave length of 24.28 m. (79’ 8") and width between 8.08 m. and 8.15 m. (26’ 6" and 26’ 9") see Chapter 5, n. 169, above. Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury (The Excavation, 104) report internal dimensions of 24.84 m. by 8.08 m. (81’ 6" by 26’ 6"). It is hard to reconcile the almost 0.61 m. (2") difference in the length of the nave among these sources.

61 See Chapter 7, n. 7, above. Nusbaum excavated forty burials of Zuni ancestors from the head of the nave. They had been placed in pits cut through the hard layer of the floor, lying in extended positions on their backs in the sand below, with their feet towards the altar and their heads “a little east of north.” These were probably only part of the total number of burials beneath the church, and some deposits had signs of disturbance from subsequent interments. Their grave goods included a terraced cross of cedar; an inlaid turquoise pendant; beaded crosses; copper pins; and corn meal deposits. See Jesse L. Nusbaum (attributed), “Burials within the Church,” in Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, The Excavation, 199-202; Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 50-55. I have heard on more than one occasion Zunis suggest that there were kivas beneath the mission churches at Hawikku and Halona, but it is unclear to me if this is part of oral traditions, if it is speculation, or if it is a genuinely held belief conditioned by prior scholarship such as Montgomery who insists that kivas were common features beneath missions, despite relative lack of evidence. Neither the Hendricks-Hodge Expedition nor the National Parks Service excavations at Halona recovered any structural evidence for kivas beneath the Zuni missions. It is entirely possible that the missions were built over kivas, but there is no archaeological evidence to date to put alongside any oral traditions that may exist to this effect.

62 The beams were lying flat on the nave floor, roughly parallel to the lengthwise axis of the nave, so they may not have been part of the roof structure, lying in the wrong general direction, without fill beneath them. They were fairly thick, similar in dimensions to the newel posts of the sanctuary stair, perhaps 0.91 m. (3’) in length. Nusbaum recorded nothing about these pieces, and the photographs are not detailed enough to provide further information about ornament, carving, or joinery. They may have been part of a communion rail, supports for a raised pulpit on the epistle side of the nave, or fallen vertical framing elements from a transverse clearstory window. See also the partially excavated timber remnants next to the newel post in excavation photographs (figures 7.61, 7.68, 7.70, 7.84).

63 Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury (The Excavation, fig. 27) represent the church nave as having an ornamental dado with an all-over diamond pattern andumber and red borders. Within these rhomboids, they depict white cruciform flowers with red circles at their centers, and small, oval-shaped interstitial petals in alternating red andumber paint. This pattern is a misappliccation of the diamonds that appeared in a border running around the top of the dado in the sacristy (Room 20; see Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,”111, and figure 7.109). The misinterpretation is likely the fault of Smith, who published similar flower patterns from the murals at Awatovi; see Watson Smith, “Mural Decorations of San Bernardo de Aguatubi,” in Montgomery, Smith, and Brew, Franciscan Awatovi, Fig 55e, g.

64 Hodge to Heye, June 15, 1919. Hodge reiterated this description of the mural paintings a few days later, “which I have already told you are of Indian motif and indeed consist partly of the ever present feather symbol which we find at Hawikuh.” See Hodge to Heye, June 22, 1919.
The apse at Hawikku was 3.66 m. (12’) wide at its opening and 3.35 m. (11’) along its back wall, with a depth of 4.72 m (15’ 6”) on its southeast side and 4.80 m (15’ 9”) on its northwest side; see legal pad sketch of church plan, MAI Records, B.273.16, NMAI Archives. The height of the apse fill is not recorded in the field notes; the approximate measure of 1.22 m. (4’) is based on the seven risers of the steps.

The platform of the capilla major was set back 30.48 cm. (12”); see legal pad sketch of church plan.

The fill of broken adobe bricks, and a possible brick alignment on the southeast side of the burial (see N05753, not reproduced), are additional circumstantial evidence supporting my hypothesis of an earlier, establishment phase structure on the site, which was torn down and reused to construct the sanctuary of the formal mission. Because of the sensitivity of human remains I am not reproducing photographs of the Hawikku burials. The altar burial, deer forelegs, and trench through the apse fill are visible in Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, The Excavation, plate 33b and NMAI photo negatives N05753 and N05754. The articulated forelegs appear to have been an intentional deposition, but I have yet to encounter ethnographic data (Spanish or Zuni) that would explain their burial beneath the predesta of the main altar. Barbara Tedlock (The Beautiful and the Dangerous: Encounters with the Zuni Indians [New York: Viking, 1992], 128) notes a Zuni practice of planting these “little bones” leftover from butchering deer in their fields to improve the harvest, although there is no immediately apparent connection to the apse fill. The human burial beneath the altar was laid on his back with his arms folded over his chest and no funerary accompaniments, on the gospel side of the apse along its southeastern wall. Nusbaum’s original notes describe it as 2’ 6” down, while he later said that it was 1.07 m. (3’ 6”) below the apse floor. Nusbaum notes that whole adobe bricks were placed on edge “at the right side of the skeleton and next to the wall” while broken and whole adobes “flat and on edge” covered the remains, which had partly been undermined by a prairie dog burrow. The body had been buried with the head towards the southwest in line with the front of the original altar, indicating it was interred prior to the construction of the altar renovations. See Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 52-53. Nusbaum, “Burials,” 199-202, 201-202. Nusbaum designated the burial 35 in his field notes, and it is presently in the collections of the National Museum of Natural History (NMNH 314297). With permission from the Zuni Tribal Council I inspected these remains in person and can attest that they show no obvious signs of trauma (scalping or crushing) that would associate them with any of the documented friars killed at Hawikku. The teeth do not show the heavy, flattened wear of an individual long accommodated to the hand-ground maize diet of the Southwest, suggesting that he was a relatively recent arrival to New Mexico. According to the analysis of Donald J. Ortner, the remains belong to a male between twenty-five and thirty-five years of age, whose deformed spine, ribs, and slightly bowed legs suggest scoliosis as a result of early childhood rickets. Morphological features and craniometric analysis indicate that he was European rather than Indigenous, and would have been about 1.6 m. (5’ 3””) tall when erect, although his spinal curvature probably shortened him by 5-10 cm. (1.97-3.94”) in practice. See Donald J. Ortner, Identification of Pathological Conditions in Human Skeletal Remains, 2nd ed. (Amsterdam: Academic Press, 2003), 18. Ortner incorrectly attributes these remains to a Pueblo Revolt victim, which could not be the case since the mission was destroyed eight years before the Revolt. See also Erica B. Jones and Stephen D. Ousley, “The Repatriation Osteology Laboratory, National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution,” in The Forensic Anthropology Laboratory, ed. M. W. Warren and H. A. Walsh-Haney (Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press, 2008), 141-143. This skeleton cannot presently be linked to any of the Franciscans known to have worked at Hawikku. Nusbaum speculated that it was the remains of Fray Martin de Arvide, killed in 1632 (“Burials,” 202), but I would contend this is unlikely. Arvide was killed before the construction of the formal mission church and the apse where Nusbaum found his body. The interim between the destruction of the establishment phase mission and the Franciscans’ midcentury return to Hawikku makes it unlikely that his remains would have been translated to the new church, and the skull showed no cut-marks corresponding to the scalping Arvide purportedly received (see Chapter 4, n. 130, above). It seems more likely that these bones belong to one of the undocumented mid-century friars responsible for the reestablishment of the Hawikku mission. It remains in good enough condition to allow testing which could at least confirm whether he was a peninsular friar, born in Spain, or a criollo born in the Americas.

The predella and foundation of the altar were made of two abutted rows of seven brick headers. The total height and upper surface of the original altar were not preserved. A low step about 2.5 cm. high extended 30.48 cm. (1” by 12”) in front of it; Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 2. The original construction of the main altar has been surprising difficult to interpret. Nusbaum’s field notes (“Church and Monastery,” 1-2, 4) do not include most of the pertinent measurements for the apse features, except for the average measures for the adobe bricks, and include an ambiguous plan-view drawing of the brick arrangement (2). Its place in the notes suggests that it is the first altar,
but it actually pertains only to the layer of bricks supporting the altar and forming the predella. He writes that the “lower altar is of 2 rows of adobies-7 each laid close together narrow way to row and two rows wide” (“Church and Monastery,” 2), describing the foundation and predella. Using his average measurements (57.15 by 26.67 by 7.62 cm/22.5” by 10.5” by 3”), the foundation for the original altar should have been about 1.87 m. wide by 1.14 m. thick (6’ 1.5” by 3’ 9”), with additional allowances for mortar between the bricks and a plaster finish. The dimensions noted on the legal pad sketch plan seem close to corresponding with these expectations. It describes the altar as 2.08 m. (6’ 10” wide), spaced 0.66 m. (2’ 2”) from the apse wall on either side, and about 0.71 m. (2’ 4”) from the back of the apse. According to it, the depth or thickness of the altar was 0.53 m. (1’ 9”), significantly thicker than the expected 0.27 m. (10.5”). Brick variability, remnant plaster finish, and six mortar seams between bricks could easily account for the wider width noted in the legal pad sketch (a difference of +21.59 cm./8.5”), but the thickness is almost twice the expected dimension of the original altar (a difference of + 0.26 m./10.5”). The legal sketch plan was drawn in the field, while the altar was still in existence, and it would seem to be the most direct, unmediated, and presumably accurate source for altar dimension. It would appear to describe the altar as found, with the renovations described in Chapter 7. Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury interpret the altar as two rows of four brick stretchers, the back being the original altar, and the front row as its subsequent renovation (The Excavation, 108 and fig. 24), yielding total dimensions of 2.29 m. wide and 0.57 m. deep (7’ 6” by 1’ 10.5”) that correspond fairly well with Schellbach’s plan and the legal sketch pad plan.

69 Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury (The Excavation, 107) estimate the steps as having treads about 33.02 cm. (1’ 1” wide and risers 15.24-17.78 cm. (6-7”) high, with the bottom step being somewhat taller, while saying that the sills were about 15.24 cm. by 20.32 cm. (6” by 8”), but the source for these measures is unclear, especially since the sills were badly burnt.

70 The stairs tapered from a bottom step about 2.95 m. (9’ 8”) wide, to a top step that was 2.64 m. (8’ 8”). At the top of the stair, the perpendicular railing was anchored in the side walls of the apse. According to the legal pad sketch, the steps were spaced 0.51 m. (1’ 8”) on either side from the apse walls and lateral altars. Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury estimate the lowest step as 2.97 m (9’ 9”) wide, and the top step as 2.59 m. (8’ 6”), perhaps based on Schellbach’s plan.

71 The posts were approximately 0.99 m. tall and 0.25 m. wide (3’ 3” by 10”), with 0.10 m. square tenons set 0.12 m. deep (4” square by 4.75” deep) in mortises cut at either end of the hewn beam of the first step. The posts were carved with four bulging, rounded segments, and the stair rails lodged in mortices 7.62 cm. wide and 13.34 cm. high (3” by 5.25”). See Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 1, 180-181; Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, The Excavation, 106. The bottom rail across the front of the raised sanctuary sat on the floor and was set in the side walls. There are suggestions of other holes in the apse walls which may be from fittings for the church furnishings, or they may be damage from rodents or the excavation.

72 Hodge to Heye, June 15, 1919; Hodge to Heye, June 22, 1919. Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury (The Excavation, 107) describe this mosaic as diamond patterned, with the pieces probably affixed by pinon gum. It is more likely that it was star- or flower-patterned with diamond shaped pieces radiating from a central point.

73 Nusbaum to Smith, March 30, 1962.

74 It is unclear which room these selenite pieces came from. The NMAI catalog describes them as accessioned in 1923. In two places, Hodge describes finding cut pieces of mica, rather than selenite. In 1919, he described finding “a quantity of small pieces of mica, many of which had been cut to shape” in Room 149 of Block D (Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition Fieldnotes, Vol. 4, 1919, Series I. Boxed Notebooks, HHAE, 195). Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury seem to have found more information about this deposit in their notes on each room of the pueblo. See Group D folder, “MAI Records” B.273.4, NMAI Archives, which recounts that Room 149 contained a deposit of “many small pieces of mica, some of them cut to shape, were found in a heap just beneath the surface. It is not improbable that these were part of a supply used in ornamenting the steps of the main altar of the church, elsewhere described. This dwelling was at the southeastern edge of the group, and therefore overlooked the church and monastery.” It is unclear if this passage is meant to describe pieces of mica or selenite as Hodge and Nusbaum otherwise describe affixed to the steps. Additionally, in 1921, Hodge wrote that he found “pieces of cut mica, such as were used in the church” in the upper level of Room 341 (Block B); see Hendricks-Hodge.
According to the legal pad sketch plan, the lateral altars were each 2.21 m. wide by 0.84 m. deep (7’ 3” by 2’ 9”). The framing of the predellas seems to have constricted slightly, with a total width listed as 2.13 m. (7’) on the gospel side, and 2.03 m. (6’ 8”) on the epistle side. They extended about 0.99 m. (3’ 3”) from the front of the altars. According to Nusbaum (“Church and Monastery,” 5), the lateral predellas were 12.7 to 15.24 cm. (5” to 6”) above the level of the nave floor. See also Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, The Excavation, 110. Photographs show that the front side and inner corner of both of the subsidiary altars were eroded away, probably due to exposure after the initial destruction of the church and its roof.

Nusbaum incorrectly identified the picture frame as a cross, but personal inspection clearly demonstrates that the pieces fit together as two sides of a picture frame, like that from Room 25. Nusbaum did not collect the copper disc, which he found in two perfectly rounded pieces adjacent to each other, without any drilling. The disc fell apart when exposed to the air. Nor did he collect the diamond, which was little more than a stain. See Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 6.

Montgomery (“Functional Interpretations,” 129) only knew about one of these three ground stones, Nusbaum’s “kneeling stone” from the apse. Because this stone did not match his expectations, Montgomery concludes that it “lacks recognizable significance.”

Woodbury (Prehistoric Stone Implements, 186) reports three fragments of travertine marble from the excavations at Awatovi. They appear to have been part of rectangular slabs originally, and were 2.5 cm. thick, with the largest fragment 12 cm. across. One of these pieces was found in the rubbish of the main church, one in the adjoining sacristy, and one in the plaza to the north of the church. Their form and material sound consistent with what one would expect of an ara.

Hodge describes the conditions of this bowl upon discovery: “on the floor at the bottom of the steps were the scattered fragments of a large, recent glazed bowl that have been struck by a falling beam,” Hodge to Heye, June 22, 1919.

The provenance attribution was recorded with the artifact and is now part of the NMAI catalog. The front side of both lateral altars eroded after the mission’s destruction, and I would interpret this provenience to mean that they came from in front of one of the lateral altars, sitting on the altar predella. Another possible implication of the erosion of the lateral altar surfaces is that they seem to have remained exposed to the elements after the destruction of the church. The collapsing roof either did not land in such a way that it covered the altars, or it did not all collapse into the nave immediately. The fall of the roof or subsequent erosion could have swept artifacts such as these small bowls down from the altar surface to the predella. Their provenance on the predella does not necessarily mean that they were originally positioned there prior to the mission attack.

These unprovenanced items without any clear indicators of mission-period association include the following:
NMAI 095632.000 (three rectangular pottery scrapers, one of which might be burned); NMAI 095631.000 (a soft white rectangular flat rubbing stone); NMAI 095633.000 (an abrading stone); NMAI 095636.000 (two oval potsherds used as smoothers); NMAI 095619.000 (one piece of an olive jar and one majolica sherd); NMAI 095625.000 (an unburnt, clearly post-mission deer bone awl with point missing); NMAI 095617.000 (stone flakes); NMAI 095634.000 (a hematite rubbing stone); NMAI 095620.000 (a fragment of worked olivella shell); NMAI 095621.000 (an olivella shell bead); NMAI 095624.000 (a fragment of bird bone showing cutting); NMAI 095623.000 (a bone bead with a serrated end); NMAI 095629.000 (a pottery spindle whorl); NMAI 095626.000 (a small animal sculpture in white stone); NMAI 095622.000 (a fragment of perforated selenite); NMAI 094025.000 (a triangular piece of cut mica); NMAI 095618.000 (two arrow points, neither with hafting or diagnostic features); NMAI 095635.000 (a piece of sandstone with a groove); NMAI 095630.000 (a small ceramic animal figurine); and NMAI 101275.000 (two partially completed stone mortars).
This ornamental accent was cut from thin copper sheeting, with each shape joining at the base angles to form strips of triangles. These pieces are crumpled and broken, preserved in a thin block of grainy matrix, perhaps deteriorated adobe wash from the mission fill. Because the pieces are embedded, it was not possible to measure the thickness of the copper sheet. The triangular pieces averaged 33.94 mm. in altitude, 35.40 mm. along their base, and 10.59 mm. thick at the attached interstices of the base angles. The pieces were not regularly cut however, and there is a great deal of variability. Their altitudes range between 27.85 and 40.00 mm., their base length from 21.85 to 41.75 mm., and their interstices from 8.41 to 12.96 mm. It would appear that they were cut free-hand, rather than from a pattern, suggesting to me the work took place at the mission site and not in Central Mexico prior to shipment, where I would expect the workmanship would be more regular. As presently preserved, there appears to be three or four independent strips of ornament compressed together in the matrix, with no signs of a wood frame among them. Likewise, there are no readily visible evidence for how these pieces were attached to their substructure. There are no nails or nail holes easily discernable, nor any wires on which they might have been strung. Another possibility would be that the sheeting was glued to a perishable support which deteriorated without trace. I hypothesize these are remnants of religious ornament from the church nave or chapels, perhaps lining a frame or applied to a sculpture.

It is hard to derive much information from this small fragment of bronze, which has an ogive-sectioned lip which may be part of a rim. It is about 40.00 mm. long and has a concave cross-section, with an average thickness of 2.62 mm. It has reddish to greenish patina over its surfaces, but no clear signs of workmanship, ornamentation, or use wear.

Due to time limitations, I was only able to inspect this piece in passing, and have no further measurements or data to report.

The cross in NMAI 094024.000, currently on display at the A:shiwi A:wan Museum and Heritage Center. I do not have precise dimensions for it. This may have been the cross which Nusbaum found accompanying one of the nave burials, but did not describe in detail. See Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 54. Burial thirty-seven, an adult in a disturbed grave 1.07 m. (3’ 6”) below the nave floor is described as having a “wooden cross in right hand on right breast.” Although the preserved cross seems larger than Nusbaum’s description would suggest, it is not impossible that this was the same piece, since he never actually describes it or its size.

Due to time limitations, I was only able to inspect this piece in passing, and have no further measurements or data to report.

“Primeramente en la yglesia ai una ymagen de bulto mui buena y ermosa […]” de la Cadena, et al., 1672, “Memorias por los custodies…” 12v; and Scholes and Adams, “Inventories,” 35-36.

“Al otro dia fué el padre fray Juan Galdo, guardian cercano del pueblo de Alona, y halló entre las cenizas la imagen de la Virgen sin que le llegase el fuego, con solas unas ampollas como las que salen á los que se les queman carnes.” Augustín de Vetancurt, Teatro Mexicano, IV, 347. The state of the charred wooden figure from the altar steps (figure 7.85) raises questions about the plausibility of Vetancurt’s account of the bulto of the Virgin surviving unburnt. The iconography of the Immaculada derives primarily from Saint John’s vision (Apocalypse 12:1-2) of the pregnant woman of the Apocalypse, who is clothed with the sun and stands upon the moon, a crown of stars around her head. The Franciscans were especially strong advocates for the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, and New Spanish artists reproduced her iconography countless times, the most famous of which is the iconic Virgin of Guadalupe (1500s); see Sarah Schroth and Ronni Baer, “The Immaculate Conception,” in El Greco to Velázquez: Art During the Reign of Philip III, ed. Schroth and Baer (Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, 2008), 259.

“[…] y los altares con muchos adornos de liencos, y la sacristía con tres calises con sus patinos—mas un biril también de plata mui bueno—ornamentos buenos de seda—y una capa de oro de lame verde—albas amitos abundante de todo,” de la Cadena et. al, “Memorias por los custodies” 12v; and Scholes and Adams, “Inventories,” 35-36. Here “biril” means viril, another name for a monstrance or custodia. An alb is a long white linen tunic that falls to the ankles, often with a girdling cincture. An amice is a white cloth worn over the shoulders during the liturgy, with two long straps to fasten it in place. See Giffords, Sanctuaries of Earth, 247, 259-260. It should be noted that Galdo’s inventory belies Montgomery’s speculative recreation of a full retablo in Hawikku’s sanctuary (“Functional Interpretation,” 130-131).
The heavy patch of erosion on the northeast wall is in the same location as Halona’s barred baptistery window, suggesting that Hawikku’s baptistery also had a window there. There are some inconsistencies in the walls which suggest some tentativeness in the baptistery’s design. The front, northeastern wall is integrated into the epistle-side buttress, while the southwest wall of the baptistery does not appear to be bonded with the nave wall. The external slope of the nave wall is clearly visible at this location. It also appears that the baptistery walls at the western corner were not fully bonded to each other, or perhaps an internal revetment was added to the northwest interior at some point. Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury (*The Excavation*, 110-111) indicate that the three walls of the baptistery were built against the nave, and “integral with that one,” with width varying between 0.76 and 0.91 m. (2’ 6” to 3’).

The baptistery doorway was 1.55 m. wide (5’ 1”) on the church side and 0.13 m. (5”) wider on the baptistery side.

Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 130-134. The sill to the baptistery door was 10.16 cm. wide and 7.62 cm. high (4” by 3”), with a 6.35 cm. (2.5”) diameter pintle socket on the northeast end, and was embedded 30.48 cm. (12”) into the wall on either side. There were mortises for jamb tenons on either side, each 7.62 by 5.08 cm. (3” by 2”). It sat on a mud-plastered sandstone foundation with what appears to have been a ramp leading to the baptistery’s higher floor level. Nusbaum’s surveyed notations of relative floor levels (“Church and Monastery,” 132) seems to indicate that the baptistery floor level was 22.86 (9”) below that of the church, but photographs seem to clearly show it was even with the church floor or even higher. The jambs and floor of this passageway were plastered, and stains on the interior indicate additional posts or features that burnt away. Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury (*The Excavation*, 105) incorrectly say that Nusbaum did not record the width of the baptistery sill.

The curbing was rectangular in its arrangement, although possibly lacking a northwestern side. This overall rectangle was about 4.09 m. by at least 2.59 m. (13’ 5” by 8’ 6”), and its curbing between 27.94 to 33.02 cm. wide (11” to 13”) and 7.62 to 10.16 cm. (3” to 4”) higher than the regular floor level, while the fourth side was unclear. Within this frame, the floor was 5.08 to 11.43 cm. (2” to 4.5”) below the room level. Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 131; Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, *The Excavation*, 111.

The platform was roughly 2.13 m. long by 1.98 m. wide (7’ by 6’ 6”), while the pedestal was 1.07 m. by 1.22 m. (3’ 6” by 4’). See Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 131; Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, *The Excavation*, 111.

Hawikku’s mission font has previously and incorrectly been described as an ornamented Hawikuh Polychrome bowl, perhaps confusing the baptismal font in its designated space with the smaller bowl that Nusbaum found on the steps to the main altar, based on Hodge’s misinformed comment (“Sequence of Pottery at Hawikuh,” in Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, *The Excavation*, 148). A number of other artifacts appear on the walls around the baptistery, although most of them appear to have come from exterior spaces and sub-foundational rooms around it, rather than from the baptistery. These artifacts include what appear to be a pair of ground stone griddles (see Photo Negative N05750), handstones, and numerous ceramic sherds. There also appears to be a *mano* embedded in the northwest wall of the baptistery, see N05807, figure 7.94.

Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 131. The diamonds were 8.89 cm. (3.5") to a side.


Room 21 was 4.65 m. long by 4.34 m. perpendicular to the church (15’ 3” by 14’ 3”).

Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 110. The slabs sit 12.7 cm. (5”) above the sacristy floor. They did not quite pave the entire 1.30 m. (4’ 3”) width of the opening, and builders inserted rectangular *manos* flat-side up alongside the slabs to complete the paving.

Ibid., 88, 110. The sill was hewn 15.88 cm. wide by 11.43 cm. high (6.25” by 4.5”), and the doorstop lip was 2.54 cm. high by 4.45 cm. wide (1” by 1.75”). Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury (*The Excavation*, 105) incorrectly say that the sill was not set in the side walls (N05789 shows that they were) and that it had a pintle hinge socket on either end, “indicating the existence of double swinging doors opening outward from the nave.” Photographs and Nusbaum’s field notes clearly indicate that there was only one pintle hinge and thus only one leaf to the sacristy door, not two.
Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 111. The embalatory sill was 7.62 cm. thick and 11.43 cm. wide (3” by 4.5”), and was raised 15.24 cm. (6”) above the embalatory floor. The northeast wall of the sacristy was thinner than the adjacent convento walls, being only 45.72 cm. (18”) thick, and was not apparently bonded to the church nave, with a narrow ledge set into the wall with no readily evident purpose. The ledge was approximately 20.32 cm. (8”) wide. This was probably not a load-bearing wall.

Close examination of photographs suggests a wear pattern in the center of the room and between the doorways, with the silhouettes of furnishings along the walls, as for instance in the western corner where a rectangle of smooth and unworn floor appears along the wall, and the plaster itself is better preserved but more heavily blackened by the fire. This pattern is probably indicative of furniture against the wall at the time of the fire. A few stone slabs may have been inserted into particularly high traffic parts of the floor.

The Churubusco mission cornice probably dates to a 1676-1678 renovation; see Lauro E. Rosell, “Churubusco: Dieguino Convent of Santa Maria de Los Angeles,” Artes de Mexico: Cuidad de Mexico-V. Sus Villas, Coyoacan y Churubusco no. 105 (1968): 77-90, 77.

If this notch was indeed part of the original viga, it may have held a cross beam as part of a simple artesonado ceiling with a beam grid forming rectangular coffers with recessed wooden panels above them, such as probably existed at the nearby Acoma mission. No artemado ceiling exists today at Acoma’s San Esteban del Rey mission, nor is one described in primary sources, but surviving panels hint at its existence. See Frank and Miller, A Land So Remote, V. 3; and Wroth and Gavin, Converging Streams, 174-175.

It should be noted that NMAI Photo Negative N05787 seems to show the beam in situ, on top of almost a foot of fill from the burnt room, and lying parallel to the nave. How it came to lie in this position is unclear. The thinness of Room 21’s northeast wall and the wide opening later cut as a doorway through its southwest wall are further indications that these were probably non-load-bearing walls.

The umber border around the bottom of the walls was between 15.24 to 17.78 cm. high (6” to 7”), while the bands at the top of the dado in the sacristy doorway were 2.54 cm. (1”) thick. Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 111. For the colors of the “checkered board of diamonds” dado, see Nusbaum to Heye and Hodge, October 6, 1919.

Photographs also show painted and plain ceramic sherds as well as a rounded stone with flattened face for abrasion or hammering (which probably originated in the post-mission Room 24).

Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 111. From Nusbaum’s notes it is clear that the jars came from the mission occupation level when he lists them as “two large decorated pots—glazed-ware of the late period—shattered” among the other materials found on this floor. Yet for both of the jars, the NMAI catalog describes their source as “Monastery, Room 21 A [or B], (Native Occupation).” Nusbaum evidently planned to draw a floor plan noting the location of the artifacts, with letters (A or B) designating the individual pieces as he had done with Room 20. The source for the attribution to a “Native Occupation” is unclear. Nusbaum made no note of a Native occupation of this space in his field notes, nor do traces of one appear in any of the photographs. Except for a small intrusion of Room 24 and its associated features high above the Room 21 floor, the sacristy does not appear to have been reused. The Hawikuh Polychrome style of the ceramic jars is consistent with a mission-period date, and their heavily burned and broken (but not scattered) condition indicates that they were in the sacristy when it was destroyed, as Nusbaum’s notes clearly state, and whoever attributed them to a post-mission occupation was mistaken. Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury (The Excavation, 122) concur that that Room 21 did not have an evident Native reoccupation.

111 Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury (The Excavation, 118) describe the patio as 11.28 m. by 11.89 m. (37’ by 39’).

112 From excavation photographs, it appears that Nusbaum used the patio as a place to toss backdirt from other rooms, from where workers scraped it out of the mission over the space where they would eventually uncover the 

portería. Nusbaum later cleaned up the patio, removing excess dirt but not going much deeper than the original ground level, except for trenches following the walls to floor level that extended out about 0.76 m. (2’ 6’’). It appears that some additional clearing took place in 1920, and the floor pit may have been uncovered at this time. The central part of the patio was never excavated, and presumably any features that might have been there remain undisturbed and should be identifiable through nondestructive geophysical survey techniques.

113 Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 90. The sill was a 15.24 cm. (6”) high.

114 All known seventeenth-century New Mexico missions had the walled patios except Quarai, which appears to have had open wooden post and lintel arcades around its patio with stone pillars at the corners; see Ivey, In the Midst, 117; and Table 9.2. Enclosed ambulatories may have cut down on drafts and preserved some warmth in the colder winters of the region.

115 The windows were 88.90 cm. (2’ 11”) above the floor of the ambulatory. In the southwest wall the eastern opening was 1.06 m. wide (3’ 6”), while the western opening was about 0.91 cm. wide (3’); see Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 88. Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury (The Excavation, 118) place the height of the openings at 0.91 m. (3’) and describe the second opening as 1.14 m. (3’ 9”) wide. In the northwest wall, a vertical jamb from a window is visible in photographs, but its exact location is not recorded, and the other jamb was not preserved, leaving its width unknown. The doorway in the southeast wall was about 1.21 m. wide (4’). The remaining walls were not preserved to sufficient height to show their fenestration.

116 Nusbaum did not dig below the main mission-period floor in most areas, so he did not locate any drains. See Dominguez (The Missions, 108) for a description of the problems created by a poorly draining patio in Taos’s eighteenth century 

convento.

117 Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 142. This pit was 0.81 m. in diameter and 0.74 m. deep (2’ 8” by 2’ 5”), with sides and floor smoothly plastered in adobe. It was 1.73 m. (5’ 8”) out from the southeastern patio wall, and 1.37 m. (4’ 6”) from the southwestern wall. Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury incorrectly locate this pit in Room 38 of the service patio because it appears on a field notebook page that Nusbaum had pre-labeled as “#38.” His text specifies that the pit was found in the “Patio or Court” and in a later letter he described it as a feature, in the southeast [sic] corner of the walled walk-around—normally the portal [i.e. arcade] within the enclosed plaza or court […] a subterranean jug-like pit over three feet in depth—not bell-shaped—but comparable to the B.M.II and III Cache pits. Since it was fairly near the room where I found a row- continuous- of cooking pits—and broken piki baking slabs-across the north side of this south tier of the living quarters— and it was evident from the reddening of the back-wall, that it was a multiple series under a single plastered pole-and-stick canopy or hood—I assumed that the cache pit was used to keep food and fats cool in summertime- as that area gets pretty hot in the middle of summer.

Nusbaum goes on to make a comparison to a Hopi pit oven for steaming corn. See Nusbaum to Smith, April 10, 1962. A similar pit feature for food storage has been uncovered at the 1690’s Jesuit mission visita of Santa Cruz de Gayánipitea in southern Arizona, but it was located inside the adobe brick structure and not exposed to the elements as this pit was. See Seymour, A Fateful Day, 158-160. I think that food would not have preserved well in this exposed location where moisture was more likely to accumulate from the surrounding roofs. Although I believe that it was most likely a pit oven for a type of fermented flatbread documented among the Zunis in the early ethnographic period, it remains possible that it could have been a drainage sump, although I know of no other equivalents. The bottom of the pit is well packed, but the mud-plastered sides are more heavily eroded in a way that could suggest use, or water erosion. Hypothetically, a sump might have allowed mission community residents to more efficiently collect rainwater in clay jars for use in the mission, while also helping to evacuate moisture from the patio to protect the structural integrity of the convento.
Photographs also show piles of rocks, slabs, and cobbles on the patio walls, which came either from the patio or ambulatory corridors.

The northeast and southeast walks were a uniform 2.13 m. (7') wide, while the northwest walk along the church was little narrower at 2.08 m. (6’ 10.84”) and the southwest walk as wide as 2.44 m. (8’).

Additionally, numerous artifact bags photographed on the ambulatory walls may indicate that other artifacts came from these spaces but were not recorded as such.

Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 88, 92, 95. Nusbaum gives the dimensions of this passage as 2.21 m. by 4.85 m. (7’ 3” by 15’ 11”). He describes the sandstone slab at the doorway as 10.16 cm. (4”) higher than the sunken middle of the passageway, which would have made its surface roughly even with the passageway floor along the walls.

Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, The Excavation, 117. The stairwell space was 1.37 m. wide and 5.33 m. long (4’ 6” by 17’ 6”), and its southwest wall was particularly thick at 1.22 m. (4’).

Ibid., 117-118. The middle landing was 1.68 m. (5’ 6”) long. The other treads were 0.30 to 0.38 m. wide (12” to 15”), and with preserved risers averaged 0.24 m. (9.57”) high the total height of the flight was probably about 1.94 m. (6’ 4.5”). Even though not preserved, the eighth step was only 1.52 m. (5’) from the exterior of the buttress, so the staircase could not have gone much higher. Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury report that the stairwell was painted, with a layer of umber over the mud-plaster base, and a coat of whitewash over that. They go on to say that, a band of reddish clay was then applied to a height of approximately 2 feet 6 inches above the floor, a lightly incised line indicating its upper limit. A second incised line two inches above, delimited a band of dull black, followed by a band of yellowish umber 2 inches wide, and a final narrow band of black ¾ inches wide.

While photographs support the idea that the stairwell was whitewashed, I cannot find any evidence supporting the authors’ assertion that a red dado was painted in the stairwell. It does not appear in photographs, and their description does not seem to match the stairwell spatially, since there was not a level floor to begin with. Nusbaum’s field notes make no mention of a painted dado in this space. Despite the specificity of their measurements, I believe it is best to disregard this description until evidence arises to support it.

Nusbaum to Hodge, October 6, 1919; Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 114; Montgomery, “Functional Interpretations,” 131-132. With rather convoluted reasoning, Montgomery denies that access to the choir loft could have been from the rooftop level of the front range, because “such a route would permit the choir personnel to look into the garth where the friars took their siestas,” violating his mistaken notion of enclosure. This logic is flawed for a number of reasons, but most obviously because the choir personnel could not access the Room 29 stairwell without entering the convento in the first place. There was no way that Native choristers could access the choir loft without passing through parts of the convento and therefore a strict spatial segregation such as Montgomery images was impossible at Hawikku.

The total height of the flight of steps at Halona was about 4.86 m. (15’ 11.2”) above the foundation level of the convento. The total rise of the Halona stairway was 3.18 m. (10’ 5.20”) while the length at floor level was 4.80 m. (15’ 9”), from the front of the bottom slab to the landing. The wood-lined steps had risers that averaged 22.43 cm. (8.83”) and treads that averaged 41.91 cm. (1’ 4.5”) in width. The slope of the wooden section of the stair (not including the stone step or landing) was 72%. See Russell Jones, Louis R. Caywood, and Edmund J. Ladd, Historic American Buildings Survey Field Note Book, Mission Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe, Halona (Zuni), McKinley County, NM, Book #1, Jim Trott Papers, unaccessioned, “Zuni Mission, 1969, Original Restoration Notes” folder (August 4, 1966 and September 22, 1966, WACC), 13.

A second stairway extended from the eastern corner of the ambulatory. I believe this stairwell was not part of the original convento’s design, but rather an alteration during remodeling of the structure’s eastern corner; see Chapter 8.
Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 140. The room’s maximum dimensions were 6.22 m. by 4.70 m. (20’ 5” by 15’ 5”).

The walls around Room 36 exhibited a number of slabs uncovered in the general area during excavations, as well as ceramic sherds which were probably not all collected. Some sherds probably belong to the bowl and canteen (see the northwest wall in N05811, for example), but one piece on the wall above the room’s western corner seems to exhibit finger grooves indicative of production on a pottery wheel, and may be an uncollected piece of a Spanish botilla.


Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 106, 112. The room was about 4.42 m. long and 3.28 m. wide (14’ 6” by 10’ 9”). Its doorway was 1.83 m. (3’ 6”) wide.

Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 112. The bedstead was 0.48 m. tall, about 0.89 m. wide, and 1.83 m. long (1’ 7” by 2’ 11” by 6’). Two courses of adobe bricks enclosed the southeast end of the bedstead, yielding a sleeping surface of about 1.52 m. (5’) long. Domínguez (The Missions, 79) describes a similar adobe bedstead in the convento of the eighteenth-century parish church of Santa Cruz de la Cañada, as well as an example in the missions of Taos (108). While Hawikku’s bedstead is seemingly small by today’s standards, the Spanish colonists were often smaller in stature than the modern averages. This bed may have been acceptable for the 1.6 m. (5’ 3”) tall Spanish man who likely a friar, buried in the Hawikku apse (See n. 67, above). It should also be noted that uncomfortable sleeping conditions were sometimes employed as a measure of bodily discipline among the Franciscans. For example, the discalced Franciscan Pedro de Alcántara slept sitting upright on top of a stone, which was the only resting place in his tiny cell beneath the stairway of the conventual retreat at El Palancar; see Ámez Prieto, El Palancar.

Primary sources indicate that other missions had windows to light their cells where friars would read and conduct meetings; see “Reply of Aguilar, [January 17, 1664],” 146; “Testimony of Fray Nicolás de Freitas, 159.

Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 112. The radius of the inner fireplace was 0.74 m. (2’ 5”), while the outer ring was between 5.08 and 7.62 cm. (2 to 3”) high, and lay 152.4 cm. (5’) out from the corner.

Young, Signs, 124-129, 154-155. For Koluwa:wa (also transcribed as Kolhu/wala:wa), see Hart, “Protection,” 199-207. For accounts of the origins of these ancestral figures, see Stevenson, The Zuñi Indians, 291, 293; Cushing, “Outlines,” 404-405; see also Chapter 4, n. 104, above. Photographs also show a number of stone slabs appearing on the walls above Room 21, but these mostly came from the post-mission reoccupation.

This floor level may also be visible in a glimpse of the deepest floor level in NMAI N05767, in the western corner of room 4, where the seam between two bricks in the earliest floor may be visible.

Nusbaum did not record the width of this opening. Based on the adobe brick floor, it was about 2.5 brick lengths wide. With an estimated length of 58.42 cm. (23”) per brick rounded up to account for mortar seams, this doorway would have been approximately 1.47 m. (4’ 10”) wide. It appears to me that it may have been inwardly splayed, but there is no definitive evidence on this point. The doorway appears in photographs completely filled with sediments, but with no apparent blocking up during its later Pueblo occupation. Presumably if they blocked the door up, it was on the ambulatory side, which does not appear in any excavation photographs. The fill does not show any clear stratification, but the lower level (approximately 60 cm./2’ thick) is much chunkier, coarse, and angular, while the remaining upper section is more fine and even. I would interpret the coarse lower fill as the initial fill from the occupation’s destruction and abandonment, while the upper sections represent windblown sediment that accumulated after occupation in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The exterior doorway was between Rooms 4 and 19 was 1.32 m. (4’ 4”) wide on the splayed interior, and narrower on the exterior.

Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 48, 106.
Nusbaum drew this niche and the battered jambs of the original window in his plan of room 3 (“Church and Monastery,” 41), but had nothing to say about it and recorded no measurements. The 1966 publication makes no mention of it. From photographs it appears to have been no wider than the length of a single adobe brick (less than 58.42 cm./23”) at its exterior. The Zuni mission convento had a similarly placed window; see figure 2.3.

The 2B fireplace curbing exhibits scars in the plaster suggesting the original jambs, with the northern being an upright slab, perhaps a third of a meter (1’) long with a beveled front edge, while the eastern jamb may have been a narrower slab. In photos, two sandstone pieces matching this reconstruction appear in the backdirt above this fireplace, and may have been its original jambs.


Such protective corner guards were known as guardacantones, and could be columns, pilasters, or simple rounded buttresses; see Giffords, Sanctuaries of Earth, 104.

Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 41, 43. The exterior width of the opening was 1.09 m. (3’ 7”), and it splayed more widely towards an interior width of 1.65 m. (5’ 5”).

Ibid., 90. Room 9 was 5.56 m. by 4.27 m. (18’ 3” by 14’). Its door was an opening 1.10 m. wide (3’ 7.25”) on the ambulatory side expanding to 1.17 m. (3’ 10”) on the interior.

Ibid., 86-87. Nusbaum believed the western fireplace was the room’s original fireplace.

The artifacts piled on the wall include a stack of bones, a rounded cobbled broken in half as a hammerstone or polisher, stones and slabs including two which might be roughed-out blanks for manos, a worn rectangular mano with diamond profile, and numerous, unidentifiable ceramic sherds some of which appear to come from utility wares. Four artifact bags also appear on the walls, but no ceramics are recorded in the field notes or catalog as coming from this room; Nusbaum therefore collected additional artifacts in this space but did not keep the records necessary to connect them to their provenance. Photographs indicate the presence of a rotted viga on the floor of 9A, and a large piece of groundstone on the floor or in the fill, possibly a trough metate or a ground canale from the roof. On the wall with the ambulatory appear a large cobbled broken in half as a hammer stone or polisher, several small, rounded cobbles, and the neck of a large jar. On the wall adjoining room 13 are a large pile of stone slabs, which seem to have been on or about the surface, since they accumulated before the excavation of Room 13 had progressed very far. With these are a number of ceramic sherd piles, and at least two worn down manos; see N05774 (figure 12.25).

Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 87.

The doorway opening was 1.12 m. (3’ 8”) wide, minus the width of its wooden jambs, which were not preserved. The foundation on which the sill sat was 7.62 to 10.16 cm. (3”-4”) higher than the center of the hallway. The sill itself was hewn to 10.16 cm. tall by 13.34 cm. wide (4” by 5.25”). The lip of the doorstop was 2.54 cm. (1”). The mortices were approximately 5.08 cm. by 8.26 cm. (2” by 3.25”) and one still had part of the rotted tenon in place. The sill extended into the wall about 30 cm. (1’) deep to secure it in place. Ibid., 92-95.


Nusbaum to Watson Smith, April 10, 1962.

Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 96. According to Nusbaum’s notation, the original floor of packed adobe appears to have been 15.24 to 20.32 cm. (6” to 8”) above the level of the ambulatory floor. Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury (The Excavation, 116-117) measure this room at 9.60 m. by 4.34 m. (31’ 6” by 14’ 3”), and believed it to be the mission’s refectory due to its size and close proximity to the kitchen.
152 Ibid., 88. The doorway was 1.22 m. (4’) wide. The southeast jam was shaved down along the door frame, perhaps to accommodate the swing of the doorway, or perhaps when it was walled up after the mission period.

153 For example, Hodge (“A Square Kiva,” 205-206) found two to three alignments of carefully drilled holes, ranging between 5.08 and 8.89 cm. (2” to 3.5”) in diameter, in the slab floor of Hawikku’s square kiva. Watson Smith (Prehistoric Kivas, 121-123), 121-123. For weaving as a male task, see Lowell, “Reflections of Sex Roles,” 454.

154 Pre-Hispanic stone carvings were inserted into the fabric of missions throughout central Mexico; see Edgerton, Theaters, 47-49, 56-57; Eleanor Wake, Framing the Sacred: The Indian Churches of Early Colonial Mexico (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2016), 139-169.

155 Nusbaum (“Church and Monastery,” 95) thought that a fireplace in what would become 14D was possibly the original fireplace, but it could not have been since it was built against a secondary, later wall.

156 Domínguez, The Missions, 200; “[…] y de allí siguen dos cuartos que sirven de dispensa y se unen contra un lado de la sacristía,” Domínguez, “Copy of Spanish Transcription,” 333.

157 Symbolic desecrations took place during the Pueblo Revolt; see Liebmann, Revolt, 60. Later, the ever-suspicious Ruiz (“Observations,” 310) recommended that the baptistery be kept locked, and the key not untrusted to sacristanes, because he believed they would steal the holy oil and consecrated water, using these sacramental substances for their “superstitions.”

158 Ruiz (“Observations,” 310) notes that water had to be removed from the font in the winter because it would freeze in the unheated room and damage the font. Nicolás de Aguilar noted that the missions were too cold for baptisms in the winter, and that friars would come to heated homes of prospective families, conducting the water baptism there, followed by an oil anointment in the church when the weather was warmer; see “Deposition of Nicolás de Aguilar, May 8, 1663,” 171-172.

159 Benavides, Fray Alonso de Benavides’ Revised Memorial, 38.

CHAPTER 8: ALTERATIONS TO THE PURÍSIMA CONCEPCIÓN

In studying mendicant architecture of medieval Italian cities, Carolyn Bruzelius argues churches and conventual houses were not products of singular, cohesive construction campaigns. Rather, these establishments were always in the process of becoming, as they negotiated urban developments, shifting patronage, and changing church legislation.\(^1\) Similarly, Franciscan missions of the Spanish Borderlands were not static. Even a short-lived occupation such as the Purísima Concepción’s formal phase, spanning little more than eleven years (by 1661 to 1672), experienced structural alterations indicative of shifting practices and concerns (figures 8.1-8.2).

**Alterations to Liturgical Spaces**

The most visible changes to the mission’s liturgical spaces were construction of a stone retaining wall along the northwest side, renovation of the altar, and a southwest sacristy expansion. Today, the coursed retaining wall of large sandstone slabs in mud mortar is the only easily visible remnant of the mission, like an emptied husk of the earthen walls it once encased, running along the epistle side of the nave and baptistery (figures 8.3-8.6). This wall was likely not original, since its foundations sat approximately 33.02 to 50.80 centimeters (1’ 1” to 1’ 8”) higher than the “main level” and foundations of the church.\(^2\) As finished, the stone wall was just as thick as the adobe walls it abutted. Combined, the result was a massive accumulation of building material, which Nusbaum jokingly referred to as “Fort Harmon Hawikuh” after the
excavation’s patron. Together, the nave and retaining walls totaled 3.02 meters (9’ 11”), one of the thickest walls of any colonial structure in New Mexico.

Construction of this retaining wall likely occurred after completion of the church, which it protected along the northwestern, uphill side. Rainwater runoff from the hillside probably collected there, and could have led to softening of the adobe bricks, similar to damage currently undermining the Halona mission church in Zuni Pueblo. Likely a street or plaza ran along this side of the structure, producing further erosion as people, animals, and carts bumped against the adobe plaster. Finally, terrado church roofs in New Mexico generally sloped away from the convento, channeling runoff to the side of the church opposite its enclosed patio. The northwest side of Hawikku’s church therefore received large volumes of runoff from both the church and the sloping hillside, threatening to cove, soften, and undermine its walls. The addition of a stone retaining wall buttressed the original adobe, protecting it from erosion and damage by passers-by, while changing the aesthetic scale of the building, rendering it more massive and formal.

Within the church itself, the only noted alteration was refurbishment of the high altar, refacing the first structure with a new row of adobe stretchers, doubling its thickness and sealing the original whitewashed surface inside (figures 7.15, 7.68-7.70, 7.75). The new structure was as wide as the original, but probably higher. Builders also raised the sanctuary, setting a squared timber sill across the apse as a riser to the new adobe and mud-plastered floor. They added a platform in front of the altar with another layer of adobe bricks and gypsum plaster, with hewn sills framing its edges, their front corners lapped and the other end of the timbers set in slots in the back wall (figure 7.69, 7.75). This new predella was the same width as the altar, and builders cut away the outer half of the lowest bricks in the old altar to set the predella sills flush with its
sides. The new design retained space behind the altar, indicating that the missionaries still hoped to obtain a formal *retablo*.

**Southwestern Expansion**

In contrast to the publishers of the Hawikku report, who believed “very little evidence appears of significant alterations by the friars during their occupancy” of the *convento*, careful inspection of field notes and photographs indicates numerous alterations to the mission’s living and working quarters, including expansions on the southwest side that enlarged the sacristy and added a second service patio. Grounds for interpreting these spaces as alterations are less than conclusive, but as I will argue, the greater part of the evidence points to construction subsequent to the completion of the *convento* core.

After initial construction, the Purísima Concepción’s sacristy underwent a major expansion, with the addition of Room 25 to the southwest, and Room 30 tucked into the resulting pocket alongside the church apse (figure 8.7). Room 25 was a long space 7.01 by 4.34 meters (23’ by 14’ 3’’) paralleling the church nave. Adobe brick pavers lay perpendicular to the room’s axis, except a row of headers against the east wall, raising the floor above the level of the original sacristy. To access this new room, builders opened a 1.52 meter (5’) wide doorway through Room 21’s non-load bearing southwest wall, with a course of brick headers in the wall becoming the new sill of the opening, slightly higher than Room 25’s pavement (figures 8.8-8.9). A mud-plastered stone curb completed the doorway, which lacked wooden framing elements. Room 25 had a raised ceiling like the original sacristy, although little remained except
a photo of a single charred viga, showing the squared edge of an unburnt side with a bead cut along its face (figure 8.10).\textsuperscript{13}

Room 25’s primary feature was a platform or dais of adobe bricks across the southwest side (figure 8.11). It sat away from the back wall, leaving a gap behind the dais where the floor was exposed (figure 8.12). Two off-set courses of adobe stretchers formed steps at the front of the packed earth platform (figure 8.13). A square sill ran along the back edge of the dais, its ends embedded in the side walls.\textsuperscript{14} Four beam sockets were cut in room’s back wall, for square timbers which once spanned the pit, probably to support a raised wooden platform and cabinet.\textsuperscript{15}

Nusbaum called Room 25 “the finest chapel in the convento.” Montgomery interpreted it as a “conventual chapel […] where] the Blessed Sacrament was reserved continuously,” imagining the room to have had an elaborate retablo centered behind the platform (figure 8.14).\textsuperscript{16} He believed the dais held an altar and was built after the installation of the hypothetical retablo.\textsuperscript{17} Montgomery’s monumental, symmetrical reconstruction is an obvious fantasy completely divorced from the room’s physical evidence. Nusbaum found no trace of an altar, nor could one have existed because burnt wood fell forward and lay flat on the platform where Montgomery hypothesized the altar would have been. The wall sockets behind the dais were not symmetrical, centered, or even continuous across the entire back wall, and could not have been constructed before the dais, which supported the sill beam and the front ends of the embedded timbers. The placement of these timbers could not have corresponded to the neat bays (calles) of Montgomery’s reconstruction. Finally, the burnt wood remnants are inconsistent with altarpiece construction, being entirely planar, with none of the rounded columns or carved moldings typical of Spanish retablos.
I believe a more plausible reconstruction is of a cabinet on a wooden platform sitting on beams spanning from the wall sockets to the dais sill. New Spanish sacristies often featured similar arrangements with elevated storage cabinets (cajoneras or vestuarios) on raised legs, platforms, or steps, typically with devotional images above (figures 8.15-8.16). These furnishings stored liturgical vestments, books, vessels, musical instruments, and other materials for church services. Hawikku’s pit and adjacent platform were covered with burnt remnants of short, wide planks and piles of undecipherable charcoal from the cajonería, which incorporated carefully sawn ornaments with hourglass shapes and a wooden slab with mortices (figures 7.111, 8.17). Exceptional amidst this charred mess was a delicate picture frame with lapped joints and inlay of mica or selenite, almost identical to the frame from the church sanctuary and probably of local production (figures 7.78, 8.18-8.19).

As with Room 21, the sacristy walls had a painted baseline and surmounting dado pattern of rhomboid diamonds in alternating red and white colors (figure 8.20). Although similar, the diamonds in this room appear larger than those in the original Baptistery and Sacristy, and slant left, opposite of the other murals that slant right. These subtle differences might imply the murals in Rooms 21 and 25 were not painted the same; rather, builders of the new sacristy emulated paintings already visible in the adjacent room without attending too closely to their details.

Three openings pierced Room 25’s northwest wall: a low doorway in the north corner for entering Room 30, an exterior window near the south corner for illuminating the dais, and an ambiguous opening or niche between them (figure 8.21). Room 30’s doorway is unusually low, with its lintel only about 0.91 meter (3’) above the floor, comprising a layer of sandstone slabs resting on six square-adzed wood lintel beams, while the thickness of the wall formed an adobe
sill about 0.30 meter (1’) above the floor, worn from people’s passage through the tight space (figures 8.22-8.23).\textsuperscript{21} In its proportions, this door was more like traditional Pueblo interior passages than Spanish-style doorways, an unusual size that is hard to explain.

The southern window over the dais illuminated the room and \textit{cajonería}. It was only partly preserved in photographs, but located past the abutting walls of the church apse and Room 30, allowing light to enter and illuminate the sacristy as well as providing one of the mission’s only views of the pueblo on the ridge above it.\textsuperscript{22} The purpose of the third opening is less clear. Nusbaum was unsure whether it was a window into Room 30, or merely a niche for Room 25. He ultimately concluded it was a niche, 86.36 centimeters wide and 53.34 centimeters deep (2’ 10” by 1’ 9”), with a height of 1.09 meters (3’ 7”) and a stone lintel spanning the top.\textsuperscript{23}

In the same wall as these three openings was an unbonded masonry seam, the strongest indication that Rooms 25 and 30 were subsequent constructions added to the original design. The seam appears just above the remnant of Room 21’s southwest wall, between the thick south corner of the church nave and the northwest wall of Room 25 (figures 8.7, 8.21-8.22), indicating the church walls were constructed first, and Rooms 25 and 30 added later.\textsuperscript{24} Other evidence for Room 25’s construction subsequent to the original sacristy includes the way its doorway was cut through the extant wall, incorporating one of its lower brick courses; Room 25’s higher floor level; and the differences in mural patterns between Rooms 21 and 25. While not conclusive, I believe this evidence points towards two construction phases, as Room 25 extended the existing sacristy, adding space for more liturgical materials and a dignified setting for the preparation of priests and acolytes, turning Room 21 into an anteroom (\textit{antesacristía}).

As with the original sacristy, Room 25 produced a host of artifacts, including numerous pieces of groundstone and ceramics visible on the walls in photographs.\textsuperscript{25} Collected artifacts
include a battered, grooved actinolite stone ax which might have been a post-mission deposition; a heavily pitted and burnt Hawikuh Polychrome jar; a large, polychromed ceramic candlestick with white diamonds around its shaft; and an almost complete Spanish lusterware soup plate (figures 8.24-8.27).²⁶

The construction of Room 25 parallel to the inset polygonal apse produced an easily enclosed spatial pocket that Nusbaum designated Room 30. This tiny, closet-like space was about 3.20 by 1.83 meters (10’ 6” by 6’), with a ceiling over 3.05 meters (10’) high, and a packed earthen floor level with that of Room 25. Its walls were mud-plastered but unpainted, and the low entryway worn, with jambs rounded from user’s hands, the sill smoothed, and the floor immediately inside packed from their feet. Although small and out of the way, Room 30 was clearly in regular use²⁷

Nusbaum describes this as the “most remarkable” space in the mission for its numerous artifacts, including charred wooden elements (figures 8.28-8.30).²⁸ Most notable were four columns on rectangular pedestals, each sculpted from a single piece of wood, only one of which did Nusbaum collect (figure 8.32). The columns had round pegs at top and bottom and were mostly likely corner posts of a baldachin, or ceremonial canopy, disassembled and leaning against Room 30’s walls in storage at the time of the fire. Equally rare is a charred wooden candlestick, which Nusbaum found underneath one of the columns (figure 8.31). Other uncollected wood fragments included a pair of round unburnt timbers and numerous pieces from furnishings that otherwise disintegrated, such as short rounded lengths similar to chair legs and a squared piece with a tenon on one end and a lengthwise groove.²⁹

Room 30’s assemblage also included assorted ceramics and other artifacts. Beneath the columns were a red-colored Plainware candle holder and a carefully ornamented San Bernardo
Polychrome salt cellar, while a round-bottom red-colored Plainware bowl nestled around the base of one of the columns (figures 8.33-8.35). More unusual was a deposition of about twenty strands of braided hair with corn husks, cobs, and stalks in the northern corner, near to a round disc of carefully cut and drilled stone with a basketry covering and inserted wooden spindle, clearly imported from Mexico or elsewhere (figure 8.36). The purpose of these last items remains uncertain.\textsuperscript{30} It appears Room 30 was an adjunct storeroom for unused materials, but the low doorway seems poorly adapted to this function. The amount of wear that it received from people coming and going might indicate other uses of this space, while items such as the corn and hair are perhaps more suggestive of offerings than stored liturgical materials.

* * *

The addition of rooms and boundary walls on the southwest side of the convento core created a second patio, although evidence for interpreting the construction sequence of this area is not conclusive, as with the sacristy extension. It could have been part of the original plan, but I believe the best explanation for these rooms is that they were a later addition to the convento.\textsuperscript{31} The service patio probably included stables and other animal housing, storage, and workrooms. Prior to its construction, mission workers could have met these needs using ad hoc structures that left no identified archaeological traces. At the time of excavation, remnants of the service patio walls were only 40.64 centimeters (1’ 4”) tall. It is possible these rooms were never completed, or that Zunis appropriated their materials after the mission period. In any case, Nusbaum did not expect to find structures in this area, describing their discovery as the “surprise of my life.”\textsuperscript{32} He encountered the southwestern rooms while looking for the exterior walls of the kitchen during
the last week of the 1919 field season. Without time to completely excavate them, he simply traced the service patio outline and located three additional rooms which remain otherwise undisturbed on the site.

Aligned with the convento’s side range, the group of three rooms 6.10 meters wide extended 9.14 meters (20’ by 30’) towards the southwest on sandstone foundations like those of the convento. Little remained of their walls, and Nusbaum does not say whether they were bonded to the convento core. The sparse photographic evidence seems to point to their being a subsequent, unbonded addition. Southwest of the kitchen was Room 37, a space approximately 2.97 by 4.50 meters (9’ 9” by 14’ 9”). A gap in the foundations on the northwest side suggested the presence of a doorway from the service patio. The next space, Room 38, was the same length but 3.81 meters (12’ 6”) wide, while the final Room 39 was only 1.30 meters (4’ 3”) in width. Nusbaum found no evidence for any additional features in his limited testing of these rooms, nor artifacts which might aid in interpreting them. His workmen also located the low remnant of an adobe brick wall heading southeast from near the middle of Room 37 (figure 5.37 and visible far right of 8.7). He did not pursue this wall, but it indicates the mission complex extended towards the southeast, beyond his expectations and the barbed-wire fence presently dividing the site. The contents of the service patio rooms and any additional walls to the southeast remain undisturbed and might be identifiable through non-destructive geophysical survey techniques.

Additional stone walls enclosed the service patio, but their exact contours are unknown. The Mindeleff brothers first reported stone alignments in 1885, when remains of wooden posts were also visible on the surface (figures 2.6, 5.3). They drew these as a straight alignment extending from the apse retaining wall towards the southwest, with two adjacent posts, then
turning at a right angle towards the southeast with several more posts. These surface features remained visible at the time of Nusbaum’s excavations, and they appear in photographs taken from the church apse (figures 8.37-8.38). Perhaps the walls were traces of corrals or stables, over which the posts once supported a roof or a ramada shade structure. In 1920, Hodge’s team further cleared the contours of these alignments, removing part of the service patio fill and posts, but apparently not digging down to the mission occupation level or documenting anything about it. The partially exposed stone walls are visible in the background of a 1920 panorama, seemingly more complex in plan than the simple right angle of the Mindeleff map (figure 8.39).

As part of testing the service patio deposits, Nusbaum dug a stratigraphic pit, near the northwestern wall of Room 38 (figure 5.38). From this pit, he determined the patio had a packed earthen floor during the mission period, above 1.07 meters (3’ 6”) of earlier cultural “debris” from Zuni use of the site prior to Spanish constructions. Above the mission period patio floor was a 61 centimeters (2’) layer of wind-blown sand, presumably accumulated after the mission’s destruction. This aeolian sediment indicates some years’ passage before reuse of the patio as a sheep corral, when another 0.61 meter (2’) of manure accumulated. Nusbaum made no note of the final 1.22 meters (4’) of stratigraphy, but the ground surface in 1920 was 2.90 meters (9’ 6”) above the “virgin earth” underlying the site.

The service patio area accumulated a number of artifacts, from the mission period or afterwards. As they exposed the mission walls, Nusbaum’s crew stacked some of these discoveries on top, including two apparent stone griddles near the church apse and Room 30 (visible in N05749, figure 8.7), as well as animal bones, assorted handstones, and ceramic sherds. Among the artifacts collected were pottery sherds with ground edges; ground stone axes;
a fragment of a small copper bell from personal ornament or horse tack; and two small brown-colored Plainware spoons (figures 8.40-8.43).

**Eastern Extension and Renovations**

The eastern corner of the *convento* was entirely remodeled sometime during the mission period. Whether concurrent with the southwest expansions is unknown, but alterations to Rooms 2/3/4/19, 1/7, and possibly 14/17/18 seem interrelated and probably belong to a single remodeling campaign during which builders added new rooms outside the *convento* core and at the roof level. Nusbaum excavated two of these additional rooms (Rooms 5 and 6) which demonstrate a mix of Pueblo and Spanish building styles. During the same phase of construction, a partition wall divided Room 1 from Room 7, the former becoming a stairwell to the rooftop level, and the latter receiving a new doorway from the ambulatory. A new partition likewise divided Room 19 from Room 2/3/4, altering traffic patterns and social implications of these spaces, while blocking up exterior openings to further enclose the *convento*.

Between the initial *convento* construction and the remodeling campaign, the ground level appears to have risen around the eastern corner of the mission. Unfortunately, Nusbaum did not dig beneath the floors of Rooms 5 and 6, so the nature of these deposits remains unknown. Perhaps this area was used for livestock corrals or dumping garbage, which could have contributed to aggradation. The Hawikku site itself is quite changeable, with windblown sediments accumulating and moving about from year to year, which also might have been part of the aggradation around this exposed corner, along with eroding adobe from the walls. Finally, this is the lowest corner of the mission site, near a small gully. Water born sediments could also
have been part of aggradation in this area during the seventeenth century (figure 8.44).\textsuperscript{37} In any case, the floor levels of Rooms 5 and 6 were respectively 81.28 and 50.80 centimeters (2’ 8” and 1’ 8”) higher than the original floors of the \textit{convento}.\textsuperscript{38}

Room 5 was a square corn grinding room, with thick walls around the southeast and northeast sides, and a thin brick stretcher wall separated it from Room 6 to the northwest (figure 8.45).\textsuperscript{39} The thick exterior walls, brick paving, corner fireplace, and alignment to existing \textit{convento} walls all point to mission-period construction, but the lack of horizontal entryway, smaller size, and incorporation of Pueblo-style grinding bins in the floor indicate a greater degree of cultural mixing, combining elements of the mission architectural competency with Pueblo ways of doing things. After finishing Room 5’s walls, the builders cut down the stone and adobe buttress (\textit{guardacantón}) on the \textit{convento}’s eastern corner, squaring the interior of Room 5 and leaving behind an intrusive, wedge-shaped profile visible in Room 5’s southern corner floor. Adobe pavers were cut to fit the profile of the buttress, and laid around the grinding bins and firebox, indicating that the buttress was in place when the floor was laid. The intentional squaring of the interior suggests that a more European spatial sensibility directed the work. The pattern of the pavers around the floor features indicates they were integral to the room’s design, and that it was intended as a grinding room from the beginning. The most plausible explanation for this room is as a purpose-built grinding room from the mission period.

The grinding bins themselves were made of stone slabs on edge with slab paving in the bottom where ground meal accumulated. The meal bin was about 2.13 meters (7’’) long, divided into three individual sections, with a narrow space between the bin and northwest wall for the women to kneel and brace themselves as they worked. Nusbaum photographed the grinding bin with six rectangular handstones or \textit{manos} of varying textures and profiles, none of
which is identifiable in NMAI collections. He probably did not find the manos this way, since the mealing bin was partially disassembled, missing its partitions, some of the slab lining, and the valuable metates. A large rectangular fireplace was the room’s final feature, occupying its eastern corner, with a slab lining along the back and adobe curbing around the front.  

A thin wall of adobe brick stretchers partitioned the grinding room from Room 6, with which it shared the same thick outer walls (Figure 8.46). Nusbaum excavated Room 6 to a packed earth floor 50.8 centimeters (1’ 8”) above the floor level of the convento core, but his photograph suggests there may have been a second, higher floor level that was even with the fireplace against the northeast wall. The lower floor presumably belonged to the mission expansion, but it is unclear whether the upper level pertained to the mission period, or a later reoccupation. Despite their differing floor levels, Rooms 5 and 6 were probably a single phase addition, with Room 6 lacking the brick paving and specialized features. Neither had doorways into the mission interior or outside, and both must have had ladders and rooftop hatchways instead. Their design manifests an increased concern for security and control of access. If the eastern extension included a second story as I argue below, the hatchways into Rooms 5 and 6 might have been through the floor of a second story room, increasing the remove and control over these spaces. Their projecting plan also provided clear sightlines to the mission entrances at the rooftop level, while displaying spatial tendencies akin to the smaller rooms, lower ceilings, and vertical entries of houses in the pueblo. Room 6’s lower floor had no discernable features except a single rectangular mano near the center. Without an original fireplace, it may initially have been a storeroom, later converted into a small domestic space. The later fireplace along the northeastern wall was set on the upper floor level, with slab lining and fire backing.
Rooms 5 and 6 appear to belong to a larger expansion of the *convento*’s eastern corner, but unfortunately, neither Nusbaum nor Hodge dug along the southeastern exterior of the *convento* wall, nor looked for additional rooms. Instead, Nusbaum used this area for disposing backdirt, which remains today (figure 8.47). The ground surface along this side of the site remains high enough to cover another range of rooms, and Nusbaum had identified the stub of at least one wall continuing to the southeast. If additional rooms stood here as I hypothesize, they were never excavated and should be identifiable through remote sensing.

The strongest evidence for a southeastern extension is Room 1, a stairwell leading from the ambulatory’s east corner to the *convento*’s outer wall. This stair does not appear to have been part of the original design, but was inserted later to provide access to the rooftop and eastern additions. The renovating builders raised a partition wall across the width of Room 1/7, carving out a narrow space for the new stairwell about 4.14 by 1.83 meters (13’ 7” by 6’; figures 8.48-8.49). The new partition was 46 centimeters (1’ 6”) thick, narrower than many original *convento* walls, but not as thin as other partitions. It appears unbonded, but tightly abutted to the existing walls (figure 8.50).

This new stairwell extended from the northeast ambulatory corridor, using Room 1/7’s original splayed doorway, which remained centered to the ambulatory corridor but was off-center to the narrower stairwell. Its off-centered layout, and the unbonded, unusually proportioned partition wall are primary clues to the contingent nature of this space. The excavated portion of the stairwell included six steps beginning in the middle of the room and rising to the southeast, with mud-plastered adobe bricks treads worn in the center from use (figures 8.51-8.52).
The Room 1 stair puzzled Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury with its evident lack of destination or purpose, and apparent end in a blank wall.\textsuperscript{47} They guessed the stairwell once led to an outer doorway, and had been blocked off during the mission period.\textsuperscript{48} This scenario is unlikely because the steps rose on the lowest side of the site and would have opened well above the exterior grade. Montgomery found it “difficult to fathom any functional need for Stairway No. 1,” except as an outside door to what he surmised was a higher grade on the southeast side of the convento. In a more speculative mode, he suggests the stairwell belonged to a subsequent alteration or possibly led to a platform or extension beyond the outer wall of the convento core.\textsuperscript{49}

I believe Montgomery’s latter guess was essentially correct. Careful examination of photographs indicates the stairs did not end at what Nusbaum presumed was the outer wall of the convento. Instead, another step is visible embedded in the thickness of the southeastern wall, with the poorly integrated fill above partly plastered over during subsequent reuse of the stairwell as a post-mission residential room (figures 8.48, 8.52, 12.20). This additional step indicates the stairs extended through the southeast wall, towards an addition that Nusbaum neither suspected nor excavated. If the upper steps remained consistent with those he uncovered, there would have been at least another seven steps to reach a hypothetical ceiling level of 2.13 meters (7’) above the convento floor, which would have extended the flight at least 2.29 meters (7.5’) southeast of the exterior of the convento wall.\textsuperscript{50} Although speculative, this seems a reasonable minimum for a southeast extension, consistent with Rooms 5 and 6. Allowing for walls, these new rooms probably extended at least 3 meters (10’) from the original convento exterior. With no internal doorways connecting to other first floor spaces, they probably had rooftop hatchway entrances, perhaps increasing their security. The most likely use for such rooms would have been as granaries and storerooms, consistent with controlled-access storage.
rooms at the *conventos* of Ábo, Quarai, Las Humanas, Giusewa, and possibly Awatovi, likely dating to the famine years of 1667 to 1672.\textsuperscript{51}

The eastern expansion may also have included second floor rooms; at a minimum, the stairwell must have had a second-story to protect its interior. Sixteenth century *conventos* in Mexico typically had enclosed second stories, and evidence exists for upper-floor *convento* rooms at Isleta, Pecos, Ábo, Quarai, and probably Acoma as well.\textsuperscript{52} Acoma certainly had a second story by the nineteenth century, and other missions at pueblos such as Laguna, San Ildefonso, Ohkay Owingeh (San Juan), Taos, Sandía, and Jemez had complete or partial second stories during Domínguez’s 1776 visit.\textsuperscript{53} The illustration of the Zuni Pueblo *convento* from Kern’s 1851 tour likewise suggests remnants of a second story (figures 4.45 and 9.20). These upper rooms were often later additions to ground-level *conventos*, and the thick walls at Hawikku could easily have supported the additional load. Based on his inspection of the Purísima Concepción ruins, Hodge believed there had been a second-floor structure at the eastern corner, and I concur in my interpretation.\textsuperscript{54} The additional story increased security on the *convento*’s most exposed side, away from the pueblo and facing the open wash. Extending beyond the original footprint, this addition offered sightlines towards the mission church and *convento* entrances, as well as the blind southeastern flank, notable defensive characteristics. If a second floor room enclosed the hatchway entrances of Rooms 5, 6, and unexcavated southeastern additions, it could easily control access with a single locking door at the top of the stairwell, suggesting the addition’s primary purpose was increasing the mission’s secure storage facilities.\textsuperscript{55}

Alterations to existing rooms were also part of the eastern renovations. Insertion of the Room 1 stairwell reduced Room 7 by almost thirty percent, yielding a rectangular space 5.49 by
4.19 meters (18’ by 13’ 9”) and requiring a new doorway from the ambulatory (lower right, figure 7.154). Builders cut an opening with square jambs and no closure in the room’s northern corner, next to the original doorway, with an adobe pier between them anchoring the stairwell partition.56 A second fireplace in the western corner of Room 7 may date to these renovations, or may have been added during subsequent Zuni occupations.57

A series of alterations also occurred in Room 2/3/4/19, probably part of the same renovation campaign. Concurrent with the construction of Room 6, the narrow window in the northeast wall of the celda was blocked up, preventing direct communication between these rooms, but leaving a splayed niche on the interior of what would become Room 4. Room 2/3/4/19’s exterior doorway was also blocked up by this time, further enclosing the convento.58 With the doorway closed, a resident friar reconfigured the living quarters by partitioning Room 19 from Room 2/3/4 with an adobe stretcher wall on top of the brick pavement, creating a narrow new antechamber to the trascelda only 2.13 meters wide (7’; figures 7.147 stage 2, 7.149). Entry to this new room was through the original celda doorway, centered in the antechamber with whitewashed adobe jambs on either side.59 A new fogon-style fireplace was squeezed into Room 19’s southern corner, against the partition and door jamb, with a thin, rounded sandstone curbing (figure 8.53).60

Although the field notes do not describe artifacts from Room 19, photographs show accumulated sherds, including rim fragments; assorted cobbles and smoothing stones; an elongated tool shaft; a broken rectangular mano with a triangular profile; and a mano with two flat surfaces and a tear-drop profile. A cylindrical remnant of a ceramic candle holder appears on top of the external convento wall, although it could also have come from Room 8 (figure 8.54). Nusbaum apparently did not collect this fragment.
Partitioning Room 19 reduced the size of Room 2/3/4 by twenty-six percent, yielding a space 6.78 by 4.32 meters (22’ 3” by 14’ 2”) and requiring a new entryway, probably the Room 4 doorway. Nusbaum fully cleared it and the site publication treats it as the only ambulatory door into 2/3/4/19, ignoring the original but uncleared Room 19 doorway. The Room 4 doorway was slightly battered towards the ambulatory, with an adobe sill one brick high along the corridor side, lacking a door, making the room open and accessible to mission community participants (figures 8.55-8.56). The opening was slightly offset and did not align with the axis of the southeast ambulatory corridor, strengthening my supposition that it was not original. Cutting the Room 4 doorway left an adobe pier roughly 60.96 centimeters (2’) square between it and the Room 19 opening. This pier formed a jamb for each doorway, anchored the partition wall, and supported Room 19’s chimney (figure 7.147, 7.149). Notably, the jambs of Room 4’s new doorway preserved a painted dado of red clay, rising 91 centimeters (3’) above the floor. Surmounting the dado was a black band 1.27 centimeters (0.5”) wide, with the upper walls painted white.

Renovations to the convento’s eastern corner added significantly to its space, with new rooms on the northeast and southeast flanks, along with second floor constructions. Despite the net addition of space, individual rooms were smaller and more specialized. Some were probably secure storage rooms, while Room 5 was equipped for grinding grain, and the antechamber to the friar’s trascelda newly segregated his sleeping quarters. Where he could previously survey the multi-purpose residential space of Room 2/3/4/19, the new partition created a degree of separation and privacy from other members of the mission community. Finally, these renovations strategically increased the enclosure of the convento’s interior, pointing to the insecurity of the mission’s last years of famine, raiding, and growing social friction.
Other Alterations

Other less extensive alterations to the original convento plan are also evident; only the trascelda (Room 22), kitchen (Room 13), and Room 9 appear basically unaltered. Changes to the long storage room (Room 14/17/18) may functionally relate to the eastern extension and renovations. With the addition of the service patio and secure storage spaces on the convento’s east corner, there was less need for a single, large storeroom. At the same time, the Room 19 partition decreased space available for dining in the celda even as the mission community’s population seems to have been increasing. While the sparse documentation of Room 14/17/18 is difficult to interpret, the space may have been reconfigured as a heated refectory in the mission’s later years.

Post-mission occupants greatly altered this room, but it appears that adobe brick pavement was added, forming a new floor level with relatively tight mortar seams and a mud plaster finish (figure 8.57). The floor’s tight pavement contrasts fairly thick mortar seams in the walls, suggesting different workmanship. The new paving raised the floor about 12.7 centimeters (5”) above the original packed earth floor, which Nusbaum exposed in a patch where he apparently removed four brick pavers to show the first stained floor beneath (figure 8.58). I hypothesize this renovated brick floor once paved the entire room, but when Zunis partitioned the space after 1672, they pulled up pavers in the southeast half to build Room 14’s partition walls (see Appendix 1).63

As part of its mission-period renovation, rectangular, slab-lined fireplaces were set into the floor of the north and west corners of Room 14/17/18, replacing bricks in the pavement pattern. The new fireplaces had slab floors and fire backing, with no evidence for their smoke
hood construction. None of these renovations remained evident in the poorly documented spaces of Room 14; I speculate that additional fireplaces would have been added in the south and east corners as well, but were removed in the post-mission period. These renovations—the carefully constructed, continuous new pavement and multiple fireplaces—may have equipped the room as a new refectory, replacing the former multipurpose celda of Room 2/3/4/19.

Another notable renovation was the enclosure of the portería (Room 36). The original arrangement of its entry is unknown; perhaps it had a central opening between a pair of posts supporting the main viga, as at Halona, Acoma, and San Ildefonso (figures 4.45, 8.59-8.60). Eventually the portería’s open front was enclosed, with the insertion of an adobe wall that was narrower than adjacent convento walls and unbonded to them, along with a wooden frame doorway to secure and presumably lock the entryway (figure 7.122, 7.126). The front door was unusually large, about 1.80 meters (5’ 11”) wide which suggests it may have had two swinging leaves. Its remnants were badly damaged when Nusbaum found them, with only the western jamb still extant but displaced. The new adobe front probably extended the full height of the room and completely enclosed it, given the insertion of the wooden door and the presence of a small fireplace against the new wall in the portería’s eastern corner. The upper portion of the wall must have supported a smoke hood or flue for the fireplace, perhaps to warm the gate keeper (portero) while on duty. Enclosing the portería increased the mission’s security, presenting another barrier between outsiders and the living quarters. The resulting entrance also created the potential for defensive crossfire from the second-story/rooftop level of the eastern convento extension. A wall from Room 6 to the atrium (which Nusbaum called Room 8, although it had no signs of occupation) was another barrier between potential attackers and the convento.
Once the *convento* was in use, it appears many rooms were too large for effective heating during the cold winters of New Mexico, and second fireplaces were added to many spaces which already had carefully constructed hearths of the first type (see Chapter 7). These new fireplaces were of the second style, with rectangular slab-lined fireboxes set into the floors of unoccupied corners, including Rooms 2A, 5, possibly 9B, 17, 18, and 36. Builders seem to have removed a single adobe paver or cut through the packed earth floors, creating sunken fireboxes with smoke hoods above for ventilation. Insertion of these additional features into the mission fabric represented a proportionate increase in labor for the mission community, expended in collecting firewood, keeping hearths burning, cleaning, and upkeep. Primary sources indicate that in the sixteenth-century, Hawikku’s firewood came from a small juniper forest about four leagues from the town, a roundtrip distance of 19.3 to 25.7 kilometers (12-16 miles), distance unlikely to have decreased by the 1660s. Even with the introduction of beasts of burden, supplying firewood necessary for a year’s cooking and heating was a major undertaking. As with the addition of new rooms and spatial divisions, the additional fireplaces suggest the mission community’s population was rising over time, increasing its burden upon Hawikku’s limited labor supply.

**Conclusions**

The Purísima Concepción mission was not a static environment, nor was it built in a single phase of construction or unchanging in its spatial distribution. Its archaeological remains showed evidence for significant alterations, additions, and reconfigurations over a relatively short period of time, reflecting the social conditions and everyday life of the mission community (figure 8.62). Some rooms, such as the church, baptistery, kitchen, *trascelda*, and probably
Room 9 do not seem to have changed much. Others retained their purpose but became more specialized or controlled. For instance, the functions of the original sacristy were redistributed among three rooms with its expansion, while Room 36 continued to function as a *portería*, but with increased security and warmth. Rooms 2/3/4 and 7 remained open, heated spaces for the mission community, but smaller in size.

Other spaces underwent more significant transformations. Alterations to the Purísima Concepción’s design expanded its overall size, but individual rooms become smaller, more enclosed, increasingly secure, and adapted to specific uses. The sacristy additions increased storage available for liturgical materials, while the service patio additions and eastern-corner renovations created more space for holding and processing domestic supplies. The smaller stores could not hold as much as Room 14/17/18’s single, large space had, but were better suited to segregation of materials by type, such as corn and dried foodstuffs; wood and cured hides; or valuable imported materials, wine, and oil. Unfortunately, destruction, looting, and reuse left little identified evidence for how these items were distributed. The unheated, unlocked rooms of the service patio would have been better suited for low-value materials and processing. Room 5 was configured for a single function, grinding grain, and it seems likely that some of the smaller, secure additions alongside it were granaries for maize and wheat.

Partitioning the *celda* (Room 2/3/4/19) rearranged its many functions which might have included antechamber, refectory, workspace, and sleeping quarters for mission community participants. With its partition, Room 19 became a designated antechamber to the friar’s cell, increasing his privacy, and separating him from what had been the open, multi-purpose *celda*. The smaller Room 2/3/4 became more like Room 7, a heated residential and working space, with open access but no identified features related to specific activities. With these changes, the
guardian friar could no longer surveille the activities of mission community participants outside his door, but the new antechamber also isolated his actions in the trascelda from the mission community. These alterations might indicate differing personalities and priorities among various friars assigned to Hawikku.

Alterations to the mission’s fabric changed patterns of movement and circulation within its spaces. Sacristies and storerooms became more removed, and the portería a more effective social filter. The service patio added a large working area and new pattern of entrance, perhaps formalizing previously ad hoc working arrangements. The partition of Rooms 1 and 19 created new transitional passages radiating out from the ambulatory, while the eastern renovations essentially reversed much of the traffic related to food production and consumption. If my interpretation of the spatial patterns is correct, food stuffs originally moved through the convento in a counter-clockwise direction, from the storeroom to the kitchen to the celda (from Room 14/17/18 to Room 13 to Room 2/3/4/19). With renovations, food would have moved in the opposite direction, from the storage and processing rooms of the eastern corner, to the kitchen, to the new refectory (from Rooms 5, 6, upper floor and southeastern extension, to Room 13, to Room 14/17/18). The eastern addition therefore represents not only an increase in space and spatial differentiation, but also a major change in the patterns of everyday usage of convento spaces.

The addition of new fireplaces was a subtler alteration with significant implications. It appears mission community participants found the original design too cold and poorly suited for the climate, since fireplaces were added in almost every occupied room. From the original design with its five corner fireplaces and kitchen hearth, at least seven new fireplaces were added, mostly of the sunken, slab-lined rectangular variety. Some of these were in corners
opposite existing fireplaces, indicating that the original hearths were insufficient. If the number of hearths can be taken as a rough indicator for firewood consumption, the amount appears to have more than doubled over the life of the mission, a substantial increase in the labor of mission community participants who cut and transported the wood, tended fires, cleaned out the ashes, and maintained the fireplaces.

When I initially presented my research to the Zuni Tribal Council in 2013, one of the question that councilmembers rightfully posed was why the Hawikku mission has such a negative presence in Zuni oral traditions, if the Spanish only occupied it for a couple decades in the mid-seventeenth century. Fully exploring this question goes beyond the scope of my dissertation, but the initial size of the Purísima Concepción’s structure and the major renovations that it underwent during its brief occupation may be part of the answer. Generally, it appears the Purísima Concepción’s mission community increased in size over time, and the mission was probably a constant draw on Hawikku’s labor pool. Once the major work of building the formal structure was complete, laborers were still needed to staff it and maintain the productivity of its estancias and herds. Although there was a brief hiatus during the office of Governor Mendizábal (1658-1660), who allowed Zunis and other pueblos to relinquish mission labor, the renovations and expansion of Hawikku’s convento would have been a considerable drain on the work force as hard times approached in the mid to late 1660s.

Alterations to Hawikku’s convento reveal a different sensibility and use of space than the original plan, betraying the hands of different designers. Of the additions, only Room 25 clearly continues the original system of proportions, extending Room 21’s width to create a larger sacristy similar to other roomy, elongated spaces of the original plan. The addition of service patio Rooms 37-39 extended the convento’s side range, but rotated the long axis of the rooms
while using smaller proportions than the spaces of the *convento* core. Rooms 5, 6, 19, 30, and presumably the southeast extension exhibit more ad hoc spatial adaptations, and a very different aesthetic, less attuned to thinking about the *convento* plan as a cohesive whole, and more engaged with Indigenous architectural norms. Only the new sacristy (Room 25) conveyed clear European sensibilities: a large, axial space paralleling the church nave with a raised dais creating a hierarchic emphasis on the room’s far end, wooden furniture, and brick paved floor. The large space and pavement of Room 14/17/18 also suggests a European sense of space, but other additions (Rooms 5, 6, 30, 37, 38, 39, and presumably the unexcavated eastern addition) gravitate towards Pueblo spatial configurations in many characteristics, including: an accretional pattern of expansion; smaller size; raised floors; rooftop entryways; and Indigenous-styled features such as sunken slab-lined fireplaces, grinding bins, and the low lintel/high sill doorway of Room 30.

These alterations suggest the built environment was trending towards a greater consonance with the Zuni architectural traditions familiar to Native participants in the mission community, as well as greater suitability to its climatic context. Such a nativizing trend does not necessarily indicate improved relations between friars and Hawikku as a whole, but may instead point to a greater entanglement of the town’s population with mission’s labor requirements. In any case, it seems unlikely that whoever designed Hawikku’s formal mission was still around for these additions, which significantly changed the careful arrangement of spaces and proportions of the original design.

Finally, the emphasis on increased security and enclosure throughout the mission indexes deteriorating conditions and the tense social context of the Purísima Concepción’s final years. Builders blocked up many external windows and doorways, enclosed the main entrance to the
mission, and strengthened it with a second, locking door. They likewise added locked and secure spaces to the sacristy and to the eastern corner of the mission, while construction of the service patio and Room 8 created additional barriers between the mission and the dangers of the world around it. The eastern expansion in particular suggests intentional fortifications, with the addition of thick new external rooms and walls, and a second floor, all of which projected out from the original plan to provide sightlines and potential crossfire to exposed portions of the convento. This addition evokes the projecting bastions characteristic of Early Modern fortress design, as well as the low adobe defensive towers (torreones) of eighteenth and nineteenth-century New Mexico. By comparison, Franciscans in the Borderlands mission of Casas Grandes built San Antonio de Padua during this same period with two round towers on the convento corners and an internal powder magazine, functional defensive features that Spanish settlers put to use during a major uprising of local Native groups in 1684 to 1686 (figure 9.67).

The description of New Spanish mission churches as “fortress churches” is a common mistake; in fact, mission churches were rarely used as fortified retreats and generally lacked the features necessary for defensive engagement. Conventos on the other hand, did incorporate structural features designed to protect residents and essential mission stores. As crop failures and famine began to afflict New Mexico in the late 1660s, vault-like storage rooms were added to some missions in order to better guard supplies. The cloister form itself had great defensive potential, with blank external walls enclosing the internal spaces, entry through limited and secure points, and readily accessible rooftop parapets that could become elevated defensive positions. Spanish towns would employ these same defensive features on a larger scale in protected communities such as Cerro de Chimayo in the eighteenth century (figure 8.61). While fortified plaza and cloister forms were not sufficient protection against European style warfare,
they were well-suited retreats against the hit-and-run raiding of Indian military tactics. Alterations to the Purísima Concepción’s convento seem to express an increased concern for security, control of resources, and potential willingness to use force in the midst of the fraught context of the late 1660s. The interactions of violence, hardship, and increased labor demands likewise resonate with Zuni oral traditions attesting to the traumatic experiences of their ancestors during Hawikku’s mission period.
ENDNOTES

1 Bruzelius, *Preaching*, 50-51, 89, 104-105.

2 Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 136, 138. Nusbaum excavated the entire length of the wall, trenching out 0.91 m. and down at least 1.52 m. (3’ by 5’). The fact that the stone atrium wall is aligned (but unbonded) with the adobe brick wall of the baptistery indicates that the baptistery and atrium were constructed prior to the retaining wall. If the retaining wall had been in place, or planned, when the atrium wall was constructed, it probably would have aligned with the retaining wall and been bonded to it for greater structural integrity.

3 For Nusbaum’s description of this wall, see his letter to Heye, October 8, 1919, 5. Nusbaum’s notes about the walls dimensions in this letter are a bit hurried and inconsistent, and he goes so far as to describe the baptistery-retaining wall thickness as “really 8 feet thick” and the nave-retaining wall thickness as 9’ 11” (6). The original adobe walls were 0.76 m. (2’ 6”) wide along the baptistery, and about 1.52 m. (5’) wide along the nave. My personal inspection of the surviving remnants suggests that parts were built in two layers or wythes, rather than in a single, cohesively bonded phase of construction.

4 Nusbaum to Heye and Hodge, October 6, 1919. By comparison, the thickest three-wythe northern wall of the Acoma church/convento is 2.29 m. (7’ 6”) thick, while some of the stone walls of the mission church of Giusewa are as thick as 3.66 m. (12’) thick. See Marshall, 1978, “Investigations,” 6; Farwell, *An Architectural History*, 94.


6 The presence of a street is deduced from the general plan and topography, which indicates a narrow, flat passage on this side of the mission, descending on either side; see figure 5.3. Nusbaum (“Church and Monastery,” 138) also described a hardened ground level or strata on the northwest side of the church around the sub-foundational Room 35, laying approximately 1.70 m. (5’ 7”) above its floor level. This may be the remnants of a packed plaza or street pavement in the open area on that side of the building.

7 Kubler, *The Religious Architecture*, 44-45. In Mexico, where mission builders employed cut stone, lime mortar, and rubble masonry, roof catchment systems were designed exactly opposite those of adobe missions. Whereas adobe structures had to channel water away by whatever means possible, stone structures were designed as complex hydrological catchments that concentrated water in the patio where cisterns stored it for later use, or piped it to external above-ground pools (albercas) or cisterns for water storage; see Ledesma Gallegos, *Tradición*, 11-12, 50.

8 The builders may have hoped to keep the interior adobe walls dryer too, as was a motivation behind a sandstone veneer added to Acoma’s church in the mid-twentieth century. See Bergman, 1980, “Historic Structures Report,” 44-45.

9 Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 1, 3; Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, *The Excavation*, 108-109. The new sanctuary floor level was about 15.24 cm. (6”) higher, with the gypsum plaster on top about 1.27 cm. (0.50”) thick. According to the legal pad sketch, the interior dimensions of the predella platform was 1.78 m. by 1.07 m. (5’ 10” by 3’ 6”). Smith Woodbury, and Woodbury (*The Excavation*, 107) describe the predella as being the same width as the altar, which they (perhaps incorrectly) identify as 2.29 m. wide (7’ 6”), by a total depth of 1.37 m. (4’ 6”). See Chapter 7, n. 68, above. The wooden sills were of square-adzed timber, about 10.16 cm. (4”) square, with lapped and pegged front corners (Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, *The Excavation*, 108-109).

Room 25’s floor was 15.24 to 17.78 cm. (6” to 7”) higher than the floor level of Room 21. Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 118. One peculiarity of Room 25 is that the pavement around the doorway at the northeast side appears more heavily worn in comparison to the center of the room or to the surface of the platform.

Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury (The Excavation, 112) describe the doorway as 1.6 m. (5’ 3”) wide, and believe incorrectly that it had a wooden sill and door. As visible in photographs, the stone and mud sill could not have accommodated a wooden door.

The beams were seated more than 3.05 m. (10’) up, the height which survived at the time of excavation; see Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 128.

The dais was set 0.81 m. (2’ 8”) in front of the southwest wall, and the pit behind was a 22.86 cm. (9”) deep. The top of the sill running along the back edge of the dais was about 21.59 cm. (8.5”) above the pit floor, and 11.43 cm. by 13.97 cm. (4.5” by 5.5”) in thickness. The top surface of the dais was about 1.68 m. (5’ 6”) wide. See Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery, 118-119; and Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, The Excavation, 112.

Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 118-119. The lower step of the platform was 10.16 cm. (4”) tall, while the upper step was 11.43 cm. (4.5”) tall. The sill along the rim of the pit was 11.43 cm. by 13.97 cm. (4.5” by 5.5”). The sockets were similar but not exactly symmetrical. The first was 10.16 cm. high by 11.43 cm. wide (4” by 4.5”) horizontal socket, 22.86 cm. (9”) above the pit floor and 30.48 cm. (12”) from the northwest wall. The second and third sockets were both vertical holes, 15.24 cm. high by 13.97 cm. wide (6” by 5.5”) located 17.78 cm. (7”) above the floor. The second socket was 1.22 m. (4’) from the wall, and the third was 1.83 m. (6’) from the wall. The final socket was horizontal, 11.43 cm. high by 17.78 cm. wide (4.5” by 7”), and 2.74 m. (9”) from the wall. The interstitial spaces were therefore an irregular 0.30 m. (1’) from the wall to the first beam, 0.79 m. (2’ 7”) to the second beam, 0.47 m. (1’ 6.5”) to the third beam, 0.47 m. (1’ 6.5”) to the fourth beam, and about 1.35 m. (4’ 5”) to the wall. This asymmetrical arrangement would seem to suggest that a fifth beam should have been found close to the southeast wall, but none was located there. From photographs it appears that at least the first socket still retained the burnt remnants of its timber element. The irregularity of these timbers may have come from piecing together scraps left over from other parts of the construction to build the platform. Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury (The Excavation, 112-113) misinterpreted a comment by Nusbaum (“Church and Monastery, 119) discussing six wooden lintels with slab covering as pertaining to the dais and its wooden framework, when in fact this section of the notes is discussing the doorway from Room 25 into Room 30.


See Giffords, Sanctuaries of Earth, 235-238. The examples of the sacristies of the Mexico City Cathedral and Nuestra Señora del Carmen in San Ángel are admittedly not the best comparisons for a Franciscan Borderland mission, since they come from a high-status cathedral and a Carmelite convento in the Valley of Mexico. Unfortunately, I have yet to visit a sixteenth or seventeenth century Franciscan sacristy preserving furnishings and open to the public. Primary sources attest to the use of similar storage cabinets in New Mexico’s mission sacristies, such as at Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe in El Paso del Norte, where there was “a handsome chest of drawers of fourteen divisions, as elaborate as if it had been made in Mexico City.” See Scholes, “Documents for the History of the New Mexican Missions in the Seventeenth Century, Part III” New Mexico Historical Review 4:2 (April 1929): 198-199. The Spanish reads, “[…] y una cajonera Rica con catorce divisiones tan Labrada como si fuera Echa en la ciudad de Mex” (Guerra, 1668, “Testimonio del estado,” 3).

In the eighteenth century, Dominguez noted equivalent furniture in missions throughout New Mexico, usually across the wall opposite the sacristy entryway, which the friars used for dressing prior to liturgical services. Dominguez usually describes these as tables, and that of the parish church at Santa Fe is most like Hawikku’s arrangement:

Along the head, or end wall, below the window mentioned, is a strong table from wall to wall. The vestments are places on it for vesting. It has six large drawers without lock or handle. In a row upon it are four small crucifixes in the round and the box in which the monstrance is kept. Beneath this table there is a dais which extends its full length […] (Domínguez, The Missions, 22).
Por toda la testera, o cabeceara, abajo de la citada ventana está una mesa fuerte de pared a pared, que sobre ella se ponen los ornamentos para revestirse, y tiene seis grandes cajones sin llaves ni manejeras; encima tiene de continuo cuatro crucifijos de bulto pequeños y la caja en que se guarda la custodia. Abajo de esta mesa y por todo su curso está una tarima [...] (Domínguez, “Copy of Spanish Transcription,” 21).

Dominguez uses the word mesa or table for this sacristy furnishing, but from his description it seems clear that he means a cajonera-like flat-surfed cabinet in which drawers provided the necessary storage. He describes similar furnishings at Isleta, where he saw “a wooden table with six drawers” across the front of the sacristy (Domínguez, The Missions, 204); and at Pecos, where “All across the end wall there is a good wooden table that has five drawers without keys” (211). Other missions had tables with two drawers stacked below the vesting surface, such as at Acoma, where priests used a wooden table “across the head wall [...] with two drawers, one above the other, in the middle” (192), and in Zuni, where “at the head there is a beautiful wooden table which the priest uses for vesting. It has two drawers, one above the other [...]” (198). For many other missions and parish churches such as Tesuque, Nambe, Santa Cruz, Santa Clara, Abiquiu, Cochiti, and Laguna, Dominguez describes a table with a single drawer as the primary vesting furniture in the sacristy (48, 54, 77, 115, 123, 156, 184). Pojoaque (62) had only a “rough table of boards on an adobe base,” an arrangement which also evokes Hawikku’s cajonera on wooden beams over Room 25’s adobe platform. At San Ildefonso the sacristy had “along the whole width of the end wall, under the aforesaid window [...] a plank table with legs, all very well made like a proper table, and the front painted to look as if it had drawers with locks and handles [...] which provides a place for the priest to vest,” (66). Other missions used adobe tables for vesting, such as was the case at San Juan (86), Santo Domingo (133), San Felipe (162), Santa Ana (167), Zia (173), Jemez (178), and Galisteo (215). Cabinets and chests provided storage in these sacristies, as they did at most of the other New Mexico missions as well. In almost all cases these furnishings were eighteenth-century replacements for those destroyed in the Pueblo Revolt. None of the missions that Domínguez describes had a retablo in the sacristy as in Montgomery’s reconstruction.

19 Nusbaum to Heye and Hodge, October 6, 1919.

20 The diamonds painted around the Baptismal font were 8.89 cm. (3.5”) along their horizontal sides; see Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 131. Nusbaum does not provide measurements for the diamonds in Room 21 or 25. Comparison to known measurements in photographs of Room 25 provides a rough estimate of between 10.26 to 11.73 cm. (4.04” to 4.62”), from which it would appear that Room 25’s diamonds were 15 to 32% larger than the earlier ones. As with the nave murals, the linear pattern was incised into the plaster first, and the colors filled in subsequently, often with strong outlining.

21 Ibid., 119. The doorway was about 0.61 meters (2’) wide. My estimate for the unrecorded height of the lintel is based on comparison of the height of the opening to its known width in photograph N05803. The lintel beams were 12.7 cm. (5”) tall where their sides were visible, and extended 38.1 cm. (1’ 3”) into the wall on either end. Their thickness (from east to west) were 22.86, 6.35, 10.16, 8.89, 11.43, and 16.51 cm. (9”, 2.5”, 4”, 3.5”, 4.5”, and 6.5”). The slabs on top were 2.54 cm. (1”) thick. These beams were the only preserved lintel in the entire mission complex and would have held potential for dendrochronological dating of the sacristy extension, but Nusbaum did not collect any samples. By 1923, they had been pulled out of the wall, as evident in Zarah Preble’s portrait of Hodge (figure 5.5).

22 This window was located 1.37 m. (4’ 6”) from the southern corner of the room, and had an adobe sill 0.86 m. (2’ 10”) wide set 0.98 m. (3’ 2.5”) above the platform (which made it almost 1.22 m./4’ above the floor level). See Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 119.

23 The sill was 0.83 meter (2’ 9”) and the lintel 1.93 meters (6’ 4”) above the floor (ibid.).

24 Unfortunately, the eastern corner of Room 25 remained thoroughly plastered inside and out, making it impossible to assess its bonding.

25 Among these are pieces strongly suggestive of a soup plate sitting in the niche in the corner of photograph N05804 (figure 8.22), and a pile of small, light-colored sherds that look like broken majolica in photograph N05749 (figure 8.7).
An unmentioned depression in the floor of the sacristy’s north corner (figure 8.20) suggests a drain like those of a sacrarium or piscina basin for washing liturgical vestments and vessels. Such segregated drains avoided mixing these fluids with everyday liquids. No corresponding sink was found in the sacristy, but if the mission’s attackers took the time to loot the church before burning it, the shattered patio sink might conceivably be from the sacristy. Perhaps the attackers removed it and threw it into the patio as a symbolic act of wreckage, similar to the destructive attention that Awatovi’s baptistery sacrarium received during the Pueblo Revolt. For the Awatovi sacrarium, see Montgomery, “San Bernardo,” 197, 287.

Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 127-128. Nusbaum only records the dimensions for the post-mission occupation of Room 30, which was longer, with the construction of a new southwestern wall. Photos make it clear that the original mission-period wall was located nearly flush with the southwestern jamb of the Room 25 niche, which was in turn 3.85 m. (12’ 7.5”) from the southwestern wall of that sacristy, yielding an approximate length of 3.20 m. (10’ 6”) for the original Room 30.

Nusbaum thought the round stone was a base for a candle stick; letter to Heye and Hodge, October 6, 1919.

Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury (The Excavation, 121) likewise believed that these rooms were added to the convento core after its initial construction.

Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 141.

Nusbaum made no record of the relative floor level. He excavated a test pit to explore the foundations at the northeast corner of Room 37, saying that he “went down here to base foundation” 1.18 m. (3’ 10.5”) deep although it is unclear if the foundational stonework was 1.18 m. thick, or if its base lay at that depth below ground level. I tend to believe the former, which would be equivalent to the foundations that he found elsewhere beneath the mission. In his letter to Hodge he describes discovering these rooms and their foundations during the final days of the 1919 field season:

I put Kanta and Lilio and Waische on south-east corner to locate outside walls-and damn me-(second time) I found that adobies had practically all been removed from part of convent [sic] south of kitchen (#13) and we[re?] but walls less than 1 ft. high-and same deep foundations-for 3 more rooms south of the kitchen (Nusbaum to Hodge, October 17, 1919).

The walls ranged from about 0.91 m. (3’) thick on the southeastern side to 0.84 m. (2’ 9”) on the southwest side, and 0.61 m. (2’) thick in the partitions.

Nusbaum describes this pit as “in center of patio” (“Church and Monastery,” 143) but no disturbances appear in that area in the 1920 photographic negative N07213, while a large pit is visible next to the wall trench of the service patio rooms (figure 5.34). I believe that this pit is his stratigraphic excavation, probably dug in the 1920 field season and added to a blank page in the 1919 field notebook.

Ibid., 143.

The southern Colorado Plateau experienced a general trend of floodplain aggradation in the sixteenth through mid-seventeenth centuries; see Jeffrey S. Dean, “Zuni-Area Paleoenviroment,” in Gregory and Wilcox, Zuni Origins, 81.
Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 82. Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury (The Excavation, 125) did not believe that Rooms 5 and 6 were part of the “friary.”

Room 5 was approximately 2.21 m. (7’ 3”) square, and its walls were about 0.84 m. (2’ 9”) thick. Nusbaum struggled to identify the bonding of the walls of this addition because the ground was still quite wet from the rainy period in the summer of 1919, complicating the excavation (See Chapter 5). Room 5 was on the lower end of the site, near a small gully. In his notes, Nusbaum states that it was “impossible” for him to determine to exact location of the exterior of Room five’s walls due to the wetness of the “adobe mud.” Perhaps the dampness of the material also made it difficult to identify the nature of the brick bonding with the earlier mission walls (“Church and Monastery,” 82-83). In photographs, the dividing wall appears to be a thin partition of single brick stretchers (see NMAI N05770, figure 8.46). For the effects of dampness on adobe bricks and their interpretation, see Van Beek and Van Beek, Glorious Mud!,157.

The slabs of the mealing bin projected 10.16 to 15.24 cm. (4” to 6”) above the floor level (ibid., 82). The fireplace was 76.20 cm. long by 52.07 cm. wide (2’ 6” by 1’ 8.5”), with an adobe lip 5.08 cm. (2”) high and wide.

It was a rectangular space, 2.90 m. long by 2.06 m. wide (9’ 6” by 6’ 9”), with walls that were rough and less-well preserved than those elsewhere in the mission. The exterior of the convento core was already showing the weathered erosion of a sloped profile when Rooms 5 and 6 were added. The upper floor level in Room 6 was about 20.32 cm. (about 8”) above the original packed-earth floor.

A semicircular section of a hatchway ring was excavated in this area, and came either from Room 6 or the remnants of Room 2/3/4/19; see figures 7.122, 12.15, 8.46 (N05746, N05770). Although it is very similar to a ring in the NMAI collections (NMAI 093642.000), close inspection suggests to me that they are different in their details and that the collected ring does not come from these rooms.

Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 83. The fireplace was set away from the northwestern wall about 38.10 cm. (1’ 3”).

Nusbaum only tested the outside of the southwest convento wall in two places. At the center of Room 9, he dug a small pit along the outer wall to determine its width, but not sufficiently to determine whether other rooms or features had ever been constructed on that side. This small excavation is visible in photographs such as N05771 and N05772 (figures 7.39 middle, 7.154, 7.156). He also followed the remnants of the walls of the service patio extension, in the process coming across the remnants of an adobe wall heading southeast, which he did not investigate further; see Nusbaum to Hodge, October 17, 1919. It is worth noting that the comparable plan of the Halona mission broke with the neat contours of a square convento in precisely the same location as Room 1’s stairwell extension, with a trascelda room extending to the southeast that appears to have been original to the structure, based on its integrated foundations (figures 9.19, 9.25).

Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 41. Although difficult to make out in photographs, this partition wall does not appear to be bonded to the original ambulatory wall.

Ibid., 41-43. Although Nusbaum did not note all of the measures for the individual steps, their risers ranged between 15.24 and 17.78 cm. (6” to 7”) high, and their treads from 40.64 to 50.80 cm. (1’ 4” to 1’ 8”) in width. The total rise of this portion of the stair was between 0.98 and 1.09 m. (3’ 2.5” to 3’ 7”) high and spanning a length of approximately 2.67 m. (8’ 9”) based on the measures that Nusbaum does provide. The fact that the steps begin in the middle of the room rather than immediately inside the doorway indicates builders knew they had plenty of length for the steps. They were not trying to cram the treads into the 4.14 m. (13’ 7”) long box of Room 1. They knew the stairway would continue past the original convento wall, providing plenty of room for its leisurely rise.

Nusbaum (ibid., 42) describes the wall as rising 53.34 cm. (1’ 9”) above the top step, giving the impression that the flight of steps ended at a blank wall. Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury (The Excavation, 117) thought that it must have led to an exterior doorway which left no traces, and assumed without any apparent reason that the stairwell was blocked off during the mission period. Montgomery (“Functional Interpretation,” 133) was even more mystified. He initially speculated that perhaps the grade was higher on the southeast side of the convento, but this clearly was not the case since that side of the mission remains the lowest part of the site.
Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, *The Excavation*, 117. I can see no evidence to support the idea that the Franciscans blocked off this stairwell, which seems purely speculative and contradicts the evidence of the worn steps and my argument that the stairwell as not original to the mission, but rather a secondary renovation.

Montgomery, “The Mission Church,” 133-134. Montgomery, Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury spent relatively little time on the Hawikku site, not visiting until late in the writing process on July 7, 1963. They failed to notice the southeast side of the mission is the lowest point of its grade, and a stairwell leading to a high exterior doorway would be most unlikely, unless there had been a southeastern extension. Their tendency to see the mission in static terms as a single construction phase also limited their interpretation. Finally, they do not seem to have realized neither Hodge nor Nusbaum ever excavated the exterior of the *convento* on the southeast side.

The average rise of the steps Nusbaum measured was 17.35 cm. (6.83”) and the average run of the treads was 44.45 cm. (1’ 5.5”). The exterior wall of the *convento* core was about 81.28 cm. (2’ 8”) in this area; Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 41-42.


Hodge (undated, “Excerpts,” 114) believed that the stair led to a second story, but did not offer any explanation for how it arrived there. Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury (*The Excavation*, 101) agreed that a second story was likely.

Nusbaum did not clear the doorway from the ambulatory into the Room 1 stairwell. While it could have had a wooden sill and locking door, it seems unlikely he would have missed seeing these fixtures on the ambulatory side. It seems more probable that a locking door would have been constructed at the top of the stairwell during the addition of the second floor spaces.

Nusbaum had little to say about the new doorway to Room 7, which appears as a seam around the blocked up opening, or partially excavated in photographs such as N05771 and N05783 (figures 7.154, 7.149, 12.8).

The second fireplace was more rudimentary than most in the *convento*, with two short, upright stones against the converging walls of the corner, as well as fire blackening on the wall and what may have been a pile of ashes. It looked more like a fire built in the corner than a proper fireplace. Nusbaum recorded no artifacts for Room 7, although a number of slabs and cobbles appear on the walls in photographs, as do a broken half of a used-up rectangular *mano*, a rough elongate stone which may be a *mano* blank, and a small rounded stone which may be a polishing stone. Unfortunately, there is no information about the stratigraphic provenience of these objects, so it is impossible to know if they belong to the mission period or post mission reoccupation.

These alterations could have occurred independently, but they appear to be part of a general tendency towards greater spatial enclosure and segregation, leading me to believe they all took place around the same time. Unfortunately, Nusbaum did not fully excavate or photograph the external doorway, so its relationship to the floor level and construction of Room 6 remain unclear.

The partition was spaced so that 22.86 cm. (9”) of the blocked exterior doorway was in Room 19, and the remainder in what would become Room 4. See Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 106; Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, *The Excavation*, 123.

The fireplace had a smooth slab bottom, and small slabs for fire backing, which appear blackened along with the wall above. The front was formed by a curbing of thin slabs and mud plaster curving around the front of the fireplace. This new hearth projected past the door’s southeast jamb, supporting my supposition that this doorway
existed prior to construction of the partition and fireplace, and was the original celda entryway rather than an integrated part of the design of the new partition, in which case the jamb and fireplace would likely have aligned better. This projection makes it clear that the doorway and fireplace were not planned as one coherent design/renovation, or the doorway would have been cut more narrowly to better accommodate the fireplace. Likewise, the position of the fireplace demonstrates that the opening could not have accommodated an inwardly swinging door. The possibility of an outwardly swinging door cannot be eliminated, although it seems unlikely given the probable inward batter of this blocked up opening.

61 Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury (The Excavation, fig. 20) have the batter incorrectly reversed in their published plan for the mission; compare to Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 48. The doorway opening was 1.33 m. (4’ 4.5”) wide on the side of the ambulatory and narrowed to 1.22 m. (4’) wide on the room’s interior side. In the field notes (“Church and Monastery,” 48), Nusbaum connects his note about the ambulatory doorway sill to the exterior door. This was clearly a mistake, however, for he measures the height of the sill above the corridor floor, and there was no corridor on the exterior side. His drawing is easily confusing and he must have placed his note on the wrong side by accident. Photos indicate the presence of the adobe sill along the corridor entryway.

62 See also N05746, figure 7.122.

63 An alternative interpretation of this space is that the partition wall was constructed first between 14 and 17/18 during the mission period, after which the adobe paving and fireplaces were added to the northwest section. I find this scenario less likely, because all the other mission period walls and alterations are squared to their spaces, while the partition wall between Rooms 14 and 17/18 was not and does not appear consistent with mission-period workmanship. It also seems hard to explain why a room important enough to need two fireplaces would be entered from the rooftop far from the nearest stair, and not through a more convenient horizontal doorway.

64 It should be noted that there appears to be fire blackening on the wall behind the upright slabs of the north corner hearth. This might indicate that this was a reconstruction over an earlier heath in the same location, which lacked slab fire backing.

65 Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 140. Found out of place 2.13 m. (7’) in front of the portería doorway, this was the only wooden jamb preserved in the entire mission, but Nusbaum neglected to describe it.

66 The fireplace had a 11.43 cm. (4.5”) deep depression as a firebox and extending out about 76.2 cm. (2’ 6”) from the southeast wall (ibid., 140). Photos suggest that it may have had a slab bottom, but no additional lining or curbing. Other New Mexico missions placed a fireplace near the portería in the convento ambulatory, seemingly for the same purpose. For example, see Marshall, 1978, “Investigations,” 43.

67 Nusbaum describes the wall as a secondary wall of “typical pueblo masonry,” meaning stone laid up in adobe mortar, that was 60.96 cm. (2’) in thickness; see “Church and Monastery,” 85. If the external doorway of 2/3/4/19 was still in use when this partition was created, Room 8 might have served as a small yard for the celda. I believe that the external doorway was blocked up at the same time as the rest of the eastern corner renovations, so it seems unlikely that it ever functioned as an attached yard, although it may have had a packed earth “floor” (see N05748, figure 7.122).


69 Klinton Burgio-Ericson, “Architectural Form and Everyday Life in a Seventeenth-Century New Mexico Mission” (presentation to the Zuni Tribal Council, Zuni, NM, March 12, 2014). The extent of these alterations is surprising, given the relatively short span of the mission’s occupation and the fact that it was a visita, lacking a resident friar for part of that time. The large formal structure shows that the Franciscans never intended the Purísima Concepción as a mere visita, even if they could not always fully staff it. From the extensive remains, it seems likely that many of the mission’s economic activities and daily routines continued even when there was not a priest in residence to oversee them. Perhaps it fell to the head sacristan or a lay brother to keep these initiatives going.

70 For examples of bastions in Early Modern fortress design, see Early, Presidio, Mission, and Pueblo, 26-28; Ramón Gutiérrez, Arquitectura y Urbanismo en Iberoamérica (Madrid: Manuales Arte Cátedra, 2002), 299-319;
Carlos Chanfón Olmos, coordinator, Historia de la Arquitectura y el Urbanismo Mexicanos, Vol. II, Tomo II, La Consolidación de la Vida Virreinal (Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2001), 142-143. For New Mexico torreones, see Boyd, Popular Arts, 23-26; Bunting, Early Architecture, 81-83; and Marc Simmons, Coronado’s Land: Daily Life in Colonial New Mexico (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1991), 61-64.

71 Di Peso, Casas Grandes, Vol. 3, 865-875, 882, 897; Di Peso, Rinaldo, and Fenner, Casas Grandes, Vol. 5, 911, 915-916. The mission was built between 1663 and 1682.

72 For examples of the inaccurate perception of mission churches as fortresses see Kubler, Mexican Architecture, 81; Manuel Toussaint, Colonial Art in Mexico, trans. and ed. Elizabeth Wilder Weismann (Austin: University of Texas, 1967), 77. For a refutation of this notion, see McAndrew, The Open-Air Churches, 255-275; and Carlos Chanfón Olmos, coordinator, Historia de la arquitectura y el urbanismo mexicanos, Vol. 2, El Periodo Virreinal, Tomo I, El Encuentro de Dos Universos Culturales (Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México and Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1997), 343-359. Only a few documented cases of mission churches used as retreats exist for Mexico and New Mexico. Ixmiquilpan’s mission purportedly served as a retreat during Chichimec attacks, although it is unclear if the church or convento was the primary refuge; see Edgerton, Theaters, 44. The use of an establishment phase Sonoran Jesuit visita as a retreat is well described by Seymour (A Fateful Day). In New Mexico, churches served as retreats during the Territorial period at Ranchos de Taos and Taos Pueblo. See Treib, Sanctuaries, 201-204; and Van Dorn Hooker with Corina A. Santistevan, Centuries of Hands: An Architectural History of St. Francis of Assisi Church and its Missions, Ranchos de Taos, New Mexico (Santa Fe: Sunstone Press, 1996), 17-18. Primary sources describe seventeenth-century New Mexico friars as possessing substantial armaments, which seem to have been intended for contesting civil authority rather than against hostile Natives, although the implied potential to exert force should not be overlooked. See “Report to the Viceroy by the Cabildo,” 71. During their conflict with Governor Luis de Rosas (in office 1637-1641), the Franciscans retreated to the mission of Santo Domingo and barricaded themselves inside in preparation for armed resistance to the Governor, although descriptions seem to indicate that it was the convento which would serve as their primary fortification, rather than the mission church; see Scholes, Church and State, 33, 140, 179. Likewise, the Nueva Vizcaya Franciscans of Casas Grandes, retreated to the fortified convento of their mission (rather than the church) during the uprising of 1684; see Chapter 8, n. 71, above. Crenellations appeared regularly on Spanish missions, but were rhetorical (symbols of the church militant) and stylistic conventions, rather than functional defensive features. The weakest point of the adobe mission church was its roof, and if crenellations were intended functionally, missions should have had internal stairways and passages to safely access the roof under fire. Jemez and Acoma had such accesses, but in most other cases defenders would have had to expose themselves before reaching the rooftop.

73 Fortress significations were part of the meanings that adhered to the cloister form, protecting residents from worldly corruption. See Chapter 8, and Phillips, Processions, 255, 393, 401.

74 Ivey, “Greatest Misfortune,” 84.

75 Bunting, Early Architecture, 63; Early, Presidio, Mission, and Pueblo, 92-93; Treib, Sanctuaries, 17.
CHAPTER 9: CLOISTERS AS FRANCISCAN PLACEMAKING IN NEW MEXICO

Hawikku has been site of contested placemaking since at least 1540, when Cristóbal de Quesada arrived with Coronado and painted one of the first European-style landscapes of North America. It marks a milestone of expedition artwork, in which Europeans represented newly occupied territories for audiences “back home,” facilitating imaginative possession of these lands. Quesada’s paintings may well be lost, and nothing is known except that he painted on animal hide. With European training, he likely used a naturalistic style of realism, perhaps drawing on Flemish trends predominating in fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century Iberia. These would have treated landscape from a high vantage, tilting it up and splaying it across a space of map-like legibility (figures 9.1-9.2).

Sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Zuni conceptions of Hawikku as a place were probably very different. According to ethnographic sources and present-day religious leaders, Zunis think of their material surroundings as having spiritual, sentient essences: as conscious, “raw” persons. They describe humans on the other hand, as “cooked” persons, who experience landscape relationally through personal obligation and responsibility to all lifeforms and places. Within their cyclical conception of time, the past remains continuous and present in the present. Zunis therefore believe ancestral spirits still inhabit the sites of their oral histories, and perceive direct, umbilical connections integrating their cultural landscape through trails, shrines, springs, and waterways. Rooted in their long relationship to the land, Zunis maintain these connections through careful stewardship and consultation; pilgrimages, prayers, songs, and offerings; oral
traditions; continued collection of resources; artmaking; and other practices. Recent initiatives include the A:shiwi A:wan Museum and Heritage Center’s Zuni Emergence and Migration Mural (1997), and Zuni Map Art Projects, as well as a monitoring partnership with the National Parks Service in areas such as the Grand Canyon, and participation in a coalition of five Indigenous nations for the preservation of Bears Ears National Monument. Many elements of migration accounts and Zuni relational concepts of place were likely part of Hawikku’s cultural landscape, since petroglyphs and material culture attest to significant cultural continuity.

Against the backdrop of these varied conceptions of Hawikku’s landscape, this chapter explores the Purísima Concepción’s architectural form as a rhetorical statement, communicating Franciscan ideas of place in seventeenth-century New Mexico. Working outward from the shared design of Zuni missions at Hawikku and Halona, I establish the importance of cloister plans for seventeenth-century New Mexico conventos. These buildings were crucial to Franciscan evangelization as centers for sustained interactions between missionaries and local Pueblo Indians. Cloister plans were neither inevitable nor strictly utilitarian design choices; rather, their use was an assertion of meaning based in monastic precedents, millenarianism, and mendicant identity. Descriptions by Estevan de Perea and Alonso de Benavides contextualize missionaries’ reliance on cloister plans throughout New Mexico in the 1620s and 1630s, presenting a spectrum of meanings both pragmatic and apocalyptic. Franciscans constructed these meanings discursively through thought, speech, and written exchange, and they were implicated in architectural design and colonial placemaking. Considering these implications provides a baseline for understanding the intentions of Franciscan missionaries in seventeenth-century New Mexico, sharply contrasting Native understandings of place. Mark T. Lycette describes the mission landscape as an “accretional and imbricated palimpsest,” in which Native
and Spanish parties constructed overlapping, often divergent layers of meaning. This chapter explores one such layer as a foundation for Chapter 10 and future research expanding upon Pueblo responses to missionization through Hawikku’s material culture.

**The Zuni Mission Design**

Cloister plans were the underlying design common to seventeenth-century New Mexico mission *conventos*, with inwardly-focused rooms and ambulatory corridors around a central, open-air patio. This plan adhered to one side of the mission church, controlling access while allowing maximum internal spatial integration, and facilitating lighting and ventilation with arcades or windows. It grouped the mission components together, reflecting the monastic ideal of individual brothers bound together by their vows. The Zuni missions had almost identical cloisters, and other unusual features indicate that they shared a single design in common.

As at Hawikku, Halona’s mission sat southeast of the old hilltop pueblo (Halona:wa North) on an ash heap or midden (figure 9.3). Today, Middle Village remains the heart of Zuni Pueblo, which is the cultural center and seat of tribal government (figures 9.4-9.5). Restored at least three times, the badly deteriorating remains of the Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe church stand in an elongated plaza (figure 9.6). It endured longer than Hawikku’s mission, surviving until 1680 when Zunis burned it and retreated from the town. When the community returned, the pueblo expanded to surround the reconstructed mission, which remained in use until the early nineteenth century (see Chapter 4). The church exists today as a smaller, partially reworked relic without a *convento*, which Zunis deconstructed during the nineteenth century (figures 2.1, 2.3-2.5, 2.7, 4.45, 4.47, 7.57).
In 1966, the National Park Service (NPS) excavated the Halona church and *convento* prior to restoration efforts (figures 7.134, 7.136, 9.7-9.8). Archaeologist Louis R. Caywood oversaw the work, with assistance from architectural historian Russell L. Jones, and Edmund J. Ladd, a Zuni Tribal member and NPS anthropologist. The Catholic St. Anthony Mission funded the work, but notably Governor Robert Lewis, Lt. Governor Casa Appa, and the Tribal Council approved it, along with twenty-one Zuni priests and religious leaders, led by Head Rain Priest (*K’yakwe Mossi*) Mecalita Wytsalucy. More recent constructions and utility trenches had destroyed parts of the original mission, while Caywood’s cavalier attitude, poor documentation, incomplete publication, and subsequent loss of field notebooks add to the difficulty of interpreting these remains. What emerges in spite of Caywood’s shoddy methods is a plan remarkably similar to Hawikku’s (figures 9.9, 9.14). Both missions had cloister-form *conventos* attached to single nave churches with unusual intercardinal orientations placing their sanctuaries to the southwest (figures 9.10). Each church also had a choir loft, a “shouldered” sanctuary design for flanking subsidiary altars, a gospel side sacristy, and an attached baptistery on the epistle side of the *sotocoro* (figures 9.12-9.18).

As with the Purísima Concepción, Halona’s *convento* had an almost square, central patio, four surrounding ambulatories, and three ranges of rooms on the perimeter (figure 9.19). Its front range comprised a stairwell, *portería*, and *celda-trascelda* pair at the eastern corner (figures 9.19-9.24). Unlike Hawikku, the Halona *convento* had a second pair of cells around the eastern corner, extending beyond the rectangular confine of the side range (figure 9.25). According to Domínguez, a kitchen and stable stood further south along the side range, but excavations discovered little about this area, lying near or beneath the *Ohhewa* kiva today (figure 9.26).
The mission’s back range comprised storage rooms and a sacristy, and had no service patio in the eighteenth century (figures 9.27).22

The many similarities between Hawikku and Halona’s missions led Ivey to argue for a shared single plan built contemporaneously at both sites, in contrast to authors who thought Halona’s structure simply postdates the Pueblo Revolt.23 I believe solid evidence points to Halona’s plan and parts of the walls predating 1680, making them contemporaneous with those of Hawikku.24 Their churches shared a design and intercardinal orientation that was quite rare throughout the Spanish Borderlands. The only other New Mexico examples of seventeenth-century churches with apses towards the southwest and portals to the northeast are the Zuni visita chapel of Kechiba:wa and San Bernardo at Awatovi Pueblo (figure 9.10-9.11). Elsewhere, similar orientations possibly existed at San Pedro y San Pablo de Patale (occupied c. 1633-1704) among the Apalachee Indians of Spanish Florida, and at the California Mission of San Carlos Borromeo del Río Carmel (1793-1797; figures 9.11, 9.28, 9.80).25 Placement of the baptismal font in a room on the epistle side was another unusual, shared feature of the Zuni missions. The fonts of earlier New Mexico missions stood under the choir loft near the church entrance. Around 1640, friars began building designated baptisteries to one side of the sotocoro. These were usually on the gospel side, and there is only one other seventeenth-century epistle-side baptistery, at the unfinished church of San Buenaventura, Las Humanas Pueblo, which probably post-dates the Zuni missions (figures 9.29, 9.52).26 Finally, the Zuni missions shared remarkably similar cloister-plan conventos, with practically identical front ranges, as well as kitchens, hallways, and sacristies in the same locations.27 Separated by less than fifteen kilometers, the unusual shared features of the Zuni missions strongly support attribution to a single designer, although they were not quite carbon copies of each other. Their basic plans were established
when missionaries returned to the Zuni region around the 1650s, with construction complete by 1661. Hawikku’s mission period ended in 1672, while after the Pueblo Revolt Halona was cleaned, repaired, and refloored, parts of which still stand.

The Zuni missions were built in a vernacular style that was consonant with Pueblo construction techniques but deeply rooted in Iberian architecture. In spite of these vernacular roots, however, they incorporate some features suggestive of more esoteric building practices. It was Kubler who first hypothesized the orientations of New Mexico mission churches might have produced intentional lighting effects. The rare direction of the two Zuni churches may be specially related to the summer solstice, like that of San Carlos Borromeo in California. Rubén G. Mendoza and the Mission Solstice Project propose San Carlos’s orientation and star-shaped choir window intentionally spotlighted its sanctuary at sunrise during the solstices. The similar orientation of Zuni missions may have had comparable lighting effects on the altar from a choir loft opening or transverse clerestory. At the time of the 2017 summer solstice, the Zuni mission clearly appeared to align with the sunrise, although I was not able to go inside or open the choir loft door to fully test this hypothesis (figure 9.30). Given the prominence of the sun in Zuni beliefs, as well as similar orientations among their kivas today (figure 9.3), the Halona and Hawikku missions may have been planned around dramatic solstice lighting effects to evoke or compete with traditional Zuni beliefs.

Sacred geometry is another esoteric architectural discourse with possible relevance to the plan of the Zuni missions. Architectural historians have argued mission designs in Mexico, Texas, Sonora, and California relied upon modular geometric systems based in medieval masonry, which were believed to convey universal, mystical meanings and echo divine cosmic order. Ferreting out traces of sacred geometry is not my objective in this project, but one basic
geometric procedure is worth noting. Although not perfectly square, both cloisters appear to manifest the geometric process of “doubling the square” (figure 9.31), in which designers traced a circle around the exterior of the patio’s four corners, and subsequently marked a new, larger square outside the circle to define the ambulatory. These steps doubled the patio area, producing a ratio of 2:1, which sacred geometry posited as an expression of divine consonance and union at the heart of the establishment. The Zuni cloisters were reasonably close to the proportions of doubled squares, and the design process juxtaposing squares and a circle conventionally signified the fusion of terrestrial and heavenly realms. Whether the Zuni missions encoded other aspects of sacred geometry remains uncertain, and they might instead exhibit basic rules of thumb and memories of more intricate geometric designs from Europe or Mexico. Nevertheless, their plans accurately map the friars’ idea of what was most important in a mission: the cloister-form at the heart of the *convento*, married to an adjacent church.

**The Cloister Form in Seventeenth-Century New Mexico**

Beyond the Zuni missions, cloister plans were widespread among seventeenth-century New Mexico *conventos*. Of fifty-two Franciscan sites in New Mexico prior to 1680, cloister-form plan occurred at every formal *convento* for which information is available (Table 9.1). Perhaps non-destructive remote sensing technologies will help to identify, better understand, and manage these largely buried cultural resources in the future. Meanwhile, archaeological evidence exists for nine *conventos*, confirming the cloister plan’s importance, and offering insight into its variations (Table 9.2).
None of the nine conventos dates to the first decades of the mission campaign, when adaptations of existing structures provided expedient housing that later formal conventos eventually replaced. Five conventos were part of the major expansion in the 1620s and early 1630s, at Pecos, Abó, Quarai, Acoma, and Awatovi Pueblos. Along with commencement of the San Buenaventura convento at Las Humanas, the Zuni conventos belong to a second burst of midcentury construction and renovation of existing missions. The sole chronological outlier is San Marcos in the Galisteo Basin (c. 1638-1640), which falls in between. Each of the nine had a central, rectangular patio with ambulatories on all four sides. Acoma’s cloister was largest, with a patio area of 415 square meters (4,471.88 ft.²), followed by Pecos and San Marcos at roughly half its size. The Zuni missions had medium-sized cloisters, while smaller examples occurred at the Salinas missions and Awatovi (the smallest, only 71.5 m.²/769.80 ft.²).

The most important and only extant example of a seventeenth-century New Mexico cloister is Acoma’s San Esteban, which gives a sense of the environment of a mission residency (figures 7.129, 9.32-9.35). Acoma did not destroy its mission in 1680, and while the community has often reroofed the convento, its plan, and walls reflect the original structure of Fray Juan Ramírez’s design. Solid adobe walls with small, barred windows lit the ambulatory, around an almost square patio, with a second story and rooftop walkway above. Limited patio excavations exposed at least three mission-period configurations, of which the first probably belongs to the seventeenth century. It included narrow sandstone benches around the perimeter of the patio and walls extending towards its center, one with a circular masonry socket, perhaps for a post (figure 9.36-9.37). Though inconclusive, these fragments are consistent with the benches, quadripartite division of space, and pathways of sixteenth-century Mexican patios (figure 9.38). Other features included a small privy (figure 9.39) in the northeast corner, and
infant burials in the southwest.¹ Large, undated murals of earth pigments on white plaster, covered Acoma’s ambulatory walks, including images of mounted horsemen; animals such as deer, antelope, and elk; and symbols of rainbows and terraced clouds (figures 9.40-9.43). Probably dating to the eighteenth century, these extensive murals show that conventos could be boldly colored visual environments, filled with Native significance.²

The Salinas mission cloisters were much smaller than Acoma’s. Abó’s cloister originally had arcaded walls, with rectangular corner piers, two pillars centered between them on either side, and intervening balustrades of reddish sandstone in mud mortar (figure 9.44-9.45).³ Subsequent alterations enclosed the arcades and changed wall locations to produce solid massing with inwardly splayed windows (figure 9.46).⁴ Quarai’s convento also began as an open structure, with rectangular sandstone and mud mortar pillars at its corners, and intervening wooden post-and-lintel arcades (figure 9.47). Low masonry balustrades stood between the posts, with central openings on the north and south sides. Fray Juan Gutiérrez de la Chica probably designed the convento around 1625, introducing an unusual transverse hallway on its east side that bypassed the ambulatories for many everyday activities (figure 9.49).⁵ The cloister retained symbolic importance, since one had to pass through it when entering from the portería, or going to the church through the sacristies. It continued to mediate the arrival of visitors and frame religious experiences of mission community members. Renovators in the late 1650s enclosed the patio walls with solid masonry, rounding out its internal corners, and leaving splayed windows on each side (figures 9.48, 8.50-8.51).⁶ Both the Quarai and Abó missions had a convento kiva centered in the middle of their patios originally. San Gregorio’s kiva was round, while that of Quarai was rectangular, and both had typical hatchways, fire pits, deflectors, and ventilation shafts, but no identifiable sipapus (see Table 9.2; figures 2.21-2.22).⁷
Las Humanas’s *convento* was the last of the Salinas missions, built under Fray Diego de Santandér (1660-1662). It was a residency for only a few years, and betrays an inexperienced designer who idealized the plan, making all rooms the same size, each with a single exterior window along with a double-size refectory (figure 9.52). The patio was nearly square, with a pair of inwardly splayed windows in each of its limestone walls, and a single doorway from the ambulatory (figure 9.53-9.54).48

Pecos Pueblo’s cloister is the earliest example from New Mexico, and the least regular, initially comprising an uneven quadrilateral of adobe brick walls around a large patio. It was an ad hoc structure, beginning as a double range of rooms extending south from the church under construction by Fray Pedro de Ortega (mid-1620 to 1621, figure 9.55). Ortega probably laid out the overall plan, but his successor Andrés Juárez completed its construction between 1621 and 1634. Juárez retained the skewed footprint, enclosing several spaces (Rooms 14, 15, and 16) that Ortega had probably intended as the west ambulatory corridor. Juárez completed his adaptation of the cloister form with corridors on three sides around the rhomboid patio (figure 9.56).49 In the early 1630s, he renovated the plan, inserting a new ambulatory within the original patio, significantly reducing its area and allowing for the partition of the first hallways as individual rooms.50 Juárez retained the cloister form at a reduced scale and paved with sandstone slabs, supplanting Awatovi as the smallest patio, while he likely also built a *convento* kiva in the nearby service patio (figures 9.57-9.60).51 The Pecos *convento* was the least regular in New Mexico, but it reinforced the importance of the cloister form to missionaries. Juárez adapted the plan when Ortega’s initial construction prevented a complete ambulatory, but he reiterated a full cloister form in miniature when given the opportunity a few years later.
In contrast, San Marcos in the Galisteo Basin presents a very regular cloister plan, although its excavation (1998 to 2000) still awaits full publication. The available plan (figure 9.61) shows a patio that is exactly square, with an ambulatory and single-tier of rooms on all four sides.\textsuperscript{52} The other Galisteo missions are not excavated, but an early surface survey of San Cristobál includes ruins of what Nels Nelson believed was an “L” shaped convento (figure 9.62).\textsuperscript{53} Clearly the residence had an open, partially enclosed patio at center. I suspect the remaining east side was enclosed as well, a hypothesis that could be tested with a geophysical survey.

Most sites easily accommodated construction of a cloister-form convento adjacent to the mission church, but sometimes constraints forced missionaries to greater lengths replicating the cloister plan, indicating its importance. For example, San José at Giusewa Pueblo (present day Jemez State Monument) was built on a steep hillside over a small tributary of San Diego Canyon, necessitating leveling and cutting down into bedrock on its uphill side (figure 9.63-9.64). The high ridge and canyon bounding the site required rearrangement of mission elements to fit the quadrant-shaped plot. The massive limestone church established the mission’s western side, while a quadrangular arrangement of rooms against its epistle flank hints at the likely existence of a cloister-plan at the convento center.\textsuperscript{54} Around this symbolic core, builders distributed rooms, corrals, and open areas as space allowed.

Awatovi’s constricted site was even more challenging, relegating the mission to a long, narrow plot on top of 6.10 meters (20’) of accumulated rubble at the edge of Antelope Mesa (figure 9.65-9.66).\textsuperscript{55} The cramped site precluded a convento alongside the church, so the designer chose an elongated arrangement instead, placing a cloister-plan residence southwest of the church, but on axis with it, and inserting a wing of rooms linking the sacristy and cloister
Rather than adopting a linear structure better suited to the narrow strip, the designer rearranged basic mission components to preserve a rectangular cloister within the site confines. Hopis reoccupied the cloister during the Pueblo Revolt, obscuring many original features, but it appears they followed the outlines of earlier ambulatory corridors around what was the smallest original patio in seventeenth-century New Mexico. Excavations indicate it probably had sandstone pavement and possibly a convento kiva at center.

All known seventeenth-century missions in New Mexico employed a variation of the cloister form as their core residential structure, yet historians have said little about this important component of the colonial built environment, considering it inevitable rather than investigating its meaning to designers and builders. Cloister-plan conventos were neither required by Franciscan regulations nor inevitable, as becomes evident by comparison to missions elsewhere in the Spanish Borderlands. Some contemporary establishments had quadrangular conventos, but lacked ambulatory corridors, resulting in open patios no different than civilian residences and haciendas. For example, the Franciscan mission of San Antonio de Padua in Casas Grandes had a quadrangular patio along its single-nave adobe church, but each room opened directly onto the patio, lacking transitional ambulatories (c. 1660-1682, figure 9.67).

Comparison to contemporaneous missions in Spanish Florida widens the range of formal options available to Franciscan designers. Only the Provincial head establishment of San Francisco in St. Augustine resembled a cloister plan, with an initial structure of wood and thatch (c. 1588), but subsequent reconstructions (early 1600s/c. 1737-1750) as apparent iterations of half of a cloister plan in timber and then local coquina stone, having ranges and open arcades (portales) on only two sides of the patio (figure 9.68). Outside St. Augustine, missionaries interpreted quadrangular plans loosely, if at all, in timber frame structures, with wattle-and-daub
or plank walls, thatched roofs, and earthfast foundations. Santa Catalina de Guale on St. Catherine’s Island off the Georgian coast had three freestanding buildings with a central plaza between them (established early 1590, destroyed 1597, rebuilt 1604, figure 9.69). These structures were the church, kitchen, and living quarters, with functions separated and arranged quite distinctly from the cloister model. Missions among the Apalachee in west Florida had at least two independent buildings: a large church, and a smaller residence at a distance from the church and perpendicular to its longitudinal axis. Occasionally a third structure stood further away, with space between the buildings forming a courtyard that was possibly fenced. (figure 9.70). San Luis Talimali (established between 1633 and 1656), had a traditional Mississippian council house (buhio) fronting the town plaza, where missionaries grafted their establishment onto the existing social structure and tapped into the authority of traditional elites, forming a blended Spanish-Indigenous space quite distinct from those of colonial New Mexico. Cloister plans may have been poorly suited to Florida’s Native societies, climate, and resources, but missionaries do not appear to have tried them in any case.

Another way to solve a mission’s residential needs was to group all necessary functions together in a single structural range. While quadrangular designs distributed rooms around a central patio, single-range plans packed them together on one or two floors beneath a single, usually pitched roof. This form also had Iberian precedents, where Franciscan houses sometimes added single-range extensions to existing cloister-form conventos. For example, San Francisco de Belví de Monroy includes a two-story, el-shaped extension with larger refectory and individual cells probably dating between 1592 and 1628 (figures 9.71-9.72). Single-range plans were especially common among eighteenth-century missions in Texas and Alta California,
where friars congregated entire towns of Native peoples in wide, fortified plazas. Examples include the el-shaped range of San José y San Miguel de Aguayo (between 1739 and 1778) and residence of the Purísima Concepción de Acuña (c. 1756-1762, figures 9.73-9.76), both in San Antonio, TX. In California, single-range conventos include San Carlos Borromeo del Río Carmelo (c. 1770-1797), San Fernando Rey de España in Mission Hills (established 1797), and the Purísima Concepción, near Lompoc (1815, figures 9.77-9.82).

Franciscan regulations did not mandate cloister form residences; instead, construction was to be “according to the conditions of the place,” empowering missionaries to accommodate local material and rhetorical needs. Florida missions demonstrate a willingness to adapt, selectively drawing on Iberian vernacular techniques and formal solutions alongside Indigenous building traditions to best fit their context. The reliance on cloister plans throughout seventeenth-century New Mexico is best understood as an active, conservative design choice, reworking Mexican precedents with medieval European roots, even as Franciscans elsewhere adopted other designs. Enclosure of New Mexico’s patio walls diminished the lighting and ventilation benefits of an arcaded cloister, implying functional needs were not foremost in the minds of their designers. Likewise, the insistence on cloister plans even on poorly suited sites indicates the form was important in itself.

I contend the symbolism of the cloister form was more significant than its utility and familiarity. The ideas associated with the cloister, and their relevance to how missionaries wanted to frame their evangelization campaign, were of primary importance. As an architectural type, Franciscan designers replicated cloister forms regardless of local conditions in New Mexico, although their proportions and location relative to the church were negotiable. Cloisters were connotative, symbolic structures communicating the missionaries’ conceptions of their
campaign while physically framing everyday interactions among mission community participants.

**Development and Transmission of the Franciscan Cloister Form**

Franciscans did not invent the cloister plan; rather, it had deep roots in European monasticism that they latched onto as part of their architectural rhetoric. Benedictines, who codified the form in the eighth century, saw the cloister as both an architectural design and a particular way of religious life focusing on seclusion from laity (*clausura*), permanent residence in one monastery (*stabilitas loci*), and vowed obedience to a governing abbot. Early Benedictine cloisters occur in monasteries such as the Abbey of Lorsch (built 765-774), and the Plan of St. Gall (figures 9.8.3-9.8.4). To create quarters conducive to secluded, communal lifestyles, Benedictines adapted the open-patio form of Roman-era *villa rustica*, which had ancient sources in the Mediterranean and Mesopotamian regions. This form was consonant with building practices in Iberia, where Romans had introduced similar central-patio houses. These remained a domestic pattern of Al-Andalus, where houses around rectangular courtyards with porticos on one or two sides were common.

The term “cloister” itself comes from classical and early Christian sources, from the root *claustrum* which signifies a barrier to entry such as a bolt, bar, or door key. By extension, the word meant a confined and secure place, and since Benedictines vowed obedience and seclusion, it came to mean the enclosed patio at the heart of the monastic establishment. For these monks, the cloister was the multipurpose space of common life, where they read, prayed, meditated, and made processions, but also the place where they bathed, washed their clothes, and did the dishes.
Individual monks and children dedicated to serve the monastery (*pueri* and *juvenes*) each had an assigned seating space in the cloister, turning gatherings into visual manifestations of monastic order. In many monasteries, monks were silent except in prayer, scriptural reading, and liturgical chant, with speech allowed only in the cloister, making it a vital space for addressing everyday needs.\(^{74}\)

Benedictine cloisters were conventionally perfect squares with ambulatories 100 Carolingian feet long (34 by 34 meters/111.55’ by 111.55’), with four paths dividing the patio into quadrants.\(^{75}\) This design carved out a still, peaceful space removed from the world, but also staged interactions among religious community members (figure 3.2, 9.85).\(^{76}\) Its arcades invited visual scrutiny of these engagements, while architectural ornament conferred dignity and aesthetic interest. Through medieval monasteries, the cloister became a symbol of the religious life, and its ideals of seclusion, order, and common pursuit of moral excellence.\(^{77}\) The cloister’s centrality furnished a powerful vehicle for communicating foundational ideals and identities of different religious orders.

It is an oversimplification of mendicant development to claim friars unreflectively adopted cloister forms from monastic orders because of convenience or familiarity.\(^{78}\) As Erik Gustafson argues in his analysis of Franciscan church forms in Tuscany, every reiteration of an existing architectural form is an intentional choice conveying meaning that begs interpretation.\(^{79}\) Early Franciscan lifestyles differed markedly from the monastic orders, and cloisters seem poorly suited to Francis’s emphasis on itinerancy and poverty. His *Earlier Rule* precluded established conventual houses altogether: “wherever the brothers may be, either in hermitages or other places, let them be careful not to make any place their own or contend with anyone for
This initial ideal of absolute, itinerant poverty was not practical, and by 1226 Francis reportedly provided instructions for simple houses on donated urban properties. With consolidation in the 1230s, Franciscans began following the example of the Dominicans, who had been constructing liturgical churches and cloister-form conventual houses based on Cistercian models since 1220. For Dominicans, these forms conveyed ideals of reform, and the cloister with its surrounding individual cells was a “nucleus of action,” where Preachers trained and prepared to engage the secular world. For Franciscans, the cloister’s rhetorical role was different. Early on, they struggled to distinguish themselves from local lay groups focused on piety, care of the sick, and preaching. Francis’s first disciples were probably indistinguishable from these pauperistic movements, living in small, rustic camps of simple buildings on town margins. During their first decades, the Franciscans encountered frequent challenges from secular opponents, to the point that Pope Gregory IX briefly revoked their privileges in 1254. Under these pressures, Franciscans needed architecture to convey a sense of establishment within the greater church while distinguishing them from other lay groups focused on poverty. The increasing number of educated clerics joining the movement in the 1230s and 1240s further impelled institutionalization and the establishment of permanent accommodations. Cloisters answered these needs, legitimizing Franciscan houses by association with earlier monastic history and dignifying what had begun as an unconsolidated group of itinerate lay preachers. The construction of cloisters alongside new Franciscan churches by the 1240s was a rhetorical act, identifying the friars as an established religious order of the Catholic Church, rather than a popular movement.

Franciscans were well aware of architecture’s potential for expressing rhetorical and connotative meanings. In Tuscany, for example, church form became “the primary articulation
of Franciscan identity.”86 Tuscan friars consistently employed wooden truss ceilings over single-nave churches, with a range of chapel and transept compositions, although other architectural forms were potentially available for their use.87 They associated the single-nave type with the primitive church and local monastic reforms, in contrast to basilican plans of episcopal churches.88 Allusion to local monastic forms was an intentional “mechanism of legitimization” articulating Franciscans’ unique position within the church.89 Other signifiers of identity for both Franciscans and Dominicans included large open plazas for preaching; incorporation of earlier buildings as prestigious precedents; intentional incompletion of major building projects as a sign of poverty; and an organic approach to construction responsive to the wishes of their patrons.90

As in Italy, Iberian Franciscans were conscious of architectural rhetoric, appropriating sites of earlier Islamic structures, and both Observant and strictly observant reformers adopted cloister-form conventos, reiterating the basic spatial form with various stylistic articulations.91 For example, the “Mudéjar Cloister” of Observant Santa María de la Rábida (c. 1400-1450) has fired-brick arcades of horseshoe arches, painted ambulatories, and a rectangular patio (figure 3.10).92 In contrast, the earliest cloister of Observant San Francisco el Real in Cáceres (c. 1480-1520s) has gothic ribbed vaulting over its corners, barrel vaulted corridors, and heavy buttressing in the patio (figure 9.85).93 Following Juan Guas’s design, San Juan de los Reyes in Toledo displays even more ornate Isabeline gothic ornamentation (1477-1504, figure 9.86).94 As time went on, newly constructed or renovated cloisters in classical or Herrerian style replaced the earlier gothic, as with the second cloister at Cáceres (c. 1548-1569), or the Observant conventos of San Francisco in Garrovillas (established c. 1476-1479, with convento renovated 1556 and 1656-1661) and Trujillo (established 1500, convento rebuilt c. 1562-1600; figures 9.87-9.98).95
The high-style ornamentation and chapels of Observant houses dignified noble patrons (figures 3.7-3.8), while cloister-form *conventos* of more eremitic, strictly observant Franciscans were small and simple. An example is the heavily restored San Francisco del Berrocal, outside Belvís de Monroy, from where the *doce* were commissioned in 1523 (built 1505-1509, figure 9.90). It retains the cloister form, with small size and simple stone cutting reflecting the stricter poverty of its reformist founders. The diminutive cloister that Pedro de Alcántara and two other friars built in 1557 at the Purísima Concepción of El Palancar takes the form’s signifying potential to an extreme (figures 9.91-9.92). As leader of the sixteenth-century discalced Franciscan reforms, Alcántara’s house of recollection or retreat has a central patio only a little more than one meter square (3.28’), with rustic, unornamented wood and rubble masonry. This *conventito* or “mini-convento” signifies the austerity at the heart of Alcántara’s efforts and actively enforced it on the cramped bodies of eight to ten friars living alongside him.

Franciscan precedents in Europe indicate friars used architectural form and style rhetorically to convey information about how they saw themselves (identity), and their place within the spatial and temporal world (cosmology), which continued in sixteenth-century Mexico. Unfortunately, Mexico’s earliest mission constructions remain largely unknown. Friars probably began by preaching in open-air patios and improvised sites, which eventually became formalized as open-air, walled enclosures with vernacular chapels. The only well-excavated early mission in central Mexico is Huejotzingo, where the first structures comprised a simple, open-sided church next to an adobe brick room that was probably the friar’s residence (c. 1524-1529; figure 9.93). The church had a basilica plan of three aisles, with stone pillars supporting the roof of the wide central nave, and wooden posts demarcated the side aisles. This church was rebuilt c. 1530 to 1545, enclosing the side-aisles with faced-stone and rubble walls, and
adding an open patio north of the church and an open chapel to the south (figure 9.94). A
cloister-plan *convento* was probably built further south, eventually becoming encased within the
formal mission (c. 1545 to 1580). Cloisters were not part of Mexico’s earliest evangelization,
but Franciscans began constructing them as soon as they became more established.

By the 1540s, Viceroy Antonio de Mendoza collaborated with mendicant leaders to
develop a standardized plan or *traza moderada* for New Spanish missions. No copies survive,
but documents reference it by 1548, and the basic elements survive in mission establishments
such as San Miguel Calpan, on the slopes of Iztaccíhuatl in the present-day state of Puebla (c.
1550, figures 9.95-9.96). San Miguel’s single-nave church and adjoining *convento* face a large,
open-air atrium with four *posa* chapels for processions and neighborhood meetings. The main
open chapel could be integrated into the mission’s *portería*, as at Calpan, or could be free-
standing, turning the atrium into an open-air church on crowded feast-days. *Conventos*
maintained cloister plans as in Huejotzingo’s second phase, adapting monastic form to the new
context of Indigenous *doctrinas*. *Convento* patios typically had a cistern, well, fountain, or tree
at center (figures 9.97-9.98), with surrounding arcades and stylized architectural ornamentation
as at San Bernardino in Xochimilco (c. 1550, figure 9.99).

While Mexico’s arcaded, open-air patios had numerous functional benefits, they were
also important connotative signifiers, expressing a sense of identity among missionaries and
“reflect[ing] the desire to be a recognizable part of this enterprise” of colonization. They were
processional spaces through which the friars led groups of Native converts on “pilgrimages,”
stopping at corner niche altars (*tersteras*) where they placed the sacramental host to receive
adoration, symbolically bringing Christ to the four corners of the world. Murals emphasized
Christ’s passion, the nobility of the holy family, paradisiacal associations, and the prestige of the
local mendicant order.\textsuperscript{105} Latin monasticism was the idealized model and referent that Mexican friars evoked by using cloister plans as representational signs; mission communities sought to transform Native society according to those monastic precedents.\textsuperscript{106} In this spirit, Mendieta retrospectively described the Mexican province of Santo Evangelio as a collective religious community, saying rather aspirationally that the Indians lived “in such good Christianity that it seemed as if the whole province were a monastery.”\textsuperscript{107}

Other important organizational shifts among the Franciscans accompanied adoption of the cloister form in Mexico. From the start, missionaries were divided between Observant friars and those from houses of the strict reforms Juan de la Puebla initiated in the late-fifteenth century. Observant Franciscans such as Peeter van der Moere of Ghent (Pedro de Gante) or Vasco de Quiroga were more likely to draw on Renaissance humanism and such figures as Desiderius Erasmus and Thomas More. Although still religious fundamentalists, they were not as rigorous as strictly observant reformers, and sometimes held rather utopian attitudes towards missionization.\textsuperscript{108} The strictly observant friars came mostly from the Custody of San Gabriel in Extremadura, and practiced rigorous retreat, self-discipline, and extreme poverty.\textsuperscript{109}

The original doce were strictly observant friars, whose view predominated in Mexico until the mid-1500s, when Spanish Observants and native-born friars increasingly comprised a more diverse body of missionaries in New Spain.\textsuperscript{110} Within this mix was a faction of relajados who rejected strict adherence to Francis’s example, and even well-respected missionaries such as Juan Foucher advocated a flexible approach to Franciscan spirituality in the field.\textsuperscript{111} The Franciscans were never monolithic, having factional divisions among moderate and extreme approaches to evangelization, as well as between friars trained more rigorously in Iberia (peninsulares), and those coming up in New Spain (criollos).\textsuperscript{112} These distinctions matter
because missions following the *traza moderada* in Mexico were much more like the *conventos* and single-nave churches of Observant establishments (figures 3.10, 3.12, 9.85-9.89) than they were Iberia’s strictly observant houses (figures 3.13, 9.90-9.92). New Mexico’s seventeenth-century missionaries took their inspiration in turn from the formal missions of central Mexico.

**Medieval Symbolism and the Cloister Form**

The significance of cloister-form *conventos* in seventeenth-century New Mexico went beyond formal roots to entangled associative meanings, which developed through medieval Biblical interpretation and commentary. Many incorporate a distinctly Franciscan conception of time and space in which friars saw themselves as an apostolic vanguard re-living Biblical and apocalyptic models among Early Modern Indigenous communities. Particularly relevant to New Spain’s mendicant *conventos* were connotations of sacred geometry; associations with Jerusalem and the Garden of Eden; and the articulation of a cosmological center at the heart of the mission and its sacralized landscape.

The cloister’s centrality, monastic precedents, and aesthetic qualities produced a richly potent signifier drawing together a tightly interwoven network of commonly understood meanings arising from medieval commentary and practice. These connotations belong to a larger Christian tradition of interpreting the terrestrial world as symbolizing the spiritual realm, which missionaries carried with them to Mexico and New Mexico. Medieval authors, particularly among the Scholastics, variously describe the cloister as a church, a school, a wrestling ground, a camp of soldiers, the tomb of Christ, and Jacob’s ladder. Within monastic traditions of secluded contemplation, the cloister could be an ark or haven of refuge; a fortress; a
voluntary prison; or even a fishpond captivating monks as the physical body was believed to entrap the soul. Medieval commentators such as Sicard of Cremona and William Durandus presented allegories of the cloister as a symbol of the contemplative soul, with each side, column, and even column base having specific meanings tied to self-discipline and love of God.

The cloister’s proportions took on further significance through the precepts of sacred geometry underlying medieval architectural practice, which held that squares express stability through the uniformity of their equal sides (a 1:1 relationship). Christian theology extended this perceived harmony to the relationship between God the Father and God the Son, as the foundation of order throughout creation. Masons relied upon squares, often from the plan of the cloister patio, as the basic design module from which they derived the convento’s other measures. They obtained many proportions through simple geometric procedures such as “doubling the square.” European conventions associated circles with celestial perfection and squares with the terrestrial plane; the process of doubling the square juxtaposed these shapes on the convento, representing the union of heaven and earth in the heart of monastic or conventual living quarters (figure 9.31). The cloister square also reflected the perceived perfection of the number four, or divine quaternity, which designers emphasized through four pathways meeting at the center of the patio. This form, the circle or square with a quadripartite division, was an ancient geometric scheme that Christians were using by the eighth century to symbolize their cosmos.

The idealism of sacred geometry later found its apocalyptic counterpart in the “end-times” or eschatological theology of many Franciscan missionaries. They were deeply invested in a millenarian imaginary, believing the end of the world and the triumph of Christianity were
near at hand, and that God had “revealed” Indigenous peoples to Christian Europe for their conversion at the end of time. For these friars, Jerusalem was a potent symbol, both historically and prophetically, foreshadowing the celestial city of John’s prophecy in Revelations 21.\textsuperscript{120} Medieval theologians and Renaissance Franciscans such as Italian Gaspar Gorritio understood Jerusalem as a multi-level symbol for the historical city, the militant church, the believer’s soul, and the church triumphant or John’s heavenly city.\textsuperscript{121} Reconstructing Jerusalem and the Temple in Palestine preoccupied some millenarians such as Christopher Columbus, while others hoped to build them anew amongst Native Americans, whom they imagined were Israel’s lost tribes.\textsuperscript{122}

Millenarian friars in Joachim of Fiore’s tradition expected a Messiah-Emperor to arise from cosmic warfare during the end times, establishing a New Jerusalem on earth and a last millennial age enduring until final judgement. In this third age, humanity would become progressively perfected, living in apostolic poverty. Some saw Francis himself as the new Messiah, while others interpreted the \textit{Reyes Catolicas} or Charles V as messianic rulers divinely charged to eliminate heretics, Judaism, Islam, and Native American religions through universal evangelism and colonial power.\textsuperscript{123} This militant belief lasted through the sixteenth century, from Fray Francisco de los Angeles Quiñones entreating Mexico’s first missionaries as “sons” going into the Father’s vineyard “as the day of the world sunk into its eleventh hour” in 1523, to Mendieta’s writing and death in 1604.\textsuperscript{124} After about 1549, however, millenarians and strictly observant friars seem to have declined among New Spanish missionaries, while \textit{criollo} friars with less rigorous training became common.\textsuperscript{125} In 1578, the execution of Dominican millenarian Francisco de la Cruz for heresy in Lima discredited Joachimite apocalypticism in the Spanish court, although it persisted in a more “quietly subversive” mode.\textsuperscript{126}
Mendieta and Fray Juan de Torquemada present the *doce’s* arrival in Mexico City as typologically analogous to Christ’s entry into Jerusalem, and the soul’s entry to heaven.\textsuperscript{127} Apostolic comparisons were crucial to this cosmological framing of colonization, regarding missionaries as new versions of Christ’s original followers, the apostles, as well as Francis’s early disciples.\textsuperscript{128} For Mendieta, the “primitive” or apostolic church prior to the 313 CE Edict of Milan, which gave the Christian church legal status, was more true than the institutionalized Constantinian church that followed it. He believed American colonization had renewed the Primitive church by geographic extension, revitalizing its pre-Constantinian roots after an interlude of eleven centuries.\textsuperscript{129} With this lofty sense of identity, mendicants regularly challenged civil jurisdiction and authority over Native communities. Millenarian Franciscans optimistically hoped to reform Indigenous society in their image of pious poverty, creating a celestial “city” and renewed terrestrial paradise as a mendicant realm.\textsuperscript{130} Mendieta idealized mission towns as monastic schoolrooms in which simple, pure-hearted converts spent hours praising God under paternally watchful friars.\textsuperscript{131}

Millenarian rhetoric often evoked Jerusalem and its Temple(s), symbolizing what Christians believed was both the center of the world and a stage for crucial historical events recurring throughout time. Their heavy symbolic investment in Jerusalem led early Christian artists to idealize it in representations such as the *Madaba Mosaic Map* (c. 542-570 CE; figure 9.100). This image retains elements of the city’s actual layout such as the *Cardo Maximus*, a long arcaded boulevard Romans built in the second century CE. Representing the city from the west with general accuracy, the Church of the Holy Sepulcher appears at center along the *Cardo*, while the Temple Mount is pushed to the upper margin.\textsuperscript{132} This plan fuses topographical and ideological representation, focusing attention on the site of Christ’s crucifixion and burial at the
Holy Sepulcher. Images of Jerusalem became further conventionalized as an enclosed, quadripartite circle or square with a center point or *axis mundi* at its heart (figure 9.101). Mapmakers manipulated the city to fit these simplified, geometric ideals, sometimes adding allegorical content. Conceiving Jerusalem as the world’s sacred-center, medieval T-O maps molded terrestrial geography around the city, conforming to Christian cosmological conceptions of place (figures 9.102-9.103). As they reinvented Jerusalem’s urban landscape, Latin Christians appropriated Islamic structures of the Noble Sanctuary (*Haram esh-Sharif*, figure 9.104). By the 1000s, they generally believed early Umayyad buildings metaphorically or actually belonged to Biblical temple constructions. They identified the Dome of the Rock (*Qubbat al-Sakhrah*, figure 9.105, 9.108) with either Solomon or Herod’s Temple, and the al-Aqsa mosque (figure 9.106) with the Palace, Temple, or Portico of Solomon.

To describe their campaign, mendicant missionaries in New Spain intertwined metaphors such as vineyards, paradisiacal gardens, New Jerusalems, and the Augustinian City of God. In particular, the plans of their missions evoked historic Jerusalem. For example, single nave churches in New Spain had tripartite organizations analogous to the Solomonic Temple’s three sections, as Franciscan Nicolaus de Lyra illustrated them in his *Notes on the Whole Bible* (1322-1331; figure 9.107). The *sotocoro* containing a baptismal font or communicating with the baptistery was akin to the Temple’s vestibule (*ulam*), while the nave and sanctuary corresponded to the holy place (*hechal*), and Holy of Holys (*Duir*). Monastic conventions likewise associated cloister-form residences alongside the church/temple with the “Solomonic portico,” and the Old Testament’s Levite residence. A portico near the Biblical Temple was thought to have been the location of many of Jesus’s activities, as well as the apostles’ meetings to organize their communal life. As historical references became conflated with Umayyad structures, Latin
commentators increasingly likened cloisters to the Al-Aqsa Mosque or porticos near it, transferring Old Testament and apostolic associations to the monastic living quarters.\textsuperscript{139} This translation first appears in Honorius of Autun’s twelfth century writings, which Sicard of Cremona and William Durandus cited and repeated. These after-the-fact associations added a dignified backstory to the already well-established architectural type of the cloister.\textsuperscript{140} There monks and friars enacted their communal lives, trying to emulate these Biblical precedents.\textsuperscript{141}

Cloisters evoke paradise through formal similarity to John’s vision of heavenly Jerusalem, with its enclosing walls, centralized sacred point, and four emerging rivers (figures 9.109-9.110).\textsuperscript{142} This form echoes through the Christian imaginary, back to the original Garden of Eden, where God created humanity and the first people fell from grace in a walled terrestrial paradise with four rivers springing from the tree of knowledge at center (figures 9.111-9.113).\textsuperscript{143} Celibate monks found a paradigm for their lives in Adam’s time alone, living in the garden prior to Eve’s creation, and they anticipated a celestial paradise where believers would live unified in possessions, love, and community.\textsuperscript{144} The walled patio garden of the cloister was open to the sky and metaphorically to God, leading to allegorical readings of the enclosed garden (\textit{hortus conclusus}) as the Virgin Mary who remained open to God’s light in the form of the Christ child (figure 9.114). This trope presents her as private and virginal, while fruitfully producing a way for humanity to regain the lost paradise. Finally, the enclosed garden symbolized the contemplative life, framing monks and friars as gardeners weeding out vices and cultivating virtues in their lives and the Lord’s vineyard.\textsuperscript{145}

Cloister gardens typically had four walkways meeting at the center, where a symbolic fountain, cistern, well, tree, or column stood.\textsuperscript{146} One of the best examples is at Nuestra Señora de la Navidad in Tepoztlán (Dominican, c. 1580, figures 9.115-9.116), which has been fully
excavated and restored to its sixteenth-century form. Similar Franciscan examples occur throughout central Mexico (figures 9.98-9.99, 9.117-9.118). These arrangements were abundantly cosmological, with the four corners, sides, and paths evoking numerologically significant foursomes such as the four directions, four winds, four seasons, and four ends of the earth. The rectangle represented the earth’s terrestrial expanse, with four corner piers symbolizing the posts of a canopy or baldachin of the Universal church spreading out over all the earth, and processions around the ambulatory’s testeras enacted an evangelistic pilgrimage to bring Christ to the world’s four corners.

Cloisters often had water features symbolizing the four rivers which radiated from the trees at the center of Eden and Paradise. Water is significant throughout scripture, from the primitive world’s watery chaos and the Genesis flood, to God’s provision of water in the desert, to baptism and Christ as a font of living water. Theologians interpreted the four paradisiacal rivers as allegories for the Gospels, flowing out from Christ to spread the living waters of baptism throughout the world, yielding a harvest of souls. In Europe, Cistercian cloisters situated along streams especially emphasized water, channeling it into the patio fountains and sinks of the residence for frequent washing. Franciscans likewise thought carefully about water supplies for their Iberian conventos, building aqueducts, incorporating nearby streams, and employing hydraulic features such as filtration systems, water tanks, cisterns, and fountains (figure 9.119). Mendicant missions in New Spain had even more elaborate hydraulic systems, with aqueducts, tanks, and fountains distributing water from the mission to the Indigenous community, sometimes in quadripartite arrangements corresponding to Native neighborhoods or barrios (figure 9.120). Cloister water features such as fountains, wells, cisterns, and channels
were functional but also symbolic, bringing Eden’s paradisiacal fountain and the New Testament’s living water into the heart of the *convento.*

Trees likewise connected to paradise, and the two trees standing at the source of Eden’s four rivers were often conflated as one. Christian cosmology held that time began in Eden where humanity ate from the forbidden Tree of Knowledge, and will end with the faithful entering paradise and enjoying the Tree of Life. Between these temporal points stood the “tree” of Christ’s crucifixion, producing the substitutionary sacrifice and mechanism for humanity to pass from the terrestrial wilderness to the celestial garden. Trees had additional eremitic meanings, often standing near hermitages and metaphorically representing a celestial ladder between heaven and earth. Trees were part of the foundation stories of specific conventual houses, and wooded groves remained places of retreat and contemplation.

The forms of cloister and patio garden resonated with the cosmological implications of a Euro-Christian understanding of time and place, spanning from Genesis until apocalypse and placing Jerusalem at the center of the terrestrial realm. Features symbolizing water and trees represented Christian means of accessing divinity, serving as an *axis mundi* or central point where heaven and earth connect. The cloister’s walls delimited this space, and along with ritual ambulatory processions, marked it as sacred. Altogether, this built environment structured meditation on humanity’s fall; on salvation through Mary and Christ; and on the anticipated apocalyptic victory embodied in the celestial city. The cloister’s form and ornament comprised a dense signifier of the Christian worldview at the heart of the religious community, representing a series of key moments in the Christian imaginary. New Spanish missions were not thoughtless repetitions of familiar cloister forms; rather, missionaries reinvented cloisters as
aspirational symbols for the transformation of Native places and societies into a Christ-centered paradise of the end time.

Turning back to New Mexico, primary sources do not directly describe the cloister’s significance to the friars who repeatedly incorporated it in their conventos. Some changes occurred with the transplanting of cloister designs to the Pueblo world. No seventeenth-century missions have shown quadripartite pathways or central wells in their patios, except possibly early Acoma. Enclosure of patio walls in New Mexico erased an important metaphor of the arcades that in Mexico had come to symbolize apostles, saints, and mendicant founders, with supporting piers and columns allegorically upholding the universal Church.\textsuperscript{160} This metaphor no longer pertained to New Mexico’s solid, mud-plastered patio walls. Absence of testera niches may indicate ambulatory processions were no longer important to mission community practices either.\textsuperscript{161}

The sacred-center connotations of cloister gardens may have received new impetus from the Pueblo context, however, in the form of convento kivas. Franciscans had long been willing to adapt non-Christian architectural forms. In Mexico, they engaged Mesoamerican cosmologies by arranging atria and cloisters as four peripheral points around a symbolic center, entangling Christian paradisiacal gardens with the quincunxial layered cosmos of four directional points around a sacred center pertaining to Mesoamerican cultures. Earlier Franciscan missionaries had used sacred tents among the thirteenth-century Mongols, and because the Spanish sometimes equated Mexican Indians with Muslims, they constructed a number of hypostyle chapels with long rows of columns supporting flat roofs, emulating Islamic places of worship such as the Great Mosque at Cordoba (784-987 CE, figures 2.23-2.24, 9.121).\textsuperscript{162}
Among the pueblos, kivas were essential religious structures, and could be round or rectangular subterranean meeting rooms for religious societies (figures 2.8, 4.36, 5.11, 5.13, 9.26, 9.122-9.123). They had a long history in the Southwest, and often encoded basic elements of Pueblo beliefs and origin accounts describing ancestors emerging from the underworld into the terrestrial realm by climbing trees or reeds. With their underground construction, kivas allude to the underworld and emergence, just as a small hole or sunken firebox in their floors represented even deeper layers. Kiva participants enter and exit by ladder, alluding to ancestral emergence, while other features encode four directional quadrants. Kivas thus represent center places, ancestral existence, and processes of emergence into the present world and social order, among other things.

Convento kivas were probably transitional classrooms or worship spaces for converts at some missions in the early seventeenth century (Table 9.2; figures 2.21-2.22, 9.47-9.48, 9.50, 9.59-9.60, 9.125). As with Mexico’s atrial crosses combining Christian crucifixes with the world tree of Mesoamerican Indigenous belief (figures 9.126-9.127), the formal and cultural convergences of convento kivas with Christian cloister symbolism are too profound to be mere coincidences. The cloister form represented aspects of Eden, Jerusalem, and Paradise, and was thus an architectural meditation on Christian concepts of salvation and the scope of history. To this cosmological symbol, New Mexico missions added kivas, with their sacred center and emergence connotations. This juxtaposition reinforced Pueblo cosmology, but implied Christianity would be an extension of emergence, paralleling Christian beliefs that their religion had developed out of Old Testament Hebrew religious practices. Such a meaningful convergence of forms and ideas around the cloister’s sacred center suggests many cosmological implications of the cloister plan persisted in New Mexico, as friars tried to encourage converts
and allied factions to incorporate novel religious practices in terms of their own cultural experiences and belief systems.

Unfortunately, Nusbaum and Caywood had little interest in excavating the Zuni convento patios, leaving them largely unexplored, and identifying no direct evidence for sacred-center symbolism other than their doubled-square proportions, but the sink from Hawikku’s patio perhaps hints at water associations (figure 7.125). A Matsaki Polychrome bowl with paint-splattered interior, convex base, and central drain, it once sat upon a pedestal and is similar to Hawikku’s baptismal font (figure 7.97). Nusbaum found its sherds along the patio’s southeast wall, closest to the doorway and kitchen side in a location similar to where earlier monasteries often had a lavatory sink for monks to wash prior to dining. However the mission community used it, this sink symbolically introduced water to Hawikku’s patio. Its bold splatters of reddish-brown paint emulate similar sprays inside other Hawikku bowls and jars (ollas), insinuating the splashing and fluidity of water. Perhaps the sink was a substitute for the fountains and pools of other cloister gardens, impractical features for the adobe building techniques of New Mexico’s highlands.

**Rhetoric Construction of New Mexico Conventos**

In light of the cloister’s layered meanings, primary sources reveal a range of significance or discursive field within which Franciscan missionaries thought about and planned their conventos. Their cloister forms did not indicate cloistered seclusion, but seem instead to have been part of a rhetorical continuity with older mendicant and cenobitic practices, portraying New Mexico as an orderly, monastic landscape. It may also have alluded to quietly held millenarian ambitions persisting into the seventeenth century. Close readings of Perea and Benavides offer
insight into how New Mexico’s Franciscans were thinking about their *conventos* and place in the landscape.

The most articulate chroniclers of New Mexico’s early evangelization, and personal participants in the 1620s’ escalation of missionization, Perea and Benavides are a study in contrasts. They seem to have collaborated effectively, but framed the missions very differently. Perea was a Peninsular, raised and inducted into the Franciscan Order in Extremadura’s cradle of strict observance and eremeticism. Benavides was an ambitious colonial from the Portuguese island of São Miguel among the Azores in the Atlantic Ocean. Perea’s writings carry on the visionary idealism of sixteenth-century millenarian friars, while Benavides wrote more strategically, comfortably engaging the levers of power. Together, they oversaw New Mexico’s missions during the critical years when cloister-form *conventos* become established throughout the colony, anticipating the midcentury design of formal missions among the Zunis. Nothing is known archaeologically about the missions they personally designed for Sandía and Santa Clara, but their texts furnish an interpretive spectrum within which New Mexico’s cloister form *conventos* became meaningful.

a. Perea as Millenarian

Perea was born c. 1565 of Portuguese parents in Villanueva del Fresno, a town in Extremadura’s southern province of Badajoz. He entered the strictly observant Discalced Franciscan custody of San Gabriel, which shared roots with New Spanish millenarianism and had a reputation for rigorous poverty, prayer, and self discipline. Arriving in Mexico in 1605, however, Perea abandoned the Discalced Franciscans to join the Observant province of San Evangelio. Sources do not describe the reason for this change, but it signals commitment to
active evangelism rather than the contemplative life of the digueños or Discalced Franciscans in Mexico. Four years later, Perea accompanied eight other missionaries to New Mexico, where he would spend his remaining life, mostly as guardian of Sandía Pueblo where he oversaw construction of a large mission church with pitched roof and wooden artesanado ceiling.

When militant Custodian Isidro Ordóñez sought to subject New Mexico’s civil authorities to Franciscan jurisdiction, arresting Governor Peralta in 1613, Perea served as his jailer for most of nine months. He even led an armed posse to recapture Peralta after a mid-winter escape from Sandía’s convento.

France Scholes describes Perea as New Mexico’s dominant figure from 1616 to 1626, a role he reprised as Custodian from 1629 to 1631. He was a zealous evangelist, a relentless defender of Franciscan authority, and an aggressive oppressor of traditional Indigenous religious expression. Although Perea never identifies explicitly as a millenarian in surviving documents, he filled his Relacion with subtle rhetorical constructions implying that he saw New Mexico as part of that faction’s efforts to create a terrestrial mendicant state through end-time evangelization.

Millenarian thought had fallen out of favor after the 1578 execution of Dominican Francisco de la Cruz, who prophesied the destruction of Spain for its treatment of Native Americans, and claimed the Americas would prevail as a new Creole-Indigenous millennial kingdom. The Counter-Reformation church was generally hostile towards Joachimite thought, which friars rarely expressed openly by the seventeenth-century. Perea did not explicitly propose millenarian ideas, but clearly ascribed to Mendieta’s version of history, in which New Spanish missions were the direct geographic extension of the original apostolic church, transcending the Constantinian interruption and comprising the ultimate phase of history.
The *Relacion* presents New Mexico as the latest iteration of the universal Primitive church through Christological and apostolic metaphors (see Chapter 4). Perea portrays Franciscan missionaries arriving in New Mexico like Christ into Jerusalem, and receiving their mission charges like the apostles received the Holy Spirit on Pentecost. Amongst Zuni and Hopi towns they reenacted narratives of Christ’s passion and early church, including the triumphal entry, Nicodemus’s nighttime meeting with Jesus, the vigil in the garden, and the apostles’ street preaching. Perea explicitly compares Roque de Figueredo to Paul among the Gentiles, saying Figueredo’s calling was equally divine. His description of purchasing a house for the first Hawikku mission evokes New Testament episodes similarly set in Jerusalem’s domestic spaces, such as the apostles’ rental of an upper room for the Last Supper (known as the Cenacle), as well as the upper room where they await the Holy Spirit and Pentecost. Finally, use of a domestic space echoes early house churches, of which the Upper Room was first, as well as early Franciscan practices of taking up residence in private homes.

Perea uses language of cosmic struggle and spiritual warfare consistent with millenarian beliefs. In relatively benign passages, he echoes Francisco de los Angeles Quiñones and Mendieta by describing New Mexico as the Lord’s vineyard and new converts as “primitive flowers of this new church.” More obviously apocalyptic is his description of Philip IV’s Catholic zeal in carrying a scepter “like the Caduceus of Mercury, a vigilant rod garnished with eyes, for the conservation of the conversions, in defense of which he expends the greater part of his Royal incomes; a rod, in fine of peace and justice.” Although not a direct Biblical quote, this image of a rod vigilant with eyeballs suggests allusions to the apocalyptic man and his iron rod, whom Joachim of Fiore interpreted as Christ and all just men born of the church. The restless eyes, on the other hand, evoke the four living beings of Revelations 4:6-8, covered in
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eyeballs front and back. Through these references, Perea seems to associate Philip with the messianic missionary kings of earlier millenarian literature, portraying him as zealous and just in his commitment to evangelizing the world.

Perea builds on themes of cosmic warfare by casting Figueredo as a “famous soldier of the Church,” ready for martyrdom and prepared to confront the evil spirits Perea believed enslaved the Zuni pueblos, causing them to oppose the Franciscans’ apostolic ministry. Similarly he presumes that demonic forces were oppressing and misleading the resistant Hopis, but credits a miraculous healing by Francisco de Porras with overcoming this opposition. Perhaps not insignificantly, in Perea’s narrative the first Zuni convert to accept baptism was christened Don Agustín, recounting the day of his Christian rebirth but perhaps also alluding to millenarian hopes of establishing Augustine’s City of God amongst Native Americans.

As Custodian and Commissary of the Inquisition, Perea used his power to denounce what he saw as immoral activities and witchcraft. More importantly, his frequent squabbles with civil authorities suggest sympathies with tacit Franciscan ambitions for a mendicant state in the Americas. Perea’s relationship with Ordóñez was complicated, but his predecessor had been overtly ambitious in expanding Franciscan power, imprisoning Governor Peralta and declaring himself to be an authority equal to the Pope himself. Ordóñez was intent on submitting civil authorities to Franciscan administration, forming a de facto mendicant state. He trusted Perea to be his jailer, but Sandía’s custodian tired of this role, becoming disenchanted with the belligerent Ordóñez and resenting his treatment of other missionaries.

Despite opposing Ordóñez, when it was his turn to lead Perea took up the mantle of aggressively contesting civil jurisdiction. Missionaries remained dependent upon the civil government’s ability to threaten force against the Indians, but frequent struggles between
Governors and aggressive Franciscans leaders such as Perea may indicate persisting hope for a priestly mendicant state, an inheritance from the objectives of Mexico’s millenarian friars. Although they did not write explicitly about recreating Israel in New Mexico, Ordóñez and Perea’s struggles with civil authorities show their desire to subordinate the government to their own administrations. Perea’s ultimate motives may remain uncertain, but his actions and imagery align with other New Spanish millenarian missionaries, representing New Mexico’s evangelization as a direct extension of the Primitive church, with great ongoing cosmic battles. Within this millenarian framework, the cloister form’s apostolic associations and its evocation of the celestial city at the end of time would have been particularly significant.

b. Benavides, the Pragmatist

In contrast to Perea’s antagonism of the civil government and pervasive typological idealism that saw New Mexico as an extension of the primitive church, Benavides approached evangelism pragmatically. Taking his vows in Mexico City by 1603, Benavides had more than twenty years of experience among New Spanish missions and with the Inquisition, before coming to New Mexico as Custodian and Commissary of the Inquisition from 1626 until 1629. Afterward, he traveled to Europe to report to the Crown and Franciscan Minister General, while also writing his Memoriales. Although he exaggerates own contributions and the success of evangelization, Benavides’s accounts to King Philip IV (1630) and to Pope Urban VIII (1634) are complex rhetorical articulations of the mission campaign’s purpose and conception.

Benavides activates well-established metaphors from missionary rhetoric, following Mendieta in claiming that the Franciscans had “discovered great treasures, spiritual as well as
temporal," as well as drawing on common agricultural metaphors, comparing Pueblo peoples to a vineyard, a harvest, and the fruits of missionary labors. He reinforces these themes by describing the land’s material bounty, rich harvests, and abundant game. The 1634 Memorial debuts a thematic focus on light and blindness, deeming the Indians “blind in the darkness of their idolatry” (i.e. traditional religious expressions) prior to the Franciscans’ arrival with the “light of the gospel [and…] Catholic faith.”

Light and darkness were closely tied to themes of cosmic warfare that Benavides shared with Perea, both of whom believed missionaries were fighting demonic forces on a spiritual battlefield for human souls. Benavides saw Pueblo religious leaders as sorcerers, serving the Devil and resisting Christianity. To justify missionaries and discredit Native resistance, Benavides constructs rhetoric of “marvels and miracles,” stories of supernatural events counteracting the opposition of reluctant Indian communities. For example, when Taos Indians attempted to kill their missionary, Benavides claims that a sudden paralyzing fear miraculously prevented them while supernatural invisibility hid the friar. Later a lightning bolt from clear sky struck down a Taos tribal elder speaking against Christian marriage. Tying the theme of wonders to metaphors of light, Benavides recounts the miraculous healing of a blind boy at Awatovi, supposedly overcoming Hopi resistance and leading to the Pueblo’s conversion. Finally, he recounts stories of María de Jesús’s miraculous bilocating ministry in the greater Southwest. These wondrous stories assuaged concerns readers may have had about the evangelization campaign, since these divine interventions purportedly demonstrated the approval of God himself.

Benavides’s interest in spiritual warfare and miraculous interventions overlapped with the outlook of millenarian Franciscans, but in other ways he saw New Mexico very differently. His
writings betray no preoccupation with the end of time; instead, he seems intent on transforming New Mexico into an orderly, acculturated monastic landscape, aspiring to oversee it as a mendicant Bishop. Benavides sets up this dream by describing Pueblo society as a pinnacle of civilization among American Indians. His 1630 Memorial begins by moving from “barbaric” Chichimecas in Chihuahua to civilized pueblos of New Mexico as the story follows the camino real north. Benavides describes Pueblo people as more civilized than the mobile hunter-gatherers of Northern New Spain, because they lived in permanent towns, farmed, ate grain and cooked meat, had recognizable governments, and wore clothes over healthy bodies. He claims Pueblo evangelization was already complete, with everyone baptized and living together with civilized order (politicamente). He portrays their missions as ‘very beautiful,’ “costly,” and “sumptuous,” stressing the orderliness of the missions even more strongly in his revised Memorial. Describing each pueblo and mission, Benavides notes their solemn worship and festivals, keeping of baptismal records, and quality of indoctrination as signs of orderliness. He claims the friars made Indians “docile” and “well instructed,” living all together “in a state of great perfection and Christianity.” Benavides asserts that he personally put some missions “in good order” before turning them over to other friars, all “unanimous and in harmony” as to their purpose. According to him, each pueblo’s guardian friar was the lynchpin of order in its mission community, like a delicate timepiece in which “all the wheels of this clock must be kept in good order by the friar, without neglecting any detail, otherwise all is lost.”

Benavides’s ambition is evident when he advocates for New Mexico to be made a diocese, advancing himself as candidate for bishop. He alleges New Mexico was unready for secularization, despite also claiming its successful evangelization. Benavides instead envisions a strictly Franciscan diocese, declaring only friars were interested in caring for Indian souls.
Perhaps because of these ambitions, Benavides seems to have cooperated with civil officials and Governor Felipe de Sotelo Osorio, declining to pursue typical complaints against him. In contrast to other more contentious friars, Benavides strikes a generally conciliatory tone, for instance praising the humility, vigilance, and piety of Spanish encomenderos. He presents missionaries as mutually dependent partners with civil authorities in a campaign of forcible acculturation and exploitation of New Mexico’s various resources.

In advocating this worldlier civil-religious partnership, Benavides describes the evangelization campaign in terms of a converted landscape, representing the Pueblo world as thoroughly transformed through the missionaries’ efforts:

[…] though all that territory belonged to the Demon until now, and was thick with idolatry […] today it is all thick with temples and conventos, and with pedestals of the Cross; and there is no one that does not praise God and His Most Holy Mother aloud in the wilds when they are saluting one another.

Benavides emphasizes the mission’s built environment as a signifier of the campaign’s success, including the visual signs of churches, conventos, and roadside shrines. He highlights their purported progress by describing a soundscape that Christianity had penetrated, even into remote places through the imagined greetings of traveling converts. Benavides reprises this vision by replacing wilderness greetings with musical liturgy:

The whole land is dotted with churches, conventos, and crosses along the roads. The people are so well taught that they now live like perfect Christians. They are skilled in all the refinements of life, especially in the singing of organ chants, with which they enhance the solemnity of the divine service.

Benavides envisions New Mexico as a monastic landscape, in which a network of Christian sanctuaries, liturgical music, and thoroughly acculturated converts transform the Pueblo world. Perhaps suggestive of his vision are images of Franciscan houses in European landscapes, such as Pedro de Villafranca’s engraving of the convento of Santa María de los
Ángeles in the Sierra de Hornachuelos (established 1490; figure 9.125). In this seventeenth-century image, the strictly observant Andalusian *convento* sits in rugged wilderness, with bountiful walled gardens, standing crosses, chapels, hermitage caves, and fountains sacralizing the landscape. Through this forest of signifiers and prancing game animals wander pairs of Franciscans in habit, gesturing with their hands and infusing the soundscape with sacred conversation.

In addition to establishing churches and cloister-form *conventos*, Zuni missionaries attempted to reshape the Pueblo landscape in other ways. *Estancia* fields and gardens extended the mission through the countryside, while standing crosses occupied plazas and desecrated Zuni shrines. Coronado’s expedition erected the first crosses among western pueblos, and by the late-sixteenth century, residents were offering them feathers, painted prayer sticks, and corn meal. A sandstone slab with the letters “IИRI” pecked like a petroglyph and highlighted in white pigment is probably a remnant of such a cross at Hawikku (figure 9.129). Hodge found it exposed on top of the north side of Hawikku’s ridge, where it was likely embedded in the base of a mission-era standing cross (compare to figures 9.126-9.127). Seventeenth-century sources describe processions through the landscapes of other pueblos, as was probably the case among the Zuni, and remnants of which Cushing may have observed in the nineteenth century when annual processions still carried a saint through Middle Village. Finally a bronze bell projected the mission’s anthropomorphic voice throughout Hawikku’s soundscape, tolling for liturgical offices and lessons. Bells carried the symbolic presence of the missionaries beyond the *convento* walls to infiltrate the lives of all Zunis nearby. The ringing sounds rolled over the fields and rooftops, insinuating themselves into individual households and even the covert corners and rituals.
of traditional religious practices. Sound could go where the friars could not, and was a crucial part
of Franciscan attempts to transform Pueblo landscapes.\textsuperscript{223}

Monastic metaphors were part of the rhetoric by which early Franciscan missionaries
sought to legitimize their evangelization campaign in New Mexico, and deeply infuse
Benavides’s writing. The comparison was not straightforward, however, since New Mexico’s
mixed mission communities with Native men, women and children were very different from
European monasteries of segregated, avowed monks and lay brethren. Such a mixed community
provoked no little anxiety on the part of Franciscans, and Benavides repeatedly emphasizes
orderliness and regularity of living arrangements that were far removed from monasticism in
actuality. Concluding the 1630 \textit{Memorial}, he reassures the Crown that New Mexico’s friars had
not neglected their contemplative obligations, and with the rest of the mission community they
kept all required masses, fasts, and spiritual devotions, being dedicated to their regal patron,

\begin{quote}
\[
\text{[\ldots] they live in such sort that it appears they are in a [religious] community [\ldots] and the}
\]\
\text{[\textit{conventos} are] with so much concert that they appear rather sanctuaries than the house of}
\]\
\text{one lone \textit{fraile}[\ldots] who with so much gratefulness, love, and good-will commend your}
\]\
\text{majesty to God, in that so distant corner, and in that primitive church.}\textsuperscript{224}
\end{quote}

Benavides claims mission \textit{conventos} became like monasteries through the faithful observances of
the collective mission community. He emphasizes the praying of masses to honor their Royal
donor, just as many monastic establishments relied upon such masses in exchange for donations
as their primary funding source.\textsuperscript{225} The King is the pious donor in this sacred economy,
supporting missions through financial outlay, and receiving back the spiritual treasure of
redeemed Indian souls praying for him:

\begin{quote}
\[
\text{Already [\ldots] all the Indians, whom we teach with so much concern, always commend}
\]\
\text{Your Majesty to God, since at so much cost you sent them, and maintain there, ministers}
\]\
\text{and churches, for the salvation of their souls; and they do it [pray for you] regularly. And}
\]\
\text{we, the Religious, as so loving and indebted vassals and chaplains, never fail, either in}
\]\
\text{the Mass or in our private prayers—in that so remote Kingdom of yours, and in that}
\end{quote}
primitive church where our Lord worketh so many marvels—to commend Your Majesty to God.226

Benavides’s rose-tinted image of daily life within the *convento* thus equates mixed mission communities to monastic establishments dedicated to their royal patron through an economy of prayer. Describing the mission staff as a quasi-convventual community, he assures European audiences of their orderly performance of duties, “with as much circumspection and care as if they were friars.”227

Benavides’s analogy to Regular religious communities implicitly justifies the heterogeneous co-residential conditions of New Mexico missions, revisiting one of the early metaphors of established Franciscanism. Twelfth-century Franciscans adopted cloisters to signal affiliation with the church hierarchy and differentiate themselves from contemporary pauperistic lay organizations, even though the friars did not live in cloistered seclusion as the architectural form had previously signified. Transplanted cloisters in Mexico and the Pueblo world were attempts to validate experimental new arenas of negotiation and cultural interaction that comprised everyday mission life. Benavides’s frequent attributions of regularity may even indicate a belief in the transformative power of the architectural form itself, that it would mold converts into the exemplary monastic models that he rhetorically invoked.

**Conclusions**

Archaeological remains at Hawikku and Halona Pueblos indicate the importance of the cloister plan to Franciscan designers, who replicated it at each site. Furthermore, all known seventeenth-century New Mexico *conventos* employed similar cloister forms. An architectural type with extensive rhetorical history in Franciscanism, cloisters initially conveying legitimacy
upon the order, and articulated identity through architectural style, materials, and scale.

Although part of everyday conventual life, cloisters also acquired a dense web of cosmological significations tied to sacred geometry, Jerusalem, and the millenarian celestial city.

Seventeenth-century friars in New Mexico did not write about what cloisters meant to them, but it is possible to triangulate from established discursive meanings and the writings of Perea and Benavides. Through this interpretive process, the cloister form emerges as an important component in a recast Franciscan identity set in the Pueblo homeland. Benavides’s pragmatic approach to civil and ecclesiastic authorities is one side of the spectrum, representing conventos as orderly nodes in a quasi-monastic landscape, where he imagined mission communities dedicating themselves to the spiritual enrichment of royal and ecclesiastic patrons. For him, the cloister form vouchsafed the regularity of everyday mission life, providing a legitimizing metaphor for interactions among Spanish and Native mission community members.

Perea’s tacit millenarianism marks the other end of the interpretive spectrum, representing New Mexico as a dramatic apostolic stage where Franciscans typologically reenacted the New Testament. Although he said almost nothing about conventos, Perea’s rhetoric suggests he would have followed other millenarian thinkers in considering the cloister in terms of apostolic metaphor; the Upper Room and Solomonic portico; and the Celestial city resonant with antecedents Eden and Jerusalem. While Benavides conjured an idealized, abundant, and civilized land of monastic order, Perea placed his narrative in the time of the Primitive church, extending the Holy Land to the world of Puebloan middle places. Both of them privileged universalizing narratives over the particularities of place, however, presenting New Mexico’s evangelization as the climax of a linear progression towards successful conversion and acculturation (Benavides), or the end of time and dawning of New Jerusalem.
(millenarians like Perea). Unlike Zuni religious practices and migration accounts that were deeply invested in their specific places and cyclical views of time, Franciscans imported single-nave churches, cloister plans, and sacred symbols in an attempt to remake Pueblo landscapes and people according to their own cosmological conceptions. ²²⁸

It is my contention that the repetition of cloister-form *convento* designs in seventeenth-century New Mexico relates directly to the culturally mixed community of people who lived and worked within them. *Convento* architecture had a rhetorical aspect, presenting the Franciscans’ efforts and the mission communities as orderly religious establishments to Spanish officials and church authorities. Mission cloisters were not simply functional architectural arrangements; they were iconological evocations of earlier monastic buildings and social contexts in which cloisters symbolized monastic life itself and “unity in multiplicity” at the heart of the ecclesiological family. ²²⁹ Transplanted to New Mexico, the cloister’s deep pedigree in secluded monasticism implied a degree of acculturation among mission community members that was mostly wishful thinking. In practice, their monastic facade masked the many compromises and local negotiations that were necessary in distant Pueblo towns such as Hawikku and Halona, where the Zuni residents guarded their own ways of seeing the world.
1 To my knowledge, Spanish expedition art is relatively unstudied. Expedition art became a significant Anglo-American genre in the mid-nineteenth century with U.S. territorial expansion. Stephen H. Long’s 1820 trip up the Platte River included British artist Samuel Seymour and American Titian Peale, who produced sketches that later illustrated the expedition’s 1823 publication. Long’s expedition was the first of many to include artists throughout the nineteenth century. Crucial representations of Zuni by Richard H. Kern and John K. Hillers were products of this discourse. See Truettner, *The West as America*; Don D. Fowler, *The Western Photographs of John K. Hillers: Myself in the Water* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1998), 16-20; Fowler, *A Laboratory*, 38-91, 362-364; Weber, *Richard H. Kern*, 4-11.

2 Toussaint (*Colonial Art*, 47) discusses Quesada as perhaps the first Spanish painter in New Spain, who arrived in 1538, and believes he was from Andalucía where his name appears in 1534. Guillermo Tovar de Teresa provides further information; see “Nuevas noticias acerca de Cristóbal de Quesada, el más antiguo pintor europeo residente en Nueva España,” in *Renacimiento en México: Artistas y retablos* (Mexico City: Secretaría de Asentamientos Humanos y Obras Públicas, 1982), 110-111. Quesada possibly arrived in Mexico in 1535, and his work is entirely unknown. See also *Andalucía en América: Arte, Cultura y Sincretismo Estético*, “Quesada, Cristóbal de (Carmona, ca. 1500 – ¿México, 1550?)” Junta de Andalucía, http://antigua.andaluciaymexico.com/lineas-investigacion/artistas/quesada-cristobal-de-carmona-ca-1500-mexico-1550/ (accessed March 4, 2017).


6 For a definition of the cloister or *claustrum* form, see Meyvaert, “The Medieval Monastic *Claustrum*,” 53. Large medieval monasteries could have multiple cloisters, and the word *claustrum* also stood for the entire monastic structure.


9 Schneider and Panich, “Native Agency at the Margins of Empire,” 7.

10 The cloister plan is distinct from the cloistered lifestyle; see Chapter 3. Chonfón Olmos (*Historia de la Arquitectura*, vol. II, tomo II, 483-484) makes a similar distinction, using the terms “*claustro*” to describe the architectural form, and “*área de clausura*” to signify spaces where cloistered seclusion was practiced.


The ultimate objective was restoring the badly deteriorated mission to service. Caywood’s excavation techniques were crude, even compared to Hawikku’s excavation forty-seven years earlier. According to Caywood (The Restored Mission, 20-22). He began the convento excavations with a backhoe trench along the nave, which revealed adobe walls on stone foundations, as much as 2.74 m. (9’) below the plaza surface level. He chose to remove fill and walls almost to floor level with his backhoe, possibly destroying much of the convento’s remains (28). After removing the walls and the fill, his team used shovels, picks, and hand brooms to clear rooms. Caywood’s cavalier attitude towards the archaeological remains at Zuni received criticism at the time from people familiar with the project, and as liaison to the Zuni tribe, Ladd wrote to Caywood on May 2, 1967 (Zuni/Western Forts Box, “Zuni” folder 1, call number 205R3 S16, WACC), specifically urging him to include the artifacts, fearing Caywood would overlook and forget materials:

I know this is a salvage report but, I think you should make a few preliminary remarks regarding the test material recovered, because, the material will probably get shoved into a corner and there will be no record and probably will go unreported and unpublished for many years, just like all the early material from Hawikku.

Ladd’s daily log of the excavation is lost, like the field notes from the convento. The whereabouts of most of these materials remains unknown, but the first two field notebooks pertaining to the Halona mission church have surfaced in the papers of Jim Trott, awaiting accession into the WACC archives in Tucson, AZ. See Jones, Caywood, and Ladd, Historic American Buildings Survey Field Note Book, Books #1 and #2. The ill fortunes of the Zuni mission excavations continue to this day, with the artifacts uncatalogued and unavailable to researchers due to their indeterminate NAGPRA status. They are housed at the WACC in Tucson, AZ, under the control of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and managed by National Park Service staff (Brenda McLain, personal communication, January 9, 2014).

A remarkable document, Tribal Resolution M70-66-102 from May 11, 1966 (copy in the collection of the author) records the signatures or marks of all these community leaders. I thank Tom Kennedy for sharing this with me.

For my drawing of the Halona mission plan, I have used a number of resources. Domínguez (The Missions, 195-202) describes the convento rooms, layout, and functions in 1776; see also Domínguez, “Copy of Spanish Transcription,” 333-334. The Mindeleff survey and field notes include measurements for the mission church and surviving rooms of the convento; see Victor Mindeleff, 1881-1886, Ms. 2621, Field plans and diagrams of inhabited pueblos and pueblo ruins of Arizona and New Mexico, NAA. Hillers’s photographs offer critical data regarding the condition and structure of the convento prior to complete collapse; see Victor Mindeleff, 1879-1887, Photo Lot 4362, Victor Mindeleff photograph albums of Pueblo architecture, circa 1879-1887, volume 4, NAA; and originals in the National Archives, Washington, DC. Caywood produced at least two plans of the mission, as he interpreted it. One includes the entire foundation of the mission church and convento (The Restored Mission, figure 1), while the other is a detail of the convento itself (The Restored Mission, figure 3). Two original glass-plate negative variations of the convento drawing survive in WACC archives (see “Figure 2, Architectural Plan- Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe de Zuni- Zuni- McKinley County- New Mexico,” negatives 68413/68413A, Photo Archives, WACC. A
comparison between the negatives and the published images reveals Caywood’s publication stretches and distorts both drawings, with the mission plan vertically stretched, and the convento plan stretched horizontally. The original drawing is more accurate, and its proportions agree generally with those of Mindeleff, and almost exactly with those of Russell Jones. Jones was the National Park Service architectural historian on site during the excavations. He produced most of the surviving field notes, and at least thirteen drawings of the mission. Twelve of these drawings are in the archives of the Historic American Building Survey; see “HABS NM, 16-ZUNIP, 2- (sheets 1-12)- Mission Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe de Zuni, Zuni Pueblo, Zuni, McKinley County, NM,” Historic American Buildings Survey, Library of Congress, Washington, DC. One additional drawing is preserved as a negative at WACC; see “Conjectural Restoration, c. 1870.” Photo Archives, WACC. Jones closely follows the field notes, and his plans are probably the most accurate source. Where Caywood speculates at numerous doorways, Jones was more cautious and draws many of the rooms without communicating openings. Caywood apparently derived doorways from his interpretation of Domínguez, rather than direct material evidence, but without the missing field notebooks, it is impossible to know whether he had evidence to support his conclusions. Caywood did not complete his convento plan until after the publication of the Hawikku excavations, which he references and had apparently read; it is possible that his interpretation of Halona derives partly from the example of the Hawikku plan. In my drawing, I have located the doorway to the trascelda in the celda, following the example of Hawikku. Domínguez clearly describes a celda/trascelda on the southeast corner of the front range, and so the doorway would have communicated between them, rather than both opening to the ambulatory as Caywood imagines. Domínguez writes: “Como se entra la portería sobre la izquierda corre celda, cuya puerta tiene llave, y sigue trascelda que hace esquina,” see Domínguez, “Copy of Spanish Transcription,” 333. Domínguez’s reversal of the trascelda and celda designations is curious, and may be a result of carelessness on his part.


19 The central patio or garth was 12.09 m. by 11.68 m. (39’ 8” by 38’ 4”) internally. Domínguez (The Missions) describes the patio as “useless,” with a single window in each side; “Está [the convento as a whole] algo obscure porque en cada lienzo tiene una ventana; y su patio de nada sirve,” (Domínguez, “Copy of Spanish Transcription,” 334).


22 Domínguez, The Missions, 200. The earth at the back side of the church and convento was heavily disturbed from the laying of pipelines and sewer lines; see Ferguson and Mills, Archaeological Investigations at Zuni Pueblo, 36-37. Domínguez (The Missions, 200) describes the back range as comprising an exit hallway, two storage rooms, and the church sacristy, though only the sacristy yielded recognizable remains. In 1977, workers laying new water lines cut through the highly disturbed soils of De’widon Lane, the street overlying the mission site, southwest of where Caywood’s crew had dug. They encountered a composite wall running roughly east-west, with a double course of adobe and sandstone. This wall remnant began 80 cm. (2’ 7.5”) below the ground level at that time, and Ferguson and Mills (Archaeological Investigations at Zuni, 175-177) raise the possibility that it was part of the mission convento based on the thickness of the adobe wall (exact dimensions unnoted), and its location. By overlaying the map from 1982 with the earlier excavation plans, I have attempted to locate this additional find relative to the 1966 finds, which suggests that the back range may have been much wider than Caywood and Jones realized. For the adjacent kiva and its designation, see Kroeber, Zuñi Kin and Clan, Map 8.

23 Ivey, no date, “Hawikuh and the Zuñi Missions,” 3-4. Ivey reiterated this assertion ("George Kubler," 144), writing the two missions were “virtually identical,” giving architectural historians “a clear example of the same plan being used twice to build two nearby missions at about the same time, using the same interim church design for both. This suggests that the same person may have constructed both buildings.”

24 Historians have disagreed on the dating of the present mission structure. Following Ralph Emerson Twitchell, some feel that it was refounded after the Pueblo Revolt, but using the standing remains of the seventeenth-century
The Spaniards then turned back to Halona, which they found uninhabited, but in which it is implied that the church was still standing, although the convento was gone. In 1690, the mission at Halona was begun anew, very probably utilizing the pre-Rebellion fabric [...]

Hodge, Hammond, and Rey (Fray Alonso de Benavides’ Revised Memorial, 293) were critical of Kubler’s interpretation, calling it an arbitrary assumption, saying that “[Kubler] disregards the declaration by Álvarez that the edifice was in process of building (not rebuilding) early in the year following [1706]. Nothing short of careful excavation could prove or disprove Mr. Kubler’s guess.” Eleanor B. Adams and Fray Angélico Chávez (Dominguez, The Missions, 198) found Kubler’s position to be more tenable, saying that “indeed, it is quite possible that the original seventeenth-century structure had survived in part.” Despite this debate about the date of the mission fabric, it is often attributed to the post-Pueblo Revolt period. For his part, Caywood (The Restored Mission, 9, 14) did not entertain the notion that the Zuni mission fabric might partly date to seventeenth century, declaring instead that its architectural history began around 1700. Despite the excavator’s confident attribution of Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe to the eighteenth century, his work produced results suggesting an earlier date for the Halona mission, and close formal connections to Hawikku. The strongest evidence was the shared design of their plans, which are too similar to have been coincidental, pushing the date of the Halona design back into the mid-seventeenth century and the return of missionaries after the death of Letrado. Hawikku’s mission was in heavily reworked ruins by the time Fray Garaicoechea arrived at Halona in 1699, and could not have served as a source for the plan of the rebuilt Halona mission at that time, nor could any of the other ruined missions in New Mexico. The most plausible explanation for the shared design elements of the two missions is that they were built at the same time, or one shortly after the other, using the same plan. Other assorted evidences also support a seventeenth-century date for the plan of the Halona mission as Caywood and Dominguez found it. As part of the excavation and restoration of the Old Church, twenty-five dendrochronological samples were analyzed at the Laboratory of Tree Ring Research in Tucson, AZ; for results, see two-page chart after page twenty four in Caywood, The Restored Mission. The large vigas of the church roof, as well as a handful of samples from unknown locations dated after the Pueblo Revolt, which is not surprising since there had been multiple re-roofings after 1700. Smaller timbers from lintels and the choir loft were significantly older, however. Four samples from timbers embedded in the oldest parts of the mission church (the southeast nave wall and the northeast façade) returned outer ring dates prior to the Pueblo Revolt, ranging from 1478 to 1664. An additional five samples from unknown locations returned outside dates ranging from 1494 to 1653. The choir loft beam and “beam over the entrance” (presumably either the balcony beam or the lintel of the main portal returned outside dates of 1684 and 1700. From these dates it is evident that the wood elements embedded in the oldest walls of the church were cut prior to the Pueblo Revolt, while elements spanning the nave were post-Pueblo Revolt. This pattern suggests that the church structure was built in the seventeenth century, and that it only partially burned during the Pueblo Revolt, with more exposed spanning elements requiring replacement while the adobe walls, some framing elements, and corbels embedded in the walls remained functional. This pattern should be interpreted with caution, however, because the oldest elements also tend to be smaller in size, and might potentially represent old wood reused in the mission construction. A more complete sampling of all surviving wooden elements in the Old Church would be a valuable source of data for better understanding its age and phases of construction. In addition to the dendrochronological evidence, Caywood (The Restored Mission, 26) uncovered two distinct floor levels in the church nave, separated by a 12.7 cm. (5”) layer of fill. The second floor was accompanied by new sills at the main portal and the baptistery door. Although he did not speculate on the significance of these floors, an obvious interpretation is that the first floor represents the nave’s original seventeenth-century floor, followed by renovations and a new floor after the Pueblo Revolt. Caywood did not note more than one floor level in the convento, but he was not looking for more than the first floor that he encountered, which he only pierced in a few test pits for which stratigraphic results are vague or unreported. In the room at the eastern corner of the convento, there was a double-layer of adobe brick pavement, which may indicate two superimposed floor levels. Caywood (The Restored Mission, 34.) called this celda the “kitchen.” Finally, although circumstantial, some features of the mission seem to be the product of a long history of occupation. For instance, Hillers’s photographs of the mission in 1879 show cracks and slumping in structures such as the convento stairwell (figure 9.21), which does not appear to be well bonded in much of its height, with uneven slumping and settling while its upper, bonded portions at the eastern corner remained in place. These variabilities in bonding may suggest the upper portion of the stairwell was reconstructed during the life of the building, and the new masonry was not effectively keyed into the standing walls. Such partial reconstruction is what one would expect in a building.
surviving the Pueblo Revolt, where burning roof timbers destabilized the upper walls and exposed them to heavier erosion. Builders of the re-established mission probably used as much of the existing walls as they could, expediently laying new adobes on top with poor bonding, resulting in slumping later in the life of the building. Taken together, these evidences support Ivey’s attribution of the Halona mission plan and parts of its surviving structure to the seventeenth century, contemporaneous with the Hawikku mission plan and structure. The plan and foundations were established when Franciscans returned to the Zuni Pueblos following the death of Letrado, probably in the 1650s, and much of Nuestra Senora de Guadelupe’s seventeenth-century adobe fabric in the façade and the northwest wall along the sotocoro probably remain today.


26 Ivey, In the Midst, 146; Ivey, The Spanish Colonial Architecture, 324-325. Examples of sotocoro baptismal fonts remain visible in numerous missions in Mexico such as the ex-Franciscan mission of San Bernardino in Xochimilco (before 1546 to 1590s; see Kubler, Mexican Architecture, 486-487). In New Mexico, the bowl of the baptismal font might be copper or ceramic, perched atop stone, adobe, or rubble-masonry pedestals. Examples include San Isidro at Las Humanas (Gran Quivira) Pueblo, where excavators found the whitewashed remains of a circular stone pillar base, 60.96 cm. (2\') in diameter with a 25.4 cm. (10") hole running through its center, which was later repainted red and white; see Ivey, In the Midst, 175-176, 179. Stanley A. Stubbs found a similar arrangement at Tabirá; see “‘New’ Old Churches,” 167. The interim church at Abó Pueblo (begun about 1623 and completed about 1628), had a baptismal font on the gospel side of the sotocoro; Ivey, In the Midst, 60. From the dispute between Custodian Ordóñez and Governor Peralta in 1613 comes a description of the baptismal font in Santa Fe being located inside and near the doorway to the church, presumably in the sotocoro; see Scholes, Church and State, 30. This was probably an initial chapel built on the site of the later Parroquia and Cathedral, by as early as 1610, perhaps under the direction of Alonso de Peinado; see Treib, Sanctuaries, 88. Mission churches with separate rooms for baptism were common in Mexico, as for example at San Bernardino de Siena, Valladolid (begun 1552), so this change in pattern represents a shift in strategy rather than a true formal innovation. See Wagner, Box, and Morehead, Ancient Origins, 77; and Renán A. Góngora-Biachi and Sergio Grosjean Abimerhi, El Convento de San Bernardino de Siena: una joya colonial de Valladolid, Yucatán (Mexico City: Fundación Convento Sisal Valladolid, 2010), 77-78.

The example of San Bernardino is complicated by documentation and by the building’s layout. The church nave, on the Epistle side, from which it was moved to the adjoining room which was part of the structure of the Capilla de Indios. Today, the font has been moved back into the church proper, where it sits in front of the sanctuary. With the shift from readily accessible fonts in the sotocoro to an independent room with a wooden door, friars could more easily control access to the font. As New Mexico friars sought independent, controlled spaces for baptismal fonts after 1640, some reworked the existing church structure to create new baptistery enclosures, as at Pecos, where an original stairwell against the gospel side of the nave was reworked as a baptistery, in which excavator Jean Pinckley found the base of the baptismal font. See Hayes, The Four Churches, 103-108; Ivey, The Spanish Colonial Architecture, 324-325. When extant missions lacked a workable space, the construction of a new room attached to the church was necessary, as was the case at Awatovi, where a semi-independent baptistery room was added adjacent to the gospel corner of the façade; see Brew, “The Excavation,” 57-58. This baptistery contained the remains of a rubble masonry stand for the font at its center, covered with a chalky white plaster. Two nearby fragments of a stone ring probably formed the top of the stand, supporting the bowl of the font. In the southwest corner of the room were the remains of a sink that may have served as a disposal drain for sacred liquids (a sacrificium). The missions of Quarai and Giseuwa likewise had semi-independent baptistery rooms added to the gospel and epistle sides of their respective facades. See Ivey, In the Midst, 145-146; and Ivey, no date, “Un Templo Grandioso,” 19. When friars began constructing new mission churches after 1640, they could integrate the baptistery into the designs, such as was the case with the expansion of the church of Abó between 1645 and 1651, where the design included the addition of baptistery integrated into the gospel side of the nave wall and entered through the sotocoro; see Ivey, In the Midst, 62-63, 66-94. The mission of San Marco Pueblo also had a baptistery integrated into the left side of the sotocoro, although the precise chronology and publication of this structure is still pending. See New Mexico Office of Archaeological Studies, “Galisteo Basin Archaeological Sites Protection Act:
Pueblo San Marcos,” http://galisteo.nmarchaeology.org/sites/pueblo-san-marcos.html (accessed January 28, 2015); and David Hurst Thomas, email message to the author, June 26, 2012. The incomplete church of San Buenaventura at Las Humanas Pueblo was also designed with an integrated baptistery, but on the epistle side of the sotocoro. This construction likely began after the Zuni missions around 1660, and remained incomplete at the time of the pueblo’s abandonment in 1667/8; see Ivey, In the Midst, 172-173, 192. After the Pueblo Revolt, it became more common to integrate the baptistery into the epistle side of the church. The church of San Ildefonso had a baptistery in this location, although it remains unclear whether it was added before or after the Pueblo Revolt; see Treib, Sanctuaries, 131. The eighteenth century churches of Las Trampas, Laguna Pueblo, and San Felipe Pueblo also have baptisteries integrated on their epistle sides.

27 Other similarities include the location of the doorway between the sacristy and church sanctuary, the incorporation of a small storage room tucked into the space created by the inset apse, choir lofts supported on posts in roughly the same location, and external balcony facades.

28 Kubler (The Religious Architecture, 23) first hypothesized that the local order and time of religious ceremonies might have determined the variable orientation of New Mexico mission churches to admit direct sunlight through the transverse clearstory window during the liturgy. He never tested this theory, which he called “heliotropism,” and which Ivey (In the Midst, 213-214) explored among the Salinas missions. The idea of a solstitial relationship among the Zuni missions was first developed by Gene E. Friedman, who noted the similarity of their alignments to the Middle Village kivas in 2004, suggesting that Zuni knowledge and agency may have played a role in the process of designing the missions. Friedman presented this information to successive tribal councils in July 2006 and March 2007, as well as the Board of Directors of Cornerstones Community Partnerships, Santa Fe, NM on October 18, 2006. I came to this idea by a different route, initially looking at the comparison to the plan of California’s San Carlos Borromeo, but am very grateful to Dr. Friedman for sharing his resources and more extensive knowledge of the subject.


30 It should be noted that the Zuni missions sit at a slightly lower latitude than San Carlos Borromeo in Carmel, which might have altered their solar geometry. It is also worth bearing in mind that while choir loft windows and domes can project narrow beams of light to hit specific pieces of liturgical furniture and ornament, the transverse clearstory floods the entire apse with light, creating a very different effect. Whether the Zuni mission originally had transverse clearstory windows in unknown.


32 See Sobral y Campa, Los Conventos Franciscanos, 15; Ledesma Gallegos, Tradición, 57-59; and Scheutz, “Pre-Euclidean Geometry,” 349-350. For the cosmological meanings of sacred geometry, see Keith D. Lilley, “Cities of God? Medieval Urban Forms and Their Christian Symbolism,” Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, New Series 29, no. 3 (Sep. 2004): 302. In contrast to establishments in Mexico, Texas, Arizona, and California, the adobe missions of New Mexico do not lend themselves to this kind of analysis. Their soft materials are unlikely to preserve precise geometric relationships and proportions, and the original structural design was likely to undergo distortion in the process of construction by Pueblo laborers for whom precise replication of a predetermined geometric design was a foreign practice, technical competency, and cultural aesthetic. Zuni masons, who were probably women, had little experience constructing large collective buildings such as the mission, and their vernacular architectural style flourished without the tight design controls and technical specifications needed for translating an organic geometric design into material reality. Furthermore, adobe is a friable medium requiring nearly annual replastering and maintenance (Treib, Sanctuaries, 37), making adobe buildings mutable, with wall surfaces, locations, and proportions that will subtly alter over time. Finally, the Zuni missions are known through
archaeological excavations, both of which were conducted hurriedly with a limited amount and quality of documentation. It is unlikely that the plans and measures recorded by these archaeologists correspond precisely to the original building design, passing as it has through the mediating/distorting processes of construction, maintenance, erosion, and excavation.


34 For the midcentury growth of the mission campaign, which Ivey dates 1655-1660, see The Spanish Colonial Architecture, 328-329.


36 Cloister size did not necessarily correspond to the size of the associated church. While Acoma and Pecos (initially) had large churches and cloisters, San Marcos had a small church and relatively large cloister, while Las Humanas had a small cloister but its church would have been among the more monumental New Mexico structures if completed.

37 For the conditions and survival of seventeenth-century fabric at Acoma, see Marshall, 1978, “Investigations,” 5-6; Bergman, 1980, Historic Structures, 4-5; Wingert-Playdon, John Gaw Meem, 1-2, 7, 21. Many of the convento’s old vigas and latillas have been reused in subsequent repairs. A number of the vigas date to around 1700, while reused latillas show that one of the early ceilings was painted in bold red and black alterations, perhaps arranged in alternating herringbone patterns. See Marshall, 1978, “Investigations,” 45.


39 Marshall, 1978, “Investigations,” 20-21, 28-29. The patio bench was formed by the thicker stone foundations of the wall, and originally extended 0.35 m. (1’ 1.78”) out from the adobe patio walls. After the accumulation of 0.6 m. (1’ 11.62”) of midden fill, the bench was widened to 0.65 m. (2’ 1.59”). The remnants of the northern wall extending into the patio comprised 4 to 5 courses of sandstone with thick adobe mortar, 0.25 m. wide and 0.50 m. tall (9.84” x 1’ 7.69”) at the time of excavation, sitting on a thin clay lens over the bedrock. It extended only 2.50 m. (8’ 2.43”) from the patio wall, but appears to have been partly deconstructed by the later intrusion at the center of the patio. The southern wall was built over 0.10 to 0.30 m. (3.94” to 11.81”) of midden fill, unlike the pre-Hispanic remnants found nearby which were built directly on bedrock. It was of irregular medium to small sandstone blocks, laid up uncoursed in thick adobe mortar, 0.50 m. thick at the base and 0.30 m. thick at the top (1’ 7.69” to 11.81”). The masonry pit or socket was appended to the wall, 0.35 m. (1’ 1.78”) in diameter. One possibility is that the socket held a wooden post, supporting a small porch over an entry to the patio space, although it preserved no traces of wood, and its function remains uncertain.

40 In a subsequent phase, an unidentifiable intrusion in the center of the patio cut through the earlier features, but its significance is unclear. Later a retaining wall of sandstone blocks in an ash-rich mud mortar was built, running east to west across the patio (ibid., 24, 27).

41 The privy structure was 2.5 m. by 2 m. (8’ 2.42” by 6’ 6.74”) in plan, and was in place at least by the time of Dominguez’s visit in 1776. It was taken down early in the twentieth century (ibid., 16). For the infant burials, see Marshall, 1978, “Investigations,” 29, 33-34. Dominguez (The Missions, 192) notes that the patio was used for growing peach trees in the eighteenth century.

43 Ivey, *In the Midst*, 55-61. This original design was probably by Fray Francisco Fonte in the 1620s.

44 Enclosure and alterations appear to have taken place under Fray Francisco Acevedo from c. 1640 to 1645 (ibid., 71-74), and again between the years 1551-1557/58. Acevedo remained guardian during this time, when he seems to have completed reworking the patio and ambulatories (95-99).

45 Ivey, *In the Midst*, 113-117. The original portales of the patio had four posts to a side, with one abutting the face of the corner pillar on each end, and two additional posts in-between, resting on a low masonry sill. Long running hallways such as the corridor built east of the Quarai cloister were relatively common in European and Mexican conventual houses, as for example in the upper floor of the Dominican convento of San Marcos in Florence, or the range of celdas added to the convento of Belvís de Monroy in Extremadura. In Mexico, Augustinian Yecapixtlá and the second floor of their convento at Yuriria, as well as the Dominican conventos of Tepoztlán and Yanhuitlán, exemplify the use of similar running corridors outside of the cloister’s circulatory pattern.

46 This enclosure was probably the design of Fray Jerónimo de la Llana; see Ivey, *In the Midst*, 147-153.

47 Ivey, “Convento Kivas,” 121, 134-137. The ventilator of the Quarai kiva was made from Spanish bricks, and artifacts in the fill of both kivas are consistent with mission-period use and termination.

48 Ibid., 186-190. In practice, Santandér’s plan was too rigid and many of the rooms were subsequently altered to make them more useful.


50 The new patio was roughly 6.08 m. by 4.65 m. (19.96’ by 15.24”), a reduction of 87% from the original patio size. Measurement approximate, taken from Ivey, *In the Midst*, 320.

51 Ivey, *The Spanish Colonial Architecture*, 317, 320-323. It was not possible to build the convento kiva in the cloister patio, because sandstone bedrock lay just below the structural foundations (314, 317). This kiva was built with adobe bricks and mud mortar, and since the bricks and mortar combinations at Pecos varied in type with firm chronological controls, the mission’s convento kiva is confidently dated to the period between 1620 and 1640; Ivey, “Convento Kivas,” 138-139. The kiva was about 6.71 m. (22’) in diameter, with a fireplace in its floor and ventilator shaft inside; Ivey, *The Spanish Colonial Architecture*, 317. When excavated, the kiva floor had a number of potsherds on it, that would suggest a date in the 1630s, and appeared deliberately backfilled with relatively clean earth that only had a few sherds; Ivey, “Convento Kivas,” 139-140.

52 New Mexico Office, “Galisteo Basin.” The single-nave, polygonal apse church adjoining the convento appears to have been built as an independent structure, perhaps an interim church with the more substantial convento built adjacent to it, with plans to renovate and expand the church later.


54 Farwell, *An Architectural History*, 96-99; Ivey, “Un Templo,” 4, 18; Treib, *Sanctuaries*, 246-249. This site in unfortunately beset with complications including incomplete excavation, extremely poor documentation for many of the excavations that have occurred, and construction of buildings on top of the convento remains in the nineteenth century.


57 Although novel for New Mexico, this arrangement with the cloister-form convento on axis with and behind the church apse had prestigious antecedents, as both the Basilica of San Francisco in Assisi and Santa María de la Rábida share similar designs. See Braunfels, *Monasteries*, 125, 133; and García, *La Rábida*, 66-68.
Brew, “The Excavation,” fig. 4.

Ivey, “Convento Kivas,” 141; Brew, “The Excavation,” 85. Excavations uncovered two superimposed kivas at the center of the patio, the first predating Spanish arrival, and the second tentatively dating to the mission period.

For Spanish placita houses, see Treib, Sanctuaries, 22-24; Bunting, Early Architecture; Bunting and Booth, Taos Adobes. Most of the surviving Spanish placita houses belong to the Post-Revolt period. Few seventeenth-century houses have been excavated, but the larger examples show a tendency towards the quadrangular placita plan; see Heather B. Trigg, From Household to Empire: Society and Economy in Early Colonial New Mexico (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2005), 72-75.

For the mission at Cases Grandes, see Di Peso, Casas Grandes, vol. 3, 864-875, 882-898; Di Peso, Rinaldo, and Fenner, Casas Grandes, vol. 5, 875-915; and Griffen, Indian Assimilation, 88-89. The Casas Grandes mission was part of the Province of Nueva Vizcaya, neighboring New Mexico and participating in many of the same general cultural patterns. Its mission served as a residence of not only the guardian friar but also laity, including women and soldiers, who sought refuge there during Indigenous uprisings of 1684.


Jones, B. Calvin and Gary N. Shapiro, “Nine Mission Sites in Apalachee,” in Thomas, Columbian Consequences, vol. II, 504, fig. 31-4; Saunders, “Ideal and Innovation,” 532-533. The convento buildings of Apalachee missions were at a distance of between 4 and 30 m. (13.12’ to 98.43’) from their respective churches.


There is very little research pertaining to the Belvís convento. I base my date on comparison of the partially restored ruins to its documented history. Construction probably began in 1505, with an official foundation date of 1509, but the ruins lack stylistically datable attributes. The earliest structures likely focused in the area of the church and cloister, and probably remained fairly small during the sixteenth century, when fourteen friars were resident. Between 1592 and 1628, the population of the mission almost doubled, to twenty-four resident friars, staying in the twenties throughout the seventeenth century. The expansion of the living quarters on the eastern side likely occurred during the late sixteenth or early seventeenth century as the mission population increased. See Ámez Prieto, La Provincia de San Gabriel, 330-335.

This regulation first seems to appear in the Franciscans’ 1239 Constitutions, but is best known from the 1260 Narbonne Constitutions; see Gustafson, Tradition and Renewal, 138-139. Gustafson (141) argues that this is the key regulation for Franciscan architecture among their scattered guidelines.

Edgerton (Theaters, 2) describes this process as “expedient selection.”

Horn, “On the Origins,” 42-43. For the Plan of St. Gall, see Chapter 7, no. 110, above.


Helms, “Sacred Landscape,” 442.


See for example, Cuadrado Sánchez, “Arquitectura Franciscana,” 19-20; and Braunfels, *Monasteries*, 132.

Gustafson, *Tradition and Renewal*, 46. Likewise, Bianca Kühnel argues that the transplantation of an artistic or architectural motif “never results in an identical form: the context changes, the overall appearance is transformed, the message is updated”; see Kühnel, “Introduction: The Use and Abuse of Jerusalem,” in *The Real and Ideal Jerusalem in Jewish, Christian, and Islamic Art: Studies in Honor of Bezalel Narkiss on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, ed. Kühnel (Jerusalem: Journal of the Center for Jewish Art, 1998), XXI. Choices to conserve an architectural precedent in new places and socio-historical contexts are just as much active, meaningful decisions as are changes and innovations, an idea which I take first from Michael Ann Williams, *Homeplace: The Social Use and Meaning of Folk Dwelling in Southwestern North Carolina* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1991), 35. In a more thorough discussion of Franciscan architectural practices, Cuadrado Sanchez (“Arquitectura Franciscana,” 56-57) argues that conservation of cloister plans was not rote repetition or wholesale adoption, but rather an active and selective process in which Franciscans kept precedents they found useful and rejected others that had become obsolete.


Bruzelius, *Preaching*, 53-56, 78. By 1216, the Dominicans were employing individual cells in the conventual house to provide privacy for friars engaging in personal study to support their external preaching. See ibid., 60; Chanfón Olmos, *Historia de la arquitectura*, vol. 2, tomo I, 299.

Carmody, *The Franciscan Story*, 103-106. Likewise, Franciscans in Iberia encountered frequent hostility from secular parishes and other mendicant orders contesting their place within the built environment and social landscape of Iberian cities; Cuadrado Sanchez, “Arquitectura Franciscana,” 42-47.

Adoption of the cloister plans was underway by the 1240s, often requiring special effort to insert these essentially rural, monastic forms into the crowded, irregular urban fabric of medieval towns (33, 62).


Ibid., 51-52.

Ibid., 85, 205-210, 240-241.

Ibid., 243-244.


La Rábida was built over the site of an Islamic *ribaṭ* or frontier fortress and hostel, from which its name ultimately derives. This site also had earlier Christian, Roman, and Phoenician associations. Between the end of the *ribaṭ*’s use and the establishment of the Franciscans, stories tell of its use for a Mozarabic church and a fortified *convento* of the Templars; see Sebastián García, *La Rábida*, 31-37.

Ibid., 66-70. La Rábida was formally founded in 1412 and belonged first to the province of Castilla, and then from 1499 to the Province of Bética. In its early years it alternated between the jurisdiction of the Conventuals and Observants, but was an Observant house after 1460. It became a house of recollect in 1623 (78-86).


Ámez Prieto, *El Palancar; Ámez Prieto, La Provincia de San Gabriel*, 405-412; José Antonio Ramos Rubio, *Monasterios de Extremadura* (León: Ediciones Lancia, 2001), 32-36. The cloister originally had four supporting wooden posts at the corners of the garth, but the dampness of the space led to their rapid deterioration, and stone piers with simple vaults were later built to better withstand these conditions. The most recent restorations of the building returned it to the original, wooden form.

These compounds, with their wood and thatch structures, served also as seats of government. Carlos Chanfón Olmos calls them *áreas-recintos-sagrados* after Fray Diego de Valadés’s Latin description in his *Rhetorica Christiana*; see *Historia de la arquitectura*, vol. 2, tomo I, 304-309. This initial phase of adopting open-air sacred enclosures for preaching and teaching ran from 1524 until the 1540s, and Chanfón Olmos refers to it as the “preconventual phase.” To date, no clear *área-recinto-sagrado* has been identified archaeologically.

Córdova Tello, *El Convento de San Miguel*, 48-62. This initial stage of construction was perhaps under the direction of Motolinía.
For the standard plan of Mexican missions, see McAndrew (The Open-Air Churches, 124-128), who sees the plan as an original synthetic creation of Mexico, possibly worked out by the Franciscans who were first to arrive. See also Edgerton, Theaters, 40-49; Mardith Schuetz, “Survival of Early Christian Symbolism in Monastic Churches of New Spain and Visions of the Millennial Kingdom,” Journal of the Southwest 42, no. 4 (Winter, 2000): 763; and Ivey, “Missions as Architectural Patrons,” 97. Elena Isabel Estrada de Gerlero argues that despite variation in their details, the Mexican missions betray a clear intention to embody an idealized model, which she sees as referring back to the monasteries of Europe as representational signs. See Estrada de Gerlero, “Sentido político, social y religioso en la arquitectura conventual novohispana,” in El Arte Mexicano vol. 5 (Mexico City: SEP/Salvat, 1982), 625, 628, 632; and Ledesma Gallegos, Tradición, 16-17.

The analysis of architectural ornament and a typological treatment of Mexican cloisters was a focus for Kubler’s Mexican Architecture (341-359), as was discerning chronological patterns in the architectural style of cloister ornament. Kubler saw cloister forms as derivative of European domestic precedents and described them as places of prayer and meditation. See also Ledesma Gallegos, Tradición, 15-17, who argues that the different types of cloisters may be more closely related to functional and environmental considerations rather than being strictly chronological.

The increasing diversity of the missionaries was so distressing to strict observants that Alonso de Escalona and Juan de Ribas unsuccessfully attempted to found a new reformed province named Insulana northwest of Mexico City in 1549 (ibid., 86-90).


118 Helms, “Sacred Landscape,” 442; Lilley, “Cities of God?” 302; Scheutz, “Pre-Euclidean Geometry,” 336, 341; Phillips, *Processions*, 305, 382, 394. Divine quaternity was seen in quartets such as the four directions, four winds, four seasons, four Gospels, four rivers of Eden and Paradise, the four cardinal virtues, and the four humors of medical theory. With the encounter of the Americas, Europeans remade world maps with four continents instead of the three of pre-Columbian O-T maps (Phillips, *Processions*, 382, 392).


121 Phelan, *The Millennial Kingdom*, 20; Lara, *City, Temple, Stage*, 43; Lilley, “Cities of God?” 300-302. This medieval typological manner of thinking remained important to Franciscan missionaries such as Mendieta, who employed it in justifying the use of force and coercion against Native peoples, and in interpreting the significance of Columbus and Cortez; see Phelan, *The Millennial Kingdom*, 6-9, 34-35.


123 Ibid., 13-14, 59. Mendieta did not directly cite Joachim of Fiore or Nicholas of Lyra, but his writing echoes their work, and clearly was inspired by the Joachimate tradition of apocalyptic mysticism that was revived during the reign of the Reyes Catolicas and reforms of Observant Franciscan Cardinal Francisco Ximénez de Cisneros (15). Other Franciscan millenarians included Toribio de Benevete (Motolinía), Martín de Valencia, and possibly the first Bishop of Mexico, Fray Juan de Zumárraga (46, 108). Not all Franciscan missionaries were of the millenarian bent, however, and others took a more practical view of evangelization, such as Bernardino de Sahagún, Juan Focher (26-27), and Pedro de Azuaga (46-47).

124 Ibid., 24; Francisco de los Angeles Quiñones quoted in Mendieta, *Historia Eclesiástica*, 128, my translation. The original passage reads:

   Mas ahora cuando ya el día del mundo va delinando a la hora undécima, sois llamados vosotros del Padre de las compañas, para que vais a su viña, no alquilados por algún precio, como otros, sino como verdaderos hijos de tan gran Padre; buscando no vuestras propias cosas; sino las que son de Jesucristo, corráis a la labor de la viña sin promesa de jornal, como hijos en pos de vuestro Padre.


126 Phelan, *The Millennial Kingdom*, 112. The Counter-Reformation church was hostile towards Joachimite perspectives, and the Italian visionary was not referenced explicitly (125).

127 Phelan, *The Millennial Kingdom*, 34-35; Mendieta, *Historia Eclesiástica*, 128-130. As further examples, Mendieta implicitly compares Mexico to the Holy Land when he parallels his account of its history to Jerome’s
account of Saint Paula of Rome’s pilgrimage to Palestine and establishment of a convent there (127). Likewise, he compares Mexico to the Holy Land promised to Abraham, calling converted Indians the children of Abraham (128), and equating the destruction of Mesoamerican temples to the destruction of the walls of Jericho upon the Israelites’ entry into the Promised Land (138).

128 Phelan, The Millennial Kingdom, 44. Quiñones had embraced similarly apostolic rhetoric in his charges to the doce; see Turley, Franciscan Spirituality, 31-32; Mendieta, Historia Eclesiástica, 121-123. See also Phillips, Processions, 22; Perez-Lila, “Introduccion,” XLII.

129 Phelan, The Millennial Kingdom, 52-56.

130 Ibid., 43, 49, 61; Phillips, Processions, 48. Motolinía specifically saw the Mexican missions as the church of the end times and end of the world; see Phillips, Processions, 49, 113-114.

131 Phelan, The Millennial Kingdom, 69, 71.


133 Kühnel, “Introduction,” XXIII.


135 Solomon had built the original temple c. 959 BCE, and it was destroyed in 586 BCE. A more modest Temple was rebuilt under Zerubbabel in 520 BCE, and in the first century BCE Herod ordered a grand renovation and reconstruction of it, which was in turn destroyed in 70 CE. Herod’s Temple was the structure of Biblical times. After its destruction, the Temple Mount was mostly unoccupied until Muslim use began in the seventh century. The Dome of the Rock was completed 691 CE. The al-Aqsa Mosque was built in 709-715 CE, and twice rebuilt c. 746 CE and c. 1033 CE. Carol Herselle Krinsky, “Representations of the Temple of Jerusalem Before 1500,” Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 33 (1970): 1-6; Beribert Busse, “The Temple of Jerusalem and Its Restitution by ‘Abd Al-Malik B. Marwân,” in Künel, The Real and Ideal Jerusalem, 22-33; Daniel H. Weiss, “Hec Est Domus Firmiter Edificata: The Image of the Temple in Crusader Art,” in Künel, The Real and Ideal Jerusalem, 210-217; Lara, City, Temple, Stage, 120-121, 143-145; Cahn, “Solomonic Elements,” 47-48.


137 Nicholas de Lyra’s commentary was purportedly required for every conventual library, and he was an important influence on millenarian theology and New Spanish missionaries, so much so that Lara (City, Temple, Stage, 128-134, 240 n. 124) speculates he provides the original model for mission architectural arrangements. Lara’s speculation is not without basis in Spanish thought. Writing in 1604, Spanish Jesuit and architectural theorist Juan Bautista Villalpando implies that the Temple of Solomon was the perfect building and archetype for all architecture, with its divine origin. See Paul von Naredi-Rainer, “Between Vatable and Villalpando: Aspects of Postmedieval Reception of the Temple in Christian Art,” in The Real and Ideal Jerusalem, 224.

138 Lara, City, Temple, Stage, 32; Krinskey, “Representations of the Temple,” 14-18. Artists cared little that this plan was unlike the Dome of the Rock, which appears in late-Medieval images as the Biblical Temple.


The allegorical relationship between the Celestial Jerusalem/Paradise/Church Triumphant and its terrestrial analogue in the form of the monastic cloister was well-established by the twelfth century in numerous medieval sources (Phillips, *Processions*, 365-375). The central point could be represented as a Tree of life, a Temple, or the Lamb of God. John specified that there would be no temple in the celestial city (Revelations 21:22) because the Lord God and the Lamb of God were the temple in themselves, but some representations such as Juan Gerson’s painting at Tecamachalco (figure 9.109) clearly show a version of the Dome of the Rock as a temple in the heavenly Jerusalem. That these beliefs about the celestial city continued in sixteenth-century Mexico are also evident in the writings of Franciscan and first Mexican Bishop Zumárraga who echoed the formulations of Durandas centuries before, urging European friars to join the evangelization campaign in Mexico, living life as a pilgrimage towards the Church Triumphant in celestial Jerusalem, fulfilling the Church Militant; quoted in Phillips, *Processions*, 305 and 339, n. 46, and see 366. The same beliefs remain evident at the dawn of the seventeenth century in Iberia, with the Jeronimite José de Sigüenza, who claimed to have designed the Patio de las Evangelistas in the palace of El Escorial, the “quintessential” Spanish cloister. According to Sigüenza, the patio was *un místico parayso terreno*, a seemingly contradictory “mystical terrestrial paradise” conflating the terrestrial paradise of Eden and the celestial paradise at the end of time. In his rendition, there were to be four basins of water representing the four rivers of paradise, the four evangelists who spread the Gospel throughout the world, and the four continents. At the center of the cloister was a ciborium representing Christ as the source of life, its dome standing on four piers, each with a niche containing a sculpture of one of the four Gospel writers. See Kubler, “The Claustral Fons Vitae,” 204-205; and Phillips, *Processions*, 382. Reiterating these various associations in the eighteenth century, Domínguez (The Missions, 68) states that a patio at the Franciscan *Convento Grande* in Mexico City was known as “the patio of Jerusalem.”

Minister General Bonaventure was a prominent Franciscan source articulating the conflation of the material garden of Eden, and the spiritual garden of the Church (i.e. the Church Militant in the terrestrial world and the Church Triumphant of the Heavenly Jerusalem/Celestial Paradise); Phillips, *Processions*, 365. That Franciscan missionaries envisioned Eden in this highly symbolic and schematic manner of a quadripartite square is evident in descriptions of theatrical reenactments of Genesis events and the fall from grace during Corpus Christi. These evangelistic spectacles included the quadripartite division of the staging area, with four mountains and lavish sets including living animals, fruit trees, flowering plants, and gold and featherwork props. See Peterson, *The Paradise Garden*, 146; and Phillips, *Processions*, 24, 348, 400.

Ledesma Gallegos, *Tradición*, 21, 42-43; Helms, “Sacred Landscape,” 432, 437, 444; Maeyvert, “The Medieval,” 58; Peterson, *The Paradise Garden*, 128. Roman forecourts with plants and fountains were originally called paradises, as were atria in Jerusalem where they were sites of prayer in the apostolic church. By the twelfth century, monastic courtyards were sometimes called paradises also, and compared explicitly to the Solomonic portico. See Peterson, *The Paradise Garden*, 130; Lara, *City, Temple, Stage*, 78-79. Missions in Mexico tapped into paradise imagery through their mural programs, a classic example being the elaborate painted vegetation on the walls of the Augustinian cloister in Malinalco. See Lara, *City, Temple, Stage*, 78-79; and Peterson, *The Paradise Garden*.
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Benavides, *The Memorial, 1630*, 11; “auemos defcubierto grandes tefores, afsi espiritualies como temporales,” (86). Benavides (Fray Alonso de Benavides’ Revised Memorial, 36, 63) reiterated this formulation in 1634, and evokes it again in a 1635 letter to Monsignor Inguli, where he frets over the potential to lose the spiritual and temporal conquests of New Mexico (“Concerning Missionary Work in New Mexico, July 8, 1635,” in Benavides, *Fray Alonso de Benavides’ Revised Memorial, 193*). Mendieta for his part, had also employed the rhetoric of spiritual and temporal treasures; see Phelan, *The Millennial Kingdom*, 64, 82, 106. For agricultural metaphors which played a more important role in his 1634 Memorial, see Fray Alonso de Benavides’ Revised Memorial, 36, 43, 54, 56, 62, 75, 80, 94, 103. In these agricultural tropes, Benavides follows earlier missionaries such as Francisco de los Angeles Quiñones and Mendieta. See *Historia Eclesiástica*, 122-123, 132; and Phelan, *The Millennial Kingdom*, 82.
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May 15, 1631,” in *Fray Alonso de Benavides’ Revised Memorial*, 140; Benavides, “Copy of the Account Which the Blessed Mother María de Jesús Writes to the Said Friars of New Mexico,” in *Fray Alonso de Benavides’ Revised Memorial*, 143-144.
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210 Benavides, *Fray Alonso de Benavides’ Revised Memorial*, 59-76.
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212 Ibid., 102. The Spanish reads: “todas eftas Ruedas deste reloj hade tener muy ajustadas el religioso sin descuidarfe un punto porque fein efto totalmente jepordaria [sic],” Benavides, 1634, “Relación y memorial,” 251.

213 Hodge, Hammond, and Rey, “Biography,” 12-16. As part of this ambition, Benavides seems to have intentionally downplayed Perea’s contributions.

214 Benavides to Inguli, 1635, 192-193. The Council of the Indies was suspicious of Benavides, his motives, and his testimony; see “Consulta of the Council” in *Fray Alonso de Benavides’ Revised Memorial*, 158. After Benavides’s
effort, the question remained of whether New Mexico should be assigned a Bishop, and Commissary-General of New Mexico Fray Juan de Prada (“Petition, September 26, 1638,” 113) wrote a petition declaring that New Mexico did not have sufficient resources to support a Bishopric, the erection of a Cathedral, or secularization. In his letter he opposes Benavides’s claims in almost every way.

215 Scholes, Church and State, 103-104; Hodge, Hammond, and Rey, “Biography,” 3-4.

216 Benavides, The Memorial, 1630, 22-23, 56-57; Fray Alonso de Benavides’ Revised Memorial, 68. Benavides does accuse one of the governors (nameless) of sponsoring slaving raids against groups of Apaches, undermining evangelization among them (The Memorial, 1630, 56-57). Notably, he dropped this criticism in 1634, blaming Vaquero Apaches’ resistance on the Devil’s hindrance and the actions of “an accursed Indian” instead of the Governor. He also praised the virtues of Don Juan de Oñate and the early Spanish colonists (Fray Alonso de Benavides’ Revised Memorial, 57, 59, 92). Other writings by Benavides suggest that his conciliatory attitude towards civil authorities may also have been strategic and rhetorical. In a petition to the Crown in favor of exempting mission community Indians from tribute obligations, Benavides is more critical of Spanish civil practices of encomienda, slavery, and land theft, as well as profiteering by the governors and their interference with Franciscan authorities (“Petitions of Benavides,” 169-173).

217 He makes appeals to the potential financial benefit of industries such as mining, and while criticizing Spanish settlers as lazy and ignorant, he implies supporting a moderate civil government to oversee these works in partnership with the missionaries’ social objectives (The Memorial, 1630, 18-19, 63, 64, 68).

218 Benavides, The Memorial, 1630, 62. The Spanish reads:

De fuerte, que eftado todo aquella tierra hafta agora por el demonio, y poblado de idolatria, fin que huuieffe perfona que alabaffe al Santifsimo nombre de Iefus; oy eftà toda poblada de Templos, y Conuentos, y de peañas de la Cruz, y no ay quie a vozes por los capos, faludandofe vnos a otros, no alaben a Dios, y a fu fantifsisma Madre […] (164-165).

219 Benavides, Fray Alonso de Benavides’ Revised Memorial, 80. The Spanish reads:

[…] y eftà toda la tierra poblada de templos, comdentas y crufes porlos caminos y tan bien induftelados y enfenados que viven como perfectos criftianos y en lopuleticlo dieftos en todas partes y en particular en el canto de órgano [unclear] culto divino […] (Benavides, 1634, “Relación y memorial,” 242).

220 de Espejo, “Report,” 225; Pérez de Luxán, Expedition, 89, 93; Oñate, “Expedition to the South Sea,” 395.

221 INRI stands for the Latin inscription for as “Jesus the Nazarene, King of the Jews,” typically represented as a sign at the top of the cross. This piece was probably affixed to the base of a standing cross. The back of the stone is scored with a metal chisel to better adhere to its substructure, suggesting that it dates to the mission period because such chisels were among the tools that missionaries brought with them to each pueblo. The NMAI catalog has no information about the provenance of this slab, and I have not found mention of it in the field notes. Hodge does speak of it at the end of a manuscript from 1924 entitled “Hawikuh of the Zunis: A Scene of Franciscan Tragedies” (MS.7.MAI.4.18, FWH, 11), where he concludes the story of the Franciscan deaths at Hawikku by writing,

The day was dying in the west when, strolling from the camp toward the brow of the Hawikuh knoll, my eye fell on a flat-topped rock which conjured up memories of generations agone and of the loneliness of him who pecked in the upper face the simple but meaningful initials- INRI.

It should be noted that there are metal chisel traces in the upper face of this slab also. The artist initially sketched part of the first letter lightly with a chisel, and then rejected this design and technique, preferring to peck the letters instead. Although Hodge seems to believe the stone was created by a “lonely” friar, it seems much more likely that the artist was a Zuni who opted to use familiar petroglyphic techniques of grinding and inscription, following a pattern that the missionary gave to him or her. It seems unlikely that a literate friar would have reversed the letter “N.” For metal chisels as part of the missionaries’ toolkit, see “Supplies for Benavides,” 118; Scholes, “The Supply Service,” 103.
For processions, see Benavides, *The Memorial, 1630*, 21; Fray Alonso de Benavides’ Revised Memorial, 66, 100; “Hearing of May 11, 1663,” 141; “Declaration of Miguel de Noriega, May, 1661,” in Hackett, *Historical Documents*, III, 185; Tamarrón y Romeral, “Copy of the report,” 82. Cushing (“Outlines of Zuni Creation Myths,” 338) describes a procession of “the dilapidated little figure of Saint Francis borne about the pueblo on the eve of the ‘Feast of the Dead,’” along with displays of candles, rosaries, brass crucifixes, the ringing of church bells, and recitations of bits of Latin chant. This was probably actually the Santo Nino/Santu figure. Bunzel (“Introduction to Zuñi Ceremonialism,” 491) for instance, writes that she believes Santu was “a small St. Francis.”

Fray Salvador de Guerra makes explicit the metaphor of bells as the anthropomorphic voice of the mission, writing of his hope that the mobile Suma Indians near El Paso del Norte (present-day Ciudad Juarez) would “like the rest, come to see themselves subjected to the voice of the two bells which this conversion now has.” See Scholes, “Documents III,” 197. The Spanish reads, “[…] fe congregesen y llegeren aberse subjetos a las Vozes de dos Campanas que oi tiene efta Combersion […]” (Guerra, 1668, “Testimonio del estado,” 2).

See Chapter 1, n. 8, above.

The praying of such masses was one of the mendicant orders’ primary form of spiritual currency, both in Europe and in the Americas. See Melvin, *Building Colonial Cities*, 134-137; Bruzelius, *Preaching*, 6, 139.

Benavides, *The Memorial, 1630*, 35-36. The Spanish reads:

[…] y a todos los Indios, como tan intereffados les enfeñamos, fiépre encomienden a Dios a V. M. pues con tantos gafts les embia, y fuftenta allí miniftros y Iglefias para la fuluació de fus almas, y lo hazé de ordinario, y nofotros los Religiofos, como tan aficionados, y obligados vaffallos, y Capellanes, jama dexamos, afí en las Miffas, como en nueftras particulares oraciones, de encomédar a Dios a V. M. en aquel tâ remote Reino fuyo, y en aquella primitiua Iglefia, adonde nueftro Señor obra tantas marauillas: en todo y por todo fea la honra y Gloria a Dios nuesftro Señor (124-125).

Emphasis added; see Chapter 1, n. 6, above.

Vine Deloria Jr. (*God is Red*, 57-62) describes the distinctive privileging of linear time in Western European/Christian religious thought, in contrast to the emphasis on space, in the form of place and nature, which he believes is characteristic of Native religious thought. Deloria’s thesis holds up in the general sense, although there are exceptions. Medieval Europeans also experienced time cyclically through the liturgical calendar and cult of the saints, and specific European individuals have seemed to experience place in a more directly interpersonal or relational manner, such as Saint Francis’s address of nature in his “Canticle of the Creatures,” or more recently in the person of John Muir. Likewise, there have been Native cultures such as the Classic Maya who recorded a stronger linear concept of history in stone inscriptions about the accomplishments of their rulers, although these linear historical narratives remained integrated into larger cyclical conceptions of time.

CHAPTER 10: FOOD PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION IN THE HAWIKKU CONVENTO

The Spanish were not alone in framing their experience of New Mexico through metaphor; associative thought and implication are also essential to Pueblo cosmology and aesthetics. While great differences in metaphoric content divided Spanish and Pueblo cultures, both thought about the material world through the indirect associations and tangled implications of metaphoric meaning. An overview of corn and its significance for Zunis demonstrates complex layering of meaning central to this chapter’s discussion of food production and consumption in the Hawikku mission convento.

Maize is an ancient domesticate of grassy teosinte plants in Mexico’s southern highlands, which reached the Southwest by at least 1000 BCE. Over time the basic staple diversified in numerous varieties with different colors and characteristics (figure 10.1). Reliance upon maize, the “seed of seeds,” weaves deeply through Zuni philosophy and concepts of the world. In some accounts, maize came from two witches, who emerged last from the underworld and exchanged the seeds for sacrifices leading to rain. Zunis think of corn as the flesh of the 'A:dowa 'E’lashdok’i or Corn Maidens, seven beautiful virgin sisters and supernatural persons representing the six colors of maize (yellow, blue, red, white, all colors, and black) and sweet corn (figure 10.2-10.3). As “raw people” invisible to eyes of humans (“cooked people”), the Corn Maidens are benevolent “mothers of men,” who bless the Zuni people and give life and bounty to their harvest. Their flesh is the proper food for human beings, conferring beauty and health, while placing Zunis in a series of reciprocal relations. Zuni households traditionally store
and protect the harvested flesh of the Corn Maidens through winter, replanting the seeds in the spring, and treating everything related to corn with a degree of sacredness.\(^6\) Corn’s growth, harvest, and nourishment are primary objects of Zuni prayers, and seed distributions are important blessings during certain ceremonies.\(^7\)

Corn is essential to reciprocation between Zunis and the animate world in which they live. They offer it to the ancestors and spirit beings (\textit{kokkos}), directly as bits of food; as ground meal with feathered prayer sticks and sprinkled on dancers; and as gifts of corn pollen.\(^8\) Ceremonial participants sprinkle corn meal on sacred objects, and paint with it on the floor to make the “road of life” from the entryway to the altar.\(^9\) Ears of corn are part of bundles called “Father and Mother corn,” which women place in storerooms to ensure bountiful crops.\(^10\) Perfect ears bound in a sequence of colorful feathers are part of \textit{miwe} (singular \textit{milî}), the “mother corn” fetishes of initiated medicine men that stand upright in the center of altars.\(^11\)

Zuni time and space are metaphorically interwoven with maize. The different colors of corn represent the six directions and passage of time through its annual cycle. Yellow corn symbolizes the north and winter season, blue the west, red the south and the land of summer, and white the east, while all-colored corn signifies the zenith, and black the underworld. The Zuni ceremonial cycle is structured around the rainy season and growing crops, with six nameless months in the summer and fall each connected to a color of corn. According to ethnographers, Zunis described time and life cycles as stages in the growth of corn, frequently a standard of measuring and comparison.\(^12\) Corn was and continues to be a metaphor for many aspects of the Zuni world.\(^13\)

Corn was linked to gendered labor divisions, with men and women comprising complimentary, equal, and interdependent groups, a social ideology with ancient Pueblo roots.\(^14\)
Women were associated with Mother Earth, possessing inalienable lands around the village through lineages, while men farmed and could clear new fields further away (figure 10.4). Women owned the household’s harvest and cared for its storage, welcoming the corn to the house as a conscious, benign, and happy presence.\(^\text{15}\) Planting and farming also had gendered implications, with men using digging sticks to deposit seed in the fertile earth, and cultivating familial relationships with the plants and fields.\(^\text{16}\) At once sacred and cosmologically significant, Zunis experienced corn through daily labor and embedded in all aspects of their lives.

Consistent with the importance of maize in Zuni ethnography, Hodge’s excavations encountered frequent traces it at Hawikku. Offerings of corn cobs, kernels, and prayer meal accompanied burials in both the pre-contact and colonial eras, while women’s grave goods included *metates, manos*, and stone griddles for processing corn.\(^\text{17}\) Hodge interpreted certain ceremonial deposits as offerings to the Corn Maidens, one of which contained a complete ear of corn possibly for sprinkling medicine water.\(^\text{18}\) Household contents such as unshelled corn, ground corn meal, and corn flour indicated reliance upon maize as a dietary staple.\(^\text{19}\) Religious implications were evident in artifacts such as an ear of “charred corn wrapped with grass […] such as is used in the Corn Dance,” and a petroglyphic slab Hodge interpreted as a “corn person.”\(^\text{20}\) Finally, Hawikku’s painted ceramics exhibit patterns associated with corn, and representations of corn plants (figure 10.5).\(^\text{21}\)

Corn’s significance for Zunis illustrates the entanglement of cultural ideas with everyday practices. Such entanglements are especially potent in cuisine, including the ingredients and foods people eat; techniques and recipes for preparing them; and habits of presenting and consuming those foods. Cuisine comprises meaningful communicative practices, which express the varied perspectives of participants, creating space for their interventions and agency.\(^\text{22}\)
Dining together bonds people socially and physically as their bodies metabolize the same food, but is also an occasion when differences and social hierarchies may become visible through seating and table rituals. In sum, food preparation, service, and consumption are communicative practices that people enact in architectural space using a variety of artifacts. Together they constitute the artistry of cuisine through space, materials, and performance.

Benavides’s description of mission community roles (see Chapter 1) indicates the centrality of cuisine to everyday activities in New Mexico conventos. As my Chapter 3 delineates, work such as growing and procuring foodstuffs, cooking them in the convento, and serving them at the table were primary tasks of mission laborers. Food preparation brought the landscape of mesas, fields, and gardens into the heart of the convento, where mission community members transformed staples for consumption by Native and Spanish residents alike.

While the Franciscans strongly determined mission designs and liturgy, traces of everyday culinary activities offer glimpses of Native mission community members. In anthropological terms, everyday cuisine encompasses highly structured activities, or the entrenched patterns of behavior that significantly shape people’s actions. Within these restraints, however, people exercise degrees of choice and agency, which are not always fully conscious or intentional. To Spanish men, food preparation was a secular, low-status activity assigned to Native women. While missionaries were anxious about many American foods, they ultimately depended upon Indigenous cooks and cuisine much of the time. For Zuni participants in the mission community, cuisine would have been interwoven with ceremonial, ritual, and cosmological implications from their cultural upbringing, as well as social systems of gender and status. Cuisine was a marginal area of the mission program, allowing for the continued expression of Indigenous ideas in the midst of the convento.
In this chapter, I consider the spatial, material, and cultural dimensions of cuisine in the *convento* of the Purísima Concepción. Drawing on primary sources, archaeological remains, and ethnographic evidence, I reconstruct New Mexico mission cuisine, analyze the techniques and spatial patterns of cooking in Hawikku’s mission, and introduce the refectory table as a space which opens up consideration of the everyday negotiation among Pueblo and Spanish cosmological metaphors and social practices. Dependency upon Indigenous labor produced an ambivalent situation undercutting many Spanish concepts of bodily nutrition. The evidence indicates Pueblo women were active participants in mission cuisine, and missions relied upon their knowledge and labor for sustenance. Culinary features and tableware from the mission exhibit innovative combinations of Spanish and Indigenous cultures, in response to the challenges of cohabitation under the colonial regime. Studying culinary practices within the Hawikku *convento* thus enlivens its architectural spaces with the sounds and bustle of everyday life. In this chapter I will focus on interconnected spaces and materials related to food, gender, and worldview, leaving much of the actual taste and aroma of mission cuisine for future consideration.

**European Nutritional Theory and Mission Cuisine**

Many Early Modern Europeans looked upon Indigenous American cuisine with distrust. Renaissance nutritional theories relied upon second-century CE Greek physician Galen of Pergamum. The commonly held but widely variable tenets of Galenic nutrition were based in the theory that four humoral fluids (blood, choler, phlegm, and bile/melancholy) determined one’s health and constitution. Texture was another key characteristic, which Europeans believed
directly affected the ease with which their bodies assimilated food. Early Modern Christians saw Eucharistic elements of bread and wine as being most like human flesh and blood of any food, and thus most nutritional and replenishing for their bodies. Europeans further believed grades of bread reflected social hierarchy, with fine white bread suitable for socially elite bodies, and coarse brown bread for lower-class working bodies.

Spanish colonists sought to retain familiar European cuisine as much as possible, looking with suspicion or disgust upon Indigenous foods such as maize, starchy roots, cactus, insects, and other small animals, while doubting whether tropical fruits and meats offered sufficient sustenance. They feared regular consumption of American foods would convert their bodies into something more Native through assimilation. They considered eating American foods a marker of criollo or “de-natured” European identity and lower social status. Following the inverse of this logic, Franciscan missionary Bernardino de Sahagún writes that Indians should eat what “Castilian people eat, because it is good food, that with which they [the Spanish] are raised, they are strong and pure and wise… You [Native persons] will become the same if you eat their food.”

The Spanish diet based in wheat, wine, and olive oil was a distinct culinary complex contrasting Indigenous diets based in maize, beans, and squash. It derived from Roman Iberia, with later Arabic contributions including sugar, melons, artichokes, citrus, rice, and sorghum. Stews and soups served hot or cold were common, with additions of stale wheat bread, chickpeas, onions, cucumbers, garlic, and olive oil. Eggplants, spinach, dried fruit, nuts, and olives were also important. Native and Spanish diets each had significant religious implications, with corn tied to traditional Pueblo beliefs, while the Catholic church mandated wheat and wine for the Eucharist, and olive oil for the sacraments.
Regular clergy such as the Franciscans stood apart from normal European dietary practices, and did not necessarily follow Galenic nutritional recommendations.36 Many monastic orders such as the Benedictines developed rules for food production and consumption.37 Francis, however, advocated a practical approach based on moderation and spiritual discernment. Franciscans were to cheerfully keep the regular fasts, but were not bound to fasting otherwise, or when in physical hardship.38 As mendicants, they were to obtain sustenance from the “Table of the Lord” through begging and the generosity of others, and be content eating what they received, be it poor or rich.39 Francis saw the body as a vehicle for the soul, warning against indulgence that might desensitize the soul, but also allowing each brother to care for his physical needs as necessary to facilitate his work.40 Some Franciscans pursued rigorous bodily discipline through sparse diets, as for example when John of Capistrano, lived on eggs, fish, and vegetables.41 Others were more liberal in enjoying the Lord’s Table, relishing rich feasts at the behest of noble patrons. For example the Chronicle of thirteenth-century Italian Salimbene de Adam betrays a deep appreciation for epicurean pleasures and a connoisseur’s knowledge of wine, recounting lavish feasts and lamenting disappointing meals.42

While some scholars have portrayed mission cuisine in Mexico as humble and modest, other accounts suggest richer dining.43 For example, the ex-Dominican friar and Englishman abroad Thomas Gage betrays a fixation on foods similar to Salimbene, filling his travel account with descriptions of meals, especially in Mexican conventos where he arrived in 1625. Gage details the “most stately dinner […] prodigiously lavished” upon the friars in the Dominican convento at Veracruz, with fish, meat, and all sorts of fowl, liquid chocolate, sweetmeats, conserves,
[and a] store of dainties, such variety as might likewise relish well and delight our sense of tasting […] we tasted what was sweet, and in the sweetmeats smelt the musk and civet, wherewith that epicurean prior had seasoned his conserves.\textsuperscript{44}

He claims to have been equally well-fed during stays at Franciscan *conventos* in Segura de la Frontera, Tlaxcala, and Huejotzingo.

The confluence of Galenic nutritional theory, in which one’s body reflected one’s diet, and Eurocentric suspicion of *criollo* and Native peoples manifests in Gage’s contemplation of his changing eating habits while in New Spain. At the Dominican *convento* of Mexico City, he wondered why he felt compelled to eat the abundant sweets,

for to every one of us […] there was brought on Monday morning half a dozen boxes of conserves of quinces and other fruits, besides our biscuits, to stay our stomachs in the mornings and at other times of the day […] in Mexico and other parts of America we found that two or three hours after a good meal of three or four several dishes of mutton, veal or beef, kid, turkeys, or other fowls, our stomachs would be ready to faint, and so we were fain to support them with either a cup of chocolate, or a bit of conserve or biscuit, which for that purpose was allowed us in great abundance.\textsuperscript{45}

In response, a doctor claimed that Mexico’s climate produced foods and people that *appeared* as good as those of Europe, but were hollow and lacking in substance.

As in the flesh we fed on, so likewise in all the fruits there, which are most fair and beautiful to behold, most sweet and luscious to taste, but little inward virtue or nourishment at all in them […] And as in meat and fruit there is this inward and hidden deceit, so *likewise the same is to be found in the people that are born and bred there*, who make fair outward shews, but are inwardly false and hollow-hearted.\textsuperscript{46}

With such prejudices, less rigorous friars such as the *relajado* faction could justify diets very different from the austerity of strict observance. In fact, many of Mexico’s distinctive foods such as *mole* and renowned sweets seem to have originated in the kitchens of convents and *conventos* during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.\textsuperscript{47} Ultimately, mission cuisine varied widely according to the mendicant order and the local context, and underlying conceptions of
mission dining seem to have run the gamut from courtly banqueting to humble domestic subsistence.

New Mexico sources reveal a wide range of available foods, depending upon the location, season, and weather. Benavides emphasizes the region’s fertility and richness, including both indigenous resources and some of Spanish introduction. Plant-based foods included corn, wheat, beans, lentils, peas, vetches, pumpkins, watermelons, muskmelons, cucumbers, cabbages, lettuce, assorted other greens, carrots, artichokes, peppers, onions, prickly pears, *pitalayías*, plums, apricots, peaches, nuts, acorns, mulberries, and piñon nuts. Along the rivers, available fish included catfish, trout, silver chub, eel, shovel nose, *matalota*, sucker, gar, and other types. Wild game included deer (mule and white tail), rabbits (cottontail and jack), foxes, wolves, mountain lions, wildcats, bears, mountain sheep, and bison. By the second quarter of the seventeenth-century, pueblos were herding cattle, sheep and swine, along with chickens and indigenous turkeys.48

Mere availability did not mean mission communities exploited all food resources. From what I can reconstruct of seventeenth-century New Mexico cuisine, they ate a simple, robust diet combining Spanish and Indigenous elements. Newly arrived friars brought supplies of meat, fish, wheat flour, wheat biscuits, cheese, fruit conserves, sugar, and spices such as saffron, pepper, and cinnamon. Every three years additional wagon trains replenished the wine, olive oil, vinegar and spices unobtainable in New Mexico.49 Records and archaeological evidence indicate heavy reliance upon cattle, sheep, wheat, beans, and American staples such as maize, chocolate, local game, and chilies, while orchards and gardens produced fruit and vegetables.50 Hawikku’s archaeological evidence points to maize as a particularly important foodstuff, which Zuni cooks prepared by grinding, boiling, grilling, and baking with hot stones.51 Documents indicate use of
hominy and the preparation of watery ground maize (*atole*), often for the sick.\textsuperscript{52} Missionaries relied upon Zuni women to expand and diversify their diet through expertise in cooking maize, the essential dietary staple of the pueblos and a food of tremendous cultural and religious significance.\textsuperscript{53} As the community grew and triennial supplies dwindled, friars must have been increasingly dependent upon Native cooks, attesting to the kitchen’s importance as a space of everyday negotiation, where new combinations of cultural practices and materials arose through practical necessity.

Shadows of famine consistently haunted seventeenth-century New Mexico, with severe food shortages from 1658 to 1660, and from 1667 to 1672. Hunger drove consumption of unappetizing starvation foods, and Indians and Spanish alike relied on missions for food during hard years, although Zuni oral histories also point to starvation as a consequence of Hawikku’s missionization itself.\textsuperscript{54} Fasting was another form of hunger, integrated into the annual cycle of mission life, and occurring as many as 170 days per year.\textsuperscript{55} Christian fasting involved significant local variations, but generally required healthy individuals to abstain from meat and animal products, eating only one meal per day, usually around the ninth hour (approximately 3:00 PM), or at sundown. Fasting meals included fruits, vegetables, grains, beans, fish, and other water-dwellers not considered “meat.”\textsuperscript{56} Benavides’s comments suggest a medieval “feast and fast” attitude towards mortifying the flesh, and his list of New Mexico fishes reflect fasting demands.\textsuperscript{57} Seafood in shipping manifests, and fish remains at the Palace of the Governors both point to Christian fasting, while an inventory from Senecú mission describes fish consumption during Lent in 1672.\textsuperscript{58} Other mentions of fasting are rare, however, and mission communities likely did not observe the full regimen due to the demands of active frontier life and the difficulty of obtaining fish and seafood in distant, arid posts.\textsuperscript{59}
Seventeenth-century New Mexico mission cuisine combined Native staples with the Iberian tradition of mixed Christian and Arab elements. Wagon trains brought many processed or partly processed components, and the cuisine used few spices or difficult ingredients. This robust simplicity was important for newly established missions, where friars with little cooking experience had to communicate with Pueblo women working in the kitchens. Beyond practical utility, the rustic cuisine of New Mexico conventos had connotative significance, expressing Franciscan values of poverty and simplicity. The otherwise omnivorous banquets of European courts avoided many foods that missions grew for consumption. Courtly diners disliked beans, onions, and garlic, for example, but these were staples in New Mexico along with cabbage and chilies. In Galenic theory, these vegetables were primarily suitable for the bodies of rustics and laborers rather than gentility. They carried a scripted message within the larger context of Early Modern European cuisine, as foods appropriate for the manual laborers making up the mission community. In sharing these foods, Franciscan friars portrayed themselves as part of the same lot of simple commoners, even while making great effort to obtain stocks of oysters, chocolate, and fruit conserves. Missionaries occupied a social position not unlike local nobility, controlling mission estates and exercising power over Pueblo labor and activities, but they presented themselves as rustic laborers in the fields of spiritual harvest, echoing the agricultural metaphors of their writing (see Chapter 9).

**Spaces of Food Production**

Jeffrey Pilcher describes the kitchens of New Mexico as “arena[s] of culinary innovation” where Pueblo women creatively recombined Indigenous, Mesoamerican and Spanish cuisine,
leading to distinctive foods such as wheat-tortilla tacos now essential to international “Mexican” food. At the Purísima Concepción, food preparation involved spaces both indoors and outdoors, at the mission and in the outlying fields, woods, and hunting grounds from which Zuni laborers brought raw materials. These workers planted, cultivated, and harvested fields to bring in maize, vegetables, fruit, and wheat, which required threshing, shelling, and dehydration on the rooftops of the mission. Mission community members put these foodstuffs away in various convento storerooms, while others brought water and firewood to convert them into meals. The process of transforming Zuni labor and products into functional commodities under the guardian friar’s control tangibly manifests the missionaries’ efforts to reorganize Pueblo landscapes, but the viewpoints, habits, and agricultural knowledge of Indigenous workers were infused throughout. Pueblo workers did not simply become mute substitutes for European peasants when Spanish colonists expropriated their labor.

Ruiz describes multiple working areas at the eighteenth-century Jemez mission, distinguishing a summer kitchen (presumably outdoors) from its winter kitchen. It is likely that Hawikku’s Purísima Concepción also had several internal and external cooking locations, but unfortunately, Nusbaum’s excavations did not yield much information about the service patio or its surroundings. Therefore, it is only possible to discuss culinary work spaces within the convento core, including the formal kitchen, a grinding room, and other informal use areas.

a. Kitchen

The formal mission plan includes space for cooking in the southern corner of the convento (Room 13, see Chapter 7 and figures 7.128, 7.130, 7.161, 10.6, 12.29). With a solid wooden door from the ambulatory (figures 7.162-7.163), it was near the service patio, but to
enter the kitchen one had to first enter the *convento* core. It had adobe benches along the walls, a storage bin on the southwest side, and a raised work area along the full-width fireplace of the northeast wall. These features indicate a combination of characteristics from European and Indigenous culinary traditions.

An adobe workbench with sandstone pavement spanned the northeast end of the room, set away from the wall to create a firepit. The bench’s irregular slabs formed a working surface with an overhanging lip in front (figures 10.7-10.9). It could have served for cutting, kneading, and many other culinary tasks, similar to “work stones” embedded in domestic floors of some Hawikku houses. It is likely that a large wooden beam spanned the room above the workbench, with wooden slats or stone slabs forming a mud-plastered smoke hood venting through chimneys at the roof level. Comparable examples of wall-length hearths and smoke hoods are documented at Acoma and Cochití Pueblos (figures 10.10-10.11).

The Purísima Concepción hearth combined European vernacular traditions with Early Modern developments in cooking technology and adaptations of Pueblo practices. During the Medieval period, open hearth cooking predominated in European halls and kitchens, located in the center of the room with smoke dissipating through vents, windows, and open-truss roofs. Few examples of these “black kitchens” survive today (figure 10.12). Starting in the eighth and ninth centuries, masons began incorporating fireplaces into the walls of elite buildings for heating and cooking, with chimneys becoming exterior status symbols, and largely replacing open hearths by the sixteenth century (figure 10.13). With time, fireplace hearths were raised to allow cooks to stand while working, and elite kitchens came to have brick ranges with several small fireboxes for cooking multiple pots at different temperatures simultaneously.
raised hearths debuted during the Renaissance, and were relatively standard in European kitchens by the late 1500s.

At the vernacular level, plaster-coated brick or wood smoke hoods accompanied the shift away from centralized floor hearths. In the region of Extremadura, for example, brick smoke bays spanned the end walls of kitchens, resting on large wooden mantle beams or flattened three-point arches (figure 10.14). This form goes back to the sixteenth century, but remains evident in monumental Extremaduran chimney stacks today (figure 10.15). These smoke bays became social centers of homes, as household members gathered and sat on stools around small fires against their back walls (figure 10.16).

Conventual kitchens in Mexico were often spacious and well-equipped with recent technological developments, but floor-level hearths with wide chimneys or smoke bays persisted through the sixteenth century, such as at Acolman (Augustinian, figure 10.17). Huejotzingo’s mission kitchen is another notable example, with an aqueduct and cistern supplying water, a cold room, a bakery, and the kitchen itself attached to the refectory through a short hallway (figure 10.18). Most cooking occurred in the kitchen’s monumental floor-level open hearth (figure 10.19), while the bakery next door included a limestone oven for bread.

Following European developments, ranges with raised cooking stations came into general use in New Spanish conventos by the seventeenth century. Mexican examples include the elaborate range at the Discalced Franciscan convento of Churubusco, a tiled range at Puebla’s Dominican convent of Santa Rosa, and a much simpler version in the later Franciscan mission of Santa Barbara, CA (figures 10.20-10.22). For the Spanish, standing before these ranges probably seemed more comfortable than squatting to cook, and the fireboxes allowed safer, more efficient heating at various temperatures simultaneously, necessary for European-style dining.
Early Modern Spanish courtly cuisine was characterized by a variety of dishes prepared using a few basic procedures: open-fire roasting; baking in pies and small pastries (ancestors of *empanadas*); grinding and stuffing of ingredients; and especially a range of stews and complex soups, with the evening being the heavier of two daily meals.\(^8^0\) While cuisine at Hawikku was simpler than European courts, the principle of preparing multiple dishes at once probably still applied, in contrast to single, shared pots of Zuni households. Artifacts including milling stones (see below), a bronze pestle for grinding ingredients (figure 10.23), and utilitarian pots for boiling and stewing (apparently not collected) testify to the adaptation of Spanish cooking processes to the mission context.\(^8^1\) The kitchen hearth with its multiple cooking stations was the centerpiece for these culinary creations.

Room 13’s long fire pit had four stations or hearths subdividing its length (figure 10.24). The northwest half of the pit was a single open hearth (station 4), with upright slabs at the northwest end and a curbing of thick slabs along its front side.\(^8^2\) Mud plaster coated the back wall, showing a crumbling, discolored surface suggestive of burning. This station was probably an open roasting pit, with the upright slab centered at its end helping to support a spit or grill.

Adobe brick partitions on the southeast end divide the rest of the fireplace into smaller cook stations, with at least two raised above the workbench. The first partition was 68.6 centimeters (2’ 3””) from the southeast wall, comprising brick headers on their sides, projecting from the back wall about 55.9 centimeters (1’ 10””). Blackening shows that the corner space (station one) served for some cooking tasks, probably as a secondary open hearth, similar to station four but smaller. A second adobe partition created cooking station two, which was 53.3 centimeters (1’ 9””) wide. Station three was narrower, only 20.3 centimeters (8””) wide, with brick filling in the back of the cook station to create a much smaller burner. Although its
partition was damaged at the time of excavations, it probably rose to the same height as the first partition, creating a raised cooking surface about 30.5 centimeters (1’) above the workbench.\textsuperscript{83}

The large kitchen fireplace was quite different from modest floor-level fireboxes in Hawikku’s houses. Its multiple cooking stations against the wall, two with raised surfaces, and overhead smoke hood derive from European and Mexican kitchen evolutions. The elevated cooking stations were analogous to seventeenth-century raised ranges, and the arrangement would have permitted preparation of multiple recipes and cooking techniques at once, suitable for feeding a collective mission community. Ashes filling the fire pit testify to heavy use, but the kitchen hearth was more than a simple imposition of Spanish cooking technologies and practices.

Although the hearth evoked Mexico’s raised ranges, Hawikku’s paved working bench interfered. It was too high and wide to easily reach across (figure 10.25), and its placement in front of a wall-length hearth was a new combination of Spanish and Native cooking technologies. To conveniently reach the cooking stations, women turning spits, adjusting pots, or adding fuel must have squatted directly on the paved working surface itself. As a result, the fireplace was as much like a floor-level hearth as a raised range in practice. The adobe fireboxes of cooking stations two and three were similar in size to the slab linings of traditional Zuni fireplaces. Like floor-level hearths, station three’s small burner could have accommodated imported, hybrid, and traditional round-bottomed Zuni vessels alike. Station two’s wider firebox, is similar to proportions of hearths for making corn wafer bread (figure 10.26).\textsuperscript{84}

Wafer bread hearths typically had upright slabs on three sides, with the fourth open to feed the fire, and a flat stone griddle on top (lower left in figure 10.10).\textsuperscript{85} These thin slabs \textit{(Helashnakya Ahle)} had carefully ground and seasoned griddle surfaces, with laborious treatments of pine pitch, cactus pulp, grease, or vegetable oils, and were burnished with a hard
pebble to yield a greasy, non-stick finish (figure 10.27). Such griddle stones had first appeared on the Colorado Plateau in the late-thirteenth century, and archaeologists have tied them to the spread of Kachina religion through the region. Ethnographic accounts describe hewe as a prime staple of Zuni cuisine, with rich cultural significance and numerous variations. Cushing claims mastery of its difficult preparation was crucial to young women’s social status. They scooped a precise mix of cooked and raw corn-flour batter from separate bowls, deftly spreading it across the hot stone with bare palms in paper-thin layers. The resulting wafer quickly toasted to produce a crisp, light, thin sheet, which the cook lifted intact, stacking, folding, or rolling it for service (figure 10.28). Zuni women still produce this bread today (figures 10.26, 10.29), which tastes like mildly sweet tortilla chips. Cushing describes it as “the most perfect of all known corn foods,” and perhaps Coronado meant hewe when he claimed residents of Hawikku ate “the best tortillas I have seen anywhere.”

The adobe partitions of station two create a space proportioned similar to paper bread hearths, and Nusbaum attests to the discovery of broken griddle stones across the kitchen fireplace, which he did not photograph or document at the time of excavation. An unprovenanced, broken griddle collected in 1919 suggests what the surface of the cooking station might have looked like (figure 10.30). Although the documentation is inconclusive, this piece likely came from the mission, and its incomplete proportions plausibly could have fit the second cooking station. The unusual double griddle is unlike other hewe and piki stones which typically have a single greased surface. About 25.5 centimeters (10.04”) in diameter, the burners are roughly tortilla sized. Nusbaum found two other round griddle slabs reused in the post-mission floor of Room 22A, and they may have originally belonged to the mission period as well (figure 10.31-10.32).
Cushing describes the religiously significant process of creating *Helashnakya Ahle* griddles in the 1880s. On that occasion, a group of female elders quarried and prepared stones after four days of prayerful retreat, accompanied by a male priest of the Badger Clan who kindled a new fire for seasoning the stones. The women worked silently to avoid contaminating the stones’ spiritual essence with passions that might later cause cracks or other malfunctions. The new griddles entered Zuni homes with a solemn ceremony including offerings, ritual introductions to the household corn, and a first baking with the elder matron presiding. The labor that went into preparing stone griddles, the risk of cracking, and their ceremonial production conferred a cherished status on *hewe* stones, and complete examples are rare in archaeological contexts since they received heavy use. The presence of undamaged *hewe* stones face-down in the post-mission floor of Room 22-A suggests that they likely came from a mission-period kitchen, but no longer belonged to anyone after the 1672 raid, leading to their reuse as paving.

Although the mission’s raised cooking stations had similarities to Early Modern cooking ranges, their simple fireboxes fit equally well with traditional Zuni floor-level culinary practices, round-bottom vessels, and stone griddles. The kitchen fireboxes and broken *hewe* stones point to Pueblo elements in mission community cuisine, while indicating the continuity of familiar bodily comportment as Zuni women produced *convento* meals. The labor of cooking in the seventeenth century was hard, physical work, and such embodied habits are not easily altered. Zuni women habitually prepared meals by kneeling behind flat grinding stones and squatting next to floor-level fireboxes, and the arrangement of the mission kitchen indicates that many of these practices continued in the *convento*. 
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Presumably, the unknown friar who designed Hawikku’s mission also laid out the kitchen, introducing the segmented, wall-length firebox with overhead smoke hood. He may have found the practice of cooking in a standing position before a raised range in the Euro-Mexican style more difficult to institute, however. Benavides indicates women were primarily responsible for adobe construction in seventeenth-century houses and missions, and missionaries were unable to compel men’s participation in masonry traditionally considered women’s work.97 If his observations remained in force during the construction of Hawikku’s formal mission, Zuni women likely built the kitchen features, adapting their design to more familiar bodily comportments such as floor-level cooking, suggesting the transformation of the raised range to a floor-level workspace manifests the agency of women involved in its construction.

Other features of the Purísima Concepción kitchen also belong to Pueblo domestic traditions. Except for adobe brick construction, Room 13’s lateral benches are indistinguishable from those for storing pots and other goods in Hawikku houses (figures 4.22, 4.29).98 The bin across the kitchen’s southwest wall also seems analogous to Indigenous food storage bins. An adobe brick partition of five slightly staggered stretcher courses separated the bin from the room, with an open access at center, smooth mud plaster on the kitchen side, and a rough interior (figure 10.33).99 Three sockets for rounded timbers averaging 6.35 centimeters (2.5”) in diameter were lodged in the southwest wall (figure 10.34), and probably spanned the bin to create a shelf, perhaps covered with boards or stone slabs.100

This wall-length bin was similar to the long, narrow features common to Hawikku households, made from rubble walls or upright sandstone slabs (figures 4.22, 10.35-10.36). They had open tops and typically occurred with fireplaces and benches, perhaps for keeping supplies of corn or wood nearby.101 In the nineteenth century, Zunis and Hopis stacked
unshelled corn in cords against storeroom walls and residences (figure 10.37). Among Hawikku’s bins were some with low curbs or gaps between individual slabs (figures 10.38-10.39), suitable for stackable materials such as unshelled maize, but not loose commodities such as shelled grain or beans, which were often stored in jars. The mission bin seems to be a larger version of domestic bins, scaled up to match the mission community’s larger population.

The storage bin, adobe benches, and floor-level workspace of the kitchen hearth add up to a space with significant Zuni characteristics, but adapted in scale and arrangement for feeding more people, and combined with Spanish introductions such as a smoke hood and raised cooking stations. Altogether, these features seem to indicate Zuni agency in the kitchen construction, perhaps as women working there adapted the space to fit familiar practices and techniques. Reliance upon traditional Pueblo cuisine and Zuni women as cooks thus reshaped elements of the *convento* through their presence. Missionaries may have controlled overt religious activities in the mission, but the materials and practices of everyday life provided occasion for expressions of Zuni vernacular practices and insinuated aspects of Pueblo cosmology in their midst. Regardless of Spanish attitudes towards Zuni cuisine, Native cooks and diners had their own associations with it, which were products of their upbringing in Hawikku households. Strongly connected to sensory experiences of taste, smell, and touch, these experiences likely introduced concepts connected to Zuni religion and worldview into the *convento* through the minds of mission community members. *Dow hewe*, for example, was a religiously significant part of ceremonial feasts. When mission cooks prepared it, and when mission community members bit into the crispy product, it is unlikely they could have avoided memories, cultural expectations, and culinary tastes rooted in their childhood experiences, largely beyond the knowledge of guardian
b. Gender and Culinary Labor outside the Kitchen

The plan of the formal mission followed European monastic and courtly trends of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, separating food preparation from consumption by designating a specialized kitchen. Yet food production involved almost all areas of the mission, from its fields to its storerooms, and archaeological remains suggest actual practice quickly deviated from the spatial segregation of culinary labor and mission community women to a distinct kitchen space.

Designation of a specialized kitchen may have reflected friars’ ambivalence about women in the convento. As a comparison, Ruiz’s attitude towards Jemez women in the mission is illuminating: for him, they represented a pronounced but necessary danger. Writing in 1776, he says the Jemez mission included kitchen spaces outdoors and within the convento, the latter with raised cooking ranges or “little brick ovens with a grate.” Ruiz was primarily concerned with regulating women working in the kitchen and preventing illicit contact with male laborers. These female mission community members included two cooks, two or three bakers, and two “big girls” each week to carry water (see Table 3.2). Ruiz is adamant they not sleep in the mission, but return to homes in the pueblo every night. He sought to strictly control their encounters with male members of the mission community, whom he did not permit to enter the kitchen except for summoning the cooks or getting fire. He feared their “wanton dalliance” with the female kitchen staff, as well as covert snacking between meals, placing the blame for these transgressions on the women. Punishment for a woman’s first offence was a stern warning, but
subsequent infractions resulted in beatings by the pueblo fiscal.\textsuperscript{107} While corporal punishment was an accepted part of monastic discipline, and certain Zuni religious observations included ritual whippings, there are no early sources describing the use of punitive beatings among the pueblos before missionaries introduced the practice. The punishment Ruiz describes is therefore a form of coercive violence that colonization imposed on Pueblo peoples, as well as being part of the long, tragic history of violence against Native women.

Ruiz’s anxieties about women and belief they were a corrupting presence within the convento extended to other parts of mission life. At harvest, he endeavored to keep mission boys from working alongside women in the fields, for “they cover the grass and join the older youths in wonton and wicked dalliance.”\textsuperscript{108} In church services, gossip and conversation by women in the congregation aggravated him, for “it is a house of prayer, not of chitchat.”\textsuperscript{109} He recalls the horror of seeing unregulated Doctrina classes upon his first arrival, in which women and girls were carousing, laughing, and pulling each other around by their clothes. In the midst of a prayer, a fiscal even stripped nude and “perform[ed] many obscene acts.” The stern friar held lessons outdoors in the winter, and in the uncomfortable service patio in the summer, to better control disorderly behavior. He assigned standing places for students out of each other’s reach, and prevented girls from covering their faces lest they sneak snacks in place of spiritual nourishment.\textsuperscript{110}

In total, Ruiz’s instructions betray a general fear of women and inequitable attribution of guilt to them, as well as a lack of compassion and empathy for his Indigenous parishioners more generally. He struggled to regulate the behavior of adolescents who came into close contact through mission duties, where they lacked the familiar norms of behavior and structures of familial interaction that they knew from their matriarchal households. Although Domínguez
described the Jemez mission as well ordered, Ruiz’s own writings suggest a sense that it was constantly careening out of the order that its missionary wished to impose. As much as he sought to tamp down insubordination and illicit behavior, his charges found means to evade and resist his demands.

The kitchen itself seems to have been at the margins of his control, and Ruiz’s primary interactions with the female kitchen staff were giving morning orders and gathering for meals. When he had something to say, he sent a boy to summon the cooks, rather than visiting the kitchen himself. Ruiz’s instructions suggest the kitchen spaces were uncomfortable to him as a primarily female domain, which he avoided. Seventeenth-century mission kitchens may have been equally mysterious to the friars, as when the missionaries of Tajique and Chililí did not know how to cook, because they were so accustomed to the labor of Indian women such as Isabel Vaca.111 Contrasting the textural picture of culinary segregation within the convento, however, archaeological evidence from Hawikku indicates women’s labor quickly spread to readily visible spaces such as the ambulatory and patio.

As I argued in Chapter Eight, renovations and additions to the convento’s eastern corner enhanced security while adding space for food processing and storage. I hypothesize that mission laborers accessed these rooms by climbing the Room 1 stairway, passing through a locked door at the second floor level, and descending ladders through hatchways to enter Rooms 5, 6, and the southeastern extension. As a room for grinding grain, Room 5 is particularly notable, combining aspects of European and Pueblo architectural styles, with built-in milling bins directly related to Pueblo gender roles (figure 8.45).

Nusbaum found the room with its three bins of upright slabs already partly disassembled, and at least five rectangular hand stones (manos), but none of their corresponding grinding
surfaces (*metates*). The *metates* would have sat inside the bins at an angle, and Zuni women knelt side by side along the northwest wall, leaning forward to rhythmically pulverize grain between the *mano* and *metate* surfaces. Milling was a social occasion as women worked together, the first cracking seeds and subsequent millers grinding them to finer and finer flour, similar to a scene from nineteenth-century Zuni Pueblo (Figures 2.2, 10.40).

Generations of Zuni ancestors had used *manos* and *metates*, which were often handed down to carry on the tradition and usage of these tools. Zuni women still use them today for grinding at certain times of the year, as has been the case for centuries. In the Zuni cosmos, White Shell Woman (*K’ohak’Oka*) is a supernatural person and sister to the moon, associated with unmarried women, corn grinding, and the ideals of feminine beauty and sensuality. According to Cushing, she taught women the art of quarrying and crafting *manos* and *metates*, the graceful motions of corn milling, songs to sing while working, how to lighten their skin with white meal, and secrets of attracting prospective suitors. In Cushing’s time, corn milling was an occasion for social gatherings and courtship, with male musicians accompanying young women dancing and grinding. Pedro de Castañeda de Nájera described a similar gathering in sixteenth-century New Mexico among the Tiguex pueblos of the central Rio Grande:

They have houses that are excellently divided up [and] very clean, where they cook food and where they grind flour. The [latter place] is a separate room or small secluded room where they have a large grinding bin with three stones set in mortar, where three women go, each one to her stone. One of them breaks the grain, the next grinds it, and the next grinds [it] again. Before [the women] go through the door, they remove their shoes and gather up their hair. They shake their clothes and cover their heads. While they grind, a man is seated at the door playing [music] with a flute. To the melody they draw their stones and sing in three parts. On a single occasion they grind a large quantity [of flour], because they make all their bread, like wafers, from flour mixed with hot water.

Except for the flutist, perhaps, Nájera’s scene could describe the grinding room of the Purísima Concepción.
Corn grinding was part of Zuni women’s labor and responsibility, tied to ideals of womanhood, refinement, and familial provision. It also had ceremonial and religious implications. Many women directly participated in community religious observations through corn grinding, feeding their families but also the *kokko* through food offerings and prayer meal. Finally, its association with femininity and sexuality challenged the patriarchal, celibate order that Franciscans sought to establish among mission communities. Traditional Pueblo attitudes about gender complementarity, women’s control over households, and corn’s sacred implications conflicted with the anxious authority that Ruiz betrays in his instructions.

The mealing room’s location was functionally secluded, but also near to storage rooms, altering patterns of movement through the *convento* for female laborers, between the kitchen, grinding room, storage spaces, and refectory. While Ruiz imagined containing women’s presence within the *convento*, the spatial distribution of tasks at Hawikku indicates a more thorough integration of women into the social spaces of the seventeenth-century mission’s living quarters.

Other mission-period artifacts associated with women’s labor attest to their visible presence among the *convento*’s heavily trafficked ambulatory spaces, including a large, shattered cooking pot (probably not collected), sherds of a charred polychrome bowl, and a ceramic candle holder (figures 7.132, 10.41). Five fire-damaged *manos* and four *metates*, suggesting an ad-hoc grinding arrangement, along with a hafted stone maul, were located along the patio wall of the southeast ambulatory corridor, with a fragment of a grooved abrader nearby. Nusbaum only collected one *metate*, the maul, and the abrader (figures 10.42-10.45). Southwestern archaeologists often find mauls alongside grinding stations, and the polished wear of this artifact’s flat face suggests use with softer materials, perhaps for crushing kernels or seeds prior
to grinding. Alternatively, mission women may have gathered their tools here for resharpening, a process of pecking with a hammer stone to re-roughen their abrading surfaces. The maul’s rounded end shows heavy impact fractures from hitting another hard surface, consistent with resharpening grinding tools.

The circular pit of the mission patio’s southern corner is another indication of culinary labor in the shared spaces of the convento. It was 81 centimeters in diameter and 74 centimeters deep (2’ 8” by 2’ 5”), with sides and floor smoothly plastered in mud (figure 7.124). Although the field notes say little, Nusbaum later hypothesized this feature was an oven for steaming green corn, such as he witnessed among Hopi communities. Steam ovens were larger and built on slopes with a secondary horizontal vent at the bottom, however, making it more likely this was a baking pit for a type of Zuni flatbread which Cushing called hepalokia. Made with fermented meal and salt in a round, subterranean pit lined with damp corn husks, cooks spread the sweet dough over several heated round slabs and stacked them within the pit (figure 10.46). Once placed, they built a fire over top, cooking the stacked bread overnight for ceremonial events, which Cushing describes as their “greatest delicacy in the way of bread.” The patio pit is the right size and shape for baking this hepalokia, and its outdoor location makes other functions unlikely. Thus, it suggests another Native component of the mission diet, which had Indigenous religious associations and corporeal aspects clashing with European nutritional concerns. To prepare the dough, Cushing says young girls chewed it and spit it back into a closed jar where it fermented, saliva acid breaking down starch to form sugar, sweetening the mix. When Europeans witnessed food processing by mastication elsewhere, they found it “dirty” and disgusting, stimulating their prejudices and fears of the dissolution of bodily distinctions between themselves and Native peoples.
Archaeological features such as the mealing room, the ambulatory assemblage, and the patio pit indicate culinary tasks spilled into the *convento*’s shared spaces, undermining gender segregation, if indeed the missionaries had ever intended it at Hawikku. Female workers in the Purísima Concepción were not isolated in the kitchen, but regularly passed through, and worked in the same spaces of the *convento* cloister that friars and male members of the mission community used. Their visibility points to the infiltration of Zuni social systems and gender norms in the core of the mission residence, foreshadowing the female sociability that so frustrated Ruiz a century later. One should not imagine the Purísima Concepción’s *convento* as a still, silent oasis carved out from the secular world, but rather as a loud, vibrant work space of men, women, and children, with chattering voices rising above the rasping of stone grinding on milling stone, the crackling of fires, and the noise of animals in the nearby service patio.

Female kitchen workers appear to have been agents in the penetration of Pueblo cosmological concepts into the mission residency. To the Spanish, cooking had few sacred associations, and was simply part of everyday labor for servants and the lower classes. For Zunis on the other hand, almost every aspect of traditional cuisine likely had sacred connotations. Maize in particular evoked a world of cosmological implications, tied to kinship and reciprocal relations to uncooked people, supernaturals, and Zuni ancestors. Zuni members of the mission community could not simply shut off or forget these ideas when they entered the *convento*. Likewise, such concepts were less readily visible than other material expressions of Zuni religion such as prayer sticks, *kokko* masks, and altar assemblages, making them more difficult for the Spanish to suppress. Spanish dependence on female labor, and their view of food preparation as a secular, lower-class activity left friars without means or awareness to police persistent Indigenous religious beliefs connected to cuisine. The labor arrangement of the mission entailed
compromises that presented opportunities for the persistence of some Zuni cultural traits in the midst of these everyday activities, evading serious scrutiny because of practical necessity and the friars’ own hierarchy of labor divisions.

**Spaces and Materiality of Food Consumption in the Convento**

In primary sources, New Mexico missionaries emphasized the propriety of their establishments, being cautious not to disclose the Native practices infiltrating *convento* life. They said little about dining and table ritual, but seem initially willing to adopt Indigenous practices of eating on the floor. Benavides writes that friars followed Native comportment by sitting on the ground “until we teach them more politeness.” Franciscans temporarily adopted Pueblo cultural norms of dining to establish a foothold before introducing wooden tables and seating, pivoting back to European cultural expectations. Dining with the mission community provided missionaries opportunities to exert control, and assert the metaphors of ecclesiological family that had long framed religious life. According to this idea, residents of a monastery or conventual house thought of themselves as a new family, not genetically related but of spiritual kinship as brothers under the supervision of their superior or spiritual father. As “the least brothers” or Friars Minor, Franciscans took this idea further, ideally living among the poor and vulnerable as equal siblings in common humility. In their active, pastoral role, however, missionaries took on patriarchal authority over congregations and mission communities as “fathers” or *padres*, which New Mexicans still call them today.

While women predominated in *convento* food production, friars attempted to portray themselves as primary sources and distributors of food, which occurred in several parts of the
convento. Guardian friars were likely to invite Spanish visitors to private meeting in the trascelda, dining or sharing hot chocolate together, while hungry pueblo residents received food alms in the entryway portería. The mission community itself dined in the refectory, a daily meal that was also an important occasion for cultural negotiation.

a. Private Meetings and Dining in the Trascelda

Hospitality was expected of New Mexico Franciscans, and missions served as a network of stopovers for traveling colonists and Native parishioners. When civil or religious authorities needed Indians to travel for business or to testify, they could stay in conventos along the way and be “charitably” entertained.\textsuperscript{135} Spanish travelers on official business also stayed in local conventos, and guests of importance received audiences with guardian friars in their cells, presumably the more private, inner cells.\textsuperscript{136} Trasceldas typically had beds, fireplaces, windows for reading, and whatever books the mission possessed.\textsuperscript{137} The trascelda offered privacy for fielding complaints such as those by itinerant German merchant Bernardo Gruber at Santo Domingo, or for conspiring against the Provincial Custodian as Governor Diego de Peñalosa and three friars did at Awatovi.\textsuperscript{138} Such meetings were not always clandestine, however. Benevides recounts the case of a Spaniard visiting the convento at Taos, sitting up with his dog and guardian Fray Pedro de Ortega late into the night, warming themselves by the fire.\textsuperscript{139}

By the third quarter of the seventeenth century, preparation of hot, liquid chocolate frequently accompanied Spanish rituals of hospitality in colonial New Mexico.\textsuperscript{140} Chocolate consumption originated in ancient Mesoamerica, but ancestral Pueblo communities also traded for cacao as part of ritual practices at places such as Chaco Canyon.\textsuperscript{141} For Aztecs, chocolate was a luxury and ritual food that elites drank as a cold, frothy beverage with additives such as
chilies, peppers, vanilla, and honey. The Spanish adopted this mild stimulant, adding milk and sugar to what became an indispensable component in colonial daily life. Consumption of chocolate in majolica and Chinese porcelain vessels became essential to the performance of Spanish cultural identity, and Franciscan missionaries were enthusiastic consumers, serving chocolate to guests because the invigorating drink was permissible during fasting.

Chocolate preparation was a laborious process. Most likely, wagon trains brought it to New Mexico as blocks of chocolate liquor, a thick, refined paste ready for melting over gentle heat (figure 10.47). Cooks could then add ingredients such as flower water, sugar, or ground spices including chili, aniseed, cinnamon, cloves, and almonds, aerating the mix with a spinning whisk (molinello), or by pouring it from cup to cup (figures 10.48-10.49). Hosts served the hot, spicy mixture in small, handle-less cups of lacquered gourd (xicalli), porcelain, or glazed majolica (jícara). Excavations recovered numerous jícara sherds at Hawikku, as well as less-common Asian porcelain sherds that also included remnants of delicate, imported cups (figures 10.50-10.51).

The work of making chocolate was normally a duty of the mission boys. In the eighteenth century, Ruiz describes a separate oven for chocolate in the sacristans’ quarters (the celda), at the door to his personal room (the trascelda). Presuming that the multiple functions of eighteenth-century mission rooms are relevant for the earlier but similar plan of Hawikku, the trascelda (Room 22) was where the guardian friar slept and would have entertained guests. The large celda (Room 2/3/4/19) would have provided sleeping quarters for the mission boys as well as a space for preparing chocolate. It is notable that the much reduced antechamber of the renovated convento retained a hearth that was perhaps intended for this job near to the trascelda. Preparing hot chocolate is the only documented cooking task for male laborers that I have
encountered, perhaps because cacao was a new introduction without prior gendered associations among the Pueblos, or perhaps because need for chocolate did not fit the kitchen staff’s routine schedule.

b. *Portería* Alms for the Needy

In contrast to the intimate hospitality of the *trascelda*, food distributions to Pueblo households lacking sufficient supplies due to crop failure or famine were public occasions for friars to present themselves in their imagined role as paternal providers. Benavides writes, “at mealtime, the poor people in the pueblo who are not ill come to the [*portería*], where the cooks of the [*convento*] have sufficient food ready, which is served to them by the friar.” A 1660 order by the Vice-Custodian Fray Garcia de San Francisco confirms this practice, directing *conventos* with the necessary means to daily distribute food to hungry Pueblo residents from their *porterías*. During the intense famine of 1667-1672, friars made weekly distributions in bulk quantities, suggesting that recipients no longer ate in *porterías* as Benavides indicates, but disbursements still took place there.

Charitable distribution of food was part of medieval courtly dining, as nobles sought to justify lavish banquets by giving leftovers to poor peasants at their palace gates. Cooks intentionally prepared excess food, which became evening fare for needy beggars along with uneaten, grease-soaked bread trenchers. Regular monastic orders exercised similar charity by giving to the needy and sharing meals in forms of commensality drawing on Biblical and Hebrew precedents. In New Spain, where missions asserted a quasi-feudal power among Indigenous communities, *portería* generosity served an ideological function similar to courtly alms, attempting to justify the economic exploitation of Native labor. Captain Andrés Hurtado
explicitly makes this argument in defense of Franciscan missions, saying they assisted both
Indigenous and Spanish communities during the 1660 famine by distributing weekly rations
every Sunday.152

During times of widespread famine, the Custodian might give regional orders distributing
surplus food to missions low on supplies. According to Ivey’s calculations from 1672
inventories, the average monthly distribution of food comprised seventy-two bushels of staples
including corn, wheat, and beans; three cows; ten sheep; and twenty wool fleeces (used for
producing clothing, see Table 10.1).153 Other foodstuffs included occasional goats, bulls, and
even oxen as well as barley, chick peas, “other grains,” and vegetables. Inventories generally
indicate local mission communities grew these stocks with their labor.154 Documents describe a
needs-based distribution within each pueblo, but such disbursements must have furnished a
tempting opportunity to reward families and factions more closely aligned with the missions.

At the Zuni missions, Galdo says poor harvests limited grain alms, which were
substantially below regional averages, but much larger meat disbursements partly offset them
(Table 10.1).155 In a single year at Halona in 1672, he distributed more than 100 fanegas of
maize, almost 70 of wheat (of which he ran out), as many as 70 head of cattle and 200 sheep, and
300 fleeces for clothing. Galdo notes that this was the pattern over three years at Halona, and
more distributions were needed but Apaches had raided many animals from the mission herds.
His Hawikku outlays were similar, and exhausted the mission’s supplies in those unfavorable
growing years. Both missions also distributed food to Spanish soldiers lodging in the pueblos for
retaliatory expeditions against the Apaches.156

Although these alms may have helped some Zunis during the devastating famine, it
should be remembered that uncompensated Zuni labor had produced all of these supplies in the
first place. Mission *estancias* decreased farmlands available to the communities, and tied up labor, while taking Zunis away from their own fields and the work of hunting and gathering to meet their families’ needs. The mission system of labor expropriation and redistribution did not necessarily increase resources available to a particular town; instead, it positioned guardian friars as distributors of these resources and likely exacerbated factionalism within the community.

Missionaries used food to reinforce the essential metaphor of ecclesiological family and frame themselves as generous fathers and providers, as in Galdo’s claim that he cared for “the sustenance of my sons, because they had none most days.” Finally, alms helped keep town populations congregated together and subject to the colonial economy, when traditional survival practices might have led many households to disperse more widely in search of resources.

In describing the dedication ceremonies of the Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe mission of El Paso del Norte (1668, present-day Ciudad Juarez), Fray Salvador de Guerra weaves a series of metaphors linking food distributions and the ecclesiological family concept. Speaking of the evangelization of formerly mobile Manso Indians whom friars had induced to settle around the mission, Guerra describes missionization as a process of weaning from carnal appetites to the spiritual nourishment of Christianity, which he believes will better satisfy converts. He assures that,

> there will not be a gentile soul among the Mansos who will not, like the rest have done, come in quest of the milk of the Gospel and of the aid of these friars, truly their fathers; especially as they are such savages that their only care is their stomachs […]

Guerra pejoratively equates Native eating habits to barbarism, echoing Benavides’s disgust with hungry Mansos devouring a whole beef raw. He believes acculturation to Spanish ways will increase the Indians’ interest in what he sees as spiritual growth, leading to the oddly transgendered analogy of spiritual fathers providing Gospel milk to Manso converts.
Guerra thus reinforces a central metaphor in the rhetoric of New Mexico’s Franciscan missionaries, portraying the guardian friar as paternal provider for the ecclesiological family. He says the Guadalupe mission distributed three meals daily “by means of pot and spoon” to Mansos to keep them nearby.\(^{161}\) Introducing a new metaphor, he then compares alms to a baited fish hook attracting and ensnaring Native converts:

> […] they also see that when they, the unfaithful, come to this post they are fed by the padres and are given cows and other fattened animals. They will come like fish to the fish hook, curious to see. They see these people who yesterday were as wild as themselves, and will come desirous of the remedy.\(^{162}\)

In his Eurocentric paternalism, Guerra believed Spanish lifeways were inherently desirable, but it is unlikely Indians came to missions seeking a “remedy” for their traditional ways of life. Rather, economic need, coercion, and force induced their participation in the mission system. Guerra’s metaphor of a fish hook, with the implicit violence of snaring a victim and pulling them in against their will, is particularly apt. While missions might have attracted some families and factions, once “hooked” it was very difficult for them to disentangle themselves.

Considering the distribution of alms archaeologically, it appears that the Hawikku portería lacked the benches common at other missions (figures 3.19-3.21). If any alms recipients ate there, they presumably sat on the packed earth floor in the Indigenous manner. Yet eating in the portería may still have evoked aspects of European dining. Among room’s few artifacts were a medium-sized Hawikuh Polychrome bowl burnt during the conflagration, and a red-colored Plainware canteen (figures 7.139-7.140).\(^{163}\) Handwashing was common during courtly and monastic dining in European traditions; servants provided hand basins for high status guests while lavabos were adequate for others (figure 10.52).\(^{164}\) The Hawikuh Polychrome bowl with its lead-based glaze ornaments includes a band of stepped fret motifs around the exterior, and a repetition of frets in the bowl framing the negative space as stepped pyramids. These were
cloud motifs associated with rain and perhaps signaling use as a water bowl. Located near the entryway to the mission, where alms distribution occurred, the portería’s bowl and canteen might evoke rituals of hospitality such as offering drinks or handwashing prior to receiving alms or entering the convento.

**c. Refectory Meals and the Mission Community**

Spanish documents rarely mention New Mexico mission refectories, but these dining rooms served for daily meals and meetings too large for the trascelda. As with the cloister, refectories had undergone centuries of formal and symbolic development in Europe, coming to be highly meaningful spaces by the time of their introduction to the Americas. This background is helpful in understanding the implications of dining in New Mexico missions, framing the Indigenous cuisine and hybrid material culture of the mission table.

Over time, European monastic refectories had come to evoke Eucharistic sacramental rituals and the Last Supper in Mount Zion’s Upper Room. Augustinian friars had memorialized the supposed location of those events with a gothic shrine of the Last Supper (also known as the Cenacle) around the third quarter of the twelfth century, with two reused central columns dividing its aisles, six rib-vaulted bays, and lancet windows (figure 10.53). This design became an archetypal model for European monastic refectories and chapter houses, especially for the Cistercian Order (figure 10.54). The Cenacle was further associated with the tomb of David; Christ’s washing of the disciples’ feet and post-resurrection appearances; the coming of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost; and the Dormition of the Virgin. Franciscans gained control of the shrine in the 1330s, and while they did not necessarily copy its design, they developed other parallels between the Last Supper and refectory dining.
Early Renaissance mendicants suggested Eucharistic metaphors by placing dining halls parallel to their churches, with pulpits and layouts like church interiors, and table rituals evocative of the sacraments. Santa Croce in Florence (Franciscan, early 1300s) is an example, as is Michelozzo’s renovation of the old refectory at San Marco (Dominican, c. 1438 to 1443), standing directly over remains of a thirteenth-century church (figures 10.55-10.56). Both conventos featured refectory paintings of the Last Supper, making the connection explicit, while San Marco also had a fresco of Dominican founders receiving a miraculous meal from angels, reenacting the Last Supper with Christ crucified above them (figures 10.57-10.59). Another San Marco painting in an upstairs cell reiterates the sacramental theme, seating disciples on a built-in bench in one of San Marco’s rooms, as Christ serves the Eucharist around an otherwise empty trestle table (figure 10.60).

Last Supper imagery bolstered the ecclesiological family metaphor central to conventual life, commemorating the story of Christ’s institution of table rituals symbolizing the adoption of believers into God’s family. Francis commanded his followers to greet one another as brothers, since they were “members of the same family.” Tadeo Gaddi further visualized the relationship between the sacramental meal and ecclesiological family with his fourteenth-century refectory mural juxtaposing the Crucifixion and a branching Tree of Life with all the prophets and evangelists in its foliage (figures 10.57, 10.61). Directly above Christ of the Last Supper, Gaddi shows Francis rapturously embracing the tree with his gathered brethren as heirs to its mystical, spiritual genealogy. The juxtaposed frescos allude to the cosmology implicit in medieval cloisters, architecture which gathered the brothers around a sacred center, the Tree of Life, and the sacraments it referenced.
Beyond symbolic content, paintings of dining scenes also reflect Medieval and Early Modern banquet practices, in which diners sat at tables or trestles around the room’s perimeter with their backs to the walls, leaving interior space open for food service (figures 10.62-10.64). Meals furnished occasion to display the relative status of diners arranged with the patron, abbot, or esteemed guests at a head table crosswise to the rest of the diners.\textsuperscript{175} This arrangement was typical of both courtly and monastic meals, and is evident in the remains of Iberian convento refectories such as the Hieronymite refectory of Yuste, the Observant Franciscan house of La Rábida and the discalced Franciscan retreat of El Palancar (figures 10.65-10.68).\textsuperscript{176}

Benedictines and Cistercians combined physical and spiritual nourishment, eating in silence while listening to scripture and recitations of their monastic Rules (figure 10.69).\textsuperscript{177} Dominicans likewise ate silently while listening to readings, and Franciscan hagiographies seem intended for the same purpose.\textsuperscript{178} The pulpits in Spanish refectories point to these readings (figure 10.70), but not all conventos had such elaborate furnishings. Spaces such as the new refectory at the Franciscan convento of Belvís de Monroy exhibit numerous niches, perhaps storage for books of mealtime readings, but there was no built-in pulpit (figure 10.71). Friars might have used a wooden lectern, along with wooden seating and tables.

As paintings of sacred meals indicate, Medieval dining relied upon movable trestle tables. Diners took helpings from central platters, usually on slices of crusty bread or wooden trenchers rather than plates. Each brought his or her own knife, while hosts supplied spoons, bowls, and cups, which diners passed around and shared, enforcing cordiality as part of table rituals (figures 10.62-10.64, 10.72).\textsuperscript{179} Plates supplanted bread trenchers around 1500, allowing food service with pre-poured sauce in individual portions.\textsuperscript{180} This shift added mediation, increasing the distance between the work of cooking food and consuming it, while changing rituals of service
as servants interacted directly with individual diners, replacing each course rather than setting shared central platters on the table (figure 10.69). In setting their tables, Early Modern patrons favored a wide variety of vessels, styles, and materials, indicating their wealth and sophistication, rather than uniform place settings that became popular in the eighteenth century.  

Finally, conceptualizations of Iberian dining shifted in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, as “Master of the House” concepts began to overlay earlier religious metaphors. The elegant social spaces of seventeenth-century elite dwellings glorified hosts with decorated rooms displaying carpets, tapestries, and credenzas of luxury items.

Descriptions of a lavish 1538 banquet in Mexico City by Cortés and Viceroy Mendoza indicate the Spanish brought as many dining practices with them to New Spain as they could. Mission refectories in Mexico were large, often ornately painted rooms, larger than the few resident friars needed (figure 10.73), indicating that they probably shared meals with members of the mission community, and Native diners likely outnumbering the Spanish.  

Processions through antechambers and mural paintings prepared diners to avoid eating for sensual gratification. Mendieta praises the use of refectories for confessions among friars, and for silent dining with devotional readings. Yet Gage’s descriptions in the early seventeenth century suggest quiet piety was not uniform: music, dancing, performance, and heavy meals characterized the refectories that he visited.

Huejotzingo’s dining room is among the best preserved examples for sixteenth-century Mexico, and was the stage for Gage’s memorable description (figure 10.74). It is a long, narrow room paralleling the church nave, with a carved helical molding above remnants of a painted border. Originally, diners probably met together and processed from the nearby Sala de Profundis (no longer extant) into the refectory at meal time (figures 10.75-10.76). Instead of a
built-in pulpit and benches, San Miguel had wooden furnishings, presently arranged as conjoined chairs behind narrow tables, with a head table at the west end and a wooden lectern for reading. Although not necessarily original, these furnishings seem to accurately reflect colonial dining practices in Mexican refectories, such as in an anonymous painting of the *Refectory of the Barefoot Carmelite Convent*, now in the Museo Nacional del Virreinato (figure 10.77).

Benavides implies that distinct refectories were part of New Mexico’s missions as well, saying members of the mission community took turns as *refitoleros* or servers in the refectories.\(^{188}\) They were gathering places for meetings too large for the *trascelda*, as Diego Romero describes in a 1662 meeting of civil officials, military officers, and friars in the Isleta refectory.\(^{189}\) Likewise, Governor Peñalosa describes dining at the Quarai mission at a table with three friars, presumably in the refectory.\(^{190}\) A Pueblo Revolt incident may also reflect mission dining practices. Arriving at Santa Ana, victorious leaders Po’pay and Alonso Catití set a table with a parody feast of Spanish dishes to deride the vanquished colonists. Dining “according to the manner of the Spanish,” Po’pay sat at the table’s head as Governor, while Catití played the role of the Franciscan Custodian or priest, sitting opposite him. Drinking from chalices, they mockingly toasted one another’s health, ridiculed Spanish rule, and scorned Christianity.\(^{191}\) Po’pay and Catití’s satirical performance shows they were familiar enough with Spanish dining practices to transform their meaning, and suggests that a single table often sufficed for mission dining in New Mexico, with the head and foot as positions of higher relative status.

Eighteenth-century mission communities were smaller and functioned on weekly rotations, but some provide further information, describing the use of multi-purpose *celdas* for mission community meals, rather than designated dining rooms. Domínguez describes each *convento* and its furnishings, never mentioning refectories, instead describing *celda/trascelda*
pairs, single celdas, kitchens, porterías, and sacristies (see Table 10.2). By comparing his text with Ruiz’s prescriptions, it appears the larger celda served as the dining room, containing the tables and benches. Every convento had at least one table, one chair, and one bench (excepting Santa Clara, possibly an oversight), and estimated seating ranged from six to twelve occupants in most cases, typically a little lower than the estimated number of participants in the weekly labor rotation. Presumably a few of the laborers were serving and working in the kitchen during the meal, and perhaps not all mission workers such as water carriers or chicken keepers stayed throughout the day until dinner. In some cases, there were more benches than tables, such as at Abiquiu, Acoma, Ohkay Owingeh, and Sandía, perhaps indicating that diners sat on both sides of the table. Most missions, however, had only a single bench per table, along with several chairs, suggesting one side was open for servers. The guardian friar likely sat at the head of the table, with mission community members on the bench and sundry chairs, or serving the meal.

At Jemez, Ruiz’s cell and kitchen were on the upper floor, with the celda containing a separate oven for preparing chocolate, two tables, two benches, and an armless chair. The mission community gathered there in the evening for prayers and commandments, including female cooks and water carriers, as well as the fiscal and choirboys. They assembled at the door to the friar’s celda at the “stroke of 12” (roughly 6:00 pm), “as soon as the cooks had seasoned the supper.” Together they prayed and recited the Ave Maria devotion, with a chief choirboy leading. Presumably dinner followed at the room’s two tables. Whereas Benavides’s description of the mission community members taking turns evokes the egalitarian ecclesiological family, Ruiz’s 1775 description seems to follow a more authoritarian “Master of the House” metaphor. Suspicious and overbearing, Ruiz sought to control every aspect of mission life, treating workers as child-like subordinates rather than equals. As with portería
distributions of alms, mealtimes furnished an opportunity for paternalistic control. While the kitchen spaces were areas of female agency within the *convento*, friars such as Ruiz used dining to assert their own power in directing devotions and heading the table.

Unfortunately, Nusbaum exposed very little of the mission-period occupation in Hawikku’s two possible refectories. As I argued in Chapter 7, the original refectory was probably the *celda* at the *convento*’s east corner (Room 2/3/4/19). An adobe paved room with splayed window, painted walls, and a corner fireplace, this space was eventually enclosed and a second fireplace added. With renovations to the *convento*’s eastern corner (Chapter 8), a new wall partitioned Room 19 as a much smaller *celda*, and the refectory function likely transferred to the spacious Room 14/17/18, with its new floor pavement and fireplaces. Little more can be discerned from the excavated ruins; neither space burned nor retained identifiable furnishings.

If the Purísima Concepción’s refectory table can only be imagined, excavated artifacts suggest something of its spread.\textsuperscript{194} Based on the sherds in the NMAI collections, glazed hollowware imports to Hawikku comprised at least thirty-eight pieces, including *jícara* cups and bowls, while flatware included at least sixty-six pieces, most of which probably came from the mission.\textsuperscript{195} The vessels were in majolica styles such as San Luis Blue on White, Mexico City Green on Cream, Abó Polychrome, and San Bernardo Polychrome, all common to the later seventeenth century, as well as lusterware, Chinese porcelain, and sundry other wares. Mostly originating in Puebla and Mexico City, imported majolica arrived in the boxes of “loza de Puebla” of the 1630 shipping contract.\textsuperscript{196} They were part of very different technological systems and eating practices than those of Indigenous Zuni families. Wheel throwing produced greater uniformity, while white tin-based glazes emulated Chinese porcelain, and kiln firing allowed more control, in contrast to Pueblo potters’ open-firing techniques.\textsuperscript{197} With a shallow basin,
outwardly flaring rim, and annular base, soup plates point to many of the changes that missionaries introduced to dining practices in Hawikku’s convento. This flatware form could serve a variety of foods, and comprised the primary vessels at convento meals (figure 10.78). They were integral to the system of interlocking technologies and comportment that missionaries introduced, including tabletops, silverware, discrete dining rooms, and Early Modern European conceptions of individual personhood.  

With their glossy white surfaces, bright blue paints, crisply articulated forms, and references to European and Asian artistic styles, imported ceramic vessels brought new visual elements to the Pueblo world. Most incorporated circular, annular-ring bases, providing visual lift, lightness, and a flat, stable foundation corresponding to the horizontal surfaces of tables and sideboards in European-style refectories. Their shallow, open bowls were suitable for utensils of Euro-American dining, presenting smaller morsels than traditional Zuni ladles (figures 4.32, 7.91). Finally, introduction of these new forms, utensils, and furnishings presumed adoption of new bodily habits as mission community members adjusted to using these artifacts and the cultural expectations that accompanied with them.

The soup plate was part of Euro-American social systems, table comportment, and concepts of individualism. The circumference of the wide rim presented flexible gripping possibilities, allowing multi-directional exchanges not requiring the direct, hand-to-hand contact of traditional Zuni ladles. In other words, they were better suited to inequitable social contexts, such as a server placing food on a table in front of diners (figure 10.79). The bowl of the soup plate can contain liquid and solid foods, offering individual portions unlike the communal pots of Pueblo dining or shared platters of Medieval banquets. They separated an individual’s serving from those of fellow diners, helping control portion size. The form was easily carried from the
kitchen to the refectory, allowing diners to eat individual portions far from the hearth, and increasing the space between production and consumption. Plating food facilitated its movement away from the female sphere of kitchen spaces to the convento’s more masculine dining rooms, allowing friars to present themselves as padres generously providing for the physical and spiritual nourishment of the mission community. Although relatively simple, the soup plate form was an important part of the Euro-American culture that Franciscan missionaries introduced to Hawikku, including a system of dining technologies that segregated food consumption from production while enacting concepts of individualistic selfhood, inequitable social hierarchy, and gendered performance.200

Missionaries not only imported Mexican majolica, but other serving materials as well, including cutlery, copper dishes (figure 10.80), and glassware. Several tiny iridescently weathered fragments of ornamental glass hint at delicate cups or vases, which might have held chrism liquid or been part of the mission table service (figure 10.81). Glass drinking vessels were believed to prevent the efficacy of poison, a great preoccupation in Medieval and Early Modern courts, but also among pueblos where friars feared the hostility of community factions opposed to them.201 Other fragments of brown, green, and clear glass probably belong to bottles and utilitarian vessels, some postdating the mission period (figure 10.82).

Although imported goods were part of refectory dining at the Purísima Concepción, Pueblo artists made other tablewares locally, using familiar materials and construction techniques to yield new combinations of Spanish forms that often incorporate Indigenous ornamental motifs as culturally mixed service vessels (figures 10.83). San Bernardo Polychrome soup plates from Room 33 and elsewhere in the pueblo exhibit ornamental bands with radiating motifs that originally articulated four quadrants, as well other religiously significant feather
motifs and cosmological indications such as a centralized fleury cross (figure 6.9, 10.84-10.85). With four fleur-de-lis finials evoking the directional ears of corn on a tradition Hopi altar, the artist of this plate oriented it within the layered cosmos, the four cardinal directions, and to the *axis mundi* which passed conceptually through the center of the plate, connecting the various levels.202 Zuni artists, on the other hand, experimented in colorful, heavily burnished slip finishes for hybrid vessels during the seventeenth century, producing distinctive soup plates based in the techniques of their own pottery traditions (figure 10.86).

Locally produced hybrid forms for use around the mission table and *convento* spaces included not only soup plates, but also pharmaceutical jars, cups, bowls, and a salt cellar (figures 7.82-7.83, 8.34, 10.87-10.88, 11.1-11.2). Zuni artists miniaturized traditional ceramic dippers, adapting them to use as Euro-American spoons, and produced candle holders in tabletop and stick forms for wax and tallow candles (figures 7.117, 7.132, 7.159, 8.33, 10.89).203 These lights replaced the hatchways and centralized fireboxes of Pueblo domestic settings, participating in the Euro-American complex of furniture, writing, printed books, and division of the day into canonical hours of labor and devotion.204 While similar to goods which Spanish colonists brought from Mexico, and implicated in their cultural systems, these artifacts are also creative adaptations of Indigenous knowledge about local places, materials, and constructions techniques which comprised a significant part of the mission’s material environment.

**Conclusions**

In conclusion, Spanish sources indicate New Mexico’s missionaries sought to establish food-based interactions in which they interceded as authorities and dispensers of nourishment to
the mission community. They rarely were the producers of the food at the center of these performances, however, which came from Indian labor, lands, and resources. Native cuisine made up a significant portion of the mission diet, and many foods were deeply implicated in the personified, reciprocal cosmology of Pueblo belief systems. Through reliance upon Indian labor, Pueblo sensibilities and conceptual systems became entangled with Spanish introductions within the mission convento’s negotiated environment. In particular, I have argued mission kitchens were predominantly female spaces, where women’s knowledge and expertise played a critical role in the sustenance of the mission community, expressing a form of agency through everyday activities in the heart of the convento.

The Purísima Concepción’s service vessels are emblematic of the mission community’s mixing of cultural traits, technologies, raw materials, and culinary products. In contrast to idealized landscape conceptions and universalizing narratives of friars such as Perea and Benavides, the hybrid cuisine and tablewares of the mission convento lead to consideration of how Pueblo beliefs implicated in these materials framed the experiences of mission community members. Hawikku’s friars may have seen these artifacts as innocuous, but Zuni participants in the mission community would likely have recognized familiar bodily habits, circulation of culturally significant materials, and the persistent visual presence of motifs related to Pueblo conceptions of space, time, and identity. Locally produced mission tablewares echoed the forms of Spanish precedents, but ornamental features such as painted feathers, the fleur-de-lis cross, directional symbolism, and aniconic burnished-slip finishes permitted the coexistence and slippage among cosmological frameworks of Zuni and Spanish dining. Likewise, when mission community members sat down for meals incorporating local game and the various maize preparations, they could not simply forget the conceptions of these foodstuffs that their
traditional cultural conditioning had instilled in them. For Zunis at the mission table, the flesh of the Corn Maidens may still have persisted in its reciprocal significance, even if Christian prayers preceded it, and even if they ate from individual plates, rather than a communal bowl on the floor. Although Spanish power framed the mission’s architectural space and set many daily routines, glimpses of Zuni agency emerge from the material traces of lived experience within those structural parameters.
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it has been argued that wheat was not cultivated in seventeenth-century New Mexico, Fray Juan Galdo includes it among the foods that he says were part of the mission’s harvest, which had been higher in previous years (Scholes, 1672, ‘Inventario de los bienes,’ 15; Table 10.1). The guardian of Socorro likewise includes wheat among the supplies produced by “the sweat and work of the minister with the help of the natives” (Scholes, 1672, ‘Inventario de los bienes,’ 10), and other friars also imply that wheat was harvested locally from mission estancias (18, 24).

65 Ruiz (“Observations,” 313) describes these tasks at the nearby Jemez mission in the eighteenth century. According to Dominguez (The Missions, 179), the eighteenth-century Jemez mission had four plots of land for farming, three of them producing 60 fanagas of wheat (2,286.11 to 3,810.18 kg./2.52 t. to 4.2 t./90 to 150 bu.) and 40 fanagas of maize (1,632.93 to 2,721.55 kg./1.8 to 3 t./60-100 bu.) each year, while the garden plot produced chilies (about 40 strings per year), onions, cabbage, and miscellaneous vegetables.

66 For a discussion of the colonial system as an extension of European feudalism, see Rafael Cómez, Arquitectura y Feudalism en México: Los Comienzos del Arte Novohispano en el Siglo XVI (Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1989).


68 Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 93-95.

69 Nusbaum (ibid., 95) described “the main cooking arrangement [as] very interesting and very intricate compared to same in the pueblo of Hawikuh.”

70 Ibid., 93-94; Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, The Excavation, 115-117. This fireplace behind the workbench was 0.76 m. (2’ 6”) wide, and dug down further into the floor level between 15.24 and 25.4 cm. (6” to 10”) deep. The workbench was approximately 40.64 cm. (1’ 4") tall, its height probably comprising three adobe bricks with mortar seams and paving slabs on top. A stretcher of adobe bricks defined its southwestern face, which was finished in mud plaster. Nusbaum did not probe the interior construction of the bench, which could have been mud-mortared adobe brick like the church altars, or simply packed earth within the stretcher-wall faces of the bench. Note that Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury’s diagram (The Excavation, fig. 28) incorrectly shows the bench faced with upright sandstone slabs on both sides.


73 So called “black kitchens” smoked and preserved meats, and warmed the house with their centralized locations, but were smoky, sooty, and unhealthful working environments. See Snodgrass, Encyclopedia, 228; and Martínez Llopsis, Historia, 148-150.

74 Albala, Food, 91-93.

75 Ibid., 96.

76 Snodgrass, Encyclopedia, 228-229.
Typically, hearths were typical partitions supporting NMAI. Likewise, one of Cattell’s ethnographic films shows a Zuni woman cooking stone griddles over hot coals to cook corn wafer bread during the time of the Hendricks and Monastery,” 95) indicates that Zunis still made use of similar hearths and arrangements of par centuries, meaning that they were less likely to be encountered during Hodge’s excavations. Nusbaum (“Church and Monastery,” 90, 98. The pestel (NMAI 093986.000) was found in Room 103 (Block E, Hodge, “Hawikuh 4,” 121), and was mis-identified as a “bell clapper” in the NMAI catalog. It is currently on display in the AAMHC, preventing precise measurements. It shows parallel cut marks against its shaft. To these items might be added those listed in the royal contract, but not necessarily uncovered at Hawikku. These include a frying pan and clay griddle (comal), a grinding bowl (perhaps the bronze pestle belonged to this item), six pewter plates, two pewter bowls, one bronze olla, one bronze saucepan or kettle, and one box of majolica dishes every three years (loza de Puebla). See Scholes, “Mission Supply Service,” 101, 104. Crushing and grinding were typical methods for preparing spices in Early Modern cuisine, hence the mortar and pestle; see Albala, The Banquet, 58.

The cooking station measured about 2.51 m. long and 0.76 m. wide (8’ 3” by 2’ 6”); Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 95. Nusbaum says that there were two upright slabs at the northwest end of the pit, but only one appears visible in photographs, extending above the level of the workbench. It may be that the thick slabs along the front of the firepit once continued its full length, but some might have been removed for construction elsewhere during the post-mission period.

Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 93-95. From photographs, these cooking stations appear to have blackened interiors from use as fireboxes.

The Zuni word for this bread is dow hewe, or variously dowahewe or hewe. See Stevenson, The Zuni Indians, 361-363; Cushing, Zuni Breadstuff, 317-343. Zunis also use piki, the Hopi word for corn wafer bread, broadly enough that a publication by Zuni A:shiwi Publishing and the A:shiwi A:wan Museum (Edaakie, Idonapshe, 8-10) employed the Hopi word alongside the Zuni term, and much of the archaeological literature continues to use piki.

Typically, hewe and piki hearths are open on one of the lateral sides rather than in front. The front opening may have made this a less comfortable station at which to work.

Cushing, Zuni Breadstuff, 326-329; ZCRAT members, September 20, 2016, Recovering Voices Visit, visit notes 22. Stevenson (The Zuni Indians, 361-362) describes the preparation of the stone using chewed squash seeds and raw pinon gum. In the modern period, stones are treated with sheep brains, pinon pitch, and ground watermelon seeds to create the Teflon-like surface.

Adams, The Origin and Development, 80-82, 154; Woodbury, Prehistoric Stone Implements, 176-177; Mindeleff, A Study, 175-176; Jenny L. Adams, Ground Stone Analysis: A Technological Approach, 2nd ed. (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2014), 235-237. Hodge did not note any wafer bread hearths among the rooms of Hawikku’s pueblo, but the excavations did uncover numerous griddle stones and griddle stone fragments. The hearths may have been located out of doors or on rooftops, as they often were in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, meaning that they were less likely to be encountered during Hodge’s excavations. Nusbaum (“Church and Monastery,” 95) indicates that Zunis still made use of similar hearths and arrangements of partitions supporting stone griddles over hot coals to cook corn wafer bread during the time of the Hendricks-Hodge excavations. Likewise, one of Cattell’s ethnographic films shows a Zuni woman cooking dow hewe bread on such an arrangement; Owen Cattell, Paper Bread (Hewe) Making and Corn Grinding, digital video recording, #3002, NMAI.
The double griddle was collected in 1919. A perusal of Hodge’s field notes from that season indicates that he found a “small, round, cooking stone of sandstone, broken” in Room 118 (Hodge, “Hawikuh 4,” 104), a “hewe stone, broken” in Room 130 (139), “part of a hewe stone” in Room 131 (141), a “round cooking stone, blackened” in Room 147 (189), and “one large hewe stone” and “one small hewe stone” in Room 154B (205). None of these descriptions match the large, rectangular hewe stone with two cooking surfaces, and I presume that Hodge would surely have made note of this artifact which is unique amongst the Hawikku collections. Furthermore, the griddle’s number indicates Nusbaum shipped it to New York with the rest of the mission artifacts at the end of the 1919 season. The artifacts appear to have been numbered and cataloged as they were unpacked. This double hewe stone appears in a series of large, flat ground stone artifacts which seem to have been packed and shipped together. While some of them may have been bulky artifacts collected in the pueblo and not shipped until the end of the season, the inclusion of NMAI 093664 in this series demonstrates that at the very least NMAI 093665 was not shipped until late in the year, once Hodge had left the field. Although this evidence is inconclusive, on the whole it suggests to me that the griddle stone was among the artifacts that Nusbaum found in the mission but did not record in his sporadic notes, perhaps one of the broken griddles from the kitchen.
The complete cooking surface ranged from 24.3 to 26.8 cm, in diameter. While the full dimensions of the incomplete cooking surface are unknown, its remains measure 27.5 by 14.2 cm. In addition to the large griddle stones for making dow hewe, Zunis used smaller griddle stones for producing hebatchi:we bread, a type of thick flour tortilla. See Stevenson, *The Zuñi Indians*, 363; Edaakie, *Idonapshe*, 12. In Room 154, which burned in place, Hodge found a large hewe stone together with a small one, suggesting that both may have been part of the typical household culinary equipment (Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, *The Excavation*, 86-87). It may be that the large double-burner griddle from Hawikku was created to produce a larger volume of this tortilla-like bread, and likely the small, uncollected griddle from Room 22 was also used for this purpose.


Cushing, *Zuni Breadstuff*, 321-330, 331-333; Edaakie, *Idonapshe*, 8. According to Stevenson, Zuni men quarried and collected the stone, which women then prepared and cured in the home (*The Zuñi Indians*, 361-362). In addition to their use in producing wafer bread, ethnographic notes suggest that similar griddle stones were used as working surfaces for preparing loaves of sourdough wheat bread and for stacking in alternation with layers of white corn dough to make a special type of fermented bread cooked in sealed pit that had previously been heated red-hot, which Cushing (*Zuni Breadstuff*, 303-304, 373-375) called k’os-he-pa-lo-kia or “salty buried-bread,” and Stevenson (365-366) called He’palokía.


Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 95. These benches were solid, and made from courses of adobe bricks three to four high against the walls and coated in mud plaster. The upper surfaces were slightly uneven, but Nusbaum did not record whether there was any direct evidence for pots or other culinary materials stored on them. The bench along part of the northwest wall appears to have not been bonded to the main workbench in front of the hearth, and may have been added later, with a row of stretcher bricks along its end to create a raised lip along that side of the bench (see figures 7.161, 7.164 and 10.7). For benches in the pueblo, see Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, *The Excavation*, 28-30.

At the time of excavation, the partition wall was about 0.61 m. (2’) high, and spaced to create an internal storage space 0.62 m. (2’ 0.5”) wide by 3.59 m. (11’ 9.5”) long, unbonded to the kitchen walls but abutting the solid adobe pier in the corner which I have hypothesized may be the remains of a corner buttress (see Chapter 7). The doorway was centered in the wall and 0.66 m. (2’ 2”) wide with no evidence for fixtures, making it likely that it was left open; see Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 94.

The timber furthest to the southeast abutted the room’s corner pier. The next timber was spaced 15.24 cm. (6”) to the northwest. The third timber was spaced further away at 64.77 cm. (2’ 1.5”). The outer wall was not sufficiently preserved to indicate much about a possible fourth timber next to the doorway, but Nusbaum (*Church and Monastery*, 93) indicates that there were four in total, so the entire southeast portion of the bin was probably covered, while the northwest portion had no timbers and was probably open. The top course of bricks comprising the partition wall appears to not have survived.

Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, *The Excavation*, 84, 63, 57, 90.


In addition to the Franciscan vows, orders were issued excluding women from conventos in New Mexico, as in a declaration of vice-custodian Friar García de San Francisco, Feb. 26, 1660, in Proceso contra López, II; see Scholes, Troublous Times, 86, n. 45.


Ruiz, “Observations,” 311, no. 5. The Spanish reads:

[…] acabado q’ se procure el P° Miro cenar, y despachar a las Cosineras, no permitiendoles baxo de pretexto alguno, dueran en el Comb° ni tampoco permita comercio en la Cosina: con sachristanes, ni mozetones, sino mostrarles asperesa, sin golpearlos, y quando reincidieren castiguírlos por mano deel fiscal […] (Ruiz, “Gobierno de las misiones de San Diego de los Jemes y San Agustín,” 1-2).


Ruiz, “Observations,” 309. The Spanish reads:

[…] la experiencia me enseña, q’ cuando estas mujeres están Juntas todo el tiempo, de rezo, y Missa, se les va en conbsercaciones, y enseñar lo que tienen, de abalorio, listones, medallas, etc., y quizen selos dio como lo ganar, y otras maldades; y assi el Religioso, que los administrare tenga cuidado en este punto, q’ por fin es casa de oración, y no de confabulaciones […] (Ruiz, 1775, “Informe,” 1).

Ruiz, “Observations,” 310; the Spanish reads:

En el verano ocurren la portería deel Norte, en el ymibierno al sementerio; Dizan q’ es impendencia [?], q’ asistan aquí en estos lugares, porq’ la yglecia se tiene para este fin, y q’ en todas las miss’ se practican estos actos en la yglecia y también, q’ en el ymibierno, haze frío, q’ esta el sementerio lleno de niebe, y q’ es contra charidad. Dire con licencia de mis PP q’ haviendo llegado a esta miss’ y baxando ala yglecia, ala hora deel rezo, veia mozos con mozas, en retozos rizas, y tirandose unos y ortras con las lanas de cueros o fresadas [?], y las mujeres con las de las taxas yen cierta oración, aun fiscal desnudo, sin tapar las verguenzas haziendo muchas desonestidades; y assi el q’ fuese compassibo, mas [unclear] q’ no rezen, y solo lo hagan, quando haya comoddidades q’ no le lastime […] (Ruiz, 1775, “Informe,” 1).


Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 82. The accompanying corner fireplace with low curbing seems outsized for Room 5’s small space, and may also have had culinary functions. Nineteenth-century Zuni cooks often parched maize kernels and toasted bread scraps for reuse, after which they were ground on metates. The low, wide form of this hearth could have served these techniques well. See Cushing, Zuni Breadstuff, 265-266, 292, 339-340. Grinding stones in the form of simple one-handed manos in shallow stone basins occur in the Southwest by the middle-Archaic period (c. 1200-400 BCE), but sets of flat or slab metates with two-handed manos such as Nusbaum found were not commonplace until c. 900 CE. See Crown, “Women’s Role,” 241; Adams, Ground Stone, 120-122, 129-130. Ancestral Pueblo women’s long association with the task of corn grinding shows up in skeletal wear from long hours kneeling and extending the arms, and grinding’s designation as a female task is well-attested by archaeological and ethnographic evidence; see Crown, “Women’s Role,” 224. Only seven mealing bins were preserved among Hawikku’s houses. Hodge speculated that bins were typically deconstructed and rebuilt elsewhere when new floors were built on top of earlier layers, resulting in a lower rate of preservation than other features such as fireplaces, bins, and benches; see Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, The Excavation, 34-35. Regional patterns indicate grinding bins were increasingly located out of doors on rooftops or in plazas during the Pueblo IV period, making them less likely appear in excavations, which rarely focus on these areas; see Scott G. Ortman, “Corn Grinding and Community Organization in the Pueblo Southwest, A.D. 1150-1550,” in Migration and Reorganization: The Pueblo IV Period in the American Southwest, ed. Katherine A. Spielmann (Tempe: Arizona State University, 1998), 181. When Spanish primary sources describe the missions’ reliance upon female “bakers,” the repetitive daily task of grinding corn and wheat at mealing stations similar to these was probably a significant
part of their work. Dominguez (The Missions, 169, 173-174) confirms the continued existence of mealing rooms in mission conventos during the eighteenth century, explicitly referencing a room for metates next to the kitchen in the convento of Santa Ana, and a similar space at Tesuque. Perhaps Nusbaum found no metates in Room 5 because the larger, more durable metates were worth carrying away to the retreat settlement upon Dowa Yalanne but the manos more easily replaceable. It is commonly the case that manos outnumbered metates in pueblo excavations, or that no metates are found, because residents remove them when decommissioning a grinding room. See Ortman, “Corn Grinding,” 176; J. L. Mobley-Tanaka, “Gender and Ritual Space during the Pithouse to Pueblo Transition: Subterranean Mealing Bins in the North America Southwest,” American Antiquity 62 (1997): 441; Adams, Ground Stone, 123-124. Although there were a number of similar manos collected in 1919, there are no notes as to whether Nusbaum collected any from the mission. Room 5 may well have continued in its function after the end of the mission period

113 Baxter, “Father of the Pueblos,” 83; Cushing, Zuni Breadstuff, 384; Mindeleff, A Study, 211-212; Ortner, “Corn Grinding,” 166; Cattell, Paper Bread (Hewe).

114 Presley Haskey, email message to the author, September 2, 2017.

115 Roscoe, The Zuni Man-Woman, 138-139.

116 Cushing, Zuni Breadstuff, 307-309.

117 Ibid., 382-390.

118 Casteñeda de Nájera, “The Relación, 419. The Spanish reads:

[...] tienen bien repartidas las casas en grande linpieça donde guisan de comer y donde muelen la harina que es Un apartado o retrete donde tienen Un harnal con tres piedras asentado con argamasa donde entran tres mugeres cada Una en su piedra que la Una frangolla y la otra muele y la otra remuele antes que entren dentro a la puerta se descalçan los sapatos y cogen el cabello y sacuden la rropa y cubren la cabeça mientras que muelen esta Un hombre sentado a la puerta tañendo con Una gayta al tono traen las piedras y cantan a tres Voçes muelen de Una Vez mucha cantidad porque todo el pan hacen de harina desleída con agua caliente a manera de obleas [...] (475).


121 For the shattered cooking pot, see Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 90. Room 11, a subdivision of the ambulatory, does not appear to have been immediately reoccupied, and the cooking pot and candlestick most likely belong to the mission period, deposited in this space during the raid on the mission, or its subsequent looting, with fill accumulating on top of them. For fire damage and subsequent reuse of these spaces, see Appendix 1.

122 Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 98. While some artifacts in the ambulatory corridors may have been deposited after the mission’s destruction, the cohesive assemblage of a grinding station and its burnt condition strongly suggest that these artifacts were in situ on the floor of the ambulatory hallway when the mission was destroyed. The abrader is attested in the NMAI catalog, but unmentioned by Nusbaum, so its relationship to the manos and metates, discovered “just above the floor” is unclear. There do not appear to have been multiple floor levels in this space, and I would assert that the burnt condition of the artifacts indicates that Nusbaum found them in situ.
The only *metate* in the NMAI collection from the 1919 field season is NMAI 093638.000, which is complete without and fracturing, and it averages between 2.91 inches thick on one end, and 2.26 inches on the other (73.91 and 57.5 centimeters). In perusing the 1919 field notes, excavators encountered the following whole and fragmented *metates*: part of a *metate* in a bin in Room 111 (Block E; Hodge “Hawikuh 4,” 89); Room 115 (Block E) produced “three mortar and grinding stones” but presumably these are mortars and hand stones, not *metates* (94); Room 116 (Block C), “various fragments of a metate” (95); a *metate* cracked in half and lying in a mealing bin of Room 103 (Block E, 120); an apparently whole *metate* “stood on edge in [the] SE corner” of Room 133 (Block C) but Hodge (153) does not specify whether it was collected; part of a large *metate* in the wall of Room 137 (Block D, 162); the fireplace curbing in room 149 included a 50.80 cm. (2”) thick *metate* (195); from room 154B (Block D) one large *metate* with a broken end, one narrow *metate*, and a portion of a large *metate* (204); Room 155 (Block D) included two thin, reworked *metates* in the construction of a bin (208); and “some fragments of metates” in Room 161 (Block D, 219). Of these finds, only the *metate* in Room 133 could match NMAI 093638, but Hodge does not say he collected it. In contrast, Nusbaum (“Church and Monastery,” 98) explicitly writes “one metate and stone maul sent to museum.” It is reasonable to conclude that the one *metate* in NMAI’s collection from 1919’s excavations is the *metate* Nusbaum found in the ambulatory (Room 15) “near the north wall, just above floor,” along with others that were “soft as a result of burning and moisture.” The *metate* and maul do not show this damage; which might be why Nusbaum did not collect them.


This pit was 0.81 m. in diameter and 0.74 m. deep (2’ 8” by 2’ 5”), with sides and floor smoothly plastered in mud.

For Nusbaum’s suggestion that it was a corn steaming oven, based on comparison to Hopi pit ovens, see his letter to Watson Smith, April 10, 1962. For an ethnographic description of green corn ovens, see Cushing, *Zuni Breadstuff*, 204-208. Other possible interpretations of this pit might be as a storage pit or sump for concentrating and removing rainwater from the patio in ceramic jars. Deni J. Seymour has identified a similar pit feature for food storage at the 1690’s Jesuit mission *visita* of Santa Cruz de Gaybanipitea in southern Arizona, but it was located inside the adobe brick structure and not exposed to the elements; see *A Fateful Day*, 158-160. Food storage pits have also been excavated at the Palace of the Governors, see n. 50 above. I think food would not have preserved well in this exposed location where moisture was likely to accumulate from the surrounding roofs, increasing the likelihood of spoilage. I am also skeptical that it was a sump, because of its location and the fact that only one such pit was discovered. It does not seem well situated for draining the patio, as a centrally located pit and sloping floor would more easily accommodate. While the plastered interior of the pit does appear to show some water damage, this might be incidental.


Cushing, *Zuni Breadstuff*, 303; Baxter, “Father of the Pueblos,” 91; Stevenson, “Ethnobotony, 75. By the time of Curtis’s publication in 1926, green sprouted wheat had replaced mastication and fermentation as a means of sweetening corn meal dough; see Curtis, *The North American Indian*, vol. 17, 99. In casual discussion, I have not found present-day Zuñis familiar with the fermentation process or layered pit bread cooking as Cushing describes them. *Hepalokia* today refers to a recipe of wheat germ and refined sugar, also known as “Indian pudding.”

Benavides, *The Memorial*, 1630, 48. The Spanish reads, “[…] que en el fueo nos fentamos co ellos a los principios, conformandonos con fu llaneza hafta que los enfeñamos mas policia” (143). Compare to “Investigation Made by Don Francisco de Valverde,” 627; and Cushing’s rather prejorative account (*Zuni Breadstuff*, 549-555).

Furniture might come from Mexico, but was also produced locally. Pecos Pueblo was particularly renowned for its woodworking. See Lonn Taylor and Dessa Bokides, *New Mexican Furniture 100-1940: The Origins, Survival, and Revival of Furniture Making in the Hispanic Southwest* (Santa Fe: Museum of New Mexico Press, 1987), 10-11; and Keith Bakker, “Pueblo Furniture Making in New Mexico,” in Wroth and Gavin, *Converging Streams*, 115-126. The charred fragments from Hawikku’s mission are some of the only extant pieces of seventeenth-century woodworking. Although a little difficult to identify, they suggest at least some local production. See also Toulouse, *The Mission*, 23-24.

Timothy Verdon, “Masaccio’s Trinity: Theological, Social, and Civic Meanings” in *The Cambridge Companion to Masaccio*, ed. Diane Cole Ahl (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 168; Braunfels, *Monasteries*, 22. This kind of ecclesiological thinking also applied to convents, where sisters lived under the supervision of their superior mother, and was a standard feature among the regular orders.


“Declaration of Captain Andrés Hurtado,” 190.

Sources mention such meetings in the *conventos* at Las Humanas, Quarai, Santo Domingo, and Awatovi Pueblos. See “Reply of Aguilar [January 17, 1664],” 146; “Deposition of Nicolás de Aguilar, May 8, 1663,” 173; “Declaration of Fray Joseph de Arias, A Lay Brother. Abó, May 23, 1668,” 275; and “Hearing of July 3, 1665,” 259-260. Members of the Santa Fe *cabildo* (“Opinion of the cabildo,” 62-63) were perturbed when they were denied this privilege during a visit to Santo Domingo, and were forced to sleep in a kiva.

“Reply of Aguilar [January 17, 1664],” 146; “Testimony of Fray Nicolás de Freitas, Mexico, January 24, 1661,” 159. Regarding mission books and reading, the Sandia mission was described as having its own library, from which an Indian artist borrowed a Bible for making paintings based upon its engravings; see “Hearing of July 3, 1665” (260), and “Points Favorable to this Defendant, and Directed Against the Suspicion That He is Married,” in Hackett, *Historical Documents*, vol. III, 264. Governor Peñalosa recounts readings from a copy of Juan de Solórzano Pereira’s *Política indiana: sacado en lengua castellana de los dos tomos del derecho; gobierno municipal de las Indias Occidentales* (Madrid, 1647); see “Hearing of July 3, 1665.” Wagon manifests and mission inventories include a number of other books including missals, breviaries, choir books, antiphonal books, and other liturgical books. See Scholes, “Mission Supply Service,” 102; and and “Supplies for Benavides,” 113-114, 118-119. In the eighteenth century, the mission of Santo Domingo had a full library, with 256 titles, often in multiple copies; see Adams and Chávez, *The Missions of New Mexico*, 220-233.


Benavides, *Fray Alonso de Benavides’ Revised Memorial*, 98. The story ended in violence. A Taos warrior entered the *convento* by stealth, apparently to assassinate Ortega. The dog gave chase, catching the warrior and “tearing him to pieces” in the monastic garden. He soon died, but not until supposedly converting and receiving baptism on his death bed.


Long-Solís and Vargas, Food Culture, 43-44.


No identifiable remnants of molinillos or their cups were found at Hawikku. For the process of making liquid chocolate, see Annie Gray, “Chocolatada! Sensing the Past: Recreating a 17th-Century Chocolate Recipe,” in Table Settings: The Material Culture and Social Context of Dining, A.D. 1700-1900, ed. James Symonds (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2010), 36-39; Pierce, “Mayólica,” 249; Long-Solís and Vargas, Food Culture, 44-45; and Coe, America’s First Cuisines. For the majolica each mission was to receive in the triennial wagon trains; see Pierce, “Mayólica,” 253-254. In the mid-seventeenth century, another form known as a mancerina developed. This was a majolica saucer with an attached ring in which the jícara-style cup sat. I have no evidence for mancerinas at Hawikku.

Ruiz, “Observations,” 311. A particularly fraught ritual of chocolate consumption between Salinas alcaldes and the guardian of Quarai’s mission confirms that these norms of chocolate preparation by mission community laborers in the celda or trascedela pertained to seventeenth-century establishments. Aguilar says he dined with the friar in his cell, where the Franciscan waited upon the alcaldes as a servant. Aguilar had been enforcing the anti-Franciscan policy of Governor Mendizabal, preventing friars from receiving Indian labor which the Governor was exploiting himself. Mendizabal had refused to allow Quarai’s residents to continue serving the mission, reducing the friar to doing his own cooking, among other tasks. In this case, the missionary made a show of his reduced status by preparing hot chocolate in front of Aguilar “with his own hands.” See “Deposition of Nicolás,” 173.

In some cases, porterías may also have served as hospitals. Sick parishioners could come to the mission to receive food and what treatment the friars could muster. While primary sources do not specify where this treatment took place, it may well have followed the Mexican pattern of using the portería as a hospital. See Benavides, The Memorial, 1630, 33. As part of their supplies, mission were to receive blankets (about one every three years) and linens for their infirmaries; see “Supplies for Benavides,” 112. For Mexican portería hospitals, see McAndrew, The Open-Air Churches, 571; and Edgerton, Theaters, 44-46.

Benavides, Fray Alonso de Benavides’ Revised Memorial, 101. The Spanish reads, “A la hora de comer todos los pobres del pueblo que no estan enfermos vienen a la portaria y los cosineros del convento les tienen prevenida suficiente comida que les admiitra el religioso […]” in Benavides, 1634, “Relación y memorial,” 250 verso. Note that Benavides continues his habit of using masculine subjects for the kitchen staff, contrasting most other seventeenth century sources. From the context of Benavides’s passage, it appears that this distribution of food took place at the first meal of the day, which was typically between 9:00 am and noon in Medieval and Early-Modern Iberia, with a second meal following the canonical hour of Vespers around 6:00 pm; see Martínez Llopis, Historia, 155.

García de San Francisco, “Order of the Vice-Custodian, Fray García de San Francisco, To the Religious of New Mexico, February 6, 1660,” in Hackett, Historical Documents, vol. III, 164; Ivey, “The Greatest Misfortune,” 83-84. Defending the mission project, Captain Andrés Hurtado confirmed that the missions had assisted both Indigenous and Spanish people during the 1660 famine; see “Declaration of Captain Andrés,” 191; and “Hearing of June 16, 1663,” 204.
Inventories of food distribution during the famine years of 1667 to 1672 are found in Scholes, 1672, “Inventario de los bienes.” Incoming Custodian Fray Nicolas Lopez de Cordoba had apparently requested inventories of the liturgical goods and artwork at each mission, as well as resources distributed over the previous year; see Ivey, “Greatest Misfortune,” 80-81. In 1952, Scholes and Adams (“Inventories,” 127-138) translated and published the inventories, but omitted the lists of food donations.
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CHAPTER 11: CONCLUSIONS

The history of Spanish missions in New Mexico is emotionally charged, caught up among perspectives that often seem mutually exclusive. Many cultural and ethnic descendants of Spanish colonists are proud of missions across the American Southwest, while Native peoples have traumatic cultural memories of the often brutal means by which the Spanish established and maintained them.¹ In writing, I have attempted to honor the lives of Zuni ancestors who lived at Hawikku, and other Native peoples under Spanish occupation during the seventeenth century. I do not want to minimalize the violence, threats, and coercion that were part of the everyday experiences of Pueblo communities, but neither do I want to sensationalize their suffering. Zuni ancestors persevered under adverse circumstances; maintained cultural and religious expressions in spite of Spanish oppression; expelled the colonists during the Pueblo Revolt; and congregated their communities around Halona to become the Zuni people whose descendants live on in the Middle Place today.

In recounting this history, I have also sought better understanding of the Franciscan friars who propelled missionization among New Mexico’s Pueblo communities. Interpreting their actions and motives requires critical examination of earlier nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholarship. The racial preoccupations of Anglo-American society during the Territorial and early statehood periods, the “poor New Mexico” mythology, Black Legend narratives, and Spanish triumphalism all shaped early studies of New Mexico missions. Many of these narratives rely upon stereotypes that minimize the complexities of the past, often with the misleading presumption that Franciscan missionaries lived in cloistered seclusion.
This project’s underlying theme has been the agency of various actors in the mission’s fraught, inequitable social context. Within the structural constraints of social norms, available resources, and environmental conditions, people made choices. Agency was never absolute, and competing visions of antagonistic groups often led to subordination, coercion, and oppression. In spite of these social constraints, however, participants in the mission community retained degrees of agency, subjective personhood, identity, individual desires, familiar habits, and enculturated ways of receiving and responding to the world around them. Individuals and families navigated their circumstances through tactics including overt and passive resistance; accommodation; communicating by code switching and implication; and by situational cooperation.

I propose that “active negotiation” is the most effective paradigm for describing mission community interactions, with its double implications of a negotiated response to conflict, and the navigation of difficult terrain. Relations within missionized towns and mission communities were constantly shifting negotiations of inequitable power, resources, factionalism, and the threat of violence. Like crossing a minefield, individuals caught up in the system had to find their ways through this hazardous and unpredictable landscape, sometimes by intentional strategy, and sometimes by intuitive reaction prior to conscious reflection. It is a worthwhile historical endeavor to look for these expressions of Indigenous agency, contributing to more truthful and inclusive representations of the past. It is not possible to recover the direct, unmediated perspectives of missionized Native people from the seventeenth century, but archeological evidence includes material remnants of their actions which are open to interpretation. Furthermore, descendent communities’ oral traditions relay cultural memories of these times,
while careful reading of primary sources can hint at complexities that Spanish authors attempted to gloss over.

I have argued the *convento* was a primary context for cultural encounters and negotiations among Pueblo Indians and Franciscan missionaries in seventeenth-century New Mexico. Competing agencies interacted in the sustained closeness of everyday labor and co-residence within the *convento*, both consciously and at the level of unreflective cultural reproduction. The specific context of the Zuni pueblos, far from seats of Spanish power, also shaped how these variable degrees of agency played out. Zunis had more success preserving their cultural institutions than many Rio Grande pueblos because of their distance, but they also had acute memories of Coronado’s violence, of Oñate’s brutal punishment of neighboring Acoma, and other depredations that tempered overt resistance. When necessary, however, Zunis defended themselves by force and alliance with other Indigenous groups.

Various projects have led to the study and excavation of New Mexico missions since the late-nineteenth century, yielding interpretations of their architectural style that often fail to acknowledge the participation and agency of Indigenous mission community members. They have treated missions as essentially Spanish places, without exploring the transformative effects of Native laborers and residents in the material environment of New Mexico *conventos*. The Purísima Concepción of Hawikku offers an opportunity to revisit seventeenth-century missionization, focusing on the *convento* as an arena of cultural negotiation.

Hawikku’s people had developed a cohesive system of domestic forms and practices, which integrated their material culture, architecture, and cosmological beliefs about their place in the world. They had millennia-deep roots in the pre-contact Southwest by the time the Spanish began to arrive in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Franciscan missionaries brought their
own cultural constructs as part of an evangelization campaign dependent upon strategies of coercion, threatened violence, and factional divisiveness. Primary sources also recount descendants of Christianized Mexican Indians from Coronado’s expedition, who facilitated Spanish access to Zuni communities.

More than two centuries later, outsiders again exacerbated factionalism when the Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition arrived during the same years as Catholic efforts to reestablish a mission at Zuni Pueblo. Hodge relied upon the Protestant faction to excavate Hawikku, against the wishes of the community and especially Catholics, who eventually halted further research. Hawikku’s artifacts are a core collection of the National Museum of the American Indian, and a key part of this dissertation. The expedition’s acquisitive goals and Hodge’s techniques based in prior experiences were already outdated and limited the information retained with these collections. My reconstruction of the 1919 field season helps to understand Nusbaum’s rushed and incomplete documentation of the mission, while analysis of the archaeological process is essential for distilling new information from excavation documents.

Archaeological remains and primary sources indicate Hawikku underwent three stages of mission construction. The initial establishment lasted from 1629 until 1632, occupying and altering existing vernacular structures beneath the later formal mission. San Bernardo wares from these rooms display the creative mixture of ceramic forms, techniques, and ornament arising during the sustained contact of Spanish missionization among the western pueblos.

The formal mission phase began in the mid-seventeenth century, with its structure complete by 1661. Nusbaum’s excavations focused on its cohesive plan of a single-nave church, atrium, and attached convento. Stylistically, it was based on Iberian vernacular traditions of adobe brick and flat terrado roofs, but having much in common with Pueblo construction styles.
The *convento* was the living space of the mission community, with blank exterior walls enclosing a highly integrated cloister-plan interior. Its distribution of heated/unheated, and open/secured rooms indicates basic patterns of use. Primary sources demonstrate that *celda/trascelda* arrangements typically combined the friar’s personal quarters with an unpartitioned, multifunctional *celda* that was a dining room, sleeping quarters, and workspace for mission community members, within sight and hearing of the guardian friar.

In the decade following its completion, the Purísima Concepción underwent significant alterations. A sacristy extension and new service patio expanded to the southwest, while remodeling on the eastern corner added rooms and rooftop entry hatches; inserted a new stairwell in Room 1/7 and a partition wall in the original *celda*; and probably included second floor rooms as well. With structural changes came alterations to patterns of use and movement through the *convento* spaces. This process trended towards greater enclosure and increased heating capacity, as individual rooms become smaller, more specialized, and more like the Indigenous architectural style. These changes indicate continuous labor demand for constructing, renovating, and serving the mission; they also suggest growing insecurity in its final years.

To interpret the Purísima Concepción’s living quarters, I have contrasted the *convento*’s design with evidence for everyday activities within its spaces. Michel de Certeau argues architecture is a tool of the powerful to control particular places, and assert their vision of order through the built environment. The tactics of subjected people, in contrast, rely on the ephemeral medium of time. Because power takes on concrete architectural forms, it lacks the flexibility to keep up with the tactical agency of subordinate individuals. In response to power, people negotiate the built environment by taking advantage of momentary opportunities, weaknesses, surprise, trickery, wit, and ambiguity. Applying a similar idea to material culture, Robert Blair
St. George argues the ambiguity and compression of the “poetics of implication” allow for indirection and associations that conceal entangled meanings in plain sight, an essential communicative technique within the unequal power structures of colonial contexts. My interpretation of Hawikku’s material environment aligns with de Certeau and St. George’s theories, treating the convento design as a Franciscan assertion of meaning, seizing place within the Pueblo landscape. By exploring everyday interactions within convento spaces, however, one may occasionally glimpse the agency of mission community members through the artifacts they left behind.

Constructing the Purísima Concepción’s convento created a particular ordering of spaces at the edge of Hawikku Pueblo. As with Halona’s convento, it used the cloister plan, apparently universal among New Mexico’s seventeenth-century formal missions. Cloister plans were not merely inevitable or habitual, as comparisons to other mission fields such as Spanish Florida demonstrate. Franciscans used architecture rhetorically, and selected cloisters as an intentionally conservative act, framing evangelization and mission life in terms of monastic precedent, millenarianism, and mendicant identity. With proportions related to sacred geometry, the cloister form evoked metaphoric implications and cosmological models of the sacralized landscape, including the terrestrial and celestial cities of Jerusalem, and the Garden of Eden. Through close reading of Perea and Benevides, I have established a range of meanings that seventeenth-century Franciscans applied to these structures. In the millenarian tradition of sixteenth-century Mexico, Perea presents New Mexico missions as extensions of the Holy Land and Primitive church, filled with apostolic metaphors and alluding to cosmic warfare, as well as earthly struggle with the civil government. Benevides similarly brings up cosmic warfare, along with agricultural imagery; contrasting light and darkness; and claims of treasures temporal and
spiritual. Most importantly, however, he represents New Mexico as an orderly monastic landscape, with thoroughly acculturated Pueblo people participating in a global sacred economy, uplifting the Spanish King as pious donor. These rhetorical constructions asserted Franciscan visions of a missionized landscape to mask the negotiated relationships of daily life, thus comprising a layer of meaning pertinent to the Purísima Concepción.

I have argued that everyday life within the mission was more complex than friars typically acknowledged. Artifacts related to food production and consumption in Hawikku’s convento show that missionaries overcame European suspicions of American cuisine, and the mission community consumed a simple, robust diet drawing on both European and Indigenous culinary traditions. Cuisine is a communicative medium, allowing intervention by various agencies and embodying cultural metaphors. For Franciscans, rustic elements signified their presentation as “common laborers” in the metaphorical fields of the Lord while also evoking sacramental and apostolic imagery. Dining provided occasion to assert European table rituals in which missionaries played the role of patriarchal providers for the ecclesiological family. Spanish missions depended largely upon Indigenous women as cooks, however, a working arrangement that allowed for the infiltration of Indigenous cultural concepts. This labor arrangement reflected Pueblo cultural competencies and gender norms, while many of the foods were implicated in Zuni traditions of a personified, relational cosmos and of religious significance, such as corn. Some Franciscans were uncomfortable with female workers, but the kitchen spaces appear to have been under women’s purview, and at Hawikku their labor spilled into other spaces of the cloister-plan residency. Culinary features demonstrate aspects of women’s agency, both conscious and non-reflective, through new material forms combining
their cultural traditions with Spanish introductions, and through the continuation of familiar ways of doing things in the new context of the mission.

Infiltration of Pueblo concepts into convento life exemplifies de Certeau’s theory of the tactical negotiation of establishment spaces, as Native members of the mission community adapted the living quarters, introduced foods, and produced creative, artist solutions to tableware needs. In the practices of everyday life, Native laborers found ways to assert parts of their understanding of the world, producing a social environment combining elements of both antecedent cultures. Hybrid ceramic vessels illustrate this cultural interpenetration, invoking the Pueblo directional cosmos, religious use of feathers, and beliefs about the surrounding environment. Other characteristics point to Spanish cultural-technological systems and aesthetics.

Much work remains to better understand everyday interactions among Pueblo people and Spanish colonists during the seventeenth century. The dearth of records, poor quality of early excavations, and diminished interest in non-Revolt periods are challenging, but numerous avenues for further investigations exist. Hawikku’s artifacts remain incompletely analyzed, as with Kechiba:wa and Caywood’s work at the Halona mission, for which several field notebooks are also missing. The Awatovi excavations beg for reanalysis, since Montgomery’s influence biased their interpretations, probably leading to misunderstanding of the mission’s architectural remains and artifacts. There has been no extensive study of San Bernardo wares from Awatovi, nor examples found elsewhere in seventeenth-century New Mexico, which deserve greater attention as a high point in colonial New Mexico’s artistic achievements.

Further excavations of mission sites would undoubtedly produce valuable new information, but descendent communities often do not want these places disturbed. Non-
invasive geophysical surveys of unexcavated sites and around the perimeters of excavated missions such as Hawikku could add knowledge in a culturally sensitive manner, recovering data about mission layouts and features of everyday labor such as fences and corals. There remain numerous unpublished primary sources, and perhaps more undiscovered in Spanish and Mexican archives, while letters archived across the U.S. are underused resources for recent Pueblo history. A systematic reconsideration of Pueblo oral traditions and their intersections with or contradiction of Spanish documents would also be helpful, along with ethnographic collection of current accounts of colonialism, where Pueblo communities may find it acceptable.

* * *

At the start of this project, it was my hope to fully analyze and publish the Spanish colonial artifacts and other materials associated with Hawikku’s mission. Other authors’ descriptions of the Hendricks-Hodge expedition as having produced “remarkably precise and minutely detailed” records with pioneering work in stratigraphy led me to believe that such an analysis would be a straightforward process of following the excavation documentation to analyze artifact assemblages room-by-room through the mission. In reality, the excavation documentation was far less precise than I had anticipated, and scattered across the country in various archives. Furthermore, the archaeological context of artifacts was poorly attested in many cases, with the architectural framework as the primary point of reference for what documentation did exist. A careful analysis of the mission’s architectural structure and its change over time thus became a priority and necessary prerequisite for the study of the site’s mission period artifacts, which remains ongoing. In concluding, I want to return to one of the
most remarkable discoveries at the Hawikku site in anticipation of the research that this study now enables.

Among the numerous hybrid ceramic creations from Hawikku, perhaps the most interesting is the San Bernardo Polychrome salt cellar (salero) that Nusbaum uncovered in the sacristy addition of Room 30 (figures 11.1-11.2). Truly remarkable despite its small size and now published for the first time as part of the Many Voices, One Nation exhibit at the National Museum of American History, its hemispheric bowl perched on a conical base with thin walls and precise painting once offered up pinches of the valuable white seasoning to mission community participants. Nusbaum incorrectly interpreted the salero bowl as an annular ring base (figure 11.3), which is clearly incorrect when one looks at how its painted motifs rest on a ground line, and the unfinished interior of the cone. This form differs from the small, cubical saleros typical of Early Modern Spain (figure 11.4), but Mexican majolica workshops were probably making conical salt cellars in the seventeenth century, perhaps based on Asian porcelain examples (figure 11.5). The conical shape is similar to nineteenth-century examples from Puebla (figure 11.6), which go back to at least the early 1700s, as a lidded salero with blue accents in a 1721 Puebla painting demonstrates (figure 11.7). Further research will likely identify earlier examples from seventeenth-century Mexico, possibly even represented at Hawikku by a sherd of an hourglass-shaped hollowware vessel (figure 11.8).

If the salero’s formal sources came from beyond the Pueblo world, its materials and San Bernardo Polychrome style indicate it was made among the towns of the Hopi Mesas. Painted motifs encircle its conical base, resting on a triple ground line reminiscent of the continuous ground lines in ancestral Hopi murals, which modern studies describe as the “sand altar display” (tuwapongya), or surface of the earth. On opposite sides are a pair of radiant niches containing
equilateral crosses, in-between which are a pair of rainbow-fan motifs. The alternating niches and fans suggest a four-directional arrangement, corresponding to the terrestrial directions of Pueblo cosmology, similar to terraced pyramids on the rims of modern Hopi and Zuni ceremonial bowls, which represent mountains or clouds at the edges of the Pueblo world (figure 11.9). Similarly, twentieth-century Zuni ceramic motifs frequently represent clouds gathering from the four points to converging on the Middle Place (figure 11.10). In this context, four arched motifs around the central bowl may be a cosmological transformation of the salero’s conical form, reverberating with meaning in both Spanish and Pueblo systems of thought, as the artist translated Spanish imagery through her own cultural filters.

The niches echo radiant halos in Spanish representations, such as a contemporary religious medal from Hawikku, on which auras of light surround the Virgin and Christ’s monogram (figure 11.11). Copper from Hawikku’s church shows that such serrated ornament was also part of the mission’s liturgical space, perhaps surrounding a santo figure (figure 7.87). Yet, Matthew J. Liebmann points out that radiant halos are similar to headdresses of certain Pueblo Kachinas as well, and similar niches were part of pre-Hispanic kiva murals. The equilateral cross also has complex origins, referencing Christianity but also suggesting the tapering points of stars in Pueblo and Navajo art. Painted star ceilings with protective implications were part of Navajo rock art in the eighteenth century, probably drawing on earlier Pueblo sources (figure 11.12). Four-pointed stars occur in Zuni rock art and throughout pre-Hispanic New Mexico. They were common shield motifs associated with warfare, fertility, and Venus (figure 11.13). Alex Seowtewa’s discussion of four-pointed star motifs on the corbels of the Halona choir loft (figure 11.14) shows these implications continued among Zunis into the twentieth century:
Stars […] they’re just like warriors that protect us when we’re asleep so no destruction will come to us till the next day, when the giver of life which is the Father Sun takes over to protect us. So we address the stars as warriors to our interpretation of certain prayers that we have here in Zuni.  

By painting equilateral, pointed arms, the salero artist transformed Christian crosses into ambiguous symbols similar to the protective stars of Indigenous traditions.

The fan motifs show even more complex visual transformations. They appear to be based on the black-painted bobbin lace motifs (encaje de bolillo) from Puebla Polychrome majolica, a style that developed in Mexico during the 1660s (figure 11.15).  

Hopi artists who took an interest in adapting Puebla Polychrome to their own San Bernardo Polychrome style typically translated the black and blue majolica colors into their own blackish-brown and reddish-brown paints (figure 11.16). Instead of faithfully replicating Mexican fan motifs, the salero maker took a boldly syncretic approach, juxtaposing rainbows and feathers in place of the bobbin lace arcs and loops to create a novel motif rooted in Pueblo cultural knowledge.

Rainbows appear often in Pueblo art; both Zunis and Hopis associate them with rain, and thus fertility, flowers, and life’s fruitfulness. For Hopis, rainbows are part of a set of images signifying the “flowery world,” an ideal philosophical state of harmony and fecundity founded in right prayers, songs, and actions.  

The salero’s band of alternating black and white is key to interpreting the arcs as rainbows. By themselves, black and white bands can signify the milky way, but combined with other arcs, they symbolize the rainbow’s shimmering colors of light diffracting through water. Such multicolored rainbows appear frequently on Zuni altars, dance headdresses (tablitas), certain kokko, and even the pueblo’s official seal.  

They are also part of Judeo-Christian thought, symbolizing God’s covenant with Noah after the Genesis flood, making them meaningful in both Christian and Pueblo belief systems and readily suitable for missions where they often appeared in mural paintings. Friezes of rainbows in Acoma’s convento (figures
9.41-9.43) had counterparts in its church nave, as well as nearby San José of Laguna Pueblo (figure 11.17).

The salero artist also transformed the bobbin lace loops into upright arrangements of feathers, single with rounded black tips on one side, and doubled with square black tips on the other, indicating two different feather types. The single round-tipped feathers are like the tail feathers of young golden eagles, which have asymmetrical black tips and appear in prominent fans on top of Zuni Shalakos, among other frequent religious uses (figures 11.18-11.19). The square-tipped feather pairs evoke flat-tipped turkey feathers, which Zunis use in prayer sticks (figure 11.20). In Hopi ethnography, turkey feathers are connected to rain, while significations of eagle feathers include prayer, dancing, rain, the sky, the sun, and warfare.

The salero feathers fan out like the tail of a bird, perhaps related to tail-feather motifs in Hopi pottery (figure 11.21), or suggesting an array of upright prayer sticks or other ritual objects. The salero’s individual, upright feathers do not look exactly like Zuni prayer sticks, which incorporate numerous different feathers and sometimes hanging attachments. In discussing similar motifs on pre-Hispanic pottery, however, Hopi scholar Emory Sekaquaptewa identifies them as prayer sticks even when only single feathers are visible. The upright arrangement seemingly stuck in a low black mound also bears some similarity to Pueblo altars, which assemble wooden uprights, feathered objects, meal paintings, medicine bowls, fetishes, and other ritual materials on the floor of kivas and ceremonial rooms. Some Hopi altars in the ethnographic publications include backdrops of upright feathers. Likewise, some Zuni altars include paintings of rainbows and upright fans of feathers, while upright ears of corn wrapped in colorful feathers (miwe) of medicine men typically stand in front of their wooden backdrops. The salero’s rainbow-fan motifs may not be exact reproductions of any particular altar or prayer
stick arrangement; rather, its artist drew upon the familiar visual culture of the western pueblos to transform foreign bobbin lace motifs into new, culturally specific ornamental motifs.

The unusual attention to ornamental motifs invested in this vessel may reflect the importance of its contents, since salt was a valued material in both Spanish and Pueblo worlds. Salt cellars have a long European history, serving as essential components in table settings and valuable heirlooms since Classical antiquity. Salt figured in Christ’s teachings, leading early theologians to connect it with the indwelling grace and wisdom of God among believers. Furthermore, salt was part of the Western liturgy of baptism by the fourth century, through the Rite of the Catechumen, in which new converts ate a pinch of salt prior to receiving their baptism. Accompanying prayers describe salt as a metaphor for incorruptibility, based in the fact that it was the primary means of preserving meat at that time. Salt was thus the first sacramental food that believers received, preceding the Eucharist. For Franciscans, it retained implications of wisdom and discernment, and friars saw themselves as the salt of the earth, preserving humanity and removing the decaying stench of greed and vice, even if they did not always live up to their own ideals.

Medieval European salt cellars were often small porringer or ceramic bowls, but in the prevailing metaphor of Eucharistic table ritual, they embodied God’s union with diners and divine presence at the table. Salt cellars were the first vessels set out upon the table and the last to be removed with ceremonial pomp. They served as status symbols, with important diners sitting above the salt cellar’s position on the table, and the rest below. As Renaissance “Master of the House” metaphors gained prominence, hosts used expensive cellars of precious materials and lusterware ceramics to exhibit prestige. To satisfy this demand, artists produced saltcellars
in a variety of forms, such as Benvenuto Cellini’s golden *Saliera of Francis I* (1543) and the ivory salt cellars of the African-Portuguese trade (figures 11.22-11.23).

Salt’s religious significance remains visible in Renaissance paintings of the Last Supper and other significant meals (figure 11.24). Most notably, Leonardo da Vinci depicts Judas knocking over a conical salt cellar in his famous *Last Supper* for the Dominican refectory of Santa Maria della Grazie in Milan (1495-1497; figure 11.25). The upended cellar signifies Judas’s betrayal of Christ, abrogation of grace, and loss of apostolic fellowship, in contrast to Christ’s distribution of grace in the bread and wine. Spanish painters also used *saleros* as religious symbols, for example when Juan Andrés Rizi emphasizes Saint Benedict’s humility and holiness by presenting a square majolica *salero* at the center of his isolated table and simple fare (figure 11.26).

Salt’s divine symbolism had parallels in Zuni thought, for whom it also embodied a supernatural presence. Similar to their conceptualizations of earth and corn as the flesh of Mother Earth and the Corn Maidens, Zunis understand naturally occurring salt deposits in personified, relational terms as the flesh of Salt Woman or Salt Mother, who helps preserve human health. According to Zuni accounts, Salt Mother once lived at a site near Black Rock, but people did not care for her properly. Trash polluted her lake and she left, moving south and leaving distinct rock formations behind her. She settled at the present-day location of Zuni Salt Lake in Catron County, NM (figure 11.27). This naturally occurring deposit has been a high-quality source of salt since the earliest Spanish *entradas* (figure 11.28). Other groups such as Navajos, Acomas, and Hopis also visited the Zuni site, which was returned to the tribe in the late 1970s. Traditionally, Zuni men conduct an annual pilgrimage to the lake to collect salt and visit religious shrines. The mission community likely used the same salt in Hawikku’s refectory,
with its divergent implications for Spanish and Zuni diners who might have understood it variously as the presence of the Christian God’s grace or the presence of the body of the Zuni Salt Mother.

The salero’s interwoven layers of meaning point towards its importance among residents of the mission community, and it must have spoken of different meanings to its various users. As with deeply intercultural atrial crosses of sixteenth-century Mexico (figures 9.126-9.127), the motifs of the salero manifest a complex tangle of European Christianity and Native Pueblo cultural expressions far more expansive than one would expect from such a small object. It demonstrates Hopi artists continued producing innovative San Bernardo wares until the decade of the Pueblo Revolt, ranking among their finest creations. Questions remain regarding its enigmatic place of discovery beneath a burnt wooden column on the floor of the sacristy closet (Room 30). Was the salero intended for the nearby refectory (Room 14/17/18)? Or had it been part of the liturgy along with other sacristy materials? Could it have been hidden away because its symbolism evoked Pueblo religious concepts too strongly? Or perhaps it related directly to the use of enigmatic Room 30? Among Hawikku’s finest artistic objects, the salero raises many unanswered questions, but clearly represents a prominent infusion of Pueblo ideas and imagery into the mission convento.

The Purísima Concepción salt cellar is exceptional in its preservation and the complexity with which its maker has entangled cultural associations, but it is only one of many items to exhibit such creative mixing of Pueblo and Spanish cultural traditions. The significance of seventeenth-century missions in New Mexico was never simple or homogenous. They meant very different things to the missionaries who impelled their construction, to the Spanish colonists and civil officials whose threat of force enabled them, and to the local Pueblo communities who
built and sustained them through uncompensated labor. The biases of primary sources typically
downplay the violence of missionization and the contributions of Native laborers to the survival
and functioning of these establishments. All too often, modern architectural history has
emulated Spanish sources in obscuring Native perspectives on the colonial past and the
importance of Indigenous mission community members. By focusing on the socio-cultural
context of the mission community as the most significant frame for understanding the
architecture and material culture of New Mexico missions, I have sought to counteract these
biases in the historical record, and explore the meaning of the Purísima Concepción for both
Spanish and Indigenous users. Although full recovery of the experiences and perspectives of
Hawikku’s mission community members is impossible, the material traces that they left behind
point to creative metaphoric entanglements that infused the hardships of life with significance, in
what was a distant Spanish frontier and a vital place in the Zuni world.
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APPENDIX 1: POST-MISSION ALTERATIONS OF THE PURISIMA CONCEPCIÓN RUINS

Although the mission period at Hawikku ended in 1672, the life of the Purísimá Concepción’s structural remains continued, as Zunis appropriated them for houses, animal corrals, and materials. These alterations included construction of new walls, fireplaces, and floors; extraction and reuse of mission-period artifacts; and deposition of a post-mission component throughout the site (figure 12.1). This history of ongoing use has major implications for interpreting its archaeological remains, since almost any photograph of the convento rooms includes post-mission walls and/or features. Understanding of these developments is necessary for accurately interpreting the mission-period remnants.

The attack of October 1672 destroyed the church’s roof, balcony, and choir loft. The roof collapsed as its timbers burned, and the weight of the packed earth above crushed elements below, such as the apse railing, but probably also smothered the fire. Deteriorating bricks washed in amongst the roof’s remnants, creating a stratum of disintegrated adobe and burnt wood on the mission floor. The fire probably started in the church, but quickly spread through the gospel door into the sacristy and convento. In the sacristies, its intensity charred the floors but left a few remnants of wooden materials. It spread through the ambulatory until three sides of the convento were burning, from the portería in the front range, to Room 9 on the southeast side, and 14/17/18 in the back range. It appears Rooms 20, 2/3/4/19, 5, 6, 1/7, and perhaps 13 did not burn, along with the southeast and service patio extensions (figure 12.2). Nusbaum notes
burnt patches along the southwest corridor floor, where they are visible in photographs (figure 7.130), as well as along the entire northwest corridor and halfway down the southeast walk.\textsuperscript{1}

Other traces show the fire spread along the northwest walk as far as the \textit{portería} (Room 36), and around the southeastern ambulatory, where Room 9’s missing wooden sill probably burnt, along with a group of crumbling, fire-damaged \textit{manos} and \textit{metates} midway along the southeast corridor.\textsuperscript{2}

After the fire, people plundered the mission ruins. Fray Juan Galdo appears to have visited the next day, collecting an unburnt polychrome statue (\textit{bulto}) of the Virgin along with whatever valuables remained accessible. Community members must also have scavenged the remnants, carrying away unburnt furnishings, ceramic vessels, and metal pieces, redistributing them throughout the pueblo. The exposed church and parts of the \textit{convento} deteriorated and added to the initial stratum of disintegrated adobe and burnt wood. With the mission’s destruction in October, it is likely the first winter passed without major reoccupation of the surviving rooms, and exposed timber may have been reused as firewood. Zuni accounts suggest other roofing beams were reused for mission construction, either at Halona or Kechiba:wa Pueblos.\textsuperscript{3}

Zunis appropriated remnants of the Purísima Concepción to construct new houses and enclosures for livestock (figure 12.3). A thick layer of “sheep and goat” manure in the church nave indicates its use as a corral.\textsuperscript{4} Zunis also reused the \textit{convento}’s central patio and some of the ambulatory spaces to keep animals. The northeastern walk (Room 23) accumulated thick manure, and the southwestern walk (Room 10) was probably also part of this corral, with a thick, coarse stratum similar to manure visible in photos elsewhere (see figures 5.27, 7.130, 12.4). The \textit{portería} (Room 36) was probably the entry to the patio corral with an earthfast fence across its
northwest opening. Fill accumulating in the patio created a layered stratigraphy of manure and fine sediment similar to the church. Finally, the service patio was reused as a corral after the accumulation of 61 centimeters (2') of wind-blown sand over the mission-era floor (figure 5.38).

Stratigraphic evidence indicates a passage of some time between the destruction of the mission and its use as a corral. In the photograph of the nave’s cross section (Figure 5.27), the lowest stratum is a light-colored soil similar to the clean alluvial deposit of the top layer. The primary difference is the presence of burnt roofing timbers in the lower half of the first layer, which slopes inwardly from the nave walls towards the center, comprising the remains of the church’s collapsed terrado roof and disintegrated adobe wash from the walls. Roofing timbers probably fell in disarray as they burnt, with the thick packed earth above falling in among them, and adobe wash accumulating another 30 to 45 centimeters (1’ to 1’ 6”) of light sediment above them.

The thickness of this stratum may represent the first eight years of the mission’s ruined condition, and perhaps the entire Pueblo Revolt period. The clean fill above the timbers suggests use of the church as a corral might not have taken place until sometime in the eighteenth century. Other spaces that Zunis reused as corrals show similarly thick accumulations of relatively clean sediments prior to manure, such as in the southwest ambulatory under Room 20 (figure 12.4), and in the service patio. After the capture of Spanish herds during the Revolt, and the safe descent of the Zuni population from Dowa Yalanne, herdsmen may have needed sheep camps away from the consolidated Middle Village, for which Hawikku’s mission ruins were an inviting option. Several post-mission domestic alterations appear to have been relatively late as well, and may be post-Revolt houses for herders.
Domestic reoccupation concentrated in the convento’s southwest range and eastern corner, where reuse was particularly heavy. Zuni builders blocked up the doorway and window of Room 22, the friar’s trascelda, filling it to a new floor level between 61 and 91 centimeters (2’ 6”- 3’, figures 7.143-7.144). On top, they built a single stretcher wall, dividing the room into two domestic spaces (Room 22A to the southwest and Room 22B to the northeast). A pavement of large slabs covered the floor of Room 22A, likely scavenged from the mission ruins, where they previously formed canales, parapets, chimney flues, splashguards, and other structural features (figure 12.5). Notable was a carefully rounded griddle stone set in the floor (figures 10.31-10.32). Other artifacts included a semi-circular hatchway sill, indicating a shift to vertical entry in the post-mission period. Finally, a square sandstone mortar was associated with this occupation (figure 12.6). A doorway with a low, worn adobe sill communicated through the partition with 22B, another partly paved domestic space (figure 12.7). A square hearth with slab base and curbing sat in the middle of this room.

The former celda (Room 2/3/4/19) underwent a complex reoccupation. The already partitioned Room 19 remained throughout the post-mission period, with its doorways filled in and a ceiling hatchway added over the a rectangular hearth sunken in the adobe brick pavement along the southeastern wall (figure 7.149). Photos show a small assemblage of sherds including a bowl rim, cobbles, an elongate artifact which might be bone, and a worn down rectangular mano, all lacking specific provenance (figure 12.8).

After the mission period, Zunis divided Room 2/3/4 into two roughly equivalent, square spaces with a stretcher partition resting on the original floor and angling across the space of
A rectangular, slab-lined fireplace was at the southwest end of the dividing wall, with a new floor surface (level 2) constructed in the northwestern room about 15 centimeters (about 6”) above the original floor. In the next construction stage, new stretcher partitions running northwest to southeast divided the square rooms into quarters, roughly corresponding to Rooms 4A/3A, 4B/3B, 2A, and 2B (figure 7.147 Stage 4). Occupants created a new floor level (level 3), roughly 30 centimeters (about 1’) above the previous occupation.¹⁴

In their final configuration, these rooms were completely reworked (figure 7.147 Stage 5). Builders cut down the previous partitions, and inserted three new division walls, running northeast to southwest, in the same direction as the original mission-period vigas. These walls created Rooms 2, 3, and 4, each elongated rectangular spaces similar to Room 19. Room 2’s new floor was approximately 81.28 centimeters (2’ 8”) higher, with sandstone paving in the southwestern half. A new spur-wall fireplace with sunken, slab-lined rectangular hearth stood against the middle of the southeast wall (figures 7.148, 12.10, 12.17).¹⁵

A brick stretcher wall separated Room 2 from the similarly sized Room 3. Another partition divided Room 3 from Room 4, badly constructed with upright slabs holding back a poorly integrated rubble core, which fell apart during excavation. Room 3 had a packed adobe floor at the same level as Room 2, with a number of features not appearing in the field notes (figures 7.150, 12.10-12.11). A spur-wall hearth sat in the center of the northwest wall, with a single upright slab forming the paredcito, along with slab fire backing and lining in the shallow, rectangular pit. A slender upright jamb against the spur supported the mantle and smoke hood, presumably of mud-plastered wood similar to the Frances Canyon Ruin fireplace (figure 7.41). A rounded stone artifact was found among the ashes of this hearth, and the intact skull of a sheep
or deer appears on the wall above. Two other upright slabs without clear purpose stood against the southeast wall opposite the fireplace. Perhaps they were part of bins or other furniture. This room’s users also reworked the mission-era window niche, adding a predella in front of the blocked-up opening to widen its sill, forming a shelf, perhaps to support larger objects such as jars.

Nusbaum found a “crude sandstone shallow mortar” in Room 3 (figure 12.12), and photos show several artifacts from either Room 2 or 3, including what may be handstones for grinding or abrasion, ceramic sherds, and a few pieces of wood. Two sherds next to the handstones are notable, appearing to be a section of a medium-sized, round-bottom bowl made in an unidentified Zuni type, alongside a sherd similar to Hopi San Bernardo Ware (figure 12.13). Their stratigraphic positioning is uncertain, but most likely came from an occupation level below the ultimate configuration of Rooms 2 and 3. A square mortar with a pecked basin appears in photo negative N05743 (figures 8.55, 12.14), along with a worn out sliver of a rectangular mano. Finally, above the walls of Room 19 are numerous unidentifiable ceramic sherds, several pieces of manos, and other slabs or blanks, along with the ceramic cylinder of a broken candle holder (figures 7.122, 8.54, 12.15).

There are few indications of Room 4’s ultimate configuration, although truncation of earlier partition walls shows that it was filled in like Rooms 2 and 3 (Figure 12.16). Nusbaum describes a small niche in the northwestern partition, but it is unclear whether this belonged to the mission period or a post-mission occupation. Fire blackening suggested an informal hearth in the room’s northern corner. A hatchway ring appearing on Room 4’s shared wall with Room 6 may be from a post-mission reconfiguration of this space, or may be original to the mission-period occupation of Room 6, which was entered from above (figure 7.122, 8.54, 12.15).
The stairwell of Room 1 was also heavily reused, with its ambulatory doorway filled and a stretcher partition raised across the tread of the second step. The fate of the upper stairwell and southeastern extension are unknown, but at some point a partition was built over the seventh step, enclosing the former stairwell as two roughly square rooms (figures 8.48-8.49, 8.51, 12.17). The lower room retained its original floor, with the two bottom steps in place. Builders hammered off the extruding corner of the second step, but the first step remained as a low bench along the small room’s southeast side. This room had no hearth, and might have been a storeroom entered through a rooftop hatchway.

It is unclear how the space of 1A was used, but a second reoccupation filled both spaces, raising Room 1’s floor level about 1.07 meters (3’ 6”) and removing the central partition to unify the space again. Loosely-fit sandstone slabs paved its northwestern half, and a rectangular hearth was set into the west corner, where Nusbaum found a scoria mortar inside the sunken firebox (figures 12.17-12.19). It appears the upper stairwell was walled-off and plastered by this period, enclosing the room’s southeast side. The final evolution of Room 1 saw the creation of a new floor level of packed earth, ranging from 17.78 to 30.48 centimeters (7”-12”) above the previous occupation (Figure 8.48, 8.51). This floor had a new spur-wall fireplace against the southwest wall, sitting on a sturdy foundation of two or three reused adobe brick courses in the floor’s fill (figures 8.49, 8.52, 12.20). The stone and earth paredcito was to the southeast, with upright slab fire backing and curbing, and a slab lining the bottom of the rectangular firebox. This final occupation included a post embedded in the middle of the northeast wall, and two fragments of a sandstone ring, presumably the rooftop hatchway. Post-mission artifacts included a hammer or burnishing stone (figure 12.21), and the scoria mortar. Uncollected artifacts from photos include a squared hammer stone and large oval cobble with a pecked groove around its
midsection, both from near the final occupation fireplace (figures 8.52, 12.22). Other artifacts included utility ware sherds, pieces from the bulging shoulder of a late-phase jar, an oblong cobble having impact fractures on its end, and ubiquitous sandstone slabs.

Rooms 7 and 9 underwent post-mission alterations very similar to each other. New residents blocked up the ambulatory doorways, and divided the rooms lengthwise with stretcher partitions of reused bricks to yield long, narrow residential spaces with hatchway entries (figure 7.154). The wall partitioning Room 7A from 7B was relatively well-constructed and sat directly on the original mission floor. Nusbaum collected a painted rim sherd from a bowl in the northwestern room (figure 12.23). Photos show additional artifacts on the walls, possibly from Room 7’s post-mission occupation, including slabs, a broken mano, a small polishing stone, and what appears to be a blank for a new mano.

The partition in Room 9 was more complicated. A low wall of adobe bricks and stones resting on the mission floor, initially divided the space lengthwise into thirds. The larger space to the southeast was filled with debris to the top of the wall. The rest of the partition wall was set back about 45 centimeters (about 1’ 6”) from the front of this stone and adobe base, rising to the ceiling level (figure 12.24). The result was a lengthwise partition of Room 9, with an integrated bench along the wall’s northwest side. Adobe bricks laid perpendicular to the bench paved its top surface, along with large, carefully shaped, rectangular sandstone slabs as a working surface, which excavators removed and set on top of the partition wall (figure 7.157).

It is unclear if the two partitioned sides of Room 9 initially communicated with one another, but builders eventually filled the northwestern 9B to a new level 60 centimeters (2’) above the original floor, and small Pueblo-style doorway roughly 56 centimeters (1’ 10”) wide passed through the partition between 9A and 9B. Presumably 9A had a similarly raised floor
level. As part of this occupation, a series of new features were constructed on top of the bench along 9B’s partition. In the southern corner were doubled bins, the taller made from two rectangular slabs on end against the corner, while the second bin was of adobe bricks on edge against it. At the opposite end of the partition in the eastern corner of 9B was a rectangular fireplace set into the wall with a stone bottom, slab curbing, and upright sandstone fire backing and lining. What may have been another floor-set firebox had a peculiar position immediately in front of the doorway between 9B and 9A. A number of wooden elements survived on the floor of this occupation, including several long, slender sticks and a heavier round beam (figure 12.25). These may be a viga and paired purlins from the ceiling reconstruction, suggesting a return to Indigenous roofing construction styles after the destruction of the mission, replacing latillas with purlins and infill.

Room 9’s post-mission occupations also produced slabs, ceramic sherds, and other artifacts, but only a sandstone mortar with two carefully ground depressions appears in the NMAI catalogue (figure 7.160). From photographs, a carefully shaped stone ring, possibly belonging to a post-mission hatchway appears, as do ceramic sherds and bowl rim fragments, worn out manos, other pieces of groundstone, assorted faunal remains, and several possible metates (figures 12.26-12.28).

During this later stage of reoccupation, the old convento doorway was in use, connecting Room 9B to Room 11, a post-mission partition of the ambulatory. Room 11 was created well after the mission’s destruction by blocking up the patio doorway and construction of an adobe stretcher wall on top of debris, which filled the southeast ambulatory corridor slightly less than 91 centimeters (3’) deep. Another stretcher wall closed off the room’s other end, yielding a space about 5.87 by 2.13 meters (19.25’ by 7’). This room apparently provided storage for the
Room 9 household. Its floor was higher than that of 9B, and three upright slabs formed a riser stepping up into the new space through the old *convento* doorway.\(^{31}\)

In addition to corralling animals, post-mission Zuni occupants reused ambulatory spaces domestically. Brick stretcher walls partitioned the passageway to the service patio (Room 12), and the northwest and southeast ambulatory walks. Nusbaum provides no information about Room 12, other than noting the stretcher partition enclosing it, creating a space 4.85 by 2.21 meters (15’ 11” by 7’ 3”).\(^{32}\) How this room was used is unknown, but neither door to the service patio or kitchen appear to have been blocked up.

Along the southeast side, additional walls parallel to those of Room 11 produced the narrow spaces of Room 15 and Room 16. These partitions were poorly constructed of four unbonded stacks of adobe bricks, the collapse of some creating an opening that Nusbaum first described as a “very narrow and Indian style” doorway between the rooms (visible in the background of figure 7.149).\(^{33}\) He identified no fireplace or occupation level in Room 15, which appears to have merely been negative space between Rooms 11 and 16. Room 16 enclosed the ambulatory’s eastern corner, with the doorways to Rooms 1, 4, and 7 walled up and a crude rubble wall across the northeast ambulatory walk.\(^{34}\) This was probably a storage room, with no fireplace or recorded artifacts, although photographs show piles of ceramic sherds, a worked deer antler, pieces of groundstone, and slabs nearby (figures 12.8).\(^{35}\)

Zuni reoccupants partitioned the northwest walk with stretcher walls between the church nave and *convento* patio, producing Rooms 26, 27, and 28 (figures 5.47 and 7.99). Rooms 26 and 27 each had small corner fireplaces in their floors. Room 26’s hearth was in the eastern corner, lacking fire backing but having a low, rounded adobe curbing in front, while the Room 27 fireplace was a pit with slab curbing.\(^{36}\) Nusbaum’s sparse documentation does not record any
further artifacts or features. It is notable that their walls sat directly on the ambulatory floor, rather than accumulated fill. Unlike other post-mission appropriations, Zuni builders removed the fill from post-fire deterioration prior to constructing their walls. Sometime later, Room 20’s domestic space was built over a deep accumulation of manure, fill, and Room 26’s remnants in the ambulatory’s western corner (see below).

Zunis appear to have reused the kitchen (Room 13) during the post-mission period. At some point in its history, a wall of single adobe stretchers was begun to partition it as two spaces. Whether this wall was ever complete is unknown, but only two courses remained at the time of excavation. It was not original to the room, being unbonded to the walls, and sitting over a heavily worn floor, which the partition’s builder had to level with stone shims and a thick bed of adobe mortar in the center of the room. This wall could date to the mission period, since careful leveling prior to construction was unlike many more expedient partitions of post-mission occupations, but its partitioning of smaller spaces without any horizontal doorway seems more typical of the post-mission period. Sometime after the mission’s destruction, Room 13 was filled to a new floor level, just below the benches’ surfaces (figures 12.29-12.30). Nusbaum made no note of this occupational level, but it is visible in photographs. The course, semi-packed appearance of the post-mission floor suggests it was not heavily used.

If a room’s reconfigurations indicate intensity of use, Room 14/17/18 was among the more heavily reoccupied parts of the mission. As I have hypothetically reconstructed this space at the time of the mission’s destruction, it was still a single room, with a continuous adobe brick pavement across the floor and fireplaces in the corners, possibly serving as refectory. The first post-mission alteration was the construction of a single-stretcher partition wall between the spaces of Room 14 to the southeast and Room 17/18 to the northwest, and concurrent removal of
brick paving in Room 14. The partition wall between 14 and 17/18 appears to sit on the original packed earth mission floor (figure 8.58); perhaps the adobe pavers of Room 14 were pulled up and repurposed to build the partition, leaving the floor in Room 17/18 undisturbed. Nusbaum does not specify whether the ambulatory door was blocked up, but new rooftop hatchways were presumably constructed to enter the reconfigured rooms.

Other partitions followed. A second dividing wall of brick stretchers was raised across Room 14 just southeast of the original doorway, and secondary partitions produced four quadrants largely without features, which Nusbaum designated Rooms 14A, B, C, and D (figure 12.32). None of these partitions were bonded to the convento walls, and that between 14C and D was made of coursed stone blocks in mud mortar, like masonry in the pueblo. Only the northern space (14D) had a fireplace, which Nusbaum did not photograph or describe. A series of three bins sat in the western Room 14C, made from adobe bricks cut into smaller pieces and laid up flat or on their sides with adobe mortar. None of these features appear in photographs.

The northwest half of the original storeroom/refectory was also partitioned, with an adobe stretcher wall through the middle separating Rooms 17 and 18, each with floor-set corner fireplaces. The partition wall abutted or was built over the edge of previously constructed large bins along the southeast side of Room 17, but there is no further information about them (figure 8.58). Another stretcher partition wall cut Room 18 into two individual spaces (18A/18B) with a doorway and brick sill between them. Photographs show numerous artifacts on the walls during excavations, including ceramic sherds, stone slabs, cobbles, manos, hammerstones, and a dark slab which may be a metate or griddle stone. Nusbaum probably left most or all of these on site, only collecting a “large smoothing stone” that he found in Room 14D, and which cannot now be
identified among NMAI collections. Most of these artifacts probably belong to the post-mission occupation.

* * *

Several reoccupation rooms stood on top of deep accumulations of fill. Although lacking definitive chronological indicators such as identifiably post-Pueblo Revolt ceramic types, these rooms may have belonged to the eighteenth or nineteenth centuries, perhaps as temporary residences for Zuni herders. The upper-levels of Rooms 1, 2, 3, and 4 may have been late occupations, but structures standing against the remnants of the church walls such as Rooms 20, 24, 29, and 30 are especially likely candidates.

Room 20 preserved a full assemblage of artifacts in situ. It stood over the western corner of the ambulatory and earlier partition of Room 26, with its floor level 1.27 meters (4’ 2”) above the ambulatory floor suggesting significant time between the destruction of the mission and this room’s construction. The stratigraphy below Room 20 appears to have included initial burnt wood and debris from the mission’s destruction; a superimposed stratum of lighter, fairly homogenous fine sediment about 36 centimeters (1’ 2”) thick, perhaps from deteriorating adobe; and a dark layer of coarse material Nusbaum describes as manure, coming up to within a foot of Room 20’s floor (figure 12.4). This stratigraphy points to a period of unoccupied deterioration following the mission’s 1672 destruction, after which Zunis constructed Room 26, and used the ambulatory corridors and patio as a corral. Manure accumulated for some years and Room 26 fell out of use before the construction of Room 20. Its builders appropriated the nave wall remnant and constructed light new foundations on the three other sides, with slabs laid in the fill over the remnants of the ambulatory walls. On top of these footings they erected adobe brick
walls to produce a new room 4.95 by 1.98 meters (16’ 3” by 6’ 6”, figure 12.32). Unshaped slabs “finely paved” its interior, and there were two square, sunken fireplaces. The fireplace in the southern corner had upright slabs as fire backing and curbing, while the other had a spur wall of heavy slabs midway against the southeastern wall, into which the firebox was set.\textsuperscript{44}

Room 20 contained a rare documented floor assemblage (figure 12.33). These artifacts included: two large utility ware cooking jars (diagram #’s 1 and 3, figures 12.34-12.35); a small, red bowl (# 2, not identifiable in the NMAI collection); a grooved stone ax (# 4, not identifiable in the NMAI collection); an ancient black-on-white ceramic ladle with square handle (# 5, figure 12.36); a small, Plainware ladle (# 6, figure 12.37); a shaft straightener (# 7, figure 12.38); a small cooking pot with a single handle (# 8, not identifiable in the NMAI collection); a large Plain bowl (# 9, not identifiable in the NMAI collection); a large water jar with depressed base and buff-colored slip finish (# 10, figure 12.39); and a “shattered [griddle] stone in crumbling condition” that was not collected.\textsuperscript{45} Not only were the identities of several of these items lost in transit, but at least two additional artifacts appear in the NMAI collections that Nusbaum neglected to record or recorded incorrectly: a concretion fetish (figure 12.40) and a flat bottomed pitcher (figure 12.41). Among these artifacts, there are no useful chronological indicators, except perhaps the broad midsection and deeply concave base of the water jar, similar to formal developments in post-1700 Ashiwi Polychrome Ware.\textsuperscript{46}

Late post-mission occupants also reused the Room 29 stairwell. They built stretcher walls of adobe brick and stone slabs across the treads of the first and seventh steps, with a slab floor at or above the level of the middle landing, about 1.22 meters (4’) above the ambulatory floor level. This room had no preserved features, and Nusbaum says only a small portion of floor remained at the time of excavation.\textsuperscript{47}
None of the sacristy rooms were reoccupied in their original configuration, and Room 21 does not appear to have been reused at all.\textsuperscript{48} A stub wall was built on top of a deep accumulation of fill over Room 21, but appears to have been associated with Room 24 nearby (figure 12.42).\textsuperscript{49} A long, narrow house similar to Room 20, Room 24 stood on top of comparably deep fill, incorporating remnants of the sacristy and nave walls. Its interior was 6.17 by 2.06 meters (20’ 3” by 6’ 9”), with a paving of large, irregular slabs. Upright slabs formed mealing bins at the room’s northeast end, with four manos but no metates.\textsuperscript{50} Two rectangular, floor-set fireplaces completed its features, with slab bottoms, curbing, and fire backing.\textsuperscript{51} One fireplace stood against the southeast wall and the other in the south corner. Nusbaum noted no artifacts, neither the rectangular manos from the mealing bins, nor the rounded hand stone which appeared in photographs (figure 7.110).

The reoccupied Room 30 used extant walls of the nave, apse, and sacristy, with a new wall along the southwestern side further out than the original, and a floor of packed earth and repurposed bricks 1.45 meters (4’ 9”) above the original (figure 12.43).\textsuperscript{52} Notes about this level are sparse, and no photograph exists, but its features included a spur-wall fireplace against the southeast wall near the southern corner, with a paredcito of adobe bricks laid on side. Nusbaum says the room was “very much filled with sheep bones and deer. A niche carved out by artificial means affected by nature was filled with bones of several animals.”\textsuperscript{53} He does not describe the form or location of this niche, but did find several ceramic artifacts, including: a brown utility jar with an orange interior (figure 12.44); a miniature brown-colored Plainware jar (figure 12.45); a fragment of a small red-colored Plainware bowl or large ladle with a rounded bottom (figure 12.46); and a large, brown, unornamented canteen (figure 12.47). Unfortunately, none of these artifacts help to date the reoccupation of Room 30, but the depth of fill and structural reliance on
the church walls suggests a period of use similar to the post-mission occupations of Rooms 20, 24, and 29, probably in the eighteenth century.

* * *

Zunis did not abandon the Purísima Concepción site after its destruction in 1672. While mission ruins may have lain open and fallow for a period of time, they became a source for useful materials, and a locus of post-mission residential and herding activities. Zunis who moved back into the remnants of the mission convento changed its architectural spaces, blocking up doorways, substituting rooftop entrances, and partitioning spaces to make them smaller. Rooms generally had higher floors, and new fireplaces were mostly of the traditional sunken firebox (Room 19) or spur wall varieties. Remnants of wooden elements in 9B may point to some ceiling reconstruction in the Hawikku manner of purlins rather than latillas. Many reoccupied rooms underwent multiple renovations during the post-mission period, producing a complex layering of partitions, floor levels, and alterations. Zunis reused other spaces to corral animals, an activity that does not appear to have begun immediately after the mission destruction, but rather some years later. While Hawikku’s people never reoccupied the site as a residential town after the Pueblo Revolt, spaces like Room 20 might indicate some temporary residential occupation of upper level rooms during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, providing accommodations for herders using the site as a sheep camp and corral. The mission’s now sparse ruins remain a resting place of Zuni ancestors buried under the nave during the seventeenth century, while also memorializing the hard labor of building and maintaining the mission establishment. Zunis’ long occupation of the site, both before and after the Pueblo Revolt, attests to generations of perseverance and creative reuse.
ENDNOTES

1 Nusbaum (“Church and Monastery,” 110) calls these the west and east sides of the “court” or plaza, respectively.

2 Ibid., 90, 98. Evidence for the fire entering into the portería include what appear to be burnt discoloration of the floor in photographs (figure 7.126), and the polychromed bowl found in the middle of its floor, which was clearly broken in a fire, perhaps when burning roofing materials fell on it.

3 See Chapter 7, n. 26, above.

4 The layer is described in as being from sheep and goats in the caption to photo negative N04701. Elsewhere it is simply described as sheep manure. I am not sure how precise one should take the distinction between sheep and goats to be. The layer of manure appears to have been approximately 0.76 m. to 0.91 m. (2’ 6” to 3’) thick in N04701 (figure 5.27), while Hodge describes it as 0.61 m. (2’) thick (Hodge to Heye, June 22, 1919), and Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury describe it as 2 or 3 feet thick (The Excavation, 125).

5 Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 140. Perhaps these herds were responsible for breaking down the northwest wall of the patio, of which only a low stub remained at the time of excavation.

6 A total of 0.61 m. (2’) of manure accumulated during this corral phase, after which it fell into disuse and further windblown sediments accumulated (ibid., 143).

7 Diverse artifacts from the church fill indicate its remains were likely also a working area or trash dump during the post-mission period; see Chapter 7, n. 82, above.

8 Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 109, 143. Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury (The Excavation, 119) also concluded that parts of the mission ruins remained in use as a sheep camp after 1692.

9 The partitioned room to the southwest (Room 22A) was 1.98 m. by 3.28 m. (6’ 6” by 10’ 9”), and the northeastern room (Room 22B) was 2.13 m. by about 3.35 m. (7’ by 11’).

10 Nusbaum (“Church and Monastery,” 113) recognized that many of these stones had been reused after the mission’s destruction, and were found in those new locations at the time of excavation, saying the pavement comprised “various shaped worked stones from other parts of the ruins.”

11 A second, smaller griddle stone 40.64 cm. (1’ 4”) in diameter and 7.62 cm. (3”) thick was also found, but not shipped back to New York; ibid. The second hewe stone is not visible in situ, but appears on the walls above the larger griddle in figure 7.144.

12 The broken hatchway stone is visible in figure 12.5.

13 Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury (The Excavation, 123-124) outline essentially the same sequence of constructions. The new fireplace in Room 19 was slab-lined, sunken 12.7 cm. (5”) below the floor level, and 35.56 cm. long by 20.32/12.94 cm. wide (1’ 2” by 8”/11”). It was 12.7 cm. (5”) out from the stretcher wall; see Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 106. The reason for this second fireplace is unclear. It may be that the mission-period corner fireplace was blocked up, or unusable for some reason. Or that fireplace may have been constructed in a way that was insufficient for cooking or other tasks, necessitating the second hearth.

14 Floor level 3 is visible in all four quadrants of the subdivided space in N05767 (figure 12.9) where the four division walls meet just left of center in the photograph. This floor level is the fill on which the poorly-constructed dividing wall between Rooms 3 and 4 rest in N05768 (figure 12.16, left side of photo) and N05767. I am uncertain why the four dividing walls were cut down in the uneven fashion visible in N05767, rather than evenly underlying the subsequent floor level 4. Perhaps there was another stage of occupation that partially reconfigured these spaces prior to the final stage of reuse, but which left insufficient evidence to be clearly recognizable.
The spur wall was 20.32 cm. wide and 50.34 cm. long (8" by 1’ 9"). To achieve these dimensions, the bricks were either not the standard size used elsewhere or were cut down. Photos seem to show some stone slabs included in the spur wall construction. The fireplace was 66.04 cm. by 48.26 cm. and 10.16 cm. deep (2’ 2" by 19" by 4"). No artifacts were noted in this room, although stones and a ceramic sherd appear in photographs on the partition wall with room 3. In N05762 (figure 7.44, right image), a reentrant corner is visible in the eastern corner of the room, seemingly belonging to the post-mission occupations.

These ceramic fragments do not appear on the walls of photo negatives N05764 or N05765 (figures 12.10, 7.150), so they likely were discovered after cutting through the late phase floor levels exposed in those photos. The bowl had a thin triple band around the interior of its rim and painted quadripartite division with ornament in each quarter, and appears to have a visible carbon streak in its cross-section. The San Bernardo piece is less visible but appears to be an angled sherd painted on its exterior, suggestive of a cup with black bands, slanted hatching, and interlocking frets. I have not been able to identify these pieces in NMAI collections.

I have been unable to positively identify this piece in NMAI’s collection. The stone appears very similar to NMAI 095644.000 (figure 12.6), which is documented coming from Room 22A, the post-mission occupation of the trascelda. Although there are great similarities between the photograph of the mortar above Room 4 and NMAI 095644, the former seems to lack the even, carefully flattened base of the latter. It may be that Nusbaum found two very similar mortars in these two nearby rooms, and opted only to collect one as a representative example.

While I would conjecture that this piece most likely originated from mission deposits, excavation photographs do not allow me to pinpoint whether it came from Room 19 or Room 8, and consequently how it might have been positioned stratigraphically.

Nusbaum also describes the mortar as a “coarse lava metate” (Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 42), but is apparently speaking of the same artifact.

The hearth was 63.5 cm. long and 49.53 cm. wide (2’ 1” by 1’ 7.5”), with the interior of the firebox set 5.08 cm. (2") below the floor level and the side curbing stones rising 10.16 cm. to 12.70 cm. high (4” to 5"); ibid., 41.

Ibid., 84. The splayed doorway from the ambulatory was filled in two stages. First, occupants raised a wall of single brick stretchers across the opening to fully enclose Room 7. Sometime later, the remaining thickness of the original splayed opening was blocked up, leaving it flush with the rest of the wall.

The stone bin was 40.64 cm. deep by 31.75 cm. wide and 33.02 cm. long (1’ 4” by 1’ 0.5” by 1’ 1”), The adobe bin was 12.7 cm. to 15.24 cm. deep (5” to 6”), with a width between 29.21 cm. and 31.75 cm. (11.5 and 12.5") and a length of 44.45 cm. (1’ 5.5”); ibid., 86).
The hearth was set 7.62 cm. to 10.16 cm. deep (3” to 4”) into the occupation floor, on top of the earlier bench. The inside dimensions of its firebox were 41.91 cm. wide and 53.34 cm. long (1’ 4.5” by 1’ 9”), following the partition wall. Nusbaum (ibid., 86) did not record the dimensions of the wall inset.

Nusbaum describes this as a secondary fireplace, but does not note if it contained ashes or signs of use as a fireplace (ibid). One side of the box was not enclosed, and it is unclear if this feature had a slab bottom. It was 48.26 cm. wide and 53.34 cm. long (1’ 7” by 1’ 9”), with a depth of 7.62 cm. (3”). I wonder if this was not a firebox at all, but perhaps some other kind of feature associated with the doorway.

Ibid., 87.

The shaped ring might also conceivably be an arched mantle for a fireplace. Other artifacts include pieces that appear to be hand stones, a roughed out rectangular mano, and slabs that might have been griddle stones, while other stones may have been part of fireplace constructions.

Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 90. Nusbaum did not identify this upper occupation level in Room 11, claiming that the room was different from the others he had excavated to that point because “it has only one floor—that is the first one or old one,” a statement that appears to be in error based on photograph N05774, where the alterations to the partially filled doorway and approximate floor level are clearly visible. For some reason this floor level was not very compacted, and the excavators did not identify it as an occupation level. Perhaps it did not receive much use after its construction.

Ibid., 92.

Room 15 was 4.27 m. by 2.13 m. (1’ 2” by 7’), while Room 16 was 3.81 m. by 2.13 m. (12’ 6” by 7’). See Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 98-100. The partition walls were stacks of adobe bricks thirteen high when found, and it seems that the bricks were either slightly below the normal length of 55.88 cm. (1’ 10”) or were pared down to fit the 2.18 m. wide (7’ 2”) ambulatory corridor.

Ibid., 114.

Ibid., 100.

Ibid., 120-122. Room 26 was about 2.97 meters (9’ 9”) long, and its hearth was 6.35 centimeters (2.5”) deep, with a curbing in front was 7.62 to 10.16 centimeters (3” to 4”) tall. Room 27 was 2.21 meters long (7’ 3”), with a fireplace 9.53 cm. (3.75”) deep, with slabs 10.16 centimeters (4”) high. Room 28 was 3.35 meters long (11’). Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury (The Excavation, 122) describe Room 27’s fireplace as raised above the floor “in the Spanish manner” but Nusbaum clearly indicates it was sunken below the floor level.

Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury (The Excavation, 122) did not believe that it had been reused.

The benches and hearthside working surfaces clearly predate the construction of this later floor, with their differing construction of adobe bricks. Likewise, the displacement of a slab from the workbench paving into the fill beneath the new floor level indicated that the bench was already in place prior to the construction of this new floor level, and its working surface damaged prior to filling and construction of the later floor. Nusbaum initially interpreted this displaced slab as a step up to the working surface, but from photographs it is evident that it was simply moved from its seating in the platform above, an interpretation that Nusbaum would later confirm; see Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 93-94.

The partition wall did not cross the space at a right angle, and the resulting rooms were not quite rectangular. Room 14 was about 4.88 m. (16’) long on the northeast side, and 4.57 m. (15’) on the southwest side. Room 17/18 was about 4.50 m. (14’ 9”) on the northeast side, and 4.80 m. (15’ 9”) on the southeast side.

Room 14A was about 2.21 m. by 2.06 m. (7’ 3” by 6’ 9”). Room 14B was about 2.13 m. (7’) square. Room 14C was about 2.13 m. by 1.68 m. (7’ by 5’ 6”). Room 14D was about 2.44 m. by 2.36 m. (8’ by 7’ 9”). These
dimensions describe the maximum dimensions of each space, none of which were perfect rectangles and thus varied slightly from one wall to the other. I have listed the northwest-southeast dimension first, and the southwest-northeast dimension second.

41 Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 96. The bins were 38.10 to 50.80 cm. (1’ 3” to 1’8”) high.

42 Ibid., 97.

43 Ibid., 109. Note that the initial fill from the destruction of the mission had been removed from this ambulatory walk, meaning that all of the fill on which Room 20 stood accumulated from further deterioration of walls after the construction of the reoccupation rooms in this part of the ambulatory.

44 Ibid., 109. The firebox along the center of the wall was set into it 15.24 cm. (6”). The stones of the corner fireplace were about 5.08 cm. (2”) thick and projected the same amount above the floor level. The pit of the fireplace was 2.54 cm. (1”) below floor level.


46 Lanmon and Harlow, The Pottery, 107-108, compare to 76. The black-on-white ladle is probably a Pueblo II or Pueblo III artifact, curated or collected by later Hawikku residents.


48 NMAI catalog notes attributing two Hawikuh Polychrome jars (NMAI 096987.000 and 096988.000) to a “Native Occupation” of this space seem to be in error, and none of the evidence corroborates this attribution. Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury (The Excavation, 122) likewise did not believe Room 21 was reoccupied.

49 All that remained of this possible structure or feature was a short spur wall over Room 21, parallel to the northeast wall of Room 24, possibly with a low roof of sticks or canes set in the remnants of the nave wall, and probably appended to the structure of Room 24; see NMAI photo negative N05795, figure 12.42.

50 Nusbaum, “Church and Monastery,” 116. The individual bins were about 60.96 cm. wide (2’), and were set 60.96 cm. (2’) away from the northeast wall. The slab siding projected about 20.32 cm. (8”) above the floor level. Only one of the original slab partitions was still in place at the time of excavation.

51 Ibid., 116.

52 The new southwest wall was 0.46 m. (1’ 6”) further out, where it appears in the plan published by Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury.

53 Ibid., 125.
Table 3.1: Selected References to Mission Personnel in Mexican Missions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission, Town (Mendicant Order)</th>
<th>Date of source</th>
<th>Description of Mission Staff Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino, Xochimilco (Franciscan)</td>
<td>1563</td>
<td>Tribute waivers requested for Native singers, scribes, musicians, and other staff for “the churches and the service of the divine cult.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan Bautista, Coyoacán (Dominican)</td>
<td>1553</td>
<td>36 Indians were constantly employed at the mission as singers, not in rotation as at other missions. The mission staff included 20 servants and caretakers for the sick, as well as messengers, porters, and sweepers. In addition, there were 4 cooks, 12 gardeners, and a doorkeeper. Numerous laborers also worked outside of the mission proper, including 80 woodcutters, 12 charcoal makers, and 24 Indians overseeing the transportation of wood to Mexico City on behalf of the mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Asunción, Cuernavaca (Franciscan)</td>
<td>c. 1550-1575</td>
<td>Local Indian Lord Toribio de Sandoval San Martín y Cortés assigned the Native staff for the mission, including a fiscal, two mayores, a topile (disciplinarian), a tepixque (oversaw manual labor), and a sacristan. He provided caretakers for the sacrament and altars, singers, bell ringers, and a doorman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Andrés Apóstol, Epazoyucan (Augustinian)</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>Archbishop of Mexico Alonso de Montúfar accuses the Epazoyucan mission of using too much labor, including gardeners, doormen, sweepers, cooks, sacristans, messengers, acolytes, singers, and musicians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel, Cholula (Franciscan)</td>
<td>1564</td>
<td>Viceroy establishes a salary for 40 singers and 16 musicians at the mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa María Magdalena, Cuitzeo (Augustinian)</td>
<td>1564</td>
<td>190 Native workers served the mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Miguel, Huejotzingo (Franciscan)</td>
<td>1558-1560</td>
<td>121 Native men served the mission. 96 men as singers and in other capacities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Agustín, Yuriria (Augustinian)</td>
<td>After 1550</td>
<td>One third of the Native population released from tribute obligations in order to facilitate their work in the mission as sacristans, singers, and skilled laborers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Information collected by Richard England Phillips (*Processions*, 40-42, 66-67, 81). Women laborers were probably not included in these counts.
Table 3.2: New Mexico Mission Personnel Described in Primary Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pueblo, Mission</th>
<th>General Descriptions</th>
<th>Trigo (1754)(^1)</th>
<th>Domínguez (1776)(^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A (General Description)</td>
<td><strong>Benavides</strong>(^3) (1634): More than 20, taking turns as porters, sacristans, cooks, bell-ringers, gardeners, refectoners, and other tasks</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (General Description)</td>
<td><strong>Report of the Cabildo of Santa Fe</strong>(^4) (1639): More than 30 or 40 Indians “constantly employed” as porter, cooks (male and female), wood-cutters, grain grinders, and unspecified field labor, stable-hands, and herding for large herds of cattle, sheep, goats, and horses</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (General Description)</td>
<td><strong>Guzman</strong>(^5) (1648): 1 interpreter, 1 sacristan, 1 cantor mayor, 1 bell ringer, 1 organ player in those missions with organs, 1 herdsman, 1 cook, 1 porter, and 1 caballo pisque (stable hand?)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (General Description)</td>
<td><strong>Aguilar</strong>(^6) (1664): At each pueblo, missions occupy the labor of 70 Indians every day, including men, women, and children: as acolytes (adult men, 8-10 in each pueblo), sacristans, singers, servants, horsemen, cooks, shepherds, farmhands, “and in other things”</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (General Description)</td>
<td><strong>Roibal</strong>(^7) (1764): Missions have 40 or more Indians on weekly rotation, including 2 sacristans as well as</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo, Mission</td>
<td>General Descriptions</td>
<td>Trigo (1754)(^1)</td>
<td>Dominguez (1776)(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abiquiu, Santa Rosa</td>
<td>unspecified field and woodcutting labor</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>“altogether like that in the missions described before […..]”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i.e., 1 fiscal (weekly), 1 sacristan (weekly), 1 female cook (weekly), 1 female baker (weekly), 1 shepherd (weekly), unspecified wood-cutting and field labor(^8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abiquiu, Santa Rosa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acoma Pueblo, San Esteban</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1 bell-ringer, 1 porter, 2 boys for the cell, 1 cook, 2 women to grind the wheat, unspecified field and pastoral labor</td>
<td>“The same as has been described at Laguna,” but with 12 women to carry water, once daily and catechism girls to carry water once weekly for peach trees in convento patio(^9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i.e. 1 fiscal mayor, 3 subordinate fiscales (1 per week), 2 chief sacristans, 8 subordinate sacristans (2 per week), 8 female cooks (2 per week), 4 female bakers (2 per week), 2 little girls to carry water (weekly), caretakers for horses and pigs, 1 young girl to care for chickens, unspecified field and wood-cutting labor(^10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acoma Pueblo, San Esteban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque, San Felipe</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Spanish community, no personnel listed</td>
<td>“These are just like those of the minister at La Cañada […]”(^11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i.e. wage labor, paid in goods: 1 female cook, 1 sacristan, 1 stable boy, 1 errand boy, woodcutters (2 in winter, 1 in summer), 1 girl to make tortillas(^12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochiti Pueblo, San Buenaventura</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2 servants for the cell, 1 bell-ringer, 1 porter, 1 cook, 2 women to grind the wheat, unspecified field and wood-cutting labor</td>
<td>1 fiscal mayor, 3 subordinate fiscales (1 per week), 1 chief sacristan, 8 subordinate sacristans (2 per week), 8 female cooks (2 per week), 4 female bakers (unspecified rotation), big girls to carry water (2 per week), pueblo takes turns in caring for sheep, cows, hens, pigs, and horses, unspecified field labor and woodcutting(^13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo, Mission</td>
<td>General Descriptions</td>
<td>Trigo (1754)&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Dominguez (1776)&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso area, San Lorenzo del Real</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Spanish community, formerly Zuma (Suma), no personnel listed, unspecified field labor</td>
<td>not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso del Río del Norte (Ciudad Juárez), Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1 horticulturalist (weekly rotation), 1 bell-ringer, 1 cook, 2 sacristans, 2 women to grind wheat, unspecified field labor</td>
<td>not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galisteo Pueblo, Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Villar&lt;sup&gt;14&lt;/sup&gt; (1660) Galisteo Mission had an unspecified number of women bakers, serving people, sacristans, and cooks, as well as 1 boy who was the personal servant to the friar</td>
<td>3 boys, 1 bell-ringer, 1 porter, unspecified number of sacristans, 2 women “to prepare the dough,” unspecified field and wood-cutting labor</td>
<td>Church and convento in ruins, no resident friar, and no mission labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halona Pueblo, Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1 gardener (weekly), 1 bell-ringer (weekly), 1 porter (weekly), 2 boys for the cell (weekly), 1 cook, 2 female corn grinders, unspecified field, pastoral, and wood-cutting labor</td>
<td>“The same as stated at the Laguna mission […]”&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt; i.e. 1 fiscal mayor, 3 subordinate fiscales (1 per week), 2 chief sacristans, 8 subordinate sacristans (2 per week), 8 female cooks (2 per week), 4 female bakers (2 per week), 2 little girls to carry water (weekly), caretakers for horses and pigs, 1 young girl to care for chickens, unspecified field and wood-cutting labor&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isleta Pueblo, San Agustín</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1 gardener, 1 bell-ringer (weekly), 1 porter (weekly), 3 boy servants to care for the cell (weekly), 3 sacristans (weekly), 1 cook (weekly), women</td>
<td>“The same as stated at the Sandia mission”&lt;sup&gt;17&lt;/sup&gt; i.e. 1 fiscal mayor, 4 subordinate fiscales (1 per week), 8 sacristans (2 per week), 8 female cooks (2 per week), 4 female bakers (2 per week), unspecified herders “whom the pueblo provides in turn,”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo, Mission</td>
<td>General Descriptions</td>
<td>Trigo (1754)</td>
<td>Dominguez (1776)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to grind the wheat (weekly), unspecified field labor</td>
<td>unspecified field and woodcutting labor</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 fiscal mayor, 4 subordinate fiscales (1 per week), 1 chief sacristan, 8 sacristans (2 per week), 6 young singers, 1 adult singer per week, also serving as translator, 8 female cooks (2 per week), 6 female bakers (unspecified rotation), 2 little girls to carry water weekly, unspecified labor to care for horse, hens, and small livestock, unspecified woodcutting in the winter, 2 boys make charcoal once a week in the summer, unspecified fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jemez Pueblo, San Diego de los Gémez</td>
<td>1 bell-ringer (weekly), 1 porter (weekly), 2 boys for the cell (weekly), 1 cook (weekly), 2 women engaged by the week (presumably for grinding), 2 woodsmen (weekly), unspecified field labor</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 fiscal mayor, 3 subordinate fiscales (1 per week), 2 chief sacristans, 8 subordinate sacristans (2 per week), 8 female cooks (2 per week), 4 female bakers (2 per week), 2 little girls to carry water (weekly), caretakers for horses and pigs, 1 young girl to care for chickens, unspecified field and wood-cutting labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Pueblo, San José</td>
<td>1 bell-ringer, 1 cook, 1 gardener, 1 porter, 2 boys for cleaning the convento and cell, unspecified number of women to grind wheat, unspecified field and pastoral labor</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 fiscal mayor, 3 subordinates (1 fiscal per week), 1 chief sacristan, 8 subordinate sacristans (2 per week), 4 female cooks (1 cook and 1 water carrier per week), 4 female bakers (2 per week, only staying 2 days per week), unspecified field, pastoral, and wood-cutting labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nambe Pueblo, San Francisco</td>
<td>1 boy for the cell, 1 porter, 1 bell-ringer, 2 sacristans, 3 female servants (weekly), 3 male servants (weekly), unspecified field and wood-cutting labor</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 fiscal mayor, 3 subordinate fiscales (1 per week), 8 sacristans (2 per week), 8 female cooks (2 per week), 4 female bakers (2 per week), with rotational woodcutters and keepers of sheep, horses, cows, hogs, and chickens, unspecified field labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohkay Owingeh Pueblo, San Juan de los Caballeros</td>
<td>1 boy for the cell, 1 bell-ringer, 1 porter, 2 sacristans, 2 woodcutters, 1 cook, 2 grinding women, unspecified field labor</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 fiscal mayor, 3 subordinate fiscales (1 per week), 8 sacristans (2 per week), 8 female cooks (2 per week), 4 female bakers (2 per week), with rotational woodcutters and keepers of sheep, horses, cows, hogs, and chickens, unspecified field labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo, Mission</td>
<td>General Descriptions</td>
<td>Trigo (1754)</td>
<td>Dominguez (1776)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pecos Pueblo, Nuestra Señora de la Porciúncula</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4 boys, 1 bell-ringer, 1 porter, 1 cook, 3 grinding women, unspecified field and wood-cutting labor</td>
<td>No resident friar, and no mission labor at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picuris Pueblo, San Lorenzo de los Picuries (Picuris)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1 boy for the cell, 1 bell-ringer, 1 porter, 2 sacristans, 1 cook, 2 woodcutters, 2 grinding women (weekly), unspecified field labor</td>
<td>1 fiscal mayor, 3 subordinate fiscales (1 per week), 8 sacristans (2 per week), 8 female cooks (2 per week), 4 female bakers (2 per week), 1 stable boy, 1 shepherd, and 1 female chicken keeper, with unspecified field and wood-cutting labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pojoaque Pueblo, Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>(visita of Nambe) 1 fiscal mayor, 1 subordinate fiscal, 1 chief sacristan, and 3 subordinate sacristans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Felipe Pueblo, San Felipe de Jesús de los Queres</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1 porter, 1 bell-ringer, 3 boys for the convento and cell, 2 grinding women, 2 woodsmen (husbands of grinding women), unspecified field and pastoral labor</td>
<td>1 fiscal mayor, 4 subordinate fiscales (weekly rotations), 2 chief sacristans (weekly rotations), 10 sacristans (weekly rotations), 10 female cooks (weekly rotations), 6 female bakers (weekly rotations), unspecified herding, field and woodcutting labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Ildefonso Pueblo, San Ildefonso</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1 gardener, 1 boy for the cell, 1 porter, 1 bell-ringer, 1 cook, 2 sacristans, 2 female servants (weekly), unspecified field and wood-cutting labor</td>
<td>1 fiscal mayor, 3 subordinates (1 fiscal per week), 8 sacristans (2 per week), 8 female cooks (weekly rotation, perhaps 2 per week), 4 female bakers (2 per week, 1 male shepherd, 1 male stable hand, 1 female chicken keeper, unspecified field and wood-cutting labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandia Pueblo, Nuestra Señora de los Dolores</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2 young men for the cell, 1 bell ringer, 1 porter, 1 “poor” cook, 2 grinding women, 2 woodsmen</td>
<td>1 fiscal mayor, 4 subordinate fiscales (1 per week), 8 sacristans (2 per week), 8 female cooks (2 per week), 4 female bakers (2 per week), unspecified herders “whom the pueblo provides in turn,”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo, Mission</td>
<td>General Descriptions</td>
<td>Trigo (1754)</td>
<td>Dominguez (1776)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Santa Ana Pueblo, Nuestra Señora de Santa Ana | (husbands of the grinding women), unspecified field labor | unspecified field and woodcutting labor | “The same as Cochiti, in order not to cause boredom by repetition. Herders and firewood also the same […]”
<p>| | | | i.e. 1 fiscal mayor, 3 subordinate fiscales (1 per week), 1 chief sacristan, 8 subordinate sacristans (2 per week), 8 female cooks (2 per week), 4 female bakers (unspecified rotation), big girls to carry water (2 per week), pueblo takes turns in caring for sheep, cows, hens, pigs, and horses, unspecified field labor and woodcutting |
| Santa Clara Pueblo, Nuestra Madre Santa Clara | 1 bell-ringer (weekly), 1 porter (weekly), 1 cook (weekly), 2 boys for the cell (weekly), 2 women to grind grain (weekly), 2 woodsmen (husbands of grinding women, weekly), unspecified field labor | “the same and in the same manner I described at San Ildefonso […]” | i.e. 1 fiscal mayor, 3 subordinates (1 fiscal per week), 8 sacristans (2 per week), 8 female cooks (weekly rotation, perhaps 2 per week), 4 female bakers (2 per week, 1 male shepherd, 1 male stable hand, 1 female chicken keeper, unspecified field and wood-cutting labor |
| Santa Cruz de la Cañada | 2 boys for the cell, 1 bell-ringer, 1 porter, 3 sacristans, 2 female servants (weekly), 2 woodcutters (husbands to the female servants, weekly), unspecified field labor | wage labor, paid in goods: 1 female cook, 1 sacristan, 1 stable boy, 1 errand boy, woodcutters (2 in winter, 1 in summer), 1 girl to make tortillas | |
| Santa Fe, San Francisco | Spanish community, no personnel listed, wage labor | wage labor, paid in goods: 1 female cook, 1 bell-ringer, 1 girl to make tortillas, 1 stable boy, 1 errand boy | |
| Santo Domingo Pueblo, Nuestra Padre | 1 bell-ringer, 1 porter, 3 sacristans, 2 boys for the cell, 2 | 1 fiscal mayor, 4 subordinate fiscales (1 per week), 10 sacristans (2 per week), 10 female cooks (2 per week), 8 female bakers (2 per week), 2 “big girls” to carry water | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pueblo, Mission</th>
<th>General Descriptions</th>
<th>Trigo (1754)¹</th>
<th>Dominguez (1776)²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santo Domingo</td>
<td>women for grinding grain, 2 woodsmen (husbands to the women), unspecified field labor</td>
<td>weekly, 1 shepherd, 1 keeper of horses, unspecified other animal keepers, unspecified field labor and woodcutting, unspecified number of musicians, drummers, and buglers for the church³⁴</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senecú (El Paso area), San Antonio Zenecú</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1 bell-ringer, 1 porter, 1 cook, 3 sacristans, 2 personal servants (“boys for the cell”), 2 women to grind wheat, 1 gardener, unspecified field labor</td>
<td>not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socorro (El Paso area), San Francisco</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2 boys for the cell, 1 porter, 1 steward, 2 sacristans, 1 cook, 3 women to grind wheat, unspecified field labor</td>
<td>not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taos Pueblo, San Gerónimo</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2 boys for the cell, 1 bell-ringer, 1 porter, 3 sacristans, 1 cook, 2 grinding women, unspecified field and wood-cutting labor</td>
<td>1 fiscal mayor, 3 subordinate fiscales (1 per week), 8 sacristans (2 per week), 4 female bakers (2 per week), 1 caretaker of horses, 1 caretaker of chickens, 8 singers for the church, and unspecified field and wood-cutting labor³⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tesuqui/ Tesuque Pueblo, San Diego</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>(visita of Santa Fe) 1 bell-ringer, 1 porter, 1 sacristan, 1 cook, 3 women to grind corn, 2 woodsmen, unspecified field labor</td>
<td>(visita of Nambe) had “no service at all” although the pueblo provided unspecified field labor³⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ysleta del Sur (El Paso area), San Antonio, Isleta</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>boys to clean the cells (weekly rotation), 1 gardener (unclear- either an annual or weekly</td>
<td>not included</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

¹ Trigo (1754) refers to a document written by Trigo in 1754.
² Dominguez (1776) refers to a document written by Dominguez in 1776.
³ Trigo (1754) ¹ specifically mentions unspecified number of musicians, drummers, and buglers for the church.
⁴ Dominguez (1776)² mentions unspecified number of musicians, drummers, and buglers for the church.
⁵ Trigo (1754) ¹ refers to unspecified field and wood-cutting labor.
⁶ Dominguez (1776)² refers to unspecified field and wood-cutting labor.

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pueblo, Mission</th>
<th>General Descriptions</th>
<th>Trigo (1754)¹</th>
<th>Domínguez (1776)²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rotation), 1 bell-ringer, 1 porter, 1 cook, 2 sacristans, unspecified number of women</td>
<td></td>
<td>“It troubles me to repeat myself, and therefore I refer to Cochiti […]”³⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to grind wheat</td>
<td></td>
<td>i.e. 1 fiscal mayor, 3 subordinate fiscales (1 per week), 1 chief sacristan, 8 subordinate sacristans (2 per week), 8 female cooks (2 per week), 4 female bakers (unspecified rotation), big girls to carry water (2 per week), pueblo takes turns in caring for sheep, cows, hens, pigs, and horses, unspecified woodcutting³⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zia Pueblo, Nuestra Señora de la</td>
<td>2 boy servants, 1 bell-ringer, 1 porter, 1 cook, 2 grinding women, unspecified field labor and wood cutting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asuncióń</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ From Trigo, “Letter of Father Trigo,” 459-468. I do not currently have the Spanish for this source, and am dependent upon Hackett’s translation, which does not specify gender for the mission cooks.

² From Domínguez, The Missions; Domínguez, “Copy of Spanish Transcription.”

³ Benavides, Fray Alonso de Benavides’ Revised Memorial, 100-101; “porteros, sacristanes, cosineros, campaneros, ortelanos, refitóleros, y otros […]” (Benavides, 1634, “Propaganda Fide,” 250).

⁴ “Report to the Viceroy by the Cabildo,” 66-74, 71.

⁵ Scholes, Troublous Times, 25;

       […] que su ssᵃ reserua para cumplimiento de la Rᵇ Cedula a cada Yglecia, y doctrina, donde huuiere nʳ° que asista los siguientes. vn interprete, vn sachristan, vn cantor maior, vn campanero, vn horganista, donde huuiere organo, vn Pastor, vn cosinero, vn portero, un caballo pisque [….] (Freitas, “Testimonio,” 261-262).

⁶ Scholes, Troublous Times, 57. Aguilar’s claim comes from “Reply of Aguilar [January 17, 1664],” 146, although Hackett only summarizes and does not directly translate the text. I have not yet obtain a copy of the original Spanish, which may be in AGN Inquisición, vol. 512, folio 165. I am unsure of the location of the other document Scholes cites, the “Testimony of Aguilar, January 23, 1664,” which he translates as follows:

       […] the Indians who serve as acolytes are not the little boys, as is said, but adult Indians, married, and with families, [and] they had eight and ten in each pueblo as sacristans, with the result that in each pueblo seventy Indians were occupied as acolytes, sacristans, singers, aids, horsemen, cooks, shepherds, and farm hands, and in other things, and besides this, every day all the others, women as well as children, were kept busy, without there being anyone who did not serve them.
Roibal was a Spaniard from Santa Fe, whom Durango Bishop Benito Crespo appointed secular priest, vicar, and ecclesiastical judge of New Mexico in 1630; see Adams, “Introduction,” Bishop Tamarón’s Visitation, 15. In a report to the Spanish crown from 1665, Durango Bishop Pedro Tamarón y Romeral quotes a letter from Roibal dated April 6, 1764 regarding mission agricultural productivity and labor; see Tamarón y Romeral, “Copy of the report,” 78.

Dominguez, The Missions, 123;

Por junto como el [de] las misiones de atrás; pero semanariamente un fiscal, un sacristán, una cocinera, una panadera, un pastor. Aquí no traen los trastes como en otras partes porque como no saben hacer loza el padre pone lo necesario. Para el acarreo de leña les tiene, puesta carreta aperada y otros muchos menesteres que diré a su tiempo (Dominguez, “Copy of Spanish Transcription,” 200).

Dominguez, The Missions, 193;

Lo mismo que queda dicho en la Laguna, pero aquí hay doce indias que todos los días traen doce tinajillas de agua para el gasto, y luego que las ponen en la cocina se van a sus casas hasta otro día, que hacen lo mismo; y el haber tantas aguadoras es porque el agua (como luego diré) está muy lejos, y para no acarrear a menudo se trae mucha de una vez. Cuando se ofrece regar los arbolitos arriba dichos, las muchachas de doctrina van con el fiscal semanero, y de un golpe traen mucha, y aun sobra (Dominguez, “Copy of Spanish Transcription,” 323).

See n. 20, below.

Dominguez, The Missions, 150; “Corre pareja con el ministro de la Cañada, adonde me remito,” Dominguez, “Copy of Spanish Transcription,” 246.

See n. 32, below.

Dominguez, The Missions, 157;

Por entero un fiscal mayor, tres menores, ocho sacristanes y el mayor, ocho cocineras, cuatro panaderas; semanariamente un fiscal, dos sacristanes, dos cocineras con dos muchachuelas que acarrean agua; las panaderas se remudan. Leña trae el pueblo la necesaria; y por todo el año se alterna en semanas el pueblo a pastores de carneros, vacas, gallinas, puercos y caballos (Dominguez, “Copy of Spanish Transcription,” 259).

“Letter from Villar, June 14, 1660,” 151.


See n. 20, below.


See n. 27, below.

Dominguez, The Missions, 179;

Por junto un fiscal mayor, cuatro menores, ocho sacristanes y el mayor, seis cantorcillos, ocho cocineras, seis panaderas; lo que semanariamente se reparte así: un fiscal, dos sacristanes, un cantor, que al mismo tiempo aprende de propósito a hablar bien el castellano y leer para que sirve de intérprete y maestro de los demás indios, dos cocineras con dos muchachitas que acarrean agua. Pastores de ganadito, caballo y gallinas, etc., si lo hay, se alterna el pueblo. Leña sólo en el invierno, que la acarrea el comín; pues en el
verano (dice este padre) y por ahorrar el acarreo se trae carbón, que hacen dos muchachos semanariamente en el monte (Domínguez, “Copy of Spanish Transcription,” 298).

20 Domínguez, The Missions, 185;

Por junto un fiscal mayor; tres menores, ocho sacristanes y dos mayores, ocho cocineras, cuatro panaderas; lo que semanariamente se reparte: un fiscal, dos sacristanes, dos cocineras con dos muchachitas que acarrean agua, dos panaderas. Pastor de caballo, de cerdos, si hay, y una gallinerita y nada más. Leña el pueblo en común (Domínguez, “Copy of Spanish Transcription,” 310).

21 Domínguez, The Missions, 55-56;

Por junto es un fiscal mayor, tres menores, ocho sacristancitos, y el mayor, cuatro cocineras y cuatro panaderas; para en particular, semanariamente un fiscal, dos sacristancillos, una cocinera, a quien acompaña una que sirve de traer agua, dos panaderas, a quienes el padre les da lo necesario, y luego que acaban se van, porque su trabajo es dos días, y no vuelven hasta que las vuelven a llamar, que es a los quince días pues en la semana intermedia vienen las otras dos, y así éstas como los demás se alternan. Todos comen dentro del convento lo que el padre puede darles, y a la noche se van a sus casas hasta otro día; sólo los sacristanes duermen en el convento (Domínguez, “Copy of Spanish Transcription,” 73).

22 Domínguez, “Copy of Spanish Transcription,” 138:

Por junto un fiscal mayor, tres menores, ocho sacristanes, ocho cocineras, cuatro panaderas, y se reparten semanariamente como dije en Nambe en todo ello. También se alterna el pueblo con pastor de carneros, caballos, vacas, marranos y gallinas con acarreo de leña. […]

23 Domínguez, “Copy of Spanish Transcription,” 145-146:

Por junto fiscal mayor, tres menores, ocho sacristancitos, cuatro cocineras, cuatro panaderas; lo que semanariamente se reparte como queda dicho en otras misiones. Con más: caballero para los caballitos de La administración, pastor de carneros y una gallinerita. Los que sirven en casa allí comen, y a la noche (menos los sacristanes) se van; y estos traen los trastes y se los llevan conforme entran y salen; y lo que añado que si les quiebra algo en servicio del actual misionero se los recompensa con semillas. Para la leña les ayuda el padre o con carreta aperada o con caballos, dándoles hacha, y los indios también hacen sus acarreos por su cuenta. […]

24 Domínguez, The Missions, 62; “[…] cuyo ministro tiene señalados aquí un fiscal mayor, un menor, tres sacristancillos y el mayor. Estos cuiden de barrer la iglesia, convento, tocar la campana para lo que se acostumbra y servir al padre los días que viene a visitarlos” (Domínguez, “Copy of Spanish Transcription,” 85).

25 Domínguez, The Missions, 135; “En junto un fiscal mayor, cuatro menores, diez sacristanes y dos mayores, diez cocineras, seis panaderas; todo ello se reparte semanariamente. Pastores y leña el común del pueblo, como dicho es en otros pueblos” (Domínguez, “Copy of Spanish Transcription,” 270).

26 Domínguez, The Missions, 69;

Por junto un fiscal mayor, tres menores, ocho sacristanes, ocho cocineras, cuatro panaderas; y se reparten semanariamente como queda dicho en la misión de Nambe. Con más: pastor de carneros; de caballos; gallinería; y acarreo de leña para todo, como en lo citada misión dejó expresado y a que me remito par no dilatarme (Domínguez, “Copy of Spanish Transcription,” 97).

27 Domínguez, The Missions, 141;

Por junto un fiscal mayor, cuatro menores, ocho sacristanes, ocho cocineras, cuatro panaderas; y semanariamente un fiscal, dos sacristanes, dos cocineras, dos panaderas. Pastores, que se remudan por el
pueblo, y acarreo de leña como queda ducho en otras partes (Domínguez, “Copy of Spanish Transcription,” 230).


29 See n. 13, above.

30 Domínguez, The Missions, 117; “Lo mismo y en la misma manera que dije en San Ildefonso” (Domínguez, “Copy of Spanish Transcription,” 187).

31 See n. 26, above.

32 Domínguez, The Missions, 31;

Acontece tener aquí el misionero la misma pensión que el de Santa Fe, y así tiene de servicio y gasto: cocinera 8 pesos; sacristán 8 pesos; caballerango 6 pesos; portador de cartas 6 pesos; dos leñeros el invierno, que dura siete meses, y uno el verano, que dura cinco, a 4 pesos cada uno; todo es en efecto de la tierra y mensualmente, comiendo dentro de casa a cuenta del amo padre. Con la molienda de trigo sucede lo mismo que en Santa Fe. Más, la tortillera para tanto mozos gana 8 pesos al mes en los mismo (Domínguez, “Copy of Spanish Transcription,” 119-120).

33 Domínguez, The Missions, 31;

en cuya suposición tiene de servicio y gasto: cocinera, 12 pesos cada mes en buenos efectos; campanero 6 como los dichos; muchacha que hace tortillas, 6 mismos; caballerango, 6 mismos; mozo para cartas a mandados según es el viaje se le paga; y todos comen dentro de casa (Domínguez, “Copy of Spanish Transcription,” 38).

34 Domínguez, The Missions, 135;

Por junto un fiscal mayor; cuatro menores; diez sacristanes; diez cocineras; ocho panaderas; pero semanariamente un fiscal, dos sacristanes, dos cocineras con dos muchachuelas que acarrean agua, y las panaderas a dos por semana, como dicho es en otras partes. Más: pastor de carneros, caballo, u otras cosas si las hay. Acarreo de leña como se necesita. Para la iglesia los músicos, cajeros y clarineros (Domínguez, “Copy of Spanish Transcription,” 217).

35 Domínguez, The Missions, 108;

Por junto un fiscal mayor, tres menores, ocho sacristanes, cuatro cocineras, cuatro panaderas; lo que semanariamente se reporte como ficho es [sic] las misiones de atrás. Pastores de caballos, gallinas, etc., y acarreo de leña. Para la iglesia hay ocho cantores (Domínguez, “Copy of Spanish Transcription,” 171).


38 See n. 13, above.
Table 9.1: *Convento* Designs among Pre-Pueblo Revolt New Mexico Missions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pueblo (Language), Mission</th>
<th>Key Dates</th>
<th>Convento Form (Primary patio; secondary patios and features)</th>
<th>Patio Interior Dimensions/Area, m. (ft.)</th>
<th>Convento location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abó Pueblo (Tompiro), San Gregorio¹</td>
<td>Est. 1621-1622; const. 1623-1628; renovated 1640-1645; renovated 1651-1657/58; renovated c. 1659-1673; aban. 1673</td>
<td>Rectangular cloister-plan patio with arcaded ambulatory on four sides, with balustrades and rectangular pillars of stone and mud mortar; renovated and slightly relocated with enclosed walls; secondary service patio</td>
<td>11.28 m. x 10.06 m. (37’ x 33’)/ 113.47 m.² (1,221 ft.²)</td>
<td>Adjoined epistle side (east of church)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acoma Pueblo (Keres), San Esteban²</td>
<td>Est. 1629; built by 1644; damaged 1680; repaired 1699-1710; <em>mirador</em> added 1745-1767; recons. or repaired 1902-1911, 1924-1929, early 1960s, 1975, 1980s, 1999-2004</td>
<td>Rectangular cloister-plan patio with enclosed ambulatories on four sides; a secondary service patio may once have existed to the west</td>
<td>20.57 m. x 20.19 m. (67’ 6” x 66’ 3”)/ 415 m.² (4,471.88 ft.²)</td>
<td>Adjoined epistle side (north of church)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda Pueblo (Tiwa), San José³</td>
<td>Est. 1600s; aban. 1680</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alamillo Pueblo (Piro), title uncertain⁴</td>
<td>Est. after 1620; aban. 1680</td>
<td>Unknown, sometimes <em>visita</em> of Socorro</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo (Language), Mission</td>
<td>Key Dates</td>
<td>Convento Form (Primary patio; secondary patios and features)</td>
<td>Patio Interior Dimensions/Area, m. (ft.)</td>
<td>Convento location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awatovi (Hopi), San Bernardo⁵</td>
<td>Est. 1629; dest. 1680; recons. began 1700; dest. 1700</td>
<td>Rectangular cloister-plan patio with ambulatories on four sides, nature of ambulatory partitions unknown; attached to church through a corridor with flanking rooms; enclosed secondary service patio extended to the southwest</td>
<td>11.00 m. x 6.50 m. (36.09’ x 21.33’)/ 71.5 m.² (769.80 ft.²)</td>
<td>Behind the apse (southwest of church) with connecting passageway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chililí (Tiwa), La Navidad⁶</td>
<td>Est. c. 1613-1614; reduced to visita status after c. 1660; aban. 1676-1677</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciénega Pueblo (Tewa), title unknown⁷</td>
<td>Est. c. 1626-1627, by 1640s, aban. 1680?</td>
<td>Visita of San Marcos Pueblo- no convento- site unknown</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochiti Pueblo (Keres), San Buena-ventura⁸</td>
<td>Est. prior to 1637; church built by 1642; dest. 1680; rebuilt c. 1706; repaired 1819; rebuilt 1900-1910; renovated mid-1960s</td>
<td>Visita of Santo Domingo in the 17th century, no convento during that time</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyamungúé Pueblo (Tewa), title uncertain⁹</td>
<td>Est. 1600s; dest/aban. 1680/1696</td>
<td>Visita of Nambe Pueblo- no convento</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso del Norte/ Ciudad Juárez (Manso Indians), N. S. de Guadalupe¹⁰</td>
<td>Est. 1630 but aban. soon thereafter; attempted reest. 1656; reest. 1659; built 1662-1668; tower added 1817-1828; renovated 1897; restored 1911-1912, 1967-1971</td>
<td>The seventeenth-century configuration is uncertain, but it is described as “a spacious cloister,” probably a rectangular cloister plan; in the eighteenth century appears to have had a rectangular patio with ambulatories and rooms along at least three sides</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Adjoined to the epistle side (north of the church)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo (Language), Mission</td>
<td>Key Dates</td>
<td>Convento Form (Primary patio; secondary patios and features)</td>
<td>Patio Interior Dimensions/Area, m. (ft.)</td>
<td>Convento location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galisteo Pueblo (Tano), Santa Cruz (17th century)/ Santa María (18th century)&lt;sup&gt;11&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Est. c. 1611; aban. 1680; reest. c. 1696-1706; aban. 1782</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giusewa (Towa), originally San José, changed to San Diego&lt;sup&gt;12&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Est. c. 1600; built before 1601; renovated c. 1614-1621; expanded and rebuilt c. 1621-1623; dest. b/w 1623-1625; reconst. 1625-1628; midcentury alterations; aban. 1680</td>
<td>Not fully excavated; probably quadrangular with open central patio (i.e. possibly cloister plan)</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Adjoined epistle side (southeast of church)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halona Pueblo (Zuni), N. S. de Guadalupe&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Est. 1629; aban. 1632; built mid-1600s; dest. 1680; rebuilt c. 1700; renovated c. 1901; excavated and reconst. 1966-1970; reroofed 1993</td>
<td>Rectangular cloister-plan patio with enclosed walls and ambulatory on four sides</td>
<td>12.09 m. x 11.68 m. (39’ 8” x 38’ 4”)/141.21 m.&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; (1,520 ft.&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>Adjoined gospel side (southeast of church)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawikku Pueblo (Zuni), Purísima Concepción</td>
<td>Est. 1629; dest. 1632; built mid-1600s; dest. 1672</td>
<td>Rectangular cloister-plan patio with enclosed walls and ambulatory on four sides; secondary service patio with rooms along one side and enclosing walls of uncertain arrangement to the southwest</td>
<td>12.04 m. x 11.58 m. (39’ 6” x 38’)/139.42 m.&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; (1,501 ft.&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>Adjoined gospel side (southeast of church)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo (Language), Mission</td>
<td>Key Dates</td>
<td>Convento Form (Primary patio; secondary patios and features)</td>
<td>Patio Interior Dimensions/Area, m. (ft.)</td>
<td>Convento location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isleta Pueblo (Tiwa), San Antonio de Padua (17th century)/ San Agustín (by 1760)</td>
<td>Est. by 1612; prob. built 1613-1617; damaged 1680; rebuilt by 1706; repaired 1716 and late 1890s; renovated 1910-1923, 1959, 2010-2011</td>
<td>The seventeenth-century convento was two stories tall but its configuration is uncertain; in the eighteenth century it may have had a rectangular cloister-plan patio, but Domínguez fails to describe it, saying it was too intricate; there appears to have been a secondary service patio to the northeast of the convento</td>
<td>Not excavated or documented</td>
<td>Adjoined epistle side (northeast of church)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kechiba:wa Pueblo (Zuni), title unknown</td>
<td>Est. mid-1600s; unfinished in 1680 (?)</td>
<td>Visita of Hawikku- no convento</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyaki:ma Pueblo (Zuni), title unknown</td>
<td>Est. mid-1600s; aban. 1680</td>
<td>Visita of Halona- no convento</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Humanas Pueblo (Tompiro), San Isidro/ San Buenaventura</td>
<td>Est. 1629; built 1630-1634/35; San Buenaventura const. 1660-1667; renovations c. 1669; raided 1670; aban. c. 1671</td>
<td>Rectangular cloister-plan patio with enclosed walls and ambulatory on four sides; secondary service patio with rooms around four sides to the south; sometimes visita of Abó</td>
<td>9.75 m. x 9.14 m. (32’ x 30’)/ 89.12 m.2 (960 ft.2)</td>
<td>Adjoined gospel side (south of church)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Lagas (Sumas), San Francisco</td>
<td>Est. by 1666</td>
<td>Hermitage and dwelling, form unknown</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mats’a:kya Pueblo (Zuni), title unknown</td>
<td>Est. mid-1600s; aban. 1680</td>
<td>Visita of Halona- no convento</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mishong-novi Pueblo (Hopi), title unknown</td>
<td>Est. date uncertain; aban. by 1680</td>
<td>Visita of Shongopovi- with a convento, of unknown form</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo (Language), Mission</td>
<td>Key Dates</td>
<td>Convento Form (Primary patio; secondary patios and features)</td>
<td>Patio Interior Dimensions/Area, m. (ft.)</td>
<td>Convento location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nambe Pueblo (Tewa), San Francisco</strong>&lt;sup&gt;18&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Est. date uncertain, early 1600s; dest. 1680; rebuilt by 1725; collapsed 1909</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Olkay Owingehe Pueblo (Tewa), San Juan Bautista</strong>&lt;sup&gt;19&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Est. 1598; dest. 1680; rebuilt c. 1706; dest. prior to 1913</td>
<td>Seventeenth-century form unknown, occasionally <em>visita</em> of Santa Clara; in the eighteenth century it was a rectangular cloister-plan patio, with ambulatories on three sides and alterations to the side along the church nave</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; century uncertain; 18&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; century adjoined to the epistle side (north of the church)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oraibi Pueblo (Hopi), San Miguel</strong>&lt;sup&gt;20&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Est. by 1630; dest. 1680</td>
<td>Probably a cloister-plan <em>convento</em>, based on oral traditions which describe it as a “spiral-shaped” house. Possibly with stone columns or piers, based on remnants later uncovered by members of the community</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown, possibly southwest of the church, according to oral traditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pecos Pueblo (Towa), N. S. de los Ángeles</strong>&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Est. 1617; built 1617-1619; rebuilt c. 1620-1627; renovated 1631-1635; renovated c. 1640; renovated late 1650s; renovated 1660s; dest. 1680; reest. 1694; rebuilt c. 1714-1717; renovated 1720s; renovated 1790s; aban. 1838</td>
<td>Cloister-plan patio with enclosed ambulatories, slightly askew from true rectangle; second story added mid-1600s; secondary service patios to the south</td>
<td>15.85 m. x 14.02 m. (&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; &lt;sup&gt;52’ x 46’&lt;/sup&gt;)&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;/222.22 m.&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; (&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;2,392 ft.&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>Adjoined gospel side (south of church) in the 17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; century. Reversal of the church’s orientation in the 18&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; century, placed the <em>convento</em> on the epistle side (still south of the church)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo (Language), Mission</td>
<td>Key Dates</td>
<td>Convento Form (Primary patio; secondary patios and features)</td>
<td>Patio Interior Dimensions/Area, m. (ft.)</td>
<td>Convento location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picuris Pueblo (Tiwa), San Lorenzo</td>
<td>Est. by 1620; dest. 1680; rebuilt c. 1706; restored 1740-1750; dest. by 1769</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pojoaque Pueblo (Tewa), N. S. de Guadalupe (18th century)</td>
<td>Est. 1600s; dest. 1680; reest. by 1707; aban. after 1915</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarai Pueblo (Tiwa), La Concepción</td>
<td>Est. 1626; built 1626-1632; renovated late 1650s; renovated c. 1667; aban. 1677</td>
<td>Rectangular cloister-plan patio with portales wooden pillars and masonry corner piers, and ambulatory on four sides; portales later enclosed with masonry; secondary hallway with cells adjoined the southeast ambulatory corridor; secondary service patio with rooms along at least one side to the southeast</td>
<td>9.60 m. x 8.69 m. (31’ 6” x 28’ 6”)/ 83.42 m.² (897.75 ft.²)</td>
<td>Adjoined epistle side (southeast of church)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Cristóbal Pueblo (Tano), San Cristóbal</td>
<td>Est. by 1620s; aban. 1680</td>
<td>Rectangular with open patio at center and ranges along at least three sides; probably a cloister-plan convento; corral or service patio to the south; occasional visita of Galisteo Pueblo</td>
<td>Not excavated; apx. 21.34 m. x 9.14 m. (70’ x 30’) based on surface remains</td>
<td>Adjoined gospel side (south of church)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Felipe Pueblo (Keres), San Felipe</td>
<td>Est. 1605; dest. 1680; moved to a different location after Pueblo Revolt</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel del Yungue (Tewa/ Spanish Parish), San Gabriel</td>
<td>Est. 1598; aban. 1609</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo (Language), Mission</td>
<td>Key Dates</td>
<td>Convento Form (Primary patio; secondary patios and features)</td>
<td>Patio Interior Dimensions/Area, m. (ft.)</td>
<td>Convento location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Ildefonso Pueblo (Tewa), San Ildefonso</td>
<td>Const. by 1617; damaged 1680; dest. 1696; reconstr. on new site c. 1701-1711; dest. and rebuilt 1905; rebuilt 1969</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Lázaro Pueblo (Tano), San Lázaro</td>
<td>Est. by 1620s; aban. 1680</td>
<td>Visita of San Marcos Pueblo- no convento</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos Pueblo (Tewa), San Marcos</td>
<td>Est. c. 1638-1640; aban. 1680</td>
<td>Rectangular cloister-plan patio with enclosed walls and ambulatory on four sides</td>
<td>14.51 m. x 14.51 m. (47.6’ x 47.6’)/ 210.54 m.² (2266 ft.²)</td>
<td>Adjoined gospel side (south of church)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandia Pueblo (Tiwa), San Francisco</td>
<td>Est. by 1612; aban./dest. 1680; moved and rebuilt 1748; aban. 1891; moved and rebuilt c. 1890-1895</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana Pueblo (Keres), Santa Ana</td>
<td>Est. 1600s; dest. 1680; reest. by 1706; rebuilt 1734; renovated 1927</td>
<td>Visita of Zia Pueblo- no convento</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Pueblo (Tewa), Santa Clara</td>
<td>Est. and built c. 1626-1629; Pueblo Revolt status unknown; rebuilt 1758; reroofed before 1903; collapsed 1905; rebuilt late 1960s</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo (Language), Mission</td>
<td>Key Dates</td>
<td>Convento Form (Primary patio; secondary patios and features)</td>
<td>Patio Interior Dimensions/Area, m. (ft.)</td>
<td>Convento location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe (Spanish Parish Church), La Asunción de N. S./ Inmaculada Concepción de N. S.</td>
<td>Est. 1610-1628; recon. 1628-1639; dest. 1680; rebuilt 1692-1717; recon. 1797-1808; replaced with present Cathedral 1869</td>
<td>Seventeenth-century form unknown; in the eighteenth century it was a rectangular cloister-plan patio, with enclosed ambulatories on four sides</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Adjoined epistle side (south of church)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe (Spanish/Mexican Indian Parish Church), San Miguel de Analco^33</td>
<td>Est. by 1628; dest. 1640; reconstr. mid-1600s; partly dest. 1680; rebuilt 1693-1710; repaired 1730, 1760; renovated 1887-1888; restored 1955, 2011</td>
<td>No <em>convento</em> documented or excavated</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santo Domingo Pueblo (Keres), Santo Domingo^34</td>
<td>Est. prior to 1605; dest. and reest. on diff. site 1605; built 1607; fortified c. 1640; dest. 1680; relocated c. 1700; rebuilt 1696-1706; rebuilt 1740-1754; dest. 1885; relocated and rebuilt 1895</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seelocú/Sevilleta Pueblo (Piro), San Luis Obispo^35</td>
<td>Est. by 1620s; aban. and reest. uncertain date; aban. by 1670</td>
<td>Unknown, sometimes <em>visita</em> of Socorro</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senecú Pueblo (Piro), San Antonio^36</td>
<td>Est. by 1620s; aban. 1675; reocc. 1677; aban. 1680</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo (Language), Mission</td>
<td>Key Dates</td>
<td>Convento Form (Primary patio; secondary patios and features)</td>
<td>Patio Interior Dimensions/Area, m. (ft.)</td>
<td>Convento location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shongopovi Pueblo (Hopi), San Bartolomé</td>
<td>c. 1637, est. by 1641; dest. 1680</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilabó/ Socorro Pueblo (Piro), N. S. del Socorro/San Miguel</td>
<td>Est. c. 1620s; aban. 1680; rebuilt by Spanish settlers c. 1800</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabirá Pueblo (Tompíro), San Diego</td>
<td>Est. c. 1631; built between 1631 and 1644; reconstr. 1660; aban. c. 1671</td>
<td>Visita of Abó- no convento</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajique Pueblo (Tiwa), San Miguel</td>
<td>Est. 1629; built before 1650; aban. 1677; reocc. 1678; aban. 1679/1680</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taos Pueblo (Tiwa), San Gerónimo</td>
<td>Est. c. 1617; built by 1629; dest. between 1631 and 1639/40; rebuilt 1640-1650; damaged or dest. 1680; rebuilt 1692; dest. 1696; rebuilt c. 1706-1726; dest. 1846</td>
<td>Seventeenth-century form unknown; in the eighteenth century it was a two-story rectangular cloister-plan patio, with ambulatories on three sides</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>17th century uncertain; 18th century adjoined epistle side (east of church)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ténabo Pueblo (Tompíro), title unknown</td>
<td>Est. 1622; built after 1629; aban. c. 1641</td>
<td>Visita, probably of Abó- no convento</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tesuque Pueblo (Tewa), San Lorenzo</td>
<td>Est. late 1620s; dest. 1680; reest. 1695 and rebuilt c. 1706; rebuilt c. 1745; dest. after 1913</td>
<td>Visita of Santa Fe- no convento</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo (Language), Mission</td>
<td>Key Dates</td>
<td>Convento Form (Primary patio; secondary patios and features)</td>
<td>Patio Interior Dimensions/Area, m. (ft.)</td>
<td>Convento location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walatowa Pueblo (Towa), San Diego</td>
<td>Est. 1622?; aban. 1680?; aban. 1696?; rebuilt 1706; dest. 1709; rebuilt before 1744; in ruins 1874</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walpi Pueblo (Hopi), title unknown</td>
<td>Est. date unknown; aban. by 1680</td>
<td>Visita of Awatovi- no convento</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zia Pueblo (Keres), San Pedro y San Pablo (17th century)/N. S. de la Asunción (18th century)</td>
<td>Est. 1598; built c. 1610-1614; damaged 1680; reest. 1692; rebuilt c. 1706; renovated 1750; restored early 1920s</td>
<td>Seventeenth-century form unknown; in the eighteenth century it was a rectangular cloister-plan patio, with enclosed ambulatories on four sides and service patio to the west</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>17th century uncertain; 18th century adjoined gospel side (south of church)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Ivey, In the Midst, 55-109.
2 Data derived from the HABS plans (compare to figures 9.32-9.33) and Burgio-Ericson, “Acoma Pueblo.”
4 Schroeder, “Pueblos Abandoned,” 237.
6 Ivey, In the Midst, 21, 233, 417.
8 Treib, Sanctuaries, 218-225; Scholes, “Documents,” 45.
10 Calleros and Graham, Queen of the Missions, 5-8; María de Lachage, La Misión, 4; Santiago Quijada and Berumen Campos, La Misión, 29-30, 63; Scholes, “Documents for the History, Part III,” 199; James Ivey, personal communication, October 2015.

13 Data from HABS drawings, see Chapter9, n. 17, above.


27 Ibid., 128-135.


29 Data derived from figure 9.61; Scholes and Bloom, “Friar Personnel,” 65.


33 Ibid., 78-85.

34 Ibid., 226-231.

35 Schroeder, “Pueblos Abandoned,” 237.

36 Ibid., 237; Ivey, *In the Midst*, 233.

38 Schroeder, “Pueblos Abandoned,” 237.


40 Ivey, *In the Midst*, 21, 233-234.


44 Kubler, *The Religious Architecture*, 126-127; Ivey (no date, “Un Templo Grandioso,” 25) does not believe that Walatova was founded before 1706; compare to Elliott, “Missions and Mesa,” 46.


Table 9.2: Comparison of Known New Mexico Cloister-Plan Conventos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site (Indian Province), title</th>
<th>Apx. Convento Const. Date</th>
<th>Patio Interior Dimensions m. (ft.)</th>
<th>Patio Interior Area m.² (ft.²)</th>
<th>Ambulatory Enclosure Dimensions m. (ft.)</th>
<th>Ambulatory Enclosure Area m.² (ft.²)</th>
<th>Convento location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abó Pueblo (Southern Tiwa/ Tompiro), San Gregorio</td>
<td>const. 1623-1628; renovated 1640-1645; renovated 1651-1657/58</td>
<td>11.28 m. x 10.06 m. (37’ x 33’)</td>
<td>113.47 m.² (1,221 ft.²)</td>
<td>16.46 m. x 16.15 m. (54’ x 53’)</td>
<td>265.83 m.² (2,862 ft.²)</td>
<td>Adjoined epistle side (east of church)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acoma Pueblo (Keres), San Esteban</td>
<td>1629-1644</td>
<td>20.57 m. x 20.19 m. (67’ 6” x 66’ 3”)</td>
<td>415 m.² (4,471.88 ft.²)</td>
<td>27.00 m. x 26.89 m. (88’ 7” x 88’ 3”)</td>
<td>726.03 m.² (7,817 ft.²)</td>
<td>Adjoined epistle side (north of church)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Design:**
Rectangular cloister-plan patio with arcaded ambulatory on four sides, with balustrades and rectangular pillars of stone and mud mortar; renovated with walls enclosed and slightly relocated; secondary service patio to the west.

**Features:**
The original patio had sandstone in mud mortar balustrades, pillars, and pilasters forming arcades around all four sides. The initial 1623-1628 patio was reworked and made smaller in 1640-1645, preserving only the original arcaded wall on the east side of the patio. The new patio was 10.06 m. x 8.23 m./82.79 m.² (33’ x 27'/891 ft.²), and its remaining three walls were enclosed, with a pair of windows on each side, and an open doorway centered on the north side. A second campaign of renovations in 1651-1657/8 enlarged the patio to 12.80 m. x 9.75 m./124.80 m.² (42’ x 32'/1,344 ft.²) and built a new wall to enclose the formally arcaded eastern side. A round convento kiva, approximately 5.18 m. in diameter and 2.13 m. high inside (17’ x 7’) was centered in the middle of the original patio. This kiva had four wooden pillars set in stone-lined sockets around its perimeter to support the roof, and a ventilator shaft with deflector inside. It was probably entered through a central hatchway in the roof, and had a fire pit filled with ash, indicating active use. There was no identifiable trace of a sipapu. The kiva was unroofed by 1640, and partly filled in during the 1640-1645 renovations, but left as an open pit about 1.22 m. (4’ deep) in the patio for the rest of the mission’s occupation. A covered drain helped to remove water from the cloister patio to the second courtyard.

**Design:**
Rectangular cloister-plan patio with enclosed ambulatories on four sides; a secondary service patio may once have existed to the west.

**Features:**
Built on top of pre-Hispanic domestic structures, with sandstone masonry foundations 1.4 m. high (4.59’) resting on bedrock, and midden fill inside. Benches ran around the
The interior of the patio, from the edges of the sandstone foundations that were wider than the adobe brick walls they supported. The initial benches extended 0.35 m. (1’ 1.78”) out from the adobe patio walls. After the accumulation of 0.6 m. (1’ 11.62”) of midden fill, the bench was widened to 0.65 m. (2’ 1.59”). Originally, a porch may have stood over a doorway into the patio on the south side of the patio, based on a masonry pit 0.35 m. in diameter and 0.45 m. deep (1.14’ x 1.48’), which may have held a post, although no remnants of wood were found inside (see figure 9.37). It was incorporated into a wall of small sandstone blocks, uncoursed and set in lots of mortar, projecting into the patio from the south side. A similar wall (without a post) projected into the patio from the north. Infant burials were made in the southwest corner of the patio. At some point during the mission’s history, a central intrusion removed much of the midden fill from the patio center; the nature of this intrusion was not determined in these limited excavations. Late in the life of the mission, a retaining wall of sandstone set in an ash-rich mortar of an unknown height divided the patio in an east-west direction and the benches were widened. A latrine stood in the northeast corner of the patio, removed in the early twentieth century. A board-lined drain for the patio of an uncertain date ran under the ambulatory floor towards the east, draining into the street outside. The walls were enclosed with three openings to a side, and covered ambulatory walks with packed earth floors. The ambulatory floors required a substantial amount of midden fill to bring them up to level (0.35 m. to 1.45 m./1.15’ to 4.76’ deep), and human remains were found in the floor, apparently reburials disturbed in the process of collecting the fill and reburied in the same medium. The ambulatory hallways were painted with elaborate murals in earth pigments on white plaster, depicting rainbows, stars, flowers, terraced clouds, horsemen, deer, elk, and antelope of an uncertain date. A fireplace stood in the northeast corner, lined with low-fire tiles and a raised firebox. The *convento* probably had a second story, with open walks around the roof of the ambulatory.

### Awatovi (Hopi), San Bernardo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site (Indian Province), title</th>
<th>Apx. Convento Const. Date</th>
<th>Patio Interior Dimensions m. (ft.)</th>
<th>Patio Interior Area m.² (ft.²)</th>
<th>Ambulatory Enclosure Dimensions m. (ft.)</th>
<th>Ambulatory Enclosure Area m.² (ft.²)</th>
<th>Convento location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. 1630s</td>
<td>11.00 m. x 6.50 m. (36.09’ x 21.33’)</td>
<td>71.5 m.² (769.80 ft.²)</td>
<td>15.50 m. x 11.00 m. (50.85’ x 36.09’)</td>
<td>170.50 m.² (1,835 ft.²)</td>
<td>Behind the apse (southwest of church), connecting passageway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Design:**
Rectangular cloister-plan patio with ambulatories on four sides, nature of ambulatory partitions unknown; attached to church through a corridor with flanking rooms; enclosed secondary service patio extended to the southwest

**Features:**
Few details preserved/identified, due to the destruction and subsequent Hopi reoccupation of the mission. The arrangement of the Hopi rooms seems to follow the pattern of typical ambulatory walls, and it seems likely that the new residents incorporated parts of the mission-period patio partitions into their renovations. Whether the original partitions were enclosed walls or arcades is unclear. The patio was probably paved with sandstone slabs, and two drains ran out from it under the floor with wooden lintels supporting walls under which they crossed. The main drain ran out beneath the side range to the southeast
and towards the edge of the mesa, while the secondary drain ran southwest under the floor of a corridor leading to the service patio. A pair of superimposed kivas were sunk in the center of the patio. The first was a pre-mission construction, while the second probably belonged to the mission period. Its roof had been removed and the pit filled with rubbish. Ivey tentatively dates this *convento* kiva between c. 1633 and 1640. A pair of bee-hive stone ovens stood along the northwest side of the patio, but whether these belonged to the mission period or the post-mission occupation is unclear.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site (Indian Province), title</th>
<th>Apx. <em>Convento</em> Const. Date</th>
<th>Patio Interior Dimensions m. (ft.)</th>
<th>Patio Interior Area m.² (ft.²)</th>
<th>Ambulatory Enclosure Dimensions m. (ft.)</th>
<th>Ambulatory Enclosure Area m.² (ft.²)</th>
<th><em>Convento</em> location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Halona Pueblo</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Zuni), N. S. de Guadalupe&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Mid-1600s</td>
<td>12.09 m. x 11.68 m. (39’ 8” x 38’ 4”)</td>
<td>141.21 m.² (1,520 ft.²)</td>
<td>18.31 m. x 18.16 m. (60’ 1” x 59’ 7”)</td>
<td>332.51 m.² (3,580 ft.²)</td>
<td>Adjoined gospel side (southeast of church)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hawikku Pueblo</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Zuni), Purísima Concepción</td>
<td>Mid-1600s</td>
<td>12.04 m. x 11.58 m. (39’ 6” x 38’)</td>
<td>139.42 m.² (1,501 ft.²)</td>
<td>17.30 m. x 17.00 m. (56’ 9” x 55’ 9”)</td>
<td>294.1 m.² (3,163.8 ft.²)</td>
<td>Adjoined gospel side (southeast of church)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Design:**
Rectangular cloister-plan patio with enclosed walls and ambulatory on four sides.

**Features:**
Enclosed adobe walls, with two windows on the northwest side. The other sides were not preserved. The patio itself was not excavated, although its overall dimensions were identified, and a stratigraphic pit sunk in the western corner. It was apparently built on top of a trash midden and burial ground.

Enclosed adobe walls, with two windows on the southwest side, one on the northwest side, and an open doorway with raised sill on the southeast side. The other openings were not preserved. The patio was not fully excavated, but had a packed earth floor and circular pit set out from its southern corner. A shattered ceramic sink was found against its southeastern wall.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site (Indian Province),&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; title</th>
<th>Apx. Convento Const. Date</th>
<th>Patio Interior Dimensions m. (ft.)</th>
<th>Patio Interior Area m.&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; (ft.&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;)</th>
<th>Ambulatory Enclosure Dimensions m. (ft.)</th>
<th>Ambulatory Enclosure Area m.&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; (ft.&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;)</th>
<th>Convento location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Las Humanas Pueblo (Southern Tiwa/ Tompiro), San Buena-ventura&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Built c. 1660-1662</td>
<td>9.75 m. x 9.14 m. (32’ x 30’)</td>
<td>89.12 m.&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; (960 ft.&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>16.15 m. x 15.24 m. (53’ x 50’)</td>
<td>246.13 m.&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; (2,650 ft.&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>Adjoined gospel side (south of church)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Design:**
Rectangular cloister-plan patio with enclosed walls and ambulatory on four sides; secondary service patio with rooms around four sides to the south; sometimes visita of Abó

**Features:**
Enclosed masonry walls, with two inwardly-splayed windows on each side and open doorway from ambulatory on the north side. No other features noted.

| Pecos Pueblo (Distinct Nation), N. S. de los Ángeles<sup>7</sup> | c. 1620 to the early 1630s | 15.85 m. x 14.02 m. (52’ x 46’); reduced to apx. 6.08 m. by 4.65 m. (19.96’ by 15.24’)) | 222.22 m.<sup>2</sup> (2,392 ft.<sup>2</sup>); reduced to 28.27 m.<sup>2</sup> (304.19 ft.<sup>2</sup>) | 26.82 m. x 18.90 m. (88’ x 62’); reduced to apx. 15.85 m. x 14.02 m. (52’ x 46’) | 506.90 m.<sup>2</sup> (5,456 ft.<sup>2</sup>); reduced to apx. 222.22 m.<sup>2</sup> (2,392 ft. <sup>2</sup>) | Adjoined gospel side (south of church) |

**Design:**
Cloister-plan patio with enclosed ambulatories, slightly askew from true rectangle; second story added mid-1600s; secondary service patios to the south

**Features:**
Somewhat irregular convento, laid out as a single range of doubled rooms initially, to which the patio and ambulatories were attached. Made of adobe bricks and after undergoing several alterations/developments, the patio was entirely paved with flagstones. Buttresses helped to support the exterior of the cloister-form walls and a covered drainage ditch ran under the patio floor and latrine to drain into the service patio to the south. The service patio also had a round subterranean convento kiva, probably built c. 1622, of adobe bricks. It may have been located there because the bedrock was too near the surface in the cloister patio. This kiva had two ventilator shafts, one plastered over, suggesting that repair and replacement had been necessary. It was built between 1620 and 1640. The roof had been removed and it was deliberately backfilled with clean soil.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site (Indian Province),¹ title</th>
<th>Apx. Convento Const. Date</th>
<th>Patio Interior Dimensions m. (ft.)</th>
<th>Patio Interior Area m.² (ft.²)</th>
<th>Ambulatory Enclosure Dimensions m. (ft.)</th>
<th>Ambulatory Enclosure Area m.² (ft.²)</th>
<th>Convento location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarai Pueblo (Southern Tiwa/ Tompiro), La Concepción⁸</td>
<td>Built 1626-1632; renovated late 1650s</td>
<td>9.60 m. x 8.69 m. (31’ 6” x 28’ 6” )</td>
<td>83.42 m.² (897.75 ft.²)</td>
<td>15.24 m. x 14.63 m. (50’ x 48’ )</td>
<td>222.96 m.² (2,400 ft.²)</td>
<td>Adjoined epistle side (southeast of church)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Design:**
Rectangular cloister-plan patio with portales on wooden pillars and masonry corner piers, and ambulatory on four sides; secondary hallway adjoined the southeast ambulatory corridor; secondary service patio with rooms along at least one side to the southeast.

**Features:**
The cloister ambulatories did not communicate directly with the convento cells. Instead, an additional hallway was inserted against the southeast side of the ambulatory, providing a second mediating space, and diminishing the cloister’s functional role as the central node in movement through the convento. A stone sill about 0.76 m. (2’ 6”) wide ran around the patio between the corner piers, supporting the wooden portales posts that were about 30.48 cm. (1’) square, four to a side. Low balustrade walls of stone ran between the portales posts, except for openings centered in the north and south sides. During the 1650s renovation, the open patio portales were enclosed within a 0.91 m. (3’) thick masonry wall. The posts were left in place inside the wall, and there were two to three openings per side, with splayed sides. A rounded stone surface veneer was added to each of the rectangular corner piers, making their impression more like that of rounded columns. An almost square kiva was centered in the cloister patio, 4.91 m. x 4.85 m. (16.1’ x 15.9’), built after the construction of the mission’s foundational platform. The roof was level with the patio floor, with an internal height of about 2.13 m. (7’). The kivas had a ventilator shaft, fire pit, “altar,” and pit that excavators identified as a sipapu, but which may have been a ladder socket, since Salinas-region kivas typically did not have sipapu. The ventilator shaft was constructed with adobe bricks, which would have been a definite indication of Spanish participation in the construction of the kiva, since adobe bricks were not otherwise used in the region. The kiva had been unroofed and filled level with the patio floor sometime during the mission period. Little information was preserved about the fill of this kiva, but a mission-period Salinas Redware chamber pot was found inside.

---

¹ Site name used by this organization.
² Dimensions rounded to nearest decimal.
³ Area calculated by multiplying length and width.
⁴ This organization.
⁵ Built date.
⁶ Renovation date.
⁷ Site name.
⁸ Site name used by this organization.
⁹ Design.
¹⁰ Features.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site (Indian Province),&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; title</th>
<th>Apx. Convento Const. Date</th>
<th>Patio Interior Dimensions m. (ft.)</th>
<th>Ambulatory Enclosure Dimensions m. (ft.)</th>
<th>Convento location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos Pueblo (Tano/Tewa) San Marcos&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Est. c. 1638-1640</td>
<td>14.51 m. x 14.51 m. (47.6’ x 47.6’)&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>19.99 m. x 19.99 m. (65.6’ x 5.6’)&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Adjoined gospel side (south of church)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectangular cloister-plan patio with enclosed walls and ambulatory on four sides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Features:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This <em>convento</em> had a square patio, probably with enclosed walls, with a stairwell leading to the rooftop level along the church. Further analysis must await full publication of the site’s excavations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> The “Indian Provinces” were political and jurisdictional groupings structuring New Mexico’s mission system. They were largely based on Native linguistic similarity and Indigenous political systems that preexisted missionization, but also grouped together with “distinct nations” or isolated pueblos that functioned akin to city-states. For an analysis of these structural distinctions based on mission lists from 1641 and 1666, see Ivey, “Cross-Cultural Exchange, 62-65.


<sup>5</sup> Data from HABS drawings, see Chapter 9, n. 17, above; Caywood, *The Restored Mission*, 23-24.


<sup>9</sup> Data derived from figure 9.61.
Table 10.1: New Mexico Mission Food Disbursements (1672)\(^1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supply</th>
<th>Average throughout NM/month(^2)</th>
<th>Est. annual total throughout NM(^3)</th>
<th>Halona, Annual(^4)</th>
<th>Hawikku, Annual(^5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grains (combing maize, wheat, and beans)</td>
<td>72 bu. (conversion rate uncertain)</td>
<td>864 bu. (conversion rate uncertain)</td>
<td>170 <em>fanegas</em> (255-425 bu./6,668-11,113 kg./7.35-12.25 t.)</td>
<td>Up to 200 <em>fanegas</em> of wheat, maize, and beans (conversion rate uncertain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>Not calculated</td>
<td>Not calculated</td>
<td>More than 100 <em>fanegas</em> of maize (150-250 bu./3,810-6,350 kg./4.2-7 t.)</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>Not calculated</td>
<td>Not calculated</td>
<td>Nearly 70 <em>fanegas</em> of wheat (105-175 bu./2,858-4,763 kg./3.15-5.25 t.)</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans</td>
<td>Not calculated</td>
<td>Not calculated</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>3 head</td>
<td>36 head</td>
<td>As many as 70 cows and bulls</td>
<td>As many as 70 cows and bulls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>10 head</td>
<td>120 head</td>
<td>As many as 200 head</td>
<td>200 head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleece</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>Up to 300</td>
<td>Up to 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies for soldiers</td>
<td>Not calculated</td>
<td>Not calculated</td>
<td>“[... ] a large quantity of cattle and food supplies, both for their sustenance while they were in the pueblo and for supplies when they set out on expeditions.”</td>
<td>“Because of the presence of the <em>alcalde mayor</em> and the detachment of soldiers, and expeditions which the Spaniards have made, much has been used for their sustenance and in preparation for the expeditions [..]”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) From Ivey, “Greatest Misfortune,” and Scholes, 1672, *Inventario de los bienes.*

\(^2\) Based on Ivey’s calculations, “Greatest Misfortune,” 83.

\(^3\) Based on Ivey’s calculations, ibid., 83.


\(^5\) Ibid., 16-17.
Table 10.2: Convento Refectories and Furnishings in Dominguez

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Missions</th>
<th>Status in 1776</th>
<th>Possible Refectory Furnishings</th>
<th>Potential seating</th>
<th>Weekly service</th>
<th>Refectory Location/ Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abiquiu, Santa Rosa</td>
<td>Convento</td>
<td>1 ordinary table, 2 benches, 4 small chairs</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>None described; a celda/trascelda make up the front range, not adjacent to the kitchen in the back corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acoma Pueblo, San Esteban</td>
<td>Convento</td>
<td>2 large tables, 3 benches, 3 armless chairs</td>
<td>12+</td>
<td>Apx. 16</td>
<td>None described; one large celda in the front range, not adjacent to the kitchen, which was in the back range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque, San Felipe</td>
<td>Parish Church</td>
<td>1 large table, 2 chairs, 1 bench</td>
<td>5+</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>None described; celda with two trasceldas in the back range, not near the kitchen in the front range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochiti Pueblo, San Buenaventura</td>
<td>Convento</td>
<td>1 table, 1 bench, 2 chairs</td>
<td>6+</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>None described; a celda with double trascelda makes up the front range and corner, with the kitchen in the back range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galisteo Pueblo, Santa Cruz</td>
<td>In ruins</td>
<td>Abandoned, 2 chairs mentioned</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>In ruins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isleta Pueblo, San Agustín</td>
<td>Convento</td>
<td>2 large table, 2 benches, 2 small chairs</td>
<td>8+</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>None described</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jemez Pueblo, San Diego de los Jemez</td>
<td>Convento</td>
<td>2 large tables in the main celda, 1 small table in the trascelda, 1 table in the kitchen, 2 benches, 1 armless chair</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Apx. 15</td>
<td>Not described; one small celda/trascelda on the first floor, with the main celda/trascelda on the second floor, as is the kitchen but not adjacent to each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Pueblo, San Jose</td>
<td>Convento</td>
<td>1 large table, 1 small table, 3 armless chairs, 1 arm chair, 1 bench</td>
<td>7+</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Not described; at least one celda/trascelda on the first floor, and one celda with double trascelda on the second floor, kitchen not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Missions</td>
<td>Status in 1776</td>
<td>Possible Refectory Furnishings</td>
<td>Potential seating$^2$</td>
<td>Weekly service$^3$</td>
<td>Refectory Location/Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nambe Pueblo, San Francisco$^{11}$</td>
<td>Convento</td>
<td>2 ordinary tables, without drawers and poorly made, 2 rough chairs, 1 ordinary bench</td>
<td>5+</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>None described; first floor plan included two spacious <em>celda</em>/<em>trascelda</em>, one of which was adjacent to the kitchen, around the corner. The kitchen had a floor-level brazier for cooking and a mud-plastered smoke hood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohkay Owingeh Pueblo, San Juan de los Caballeros$^{12}$</td>
<td>Convento</td>
<td>1 very large table without drawer, 3 rough benches, and 1 small chair without arms</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>None described; a <em>celda/trascelda</em> make up the front range, with another <em>celda</em> around the corner adjacent to the kitchen. Another roomy <em>celda</em> is next to the kitchen storeroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pecos Pueblo, Nuestra Señora de la Porciúncula$^{13}$</td>
<td><em>Visita of Santa Fe at the time</em></td>
<td>None described</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None described; multiple cells mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picuris Pueblo, San Lorenzo de los Picuríes (Picuris)$^{14}$</td>
<td>Convento (recently moved/under construction)</td>
<td>1 regular table, 3 small chairs, all that was left after the old mission’s destruction</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Previous <em>convento</em> in ruins, new <em>convento</em> under construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pojoaque Pueblo, Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe$^{15}$</td>
<td><em>Visita of Nambe Pueblo</em></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Felipe Pueblo, San Felipe de Jesús de los Queres$^{16}$</td>
<td>Convento</td>
<td>1 large table, 3 small chairs, 1 bench</td>
<td>6+</td>
<td>12-13 (?)</td>
<td>None described; two <em>celda/trascelda</em> pairs, one of which abuts the kitchen on the side range.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Missions</td>
<td>Status in 1776</td>
<td>Possible Refectory Furnishings</td>
<td>Potential seating²</td>
<td>Weekly service³</td>
<td>Refectory Location/Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Ildefonso Pueblo, San Ildefonso¹⁷</td>
<td>Convento</td>
<td>1 very large strong table and drawer, 2 small chairs, 1 small bench</td>
<td>4+</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>None described; the first floor has a <em>celda/trascelda</em>, but the friar lived in a three-room suite on the second floor. The kitchen was on the second floor as well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandía Pueblo, Nuestra Señora de los Dolores¹⁸</td>
<td>Convento</td>
<td>1 table, 2 chairs, 3 benches, 1 new table, 1 new chair, 1 new small bench</td>
<td>14+</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>None described; at least one <em>celda/trascelda</em>, not adjacent to the kitchen in the back range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana Pueblo, Nuestra Señora de Santa Ana¹⁹</td>
<td>Convento</td>
<td>1 large table, 1 small table, 4 chairs, 2 benches</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>None described; two <em>celda/trascelda</em> pairs, not adjacent to the kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Pueblo, Nuestra Madre Santa Clara²⁰</td>
<td>Convento</td>
<td>2 nondescript old tables, 2 chairs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>None described; a <em>celda/trascelda</em> combination as well as several other rooms, none adjacent to the kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz de la Cañada²¹</td>
<td>Parish Church</td>
<td>1 ordinary table with drawer, 1 small chair, 1 little bench</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>None described; a <em>celda</em> is located next to the kitchen, and a salon with a locking two-leaf door is adjacent around the corner, with the friar’s <em>celda/trascelda</em> next</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe, San Francisco²²</td>
<td>Parish Church</td>
<td>1 ordinary table without drawer, 4 little armless chairs, 2 crude arm chairs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>None described; the old kitchen was located in the service patio, two <em>celda/trasceldas</em> located around the cloister on the first floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Missions</td>
<td>Status in 1776</td>
<td>Possible Refectory Furnishings</td>
<td>Potential seating(^2)</td>
<td>Weekly service(^3)</td>
<td>Refectory Location/Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santo Domingo Pueblo, Nuestra Padre Santo Domingo(^23)</td>
<td>Convento</td>
<td>4 tables, 2 chairs, 2 benches</td>
<td>8+</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>None described; a very long celda/trascelda make up the front range, with the kitchen nearby and around the corner, but separated by a passage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taos Pueblo, San Gerónimo(^24)</td>
<td>Convento</td>
<td>1 ordinary table and 1 small table, 4 small chairs, 2 benches</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>11+</td>
<td>None described; the large celda/trascelda of the front range is next to and around the corner from the kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tesuqui/ Tesuque Pueblo, San Diego(^25)</td>
<td>Visita of Nambe</td>
<td>None described</td>
<td>None described</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Not described; a celda/trascelda is located adjacent to kitchen and storeroom, around the corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zia Pueblo, Nuestra Señora de la Asunción(^26)</td>
<td>Convento</td>
<td>1 large table, 1 small table, 2 arm chairs, 3 armless chairs, 2 benches</td>
<td>11+</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>None described; one celda/trascelda and one celda/double trascelda, neither of which abuts the kitchen in the back range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuni Pueblo, Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe(^27)</td>
<td>Convento</td>
<td>2 ordinary tables (1 in each cell), 2 benches (1 in each cell), 2 small chairs (1 in each cell)</td>
<td>8+</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>None described; two celda/trascelda pairs, one of which was adjacent to the kitchen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Domínguez, *The Missions*; Domínguez, “Copy of Spanish Transcription.”

\(^2\) Assumes that a small bench seats 2+ people and an ordinary bench seats 3+ people.

\(^3\) One guardian friar plus the number of workers listed in Table 3.2 as a weekly rotation, not including those such as woodcutters and shepherds unlikely to be present in the convento on a regular basis.

\(^4\) Domínguez, *The Missions*, 123.

\(^5\) Ibid., 192-193.

\(^6\) Ibid., 149-150.

\(^7\) Ibid., 156-157.

\(^8\) Ibid., 205.
9 Ibid., 178-179.
10 Ibid., 185.
11 Ibid., 55-56.
12 Ibid., 87-88.
13 Ibid., 212.
14 Kessell, The Missions, 97-98; Dominguez, “Copy of Spanish Transcription,” 141-145.
15 Domínguez, The Missions, 62.
16 Ibid., 163.
17 Ibid., 67-69.
18 Ibid., 141-142.
19 Ibid., 168-169.
20 Ibid., 116-117.
21 Ibid., 79-80.
22 Ibid., 28.
23 Ibid., 134-135.
24 Ibid., 107-108.
25 Ibid., 48-49.
26 Ibid., 173-174.
27 Ibid., 199-200.
1.1. *Friars in Refectory*, by Ross G. Montgomery, in “San Bernardo de Aguatubi,” fig. 44.
1.2. Kitchen Showing “Turn” and Cooking Estufa of the “Multiple Unit Receptacle Type for Burning Charcoal,” by Ross G. Montgomery, in “San Bernardo de Aguatubi,” fig. 45.
1.3. Map of the U.S. Southwest, including modern towns (Gallup, Phoenix, and Tucson) and important colonial towns and pueblos. Drawing by the author.

1.5. General view of mission excavations in progress, showing Zuni workmen clearing the convento walls, Hawikku, NM. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05812). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

1.7. Photomontage panorama of the pueblo of Hawikku (left) and the ruins of the Purísima Concepción formal mission structure (right, circled). Photomontage by the author, 2011.

2.3  *Old Mission Church, Zuni Pueblo, N.M. View from the Plaza, 1873.* Timothy O'Sullivan, Albumen print from *Geographical and Geological Explorations and Surveys West of the 100th Meridian*, vol. 2. LOT 4677-C, no. 20 [P&P], Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division, Washington, DC.

2.5 Apse and southeastern side of the Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe Mission in Halona (Zuni) Pueblo, with remains of *convento*. Photograph by John K. Hillers, 1879. National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution [detail of Mss. 4362, vol. 4].

2.6 Mindeleff map of the Hawikku site, with the remains of the Purísima Concepción mission lower left, 1885. See also detail, figure 5.3. National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution [Mss. 2621].
2.7 Plans of the Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe Mission Church, details from Mindeleff maps of the Zuni Pueblo site, 1879. National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution [Mss. 2621].


2.11  Plan of San Bernardo mission, Awatovi Pueblo, AZ, established 1629. Drawing shows the plan of the mission phase structure, with dotted lines indicating presumed or possible mission-period walls. After J.O. Brew, “The Excavation,” fig. 4.


2.14 Franciscan mission of Santa Barbara, CA. Established 1786 and completed by 1820. View from southern corner, with church dome visible to right, and two bell towers to far left marking the location of the main building of the former St. Anthony’s Seminary, a post-1923 earthquake reconstruction designed by Ross G. Montgomery, and built by B. D. Kronnick, 1925-1927. Photomontage by the author, 2013.
2.15 Plan of San Bernardo mission, Awatovi Pueblo, AZ, with the rooms that the excavators interpreted as a kitchen (red), cloister-plan *convento* (yellow), classrooms (blue), and sacristies (green). After Brew, “The Excavation,” fig. 4.

2.17 Plan of the ex-Franciscan mission of Los Santos Ángeles, Guavavi, AZ, c. 1770. Showing the traces of the rectangle of its fortified village south of the church and convento. After Ivey, “Missions as Architectural Patrons,” 103.

2.18 Ruins of the ex-Franciscan mission of Los Santos Ángeles, Guavavi, AZ, c. 1770, with walls of the church to the right, and patio to the left. Today part of the Tumacacori National Historical Park. Photomontage by the author, 2015.
2.20 Plan of San Francisco de la Espada, San Antonio, Bejar County, Texas, rotated from the previous image. Showing the open, single-courtyard plan, as in 1824. After Historic American Building Survey, TEX, 15-SAMT.V.2-(sheet 1 of 4), drawn by Welton Cook.

2.21 Partially restored *convento* kiva at Nuestra Señora de la Purísima Concepción, Quarai Pueblo, NM, c. 1630-1633, abandoned by 1677. Photo by the author, 2011.
2.22  Partially restored *convento* kiva at San Gregorio, Abó Pueblo, NM, c. 1629-1644, abandoned by 1678.  Photo by the author, 2011.

2.23  Plan of the Franciscan mission of San Gabriel, Cholula, State of Puebla, Mexico. *Capilla Real* built in the 1540s with domes added 1581-1608; *convento* built 1548-1552; church complete by 1581.  After Perry, *Mexico’s Fortress Monasteries*, 110.

3.1 Looking north at the house of the Santo Niño, Zuni Pueblo, NM, with the roofline of the Zuni mission church visible behind. Photo by the author, 2011.
3.2 Example of a Benedictine cloister at the monastery of Saint-Trophême, Arles, France, 1100s. Photo by the author, 2005.

3.3 Example of a Benedictine dormitory or dorter at the monastery of Saint-Trophême, Arles, France, 1100s. Photo by the author, 2005.
3.4  Large cloister, Santa Croce, Florence, Italy, attributed to Filippo Brunelleschi and Bernardo Rossellino, finished c. 1453. Photo by the author, 2014.

3.5  Large cell, convento of San Francisco (Discalced Franciscan), Belvís de Monroy, Extremadura, Spain. Part of an addition probably dating c. 1592-1628. Photo by the author, 2015.
3.6 Individual friar’s cell in the *convento* of the ex-Franciscan mission of San Miguel Arcangel, Huejotzingo, State of Puebla, Mexico. Built late-1540s to the 1570s. Photo by the author, 2010.

3.7 Looking towards the Pazzi Chapel across what were originally two cloisters of the Franciscan conventual house of Santa Croce, Florence, Italy. Central path marks present entry from exterior of the conventual house. Portico at left, 1300s; Pazzi Chapel at center by Filippo Brunelleschi, c. 1429-1459, continuing to the 1470s. Photo by the author, 2014.
3.8 Entryway to the Peña family chapel and chapter house, inside the gothic cloister of the Observant Franciscan convento of San Francisco, Cáceres, Extremadura, Spain. Finished 1491. Photo by the author, 2015.

3.9 Individual cells in the Dominican conventual house of San Marco, Florence, Italy. This second floor was added by Michelozzo, 1437-1444, with frescos by Fra Angelico, c. 1438-1445. Photos by the author, 2014.
3.10 Mudéjar cloister of the convento of Nuestra Señora de Santa María de la Rábida (Observant Franciscan), Andalucía, Spain. Lower story built c. 1400-1450, second story expanded in the 1600s. Photo by the author, 2015.

3.11 Exterior of Pedro de Alcántara’s Puríísimas Concepción del Palancar (Discalced Franciscan), outside of Pedroso de Acim in Extremadura, Spain. Beginning with a small conventito for devotional retreat in 1559, this establishment was subsequently expanded in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to its present size. Photo by the author, 2015.

3.13 Convento of San Francisco del Berrocal (Discalced Franciscan), Belvís de Monroy, Extremadura, Spain. Initially constructed by Fray Pedro Melgar, 1505-1509, with later alterations. Photo by the author, 2015.
3.14 Church and convento of the ex-Franciscan mission of San Miguel in Huejotzingo, State of Puebla, Mexico, built late 1540s-1570s. Photos by the author, 2010.

3.16 Renaissance-style porch in front of the internal *portería* of the ex-Franciscan *convento* of San Francisco (Observant) in Cáceres, Extremadura, Spain. Built c. 1561-1571. Photo by the author, 2015.

3.18 Portería with open chapel (the higher arch to the right) of the ex-Franciscan mission of San Andrés Calpan, State of Puebla, Mexico. Built c. 1550. Photo by the author, 2010.

3.20 Ruins of *portería*, Nuestra Señora de la Purísima Concepción, Quarai Pueblo, NM, c. 1630-1633, abandoned by 1677. Photo by the author, 2011.

3.21 Ruins of *portería*, San Buenaventura, Las Humanas Pueblo, NM, c. 1659-1660s. Photo by the author, 2011.

4.1 Hawikku and its context from the access road to the northeast. The pueblo is located on the low ridge in the upper middle ground. Photo by the author, 2011.
4.2 Hawikku’s present interpretive paths and ruins, looking south. Photo by the author, 2015.

4.3 Hawikku Pueblo, mounds of crumbling rock walls, looking northeast. Photo by the author, 2011.

4.5 Assorted ceramic sherds and lithics on the Hawikku Pueblo site. Photo by the author, 2011.
4.6  Map of Zuni Reservation and settlement sites in western New Mexico. After Richard B. Woodbury, “Zuni Prehistory and History to 1850,” 467, fig. 1.

4.7  Dowa Yalanne Mesa, the traditional refuge site southwest of Zuni Pueblo, NM. Photo by the author, 2011.
4.8 Inscription of Oñate’s 1604-1605 expedition to the Gulf of California, reading: *Paso por aquí el adelantado don juan de oñate del descubrimiento de la mar del sur a 16 de abril de 1605*, translated as, “There passed this way the Adelantado Don Juan de Oñate, from the discovering of the South Sea, on the sixteenth of April, 1605.” Translation by Slater, El Morro, 7; photo by the author, 2013, with exaggerated contrast.

4.10 Plan of the ruins of Hawikku Pueblo. After Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, *The Excavation*, fig. 1, with additional unexcavated features from the Mindeleff maps indicated as rock scatters. Please note that the relationships of these features to one another are not exact, due to variations among the source maps.
4.11 Plan of the upper (most recent) rooms of Hawikku’s Block A house ruin. After Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, *The Excavation*, fig. 6. See figure 4.10 for full site plan.
Plan of the upper (most recent) rooms of Hawikku’s Block B house ruin. After Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, *The Excavation*, fig. 7. See figure 4.10 for full site plan.
Plan of the upper (most recent) rooms of Hawikku’s Block C house ruin. After Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, *The Excavation*, fig. 12. See figure 4.10 for full site plan.
Plan of the upper (most recent) rooms of Hawikku’s Block E house ruin. After Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, *The Excavation*, fig. 17. See figure 4.10 for full site plan.
Plan of Hawikku Pueblo’s Block F ruins and rooms below the foundations of the formal mission, combining the site maps of the Mindeleff brothers and the Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition. After Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, *The Excavation*, fig. 19. The rock scatters represent unexcavated structures identified by the Mindeleffs. See figure 4.10 for full site plan, and figures 4.17 and 6.4 for details.
Plan of Hawikku Pueblo’s Block F ruins and rooms below the foundations of the formal mission, combining the site maps of the Mindeleff brothers and the Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition. After Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, *The Excavation*, fig. 19. The rock scatters represent unexcavated structures identified by the Mindeleffs. See figure 4.10 for full site plan, and figures 4.16 and 6.4 for details.
Hawikku Pueblo, wall alignments from the western housing block (Block C), looking southeast. Photo by the author, 2014.

Hawikku Pueblo, remains of late-phase masonry walls on the east side of Block B or D. Photo by the author, 2014.
Plan of the upper (most recent) rooms of Hawikku’s Block C house ruins, with sequential construction phases highlighted. After Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, *The Excavation*, fig. 12. See figure 4.10 for full site plan.
4.21 Pueblo room with preserved plaster finish, Room 244 (Block C). National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N06874). Frederick Webb Hodge (or more likely Jesse L. Nusbaum), 1920.

4.23 Framing system for ceilings and floors in Hawikku Pueblo rooms. From Room 220 (Block C). National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N06853). Frederick Webb Hodge (or more likely Jesse L. Nusbaum), 1920.

4.24 Possible rainspout (canale) for draining roof and parapet, Room 232 (Block E), Hawikku. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N06863). Frederick Webb Hodge (or more likely Jesse L. Nusbaum), 1920.
4.25 Hawikku Pueblo, remains of a sandstone rooftop hatchway, left on the site after excavations. Photo by the author, 2011.

4.27 Post-and-lintel porch structure (*portales*) adjacent to Room 117 (Block C), with remnants of outdoor hearths. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N06796). Frederick Webb Hodge (or more likely Jesse L. Nusbaum), 1920.

4.28 A probable upper-level, open-air working space between three domestic rooms, with small hearth. Designated Room 140 (Block D). National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N04685). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.
A typical domestic space with benches and sunken, slab-lined hearth with pot stones, Room 375, second level (Block B). National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N07578 and N07579). Unknown photographer from the Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition, 1921.

Zuni utility ware jars (*ollas*). Left: from Hawikku Room 180B (Block F), collected 1920. Right: from Room 212 (Block C), collected 1921. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (103615.000 and 106903.000). Photos by the author.
4.31 Matsaki Polychrome jars from Hawikku. Left: collected 1919, no provenance. Right: from Room 302 (Block C), collected 1921. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (089091.000 and 109259.000). Photos by the author.

4.32 Matsaki Polychrome ladles from Room 292, second level (Block A), collected 1922. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (109810.000 and 109811.000). Photos by the author.

Schematic diagram of the six-directional Zuni cosmos, with inter-cardinal orientation linked to the summer and winter solstices. Diagram by the author, after Young, *Signs from the Ancestors*, 98, fig. 42.

4.36  Kiva with projecting exterior ladder, leading to rooftop hatchway entrance and inner ladder for ceremonial use, Zuni Pueblo, NM. Photo by the author, 2017.
Problematic inscription (turned vertically for space), either from 1620 or from Governor Silva Nieto’s expedition to the Zuni pueblos, reading [...] cap\textsuperscript{am}, gen\textsuperscript{t}, de los pro\textsuperscript{as}, del nuevo mex\textsuperscript{co}. Por el Rey nro. S\textsuperscript{t} Paso por aqui de buelta de los pue/Blos de Zuni a los, 29 de Julio del a\~no de 1620 y los puso en paz a su pedim\textsuperscript{co}, pi/Diendole Su favor como vasallos de su mag\textsuperscript{d} y de nuevo dieron la obediencia todo lo qu[e]/hizo con el agasax e selo y prudencia como tan christianisimo y gran caballero, tam particu/lar y gallardo soldado de inacabable y loada memori[...], which translates as “[...] Captain-General of the Provinces of New Mexico for the King our Lord. He passed by here in returning from the pueblos of Zuni on the 29th of July of the year 1620, and he put them at peace at their petition, praying his favor as vassals of His Majesty, and anew they gave obedience—all of which he did with clemency and zeal and prudence, as a most Christian and great gentleman, a most extraordinary and gallant soldier of imperishable and praised memory.” Transcription and translation by Slater, El Morro, 8. Photo by the author, 2014, with exaggerated contrast.
4.38 Inscription of Governor Silva Nieto’s return to Zuni, reading *Aquí... Gobernador... Don francisco M[anuel] de Silua Nieto/Que lo ynpucible tiene ya sujeto/Su Braco yndubitable y su Balor/Con los carros del Rei Nuestro Señor/Cosa que solo el Puso en este Efecto/De Augosto 5 Seiscientos Biente y Nueue/Que se byen A cuñi Pase y la Fe lleue/ [...] el año de 1629... escolta a los ca[r]*, translated as “Here ***** Governor/Don Francisco Manuel de Silva Nieto/Whose indubitable arm and valor/Has now overcome the impossible/With the wagons of the King our Lord/That one well may pass to Zuni and carry the faith.” Transcription and translation by Slater, El Morro, 9; photo by the author, 2014, with exaggerated contrast.

4.40 Inscription of the de Vargas’s reconquest of the western pueblos, reading: *Aquí estubo el Genº, Dº.Dº./de vargos, qº, Conquistó/à Nra, Stº, Fé, y à la Rº/Corona todo el nuevo mexico a su costa, AÑO DE 1692*, translated as “Here was the General Don Diego/de Vargas, who conquered/for our Holy Faith, and for the Royal/Crown, all the New/Mexico, at his expense,/ Year of 1692.” Transcription and translation by Slater, *El Morro*, 13; photo by the author, 2014, with exaggerated contrast.

4.42 Detail of stereograph showing the Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe Mission Church, in ruined state with altarpiece in place, 1873. Photo by Timothy H. O’Sullivan, Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division, LOT 3427-3, no. 47, Washington, DC.

4.43 Altarpiece figure of San Miguel by Bernardo Miera y Pacheco, originally from the Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe Mission. Repatriated from Smithsonian Institution, and on display in the Zuni Pueblo Department of Tourism Offices. Photo by the author, 2011.
4.44 Altarpiece figure of San Rafael by Bernardo Miera y Pacheco, originally from the Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe Mission. Photographed prior to a 1965 fire in its display case which severely damaged the sculpture. Smithsonian Institution Archives, Washington, DC. Image # Acc. 02-057, Box 1, Folder- Zuni Repatriation, St. Michael.

4.46 Cemetery of the Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe Mission, Zuni Pueblo, New Mexico. Photo by the author, October 2015.

4.48 Ruins of the Purísima Concepción site, looking southeast from Hawikku Pueblo. Photo by either John K. Hillers, c. 1879 or the Mindeleff brothers, c. 1885. National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution [Mss. 4362, vol. 2].

4.49 Ruins of the Purísima Concepción site, looking west with the pueblo mound in the background. Photo by either John K. Hillers, c. 1879 or the Mindeleff brothers, c. 1885. National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution [Mss. 4362, vol. 2].
4.50 Ruins of the Purísima Concepción site, looking southeast at the adobe brick walls of the apse and epistle side of the church nave. Photo by either John K. Hillers, c. 1879 or the Mindeleff brothers, c. 1885. National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution [Mss. 4362, vol. 2].


5.1 Halona Plaza from the A:shiwi A:wan Museum and Heritage Center, looking southeast at the area overlying the original Halona:wa South ruins. Photo by the author, 2015.

5.3 Detail of Mindeleff map of the Hawikku site, with the remains of the Purísima Concepción mission circled, 1885. National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution [Mss. 2621]. For full map, see figure 2.6.
5.4 Selected nineteenth-century sherds from the Hawikku site, including an unidentified ware stamped “Royal” (upper left); a piece of Alfred Meakin Royal Ironstone China (between 1875 and 1897, upper right); and an unidentified slipcast vessel with annular ring. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution. Photos by the author.

5.5 *In the Monastery* (Frederick W. Hodge), photo by Zahrah Preble, 1923, gelatin silver print. Courtesy of the Braun Research Library, Autry National Center of the American West, Los Angeles; A.164.61.
5.6  *Untitled (George Gustav Heye and Frederick W. Hodge in Zuni Pueblo)*, 1915, gelatin silver print. Courtesy of the Braun Research Library, Autry National Center of the American West, Los Angeles; P.39330.

5.7  *Modern Masonry House Called the Cushing House*, A. C. Vroman, 1899. This house is also known as the Hemenway House, initially built in the early 1880s by Cushing, and expanded in 1888-1889 by members of the Hemenway Expedition. National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution [BAE GN 02277].

5.9  *Camp scene, view looking west*, 1918, glass plate negative. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N02249). Photograph by Edwin Francis Coffin.
5.10  Left: *Untitled* (Frederick W. Hodge and Jesse L. Nusbaum in Camp Harmon), probably 1920, gelatin silver print. Right: *Untitled* (Frederick W. Hodge and Aileen Nusbaum), probably 1920, gelatin silver print. Both courtesy of the Braun Research Library, Autry National Center of the American West, Los Angeles; P.39270 and P.39269.

5.11  Plan of the circular kivas located on the plain west of Hawikku Pueblo (Site I), probably dating to the Pueblo II period (c. 950/1000-1150). Original survey by E. F. Coffin. After Hodge, *Circular Kivas*. 
5.12  Looking eastward along the bottom of the plaza trench at the seven-foot level, Hawikku ruins, 1921. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N07428). Photograph by the Hendricks-Hodge Hawikku Expedition.

5.13  Roof of square kiva unearthed during the process of trenching the plaza. Looking toward the northeast, 1921, glass plate negative. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N07441). Photograph by the Hendricks-Hodge Hawikku Expedition.
5.14 Owen Cattell and Donald A. Cadzow filming “Ninita” weaving, 1923, photo by Zahrah Preble. Courtesy of the Braun Research Library, Autry National Center of the American West, Los Angeles; A.164.32.

5.15 Cover, and spread of the Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition’s “Church and Monastery” field notebook, written in 1919 by Jesse L. Nusbaum. This two-page spread documents Room 13, the kitchen of the Purísima Concepción mission. Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library (Archives 9170).
5.16  Untitled photograph of Frederick W. Hodge and workmen excavating the north or west cemetery of Hawikku using a vertical face trench, ca. 1917-1918, gelatin silver print. Courtesy of the Braun Research Library, Autry National Center of the American West, Los Angeles; P.39253.

5.17  *Untitled* (Frederick W. Hodge and assistants excavate deposit in Hawikku), attributed to Zahrah Preble, 1923, gelatin silver print. Courtesy of the Braun Research Library, Autry National Center of the American West, Los Angeles; A.164.53.
5.18 Western side of the Hawikku promontory, where Hodge excavated a large cemetery and pueblo Rooms 1-15, mostly in 1917 and 1918. The berm of backdirt from the excavation trench is at center, crossed by a light path. The remnants of Block C lie at the crest of the hill, where the interpretive trail sits. Photo by the author, 2015.

5.19 Detail of a map combining surveyed plans of the site with burial locales. Roomblock C is at center, with the rest of the pueblo above. As this plan is oriented, the top side is towards the east. Burial sites are marked along the western slope, and the plaza trench has also been added across the main plaza in upper left. Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library ("Maps of Hawikuh Ruins. 19--,") Archives 9239).
5.20 Looking north across the houses of Block C, with Rooms 245 and 254 (with ladder) visible in the foreground. Note the stages of room clearing, with a workman beginning to clear Room 327 (at far right) and another scraping the backdirt away. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N06888). Photograph attributed to Frederick Webb Hodge, but probably by Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1920.

5.21 Room clearing in progress looking southeast, Room Block B, with Gaialito standing in Room 339 (left foreground). Note the stages of room clearing, with backdirt deposited in previously excavated rooms to left. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N07472). Frederick Webb Hodge, 1921.
5.22 Example of a cleared space, Room 203 (Block C). National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N06833). Photograph attributed to Frederick Webb Hodge, but probably by Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1920.

5.23 Remnants of Hodge’s plaza trench today, looking roughly east from Block C. Tumbleweeds have accumulated in the trench depression. Photo by the author, 2014.

5.25 View of Pueblo Ruins, One of the Seven Cities of Cibola, A. C. Vroman, 1899, black and white gelatin glass negative. View of the mission ruins from the northeast, showing the mound of melted adobe walls after the removal of adobe bricks for reuse at Ojo Caliente. National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution [BAE GN 02341B].
5.26 *Portrait of Tilina* (left) and *Portrait of Kanta* (right), Jesse L. Nusbaum, sepia print. Both dated 1921, but probably 1920. Courtesy of the Braun Research Library, Autry National Center of the American West, Los Angeles; OP.79/78.

5.27 Section of fill at the southwest end of the church nave, showing the extent of excavations, charred wooden timbers, and well-defined strata of manure, glass plate negative. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N04701). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

5.29 *Entrance to church, Hawikuh* (Hawikku). Note the unexcavated section of mounded fill in the center of the nave, with tracks of a scraper across it. Photo attributed to Zahrah Preble, c. 1923, gelatin silver print. Courtesy of the Braun Research Library, Autry National Center of the American West, Los Angeles; A.164.62.
5.30 Altar deconstruction in progress. Nusbaum is kneeling in front of the original altar, while Heye stands at the top of the steps and Harmon Hendricks sits under the umbrella. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (P11804). Photographer unknown, 1919.

5.31 Altar deconstruction in progress. Nusbaum is kneeling in front of the original altar, while Hodge (probably) stands at left, and Heye at right. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (P11809). Photographer unknown, 1919.
Plan of the Purísima Concepción convent excavations in progress, exhibiting the cloister form of an open, central patio with surrounding ambulatories and three ranges of rooms. At this point, Nusbaum’s drawing is more regular and grid-like than the actual remains. Page 81 of the “Church and Monastery” field notebook, by Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919. Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library (Archives 9170).

Excavation sketch of the Purísima Concepción mission, showing ongoing excavations of the baptistery, sub-foundational rooms of the northwest side, sacristy area (Rooms 20, 25, and 30), and service patio rooms. Nusbaum to Hodge, October 6, 1919, National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution [Papers of Jesse Logan Nusbaum, Box 3, “Geo. Heye-Heye Museum Am. Indian”].
5.34 Panorama of the excavated ruins of Hawikku’s Purísima Concepción mission, 1920 or later (rotated for space). Showing the *convento* patio at center and berms of backdirt from excavations at the southern side (left) and northern side (right). National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N07211-N07213). Photographs by Frederick Webb Hodge, panorama digitally reconstructed by the author.
5.35 Site of the Purísima Concepción mission, viewed from the pueblo, looking southeast. The church, with its shadowed stone retaining wall, is in the center of the photograph, with berms of excavation backdirt marked in blue along the southeast and northeast sides of the *convento*. Photo by the author, 2011.

5.36 Excavation sketch of the Purísima Concepción church, baptistery, and sub-foundational Room 32. Nusbaum to Hodge, October 10, 1919, National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution [Papers of Jesse Logan Nusbaum, Box 3, “Geo. Heye-Heye Museum Am. Indian”].
5.37 Excavation sketch of the Purísima Concepción convento’s southern corner, with the rooms of the service patio (Rooms 37, 38, 39) and spur wall heading towards the southeast, at the end of the excavations. Nusbaum to Heye and Hodge, October 17, 1919. Courtesy of the Braun Research Library, Autry National Center of the American West, Los Angeles.

5.38 Stratigraphic drawing of test pit in the service patio, page 140 of the “Church and Monastery” field notebook, by Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919. Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library (Archives 9170).
Completion of the excavation of Room 32/272 in 1920, with a Zuni workman sitting in the lower level of the room, and the steps of the atrium entryway at right. The baptistery and façade buttress are visible in the background. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N06776). Photograph probably by Jesse L. Nusbaum.

Hawikku Site Map for Roomblock B, probably by Ed Coffin, c. 1919-1923. Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library (Archives 9170).
5.41 Detail of Block F and the Purísima Concepción mission ruins, from “Base Map to Scale of Contour Map,” with heightened contrast. Note that the atrium dimensions were already incorrectly truncated. Plan by Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition or Louis Schellbach. Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library (“Maps of Hawikuh Ruins. 19--,” Archives 9239).

Plan of the Purísima Concepción mission, as published by Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury (*The Excavation*, fig. 20). Note the patio pit misplaced in Room 38 (lower right), the truncated portions of the atrium, and the juxtaposition of all occupational phases.

5.45 Page 142 of the “Church and Monastery” field notebook, documenting a pit in the convento patio, a page which Nusbaum pre-labeled incorrectly as Room 38. Excavated in 1919 or possibly 1920. Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library (Archives 9170).
5.46  *Church and Monastery of Hawikuh* (Hawikku), Edward S. Curtis, c. 1925, gelatin silver print. Courtesy of the Braun Research Library, Autry National Center of the American West, Los Angeles; P.37742.

5.48  *Hodge beneath the ramada in the Hawikuh camp, note the jumble of broken pottery awaiting repair. What a job!* by Zahrah Preble, 1923. Courtesy of the Braun Research Library, Autry National Center of the American West, Los Angeles; P39249.

Ranges containing the Hawikku artifacts in the archaeological collections of the NMAI’s Cultural Resource Center. The author is included to give a sense of the scale of the assemblage, which fills almost 2.5 rows, floor-to-ceiling. Photo by Maria Martinez, 2016.

Hawikku site, from the southeast with mission ruins in foreground and pueblo ruins along the ridge. Photo by the author, 2015.
6.2 Detail plan of the sub-foundation rooms beneath the formal mission. Drawing by the author, 2017. See figures 4.16 (center) and 4.17 for the larger site context.

6.3 Photograph of sub-foundational Room 35 looking towards the east. Foundations of the retaining wall at the western corner of the nave are visible on a pedestal of fill in upper center. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05810). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.
6.4 Detail of N05750, looking southwest, showing the baptistery at left and sub-foundational features beneath (center). The stone retaining wall has been cut down to expose more of Room 33 in the very center of the photograph. Above Room 33 is the only image of the partially excavated Room 34 and the trench along the retaining wall. In front of Room 33 are the thick rubble wall and battered remnant of an adobe brick wall, perpendicular to the stone atrium wall and first entry step. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05750). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

6.5 Photograph of sub-foundational Room 33, looking towards south. The mission atrium wall is visible at upper left, and foundations of the retaining wall at the north corner of the baptistery are visible on a pedestal of fill in upper center. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05809). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.
6.6 Detail of page 134 of the “Church and Monastery” field notebook, with the plan and measurements of Room 33. Cornell Rare and Manuscript Collections (Archives 9170, Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition papers).

6.7 Room 33 assemblage, traditionally styled ceramic artifacts, including utility ware jar (096992.000, left) and sherds at right, falling under NMAI numbers 096950 and 096953. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution. Photos by the author.

6.10 Map of sites in the Hopi area, with blue stars for presently-occupied pueblos and red triangles for important ancestral archaeological sites. After J. O. Brew, “Hopi Prehistory and History,” 514, fig. 1.


6.13 Profiles of San Bernardo hybrid ceramic ware sherds, Room 33. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (096950.000 and 096979.000).
6.14 Hawikku mission from the northern corner looking south, with the gateway to the atrium and Room 32 in the foreground, and other sub-foundation rooms on the right side. Room 32 shows an upper floor level partially removed on the southeast end, and the projection of the walls above the atrium ground level, as part of the steps progressing into the mission complex. The baptistery and façade of the mission church are in the mid-ground. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05750). Photograph by Jesse L. Nusbaum.

6.15 Slumping pit beneath the fence line filled with tumbleweeds, marking the location of sub-foundational Room 32, Hawikku Pueblo ruins. Photo by the author, 2014.

6.17 Nusbaum’s plan (above) and profile (below) of the sub-foundational features of Rooms 33 and 34. Detail of page 133 of the “Church and Monastery” field notebook, with the plan and measurements of Room 33. Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library (Archives 9170, Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition papers).
6.18  Ceremonial pathway leading out of Zuni Pueblo’s central dance plaza to the south, after summer solstice observations. Photo by the author, 2017.

7.1  Formal church of the ex-Franciscan mission of San José y San Miguel de Aguayo, San Antonio, TX. Established on this site 1739/40, church built 1768-1782 with rococo style façade retablo. Photo by the author, 2014.
7.2 San Juan Capistrano interim church, built 1756. San Antonio, TX. Photo by the author, 2015.

7.4 Detail of puddled or coursed mud walls at the Great House (Sivan Vah'ki) of the Hohokam site of Casa Grande, Pinal County, AZ, built c. 1350 CE. Photo by the author, 2015.


7.7 Wooden digging stick, collected by the Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition in 1923 from Zuni Pueblo. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (120788.000). Photos by the author.
7.8 Digging stick impressions in the face of adobe bricks from the Hawikku mission. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (Left: NMAI 093634.000/Right: NMAI 093634.001). Photos by the author.

7.10 Deconstructed foundation of the high altar, showing the two rows of brick headers that supported the original altar and formed a predella in front of it, covered with a coat of plaster. The sides are cut down to receive new sills at the time of renovation. Sockets for the sills are visible in the back wall, as is what appears to be a Flemish bond masonry pattern lacking the regular diagonal alignments between bricks. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05751). Photograph attributed to Frederick Webb Hodge, probably by Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

7.11 Comparative example of Flemish bond masonry pattern with glazed headers, illustrating the diagonal pattern that results from regularly sized fired brick, unlike the irregular adobe bricks of the Hawikku apse. From Vauter’s Church, Essex County, VA. Built by John Vauter c. 1719, with addition by Edward and Benjamin Vauter c. 1731. Photo by the author, 2015.
7.12 Recreation of c. 4000 BCE construction style at the village of Abu Hamid in the northern Jordan Valley. With adobe bricks on rubble foundations and trabeated flat roofs of packed earth, these houses were early exemplars of the widespread tradition of mud construction throughout the Mediterranean and Mesopotamian regions. Jordan Museum, Ammon. Photo by the author, 2016.

7.13 Example of flat, packed-earth roofs at Aït-Ben-Haddou in the High Atlas Mountains of Ouarzazate Province, Morocco. The oldest of the extant Kasbah structures date to the 1600s. Photo by the author, 2017.


7.20 Drawing of carved ornament on a *viga* from the Purísima Concepción mission. Page 178 of the “Church and Monastery” field notebook, by Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919. Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library (Archives 9170, Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition papers).


7.24 Painted roof beam (viga) from an “old house” in Zuni Pueblo, undated, one of three with the same painted patterns, probably salvaged from the Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe convento. Surfaces (from top to bottom): side, underside, side, unpainted topside. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (124525.000). Photos by the author, 2015.

7.25 Fragments of wood with black painted cross and circle, from the convento of Hawikku’s Purísima Concepción mission. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (095685.000). Photo by the author.
7.26  Details of windows along the gospel side of the nave (left), and in the northeast wall of the baptistery (right), Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe Mission, Zuni (Halona) Pueblo. John K. Hillers, 1879. National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution [details from Mss. 4362, vol. 4].

7.28 Undated wooden frame and shutter with pintle hinges from a house in Zuni Pueblo, collected by the Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition in 1923. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (120776.000). Photos by the author.


Two iron eyelets, possibly part of hinges, from the Purísima Concepción “monastery” (convento). National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (095670.000). Photos by the author.


7.37 Two details of the carved columns supporting the choir loft (c. 1659-1668), with restored mural pattern behind. Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe mission of El Paso del Norte (Ciudad Juárez), Chihuahua State, Mexico. Photos by the author, 2015.

7.39 Details of original mission fireplaces: from Room 2 east corner; Room 7 south corner; and Room 9 east corner. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N095763/N05771/N05772). Photographs by Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

7.42 Plan of the roof levels of the Purísima Concepción Mission, with clustering of fireplace flues in red. Darker values indicate higher elevation. Parapet locations are approximate, based on ground-level plan, without accounting for recession of the walls as they went up.

7.43 Details of secondary mission-phase fireplaces with slab linings set into the floor: from Room 2 south corner; from Room 14/17/18 north corner; and Room 5 east corner. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N095763/ N05813/ N05769). Photographs by Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

7.46 Plan of the initial construction of the formal phase of the Purísima Concepción mission of Hawikku. Based on Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, *The Excavation*, and my own analysis.
7.47 Atrium space today, looking northeast from the Purísima Concepción sotocoro. The fence marks the approximate location of the mission’s northeast side, with a rocky berm of leftover backdirt on the far side. The present grade of the atrium area is visible as red earth beyond. Photo by the author, 2011.

7.48 View of the façade of the Purísima Concepción Mission, looking towards the northwest, with the church buttresses and narthex in foreground, and the projecting remnants of Room 32 in the background at middle right. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05745). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.
7.49 Sanctuary of Nuestra Señora de los Remedios, Cholula, State of Puebla, Mexico. 1594-1666, largely rebuilt in 1864. The church stands on top of a pre-Hispanic pyramid which was in use for at least 1,500 years prior to the arrival of the Spanish, remnants of which are visible in the foreground. Photo by the author, 2010.

7.50 Façade and portería, ex-Franciscan mission of San Luis Obispo, Tlalpanalco, Morelos State, Mexico, 1560s. Photo by the author, 2010.
7.51 Plan of the Porziuncola, Francis’s early chapel (occupied by the early 1200s) outside of Assisi, which became the centerpiece of the Renaissance Basilica of Santa Maria degli Angeli. After Bruzelius, *Preaching*, 27 fig. 15.

7.53 Detail of the plan of the Purísima Concepción mission church and liturgical spaces, with the original altar arrangement. Drawing by the author, see figure 7.46 for complete plan, and figures 8.1-8.2 for subsequent alterations.

7.54 Hawikuh Polychrome bowl with feathered gourd at center. Collected 1919, from the “northeast front of church.” National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (096983.000). Photos by the author.

7.56 Facade, Nuestra Señora de la Asunción, Zia Pueblo, established c. 1610-1628 as San Pedro y San Pablo, reconstructed 1693 under its new name. PICT 000-675 NJS, Box 12, Vol. 5, page 80, Carlos Vierra Collection of New Mexico Architecture, in the John Gaw Meem collection of non-job-specific photos, Special Collections and Center for Southwest Research, University of New Mexico Libraries, Albuquerque, NM.


7.60 Beam painted with compass flowers and arcs, with *latillas* above, from the choir loft of the Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe Mission in Zuni (Halona) Pueblo, NM. Originally built in the mid-seventeenth century, this church was rebuilt c. 1700. Photo for Caywood’s 1966 excavation and subsequent restoration. “Excavation, Stabilization, and Partial Restoration Estimates for the Mission of Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe de Zuni, Zuni, New Mexico.” 1965, Western Archaeology and Conservation Center, Tucson, AZ, pg. 40.

7.62 Inaccurate drawing of the mural paintings from the nave walls of the Purísima Concepción church. The flowers inside the painted tiles do not accurately represent the star motifs of the actual paintings. After Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, *The Excavation*, fig. 27.
7.63 Reconstruction of the nave mural pattern, based on remnants visible in excavation photographs, with stars of alternating kite shapes. Colors not recorded, upper section not preserved. Drawing by the author.
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7.67 Detail of mural painting remnants along the epistle-side of the Purísima Concepción sotocoro wall next to the baptistery doorway, showing the incised drawing underlying the painting. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (detail of N05808). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

7.68 Sanctuary of the Purísima Concepción mission church, looking southwest. The renovated altar is visible, with boards holding it in place. Ground sandstone slabs are visible in the apse and on the predella of the gospel-side altar. Several burnt timbers remain in the nave, and the sacristy was not yet excavated at the time this picture was taken. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N04693). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

7.70 Sanctuary of the Purísima Concepción mission church, looking southwest. The renovated altar is visible, with boards holding it in place. Ground sandstone slabs are visible in the apse and on the predella of the gospel-side altar. Several burnt timbers remain in the nave, at lower right. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N04694). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

7.72 Detail drawing of the gospel-side newel post from the Purísima Concepción church. Page 180 of the “Church and Monastery” field notebook, by Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919. Cornell Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections (Archives 9170, Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition papers).
7.73 Ground and shaped pieces of selenite, collected in 1923 without provenance, Hawikku Pueblo. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (124817.000). Photo by the author.

7.74 Cut pieces of mica from the altar and stairs of the Purísima Concepción mission church (095638.000), in the church generally (094025.000), in the convento (095697.000), and without provenance but collected in 1919 (094327.000). National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution. Photos by the author.
7.75 Looking down at the altar from the gospel side of the apse, with renovated altar front, predella, and ground sandstone slab in place. Both courses of adobe brick headers from the two phases of altar construction are visible in the bonding on its top surface. The lack of bonding between the lateral altar and church walls is visible at upper right. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N04696). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

7.76 Detail sketch of the artifacts from the sanctuary step and Nusbaum’s “kneeling stone,” from the Purisima Concepción mission church. Page 6 of the “Church and Monastery” field notebook, by Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919. Cornell Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections (Archives 9170, Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition papers).
7.77 Charred fragments from a small wooden cross with pieces of selenite ornament affixed to the front side. Found on the ground sandstone slab of the mission church apse. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (094026.000). Photos by the author.

7.78 Charred fragments of a wooden picture frame, with a grooved front side and lapped corner joint with wooden pins. Found on the ground sandstone slab of the mission church apse and misidentified as a cross by Nusbaum. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (093989.000). Photos by the author. Compare to figure 8.19.

7.80 Details of the carefully ground and broken sandstone slabs from the apse steps (left) and the gospel-side lateral predella (two views, right). Uncollected. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N04698/ N04694/ N04693). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.


7.84 Looking down at the partially excavated sanctuary steps and nave floor from the gospel side of the apse. A scattering of charred wood, ceramic sherds, and the ground sandstone slab are visible on the steps, as are burnt remnants of the newel posts and roofing timbers on the floor. The unexcavated portion of the nave is visible at right. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N04698). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

7.87 Cut copper ornament in excavated matrix from the Purísima Concepción mission church. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (095666.000). Photo by the author.

7.88 Fragment of cast bronze from the Purísima Concepción mission church. The patches on concave side are from being glued to cardboard at the MAI. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (095628.000). Photos by the author.
7.89 Glass artifact from the Purísima Concepción mission church, melted during the destruction of the mission. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (095627.000). Photos by the author.

7.90 Wooden cross with terraced finials and lapped joint, from the Purísima Concepción mission church. Approximately 22.78 cm. long and 18.00 cm. wide (8.97 by 7.09”). Currently on display at the A:shiwi A:wan Museum and Heritage Center. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (094024.000). Photo by the author.

7.92 Looking northeast at the Purísima Concepción baptistery (Room 31), with the doorway to the sotocoro and church at right and font pedestal at center. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05805). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.
7.93 Looking northeast at the Purísima Concepción Baptistery (Room 31), with the doorway to the sotocoro and church at right and font pedestal at center. Room 32 is in the background with the entryway gate to the atrium, while the pile of stones at left is from the disassembly of the retaining wall overlying Room 33. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05806). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

7.94 Looking southwest at the Purísima Concepción Baptistery (Room 31), with the doorway to the sotocoro and church at left and font pedestal at center. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05807). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.
7.95 View through the *sotocoro* entryway to the Purísima Concepción Baptistery (Room 31), looking northwest, with the font pedestal at center. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05808). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.


7.98 Ceramic baptismal font from the Hospital de San Lázaro, Seville, with detail of the interior and drain, c. 1300s to 1400s. Museo de Bellas Artes, Seville. Photos by the author, 2015.
7.99 Looking north at the Purísima Concepción sacristy (Room 21), with doorways into the ambulatory (middle right) and church nave (middle left). Burnt remnants of roofing timbers lean against the walls. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05788). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

7.100 Looking southeast through the doorway from the Purísima Concepción nave into the sacristy (Room 21), with Room 14/17/18 in the background. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05789). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

7.102  Detail of the doorway sill from the Purísima Concepción sacristy (Room 21), into the church nave. Note the possible rectangular *manos* set into the pavement on the left side of the doorway, and the burnt roofing timber at the right, probably an ornamental corbel. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (detail of N05791). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.
Looking northwest at the excavated Purísima Concepción sacristy (Room 21), with doorway into the nave (right) and Room 25 sacristy addition (left). Burnt roofing timbers lean against the walls, and a bonding seam between the church wall and sacristy addition is visible at upper left. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05791). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

Partially excavated sacristy of the Purísima Concepción (Room 21). At left, the Room 25 entryway is still filled and the wall stub associated with the Room 24 post-mission occupation is visible in center left. The ambulatory entryway is also filled at right, beneath the walls of post-mission Room 20. What appear to be burnt roofing timbers and possibly furniture are visible in the western corner of the room. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05787). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.
7.105 Charred remnant of a carved wooden cornice from the Purísima Concepción sacristy (Room 21). Profile at right shows likely reconstruction of the original contours. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (095667.000). Photos by the author.

7.106 Painted and carved cornice above a testera niche in the ambulatory of the main cloister at the convento of Santa María de las Ángeles, Churubusco, Distrito Federal, Mexico. Franciscan/Discalced Franciscan, established 1520s, present fabric from the 17th and 18th centuries, today the Museo Nacional de las Intervenciones. Photo by the author, 2010.
7.107 Details of burnt roofing timbers from Room 21, the Purísima Concepción sacristy, reoriented according to their probable original orientation in the structure. The long upper piece was probably a *viga*, with a possible joinery notch on top and ornamental bead along the underside. The lower piece may be a carved corbel, with the butt end unburnt and rotted from being embedded in the nave wall. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (details of N05791). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

7.108 Detail of painted dado at the bottom of the walls in the Purísima Concepción sacristy (Room 21). A patch of burnt rhomboid outlines is visible at the far left, while an unburnt patch of colored diamonds is visible to the right of the roofing timber halfway to the door opening. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (detail of N05791). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.
7.109 Detail sketch of a patch of painted dado, surmounted by a border of flowers within diamonds, from the sacristy doorway of the Purísima Concepción. Page 111 of the “Church and Monastery” field notebook, by Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919. Cornell Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections (Archives 9170, Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition papers).

7.110 Detail of artifacts from Room 21, probably uncollected, which included burnt wooden remnants (left), painted and unornamented ceramic sherds, and an artifact bag next to spherical ground stone with flattened side. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (detail of N05786). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.
7.111 Wooden ornamental pieces burnt during the destruction of the Purísima Concepción convento, many probably openwork spats from chairs or cupboard doors. The hourglass-shaped piece at lower left is from Room 25 (see Chapter 8). The rest came from unspecified sources in Rooms 21 or 25. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (095677.000/095677.001 at far right). Photos by the author.

7.112 Wooden artifacts from the Purísima Concepción convento, without further provenance information. Clockwise from upper left: a thin, round wooden disc with central hole, probably a spindle whorl; a hollow wooden cylinder; a bent twig; a rounded wooden cylinder resembling a loom beams. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (093992/095675/095674/095676). Photos by the author.
7.113 Burnt wooden planks from the Purísima Concepción convento, without further provenance information. Left: slab with sawn end and beveled sides (095679.000). Right: slab with sawn end, beveled side, and sawn semi-circular cut (095683.000). National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution. Photos by the author.

7.114 Burnt fragments of a grooved wooden rail from the Purísima Concepción convento, without further provenance information. These rails were probably part of furniture, holding paneling or openwork ornamental spats. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (095678.000). Photos by the author.
7.115 Burnt fragment of a coarsely carved, wooden disc form, with a circumferential groove. Surfaces show flaking traces of finish, perhaps gesso and paint. Traces of another material (perhaps leather) are visible in the circumferential groove. From the Purísima Concepción convento, but without further provenance information. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (095678.000). Photos by the author.


7.120  Detail of sacristy (Room 21), looking southeast through the church nave door. Post-mission partitions of Room 14/17/18 visible in the background, as is a ceramic candle holder (096972.000) on the *convento* wall. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (detail of N05789). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.
7.122 Panorama of the front (northeast) range of the Purísima Concepción *convento* after excavation in 1919 (rotated for space). Note the view of the unexcavated patio at center. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05746, N05748). Photographs by Frederick Webb Hodge, panorama digitally reconstructed by the author.

Circular pit from the “southeastern corner of Monastery plaza.” Packed earth and mud plaster in the floor of the *convento* patio, 81.28 cm. in diameter by 73.66 cm. deep (2’ 8” by 2’ 5”). National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N07210). Photograph attributed to the Hendricks-Hodge expedition, probably Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1920.
7.125 Matsaki Polychrome sink (*sacrarium or lavabo*), from against the wall in the southeast side of the patio courtyard, with reconstructed profile. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (096960.000). Photo and drawing by the author.

7.126 View of the front range of the Purísima Concepción *convento*, looking southeast with stairwell (Room 29) in foreground and *portería* (Room 36) at middle ground. The northeast ambulatory corridor and patio are visible at right. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05811). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.
7.127 View of the side range of the Purísima Concepción convento, looking southwest. At the center is the southeast ambulatory walk with opening to the service convent at the end. Room 9 flanks it to the left, and the open patio is to the right. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05739). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

7.128 View of the back range of the Purísima Concepción convento, looking towards northwest with the church nave and pueblo ruins in the background. In the foreground is the mission kitchen (Room 13). In the middle ground are (from left to right) Rooms 14/17/18, the southwest walk of the ambulatory, and the open patio. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05738). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

7.130 Excavation of southwest ambulatory hallway in progress, with a cross-section of the stratified fill visible at the end of the hallway under the remnants of post-mission Room 20. Dark patches on the floor are from the fire that partially destroyed the mission. The kitchen (Room 13) is visible in the foreground. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05740). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.
7.131 Charred remnant of a furniture leg, found in the southwest ambulatory corridor (Room 10). National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (095669.000). Photograph by the author.

7.133 Original *convento* stairwell (Room 29), with sandstone slab steps and post-mission walls still in place on the top and bottom steps. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05800). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

7.134 Excavation in progress of the *convento* stairway at the Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe Mission, Zuni (Halona) Pueblo. The sockets of the log sills embedded in the church wall are visible ascending from lower left to upper right, with a string marking their slope. The opening of the choir doorway is visible at upper left. 1966, Western Archaeology and Conservation Center Photo Archives, cat. 68455.
7.135 Drawings of profile and plan of stairwell, Halona (Zuni) Pueblo’s mission, Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe Excavation Field Note Book Number 1, pg. 13, by Russell Jones, September 28, 1966. Western Archaeology and Conservation Center, Jim Trott Archives, not fully accessioned, presently in Box 3, SWRO Architectural Conservation program, Archaeology Records.

7.136 Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe, Zuni (Halona) Pueblo. North corner of convento in the process of excavation, showing the remains of the choir-loft doorway on the second floor, above the stairwell. Photo by Louis R. Caywood, Western Archaeology and Conservation Center Photo Archives, cat. 68439.
Southeastern side of the restored Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe mission church in Zuni Pueblo, during the 2015 Harvest Dance. The left two windows are the original nave window locations, while the right window is the partially closed opening of the choir-loft doorway. Photo by the author.

Left: Red paint from the dados of the *convento*. Right: White paint from the *convento* dados. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (095690.000/095689.000). Photos by the author.


7.146 Lizard-like petroglyphs, part of a larger panel on the eastern side of El Morro National Monument, Cibola County, NM. Photo by the author, 2013.
Plan of Room 2/3/4/19 with alterations during mission and post-mission period. I have not included the hypothetical southeastern addition, because no direct evidence for its wall locations was recovered.

7.149  Room 19, looking southwest, with the adobe partition wall at left. The original doorway from the ambulatory into Room 2/3/4/19 is visible at center, with whitewashed jambs and uncolored, post-mission fill. The floor is the original adobe brick pavement, and a secondary mission-era fireplace sits in the southern corner. The rectangular sunken fireplace was presumably added in the post-mission period. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05783). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.
7.150  Post-mission occupation level of Room 3, showing its final configuration. The blocked-up remnant of the original mission window, visible in the upper middle of the photograph with its inwardly splayed jambs, has been transformed into a wall niche with a small platform in front. Also notable is an early spur-wall fireplace arrangement at the middle left, with an upright jamb still in place, presumably a support for the lintel and smoke hood. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05765). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

7.151  Sketch of Room 19 plan, convento of the Purísima Concepción. Note the blocked-up doorway to the ambulatory, indicated by dotted line and incomplete jambs at top of drawing. Page 106 of the “Church and Monastery” field notebook, by Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919. Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library (Archives 9170, Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition papers).

7.154 Side range of the Purísima Concepción convento, looking southwest. The remnants of Room 7 are visible in the foreground, with a post-mission partition wall at center, and blocked-up remnants of renovation-period doorway at right. Adobe curbed fireplace in southern corner (middle left) is probably the original mission-period hearth, while the more rudimentary slab fireplace in the western corner is probably a later addition. Rooms 9 and 13 are visible in the background. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05771). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

7.155 View of the Purísima Concepción convento excavations in progress, looking west. Room 9 is in the foreground, with post-mission partition wall in the middle stacked with artifacts. Doorway to ambulatory is open at middle right. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05737). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

7.158 Detail of Room 9 post-mission partition wall, with artifacts on top, including semi-circular stone slab possibly from a hatchway. On top of the slab is half of a cylindrical ceramic artifact, probably part of a hybrid candle holder. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (detail of N05773). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.


7.161 Convento kitchen of the Purísima Concepción (Room 13) looking northeast, with adobe brick bin in foreground, secondary or post-mission partition wall at center, and paved work bench with raised cooking partitions at back. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05777). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

7.164 View of the southwestern range of the convento, with the kitchen (Room 13) visible in the foreground, and Room 14/17/18 in the middle ground (left) next to the ambulatory and patio (right). The sacristy complex is visible in the background along the church nave, with the windows of Room 25 and its bonding seam with the church wall visible. The identity of the woman visitor in the ambulatory is unknown. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05741). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

7.166  Detail of Room 14/17/18 sill with slab pavement. At mid-right is a ground hole which may be a kiva loom anchor. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (detail of N05781). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.
7.167 Spatial arrangement of the Purísima Concepción. Hearths in red; locked, unheated rooms in blue; locked heated rooms in yellow; and unlocked heated rooms in orange.
8.2 Plan of the Purísima Concepción Mission of Hawikku Pueblo, with alterations and additions highlighted. Based on Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, *The Excavation*; field notes by Victor and Cosmos Mindeleff, NAA Mss. 2621; and my own analysis.
8.3 Purísima Concepción mission, looking southwest through the nave towards the apse location. The adobe rise at left marks the gospel nave wall, and the epistle wall was just inside the stone retaining wall at right. Photo taken near the gospel façade buttress, by the author, 2011.

8.4 Remnants of the retaining wall marking the position of the nave wall and baptistery of the Purísima Concepción, looking south. Photo by the author, 2011.
8.5 Retaining wall, marking the baptistery of the Purísima Concepción, looking west. Photo by the author, 2014.

8.6 Detail of the retaining wall, showing the two wythes of its construction, a distinction visible in the vertical face at the center of the picture. Photo by the author, 2015.

8.10 Detail of a fire-damaged *viga* section from the ceiling of the sacristy addition (Room 25), oriented according to its likely original position, with a bead cut into the less exposed face which probably faced up, against the ceiling. Hawikku, NM, 1919. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (detail of N05803). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

8.12 Pit at the southwest end of Room 25, with adobe dais and burnt wooden sill at right. Nusbaum found the pit filled with charred remnants of the sacristy furnishings. A slab with mortices (095684.000) is visible at lower left against the wall. An hourglass-shaped piece of cut wooden ornament (probably 095677.000-1) appears near the center of the photograph in front of the second cluster of artifacts. The picture frame (095681.000) appears above that cluster in upper center. Hawikku, NM, 1919. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05797). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

8.13 Nusbaum’s sketches of the Purísima Concepción’s sacristy extension (Room 25) plan and cross-section of its dais construction. Page 118 of the “Church and Monastery” field notebook, by Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919. Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library (Archives 9170, Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition papers).
8.14 Ross G. Montgomery’s speculative, inaccurate reconstruction of a full-scale retablo and altar at the southwest end of the Purísima Concepción’s sacristy extension (Room 25). The archaeological evidence does not support this conjectural arrangement. After Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, *The Excavation*, fig. 33.

8.15 Wooden sacristy cabinets (*cajonería*) on a raised stone dais. Cathedral of Mexico City, sacristy enclosed in 1623 and equipped for use by 1626, with paintings added 1684-1686. Photo by the author, 2010.

8.17 Wooden slab with cut mortices, from the pit behind the dais of the Purísima Concepción sacristy extension (Room 25). National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (095684.000). Photos by the author.

8.19 Wooden picture frame with grooved front and lapped corner joints with wooden pins, from the pit behind the dais of Room 25. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (095681.000). On display at the A:shiwi A:wan Museum and Heritage Center, photo by the author.


8.23 Northwestern wall of the Purísima Concepción sacristy extension (Room 25), showing mural painting, paved floor, low doorway to unexcavated Room 30, charred viga remnant, and bonding seam with original church and convento. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05803). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

8.26 Polychromed candlestick with white diamonds on red ground, from the Purísima Concepción sacristy extension (Room 25). Collected 1919, National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (096971.000). Photos by the author.

8.28 View of the Purísima Concepción sacristy extension closet (Room 30), charred wooden artifacts in situ. Taken from the southwest wall looking northeast, with the low doorway at upper right. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05801). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

8.29 View of the Purísima Concepción sacristy extension closet (Room 30), charred wooden artifacts in situ. Taken from the northeast wall looking southwest, with the low doorway at lower left. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05802). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.
8.30 Nusbaum’s sketch of the Purísima Concepción’s sacristy extension closet (Room 30) plan with artifact locations. Page 128 of the “Church and Monastery” field notebook, by Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919. Cornell Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections (Archives 9170, Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition papers).

8.31 Charred wooden candlestick, turned from a single piece of wood. From the floor of the Purísima Concepción’s sacristy extension closet (Room 30). National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (095668.000). On display at the A:shiwi A:wan Museum and Heritage Center; photo by the author.
8.32 Left: Charred wooden column from the floor of the Purísima Concepción’s sacristy extension closet (Room 30). National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (095642). On display at the A:shiwi A:wani Museum and Heritage Center, photo by the author. Right: Nusbaum’s sketch of the Room 30 column with dimensions and tenons. From Jesse L. Nusbaum’s letter to George Gustav Heye, October 8, 1919, National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution [Papers of Jesse Logan Nusbaum, Box 3, “Geo. Heye- Heye Museum Am. Indian”].


8.36 Cylindrical marble base with central drilled hole, conical wooden insert, and woven covering. Burnt in the mission fire, it was believed to have been a base or stand. From the Purísima Concepción sacristy extension closet (Room 30). Collected 1919, National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (095682.000). Photos by the author.
8.37 Detail of the service patio area, looking southwest from the Purísima Concepción mission church. Raised stone alignments from the mission’s service patio are visible beyond the apse, along with the remnants of a single upright post in the lower right. A deep deposition of backdirt from the excavations appears in the background. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (detail of N04697). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

8.38 Looking southwest from the apse of the Purísima Concepción mission church. The raised stone alignments from the walls of the mission’s service patio are visible in foreground, along with the remnants of a single upright post in the lower right. Excavations of the pueblo roomblocks are visible in the background, while a deep deposition of removed backdirt appears at middle left. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N04704). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.
8.39 Detail of panorama showing the partially excavated back walls of the service patio at center, as exposed in 1920. The sacristy extension (Room 25) is visible at lower right, and the piles of backdirt in the foreground are from clearing the mission con vento walls. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N07211-N07213). Frederick Webb Hodge (or more likely Jesse L. Nusbaum), panorama digitally reconstructed by the author.

8.40 Crushed fragment of a small copper bell, found in the service patio area, south of Rooms 25 and 30, perhaps in the process of clearing the exterior of the mission walls. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (096955.000). Photos by the author.
8.41 Triangular pottery smoother, with no visible painted ornament (lower left, 096958.000); two painted pottery sherd scrapers, Matsaki Polychrome and Hawikuh Polychrome ware (top, 096957.000); and unornamented pottery sherd scraper (lower right, 096956.000). All from the service patio area south of Rooms 25 and 30, collected 1919. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution. Photos by the author.

8.42 Two grooved groundstone axes with battered ends, from outside the southeast wall of the Purísima Concepción sacristy extension (Room 25). Collected 1919, National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (095649.000). Photos by the author.

8.44 Overgrown mound of the Purísima Concepción mission site prior to excavation in 1917, photographed from the ridgetop looking roughly southeast. The nave walls and stone retaining wall are visible in the middle-ground as long, exposed mounds, with the convento remnants beyond. The possible second-story of the convento’s eastern renovation appear as a stone-covered mound beyond the church, next to the darker strip of vegetation marking a drainage gully southeast of the mission. Stone alignment and several post remnants of the service patio are visible at middle-right. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N01913). Frederick Webb Hodge, 1917.
8.45 Grinding room (Room 5) in the eastern addition to the *convento*, looking toward the south. The partially disassembled grinding bin with six *manos* is in the foreground, with a large corner fireplace at middle left, and the cut-away traces of the corner buttress in the upper right. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05769). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

8.46 Storage or residential room (Room 6) in the *convento*’s eastern addition, looking northwest. A fireplace is visible in the upper right (northern) corner, which may mark the level of a second occupational level, as may an apparent trace of a flat floor surface in the lower right corner. The rectangular *mano* at center was apparently found in situ on the floor. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05770). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.
8.47 Site of the Purísima Concepción mission looking northeast, with the fence line along the southeast side of the *convento* ruins. The berm of backdirt from the excavations remains visible to the right of the fence. Photo by the author, 2011.

8.48 Stairwell of the eastern addition to the *convento* (Room 1), with partition wall separating it from Room 7 at right. The adobe steps of the stair are visible in the bottom of the excavation, beneath two post-mission fireplaces on pedestals of fill and a post-mission partition wall across the second step. The shadowed lip and riser of another step embedded in the wall are visible at the upper left, continuing the flight of stairs. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05761). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.
8.49 Eastern addition stairwell (Room 1) in the process of excavation, looking northwest. Mission period adobe treads visible lower center. Two post-mission occupation levels are visible: the later, upper level with a spur wall fireplace and packed adobe floor; and the earlier, lower level with a slab-paved floor. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05757). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

8.50 Detail of the English-bond partition wall, inserted into Room 7 to create the Room 1 stairwell during the eastern addition to the convento, looking northeast. Although subtle, bonding seams can be traced at either end of the wall, indicating it was not originally part of the plan. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (detail of N05778). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.
8.51 Nusbaum’s profile drawing of the Room 1 stairwell, and post-mission reoccupation levels. Page 42 of the “Church and Monastery” field notebook, by Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919. Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library (Archives 9170, Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition papers).

8.52 Eastern addition stairwell (Room 1) during excavation, looking south, with mission period adobe treads visible beneath the post-mission occupation levels. The seam of another step embedded in the wall is visible at upper left, continuing the flight of stairs beneath subsequent fill and plaster. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05760). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.
8.53 Detail of the partition wall added during mission renovations to create Room 19, with the remains of the new fireplace in the corner, and the whitewashed jamb of the original doorway (filled) in the back. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (detail of N05783). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

8.54 Detail of artifacts on the wall between Rooms 4, 19, and 8, including part of a rooftop hatchway, a pair of mano blanks or fireplace jambs, ceramic sherds, a cylindrical fragment of a ceramic candle holder (middle right), and additional manos. The sill of Room 4’s doorway, the Room 19 partition wall, and the original, filled doorway of Room 19 are visible in the background. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (detail of N05744). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.
8.55 View of the eastern corner and southeastern range of the Purísima Concepción convento, looking south. Rooms 2, 3, and 4 are visible in the foreground with the filled doorway and adobe sill of Room 4’s renovated doorway visible at right. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05743). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

8.56 View of the eastern corner and southeastern range of the Purísima Concepción convento, looking south. Rooms 5, 6, and 8 are visible in the foreground, with artifacts on the wall between them and Rooms 2, 3, 4, and 19. The Room 4 doorway has been cleared, as has most of the rest of the convento. A block of unexcavated fill remains in situ in the center of the patio at middle right, and a large mound of removed backdirt in distance at right. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05744). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.
8.57 Rooms 17 and 18 (foreground) with excavations proceeding on the mission sacristy (Room 21, background), looking northwest. The adobe brick pavement in the foreground is probably a mission period alteration, with two slab-lined fireplaces inserted as part of the renovation. The interior partition walls belong to post-mission alterations. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05813). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

8.58 Room 18, looking southeast across the back range of the Purísima Concepción convento. The floor in the foreground is probably a mission-period pavement of adobe bricks. Excavators apparently removed several pavers in the middle ground to reveal the original, stained earth floor of Room 14/17/18 beneath. The wall at middle is probably a post-mission partition, as are the lower walls at front and right. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05782). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.
8.59 View of the western façade of Acoma’s San Esteban mission, with the church at left and post-and-lintel opening of the portería at center. The second-story and mirador with massive stone buttresses are visible at right. Adam Clark Vroman, black and white gelatin glass negative, 1899. National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution (06353400).

8.60 Portería with carved posts supporting corbelled impost blocks of the San Ildefonso mission, probably dating to the 1701-1711 reconstruction phase. Photograph by Charles F. Lummis, 1889. PICT 000-675 NJS, Box 12, Vol. 5, page 61, Carlos Vierra Collection of New Mexico Architecture, in the John Gaw Meem collection of non-job-specific photos, Special Collections and Center for Southwest Research, University of New Mexico Libraries, Albuquerque, NM.
Plan of the Plaza del Cerro, Chimayo, as it appeared in 1975, with traces of the original fortified plaza forming a rectangle at center. Santa Fe County, NM. Established c. 1730, and heavily restored in subsequent years. After Historic American Buildings Survey, NM,20-CHIM,1- (sheet 1 of 2).
8.62 Spatial arrangement of the Purísima Concepción. Unlocked, unheated rooms in green; locked, unheated rooms in light blue; locked heated rooms in yellow; and unlocked heated rooms in magenta. Rooms for which access was probably controlled by increased segregation, vertical entry, and possibly closed hatchways are in dark orange (heated) and dark blue (unheated).
9.1 *The Conquest of Tunis*, woven by Wilhelm Pannemakere after designs by Jan Cornelisz Vermeyen and Pieter Coecke van Aelst I, for Charles V, tapestry, c. 1548-1554. After https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Real_Alc%C3%A1zar._Sal%C3%B3n_de_los_Tapices._Pa%C3%B1o_IX_Saqueo_de_T%C3%BAnes.jpg (accessed October 6, 2017).

9.3 Pueblo of Zuni, Plan of Middle Village, 1972. Created by James Lamsam, Historic American Buildings Survey, NM,16-ZUNIP,1- (sheet 1 of 6). With the mission (blue), plazas (yellow), and kiva locations (red) highlighted, and the original seventeenth-century town located in the upper left.

9.4 Zuni Pueblo from the north, on NM Highway 53. These houses are built around the plazas and on top of mounded, buried remains of Halona:wa North. Photo by the author, 2011.
9.5 South side of Zuni Pueblo, looking southeast along Sunshine Street. Photo by the author, 2011.

9.7 Excavation of the *convento* of Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe at Halona (Zuni) Pueblo. View is from near the front entryway (the *portería*), looking west towards the nave and apse of the church. Western Archaeology and Conservation Center Photo Archives, cat. 68,442. Louis R. Caywood, August 29, 1966.

9.9 Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe at the time of restoration (dark gray) and the archaeological remains of the original church plan and convento, as uncovered in 1966 (light gray). Drawing by Russell Jones, November 30, 1966. Historic American Buildings Survey NM,16-ZUNIP,2.
9.10 Comparison of the Hawikku (top) and Halona (bottom) mission plans, at the same scale. North is up, determined by comparison to Google satellite maps, while compasses show the orientation as recorded in the excavation documentation. Drawings by the author.
Comparison of the inter-cardinal plans of San Carlos Borromeo (Carmel, CA; top), San Bernardo (Awatovi Pueblo, AZ; middle) and the Kechiba:wa visita chapel (bottom), at the same scale. North is up, determined by comparison to Google satellite maps, while compasses show the orientation recorded with the original plans. Drawings by the author. After plans by the California Historical Survey Commission (Historic American Buildings Survey, CAL,27-CARM.1—64); J.O. Brew (“The Excavation of Franciscan Awatovi,” fig. 4); and the Mindeleff surveys.
9.12 Arial view of Zuni Pueblo and mission, with excavations of *convento* in progress, looking from north to south. Western Archaeology and Conservation Center, reversed from photo negative 68418. Anonymous photographer, 1966.

9.13 View of the Halona mission church choir loft prior to excavation and restoration, October 12, 1965. The beams of the choir loft are still anchored in place, as is one of the supporting posts. Western Archaeology and Conservation Center, “Excavation, Stabilization, and Partial Restoration Estimates for the Mission of Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe de Zuni, Zuni, New Mexico,” fig. 35.
9.14 Plan of Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe Mission, Zuni Pueblo, NM. Based on HABS drawings by Russell Jones, Ferguson and Mills (Archaeological Investigations at Zuni Pueblo, 7, 175-177), and my own analysis.
9.15 Excavation of the church nave and apse, looking southwest towards the apse, with workman Richard Ponteak at center, 1966. Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe, Zuni Pueblo, NM. Western Archaeology and Conservation Center Photo Archives, cat. 68,467.

9.16 Detail of the painted beams, *latillas*, and earthen floor of the Halona mission church choir loft in 1966, representing post-Pueblo Revolt reconstruction. Western Archaeology and Conservation Center Photo Archives, cat. 68,474.
9.17 Blocked-up doorway of the Zuni sacristy during excavations, with wooden lintel and sandstone sill in place. Western Archaeology and Conservation Center Photo Archives, cat. 68,476. Louis R. Caywood, September 20, 1966.

9.18 Doorway from the sotocoro to the baptistery, looking southeast into the church, during excavations. Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe at Halona (Zuni) Pueblo. Western Archaeology and Conservation Center Photo Archives, cat. 68,500. Louis R. Caywood, October 5, 1966.

9.20 Detail of the façade and remains of the *convento*, Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe Mission, Zuni, NM. Drawn by Capt. S. Eastman, from Richard H. Kern’s 1849 sketch, and engraved by J. C. McRae, for Henry R. Schoolcraft, *Information Respecting the History*, vol. IV, pl. 2. See also figure 4.45.

9.22 Halona *convento* during excavations, looking northeast. The adobe bricks visible in the foreground are the remnants of the northwest patio wall. In the upper center a remnant of the wall between the stairwell and *portería* is visible. The present stone wall of the *camposanto* fills the former opening of the *portería*. Western Archaeology and Conservation Center Photo Archives, cat. 68,476. Louis R. Caywood, September 28, 1966.
9.23 Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe mission, Zuni Pueblo. Friar’s cell in the east corner of convento in the process of excavation, looking southwest from church. The man in the pit stands just in front of the spur-wall fireplace. The raised sill of the doorway is in front of him. Western Archaeology and Conservation Center Photo Archives, cat. 68,496. Louis R. Caywood, October 4, 1966.

9.24 East corner of convento in the process of excavation, looking southeast. The main floor level with adobe brick pavement is exposed, with four inset postholes visible, and a pit where the exterior wall originally stood (lower left). Western Archaeology and Conservation Center Photo Archives, cat. 68,488. Louis R. Caywood, September 28, 1966.
9.25 Detail of Test Pit 5, southeast juncture of *celda* with southeastern range of rooms, showing stone foundations. Western Archaeology and Conservation Center Photo Archives, cat. 68502. Louis R. Caywood, October 14, 1966.

9.27 South corner of *convento* in the process of excavation, looking northwest towards the church. The trench in the foreground shows the exposed adobe bricks of the southwest ambulatory wall, with the remnants of the sacristy and blocked-up sacristy door in the background. Western Archaeology and Conservation Center Photo Archives, cat., 68471. Louis R. Caywood, October 4, 1966.


9.30  Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe Church, oriented with the façade towards the rising sun around the time of the summer solstice.  Zuni Pueblo, NM.  Photo by the author, June 20, 2017, at 6:20 AM.
9.31 Comparison of the Hawikku and Halona mission plans, at the same scale and orientation, illustrating the process of doubling the square. Drawings by the author.

9.32 Plan of the San Esteban del Rey mission, Acoma Pueblo, Cibola County, NM. After the various Historic American Buildings Survey drawings from 1934, NM.31-ACOMP.2. See also figure 9.33.
9.33 Cloister-plan *convento* of the San Esteban del Rey mission, Acoma Pueblo, Cibola County, NM. Detail of figure 9.32.


9.36 North stratigraphic test (at center) in the patio of the San Esteban del Rey *convento*, Acoma Pueblo. In the pit, the stone bench and foundations of the patio walls are visible, as are remnants of a wall transecting the patio from north to south, possibly part of an original quadripartite division of the space. Anonymous photographer, c. 1975. New Mexico Historic Preservation Division Archives, SR 23.
9.37 Plan view of the features of the south stratigraphic test area in the patio of the San Esteban del Rey convento, Acoma Pueblo. The stone foundations of the convento walls formed a bench around the patio (top), and the wall and socket feature of the early mission period (feature 2 at center). After Marshall, 1978, *Investigations*, 97, fig. 13.

9.38 Plan of San Guillermo (Augustinian), Totolapan, Morelos, built c. 1536-1545. Note the crossing paths of the convento patio, the original arrangement of this space as uncovered through archaeological excavations. After Ledesma Gallegos, *Tradición y expression de los patio*, 94.
9.39 Acoma *convento* with the latrine of the southwest corner visible at lower center. By A. C. Vroman, 1899. National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution [06353800].

9.41 Illustrations documenting mural painting from the ambulatory of San Esteban del Rey, Acoma Pueblo. Top: Antelope from the east wall of the east ambulatory (left) and photograph of the antelope, with rainbow mural visible on an earlier layer beneath it (right). Bottom: Elk, from the north wall of the south ambulatory (left) and section of a rainbow (right). Recorded by Michael P. Marshall, 1976. New Mexico Historic Preservation Division Archives, SR 23.


9.44 Plan of San Gregorio mission, Abó Pueblo, as originally constructed, c. 1630, with *convento* kiva and arcaded patio. After Ivey, *In the Midst*, 63.

Splayed window of the enclosed west wall of the patio, San Gregorio mission, Abó Pueblo. First constructed 1623-1628, the truncated wall foundation in midground marks the location of the original arcade. The walls behind are renovations of 1640-1645, and 1651-1657/58. Photo by the author, 2011.
9.47 Plan of the Nuestra Señora de la Purísima Concepción Mission, Quarai Pueblo, as originally designed, c. 1632. Note the square *convento* kiva in the arcaded patio, as well as the long hallway to the southeast. After Ivey, *In the Midst*, 119.

9.48 Plan of the Nuestra Señora de la Purísima Concepción Mission, Quarai Pueblo, after enclosure of the patio and other renovations to the *convento*, c. 1670. After Ivey, *In the Midst*, 149.
9.49 Continuous back hallway, from the convento of La Purísima Concepción mission, Quarai Pueblo. Designed by Juan Gutiérrez de la Chica and built 1626-1632, with renovations in the late 1650s. Photo by the author, 2011.

9.50 Cloister patio from the convento of La Purísima Concepción mission, Quarai Pueblo, looking east across the rectangular convento kiva. Designed by Juan Gutiérrez de la Chica and built 1626-1632, with renovations in the late 1650s. Photo by the author, 2011.
9.51 Rounded corner revetment from the late 1650s renovation of the cloister of the La Purísima Concepción mission, Quarai Pueblo, looking east across the rectangular convento kiva. Photo by the author, 2011.


9.55 Plan illustrating the initial constructions of Fray Pedro de Ortega (mid-1620 to 1621), Nuestra Señora de las Ángeles mission and convento, Pecos Pueblo. After Ivey, *The Spanish Colonial*, 312.


9.58 Stabilized ruins of the Nuestra Señora de las Ángeles mission and *convento* at Pecos. The visible remains are from the eighteenth century reconstruction of the mission, but this patio partly follows Juárez’s constricted renovation of the cloister plan, built in the early 1630s. The north and east walls (left and upper left) are in the same position as the originals, while the south and west walls were relocated (foreground and upper right). The Juárez floor was also paved with sandstone slabs. Photo by the author, 2011.
9.59  NPS restoration of the Juárez convento kiva at Pecos, dated c. 1620-1640 (foreground), with stabilized ruins of the seventeenth and eighteenth-century conventos visible middle ground, and the remains of the eighteenth-century church in the background. Photo by the author, 2011.

9.60  Interior and detail of mission-era adobe bricks in the Juárez convento kiva at Pecos, as restored by the NPS, dated c. 1620-1640. Photos by the author, 2011.


9.64 Panorama of the site of the San José mission, Giusewa Pueblo, NM. The photo is taken from within the *convento*, with the church at left. The ridge behind the mission is visible at center, and the tributary canyon limiting its extension is at right behind the wall remnants. Photos by the author, 2011.
9.65 The site of Awatovi Pueblo from above, with the mission site circled on the edge of Antelope Mesa. From Google Earth, 2017.


9.70 Reconstruction of the Apalachee settlement and mission of San Luis de Talimali, FL, plan with separate *convento* and church structures facing the town plaza. After Hahn and McEwan, *The Apalachee Indians*, 72, 90.

9.72 Two-story, single-range addition to conventual house of San Francisco de Belvís de Monroy, Extremadura, Spain, probably dating c. 1592-1628. Door to refectory at left, celdas at right. Photo by the author, 2015.


9.76 Church and single-range *convento* (at right) of the ex-Franciscan mission of the Purísima Concepción de Acuña, San Antonio, TX. Established 1730s, convento rebuilt c. 1756-1762. Photo by the author, 2014.


9.89 Patio elevation of the *convento* of San Francisco in Trujillo, Extremadura. Established in 1500, and rebuilt/extensively renovated between 1562 and 1600, with masons Francisco Becerra, García Carrasco, and Francisco Sánchez overseeing various stages of the work. Photo by the author, 2015.


9.93 First-stage open church and possible residence of the ex-Franciscan *convento* of San Miguel, Huejotzingo, State of Puebla, Mexico. This construction appears to date to 1524-1530. After Córdova Tello, *El Convento de San Miguel*, 59, fig. 19.
9.94 Ex-Franciscan mission of San Miguel, Huejotzingo, State of Puebla, Mexico. The second stage of construction dates to c. 1530-1545, while the final construction took place from 1545-1580. After Córdova Tello, El Convento de San Miguel, 91, fig. 39.


9.100 Detail of Jerusalem from the Madaba Mosaic Map, now within the church of St. George in Madaba, Jordan, c. 542-570. Photo by the author, 2016.
9.101 Left: Detail of plan of Jerusalem, known as the *Uppsala Map*, 1100s. Uppsala University Library C 673, f. LXXXVI, or possibly C691 f39v, associated with the *Gesta Francorum*, copied by Robert le Moine de Reims, c. 13th century, French. Right: Detail of plan of Jerusalem, from a fragment of a Psalter (The Hague, KB, 76 f5), c. 1200s, after Lara, *City, Temple, Stage*, 123, fig. 4.11.

9.102 Hereford *mappa mundi*, with Jerusalem circled, attributed to Richard of Haldingham and Lafford, c. 1285, ink on vellum, English.
9.103 Ebstorf *mappa mundi*, with Jerusalem circled, c. 1300 CE, north German, painted goatskin.


9.107 Plan of the New Temple, following Ezekiel, by Nicolaus de Lyra. From Hartmann Schedel’s Nuremberg Chronicle, 1493. The plan shows the entire Temple compound, with the building itself in upper center, with green interior walls marking the three-part division. After Lara, City, Temple, Stage, 130, fig. 4.21.

9.108 Jerusalem with the Dome of the Rock as the Solomonic Temple, interior lunette of central arch of the tramezzo screen, Chiesa di Santa Maria degli Angioli, Lugano, Switzerland (Franciscan), 1538-1540, fresco. Photo by the author, 2018.
9.109 The Heavenly City of Jerusalem with the Dome of the Rock as Temple, Juan Gerson, c. 1562, *sotocoro* painting of the Asunción de Nuestra Señora Mission, Tecamachalco (Franciscan), State of Puebla, Mexico. After Lara, *City, Temple, Stage*, 82, fig. 2.49.

9.110 John’s vision of the celestial Jerusalem from Revelations 21, engraving by Adriaen Collaert after Maarten de Vos, c. 1600, in *Et Vitam Aeternam/The Apostle’s Creed*. The British Museum, Nn.7.4.28.
9.111  Expulsion from the Garden of Eden, relief from the façade of the Cathedral of Orvieto, by Maitini, 1300s, marble. Note the tree of knowledge with the serpent at the center of the garden, in front of an octagonal well or spring with the four rivers of Eden springing from its corners. After Oppenheimer, *The Monuments of Italy*, III, pl. 125.


9.114 Mural painting of the Immaculate Conception flanked by Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus. *Convento* of San Miguel Arcangel, Huejotzingo, State of Puebla, Mexico (c. 1545 to 1580). Note the numerous Marian symbols surrounding her with connections to the cloister plan and garden, including trees, the fountain, the City of God, the well, and the enclosed garden (lower right). Photo by the author, 2010.


9.119  Fountain with modern reconstruction (left) and remains of a water tank (aljibe, right), ex-Franciscan *convento* of San Francisco del Berrocal, Belvís de Monroy, Extremadura, Spain. Initially constructed by Fray Pedro Melgar, 1505-1509, with later alterations. Photos by the author, 2015.

9.120  “*La Conchita*” fountain on the exterior of the atrium’s northwest corner, ex-Franciscan mission of San Miguel Arcángel, Huejotzingo, State of Puebla, Mexico (c. 1545 to 1580). Once one of at least four perimeter fountains for use by the Indigenous *barrios*, this is the only example to survive. Photos by the author, 2010.

9.123 Large, square kiva at Homol’ovi II, Winslow, AZ. Site occupied c. 1330-1400 CE. Photo by the author, 2015.


9.127 Small sixteenth-century atrial cross from ex-Franciscan mission of Asunción de Nuestra Señora, Tlaxcala, Mexico. Established 1524-1527, present convento begun 1537-1540. Interestingly, the “N” of “INRI” on this rustically carved example is reversed in the same manner as the plaque from Hawikku. Photos by the author, 2010.
9.129 Sandstone slab with “IИRI” pecked into it, and highlighted with white kaolin or paint. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (093637.000). Photo by the author.

10.1 Zuni heritage corn in different colors, from the collections of the National Museum of Natural History, Washington, DC. Photo by the author, 2016.
10.2 Carving of a Zuni Corn Maiden, by Marilyn Quam, 4 cm. tall. Made from an unidentified stone and turquoise, 2017. The gridded pattern of her dress evokes the texture of an ear of corn. In the collection of the author.

10.3 Bi-faced carving of a Zuni Corn Maiden, artist unknown, signature appears to be “FR,” 6 cm. tall. Amethyst, turquoise, shell, and ink, purchased 2015. In the collection of the author.

10.6 Detail of the Hawikku mission kitchen plan, with the hearth highlighted in red, the working benches in blue, and the storage bin in green. See figures 7.46 and 8.1 for the full plan.

10.7 Detail of the work bench and hearth with adobe partitions and the charred northeastern wall behind it. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (detail of N05777). Jesse L. Nusbaum.

10.9 Detail of Purísima Concepción convento kitchen firebox, partially excavated, looking west with raised working surface to left and individual fireboxes divided by adobe brick partitions at right. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05780). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

10.11 Undated wall-length hooded fireplace with floor-level cooking in a Cochiti house. After George P. Hammond and Agapito Rey, *Expedition into Mexico Made by Antonio de Espejo, 1582-1583*, plate III.

10.13 Fireplaces in the castle of Belvís de Monroy, Extremadura, Spain. Hernán Pérez del Boste built the original fortress in the late 1200s, which the Monroy family converted into a palace residence in the 1500s. Photos by the author, 2015.
Cross-section illustration of a typical smoke bay and brick chimney in the region of Badajoz, Extremadura, Spain. After Alberto González Rodríguez, “Las Chimeneas,” fig. 3.


10.20 Photomontage of the kitchen in the *convento* of Santa María de las Ángeles, Churubusco, Distrito Federal, Mexico. The room in the back is a smoke bay, which includes an open hearth to the left (not visible) while smaller, raised burners line the wall in the foreground. Franciscan/Discalced Franciscan, established 1520s, present fabric from the 1600s to 1700s. Today the Museo Nacional de las Intervenciones. Photos by the author, 2010.

10.21 Raised cooking range with four separate burners and arched storage for firewood beneath, finished in tile revetments. In the kitchen of the Dominican administered convent of Santa Rosa, Puebla, Mexico. Built in the 1600s. After Stoopen, *Artes de Mexico*, 34.

10.24 Cross-section diagram of cooking stations comprising the wall-length hearth of the Purísima Concepción kitchen (Room 13), looking northeast. Reconstructed with a cooking pot and stone griddle in place on the raised burners of stations 2 and 3. Figure is 1.52 m. (5’) tall for scale.

10.25 Cross-section of the Purísima Concepción convento kitchen (Room 13), with firebox and working bench at right, looking northwest. Figure is 1.52 m. (5’) tall for scale.
10.26 Folded sheets of Zuni corn wafer bread (*dow hewe*), made by Ruth Haskey from blue corn for summer solstice observations. Photo by the author, 2017.

10.27 Detail of the greased surface of a stone griddle (*helashnakya ahle*) in raking light, found in the post-mission occupation floor of Room 22. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (093664.000). Photo by the author.

10.29 Modern hearth for Zuni corn wafer bread (*dow hewe*). The heirloom stone belonging to Ruth Haskey is set on a gas burning grill, with a wall-length ventilation hood. Photos by the author, 2017.

10.31 Details of a round griddle stone (093664.00) in situ but upside down in the post-mission floor of Room 22 (left), and after removal on top of the wall, with a smaller uncollected stone on top (right). National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (details of N05794 and N05792). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.
10.32 Top and bottom sides of a round griddle stone, sandstone, from the post-mission occupation floor of Room 22. Probably originally used in the mission-period *convento*. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (093664.000). Photos by the author.

10.33 Detail of interior and open point of access to the bin along the southwest wall of the mission kitchen (Room 13). National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (detail of N05777). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.
Details of three round timbers embedded in the southwest wall of Room 13 bin, probably supporting a shelf or rack. Left: detail of photograph showing the three holes in the wall. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (detail of N05743). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919. Right: Plan illustration from page 93 of the “Church and Monastery” field notebook, by Jesse L. Nusbaum. Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library (Archives 9170, Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition papers).

Hawikku domestic room (Room 194, first level, Block F) with a set of narrow bins along its end wall. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N06828). Photograph attributed to Frederick Webb Hodge (probably Jesse L. Nusbaum), 1920.
10.36 Hawikku domestic room (Room 214, first level, Block C) with a narrow bin along its far wall. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N06846). Photograph attributed to Frederick Webb Hodge (probably Jesse L. Nusbaum), 1920.

10.38 Hawikku domestic room (Room 151, first level, Block D) with a narrow bin made of low curbing in the far corner. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05821). Photograph attributed to Frederick Webb Hodge (probably Jesse L. Nusbaum), 1919.

10.39 Plan of Hawikku domestic room (Room 243, second level, Block C) with slab storage bin highlighted. Note the spaces between the slabs. Coffin, “Hawikuh Room Plans I,” 57. Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library (Archives 9170, Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition papers).

10.41  Large sherd of a badly burnt Hawikuh Polychrome jar, found in the southwest ambulatory walk of the Purísima Concepción mission (Room 10). Collected 1919. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (096981.000). Photos by the author.

10.43 Large *metate* grinding stone (NMAI 093638), collected at Hawikku in 1919, from the mission-period ambulatory (Room 15). The *mano* (093671.000) was collected in 1919 without recorded provenance, but is similar to those found in the mission. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution. Photo by the author.
10.44 Stone maul from ambulatory (Room 15) of the Purísima Concepción mission. Collected 1919. Note flat end and softer use wear (lower left), and the rounded end with hard-surface impact fractures (lower right). National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (095648.000). Photos by the author.

10.46 Cross-section of a *Hepalokia* pit oven, with bread dough and hot stone layers stacked inside. After Cushing, *Zuni Breadstuff*, plate XI.

10.47 *A Man Scraping Chocolate*, anonymous Spanish artist, c. 1680-1780, oil on canvas. North Carolina Museum of Art, Raleigh, Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Benjamin Cone, G.69.20.1.

Majolica hollowware sherds, probably from chocolate cups imported for the mission (jícaras), recovered during the Hawikku excavations. Clockwise, from upper right: Puebla Polychrome (c. 1660-1672, 101777.000-03); Puebla polychrome (3 sherds, 109173.000-03); Abó Polychrome (3 sherds, c. 1650-1672, 094217.000-04); and Abó Polychrome (1 rim sherd, drilled in corner and edges ground down, 074877.000).

National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution. Photos by the author.

10.52 Font at the entrance of the New Refectory, Monastery of San Jerónimo de Yuste (Hieronymite), Extremadura, Spain. Added to the monastery c. 1508-1547. Photo by the author, 2015.

10.53 Interior of the Upper Room Chapel or Cenacle, Mount Zion, Jerusalem. Rebuilt by the Augustinian Order, c. 1150-1175 CE, possessed by the Franciscans c. 1330s, with mihrab from Muslim reuse. Photo by the author, 2016.

10.56  Old Refectory, San Marco (Dominican), Florence, Italy. Rebuilt by Michelozzo, 1438 to c. 1443, further extended 1529. Photo by the author, 2014.

10.58  *Last Supper*, by Domenico Ghirlandaio, fresco, 1479-1480. In the small refectory of San Marco (Dominican), Florence, Italy. Photo by the author, 2014.


10.61 *Crucifix with the Tree of Life*, fresco by Tadeo Gaddi, 1300s. From the refectory of the Franciscan conventual house of Santa Croce, Florence, Italy. Photo by the author, 2014.
10.62 Detail of Vallombrosan friars in a medieval refectory, from the altarpiece of *St. John Gualbert Enthroned with Four Stories of His Life*, by Giovanni del Biondo, c. 1370, tempera on wood. From the former church of the nuns known as “Women of Faenza,” in the Vallambrosian Monastery of San Salvi, now in Santa Croce, Florence, Italy. Photo by the author, 2014.


10.65  New Refectory, Monastery of San Jerónimo de Yuste (Hieronymite), Extremadura, Spain. Added to the monastery c. 1508-1547, ceiling and wooden tables are not original. Photo by the author, 2015.


10.73 Refectory of the ex-Augustinian mission of San Agustín, Acolman, State of Hidalgo, Mexico. Today serving as the site museum. Built late 1540s-1560s, with fresco mural and ceiling ornament. Photo by the author, 2010.

10.75 Patio (right) and original site of the Sala de Profundis (left, with smooth walls and niches). Arched doorway at center-left leads into the refectory. Convento of the ex-Franciscan mission of San Miguel Arcangel, Huejotzingo, State of Puebla, Mexico. Built late 1540s-1570s. Photo by the author, 2010.
10.76 Plan of San Miguel Arcangel, Huejotzingo, as realized by the 1570s, with Sala de Profundis (blue), refectory (yellow), and kitchen (red) highlighted. After McAndrew, *The Open-Air Churches*, 135, fig. 29.

10.78 Imported soup plates, from left to right: luster-ware (not to scale, mid-1600s, *convento* Room 25); fragments and complete plate in Mexico City Green on Cream (made from c. 1550s to the early 1700s); and San Luis Blue on White (made from c. 1550 to 1650). National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution, photos by the author.

10.80 Bottom and top of a small copper dish, flattened and ground in reuse. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (124544.000), photos by the author.

10.81 Ornamental glassware fragments from Hawikku. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (109218.000/086594.000-1), photos by the author.
Selected utilitarian glassware fragments from Hawikku. The brown bottle glass of the top row probably belongs to the nineteenth or early twentieth centuries. The rest are likely older. Where relevant, photos represent both sides of the fragment, or its color with backlighting. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution, photos by the author.
10.83 San Bernardo Polychrome soup plates, from Room 33 (sub-foundational room, possibly earliest phase of the Purísima Concepción mission establishment. Unpainted rim portions are reconstructed. Left: (096968.000) approximately 20 cm. diameter, on display in the A:shiwi A:wan Museum and Heritage Center, Zuni Pueblo, NM. Right: (096967.000) approximately 19.5 cm diameter, with annular ring base. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution, photos by the author.

10.84 San Bernardo Polychrome Soup plate sherds with Indigenous motifs, including on the left: four-directional dragonflies (double-barred crosses on red, 110281.001-1), collected from Room 339 (Block B), in 1921. Right: black-and-white sky bands, lozenge-shaped feathers, and stepped frets (109431.001 [sherd box 2/5]-1), from an unprovenanced sherd collection accessioned in 1921. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution, photos by the author.
10.85 Detail of the central fleury cross motif from San Bernardo Polychrome soup plate, found in Room 33. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (096968.000), photo by the author.

10.86 Red-colored Plainware soup plates with flat bottoms, from formal mission phase. Left: (096969.000) from the sacristy of the Purísima Concepción mission (Room 21), 20.2 cm diameter. Right: (093752.000) from Pueblo room 153, Block D, 17.9 cm diameter. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution, photos by the author.
10.87 Fragments of pharmaceutical jars (*albarelos*). Above: domed lid of a San Bernardo Polychrome jar (074890.000), found in the “old house ruins under western cemetery.” Bottom: rim sherd of a San Bernardo jar (109431.000). National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution, photos by the author.

10.89 Assorted candle holders from Hawikku. From left to right: tabletop candle holder (101676.000-2); conical base candlesticks including 096973.000 from mission Room 30; 096972.000 from Room 21; and 096974.000 from Room 11. Candlesticks are not to scale, and are presently on exhibit at the A:shiwi A:wan Museum and Heritage Center in Zuni Pueblo, and the George Gustav Heye Center in New York, NY. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution, photos by the author.

11.1 Three-dimensional cross-section rendering of the Purísima Concepción salero (096970.000), with arbitrary color, based on CT-Scans conducted at the NMNH.

11.3 Hawikku salero upside down as a “vase with annular ring,” in Nusbaum’s letter to George Gustav Heye (Oct. 8, 1919), highlighting added. National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution [Jesse Logan Nusbaum Papers, Geo. Heye-Heye Museum Am. Indian Folder].


11.7 Detail of a table setting with majolica or porcelain salt cellar with domed lid (circled), a Tonalá ware vase, and silver platters. From The Three Temptations of Christ, by Pascual Pérez, 1721, painted in Puebla, Mexico, oil on canvas. Now in the Conquistadora Chapel of the Cathedral of Santa Fe, NM. Photo by the author, 2016.
11.8 Broken sherd of an hourglass-shaped hollowware vessel, perhaps part of a conical-base salero or other similar form. Collected 1919, National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (101178.000-1), photos by the author.

11.9 Zuni Polychrome terraced bowl, c. 1875. After Lanmon and Harlow, *The Pottery of Zuni Pueblo*, 324, fig. 23.1.
11.10 Left: Motif signifying “All clouds meet[ing] together in Itiwana [sic, the Middle Place or Zuni].” Right: Motif signifying “Clouds quarreling with the rainbow […] but we [the Zuni in the Middle Place] shall have rains anyway, because the other clouds come above the rainbow.” After Bunzel, The Pueblo Potter, 98, figs. 28, 27.

11.11 Religious medal with the Immaculate Conception on one side, and the veneration of the Holy Name of Jesus on the other. Note the radiant halos around the Virgin and the Holy Name. From Room 395 (Block B), Hawikku. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (124534.000). Photos by the author.


11.15 Sherds with bobbin lace fan patterns (*encaje de bolillo*) from Puebla Polychrome vessels. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution, photos by the author.
11.16 San Bernardo Polychrome soup plate rim sherd, with patterns derived from Puebla Polychrome bobbin lace ornament. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (109431.001 [3 of 5]-3), photo by the author.


11.21 Jars with radiant tail feather motifs around the openings, from the Sikyatki site, First Mesa, AZ. After Fewkes, *Prehistoric Hopi*, pl. CXLII, c, b.


Sample of salt from the Zuni Salt Lake, collected by Frederick Webb Hodge in 1921. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (108767.000). Photo by the author.
12.2 Plan of the Purísima Concepción Mission of Hawikku Pueblo, illustrating the extent of fire damage as evident from the field notes and photographs. Drawing by the author.
Plan of the Purísima Concepción Mission of Hawikku Pueblo, with reoccupation rooms coded by use as a domestic space (yellow) or as a corral (blue). The reuse status of mauve spaces is uncertain, while unhighlighted spaces do not appear to have been reused. Hearths in red. Based on Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury, *The Excavation*; field notes by Victor and Cosmos Mindeleff, NAA Mss. 2621; and my own analysis. Drawing by the author.
12.4 Filled doorway from the sacristy (Room 21) into the ambulatory of the Purísima Concepción *convento*, looking northeast, Hawikku, NM. The stratified fill of the ambulatory corridor is visible above the slabs of the doorway sill, surmounted by slab foundations and adobe walls of post-mission Room 20, which abutted the remnant nave wall to the left.

12.5 Post-mission occupation level of Room 22-A, the southwest half of the reoccupied *trascelda*, Hawikku, NM. Hatchway ring and other artifacts visible on the walls, while slabs from the lining of the *trascelda* chimney flue are visible affixed to the wall in upper right corner, and a rounded griddle stone (093664.000) lies among the paving slabs.

12.7  Post-mission occupation level of Room 22-B, the northeast half of the reoccupied *trascelda* (foreground), with Room 22-A in the background, Hawikku, NM. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05793). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

12.9  Room 3 of the Purísima Concepción convento, looking southwest, Hawikku, NM. Room is partially excavated and exposes multiple walls and floor levels of occupation. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05767). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.
12.10  Final, post-mission occupation level of Rooms 3 and 2 of the Purísima Concepción convento, looking northeast, Hawikku, NM. Note spur walls in both late-occupation rooms, and the filled window turned into a niche at the back of Room 3. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05764). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

12.12 Shallow, circular mortar, from Room 3 of the Purísima Concepción convento, probably belonging to a post-mission occupation, collected 1919. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (095643.000). Photo by the author.

12.13 Detail of ceramic sherds and an abrasion stone on the partition wall between Rooms 2 and 3 of the Purísima Concepción convento, Hawikku, NM. These sherds appear to belong to a type of Zuni polychrome (upper) and San Bernardo Polychrome (lower), based on their style of ornament. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (detail of N05763). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

12.15 Detail of artifacts on the walls of the excavated convento rooms, Hawikku, NM. At left: a hatchway ring and possible mano blank or fireplace jamb, probably from Room 6. At center: ceramic sherds, a ceramic cylinder from a candle holder, manos, and a large slab from Room 19 (in background) or Room 8 (foreground). At upper right: slabs and stone griddles from the reoccupation floor level of Room 22. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (detail of N05746). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.
12.16 Room 4, a post-mission partition and occupation of the Purísima Concepción’s *celda* (Room 2/3/4/19), looking southwest, Hawikku, NM. Note the partially excavated doorway and sill at the back of the room, and the poorly constructed slab and rubble partition wall on top of fill at the left, dating to the final occupation of this space. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05768). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

12.17 Stairwell of the Purísima Concepción *convento* (Room 1) with post-mission occupation levels, looking northwest, Hawikku, NM. The mission-period steps are visible in foreground, surmounted by a post-mission adobe partition wall on the second step, a subsequent occupation level with slab pavement and inset fireplace in the back half of the room, and the spur-wall fireplace from the final occupation at mid-left, on a pedestal of fill. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05759). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

12.19 Scoria mortar from the second level of post-mission occupation in Room 1 of the Purísima Concepción convento, collected 1919. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (095646.000). Photos by the author.
12.20 Spur wall fireplace from the final post-mission occupation level of Room 1, looking south, Hawikku, NM. Mission period steps visible at left, as is the upper step embedded in wall. Note the abrasion stone and partial hatchway ring in upper center. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05755). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

12.21 Abrasion and percussion stone from the final level of post-mission occupation in Room 1 of the Purísima Concepción convento, collected 1919. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (095657.002). Photos by the author.
12.22 Details of artifacts from the various occupations of *convento* stairwell (Room 1), Hawikku, NM. Left: Hatchway ring, pecked cobbles, and abrasion stone. Right: a larger assortment of artifacts from the more completely excavated space, including additional cobbles and groundstone artifacts. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (details of N05760 and N05761). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

12.24 Nusbaum’s profile drawing of the post-mission bench and partition wall dividing Room 9 of the Purísima Concepción convento. Page 86 of the “Church and Monastery” field notebook, by Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919. Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library (Archives 9170, Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition papers).

12.25 Excavation of Room 9-B in progress, looking southwest, Hawikku, NM. The upper post-mission occupation floor is visible, with wooden elements in situ. The mission period floor is visible in the adjacent 9-A space to the left) and post-mission fill and occupation level of ambulatory (Room 11) at right. Note the slabs forming a riser stepping up into Room 11, and the numerous artifacts from 9-A visible on the partition wall. The field-plan for the mission site is visible in upper right, and numerous slabs are piled on the wall with Room 13. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05774). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.
12.26 Detail of artifacts on the walls of Rooms 9 and 13, looking north-northwest, Hawikku, NM. A rim sherd of a jar appears in the background from Room 9 as does an apparent mano. The large, burnt slab at center may derive from the kitchen fireplace assemblage. Two excavation stakes with labels lie on the junction of the walls. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (detail of N05738). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

12.27 Detail of the artifacts and artifact bags accumulated on the wall between Room 9 and the ambulatory, looking west, Hawikku, NM. Among the unidentifiable bags and slabs may be the fragments of the sandstone mortar with two basins (095645.000) at center, near the junction of the walls), and the intact metate (093638.000) between the pair of bags and stack of slabs at the far end of the wall. The function of other slabs is uncertain, but many suggest shaping of edges or smoothing of faces. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (detail of N05778). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.
12.28 Detail of the artifacts accumulated on the wall between Room 9 and the ambulatory, looking south, Hawikku, NM. Although slabs predominate, numerous piles of sherds are also visible, along with several handstones and abraders and some faunal remains. The intact metate (093638.000) may be visible next to the bags, midway down the wall. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (detail of N05739). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

12.29 Kitchen of the Purísima Concepción convento (Room 13), with Rooms 9 and 7 in the background, looking northeast, Hawikku, NM. The post-mission fill and occupation level is visible in the foreground, level with the mission period workbench and wall-length hearth of the kitchen. The only test of the southeast exterior of the convento core is visible at far right. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05778). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.
12.30  Detail of the Purísima Concepción kitchen (Room 13) in the process of excavation, showing the post-mission occupation floor roughly level with the top of the mission-period benches, looking south, Hawikku, NM. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (detail of N05775). Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919.

12.31  Detail of panorama with Room 14/17/18, subdivided with post-mission partition walls, looking northeast, Hawikku, NM. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (N05747-N05749). Frederick Webb Hodge (or more likely Jesse L. Nusbaum), 1919, panorama digitally reconstructed by the author.

12.33 Nusbaum’s plan drawing of post-mission occupation of Room 20, with artifact distribution. Page 108 of the “Church and Monastery” field notebook, by Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919. Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library (Archives 9170, Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition papers).


12.40  Natural stone concretion that may have been used as a fetish, from the post-mission Room 20 of the Purísima Concepción convent, collected 1919. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (095656.000). Photos by the author.


12.43 Nusbaum’s plan drawing of post-mission occupation of Room 30, with artifact distribution. Page 125 of the “Church and Monastery” field notebook, by Jesse L. Nusbaum, 1919. Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library (Archives 9170, Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition papers).


12.46 Small red-colored Plainware bowl or large ladle, with a rounded bottom, from the post-mission occupation of Room 30 in the Purísima Concepción *convento*, collected 1919. National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution (096963.000). Photos by the author.
REFERENCES


de Anaya Almazín, Francisco. 1638. “Inquisición, Legajo 388, Carta Francisco de Anaya Almazín sobre la queja de los indios Taos contra Fray Nicolás Hidalgo.” Mss. 867. Vol. 48. Center for Southwest Research, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM.


---. The Gilded Man (El Dorado), and Other Pictures of the Spanish Occupancy of America. New York: D. Appleton, 1893.


Benavides, Alonso de. 1634. “Propaganda Fide, Congregaciono Generali-Scitture Antiche, Relación y memorial escritos por Alonso de Benavides,” Mss. 841. Vol. 115C. Center for Southwest Research, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM.


---. “Benavides to the Missionaries in New Mexico Regarding his Interview with Mother María de Jesús de Agreda [1631]” In Fray Alonso de Benavides’ Revised Memorial of 1634. Edited and translated by Frederick Webb Hodge, George P. Hammond, and Agapito Rey, 146-149. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1945.

---. “Copy of the Account Which the Blessed Mother María de Jesús Writes to the Said Friars of New Mexico.” In Fray Alonso de Benavides’ Revised Memorial of 1634. Edited and trans. by Frederick Webb Hodge, George P. Hammond, and Agapito Rey, 143-146. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1945.


---. “Relación y memorial escritos por Alonso de Benavides.” February 12, 1634. Mss. 841, Archivo General de las Indias and Other Archives in Spain. Vol. 115C, 223r-252v. Center for Southwest Research, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM.


Bourke, John G. “Bourke on the Southwest, IX.” New Mexico Historical Review 11, no. 2 (April 1936): 188-207.


Coffin, E. F. “Hawikuh Room Plans I.” Collection 9170, Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition Papers, 1917-1923, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library, Ithaca, NY.


Davis, W.W. H. *El Gringo, or, New Mexico and Her People*. Santa Fe: Rydal, 1857.


Division of Ethnology Manuscript and Pamphlet File. National Anthropological Archives. Smithsonian Institution, Suitland, MD.


Domínguez, Francisco Atanasio. “Copy of Spanish Transcription of Biblioteca Nacional de Mexico (BNM), Legajo 10. No. 86 and No. 43, Visit of Fray Atanasio Domínguez to New Mexico, 1776.” Mss. 867. Box 13, folder 25 a/b. Center for Southwest Research, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM.


---. *Documents of the Coronado Expedition, 1539-1542: “They Were Not Familiar with His Majesty, nor Did They Wish to Be His Subjects.”* Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2005.


Frederick Webb Hodge Manuscript Collection. Braun Research Library, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA.


Gilman, Patricia A. 1978. “Contact Period Puebloan Architecture: A Study of Culture Change at Hawikuh New Mexico.” Library Archives, Laboratory of Anthropology, Santa Fe, NM.


Gómez de la Cadena, Francisco, Fernando de Velasco, Lucas Moldonado Olasqueaín, Juan Galdo, José de Espeleta, and Nicolás Hurtado. 1672. “Biblioteca Nacional de Mexico Legajo 1, Parte 2, Documento 34, Memorias por los custodies…” Mss. 867, Vol. 118B, Center for Southwest Research, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM.


Groom, Susanne. At the King’s Table: Royal Dining through the Ages. London: Merrell, 2013.


de Guerra, Salvador. 1668. “Biblioteca Nacional de Mexico, Legajo 1, Parte 2, Documento 30, Testimonio del estado que tiene la conversión de los Mansos y dedicación de su iglesia.” Mss. 867, Vol. 118B, Center for Southwest Research, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM.


Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition papers. #9170. Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.


---. “Hawikuh 4, 1919, Rooms 100-164.” Collection 9170, Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition Papers, 1917-1923. Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library, Ithaca, NY.


---. *History of Hawikuh, New Mexico, One of the So-Called Cities of Cíbola.* Los Angeles: The Southwest Museum, 1937.


---. “Convento Kivas in the Missions of New Mexico.” *New Mexico Historical Review* 73, n. 2 (1998): 121-152.


---. No date. “Hawikuh and the Zuñi Missions.” SWRO Acc. 126, cat. 734, Ser 4, Ice Papers, Box 6, Folder 480, “Zuni 7, Hawikuh and the Zuni Missions.” Western Archaeology and Conservation Center, Tucson, NM.


---. Presidios of the Big Bend Area. Santa Fe: Southwest Cultural Resources Center, 1990.


“Lewis, Margaret A., Corresp. 1912-1918.” Braun Research Library, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA.


“MAI Records.” Archives of the National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution, Suitland, MD.


“Maps of Hawikuh Ruins. 19-\(-\).” Archives 9239. Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library, Ithaca, NY.

“Maps of Hawikuh Ruins.” Archives 11929. Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library, Ithaca, NY.


---. 1881-1886. Ms. 2621, Field plans and diagrams of inhabited pueblos and pueblo ruins of Arizona and New Mexico. National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Suitland, MD.


---. “Church and Monastery, 1919.” Collection 9170, Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition Papers, 1917-1923. Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library, Ithaca, NY.

---. Papers. National Anthropological Archives, Suitland, MD.


de Oñate, Juan. “Expedition to the South Sea and the Salines.” In Don Juan de Oñate: Colonizer of New Mexico, 1595-1628. Edited and translated by George P. Hammond and Agapito Rey, 393-397. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1953.


Papers of Jesse Logan Nusbaum. National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Suitland, MD.


“Points Favorable to this Defendant, and Directed Against the Suspicion That He is Married.” In Historical Documents Relating to New Mexico, Nueva Vizcaya, and Approaches Thereto, to 1773. Vol. III. Edited and translated by Charles Wilson Hackett, 263-264. Washington, DC: Carnegie Institution, 1937.


de la Rosa Figueroa, Francisco Antonio. 1764. *Bezerro general, menologico y chronologico de todos los Religiosos que de las tres Parcialidades conviene á saber Padres de España, Hijos de Provincia, y Criollos ha avido en esta S." Proc." del S." Evang."* Ayer Ms. 1088, Newberry Library Special Collections, Chicago, IL.


Ruiz, Joaquín de Jesús. 1775. “Biblioteca Nacional-Madrid, Legajo 10, parte 1, Documentos 20-21, Informe por fray Joaquín de Jesús Ruiz tocante el visita jurídica del visitador fray Francisco Atanasio Domínguez a las misiones internas de la Conversión de San Pablo de la Nueva México, sobre la forma en que se gobierna en lo espiritual y lo temporal la misión de San Diego de los Jemes.” Mss. 867, Vol. 127A. Center for Southwest Research, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM.


---. Undated. “Biblioteca Nacional-Madrid, Legajo 10, parte 1, Documento 12, Gobierno de las misiones de San Diego de los Jemes y San Agustín de la Isleta que observó fray Joaquín de Jesús Ruiz, ministro que fue de ellas.” Mss. 867, Vol. 127A. Center for Southwest Research, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM.


Scholes, France V. 1672. “Biblioteca Nacional de México, Legajo 1, partes 1 + 2, Documentos 34. Transcription of ‘Inventario de los bienes y gastos de las misiones de Nuevo México.’” Mss. 867, Box 13, folder 8. Center for Southwest Research, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM.

---. *Church and State in New Mexico*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1937.


Scholes, France V. and Eleanor B. Adams, trans. 1952. “Translation of Biblioteca Nacional de Mexico Legajo 1, Parte 2, Documento 34, Memorias por los custodies…” Mss. 867, Box 13, Folder 8. Center for Southwest Research, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM.


---. “Mission Archaeology in the Galisteo Basin.” *Archaeology Southwest* 19, no. 4 (Fall 2005): 11.


Stubbs, Stanley A. and Bruce T. Ellis. *Archaeological Excavations at the Chapel of San Miguel and the Site of La Castrense, Santa Fe, New Mexico*. Santa Fe: Laboratory of Anthropology, Museum of New Mexico, 1955.


---. “Copy of the report which the Most Illustrious Lord Tamarón, Bishop of Durango, makes to the King Our Lord (God keep him), with regard to the curacies and missions of this diocese in so far as it pertains to our friars and the missions which are in charge of the Order, both within the boundaries of this province of Zacatecas, and in the Custody of New Mexico... 1765.” In Bishop Tamarón’s Visitiation of New Mexico, 1760. Edited by Eleanor B. Adams, 77-94. Albuquerque: Historical Society of New Mexico, 1954.


“Tsnahey, Corresp. 1912-1918,” Braun Research Library, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA.


1020


