

1985

Demographic Patterns and Changes in Mid-Seventeenth Century Timucua and Apalchee

John H. Hann



Part of the [American Studies Commons](#), and the [United States History Commons](#)

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/fhq>

University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Florida Historical Quarterly by an authorized editor of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

Recommended Citation

Hann, John H. (1985) "Demographic Patterns and Changes in Mid-Seventeenth Century Timucua and Apalchee," *Florida Historical Quarterly*. Vol. 64 : No. 4 , Article 3.

Available at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/fhq/vol64/iss4/3>

DEMOGRAPHIC PATTERNS AND CHANGES IN MID-SEVENTEENTH CENTURY TIMUCUA AND APALACHEE

by JOHN H. HANN

SURPRISINGLY little is known about the village patterns of northern Florida's natives prior to their missionization or about the settlement policy followed by the friars during the formation of the Florida mission chains. This is particularly true for the inland missions of Potano, Utina, Ustaca, and Apalachee. There is no evidence that the Florida Franciscans followed the "reduction"¹ approach of their Jesuit contemporaries in the South American mission provinces of Guaira, Itatin, Tape and Paraguay, whose people had a material culture roughly similar to that of North Florida's missionized tribes.² Thus, it is generally assumed that the friars adapted their mission organization in Florida to the aboriginal settlement pattern, setting up their mission centers in a principal village of the district. From there the friars went out to catechise the natives in nearby subordinate villages, which became known as *visitas*, rather than insisting that those natives move to the mission center, which was called a *doctrina*.³ Only after the establishment of these missions, when most of the natives of the mission zone had already been Christianized, are there indications that some of the Indians did change their domicile at the instigation of the Spaniards. But in those cases the moves were inspired by secular rather than reli-

John H. Hann is historic site specialist at the San Luis Archaeological and Historic Site, Division of Archives, History and Records Management, Department of State, Tallahassee. He was formerly professor of Latin American history at Florida State University.

1. The "reduction" system was the concentration of scattered, often seasonally, nomadic native populations at mission centers located usually at sites chosen by the priests, at which the natives were expected to live year-round.
2. These missions spread over much of the Parana-Paraguay Basin of what is today southern and southwestern Brazil, Paraguay, and northeastern Argentina.
3. *Visitas*, however, were not always subordinate villages. And once the people of a *visita* had been Christianized, they were expected to come to the *doctrina* for Sunday mass when those *visitas* were reasonably close to the center.

gious authorities. One parallel, however, to the Jesuit's policy in the South American interior was the Franciscans' attempt at mid-century to isolate their charges in Apalachee from contact with any Spaniards other than themselves by excluding soldiers and settlers from that province.

In contrast to the prevailing paucity of information on settlement patterns, the record of Governor Diego de Rebolledo's 1657 visitation of Apalachee and Timucua provides information on this topic. Although that visitation record has been mined extensively during the last two decades for two dissertations and for a number of journal articles, a valuable aspect of that document's contents has not yet received much attention.⁴ This is its depiction of the settlement pattern in the two provinces and its indication of drastic decline and dislocation in western Timucua's population.

For Apalachee the village distribution pattern reflected in this 1657 document, and in other later ones, mirrors the less well defined one presented in the De Soto chronicles. The pattern is one of a considerable number of more or less autonomous principal villages surrounded by subordinate or satellite villages, hamlets, and individual farmsteads scattered through the countryside.⁵ Among the Timucuan, by contrast, many villages and their chiefs were united under a regional tribal chief who enjoyed considerable authority throughout the area.⁶ In the 1650s a friar referred to these Timucuan tribal chiefs as having been like emperors and absolute lords when they were pagans.⁷

4 . Fred Lamar Pearson, Jr., "Spanish-Indian Relations in Florida: A Study of Two Visitas, 1657-1678" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Alabama, 1968); Robert Allen Matter, "The Spanish Missions of Florida, the Friars Versus the Governors in the 'Golden Age', 1606-1690" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Washington, 1972).

5 . A caution is in order. There is no categorical description of the Apalachees political organization either during the De Soto intrusion or during the mission era such as there is for other groups in the southeast. In using such scintilla as is available, these limitations must be considered.

6 . Jerald T. Milanich, "The Western Timucua: Patterns of Acculturation and Change," in Jerald T. Milanich and Samuel Proctor: *Tacachale, Essays on the Indian of Florida and Southeastern Georgia during the Historical Period* (Gainesville, 1978), 67.

7 . Fray Juan Gómez de Engraba to Fray Francisco Martínez, March 13, 1657, Archivo General de Indias, Seville (hereinafter AGI) 54-5-10, in the Woodbury Lowery Collection (hereinafter WLC) mf. reel III. Most of the material cited from this collection was viewed on the microfilm copy held by the Florida State University, which is contained in four reels in contrast to the

But soon after the establishment of the missions, Timucuan political organization became decentralized as the tribal level organization declined in importance or disappeared entirely.⁸ For extraordinary situations some vestige of that tradition appears to have survived until the 1650s. The same friar who characterized the Timucuan tribal chiefs as having been absolute lords in pagan times and who seemingly implied that they had largely lost that position also noted that during the 1656 revolt, "while being Christian, they still recognized him as such an absolute lord, and as a result many other chiefs and leading-men and vassals followed him."⁹ This tribal leader was the Utinan chief of San Martín de Ayaocuto. In 1607 another friar had described him as the chief of more than twenty villages.¹⁰

The 1657 visitation record identifies twenty-nine western Timucuan villages and thirty-four or thirty-five Apalachee villages.¹¹ The completeness of that listing for western Timucua remains an unknown, as the assembling of the Timucuan chiefs took place soon after the 1656 rebellion during which eleven chiefs were hanged and a number of villages depopulated. And for Timucua there is no pre-rebellion estimate of the total number of either the missions or the native villages for comparison with the figure from 1657. For Apalachee, by contrast, it is evident that the 1657 identification of thirty-four or five separate villages represents most of the forty-some settlements the province was said to contain a decade earlier.¹² And for Apalachee, all the missions mentioned in 1657, along with a number of their satellites, appear on the various subsequent

P. K. Yonge Library's copy which is spread over seven reels. Whenever the writer has used transcriptions made from the P. K. Yonge Library's copy, he has changed the reel citation to conform to that of the Florida State University copy.

8. Milanich, "The Western Timucua," 67.
9. Gómez de Engraba to Martínez, March 13, 1657, AGI 54-5-10, WLC, reel III.
10. Luis Gerónimo de Oré, OFM, *The Martyrs of Florida* (1513-1616) trans., Maynard Geiger, OFM (New York, 1936), 114.
11. Diego de Rebilledo, Testimony from the Visitation That Was Made in the Provinces of Apalache and Timucua and Ustaca, 1657, AGI Escribanía de Cámara (hereinafter EC), leg. 155B, Stetson Collection (hereinafter SC). Inasmuch as this document and the pieces appended to it are the major source for this article, the material drawn from it will not be footnoted hereinafter when it is clear that this document is its source, in order to avoid a plethora of repetitious footnotes.
12. Royal Officials of Florida to king, March 18, 1647, AGI 54-5-14/105, SC.

mission lists for the rest of the century, whereas the roster for Timucua shrank steadily.

In Apalachee the governor himself, in the course of the visitation, traveled successively to all ten of the missions then in existence there. The chiefs and the leading-men of the twenty-four satellite villages identified were required to assemble in the principal council house of the mission village under whose jurisdiction they fell.¹³ Inasmuch as the governor began the inspection at the western end of the province in Cupaica, it is probable that he had already visited all or most of the missions on the royal road as he traveled westward to reach San Luis and Cupaica.¹⁴ In Timucua, however, Governor Rebolledo did not carry out an inspection of each mission village. Instead he instructed Matheo Luis de Florencia, a Spaniard from San Luis, to visit the Timucuan villages to summon those surviving chiefs who remained loyal and those who had been newly installed to a general visitation to be held by the governor at San Pedro de Potohixiba.¹⁵

The following Timucuan villages were represented at this meeting together with their respective native leaders.¹⁶

I- SAN PEDRO DE POTOHIXIBA— Diego Heba, principal chief

1. Santa Ana— María Meléndez, chieftainess.

II- CHAMILE AND SAN MARTÍN— Lázaro, principal chief

1. Cachipile— Francisco, chief

2. Chuaquin— Lorenzo, chief

III- AXAPAJA AND SANTA FÉE— Alonso Pastrana, principal chief

1. San Francisco Potano— Domingo, chief

13. There probably were more satellite villages than were identified here as the naming of such villages was consequent on the naming of the chief. In the chief's absence the settlement was not named.

14. Such a prior consultation with the native leaders is indicated by the governor's issuance of his regulations to deal with the province's problems and complaints at the completion of the visitation of Cupaica. Usually such regulations were issued only after all the villages had been heard formally.

15. The spelling of native names varies considerably from document to document. In quotations the spelling used by the source will be retained; otherwise a standard spelling based on one commonly found in the documents will be used. Potohiriba was here spelled Potohixiba. The 'x' here and elsewhere could be either an 'r' or a 'j'.

16. Upper case denotes the villages whose chiefs were identified as principal chiefs.

2. San Pablo– Francisco Alonso, chief
 3. San Juan– Juan Bautista, chief
- IV- SANTA ELENA DE MACHABA– Pedro Meléndez, principal chief
1. San Joseph– Sevastian, chief
 2. San Lorenço– Dionisio, chief
- V- SAN MATHEO– Sevastian, principal chief
1. San Francisco– Francisco, chief
 2. San Miguel– Francisco Alonso, chief
 3. Santa Lucia– Francisco, chief
 4. San Diego– Francisco, chief
 5. Santa Fé– Antonio, chief
 6. San Pablo– Bernabé, chief
 7. San Francisco– Francisco, chief
 8. San Lucas– Lucas, chief
 9. San Matheo– Santiago, chief
- VI- San Agustín [de Urica?]- Domingo, chief¹⁷
- VII- NIHAYCA– Lucia, principal chieftainess
- VIII- TARI– No leader in attendance¹⁸
1. San Pedro de Aqualiro– Martín, chief
- IX- Santa María-Alexo, chief, and Alonso, leading-man

Analysis of this listing and of the meager content of the visitation record for Timucua and other sources suggests several conclusions and raises many questions. Among the twenty-nine villages, Potohiriba, Potano, Santa Fé de Toloca, Machaba, Chuaquin, Tarihica, and San Matheo have been identified as having participated in the 1656 revolt. Guacara, not mentioned on this list, has also been identified as one of the rebellious settlements. Guacara's absence from the 1657 list, together with its identification as one of the vital communication links still in need of being resurrected at the end of 1659, suggests that by 1657 its people either had taken flight or had been obliterated during the fighting that accompanied the rebellion or during

17. The position of this village and its leader, as well as that of Santa María, is anomalous. Neither chief was given the title of principal chief, but neither were they said to belong to another's jurisdiction.

18. Tari was not mentioned during the main general visitation session, but Florencia was instructed to visit Tari to deliver the summons to the general visitation. The chiefs of Aqualiro and Santa María (IX) appear to have arrived late as they were given a separate interview.

the plagues that preceded and followed the revolt. Situated where one of the trails crossed the Suwannee, Guacara would have been particularly exposed to traveller-borne pathogens. San Francisco Potano, Santa Fé, and San Martín were other communication links identified as being in need of resurrection at the end of 1659.¹⁹ Tari's inclusion among those to be summoned to the general visitation seemingly indicates that the village had survived to some degree. But the absence of the leader of the principal village of Tari suggests that the leadership element and many of the people had taken to the woods. If apprehended, Tari's chief would likely have been executed. He had been the first to voice opposition to Governor Rebolledo's orders that would lead to revolt. But it was San Martín's chief who initiated the armed rebellion in protest of the governor's policy when Rebolledo spurned the native leaders' objections to his demand that leading-men, as well as ordinary Indians called to St. Augustine for labor details, should carry seventy-five pounds of corn with them. This seems to indicate that the chief of San Martín still held something of the leadership position attributed to that village's chief in 1607, when he was described as the head chief of twenty Timucuan, i.e. presumably Utinan settlements.²⁰ However, both this reference to San Martín's chief in 1607 and his role in the 1656 rebellion suggest that in wartime his leadership may have extended beyond Utina. It was this chief's war with Apalachee, which the friars viewed as a hindrance to their work in western Timucua, that moved Fray Martín Prieto to journey to Apalachee's Ivitachuco in 1608 to establish peace between the warring Apalachee and western Timucuan.²¹

The depopulation of San Martín, along with the disappearance of its leadership element is confirmed by the visitation record. The reason for the pairing of Chamile and San Martín on this list was Chief Lázaro Chamile's agreement to move with the inhabitants of his village almost 100 miles to the east to occupy

19. Gómez de Engraba to Martínez, March 13, 1657, and April 4, 1657; Domingo de Leturiondo (partial report on the service-record of Captain Juan Francisco de Florencia, January 29, 1671), AGI 54-5-10, WLC, reels III and IV.

20. Gómez de Engraba to Martínez, March 13, 1657, and April 4, 1657, AGI 54-5-10, WLC, reel III; Oré, *The Martyrs*, 114.

21. Oré, *The Martyrs*, 114-16.

the presumably deserted settlement of San Martín. In agreeing to the move, Chief Chamile asked the governor to prohibit any encroachment by other natives on the lands he was leaving behind. He wished to maintain control over them so that his people might hunt and gather fruit there. The visitation record does not make clear whether the people of Chamile's satellite villages of Cachipile and Chuaquin were to accompany him on this migration, but their denomination as satellites would seem to imply that. On the 1655 mission list both had been identified as mission centers under the names San Francisco de Chuaquin and Santa Cruz de Cachipile, located sixty and seventy leagues respectively from St. Augustine. Chamile, presumably, is the San Ildefonso de Chamini of the 1655 list, which also was seventy leagues from St. Augustine. In 1662 some friars noted that most of the transplanted Indians had fled to the woods to live with pagan natives. Observing that some had died there in apostasy, the friars requested that the survivors be returned to their former homes. Though the records do not indicate whether any of Chamile's people did return to their home villages, the lack of any further mention of Chamile, Chuaquin, or Cachipile suggests that they did not.²²

Nihayca's identity raises some questions. No village name with that spelling appears on any earlier or later mission list or in Swanton's catalogue, of Timucuan village names. Pearson's rendering of the name as Nihoica is similar enough to Ajoica to suggest that Nihayca could be Ajoica. This in turn would mean that Ajoica as a mission center goes back beyond the circa-1660 foundation date generally assigned to it.²³

The Potano region also experienced a desolation similar to that suffered by San Martín. That Arapaja and Santa Fé were being fused in a manner similar to the fusion of Chamile and San Martín is revealed by Chief Pastrana's request for the same rights as Chamile's to the lands he was abandoning. Although Pastrana's prior identification with Arapaja is not clearly delineated, this move also seems to have involved the migration southeastward of an Utinan people who had been living seventy leagues from St. Augustine to a site only thirty leagues distant

22. Charles W. Spellman, "The Golden Age of the Florida Missions 1632-1674," *Catholic Historical Review*, LI (October, 1963), 355.

23. Pearson, "Spanish Indian Relations," 109; Milanich, "The Western Timucua," 72.

from Spanish Florida's capital. Although San Francisco Potano had survived the debacle of 1656 and the preceding epidemics, its decline and/or its punishment is reflected in its reduction to the status of a village subordinate to the new Utinan principal chief of Santa Fé.

In an early August 1657 reply to charges by the friars, Governor Rebolledo attested to the sharp decrease in Timucua's population, noting that the opportunity for conversions and the number of people needing the services of the friars had diminished both there and in Guale. He observed that very few Indians were left in either province "because they have been wiped out with the sickness of the plague and small-pox which have overtaken them in the past years."²⁴ He said nothing about the losses he was responsible for, that resulted from the rebellion and from the flight from Timucua's villages by the survivors of the fighting. Rebolledo's use of the more remote northern Utinan villages as a population reservoir from which to replenish the depopulated mission centers on the royal road suggests that their location may have protected them to some degree from the worst ravages of the plagues of the 1649-1656 and the 1613-1617 periods or from direct involvement in the revolt and the subsequent fighting.

Potano continued to decline in population, and Rebolledo's efforts to revitalize Santa Fé and San Martín failed. On November 19, 1659, Juan Francisco de Florencia was ordered to go to Ustaca and to Timucua to repopulate and to resurrect the places of San Francisco, Santa Fé, and San Martín, as well as San Juan de Guacara. At this time these villages' depopulation was attributed to some of the natives having died from an epidemic and to others having fled to the woods. The resuscitation of these settlements was deemed necessary because they served as way-stations on the road from St. Augustine to Ustaca and Apalachee.²⁵ Inasmuch as none of the four sites designated for repopulation were in Ustaca, it is reasonable to assume that Florencia's mandated visit to Ustaca was to obtain colonists for the deserted sites. This pattern would be repeated on a smaller scale a generation later in 1678 when the visitador, Domingo de

24. Rebolledo (reply to the Franciscan's petition of August 4, 1657), August 5, 1657 (document appended to Rebolledo's visitation record), AGI, EC, leg. 155B, folios 40-50, SC.

25. Leturiondo (partial report, January 29, 1671), AGI 54-5-10, WLC, reel IV.

Leturiondo, would recruit another band of Ustacans drawn from Potohiriba, Machaba, and San Matheo for the establishment of an entirely new settlement at Ivitanayo, where it was felt that a way-station was needed.²⁶

This documentation of the Spaniards' method of moving about the various branches of the Timucuan polity from the west and north (and particularly toward Potano) offers an additional explanation for the ability of certain villages in this area to hold their own, or even to grow, despite the province's general secular trend toward sharp demographic decline. It provides an explanation as well for the early disappearance of the northernmost Utinan missions. And it supplies documentary corroboration in part for the findings of archeologists who have noted changes in ceramic types for these areas during this time period. Milanich, citing Kathleen Deagan, observed that circa 1660 at the Fig Springs-Santa Catalina-Ajohica site "there was an almost complete replacement of prehistoric pottery types by types of the Leon-Jefferson, historic, wooden paddle-stamped series." The Potano region, Milanich noted, also experienced an intrusion of non-Potano ceramics, one that was more diverse than that at Fig Springs. Archeological research, he commented, indicated that eastern Timucuan and Guale peoples, as well as Apalachee and/or Utina and Yustega, were moving into the area.²⁷ For the late-seventeenth century the Joaquín de Florencia visitation record documents the presence of significant numbers of Apalachee men in Timucua working as contract laborers. But, inasmuch as they were unaccompanied by women, it is not clear whether their presence would be reflected by a change in ceramic styles.²⁸

In this Apalachee migration, some of Florida's hispanicized Indians were following a classic pattern that prevailed elsewhere in Spanish America. The pattern consisted of an evolution from the repartimiento system's sporadic compulsory labor at pre-

26. Leturiondo, Inspection of the Provinces of Apalache and Timucua, 1677-1678, AGI, EC, leg. 156B, folios 596-598, SC.

27. Milanich, "The Western Timucua," 75, 79-80.

28. Joaquín de Florencia, General Inspection That the Captain, Joaquín de Florencia Made of the Provinces of Apalache and Timucua, Interim Treasurer of the Fort of St. Augustine of Florida, Judge Commissary and Inspector-general of Them by Title and Nomination of Don Laureano de Torres y Aiala, Knight of the Order of Santiago, Governor and Captain General of the Said *Presidio* and Provinces by His Majesty, November 5, 1694, AGI, EC, leg. 157A, cuaderno 1, folios 44-205, passim, SC.

scribed low wages, to freely undertaken regular long-term contract labor at more attractive wages, as employers sought to compensate for the shrinking of the available labor pool. In time the free contract-laborer would have been converted imperceptibly into a debt-peon in most cases had not the process been interrupted in the first decade of the eighteenth century by the English-inspired attacks that destroyed or dispersed most of Florida's surviving native population.

To date there is no precise indication of the relative impact of Timucua's various troubles on the reduction of the population there during the 1649 to 1659 period. Epidemic disease, hunger, overwork under harsh conditions, rebellion, and flight have all been mentioned as factors responsible for this calamity. But epidemic disease is clearly indicated as a major factor. In mid-1650 the governor reported that "the plague" had afflicted the presidio.²⁹ That it spread to the natives is suggested by a friar's report that during 1649 and 1650 many of the missionaries had died of the plague.³⁰ Late in October 1655 Rebolledo reported that since the start of that year there had been "a high mortality rate," resulting from a "series of small-pox plagues which have affected the country for the last ten months. Many have died," he added, "as a result of this and of the trials and hunger which these unfortunate people have suffered." So great was the decrease of the available labor force that the governor found it necessary to suspend his plans for the urgently-needed repair of St. Augustine's fort. He noted that the practice of having the Indians cut the wood and haul it on their shoulders over the considerable distance from the forest had been ruled out.³¹ Fifteen months later the governor commented once more on the impact of the recent epidemics. On this occasion he indicated that all three mission provinces had been affected. Noting that there was a loss of population even in Apalachee, he remarked that the loss had been less drastic there than in

-
29. Benito Ruiz de Salazar to king, July 14, 1650, AGI 54-5-10, WLC, reel III. This ambiguous term, *presidio*, could signify either the garrison alone or St. Augustine alone or the entire region under St. Augustine's jurisdiction.
 30. Fray Pedro Moreno Ponce de León, memorial, September 7, 1651, AGI 54-5-10, WLC, reel III.
 31. Rebolledo to crown, October 24, 1655, AGI 58-2-2/2, North Carolina Collection, xerox copy of translation by Ruth Kuykendall made from P. K. Yonge Library of Florida History's microfilm copy, in the possession of the author.

Guale and Timucua. In the latter two, he observed, very few Indians were left because so many had died off in recent years "with the illnesses of the plague and of small pox."³² Modern authorities differ as to the nature of the disease the Spaniards spoke of in this instance as "the plague."³³ Still another epidemic struck the natives in the latter 1650s. In 1659 the incoming governor reported that a recent epidemic of measles had killed 10,000 Indians.³⁴

Data from Oré's work reveal the extent of Potano's decline in the mere half-century that had passed since Fray Prieto began his formal evangelization in 1607. Prieto mentioned the existence in that year of four Potano towns containing a total of 1,200 people. He gave their names as San Miguel, San Francisco (one and one-half leagues from the former), Santa Ana, and San Buenaventura. Initially the friar resided at San Miguel, visiting San Francisco and Santa Ana each day to offer catechetical instruction. By 1616, however, the convent was at San Francisco Potano, and another mission among the Potano, named Santa Fé de Teleco in Oré's work, had made its appearance.³⁵ By 1659, few if any Potanans were left in that area.

Several of Rebolledo's remarks during the visitation, coupled with the 1655 mission list, provide insight into the geographical distribution of the Utinan villages, few of which have yet been found by archeologists. Utina's reputed possession of the largest population among the various Timucuan provinces undoubtedly was a reason for the governor's turning to it for people to resurrect the above-mentioned depopulated villages.³⁶ But probably no less important in Spanish eyes was the unsuitability for Spanish purposes of the 1657 locations of a number of the Utinan villages. As one of his pretexts for not holding a regular

32. Rebolledo, reply to the Franciscans' petition, August 5, 1657, AGI, EC, leg. 155B, folio 43, SC.

33. John R. Swanton, *Early History of the Creek Indians and Their Neighbors* (Washington, D.C., 1922), 338; Amy Bushnell, "The Menéndez-Marquez Cattle Barony at La Chua and the Determinants of Economic Expansion in 17th Century Florida," *The Florida Historical Quarterly*, LVI (April 1978), 4 19; Henry F. Dobyns, *Their Number Become Thinned, Native American Population Dynamics in Eastern North America* (Knoxville, 1983), 279-80.

34. Alonso de Aranguiz y Cotes to king, November 1, 1659, AGI 58-2-2/4, SC.

35. Oré, *The Martyrs*, 112- 14.

36. Milanich, "The Western Timucua," 69-70; Manuel Serrano y Sanz, *Documentos históricos de la Florida y la Luisiana, siglos XVI al XVIII* (Madrid, 1912), 132-33; B. Calvin Jones, conversation, June, 1985.

visitation in Timucua, Rebolledo remarked that the places in Timucua were "far apart from one another along crosswise paths, and not along the royal road," scattered in such a fashion that the personal visitation of all of them would put a serious drain on his time. This awkward dispersion for Spanish communications purposes is corroborated in the distances from St. Augustine given for the twelve inland Timucuan missions mentioned on the 1655 list. Classified by province they are the following:

- | | |
|--------|---|
| | 1-San Martín de Ayaocuto thirty-four leagues |
| | 2-Santa Cruz de Tarica fifty-four leagues |
| | 3-San Agustín de Urica sixty leagues |
| UTINA | 4-San Francisco de Chuaquin sixty leagues |
| | 5-Santa Cruz de Cachipili seventy leagues |
| | 6-San Ildefonso de Chamini seventy leagues |
| | 7-Santa María de los Angeles de Arapaja seventy leagues |
| | 8-San Pedro y San Pablo de Poturiba sixty leagues |
| USTACA | 9-Santa Elena de Machaba sixty-four leagues |
| | 10-San Miguel de Asile seventy-five leagues |
| | 11-San Francisco Potano twenty-five leagues |
| POTANO | 12-Santa Fé de Toloco thirty leagues |

Although Utina was east of Ustaca and thus, supposedly, closer to St. Augustine, three of its seven listed missions are farther away than two out of the three Ustacan villages mentioned. An additional two Utinan settlements, at sixty leagues from St. Augustine, are at the same distance from that center as is Ustaca's Poturiba. Inasmuch as the Santa Fé River is considered to be Utina's southern limit, this phenomenon can only be accounted for by angling a number of those villages off to the north somewhere along an arc swinging from the vicinity of present-day Moultrie and Tifton, Georgia, through the area just south of the Altamaha River. That Utina reached deep into southern Georgia is suggested as well by Father Oré's 1616 itinerary for his visitation of the Franciscan convents then in existence. From Santa Cruz de Tarihica, Oré recounted, "he determined to take a shortcut that was arduous by entering a desert and unpopulated district for fifty leagues in order to go

to the convent of Santa Isabel de Utinahica . . . [and on the way] he passed through some towns inhabited by pagan Indians . . . [and] arrived at Tarraco . . . [whose Indians] formed a fairly large district. Continuing our journey, we arrived at three or four small towns containing pagans." Before he reached Utinahica he traveled an unspecified, but likely considerable distance further, crossing various rivers too deep to ford. From Utinahica he descended to the land of Guale in canoes by a river that he described as larger than the Tagus.³⁷

This "splendid isolation" of the more northern Utinan settlements may have preserved them and the villages north of them along the Oconee from the ravages of the earlier epidemics. But when those who migrated from these remoter villages at the governor's behest began to perish soon after in the measles epidemic of the late 1650s, the surviving migrants likely fled to the woods as Juan Francisco de Florencia and the friars reported.

These are the points that are indicated or that can be inferred from the Timucua visitation record and the few other documents cited. Records suggest a massive depopulation as a result of the death or flight of the original inhabitants of a number of Timucuan villages, particularly those living inland near St. Augustine, and those of northern Utina. The records also indicate a significant shift in Utina's population southward and eastward, and the rapid disappearance (from the mission scene at least) of most of this migrant population.

Archeologists have found changes in the pottery types at these sites that coincide with these demographic developments recorded in the documents. They have suggested that they are reflective in part of a movement into these areas from Apalachee, Ustaca, or Utina. But, in addition to these migrants from within the Spanish ecumene, they have suggested that these changes in ceramic types (which they describe as originating with central Georgia Muskogean speakers), indicate that there was "some sort of population movement of Creeks into" these areas of northern Florida "during the middle of the seventeenth century."³⁸ The present writer is unaware of any

37. Oré, *The Martyrs*, 129-30.

38. Milanich, "The Western Timucua," 75.

documentary record for the intrusion of Creeks into these areas at so early a date. Indeed such an intrusion might seem to be ruled out by Rebolledo's remark that the drastic decline of the Timucuan population removed the need for as many friars as were then in Timucua. He suggested that this surplus might be better employed by being sent westward to launch the Christianization of the Apalachicolos (Creeks) and Chacatos. Had pagan Creeks been moving into the abandoned or depopulated Timucuan settlements, their evangelization would seem to have provided ample work for the friars and, accordingly, the governor would have been unlikely to advance such a proposal. The movement southward and eastward of the Utinans from the northernmost settlements, followed by the influx of Ustacans, seems to offer an adequate explanation that is solidly documented. The inhabitants of these northern Utinan villages would have been one of the "Florida" groups most ideally situated for receiving influences from that central Georgia area in the vicinity of Macon and for carrying them southward and eastward.

No definitive conclusions are presently possible in this matter. As Milanich noted, "The question of whether or not the adoption of Georgian pottery styles by Florida Indians represents diffusion of techniques or actual population mixing remains unanswered." The subject, he concluded, is one that needs more research.³⁹ B. Calvin Jones stated the problem most succinctly, observing that not enough is known about Utina ceramics to make a judgment concerning their nature either prior to or during the mission era. Baptizing Springs, he noted, is the only Utina mission site that has been explored to any significant degree. Lana Jill Loucks, who worked at that site, described its ceramic assemblage as predominantly Leon-Jefferson.⁴⁰ In his limited surface collecting at the Guacara site, Jones found a heavy Leon-Jefferson representation in it. Before solid judgments can be made as to the provenience of Leon-Jefferson type ceramics from sites such as Baptizing Springs or those in Potano, Jones concluded, a closer analysis of all the ceramics is

39. *Ibid.*

40. Jones, conversation, 1985; Lana Jill Loucks, "Political and Economic Interactions between Spaniards and Indians: Archaeological and Ethnohistorical Perspectives of the Mission System in Florida" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Florida, 1979), 302.

needed in order to identify traits within the widely diffused Leon-Jefferson ceramic complex that might distinguish the Leon-Jefferson-type ceramics found in Ustaca or Utina or Potano from the better-known Apalachee variety for which the style is named.⁴¹

Study of the 1657 visitation record and other documents of the period indicates that for Timucua the 1655 mission list is anything but a complete enumeration of the mission villages in existence at that date. It omitted the Guacara mission, which was in existence as early as 1616 and vital enough to take part in the revolt in 1656. The 1655 list also omitted San Matheo. The latter's identification in 1657 as having nine daughter-villages, all bearing saints' names, suggests that it had been a mission center for some time. This brings into question the practice of using absence from the 1655 list as a criterion for concluding that a mission was founded only after that date, as has been done, for example, with reference to both Santa Catalina and Ajoica.⁴²

For Apalachee, by contrast, the 1655 enumeration omitted only one of the pre-existing missions, San Antonio de Bacuqua. But the 1657 listing of the Apalachee missions is no less valuable for that than the one for Timucua, because it also lists most of the satellite villages under the jurisdiction of each mission center and, for the first time, it provides the native name of each of the Apalachee missions. The following is the data on the Apalachee settlements and on their leaders as recorded by Governor Rebolledo in the course of his visitation of each of those missions.

- I- SAN DAMIÁN DE CUPAICA— Baltasar, principal chief
 1-Nicapana— Bentura, chief
 2-Faltassa— Martín, chief
 3-San Cosme— Bentura, chief
 4-San Lucas— Lucas, chief

41. Jones, conversation, June, 1985.

42. These two sites are commonly identified conjointly as Santa Catalina de Ajoica (or Ajohica). By 1678 the two villages' people had indeed been merged as the surviving people of Ajoica moved to Santa Catalina, but prior to this the two settlements were distinct.

- II- SANTA MARÍA DE BACUCUA– Alonso, principal chief⁴³
 1-Guaco– Martín, chief
- III- SAN PEDRO DE PATALI– Baltasar, principal chief
 1-Ajamano– Francisco, chief
 2-Talpahique– Alonso, chief
- IV- SAN LUIS DE XINAYCA⁴⁴– Francisco Luis, principal chief
 Antonio García, its captain and cousin of the chief
 Antonio de Ynija, a leading man
 Pedro García, a leading man
 1-Abaslaco– Gerónimo, chief
 2-San Francisco– Francisco, chief
- V- SAN JUAN DE ASPALAGA– Alonso, principal chief
 1-Pansacola– Manuel, chief
 2-Sabe– Xpobal [Christobal], chief
 3-Jipe– Santiago, heir to the chieftainship
- VI- SAN MARTÍN DE THOMOLE– Antonio, the *hiniya*,⁴⁵
 representing the absent principal chief
 1-Ciban– Bernardo, chief
 2-San Diego– Diego, chief
 3-Samoche– Bernardo, chief
- VII- SAN JOSEPH DE OCUYA– Benito Ruiz, principal chief
 1-Sabacola– Gaspar, chief
 2-Ajapaxca– Santiago, chief
 3-Chali– Jerónimo, chief
- VIII- SAN FRANCISCO DE OCONE– Francisco Martín,
 principal chief
 1-San Miguel– Alonso Martín, chief
- IX- SANTA MARÍA DE AYUBALE– Martín, principal chief, and Alonso, a leading man and brother of the chief
 1-Cutachuba– Adrián, a leading man

43. Elsewhere the name was always given as San Antonio de Bacuqua.

44. Subsequently in this visitation record the name was given as San Luis de Nixaxipa.

45. This title, usually spelled *inija*, was given to the native official second-in-command to the chief.

- X- SAN LORENÇO DE YBITACHUCO– Don Luis
 Ybitachucu, principal chief
 Lourenço Moreno, captain of the place
 Francisco and Santiago, leading men
 1-San Juan– Andrés, chief and uncle of Don Luis
 2-San Pablo– Pedro Muñoz, chief
 3-San Nicolás– Thomás, chief
 4-Ayapasca– Fabian, chief
- XI- SAN MIGUEL DE AZILE⁴⁶– Gaspar, principal chief
 and uncle of Ybitachuco's Don Luis
 Lucas, identified as a chief, but no village mentioned
 Juan de Medina, principal heir to Lucas
 Lázaro, a leading man and father of the chief of Sabe

The Apalachee list requires little comment as the settlement pattern that it reflects does not appear to have altered much over the remaining half-century that these missions endured. No subsequent mission list furnishes as detailed a catalogue of the satellite villages. However, the mid-1670s Ball-game Manuscript states that each main village had three or four smaller satellite villages attached to it, and, using San Luis as an example, named its three satellites as San Francisco, San Bernardo, and San Agustín. One of the latter two is probably the Abaslaco mentioned by Rebolledo as there is evidence for Abaslaco's continued existence into the 1690s. A 1680s reference indicates that San Luis then had four subordinate villages.⁴⁷ For Aspalaga, the 1677-1678 visitation record identifies Culcuti as an additional satellite beyond those mentioned in 1657. On a later list a fifth satellite village, named San Pedro, is noted for Cupaica, and a 1657 letter written from there by a soldier also mentions a San Pedro. Cupaica's Nicopana and Faltassa reappear in 1677 as a consequence of a dispute over the chieftainship of the latter. Tomole's Samoche and San Diego also reappear in the Ball-game Manuscript. The same diffuse settlement pattern was depicted for Apalachee as late as October 1702, somewhat ob-

46. Normally Asile was considered to be a part of Ustaca. It is not clear why Rebolledo recorded it as being "of the jurisdiction of Apalachee."

47. Leturiondo, Inspection . . . 1677-1678; Florencia, General Inspection, November 5, 1694; Vi Ventura, testimony by, 1686; AGI, EC, leg. 156B, folio 575; EC, leg. 157A, cuaderno I, folios 71-73; EC, leg. 156C, pieza 25 (E. 20), folio 67, SC.

liquely, in a remark by the governor's deputy that "The villages of this province are very insecure as they are widely scattered, as the individual houses are likewise, inasmuch as the villages are distributed over a radius of three or four leagues."⁴⁸

The additional villages mentioned after 1657 bring the total of named Apalachee villages during the mission era to forty, just short of the forty-plus spoken of as existing in the 1640s. The 1657 listing, accordingly, would seem to be incomplete. It is probable that San Luis's four satellites of the 1680s and the satellites of other villages mentioned later already existed in 1657, as there seems to be a general correlation between the populations given for the missions in 1675 and 1689 and the number of satellites they were recorded as having.⁴⁹ Ayubale, with only one noted in 1657, is an exception. That suggests the possibility that one or more satellites of this sizeable mission were omitted on the 1657 list, probably because their leaders did not appear for the visitation.⁵⁰ Recent archeological research has revealed the existence of two presumably temporally distinct missions for Patale on sites that were little more than three miles apart.⁵¹ Patale's usual name of San Pedro y *San Pablo* de Patale suggests the possibility of a separate village of San Pablo. This was the case for Apalachee's other twin-patron mission, Cupaica. In 1657 it was identified only as San Damián de Cupaica, and San Cosme was named as a subordinate village. Ustaca's twin-patron site of Potohiriba had two temporally distinct mission centers.⁵² It is possible that either of Patale's subordinate villages, Ajamano and Talpahique, could also have borne the name San Pablo, but the early abandonment of one of the Patale sites seems to rule that out. To date no documentary evidence has

48. Leturiondo, Inspection . . . 1677-1678; Manuel Solana to Governor Joseph de Zúñiga y Cerda, October 22, 1702; AGI, EC, leg. 156B, folios 546-49, 555-56, 579; and 58-2-8, SC.

49. Pablo de Hita Salazar to queen, August 24, 1675; Bishop Diego Ebelino de Compostela to king, September 28, 1689; AGI 58-1-26/38 and 54-3-2/9, SC.

50. In 1675 it had about 800 inhabitants, and in 1689, it was the third largest mission, surpassed only by Cupaica and San Luis.

51. Jones, conversation, May 1985; Rochelle Marrinan, conversation, 1985. One of these sites has been explored sufficiently to indicate that it dates from the early mission period and that its existence as a mission site was short-lived. The other site has not been explored sufficiently to permit conclusions about the time of its occupation with such precision.

52. Andrés García, *Aulos* Made Officially against Santiago, Native to the Village of San Pedro, 1695, AGI, EC, leg. 157A, cuaderno I, folios 177-78, SC.

surfaced concerning the reason for the early abandonment of that site. Indeed, the only such evidence for the move is a reference in the year 1700 to the rancher Marcos Delgado's having moved his existing ranch, that lay between Bacuqua and Patale, to a *chicasa*⁵³ of Patale in response to the complaints of the natives of those two missions that the cattle from his Bacuqua ranch of Our Lady of the Rosary were destroying their crops.⁵⁴

This use of the lands of abandoned native villages was not unusual. In 1699 another Apalachee rancher, Diego Ximénez, moved his enterprise to a *chicasa* of Cupaica.⁵⁵ During the 1678 visitation of Utina's Santa (Catalina, Lucas, the chief of Ajoica, reported that "he had entered an agreement with Nicolás Suárez so that he might place a cattle ranch between the two (Ajoica and Santa Catalina) on the former site of Ajoica, which is depopulated."⁵⁶ And it is this writer's opinion that the original site of Delgado's ranch was probably the former site of the village of Bacuqua. In 1657 Bacuqua's chief received permission to move his village because the site's soil and firewood were exhausted. On reading this passage, the recollection that Delgado gave Bacuqua as his place of residence on a 1693 sales contract triggered the thought that an abandoned native village and its surrounding farmlands would make an ideal ranch site with their abundance of cleared land and nearby water source and that the high airy location of the typical Apalachee village would be attractive as a ranch headquarters.⁵⁷ It is known that Delgado's residence was on the ranch and not in the 1693-era village of Bacuqua. In 1695, on agreeing to move his ranch, Delgado asked to be allowed to keep his residence at the former ranch site.⁵⁸

There is evidence in the 1657 visitation record that some of the rebellious elements from Ustaca had sought refuge in

53. It is the Apalachee word for the site of an abandoned village and for the surrounding lands that belonged to the settlement.

54. Manuel Jacomé de Fuentes, testimony of, December 21, 1700 (residencia of Governor Laureano de Torres y Ayala, 1700), AGI, EC, leg. 157A, microfilm roll 27P in the residencia series, P. K. Yonge Library of Florida History.

55. *Ibid.*

56. Leturiondo, Inspection . . . 1677-1678, AGI, EC, leg. 156B, folios 602-04.

57. Marcos Delgado, bill of sale by, 1693, in Irving Leonard, trans., *Spanish Approach to Pensacola, 1689-1693* (Albuquerque, 1939), 254, fn. 3.

58. Florencia, General Inspection, November 5, 1694, AGI, EC, leg. 157A, cuaderno I, folios 77-79, SC.

Apalachee and had attempted to foment revolt there. On completing his visitation of Apalachee with the session at Asile, Rebolledo issued a proclamation that the Timucuan and Ustacans who were then living in Apalachee were to return to their home village within fifteen days, unless they had been domiciled in that province for two years or more. The penalty for men caught in non-compliance of this order was 100 lashes and four years at forced labor. The women also were to receive 100 lashes and would be remanded to serve at the fort at St. Augustine. The record gave no indication of the number of Timucuan thought to be present in Apalachee as refugees from the governor's brutal repression of the rebels.

This proclamation is probably one of the sources of the oft-repeated misconception that Apalachee participated in the 1656 Timucuan revolt. Most of the secondary sources that mention the revolt speak of it as having spread to Apalachee in 1656 or in 1657.⁵⁹ This writer, however, is unaware of any primary sources to indicate that the revolt actually spread to Apalachee. On the contrary, a number of such sources state the opposite. The soldiers in Apalachee whom the governor commissioned to investigate the rumors of impending trouble there reported that those rumors were precisely that, characterizing them as merely inventions of the priests, designed to thwart the governor's plans to expand the military's presence there. One soldier observed, "This is the sum total of the uprising in Apalachee, because I do not find any other one," while another soldier, playing down even the threat of revolt, attributed the rumors to "Timucuan gossips who have assumed that Apalachee wishes to revolt because they asked it to."⁶⁰ In August 1657 the governor himself, writing to report his having twenty-six of the Apalachee leaders as house guests, affirmed unequivocally that their loyalty was the principal reason that Apalachee had not participated in the

59. Among the scholars who have worked with the primary sources for this period, Amy Bushnell is the only one whom this author is aware of who has avoided this pitfall.

60. Adrián de Canisaxes y Ossoxio to Rebolledo, May 8, 1657, and May 21, 1657; Pedro de la Puerta to Rebolledo, July 12, 1657; Antonio de Santucha to Rebolledo, July 18, 1657, AGI, EC, leg. 155B, no. 18, folios 50-57 in microfilm roll 27-G of the residencia series, P. K. Yonge Library of Florida History. These documents are among those appended to the Rebolledo visitation record.

recent revolt in Timucua.⁶¹ Although misinterpretation of some of the earlier heated remarks of the more voluble of the friars appears to have been a major source of the misconception, the absence of revolt in Apalachee at this time is reflected equally clearly in a 1664 collective note to the king by a number of the friars.⁶² Doubtless there was unrest, but it does not seem to have passed beyond a threat of revolt. And possibly the threat consisted of little more than the friars' perception that there was such a threat.

In addition to the already noted request for the moving of the site of Bacuqua in 1657, there is evidence that during the preceding year San Luis's chief had moved his village to be where the soldiers were.⁶³ More directly expressed is the revelation of the continuity between that chief's 1657 mission village of San Luis and the native village of Anhayca Apalachee appropriated by Hernando de Soto for his winter quarters in 1539. The triad of Anhayca-Iviahica-Iniahico by which the De Soto chroniclers identified this village is similar enough to the Xinayca-Nixaxipa of 1657 to suggest that the earlier renditions are garbled versions of the latter as perceived by sixteenth-century Spanish ears unaccustomed to the Florida natives' tongues. A half century earlier an even more recognizable variant of Anhayca was similarly linked with one of Apalachee's leading chiefs. In 1608 Fray Prieto recorded that the Apalachee leaders assembled at Ivitachuco to meet him delegated the chief of Inihayca to go to St. Augustine to give obedience to the governor in their name. Noting this resemblance, Father Geiger observed that "Inihayca is probably the Anhayca Apalache mentioned by the Gentleman of Elvas."⁶⁴ The survival of these names from the early sixteenth century into the mission era in association with the head village of San Luis suggests that San Luis de Xinayca of 1657 represented the same corporate entity as De Soto's Anhayca, though the two probably did not occupy the same physical site. It is possible, however, that the Spanish came to

61. Rebolledo reply to the Franciscans' petition, August 5, 1657, AGI, EC, leg. 155B, no. 18, folios 40-50, in microfilm roll 27-G of the residencia series, P. K. Yonge Library of Florida History.

62. Franciscan Friars to king, June 16, 1664, AGI 58-1-35, WLC, reel IV.

63. Canisaxes y Ossoxio to Rebolledo, May 8, 1657, and May 21, 1657, AGI, EC, leg. 155B, no. 18, folios 50-54, microfilm roll 27-G of the residencia series, P. K. Yonge Library of Florida History.

64. Oré, *The Martyrs*, 117, 122, fn. 13.

the San Luis site because of its' historic associations as much as its' strategic qualities.

In conclusion, the 1657 visitation record and the other pertinent documents from the era give no indication that Apalachee was experiencing the calamitous demographic dislocation and decline that was manifest in Timucua. Whereas this trend would continue for Timucua, as the number of its missions shrank with each successive listing, one additional Apalachee mission was to emerge by the mid-1670s along with several other missions inhabited by non-Apalachees. Moreover, all the Apalachee missions existing in 1657 were to survive till the eve of the province's destruction in 1704.

Why there is so sharp a difference is a subject that needs further research. Similarly, the presence of non-western Timucuan and non-Timucuan in western Timucua merits further documentary research. While the Spaniards meticulously noted the presence of non-Apalachees in Apalachee territory, to this writer's knowledge, no one has cited documentary evidence that the Spaniards similarly identified the non-locals from coastal Timucua, and Guale, and Creek territory whose presence there archeologists have detected.

In view of the magnitude of Timucua's demographic disaster and dislocation, Father Spellman's remark concerning Timucua's troubles during this period is particularly apropos. He observed that this period of the mid-seventeenth century that has so often been hailed as the beginning of the missions' "Golden Age" was anything but that for Timucua.⁶⁵ In June 1657 the Council of the Indies was of a similar mind in recommending the immediate removal and imprisonment of Governor Rebolledo for "the cruelty and inhumanity" of his repression of the revolt that "his own actions had precipitated," and for having created a situation that seemed to threaten the total loss of the Florida missions whose natives' "conversion and conservation had cost so much wealth and effort."⁶⁶

65. Spellman, "The 'Golden Age'," 355.

66. Council of the Indies, Order for Governor Rebolledo's Removal and Imprisonment, WLC, reel III. As reproduced by Lowery, this document bears the heading "In the council on May 29," and the closing note, "Madrid, twelfth of June of sixteen hundred and fifty seven."