INTRODUCTION
The New Mexico Colony, founded in 1598, is both the oldest and arguably the most remote Spanish colony in the American Southwest, factors that likely contributed to the emergence of a distinctly New Mexican cultural identity during the late colonial period (1692–1821). Throughout its long history, generations of colonists from New Spain—many of whom were of mixed ethnic heritage (Snow 1996)—interacted closely and constantly with a variety of indigenous groups residing within and around the colony (Brooks 2002; Swadesh 1979; Trigg 2003; Trigg and Gold 2005). These colonists adopted elements of indigenous architectural traditions (Boyd 1973; Bunting 1976; Kubler 1990), subsistence practices (Dunmire 2004; Trigg 2005), and craft technologies (Dick 1968; Moore 1992), and exploited existing indigenous trade networks to supplement their supplies of food, cooking ware, clothing and bedding material, and domestic labor (Eiselt 2006; F. Levine 1991; Snow 1983). Pigs did not fare well in the harsh climate, thus, sheep and to a lesser extent goats and cattle formed the basis of an emergent herding economy (Baxter 1987; Dunmire 2013). Relationships
between male colonists and local, indigenous women were exceedingly common, and while these relationships ranged in character from brutal enslavement and rape to church-sanctioned marriage, most unions produced children of mixed ancestry and variable legal status. Thus, by the late eighteenth century, New Mexico’s Spanish colonial population could be characterized as a multi-ethnic “menagerie of frontier peoples” (C. Carrillo 1997:25), many of whom had little or no Spanish ancestry.

Between circa 1785 and 1810, the New Mexico colony experienced rapid economic and population growth culminating in what many scholars have come to view as a cultural fluorescence (Boyd 1974; Brooks 2002; C. Carrillo 1997; L. Frank and Miller 2001a, 2001b, 2001c; R. Frank 1991, 2000; Swadesh 1974). In order to expand and protect its territory, colonial authorities granted lands along the frontier to groups of applicants, many of whom were of indigenous or mixed heritage and lacked the wealth or status to purchase lands nearer to the colonial core. These settlers pushed the boundaries of the colony beyond the middle Rio Grande Valley by establishing numerous rural villages far north and south along the Rio Grande, northwest along the Chama River, and east along the Pecos River. In order to obtain the supplies and protection necessary to survive in these peripheral spaces, the colonists sought out and established trading relationships with members of neighboring indigenous groups—especially the Comanches, Apaches, Navajos, and Utes (C. Carrillo 1997; Eiselt and Darling 2012; R. Frank 2000; Kutsche et al. 1976; Swadesh 1974; Van Ness 1979). Blending local and imported traditions, colonists developed unique forms of craft production, syncretic religious practices, and a distinctive regional dialect. Within this context, colonists increasingly identified themselves in legal documents as Vecinos (literally, “neighbors”), employing a term that “denoted both a cultural and civic identity, rather than caste or race” (Nieto-Phillips 2008:38). Their strong preference for this term suggests that the most salient aspect of Spanish colonial identity in late colonial New Mexico was not Spanish ethnicity but one’s residence and accepted membership in a Spanish colonial community. This chapter explores the significance of Vecino identity in New Mexico and considers how it was manifested in the spatial organization and material remains of village sites during the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

UNDERSTANDING AND DEFINING CIVIC IDENTITY IN COLONIAL NEW MEXICO

Vecino derives from vecindad, a Castilian term dating to the medieval period when Christians began to reconquer and resettle lands previously occupied by the Moors. Within this context, vecindad referred to the various rights and responsibilities shared by members of these new Christian communities, which often included rights to common lands and natural resources and obligations to
construct, occupy, govern, and protect the settlement (Herzog 2003). This concept accompanied Spanish colonists into the Americas and eventually into New Spain’s northern frontier, where the derivative term vecino was used to identify colonial citizens who inhabited, maintained, and defended colonial settlements and, thus, were entitled to exercise their rights to grants of property and access to common lands (Guerrero 2010; Gutiérrez 1991; Herzog 2003).

The use of Vecino as an identifier in legal records in colonial New Mexico increased in the late eighteenth century and early nineteenth, eventually superseding the use of the casta, or racial categories, that dominated records earlier in the colony’s history (R. Frank 2000; Gutiérrez 1991:191–94). This same period also witnessed an expansion of colonial efforts to establish settlements in the north and east, a task that royal authorities achieved by issuing grants of land along these frontiers to applicants of varied ethnic backgrounds, many of whom lacked the social or economic capital to purchase lands in more desirable locations within the colony. Granting lands (and the civic rights and obligations reserved for landowners) to individuals of primarily indigenous ancestry transformed these “Indians” into Spanish colonial citizens and likewise transformed colonial citizenship into something a little less “Spanish.” Thus, as the colony became increasingly dominated by and dependent on multiethnic settlements along the frontier, New Mexicans began to recognize civic status and practice as more important than ethnic heritage (Jenks 2013b). And, this emphasis on and expression of Vecino identity would continue to grow even during the Mexican period (1821–46) (Gutiérrez 1991:table 5.1), encouraged by further expansion of the colony through communal land grants and by the new government’s legal abolition of racial categories.

This growing emphasis on civic identity also is evident in other parts of New Spain during the late eighteenth century and early nineteenth, though the context and specific character of these identities vary by region. The terms vecino, vecinos de razón, and gente de razón were used in the colonial settlements of Arizona and California to describe individuals mostly of non-European ancestry who were subjects of the Spanish Crown (Guerrero 2010:5–7). Many of these individuals were (or were closely related to) presidio soldiers, and by highlighting their civic status these terms served to distinguish them from neighboring populations with similar ethnic backgrounds but dissimilar loyalties and lifestyles (Guerrero 2010:7, 12; Jenks 2013a). At the presidio of San Francisco in northern California, Barbara Voss and others have examined archival and archaeological evidence of the creation of another civic identity—Californio—that united a small but diverse group of colonists and soldiers by emphasizing their shared affiliation with the colony, which set them apart from the local Native population (Smith-Lintner 2007; Voss 2005, 2008). Both of these examples differ somewhat from Vecino identity in New Mexico,
which developed among farmers rather than soldiers and thus emphasized
the village over the colony (Jenks 2011a). Nevertheless, the proliferation of
these civic identities during this period seems to reflect a wider shift in identity
politics in New Spain.

Civic identity was an important organizing principle for the colonists, and it
is equally important to contemporary archaeologists as we attempt to under-
stand what constituted a “Spanish” way of life in colonial settlements that
were occupied extensively—sometimes exclusively—by individuals of mixed
and indigenous ancestry. In investigating this specific kind of civic identity, it is
important to understand that, during this period, Vecino identity was thought
of less as a legally ascribed status than as a process and performance—an iden-
tity that was earned through displays of commitment to the community and
enacted in daily practices associated with Vecino identity. As Tamar Herzog
(2003:42) says of vecindad in eighteenth-century Castile, “People are citizens by
virtue of their activities, and they lose their condition as citizens if they fail to
enact the citizen role. Status is thus socially negotiated and socially recognized.”
This explanation of Vecino identity lends itself to interpretation through the
archaeological theory of practice, which borrows from Pierre Bourdieu (1977)
and Anthony Giddens (1979) in viewing routine activities within a structured
space as simultaneously constructing and expressing underlying cultural values
(e.g., Clark 2005; Lightfoot et al. 1998), including those associated with notions
of “good” and “bad” citizenship. Viewed through this lens, continuity or change
in these daily practices may be seen as evidence of the evolution of these cul-
tural values in response to internal or external stimuli.

I draw on practice theory to identify and interpret evidence of Vecino identity
at a sample of excavated Hispanic New Mexican sites occupied at various times,
and in various places, in the former Spanish colony. The term “Vecino” expresses
close physical proximity to other persons, typically in the form of shared resi-
dence within a neighborhood. Thus, the spatial organization of Hispanic villages
structured Vecino identity in both a literal and figurative sense. Similarly, Vecino
identity was expressed through the act of being a vecino of a particular com-
unity—participating in the routines and rituals of daily life within that village.
Because Vecino identity was defined by one’s residence and participation in a
New Mexican Hispanic village, analyses of the historical, material, and spatial
records of village life at Hispanic New Mexican sites dating to the late colonial
period can be used to derive, inductively, the processes involved in the construc-
tion and expression of that identity.

Finally, social identities gain meaning and shape through comparison and
contradiction with “others,” and Vecino identity is no exception. Civic identity
peaked in importance in New Mexico during a period of regular interactions
between an increasingly rural Hispanic village population and various neighboring nomadic tribes, and was sustained as relations with these tribes were gradually supplanted by relations with American traders, soldiers, and ranchers. The significance of community membership and residence for Vecinos, therefore, likely derived in part from the absence or relative unimportance of village life for nomadic Indians and early American populations, who at various times were the enemies or economic allies of Vecino communities. In this way, an examination of Vecino identity requires some consideration of the social and economic context of these communities, and an appreciation of how the identity was shaped not only by what villagers did, but also by what they chose not to do. The remainder of this chapter explores, through the comparison of archaeological assemblages from Hispanic New Mexican sites, what it meant to be a Vecino within this Spanish colony, how this civic identity varied across space, and how it evolved over time.

EXCAVATING VECINDAD: IDENTIFYING AND EXPLORING REGIONAL PATTERNS

I reviewed and compared archaeological data from twenty-five New Mexican Hispanic sites in order to identify broad patterns of behavior shared by Vecinos and to interpret apparent variations in these patterns (Table 8.1 and Figure 8.1). I have organized these sites by region and present them in roughly chronological order, with the expectation that much of the variation between sites can be understood as the result of shared environmental context and settlement history. Most of the regional categories are self-explanatory, though it is worth explaining that Rio Arriba, Rio Medio, and Rio Abajo are local terms that refer to the upper, middle, and lower portions of the Rio Grande Valley, and divisions between the three are marked by the mouths of the Jemez and Puerco Rivers.

It would be difficult, if not impossible, to compare data from all of these sites using quantitative measures, as different archaeologists focused on different attributes and too many variables and categories are involved. Therefore, these comparisons are largely qualitative, focusing on observed differences in the patterns of archaeological data. I include plaza communities and isolated ranch sites in the sample, but have excluded colonial-period cities (Santa Fe, Albuquerque, Santa Cruz, and El Paso) because data from these sites are likely to be anomalous. There is some bias toward sites in the Rio Arriba, owing to the relative abundance of cultural resource management (CRM) projects conducted in this region and the ready availability of contract reports produced by the Office of Archeological Studies. Likewise, sites located in present-day Colorado are likely underrepresented, as site reports are more difficult to obtain.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Site Name(s)</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rio Medio and Rio Abajo Regions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia</td>
<td>Valencia (LA 67321)</td>
<td>1700–ca. 1850</td>
<td>(Akins 2001; Brown and Vierra 1997; Mensel 1996; Wiseman 1988)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernalillo</td>
<td>San Antonio de Los Poblanos (LA 46635)</td>
<td>1710–1830</td>
<td>(Rudecoff 1987a; Rudecoff and Carrillo 1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernalillo</td>
<td>Tijeras Arroyo Hacienda Site (LA 140040)</td>
<td>1720–1846</td>
<td>(Hurt et al. 1980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernalillo</td>
<td>San José de Los Ranchos (LA 46638)</td>
<td>1730–1904</td>
<td>(Condie 2007; Rudecoff 1987b; Sargeant 1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandoval</td>
<td>San José de las Huertas (LA 25674)</td>
<td>1764–1838</td>
<td>(Atherton and Rothschild 2008; Brody and Colberg 1966; Crane and Wenzel 1991; Ferg 1984; Rothschild and Atherton 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandoval</td>
<td>Ideal Site (LA 8671)</td>
<td>1835–65</td>
<td>(Brody and Colberg 1966; Crane and Wenzel 1991; Ferg 1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandoval</td>
<td>Rio Puerco Site (ENM 198)</td>
<td>1800s</td>
<td>(Haeker 1976)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socorro</td>
<td>Paraje de Fra Cristóbal (LA 1124)</td>
<td>1857–1924</td>
<td>(Boyd 1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rio Arriba Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
<td>Trujillo-Romero Site (LA 6579)</td>
<td>1750–1821</td>
<td>(Maxwell et al. 1998; Wiseman 1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
<td>Santa Fe River Site 16/4 (LA 16769)</td>
<td>1750–1850</td>
<td>(Crane and Wenzel 1991; F. Levine et al. 1985; Payne 1999; Toll 1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taos</td>
<td>Ranchos de Taos (LA 8976)</td>
<td>1770s–present</td>
<td>(Eiselt and Darling 2012; Gonzalez 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Arriba</td>
<td>Los Luceros / La Soledad (LA 37549)</td>
<td>1775–1912</td>
<td>(Snow 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
<td>Vicente Valdez Site (LA 4968)</td>
<td>1830–70</td>
<td>(Boyer et al. 2001; Moore 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Arriba</td>
<td>Parker Borrego</td>
<td>1830–80</td>
<td>(Eiselt and Darling 2012; Peles 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chama River Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Arriba</td>
<td>Santa Rosa de Lima de Abiquiú (LA 806, LA 6602)</td>
<td>1700–early 1900s</td>
<td>(C. Carrillo 1978; Eiselt and Darling 2012; Moore et al. 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Arriba</td>
<td>La Puente (LA 54313)</td>
<td>1700–early 1900s</td>
<td>(Betram 1990; Boyer 1992; Moore et al. 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Arriba</td>
<td>Las Casitas (LA 917)</td>
<td>1750–1870</td>
<td>(Eiselt and Darling 2012; Quintana and Snow 1980; Sunseri 2009)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*continued on next page*
### Pecos River Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Site Name(s)</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Miguel</td>
<td>San Miguel del Vado (LA 2734)</td>
<td>1790s–present</td>
<td>(Hurt 2002; Jenks 2011b, 2011b, 2013b; Neasham 1940)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Miguel</td>
<td>El Cerrito (LA 101030, LA 84318)</td>
<td>1820–early</td>
<td>(Boyd 1971; Hannaford and Severts 1996; Townsend 2004; Windes 2011;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Windes and Bagwell 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Miguel</td>
<td>José María Martínez Site (LA 99029)</td>
<td>1850–1970</td>
<td>(Moore 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe</td>
<td>Los Ojitos (LA 98907)</td>
<td>1860s–1940</td>
<td>(Gray and O’Mack 2008; Hanson et al. 2010; Jenks 2009; O’Mack 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaves</td>
<td>Ontiberos Site (LA 27573)</td>
<td>1903–8</td>
<td>(Oakes 1983)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Purgatoire River Region (Colorado)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Site Name(s)</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Las Animas</td>
<td>La Placita (5LA6104)</td>
<td>1880s–90s</td>
<td>(Clark 2003, 2005, 2012; Clark and Corbett 2006; Clark and Wilkie 2006)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rio Medio and Rio Abajo Regions

Archaeologists have conducted excavations at a number of Hispanic sites in the Middle and Lower Rio Grande Valley area, including the plaza communities of Valencia, San Antonio de Los Poblanos, San José de Los Ranchos, and San José de las Huertas; a small hamlet that developed around the Paraje de Fra Cristobal; and three isolated ranchos (see references in Table 8.1). The site of Valencia is situated south of Albuquerque and east of the Rio Grande along the Camino Real. Colonists settled the neighboring plaza communities of Los Poblanos and Los Ranchos in the early eighteenth century on the east bank of the Rio Grande just north of Albuquerque. Frequent floods caused most residents to abandon these plazas by the early twentieth century. The site of Las Huertas is located just north of Las Huertas Creek (a tributary of the Rio Grande) near the present-day town of Placitas. The ranch sites are spread across the region: one east of Albuquerque along the Tijeras Arroyo, one south of Las Huertas on the Las Huertas Creek, and one on the Rio Puerco in Navajo territory in the west. The last and latest of the sites in this sample, Paraje de Fra Cristobal, was settled in the mid-nineteenth century east of the Rio Grande and about seven miles downstream from the ruins of Fort Craig.
Most of these sites produced numerous faunal remains, with sheep/goat bone dominating the collections followed by cow, pig, and chicken. Eggshells were identified at several sites, as were examples of wild game species (especially mule deer). Paraje de Fra Cristobal in the south was the only site in this sample to produce rabbit bones (Boyd 1986). Butchery marks were observed at several sites, most often on sheep/goat bone, and archaeologists interpreted these marks as evidence that these animals were raised and butchered at those sites (Boyd 1986; Rudecoff and Carrillo 1987). New Mexican ceramics also were abundant, often being dominated by locally made utility wares such as Carnue Plain and Plain Black. Decorated wares included Isleta Red-on-tan; Tewa Series Polychrome; Puname-area polychromes; Ranchitos and Santa Ana Polychrome; and a few decorated wares from Acoma, Laguna, Zuni, and Hopi. The most abundant wares were typically those produced by nearby Pueblos, thus wares produced by Northern Tewa potters (e.g., Tewa Polychrome) were more common in the north while wares produced by Keresan potters—especially those in the Punamé region—were more common in the middle (Figure 8.2). New Mexican ceramics were least common at Paraje de Fra Cristobal, which, in addition to being occupied later than the other sites, also was located some considerable distance from Pueblo potting communities (Boyd 1986).

All of the sites in this sample produced some historical-period artifacts, though these were most abundant in sites with twentieth-century components (e.g., Los Ranchos and Paraje de Fra Cristobal). Mexican majolica and Euro-American white-bodied tableware sherds were present at most sites, and porcelain was present at a few. Lithic artifacts were relatively rare, often consisting of expedient tools, gunflints, strike-a-lights, and a few groundstone artifacts. Botanical remains identified included maize, beans, peaches, and melon, as well as wood charcoal fragments mostly from riparian and low-elevation species.

**Rio Arriba Region**

Excavated Hispanic sites in the Upper Rio Grande region include the plaza communities of Ranchos de Taos and La Soledad, a small hamlet identified as the Vicente Valdez Site, and three ranchos (see Table 8.1). Ranchos de Taos, which was founded in the eighteenth century and is still occupied today, is located south of Taos along the Rio Grande del Rancho River. The remains of La Soledad are situated along the Rio Grande underneath a rural hamlet near the town of Alcalde. The Vicente Valdez Site is a loose cluster of eight colonial-period structures situated on the east bank of the Rio Tesuque. Once again, the ranch sites are spread across the region, with one located north of San Juan Pueblo on the Rio Grande, one just north of the Vicente Valdez Site on the Rio Tesuque (north
of Cuyamungue Pueblo), and one on the east bank of the Santa Fe River west of the city of Santa Fe.

In contrast to the Rio Medio, the most abundant artifacts from Hispanic sites in the Rio Arriba appear to be New Mexican ceramics, which often outnumber materials from other material categories. Utility and decorated wares (likely produced by Northern Tewa potters) and micaceous wares (likely produced by Jicarilla Apache potters) dominate these ceramic collections. Common utility wares include Plain (Kapo) Black, Plain Red, Tewa Micaceous, and Sangre de Cristo Micaceous, while decorated wares include Tewa Polychrome Series, Red Mesa Black-on-white, and a little Puname Polychrome. Once again, the type and distribution of New Mexican ceramics seem to reflect local market availability. Faunal remains are the second most common artifact, and while fewer of these collections have been analyzed, the most commonly identified species are sheep/goat and cow. Ax-cut butchering marks were observed at two sites, one of which also produced bones with saw marks (Peles 2010). Many sites produced small quantities of Mexican majolica sherds, while Euro-American white-bodied wares were recovered from sites occupied after the opening of the Santa Fe Trail.
in 1821. Lithic artifacts were relatively rare. Botanical remains identified at these sites include maize, peach, and beans, as well as watermelon, piñon, pistachio, plantain, wheat, orange, lentil, plum, and pepper.

**Chama Region**

Archaeologists have conducted excavations at several Hispanic sites in the Chama River region (west of Rio Arriba), including the plaza communities of Las Casitas, La Puente, and Santa Rosa de Lima de Abiquiú, as well as a few small ranch sites (see Table 8.1). Las Casitas was a fortified, plaza-centered settlement occupied primarily by *genízaros*, a term commonly used to describe the free descendants of Native American captives. The settlement was established above El Rito, a tributary of the Chama River. The site of Santa Rosa de Lima is situated immediately south of the Chama River just east of Abiquiú, while La Puente, located several miles east, probably represents an earlier incarnation of that community. Sunday Eiselt has identified and investigated several small ranch sites associated with the old community of San Lorenzo, all located along the Rio del Oso, another tributary of the Chama River (J. Andrew Darling and B. Sunday Eiselt, chapter 7 in this volume; Eiselt 2006). Contract excavations also have been conducted at the Trujillo House site located just west of Santa Rosa de Lima (Betram 1990; Betram et al. 1989; Moore et al. 2004).

Analyses of faunal bone recovered from these sites identify the remains of sheep/goat (dominant in the Mexican and American periods); cow (more common in the Spanish period); and smaller numbers of equid, pig, dog, and chicken bones. Several sites produced mule deer bones, and small numbers of bear, rabbit, bison, antelope, turkey, cougar, and badger bone were recovered from either Las Casitas (Quintana and Snow 1980; Sunseri 2009) or La Puente (Betram 1990; Boyer 1992; Moore et al. 2004). Chop marks were observed on most of the domestic animals (including horse) and on most of the large game at Las Casitas. Eggshell, likely from chicken eggs, also was recorded at La Puente. New Mexican ceramics were abundant at all sites, and most seemed to include a mix of utility wares produced by Northern Tewa, Jicarilla Apache, and Hispanic potters (Eiselt and Darling 2012). Common utility wares include Plain Black (Tewa and Hispanic), micaceous wares (Tewa and Jicarilla Apache), and Plain Red (Tewa). Decorated wares include Tewa Polychrome Series, Casitas Red-on-brown, San Juan Red-on-tan, and a few Puname-area Polychromes.

Lithic artifacts are surprisingly common at Hispanic sites in the Chama region, and include debitage (byproducts of stone tool production), expedient tools, groundstone, ceramic polishing stones, and strike-a-lights, most produced using locally available materials. Historical-period artifacts recovered from these
sites are diverse, and include Euro-American white-bodied tableware fragments, clothing fasteners, and comb fragments. Only the site of La Puente produced majolica (a few dozen fragments [Moore et al. 2004]), and tin tinklers and tin scraps (suggesting tinworking) were found at the ranch sites around old San Lorenzo (Eiselt 2006; see also Darling and Eiselt, chapter 7 this volume). Botanical remains include maize, peach, squash, apricot, and chili pepper, as well as wood charcoal produced from riparian and lower-elevation species (especially piñon and juniper).

**Pecos and Purgatoire River Regions**

Relatively less archaeological work has been done at Hispanic sites located east of the Rio Grande Valley. Hispanic settlements in the east were established relatively late, mostly in the nineteenth century and early twentieth century, in territories previously explored by New Mexican bison hunters (ciúboleros), participants in the Plains trade (comancheros), and shepherds. Archaeologists have conducted test excavations at the late Spanish colonial plaza communities of San Miguel del Vado and El Cerrito, the American-period hamlets of Los Ojitos and La Placita, and a couple of isolated ranch sites (see Table 8.1). The late eighteenth-century village of San Miguel was established just west of a natural ford (vado) in the Upper Pecos River as it flows out of the Sangre de Cristo Mountains and onto the plains. El Cerrito was a later, smaller settlement located about thirteen miles downstream from San Miguel on the same Spanish colonial land grant. Hispanic homesteaders founded Los Ojitos in the 1860s and 1870s south of Puerta de Luna along a bend in the Pecos River. Archaeologists have investigated several Hispanic sites along the Purgatoire River in present-day Colorado (e.g., R. Carrillo et al. 2003; Church 2001, 2002); however, only the site of La Placita, an illegal plaza settlement dating to the late nineteenth century, is included in this sample. Finally, test excavations have been conducted in a midden associated with the José María Martínez Site—a ranch located along the Pecos River upstream from San Miguel—and at the Ontiberos site—an early nineteenth-century Hispanic ranch house and dugout located west of Roswell in southeastern New Mexico.

Faunal remains recovered from the eastern sites exhibit considerable variation, with more sheep/goat bone recorded for the earlier settlements of the Upper/Middle Pecos and more cow bone identified in the later sites in the north (La Placita) and south (Ontiberos). Small quantities of pig, equid, chicken, and dog bones were identified, along with wild species including mule deer, elk, bison, turkey, and fish. Eggshell, likely from chickens, was recorded at several sites. La Placita and Ontiberos produced butchered remains of cottontail rabbits and jackrabbits, suggesting that these animals were either raised or captured.
and then butchered at the site (Clark 2003, 2012; Oakes 1983). Saw marks appear more frequently on cow bones, suggesting that some of these derive from cheap stew cuts of meat purchased by the residents, whereas chop marks identified on sheep/goat bone likely resulted from butchering the animal at home. New Mexican ceramics were relatively abundant in sites near the Sangre de Cristo Mountains, where the most commonly identified types were Sangre de Cristo Micaceous, Plain Black, Plain Red, and Tewa Polychrome Series, though a few Puname-area Polychromes also were recorded. New Mexican ceramics were less common along the Middle Pecos and wholly absent at La Placita and Ontiberos—later sites located far from any indigenous potting communities. Historical-period artifacts commonly recovered from these sites include sewing equipment, clothing fasteners, and Euro-American white-bodied tableware fragments. Canning jars were present at sites established during the American period (Los Ojitos, Ontiberos, and La Placita), but are conspicuously absent from the assemblages of sites established during the Spanish or Mexican periods. Lithic artifacts were rare, consisting mostly of debitage and expedient tools produced using local materials. Analyses of macrobotanical remains recovered from the New Mexican sites reported maize, beans, peach, cherry, squash, and apricot. La Placita, in contrast, produced only wild plants such as piñon and Chenopodium seeds.

What Does It Mean to Be Vecino?

Certain characteristics are shared by most or all of the Vecino sites described above. Not all villages were laid out in the same manner, but most contained a Catholic church or chapel in a central location, and some Catholic materials or features are documented at most sites. Domestic architecture typically consisted of a hybrid of Spanish and Pueblo traditions, made up of linear arrangements of habitation, storage, and animal rooms/corrals often clustered together or organized around a central patio. Structure walls could be any combination of adobe and stone, though high stone foundations were more common in flood-prone areas. Most structures had flat, Pueblo-style roofs and dirt/puddled-adobe floors, sometimes covered with linoleum or milled lumber as these materials became available. Rooms were multipurpose with few interior features (corner fireplaces, niches, storage pits) and could be readily altered to serve the needs of the season or to accommodate new goods, animals, or family members.

Archaeological evidence of the raising of sheep and goats for their wool, milk, and meat is extremely common. It is also evident that cattle ranching, while less common, was practiced in all regions and time periods. Smaller numbers of animals often were kept for subsistence purposes, such as pigs and chickens (mostly
for their eggs), and equines were used for agricultural labor and transportation. Most Vecinos grew garden vegetables, fruit trees, and some crops—especially in the productive floodplains of the Rio Grande—and common cultigens included maize, peaches, squash, chilies, and beans. Wheat and corn were staple crops, according to records of that time, though most of the archaeological evidence for these crops is indirect, consisting of ovens (hornos) for cooking wheat bread and manos and metates (especially in the northwest) for grinding corn. Grist mills (molinos) constructed along the acequias ground the wheat harvested by community members into usable flour (e.g., Gritzner 1974). Unfortunately, these features have received less study than the communities themselves. Wild animals were sometimes hunted, probably as much for the hides as for their meat; however, in most cases it appears that they were hunted opportunistically to supplement local supplies, and wild resources seldom appear in contexts where they would have been difficult to obtain.

Stock animals frequently were butchered at the household level, often through use of metal axes to produce roast or stew-sized cuts and breaking open the cranium to harvest the tongue and brain. Meat could be prepared in pit roasts or stewed in earthenware pots with chilies or other vegetables. Surplus meat and plant food were commonly preserved through drying, even after the introduction of American canning technology, and part of the popularity of stews in New Mexico probably derives from a tradition of working with dried food. Groundstone and griddles, while sometimes present, were less common in Vecino assemblages than expected. It may be that cornmeal products (tortillas, atole) were less fundamental to Vecino cuisine than they were to the diets of their Pueblo neighbors and/or that corn was more often used as animal fodder.

Artifacts relating to the manufacture and maintenance of cloth/clothing are present at all of these sites, and evidence of limited metallurgy is common as well. The leather clothing and commercial exports described in historical accounts are not especially apparent in the material record, perhaps because these items were generally obtained in trade from nomadic Indian groups or perhaps because the material correlates that I seek (metal and lithic scrapers) are not the best or only correlates of this activity. Evidence from all sites indicates that Vecinos were active participants in local trade networks, regularly bartering with neighboring indigenous communities and occasionally traveling to regional trade centers (e.g., Santa Fe) in order to reach a broader market for their goods. The church also likely facilitated social and economic interactions, drawing rural settlers to the nearest parish church for religious holidays, and inviting neighboring communities to enjoy food and entertainment at the annual feast day celebration.
Regional Variants and Change over Time

While Vecino sites have much in common, some general differences can be observed between sites located in different regions or occupied at different times (see Darling and Eiselt, chapter 7 in this volume). A variety of social and economic factors influenced village layout, and some settlements—especially along the Chama River and the Middle Pecos—appear to have been more dispersed. Frances Swadesh (1974) suggested that this pattern in the Chama River area was deliberate, making it easier for settlers to conduct illicit trade with indigenous neighbors and making their properties less appealing to potential Indian raiders. Environmental conditions also may have played a role—especially for the Middle Pecos settlements—as the narrow, flood-prone river valley and difficult terrain would have made it particularly difficult for residents to travel back and forth from a central village to their allotted agricultural lands.

Faunal assemblages were surprisingly small in the Las Huertas grant sites (San José de las Huertas and the Ideal Site). Documentary and oral history indicate that these settlers raised sheep and goats (Atherton and Rothschild 2008; Rebolledo and Márquez 2000), so the lack of faunal bone may simply be a product of excavations focusing on interior spaces. Rabbits appear in the faunal assemblages of several sites, but only contributed significantly to the local diet at La Placita (in southeastern Colorado), which also is the only village that appears not to have cultivated crops. A greater diversity of crops (including sugar cane) could grow in the lower latitudes of the Rio Medio and Rio Abajo; however, this diversity is not readily apparent in the botanical remains described above. Many more lithic artifacts have been recovered from sites in the Chama River area than in any other region, and include greater numbers of expedient tools, gunflints or strike-a-lights, and groundstone. This region also has more evidence suggesting local craft production, both in the form of tinworking (Brown et al. 1978:138; Darling and Eiselt, chapter 7 in this volume; Eiselt 2006) and ceramic manufacture (Brown et al. 1978:58–59; Eiselt 2006; D. Levine 1990, 2004; Olinger 2004).

The most obvious differences between Vecino sites are found in patterns of nonlocal goods, reflecting the approximate areas of different local and regional trade networks that existed within New Mexico. Local trade networks are most apparent in the assemblages of New Mexican ceramics. The New Mexican ceramic assemblage from the single Vecino site in the Rio Abajo region was dominated by wares likely produced by Southern Tiwa potters at Isleta or Isleta del Sur (see Figure 8.2). Decorated/polished wares produced by Keresan potters at Santa Ana and Zia and Western Keres potters at Acoma and Laguna occurred most frequently in Vecino sites in the Rio Medio region. Vecino sites in the north were supplied mostly with decorated/polished wares produced by Northern Tewa potters and micaceous utility wares produced in and around the Sangre de Cristo Mountains (mostly by Jicarilla Apache potters). In addition, sites in the
northwest (Chama River area) contained greater numbers of locally produced polished black wares, and sites in the far north (Taos) and far east (Pecos River) contained greater numbers of Apachean micaceous ceramics. Vecino sites located far away from Pueblo or Apache communities—that is, the Ontiberos Site and La Placita—did not possess New Mexican ceramics.

Regional trade networks are most apparent in the assemblages of historical-period artifacts. Majolica and Mexican glaze ware ceramics are the most obvious Mexican imports, and these items appear consistently—if not in great numbers—at sites along the Camino Real. Fewer (if any) majolica/Mexican glaze ware sherds were recovered from sites outside of the Rio Grande Valley, including at relatively populous sites like San Miguel del Vado. The purchase and resulting presence of majolica ceramics could indicate greater wealth or social status, or a desire to project a more Spanish identity (see Snow 1993). However, it is unlikely that the absence of these ceramics outside of the Rio Grande Valley reflected differences in ethnicity or class (with genízaro buffer settlements being excluded from the Mexican trade), as San José de Las Huertas began as a genízaro buffer settlement and produced dozens of Mexican ceramics. In most cases, differences in the prevalence of Mexican imports within the Vecino assemblages likely reflect differences in access to the Camino Real trade. American imports seem to have penetrated more deeply into the countryside, appearing in the assemblages of most sites occupied after 1821. Unfortunately, it is difficult to determine how the distribution of American goods might have changed over the course of the territorial period, as the date ranges for sites often are based on the prevalence of American imports. (Thus, there is a fair amount of circular reasoning involved in making the observation that American imports are available everywhere after the train arrived in 1880.)

As the previous statement suggests, some of the differences between the assemblages of Vecino sites may reflect change over time rather than (or in addition to) regional differences. Animal husbandry practices are remarkably consistent; however, the introduction of American cattle from the Central and Southern Plains and the growth of the cattle industry around Las Vegas do appear to have influenced sites along the Pecos River. Horticulture likely was similarly affected, as the demand for fodder increased and the availability of cheap grain imports—especially wheat—made it easier to change crops. Bone saws first appear during this period, and the rise of a butchering industry likely responded more to the demands of an Anglo market (including soldiers) than to the needs of Vecinos, though some this saw-cut meat did make it into Vecino homes. Band saws also changed the timber industry, bringing more milled lumber into Vecino villages and homes.

Clothing manufacture and maintenance remained important throughout time; however, in earlier sites this may be expressed more in wool shears, weaving
equipment, awls, and leather-working tools (scrapers), with later assemblages more likely to include scissors, needles, buttons, and beads. Flaked glass items may be more abundant than flaked stones in the later assemblages, especially in areas where the local stone is not as sharp or easily modified as glass (e.g., San Miguel del Vado and Los Ojitos). Finally, American land-use laws restricted the landholdings of older communities while the new Homestead Acts influenced the arrangement of new settlements. In most cases, the loss of the common lands drove members of older land grant communities into the labor force to compensate for the loss of grazing lands and timber. Those who sought to establish new communities were forced to deal with an American public land grant system that used an arbitrary grid to measure out equal sections of land that, because they ignored local geography, varied tremendously in available resources and agricultural productivity (see Church 2002).

In sum, Vecino identity drew on a common set of beliefs and routine practices, many of which emphasized social integration and economic interdependence. These values are apparent in the corporate structure of the villages and in the spiritual, familial, and economic ties between community members and between communities. At a regional level, the emphasis on economic interdependence linked Vecinos to neighboring Native communities, whose differing values and practices influenced the development of Vecino identity in those regions, thus creating interesting regional variants.

CONCLUSIONS
The concept of Vecino identity—a civic identity defined by one’s residence and accepted membership in a Spanish colonial community—is intriguing, particularly for those studying cross-cultural interaction and identity formation. Historical archaeologists are often frustrated by their inability to distinguish ethnic groups along cultural frontiers because these groups often shared overlapping territories, performed many of the same tasks, and used materials that were produced by or circulated among all of them. To further complicate matters, these groups often intermixed and intermarried, raising children of mixed heritage (e.g., Cordell and Yannie 1991). The conscious adoption of Vecino identity by New Mexican colonists moved the focus away from ethnic divisions and toward shared practices, allowing us to recognize the creation of this new civic and cultural identity (Nieto-Phillips 2008:38) and investigate how vecindad helped to integrate a multiethnic, multicultural population.

Archaeologists working in culture-contact zones tend to fixate on the ethnic component of these relations, deriving “ethnicities” from historical-period notions of race or caste, and expecting that cross-cultural interactions would have led to an exaggeration of ethnic differences (Barth 1969), some of which will be visible in the archaeological record as “ethnic markers.” Often times,
this is the case. Ethnicity, however, is not the only axis of social identification, and sometimes—especially along colonial or national frontiers—civic identity becomes the more important organizing principle of a population. Amidst the many studies of creolization (e.g., Cusick 2000; Dawdy 2000; Deagan 1973; Worth 2012) and ethnogenesis (e.g., Anderson 1999; Hill 1996; Lightfoot 2005; Voss 2008) along colonial frontiers, this examination of Vecino identity serves as a reminder that diverse frontier populations often came together as communities, and membership in a community could be just as—or more—important than affiliation with an ethnic group. Thus, there is something valuable to be learned from focusing less on the attributes that divided colonial populations and more on the practices that united them.

REFERENCES CITED


Betram, Jack B. 1990. “Archaeofaunal Analysis of Samples from Casa Trujillo (LA 59658) and La Puente de Abiquiú (LA 54313), Rio Arriba County, New Mexico.” Manuscript on file, Office of Archaeological Studies, Museum of New Mexico, Santa Fe.


Neasham, Aubrey. 1940. “Special Report on the Proposed National Historic Site of San Miguel del Vado (Submitted to Region III, National Park Service, Department of the Interior; located in the LA 2734 site file).” Manuscript on file, Archaeological Records Management System (ARMS), Museum of New Mexico, Santa Fe.


Rudecoff, Christine A. 1987a. *Archaeological Testing at LA 46635 (San Antonio de los Poblanos), Bernalillo County, New Mexico*. Laboratory of Anthropology Notes 311. Santa Fe: Laboratory of Anthropology, Museum of New Mexico.


