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E. Statement of Historic Contexts

Introduction

This document addresses properties along the routes of El Camino Real de los Tejas National Historic Trail, designated as such by the United States Congress in October 2004.¹ The authorizing legislation designated approximately 2,580 miles of trail extending along multiple routes and alignments from the Rio Grande near Eagle Pass and Laredo, Texas, to Natchitoches, Louisiana.² Despite the singular name applied to the route, the historic El Camino Real was actually a network of regional roads (which may be referred to collectively as los caminos reales) in a corridor extending from the Rio Grande crossing near San Juan Batista Mission (approximately 35 miles downstream from Eagle Pass, Texas) to the Presidio at Los Adaes (approximately 20 west of Natchitoches, Louisiana). Historically, a variety of names were applied to the different segments and alignments, a practice richly illustrative of the different regional and international influences on usage of the roads over the centuries. As presently recognized by the NPS, the routes that make up El Camino Real de los Tejas NHT, herein after referred to as El Camino Real NHT, are identified as: the Upper Road, the Lower Road, El Camino Pita; Lower Presidio Road; and the San Antonio Laredo Road (see Map 1). These routes served as part of a complex transportation network during the Spanish Colonial Period through 1821, and were composed of regional routes whose alignments shifted over time in response to changing settlement patterns and environmental conditions. The series of routes identified in the NPS Comprehensive Management Plan which comprises the San Antonio-Laredo Road, and the Lower Road / Old San Antonio Road (which reaches the cities of Goliad and Cuero) are generally not considered part of the primary historic El Camino Real corridor, but represent historic Spanish routes and are nevertheless included in the National Historic Trail. Some parts of El Camino Real are co-located with modern highways, while other segments traverse sparsely inhabited areas.³

This document incorporates by reference the findings of the following studies: A Texas Legacy: The Old San Antonio Road and The Caminos Reales A Tricentennial History, 1691-1991⁴; Historical Geographic Dictionary of the El Camino Real Para Los Texas;⁵ El Camino Real de los Tejas National Historic Trail Feasibility Study and Environmental Assessment⁶; Draft Cultural Resources Inventory El Camino Real de los Tejas National Historic Trail⁷; and El Camino Real de los Tejas National Historic Trail Final Comprehensive Management Plan/Environmental Assessment, Louisiana, Texas.⁸

The period of significance for this MPDF is limited to the period between the establishment of the road (c.1690), to the end of the Spanish Colonial Period in 1821, but it is understood that elements of the trail system was used by Native American tribes for centuries prior to the arrival of Europeans, so the corridor’s pre-European history is

¹ Public Law 108-342, 108th Congress, “An Act to amend the National Trails System Act to designate El Camino Real de los Tejas.”
² NPS, Final Comprehensive Management Plan, 3.
³ NPS, Feasibility Study, iii, 43-44.
⁵ Joseph P. Sánchez and Bruce A. Erickson, Historical Geographic Dictionary of the Camino Real Para Los Texas (1997; a project of the Spanish Colonial Research Center, a partnership of the National Park Service and the University of New Mexico).
⁷ Deirdre Morgan-Remley, Draft Cultural Resources Inventory El Camino Real de los Tejas National Historic Trail (Castroville, Texas: Morgan Environmental Associates, 2008).
⁸ NPS, El Camino Real de los Tejas National Historic Trail Final Comprehensive Management Plan/ Environmental Assessment, Louisiana, Texas. (Santa Fe, New Mexico: National Trails Intermountain Region, National Park Service, United States Department of the Interior, September 2011).
therefore discussed in order to put the trail system into a larger context. Likewise, since routes within the corridor often served as the basis for roads during later periods (and into the present day), the period leading to Texas Statehood in 1845 is also discussed.

Areas of significance for historic resources associated with El Camino Real include archeology, commerce, community planning and development, ethnic heritage, exploration/settlement, military, politics/government, religion, social history, and transportation. El Camino Real has national significance because of its associations with the Spanish colonial empire, and for its role as the basis for a significant part of the transportation network through the Mexican and Texas independence movements and Texas statehood. It also is associated with convergences of Native American, European, and American cultures, international geopolitical convergences, economic history, settlement patterns and social organization, road development and administration, and environmental history. For listing in the National Register of Historic Places, individual resources associated with El Camino Real may have a national, state, or local level of significance, depending on the property’s particular history and association with El Camino Real.

**Summary of Associated Resources**

Resources associated with El Camino Real include buildings, sites, structures, and districts that are significant in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and/or culture. As defined by National Register criteria, these significant resources “possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association” and are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. All of the property types are historically and thematically linked by their direct association with the development and/or use of El Camino Real during the period of significance, ca. 1680-1821. The condition of individual National Register-eligible properties associated with El Camino Real ranges from poor to excellent. Many of the historic properties have not yet been fully documented, particularly archeological sites. Enough is known, however, about a broad range of properties to determine their character-defining elements and to evaluate their integrity.

**Historic Context**

The period of significance for *Historic Resources of El Camino Real* is limited to the period of Spanish colonial rule in Texas, from the establishment of the system in c.1690 through 1821. Native American occupation of present-day Texas, however, began thousands of years prior to the Spanish and Mexican rule of the area. During the Late Archaic period, various tribes established a vast network of routes used for trade, cultural exchange, and warfare. These routes also evolved to link major Native American settlements, notably the Caddo. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, additional tribes moved into Texas, including the Apache, Cherokee, Choctaw, Comanche, Kiowa, largely as a result of displacement from traditional lands north and east of Texas. Such dislocations continued through the nineteenth century, with tribes such as the Cherokee, Delaware, and Shawnee moving into Texas from as far away as the northeastern United States.

When European explorers reached southern Texas during the sixteenth century, they often followed the same travel routes used by indigenous groups. Indeed, Europeans relied on Native Americans as guides for their expeditions. With the advent of the Spanish Colonial Period in the 1680s, the framework of El Camino Real

---

9 NPS, 36 CFR60, National Register Federal Program Regulations, (www.nps.gov/nr/regulations.htm, accessed May 2011), 36 CFR 60.1(a) and 36 CFR 60.4.
began to be established. The transportation network continued to evolve during the 140-year period the Spanish claimed Texas as their own. When the former Spanish colony of Mexico achieved independence from Spain in 1821, Texas became a province of the newly established country. An influx of Anglo settlers from the United States during the Mexican Period wrought numerous changes to the network of roads and trails that made up El Camino Real. By 1835, a potent independence movement in Texas developed that later resulted in establishment of the Republic of Texas. During the republican period, the loci of political and economic activity in Texas began to shift away from El Camino Real east/west routes of the earlier periods. By the time of Texas’s annexation by the United States and the conclusion of the Mexican-American War in 1848, new settlement, commercial, political, and social patterns reduced the influence and prominence of El Camino Real.

Late Prehistoric/Pre-Contact Native American Context, prior to Establishment of El Camino Real (c.600-c.1690)

While the period between c.600 and c.1691 is not a period of significance for this Multiple Property Submission, the following is given to place El Camino Real in a larger historic context. For more than one thousand years, indigenous people used the trails that became collectively known as El Camino Real. Archeological sites document that the trails comprised a major travel and transportation corridor between North America and Mesoamerica. The accounts of Luis de Moscoso Alvarado, Francisco Vázquez de Coronado, and Álvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca all mentioned the presence of such routes. These Native trade networks were developed during the Archaic Period, became better defined between AD 900 and 1200, and continued to be used into the Historic Period.10

The existence of long distance trade routes among the Native populations was verified when early French and Spanish explorers discovered European and other trade goods in east Texas that originated in Chihuahua and New Mexico. The Hasinai Caddo in particular had made mention of their interactions as far west as New Mexico and as far east as the Mississippi River. This is supported by archeological evidence that suggests interaction between Native groups took place from Puebloan country in the southwest nearly to the Mississippi River.11 Native tribes dispersed across the Central Plains engaged in similarly complex interactions that stretched from present-day North Dakota to as far south as Texas, and from the Mississippi west to the Rocky Mountains.12

Indigenous tribes possessed immense, intimate knowledge of the natural and cultural landscape within which they lived. Indeed, each tribe’s relationship to the landscape and environment played a crucial role in cultural development, affecting oral traditions, religious practices, sustenance, material culture, and engagement with other tribes.13 Long-distance relationships were common as Native groups traveled to hunt, trade, fight, and socialize. One or two locations have also been identified near the lower Colorado River where trade fairs between

13 Ibid., 8-9.
Native groups from all directions took place. Gatherings of non-local Indians there were reported by the Spanish.\textsuperscript{14}

The series of routes that became El Camino Real followed these established Native American trails between prehistoric communities and trading areas. Spanish and French explorers in Texas marveled at the expertise Native American guides displayed as they escorted them along ancient trails. During a journey up the Red River in 1718-1729, Jean-Baptiste Bénard de la Harpe wrote “[they] do not make any mistake when they show the part of the world where the nation dwells of which they have knowledge, and that, taking the bearing of the places with the compass, one is certain of their situation.”\textsuperscript{15}

The identities of all the various Native American tribes who played a role in creating El Camino Real are not known. Caddoan, Coahuilteco, Jumano and possibly Sanan routes of travel are believed to have comprised portions of El Camino Real.\textsuperscript{16} Attempts to document late prehistoric groups who may be associated with the antecedents of El Camino Real, however, have met with limited success. At Aquarena Springs in San Marcos, Hays County, a series of seven archeological sites have been identified to date (41HY37, 41HY147, 41HY160, 41HY161, 41HY165, 41HY306, and 42HY317). Archeological investigations recovered diagnostic projectile points and lithic debitage which established that occupation of these sites by Native Americans began during the Paleoindian Period (11,500-8800 BP) and continued through the eighteenth century. The Spanish established a mission here in 1755. By the nineteenth century, Anglo settlers began arriving in the area and occupation has been continuous since that time.\textsuperscript{17} Documentation of sites such as those at Aquarena Springs has allowed archeologists to develop general historic contexts and timelines for Native American occupation in Texas from the Paleoindian Period through the Historic Period. Information about day-to-day life, material culture, religious beliefs, burial practices, subsistence patterns, and other activities, however, is less readily available.

Attempts to document Native American tribes who shaped trail networks are further complicated by the fact that cultural displacement and relocation of tribal groups began almost immediately upon the arrival of European explorers to North America. Epidemics decimated many tribal populations, leading to a breakdown of social, cultural, and religious ties. European interactions with Native Americans, including religious missions, military expeditions, and colonists’ settlements, also disrupted traditional Native American lifeways. This period often is known as the Protohistoric Period and is defined as the transition between earliest European contact and later European settlement.\textsuperscript{18}

During the Protohistoric and early Spanish Colonial periods, a number of Native American groups camped at the San Marcos Springs, but very little is known about them. One early group, the Cantona Indians, is credited with calling the San Marcos Springs \textit{Canocanayestatetlo}, meaning “warm water.” The tribes in the area during the Protohistoric and early Spanish Colonial periods, however, soon were displaced by other tribal groups, such as the Tonkawa and Lipan Apache. In turn, these tribes gave way to the Apache and Comanche tribes, as well as the Spanish.\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{15} Calloway, \textit{One Vast Winter Count}, 10.
\textsuperscript{17} Joel Shiner and J. Barto Arnold, III, Aquarena Springs Archeological District Draft National Register Nomination Form (On file at the Texas Historical Commission, 14 September 1979); Sean Soucie, David L. Nickels, Kevin L. Shubert, and Colby J. Mischefsky, Archeological Trench Monitoring at the Aquarena Springs Golf Course, San Marcos, Hays County, Texas, Technical Report No. 16 (Center for Archeological Studies, Texas State University-San Marcos, 2004).
\textsuperscript{18} Souci et al., Archeological Trench Monitoring, 16.
\textsuperscript{19} W. W. Newcomb, Jr., \textit{The Indians of Texas: From Prehistoric to Modern Times}, (Austin: The University of Texas Press, 1993); Souci et al., Archeological Trench Monitoring, 16.
The Apache and Comanche, in particular, exercised tremendous influence in Texas despite the fact that they were comparatively late arriving on the scene. A nomadic tribe, the Apache, occupied a vast territory in the present-day American Southwest as well as northern Mexico. Owing to their itinerant way of life, Apache bands exhibited little political cohesion, although they often were united by kinship. They were generally hostile to European explorers, although they adopted the Europeans’ use of horses without hesitation. Access to horses revolutionized the Apache way of life, allowing them to become skilled and formidable warriors who often, and easily, repulsed Spanish incursions into their territory for decades.  

The same may be said for the Comanche who, in the space of three generations, transformed themselves from nomadic bands of hunter-gatherers into an “imperialist power” in their own right. Displaced from their traditional homelands in the central Great Plains, the Comanche reached present-day Texas during the early eighteenth century. Like the Apache, the Comanches’ use of horses allowed them to become a major fighting force and, within a century, the dominant tribe across a vast swath covering some 240,000 square miles of the Southwest and lower Great Plains. From 1750 to 1850, the Comanche represented one of the greatest obstacles Spain faced in its attempts to conquer and control northern New Spain.

Journals and diaries kept by French and Spanish explorers during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries include descriptions of many different Native American tribes in present-day Texas. Among the Spanish alone, approximately 140 named tribes were documented in the 11 Spanish diaries known to have been recorded between 1689 and 1768.

Although the Spanish noted the names of the groups they met, there are many unknowns about these peoples. The Spanish had different ways of grouping the Indians they encountered, such as location or terrain, jurisdictional area, or cultural similarities. Many of the Native groups the Spanish encountered were either travelers themselves or had been displaced to the location from elsewhere. Unfortunately, the network of Native pathways also provided a travel corridor for disease. At the time of the early Spanish expeditions the Native groups throughout much of North America were experiencing the effects of depopulation due to European diseases. This likely caused radical reorganization within and between groups such as the Caddo and may have caused some to become extinct altogether. Furthermore, some groups were displaced by Europeans and hostile tribes such as the Apache and later the Comanche. Such circumstances add to the mystery surrounding some tribes recorded by the Spanish, whose tribal names and language may never be known. A formal classification of Native groups by language was not undertaken until some had already gone extinct, thus making classifications impossible to verify.

Among the tribal groups that the Spaniards encountered were a number of Coahuiltecan bands, including the Payayas (at San Antonio), the Aranamas (south of the Payayas, between the San Antonio and Guadalupe rivers) and the Tamiques and the Orejons (along the lower Nueces). The San Antonio missions were built to serve substantial populations of Coahuiltecan groups living along the San Antonio River and its tributaries. In 1749, Mission Nuestra Señora Espíritu Santo de Zúñiga and Fort La Bahía were moved to present-day Goliad to Christianize the Karankawa and Coahuiltecan Indians. In central Texas, Spanish explorers first described a group

---

22 Foster, *Historic Native Peoples of Texas*.
of small tribes known as the Tonkawa in 1691. During the mid-eighteenth century, some of the Tonkawa became associated with the San Xavier missions on the San Gabriel River.24

In 1527, Pánfilo de Narvaez, who had succeeded Ponce de Leon as governor of the region known as La Florida, led a doomed expedition into northern Florida. After encountering hostile tribes, the expedition retreated to the coast and sailed along the Gulf Coast toward Mexico. A hurricane near present-day Galveston wrecked the group. Eventually, four survivors made their way along the Rio Grande to near El Paso then traveled west and south until finally reaching Mexico City in 1536. The group brought with them information about their encounters with different tribes then living in southern and western Texas. Among them were the Karankawan Indians, who were later responsible for the destruction of Fort St. Louis. The Spaniards’ original mission of Nuestra Señora Espíritu Santo de Zúñiga was built for the Karankawa.25

Likewise, Spanish and French explorers encountered a diverse array of Native American tribes in eastern Texas and western Louisiana. Many of these were associated with the Caddo confederacy, which encompassed numerous tribes that shared cultural attributes and language. For example, the Hasinai were a Caddoan confederacy that included the Anadarko, Ais, Hainai, Hasinai, Nabiti, Nacogdoches, and Napedache tribes. They resided along the upper Neches, Trinity, and Angelina rivers in east Texas. The Ka’dohadacho, the largest of the southern Caddoan confederacies, included the Petit Caddo, Nazoni, Nanatsoho, and Upper Natchitoches. They originally settled along the Red River in northeastern Texas and southwestern Arkansas, but pressure from the Osage caused members of this confederation to migrate southward. Eventually, they claimed an area north of the Yatasi near Caddo Prairie and Caddo Lake, Louisiana. Meanwhile, the Caddoan-speaking tribes of the Adaes (the Adai and their linguistic relatives, the Eyeish), Doustioni, Natchitoches, Ouachita, and Yatasi lived in the vicinity of present-day Natchitoches, Mansfield, Monroe, and Robeline, and along the Sabine River in Louisiana.26

Caddo villages were spread over a large area in eastern Texas. The villages on San Pedro Creek, in particular, served as an important access point to the lands of the various Caddo tribes.27 Archeological investigations have demonstrated that their tenure in this area lasted for hundreds of years. Located on a small rise alongside San Pedro Creek, the Butler Branch site (41HO216) includes stratified and buried prehistoric components.28

The many tribes that made up Caddo confederacies played a key role in the early formation of trade networks that became El Camino Real in eastern Texas. The Hasinai Caddo, or Tejas as the Spanish referred to them, was first described in historic accounts by the De Soto entrada in 1542.29 The Spanish and French took great interest in the Hasinai, who were considered by the Spanish to be more advanced and receptive toward the Spanish than other

24 NPS, Feasibility Study, 54-55.
25 NPS, Feasibility Study, 54; Thomas Merlan, Michael P. Marshall, and John Roney, Camino Real in Mexico, AD 1598-1881, (National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form 2010), 20.
26 NPS, Feasibility Study, 55.
28 Todd McMakin, State Archeological Landmark Application: Sites 41HO211 and 41HO216 (On file at the Texas Historical Commission, 2006).
area tribes. Due to an extensive trade network that stretched west to northern Mexico and New Mexico and east to the Mississippi River, the Caddo also acted as liaisons between Europeans and several other tribes.

When the Spanish and French began their explorations into Texas, they made use of Native guides who were familiar with established trade routes. The Spanish and French were well aware that they were following existing trails and made note of those they saw, some of which were reported to appear very old. The Spanish also observed petroglyphs and rock piles that served as signposts for travelers; these markers were referred to multiple times as the Spanish retraced their steps, further suggesting that the Europeans were traveling along established pathways.

The long-established status of the Native American trade routes through the Neches and Angelina river basins meant that these became the best defined sections of El Camino Real during the late seventeenth century, and they remained as such through the early nineteenth century. Consequently, the Caddo became an early focal point for Spanish missionaries in Texas. The Spanish used the Caddo trail network during the late seventeenth century to penetrate eastern Texas in their effort to establish a network of missions and presidios. Their goal was to create a buffer between French colonies in Louisiana and Spanish colonies southwest of the Río Grande. The Spanish built several missions and presidios among the Hasinai Caddo beginning in 1690, but all of these were abandoned by 1693. A second, more successful round of building began in 1716, with the missions typically located along segments of what became known as El Camino Real. Thereafter began a period of sustained contact and recorded history between the Spanish and Caddo groups.

Caddo villages located on or near segments of El Camino Real became important not only as trade partners for Europeans, but also in the mediation between European powers. The European presence in eastern Texas is evidenced through archeological remains in historic Caddo settlements occupied during the timeline that various segments of El Camino Real were in use. Sites within Mission Tejas State Park are prime examples of Spanish Colonial Period Caddo settlements. Unfortunately for the Spanish, many of the Caddo refused to relocate near the missions, staying instead in their communities of farmsteads, or ‘rancherias’ as the Spanish called them. Many of these rancherias survived into the nineteenth century.

Several sites associated with the Caddo, their interactions with the Spanish and French, and the evolving use of El Camino Real have been documented. Some of these sites are in the Mission Tejas State Park and appear to have

---

31 Foster, *Historic Native Peoples of Texas*; Perttula, “The Caddo Nation.”
33 Corbin, “Retracing the Camino de los Tejas”; Cunningham, “The Domingo Ramón Diary”; Foster, *Spanish Expeditions into Texas*.
37 Swanton, “Source Material.”
38 Perttula, “The Caddo Nation.”
been occupied by Nabedache Caddo during the Spanish Colonial Period. For example, the Nabedache Blanco site (41HO211) was first occupied by ancestors of the Caddo during the Woodland Period (c.500 BC-AD 800). Archeological evidence recovered at the sites suggests they were associated with a large Caddo village in the San Pedro Creek valley, as well as with two Spanish missions in the area during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. In addition to decorated ceramic sherds, European trade goods such as beads, gun parts, a metal hoe, and a Spanish spur were also identified. The spur, in particular, may constitute some of the earliest artifactual evidence of direct contact between the Spanish and Nabedache Caddo during the early to mid-seventeenth century.  

Period of Significance: Establishment of El Camino Real through the end of the Spanish Colonial Period, c.1690-1821.

The Spanish empire undertook a period of colonialism and expansionism that lasted from 1535 to 1821 (a period also known as the Viceregal Period). Spain competed with England and France in the race to capitalize on the riches of the New World. The Spanish empire expended vast amounts of human energy and economic resources in pursuit of its expansionist ambitions. During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Spain achieved dominance in northern and western South America, Central America, Mexico, western and southern North America, and the Gulf of Mexico region.

Based on a pre-existing network of Native American trails, El Camino Real served as the principal east/west land route across Texas throughout the Spanish Colonial Period. Over the course of a century, the Spanish established numerous missions, presidios, villas, and ranchos along El Camino Real. The consequences of the route’s development - as well as commerce and immigration policies - played a vital role in European expansionism and imperialism. Major expeditions included those of Alonso de Léon in 1687-1690, Domingo Terán de los Ríos and Father Damián Massanet in 1690-1691, Salinas Varona in 1693, Ramón and Espinosa in 1716, the Marqués de Aguayo in 1721, and Marqués de Rubí in 1767. Although the Spanish sought to develop permanent settlements in the Texas province, they also valued the territory as a buffer zone between major Spanish holdings in California, the Southwest, and Mexico and the French presence in Louisiana.

Beginning in 1776, the Spanish involved themselves in the American Revolution by lending aid to the rebelling English colonies. El Camino Real played an important role in transporting supplies and war materiel from Mexico to the colonies. In 1803, a scant twenty years after the United States won independence, the Louisiana Purchase essentially removed France as a colonial presence in North America. Within another decade, the fight for Mexican independence erupted and, ultimately, pushed Spain out of Mexico, thus bringing an end to the colonial period in Texas.

Definition of El Camino Real de los Tejas

*El Camino Real* translates as “the Royal Road.” In keeping with the traditional relationship established under Spanish custom and practice governing royal roads in Europe and the New World, a *camino real* historically was defined as a road that connected one Spanish capital with another, a distinction not shared with roads connecting ordinary Spanish or Indian villages. *Tejas* refers to the Tejas Indians and the lands where they lived in what is now eastern Texas and northwestern Louisiana. The term *El Camino Real de los Tejas* was first applied during the early years of the eighteenth century only to the route used by the Spanish to go from Coahuila to east Texas. The Spanish road system in Texas then evolved and expanded as other routes were opened. Over time, geographic, religious, political, economic, and military factors contributed to the evolution of El Camino Real into a series of roadways and trails.  

---

41 NPS, *Feasibility Study*, 7.
El Camino Real connected a series of Spanish missions and posts between Monclova, Mexico, and Los Adaes, the first capital of the province of Texas. The changing routes extended from Saltillo through Monclova and Guerrero, Coahuila, Mexico, into Texas by way of San Antonio and Nacogdoches, and as far as Los Adaes in what is now northwestern Louisiana. It constituted the only primary overland route from the Río Grande to the Red River Valley in Louisiana during the Spanish Colonial Period. Properties located along a camino real, such as villas and capitals, had charters that prescribed their royal privileges (reales and regalias). This meant that such properties enjoyed the same status and privileges granted to the main routes of travel used by officials and others acting in the interest of the Spanish monarchy. An important factor under which a town received a set of privileges was its economic importance to a region, province, or colony. San Antonio was one of the first, and most economically and politically significant, villas in Texas, a status that it maintained for the duration of the Spanish Colonial Period.43

**Early European Expeditions and Outposts in Texas**

Texas was among the last areas of New Spain to be colonized. Countering French and, to a lesser degree, English influence comprised a primary motivating factor for Spain’s colonizing efforts in Texas through much of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Texas provided a buffer between French Louisiana and major Spanish holdings in California, the Southwest, and Mexico. As Spain and France struggled for dominion over southern North America, their rivalry played out along the evolving trade routes of El Camino Real. Because the Spanish military regulated major roads during the Spanish Colonial Period, Spanish forces were integral to Spain’s efforts to colonize Texas. Spanish missionaries also were crucial to Spain’s colonization program, as efforts to convert Native Americans to Christianity figured prominently in the empire’s goals.

Spain established presidios and missions along El Camino Real to solidify its claims in Texas, to forestall French and English exploration, and to proselytize indigenous populations. The development and maintenance of El Camino Real across vast distances and difficult terrain represented a major commitment of Spanish resources and human energy. Because of the international competition, Spain undertook colonization sooner than it might otherwise have done, and likely before sufficient resources had been marshaled for the effort. Spain’s early record in its colonization effort bears out this supposition. The first permanent Spanish settlement near present-day Texas was Saltillo, founded during the 1570s, a short distance from Texas’s southeastern border. Sixty years later, the Spanish undertook one of their first missionary efforts within Texas itself. The mission, located just east of present-day San Angelo in west central Texas, to serve the “Jumano” Indians, lasted just six months.

Although Spain claimed Texas for its own, the French undertook an expedition that included portions of the region in 1681-1682 under Robert Cavelier, Sieur de La Salle. The expedition focused its efforts on reconnoitering the Mississippi River. LaSalle next was tasked with establishing a French colony at the mouth of the Mississippi. His expedition, however, mistakenly landed at Garcitas Creek near Matagorda Bay, a considerable distance west of their intended destination. Spain captured one of the ships in LaSalle’s expedition, and the discovery that France sought to establish a colony on New Spain’s frontier caused significant concern among the Spanish.

---

42 Ibid.
43 Ibid.
46 NPS, *Feasibility Study*, 40.
48 Morgan-Remley, *Draft Cultural Resources Inventory*, 16.
In 1684, Spain had made a second attempt to establish a mission for the “Jumano” Indians just east of San Angelo; again, the endeavor lasted for only a few months. Nevertheless, Spain sought to answer the French incursion at Garcitas Creek by launching a series of expeditions aimed at renewing their efforts to colonize Texas. The Viceroy of New Spain first sent an expedition under Alonso de León to locate the French post founded by LaSalle. The trail followed by de León in 1687-1688 between Monclova and South Texas later became a major segment of El Camino Real known as the Upper Presidio del Río Grande Road. In 1689, de León’s expedition reached Garcitas Creek and found the French settlement had already been destroyed by Indian attacks and internal dissension. The expedition returned to Monclova to report their findings.50

A year later, de León returned to burn the remnants of the French colony. He established San Francisco de los Tejas mission among the Tejas Indians near San Pedro Creek in present Houston County, and he also founded a second mission, Santísimo Nombre de María, near the Neches River. He continued to use the same route from Mexico, which passed from the Rio Hondo east to Matagorda Bay and finally into eastern Texas. The route formed the basis for segments of El Camino Real that were used in succeeding decades.51

In 1691, Texas was officially created as a frontier province (Provincia de Texas) with Domingo de Terán (also recorded as Domingo Terán de los Ríos) appointed as the first governor. In May of that year, Terán provided a military escort to a mission expedition led by Father Damián Massanet. The group traveled north out of Monclova, crossed the Río Bravo (Río Grande) and the Arroyo Hondo, passed through the future site of San Antonio (Massanet named the area San Antonio de Padua), crossed the Guadalupe River, and eventually reached the San Francisco de los Tejas mission in present Houston County. During the course of the expedition, Terán extended a segment of El Camino Real to the Nacogdoches area. Terán later withdrew his command, leaving Massanet and a small group of soldiers to run the missions.52

The Spanish entradas (expeditions) prepared the way for future colonization by documenting the previously unknown geography, topography, climate, fauna, flora, cultures, and mineral resources in the region. Diaries and travel journals kept by these explorers and early colonists provide the earliest known recorded observations of eastern Texas.53 For example, in 1691, Francisco Casanas de Jesús Marla, a Spanish missionary, described the setting as follows:

This province of the Asinai is very fertile, suitable for anything that may be planted here. So rich is it that I even venture to say that it is better than the soil of Spain. It has but one fault, that of being very thickly covered with a great variety of trees. Furthermore, there are few stretches of open country.... The kinds of trees found are walnuts and nearly all the different species of nut-bearing trees. There are also many mulberries and other kinds of fruit trees, such as chestnuts. However, the chestnut is not so large as that of Spain. The other kinds of fruit are not known in that country but they are very good. For instance, asses (hawthorn?) and plums are not like those in Spain; but I believe that they would be just as good if they were well cultivated. I do not know the names of the other trees; but I do know that their fruit is very good, because I have eaten of all
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of them. There are also many species of acorns, all of them good. Some of them are as sweet as chestnuts. From the other kinds the Indians make a kind of food which serves as bread, just as if it were corn. Throughout the entire province there are many pine trees, very tall ones, too. There are also trees of different kinds that serve only to delight the eye through the variety of their flowers. The rest of the trees are of very fine wood for manufacturing anything that one might wish to make. There are also different kinds of plants such as the blackberry bush and innumerable other vines, some entangled among the trees and others in the form of stubby vines growing in the open spaces. There are so many that they look as if they had been planted by hand. Some of the vines bear very fine grapes... There are also many kinds of herbs, very good to eat. There are edible roots which, like sweet potatoes, grow under ground... This country contains various kinds of animals that are good to eat, such as wild hogs. They are quite large and savage like those in New Spain. There are many deer, prairie chickens, and wild ducks but these are to be had only in the winter time. There are two other kinds of ducks, much smaller, but good to eat. There are likewise many kinds of fowls not so large as chickens in Spain. They come at the same time as the wild ducks. Rabbits are also to be had in great numbers and many kinds of birds that stay in the country the year round, such as partridges, quails, herons, and an endless number of birds that sing very melodiously in the spring.  

Although Spain demonstrated a commitment to colonizing Texas, many of the earliest missions in eastern Texas proved to be short-lived. Mission Santísimo Nombre de María, which reportedly consisted of a straw chapel and missionary’s residence, was destroyed by flood in 1692. The Mission San Francisco de los Tejas mission was abandoned in 1693 due to hostilities with local Indians.  

Evolution of El Camino Real, 1600s-1700s  

During the Spanish Colonial Period, the development of El Camino Real as a network of regional roads irrevocably changed American Indian family and community life, religious practices, and intertribal relations. Resource use and technology underwent significant changes as well. Some tribes that once had moved from place to place harvesting resources over the course of the year became sedentary farmers as they were concentrated in the newly established Spanish mission lands. Traditional tribal areas were depopulated by disease, military activities, relocation, and resettlement. In some instances, tribes displaced from traditional lands farther north and east moved into Texas. New intertribal alliances and enmities developed, and in some instances survivors from two or more tribal groups banded together. The cultural upheaval caused the loss of many indigenous traditions and lifeways. Infiltration of Spanish culture and technology brought numerous changes to the way of life for indigenous people, especially their use of horses, metal tools, weaponry, and trade goods. Spanish and indigenous cultures also blended, incorporating aspects from both into a new culture. These aspects of El Camino Real’s influence are important to the overall historical significance of the road network.  

Equal to cultural influences, the evolution of El Camino Real was shaped by environmental factors. The variegated terrain across Texas included dense forests, floodplains, and desert. In eastern Texas, the Post Oak Savanna proved an especially formidable barrier to overland travelers, while the rolling countryside of the Balcones Escarpment offered travelers a welcome respite from the harsher conditions found elsewhere. The need  

54 Originally quoted in Hatcher 1928: 209-211 and reproduced in Dee Ann Story, ed., “The DeShazo Site, Nacogdoches County, Texas, Vol. 1: The Site, Its Setting, Investigation, Cultural Features, Artifacts of Non-Native Manufacture, and Subsistence Remains, Texas Antiquities Permit Series No. 7” (Austin, Texas, 1982). Most of the historic accounts of travel along the trail focus on setting, flora, fauna, and peoples encountered on journeys. Diaries and travel logs noted river and dry arroyo crossings, and often described terrain as “rough” or “level,” but rarely described the qualities of the road itself in terms of materials or dimensions.  
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for reliable sources of water dictated the formation of travel routes. Locations of dependable ponds and streams were recorded and used repeatedly as camping sites. These combined to confine travelers to comparatively narrow corridors that shifted from time to time depending on local environmental factors, such as floods or droughts.57

While El Camino Real was shaped by cultural and environmental influences, the road network proved profoundly influential in turn. Huge swaths of the Texas landscape were affected by the routes of El Camino Real, particularly with regard to physical and legal patterning of land grants, placement of settlements, and subsequent development of transportation routes. Grant boundaries followed El Camino Real routes, helping to establish land use patterns that continued across subsequent centuries. The term “Royal Road” also is mentioned or shown in a number of grant and claim documents, which provide a means of tracing the routes over time. Furthermore, El Camino Real comprised a spine from which Texas’s road network expanded through the nineteenth century. In eastern North America, trade routes generally paralleled rivers but the generally east/west direction of El Camino Real meant rivers were crossed instead. As a result, Texas’s trade patterns differed significantly from those in eastern parts of the country through the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.58

Spanish Reaction to French Encroachment in Texas (1700-1720)

From 1701 to 1713, the War of Spanish Succession distracted many European colonial powers from their activities in the Americas. One potential heir to the Spanish throne, Philip d’Anjou of the French Bourbons, also was in line to inherit the French throne. Leopold I, of the Austrian Hapsburgs, also had a legitimate claim. Spain itself was divided in its support of the two potential heirs. The resulting war lasted for more than a decade. In North America, it was known as Queen Anne’s War, with hostilities almost entirely confined to the eastern seaboard and Florida. The succession issue finally was resolved with Philip renouncing his claim to France’s monarchy and assuming the Spanish throne as Philip V, making him the first, and longest ruling, Bourbon king of Spain.

During the war years, exploration in New Spain continued. An uneasy relationship existed among Spanish and French explorers. While outright hostilities did not break out, the Spanish colonial government remained suspicious of French traders’ intentions through the 1710s.

In 1700-1703, Spain responded to French incursions into Spanish territory by establishing three new missions (San Juan Bautista, San Francisco Solano, and San Bernardo) and a new presidio (San Juan Bautista del Río Grande del Norte [Presidio del Río Grande]).59 This complex of three missions and a presidio is collectively referred to as San Juan Bautista. Among the best known French explorers was Canadian-born Louis Juchereau de St. Denis, who had a long career traveling through New Spain and Louisiana. In March 1700, St. Denis and 22 Canadians explored along the Red River and, five years later, he traveled as far west as San Juan Bautista on the Río Bravo (Río Grande) in the area of what is now the City of Eagle Pass.60

In 1709, Captain Pedro de Aguirre, commander of the Presidio del Río Grande, escorted fathers Antonio de San Buenaventura Olivares and Isidro Espinosa to the San Marcos River (possibly present Colorado River). Leaving Mission San Juan Bautista, they had instructions to proceed only as far at the Río San Antonio de Padua and make contact with the Tejas (the Asinai). A few days after they had crossed the Nueces River, they passed the future site of San Antonio and camped at the river known as San Antonio de Padua. There they made contact with a tribe known as the Yojuanes, who knew the Tejas. Having spent a few days among them, the Spaniards determined the
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Tejas were camped three days’ travel away and likely would be hostile. Lacking authorization to travel any farther, Captain Aguirre decided to return to San Juan Bautista.

Although the expedition may have seemed fruitless, it reactivated an interest in the area. Later, Espinosa penned a history of the area describing Texas, its people, and its history, inclusive of the founding of San Antonio. Like other Spanish explorers, Espinosa also wrote extensive descriptions of the environment he encountered. The thick forests of eastern Texas were among the most impressive aspects, as Espinosa related:

The entire country is filled with various kinds of trees, such as oaks, pines, cottonwoods, live-oaks, large nuts which yield the thick shelled nuts- and another kind of tree which yields small thin shelled nuts. The Indians use all of these as food. In addition to the nut bearing trees, there are other fruit trees, like the medlar, the plum, and the large wild cherry. Among them there is found a white grape that looks like a muscatel. It only needs cultivation to make it as good as the domestic variety.

There are great quantities of red and white mulberries and large blackberries which are very sweet, a great abundance of pomegranates like those in China and a quantity of chestnuts, although the fruit they yield is small, about like the white oak acorns. The pastures and other portions of the land are very much like those in Florida- a country contiguous to Texas. Everything that is read about the beauty and fertility of the first named province can be applied to the latter with but little modification. In general the country is level though in some portions it is rough.... The climate is very much like that of Spain since it begins to rain in September and the water continues to fall up to April. During the four remaining months the weather is very hot and showers are very scarce during this time. So, in order to succeed in raising a crop, one must have added rains from Heaven. If this is scarce, the crops are short. Throughout the whole country there are rivers and, large perennial arroyos, and many springs which are so low during the summer season that their waters cannot be drawn off for irrigation. Besides, since the country is so thickly wooded, there are no places suitable for irrigation even with a great deal of work. This has been the greatest difficulty at all times in gathering the Indians into compact settlements. There are many lagoons in which an abundance of fish are found. These fish are not always found in the same spots, but the locations vary according to the rises in the rivers and arroyos during the winter. When warm weather comes the Indians go with their families to certain spots and stay for some days, living on fish. They carry home quantities of cooked fish, I ate some of these, among them the fish called dorado. The animals that are most abundant in these woods are deer and venison from which the Indians secure their staple food, together with wild ducks. To these are added during the winter months many bustards and cranes, while partridges and quails are abundant during the entire year.

Spanish colonialists maintained their interests in establishing missions among the agricultural east Texas Indians through the War of Spanish Succession. They also continued to view French incursions into the area with suspicion, if not outright hostility. The aforementioned French trader, St. Denis, had continued his travels in Louisiana and New Spain. In 1713, he contacted the Tejas Indians in eastern Texas, then traveled southwestward through present-day Bexar County and finally on to the Río Grande. The next year, he returned to the Río Grande to trade with the Spanish, but such trade was illegal. He was arrested and escorted to Mexico City for interrogation by the Spanish viceroy. He stated he was there only to trade for items needed for French colonists to
survive in Louisiana. Spanish officials redoubled their efforts to establish a buffer colony between French Louisiana and Spanish Texas.64

In 1716, Domingo Ramón, son of Diego Ramón, who was presidial captain at San Juan Bautista, received an appointment to command a military unit charged with reestablishing a Spanish mission in east Texas. By this time, the charismatic St. Denis had convinced the Spanish of his veracity and he was appointed to act as commissary officer and guide for the expedition. Isidro Felis de Espinosa accompanied them and recorded events in his personal diary. In mid-February 1716, the expedition of 75 men, women, and children, left Saltillo bound for the Río Grande. By April 6, the expedition had reached the river and crossed at Paso de Francia. The expedition stopped along the San Antonio River, before proceeding to the Comal River in the vicinity of present New Braunfels, then toward the Colorado River south of present-day Austin. At the end of June, they reached their destination near the Neches River in eastern Texas.65

In east Texas, the expedition’s missionaries established Nuestro Padre San Francisco de los Tejas Mission in Cherokee County to commemorate the original San Francisco de los Tejas Mission (1690-1693), and they also established Mission Nuestra Señora de la Purísima Concepción de los Ainais, Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe de los Nacogdoches, and San José de los Nazonis, all in Nacogdoches County. In early 1717, two more missions, Nuestra Señora de los Dolores de los Ais and San Miguel de Linares de los Adaes, were founded respectively among other tribes in present-day San Augustine County and present-day Natchitoches Parish, Louisiana (which was then claimed as part of the Spanish province of Texas). Presidio Nuestra Señora de los Dolores de los Tejas also was established at this time. With the creation of the missions and a garrison among them, the Spanish initially felt they had countered the French threat. The harsh environment and living conditions, however, caused many of the military guard to desert the area. Moreover, within a short time, several missions were doomed by the outbreak of another war among European powers because soldiers had to be transferred elsewhere.66

In 1718-1719, Philip V, the new Bourbon King of Spain, participated in a war against the Quadruple Alliance of Austria, France, Britain, and the Netherlands. Upon learning of renewed hostilities, Lt. Philippe Blondel at the French post of Natchitoches, Louisiana, led an attack against the Spanish Mission San Miguel de Linares de los Adaes, which at the time was occupied by a single lay brother and one soldier. The lay brother managed to escape and fled to Nuestra Señora de los Dolores Mission (at the site of present-day San Augustine, Texas). He reported to Fray Antonio Margil de Jesús that Blondel had stated the French captured Pensacola and that a hundred soldiers were on their way from Mobile to capture Spain’s east Texas settlements. Margil, in turn, retreated to Mission Nuestra Señora de la Purísima Concepción (in present Nacogdoches County).67 The fate of the lone soldier at the mission is unknown.

Meanwhile, Domingo Ramón coordinated evacuation of Presidio Nuestra Señora de los Dolores de los Tejas and withdrew toward San Antonio to await reinforcements. Margil, Isidro Félix de Espinosa, and two soldiers remained at Mission Concepción for a time, but decided to follow the route of Ramón’s retreat as well. They camped at the border of Hasinai (Tejas) country until the end of September, when Espinosa alone started for San Antonio de Béxar and San Juan Bautista to seek help. Along the way, he met a volunteer relief expedition from
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San Juan Bautista and learned that no reinforcements would be forthcoming. All of the Spanish then marched to Mission San Antonio de Valero to regroup.68

During this time, the Marqués de San Miguel de Aguayo was appointed governor of Coahuila and Texas. Aguayo also was charged with mounting a military campaign to reclaim east Texas for Spain. The expedition, however, was delayed for eighteen months, by which time the War of Quadruple Alliance had ended. Rather than pursuing the French in battle, Aguayo led a mission of reoccupation of the abandoned missions.69 Other than Blondel’s attack on Mission San Miguel de Linares, no overt hostilities occurred between the Spanish and French during the brief war. In the aftermath, Spain made significant progress toward establishing permanent settlements along El Camino Real.

Permanent Spanish Settlements

Among the first and most important permanent Spanish settlements in Texas was San Antonio de Béxar, a product of Spanish desires to strengthen the claim to Texas and diminish French expansionism. A veteran missionary to Texas, Fray Antonio de San Buenaventura Olivares, proposed the establishment of missions at the headwaters of the San Antonio River. His proposal was reviewed in 1716, and funding for a founding expedition followed in 1717. The titular head of the expedition was Martín de Alarcón, a Knight of the Order of Santiago, and then-governor of Coahuila and Texas, while Father Olivares was charged with establishing the mission sites at San Antonio. By March 1718, the expedition left San Juan Bautista to cross the Río Grande, and reached the Río San Antonio on April 25, 1718. There they established the Presidio of San Antonio de Béxar, Villa de Bejar, and Mission San Antonio de Valero (later known as the Alamo).70

In 1720, the aforementioned expedition led by Governor Marqués de San Miguel de Aguayo began. By October 1720, he had organized an army of 500 men provisioned with four thousand horses, six hundred head of cattle, nine hundred sheep, and about eight hundred mules. His orders were to receive French deserters into Spanish service and allow the French to settle in Texas if they so desired, as long as they made no attempt to resist Spanish forces. The expedition set out from Monclova in November 1720. Aguayo took the main force to San Antonio. From there, the group marched to the Comal River, near modern New Braunfels, and proceeded to a point beyond the San Marcos River. Blazing a new route, Aguayo straddled Apache territory to the Brazos River near present Waco. After a meeting with St. Denis, Aguayo directed further changes in the establishment of Texas outposts from San Antonio.71

Under Aguayo’s leadership, as of 1722, two missions, one sub-mission, one presidio, and one villa were founded in present-day Bexar County, as follows: Mission San Antonio de Valero (formerly Mission San Francisco Solano on the Río Grande); Presidio of San Antonio de Béxar; Villa de Béxar; Mission San José y San Miguel de Aguayo; and Mission San Francisco Xavier de Nájera.72 Missions were re-occupied in east Texas in or near their previous locations, except the mission that was previously known both as San Francisco de los Tejas and Nuestro Padre San Francisco de los Tejas, which was re-established at a third location in Houston County in 1721. The name of the mission at its third location was San Francisco de los Neches.73

Spain also strengthened its defenses starting in 1721 by adding a presidio and villa in the Los Adaes settlement, which served as the capital of Texas. The same year, a presidio and mission were established in Victoria County.
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The first location of the Presidio Nuestra Señora de Loreto de la Bahía was founded on the site of La Salle’s ill-fated colony on the west bank of Garcitas Creek, while the first location of the Mission Nuestra Señora del Espíritu Santo de Zúñiga is believed to have been on the creek’s east bank. In 1726, the presidio and mission were moved to the Guadalupe River in Victoria County.  

Pedro de Rivera y Villalón, a brigadier general in the Spanish army, undertook an inspection tour of New Spain’s frontier defenses between 1724 and 1728. The Spanish viceroy instructed him to investigate and correct abuses by officers against their men; to look into causes of low morale among the troops, as well as their lack of arms, equipment, horses, clothing, and provisions; and to determine which posts were needed, which were to be abolished, and which were to be reduced in size. Throughout the journey, Rivera kept a diary in which he described the locations of Spanish and Indian settlements, customs and habits of the inhabitants, and agricultural products. These observations form the basis for his report.  

By the time his tour concluded, Rivera called for the abolition of some outposts, reduction in force at others, and the transfer of other outposts to more strategic points. He also advocated consolidation of frontier settlements for the sake of economy. For example, in 1726, when Rivera toured San Antonio de Béxar, the presidio had a complement of fifty-four soldiers. Forty-five were on duty at the presidio, while nine were on mission guard or escort duty. Four settlers and their families lived near the presidio, as did the families of the soldiers, making for a total Spanish population at around 200. Rivera recommended that the complement of the presidio be cut from fifty-four soldiers to forty-four, although he found the presidio to be efficiently run and the soldiers well disciplined. On the other hand, his impression of the Presidio de los Tejas was much less favorable and he recommended that the outpost be abolished.  

Additionally, Rivera stated that Spain should not tolerate Apache aggression, and he recommended relocation of the La Bahía presidio (Nuestra Señora de Loreto) to the Medina River to check the Apaches in that area. His recommendation regarding La Bahía was not implemented, but three east Texas missions were relocated in the aftermath of Apache attacks. All three moved to San Antonio in 1731, bringing the total number of missions in present-day Bexar County to five. The new names of the east Texas missions that were re-established in Bexar County were as follows: Mission Nuestra Señora de la Purísima Concepción de Acuña (1731-1824), formerly Mission Nuestra Señora de la Purísima Concepción de los Ainais in Nacogdoches County; Mission San Juan Capistrano (1731-1824), formerly Mission San José de los Nazonis in Nacogdoches County; and Mission San Francisco de la Espada (1731-1824), formerly San Francisco de los Neches in Houston County. Additionally, in 1731, Spain brought displaced Canary Islanders to Bexar County, where they were assigned temporary farming lands. They built a series of stone-lined acequias at San Pedro Springs; remnants of these are still visible at San Pedro Park. As a result of these activities, San Antonio became a major Spanish population center in frontier Texas.  

Tribes such as the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache were highly mobile hunters who used horses acquired from the Spanish to follow bison herds across the southern plains. As the original tribes inhabiting southern Texas were gathered into missions, the Plains groups quickly moved southward, hunting and raiding. Although missions were also established for some of the Plains tribes during the mid-eighteenth century, the Spanish missionaries usually were not successful in converting these non-sedentary groups. Indeed, the equestrian powers proved to be formidable opponents to the Spanish in their quest to colonize Texas. The Comanche and Apache, in particular,
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controlled vast territories that acted as barriers to Spanish penetration into northern New Spain. Repeated raids by the bellicose indigenous tribes stifled permanent Spanish settlements across much of Texas.\(^79\)

During the 1740s and 1750s, the advance of the northern frontier of New Spain forced hunter-gatherer groups to move north and English colonies pushed Indian groups from eastern U.S. These movements of new tribes into the area disrupted traditional territories and the Apaches relocated into the San Antonio area due to pressure from the north by the Comanches, Wichitas, Tawakonis, and others.\(^80\) After several military campaigns, the Spanish and Apaches reached a peace accord in 1749. During this time, four San Xavier Missions were established along the San Xavier River (now known as San Gabriel River) in Milam County on the road to the Tejas. By the mid-eighteenth century, the names and dates of the missions and presidio were as follows. The first was Mission San Francisco Xavier de Horcasitas (1746-1758), known as Nuestra Señora de los Dolores del Río Xavier from 1746 to 1747; it moved to the present-day San Marcos area in Hays County (1755-1756) and moved again to the New Braunfels area in Comal County (1756-1758). The second was Mission San Ildefonso (1748-1752). The third was Mission Nuestra Señora de Candelaria (1749-1756), which moved to the present-day San Marcos area in Hays County 1755-1756. And finally, Presidio San Francisco Xavier de Gigedo (1750-1757), which moved to the present-day San Marcos area in Hays County in 1755-1757.\(^81\)

Mission ranchos were integral to the successful operation of Spanish missions, in both practical and spiritual terms. Missions had to produce all of their own food, and the ranchos were tended by Native American converts to Christianity, who learned agriculture and the raising of stock from the Spanish missionaries.\(^82\) In this way Spanish missions were intended to completely assimilate the local population in every aspect of life, for although missions were established as a governmental agency they were not intended to remain so. The long-term Spanish policy dictated that after an unspecified period of time mission settlements would eventually be privatized or secularized. Communal property was to be divided up among the locals and religious duties handed over from the missionaries to the Catholic diocesan church, resulting in a loyal Spanish colonial settlement.\(^83\) The Secularization of missions began in the late eighteenth century and continued into the nineteenth century.\(^84\)

Spain’s establishment of various missions, presidios, and villas in west and central Texas during the mid-eighteenth century saw a clear pattern of development emerge along El Camino Real. Official government and church business, as well as individual commerce, comprised the traffic on El Camino Real. Civilian villages were placed near a mission or military post, while land owners exploited the countryside from these centers via roads. Roads also were used as a partial boundary of church (mission) lands and privately owned ranchos.

An example of a Spanish settlement pattern is demonstrated at the Villa de Dolores, established in 1750 on the north side of the Río Grande, downstream of present-day Laredo. Dolores became the northernmost outpost of Nuevo Santander. As a result, a new crossing of the river came into use. This crossing provided a route to San Antonio and Los Adaes with less risk of Indian attack. By 1755, almost all the traffic bound from the interior to La Bahía, San Antonio, and Los Adaes crossed the Río Grande at Dolores. Because of its strategic importance at the time of its founding, Dolores was given the status as \textit{villa} despite its being, in reality, a rancho or estancia. With the 1755 founding of Laredo at Paso de Jacinto on the Río Grande, however, the traffic pattern began to
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shift. Although Dolores remained a principal crossing for only a short time, it set a precedent for traffic turning east from the Río Salado rather than continuing north to San Juan Bautista. Thus, it set the stage for the emergence of Laredo as a major transit point for traffic between Mexico and Texas. The Laredo to San Antonio road(s) also played an important role in the settlement of Nuevo Santander, part of which is now encompassed by southern Texas. Emigration from central Mexico and from the presidios in the northern province to this area was encouraged by liberal land grants that imbued the Nuevo Santander settlements with a stronger civilian presence that stood in contrast to the mission communities of eastern Texas.85

Spain’s peace accord with the Apaches proved to be short-lived. Hostilities between Spanish colonists and Apaches, as well as other Native American tribes, plagued Spain through the late eighteenth century and, indeed, played a major role in the Spanish empire’s failure to gain a secure hold on its northernmost holdings in New Spain. 86 In light of their ongoing losses in blood and treasure, the empire repeatedly explored means for effective government of its vast holdings in New Spain. José Bernardo de Gálvez Gallardo served as visitor general of public finance in New Spain from 1765 to 1771. A position more powerful even than that of viceroy, the visitor general was charged with making recommendations and reforms regarding general colonial policy. In the northern frontier, including Texas, Gálvez’s reforms included an overhaul of the revenue collection system, strengthening royal monopolies on trade and commerce, and expelling Jesuits from the viceroyalty. The visitor general also initiated the permanent settlement of Alta California.87

In 1767, Marqués de Rubí undertook an inspection of Texas as an element of Gálvez’s reforms. He recommended that Spanish Texas should be pulled back to the San Antonio River and the coastal defenses, and that all Spanish activities north of El Camino be abandoned, which included Los Adaes. As a result, after 1772, San Antonio became the capital of Texas.88 Simultaneously, however, Rubí recommended a harsh policy toward the native tribes in the region, particularly the Apache, who had fiercely resisted Spanish incursions into their territory.89 In 1769, Jacobo Ugarte y Loyola was appointed governor of Coahuila, a position he held until 1777. During his tenure, Ugarte developed a divide-and-conquer strategy for coping with Indian resistance. He negotiated peace treaties with tribes who were friendly toward Spain, and then sought to turn them against those who were hostile.90 In 1776, the Spanish king formally authorized designation of the Provincias Internas, first proposed by Gálvez during the late 1760s. The semiautonomous administrative unit included Texas, Coahuila, Nueva Vizcaya, New Mexico, Sinaloa, Sonora, and Baja and Alta California. With the establishment of this jurisdiction separately from the viceroyalty of New Spain, the empire’s continuing goals were to govern the frontier effectively, to stimulate economic development, and to protect Spanish claims from other colonial powers.91 In 1777, Teodoro de Croix was named commandant general of the Provincias Internas.92 Later that year, he commenced an inspection of his new jurisdiction. At Monclova, San Antonio, and Chihuahua, Croix met with frontier military officers to strategize methods for countering Apache hostilities. Croix also built up a more extensive military presence along the northern frontier than had previously existed, with 4,686 men from Texas to Sonora. Juan Agustín Morfi, a Spanish priest, traveled the road from San Juan Bautista to the old missions at San Antonio.
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**El Camino Real as a Lifeline**

During the eighteenth century, with the establishment of a system of missions, presidios, villas, and ranchos, El Camino Real became the main thoroughfare for Spanish colonial traffic and trade. The travel routes became a critical component in the economic and demographic development of the Spanish and French frontiers. Overland trade of both lawful and illicit goods or contraband among the residents of Spanish Texas, Mexico, and French Louisiana took place principally along El Camino Real. Tejanos used roads to transport goods, livestock, and occasionally Indian captives in exchange for food, household or ecclesiastical supplies, and construction materials. The route and the adjoining settlements allowed the movement of people and goods through areas of difficult terrain, such as the swamps and woodlands of eastern Texas and northwestern Louisiana, as well as areas with hostile Native American populations.93

El Camino Real also was the “lifeline” between settlements south of the Rio Grande and the northeastern frontier. Although the Texas province had a lengthy coastline, very little seaborne contact with Mexico occurred before the nineteenth century. Consequently, El Camino Real was the primary commercial, transportation, and communication route between Texas and the rest of New Spain.94 At times, segments of El Camino Real shifted in response to unfavorable relationships with Native American tribes. For example, the preferred route between San Juan Bautista to San Antonio shifted southeastward through the eighteenth and early nineteenth century, likely because of Apache and Comanche threats to Spanish travelers.95

Starting in 1779, the royal road became an important conduit for moving soldiers and provisions to aid the American Revolution. Between 1779 and 1782, approximately 9,000 head of cattle were driven by Spanish Texas rancheros and escorted by Spanish soldiers along the Lower Road from La Bahía to Nacogdoches, Natchitoches, and Opelousas. The livestock were used to supply Spanish forces under the command of General Bernardo de Galvez, who defeated the British along the Gulf Coast. Spain’s overall assistance during the American Revolution proved vital to helping the revolutionaries prevent the British from gaining control of the Mississippi River and Gulf Coast.96

Spanish involvement in the American Revolution, however, doomed Croix’s plans for implementing a more forceful military strategy in Texas. In 1783, Croix was promoted to lieutenant general and viceroy of Peru. In 1786 the viceroy regained control of the Provincias Internas and, for a brief period, the interior provinces were divided into three military regions. The eastern region included Texas, Coahuila, Nuevo León, and Nuevo Santander. In 1787, another reorganization combined the three regions into two, and five years later, by order of King Charles IV, the regions were consolidated again into a single unit. Symptomatic of Spain’s inability to reach a satisfactory arrangement, in 1804, the king again created two separate jurisdictions. Although delayed for a time, this arrangement remained in place through 1821.97

**Spanish Colonial Period Draws to a Close**

By the early nineteenth century, the interests of the French, Spanish, and English colonial powers in North America began to be subsumed by the newly independent United States and, later, Mexico. In 1803, the Louisiana Purchase essentially removed France as a colonial presence in the present-day United States. The United States soon showed interest in adjacent Spanish lands of Texas, Nuevo Santander, Nuevo León, Coahuila, and Nuevo
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México. Philip Nolan and Zebulon Pike led incursions into this territory, as the United States had placed claims on the Río Grande as the western and southern boundary of Texas. Spain responded by establishing San Marcos de Neve on the San Marcos River and Santísima Trinidad de Salcedo on the Trinity River; additional posts were established on the San Marcos and Colorado rivers and along the Camino Arriba between Bastrop and Nacogdoches.98

Between the 1780s and 1810s, New Spain was in a financial crisis brought on by poor harvests and war in Europe. With Spain concentrating more on the French Revolution and Napoleonic Wars, Spanish colonists grew increasingly disaffected from the mother country. In Mexico, local elites saw the opportunity to seize more control of local affairs, creating an atmosphere of unrest that eventually spread into the Texas frontier by way of Spain’s network of missions and settlements. The rebellions and battles that followed, including those headed by the “father of Mexican independence,” Father Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla, collectively comprise the Mexican War for Independence between 1810 and 1821.99

Several frontier towns and settlements were affected by the upheaval between rebels and royalists with both groups traveling via El Camino Real. One such example is the rebel force of the Gutiérrez-Magee expedition. The force of 300 men formed by José Bernardo Gutiérrez de Lara and August W. Magee traveled from Trinidad de Salcedo, a Spanish villa located on the east bank of the Trinity River, to San Antonio by way of El Camino Real in September 1812. A series of battles ensued across central Texas culminating in the Battle of the Medina which took place along El Camino Real at the Medina River on August 18, 1813. The four-hour battle resulted in a royalist victory and massive executions of rebels in San Antonio and Nacogdoches.100

The legacy of the Battle of Medina proved to be potent. Some veterans of the battle went on to fight with Andrew Jackson in the War of 1812, and some even fought in the Texas War of Independence in 1835-1836. Although the Spanish royalists won the day, peace did not prevail in Texas for the remainder of the 1810s. Americans remained keenly interested in the province. Numerous plots and plans for invasions were hatched, although none succeeded in ejecting the Spanish royalists.101 For the next several years, the battle for Mexican independence consisted largely of local revolts and guerrilla actions that did not seriously threaten royal authority.102

It was not until 1821 that turmoil in Spain once again led to political tensions between Spanish government authorities and colonial authorities in Mexico. As a result, Agustín de Iturbide, a Spanish royal officer who aligned himself with insurgents and Mexican rebel Vicente R. Guerrero developed the Plan de Iguala, a blueprint for Mexico’s independence from Spain. The plan guaranteed preservation of the Catholic Church’s status as the state-established religion, the creation of a constitutional monarchy in Mexico, and equality of peninsulares (born on the Iberian Peninsula) and criollos (American-born Spaniard).103 By the end of July 1821, when Juan O’Donojú, newly arrived from Spain to assume control of the colonial government, loyalists controlled only
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Mexico City and Veracruz. On August 24, O’Donoulu met with Iturbide at Córdoba, where he signed a treaty granting Mexico independence from Spain. In September 1821, Iturbide entered Mexico City. The following May, he proclaimed himself Agustín I, the first emperor of the new Mexican nation. His extravagant and irresponsible reign lasted less than two years. Antonio López de Santa Anna led a revolt against him that started in December 1822. In January 1823, Iturbide signed a permit for Stephen F. Austin’s colony, the first permit issued for a legal Anglo-American settlement in Texas (a colonization effort was started by his father, Moses Austin, in 1820, but Stephen pursued it after Moses died in 1821). After abdicating on March 19, 1823, he sailed for Italy.104

By the time the Spanish Colonial Period drew to a close in 1821, El Camino Real had served as an important thoroughfare through provincial Texas for more than 140 years. The various routes of El Camino Real played an important role in shaping settlement patterns, siting of principal colonial-era settlements, and cultural interactions with Native Americans. The legacies of Spanish reliance on El Camino Real included the continued use of Spanish place names (adapted to English pronunciation); the boundaries of old land grants that shaped the cultural landscape for decades afterwards; and extant examples of Spanish, Mexican, French, and Native American structures and building traditions.105

Over the course of their imperial occupation of Texas, the Spanish expended vast quantities of blood and treasure. Ever fearful of French expansionism, they were largely successful in their attempts to quell French penetration into Texas by way of Louisiana. Their success, however, may have been largely assisted by the Louisiana Purchase, which allowed the United States to supplant France as the major threat to Spanish interests in North America.

Tragically, Spanish use of El Camino Real coincided with disastrous losses for Native American tribes in the area. In her ethnographic study of the region, Mariah Wade found that most of the groups indigenous to central, south-central, and southwest Texas entered the Spanish missions that were established from the 1720s to the 1750s. Some groups attempted to desert the missions, but were forced to return either by Spanish authorities or due to raids from hostile tribes, particularly the Apache. Across the eighteenth century, the majority of these tribes lost control of their traditional territories and became at least partially acculturated to Spanish customs. However, the Spanish missions across the Southwest were largely unsuccessful at converting Native American groups. Those that did were often weakened by disease and warfare to the point where they needed Spanish protection or were forced to participate in mission life.106

By the early nineteenth century, the Indian population of the area that is now Texas and Louisiana had been decimated by disease, raiding, and warfare. Some indigenous groups had all but disappeared or were supplanted by tribes that had been displaced elsewhere by English and French colonization. Most of the Coahuiltecan groups in south Texas disappeared or were absorbed into the Mexican population. Those who remained had been absorbed into a larger, distinctive milieu that incorporated aspects of French, Spanish, African, and native cultures. The Muskogean-speaking Alabama and Coushatta tribes (originally from Alabama and part of the Upper Creek Confederacy) had migrated into what is now east Texas during the eighteenth century. The Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache tribes also were among the previously displaced groups who moved into the void. All of these displaced tribes posed significant challenges for the Mexican, Texas, and American governments through the mid-nineteenth century.107
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El Camino Real after the end of Spanish Rule.

Summary

The period of significance for this MPS is limited to c.1690-1821, focusing on the development and use of the Camino Real road systems through the Spanish Colonial Period, in keeping with the focus of the National Historic Trail Comprehensive Management Plan. Just as segments of El Camino Real had precedent in the trails used by Native American groups before European contact, the various trails – to varying degrees – continued to serve as components of later transportation networks, through the Texas Republic Period, early statehood, and even to the present day. Many properties nominated under this Multiple Property Documentation form will have periods of significance that extend well beyond the period of significance highlighted in this document, and those nominations will provide additional context specific to their individual significance beyond their association with El Camino Real. Dramatic changes in the function of El Camino Real occurred with the loss of Spanish control over Texas. Established as a route for colonization from the south, allowing the founding of presidios, missions, and civil settlements, it served as a link to Satillo and Mexico City.\(^{108}\) In August 1821, the Treaty of Córdoba formally established Mexico as an independent nation, and that same month, Stephen F. Austin arrived in San Antonio to carry out the colonization plan started by his father Moses in 1819. Settlers from the United States arrived by sea at the mouth of the Brazos, as well as overland on several trails, including Camino Real, as well as Trammel’s Trace (running from Fulton Arkansas, south to Nacogdoches), among others.\(^{109}\) Some of the routes of El Camino Real continued to serve as important roads through the Republic Period and into Texas statehood, but new settlement patterns called for the creation and use of new trails as well, diminishing the singular importance of the older corridor. Establishment of ports along the gulf coast led to many new settlements beyond the reach of El Camino Real, now served by new north-south oriented roads that paralleled rivers.

1821-1836

The Mexican Period represented a time of competition and struggle between the competing interests of the newly established Mexican government and the expansionist goals of American politicians and pioneers. As Spain had done, Mexico regarded its northernmost province, Texas, as a buffer zone. In 1819, the Adams-Onís Treaty named the Sabine River as the boundary separating the United States and Mexico. At the same time, however, Anglo settlers poured into the area in search of cheap land and economic opportunity. The colonies of Moses Austin and Green DeWitt represented the most ambitious efforts by immigrating Americans. Throughout the 1820s, Mexico struggled to balance its desire to see Texas settled and tamed with its unease about the goals and intentions of Anglo settlers. Simultaneously, upheavals plagued the Mexican government, with frequent changes in leadership caused by rivalries among various factions. The lack of stability contributed to Texans’ wariness of Mexican rule.

Symptomatic of the tensions between the competing aspirations of the two cultural groups was a lessened emphasis on El Camino Real. In east Texas, where Anglo settlements proliferated, improved steamboat navigation offered the potential for greatly increasing traffic from Texas’s Gulf Coast to America’s east coast market centers. With east Texas becoming more oriented toward the east, El Camino Real began to lose its prominence as a principal overland route linking eastern Texas to northeastern Mexico. Weakening ties between eastern Texas and Mexico carried significant political, economic, and cultural ramifications that played out through the 1830s.

Immigration to the Mexican Republic during the 1820s was marked by an influx of primarily Anglos followed by groups of a wide variety of ethnic and linguistic groups. Many of these groups settled in east Texas. Meanwhile,
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by the early 1820s, Hispanic Texans lived primarily in central and southern Texas. Most worked on ranchos and farms, while the remainder lived and worked in the three early eighteenth century settlements of San Antonio, Goliad, and Nacogdoches. In 1834, Mexican government inspector Juan N. Almonte estimated that Béxar and outlying ranches had a Hispanic population of 2,400, Goliad 700, and Nacogdoches 500, although the accuracy of his figures is not known.110

By the early nineteenth century, Laredo had emerged as an increasingly important trade center, and a regional road served the Laredo-San Antonio corridor, with land-grant empresarios and presidial soldiers overseeing road maintenance.111 According to Leffler and Long, approximately forty ranches had been established around Laredo by the early 1800s, and by about 1815, ranches were being established to the east at Palafox Villa, about halfway between Laredo and San Juan Bautista. During the 1820s, ranchers went from favoring cattle to sheep, and wool became the area’s principal export. Between 1828 and 1831, one hacienda and twenty-three ranchos were established near Laredo, and another 100 parcels of common pastureland (sitios de ganado) were assigned to various individuals. Over the next several years, ranches were established as much as thirty miles outside Laredo. Laredo had a population of about 2,000 in 1835.112 By the time of the Texas Republic, the Laredo-San Antonio Road replaced the Camino Pita segment of the Camino Real as the primary route from San Antonio to the Rio Grande.113

Proximity to the United States, as well as fertile, well-watered soils and plentiful game attracted Western European and Anglo-American immigration to east and central Texas. In 1820, Moses Austin became the first American empresario to seek to establish a colony in Texas. He crossed the Sabine River and traveled along El Camino Real to San Antonio to petition the then-Spanish Governor of the Province of Coahuila y Texas for land to establish 300 families as colonists. The Austin Colony’s petition was approved in 1821. Moses Austin died that same year, but his son, Stephen F. Austin, along with Philip Hendrick Nering Bögel, continued the colonization plan. That same year, Mexico won independence from Spain. Over the course of several years, the empresarios negotiated with the short-lived imperial Mexican government, finally receiving a contract in 1823; the succeeding republican government chose to honor the contract.114

Austin’s colony was located between the Lavaca and San Jacinto rivers south of the route of the portion of El Camino Real that had by that time already become known as the San Antonio Road. The San Antonio Road would be referenced in several land grants and would remain a well-known route to the present day. From the mid-1820s through 1834, Austin became the most successful empresario in Texas, with 966 families settled in his colony. For the colonists, tracts were surveyed as leagues and labors, using waterways and roads as boundaries; for this reason, El Camino Real often is mentioned in original land grants and deeds from the nineteenth century. A state-appointed land commissioner issued deeds only after 100 families had been settled. In the process, Austin himself earned 197,000 acres of bonus land, which did not have to be contiguous with his colony. The land could be sold, but only to those interested in permanent settlement, a requirement that discouraged land speculation.115
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During the 1820s and 1830s, the influx of Anglo settlers to Texas wrought substantial political, cultural, and economic changes. Settlement patterns, communication systems, road networks, and market systems shifted. With the arrival of so many colonists, settlements emerged in areas far removed from the main routes that previously characterized El Camino Real, and a new network of roads began to crisscross the region, especially in east Texas. Complex road networks continued to develop throughout the Mexican period, as is well documented in the 1830 minutes of the San Felipe ayuntamiento in Austin’s colony, in which Stephen Austin called for the construction of several new routes in the area as well as assessments of some of the roads that pre-dated the Mexican period.116

During the Spanish Colonial Period, settlement patterns had been organized and centralized, with a presidio, mission, or villa serving as the nucleus for future settlement. In contrast, Anglo-American settlement patterns were characterized by dispersed settlement, usually along or near an existing road. Although Mexican law initially required that all Anglo settlement adhere to Catholicism, the Catholic Church never held a prominent position of authority in Anglo settlements; eventually, Mexico allowed Protestant immigrants as well. Secular towns and villages acted as trade and market centers. Later European immigrants (primarily German, Czech, Polish, French, and Swedish) followed a similar pattern. During the Spanish colonial period, overland travel had been dominated by military and religious entities, whereas civilian travel and commerce comprised much of the Anglo traffic.117

1836 –1845

By the time of the Texas Independence, Anglo settlers had brought a new language, new religious communities, new settlement patterns, and their institution of slavery to Texas. Use of El Camino Real evolved considerably during this period, as new settlement and trade patterns lessened the importance of some trade centers. The tendency of east Texas Anglos to look to the east for commerce weakened affinity for Mexico. Hispanic settlers in west Texas maintained their ties with Mexico, but saw little incentive to do the same with east Texas. By the early 1830s, a movement was afoot to create a Texas state separate from Coahuila. Consequently, east/west travel through the state became less important. Some segments of El Camino Real fell into disuse, while others shifted to follow new trade routes. In east Texas, the road network became more complex as Anglo colonies in the vicinity of present-day Victoria and Austin drew increasing numbers of settlers. In key ways, however, life had maintained continuity as well, with both Anglo and Hispanic settlers dependent on an agrarian economy that allowed for little more than subsistence and beset by a harsh environment and climate. More than a decade of conflict followed, as a new nation, the Republic of Texas, was established and then annexed by the United States.118

Throughout the Texas Revolution, El Camino Real functioned as an important transportation route for both armies. Locales along the routes, such as Spanish colonial-era missions, were commandeered for military purposes. Texans burned some settlements to the ground rather than see them fall in Mexican hands. Some of the most dramatic and tragic events of the revolution, such as the Texas defeats at the Alamo and Goliad, took place along El Camino Real. The events highlighted the continuing importance of the road network. Additionally, the historical significance of sites associated with Texas’s struggle for independence helped to assure that some would be preserved for future generations.119

The first capital of the Texas Republic was located in Houston, at that time a newly established settlement. The Texas Congress unilaterally established Texas’ borders in late 1836, and designated the Río Grande as the
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southwestern border even though Mexico refused to recognize Texas’s independence. The border dispute would contribute to escalating hostilities between Mexico and both Texas and the United States during the early 1840s. In 1839, a Texas congressional committee was charged with selecting a permanent location for the Texas capital, in accord with the stipulation that it be located between the Colorado and Trinity rivers and north of the portion of El Camino Real now known as the Old San Antonio Road. The committee chose the frontier settlement of Waterloo, renaming it Austin, and the government moved there in October 1839.120

The transition of Texas from a state of Mexico to a republic allowed immigration to increase substantially. Texas needed a rapidly growing population to offset the many economic problems besetting the country. The revolution had severely damaged the economy as many Texans had lost everything they owned and the country was deeply in debt. Texan and Mexican outlaws roamed freely along the Río Grande frontier. Vast land holdings still in the public domain represented a means for the republic to raise funds and increase its population. On January 1, 1840, the Texas Congress passed a law authorizing the formation of colonies. Among those who received contracts were William S. Peters, who brought 600 families from the American Midwest and Northeast to settle along the Red River. Immigrants came from Europe as well. In 1842, William Kennedy, an Englishman, with Henri Castro, a Frenchman, William Pringle, and others each received permission to settle 600 or more immigrants between the Nueces and the Río Grande. Castro was the most prolific of the group, sending a total of 2,134 settlers to settle on the Medina River at Castroville by 1845.121

In addition to Americans and Europeans, Native Americans seeking to relocate away from the east came to Texas. The immigrants arrived by way of numerous routes, including El Camino Real, of which new routes came into use and some previously abandoned roads were retraced. Many settlers from the eastern U.S. took the Natchez Trace, travelled west to the Red River settlement of Natchitoches, Louisiana, then along the Old San Antonio Road to San Antonio. This became the primary thoroughfare for immigration to the rich farmlands of the coastal plains. Ports and colonization of coastal regions also became possible with the elimination of Mexican restrictions. From 1836 through 1845, the population of Texas increased about 7,000 per year. By 1847, the Anglo and Hispanic population had risen to 102,961 and the number of slaves to 38,753. The population and demographic changes were massive. In 1830, Texas had an estimated population of 7,000 who were predominantly Hispanic. Within twenty years, the population had burgeoned to 212,000 from a range of American, Mexican, African, and European backgrounds.122

Settlement and economic patterns that had taken root during the 1820s continued to transform Texas. During the Spanish period, populations were concentrated in town centers, with outlying ranches controlled from the towns. The pattern began to shift after Mexican independence as cash-crop and subsistence farming overtook ranching as the principal agricultural endeavor. By the late 1830s, towns acted as market and administrative centers surrounded by widely dispersed owner-occupied farms. The traditional southwest to northeast axis of traffic, commerce, and communications had paralleled the Texas coast at some distance, with Saltillo acting as the major port. After Texas gained independence, however, elimination of Mexican prohibition on coastal settlements in Texas meant that New Orleans became the principal market for Texas imports and exports. Starting in the 1820s, and then much more so after Texas independence, north/south roads paralleling Texas rivers were being used, a pattern that was much more typical of the eastern United States than ever had been the case in Spanish and Mexican Texas. Recognizing the importance of roads to the country’s development, the Republic of Texas required each land district to provide road maintenance. Typically, prisoners were used to clear and improve roads.123
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Texas Statehood

After Texas joined the United States, El Camino Real became less used, as north-south routes, rather than east-west routes, became more important for new settlements in the state. However, portions of the trail were used shortly thereafter as a way for those traveling to California from east Texas seeking fortune in the California Gold Rush between 1848 and 1855. Again, portions of the route were used during the Civil War to transport cotton from east Texas into Mexico when transportation through the American South was hazardous and/or impossible. As transportation became more efficient, especially in the age of the railroads, many of the routes were abandoned with a few small segments used for local travel. In 1915-1916, a professional surveyor, V. N. Zivley, surveyed a route that largely had been established about 1795 from San Antonio to Nacogdoches, which he referred to as the Old San Antonio Road. Consequently, in 1919, the Texas State Legislature declared this route as a Texas historic trail. On March 29, 1929, the Texas Senate provided for the preservation of the Old San Antonio Road.124 Since this date, El Camino Real has undergone various documentation and preservation efforts, which are discussed in greater detail in Section H of this nomination.
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F. Associated Property Types

Significant buildings, sites, structures, and districts that are physically and thematically associated with the events and/or themes described in the historic context (Section E) may be nominated under this Multiple Property Submission. The period of significance for Historic Resources of El Camino Real spans the period from c.1690 through 1821. The primary areas of significance for historic properties nominated for their association with Camino Real are “Exploration/Settlement” (Criterion A) and “Archeology” (Criterion D), and this document will focus on those areas and criteria, although further research regarding each property may also support significance under Criteria B and C. Properties may also be eligible under additional areas of significance related to their historic function(s), including Commerce, Ethnic Heritage, Military, Politics/Government, and Religion, depending on the property’s particular history. All of the intact missions in Texas associated with Camino Real (those in San Antonio) were evaluated and listed at the national level of significance, partly because their high level of integrity and close proximity to one another ensured that they exemplified the ideals and community-building philosophies of the Spanish Government during the colonial period. Most properties nominated under this form will be nominated at the state or local levels of significance.

The property types described below were identified during the course of the following studies: *A Texas Legacy The Old San Antonio Road and The Caminos Reales, A Tricentennial History, 1691-1991* (McGraw et al. 1991); *Historical Geographic Dictionary of the El Camino Real Para Los Texas* (Sanchez and Erickson 1997); *El Camino Real de los Tejas National Historic Trail Feasibility Study and Environmental Assessment* (National Park Service [NPS] 1998); *Draft Cultural Resources Inventory El Camino Real de los Tejas National Historic Trail* (Morgan-Remley 2008); and *El Camino Real de los Tejas National Historic Trail Final Comprehensive Management Plan/Environmental Assessment, Louisiana, Texas* (National Park Service 2011).

The listing of associated property types contained herein is based on research and field investigations that have been completed to date that focus specifically on El Camino Real. Future archeological and architectural surveys are likely to identify additional resources, particularly in more remote areas. Additional property types may be developed as needed should any future registration efforts include historic resources that do not meet the property type categories described herein.

Furthermore, many previously documented resources are located along El Camino Real, including state and national parks and forests, state historic sites, state monuments, highway historical markers, historic districts, individual properties, and museums. A number of these have some thematic relationship either directly or indirectly to El Camino Real.125 Numerous historic properties already listed on the National Register also may be associated with El Camino Real, and the documentation for these previously identified properties may be updated and amended at a future time.

Property Type: Buildings

With the exception of the five San Antonio missions, very few intact individual buildings have been identified that are associated with El Camino Real. Although the Spanish and their successors undertook numerous settlement campaigns, the vast majority of buildings from the period did not survive through the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Efforts to convert Native Americans to Christianity represented one of the main thrusts of Spanish attempts to colonize Texas from the seventeenth century through 1821. The Spanish typically established a Catholic mission in conjunction with a military presidio, irrevocably linking the two pillars of Spanish authority over indigenous inhabitants. Consequently, missions and presidios often were the largest and sturdiest buildings erected during the colonial period. The best known surviving examples of these include the San Antonio Missions National Historical Park, the Spanish Governor’s Palace in San Antonio, and Our Lady of
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Loreto Chapel at Presidio La Bahía in Goliad. These nationally significant buildings already have been designated as National Historic Landmarks and/or listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Other known presidios and missions have been preserved as archeological sites, and are discussed in greater detail below. Unique among buildings associated with El Camino Real is the Spanish Governor’s Palace, located in San Antonio. Originally part of the Presidio de San Antonio de Béxar, it served as the seat of Spanish government used during the time San Antonio was capital of the Spanish province of Texas. The building housed the comandancia, or headquarters for the presidio, and provided living quarters for governors, captains of the garrison, civil alcaldes, and the presidio captain. An example of a Spanish colonial townhouse, this National Historic Landmark is the only extant example in Texas of an eighteenth-century Spanish official residence.126

Inns and stores that provided goods and services for El Camino Real travelers also gain significance from their association with the roads’ historic usage, but such properties are more likely to date from the Mexican and Texas Republic periods when entrepreneurs of all stripes began flooding into Texas. Standing residential buildings associated with El Camino Real are rare, but some exist, albeit lacking the high level of integrity found in masonry mission buildings and presidios. A good example is the jacal at Perez Rancho in Bexar County, which dates to c.1700 and stands as reminder of Spanish settlement in close proximity to the Camino Real crossing (the site of which is known as “Delores Crossing”) of the Media River. While its integrity is diminished due to its fragile nature, it nevertheless represents the settlements of families and individuals that were made possible by their proximity to the road.

Significance and Registration Requirements: Buildings (Criterion A, Exploration/Settlement)

Buildings nominated under this form must be associated with and the settlement of Texas and/or Louisiana along El Camino Real. The direct association between the historic property and El Camino Real must be conveyed by the property’s integrity; extensively altered buildings should be assessed on a case-by-case basis to determine if they are eligible under this Multiple Property Listing. Examples of historic buildings along El Camino Real include government buildings, dwellings, inns, and stores. Future investigations may identify buildings with other historic uses related to El Camino Real’s history. In many instances, isolated buildings or structures may be the lone survivors of larger complexes; in such cases, the remaining buildings can help illustrate historic uses of El Camino Real.

Certain characteristics of buildings must be present regardless of the specific historic usage of a particular resource. National Register-eligible examples of buildings must retain the general characteristics of the property type including:

- Original construction materials (generally adobe, stone, brick, and/or wood), particularly on exterior surfaces;
- Their basic original form and rooflines;
- Original design details and/or ornamentation;
- Sympathetic repairs and maintenance using like materials and methods of construction.

With regard to integrity, buildings must retain integrity of location, as the relationship of the building to El Camino Real is a critical aspect of its historical significance. Within the building’s immediate environs, the setting should be intact, with features indicative of the building’s original, historic use. To retain integrity of design, workmanship, and materials, original construction materials should be retained to the fullest feasible extent. Additionally, repairs, if present, should have been carried out using new materials that match the original in content, color, texture, shape, and size, and using construction methods as similar to the original as possible. Introduction of unsympathetic components that obliterate or obscure historic materials will erode integrity. Interior spaces are of less importance to overall integrity than exterior spaces; however, interior spaces that are
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frequented by the public should retain original materials and design to the fullest feasible extent. Integrity of feeling and association will be maintained only if the resource retains physical characteristics that convey a sense of the relevant historic period’s aesthetics and construction methods. Integrity of location also is necessary to convey integrity of feeling and association. Modifications to expand the accessibility of buildings, such as the addition of a wheelchair ramp to the main entry, should not be considered as detracting from the integrity of the resource. In cases where historic buildings have little or no above-ground integrity, as is often the case in the ruins of buildings, such properties may be eligible as sites under Criterion D.

Property Type: Structures

Dams, acequias, aqueducts, and other irrigation-related structures rank as the most significant sub-types of structures that have been identified with a direct association to El Camino Real. Beginning in the Spanish Colonial Period, these were constructed at various locations along El Camino Real. Such structures often were necessary to render lands suitable for agriculture by Spanish (and later, Mexican and Anglo) settlers. Dams typically were constructed of earth and stone. The dams were used to divert water into ground-level acequias and above-ground aqueducts to supply water for irrigating crops and for drinking water. Most acequias were simple open ditches with dirt banks, although they could be constructed to flow through a pipe or over an aqueduct. San Antonio Missions National Historical Park preserves four eighteenth-century Spanish missions as well as their associated dams, acequias, and other irrigation structures. The Mission San Jose acequia and dam, Mission Espada acequia and dam, and Mission San Juan dam all are included within the park boundaries. Collectively, they are often considered the best extant examples of Franciscan-designed dams in Texas. Less well-known structures include the Guadalupe River Dam and the National Register-listed Mission Creek Dam and Acequia Site, both in Victoria County. A dam that may date to the Spanish Colonial Period also has been identified near San Marcos de Neve in Hays County.

Significance and Registration Requirements: Structures (Criterion A, Exploration/Settlement)

The location of arable land with accessible supplies of usable water directly influenced the shifting routes of El Camino Real. Such locales were highly desirable to sedentary Native American tribes, Spanish colonists, and Mexican or Anglo settlers. During the Spanish Colonial Period, construction and maintenance of dams, acequias, and other irrigation-related structures represented a substantial commitment of time and resources on the part of Spanish colonists. Irrigated farmland was crucial to the survival of many missions and other frontier settlements. Success with raising crops and livestock depended on ready access to usable water supplies. Meanwhile, stable drinking water supplies were vital both to permanent settlers as well as to travelers along El Camino Real.

To be eligible for the National Register under this Multiple Property Listing, a structure must have a direct association with the historic usage of El Camino Real during the period of significance and be associated with the settlement of the region in the vicinity of El Camino Real, and the association must be conveyed by the property’s integrity. To date, dams, acequias, aqueducts, and other irrigation-related structures rank as the most significant sub-types of structures that have been identified with a direct association to El Camino Real. Structures associated with El Camino Real are eligible under this MPDF under Criterion A in the area of settlement, as they are generally associated with the infrastructural improvement necessary to establish permanent settlements in the Americas. In cases where historic structures have little or no above-ground integrity, as is often the case in the ruins of trail segments, and components of water delivery systems such as dams and acequias, such properties may be eligible as sites under Criterion D.
Property Type: Sites

Over the years, travelers on El Camino Real left behind many traces of their journeys: river crossings, artifacts, campsites, village sites, and building and sites, including the ruins of buildings and structures. These physical remains document the route and its travelers and provide a unique insight into American history and into the lives of the people, both European and Native American, who settled Texas. To date, the following sub-types of sites have been documented along El Camino Real: road and trail segments; river crossings and paraje sites; Spanish mission sites; presidios and military outpost sites; battlefields; villa Sites; rancho sites; cemeteries; and nineteenth century settlement sites. Many of these sites were identified during past surveys of road corridors or development areas. Future investigations may identify additional sites with historic uses beyond those described below.

Road and Trail Segments

Road and Trail Segments are physical features on the landscape that date between approximately 1680 and 1848. As the various routes and alignments of El Camino Real evolved over time, road and trail segments variously experienced heavy use, were abandoned, shifted alignment, were converted for local use, and/or were incorporated into modern-era road systems. Along much of El Camino Real, physical evidence of the trails has been obliterated or obscured by changes in the landscape, such as agriculture, development, road and bridge construction, and other activities. Some original segments, however, are extant today. Some have been documented over the course of several studies. Williams completed field investigations to identify and map intact road segments in eastern Texas, and defined road segments as follows:

The primary method used for identifying an old road segment was to find, within an undisturbed area of forest, a slight to extreme linear depression approximately 1 to 2 meters (3.3 to 6.6 feet) wide and follow it, looking for a reason or purpose for it being there. If the depression stayed consistent in width, the depth could be explained by the natural wearing of carts or wagons, oxen, mules, and foot traffic versus mechanical modification, and the depression could not be explained by natural processes such as erosion or by modern farming, hunting, logging, or forest management activities...

To date, intact road and trail segments have been documented in Atascosa, Bastrop, Bexar, Frio, Hays, Houston, La Salle, Medina, San Augustine, and Sabine counties in east Texas. Travel on El Camino Real included wagons, carts, mule trains, equestrian traffic, and foot traffic. The way in which the trail segments manifest themselves today is, in part, dependent on the mode of transportation used. For example, where mule trains were used exclusively, the trail is much narrower than trail profiles left by carts or wagons.

Historical associations of potential road segments have been identified through both field investigations and archival research. For example, archeologists with the Texas Department of Transportation identified a segment of the early-nineteenth-century Laredo-San Antonio Road along Somerset Road, west of the community of Somerset. The historical link was solidified by research that showed much of FM 2790 (a Farm-to-Market road)
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between Somerset Road and the Atascosa County line lay within the mission ranch of El Atascosa, owned and
operated by Mission San Jose y San Miguel de Aguayo. Aerial photographs also have been examined to identify
road and trail segments. It is possible for segments to survive even within close proximity to modern highways, as
is the case with a segment of the Old San Antonio Road that parallels an existing right-of-way within the City of
San Marcos in Hays County.134

River Crossings

River crossings often lack material culture, but retain other forms of physical evidence. Rutted trail segments are
the most frequently observed cultural feature. Variations in the environment, such as vegetational changes or
steep river banks, may also be a signal that an area was utilized as a water crossing. A depiction on historic maps
or a description within a primary source document, such as a trail-related narrative, is important additional
evidence in documenting river crossings.

According to Morgan-Remley, river crossings typically were located at natural fords, where stable bottoms
comprised of natural bedrock or gravel alluvium provided a stable support for humans, animals, and vehicles, but
evidence of human modification of landscape features at river crossing sites also has been documented. In some
places, simple bridge structures, such as fallen trees, were used. References to the use of rafts at crossings also
have been found. In Bexar County, river crossings were made at each of the dams associated with the missions in
present-day San Antonio. River crossings are important in the documentation of El Camino Real, because they
help in mapping the routes taken. River crossings may not have been situated directly on a segment of El Camino
Real. Some historic maps and travel narratives show that travelers had to leave the main trail and travel some
distance along a river to reach a crossing, then return to the trail.135

As described in the NPS’s 1998 feasibility study, Hubbard and Fox noted that river crossing sites retain physical
features that indicate their historic use. For example, the crossings associated with the Woll and Presidio Roads,
which ran between Guerrero in Mexico, south of Piedras Negras and San Antonio, created still-visible, deeply
eroded, linear scars near the Texas side of Cuervo and Tovar creeks. In Dimmit County, wagon ruts are still
etched into the sandstone at Pefia Creek. A crossing on the Guadalupe River is marked by bank depressions
immediately upstream from the bridge on Texas Highway 183; also known as the Santa Anna crossing, travelers
historically used it going to and from Gonzales to the south. Some current highways parallel or cover El Camino
Real routes, and a number of historic ruts and sites are within state highway rights-of-way.136

River crossings were used across multiple time periods and for varying purposes by travelers ranging from
colonial-era Spanish missionaries to nineteenth-century Anglo homesteaders. If the route of El Camino Real
shifted its location, the old river crossings may have fallen into disuse, or they may have remained in use by local
residents. For example, at McKinney Falls State Park in Austin, the Onion Creek crossing of El Camino Real has
been documented. The crossing likely predates the adjacent property and ruins of pioneer Thomas F. McKinney’s
house and mill; McKinney came to Texas during the 1820s as one of Stephen F. Austin’s original colonists. The
McKinney Homestead site is listed in the National Register. Similarly, the Reading Site, near the Brazos River
crossing on Texas Highway 21, dates to the early Spanish colonial period but saw use in association with
Moseley’s Ferry, which operated between 1846 and 1912.137 McGehee Crossing in Hays County has been
documented for its association with one of the El Camino Real routes starting in the eighteenth century. It
continued to be in use through the mid-nineteenth century when Anglo settlers reached the area.138 In Bexar
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County, the Dolores/Perez/Applewhite Crossing originated during the late Spanish Colonial period. The Paso de Dolores, as it was known, was first identified from the 1808 field notes of the Ygnacio Perez four-league land grant on the southern bank of the Medina River. Later, the crossing came to be associated with the mid-nineteenth century Perez and Applewhite roads.\footnote{J. M. Adovasio and Melissa M. Green, eds., Historic Archaeological Investigations in the Applewhite Reservoir Project Area, Bexar County, Texas, Report of Investigations No. 6.}  

**Paraje Sites**

Parajes, or travelers’ campsites, were located at many river crossings and can provide clues to life on the trail. Occupation of these sites was temporary and ephemeral. As a result the material cultural remains associated with parajes are generally relatively sparse. Most parajes along the trail were simple campsites, usually located near river crossings, where travelers could find good water near the trail. Parajes were oftentimes located on both sides of a river crossing so that depending on the river’s conditions, camp could be made before or after reaching the crossing. El Camino Real crossings sometimes were placed in the vicinity of existing Native American villages or parajes. In general, crossings were used on a seasonal basis and, therefore, the associated parajes (or campsites) were not occupied on a continual basis. Additionally, missions, presidios, villas, and ranch headquarters often served the functions of parajes along the trail, but these are discussed separately below.\footnote{Morgan-Remley, *Draft Cultural Resources Inventory*, 33-34.}

**Historic Period Native American Sites**

Travelers along El Camino Real reported encountering numerous Historic Period Native American Sites, primarily villages. The Spanish referred to these sites as “rancherías.” Some represented long-time occupations that predated the historic period, such as the paraje known as Indian Mounds near the present-day Caddoan Mounds State Park. According to Morgan-Remley, approximately 20 potentially historic period village sites in proximity to El Camino Real have been identified to date. Some may have served as parajes at some point during the trail’s period of significance.\footnote{Morgan-Remley, *Draft Cultural Resources Inventory*, 34; NPS, *Feasibility Study*, 106.}

In Hays County, a Native American village was located at Aquarena Springs on a site now owned by Texas State University. The area surrounding the site also includes a 100-year-old gristmill, a Spanish mission, and a frontier home, all of which are included in the National Register-listed Aquarena Springs Archeological District.\footnote{NPS, *Feasibility Study*, 106.} The Tonkawa Indians referred to the springs as Canocanayesatelo, meaning “warm water.” Europeans discovered the springs in 1709 during the expedition of Isidro Félix de Espinosa, Antonio de San Buenaventura Olivares, and Pedro de Aguirre. By the 1750s, the Spanish had established a mission here, and it became an important stop on El Camino Real as well as the later Old San Antonio Road.\footnote{Diana J. Kleiner, “Aquarena Center,” *Handbook of Texas Online*. http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/dua02. Accessed February 2011 (Texas State Historical Association).}

**Spanish Mission Sites**

Spanish Mission Sites are the remnants of the numerous missions established by Spaniards during the colonial period as part of the empire’s largely unsuccessful efforts to convert Native Americans to Christianity. While some missions were abandoned, others were relocated and, usually, given a new name. Missions were often moved and this is reflected in the changing routes of El Camino Real, thus illustrating the road system’s
fluctuations over time. An example of such a mission was Mission Nuestra Señora de los Dolores de los Ais in San Augustine County. First established in 1717 by the Ramón expedition to convert the Ais Caddo Indians, it was abandoned after a short time. The Aguayo expedition reestablished the mission at a different location in 1722, but it met with little success and finally was abandoned in 1773. The site now is owned by the city of San Augustine.

Because many of the missions were occupied only for brief periods, they never had more than a few roughly constructed buildings. When abandoning a mission, the missionaries removed all materials that identified the site as a religious property, including furnishings and religious vestments, as well as the population of converts who lived at the mission. To date, Morgan-Remley found that 29 mission locations have been identified along El Camino Real north of the Río Grande. Of these, 15 have been subject to archeological investigations and have been found typically to include cultural landscapes and features recorded as part of the archeological sites.

Missions generally consisted of walled communities, with gateways provided entrance into the compounds. Fortified bastions located along the walls provided defense. Living quarters built against the inner face of the perimeter walls housed Native American neophytes and the handful of Spanish soldiers assigned to the mission. The Church served as the focal point of the mission, with missionaries living in a convento. Workshops and storerooms dotted the grounds. Agricultural fields, pastures, orchards, vineyards, and ranches lay outside the walls.

Examples of documented mission sites include Mission Rosario in Goliad County, which was excavated in 1973-1974; a mission site at the aforementioned Aquarena Springs Archeological District in Hays County; and the mission of Nuestra Señora de los Dolores de los Ais and the adjacent segment of El Camino Real in San Augustine. Investigations at the latter site yielded evidence of approximately 50 years of occupation by Spanish colonists. In Milam County near the San Gabriel River, the San Xavier Mission Complex Archeological District contains five sites dating from 1745 to 1755. There are three known mission sites, San Francisco Xavier de Horcasitas, San Ildefonso, and Nuestra Señora de la Candelaria, as well as two non-mission sites related to the Spanish occupation of the valley. In Victoria County, the third site of Mission Nuestra Señora del Espíritu Santo de Zúñiga has been documented. Portions of the mission walls are extant, and the foundations of the mission, living quarters, and other appendages have been subjected to archeological investigation since the 1990s.

Extensive archeological features also are extant within larger properties that retain building complexes, such as at San Antonio Missions National Historic Park. In addition to the mission buildings themselves, mission operations relied on agricultural activities for sustenance. Cultivated gardens (huertas) were adjacent to the mission compounds, and large farms (labores) and ranches were in more outlying areas. Some of the historic farmlands on the labores of Mission San Juan Capistrano and Mission San Francisco de la Espada are still under cultivation or used for grazing animals. Other resources associated with agriculture include irrigation systems, dams, aqueducts, and acequias. Archeological features have been documented that are associated with Acequia de San Jose, Acequia de San Juan, Espada Dam, Espada Aqueduct, and Acequia de Espada.
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Presidios and Military Outpost Sites

Along with missions, the Spanish empire established numerous presidios and military outposts along El Camino Real. The presidios provided protection for missionaries as well as ranchos and villas founded by Spanish settlers. Like the missions, the presidios often were moved from place to place, in response to threats from rival colonial powers and hostile Native American tribes. This is reflected in shifts in El Camino Real segments. To date, five presidio sites have been identified along El Camino Real. Among these, in Bexar County, the Presidio de San Antonio de Béxar was located along Cibolo Creek about 1735 to guard a stream crossing and trail as well as surrounding cattle ranches. Abandoned just two years later, it was re-established in 1771 and remained occupied until around 1782. The presidio site also is known as El Fuerte de Santa Cruz, El Fuerte del Cibolo, Fort Cibolo, Santa Cruz de Cibolo, and Carvajal Crossing. In Goliad County, near the aforementioned site of Mission Rosario, archeological investigations at the nearby mission and presidio site yielded artifacts dating from a nineteenth-century Spanish fortification. Finally, in Nacogdoches County, Presidio Nuestra Señora de los Dolores de los Tejas, established in 1717, originally stood near Mission San Francisco de los Tejas but was abandoned in 1719. It later was reestablished near Mission Nuestra Señora de la Purísima Concepción de Ainais and remained in use until 1779. Archeological investigations recently have uncovered the presidio’s precise location. Such investigations are needed to identify many of the early mission and presidio sites.

Spanish Villa Sites

Spanish Villa Sites were civilian settlements established during the colonial period, usually in close proximity to presidios and missions along El Camino Real. Unlike presidios and missions, however, villas were not supported directly by the Spanish crown. Instead, villas were private endeavors subject to taxation; their tax revenues helped fund religious and military activities in Texas. Villas at Béxar and Los Adaes were founded by the early 1700s. More followed during the mid-eighteenth century with the founding of Nuevo Santander, a civilian province around present-day Laredo under the direction of José de Escalón. To date, nine villa sites have been identified along El Camino Real and archeological investigations have been carried out at four of them.

South of Laredo in Webb County, the ruins of Villa de Delores are associated with Nuevo Santander. Established in 1750, the villa enjoyed early success as a cattle ranch. The site is listed in the National Register. The present city of Laredo dates to 1755 and was the last of the civilian settlements to be established in Nuevo Santander. The villa survived numerous Lipan, Apache, and Comanche raids through the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Following the Mexican-American War, Camp Crawford (also called Camp Laredo) was established in this area. A new post was built in 1850 and the name changed to Fort McIntosh. The ruins and archeological features of the villa and fort are now part of the grounds of Laredo State College. The San Agustín Laredo Historic District encompasses the nucleus of the original city. Finally, in Hays County, the remains of the Villa San Marcos de Neve were found near the San Marcos River. The Spanish settlement was established in 1808 and meant to act as a bulwark against American encroachment. It was abandoned after just four years, due largely to harsh winters, drought, raids by Native Americans, and the emerging Mexican independence movement.
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Rancho Sites

Rancho Sites often are associated with Spanish missions and presidios. Occupied by Spanish and later Mexican colonists as well as Native Americans, they were intended to produce needed agricultural goods for the local populations. Within the San Antonio Missions National Historic Park, burial middens, structural remains, and irrigation systems are among the archeological features that have been documented at ranchos that once raised livestock for the nearby missions.\(^{155}\) In Wilson County near Floresville, the Rancho de las Cabras site contains the archeological remains of a defensive compound comprised of diamond-shaped ramparts with rooms along the walls. Evidence of occupation by the Coahuilteco Indians as well as Hispanicized colonists has been found at the ranch and the associated Mission Espada. Part of the rancho’s original grazing pasture also has been identified. In Bexar County, the Rancho de Perez was a Spanish land grant ranch located on the north bank of the Medina River near San Antonio. Now a State Archeological Landmark, the privately owned site was maintained by the Perez family through the late twentieth century. A 100-square-meter cemetery is within the rancho’s boundaries, and may have existed as early as 1800.\(^{156}\) The rancho site now is within the boundaries of the Medina River Greenway owned by the City of San Antonio. In Nacogdoches County, Rancho San Bernardo del Loco was established by Bernardo D’Ortolan in 1795. A French citizen who became a Spanish loyalist, D’Ortolan was in Texas as early as 1775. He eventually attained the rank of captain in the local militia and cavalry and was based in Nacogdoches for more than twenty years. His rancho originally encompassed more than one-and-one-half leagues of land in depth and width. Although forced to move to Louisiana following his participation in the Gutierrez-Magee Expedition, he transferred control of his rancho to Raphael D’Ortolan, an African Creole slave and, perhaps, his illegitimate son. The D’Ortolan family lost control of its lands in Nacogdoches County after the Texas Revolution.\(^{157}\)

Grave Sites and Cemeteries

Travel on El Camino Real represented a significant hazard for most travelers during the seventeenth, eighteenth, and early nineteenth centuries. Disease and accidents claimed many lives, and grave sites and cemeteries served as stark reminders of the challenges associated with entering an unknown territory. Hostile confrontations between rival groups, including Native Americans, Spanish and French colonists, Mexican and Texan rebels, Anglo-American immigrants, and the United States and Mexico also took place along many segments of El Camino Real.

Trail-side graves likely were not uncommon, but identifying and documenting such sites has become increasingly difficult with the passage of time. Graves may have been left unmarked, or with temporary markers, or the marker may have been removed or damaged at some point. Researchers investigating travelers’ accounts for grave locations now can glean only general information about the grave location. The transitory nature of El Camino Real, with segments falling into disuse and route alignments shifting over time, meant that many gravesites were forgotten.

Within communities established along El Camino Real, however, cemeteries were often established and there is a greater likelihood of identifying and documenting these. Even at sites that have been abandoned, such as a mission, Native American village, or frontier homestead, archeological research methods can identify and delineate a cemetery. At communities that survived, some cemeteries remained in use. These may have marked and/or unmarked graves of individuals who were important to the history and use of El Camino Real. In the San Antonio area alone, the Ruiz/Herrera Cemetery, Mitchell/Mauermann Cemetery, El Carmen Catholic Cemetery, and Jett/Yoakum Cemetery all have documented association with El Camino Real.
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Significance and Registration Requirements: Sites (Criterion A, Settlement; Criterion D, Archeology)

Sites associated with El Camino Real may be eligible for the National Register under Criterion A and/or D. To be eligible under Criterion D, a site must yield, or be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory pertaining to specific research questions about the history of El Camino Real or one or more of the component parts that came to make up El Camino Real over time. The types of information that are illustrative of historic use of El Camino Real may include development of travel and trade networks by Native Americans, Spanish colonists, and/or Anglo settlers; expansion of Spanish colonial influence through Texas; and/or military uses of El Camino Real.

To be eligible for the National Register under this context, a site must have a direct association with the historic usage of El Camino Real during the period of significance, and the association must be conveyed by the property’s integrity. To date, the following sub-types of archeological sites have been documented as being associated with El Camino Real: road and trail segments; river crossings; paraje sites; historic period Native American sites; Spanish mission sites; presidios and military outpost sites; battlefields; Spanish villa sites; rancho sites; cemeteries; and nineteenth-century settlement sites. Additional site sub-types may be identified during the course of future investigations of El Camino Real. Contiguous or discontiguous archeological sites, with and without associated buildings and structures (or ruins thereof) may be nominated as districts. Natural features, including streams, springs, and natural landmarks that served as points of reference for travelers along the Camino Real may be included within the boundaries of nominated properties, but would generally not be eligible on an individual basis.

The various site types discussed in this document are the product of El Camino Real traffic during the Spanish rule in Texas. These sites may appear as single entities or as part of a district of related sites. Late prehistoric/pre-contact period and historic period Native American sites, Spanish mission sites, presidio and military outpost sites, battlefields, Spanish villa sites, rancho sites, cemeteries, and nineteenth-century settlement sites all fall into a more traditional definition of an archeological site.

Archeological sites provide the medium from which this data may be collected. These physical remains most often take the form of artifacts (i.e., stone tool fragments, ceramics, architectural debris), archeological deposits or features (i.e., structural remains, trash pits or middens), and ecological remains (i.e., plant or pollen remnants). Alterations to the landscape, such as wagon and cart roads, animal and human pathways, earthworks, and agricultural cultivation, also shed light on human activities over time. Of equal importance to the remains themselves are the spatial relationships of material culture. This “archeological context” allows a researcher to begin to draw conclusions about a site and its past inhabitants. The sites discussed within this Multiple Property nomination are directly associated with the history and evolution of El Camino Real. In some instances, such sites are the only physical remnants of the people and events associated with El Camino Real across the centuries of its existence. Investigation and preservation of these sites are necessary to develop the fullest possible understanding of El Camino Real-related historic contexts.

For a site to be considered significant, it must also retain integrity, but those nominated under Criterion D need not have above-ground integrity. While disturbed sites can still be eligible for the National Register if their undisturbed portions contain significant information potential, sites that have lost their stratigraphic context due to land alteration are commonly considered to have lost integrity of location. Typically, archeological sites that exhibit a high degree of integrity include: 1) the spatial patterning of surface artifacts or features that represent different usage or activity areas, 2) spatial patterning of subsurface artifacts or features, or 3) an overall lack of serious disturbance to the resource’s archeological deposits.

Due to the variety of sites that may be nominated under this context, it is incumbent upon each nomination preparer to develop research questions specific to each nominated property regarding its potential to provide
information related to Camino Real. In order to meet Criterion D under this context, each nomination must include an analysis of the property’s potential for research, including questions that may be answered upon analysis of the site that may support local, state, or national significance of the property.

Road and Trail Segments

Under Criterion A, a site must be associated with a pattern of settlement related to historic use of El Camino Real during some part of the period of significance, and retain a good degree of integrity. Those sites eligible under Criterion A will most likely be segments of the road, and river crossings. National Register-eligible examples of road and trail segments must retain the general characteristics of the property type including:

- Visual quality reminiscent of the road or trail’s historic use.
- Lack of intrusion by subsequent construction, such as paved roads, bridge abutments, or flood control devices, directly on the trail segment.
- Retention of physical features, such as wagon wheel and mule cart ruts and/or animal or human pathways that illustrate the trail’s continuing physical presence on the landscape.

With regard to integrity, road and trail segments must have integrity of location as, by definition, they are a part of the physical landscape. Integrity of setting may be variable for road and trail segments, depending upon their locations. In urbanized areas, intact road and trail segments may be in close proximity to modern-period intrusions such as paved roadways, buildings, power lines, fences, and other features of the present built environment. In such situations, the road or trail segment should be within a relatively unobstructed swath of land that permits observation of the physical features. In rural and undeveloped areas, the setting for road and trail segments is anticipated to be more evocative of the historic period, with features such as vegetation and landscape views contributing to the historic sense of time and place. Integrity of setting will not be degraded by the presence of nearby modern-period visual intrusions such as barbed wire fences, telephone and power lines, roads, hedgerows, and cultivated fields. On the other hand, retention of current natural or historic vegetation patterns and landscape views (including small-scale features such as springs and large-scale features such as prominent landmarks) will enhance the integrity of setting. Integrity of design, workmanship, and materials is likely to be influenced by variables such as erosion, soil stability, flooding, and other types of weathering. Deterioration of design, workmanship, and materials of road or trail segments as a result of natural forces alone can render a road or trail segment ineligible for National Register listing; all physical aspects of a segment, therefore, should be carefully documented before signs of deterioration worsen. Integrity of feeling and association will be maintained only if the resource retains physical characteristics that convey a sense of the historic use of El Camino Real.

Regarding Districts

Districts nominated under this context may include archeological sites, buildings, structures, and the ruins of buildings and structures (classified as sites) in close proximity to one another. All intact mission complexes in Texas have been listed in the National Register, and those without extant buildings are either listed as archeological sites or are eligible for listing as such. Among the best known are the five missions within the San Antonio Missions National Historical Park: Mission San Jose y San Miguel de Aguayo, Mission Nuestra Señora de la Purísima Concepción de Acuña, Mission San Juan Capistrano, Mission San Francisco de la Espada, and Mission San Antonio de Valero. Situated in a north-south corridor along the San Antonio River, these five missions helped form the nucleus of present-day San Antonio, with origins extended back to the early eighteenth century. Each mission has remained in use to the present day.161 All five missions are listed in the National Register of Historic Places, and Missions San Jose, Concepción, and San Antonio are National Historic Landmarks. Furthermore, the Espada dam and aqueduct and the Espada and San Juan acequias remain in use.

161 Ibid., 104.
The Espada Dam, completed by 1740, is one of the oldest stone dams still functioning in the United States. Similarly, the Espada Aqueduct, one of the oldest arched Spanish aqueducts in the United States, continues to carry water over Piedras Creek as part of the Espada Acequia; the aqueduct is now a National Historic Landmark.162 Mission San Antonio de Valero, established in 1718, was the first Spanish settlement on the San Antonio River. It acted as a way station between Mission San Juan Bautista on the Río Grande and the missions in east Texas, but is best known as the scene of the Battle of the Alamo in 1836. Construction of the church building began in 1755. The mission buildings were largely destroyed as a result of the battle, but have since been reconstructed. The mission is a National Historic Landmark and is listed in the National Register of Historic Places.163

Intact ranches from the Camino Real period of significance are not extant, although individual components (buildings and/or archeological sites) may be eligible for listing under this context. Ranch buildings and structures dating from the period of significance are rare, although the pastoral cultural landscape, emblematic of Texas’ cattle industry history, remain extant in some locations. Among the most notable is El Lobanillo Ranch near Geneva in Sabine County. Established by Antonio Gil Ybarbo, it has been continuously occupied since the mid-eighteenth century. Ybarbo himself lived here until the presidios and missions of east Texas were evacuated during the 1770s.165

---

162 Ibid., 59-60, 104.
163 Ibid., 62, 104.
165 Ibid., 50.
G. Geographical Data

The historic resources associated with El Camino Real are located within the following counties in Texas: Atascosa, Bastrop, Bee, Béxar, Brazos, Burleson, Caldwell, Cherokee, Comal, DeWitt, Dimmit, Fayette, Frio, Goliad, Gonzales, Guadalupe, Hays, Houston, Karnes, LaSalle, Lavaca, Lee, Leon, Live Oak, Madison, Maverick, McMullen, Medina, Milam, Nacogdoches, Robertson, Sabine, San Augustine, Travis, Victoria, Washington, Webb, Williamson, Wilson, Zapata, and Zavala; and in Sabine and Natchitoches parishes in Louisiana.

Supplementary Geographical Information

Inclusion of geographical data with documentation of El Camino Real is important to interpreting and understanding the significance of the overall trail network as well as associated historic resources. Establishing the various routes followed by El Camino Real and the physical and cultural environment through which they passed are of particular importance. An understanding of the physiographic regions through which El Camino Real passes allows more in-depth understanding of the challenges and opportunities faced by travelers, which, in turn, influenced the evolution of route segments. Spatial and temporal variations in the physical environment also shaped trail routes. The local climate affects the physical processes that molded the landscape over time, including mechanical and chemical weathering and erosion. Many of the property types associated with El Camino Real are part of the physical landscape, thus requiring an understanding of their physical and cultural emergence in order to identify, document, and interpret them and assess their historic significance.

Routes of El Camino Real de los Tejas

El Camino Real is comprised of multiple routes and segments that evolved over time in response to changing needs and conditions. Stretching from the Río Grande to Los Adaes (near Robeline, Louisiana), El Camino Real first should be considered as a broad corridor with multiple segments made up of regional routes. The first segment in Texas extended from the Río Grande to San Antonio. From 1721 through 1772, El Camino Real ran from the present state of Coahuila, Mexico, through San Antonio to Los Adaes, the first capital of Spanish Texas, near Natchitoches, Louisiana. When San Antonio was the capital of Texas (1772-1821), it was the terminus for El Camino Real from the Río Grande and points south. Together, these segments formed the long corridor known as El Camino Real and the later immigration and trade route that is now identified as the Old San Antonio Road. El Camino Real and its variations, along with the Old San Antonio Road, contributed to the settlement and development of the Texas frontier during the Spanish, Mexican, and Anglo-American periods.

For the purposes of this Multiple Property Listing, the term El Camino Real de los Tejas applies to the entire Camino Real system within Texas, including Camino Pita, Lower Presidio Road/Camino Abajo del Presidio del Río Grande/Camino de en Medio, Laredo Road, Upper Presidio Road, Camino Arriba del Presidio del Río Grande, Upper Road/ Camino de los Tejas, Lower Road, and Old San Antonio Road/Camino de Arriba. Some of these have overlapping alignments while others have distinctively different alignments. The Old San Antonio Road is a separate road system that in part followed El Camino Real and overlaps it in many segments. All the evolving routes are components of El Camino Real, but each has its own distinctive history and nomenclature; in some cases, however, different names were applied to the same route. The variations in name and alignment illustrate different regional and international influences as the preferred route changed over time. Summary descriptions of the trail segments were presented in the 1998 NPS study El Camino Real de los Tejas National Historic Trail Feasibility Study and Environmental Assessment, and were as follows.

---

168 NPS, Feasibility Study, 8, 12.
169 Ibid., iii, 1, 7.
**Río Grande to San Antonio**

The three basic routes between the Río Grande and San Antonio were the Camino Pita, the Lower Presidio Road, and routes from the Laredo area. The first Spanish expeditions into Texas from Monclova, Coahuila, crossed the Río Grande at fords long used by the indigenous people of the area. Later, the Presidio del Río Grande and its associated missions were established near modern Guerrero, Coahuila. Of the several fords in this area, Paso de Francia was most commonly noted by travelers. Starting in 1689, El Camino Real between Paso de Francia and San Antonio evolved, gradually becoming known as the “Camino Pita,” or the Pita Road, named for a campsite first used in 1716. These roads, which went northeast from Paso de Francia and then east toward San Antonio, were used by the first Spanish explorers and settlers of Texas. This remained the set route of subsequent expeditions through the 1720s, until Indian conflicts forced traffic to move farther south.  

The second, later route, used primarily from c.1750 to c.1800, was known as both the Lower Presidio Road and as Camino Abajo del Presidio del Río Grande. It went almost straight east from Paso de Francia before turning north to San Antonio. This route was also known as Camino de en Medio because the route was between two other roads. The Pita Road lay to the north and, on the south, another main road to San Antonio ran east from the Laredo crossing of the Río Grande.  

The third route between the Río Grande and San Antonio came into use with the founding of the villas of Dolores and Laredo in the 1750s and the requirement that they provide boats for travelers to cross the river. By the late 1760s, many official expeditions to Texas crossed at one of these new villas. The routes from Laredo to San Antonio and Los Adaes emanated from Monclova and Saltillo, just as the earlier routes had done. A spur from the San Antonio Road (1750-1830) went directly north-northeast from Laredo. A second route from Laredo to San Antonio (1750-1830) ran east-northeast to La Bahía, near the present Goliad, Texas. The route then turned back to the northwest, following the San Antonio River to San Antonio.  

Later, an “Upper Presidio Road” was opened (1795-1850). That road generally followed the route of the earlier Camino Pita to a point east of the Frio River, a short distance west of San Antonio, where the two roads diverged. The Camino Arriba del Presidio del Río Grande was a name given to a segment of the road between Presidio del Río Grande (modern Guerrero, Coahuila) and San Antonio.  

**San Antonio to Los Adaes, 1691-1773**

During the eighteenth century, two main routes were located between San Antonio and Los Adaes: the Upper Road, or the Camino de Los Tejas (1691-1800), and the Lower Road (c.1727-1790s). The Old San Antonio Road (1795-1850) followed both routes. With some variations, the Upper Road was the predominant route for the explorers and early settlers of eastern Texas. Even after use of the Upper Road decreased, it remained an alternate route to the east.  

The Upper Road is not well defined from a point about 10 miles northeast of Austin to the San Gabriel River. From the San Gabriel River to the Trinity River, three variations are known, one that can be partially identified from records and two other, more northerly routes. Diaries, chronicles, records, and onsite investigations do not provide sufficient information at this time to locate the latter two.  

---

172 Ibid., 11.  
175 NPS, *Feasibility Study*, 11.
During the 1720s, the road east from San Antonio shifted south to avoid conflicts with Indians. The Lower Road (c. 1727-1790s) followed the San Antonio River downstream and turned east to cross the Guadalupe River near present Cuero, Texas, the Colorado River just north of La Grange, and the Brazos at the mouth of the Little Brazos River, near Hearne. After La Bahía presidio and mission were moved to their final sites near present Goliad in 1749, the road was extended to La Bahía, where it intersected with the Laredo Road after the founding of Laredo in 1755. The Lower Road joined with the northern route before their common crossing of the Trinity River. Most traffic, and especially official expeditions, followed the Lower Road between 1727 and the closing of Los Adaes in 1773. The Lower Road’s significance lies in its being the primary route to Los Adaes over most of the 52-year period in which Los Adaes was the capital.176

East of the Neches River, all three routes - the Upper Road (also known as El Camino Real de los Tejas), the Lower Road, and the Old San Antonio Road (which was sometimes called Camino de Arriba) - are all on the same general alignment, with a few variations.177

San Antonio to Natchitoches, Louisiana, 1773-1850

After the presidio at Los Adaes was closed and the capital moved to San Antonio, Spanish residence and interest in eastern Texas declined but did not end. Both the Upper Road and the Lower Road to the east continued in use, with the Lower Road receiving more traffic. In the interest of straightening the route to east Texas, a new mail road was pioneered in 1795. Many segments of the new road, which Anglo-American immigrants would later call the San Antonio Road, are the same as the Upper Road; other segments are the same as the Lower Road. In the area of New Braunfels, the San Antonio Road turns slightly south to avoid crossing the Comal and Blanco rivers. It then headed straight for the Brazos crossing of the Lower Road, passing the Colorado River at Bastrop. The Old San Antonio Road follows the Upper Road from San Antonio to the New Braunfels area where it turns slightly south to cross the Guadalupe and San Marcos rivers. It then heads through Bastrop to the Brazos River, where it crosses in the same area as the Lower Road. The route also followed parts of the Lower Presidio Road and Laredo Road. The Old San Antonio Road was used from about 1795 to 1850 as the primary migration route from the east into what is now Texas.178 The earlier and later roads coincide in some places in Louisiana and Texas; in others, the routes changed through time. The establishment of ferries also helped to change regional transportation patterns. In what is now Leon County, parts of El Camino Real were essentially abandoned when Robbins’ Ferry (across the Trinity River) and other downstream ferries (on the Sabine River) were built.179

176 NPS, Feasibility Study, 11-12.
177 NPS, Feasibility Study, 12.
178 NPS, Feasibility Study, 12; Sanchez and Erickson, Historical Geographic Dictionary, 9; Clark and McGraw, “Methodology,” in A Texas Legacy, 15.
179 NPS, Feasibility Study, 12.
H. Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods

Identification and Documentation

The historical significance of El Camino Real was recognized by the early twentieth century. The Texas Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR) adopted a resolution to formally identify the historic route in 1911. In 1915-1916, a professional surveyor, V. N. Zivley, surveyed a route that largely had been established about 1795 from Paso de Francia to the state border of Louisiana. The route Zivley surveyed was an amalgam of trail segments, each with its own variations, time frame of popularity, and local significance. Over time portions of these segments became the most established or well documented in the notes and maps of previous land surveyors, thus becoming the easiest for Zivley to retrace. These segments were referred to by many names over the centuries, including the Old San Antonio Road, the King’s Highway or Camino Real, and Presidio Road. Zivley refers to each of these names in his notes and appears aware of the differing segments. Zivley placed wooden posts as he went which DAR later replaced with granite markers; these are still known as Zivley survey markers. While many of the markers remain in their original location, a number have been removed or moved to a new location, and many more are located on private property and are inaccessible.

The notion that only one trans-Texas route had existed historically is a misconception and an unfortunate consequence of the Zivley survey. By combining multiple trail segments from different time periods into one route Zivley in effect created a continuous road across Texas that likely never existed at one place and time. The route mapped by Zivley and the markers erected have become significant in their own right as many communities have incorporated the Zivley route into local lore and the markers spur continuous interest in the subject. Further, in 1919, the Texas State Legislature declared the route surveyed by Zivley, to be one of Texas’s historic trails. A decade later, on March 29, 1929, Texas Senate Bill No. 570 provided for preservation of the Old San Antonio Road. Over the next three decades, the road variously was referred to as State Highway 21 or as State Highway OSR (Old San Antonio Road). In subsequent years, the road was upgraded along much of its length with paving and straightening of sharp curves.

The most recent documentation and preservation program for El Camino Real began in July 1989. Texas Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 2 directed the State Department of Highways and Public Transportation (now the Texas Department of Transportation) to identify original remnants of El Camino Real and to develop a preservation plan for them. In 1991, the Texas Department of Transportation sponsored publication of a collection of articles derived from the Senate-ordered study. The 1991 study found that the historic trail was composed of multiple segments within a travel corridor that extended from Louisiana, across Texas, and into Mexico. Due to public interest in the project, the Texas Department of Transportation reprinted the report in 1998.

In 1997, the Historical Geographical Dictionary of the Camino Real Para Los Texas focused on tracing the various routes of El Camino Real through the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries. The study authors relied on primary as well as secondary sources to compile a comprehensive listing of the evolution of El Camino Real over time. The following year, the NPS prepared a feasibility study to evaluate the potential for designating
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184 McGraw et al., A Texas Legacy.
El Camino Real as a national historic trail. The study documented the international and national significance of the travel corridor, and established how the proposed trail met guidelines in the National Trail Systems Act.\(^{185}\)

El Camino Real received designation as a national historic trail in October 2004. In 2008, Morgan Environmental Associates prepared a report summarizing a database of trail-related and potentially trail-related cultural resources sites, and a database of references used in documenting trail-related resources. Both databases informed the development of the Final Comprehensive Management Plan / Environmental Assessment prepared by NPS.\(^{186}\)

Preparation of this multiple property documentation of El Camino Real is based upon the findings of these previous studies, as well as additional secondary source research and field investigations carried out in early 2011. Funding for the project was provided by the NPS in the U.S. Department of the Interior and administered by the Texas Historical Commission.

To develop an understanding of the range of resource types associated with El Camino Real, site visits were made to the following properties: Bernardo D’Ortolan Site; Raphael D’Ortolan Site; Onion Creek Crossing within McKinney Falls State Park; San Marcos de Neve; McGehee Crossing; Mission Nuestra Señora del Espíritu Santo de Zúñiga; Comal Springs at Landa Park; Rancho de Perez; Dolores/Perez/Applewhite Crossing; and Mission Tejas State Park. Local experts in the history of El Camino Real served as escorts during all site visits.

Background research took place at the Texas Historical Commission, the Texas Archeological Research Lab, the Texas State Historical Association, and the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department. Online research sources included the Texas Historic Sites Atlas and the Handbook of Texas Online. Informant interviews and numerous previous studies provided voluminous data with which to prepare the multiple property listing documentation form.

The property types are organized in the resource categories of building, site, structure, and district, with a range of sub-types encompassed by each type. Integrity requirements were based on knowledge of existing properties. The architectural and physical features of the resources associated with El Camino Real, derived from the aforementioned surveys, were considered in developing the outlines of potential registration requirements.

\(^{185}\) Sanchez and Erickson, *Historical Geographic Dictionary*; NPS, *Feasibility Study*.

\(^{186}\) Morgan-Remley, *Draft Cultural Resources Inventory El Camino Real de los Tejas National Historic Trail*; NPS, *El Camino Real de los Tejas National Historic Trail Final Comprehensive Management Plan/ Environmental Assessment, Louisiana, Texas*. 
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Appendix: Potentially Eligible Historic Sites and Segments

These properties have not been evaluated regarding eligibility for listing in the NRHP, but rather for their value in interpreting the history of El Camino Real.


The National Park Service selected sites and segments for further study following an analysis of more than 500 properties. Volunteers in the trail community, individuals serving on county historical commissions in Texas, and experts in Louisiana were asked to submit sites and segments for the consideration of the planning team. Two professional archeologists worked in Texas and Louisiana to identify historically significant sites and segments that would meet the criteria specified in the National Trail System Act. This research yielded a database of more than 500 sites for the 40 Texas counties and the two Louisiana parishes. Of these 500 sites, 250 sites were then tentatively selected for further examination. The criteria for selection included the following:

- site or segment association with the trail;
- its historic significance;
- the existing level of information about it;
- its confirmed location;
- its accessibility;
- its scenic quality;
- whether it is relatively free from intrusion; and
- whether it has the potential to be developed for visitor use.

During the review process the planning team reexamined all the available evidence about tentative sites and segments that had been submitted and contacted individuals who made additional suggestions for inclusion. While the properties were not evaluated for their eligibility for listing in the National Register, this list served as a starting point for determining which properties to nominate to the National Register as part of a multiple property submission.

LOUISIANA - SEGMENTS

**Natchitoches Parish**

Name: *Camino de la Laguna* (part of a series of trails located at Los Adaes State Historic Site)

_Historic use type:_ Trail segment  
_Description:_ This is a road that goes north from Los Adaes to La Laguna de Los Adaes. This road is clearly labeled on a map prepared by José de Urrutia in 1767. Its location has been confirmed on the ground.  
_Time period:_ 1700s  
_Ownership:_ Public (Louisiana Office of State Parks)

Name: *Camino del Baño* (part of a series of trails located at Los Adaes State Historic Site)

_Historic use type:_ Trail segment  
_Description:_ This is a road that travels south from Los Adaes to Rancho del Baño. This road is clearly labeled on a map prepared by José de Urrutia in 1767. Its location has been confirmed on the ground.  
_Time period:_ 1700s  
_Ownership:_ Public (Louisiana Office of State Parks)
Name: Camino del Bayuco (part of a series of trails located at Los Adaes State Historic Site)

**Historic use type:** Trail segment  
**Description:** This is a road that travels south from Los Adaes, then turns east to a destination named El Bayuco. The road is clearly labeled on a map prepared by José de Urrutia in 1767. Its location has been confirmed on the ground.  
**Time period:** 1700s  
**Ownership:** Public (Louisiana Office of State Parks)

Name: Camino de Natchitois (part of a series of trails located at Los Adaes State Historic Site)

**Historic use type:** Trail segment  
**Description:** This is a road that travels east– northeast from Los Adaes toward Natchitoches. This road is clearly labeled on a map prepared by José de Urrutia in 1767. Its location has been confirmed on the ground.  
**Time period:** 1700s  
**Ownership:** Public (Louisiana Office of State Parks)

Camino del Bayuco and Camino de Natchitois are part of the same series of trails located near Los Adaes State Historic Site. These roads were a critical part of the El Camino Real de los Tejas, connecting the Spanish settlements in Texas and Louisiana.

**Natchitoches/Sabine Parishes**

Name: Camino de los Ais (part of a series of trails located at Los Adaes State Historic Site)

**Historic use type:** Trail segment  
**Description:** This is a road that travels west– southwest from Los Adaes toward Mission Dolores de los Ais. The road is clearly labeled on a map prepared by José de Urrutia in 1767. Its location has been confirmed on the ground.  
**Time period:** 1700s  
**Ownership:** Public (Louisiana Office of State Parks)

**LOUISIANA - SITES**

**Natchitoches Parish**

Name: American Cemetery

**Historic use type:** Cemetery/Second site of Fort St. Jean Baptiste  
**Description:** This cemetery, established early in the 18th century, was the site of the relocated Fort St. Jean Baptiste. It is the oldest cemetery in Louisiana and includes graves from the middle of the 18th century. It was named the American Cemetery after the Louisiana Purchase in 1803.  
**Time period:** 1700–1800s  
**Ownership:** Public (City of Natchitoches)

Name: Los Adaes Village

**Historic use type:** Village  
**Description:** This is the archaeological site of a village established by some of the residents who left Los Adaes in the 1770s and returned to Louisiana after the unrest associated with the unsuccessful Gutiérrez-Magee Expedition of 1812–1813.  
**Time period:** late 1700s–1800s  
**Ownership:** Private

Name: Caddo Memorial Plaza

**Historic use type:** Sacred ground/historic marker  
**Description:** This is the site where more than 100 American Indian graves were unearthed in the 1930s, at the start of construction of the hatchery by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. At that time, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act was not in effect, and many human remains, as well as funerary items, were crushed, stolen, looted, or destroyed. Some remains were transported to the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, DC, where they were kept in “The Nation’s Attic” at the National Museum of Natural History until 2007. In 2000, authorized by the Museum of the American Indian Act, and supported by the Caddo Nation’s Tribal Council and Repatriation Committee, the Caddo Nation Cultural Preservation Department began a long journey to return these remains to their ancestral home on Caddo Nation lands.  
**Time period:** 1700–1800s
Ownership: Public (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)

Name: Fort Claiborne
Historic use type: Fort
Description: Fort Claiborne was established in 1804. It was named after William C. C. Claiborne, then-governor of territorial Louisiana. The fort protected United States interests on the southwestern frontier. Troops were garrisoned here almost continuously until the establishment of Fort Jesup in 1822.
Time period: 1804–1822
Ownership: Public (City of Natchitoches)

Name: Fort Seldon
Historic use type: Fort
Description: This was an American fort first occupied in 1816, and then again between November 1820 and May 1822. The site covers a square mile; a kitchen is the one structure still standing. One of the Officer’s Quarters has been reconstructed and serves as a visitor center/museum.
Time period: 1816–1822
Ownership: Public (City of Natchitoches)

Name: Fort St. Jean Baptiste State Historic Site
Historic use type: Fort (reconstructed)
Description: French-Canadian trader Louis Juchereau de St. Denis was on a mission to establish trading ties with Mexico. After traveling nearly 140 leagues up the Red River he encountered an impenetrable logjam; at this spot he hastily built two crude huts, which became Fort St. Jean Baptiste and the town of Natchitoches, the oldest permanent settlement in the entire Louisiana Purchase territory. St. Denis was named the commandant of the fort in 1722, and the colony thrived until his death in 1744. In 1731, an attack by the Natchez Indians exposed the vulnerabilities of the small French fort, prompting French officials to send engineer François Broutin to oversee the construction of a larger and stronger fortification. Spanish officials charged it was an invasion of Spanish territory, but St. Denis politely ignored their protests. The fort continued to be garrisoned by French marines until 1762, when France’s defeat in the French and Indian War forced it to cede Louisiana to Spain. Spanish authorities continued to operate the fort as a military outpost and trading center; however, the fort no longer protected a territorial boundary, so its strategic importance was diminished. Spain eventually abandoned the fort, and by the time the United States acquired the territory in 1803, it was in ruins and no longer usable.
Time period: 1700s
Ownership: Public (Louisiana Office of State Parks)

Name: Gorum Community
Historic use type: Community
Description: This community became the home of Adaesanos, the former settlers at Los Adaes, who moved here after El Presidio de Nuestra Señora del Pilar de Zaragoza de los Adaes was closed by Spanish authorities in 1773.
Time period: Post-1773
Ownership: Private
Name: Mission San Miguel de Linares de los Adaes

**Historic use type:** Mission site

**Description:** This National Historic Landmark was originally founded in 1717 by Diego Ramón for the Adaes Indians near present-day Robeline, Louisiana. The mission was abandoned a couple of years later, but it was reestablished in 1721 by Marqués de San Miguel de Aguayo. It remained active until 1773 when it was again abandoned. It is part of Los Adaes State Historic Site.

**Time period:** 1700s

**Ownership:** Public (Louisiana Office of State Parks)

Name: Presidio de Nuestra Señora del Pilar de Zaragoza de los Adaes

**Historic use type:** Presidio site

**Description:** This National Historic Landmark was founded in 1721 by the Marqués de Aguayo as a frontier outpost to check French expansion in East Texas. It was located a quarter league from the mission of San Miguel de Linares de los Adaes, near the site of present Robeline, Louisiana. The presidio was built in the form of a hexagon with three bastions or bulwarks, Six cannons that the Marqués de Aguayo had brought from Coahuila were left in the presidio, which had an initial complement 100 men. In 1729, Spain designated Los Adaes the capital of the province of Texas. This made Los Adaes the official residence of the governor, and a house was constructed for him within the presidio. Los Adaes remained the administrative seat of government for the entire province for the next 44 years. In 1772, ten years after Louisiana was transferred to Spain, Los Adaes closed and the inhabitants moved to San Antonio. However, many of the 500 soldiers and family members soon left San Antonio and returned to Louisiana, where their descendants live today. The presidio is part of Los Adaes State Historic Site.

**Time period:** 1700s

**Ownership:** Public (Louisiana Office of State Parks)

Name: François Roquier House

**Historic use type:** Trading post

**Description:** This is a National Register property (contributing to the Natchitoches Historic District) that was a trading post where members of the Appalachee, Coushatta, and Biloxi tribes came to purchase and exchange supplies. It is an excellent example of architecture in Louisiana with bousillage (mixture of clay and Spanish moss or clay and grass used as plaster to fill the spaces between structural framing), half-timber, and post-in-the-ground, which were typical French construction techniques.

**Time period:** 1700–1800s

**Ownership:** Public (State of Louisiana, Northwestern State University)

Name: Spanish Lake

**Historic use type:** Community

**Description:** This lakeside community was originally called Laguna de los Adaes, later Juan de Mora Lake, and finally Spanish Lake. Bison are reported to have watered at this site. In its report, the 1718 Alarcón Expedition provided a full description of the lake. The lake was about two leagues from Presidio de Nuestra Señora del Pilar de Zaragoza de los Adaes, and the expedition camped about a league from the presidio. The report noted that the Cadodachos River flowed through the presidio and on to Natchitoches. The distance between presidios was 60 leagues. The nearest access point for the lake was four leagues from Natchitoches. Various kinds of fish are abundant year-round, along with many ducks of various sizes, which overwinter here.

**Time period:** 1718–1800s

**Ownership:** Private
Name: Tauzin-Wells House
Historic use type: Residence
Description: It is believed to be the oldest standing building in Natchitoches and the second oldest residence west of the Mississippi River. It was built by the Buard family in 1776, and is one of the oldest examples of a Creole cottage. It is a one story house with half-timbered bousillage walls (mixture of clay and Spanish moss or clay and grass used as plaster to fill the spaces between structural framing) and a low pitched roof. The floor plan is centered around a central chimney that is accessible by two main rooms. Originally, the house had a full gallery, wrapping around the entire building. In 1790, the side galleries were enclosed to provide more living space. This property was the site of a subsidiary trading post for the Davenport-Barr mercantile operation.
Time period: 1776
Ownership: Private (not open for tours)

Sabine Parish

Name: Fort Jesup State Historic Site
Description: This Archeological and State Historic Site was built in 1822 after the Sabine River was set as the boundary between the United States and Spanish (Adams-Onis Treaty of 1819) and after Mexico’s Independence from Spain was achieved in 1821. It served as staging for the Mexican War in 1845.
Time period: 1822-1846
Ownership: Public (Louisiana Office of State Parks)

Texas - Segments

Bexar County

Name: Mission Road/Mission Trail and Villamain
Historic use type: Trail segment
Description: This extensive National Historic district includes 52 contributing buildings and 39 contributing sites. Mission Road follows part of the original route connecting the five main missions. The Mission Parkway study collected data on all of the local roads that connect to the main road system and documented the significance of these roads, which are mostly now city streets or National Park Service roads.
Time period: 1718
Ownership: Public (National Park Service/City of San Antonio)

Houston County

Name: Mission Tejas State Park Trail Segment
Historic use type: Trail segment
Description: This 1.5-mile-long trail segment crosses an area that has remarkable visual integrity. The trail segment runs roughly parallel to State Road 21 and at times crosses the highway. A Caddo Indian site within the state park appears to be adjacent to the trail. Although the original site of the 1690 Mission San Francisco de los Tejas has not yet been found, recent research conducted by Historian Robert Weddle confirms that this segment was part of El Camino Real de los Tejas.
Time period: 1600s
Ownership: Public (Texas Parks and Wildlife Department)
Sabine County

Name: Lobanillo Swales

*Historic use type:* Trail segment

*Description:* Two sets of deep and parallel swales extend about one-quarter mile through the forest. One set of swales has seven parallel ruts reaching a depth of 18 feet and 12 feet wide. A state historic marker in nearby Geneva says that the historic Spanish rancho known as El Lobanillo, was located nearby. The rancho included the pueblo of Gil Y’Barbo (1729–1809), a refuge used by his ailing mother and other refugees in 1773, when Spain evacuated colonists from western Louisiana and East Texas. It was given as a land grant to Juan Ignacio Pifermo in 1794, and inherited in the early 1800s by John Maximillian (ca. 1778–1866).

*Time period:* 1700–1800s

*Ownership:* Private

TEXAS - SITES

Bexar County

Name: Acequia Madre de Mission de Valero

*Historic use type:* Irrigation structure

*Description:* This was part of a network of ditches built by the Spanish and their Indian charges after the founding of San Antonio in 1718. Construction of the acequia began a year later. Hand-dug and made of dressed limestone, the acequia diverted water from the San Antonio River through agricultural fields which belonged to San Antonio de Valero Mission. Irrigation would be the key to the growth of the missions and the town during the initial settlement of the region.

*Time period:* 1690s

*Ownership:* Public (City of San Antonio/San Antonio River Authority)

Name: Comanche Lookout

*Historic use type:* Natural landmark

*Description:* Comanche Lookout Park is a 96-acre public park owned by the City of San Antonio. The Cibolo Creek floodplain lies at the base of this escarpment, between the Gulf Coastal Plain and the Edwards Plateau. American Indians used this hill as a vantage point for warfare and hunting. Apache and Comanche Indians dominated the area as they hunted along waterways, including nearby Cibolo Creek. The hill was also a prominent landmark for travelers in the 18th and 19th centuries. It was noted in early field survey notes and on Stephen Austin’s map. Located on the original road to San Marcos Spring, one of several routes of El Camino Real de los Tejas extended past the base of the hill.

*Time period:* 1700–1800s

*Ownership:* Public (City of San Antonio)

Name: Dolores-Applewhite Crossing

*Historic use type:* River crossing

*Description:* Archival research and a review of the Pérez family historical documents have verified the location of this historic ford of the Medina River. It was first identified in the 1808 Spanish grant to Ignacio Pérez. It is a beautiful crossing with swales and wheel marks on the stones across the creek bed.

*Time period:* 1700-1800s

*Ownership:* Public (City of San Antonio)

Name: Iglesia de Nuestra Señora de la Candelaria y Guadalupe/San Fernando Cathedral

*Historic use type:* Church

*Description:* Listed in the National Register of Historic Places, this was the parish church of the villa of San Fernando de Bexar, which was built between 1737 and 1749 and restored in 1839. The gothic Cathedral of San Fernando, built between 1868 and 1873, incorporated portions of the existing Spanish church.

*Time period:* 1737–present

*Ownership:* Archdiocese of San Antonio
Name: La Villita Historic District/Villa de San Fernando/El Pueblo de San José y Santiago del Alamo/Las Islitas

**Historic use type:** Village/town

**Description:** Listed in the National Register of Historic Places, these four settlements are essentially contiguous and therefore are counted together as a complex. The historic district includes 27 contributing buildings, structures, and archeological remains dating to the Spanish period and later, with influences from later German settlements. La Villita was the civil settlement that grew up as a barrio around the Presidio San Antonio de Bexar.

**Time period:** 1700s

**Ownership:** Private

Name: Loma Alta

**Historic use type:** Natural landmark

**Description:** Legal documents indicate that, in 1765, Loma Alta was used as a landmark in determining the boundaries of Rancho San Lucas of Mission San José in a dispute involving Fray Pedro Ramírez de Arellano.

**Time period:** 1700–1800s

**Ownership:** Private

Name: Main and Military Plazas

**Historic use type:** Main plaza/military plaza

**Description:** This National Historic Landmark is comprised of 13 whole blocks, two plazas, and portions of two additional blocks. The Military Plaza was established in 1722. The Main Plaza is associated with the settlement of 16 Canary Island families and the founding of Villa San Fernando on Main Plaza in 1731. A portion of the 18th Century Pajelache Acequia (San Pedro Ditch) runs under Main Avenue. The Melchor de la Garza house, built around 1800, is a small one-story caliche block cottage that is a remaining example of the type of homes that once ringed the two plazas.

**Time period:** 1700–1800s

**Ownership:** Public (City of San Antonio)

Name: Mission Espada Aqueduct

**Historic use type:** Irrigation structure

**Description:** This National Historic Landmark shows the vital role of water in the survival of missions in the vicinity of San Antonio. According to tradition, goat’s milk served as a cementing agent in the mortar used in constructing the aqueduct.

**Time period:** 1700s

**Ownership:** Private (Espada Ditch Company, a cooperative in which the National Park Service and others have shares)

Name: Mission Espada Dam

**Historic use type:** San Antonio River crossing/irrigation structure

**Description:** Listed in the National Register of Historic Places, this dam is a Spanish Colonial irrigation structure, which served as a river crossing, connecting the local network of roads between missions on both banks of the San Antonio River.

**Time period:** 1700s

**Ownership:** Public (National Park Service/San Antonio River Authority)
Name: Mission Nuestra Señora de la Purísima Concepción de Acuña

*Historic use type:* Mission

*Description:* Both a National Historic Landmark and State Archeological Landmark the site includes a Spanish Colonial mission and associated grounds. The mission was secularized in 1793 and the church was completely abandoned by 1819. The church has exceptional architectural preservation (including intact frescos) and is the oldest unrestored stone church in the United States. It was originally founded in 1716 in East Texas as Concepción de los Ais, temporarily relocated to the area of present-day Austin in 1730 before being reestablished at its final location in Bexar County. The church took about 20 years to build and was dedicated December 8, 1755. The facade was originally covered with brilliant quarter-foils and squares of red, blue, orange, and yellow. The mission is still in use.

*Time period:* 1731–1824

*Ownership:* Private (Archdiocese of San Antonio, but managed though a cooperative agreement with the National Park Service)

Name: Mission San Antonio de Valero, 3rd Site (the Alamo)

*Historic use type:* Mission

*Description:* Started by Father Antonio de San Buenaventura y Olivares in 1716 this National and State Historic Landmark was originally located west of San Pedro Springs. It survived three moves and numerous setbacks during its early years. Because the Spanish government failed to complete or adequately garrison the local presidio, the mission had frequently to provide for its own defense. Protective walls, eight feet high by two feet thick, were erected enclosing a main plaza located west of the convent and guarded by small artillery and a fortified gate. During the 19th century struggle for political and military control of Texas, these rudimentary fortifications made the old mission symbolically and strategically important. The site served a variety of functions, including quarters for San Antonio’s first hospital (1805 to 1812). Between 1810 and 1865 the former mission changed hands at least sixteen times, belonging variously to Spanish, Mexican, Texas, Union, and Confederate forces.

*Time period:* 1724-1793

*Ownership:* Public (State of Texas)

Name: Mission San Francisco de la Espada

*Historic use type:* Mission

*Description:* Listed in the National Register of Historic Places, this mission was originally founded in 1690 as San Francisco de los Tejas in present-day Houston County. It was reestablished in San Antonio in 1731 with a different name. The original buildings at Espada, the farthest south of the five missions near San Antonio, were undoubtedly of adobe. A wall surrounded the church (usually called a chapel), friary, granary, and workshops. Extensive farms and pastures lay nearby. One of the few remaining early structures is the southeast bastion (fortified round tower), the only mission fort structure left intact in San Antonio. Its three-foot-thick rock walls, which contain holes for cannons and muskets, support a vaulted roof.

*Time period:* 1731–1824

*Ownership:* Private (Archdiocese of San Antonio, but managed though a cooperative agreement with the National Park Service)

Name: Mission San José Acequia

*Historic use type:* Irrigation structure

*Description:* Listed in the National Register of Historic Places, this is an acequia, or irrigation ditch, constructed to serve the current location of Mission San José. It may have been in use until early in the 20th century.

*Time period:* 1722–present

*Ownership:* Multiple (National Park Service, private and City of San Antonio)
Name: Mission San José y San Miguel de Aguayo, 3rd Site

**Historic use type:** Mission

**Description:** This National Register property was established in 1720 on the east bank of the San Antonio River but was removed to a new site on the west bank around 1724-1727, and again a second time to this present site around 1739. The first buildings were constructed of palings, wattle and daub, thatch and adobe. By 1749 the mission complex consisted of a church, a friary, granary and Indian habitations. The Indian houses were integral with the ramparts and served to enclose the large protected plaza. The present renowned church was begun in 1768 by Fr. Pedro Ramírez de Arellano, and it was completed sometime after 1778. By then the purpose of the mission was largely fulfilled; this fact, coupled with a great decline in the Indian population, caused the mission to be secularized in 1793.

**Time period:** 1739–1824

**Ownership:** Multiple (Archdiocese of San Antonio, State of Texas, Bexar County, and the San Antonio Conservation Society)

Name: Mission San Juan Acequia

**Historic use type:** Irrigation structure

**Description:** Listed in the National Register of Historic Places, this acequia is associated with Mission San Juan.

**Time period:** 1700s

**Ownership:** Public (National Park Service)

Name: Mission San Juan Capistrano

**Historic use type:** Mission

**Description:** This site listed in the National Register of Historic Places was formerly the East Texas mission of San José de los Nazonis. It was renamed in 1731, when it was moved to the site of present San Antonio. San Juan Capistrano was exposed to frequent Indian attacks and the lands allotted to the mission were not sufficient for its horses and cattle and the raising of the required crops. Construction of a separate church was begun, but it was never completed, and services had to be held in a large room in the monastery. The buildings of the mission standing today have no sculpturing, but the walls are thick and the rooms commodious. Most of the original square remains within the walls, offering an authentic picture of the mission plan.

**Time period:** 1731–1824

**Ownership:** Private (Archdiocese of San Antonio, but managed though a cooperative agreement with the National Park Service)

Name: Mission San Juan Dam

**Historic use type:** Irrigation structure/river crossing

**Description:** Listed in the National Register of Historic Places, this Spanish Colonial irrigation structure served as a river crossing, connecting the local network of roads between missions on both banks of the San Antonio River. The feature was excavated in the 1970s.

**Time period:** 1700s

**Ownership:** Public/private (The property is right on the edge of National Park Service and San Antonio River Authority property)

Name: Nogales Crossing

**Historic use type:** River crossing

**Description:** This ford is listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Archeologist Jake Ivey notes that the boundaries of the mission lands of Nuestra Señora de la Purísima de la Concepción extended to a point called the Nogales Crossing, which he states is at the San Juan Dam on the San Antonio River, and that this spot marks one of the boundaries for Mission San Juan.

**Time period:** 1700s

**Ownership:** Public (Multiple management agencies)
Name: Padre Navarro House
**Historic use type:** Residence
**Description:** Listed in the National Register of Historic Places, this was a residence constructed by the Mission Concepción parish priest, Padre Navarro.
**Time period:** early 1800s
**Ownership:** Private

Name: Paso de los Tejas
**Historic use type:** Spring/paraje
**Description:** Materials for the construction of missions were acquired from a series of quarries in this location. There are remnants of structures associated with the period of significance of the trail.
**Time period:** 1690s
**Ownership:** Public (City of San Antonio)

Name: Pérez Cemetery/Rancho de Pérez
**Historic use type:** Ranch/cemetery
**Description:** This is a state archeological landmark, a component of the ranch headquarters of Rancho de Pérez, part of the Ignacio Pérez land grant. The ranch was known as the Rancho de Piedra (Stone Ranch). The site is located north of the Medina River and has been preserved and protected by the Pérez family for more than a century. There is a chapel at the cemetery, which was constructed on top of the foundation of the original Spanish Colonial period chapel. Some elements of the original chapel remain.
**Time period:** late 1700s/early 1800s
**Ownership:** Cemetery is private (owned by Pérez family descendants); ranch is public (owned by the City of San Antonio)

Name: Presidio San Antonio de Bexar, 1st Site (San Pedro Springs)
**Historic use type:** Presidio/village/paraje
**Description:** This National Register Property located five miles from the San Antonio River has been inhabited since prehistoric times. When Spanish explorers visited the springs in the late 17th century the area was occupied by the Payayas Indians who lived in the village of Yanaguana. The area around the springs was the original site of the present city of San Antonio and in 1729 it was dedicated as a public space by the Spanish government.
**Time period:** 1692
**Ownership:** Public (City of San Antonio)

Name: Presidio San Antonio de Bexar, 2nd Site/Governor’s Palace/Casa del Capitán
**Historic use type:** Presidio
**Description:** This National Historic Landmark was the final site of the Presidio San Antonio de Bexar. The building is primarily a 19th-century reconstruction on the foundation of the original building. The site, known popularly as the Governor’s Palace, was actually the residence of the captain of the presidio until 1773, followed by the senior officer. Marqués de Aguayo began construction in 1722, but there is a date of 1749 over the doorway. Construction may never have been completed during the Spanish period. The present building is a reconstruction completed in 1930.
**Time period:** 1722
**Ownership:** Public (City of San Antonio)

Name: Sabinitas/Jett/Palo Alto Crossing
**Historic use type:** Connecting side trail/river crossing
**Description:** This ford is a state archeological landmark. It crossed the Medina River for the Camino de los Palos Altos known to the Spanish as Paso Sabinitas.
**Time period:** 1700s
**Ownership:** Private
Name: Yturri-Edmunds Historic Site

**Historic use type:** Mill/residence

**Description:** Part of the Mission Parkway Historic and Archeological District, this structure was originally a mill that was later converted to a residence. The mill was built in 1820 by Manuel Yturri Castillo. It is part of a site with several 19th-century buildings and is open to the public. The site is located on former lands of Mission Concepción.

**Time period:** 1820

**Ownership:** Public (San Antonio Conservation Society)

---

**Brazos County**

Name: Rye School Loop Swale

**Historic use type:** Trail segment

**Description:** This swale, parallel to a raised road segment, is very easy to see when the vegetation loses its leaves. The swale starts very faintly but becomes more discernable as it nears Rye Loop road (coming from the southwest). At its most pronounced, it is about 2-meters wide, almost 2-meters deep, and is about 70-meters long before it curves toward the northwest and angles into the Rye Loop alignment. After the curve to the northwest, it continues for about 30-meters before it is lost in a tangle of greenbrier vines. In a diary entry from 1807 American explorer Zebulon Pike made references to camping in this area.

**Time period:** 1800s

**Ownership:** Public (City of College Station)

---

**Cherokee County**

Name: Caddo Mounds Trace No. 1

**Historic use type:** Road segment

**Description:** Both the magnetometer data of existing subsurface swales and the 1806–1807 Juan Pedro Walker map clearly indicate the relationship of El Camino Real de los Tejas National Historic Trail to the three Caddo Mounds. A preliminary survey of the surrounding landscape during a National Park Service evaluation field trip confirmed that there is only one possible route for the trail to take north of the mounds. The mounds and the trail’s relationship to them are also discussed in primary Spanish documents. For example, in 1767, Nicolás de Lafora records passing just north of the mounds, stating: “We forded this river [the Neches] in shallow water and one league beyond we climbed a hill. On the summit is a mound which appears to be hand-made.” Recent research conducted by Historian Robert Weddle confirms the relationship of this site to the trail.

**Time period:** Pre 1700–1800s

**Ownership:** Public (Texas Historical Commission)

---

Name: Caddo Mounds Trace No. 2

**Historic use type:** Road segment

**Description:** Both the magnetometer data of existing subsurface swales and the 1806–1807 Juan Pedro Walker map clearly indicate the relationship of the trail to the three Caddo Mounds. A preliminary survey of the surrounding landscape during a National Park Service evaluation field trip confirmed that there is only one possible route for the trail to take north of the mounds. The mounds and the trail’s relationship to them are also discussed in primary Spanish documents. Recent research conducted by Historian Robert Weddle confirms the relationship of this site to the trail. Time period: Pre 1700–1800s

**Ownership:** Public (Texas Historical Commission)
Name: George C. Davis Site/Indian Mounds  
**Historic use type:** American Indian village/paraje  
**Description:** Listed in the National Register of Historic Places, this site was the south-westernmost ceremonial center of the Caddoan peoples who flourished on the western edge of the woodlands of eastern North America between 1000 B.C. and A.D. 1550. It consisted of three large earthen mounds, as well as a large portion of a prehistoric village. One of the principal routes of the Old San Antonio Road, which extended diagonally across southern Cherokee County, ran along one edge of the mound site. The earliest mention of the mounds was made by Athanase de Mézières, a Frenchman in the employ of Spain, who traveled from Louisiana to San Antonio in 1779. Recent research conducted by Historian Robert Weddle confirms the relationship of this site to the trail.  
**Time period:** Pre-1700s  
**Ownership:** Public (Texas Historical Commission)

Name: Weeping Mary Crossing  
**Historic use type:** River crossing  
**Description:** This hard-rock crossing of the Neches River has been identified by archaeologists J. Corbin and T. Campbell as following the portion of El Camino Real that passed north of the Caddo mound complex, an important landmark noted by many of the early travelers.  
**Time period:** 1718-1800s  
**Ownership:** Private

**Comal County**

Name: Comal Springs  
**Historic use type:** Springs/paraje  
**Description:** Spanish explorers discovered Comal Springs in 1691. The many American Indian tribes they found living there referred to it as Conaqueyadesta, translated as “where the river has its source.” In an excerpt from his diary, Father Isidro Félix Espinosa, who accompanied Domingo Ramón’s expedition in 1716, described it this way: “Groves of inexpressible beauty are found in this vicinity. The waters of the Guadalupe are clear, crystal and so abundant that it seemed almost incredible to us that its source arose so near. It makes a delightful grove for recreation.” Comal is the Spanish word for “basin,” which somewhat describes the local geography. In 1764, the springs were visited by French explorer Louis Juchereau de St. Denis. They eventually became a paraje, or resting place, on the El Camino Real de los Tejas.  
**Time period:** 1691–1800s  
**Ownership:** Public (city of New Braunfels)

Name: Davenport Crossing (Nacogdoches Road Crossing at Cibolo Creek)  
**Historic use type:** Creek crossing  
**Description:** This crossing of Cibolo Creek is located on the route that Governor Martín de Alarcón (1718) followed on his way to exploring East Texas. There are swales and wheel marks on the stones across the creek bed.  
**Time period:** 1718-1800s  
**Ownership:** Private

Name: Guadalupe River Crossing  
**Historic use type:** River crossing  
**Description:** This Texas Historic Landmark, a major crossing of the Guadalupe River, was used by travelers and caravans carrying supplies to Spanish missions in East Texas. It sometimes took weeks for the floodwaters to recede so that travelers could cross.  
**Time period:** 1700s  
**Ownership:** Private (The crossing can be viewed from the Faust Street Bridge, a restored pedestrian bridge owned by the city of New Braunfels)
DeWitt County

Name: Salt Creek Swales
*Historic use type:* Road segment
*Description:* Alonso de León’s expeditions of 1689 and 1690 are supposed to have camped on the banks of Salt Creek, an area highly regarded as a salt deposit. The swales that extend for about 1/2 mile are adjacent to farm buildings, but the setting retains a high degree of integrity.
*Time period:* 1800s
*Ownership:* Private

Dimmitt County

Name: Crossing/Paraje at San Pedro Creek
*Historic use type:* American Indian village/Crossing/Paraje
*Description:* This is a site with petroglyphs. It is referenced as “Campo de Cuervo” in the Texas Historic Sites Atlas, but the location is more consistent with the San Pedro paraje on the Lower Presidio Road. The site is a well-preserved late-period American Indian site.
*Time period:* 1600–1700s
*Ownership:* Private

Frio County

Name: Frio Town Crossing
*Historic use type:* River crossing
*Description:* This Frio River ford is north of Old Frio Town, which was built primarily to serve as a station along the Upper Presidio Road.
*Time period:* 1691–1827
*Ownership:* Private

Goliad County

Name: Cabeza Creek Crossing on La Bahía-Bexar Road and Trail Segment
*Historic use type:* Creek crossing and swales
*Description:* Part of a National Historic District, this is a gravel bar ford on Cabeza Creek that may have been associated with the Bexar-La Bahía Road. Artifacts recorded for the site are American Indian - likely prehistoric, but could also be protohistoric or historic. Swales stretch on both sides of the crossing.
*Time period:* ca. 1700s
*Ownership:* Private

Name: Confluence of Cabeza Creek & San Antonio River
*Historic use type:* Natural landmark
*Description:* A component of a National Historic District, this confluence site was described by explorer Jean Louis Berlandier, who mentioned that Indians were camped on the banks of the river.
*Time period:* ca. 1700–early 1800s
*Ownership:* Private
Name: Mission Nuestra Señora del Espíritu Santo de Zuñiga (La Bahía), 4th Site

**Historic use type:** Mission

**Description:** Listed in the National Register of Historic Places, this site is the final location of Mission Nuestra Señora del Espíritu Santo de Zuñiga.

**Time period:** 1749–1830

**Ownership:** Public (Goliad State Historic Park – Texas Historical Commission)

---

Name: Mission Nuestra Señora del Rosario de los Cujanes

**Historic use type:** Mission

**Description:** This National Register property was established in November 1754 by Father Juan de Dios Camberos in an attempt to make peace with the various Karankawan tribes, who had been troublesome to the Spaniards since the early eighteenth century. The first buildings were made of timber and whitewashed clay; later, stone and mortar were used. Indians came to the mission from time to time but were reluctant to stay, especially when supplies gave out. They were difficult to control, and the fathers complained of their indolence. The Indians came to the mission in the winter, but most left when spring came and they could produce their own food. By 1781 the mission was virtually abandoned. Father José Mariano Reyes reopened it in 1789 and built a small hut and a log chapel among the ruins. In 1791 a new church of stone and plaster was completed. The Indians had argued for a mission closer to their homes, and as a result Nuestra Señora del Refugio Mission was established in 1792. In 1797 all the Cocos at Rosario went to Refugio. By 1804 the buildings were in need of repair, especially after heavy rains caused part of the front to collapse. After failing to obtain money for repairs, Father Huerta, the missionary in charge, took the remaining Indians to Refugio. On February 7, 1807, Rosario was formally combined with Refugio.

**Time period:** 1764–1826

**Ownership:** Private (By appointment only)

---

Name: Presidio Nuestra Señora de Loreto de la Bahía, 3rd Site

**Historic use type:** Presidio

**Description:** This National Historic Landmark dates from April 6, 1722, when the Marqués de Aguayo laid out the plan for construction of fortifications at the La Salle settlement site, in southern Victoria County. With construction begun, Aguayo turned his attention to the founding of Nuestra Señora del Espíritu Santo de Zuñiga Mission, close to the presidio. The new presidio was to guard the coast against possible French intrusion. Faced with continuing troubles with the Karankawas, authorities moved the mission and presidio in 1726 to the Guadalupe River, near Mission Valley (in present-day Victoria County), twenty-odd miles farther inland. For the next twenty-six years, the mission and presidio prospered with farming and cattle ranching that furnished food for themselves and the mission settlements in East Texas and at San Antonio. In 1749 the presidio and mission were again moved, this time to a place called Santa Dorotea, the site of present-day Goliad, as part of colonizer José de Escandón’s plan to make them the northern anchor of the colony of Nuevo Santander. The captain of Presidio la Bahía, Joaquín del Orobio Basterra, oversaw the move, but the plan to bring the presidio under the Nuevo Santander jurisdiction failed. Capt. Manuel Ramirez de la Piscina, the new commander, undertook physical improvements, including temporary housing for the soldiers and their families, the captain’s own house, and a chapel. He also directed the building of permanent structures for Missions Espíritu Santo and Nuestra Señora del Rosario. The garrison of fifty men guarded not only the presidio but also the two missions and the horse herd pastured several leagues downriver and were sent occasionally to escort travelers and supply trains between San Antonio and San Juan Bautista on the Rio Grande. As Mexico’s political unrest intensified, ultimately leading to revolution, La Bahía was involved in episodes, such as the Gutiérrez-Magee expedition of 1812-13, the Henry Perry campaign of 1821 and the James Long expedition of 1821. After Mexico won independence from Spain, the presidio assumed a new role: protecting and supervising the various colonists coming into the region.

**Time period:** 1749-1830

**Ownership:** Catholic Diocese
Name: Rancho Señor San José/Rancho de Capitán Piscina  
**Historic use type:** Ranch headquarters  
**Description:** Part of a national register historic district, sites at this ranch headquarters were recorded as archeological site numbers 41GD84, 41GD85, and 41GD86. Another site that may be associated with this ranch is site no. 41GD49, which is a burial site containing both prehistoric and historic artifacts. The description of the historic artifacts suggests that they may be from an early period.  
**Time period:** 1700s  
**Ownership:** Private

**Hays County**

Name: McGehee Crossing  
**Historic use type:** River Crossing  
**Description:** This is a ford of the San Marcos River, located on the Old Bastrop Road. There is a state historic marker that indicates that Louis Juchereau de St. Denis traveled this route to establish trade between the French in Louisiana and the Spanish of Coahuila Province on the Rio Grande in 1714. The first settlement at the San Marcos River crossing along the trail route was Villa San Marcos de Neve, established by Spanish authorities in 1808. It was abandoned just four years later, as the Mexican Revolution began to brew. In 1820 and 1821, Texas colonists Moses Austin (1761–1821) and his son, Stephen F. Austin (1793–1836), very likely crossed the San Marcos River near this point. About 1846, Thomas Gilmer McGehee (1810–1890) settled on a Mexican land grant on the east side of the river. In 1859, Charles L. McGehee, Jr. (1837–1929), Thomas’s nephew, acquired 1,200 acres of land bordered by El Camino Real de los Tejas and the river.  
**Time period:** 1690s  
**Ownership:** Private

Name: Old Bastrop Road/County Line Road Trail Segment  
**Historic use type:** Trail Swales  
**Description:** This 20-foot long intact segment is in the right-of-way of Old Bastrop Road. The segment, as well as the crossing, is northeast of Lover’s Land just beyond a right-hand turn at the end of the access for Route 71. The road is also known as CR 266 in Hays County. Numerous primary and secondary sources have been used to track the road. This is the route of the Old San Antonio Road from the York Creek Cemetery in Comal County, following Old Bastrop Road past the San Marcos River where its name becomes County Line Road. Swales have been recorded along this stretch of road at various points.  
**Time period:** 1600s  
**Ownership:** Private

Name: San Marcos de Neve  
**Historic use type:** Village/town  
**Description:** A study conducted in the 1990s indicates that the site is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places under criteria A, C, and D. Aerial photos from 1951 show intact road segments. It was intended as part of a chain of defensive settlements stretching from Bexar to Nacogdoches and was personally funded by the Spanish governor of Texas, Manuel Antonio Cordero y Bustamante. Cordero charged Felipe Roque de la Portilla with leadership of the expedition to reestablish a Spanish presence on the San Marcos River, where the San Xavier missions had been temporarily relocated fifty years earlier. Colonists for the San Marcos villa were recruited from south of the Rio Grande rather than from Bexar and Louisiana. The first group of colonists set out from Refugio (now Matamoros) in December 1807 and by February 1808 had settled near the San Marcos crossing. Lt. Juan Ignacio Arrambide was appointed justicia (magistrate) of the town, with power to issue titles to land. Estimates of the villa’s size vary from about fifty to eighty people, including perhaps a dozen families and servants and as many as 1,700 animals-cattle, horses, and mules. A central plaza had been laid out and titles issued to thirteen town lots when a flood on June 5, 1808, nearly wiped out the nascent community. The colony held out for several years, but harassment by Comanche and Tonkawa Indians finally forced its abandonment in 1812.  
**Time period:** 1808-1812  
**Ownership:** Private
Name: San Marcos Spring

Historic use type: Paraje

Description: This paraje was used by several of the early expeditions into Texas. Domingo Terán de los Ríos and Father Damián Massanet (1693), Governor Gregorio de Salinas Varona (1693), and Captain Pedro de Aguirre and Father Isidro Félix Espinosa (1709) were some of the many who camped at this site. Immense springs rise at the Balcones Escarpment, a geologic fault that slices across the state, separating upland from lowland Texas. The abundance of freshwater attracted American Indians of the Central Texas region, and later European explorers and settlers. The name San Marcos first appears in the records of the Alonso de León Expedition of April 26, 1689 (Saint Mark’s Day), marking another Texas river; it was first applied to this river in 1709. Following later explorations, several Spanish missions were temporarily located here in 1755.

Time period: 1700s

Ownership: Public (Texas State University)

Name: Willow Springs Creek Crossing

Historic use type: River crossing

Description: This archeological site yielded lithic scatter near a ford of El Camino Real de los Tejas, and includes a well-preserved segment of the trail.

Time period: 1690s

Ownership: Public (Texas Department of Transportation)

Houston County

Name: Hurricane Shoals

Historic use type: River crossing

Description: Corbin and Williams believe this river crossing is located at Kickapoo Shoals (Kickapoo Rapids), and that the crossing was used by the 1716 Ramon Expedition. Montgomery (1995) notes that he found maps showing that one of the routes of the La Bahia Road passed through Walker County to join the Kickapoo Shoals Crossing. Recent research conducted by Historian Robert Weddle confirms the site’s relationship to the historic period of the trail.

Time period: 1600s

Ownership: Private

Name: Rattlesnake Ranch Swale

Historic use type: Trail swale

Description: Archeological investigation has established a historic relationship to the trail. It is a short segment. Visual integrity is partially compromised due to the presence of oil-drilling equipment on the site.

Time period: 1700–1800s

Ownership: Private
Karnes County

Name: Carvajal Crossing  
**Historic use type:** Creek crossing  
**Description:** This rock-bottomed ford across Cibolo Creek in north central Karnes County was the best-known ford along the old cart road that traveled from the Texas coast to San Antonio. Situated halfway between Goliad and San Antonio, the crossing was close to the old Fuerte del Cibolo (also known as Fuerte del Santa Cruz) and the ranch headquarters of Andrés Hernández, who may have owned the first ranch in Texas. According to old maps and journals, at different times the crossing was called Tawakoni Crossing, the Crossing of the Tehuacanas, or Cibolo Crossing. About 1830, José Luis Carvajal, scion of a Canary Island family from San Antonio, acquired the ranch property adjoining the crossing; since that time the ford has been called Carvajal Crossing. The crossing is located south of the Farm to Market Road 887 bridge over Cibolo Creek.  
**Time period:** 1700s  
**Ownership:** Private

Name: Fuerte del Cibolo  
**Historic use type:** Fort  
**Description:** This fort was not a formally designated presidio; however, it played an important role in protecting San Antonio and La Bahía at a time of increasing Spanish settlement in this area, following the decommission of missions and presidios in East Texas, including Orcoquisac/Anahuac, San Sabá, and Cañón. The original fort may have been established in 1735 and abandoned in 1737, but it is not clear if it was reestablished on the same site. Fuerte del Cibolo was located at a natural ford of Cibolo Creek known as Carvajal Crossing (see above entry). This fort likely had more than one location and has been confirmed archeologically.  
**Time period:** 1770s–1780s  
**Ownership:** Private

Leon County

Name: Kickapoo Rapids  
**Historic use type:** River crossing  
**Description:** Corbin and Williams believe this river crossing is located at Kickapoo Shoals (Kickapoo Rapids), and that the crossing was used by the 1716 Ramón Expedition. Montgomery (1995) notes that he found maps showing that one of the routes of the La Bahía Road passed through Walker County to join the Kickapoo Shoals Crossing. Recent research conducted by Historian Robert Weddle confirms the site’s relationship to the historic period of the trail.  
**Time period:** 1600s  
**Ownership:** Private

Maverick County

Name: Paso de Francia*  
**Historic use type:** River crossing  
**Description:** This ford of the Río Grande may have been used by Alonso de León’s third entrada in 1689 in search of La Salle’s colony.  
**Time period:** 1689-1836  
**Ownership:** Private
Name: Paso de las Islas*
**Historic use type:** River crossing
**Description:** This ford of the Río Grande was one of five crossings that served Spanish travelers between San Juan Bautista at the site of present Guerrero, Coahuila, and the Texas settlements. At this point the river spreads out in shallow branches that flow among several islands (islas).
**Time period:** 1700s
**Ownership:** Private

Name: Paso de los Pacuaches*
**Historic use type:** River crossing
**Description:** It is located six miles upstream from Paso de Francia near the mouth of Cuervo Creek. During the early years of San Juan Bautista Presidio, it was called the Paso de Diego Ramón. The ford was used by General Adrian Woll and his army when he raided San Antonio in 1842. San Antonio Crossing was the name given to each of several fords on the Río Grande in present Maverick County.
**Time period:** 1691-1916
**Ownership:** Private

* The team responsible for evaluating high potential sites and segments was not able to visit these sites during the evaluation period due to hunting activities on this privately owned property; however, other National Park Service staff from the National Trails Intermountain Region office in Santa Fe and a photographer working in association with this project have visited the river crossing site and confirm its integrity.

**Milam County**

Name: Apache Pass
**Historic use type:** River crossing
**Description:** This historic ford is located within the San Xavier Mission Complex National Archeological District that includes three missions and a presidio. This crossing of the San Gabriel river is near archeological site 41MM10 (a possible presidio) and 41MM18 (possibly Mission Candelaria) and upstream from Missions San Francisco and San Ildefonso. The ford can be easily observed from a point on a suspension bridge just downstream of the crossing.
**Time period:** Unclear
**Ownership:** Private

Name: Mission Nuestra Señora de la Candelaria
**Historic use type:** Mission
**Description:** This mission is listed in the National Register of Historic Places as part of the San Xavier Mission Complex Archeological District. Located on the south bank of the San Gabriel River, it was founded in July 1749 to congregate Coco Indians and their allies, including the Tops and Karankawas. Mission Candelaria had a particularly unfortunate association with the soldiers sent to protect it. When a presidio was established near the mission in 1751 the commander of the presidio, Capt. Felipe de Rábago y Terán, decided upon his arrival that the missions should be moved, and constantly undermined the work of the missionaries. Relations continued to deteriorate as reports of lewd behavior among the Spanish troops spread to the mission community. Mission Candelaria was occupied intermittently by Bidais, Orocoquisas, and Cocos. It was finally abandoned in 1755 after a severe drought and epidemic.
**Time period:** 1749–1755
**Ownership:** Private
Name: Mission San Francisco Xavier de Horcasitas

*Historic use type:* Mission

*Description:* This mission is listed in the National Register of Historic Places as part of the San Xavier Mission Complex Archeological District. The impetus for the mission came in June 1745 when a group of Indians came to San Antonio de Valero to ask for a mission in their own territory. Father Francisco Xavier Ortiz favored the idea because it would convert a new group of Indians, would stop apostates from San Antonio missions from taking refuge with those Indians, and would help break Indian commerce with the French. After a protracted debate over location the viceroy approved and supported the mission establishment. San Francisco Xavier Mission was founded on the south bank of the San Gabriel River in February 1748. It served the Yojuane, Mayeye, Ervipiame, Asinia, Top, and Nabedache groups. Missionary work suffered as a result of conflict between the missionaries and military authorities. A small detachment of soldiers proved inadequate to ward off the frequent Lipan Apache attacks, but royal officials refused to send additional troops. Although the missionaries urged the Viceroy to establish a presidio to guard the missions, they complained about lack of cooperation and the immoral behavior of the soldiers and their commander. In 1752, an attack on Mission Candelaria, which resulted in the deaths of a missionary and a soldier, further undermined morale. Drought and epidemics also plagued the missions between 1752 and 1755 and eventually drove the Spanish to move the presidio and the missions to the San Marcos River in August 1755.

*Time period:* 1746–1756

*Ownership:* Private

Name: Mission San Ildefonso

*Historic use type:* Mission.

*Description:* This mission is listed in the National Register of Historic Places as part of the San Xavier Mission Complex Archeological District. Begun on December 27, 1748, and formally established on February 25, 1749, it was located on the south bank of the San Gabriel River, near the mouth of Brushy Creek (Arroyo de las Ánimas). Gathered at this site were Orocquisac, Bidai, and Deadose Indians, who spoke a similar dialect and intermarried. These Indians had extensive trading contacts with the French, and when the mission ran out of food the soldiers and missionaries were forced to trade with the Indians for supplies. Missionaries claimed this undermined their authority with their neophytes. A group of Coco Indians, also gathered here awaiting establishment of a separate mission, fled in March 1749 because of harassment from soldiers charged with protecting the missions. The remaining Indian groups, unable to adjust to sedentary life, left the mission in October 1749. Missionaries managed to recongregate the Indians by 1750, but shortly after the Indians abandoned this mission to join their allies in a campaign against the Apaches. The missionary in charge of San Ildefonso, Father Juan José Ganzabal, was killed at Mission Candelaria in 1752. This incident did much to destroy the morale of both the missionaries and the Indians. When the Bidais tried to return to the mission in 1753, the fathers sent them back to their lands because the mission lacked supplies. In August 1755 unhealthy conditions at the site forced the missions and the presidio to withdraw to the San Marcos River.

*Time period:* 1749–1755

*Ownership:* Private

Name: Presidio San Francisco Xavier de Gigedo

*Historic use type:* Presidio

*Description:* This property, listed in the National Register as part of the San Xavier Mission Complex Archeological District was a Spanish military outpost founded on March 30, 1751, on the south bank of the San Gabriel River to protect and aid the San Xavier missions. The garrison remained at the presidio until 1755, when disease and drought forced the soldiers to flee with the missionaries and their neophytes to the San Marcos River.

*Time period:* 1750–1757

*Ownership:* Private
Name: Sugarloaf Mountain  
**Historic use type:** Natural landmark  
**Description:** It is located near the confluence of the Little and Brazos rivers where a system of trails developed by American Indians was eventually used by the Spanish until late in the 18th Century. The hill is capped with red sandstone and overflows a broad stretch of the floodplain. This landmark is apparently linked to the Ervipiame who were eventually absorbed by the Tonkawa, who refer to Sugarloaf as Turtle Mountain. References to this landscape feature date from the 1750s.  
**Time period:** 1700s  
**Ownership:** Private

Nacogdoches County

Name: Acosta-Durst-Taylor House  
**Historic use type:** House  
**Description:** Archeological investigations have shown that the 1820s-era Durst-Taylor House was built upon the dirt floor belonging to the 1790s-era Acosta House that preceded it.  
**Time period:** 1790s  
**Ownership:** Public (City of Nacogdoches)

Name: Adolphus Stern House  
**Historic use type:** House  
**Description:** This state historic landmark is listed in the National Register Historic Properties. It consists of a 19th-century house that belonged to Adolphus Stern, a prolific writer who took part in the Fredonia Rebellion. Archeological investigations verify the authenticity of the structure. It is now a private museum, open to the public.  
**Time period:** 1820s  
**Ownership:** Private

Name: Bernardo D’Ortolan Rancho and Swales  
**Historic use type:** Ranch  
**Description:** This site is associated with the Spanish Colonial–period ranch belonging to Bernardo D’Ortolan. This site contains swales, the main ranch house and out buildings occupied by Bernardo D’Ortolan from 1796 until he left Texas as a result of his involvement with the failed Magee-Gutiérrez Rebellion in 1813. This ranch is significant because it one of the only Spanish ranchos ever to be identified with archeological remains on the eastern segments of El Camino Real de los Tejas.  
**Time period:** 1796–1840s  
**Ownership:** Private

Name: Mission Nuestra Señora de la Purísima Concepción de los Hainais (Gallant Falls)  
**Historic use type:** Mission  
**Description:** It is the oldest Mission site yet discovered in Spanish Texas, the oldest European site yet discovered in East Texas and the oldest site yet discovered known to bear the name Tejas. It served as the headquarters of the three western College of Queretaro Missions under the direction of Fray Isidro Félix Espinosa.  
**Time period:** 1716-1730  
**Ownership:** Private
Name: Old Stone Fort/La Casa de Piedra  
**Historic use type:** Trading post  
**Description:** Built by Antonio Gil Y’Barbo as a market or storage area for the town of Nacogdoches, the trading post is located on Old San Antonio Road and La Calle del Norte. This location may have also been associated with the Barr and Davenport Trading Post. The original post was torn down in 1902. The Stone Fort Museum is a replica constructed on the grounds of Stephen F. Austin State University.  
**Time period:** 1779–1902  
**Ownership:** Public (Stephen F. Austin State University)

Name: Pocket Park Site  
**Historic use type:** House site  
**Description:** This is a site with Spanish Colonial–period artifacts.  
**Time period:** 1700–1800s  
**Ownership:** Public (City of Nacogdoches)

Name: Washington Square Moundsite  
**Historic use type:** Burial and temple site  
**Description:** This is a Southeastern Ceremonial Complex affiliated with the Caddo Nation of Oklahoma. The ceramic styles are identified as Caddo, which date approximately from A.D. 1200 to 1400. In 1985, human remains representing a minimum of three individuals were removed from two burials at the Washington Square Site in Nacogdoches during excavations under the direction of Dr. James Corbin. No known individuals were identified. The 122 associated funerary objects included 49 ceramic vessels; marine shell beads and fragments, one pendant, and several tools.  
**Time period:** Pre-1700s  
**Ownership:** Public (Nacogdoches Independent School District)

**Rusk County**

Name: Mission San José de los Nazonis  
**Historic use type:** Mission  
**Description:** This mission was founded by the Domingo Ramón Expedition in 1716. It served the Nazoni Indians, on a branch of Shawnee Creek, in what became northwestern Nacogdoches County. The mission was abandoned in 1719, following French incursions from Louisiana, but was restored by the Marqués de Aguayo in 1721. In 1730, it was removed to the Colorado River in Texas, near the site of Austin’s Zilker Park, where it stood alongside the San Francisco de los Neches and Nuestra Señora de la Purísima Concepción de los Hasinai missions. The following year, all three Austin missions were moved to the San Antonio River and reestablished as San Juan Capistrano Mission.  
**Time period:** 18th century  
**Ownership:** Private

**Sabine County**

Name: Oliphant House  
**Historic use type:** Residence of ferry operator  
**Description:** Listed in the National Register the Oliphant House was built in 1818 and is one of the earliest pre-Republic, Anglo-American structures in Texas. The log house, once part of the early settlement of Gaines Ferry, is the only surviving structure of James Gaines’ large plantation and ferry-tavern enterprise on the Sabine River crossing of the El Camino Real. James Gaines built the house for his in-laws.  
**Time period:** 1800s  
**Ownership:** Private (Daughters of the Republic of Texas)

**San Augustine County**

Name: Garrett Trace
Historic use type: Trail swale
Description: The trail swale is located in front of a two-story house belonging to William Garrett (1808–1884) that is now a state historic landmark. Garrett purchased this land soon after coming to Texas in 1830. In 1861, he erected the house using pine boards from his nearby sawmill. Built by slave labor, the structure had unusual free-standing columns in front and carved mantels over its six fireplaces. Garrett’s home was often a stop for travelers on the Old San Antonio Road.
Time period: 1700–1800s
Ownership: Private

Name: Mission Nuestra Señora de los Dolores de los Ais, 2nd Site
Historic use type: Mission
Description: This National Register property and state historic landmark was first established in January of 1717. It was abandoned in 1719 with the advent of hostilities between Spain and France. When the mission was reestablished in August 1722, Father Antonio Margil de Jesús moved it east of the previous site near a stream and a large tract of level land that could be used for cultivation. Recent research has located the site on a hill next to Ayish Bayou within the present city limits of San Augustine. Archeological research has enhanced our view of everyday life at Mission Dolores. Cow and ox bones, common in the excavated trash pits, give clues on butchering techniques and preferred cuts of meat. Such recovered items as gun flints and other parts, broken knife blades, and horse trappings were probably associated with the soldier guards living at the mission. Pieces of broken pottery, especially Indian-made wares, are plentiful. It would appear that the inhabitants relied heavily on locally made utensils.
Time period: 1717–1773
Ownership: Public

Travis County

Name: McKinney Falls State Park/Onion Creek Crossing
Historic use type: Road swale
Description: The arroyo/Río de las Garrapatas (present-day Onion Creek) was first described in 1709 by Father Isidro Félix Espinosa with the Olivares-Aguirre expedition, and it is mentioned in several other Spanish texts. Recent research conducted by Robert Weddle reveals that in 1716 the expedition of Domingo Ramón followed the left bank of Onion Creek along the western edge of McKinney Falls State Park to its junction with Williamson Creek. Recent images clearly document the rock indentations that resulted from extensive use of the area.
Time period: 1700–1800s
Ownership: Public (Texas Parks and Wildlife Department)

Victoria County

Name: Guadalupe River Dam
Historic use type: Irrigation structure
Description: This irrigation structure is associated with a significant mission site and is listed in the National Register of Historic Places.
Time period: ca. 1726–1749
Ownership: Private
Name: Mission Creek Dam and Acequia Site  
**Historic use type:** Irrigation structure  
**Description:** This is a dam reportedly constructed by Araname Indian converts from the nearby mission. It is listed in National Register of Historic Places.  
**Time period:** ca. 1726–1749  
**Ownership:** Private

Name: Mission Espíritu Santo de Zúñiga Quarry  
**Historic use type:** Quarry  
**Description:** This Spanish quarry is associated with important local missions closely tied to the early history of the trail.  
**Time period:** ca. 1722–1749  
**Ownership:** Private

Name: Mission Nuestra Señora del Espíritu Santo de Zúñiga (Tonkawa Bank), 2nd Site  
**Historic use type:** Mission  
**Description:** This mission is listed in the National Register of Historic Places. It was moved from the original location on Garcitas Creek around 1726. It was constructed of mortared stone on a bluff called Tonkawa Bank near a popular low-water crossing. The original mission, which appears in Spanish records also as La Bahía del Espíritu Santo de Zúñiga, was a reference to its location on La Bahía del Espíritu Santo (the Bay of the Holy Spirit, now called Matagorda Bay and Lavaca Bay) and also honored Báltasar de Zúñiga, viceroy of New Spain. The establishment remained at its original site only about four years and was relocated at least twice. As early as April 1725 the padres recommended moving it and its presidio to a location more favorable to their missionary efforts. They had been unable to induce the wandering Karankawas to accept Christian teachings or stay at the mission, and there had also been incidents of ill feeling and violence between the Indians and the Spaniards.  
**Time period:** 1725–1726  
**Ownership:** Private

Name: Mission Nuestra Señora del Espíritu Santo de Zúñiga, 3rd Site  
**Historic use type:** Mission  
**Description:** This mission was occupied from 1726-1749 by Franciscan missionaries along with Aranama and Tamique Indians. The archeological record of the mission offers a unique opportunity to examine the processes of change at work and their effects on both the mission Indians and the friars. Through the examination of the material and faunal remains, questions of the effects of contact and long-term interaction are addressed. This research adds to our knowledge of the mission era in south Texas and contributes to the cultural history of Texas. This site is also significant for its extensive ruins that have not been reconstructed as most missions with standing architecture were during the WPA years. It represents an excellent example of unaltered Spanish Colonial Architecture.  
**Time period:** ca. 1726–1749  
**Ownership:** Private
Name: Presidio Nuestra Señora Santa María de Loreto de la Bahía del Espíritu Santo, 1st Site (Fort Saint Louis)

**Historic use type:** Presidio

**Description:** This site, listed in National Register of Historic Places, was the original location of French Fort St Louis established by La Salle in 1685. When the Spanish finally discovered the remains of the French settlement in 1689, they buried the cannons and burned the buildings. The Spanish established a presidio on the site in April 4, 1721, when Capt. Domingo Ramón occupied the site of La Salle’s Texas Settlement on the right bank of Garcitas Creek five miles above its mouth in Lavaca Bay. Ramón, as part of the Marqués de San Miguel de Aguayo expedition, was to hold this crucial site while the main thrust of the expedition, led by Aguayo, proceeded into East Texas. Aguayo’s purpose was to drive out any French and reestablish the missions abandoned in 1719. A year after Ramón’s occupation, on April 6, 1722, Aguayo laid out the plan for construction of fortifications at the La Salle settlement site. The new presidio was to guard the coast against possible French intrusion: a prescient move in view of the fact that French maritime expeditions had probed the coast in 1720 and 1721, seeking “La Salle’s bay” with expectations of building fortifications. Faced with continuing troubles with the Karankawas, authorities moved both the mission and presidio in 1726 to the Guadalupe River.

**Time period:** 1721–1726

**Ownership:** Private

---

Name: Presidio Nuestra Señora de Loreto de la Bahía, 2nd Site

**Historic use type:** Presidio

**Description:** This is the second site of the Presidio Nuestra Señora de Loreto de la Bahía.

**Time period:** 1726–1749

**Ownership:** Private

---

**Webb County**

Name: El Paso de Jacinto/Paso de los Indios

**Historic use:** River crossing

**Description:** Around 1746, explorer Jacinto de León discovered a ford that allowed safe passage across the Río Grande in this vicinity. It came to be known as Paso de Jacinto, but it had probably been used for centuries before by American Indians. The Laredo community, which began as a ranch established by Tomás Tadeo Sánchez de la Barrera, grew up around it. In 1754, colonizer Jose de Escandón asked Sánchez to find a place for a settlement along the Nueces River. Sanchez failed to identify a suitable location on the Nueces, and instead, in May 1755, settled along the Río Grande, downstream of Paso de Jacinto. Two years later, Agustín López de la Cámara Alta reported that the settlement at the crossing was important in sustaining what had become a major business and military route across the Río Grande. He also stated that the settlers’ pursuits mainly involved breeding cattle and gathering salt from regional salt lakes. By the turn of the 19th century, the crossing was marked on maps as Paso de los Indios; a century later, the Old Indian Crossing, as it was known in English, was a well-known landmark near the northern edge of Fort McIntosh. In 1757, this ford was recorded by Tienda de Cuervo as the crossing used by people with horses.

**Time period:** 1740s

**Ownership:** Private (Laredo Community College allows public access to the site)

---

Name: Rancho los Ojuelos

**Historic use type:** Ranch

**Description:** This National Historic district consists of 13 stone houses (several in ruins) constructed from hewn sandstone blocks, chinked and plastered, ranging from rectangular flat roofed Colonial Style buildings to hip roofed two room structures. It was temporarily settled in 1810 by Eugenio Gutierrez who received a grant from the Spanish Crown for two sitios (ca. 8,856 acres). The ranch headquarters were located near a large natural spring (ojuelos). This site is a good example of the type of multipurpose hacienda (socio-economic-agricultural-religious establishment) that evolved close to Dolores in South Texas, adjacent to the Río Grande.

**Time period:** Post-1750s

**Ownership:** Private

---

Name: Republic of the Río Grande Museum/Villa Antigua Border Heritage Museum
Historic use type: Residences
Description: Located in the downtown San Agustin Historical District it was once the Republic of the Rio Grande capitol building. It now showcases memorabilia from the short-lived Republic of the Rio Grande and displays pictures, books, and furniture from the 19th century Laredo area. There are three restored rooms: an office and sitting area, a bedroom, and a kitchen. Casa Ortiz, a component of this complex, is a state historic landmark.
Time period: 1800s
Ownership: Private (Webb County Heritage Foundation), but open to the public.

Name: San José de Palafox
Historic use type: Village/town/paraje
Description: This National Register Archeological and Historic District was an unsuccessful settlement on land that the Spanish crown granted to Mexican settlers during the early nineteenth century. In 1810 the Spanish government ordered the establishment of a new town on the margin of the Rio Grande, named Palafox, in honor of a Spanish general, Francisco de Palafox y Melci. Juan José Díaz was to administer justice and distribute land to settlers, mostly families from the older settlements of Coahuila, though no money was available to fund the construction of public buildings. The settlers themselves built a church in the center of town. The townspeople prospered by raising livestock, especially sheep and goats, and the town grew from almost 240 inhabitants in 1815 to 277 by the end of 1816. The townspeople, however, soon faced depredations by Comanches who burned the village in 1818. Some families returned by 1824, and in 1826 sixty soldiers were ordered to Palafox to build barracks, but the town was finally destroyed in 1829.
Time period: 1700s
Ownership: Private
Note: The evaluating team was not granted permission to access this site.

Wilson County

Name: Rancho de las Cabras
Historic use type: Ranch
Description: This National Register Property and State Archeological Landmark is a ranching outpost of the San Francisco de la Espada Mission in San Antonio. Missionaries and Indians raised livestock at the ranch from 1731 to 1794. The site originally included fortifications and a chapel, but only a few foundations remain. It was located on the west bank route of the Bexar–La Bahía Road.
Time period: 1700s
Ownership: Public (National Park Service)

Zapata County

Name: Jesús Treviño Fort and Ranch
Historic use type: Fort and ranch
Description: This site is a national historic landmark. It was settled in 1830 by former residents of Revilla (now Nuevo Guerrero, Tamaulipas) under the leadership of Jesús Treviño. The site was in the southwest corner of the original Hacienda de Dolores, a grant made in 1750 by Col. José de Escandón to José Vázquez Borrego, and was named for the patron saint of Guerrero, Saint Ignatius Loyola. In 1830 Treviño built a sandstone home, known as Fort Treviño, 100 by 140 feet. José Villarreal placed a sundial at the home in 1851; the timepiece has become a tourist attraction. San Ygnacio became a center of trade by the mid-1800s, and the town was the scene of several border skirmishes throughout the years.
Time period: 1830s
Ownership: Private
Name: Nuestra Señora de los Dolores Hacienda/Rancho Viejo/Dolores Viejo

**Historic use type:** Village/ranch

**Description:** This National Historic Register property was a ranch settlement crucial to the Spanish colonial government plan to settle a region between the Nueces River in the north and Tampico in the south. In 1750 the Hacienda de Nuestra Señora de los Dolores was founded by a grant of land from the crown of Spain to José Vázquez Borrego, a wealthy rancher from Coahuila. This settlement, at the junction of Dolores Creek and the Rio Grande, is considered to be the first Spanish colonial venture on the north bank of the Rio Grande. The name Hacienda Dolores dates to 1757, when the settlement was so labeled by José Tienda de Cuervo on his inspection tour of the newly founded settlements that were part of the colonizing program of José de Escandón. However, given the fact that Dolores was the headquarters for an outpost ranching operation and that the owner, Vázquez Borrego, lived at his Hacienda de San Juan del Álamo in Coahuila, it might more properly be called Rancho Dolores.

**Time period:** 1750–1851

**Ownership:** Private

**Note:** The evaluating team was not granted permission to access this site.

Name: San José de los Corralitos

**Historic use type:** Residence

**Description:** This property is listed in the National Register of Historic Places. The first building erected on this land grant was a fortified ranch structure to protect the family from Indians and marauders from across the Rio Grande. It dates from 1753, when Colonel José de Escandón donated a 350,000-acre grant, a portion of which would eventually become the village of Corralitos (little corrals) and part of an effort to hold title to the Borrego family grant known originally as Nuestra Señora de los Dolores. Don José Fernando Vidaurri, grandson of the original Borrego grant owner, built the single-room dwelling of sandstone, mud mortar, mesquite and Montezuma cypress. It had 33-inch thick walls; one door on the east elevation; no windows; six gun ports; and a flat, 11-foot tall ceiling. The gun ports facilitated the muzzle of a black-powder firearm, which extended through the opening to be visible from the outside.

**Time period:** Post-1750

**Ownership:** Private (It is open to the public and is part of the National Ranching Heritage Center, Texas Tech University in Lubbock)
Map 1: El Camino Real de los Tejas National Historic Trail Map
Map 2: Historic Routes of the *caminos reales* and the Old San Antonio Road