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ABSTRACT

Identifying subordinate groups in the archaeological record in colonial situations has gained currency as historical archaeologists have sought to describe and investigate how the perspectives of and roles played by the colonized and the colonizers contribute to processes of culture change in colonial society. Neither the culture of the colonizing group nor the culture(s) of the peoples colonized can really be characterized as a single unit, because a culture represents the reflexive interaction of different groups within the culture. Archaeological interpretation at colonial sites should recognize and incorporate the perspectives of these groups.

The model developed in this dissertation uses a processual-plus perspective (Hegmon 2003) to ask questions about gender in a systematic fashion. The author constructs a model for the identification of women at historical sites using ethnographic information and colonial documents and paintings. Archaeological collections from the pueblo of Tubac and Presidio Santa Cruz de Terrenate are then used to evaluate the model.

The archaeological site of Presidio Santa Cruz de Terrenate (AZ EE:4:11[ASM]) on the Río San Pedro represents a Spanish military installation on the eastern border of the Spanish Pimería Alta. Little documentation has been found that describes the residents or society at the presidio. Charles Di Peso excavated at the site in the 1950s (Di Peso 1953), and a crew from the University of Arizona conducted a surface survey and
collection of artifacts in 1993. The colonial pueblo of Tubac was established in 1752 under the protection of Presidio San Ignacio de Tubac. The author had access to Spanish colonial documents that described the society at Tubac. The South Barrio of Tubac (AZ DD:8:33[ASM]) is a site that represents a much disturbed area of colonial-period structures. It was surveyed and excavated by a graduate student at the University of Arizona. Because of problems in the contextual information from both sites and the poor condition of the artifacts, the information proved to be inadequate for evaluating the model. At sites with better contexts and excavation strategies, this model should allow investigation of the material correlates of female activities.
CHAPTER 1: TO FIND WOMEN

Women resident at Spanish colonial sites in Arizona (which was part of the Pimería Alta in colonial Sonora) in the eighteenth century represent a little-studied group whose contributions to colonial society are not well understood. Very few of these women were Spaniards or Europeans, and considerations of ethnicity and casta (a kind of social ranking largely based on the individual’s amount of Spanish blood) determined to some extent the roles these women could fill in society. Finding Spanish or European female-associated artifacts that were imported from the interior of New Spain is important, but the local Tohono O’odham women at the missions and in the towns also affected the signature. Identifying female elements is important to improving understanding of the culture and society of the northern Sonoran frontier, because other interpretations have concentrated on the male elements. That does not mean that those interpretations of frontier society are not accurate, but looking specifically at the contributions of women and children to colonial society may provide valuable and unexpected insights into the emergence of Hispanic culture, a process that continues into the present.

The Pimería Alta was a desert area on the frontier of New Spain, ironically bounded by the Colorado River on the west, the Gila River on the north, the San Pedro
River to the east, and on the south by the Río Magdalena and Río Altar in northern Sonora (Figure 1). About a century before the Spaniards arrived, a number of cultural groups in Arizona and Sonora participated in an involved regional exchange system (McGuire and Villalpando 1989:172). When Spanish missionaries first came into the area that would later be known as the Pimería Alta, they encountered an environment characterized by aridity and a landscape of desert plains in the west that became more of a basin-and-range topology toward the east (Brenneman 2004; West 1993). There they encountered Piman-speaking or O’odham groups practicing horticulture in different ways (Brenneman 2004; West 1993). The Tohono O’odham (desert people) lived—and still live today—in one of the driest parts of the Sonoran Desert. This area receives on average less than five inches of rain per year, water that mainly comes as violent storms in the months of July, August, and September (Sheridan 1996:120). These storms flood dry arroyos and washes in the desert, washing fertile mountain soils onto the dry plains. The Tohono O’odham adapted to their environment by practicing horticulture on soils in the valleys that had been newly enriched by the seasonal floods, then seasonally moving to winter villages in the mountains near permanent water sources to take advantage of mountain foods and resources (Fontana 1981:37; Sheridan 1996:122). Bernard Fontana called these groups the “Two Villagers” because of this seasonal movement (Fontana 1983:131). Their villages consisted of open ranchería-style settlements up and down the river drainages of Arizona and Sonora and mountain camps where wild resources were
gathered on a seasonal basis. Fontana called the O’odham groups that lived along the rivers that bordered the Pimería Alta “One Villagers” because they could live and grow food the year around in their villages in the floodplain, although by the time of contact with the Spaniards the sophisticated irrigation networks of the prehistoric Hohokam had disappeared (Fontana 1983:133; Sheridan 1992:157). The Spaniards categorized these O’odham groups using ethnic terms like Pima, Papago, and Sobaipuri.

The Río Santa Cruz has its source in the San Rafael Valley of southeastern Arizona and flows south into Sonora, turns briefly west, and then flows north to join with the Río Gila in the American state of Arizona. This river formed a lifeline in the Pimería Alta, providing water to the ranchos, missions, and presidios in the San Luis, San Rafael, and Santa Cruz Valleys (Kessell 1976). The availability of water had an important influence on where native rancherias and Spanish missions and settlements could be placed, as well as how defense against hostile Apaches and other indigenous groups could be achieved.

This dissertation examines museum collections from two different sites in the Pimería Alta—the south barrio of the pueblo of Tubac (AZ DD:8:33[ASM]) and Presidio Santa Cruz de Terrenate (AZ EE:4:11[ASM])—to form a model that identifies material culture used primarily for tasks associated with women, as well as personal artifacts and dress belonging to women or infants. Chapter 2 discusses the different colonial and indigenous groups on the Sonoran frontier in the late eighteenth century as well as methods of defining groups in the archaeological record. Then Chapter 3 focuses on recognizing women and gender groups, the primary subject of this dissertation. Chapter 4
explains colonialism and the archaeology of colonialism and culture change, giving as an example Kathleen Deagan’s Spanish Colonial Pattern, a model that explains the ethnogenesis of Hispanic society in Spanish Florida (Deagan 1983; Ewen 1991). After the theory, Chapter 5 details the Pimería Alta and the history of Spanish settlement there. Chapter 6 then combines the theory and history of the Pimería Alta to form a model that will facilitate the documentation of gender groups at Spanish colonial sites. Artifact collections from the Spanish colonial sites of Tubac and Santa Cruz de Terrenate are used to evaluate this model in Chapters 7 and 8. Chapter 9 evaluates the applicability of the proposed model to these collections and suggests future research directions.
CHAPTER 2: DESCRIBING GROUPS IN THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL RECORD AND GROUPS ON THE SONORAN FRONTIER

Groups are composed of individuals in a society that share a common interest that sets them apart from the larger society. The definition or identification of a group and an individual’s membership in that group may be emic (self-identification), or an etic identity conferred by the larger society, or a combination of emic and etic factors. Each individual belongs to myriad groups, and group identity may change depending on time, situation, and context. Some groups may be large and inclusive, based for example on physical characteristics such as gender or ethnicity, or membership may be based on exclusives like status or income. Archaeologists and historians understand the past as a series of group interactions on many levels, and the archaeological description of the groups present at a site aids in understanding the interactions that occurred there. Some common qualities that may be used to define groups include: income, occupation, status, religion, ethnicity, and gender (Conkey and Gero 1991; Conkey and Spector 1984; Gibb and King 1991; Gilchrist 1999; Hegmon 2003; Linton 1971; McEwan 1991; Schiffer 1995a; Scott 1991; Sørenson 2000; Spector 1983; Wall 1994; Waugh 1995; Wylie 1991).
Describing Groups in the Archaeological Record

Different approaches have been suggested for finding evidence of different behaviors and activity sets in the archaeological record, which then can provide a basis for the description of groups.

Behavioral Chain Analysis

Michael Schiffer (1995b:56) proposes behavioral chain analysis to develop “archaeological test implications for determining whether a specific activity was conducted at a site.” The social group that performed the behaviors is part of the chain, so if it can be documented that the activity under consideration was typically done by a specific group (like women or slaves), then evidence of the activities in that behavioral chain is a strong suggestion of that group’s presence at the site (Schiffer 1995a).

Task-Differentiation Framework

One method for investigating the operation specifically of gender groups in a society is to create a “task-differentiation framework,” which is fully explained in Chapter 3. First described by Margaret Conkey and Janet Spector (1984) and based on
research work by Spector in the Dakotas in the early 1980s (Spector 1983), the framework also focuses on visible evidence of group activity. The first step in creating a framework is to identify the activity patterns or behavioral chains required to reproduce the culture and the task sequence that comprises each activity. Second, the social, spatial, and temporal dimensions of each task must be defined. By using a method of modeling and comparing different activity patterns, the archaeologist can identify the material dimensions of the task that are visible in the archaeological record (Conkey and Spector 1984). The attribution of different artifacts or activities to a particular gender or ethnic group is not necessarily the only interpretive goal, but according to Conkey and Spector (1984:27) it is an inextricable part of the interpretation of an archaeological site.

*Spanish Colonial Pattern*

Kathleen Deagan (1983) developed a model of culture change during colonization using her work in Spanish Florida. Based on the roles and contributions of women and men of different ethnicities, Deagan establishes artifact patterns using the evidence from excavations of three *criollo* Hispanic sites (Shepard 1983) and one mestizo household in St. Augustine. Charles Ewen proposed a Spanish colonial pattern based on Deagan’s work and on his work at Puerto Real in Haiti (Ewen 1991), which led to testable implications of Deagan’s model in the archaeological record. Deagan defined the roles in Spanish households and Spanish society typically assumed by females based on documentary and historical research. Activities that fall into different aspects of female
roles leave behind material evidence when they are performed, which often leaves an identifiable activity area within the household. When soldiers and other Spanish men brought a woman of a different ethnic group into the household to fill the roles of a Spanish woman, she brought the tools and techniques with which she was familiar from her native culture, acting as an agent of change.

**Recovery Context**

The definition of an activity area forms an important component of all three of the above models. To do a behavioral chain analysis, it must be assumed that all materials within the bounded areas of the household or the work area are found at their locations of use; establishing activity areas using secondary refuse is very difficult (Schiffer 1995a:64). When constructing a task-differentiation framework, the spatial dimension of the task is one of three dimensions that must be considered. Both Deagan and Ewen identified the Spanish colonial pattern through the location and interpretation of activity areas that fit descriptions of female activities. Much of the archaeological data I deal with comes out of a midden context, leaving activity areas ill-defined. I am going to look at a suite of finished products from the site, items that may have been part of a behavioral chain like food processing but have been discarded. Because I am dealing primarily with finished products, I adopt a more holistic view of women’s and men’s activities that
includes personal items, hygiene items, and clothing. The attributes of this suite of artifacts—form, material, decoration, and manufacture—reflect those who made them, those who used them and how they were used, and the origin of each artifact. Inferences drawn from objects recovered from a midden context allow conclusions to be drawn about the ethnicity, profession, socioeconomic level, and gender of the inhabitants of the site, conclusions that can then be combined with documents for a more complete interpretation of the history and archaeology at that site.

Analysis

In order to form my model for the identification of women in the eighteenth-century Pimería Alta, I create a modified task-differentiation framework informed by Deagan’s Spanish colonial pattern and using Schiffer’s behavioral chain analysis to create a potential list of female-associated artifacts. The Spanish colonial pattern, as described by Deagan (1983) and refined by Ewen (1991), is based on evidence from colonial sites in Spanish Florida and the Caribbean. Van Buren (1999) has evaluated the explanatory power of the Spanish colonial pattern in colonial Potosí, Bolivia, and finds that climate conditions and Spanish settlement strategies there were different from Florida and the pattern is not as clear. Like Van Buren, I intend to use Deagan’s model as background information on Spanish colonial strategies, while evaluating the pattern
under desert conditions and at the edge of Spanish control at the sites of Tubac and Terrenate. Information from historical documents and ethnohistorical sources will provide me with needed data to create task-differentiation frameworks for Terrenate and Tubac. Although I have not been able to identify households from the Tubac and Terrenate collections, I have based the framework on information gleaned from census records describing women resident at missions, the estancia (ranch) of Santa Ana, and the pueblo of Tubac in the Pimería Alta. I also draw information from ethnographic descriptions of activities that can form a basis for creating behavioral chains and visual sources to provide information on clothing and personal items. Combining the task-differentiation framework with the behavioral chains defined, I hypothesize a list of artifacts expected to occur at each site, regardless of context. Deagan’s and Ewen’s work in St. Augustine and Puerto Real provide a basis for comparison, although there will be differences. Through this research, I establish a model for recognizing a female presence at Spanish colonial sites in the Pimería Alta. I use archaeological and historical information from the Spanish colonial presidios of Santa Cruz de Terrenate and San Ignacio de Tubac as my research collections to evaluate the model. A civilian settlement grew up in the protection of Tubac, so the artifact collection there is not strictly military. The presidio of Terrenate represents a very short-term military occupation, although native labor was used in its construction. It is among the native construction crew that the best opportunity exists for the presence of females at Terrenate, because they may have also been part of the construction crew themselves, or carried out domestic tasks in
support of the crew. Apparently, civilian settlement around the presidio was not extensive or long-lived, because of intense Apache raiding.

**Colonial Indigenous Ethnic Groups**

Many extant sources discuss the native groups resident in the Pimería Alta and neighboring areas at the time of initial Spanish contacts and their incorporation to a greater or lesser extent in the Spanish colonial system (Fontana 1981:36–40, 1983; Gerhard 1993; Griffen 1983:331; Kessell 1976; Sheridan 1996; Spicer 1962; Simmons 1979). Several tribes in colonial Sonora spoke mutually intelligible languages belonging to the Uto-Aztecan family (Gerhard 1993:279). An O’odham individual (from a tribe named Pima or Papago by the Spaniards) in the colonial period could start walking south from the Río Gila and find people with whom she or he could easily communicate for more than 1,000 miles, including those the Spaniards referred to as Pimas Bajos farther south in Sonora, Tepehuan peoples in Chihuahua and Durango, and the Tepecanos in Jalisco (Sheridan 1996:118). The O’odham in the Pimería Alta lived surrounded by nomadic hunting and gathering groups. The Jocomes, Janos, and Sumas lived in north-central and northeastern Mexico (Griffen 1983:Figure 1). Nomadic Apache groups lived in the mountainous areas in and around the Pimería Alta. Bands from all of these hunting and gathering groups raided mission pueblos and Spanish settlements, although the
Jocomes, Janos, and many Suma had nearly disappeared by the eighteenth century (Griffen 1983:331).

Most tribes in the Pimeria Alta practiced lifeways radically different from the colonial system the Spaniards brought. The missionaries and explorers gave ethnic or pseudoethnic names (like Pima, Papago, and Sobaipuri) to tribes in the Pimeria Alta, trying to better understand their connections to one another and to apparently related groups to the south. Historical documents provide names used to refer to different groups by Spanish officials, although there are many inconsistencies depending on the time the record was made, what the document was recording, and the type of official who was naming the native groups.

**Castas on the Sonoran Frontier**

While the Spaniards were fighting the Moors to regain control of the peninsula, and after all parts of Spain that had been under Muslim control for centuries had been reconquered, a concern with *limpieza de sangre* (purity of blood), or pure Christian Spanish ancestry, arose. The status of men in Spanish society and the kinds of religious and government positions open to each man depended largely on his ability to demonstrate that he had no Muslim or Jewish blood. Women, at least in the upper classes, did not work outside of the home, but a woman’s ancestry and family ties affected her
wealth, status, and how high she might marry. Spanish colonists in Mexico kept this concern for Spanish blood and over time developed a rigid system of castas. Mission Indians, native groups that had not yet converted, and African slaves became the lowest castas. Because of the phenomenon of mestizaje, an individual’s casta was determined by the relative proportions of Spanish (or European), Indian, and African blood that ran in that person’s veins.

In the central areas of New Spain, where the native societies had for the most part been fairly complex with the people living in cities as settled agriculturists and craft specialists, the Spaniards had found colonization easier because they could import Spanish Catholicism and Spanish customs more easily, and the colonial government used the castas to organize separate corporate groups and their roles in colonial society. On the Sonoran frontier, because the colonists were a lower percentage of the population, the casta system did not fully develop, resulting in a society where social mobility was easier. Ethnic and casta terms were used more to differentiate different Indian groups, their religious status, and the security of Spanish control (Jackson 1999:97). As can be seen from an examination of the Mission 2000 database (National Park Service [NPS] 2000), the race or tribe of the female was sometimes not even stated, and recording a woman’s casta status was less important than whether or not she was an Indian. In fact, whether or not a woman was recorded as española probably depended on her lifestyle as much as on the amount of Spanish blood in her veins.
CHAPTER 3: INTERPRETING GENDER IN THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL RECORD

There are many archaeological questions for which suggested answers are based on the interaction between different groups—national groups, groups of different cultures, or even different groups within a culture. Groupings within a culture include individuals of different social position, or ethnicity, or occupation—any common bond that divides individuals into categories. The category of gender is very large and subsumes many other divisions. Traditional archaeological interpretations show little consideration for the diversity at a site or in a society, producing conclusions that make sense among those using the same theoretical perspective, but without considering the perspectives and actions of all the social groups involved in producing the archaeological record. The first step in describing the presence of any group in a culture needs to be defining the group and how to see it archaeologically. My research project includes devising a systematic method to identify gender groups on the frontier in colonial Sonora. In devising a method, I intend to combine behavioral archaeology’s focus on the relationship between human behavior and material culture as defined by Schiffer (1999:166) with Hegmon’s description of “processual-plus” archaeology (Hegmon 2003), a perspective that she calls “generally processual” but that allows the incorporation of postprocessual concerns with structuration, agency, meaning, and
practice. Much of the theory about the identification of groups (and all of Hegmon’s examples) comes from prehistoric archaeology, and ethnographic analogy from historical descriptions is important. Janet Spector (1983) uses interviews with elders to develop her task-differentiation framework to interpret the archaeology of the nineteenth-century Mandan, Hidatsa, and Arikara Indians in her analysis of culture change after contact with Europeans. Historical archaeology includes the historical record as a data source. In my work on the colonial Sonoran frontier, I use colonial records and archaeological data to look at the female presence at the Spanish pueblo of Tubac and Presidio Santa Cruz de Terrenate.

**Theoretical Criticism**

Alison Wylie (1992) criticizes the reductive ecomaterialism of the processual archaeology developed in North America in the 1960s and 1970s. Processual archaeologists like Louis Binford, in an effort to “elevate” archaeology above the humanities and practice a harder form of science, followed a scientific, hypothetico-deductive method of where archaeological evidence and “middle-range theory” are used to create and test hypotheses about cultural processes and to arrive at general, predictive cultural laws. Truly scientific practice requires variables that can be measured, leading processual archaeologists to focus on the environment, subsistence strategies, and human
adaptation at the expense of other, ethnographic variables that were not so easily measured in a scientific fashion. However, any understanding of the processes of cultural systems requires: 1) a clear conceptualization of what is being studied, and 2) an understanding of internal, ethnographic variables, which are mediated by the ecosystem and which allow cultural groups to mediate or modify their environment, leaving material evidence in the archaeological record.

Development of the Archaeology of Gender

Why choose gender to talk about culture change in the colonial Pimería Alta? Gender is a constantly evolving concept, or cultural construction, that deals with the roles of women and men in a particular society. Past interpretations of colonial life and culture in the Pimería Alta have focused on the missions and missionaries, an undeniably important vector for the introduction of Spanish culture and religion and the blending of this new colonial lifestyle with the culture of the indigenous peoples of the land. Another focus has been the later militarization of the frontier as the colonial forces dealt with disruptions caused by the raids of Apaches and other hostile indigenous groups (Brinckerhoff and Faulk 1965; Spicer 1962; Dobyns 1972, 1995; Weber 1992; Williams 1986). Historians and others writing about the colonial Spanish frontier (Bannon 1974; John 1975; Spicer 1962; Weber 1992) have also emphasized the Spanish government’s
concern with the spread of English, French, and Russian imperial efforts. Archaeological interpretations from the perspectives of the missionaries and the military have emphasized the political and economic variables associated with men in the investigation of acculturation and culture change on the northwestern frontier of New Spain.

Postprocessual archaeologists have moved beyond the “new,” scientific archaeology of the 1970s to reincorporate the human perspectives in archaeological interpretation. Attempting to interpret the history of an archaeological site from the perspective of different classes, ethnicities, or genders enriches the archaeological understanding of the past. In this dissertation, I emphasize the roles of different groups of women had in making necessary changes to allow for the development and reproduction of colonial Hispanic society in the Pimería Alta. I compare the material patterns of Spanish colonial culture change in the Pimería Alta to patterns observed in the borderlands of Spanish Florida and the Caribbean, then develop a method to investigate how material culture from Tubac and Terrenate demonstrates the presence of women at these sites.

Gender and Sex

In the western world, “gender” is often equated with “sex,” but the two categorizations have been largely separated in modern feminist thought. Gender and sex are not the same thing, although gender can be defined as “the cultural interpretation of sexual difference” (Gilchrist 1999:1). When I write about men and women, or females and males, I am not using these terms only as a reference to sex, or biological and
physical differences related to childbearing. The concern here is not so much the reproduction of children but the reproduction of the society in which these children live. Gender roles are not usually based on just sexual characteristics, but also on the distribution of power and control in the society.

Gender represents one of the fundamental structuring principles of all human social relations, but gender structures are entirely culture-bound. The tools used by each gender in necessary tasks are sometimes specific to the task, or sometimes the production of the tools used in many tasks comes under the primary responsibility of one gender. An example of this situation is household ceramic production, which in Spanish colonial society fell to women. In this chapter, I discuss the development of a gendered perspective in archaeology, connecting it to a maturing feminist philosophy, and use case studies to show how a consideration of women in the archaeological record represents the inclusion of “other,” subordinate perspectives, leading to a more complete and inclusive interpretation of the archaeological record. I define my expected artifact pattern using Deagan’s (1983) Spanish colonial pattern at St. Augustine and Ewen’s (1991) suggestion of the archaeologically testable implications of the pattern, evaluating how well the Spanish colonial pattern can be generalized to interpret colonial sites outside of Spanish Florida and the Caribbean. The Spanish colonial pattern shares similarities with Janet Spector’s task-differentiation framework, and aspects of both models strengthen my description of gender tasks and roles in the Pimería Alta and the material correlates of those roles. I use these strategies to structure my model for the interpretation of archaeological materials from Tubac and Santa Cruz de Terrenate, exploring how the
combined use of colonial documents and recovered material culture can result in an interpretation informed by a consideration of how women and men interacted on the Spanish frontier.

**Previous Archaeological Considerations of Gender**

Archaeological interpretation, in the recent past and even today, suffers from tendencies to project modern, Western gender roles back in time across cultures and to create universal “essentials” of human behavior (Conkey and Gero 1991; Conkey and Spector 1984; Gilchrist 1999; Wall 1994; Wylie 1991). The “Man the Hunter” model (see Washburn and Lancaster 1968) of hominid behavior and human evolution, for example, made assumptions that the females were tied to a home base because of their primary responsibility, childbearing. This gave men the responsibility of scavenging or hunting for meat and returning to share with their women, thereby securing sexual favors and the continuance of their genetic line. Soon after Washburn and Lancaster put the “man the hunter” model forward, Sally Linton came back in rebuttal with the “Woman the Gatherer” model (see Linton 1971). She argues that “a theory which leaves out half the human species is unbalanced” (Linton 1971:39), pointing out the strength of the mother-infant bond among nonhuman primates and that females, even females with small children, can successfully gather enough food to support their families. Ethnographers working with modern groups with hunting-gathering economies have documented instances of females taking small animals while gathering plant resources (see Dahlberg 1981). Elements of the “man the hunter” model have influenced archaeological
interpretations across all time periods, from the Plio-Pleistocene until historical contact
with Europeans, but women’s contributions to the maintenance of society are no less
important simply because they are less ostentatious.

The desire of American archaeologists in the 1960s, 1970s, and early 1980s was
to become more like the so-called “hard” sciences and produce testable, provable
hypotheses and generalized laws of cultural behavior. They hoped that these laws could
then be applied across societies to interpret cultural behavior in different contexts. This
led to a concern with the use of systems theory and the use of models. Binford (1962,
1983) and others developed a mode of interpretation using an eco-system model of
environmental adaptation and carrying capacity. The model provided a good way to
interpret the past and has been profitably used in interpretations worldwide. However, as
originally developed by Binford (1983), this model rejects cultural variables that are not
directly based on physical survival as dependent and unscientific. Ethnographic
phenomena—how the members of a cultural group construct their society—are structured
by but not based directly on the environment and available resources (Wylie 1991:35–
36), and these ethnographic phenomena are the stuff of archaeology.

Reactions to the Scientific Perspective

Archaeologists no longer see human societies as simply reacting to external
changes in the environment and other systems. People are agents who can cause changes
in how they live and their relationships with others. We also have recognized that no
society is a single, uniform group. Society members come from different backgrounds
with different perspectives. They make up different groups—ethnic, class, geographical, professional, and gender—just to name a few. Each group experiences, participates in, and produces society with perspectives different from other societal groups. Archaeologists today see how approaching the past from these different group perspectives provides for a richer interpretation of the archaeological record.

In 1984, Margaret Conkey and Janet Spector called archaeologists’ attention to how unconscious beliefs about gender and “man the hunter” models influenced interpretations of the past in a way that reinforced modern western beliefs about what it means to be a woman or a man. Women and men, by virtue of the roles they play in the construction of a society, leave different traces in the archaeological and historical records (Conkey and Spector 1984:4). This seminal article forms the foundation for the development of a gendered perspective in American archaeology. Gender and gender structures in society are examples of systems, systems that affect other systems of interest to archaeologists, like trade, production, agriculture, and state formation (Conkey and Gero 1991:16–17). The use of gender in the archaeological interpretation of societies was increasingly recognized in the late 1980s and 1990s as a valuable, even necessary angle of analysis (Conkey and Gero 1991; Gilchrist 1999; Sørensen 2000; Wylie 1991).

Historical archaeology projects provide excellent chances to interpret the archaeological record from a gendered perspective because of the availability of documents that describe aspects of the society under investigation. However, historical documents present an inescapable bias in that they are written by those in a society with the ability, the opportunity, and the freedom to record events and situations. One possible
way to correct this bias is to correlate activities and material culture to create a sort of framework that connects the socioeconomic activities and relations represented in an archaeological situation with the material signatures of the groups of actors affected by those relations (Scott 1991:43).

Development of Gender Studies in Archaeology

Early on, an embedded assumption that engendered archaeology would produce a radically distinct, feminist past argued against interpreting the archaeological record in terms of gender structures (Sørenson 2000:4, 34–35). Today, using a gender perspective in archaeology does not mean considering only women, or using solely a feminist perspective. The engendering of archaeology owes much to the development of a feminist philosophy in history and the sciences. Roberta Gilchrist (1999:2–3) breaks this development into three stages, or waves. She characterizes the first wave as the suffrage movements in America and Europe when women won many legal and political rights. The second wave focused on issues of equality in the public and private spheres, grounded in opposition to patriarchy. The third wave of feminist thought shifted feminists’ focus more toward cultural and symbolic ways of approaching an understanding of the differences among the genders recognized by a society. The third wave is postmodern feminism, emphasizing the different experience of females and males.
The development of the archaeology of gender parallels the development of a feminist philosophy in science and a feminist approach in cultural anthropology (Conkey and Spector 1984; Gilchrist 1999; Sørenson 2000; Wylie 1991). Archaeology in the United States has been particularly influenced by second wave feminism, searching for universals in the archaeological record that explain the process of women’s subordination (Gilchrist 1999; Wylie 1991). This explains archaeologists’ past focus on determining the “gender” of artifacts to explain female roles in production and the Marxist-feminist view that women became subject to male oppression during the transition to capitalism (Wall 1994:9) or the imposition of a colonial structure.

**Task-Differentiation Framework**

Janet Spector developed a task-differentiation framework when conducting a study of the Mandan, Arikara, and Hidatsa groups of Indians and how their cultures changed under colonialism (Spector 1983). The framework aimed to identify the groups in the society who had responsibility for different productive activities, define the tools and artifacts used by each group, and locate those artifacts in the material record at an archaeological site. Others have adapted this framework, creating task assignment lists at their own sites.
As outlined by Margaret Conkey and Janet Spector (1984) the first step in creating a framework is to identify the activity patterns required to reproduce the culture and the tasks that comprise each activity. Secondly, one describes the social, spatial, and temporal parameters of each task; or who does it, where do they do it, and when does it happen? By constructing a model (Conkey and Spector 1984:27) and then comparing different activity patterns, an archaeologist can identify the material dimensions of the task that may be seen in the archaeological record and suggest with which gender the artifacts may associated. According to Margaret Conkey and Joan Gero, this attribution of different artifacts or activities to a particular gender is not the goal of engendering the archaeological record, but it is inextricably part of the inquiry (Conkey and Gero 1991:11), constituting the first steps toward the incorporation of gender concerns into archaeological interpretations.

Janet Spector elucidated the task-differentiation framework based on her reanalysis of ethnographic information about the historically known Hidatsa, an Indian group of the northern plains (Spector 1983:77). She used ethnographic reports made in the early twentieth century by Gilbert Wilson (1917, 1934, 1971) and Alfred Bowers (1965), who interviewed elders of the tribe to reconstruct the “traditional” culture the Hidatsa practiced in the nineteenth century before being forced to join with the Mandan, a related group, and the Arikara, who spoke a language from a different linguistic family, on the Fort Berthold Reservation. Neither ethnographer showed a particular concern for the gender system of the Hidatsa, but using the information provided Spector was able to create a table (Spector 1983:83–88) describing the “tasks associated with the
procurement and processing of cultigens” that identified the members of the social group performing each task by the number of individuals involved and their gender, age(s), and relationship; where each task was performed; the seasonality of each task, and the materials required. From this table, Spector was able to create “maps” highlighting different dimensions of each task and compare how the maps of each task compared in terms of which gender carried out the task and the artifacts needed (Spector 1991:391-392). Spector concludes that creating this framework will not measure the status of the gender that typically performs the task but might provide a means of judging the relationships of each gender to colonization and culture change.

Other Uses of Task Differentiation

Chesapeake Frontier. James Gibb and Julia King (1991) used three seventeenth-century domestic home lots on two tobacco plantations in the Chesapeake tidewater area, where the Potomac River meets Chesapeake Bay, to investigate the economics of the “colonial enterprise” in the region, recognizing that its economic system was based on tobacco production, and that each household formed a primary unit of production. Their specific goal was to describe domestic activities in each household and the impacts of the activities on the spatial organization of the home lot, something that seemed to be related to divisions of labor by gender and by class.

The English Chesapeake frontier in the seventeenth century, like the Pimería Alta a century later, was characterized by high mortality, an unbalanced ratio of men to
women, and the use of “bound labor” in the form of African slaves and indentured servants rather than mission labor (Gibb and King 1991). Gender attributions came from previous research, historical documents that described the roles of English and colonial housewives, the records of local court cases when women or men did not meet societal expectations of proper behavior, and logical conclusions inferred from other sources. Using information from these sources, Gibb and King created a table of activities, who performed them, and where they occurred on and off the home lot based on Spector’s 1983 task-differentiation model (Gibb and King 1991:Table 1). Analysis of midden contents from the three sites using the table resulted in the definition of activity patterns comparable to gender and class divisions on the Chesapeake frontier (Gibb and King 1991:109).

Michilimackinac. Michilimackinac was a mission, fort, and fur-trading village in the upper peninsula of Michigan, founded by the French around 1715 at the meeting point of the Great Lakes known today as Lake Michigan and Lake Huron. The complex was taken over by the British in 1761, and in 1781 they moved the settlement to Mackinac Island in Lake Huron for better defense during the American Revolution. Even after the British took control of Michilimackinac, the village remained a culturally diverse community with British, French Canadian, metis (people of Native American and European ancestry) and Native American inhabitants, but this ethnic diversity is not reflected in the documentary record (Scott 1991:42–43). Like Spector, Elizabeth Scott focused on subsistence activities, including the equipment used in food preparation and consumption, as necessary to survival and patterned by ethnicity and gender, highlighting
the interdependence among the different ethnic groups. She forms broad activity-
differentiation categories that describe who carries out the task, for whom, where and
when it happens, and what tools are used, adapting Spector’s framework (Scott
1991:Table 1). Scott determines that subsistence remains and the tools used in
subsistence activities cannot positively identify a female presence at Michilimackinac by
themselves, suggesting the addition of artifacts of clothing and personal adornment (Scott

Postscript to Task Differentiation

In her later writing, Spector finds that the task-differentiation framework does
organize artifactual and documentary data about gender in an “orderly way,” but the
framework’s description of gender roles does not really lead to greater understanding or
alter the way knowledge is presented about the past (Spector 1991:393). Combining an
archaeological focus on women’s roles with the older archaeological focus on men
creates a partnership in the archaeological understanding of how a society is constructed.
CHAPTER 4: CULTURE CONTACT AND THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF COLONIALISM

In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries A.D., the countries of Europe needed to expand their areas of control beyond their borders because of demographic and economic changes. An emerging, capitalist economic system opened avenues to prosperity beyond agriculture, and the new industries required raw materials, labor, and markets. The discovery of North and South America offered land that seemed uninhabited by European standards, because it was not developed in a fashion familiar to European society, although people had lived in the Americas for millennia. Contact between the different groups of Europeans and indigenous Americans was neither peaceful nor easy. Culture contact in any situation usually sparks changes in all of the cultures involved. In situations of colonization, methods to measure the amount of change in the cultures involved have been developed over time. Sometimes, the cultural changes in the colonizing group(s), isolated from the parent culture and faced with an environment totally different from home, and the cultural changes in the colonized group(s) resulted in ethnogenesis (the emergence of a new society). This new society included elements from the parent cultures, uniquely adapted to the new socioeconomic, political, and environmental landscape. This chapter offers a brief review of acculturation, the first anthropological model of culture change, and how it has been modified over time as the
focus of anthropology has broadened to include the perspectives of the colonized groups, the colonizers, and their interactions.

In a colonial situation, one power exerts control over another area or cultural group or groups, subordinating the area or people to the colonial power’s benefit. These controls can be economic, sociopolitical, or geographic, and usually involve the movement of permanent settlers from the colonial homeland to the colonized area. Where power and control of the subordinated area are present without an influx of settlers from the colonizing power, the process has been discussed as imperialism, but the difference between imperialism and colonialism is largely one of perspective (Horvath 1972; Majewski and Ayres 1997). In fact, colonialism has often been described as ‘imperialism seen from below’ (Bartel 1985:9; quoted in Majewski and Ayres 1997:59). A historical archaeology of colonization provides a way to integrate the perspective of the colonized groups into an understanding of colonialism and culture change. It is a truism that histories are written by the victors. This is especially true in colonial areas like the Pimería Alta, where the Spanish colonizers would leave an enduring, written record of their efforts to transform the environment and the people indigenous to the area. Archaeologists and historians have developed different models to explain cultural changes that result from contacts among societies, sometimes in situations of colonialism.

Beginning with the first voyage of Columbus, the people of the Americas and Europe, as well as Africa and Asia, began the process of forging new global, social, economic, and political systems based on their interactions, exchanges, and experiences (Deagan 1990a:225). This process was not a melting pot where cultures simply blended
together, but a situation of culture contact, colonialism, and acculturation more likely to create differences and conflicts (Little 1994:12). The observance of the Columbian Quincentenary in the 1990s caused a new upsurge of interest among scholars and the public about the Columbian Exchange, or the events and effects of the Spanish colonization of the New World. Interest in the Spanish experience—and those of the other European colonizing groups—and how they affected and were affected by the native peoples they encountered in the Americas and other parts of the world has lent new currency to a long tradition of historical and archaeological studies. This interest demands the development of new models for exploring the contact period.

Initial theories of culture contact assumed a dominant versus subordinate scenario involving two groups. The dominant group imposed changes onto the subordinate, colonized group, using coercive force if necessary. The colonized people played the passive role, changing their culture and acculturating to the dominant society. Modern theories of ethnogenesis and transculturation categorize the groups involved not simply as a dominant group imposing change on a passive recipient; they explore situations where survival depends on indigenous familiarity with available resources and situations of resistance in the subordinate group or groups. The dominant group’s need to become familiar with local resources and instances of resistance among members of a subordinated culture affect cultural change in both groups. These theories also recognize that factions exist within each of the groups involved in a contact situation. Competition between factions directly affects which aspects of each group’s culture are presented, and
the negotiations between involved groups determine how changed or new practices affect transculturation and ethnogenesis.

**Proposed Methods of Culture Change in Contact Situations**

*Acculturation*

The first model developed to explain the processes of culture change in situations of contact, including colonialism, was acculturation. Acculturation is one aspect of culture change that happens when the integration of cultural groups results in the increase of similarity between the cultures or the emergence of a new culture combining elements from each group (Kroeber 1948:425; Redfield et al. 1936; Seigel et al. 1954). Acculturation is the process that transpires when sustained contacts occur between different cultural groups resulting in cultural change in either or both. A dominant group presents a selection of traits from its parent culture to subordinate colonized groups, possibly involving coercion to encourage adoption of these new cultural practices. The imposed traits accepted by the subordinate group changed its culture, sometimes in radical fashion. In fact, sometimes the subordinate group might completely assimilate into the new dominant culture as the people abandoned their indigenous culture to imitate the dominant one, voluntarily or otherwise. The original formulation of acculturation did
not state that it was only a one-way process, but the term itself is implicitly ethnocentric (Rogers 1993:75). Later anthropologists saw acculturation as only occurring in one direction, with complete assimilation as the ultimate result. Classic acculturation models are today criticized for their emphasis on active European (Western) colonizers imposing changes on passive colonized cultures, and an underemphasis on how agency expressed in the decisions of individuals might affect the course of acculturation.

Later archaeologists refined and expanded descriptions of the acculturation model. Edward Spicer described what occurred in situations of culture contact in a 1961 article. When cultures meet, two interrelated processes begin to operate: the development of interrelations between groups resulting in the growth of a common social system; and the necessary adjustments to cultural beliefs, behaviors, and practices (on the parts of every cultural group involved) to make those relationships possible.

George Foster (1960), in his book *Culture and Conquest*, described acculturation in situations of colonialism as a process where more powerful colonizing groups control the contact situation and at least partially shaped the results of the process, although the responses of the less powerful colonized peoples also affect the results of contact. Foster points out that cultures as whole entities do not meet; it is the individual cultural members who interact. No one individual carries his or her entire cultural system but only the aspects to which that person has been exposed. Upon arrival in the new land, the colonizers present a conquest culture to the native groups, a culture in which not all of the traits have been consciously selected. The process does not end there. The less powerful group or groups also have vibrant cultural traditions, and the imposition of new and
unfamiliar cultural traits often occasioned violent conflicts in contact situations. The cultural traits presented to the less powerful undergo a second screening process and may be accepted, rejected, or modified by the less powerful based on local environmental and cultural factors. Looking at how different members of a colonized culture resist and adapt to the continuing demands of an imposed dominant culture provides insight into the ideological and material role of the non-dominant people in a colonial situation and how it affects the archaeological evidence (Little 1994).

Transculturation

In fact, initial acculturation may be more on the part of the colonizing group as people arrive and settle in an unfamiliar landscape and must emulate native practices to survive in the new world. Archaeologists dissatisfied with the shortcomings of acculturative models developed action models of culture change that treat the members of a culture as active agents of change and see material results of contact in the archaeological record as responses to changes produced by the interactions of cultures. They point out that acculturation may occur in each culture involved in a contact situation. When Spaniards first began to colonize the island of Hispaniola in the Caribbean they met the indigenous Taino inhabitants. During the early phases of contact and settlement, interaction between the Taino and the Spaniards had an acculturative effect on the latter, who adopted native traits to adjust to a new and unfamiliar environment. Later on, after the Spaniards had gained political control of the island and
the native Taino population had been drastically decreased because of mistreatment and exposure to disease, Taino potters changed the forms of their vessels to better suit Spanish cooking techniques. This situation of dynamic interaction and acculturation on both parts has been called transculturation in contrast with acculturation (Deagan 1998:27–28; García-Arevalo 1990). Transculturation or creolization in a situation of cultural contact represents a synergistic process where cultural traits are chosen and modified by actors from all the groups involved to fit into the creation of a new society.

*Ethnogenesis*

Postmodern concerns to ensure that the roles of all of the groups involved are considered when building models of cultural contact have resulted in the development of theories of ethnogenesis. Ethnogenesis resembles evolution, only cultural instead of physical. Each distinct cultural or ethnic group represents an *ethnos* (plural *ethnoi*), a group recognized by other groups as well as its own members (Moore 1994:13; Sturtevant 1971). New *ethnoi* are created when cultures meet through the combination and transformation in both forms and meanings of elements from multiple cultural traditions (Deagan 1998; Moore 1994). William Sturtevant has given a striking example of the ethnogenetic process occurring among the Seminole tribe of Florida, which represents an entirely post-European coming together of related groups of Creek Indians and others that has resulted in a recognized *ethnoi* (Sturtevant 1971:92). Ethnogenesis represents the formation of a unique cultural system that emerges from the formation of new relationships between elements of cultural groups that remain in contact for a period
of time, often accompanied by the physical and genetic processes of *mestizaje* and intermarriage.

**Model of Colonization and Culture Change**

Historians and historical archaeologists have proposed different models for the study of culture contact and colonization, including a capitalism paradigm (Little 1994) and models of acculturation that describe change but do not explain it (Ramenofsky 1991:440). Most such models share a Western European cultural bias and an implication that culture change was imposed from outside, leaving native peoples in the less active role of culture recipients. Different models of the archaeology of colonialism (Alexander 1998; Gosden 2004; Majewski and Ayres 1997), have the potential to treat both colonizers and native peoples in a much more dynamic fashion by emphasizing the integration of different sources of information on the colonial experience, including historical and ethnohistorical documents, oral traditions, archaeological data, and ethnographic description. The following discussion explores and evaluates these models of colonialism in the milieu of the Spanish colonization of the Americas and the Caribbean.

**Defining the Model**

This model of colonial strategies and their consequences (Table 1) is adapted from the work of Alexander (1998), Gosden (2004), and Majewski and Ayres (1997). It
provides an excellent basis for the investigation of change during periods of culture change under colonialism. This model describes the characteristics of three different colonial situations and the likely consequences. It treats the cultural responses of the colonized people as a factor equal to the strategy of the colonizers in the formation of new colonial cultural forms and provides a basis for considering the possible archaeological correlates of these strategies and responses.

It must be understood that there is no sequence in which these strategies necessarily occur, and each may reoccur if conditions change. Each colonial situation differs in the strategies of the incoming group and the responses of those contacted, and aspects of all three strategies may be present at the same time. In the Pimeria Alta in the eighteenth century, the initial colonization of the Spaniards had occurred over long distances, and missionary priests under the protection of mounted troops did attempt to change local cultures and technologies. Such practices had increased the levels of conflict and made protection of colonial settlements uncertain. However, after an initial period of resistance the cultural landscape became more peaceful and economic and personal relationships began to form, although groups like the Apaches continued to raid Spanish and native mission settlements, and cultural misunderstandings and Spanish actions continued to occasionally incite native resistance.

The model of the archaeology of colonialism in Table 1 is a model for investigating change. It does not address the causes of or reasons for those changes. To complete an engendered model of culture change and ethnogenesis in situations of colonialism, these concerns must also be included. In Ramenofsky’s selectionist model, the persistence of cultural traits depends on the different selective pressures operating on those traits (Ramenofsky 1991:441–442). A process like this might explain cultural persistence, but it does not address culture change, and it has an implied bias that only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colonial Strategy</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Initial Colonization | • Often occurs at extreme distances  
| | • Unequal levels of military, communication, and transport technologies  
| | • Extreme lack of respect for indigenous cultures  
| | • Coercive change and possibly violent resistance | • Creation of a “settler society” (Gosden 2004)  
| | | • Refugee sites  
| | | • Forced missionization or resettlement  
| | | • Cultural compartmentalization  
| | | • Culture change; ethnogenesis possible |
| Colonization with Peaceful Interactions | • Long-term, nondirected interaction process  
| | • Economic relationships (trade and exploitation)  
| | • Acculturation pressures  
| | • Opportunities for ethnogenesis to occur  
| | • Situations of conflict still likely | • Creation of working relationships between different cultures and social structures  
| | | • Gradual culture change on both parts  
| | | • Accommodation and ethnogenesis most likely |
| Long-term Colonization and Peaceful Coexistence | • Cultural groups similar, with fairly equal levels of technology  
| | • Established contact history  
| | • Existence of ethnic enclaves  
| | • Many relationships of trade and exchange  
| | • Primarily peaceful coexistence | • Ethnic enclaves maintaining separate repertoires of material culture  
| | | • More like reorganization of pre-existing hierarchy  
| | | • “Networks of interdependency” and trading relationships crosscut linguistic and territorial boundaries |
native cultural traits are under selective pressure. Ethnogenesis, a phenomenon of mutual acculturation between colonizers and native peoples (Deagan 1996), is more inclusive than Ramenofsky’s Darwinian model and a better method for explaining cultural survivals and the development of new, colonial cultures.

As for judging the rate and amount of culture change and/or ethnogenesis in a colonial situation, Farnsworth (1992) proposes a quantitative measure. Artifacts from native contexts at colonial sites include imported Spanish items that fit into the native culture with no modification, Spanish items that do not fit into the native culture, items that reflect a hybridization of Spanish and native traits, traditional artifacts that articulate with the cultural changes brought by the colonizers, and traditional artifacts that do not (Farnsworth 1992). By measuring the relative percentages of these different types, Farnsworth contends that archaeologists can calculate roughly how much acculturation and ethnogenesis has transpired.

Themes in the Archaeology of Colonialism

Application of the archaeology of colonialism model to the Spanish colonial experience in the New World is not a monolithic exercise. At its largest, the empire of New Spain included Florida and the Caribbean islands in the east, and continued south through Mexico. Northern New Spain included Texas, the American Southwest, and the Californias. Spanish colonial strategies and the responses of the native people varied according to region, environment, existing native societies, and other local conditions. Because of the variety of the Spanish colonial experience, the model must also be
adaptive. This brings out underlying structural themes that must be addressed when considering the archaeology of colonialism.

_Ethnogenesis in New Spain_

Ethnogenesis occurs when people from different cultural traditions come into sustained contact. Instead of one culture dominating all others and forcing assimilation, elements from the different cultures come together and fuse, creating a new and distinct culture with recognizable influences from each of the donor cultures. This process goes beyond simple acculturation, where different cultures form economic and social relationships, including the adoption of foreign cultural elements, but do not merge (Little 1994:9). It is different as well from compartmentalization, which is usually seen when a colonized group outwardly acculturates to a dominant culture but privately practices its own traditions (Weber 1990:435).

Cultural and ethnic mixing of peoples appears to have been much more widely practiced in the Spanish-American colonies than in other European colonies, something that directly affects the possibilities for ethnogenesis (Deagan 1996:153). The initial Spanish colonists in all areas of New Spain were overwhelmingly male, which resulted in a process known as _mestizaje_, where Spanish men had relations with and sometimes married native women, bringing them into the colony’s domestic sphere and producing a new population with a high percentage of mestizos, or people of mixed ethnic backgrounds (Deagan 1973:56–57). In fact, intermarriage and a general respect for native hierarchies characterized Spanish colonization in many parts of the New World (Deagan 1990a:229–230), belying the popular image of all Spaniards as bloodthirsty conquistadors. Beyond this sexual interaction, the Spanish colonists and the native groups
under their control interacted through missionization, labor, trade, and hegemonic relationships on many levels (Deagan 1990b:304; Little 1994:9).

Most archaeological and historical research on ethnogenesis and acculturation has focused on the domestic roles of native women in Spanish households, despite other important phenomena such as the mixing of different native groups in Florida as a response to disease and English raids (Deagan 1973:56–57, 1990b:307) or the isolation of colonists in New Mexico, a living situation that caused them to use already existing, native economic networks for trade and survival (Levine 1995:59). Native women brought native ceramic and cooking technology, as well as native foodways, into Spanish households. At the same time, the Spanish colonists were quickly adapting to a diet of a combination of American foods native to the area, which generally grew better than imported European crops, and some European imports, like wheat in the American Southwest, that grew well in the new environment (Deagan 1996:146–148). The Spanish adopted native foods and cooking technology to a point, but the occurrence of Colono Ware, native-made pots with European shapes or characteristics, suggests that women were also adapting to the preferences of their Spanish husbands or masters (Ferguson 1992:18–22). In essence, the Spanish willingly incorporated native traits into the domestic arena, which was less visible socially, and non-Spanish women became a major force in ethnogenesis through their participation in running the household and raising children (Deagan 1990a:240).

Most of the evidence for the role of women in ethnogenesis has been recovered archaeologically, because domestic issues do not figure greatly in official Spanish colonial documents. Interactions between Spanish colonists and native men, which were based on service and labor exploitation, are better described in the historical record but left few obvious material traces in the archaeological record (Deagan 1996:149).
Activities associated with men, such as the construction of dwellings, construction, farming, and hunting tools, weapons, and the political arena show more evidence of continuity of Spanish traits (Deagan 1973:64). This is almost the reverse of prehistoric situations, where archaeologists have assumed that men’s activities left more visible traces than women’s work. Clearly, ethnogenesis is an important piece of the historical archaeology of colonialism, but a full understanding of ethnogenetic and acculturative processes requires more archaeological and historical research on how native and Spanish men may have participated in the process and a concentrated effort to uncover the native male contribution to the emerging Hispanic culture.

*Transition to History*

The second theme that must be addressed under an archaeology of colonialism is the fact that native societies encountered by the Spanish did not spring into existence, full-blown, at contact, but were themselves products of centuries of cultural contact and development. If historical archaeologists wish to understand native societies under colonialism, they must be aware of each society’s protohistoric and prehistoric antecedents (Lightfoot 1995:200). Even if a native people disappears completely, their cultural and genetic legacies are passed on through the processes of ethnogenesis and *mestizaje* (García-Arevalo 1990). Investigating processes of cultural change and continuity from prehistory through the protohistoric period into historically known, colonial Spanish society suffers because it has been divided into different subdisciplines with different sources of data, and reconciling them will not be easy. The following example illustrates this point nicely.
Archaeologists investigating the prehistoric Puebloan Southwest have often used ethnographic accounts of Pueblo peoples, recorded in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, to explain the patterns of material culture they find in their surveys and excavations. Questions of applicability must arise, however, when the major dislocations of the contact period are considered. Spanish missionary and civil reports suggest that the ethnography of sixteenth and seventeenth century Pueblo society was quite different from the groups early anthropologists encountered (Wilcox 1981:378–379). Understanding the ethnography of the contact period in New Mexico is also important for historical archaeologists in understanding the Spanish reaction to the Pueblo tribes they encountered. The archaeological evidence indicates that prehistoric Pueblos were involved in wide and complex trading and economic relationships with other native groups before the Spanish arrived (Wilcox 1981:380). How did Spanish explorers and Spanish trade goods impact these relationships? It is a recognized phenomenon that prehistoric societies in the American Southwest were undergoing culture changes caused by the introduction of Spanish artifacts, food crops, and introduced epidemic disease during the protohistoric period, before actual contact with Spanish explorers and missionaries (Lightfoot 1995:200). A historical archaeological understanding of colonization will never be complete unless researchers consider the prehistoric background of colonized groups.

How can historical archaeologists appreciate the prehistory of the groups they study? The solution is more cross-disciplinary and multi-period research. Archaeologists trained in prehistoric methods rarely have the technical knowledge to undertake a critical study of available historical documentary information, while historical archaeologists with a grounding in historical research are more likely to rely on the documents than on scientific methods developed to test hypotheses about prehistoric cultural patterning, with
the result that much historical and prehistoric information is not directly comparable (Lightfoot 1995). The data are there—a great deal of historical data from early excavations of prehistoric and protohistoric sites has not been systematically described or analyzed (Levine 1995:60). If prehistoric and historical archaeologists can become more familiar with each others’ methods and results, they can work together to establish a better cultural background for the application of an archaeology of colonialism model.

*Integrating the Data*

The overall effectiveness of the archaeology of colonialism model as an investigative and explanatory device depends entirely on historical archaeologists and ethnohistorians’ abilities to control and integrate data from very different sources of information about the colonial period under study. A complete approach must consider cultural information provided by ethnohistorical accounts, historical documents, period artworks, ethnographic observations, linguistic data, native oral traditions, and archaeological materials recovered from different types of sites (Lightfoot 1995:199). Since in most parts of the New World the colonial experience involved the confrontation of literate and non-literate peoples, neither the historical nor the archaeological record can provide a complete understanding of the colonial period (Deagan 1996:136). In some cases, the native elites did leave their own documents, written in the language of their colonizers. Most documents and ethnohistorical narratives were written by the Spanish and other Europeans, written with a Western bias that may be hard to recognize (Galloway 1991:453). Archaeologists and ethnohistorians alike must remain constantly aware of possible factors affecting the content and presentation of different kinds of documents. Each historical text is like an artifact, in that it functioned in the systemic
context that produced it and is also subject to cultural formation processes (Galloway 1991:457–458). Documents must also be subjected to external and internal criticism in order to gauge the authenticity and credibility of the document, a task more difficult when copies or translations are poor (Wood 1990). Using good copies of documents in the original written language whenever possible will help to alleviate these problems, as will a careful consideration of the author's tone, vocabulary, semantics, pacing, intended audience, and overt and covert purposes in writing (Galloway 1991:463–465).

Good archaeological research can provide independent observations about colonial society, as well as independent corroboration of historical detail. Archaeology provides the means to create a picture of colonial situations that is less affected by the biases of the authors of the documentary record, although archaeologists must remain cognizant of the information biases they themselves introduce via their choices of method and theory. Historical archaeology brings together independent sources of anthropological data and the details of historical documents, intertwining them in a more complete understanding of colonial situations (Little 1994:8).

**Model Creation**

The development of an archaeology of colonialism model provides a new method for the investigation of the experiences of colonizing powers, as well as the colonized peoples that they dominate. This model can provide new avenues for documenting the substance, rate, and causes of culture change. It incorporates the fact that colonized people are not merely passive culture recipients, but active participants in the negotiation
of changes that affect both colonizers and colonized. By addressing some of the themes that derive from the archaeology of colonialism model, including the structure and operation of the progress of ethnogenesis, the need for more consideration of prehistoric archaeology in understanding the roots of the colonial experience, and the necessity for critically evaluating and integrating different sources of information, historical archaeologists and other students of the archaeology of colonialism can only improve their understanding of the dynamic interplay of cultural, social, and economic relationships that characterizes the meeting of different peoples.

*Spanish Colonial Pattern*

The culture the colonists brought to different areas of the Spanish Empire was not a generic, homogenized “Spanish culture”; the culture in different areas of New Spain reflected the regional cultures which the Spanish colonials experienced. The local conditions and native groups in the areas colonized also contributed to the diverse Hispanic cultures that arose (Ewen 2000). A “colonizing culture” does not meet a “colonized culture” in situations of culture contact. “Culture” is an open system in which individuals with exposure to different aspects of a social structure affected by landscape, environment, and individual actions participate. The complete cultural systems in a contact situation never meet (Foster 1960:10).

According to George Foster (1960:11–12), the colonizing group brings a “conquest culture”—an artificial, simplified creation of the colonizing culture designed to cope with recognized problems in the contact situation. Foster thought in terms of the
meeting of single cultures, but in situations of colonialism like New Spain, the colonists came from across Europe and the different parts of Spain, which was still a collection of kingdoms without a unified culture. In Foster’s model the imposition of a conquest culture brings about planned changes in the cultures of the colonized groups and unplanned changes that incorporate elements of the indigenous culture more suited to local landscape resources and the environment. A conquest culture can be thought of as the result of a screening and simplifying process in the colonizing culture that recombines elements for export, screened again and enriched by elements produced by the contact situation and the cultures contacted. These dual processes happened in New Spain but the multiplicity of cultural groups involved complicated the process. The key to seeing creolization or ethnogenesis in the archaeological record is the presence of temporally and culturally diagnostic changes in material culture that reflect changes in behavioral patterns. Unfortunately, these patterns of accommodation are not always visible materially (Ewen 2000).

St. Augustine

The Spanish colonial pattern was first described by Kathleen Deagan to interpret the results of contact between colonizing Spaniards, primarily male, and indigenous and enslaved African women in colonial Spanish Florida. This built on Deagan’s previous work with the concept of mestizaje (Deagan 1973), or the biological mixing of peoples, and how culture change resulted from these contacts and the resulting mestizaje. The
mixing happened because there were very few female Spaniards among the colonists, especially at first. The Spaniards had a policy in their colonization strategy of forming strategic alliances by marriage with *caciquas* (high-ranking indigenous women), and this was part of a very liberal Spanish attitude toward fraternization with native women, not dissimilar to French colonial practices, but constituting a major difference with the strategies of other colonial powers (England).

The model basically says that because women were usually not out in public, at the forefront of dealings with Spaniards, but occupied the more private roles of housekeeper and child-raiser, they had less contact than their men with the colonial forces and tended to preserve elements of indigenous culture. When a Spanish man incorporated an indigenous woman into his household, she introduced the necessary changes for survival in an environment unfamiliar to the Spanish and incorporated the technologies she had grown up with into her activities and dress. Native artifacts also replaced European items that were scarce because of distance, cost, and difficulties in transport, meaning that European items were used to maintain status in visible displays of the colonial culture, like the ceramic plates used on the table to eat the foods prepared in the kitchen, while the technologies and tools used in the kitchen to produce the food (and the types of food produced) retained a closer relationship to indigenous artifacts. Deagan hypothesized that this process formed patterns of culture change which would be visible over time. Her hypothesis was greatly influenced by South’s “Carolina Pattern” of change at English colonial sites (South 1977).
Deagan (1983) developed a theoretical model of the culture contact between the Spanish conquest culture and the indigenous cultures of Florida based on her investigations at St. Augustine. The Spanish crown funded the establishment of St. Augustine on the Florida peninsula in 1565 as a response to French encroachment from the north and to protect the Spanish fleet from pirate attack. St. Augustine began as a male-dominated military presidio, isolated from the rest of New Spain but dependent upon it. When war broke out in the early eighteenth century between Spain and England, the interior of Spanish Florida was abandoned, and the people and mission Indians concentrated in St. Augustine for defense from British raids. Deagan’s investigations focus on the beginning of the eighteenth century until 1763, when Spain ceded Florida to England (Deagan 1983:22–27). Her interests lay in exploring how the diverse groups in eighteenth-century St. Augustine interacted through acculturative processes and intermarriage to form a new, Hispanic culture pattern.

St. Augustine was never economically self-sufficient, drawing all of its needs from the local landscape. The town was a defensive outpost dependent on an annual *situado*, or subsidy, that came from mainland Mexico. The subsidy included both cash to pay the garrison and supplies to meet the demand of the colonists for European clothing, table service items, and other necessities to maintain a European identity. The colony retained a primary reliance on externally produced, imported goods, using only a few things produced locally by indigenous groups at the missions. Such products especially included native or mission-produced cooking wares; visible table wares and other symbols remained primarily European.
*Ethnicities at St. Augustine.* Deagan recognized five ethnic groups at Spanish St. Augustine. *Peninsulares* were colonists born in Spain who had immigrated to Florida. There were a few other non-Spanish Europeans at St. Augustine, shopkeepers who supplemented the *situado* with other European goods, primarily English ceramics. *Criollos* included the children of *peninsulares* born in the Spanish New World. In the colonial class system, *criollos* were recognized as Europeans but were not considered as capable as true Europeans. *Mestizos* were the product of Spanish and indigenous liaisons—either through official marriages or unofficial relationships. St. Augustine was a locus of interaction between Spaniards and the indigenous Indian groups, both through exchange with the mission groups and raids by hostile tribes. In the eighteenth century, St. Augustine was also home to a significant African population, both enslaved and free. All of these different peoples had modifying influences on the cultures the colonists brought from their homelands, cultures that were also forced to adapt to the Florida environment.

*Puerto Real*

Charles Ewen used his excavations at Puerto Real, Haiti, to examine and refine Deagan’s proposed model and suggest archaeologically testable implications (Ewen 1991, 2000). The town of Puerto Real was one of the earliest Spanish settlements in the Caribbean, occupied from 1503 to 1578. Its purpose was more for colonization and exploitation of the Caribbean environment than defense of other Spanish colonies. This is
much earlier than the First Spanish Period at St. Augustine or the settlements in the Pimería Alta in which I am interested, but time is not a determining factor in testing models of acculturation and ethnic mixing. Ewen uses data from St. Augustine to develop the “Spanish colonial pattern” and verifies this pattern using data from his work at Puerto Real.

Based on excavations at Puerto Real, Ewen suggests five test implications for the Spanish colonial pattern:

1. Food preparation activities should show a significant admixture of European and locally manufactured wares. When Spanish men brought non-Spanish women into the household, these women used native tools and cooking vessels. These activities happened inside the household and were not visible, so the use of indigenous technologies filled in an area where European artifacts were hard to obtain because of transportation costs from Spain.

2. Status related artifacts should be almost exclusively European. Status in the colonies depended on maintaining Spanish identity, so colonists were willing to pay the money to ensure that visible items were European.
3. Structures should employ local materials in their construction, but the mode of construction and architectural style should be Hispanic in nature. [Settlers at Tubac were assigned European-style house and planting lots (Jones 1979:194)].

4. The diet of the colonist[s] should show a mixture of the Iberian barnyard [animal] complex of peninsular Spain and the subsistence strategies of the indigenous peoples.

5. The material and faunal assemblage should reflect a crystallization of the Spanish colonial pattern through time [Ewen 1991:44–48].

Both Deagan and Ewen identified the Spanish colonial pattern through the identification and interpretation of activity areas that fit descriptions of women’s activities. The primary female roles in Spanish society at St. Augustine and Puerto Real were those of wife, mother, and maintaining the household, including cooking.
Spanish colonization of the north was really a process of fits and starts. The *villa* of San Miguel de Culiacán was established in Sinaloa in 1531, and Santa Fe was founded in 1598, but the Spaniards did not found Presidio de San Agustín and the Hispanic town of Tucson until 1776 when the garrison of the Presidio San Ignacio de Tubac transferred north. The colonization of northwestern New Spain was profoundly different from that of central Mexico (McGuire and Villalpando 1989:139). When the conquistadors left central Mexico in the sixteenth century, they entered a world of diverse peoples and settlements, with no overarching state authorities (McGuire and Villalpando 1989:161; Spicer 1962:8). Missions, mines, and ranches were established in central Sonora and along the southern edge of the Pimería Alta among the Pimas Bajos between 1650 and 1675 (Doyel 1989:145), but the Jesuit Padre Eusebio Francisco Kino did not begin missionization among the Pimas Altos in the valley of the Río Santa Cruz until the 1690s. In 1766 the province of Nueva Vizcaya, which included the territory of Sonora and the Pimería Alta, had a population of colonists and mestizos approaching 50,000 in addition to a population of natives that was still fairly dense (Weber 1992:206). Major events in the colonization of the Pimería Alta appear here as Figure 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Date</strong></th>
<th><strong>Event</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1531</td>
<td><em>Villa</em> San Miguel de Culiacán established in central Sinaloa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1598</td>
<td>Santa Fe, New Mexico founded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>Kino enters into the Pimería Alta and begins founding missions to the Pimas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1691</td>
<td>Founding of Los Santos Angeles de Guevavi and San Cayetano de Tumacácori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1692</td>
<td>Kino founds San Xavier del Bac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Pima uprising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1724</td>
<td>Pedro de Rivera’s inspection passes through the Pimería Alta, resulting in the Regulaciones de 1729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1733</td>
<td>Creation of the gobierno de Sinaloa y Sonora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td>Silver discovered at the Real de Arizona/Arizonac in the Pimería Alta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>Yaqui Revolt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1751</td>
<td>Pima Revolt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752</td>
<td>Founding of Presidio San Ignacio de Tubac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1753</td>
<td>Mission and ranchería of Tumacácori relocated to west side of the Río Santa Cruz so that it could be better-protected; mission renamed San José de Tumacácori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1762</td>
<td>Sobaipuri from the Río San Pedro move to Piman missions on the Río Santa Cruz because of Apache pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1766</td>
<td>Marqués de Rubí inspects Tubac as part of proposed realignment of presidios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767</td>
<td>Expulsion of Jesuit missionary priests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1768</td>
<td>Franciscan missionaries replace Jesuits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1768–1771</td>
<td>Spanish military expeditions against Seris and other hostile groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772</td>
<td>Results of Rubí’s inspection published as Regulaciones de 1772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1773</td>
<td>San José de Tumacácori replaces Los Santos Ángeles de Guevavi as <em>cabecera</em>; abandonment of Guevavi because of isolation and vulnerability to Apache raids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1775</td>
<td>Hugo O’Conor inspects presidial line to determine new sites for some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1776</td>
<td>Creation of Provincias Internas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1776–1783</td>
<td>Teodoro de Croix is <em>comandante general</em> of the Provincias Internas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1776</td>
<td>As a result of O’Conor’s inspection, Tubac garrison transfers to Tucson and Presidio Santa Cruz de Terrenate established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1779</td>
<td>Formation of the diocese of Sonora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780</td>
<td>Santa Cruz de Terrenate abandoned because of Apache raiding; garrison retreats south to Las Nutrias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1787</td>
<td>Pima Company San Rafael de Buenavista becomes garrison at Tubac; Santa Cruz de Terrenate garrison transfers from Las Nutrias to former mission Santa María Suamca and becomes known as Presidio de Santa Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793</td>
<td>First Apache peace camp established at Tucson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 2. Pimería Alta timeline
Spanish Reasons for Moving North

The groups of Spaniards that moved into the Pimería Alta were explorers, miners, religious, soldiers, farmers, and ranchers, all establishing themselves at different times and interacting with each other, the landscape, and the indigenous groups in different ways. The Pimería Alta comprises a large part of the Sonoran Desert biome (West 1993); the landscape in the eastern Pimería Alta is characterized by aridity, heat, and a rugged basin-and-range geology with few perennial rivers and water sources. The earliest documented human occupation of the area occurred 12,000–15,000 years ago, and the peoples resident in the area at Spanish contact had adapted very well to the climactic patterns and available resources. As Spanish colonists attempted to impose control on the land and indigenous groups, every culture involved in the contact situation underwent changes in response to the influences of the other groups.

Why did the Spaniards move north out of central Mexico? Missionaries, of course, felt called by God to establish teaching centers where Indians could be congregated and “brought to the light” of Catholic Christianity and European culture. Missions were sites of intense interaction between the missionary priest or priests and those natives who were either attracted to or congregated at mission pueblos (planned communities to facilitate conversion of Indians) by the military. As teaching centers
where Christianity, European crops and livestock, the Spanish language, and the Hispanic lifestyle were introduced and taught, great culture change occurred at the missions, but not so much in the sense of Indian women being incorporated into Spanish households. The missionary fathers could teach European practices but could not really control what happened in the privacy of neophyte households. The priests and overseers were outsiders who had the greatest control over exterior, public household operations, though their cultural teaching could influence attitudes toward appropriate female and male roles.

At the same time as the missionaries were trying to convert the natives and teach them elements of Hispanic culture, (Foster 1960) soldiers, miners, and civilians moved into the Pimería Alta. As each group moved to the north, indigenous groups provided sources of both labor and conflict. Ethnohistorical narratives and colonial documents authored by the Spanish officials in power reflect the European view of the time that those who did not live like Europeans, in settled communities surrounded by established farms, were not as culturally or biologically advanced as Europeans, who felt that they enjoyed the most “civilized” life in the known world. The Spanish mission program represented a true desire on their part to “help” indigenous groups become more “civilized” in a European way, regardless of the desire of the indigenous group and whether or not the environment would support the necessary changes. As miners and missionary priests ventured northward from colonial Sonora into the Pimería Alta, armed forces were used to bring natives into mission villages and to protect the missions, missionaries, and new converts from hostile groups, especially raiding Apaches. Missionized O’odham individuals herded mission animals and farmed, and miners in the Pimería used the newly
missionized natives as a source of labor. Finally, attractive colonial land policies, the sometimes uncertain protection of the presidios (in the Pimería Alta, a presidio “was most often a garrisoned fortification which defended a populated or strategically important position [Moorhead 1975:xiii]”), and the availability of missionized Indians to provide labor and household service attracted Spanish civilian ranchers and farmers. A few merchants and traders then moved north to supply the new markets. Mines, presidios, towns, rancherias, and farms provided avenues of contact outside of a religious setting. This is where indigenous women were incorporated into colonial Spanish households and shared their knowledge of the environment and how to survive in it. As Spanish colonists moved into the Pimería Alta, they settled at different types of settlements. A map of colonial settlements can be seen in Figure 3.

**Colonial-period Settlement Types**

*Reales de Minas*

The discovery of silver at Arizonac in 1736 caused a small population boom in that area of the Pimería Alta and the formation of the Real de Arizonac, a temporary mining community (Gerhard 1993:285) (see Figure 3). *Alcalde mayor* of Sonora Gabriel Prudhón emphasized the mineral resources of the Pimería Alta, a move that attracted many
colonists (Polzer 1998:103). *Reales* and the *ranchos* associated with the *reales* formed the largest civilian Spanish settlements outside presidios in the Pimería Alta. Segments of the Spanish and mestizo population shifted in and out of the different types of settlements, depending on economic conditions and where the indigenous groups were more actively raiding. Mining camps like the Real de Arizonac drew other types of settlement into Sonora. Farmers and stock raisers moved in around the camps, finding ready markets for their produce, meat, and other goods. Because these people were not
dependent on the ore in the mines for their livelihood, farming and ranching communities tended to be more stable in population and existence than the camps, at least where good land and water could be found (Stern and Jackson 1988). By the 1770s, miners were exploiting sources of silver near Arivaca, a visita of Guevavi, and in the Santa Rita Mountains to the east of Tubac (Jackson 1999).

Missions

Padre Eusebio Francisco Kino arrived in northern Sonora in 1687. He desired to work and found missions among the Seri, but Padre Visitador Manuel González sent him north to the Pimería Alta. Kino first came into the Pimería Alta on March 13, 1687 (Polzer 1998:35), and founded seven missions or visitas that year in the river valleys of Rios San Miguel, Magdalena, and Altar (see Figure 3). Using Mission Nuestra Señora de los Dolores on the Río San Miguel as his headquarters, Kino began moving into the Pimería Alta. He followed the river valleys north, then east through natural travel corridors-looking for already existing concentrations of Pima Indians to convert and organizing mission districts of a cabecera with a resident missionary priest and visitas or visiting stations to which he would travel (see Figure 3). During his extensive exploratory travels, he established Los Santos Ángeles de Guevavi on the Río Santa Cruz just north of the modern international border as a mission cabecera, San Cayetano de Tumacácori downstream to the north as a visita of Guevavi, and San Xavier del Bac (just south of the modern city of Tucson, Arizona) with its visita of San Cosmé del Tucson in 1691. Kino
continued to explore the Pimería Alta through the end of the seventeenth century and beginning of the eighteenth. He visited rancherias on the Río San Pedro, the ruins of the prehistoric pueblo of Casa Grande, and the rancherias of the Río Gila all the way to its junction with the Colorado (thereby confirming that Baja California was not an island), always proposing more sites for visitas or mission cabeceras. Juan Mateo Manje, the military officer who often accompanied Kino, describes in his journals the abundance of crops in the valleys and the friendly curiosity of the Piman-speaking groups he and Kino encountered. Kino died in Sonora in 1711 and was buried at Santa María Magdalena, a visita of San Ignacio de Caburica (Burrus 1971:114), but his work in mapping the Pimería Alta and making mostly peaceful contacts with tribal groups besides the Apache groups who continued to attack and to raid Spanish missions and settlements, eased entry onto the northern frontier for other groups of colonial Spaniards.

The initial missionization of the Pimería Alta was carried out by the Jesuit order of the Catholic Church. Missions were not designed to be sites of intense daily contact between indigenous groups and nonreligious, civilian settlers. The missionary father was ideally the only full-time European resident and might have previously converted Indian assistants to aid him in teaching colonial Hispanic lifeways. Because the Jesuit and Franciscan missionaries, the two orders who were active in the Pimería Alta, had priests from many places in Europe, the mission priest might not even be from Spain. Missions were the places of intensive attempted programs of culture transfer only because the community was designed to facilitate instruction in a Spanish or European lifestyle (Spicer 1962:287). Missions were mainly founded in or near existing rancherias,
although pueblos for the newly converted natives would be created as needed. The job of the missionary father was to convert the neophytes to Christianity and teach them European crafts and techniques of herding and raising food crops. This required that the needed equipment, seeds, and livestock be brought to the mission; as early as the 1690s Kino was driving herds of cattle and sheep down the Río Santa Cruz for new missions. Food crops that adapted well to conditions in the Pimería Alta were introduced in more southerly missions and in some cases proceeded north through the native trade network as fast or faster than first contact with Spaniards. The Jesuits brought natives from already missionized groups—in the Pimería Alta usually Yaquis or Ópatas—to live at the new mission to teach, and hopefully demonstrate, a proper Christian lifestyle. After the Spanish king signed orders in 1767 expelling the Jesuits from Spanish possessions worldwide, the Franciscan order took over the missions in the Pimería Alta. By 1768, they had replaced the Jesuit missionary priests in each of the eight Pimería Alta missions with a Franciscan priest (Table 2).

The incoming Franciscans found the Pimería Alta missions and mission system in shambles. Mission structures and churches were sometimes in disrepair, and vestments and church finishings had disappeared from some of the missions. Colonists were encroaching on fertile mission property, and Indians could legally leave the missions to live and interact with Spaniards and gente de razón (literally, people of reason). Authority over the temporal, daily business at the mission had been taken from the missionaries. The king appointed Spanish managers to hold mission assets in trust for the mission Indians, and many of them abused their positions (Kessell 1976). José de Galvez,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MISSION NAME</th>
<th>FRANCISCAN MISSIONARY IN 1768</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Ignacio de Caburica</td>
<td>Fray Diego Martín García</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Purísima Concepción de Nuestra Señora de Caborca</td>
<td>Fray Juan Diaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Theresa de Atí (Atil)</td>
<td>Fray Joseph Soler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pedro y San Pablo de Tubutama</td>
<td>Fray Joseph del Río</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Gertrudis de Sáric</td>
<td>Fray Joseph Agorreta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa María Suamca (Soamca)</td>
<td>Fray Francisco Roche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Santos Ángeles de Guevavi</td>
<td>Fray Juan Chrisóstomo Gil de Bernabé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Xavier del Bac</td>
<td>Fray Francisco Gárces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

who was then *visitador general*, gave temporal authority back to the Franciscan friars in 1769. Throughout the Franciscan period, there was a constant struggle between those who realized that traditional missions were still needed to “civilize” the Indians and reformers in both the church and the Spanish government who felt that the missions and missionaries could be secularized and transformed into regular, taxpaying parishes with curates. The move to secularize led to the formation of the diocese of Sonora in 1779, with the introduction of a bishop and secular priests, but the Franciscans had regained full control by 1791 (Kessell 1976:150, 168).
Militarization of the northwestern frontier proceeded slowly. The Presidio de Janos, near the modern town of Janos in Chihuahua, was founded in 1686 (Gerald 1968:21), and Presidio Santa Rosa de Corodeguachi, also identified as Fronteras, about 150 miles to the west of Janos in the Pimería Alta, was formed in 1692 (Moorhead 1975:22). Fronteras became Presidio de San Bernardino, on the Río San Bernardino east of the modern town of Douglas, Arizona, in 1775, but that site was abandoned in 1780 (Gerald 1968:21). Other presidios in the Pimería Alta included Santa Gertrudis de Altar and San Ignacio de Tubac (see Figure 3). The company stationed at Presidio Santa Gertrudis de Altar on the Río Altar in the southern Pimería Alta had been originally assigned in 1595 to a presidio farther to the south at San Felipe y Santiago de Sinaloa on the Río Sinaloa but was soon moved north to the Río Fuerte. After the Yaqui revolt of 1740, the soldiers were stationed to guard the edges of Yaqui territory. In 1752, the garrison received its ultimate reassignment to a site on the north banks of the Río Altar, after it split from the Río Concepción, as can be seen in Figure 3 (Polzer and Sheridan 1997:188n7, 256). San Ignacio de Tubac, on the Río Santa Cruz about a league north of Tumacácori, was also established in 1752. In 1776, the Tubac garrison was ordered north, closer to San Xavier del Bac, resulting in the establishment of San Agustín de Tucson.

There was also the peripatetic Terrenate company, which was formed at the headwaters of the Río San Pedro in 1741. In 1776, the company moved briefly downstream on the San Pedro to become Presidio Santa Cruz de Terrenate but was forced
by Apache pressure to return upstream to Las Nutrias in 1780. In 1787, the company finally settled at the abandoned mission of Suamca (see Figure 3). The duties of these garrisons primarily included the protection of Spanish settlements and nearby missions from raids by hostile tribes and the creation of a frontier, from which to launch expeditions farther afield. In theory, presidios would also form the nucleus for a civilian town. As the Spaniards moved to the northwest, this became problematic because of native raids and the reluctance of the central government in Mexico City to properly fund presidial forces.

The presidio was an early type of frontier settlement, the site of a garrison of presidial soldiers. Spanish regulations encouraged every soldier to settle his family around the presidio where he was stationed. Soldiers could hold land, and soldiers’ families and retired members of the presidial garrison made up a goodly proportion of the civilian settlement around some presidios (Moorhead 1975:224–225). Other civilians were also attracted to, and encouraged to settle around, the presidios that protected the Spanish frontier. The soldiers and their commanders were assigned to protect the roads and pueblos, a welcome protection for the nearby civilian settlement, and to act as a sort of police force in the area. The military regulations promulgated in 1772 stated that farm fields and house lots were to be provided for any civilian who wished to settle at the presidio. The settlers found a ready market for agricultural products and their other skills at the presidios, which seem to have been continually short on supplies (Stern and Jackson 1988). If a presidio were disbanded or moved to a new location, government policy stipulated that the civilian settlement should remain, and the settlers should be
provided arms at cost to form a militia company to defend themselves and aid official presidial forces if the need should arise. When an area was deemed pacified, the presidio’s captain would be replaced by an alcalde mayor as the presidio became a regular Spanish town. The commander would occasionally end up as a governor (Gerhard 1993:15). For example, Captain Juan Bautista de Anza was the captain of the Tubac presidio until 1776 when the garrison moved to Tucson, then he spent a year as the military commander of Sonora and was appointed governor of Nuevo México in 1778.

Civilian Settlements

The first big influx of non-native civilians into northwestern New Spain was mineral prospectors, following Jesuit missionaries’ reports of workable veins of precious metals. For the most part, the population of these camps remained extremely fluid, moving on as the easily recovered ore ran out. However, some of the larger camps, like San Juan Bautista farther south in Sonora that had been founded in 1657, survived to become real civilian towns (Stern and Jackson 1988). Colonial settlers moving into the Pimería Alta in the late 1600s were driven back south by a Pima rebellion in 1695, when the Pimas Altos retaliated against an unduly punitive expedition against them by the flying company of Sonora (Naylor and Polzer 1986). Gerhard gives the estimated population of the gobierno of Sinaloa y Sonora in 1750 as 60,000 Indians and 30,000 non-Indians (Gerhard 1993:Table B), while Sheridan is more conservative, estimating the population of the gobierno at 50,000 Indians and 15,000 “others” (Sheridan 1992:Table
1). The first civilian Hispanic settlements in the Pimería Alta unconnected to a mission were farms and *ranchos* in the Santa Cruz valley that appeared in response to the needs of miners and these appeared as early as the 1730s (Jackson 1999:64-65) and the town that grew under the protective shadow of Presidio San Ignacio de Tubac (see Figure 3).

**Conditions along the Río Santa Cruz and the Río San Pedro**

All the native societies colonized by the Spaniards resisted Spanish domination. Contact generally followed a pattern of three phases: initial friendly relations, then a period of revolt and unrest as the Spanish imposed missions and European practices, then submission to Spanish controls, at least to some extent (Spicer 1962:16). Tribes in southern and central Sonora that were agricultural and tended to live in fairly concentrated settlements or towns before contact with the colonizers adapted to Spanish practices more easily than groups farther to the north, like the Pima groups, who lived in smaller, more mobile, autonomous communities. Most native groups in the Pimería shared the common practice of agriculture. Different Pima groups ranged from the high sierras and valleys of Sonora into the deserts of the Pimería Alta, or northern Sonora, Mexico to the Gila River in Arizona.

The Sonoran frontier provided a window of opportunity for mestizos and others not of “pure” Spanish blood. As late as the 1760s, the Hispanic population of Sonora was
concentrated in southern Sonora, below the modern international border (Weber 1992:209). With few settlers and a great deal of available land, the strict Spanish race laws became somewhat relaxed, allowing anyone who was willing to brave the elements, isolation, and raids by hostile natives to claim land and make a stab at becoming a prosperous citizen of the province.

So what was the situation along the Río Santa Cruz and the Río San Pedro between 1750 and 1800? Hostilities between the Spanish colonists and the Apaches were almost constant, because of nearly ceaseless Apache raiding of Spanish settlements and missions. The Spanish government relied on two colonial institutions: the mission and the presidio. Kino had visited Sobaipuri rancherias along the Río San Pedro in the 1690s and suggested several as sites for visitas in the future. Sobaipuris from the San Pedro who had been caught stealing livestock from mission pueblos along the Río Santa Cruz in 1692 came to Kino and requested missionaries (Polzer 1998:42). However, because the Río San Pedro represented a true border, far from military reinforcements and open to Apache attack, many of the Sobaipuri Pimas on the Río San Pedro agreed in 1762 to evacuate and join their cousins at the missions on the Río Santa Cruz. Other than the failed attempt at Terrenate, no enduring missions, presidios, or other Spanish settlements were founded in the latter half of the eighteenth century in the San Pedro Valley.

The Spanish padres tried to keep mission operations peaceful, but as early as 1695 the Pimas at Tubutama rose up against the Ópata overseer. The missions of Caborca, Oquitoa, and Tubutama on the Río Altar were destroyed, but the uprising did not spread beyond the Altar valley (Polzer 1998:51–52). The Spaniards and already missionized
Indians came to terms, but the Pimería Alta continued to exist in an atmosphere of general unrest. At the same time, civilians were mining, ranching, farming, and forming towns in better-protected areas of the Pimería Alta. For example, colonial farms and ranchos like San Lázaro, Divisadero, Santa Bárbara, and Buenavista in the San Luis and San Rafael Valleys along the upper Río Santa Cruz (Kessell 1976; Officer 1987) formed tight-knit communities until an increase in Apache raiding forced their abandonment in the 1760s. The expulsion of the Jesuit order from Spanish possessions in 1767 left the missions without supervision, although the Franciscan order quickly replaced the Jesuits in the Pimería Alta.

The mission cabecera of Guevavi, in the upper Santa Cruz River valley was central to the mission pueblos, rancherias and Hispanic settlements of the valley and had Calabazas and Tumacácori as its visitas. Because Guevavi proved so hard to defend, by 1773 it had been abandoned and Tumacácori, south of Tubac, had been made the chain’s cabecera. After the expulsion of the Jesuits, Hispanic settlers had moved into mission villages, and according to the 1774 Tumacácori census there were 98 Pimas or Papagos at the mission, along with 19 gente de razón. At Calabazas, there were no gente de razón, but 138 Pima or Papago individuals lived there. Farther north at San Xavier del Bac, the 1774 census counted 399 Pimas or Papagos, but no gente de razón (Kessell 1976:88).

Religious and secular officials continued to tinker with the Pimería Alta missions, sometimes trying to strengthen them and sometimes trying to completely do away with the traditional mission. Fray Diego Ximénez, procurador (bookkeeper) for the missions in the Pimería Alta, issued a plan for the region in 1773 that requested the money to
provide for two priests and a guard of two or three soldiers at each mission, that colonists not be allowed to live in mission villages or to employ mission Indians off of mission property, and that the missionary have the authority to supervise or punish the residents of the mission. Viceroy Antonio Bucareli issued a declaration that contained all of the requests made by Ximénez, except for a second missionary and the guards (Kessell 1976:85–86). Increasing the staff at the missions represented an additional expense, and the governments in Spain and in Mexico were notoriously parsimonious, something that affected both the missions and the presidial garrisons. It was not until 1795 that the Franciscans were finally able to staff two priests at each mission in the Pimería Alta.

In 1737, only a few years after Sonora became a separate province, its one presidio, Fronteras, had 12 men of its 50 member garrison fighting Seris in the southwest, another 12 guarding the missions in the Pimería Alta, and others engaged in escort and guard duty. The nearest reinforcements were over 90 miles away at the presidio of Janos in Nueva Vizcaya. Undermanned, Fronteras was totally incapable of curbing Apache raiding and protecting Sonoran citizens and peaceful Indians. A new presidio, San Felipe de Jesus de Guevavi, alias Terrenate, was established in 1742 near the headwaters of the Río San Pedro, just south of the international border in north-central Sonora, to aid Fronteras in curbing Apache raids (Moorhead 1975:51). In 1749, the Seris, this time joined by some Pimas Altos and Papagos, rebelled. Luis Oacpicagigua of Saric led some of the Pimas of the Pimería Alta in a 1751 revolt, and these events resulted in the establishment of the northern presidio of San Ignacio de Tubac and the final settlement of the garrison originally from the presidio of Sinaloa at Santa Gertrudis de Altar in 1752. In
1765, the presidio San Carlos de Buenavista was established down on the Yaqui River to help control the Seris (Moorhead 1975:52). In slightly less than 30 years, the number of troops in Sonora had increased from a single garrison to five presidios and a mobile flying company (*companía volante*) that did not have a fixed presidial base. Even this increase of soldiers and equipment did not establish firm Spanish control of the frontier, despite the attempts at further regulation in 1772 and 1786. Because of the Pima Revolt in 1751 and the never-ending pressure of Apache raids, the population became concentrated in places more easily defended, especially at the presidio and town of Tubac and at the Tumacácori mission in the Santa Cruz Valley. The duties of the Tubac garrison included defending the mission districts of Guevavi, later Tumacácori, and San Xavier del Bac; patrolling the countryside against Apache raids; deploying troops to larger frontier campaigns against Seris, Pimas, and Apaches; assisting the other presidios in the Pimería Alta; taking messages between the presidios; and escorting payroll and trade caravans from Sonoran centers to the south.

Presidios were of the utmost importance in enabling settlement on the frontier. Although presidios in the more established parts of New Spain might have garrisons of only a few men, who were simply quartered in the town (Moorhead 1975:165, 181), presidios on the frontier were fortified sites with fairly large garrisons. Presidial troopers were professional soldiers but were not part of the regular Spanish army; after the Seven Years’ War in Europe ended in 1762, recruiting efforts focused on the formation of units of local men because, officials felt, they were more familiar with the environment and problems of the frontier. Other soldiers formed *companías volantes* or flying companies
that included more men than a presidial garrison and were not attached to a specific presidio. These companies patrolled the roads, went on campaign with regular presidial companies, and served as emergency reinforcements (Moorhead 1975:180). Friendly native scouts and auxiliaries also formed an incredibly important supplement to regular troops because of their knowledge of the ways of the enemy. Although the forms and duties of presidial companies were not fully standardized until the military regulations of 1772, the settlements on the frontier of Sonora would have perished without the military protection the presidios provided.

After 1700, the Spanish Crown’s expenditures nearly doubled in response to increased raids, particularly by the Apaches, that approached the level of open warfare. As early as 1706, Juan Mateo Manje was suggesting the formation of another presidio near the source of the Río de Sonora to protect the mission of Dolores (Burrus 1971:152). Throughout the Pimería Alta’s history nearly every military and civilian official who inspected or visited the area wanted to move, consolidate, or increase the number of presidios on the frontier. The Pimería Alta was in a nearly constant state of conflict after 1750. Detachments of soldiers assigned to San Ignacio de Tubac, for example, aided in offensives against the Seris in 1766 and 1768–1770. The Seris, an indigenous group that lived along the coast of Sonora, rebelled and were joined by renegade Pimas Bajos before 1751. After the Pima Revolt, Upper Pima rebels known as Piatos joined the Seris and Pimas Bajos to conduct successful guerrilla warfare against the Spaniards, raiding and then retreating on foot into the monte (mountainous wilderness), where they could not be followed by mounted Spanish troops. Colonel Domingo Elizondo led an army of more
than 1,000 Spanish troops to attack the Seri forces. At first he used European strategies in an unfamiliar landscape, in which they proved a total failure (Sheridan 1999). Because Elizondo was unable to bring his enemies to a pitched battle, he would not release the Tubac presidial troops to return to the north and help the troops that had remained at Tubac and soldiers from other presidios in the Pimería Alta fight the Apaches, who were active because many of the soldiers were on detachment (Dobyns 1995).

Changes in Military Regulations and Creation of the Provincias Internas

In a review of the defenses on the frontier of northwestern New Spain, the Marqués de Rubí spent two years, 1766–1768, inspecting presidios and towns from the Colorado River to San Antonio de Béxar in Spanish Texas, the modern city of San Antonio. His conclusions were published as the Reglamentos de 1772. Rubi described reforms that would, he felt, improve Spanish abilities to defend the frontier against hostile Indian raids and allow offensive campaigning against them. The proposed reforms would also save some money for the Spanish colonial government in Mexico. The Reglamento created new presidios, ordered more soldiers to the frontier, and generally emphasized force over diplomacy. It stipulated that soldiers’ families would follow the men, and that presidial soldiers would be granted land to farm around the presidio upon their retirement.
One of Rubí’s recommendations concerned finding new sites for and transferring five Sonoran presidios to create a new, defensive “line” that would better serve to deter raiders. Rubí also ordered frontier troops to campaign more aggressively against hostile Indians and transferred 100 dragoon soldiers, the Voluntarios de Cataluña, to the area known as the Províncias Internas, where they would serve as a flying company under Coronel Don Hugo O’Conor (Bobb 1962:139). O’Conor received orders in 1773 to review the troops and find new sites for the presidios of San Ignacio de Tubac and Terrenate; he decided to move the Tubac garrison to Tucson, a visita of San Xavier del Bac and move Terrenate farther north along the Río San Pedro to Santa Cruz (see Figure 3), and these transfers were completed by 1776.

The people who remained at the town of Tubac after O’Conor transferred the presidio to Tucson did form a militia commanded by Capitan Juan Chrisóstomo Ramirez, a retired soldier from the Tubac presidio, to guard against Apache raids at Tubac (Officer 1987:54). A detachment of guards from the presidio at Tucson was assigned to protect the settlers remaining at Tubac as well as the missions of San Xavier and Tumacácori in the 1770s, but by 1783 no colonists remained in Tubac’s vicinity and only three Hispanic families persevered at Tumacácori (Kessell 1976:132; Officer 1987:58). The town of Tubac struggled to survive without a permanent military present until the San Rafael Company of Pima soldiers with Spanish officers was stationed there in 1787 (Dobyns 1972; Officer 1987:63).

The Províncias Internas, including Texas, Nuevo México, Coahuila, Nueva Vizcaya, Sinaloa, Sonora, and California were created as an official division in 1776 to
form a secure front against other colonial powers and to present a more organized effort against raiding Apaches (Gerhard 1993:16; Moorhead 1975:76). The creation of this new division was a part of the Reglamento de 1772. Teodoro de Croix was appointed the first comandante general of the Províncias Internas in 1776, a post he filled until 1783. His position involved the supervision of all branches of government in the Províncias Internas: gobierno, justicia, militar, hacienda, and patronato real (Gerhard 1993:16).

Each presidio in the Províncias Internas was meant to become the nucleus of a civilian town. A town did form around Tubac, but many of the other presidios were too exposed or did not have enough fertile farmland to support a civilian population.

Presidios on the northwestern frontier were defensive installations, designed to protect Spanish missions and settlements from raids by hostile groups that in the Pimería Alta included the different Apache groups and at times the Pima, Yaqui, and Seri. Presidios were really reactive in nature because they were established in an area after raids or attacks had occurred. Reglamentos promulgated in 1729 and 1772 specified things like the number of soldiers that should be in each presidial garrison, the supplies each soldier should maintain, and the structure of command. The reglamentos also laid out ways in which civilian settlers could be attracted to the presidio.

Even after the Reglamentos de 1772 and the separation of the Províncias Internas as a distinct administrative unit, Spanish officials continued to tinker with policies for presidial soldiers on the frontier and their duties, usually in an attempt to save money. Indian hostilities increased or decreased in response to these changes. A royal order issued in 1779 stated that the comandante general of the Províncias Internas was only to
use armed force to defend Spanish settlements from hostile Indians and to persuade the hosts into peaceful coexistence through gifts of food, faulty firearms, and alcohol (Kessell 1976:136).

Life on the colonial frontier became much more peaceful after 1786. The Instrucciones de 1786, written by the Conde de Gálvez, made official a policy of granting peace to and mutual nonaggression pacts with groups of Apaches who asked for peace. Apaches who chose nonaggression were to be given rations of food and liquor, hunting weapons, and clothing, in order to make the new way of life promoted by the Spaniards more profitable than violent raiding (Dobyns 1972; Kessell 1976:163). By 1793 groups of Apaches known as “Apaches de Paz” had settled into camps outside presidios and missions. In 1795 over one hundred presidial soldiers and native auxiliaries assembled at the deserted Presidio Santa Cruz de Terrenate on the Río San Pedro and peacefully traveled northeast through Apache country to the Zuni pueblos and back to the Río San Pedro (Kessell 1976:185).

### Characteristics Of Pimería Alta Settlements

One of the characteristics of settlements in the Pimería Alta, whether a rancho, a mission pueblo, or a presidio and its surrounding pueblo, was isolation. The great distances between presidios meant that the military force at each found that trying to
fulfill the presidio’s responsibilities of patrolling a large area, protecting nearby missions and *ranchos*, and guarding caravans on their journey north, let Apaches and other hostile groups of Indians move about with near impunity. Despite the violence and danger of living on the frontier, missionaries brought a new social structure and belief system and introduced new crops that grew well along the river floodplains. Families of soldiers, farmers, miners, and other civilians came north as well, providing other avenues by which Indians could gain experience with the colonial Spanish society. Because of the violence and danger of living on the frontier, a close-knit Hispanic society developed as Indians, especially women and children, were integrated through Christian baptism and education, as well as marriage to non-Indian residents of the pueblos. Whether as wives or as servants, as Spanish women or women of other ethnic groups, the role of a woman in a Hispanic household was primarily domestic (McEwan 1991), providing a space out of the public eye for the development of a colonial Hispanic culture.
CHAPTER 6: IDENTIFYING GENDER GROUPS IN THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL RECORD

The next step in exploring the presence of women and the interactions of gender at the sites of Tubac and Santa Cruz de Terrenate involves creating a list of the sorts of artifacts associated with females that could be present at each site. This first requires an understanding of the environment, history, and development of colonial Sonora. Theories presented earlier concerning gender, colonization, and the agency of individuals and groups are then used to construct a hypothetical model of the material culture that might indicate the presence of women. The colonization of New Spain has left an incredibly rich historical record, preserved in archives in Spain, Mexico, the United States, and other places. In this chapter, I evaluate and draw information from sources including eighteenth-century casta paintings from Mexico that depict different racial mixes and census records compiled from different mission cabeceras on the northwestern Spanish frontier, in combination with information from early twentieth-century ethnographies of the Indian groups native to the eastern Pimeria Alta. From these sources, I construct a list of artifacts that could appear in the material signature of women at a Spanish colonial site, depending on the resources that were available. When the archaeological record is rich enough, the proposed model should also be able to differentiate groups of women on the basis of factors such as ethnicity. This model will be tested using previously collected
artifacts from two sites in colonial northern Sonora, the area that is now central, southern Arizona.

**Research Expectations**

If women of different ethnic mixes were present at Tubac or Terrenate, a significant percentage of the recovered artifacts should be artifacts associated with female tasks, female dress, and female personal care items. Artifacts that function also as ethnic markers reflect the ethnicities of resident females and the overall degree of Hispanization of the community. Changes over time in the number of female-associated artifacts as a percentage of the total assemblage may reflect a growth or a reduction in the presence of women at the site. If the ratios of ethnic markers change over time while there is no significant change in the total percentage of artifacts associated with females relative to total artifacts collected, those changes may reflect an increase or decrease in the process of ethnogenesis or in the Hispanization of the community.

*Interpreting Material Culture*

Because items of material culture recovered from an archaeological site are affected by both natural and cultural formation processes (Schiffer 1987:7, 22), there is
generally no direct link between patterns of material culture at a site and the social contexts that produced the patterns. This means that there can be no simple or straightforward interpretation of the archaeological record. Archaeologists cannot interpret the material patterns of a society without understanding its nature based on known sociocultural variables (Shanks and Tilley 1987:104). Using the perspective of only a single or dominant group makes for a woefully thin interpretation that cannot be used to understand the whole. To avoid this problem, I follow a “processual-plus” model (Hegmon 2003) for describing Spanish colonial settlement. It allows for the inclusion of different groups’ perspectives, enriching understanding and interpretation in different social contexts.

The proposed model for interpreting Spanish colonial society focuses primarily on the identification of women resident at eighteenth-century civilian and military sites on the Sonoran frontier, with a secondary focus on the women’s ethnicity. A woman in civilian and military settlements on the frontier played different public and private roles in her household and the settlement according to her ethnicity, her status within the household, and the household’s status in the community. Artifacts used in women’s tasks and female items of dress in the archaeological record not only document a female presence, they may also offer information on changes in colonial society in Sonora and the emergence of a Hispanic culture that reflects aspects of both the colonial and the colonized groups.
Developing the Model

I have examined the different theoretical perspectives of processual, behavioral, and postprocessual archaeology and how they might apply in historical archaeology, and I draw from all three to create a “processual-plus” model as described by Hegmon (2003). The “processual-plus” approach incorporates elements from behavioral archaeology in its focus on material objects and their use by human actors, as well as the postprocessual concerns of agency and gender. The main points of each perspective are summarized in Figure 4.

Processual Archaeology

Processual archaeology deals best with general, large-scale causes of change such as changing environments, population increase, and contact or competition with other cultural groups (Schiffer 1995b:23). Archaeologists form hypotheses and use middle-range theory to explain how archaeological evidence translates into behavior. The original goal of processual archeology was to compare the archaeological evidence in different situations to create general laws of behavior that could explain cultural processes involved in human adaptation to changing ecosystems (Binford 1962).
Processual Archaeology

- large-scale causes of change
- middle-range theory
- cultural processes and human behavior in the ecosystem

Behavioral Archaeology

- study of material objects
- natural and cultural formation processes
- human behavior and the multiple functions of artifacts in society

Postprocessual Archaeology

- how individuals and groups construct the past
- different groups create multiple and competing versions of the past
- understand and take into account the contributions of individuals and groups

Processual-Plus Viewpoint

- uses systematic methods
- incorporates postprocessual concepts
- not wedded to a single theoretical paradigm

FIGURE 4. Relevant features of theoretical perspectives in archaeology.
Behavioral Archaeology

The broadly stated goal of behavioral archaeology is “to generate both historical narratives and general principles” (Schiffer 1995b:22) through the study of material objects in any time or area that can be used to describe and explain human behavior (Reid 1995:17; Reid et al. 1975). Behavioral archaeology has given archaeologists methods to investigate how natural and cultural processes have affected the formation of the archaeological record. In behavioral archaeology, systemic questions of adaptation and survival are deemphasized in favor of how people make, use, and discard material things. Instead of concentrating on the identification and technology of artifacts, the focus of middle-range theory is on human behavior and the multiple functions of artifacts in society.

Postprocessual Archaeology

Interpretive models in postprocessual archaeology concentrate almost entirely on how individuals and groups construct the past through their actions. Instead of a single, undifferentiated culture, postprocessualists like Michael Shanks and Christopher Tilly (Shanks and Tilly 1987:11) recognize that within a single culture, groups that are different on the basis of gender, ethnicity, status, politics, and income create multiple and competing versions of the past. Part of the postprocessual phenomenon has been the
inclusion of theories of agency in archaeological interpretation in an attempt to understand and take into account the contributions of individuals and groups. Agency is a distinct interpretive mindset that recognizes individual members of a society as actors who create their society and affect the formation of the archaeological record. One way to identify groups in the archaeological record is through interpretations of the artifacts that are the material consequences of past actions and that reflect agency. Changes in the archaeological record may reflect changes in culture over time, and identifying suites of artifacts associated with particular activities will aid in the identification of groups who performed those activities.

*Comparing the Three*

Processual archaeology uses the material record to analyze data and develop quantitative methods to test hypotheses about processes of cultural adaptation and survival. This is illustrated using examples from historical archaeology. In his work at Jamestown, J. C. Harrington noticed a relationship between the diameter of the bore in an English clay pipe stem and the date when the pipe was made, which Lewis Binford refined into a simple formula to yield the midpoint date of the site’s occupation (Deetz 1996:29). Stanley South also used detailed records of the manufacture of European ceramics as the basis for the Mean Ceramic Date formula, which also produces a date reflecting the middle of occupation (South 1972). Subsequent studies have tested and refined South’s and Harrington’s methods (Deetz 1996; Majewski and O’Brien 1987).
Behavioral archaeology was developed in reaction to inadequacies in processual archaeology’s hypothetico-deductive model. Interpreting the archaeological record using the behavioral method involves placing the emphasis on how people make, use, and discard material things (Walker et al. 1995:5). Behavioral archaeologists also consider how a site or activity area is formed and how cultural and natural processes could transform the archaeological record. Stanley South’s Carolina Pattern is based on the presence of artifacts that he grouped into functional categories, an implicitly behavioral paradigm for the description and explanation of human behavior in the recent past (Orser 1995:189; South 1977).

Postprocessual archaeologists, who feel that behavioral archaeology is still too empirical in perspective, maintain that the material record represents the informed choices of action by individual agents in specific contexts and not uniform behaviors (Wobst 2000:40). They consider that the creation of the past and the archaeological record are reflexive processes, one always affecting the other. The choices of individual agents in a society have a constant effect on the construction of that society, while in turn individual choice is structured by the rules of society and culture. The archaeological record is composed of many “texts” (Shanks and Tilly 1987:17), each one reflecting the perspective and understanding of different groups. How obvious the text of a particular group may be in the record depends on formation processes over time and the power relationships in the society of which that group was a part. A complete interpretation of the archaeological record of a site, relations between different types of sites, or an
identified period of time must include the unwritten stories, the “hidden transcripts” (Cusick 1998:139; Scott 1990:14) of subordinate groups, including women.

**Processual-Plus Perspective**

Michelle Hegmon (2003) describes “processual-plus” archaeology as a method that asks systematic and objective scientific questions but incorporates postprocessual concepts like agency and gender in the answer and is not wedded to a single theoretical paradigm. The archaeology of gender, specifically of women’s agency, or contributions to and participation in the cultural construction of a society (Dobres and Robb 2000:8–9), is an example of processual-plus archaeology because hypotheses are made using ethnographic variables like power and ethnicity to answer inquiries concerning the postprocessual question of the construction of gender roles and relationships (Hegmon 2003), and the effects different genders have on culture change in situations of colonialism. A model to investigate questions of gender at Sonoran colonial sites in the eighteenth century is best served by the use of a processual-plus perspective. Figure 5 details the steps involved in a processual-plus model to investigate these questions.
Constructing a Model of Gender at Spanish Colonial Sites

The steps in my processual-plus model combine elements of processual, behavioral, and postprocessual archaeology to determine a possible gender signature. Colonizing activities produce large-scale, significant change in the ecosystem and sociocultural construction of groups. Adapting to the changes sparked by colonization leads to changes in the behaviors of the dominant and subordinate groups with accompanying changes in the form and uses of material culture. Investigating how women took part in the construction of Spanish colonial society at the sites of Tubac and Terrenate contributes another perspective to the interpretation of the archaeological record of the Pimería Alta.

Data Sources

What are the sources of data that inform on the ways that women took part in the survival of their families, and what do these sources say about the female roles in the construction of Hispanic society at Tubac and Terrenate? What tools were available to women to fulfill their roles? Many, if not most, of the women resident at colonial sites outside the oldest areas of colonial settlement were not able to keep diaries or correspond with relatives. This means that information about these women must be drawn indirectly.
from documents created by men, including eighteenth-century census data and colonial paintings. Information about the residents of the Pimería Alta at this time may also be drawn from idealized portraits painted to delineate the *sistema de castas*, a complex system of ethnic and class groupings.

*Mission records.* Mission 2000 (National Park Service [NPS] 2000) is an online, searchable database of census records from Spanish missions and towns on the northern frontier of New Spain, accessible through the Tumacácori National Historical Park website. Although Mission 2000 represents an incredibly valuable source of data about the population of northern New Spain, it must not be used uncritically. The Mission 2000 home page states that all of the data contained within have been “taken from the original mission records and updated weekly on the internet” (NPS 2000). This suggests that the original documents from which the data were taken were not available when the data were input, providing openings for possible errors in either copying the data from the original records or entering the records into the database. The types of documents from which information was taken include records of baptism, marriage, burial, censuses, inspections carried out by church and military inspectors, and accounts of Indian uprisings. All individuals whose names appear in these records received an entry in the database, whether or not any more information about that person appeared in the document, although all events in which that person’s name appears are included in the entry. Links in the database are formed based on personal names. The spellings of names were not standardized in colonial New Spain, so the database allows searches on partial
1. Describe the environment of the study area and locally available resources.

2. Explore the archaeological contexts in the study area, including the different ethnic and cultural groups, the settlement history of the area, and the history of sites.

3. Determine tasks generally assigned to the different genders and the clothing and personal items likely to belong to each through study of primary and secondary historical documents, illustrations, and secondary texts.

4. Read descriptions, modern and historical, of the products of each task and the tools required at each stage.

5. Hypothesize a set of expected artifacts that could form a “material signature” of women at the site.

6. Establish parameters and methods of excavation at a site. When working with excavated collections, determine proveniences and contexts of recovery. The strength of the expected signature depends on the contexts of data recovery.

7. Evaluate recovered artifacts for presence/absence of hypothesized gender-specific artifacts.

FIGURE 5. Steps to determine a gender signature from a processual-plus perspective.
names (NPS 2000). Different individuals sometimes shared the same name, representing another potential source of confusion.

Using the Mission 2000 database, I conducted a systematic sampling of female individuals listed in marriage records from missions in the Pimería Alta, including San Xavier del Bac, San José de Tumacácori, Los Santos Ángeles de Guevavi, Santa María Suamca (Soamca), San Diego del Pitiquito, San Ignacio, and La Purísima Concepción de Nuestra Señora de Caborca. Records from the pueblo of Tubac and the *estancia* of Santa Ana were also included. For the purposes of this research only marriages that occurred between and 1740 and 1800 were included. All of the women whose names appeared in the record—brides, previous wives now deceased, mothers of the bride and mothers of the groom, godmothers, and witnesses—were entered separately, although care was taken to avoid any woman appearing more than once in the project database. When more than 50 marriage records from a single mission or pueblo existed, a 10 percent random sample was taken, resulting in a total of 181 records.

The information contained in these records included the names of the individuals concerned, the date of the event, where the marriage ceremony actually took place, and the residences of the couple. Where information on the ethnicity (given in the Mission 2000 database as “race or tribe”) of the woman or husband appeared, it was entered into the database as well. By the eighteenth century in New Spain, enough *mestizaje* had occurred that an individual’s ethnicity could no longer be determined solely on the basis of physical characteristics but was based increasingly on residence and lifestyle. Ethnicities were subject to manipulation for maximum social advantage in different
situations (Chance and Taylor 1977:465). Of 24 women for whom ethnicity was given, 17 were listed as members of an Indian group (including 2 Yaqui women, but none listed as Apache), and 7 were listed as “Española” or “Vizcaina” (Basque). Among the 27 husbands in the database for whom an ethnicity was given, 9 were Spanish and 18 were Indian. None of the records in the database of Spanish women or men distinguished *criollo* from *peninsular*.

What is evident from the data is that each mission *cabecera* served many smaller *rancherias*, farms, and towns in the surrounding countryside, and that some individuals were fairly mobile among colonial settlements, despite the threat of Apache attack. It is also interesting that in one record, from the mission of Pitiquito (located on the northern bank of the Río Concepción before it splits into the Río Altar and the Río Magdalena), Juana Ignacia de la Parra, a Spanish woman, married the Pima Indian, Xavier, in 1775. Although it was an accepted colonial practice for Spanish men to marry Indian women, apparently the reverse might also occur, although the conditions surrounding this marriage remain unknown.

The Mission 2000 database also contained a field labeled “title” wherein an individual’s occupation or position was listed. Unfortunately for this project, none of the 181 women whose records were examined were given a title beyond “*mujer de*” (wife of). This means that all that may be considered is the husband’s title, which was often no more than “*marido de*” (husband of). When the husband’s occupation or colonial office was given, it may provide a clue at least to relative wealth or status. Occupations listed among all the 10,263 women in the entire Mission 2000 database (years included
currently are 1698–1811) do not amount to a significant percentage of the total (NPS 2000). Apparently, the occupations of females were not often recorded, most likely because women did not usually work outside the household.

*Ethnographies.* Although the missionary priests recorded the lives of the mission residents, women’s activities and clothing were not often detailed. I have looked at two eighteenth-century reports that contain information about female dress or activities (Nentuig 1764; Pfefferkorn 1989 [1794]), as well as secondary sources dealing with colonialism and culture change in Sonora and Chihuahua that incorporate colonial Spanish information (Radding 1997; Deeds 2003). Early twentieth-century ethnographic studies of the O’odham groups in the Pimería Alta (DeWald 1979; Hrdlička 1906; Rea 1997; Russell 1975; Underhill 1936, 1939) as well as personal stories of individuals written down or told to ethnographers (Shaw 1974; Webb 1959) also provide information on tasks, tools, and activities of the nineteenth century. Although the lapse of time between when the events were a daily occurrence and the time at which these people were interviewed—as well as the questions, knowledge, and style of the anthropologist conducting the interview and the reason for the writing of the ethnography—have undoubtedly affected the credibility of each ethnography (Wood 1990), the information should bear general similarities to late colonial Sonoran society. Table 3 summarizes the findings from these sources.

Five activity areas that contain tasks usually associated with females are recorded by the majority of the ethnographic sources. Traditionally, women have assumed the responsibility of feeding their families and tending to children. Tools needed to process
and prepare foods in a household that would likely survive in the archaeological record include: wooden or stone mortars with wooden pestles to pound mesquite pods; manos and metates of coarse-grained stone to grind corn and other seeds; knives and other tools to skin, peel, or cut up foodstuffs; ceramic cooking vessels; wooden trays and baskets to parch corn and other items; and utensils like ladles or spoons to stir and assist with the cooking process (Deeds 2003; Hrdlička 1906; Radding 1997; Russell 1975).

Unfortunately, many tools used in food preparation could also be used in other activities associated with both genders.

Ceramic vessels and other tools recovered from unclear contexts like middens do not necessarily establish the presence of a kitchen, and food must be prepared whether or not females are available. Artifacts associated with the care of infants and young children would strongly suggest the presence of mothers at a site; however, the survival and identification in the archaeological record of items other than toys remains problematic. Women often aided men in agricultural tasks, planted seeds after fields were prepared, or harvested the crops. Female production of ceramics for household use has been documented among ethnographic groups in the Pimería Alta, so documenting artifacts used in ceramic manufacturing activities at eighteenth-century sites could provide a clue not only to the presence of women but also ethnicity. Unfortunately, few of the tools associated with women’s tasks may be strongly associated with those tasks, especially when found as an isolate outside the context of an activity area. Many of these tools were not made of stone, but of perishable materials such as gourds, wood, or bone, and do not always preserve well in the archaeological record.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Basketry</th>
<th>Ceramics</th>
<th>Food Processing and Preparation</th>
<th>Food Gathering</th>
<th>Weaving</th>
<th>Spinning</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Childcare</th>
<th>Household Maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deeds 2003</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeWald 1979</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hrdlička 1906</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nentuig 1764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pfefferkorn 1989 [1794]</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radding 1997</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rea 1997</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell 1975</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw 1974</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underhill 1936 and 1939</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webb 1959</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3. Recorded Female Activities
Two of the ethnographic sources also describe items of female clothing in the colonial Pimería Alta. The Jesuit missionary Ignacio Pfefferkorn documents the clothing worn by Hispanic women in his eighteenth-century description of Sonora: a gown, pleated from the belt; a shirt-waist or blouse that might have silk, gold, or silver embroidery; and a *rebozo* (mantilla or shawl) that might be trimmed with gold or silver ornaments. He describes hairstyles for both women and men that included braids ending with metal ornaments (Pfefferkorn 1989:287–288 [1794]). Frank Russell (1975:157–158), who carried out ethnographic work among the Pima Indians, details female costume both before and after contact with the Spaniards. Females dressed in knee-length kilts of willow bark and cotton blankets tied with a maguey cord or a woven belt before the Spanish entry into the Pimería Alta; afterwards they wore a sleeveless chemise with an improvised mantilla. Russell notes that both genders wore strings of beads, although it was the men who fashioned necklaces and earrings, while women stuck to bracelets (Russell 1975:168).

*Casta Paintings*. In colonial New Spain, perceived ethnic heritage could directly affect an individual’s or family’s class, economic opportunities, and marriage prospects. A detailed system of ethnic divisions, or *castas*, developed, based on basically the “Spanish-ness” of an individual and his or her ethnic background and percentage of Spanish blood (versus Indian and African). Colonial artists throughout Latin America created different series of *casta* paintings to formalize the *sistema de castas* and to demonstrate the characteristics of each caste (Chance and Taylor 1977; Katzew 1996). Figure 6 gives one example of a *casta* painting. Each painting illustrates a mother, father,
and offspring, identifying the *castas* of each adult, and the *casta* of their child or children. Peninsular Spaniards held the highest status; African slaves, free blacks, and unconverted Indians filled the lowest ranks of the system. If a Spanish female had a child with an Indian male, that child would be a *mestizo*, also referred to as a *coyote* in the Pimería Alta, and hold a slightly lower position in the *sistema de castas*. A man’s *casta* membership determined the kinds of positions that he could legally hold. For example, the highest governmental and religious positions were restricted to *peninsulares*, or colonists who had emigrated from Spain. *Criollos*, or full-blooded Spaniards who were born in the colonies, were considered less capable by the *peninsulares*.

The *sistema de castas* became more complex and less well-defined in the eighteenth century because *casta* membership could no longer be determined clearly in many cases and society had also become divided along cultural and economic lines (Katzew 1996:44). Some of the categories in the *sistema* became status categories that were determined by physical appearance, occupation, wealth, and lifestyle as much as by ancestry (Chance and Taylor 1977:465). A great deal of intermarriage had occurred in the Pimería Alta by the late 1700s, mission Indians had moved into Hispanic pueblos, colonists were residing in the mission pueblos, and the mission priests would record the ethnicity of their charges in the way that best avoided Spanish taxes. Mexican *casta* paintings therefore provide a good source for obtaining information on women’s costume and the artifacts of their lives. Some issues that must be considered when drawing information from them is that most of them are set in the older, more established parts of Mexico, where access to a variety of materials and imported
FIGURE 6. Francisco Clapera, 14. De Chino e India, Genizara, ca. 1785 (Collection of Frederick and Jan Mayer, courtesy of Denver Art Museum).
goods may have been greater. The characters in the painting may or may not have been real people, but they represent the artist’s conception of the characteristics of any certain casta. In general, these paintings represent the society’s ideal description of the castas; the reality may have been quite different. A partial list of ethnic groups and castas recognized in the Pimería Alta, drawn from a search of the Mission 2000 database, includes Español, Criollo, Castizo, Mestizo, Coyote, Indio (including Opata and Yaqui), Morisco, Mulato, De Razón (mixed casta, but culturally Hispanic), and other Europeans. The individuals in two troop reviews and a census taken at Tubac in 1752, 1767, and 1775 and one review done at Terrenate in 1775 before the transfer primarily represent males because of the military nature of the documents.

I examined 20 casta paintings from colonial Mexico, an admittedly small sample, drawn from two exhibition catalogs by Illona Katzew (1996, 2004). For purposes of analysis, I classified the three paintings where both adults were Spaniards, castizos, or mestizos as “casta alta.” The 10 paintings where one adult was Spanish or castizo became the “casta media” group. In the remaining seven paintings, both adults were of mixed castas, so those formed the “casta baja” group. I created a table to record my observations of each group, presented here as Table 4.

In general, many of the females in the paintings, regardless of age or casta status, wore items of jewelry. Items of jewelry visible in the paintings included short bead necklaces that were either many individual strands, or one long strand wrapped around the neck twice or more. Women and girls also wore long earrings, usually one or more beads and a charm suspended from an apparent post through the earlobe. Fewer bracelets
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jewelry</th>
<th>Clothing</th>
<th>Other Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Casta Alta** | 1. Drop earrings with charms. Charms usually teardrop-shaped, may be pearl, clear, or colored beads.  
2. Short strand(s) of beads at throat. May be pearls or colored beads, possibly with a charm.  
3. One woman wears a red wristband with a silver charm.  
4. No visible differences based on age. | 1. lace trim  
2. gold/metallic threads in trim or embroidered decoration  
3. Leather shoes or slippers are visible in two paintings (Katzew 2004:Figure 85, Figure 210); black leather shoe has high, brown heel. |  
| **Casta Media** | 1. Silver earrings with pearl, silver, or beaded charms.  
2. Necklaces are short strands of possible pearls, silver links, or beads, some with pendants or charms.  
3. Bracelets are strands of beads, possibly pearls.  
4. Mulata (Katzew 1996:Plate 1) is wearing a copper-colored band ring.  
5. Mestizo infant (Katzew 2004:Figure 8 detail) wears a probable religious medal. | 1. lace trim on hems and borders; Spanish woman has a wide, lace collar  
2. colorfully decorated and embroidered huipiles, some with gold (Katzew 2004:Figure 8 detail, Figure 84, Figure 209)  
3. possible metal grommets on bodices  
4. ribbons in hair or on clothing  
5. One, possibly two women are wearing shoes; mulata's shoes are leather with metal buckles (Katzew 2004:Figure 84, Figure 120) | 1. Several are pictured working in the kitchen preparing food or drink.  
2. In one scene, Spanish woman and mulato man pictured playing cards (Katzew 2004:Figure 162 detail).  
| **Casta Baja** | 1. Drop earrings have dark or colored beads, none appear to be pearl, although there may be small silver beads.  
2. Three necklaces pictured are red beads with black or silver trim.  
3. One india wears simple dark band ring. | 1. possible metal grommets on bodice  
2. lace trim  
3. colored ribbon trim  
4. metal threads | 1. Paintings show work environment, women in kitchen.  
2. Two paintings picture spinning wheel. In Katzew 2004, Figure 50, the woman is at the wheel; in Katzew 2004, Figure 224, both woman and man are involved in the work.  

appeared in the paintings, and in three instances women of the lower and middle classes wore simple band rings. Items of clothing unique to women in the paintings included several colorfully decorated and embroidered gowns or *huipiles*, trimmed with lace and ribbons, worn by four Indian women in the middle and lower class groupings.

Artifacts that are associated with females that are displayed in these paintings and that would likely survive in the archaeological record include beads and women’s jewelry. In the middle and upper class paintings, female and male dress for individuals of any age appear equally likely to sport decorations of lace and/or metallic threads in embroidered designs, although upon closer examination the patterns, width, and placement of lace ruffs or frills may show a difference by gender or age.

What is interesting is that in the three paintings of the highest *castas*, two (Katzew 2004:Figure 85, Figure 86) present simple scenes of a family strolling or standing in a courtyard or street. In the third (Katzew 2004:Figure 210), the family is pictured seated at a table, looking at a brightly colored bird held by the man, a Spaniard. Writing implements and papers on the table before him suggest that he has been writing, and a halved avocado in front of the woman suggests food preparation, although no tools are in evidence. The mestiza woman simply sits across the table holding her daughter, a castiza, as she reaches for the bird. Three of the *casta* paintings classified as *casta media* (Katzew 1996:Plate 12, Plate 13, Plate 20) are set in kitchens, where the woman is engaging in the traditional female task of food preparation. The vessels in which food is actually being cooked are plain, brown vessels that were perhaps manufactured locally, although the pitchers in Plates 12 and 13 represent a colonial form. White-glazed plates appear stacked
on a shelf in Plate 12. A large serving platter in Plate 13 appears to be blue-on-white majolica, and a liquid of some sort is being poured into and consumed out of glass bowls. Two handleless cups of chocolate on small plates or large saucers, all of blue-on-white majolica, are visible in Figure 162 in Katzew (2004).

Most of the seven casta paintings in this study depicting casta baja individuals also contain ceramic vessels including olive jars, blue-on-white majolica, and red vessels including trays, plates, bowls, and a pitcher that are most likely lead-glazed. Figure 50 and Figure 224 in Katzew (2004) show the woman engaged at a large spinning wheel with husband and child assisting in the task. In one painting of this group (Katzew 2004:Figure 17 detail), the woman wears a red gown or huipil displaying the lace and metallic threads seen in the casta alta paintings. The man and the child are also more richly dressed, and the pose of the painting is reminiscent of the three casta alta paintings, which may reflect the increasing effects of economics on the sistema de castas in the eighteenth century.

Testamentos. For historical archaeologists conducting archaeology, wills left by women and men from more prosperous families and probate inventories of their possessions recorded after the individual died provide an invaluable source of information on material possessions. Hoping that the same situation would exist in colonial New Spain, I investigated the testamentos or wills of Costanza de Sotomayor, Juana Manuela de Loya, Ana Quijada, and Rosalia de Fuente Fria, four women who lived
on the northern frontier of Chihuahua, dating to 1653, 1677, 1729, and 1789. Although this is farther east than the Pimería Alta, and only one will fell into my time period, I hoped to get an idea of the kinds of possessions that prosperous Hispanic women at the edge of Spanish territory owned or to which they could aspire. A Spanish woman might own anything from slaves and household goods to jewelry (McEwan 1991). The three testamentos that I examined included crops, livestock, farm implements, slaves, furniture, carpets, fine boxes imported from Michoacán, many paintings of the apostles and silver busts of saints, and other items, but nothing that could definitely be associated with women in the archaeological record. Increasing the sample of women’s wills from the Archivo Parral and the inclusion of testamentos of women from other places, held in other archives, will allow a better evaluation of the data contained in women’s testamentos and the kinds of questions best answered by those data.

Constructing the Model

From these sources of information, I constructed possible material signatures that could establish whether or not Terrenate and Tubac had resident female populations. In the Pimería Alta, a hypothetical list of artifacts created through the use of this model should include ceramic vessels and tools used in the preparation of food. Ideally these

---

1 Archivo Parral [AP], Parral, Chihuahua, MF. RL. 1653B FR. 1031–1034; AP MF. RL. 1729A FR. 0659–0662; AP MF. RL. 1677B FR. 1036–1097; AP MF. RL. 1789A FR. 0327–0663
vessels would have the carbon cores that indicate manure temper. According to McEwan, the material signature of Indian women at Spanish colonial sites includes artifacts associated with food production, especially Colono Ware ceramics, and the archaeological correlates of Spanish women are primarily associated with maintenance of the household (McEwan 1991:34, 37). Majolica tableware and porcelain had to be imported and were important to both female and male colonists as symbols of a Spanish or Hispanic identity. Archaeologists might also recover whole or identifiable fragments of jewelry or clothing that are similar to those in the casta paintings. Ivor Noël Hume, excavating a site at Martin’s Hundred, a seventeenth-century plantation in the British colony of Virginia, reported finding short strands of silver and gold wire, of the sort “used in the early seventeenth century to decorate better quality clothing” (Noël Hume 1982:57–58). Of course, any artifacts that could be definitely associated with children or infants provide a strong signal.

I did not control the parameters and methods of excavation at either Terrenate or Tubac, but the artifacts collected are available for study. I documented the numbers of artifacts associated with female tasks in the collections from each site, bearing in mind that men could do most of these activities when no women were present. Census records indicate that there were women living at Tubac, so I will use the South Barrio artifacts to evaluate the model. Lack of consistent provenience data and records of the excavation in the south barrio of Tubac severely limit the identification of household contexts.

Few records exist that describe Presidio Santa Cruz de Terrenate, so it will constitute more of a test case. Di Peso (1953) believed that he was excavating different
phases of the Sobaipuri (Native American) ranchería of Quiburi that were overlain by the Presidio Santa Cruz de Terrenate. He did not excavate in a manner designed to identify households but focused instead on recording and describing the rancherias below the presidio, and his report on the excavations was written before the development of modern methods. The University of Arizona project on which I was a crew member was a surface survey and collection, not an excavation. Therefore, I cannot use household data as other historical archaeologists have (Deagan 1983; Ewen 1991; Spector 1983; Van Buren 1999) to look at the females present, but focusing on the artifacts when the context is unclear, as in a midden, should still allow the estimation of a female presence. Women resident at Spanish colonial sites in Arizona represent a little-studied group whose contributions to colonial society are not well understood. Few of these women were actual Spaniards or Europeans, and considerations of ethnicity and castas determined to some extent the roles they could fill in society. Finding artifacts associated with Spanish or European women that were imported from the interior of New Spain is important, but the local Tohono O’odham women at the missions and in the towns also affect the signature.

Identifying female-related tools and artifacts from the hypothetical list that I created from the documentary record in the collections from Tubac and Terrenate is not enough to signal the presence of females. Many natural and cultural formation processes, including the excavation methods used at each site, affect provenience and context. A single class of artifacts is not sufficient to document the presence of women. Instead, I suggest that archaeologists look for artifact patterns or material signatures that document
different aspects of female life, dress, and activities. Archaeology as currently practiced is called the “study of representations” by Bartlett (2000:62–63). Archaeologists interpret the record by using middle-range theory to transcribe and interpret behaviors represented in the contexts and artifacts of the past and the meaning of those events represented in the record. Instead, archaeologists should practice archaeology as the archaeology of “inhabitation” (Bartlett 2000:66–67), where objects in the material record do not merely represent what happened but the changing contexts that affected the choices of human agents. Finding elements of female agency is important to improving the understanding of the culture and society of the northern frontier of colonial Sonora, because other interpretations have concentrated on the male elements. That does not mean that those interpretations of frontier society are not accurate, but looking specifically at the contributions of women to colonial society can help to complete an interpretation of the ethnogenesis of a frontier Hispanic culture, an ethnogenesis that in many ways continues into the present in the border states of Arizona and Sonora.
CHAPTER 7: TUBAC

Tubac, Arizona, was a prehistoric settlement in the Santa Cruz Valley that became the site of the first colonial Spanish pueblo in Arizona. The presidio San Ignacio de Tubac was established after the Pima Revolt to protect the Spanish missions and ranchos from further unrest by the Pimas. Figure 7 gives a list of the major events in the history of Tubac and the Santa Cruz Valley.

Spanish Settlement along the Río Santa Cruz

As Fray Kino made his first expedition into the Pimería Alta, he followed the Río Santa Cruz downstream to the north. After founding the mission of Guevavi and its visita of Tumacácori, Kino passed through a Piman ranchería on the west side of the river called Tubaca. By the 1730s, this ranchería became a mission farm of Guevavi, and there were Spanish families living at the farm to supervise the work of the mission Indians. Spanish settlers gradually followed the missionary efforts of the Jesuit priests, migrating northward from Santa Ana on the Río Magdalena, founding mining camps and ranchos along the river, including Divisadero, Santa Bárbara, San Luis, and Buenavista (see
FIGURE 7. Timeline of Colonial events in the Santa Cruz Valley and at Tubac.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1691</td>
<td>Fray Eusebio Francisco Kino traveled up the Río Santa Cruz and visited the Piman ranchería of Tubaca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732</td>
<td>Tubaca became a visita and mission farm of Los Santos Ángeles de Guevavi; there were Spanish families living at the farm to supervise the neophytes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740s</td>
<td>Spanish ranchos and estancias, including Buenavista, San Luis, Santa Bárbara, and Divisadero flourish in the San Luis Valley, south of Guevavi on the Río Santa Cruz (Kessell 1976:34; Officer 1987:45).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1751</td>
<td>Pima Revolt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752</td>
<td>Presidio San Ignacio de Tubac established to better protect missions and settlements in the Pimería Alta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td>Juan Bautista de Anza assumes command of presidial garrison.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>Ranchos and estancias along the Río Santa Cruz were abandoned because of hostile Apache raiding (Lafora 1771; Officer 1987:45).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1775</td>
<td>Juan Bautista de Anza led the first colonizing expedition to San Francisco, California area; some members of expedition were vecinos of Tubac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1775</td>
<td>Don Hugo O’Conor, comandante inspector of the Provincias Internas visited Tubac and signed orders to transfer presidio to Tucson, visita of San Xavier del Bac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1776</td>
<td>Presidial garrison moved to Tucson; remaining civilian settlers formed militia to defend pueblo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1779</td>
<td>Vecinos of Tubac go to new Spanish settlements on the Río Colorado.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1783</td>
<td>Apache raids caused complete abandonment of pueblo of Tubac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1787</td>
<td>The Pima company of San Rafael de Buenavista reestablishes a presidio at Tubac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1788</td>
<td>Soldiers from Tubac participate in Great Offensive against hostile Apaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793</td>
<td>Apache peace camp established at Tubac.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dobyns 1995:82; Kessell 1976:34; Officer 1987:45. Despite the ever-present threat of raids by Apaches and other hostile groups, female and male Hispanic settlers and their families moved among the camps and ranchos along the Santa Cruz. For example, Rosalia Durán and Luis Villela, two Spaniards who had come north from the mission of San Ignacio to settle at Tubac, were married in the church at Guevavi on February 17, 1740. Also married at Guevavi on that date were two other Hispanic
residents of Tubac, Francisco Ortega and Gertrudis Barba; Gertrudis later became
godmother of María Francisca Barba, who lived at Santa Bárbara and was the daughter of
Juana María Higuera, an Ópata, and Juan Agustín Barba, her husband (NPS 2000). On
December 19, 1743, an Apache attack on the rancho of Divisadero killed six people,
including Rosa, and Guitera, her daughter; María Manuela Martinez, a married settler;
and Narcisa, the wife of Xavier. They were all buried at Mission Santa María Suamca
(NPS 2000). The Río Santa Cruz and the valleys through which it flowed formed the
social and population center of colonial settlement in the northern Pimería Alta in the

Presidio San Ignacio de Tubac, 1752–1776

Presidios on the northwestern frontier were defensive installations, designed to
protect Spanish missions and settlements from raids by hostile groups that in the Pimería
Alta included the different Apache groups and at times the Pima, Yaqui, and Seri.
Presidios were usually reactive in nature because they were established in an area after
raids or attacks had occurred. Reglamentos promulgated in 1729 and 1772 specified the
number of soldiers that should be in each presidial garrison, the supplies each soldier
should maintain, and the structure of command. The reglamentos also laid out ways in
which civilian settlers could be attracted to the presidio.
Spanish settlement along the Río Santa Cruz was interrupted in January of 1751 when Luis Oacpicagigua, a Pima Indian whom the Spaniards had appointed *capitán general* of the tribe, led a general uprising against Spanish settlement and missionization efforts in the Santa Cruz River Valley. Although Oacpicagigua surrendered at Tubac by March 1751 (Dobyns 1995), the Pimería Alta remained in a state of general unrest until the 1780s, unrest triggered by increased Apache raiding activity, rebelling Seri groups along the west coast and in the highlands of Sonora, and Pimas who had not recognized Oacpicagigua’s surrender.

The presidio of San Ignacio de Tubac was established in 1752 on the Río Santa Cruz north of the mission *cabecera* of San Miguel de Guevavi (see Figure 3). The original garrison consisted of 50 soldiers under the command of Capitan Tomás de Beldarrain, of whom the captain and at least 20 soldiers brought their wives and families (Jones 1979:192; NPS 2000). Spanish civilians were attracted to the well-watered land around the presidio that could be protected by the garrison and merchants were attracted by the market of the presidio and farms in the area, so a town did develop.

Presidio San Ignacio de Tubac was founded to increase the number of soldiers on the frontier and increase protection of Spanish missions and *ranchos* along the Río Santa Cruz (Spicer 1962:129). Most of the increase in the civilian population around Tubac while the presidio was there came from a high birth rate and the immigration of soldiers’ relatives. Because not all of the garrison soldiers had families, a proportion of the pueblo’s population came from unrelated civilians. Because of increased Apache raiding, people from the *ranchos* south of Tubac and Indians from the area’s missions went to
Tubac for protection. The first commander, Capitán Juan Tomás de Beldarrain, his wife, María Teresa Prudhom Butron y Mujica, and the alferez Juan Crisóstomo were Spaniards. The ethnicity of two other soldiers of the garrison is given as Spanish, and one of the soldiers in the 1752 Tubac census was listed as Sicilian (NPS 2000). The mission farm at Tubac was also reestablished, but most of the Pima inhabitants swiftly joined the mission communities of Tumacácori or Guevavi.

*History of San Ignacio de Tubac*

From the beginning of the presidio, the garrison was spread out. When the governor of Sinaloa and Sonora, Don Diego de Ortiz Parrilla, issued orders in 1752 to found the presidio, the garrison numbered 51 soldiers and officers, but 20 were immediately detached to Ocuca, another post near the Río Magdalena, northwest of Santa Ana. That detachment returned to Tubac after the founding of a presidio at Altar, but the responsibilities of the Tubac garrison included escorting supplies and expeditions, guarding the herd of horses for remounts, and supplying small detachments of soldiers to guard missions at Bac and Guevavi. Part of the garrison was frequently detached to aid in frontier offensives against Apaches and Seris (Dobyns 1995). On September 7, 1759, Capitán Juan Tomás de Beldarrain, the first commander of San Ignacio de Tubac, died of an arrow wound sustained while leading Tubac men against the Seris on Tiburón Island (Dobyns 1995; NPS 2000). Captain Juan Bautista de Anza, the younger, whose father had commanded the presidio at Fronteras, replaced Beldarrain, whose wife, María Teresa
Prudhom Butron y Mujica, moved for a time to Santa Ana on the Río Magdalena, and
died in Horcasitas, Sonora in 1787 (Dobyns 1995; NPS 2000).

Juan Bautista de Anza, the younger, was a Spaniard, born at Fronteras in 1734,
who became the captain of the Tubac garrison in 1760 (Dobyns 1995:229; Documentary
Relations of the Southwest [DRSW] 2000). His mother, who had lived at the presidios of
Janos and Fronteras and the rancho of Divisadero in the San Luis Valley, died at Tubac
in 1760 and was buried at Guevavi. His wife and other members of the family joined him
at Tubac (NPS 2000; Officer 1987:38). Under his leadership, the Tubac garrison was
very active. Soldiers from Tubac, sometimes accompanied by vecinos and Pima auxiliary
soldiers, formed parts of military campaigns against the Seris in the west and along the
coast of Sonora and defended colonial settlements and missions against Apache raiding
activities (Dobyns 1995). A 1770 expedition settled unrest among the Tohono O’odham,
who were enticed to settle at the Spanish missions to replace Pima inhabitants, who had
either died of the new diseases that accompanied Spanish movement, or had adopted
Hispanic culture and moved into Spanish pueblos like Tubac (Dobyns 1995:193). Anza
himself led two expeditions into Alta California. In the first expedition in 1774, Anza led
a detachment of troops to open a way to northern California and to establish a presidio at
Monterey. Anza returned to Tubac and went to Mexico City to report and to obtain orders
for a second expedition to colonize the area near to modern-day San Francisco. Although
Anza began recruiting colonists in Sonora on his way back to Tubac, the colonizing
expedition that left Tubac on October 23, 1775, included vecinos and soldiers from the
presidio and pueblo of Tubac (Dobyns 1995:Appendix II).
Don Hugo O’Conor, *comandante inspector* of the Províncias Internas, inspected the Presidio de San Ignacio de Tubac and its associated pueblo in 1775 and decided that the town of Tubac had enough security to move the frontier northward. Accordingly, he signed orders transferring the garrison to the mission *ranchería* of Tucson, a *visita* of San Xavier del Bac. According to O’Conor, the civilian population of Tubac in 1775 consisted of 41 families of *gente de razón*, two Ópata families, an Apache family, and one family of Indians from the Río Grande Valley in New Mexico. Although according to regulations the civilians should have stayed behind at Tubac, O’Conor believed that many would follow the garrison to Tucson because the families were so closely related (Kessell 1976:107). Those who had remained at Tubac formed a militia to defend against the increased aggression of Apache groups under Capitan Juan Crisóstomo Ramirez, a retired soldier from the Tubac garrison (NPS 2000; Officer 1987:54–55).

*Interregnum, 1776–1787*

Just as O’Conor had predicted, many of the civilians at Tubac followed the soldiers to the new Presidio de San Agustín de Tucson, both for protection and to be near relatives. Approximately 40 families of civilians or 150 people remained at Tubac after the garrison had left, and as early as 1777 the *vecinos* of Tubac had petitioned the government to move because of Apache raiding (Dobyns 1995:410, 414). Even though the captain of the Tucson presidio assigned a small detachment of guards to protect Spanish missions and settlements, moving the Tubac garrison north left a large area open
to Apache movement and raiding (Kessell 1976:132). Because of families moving to Tucson and a 1780 colonizing expedition to found new settlements among the Yumas on the Río Colorado, Tubac was temporarily abandoned in 1783 (Dobyns 1995:426; Kessell 1976:154).

Presidio San Rafael de Buenavista at Tubac, 1787–1800

In order to increase security and to better protect the missions, ranchos, and other Spanish settlements along the Río Santa Cruz in the Pimería Alta, the Spanish government formed in 1772 a company of Pima and Piman-speaking auxiliary soldiers commanded by Spanish officers (Dobyns 1972, 1995:435; Kessell 1976:161; Officer 1987:63). Called the San Rafael de Buenavista company, it served first at mission San Ignacio along the Río Magdalena in Sonora (Dobyns 1972, 1995; Kessell 1976:161; Officer 1987:63). In 1783, the San Rafael Company at San Ignacio numbered 80 soldiers: 67 Pimas Altos, six Ópatas, four Pimas Bajos, and three Yaquis (Kessell 1976:161).

The Pima company of San Rafael de Buenavista transferred to the pueblo of Tubac in 1787 (Dobyns 1972, 1995:433; Kessell 1976:163; Officer 1987:63). Civilian Spaniards were encouraged to come and settle in Tubac once the San Rafael Company had arrived, but the townspeople remained primarily of Indian extraction (Dobyns 1995:478–479; Kessell 1976:171). The first commander of the Pima Company, Pedro Villaescusa, a Spaniard, had begun his military career in 1775 at Santa Cruz de Terrenate (Dobyns 1995:46; Officer 1987:63). He was married to Doña Ignacia Otero, the sister of
Toribio Otero, to whom Lt. Nicolás de la Errán, the second Spanish commander of the San Rafael Company, granted five lots of land in 1789 (Dobyns 1995:478–479; Officer 1987:63). Errán and his wife later became godparents of several converted Indians at Tumacácori (Dobyns 1995:448).

In 1786, Virrey Bernardo de Galvéz changed military policy on the frontier (Kessell 1976:163). Instead of simply battling hostile Apache groups, Spanish officials were to offer treaties and nonaggression pacts to Apaches who came to make peace (Dobyns 1972). Members of the Pima Company of San Rafael participated in the 1788 Great Offensive, a campaign in Sonora against still-hostile Apache groups, and by 1795 the Pimería Alta was considered safe enough to reopen direct trade routes between Sonora and New Mexico (Dobyns 1972). Some pacified Apaches and their families settled in a camp at Tubac in the 1790s and were incorporated into the community, to the extent that some Apache men enlisted in the “Piman” garrison (Dobyns 1972).

**Tubac Society**

The pueblo of Tubac was revitalized as vecinos returned because of the garrison protection and because it was expected that the families of married soldiers would settle near their men; merchants and other settlers came because of the increased market for goods and produce created by soldiers and soldiers’ families. Also, because of the danger
from Apache raids, many of the Spanish settlers from the ranchos and settlements south of Tubac moved closer to the presidio and increased the number of civilian settlers at the pueblo of Tubac (Dobyns 1995; Officer 1987). The mission visita and later cabecera of Tumacácori lay only a few miles to the south along the Santa Cruz, and the two communities in many ways functioned as one. Mission priests from Tumacácori also served the vecinos of Tubac, and the residents of the presidial and mission community interacted freely (Kessell 1976:102). Demographic data from the Mission 2000 database, a compilation of mission registers and padrones (censuses) from across the Pimería Alta, shows the movement of women up and down the Santa Cruz.

The people accorded the highest status at Tubac included the administrative assistants at nearby missions and their families. When women were pregnant, they often went to Tubac in order to have their child among Spaniards (Dobyns 1995:342). Women who lived at Tubac, Tumacácori, Guevavi, and the ranchos along the Santa Cruz traveled to mission churches at Guevavi and Tumacácori to be married and for religious ceremonies like burials and baptisms. Ritual kinship, or compadrazgo, through baptism and the reciprocal obligations of godparents and adult “godchildren,” or the child’s family in the case of an infant, became a vitally important tie, binding families together and incorporating mission Indians into Spanish colonial society. Before 1767, Ópata and Yaqui families from missionized areas of Sonora came into the Pimería Alta with Jesuit missionaries, who wanted these already Christianized Indians to set examples of “proper” behavior at new mission pueblos. When Franciscan missionaries replaced the Jesuits in 1768, they encouraged these older Christian Indians who had become more Hispanicized
to enter into godparent relationships with the Pimas settled at missions like Tumacácori or Guevavi (Kessell 1976). Many of the soldiers and settlers at Tubac became godparents to Pimas and Tohono O’odham who lived in the mission pueblos and in the town, greatly facilitating the emergence of Hispanic society on the frontier (Dobyns 1995:299).

Modern Tubac

Joseph de Urrutia drew a map of the colonial pueblo of Tubac in 1767, seen here as Figure 8. Because of the way the map has been reproduced here, south is at the top. The U-shaped structure on the map represents the captain’s house and military headquarters of the presidio. South of the presidio on the Camino de Tumacácori lies a cluster of structures that today form the archaeological site identified as the South Barrio (AZ DD:8:33[ASM]). The pueblo of Tubac remained a military post through the last years of New Spain and the Mexican Republic and became a part of the United States with the Gadsden Purchase of 1853. After the purchase, it served as the headquarters of the Sonora Exploring and Mining Company and in 1860 was the largest town in Arizona. The American Civil War meant that the region lost its American troops to defend against the still hostile Apaches, and the town was again abandoned. Although the town was reoccupied after the war, it never regained the same size or prominence. Today, Tubac is the home of a state historical park and presidio museum, an artists’ colony, and a growing
FIGURE 8. Joseph de Urrutia’s 1767 map of Tubac (Dobyns 1995:98; original in British Library)
residential area. This means that the site of the South Barrio has seen later construction and earth-moving activities that have churned the archaeological deposits.

**Archaeology at Tubac**

Tubac Presidio State Historic Park, founded in 1957, incorporates the archaeological remains of the “Captain’s House”/military headquarters of Presidio San Ignacio de Tucson. Immediately south of the park is a residential neighborhood dating to the presidial period and later, called the South Barrio (AZ DD:8:33[ASM]), now owned by the Archaeological Conservancy for purposes of preservation and interpretation of the Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail that runs along the east edge of the park. A crew from the Arizona State Museum carried out excavations of part of the residential area around the captain’s house for the state park (Shenk and Teague 1975).

As part of the Conservancy’s preparation of a South Barrio interpretive area, Steve Koczan performed shovel tests of sites for fenceposts and interpretive signs. Based on those tests, Koczan found that the different periods of occupation at Tubac could not be distinguished stratigraphically (Koczan 2003).
Excavations in the South Barrio (Figure 9) were carried out intermittently for a number of years in the late 1980s and 1990s by volunteers under the direction of Jack Williams, then a graduate student in archaeology at the University of Arizona. Nothing has been published on these excavations, but field notes are curated at Arizona State Museum. The Archaeological Conservancy recently purchased the South Barrio as part of an archaeological preserve. The artifacts recovered by Williams in the South Barrio excavations were delivered to the Arizona State Museum for processing and curation in the original bags from the excavation. Provenience information was inconsistently recorded, and no map or overall report had been prepared that could be used to organize the confusing nature of the data. Each larger bag was assigned a new provenience number in the lab, but sequential numbers do not mean that the units are contiguous on the ground. The materials in the bag were separated and recorded by material type. Williams identified two structures seen on the 1776 Urrutia map that he referred to as Casa Escondida and Casa de los Osos, and a large trash area, the East Midden. It is this collection that is used to evaluate the proposed model of a female material signature. Because the midden and part of the site have been affected by Army Corps of Engineers flood control earthmoving and because of the poor quality of excavation records, no attempt has been made to identify activity areas or changes over time, although the concentration of slag found near Casa de los Osos does suggest smelting activities were taking place there or nearby.
FIGURE 9. South Barrio of Tubac. This map was produced by The Archaeological Conservancy as part of a project financed in part by a grant from the Historic Preservation Heritage Fund which is funded by the Arizona Lottery and administered by the Arizona State Parks Board.
Analysis

Artifacts from all the provenience assigned in the lab that could be securely placed in one of the three identified features were examined to see if artifacts likely associated with women could be identified, and if these artifacts formed a pattern. Materials were separated and bagged by material types. The total number of bags equaled 17,276 from a total of 6,571 lab-assigned proveniences, divided into 21 material types, as presented in Table 5. The chronology of the deposits could not be securely established, and the 21 classes of material reflect the nearly continuous occupation of Tubac from 1752 to the present. Not all of the material classes were included in the analysis. Obviously modern artifact classes, such as rubber and plastic, were not considered, and analysis of butchering techniques used on the faunal bone lies beyond the scope of this analysis. The faunal bone as well as the rest of the material classes is extremely fragmentary. The material classes of ceramics, metal, and artifacts made of bone or shell provide the most appropriate artifacts to evaluate the model of a female presence at Presidio San Ignacio de Tubac.

Metal, Bone, and Shell Artifacts

Ample documentary evidence exists for the presence of women in the presidio and pueblo of Tubac, and clothing creation and maintenance generally falls into the
TABLE 5. Number of Bags by Material Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Class</th>
<th>Number of Bags</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adobe</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botanical (e.g. nutshells, seed pods)</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>4,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>1,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloth</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction materials (including modern)</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fauna (e.g. Eggshell)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faunal Bone</td>
<td>2,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>1,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundstone</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithic</td>
<td>1,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>1,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral Ore</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubber</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slag</td>
<td>1142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Artifacts</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of bags:</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,256</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

category of women’s tasks. Datable metal artifacts included several coins, all of which dated to the Mexican period or after the Gadsden Purchase. Few of the metal artifacts were large enough to permit identification. One needle, six thimbles, and 14 metal buttons were noted in the database, although no description or chronological information accompanied the identification. Three crosses and a crucifix were identified, but these were used by both women and men of different ethnicities.

In the faunal bone class are included undated examples of bone buttons and two fragments of bone combs. Buttons of shell and beads of coral are noted in the shell
material class. As in the other classes, the artifacts of bone and shell are not accompanied by further description or dates.

**Ceramics**

Ceramic types recovered from the South Barrio at Tubac included sherds from prehistoric Hohokam vessels, historical-period indigenous plain ware, majolica and lead-glazed Mexican earthenware, porcelain, and late-nineteenth- and early twentieth-century nonvitreous and semivitreous ceramics, even stoneware. Sherds from figurines, pipes, and tiles were identified, as well as bowls, jars, plated, and handle fragments. No complete and few reconstructible items were collected, which is evidence of the extreme disturbance that has occurred at the site. Earthenware sherds from Casa Escondida, Casa de los Osos, and the East Midden were separated and possible prehistoric sherds and sherds with obvious glazes removed, leaving 280 sherds. Seventy-nine of those came from vessels with organic temper, indicated by the dark carbon streak left in the vessel paste that indicates that not all the organics were burned out during firing. Although the presence or absence of this carbon streak does not definitively date when the vessel that produced the sherd or sherds was made, Pima and Tohono O’odham potters largely began using organics after coming to or being congregated in missions. Their movements were curtailed, and the mission herds provided an excellent source of manure temper (Whittlesey 1997:451; Fontana et al. 1962). The small sample size, the fact that the number of vessels cannot be estimated from the sherds, and the fact that the sherds came
primarily from vessel bodies, lead me to conclude that no conclusive ceramic signature of a female presence at Tubac can be determined using artifacts from the South Barrio.
CHAPTER 8: PRESIDIO SANTA CRUZ DE TERRENATE

The Presidio San Felipe de Jesús de Guevavi, alias Terrenate, was the first presidio to bear the name Terrenate. It was established in 1742 near Las Nutrias, Sonora, at the headwaters of the Río de Terrenate, which joins with the rivers of Las Nutrias and Guachuca to form the Río San Pedro, seen on Figure 3. The San Pedro has its source in northern Sonora and flows north through Arizona to join the Río Gila (Gerald 1968). As early as 1749, Augustín de Vildósola, the governor of Sonora, had suggested that moving the garrison to the San Pedro River might better position it to protect Sonoran settlements from raiding Apaches, but the presidio remained at the Río de Terrenate’s source (Croix 1941:200 [1781]). A small town did develop around the presidio, as can be seen in the places of residence given for some women in the Mission 2000 database (NPS 2000) and in a 1774 inspection of San Felipe de Jesús de Guevavi, which includes a roll of vecinos with information on their caste or ethnicity, occupation, and the number of individuals in each family.

In 1764, in response to the seeming inability of the military to contain native raiding and the possible dangers of encroachment by other European empires on the North American continent, the Marqués de Rubí was commissioned to make an

---

2 Archivo General de Indias, Seville [AGI], Provincia de Sonora, Presidio de Terrenate. Revista pasada por el Capitan de Infanteria Don Antonio Bonilla Ayudante Inspector de los Presidios internos de esta Nueva España á la Compañia de dotacion del expresado Presidio. Audencia de Guadalajara, legajo 272, 1774
inspection and comment upon the condition and possible reorganization of his majesty’s frontier defenses. Rubí’s written list of recommendations would be adopted and published as the military Reglamento de 1772. Rubí recognized that it was impossible to control all the territory that the Spanish empire claimed, regardless of the number of troops. Instead, he proposed a line of presidios that would run roughly along the 30th parallel (approximately the modern international boundary) from the Gulf of Mexico to the Gulf of California, stationing garrisons approximately 40 leagues (roughly 100–120 miles) apart in areas of good water and pasturage. After the Reglamento de 1772, several new locations were considered for the new presidio. Rubí recommended that a presidio be established on the San Pedro, Guachuca, or Nutrias River systems, closer to Fronteras than to Tubac (Croix 1941:167 [1781]).

Don Hugo O’Conor—an Irishman who was one of the many “wild geese” who fled British-occupied Ireland to fight for the Catholic kings of France and Spain—was the first comandante inspector of the Províncias Internas. He ordered the garrison to a new location farther north on the Río San Pedro (see Figure 3), where it was called Presidio Santa Cruz de Terrenate (Brinckerhoff and Faulk 1965:58; Moorhead 1975:71). O’Conor’s choice of the site for Santa Cruz de Terrenate was determined by his decision to transfer San Ignacio de Tubac north on the Río Santa Cruz to Tucson. The reglamento had specified that Terrenate was to be transferred only a short distance, to the headwaters of the Río San Pedro. That way, it would be close enough to the presidio of Fronteras to allow one presidio to easily aid the other (Brinckerhoff and Faulk 1965; Gerald 1968). However, the reglamento also stated that presidios could only be 40 leagues apart.
O’Conor had already established San Agustín del Tucson and had to transfer Terrenate farther to the north to fit with the regulation distance. He assigned the new presidio of Santa Cruz del Terrenate to a site on the San Pedro that was 25 leagues north of the first presidio called Terrenate (Croix 1941 [1781]), a location on the west bank of the river (see Figure 3) that was isolated and hard to reinforce from the presidios of Tucson and Fronteras. O’Conor reported abundant pasture, water, and wood at the new site, and Teodoro de Croix (1941 [1781]) lost no time ordering the Terrenate garrison to the north.

**Presidio Santa Cruz de Terrenate**

O’Conor formally established the presidio of Santa Cruz de Terrenate on December 10, 1775, and the garrison arrived at the place sometime during the first four months of 1776 (Williams 1986). The original garrison consisted of 56 men, including the commander, his lieutenant, an alférez (roughly equivalent to a second lieutenant), a sergeant, 2 corporals, and 10 native scouts. Half of the 45-member compañía volante of Sonora was also assigned to Terrenate to patrol the roads (Williams 1986:131–132).

Santa Cruz de Terrenate sits in a landscape of rolling hills. The lip of the deep arroyo that the San Pedro River flows through is less than 25 meters to the east of the presidio’s walls. The hills provided excellent hiding places for the Apache to attack the presidio and retreat (Moorhead 1975:73). Problems and troubles beset the garrison at
Santa Cruz de Terrenate almost from their arrival. The garrison, Indian laborers, and any other settlers must have moved as quickly as possible to construct the outer wall, but that could not totally prevent Apache raids on the presidial horse herd, a main target. Over time, the Apaches grew even bolder about stealing the presidio’s horses (Williams 1986:135). Even if the soldiers managed to defend their herds, they had neither the personnel nor the tactical knowledge to pursue the raiding Apaches into the rocky, wild mountains where they could hide (Croix 1941 [1781]:139). In their first months at the Santa Cruz site, the soldiers rarely met the Apaches in open battle; however, in one of these encounters, on July 7, 1776, the Apaches killed 29 soldiers and the commander of the presidio, Captain Francisco de Tovar (Croix 1941 [1781]; Williams 1986). Another commander, Francisco Ignacio de Trespalacios, would die two years later with another 19 soldiers and settlers while fighting a rearguard action (Croix 1941 [1781]). Essentially, the highly mobile tactics of the Apaches, combined with an intimate knowledge of the landscape, allowed them to raid herds and fields and attack traveling parties with virtual impunity, striking fast and then retreating into well-hidden mountain refuges. Santa Cruz de Terrenate did not have a large enough garrison at any one time to mount an effective pursuit and leave an adequate guard at the presidio itself, and the other presidios of the line, like Tucson, could not send reinforcements for the same reasons (Croix 1941 [1781]). Neither could the presidios to the south send much help, for they were either too far away or too busy fighting other hostile groups like the Seri, who never peacefully accepted Spanish hegemony. Losses remained high throughout the four-year occupation of Santa Cruz de Terrenate.
Perhaps no amount of manpower could have made the presidio of Santa Cruz de Terrenate a success. Although O’Conor reported in 1775 that the troops were well-trained and well-supplied in all of the presidios of the line (O’Conor 1971), the truth eventually surfaced. When Adjutant Inspector Don Roque de Medina inspected Presidio Santa Cruz de Terrenate in 1779, he found that none of the soldiers had been properly trained, their horses and equipment were severely neglected, and many of their muskets were totally unusable (Williams 1986:138). De Medina also corroborated the report of the captain of the Catalanian Volunteers that in 1778 the settlers at the presidio were unable to harvest irrigated fields of grain, corn, chick peas, beans, cotton, chilies, and many other kinds of produce (Croix 1941 [1781]:204). Provisions for the presidio, including wheat, corn, chick peas, beans, and meat came irregularly from the missions of San Ignacio, Cocóspera, or the estancia (ranch) of Santa Ana. Álferez Pedro Villaescusa, who was the company paymaster (and who would later command the Pima Company of San Rafael at Tubac), had seeds to sell to the vecinos and soldiers, but the Apaches attacked the presidio and burned the settlers’ houses and crops at least once, indicating the dangerous conditions (Williams 1986). In reality, the settlers and soldiers were isolated, poorly supplied, and on the edge of starvation. Apache raiders prevented cultivation or burned the standing crops, robbed the horse herds, and attacked the few mule trains that tried to get supplies to the embattled presidio (Croix 1941 [1781]). Neighboring presidios were too far away, and in too much trouble themselves, to send help to Santa Cruz de

---

3 AGI, Provincia de Sonora, Real Presidio de Santa Cruz. Revista passada por el Aydante inspector Don Roque de Medina, á la compañía de cavalleria que guarnece el expresado Presidio, Guadalajara, legajo 272, 1779
4 Guadalajara, legajo 272, 1779
5 Guadalajara, legajo 272, 1779
Terrenate. In 1780, the garrison and settlers at Santa Cruz de Terrenate gave up their increasingly difficult struggle to hold the frontier presidio and transferred back to Los Nutrias, just a short distance away from the old site of San Felipe de Jesús de Guevavi, alias Terrenate. Losses totaled two captains, more than 80 soldiers (Croix 1941:204 [1781]), and an unknown number of native auxiliaries and civilian settlers. The line could no longer be held.

Archaeological Investigations at Presidio Santa Cruz de Terrenate

Charles C. Di Peso of the Amerind Foundation carried out the first archaeological investigations at Terrenate (AZ EE:4:11[ASM]) in the 1950s as part of his doctoral research (Di Peso 1953). Di Peso was interested in the archaeological description of the Sobaipuri, the group resident along the Río San Pedro at the time of contact with Spaniards. He made extensive use of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Spanish accounts of contact with the Sobaipuri, to describe where they lived, their physical appearance, and customs. Using period maps, he located the Sobaipuri ranchería of Quiburi, excavated, and produced a detailed settlement history and artifact descriptions using ethnographic analogy derived from the Spanish ethnohistorical accounts. Di Peso thought that he had located the ruin of Quiburi on the west bank of the San Pedro River, north of Fairbank, Arizona, basically underneath the remains of the Presidio Santa Cruz
de Terrenate (Williams 1986). This belief affected his interpretation of occupational phases and recovered artifacts. Later scholars have determined that the maps and records that Di Peso used clearly show Santa Cruz de Terrenate and the *ranchería* of Quiburi to be in different locations along the river (Seymour 1989), and most archaeologists now working with the Spanish colonial period in the Southwest no longer accept Di Peso’s interpretation of the location and settlement history of Quiburi. Sources on Spanish colonial history describe Spanish families living in similar jacal structures while building their permanent presidial quarters. This is probably what happened at Santa Cruz de Terrenate, especially since the main passage into the jacal compound aligns with the gates of the presidio (Gerald 1968:20). The presidials built their defending walls around their temporary quarters, basing fortifications on the standardized form elaborated in the 1772 regulations (Gerald 1968:19). In plan, the presidio formed a rough square approximately 100 meters on each side. The outer walls consisted of thick adobe bricks on stone footings. A diamond-shaped bastion extended from the southwest corner, allowing sentries a better view of the rolling hills that surrounded the presidio south, west, and north, as well as the corral, nestled under the bastion’s protection along the west wall. The only opening into the presidio was the main gate, on the east side of the compound overlooking the San Pedro River. Another bastion on the northeast corner was considered unnecessary because of the river’s protection (Di Peso 1953:56–57; Williams 1986:131, 147).

Interior structures were butted up against the outer wall. Guardrooms flanked either side of the main gate. In the middle of the south wall stood a chapel; a simple, one-
room building whose floor sloped up slightly toward the altar. Judging by the graves found beneath the floor, the chapel also served as a cemetery. The bastion was lined by four large rooms that may have been storage areas, one along each wall. Living quarters dominated the west wall. Ten two-room apartments were built against the wall, 5 on either side of a large, 12-room apartment, the largest structure in the presidio. Di Peso (1953:70) refers to the 12-room structure as the military headquarters of the presidio; another possibility is that this was where the captain’s quarters were located. From foundations evident at the site, more small apartments should have lined the other walls of the presidio, replacing the temporary quarters, but the garrison left these uncompleted when it abandoned the presidio in 1780 (Gerald 1968:17–18).

Di Peso’s Archaeology

At Santa Cruz de Terrenate, Di Peso mapped the site, and then put in a series of test trenches to identify archaeological features. When a cultural feature or structure was encountered, the trench was widened to expose the entire feature and then excavated stratigraphically. Trash middens were investigated by means of a stratigraphic test pit dug in arbitrary levels (Di Peso 1953:51). The map of Di Peso’s excavations records a fairly large “east midden” area directly to the north of the presidio’s main gates. His work in the presidial chapel revealed that the floor had been used as a campo santo, holding the remains of possibly 20 individuals, including an infant and a small child (Di Peso 1953:248; Gerald 1968:17).
“Archaeology” by Metal Detector

Because the ruins of Presidio Santa Cruz de Terrenate lie on easily accessible public land, an unknown amount of data has been lost to pothunting activities and looting. In the years between 1970 and 1990, an amateur archaeologist armed with a metal detector collected over 700 artifacts from all areas of the site. The Bureau of Land Management [BLM], the agency that manages the site of the presidio as part of the San Pedro National Conservation Area, has recovered this collection, and a master’s thesis describing the collection (Morgan 2000) was made available to the author.

University of Arizona Archaeology

After Di Peso’s excavations, no official investigations were carried out at the site until after it was acquired by the BLM in 1968. The BLM set up a grid system for the site in 1992 and then surveyed and surface-collected a limited area scheduled to be modified by the construction of an interpretive trail and signs. The most recent fieldwork at Santa Cruz de Terrenate took place in October and November of 1993 under an agreement between the BLM and Dr. J. Jefferson Reid of the University of Arizona. Using the map grid established by the BLM, a crew of graduate students completed a transect survey of the presidio and immediate surrounding area, collecting and point-proveniencing artifacts with a transit and an EDM. A midden area approximately six
meters to the east of the main gate was identified, and the central midden was divided into 100 1-by-1 meter squares and intensively collected, taking all artifacts except fire-cracked rock. The east midden is visible in Figure 10 as an extremely high artifact concentration just outside the gate. The downslope area to the east and north of the main concentration was also collected in 1-by-1 meter squares. Lithic debitage, long-bone fragments, and plainware body sherds less than 5cm in size were not collected in this area. Despite previous efforts by Di Peso and others, a large amount of artifactual material was collected. No test pits were excavated in the midden or elsewhere on the site in 1993. Based on the evidence, the presidio of Santa Cruz de Terrenate may be considered a purely Hispanic occupation with a restricted, four-year period of occupation. Only refuse associated with the presidio has been collected from the east midden, which was deposited just outside the main gate of the presidio while it was occupied. The tightly controlled chronology and documented Hispanic occupation at Santa Cruz de Terrenate provide an excellent opportunity to establish baseline descriptions of Hispanic artifact classes in the late eighteenth century.

Analysis

Di Peso’s 1953 report on his excavations at Santa Cruz de Terrenate provide the best evidence for a female presence. Although he found no direct evidence of the physical presence of women, he did discover two child burials near or under the side altar of the chapel against the south wall (Di Peso 1953:248). This suggests that women,
FIGURE 10. Plan of Terrenate Showing Concentrations of Plainware Ceramics (from Sugnet and Reid 1994:Figure 1.3).
whether or not they actually lived at the presidio, lived close enough to come to the
chapel for services. Di Peso checked about 20 percent of the “east gate trash heap” he
identified along the wall north of the gate by a stripping and screening process, finding
499 plain ware sherds with organic and sand temper, a bronze thimble, and a buckle
typical of those found at the knees of breeches in the eighteenth century (Di Peso
1953:86–87). Elsewhere on the site, he recovered only a limited number of artifacts not
directly related to the military purpose of the presidio. These included one earring of a
style typically worn by women in Spain and often given to Christianized Indians, one
ring of bronze or brass that was also a gift to the newly Christian; three religious
medallions worn by men and women; three thimbles and two pairs of scissors; buttons
found on garments and buckles from clothing or leather straps and harness; and a conical
metal tinkler made from sheet metal and used as decoration on the fringes of bags or
clothing (Di Peso 1953:201–248).

Of the metal artifacts categorized by Morgan (2000), she describes 15 fragments
from different types of buckles, 5 of which have ornate decoration. Eight fragments from
buckle tongues are of a type often used on sword bandoliers (Morgan 2000:45). The
metal buttons found include those of a standard military issue, three that stylistically
postdate 1780, and ornately decorative button covers often used in trade. Jewelry items
recovered included a plain band ring, two empty brooches that could be used to fasten
cloaks or to house a cameo or stone, and another single earring typically worn by both
women and men and used as a trade item (Morgan 2000:46). None of these artifacts is
distinctively female in style.
The reports of both Sugnet and Reid (1994) and Waugh (1995) focus on Hispanic and indigenous ceramics both from the east midden identified in the 1993 University of Arizona survey and collection and the site in general. Sugnet and Reid (1994) described the majolica tableware, Hispanic utility ware, and nonindigenous ceramics from Terrenate and compared their findings to Di Peso (1953). A total of 41 non-indigenous ceramic sherds came from the east midden: 25 majolica sherds, 11 sherds of Hispanic utility ware, and 5 sherds of other European wares or porcelain. Majolica was considered necessary to maintain Spanish or non-Indian identity, and military officers, soldiers, and their families kept as much as possible to use at table where their identity could be made visible. A total of 838 plain ware body and rim sherds from the midden was examined by Waugh (1995). Almost 72 percent of these sherds exhibited mixed sand and manure temper (Waugh 1995). In the 779 sherds for which thickness could be measured, over 81 percent fell between 5 and 8 mm. More than three-quarters of the recovered rim sherds came from vessels identified as bowls, and almost 9 percent were from probable plates, a form that appeared only after contact with the Spaniards.

Potential Manufacturing Groups

The analysis of plain wares from controlled surface collection of the east midden at Santa Cruz de Terrenate raises several interesting and important questions concerning the technology of its manufacture, including who was making it, where the vessels were coming from, and the technological knowledge behind choices of temper and clay.
Possible manufacturing groups at Santa Cruz include the families of the soldiers and native scouts, the Indians employed in the construction of the presidio, Indian potters at nearby rancherías, or the soldiers themselves (Whittlesey 1994:10).

Leland Ferguson (1992:19–22) explains the concept of Colono Ware made by African slaves in the southeastern United States. Expanding upon Ivor Noël Hume’s concept of Colono-Indian Ware (Noël Hume 1982:12), Ferguson describes Colono Ware as occurring whenever the colonial experience affects manufacturing techniques, forms, or where handbuilt pottery was made. In the Caribbean areas of Spanish colonization and in parts of New Spain, the colonists influenced the native potters to produce forms suited to Spanish tastes, although in Florida the colonists simply accepted traditional native forms with little modification (Deagan 1983:234). In Florida, Colono Wares compensated for the scarcity of imported, European dishes (McEwan 1993:312). The colonists of northern New Spain also depended on Native American ceramic production (Williams 1992:15).

The friendly Pimas could have been making the Colono Ware utilitarian pottery at Terrenate, although Apache raids had caused the last groups of Sobaipuri Pimas to evacuate the San Pedro River valley by 1762. Likewise, the families of the missionized Pima workers who helped to construct the presidio could have manufactured the vessels, but a report received by the comandante general of the Provincias Internas in 1777 indicated that the civilians at Terrenate had been scattered and burned out by the Apaches (Moorhead 1975:79).
Material remains recovered by Di Peso through excavation, and artifacts from the surface collection carried out by the crew from the University of Arizona contain little that would suggest a resident population of women and children (Di Peso 1953; Whittlesey 1994). I suggest that the soldiers would not willingly have brought their women and children to such a threatened outpost, especially before the construction crews had completed permanent housing. The 1777 report indicates how the existence of the troops and people building the presidio was threatened by Apache raids. The first captain at Terrenate, as well as the second, were killed fighting the Apaches. Although Di Peso located burials in the chapel that indicated the possibility of at least one woman at the presidio, the analysis of artifacts from the 1993 University of Arizona work provides no definitive evidence of female or juvenile inhabitants of the presidio.
CHAPTER 9: FINDING WOMEN IN THE PIMERÍA ALTA: AN EVALUATION OF THE MODEL

The Pimería Alta remained the northern edge of Spanish and Mexican society east of California until a new international boundary line divided the area, putting the northern region of the Pimería Alta into the United States of America. Great changes occurred as forces of the Spanish crown, emissaries of the Christian God, and Spanish civilians settled the valley of the Río Santa Cruz and tried to impose their conquest culture (Foster 1960) on the indigenous groups already adapted to a desert ecosystem. Of the many ways to interpret the ethnogenesis of Hispanic culture in the Pimería Alta, the critical roles colonial women played in the change have not been well investigated by historical archaeologists. There are a number of reasons why this is so, some of which I summarize in this concluding chapter.

After examining the theoretical perspectives of processual, behavioral, and post-processual archaeology, I decided that Hegmon’s processual-plus viewpoint (Hegmon 2003) provided the most suitable tools for the formation of a model to investigate women living at colonial sites on the Sonoran frontier. Taking a processual-plus view, I systematically combined behavioral archaeology’s focus on the study of material things and how they signal human behaviors and behavioral change with a postprocessual
treatment of questions about agency and the roles of women to formulate an initial model. I made that model specific to the Pimería Alta through a critical analysis of historical and ethnographic sources of information describing women of different ethnic groups in colonial New Spain.

Early Spanish society in the Pimería Alta included Spanish missionaries (who were Catholic but not necessarily from Spain), Spanish army troops, and civilian groups of Hispanic colonists like miners, merchants, and families of settlers. Women formed an integral component of the civilian groups, and looking at the settlement of the Pimería Alta from the female perspective emphasizes the nonmilitary areas of Spanish colonization. Non-Spanish colonial groups included O’odham Indian (Pima and Papago) families who lived at the missions and in rancherías near visitas, working to support the mission while also laboring in colonial pueblos and mines, and Yaqui and Ópata Indians, who came north to be examples of “good Christians” in the missions and pueblos. Some Pimas rebelled in 1751 against unfair Spanish treatment, resulting in the establishment of the presidio of San Ignacio de Tubac to protect Spanish settlements and missions in the Santa Cruz Valley. Although the presidial garrison did its best to protect missions and settlers, the frequent raiding by different Apache groups meant that Pima settlements and the presidio of Santa Cruz de Terrenate in the valley of the Río San Pedro were largely abandoned by 1780, and the population tended to cluster in areas that could be better protected.

Between 1750 and 1800, the period of this research, the different ethnic groups in the Pimería Alta, including even the Apaches, were becoming tightly interrelated through
movement into better protected areas, intermarriage, and the practice of godparenthood. The description of all of these colonial groups and the part or parts each played in the ethnogenesis of a Hispanic society provides necessary background information in the building of a model to recognize gender groups in the Pimería Alta. Extreme ethnic diversity also makes gender identification complicated and difficult.

Colonial groups not based on ethnicity that are frequently included in historical and archaeological accounts of the Pimería Alta include missionary priests, conquistadores and the military, and ranchers, to name just a few. Colonial women in the Pimería Alta have not been studied as frequently as men, although much has been written about colonial women in eastern New Spain, Spanish California, and other Spanish colonies in Latin America (Bouvier 2001; Deagan 1973, 1983, 1990a, 1990b, 1996, 1998; Ewen 1991; McEwan 1991). Gender systems constitute a basic structure in every society and form the foundation for important aspects of a society’s culture. By comparing different activity patterns, an archaeologist can identify the material dimensions of the task that may be seen in the archaeological record and associate those artifacts with the societal group that usually participated in that task. In many situations, today’s archaeologists incorporate postmodern feminist ideas that emphasize the different experience of females and males in their interpretations, realizing that a full interpretation of the archaeological record at a site incorporates the experiences of women, as well as of other identifiable groups who lived at the site and contributed to the archaeological record.
How women as a group may contribute to ethnogenesis in a colonial situation depends on the strategies of the colonizing group and the interactions between the colonizers, the colonized, and the subgroups of each. Table 1 outlines the characteristics and consequences of different colonial strategies. By the second half of the eighteenth century in the Pimería Alta, the nature of interaction had become generally more peaceful as Indians became, at least outwardly, more Christian and integrated into Hispanic settlements through marriage and baptism. This integration decreased the social distance between women of different castas and ethnic groups through increases in familial relationships and daily interaction. The material culture of a site provides a good way to evaluate the presence of and interaction between different colonial groups at a site, in this case considering females as a colonial subgroup.

**Evaluating the Model**

A model to investigate the possible presence of women from any subordinate group in the archaeological record should include data on the environment and cultural groups present in the region. In a historical situation such as the eighteenth-century Pimería Alta, there were historical documents offering information on settlement history, types of sites, locally available versus imported products, types of personal possessions to which the inhabitants may have had access, and the social history of the area.
Archaeologists can study this available data and compile a list of hypothetical artifacts that may be present on the site in question. These lists can then structure excavation techniques and recovery strategies, depending on the conditions at the site. In this research, my question concerned the presence of females at presidios and pueblos. The information available included demographic data, items of dress and personal artifacts drawn from *casta* paintings, early twentieth-century ethnographies of the O’odham, and general historical data from Spanish colonial documents. This allowed me to construct lists of artifacts possibly present at the pueblo of Tubac and the presidio of Terrenate.

The material culture from Tubac and Presidio Santa Cruz de Terrenate is insufficient to evaluate the proposed model for identifying women in the Pimería Alta. This insufficiency, however, derives partially from artifact fragmentation and inadequate documentation for the archaeological work conducted at the pueblo of Tubac. At Presidio Santa Cruz de Terrenate, the questions Di Peso asked at the time of his excavation in the early 1950s concerned the culture history of the Sobaipuri Pima, and his methods of data collection were neither directly concerned with nor easily applicable to answering questions of gender representation at the presidio. I conclude that the problem in these two cases was not with the model but with the available data. Like other pattern-recognition models for the historical period (cf. Deagan 1983; South 1977), a gender-specific model should work at other Spanish colonial sites in the Pimería Alta where the contexts and excavation strategies are more clearly defined. The conclusion of this research is admittedly unsettling to the widespread emphasis on identifying the critical role of women in the material culture record of the past. If the presence of women cannot
be unambiguously identified in the archaeological record of the historical period, then such identifications will be doubly difficult in the prehistoric record.
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