



Figure 1. Key Cacaxtle Locations in Northeastern Mexico and Southern Texas. A, Known territorial range of the Cacaxtle, 1663-1693; B, Area of Northwestern Coahuila misidentified as Cacaxtle range by Moreno (1944); C, Salinas sighting of 5 Cacaxtle Indians in 1693; D, French map of Kaikache Location (Delisle 1718).

## THE CACAXTLE INDIANS OF NORTHEASTERN MEXICO AND SOUTHERN TEXAS

T. N. Campbell

A large area in present-day northeastern Mexico and southern Texas was originally inhabited by numerous distinctively named Indian groups who subsisted by hunting and gathering. After European colonists, mainly Spanish, arrived in the latter part of the 16th century, the fragile economies of these Indian groups were disrupted, their populations declined, and their ethnic identities were eventually lost. Most groups were sparingly recorded in European documents, and it is now difficult and time-consuming to retrieve such information as happened to get recorded. Although hundreds of Indian group names are known, there have been very few monographic studies of specific ethnic units. It seems to have been assumed that limited documentation renders such studies unprofitable. This attitude is difficult to defend, for such studies constitute a logical and necessary step toward sorting the various Indian groups into meaningful categories based on territorial range, language, and culture, and toward elucidating not only interaction between any two Indian groups but also interaction between various Indian groups and the Europeans. The Indians of this region as a whole remain poorly understood primarily because of this failure to focus attention on specific groups (Campbell 1983a).

Cacaxtle is an imported name that Spaniards gave to one of these hunting and gathering groups. The Cacaxtle are known mainly from accounts of two Spanish military expeditions, one made in 1663, the other in 1665. Although the two accounts do not reveal very much about the Cacaxtle, these people have received special attention because, so far as the record shows, they were the first Indians identified as actually having been seen by Spaniards in southern Texas after Cabeza de Vaca traversed that area in 1535. Historians have phrased this in military terms, pointing out that in 1665 the Cacaxtle were attacked by the first Spanish military expedition to pass northward across the Rio Grande and that these hostilities represent the first clearly recorded battle between Spaniards and Indians in what is now southern Texas (Bolton 1916:284; Castañeda 1931:9 and 1936, I:212; Weddle 1968:5). These historical "firsts" probably explain why the name Cacaxtle, or some recognizable variant of it, has appeared so often on maps that omit the names of many better documented Indian groups.

Limited knowledge of the Cacaxtle Indians has led to divergent opinions about who they were and where they were living when encountered by Spaniards in 1663 and 1665. The principal objectives of this essay are (1) to present such information as was recorded about the Cacaxtle in the 30-year period (1663-1693) during which they were actually seen by Europeans; (2) to evaluate this information and try to place it in a clearer historical perspective; and (3) to correct what appear to be errors in previously published statements about Cacaxtle ethnic identity and territorial range.

ORIGIN OF THE NAME CACAXTLE

It is doubtful if Cacaxtle was the name that these Indians used in referring to themselves. Cacaxtle is one form of a word that Spaniards in colonial Mexico borrowed from the Nahuatl language. It was used to designate various devices made by Indians for the purpose of carrying loads on their backs and shoulders, particularly a kind of carrying frame or backpack (Santamaría 1974:174). A netted carrying frame made of wood is known to have been used by unspecified Indian groups of northern Nuevo León in the early 17th century (Campbell 1983a:352). It is possible that another name for the Cacaxtle Indians is recorded in Spanish documents without indication of its being synonymous with Cacaxtle. Unless documents are found that shed light on this matter, we will probably never know any more than we do now.

The name Cacaxtle may have been used by Spaniards of northeastern Mexico to refer to more than one ethnic group, but the information now available seems to indicate that it was used to designate only one specific group.

#### SPANISH-CACAXTLE CONFLICT

No primary documents (official reports, diaries, journals, etc.) connected with the Spanish military expeditions of 1663 and 1665 have yet been found. Information on these expeditions comes from the exasperatingly brief accounts of Juan Bautista Chapa, who wrote a history of Nuevo León covering the years 1650-1690 (León y otros 1961:142-143, 147-149). Chapa, who died in 1695, lived in northeastern Mexico during the period about which he wrote. In effect, this secondary source has become the primary source of information. All other secondary sources are based on Chapa. The most complete secondary source in English is Castañeda (1936, I:211-213), who paraphrases Chapa's descriptions. In some secondary sources statements occasionally appear which cannot be confirmed by careful reading of Chapa's accounts of the two expeditions.

#### Frontier Indian Raids

It is evident from statements made by Chapa that Indian raids on Spanish frontier settlements north of Monterrey and Saltillo were fairly common during the mid-17th century. He indicates that in the 1660s most of the raiding was done by various Indian groups living to the north of the Spanish settlement centers and that some of the raiding Indians came from localities as far north as the Rio Grande. In terms of present-day maps, these various Indian groups were living in northeastern Coahuila and northern Nuevo León, and the territorial ranges of some of them must have extended across the Rio Grande into the adjoining part of Texas. Apparently Spaniards at this time did not keep routine records on the number of raids, and there is no way to determine how many raids were made during any particular year. It is disappointing to find that Chapa does not specify the names of various Indian groups involved in raids occurring in the 1660s.

These raids seem to have been mainly small-scale operations in which Indian parties waylaid unescorted travelers on roads or attacked small outlying farms and ranches where armed Spaniards were few and risks were minimal. It seems reasonable to assume that the Indians usually approached by stealth and attempted to achieve surprise. It is said that they sometimes merely took horses and mules from herds pastured at some distance from a Spanish settlement and that there were no casualties.

The rhetoric used by Chapa is similar to that found in documents pertaining to Indians on other European settlement frontiers in North America. Chapa referred to a series of raids in any locality as an uprising or rebellion. He said that innate malice and depravity led Indians to attack Spaniards. When Indians made off with any kind of Spanish property, the act was labelled as theft or robbery. When Indians killed Spaniards, it was murder; but when Spaniards killed Indians it was part of a pacification program designed to lead Indians into civilized life. From this rhetoric little can be learned about Indian motives for raiding.

Some of the Indians must have previously been displaced from their homelands by Spaniards, and these Indians may have been motivated to some extent by a desire for revenge. Chapa emphasized deaths of Spaniards during raids, but he implied that the Indians had economic motives for making raids. Chapa did not name many items taken by raiding Indians, but these Indians evidently wanted horses, mules, and goods of European manufacture, such as tools, utensils, and weapons, as well as textile clothing and ornaments. They preferred, possibly because of accumulated resentment, to obtain these things by raiding instead of trading.

According to Chapa, it was routine, after a raid or a short series of raids, for Spaniards of Monterrey and Saltillo to send out a party of 25 or 30 soldiers

and frontier militiamen to find the Indians and punish them. Apparently the guilty Indians were not often found, and there must have been some cases of mistaken identity in which the wrong Indians were punished, which would increase Indian resentment. In the early 1660s this *ad hoc* policy was not reducing the number of raids, and it was decided that larger Spanish forces should be sent out to campaign extensively in the northern area and teach all the raiding Indians a lesson. It is against this raiding background that two such military expeditions will be reviewed, one in 1663, the other in 1665, during which Spaniards encountered a group of Indians referred to as Cacaxtle. The dates of the military expeditions of 1663 and 1665 have sometimes been erroneously given as 1653 and 1655 (*e.g.*, Bolton 1916:284; Forbes 1959: 205 and 1960:155).

### Expedition of 1663

Chapa's account of the Spanish expedition of 1663 is quite brief and contains less descriptive detail than his account of the 1665 expedition. In 1663 the Spanish party was led by an experienced frontier soldier, Juan de la Garza. It consisted of over 100 men from Monterrey and Saltillo (see Figure 1). The Saltillo contingent included a few Tlascaltecan Indians, originally from southern Mexico, who were living in a village near Saltillo. The party, which took along 800 horses and 80 pack loads of food and other essentials, left Monterrey on October 1, 1663, and returned in March of the following year.

Although the direction of travel is not specified, it can be deduced that it was northward, since the stated purpose of the expedition was to punish the raiding "nations of the north." Without mentioning anything that happened along the way, the account states that after traveling for a distance of 70 leagues, or about 180 miles, the Spaniards found a large encampment of Indians identified as Cacaxtle. This encampment was attacked, 100 Indians were killed, and 125 captured. There were no serious Spanish casualties, and it is said that the captives were later taken to Zacatecas for work in the silver mines.

This laconic account leaves several questions unanswered. One of these is why the Spaniards apparently traveled 180 miles northward without meeting any Indians. If any Indians other than the Cacaxtle were encountered and were punished, it would seem that this should have been mentioned in the account, for it would enhance the record of success. It is possible that this area was not occupied by any Indians during the winter months. If, however, Indians were present, the most plausible explanation of why none were encountered is that the Spanish party was unusually large for the time; it traveled slowly because so much baggage was carried; it was visible at considerable distances in the open country traversed after leaving the mountains immediately north of Monterrey; and the Indians simply kept out of sight, perhaps passing the news on to other Indians along an obvious northward line of Spanish travel. In other words, the Indians were there and saw the Spaniards, but Spaniards did not see the Indians. The Spanish leaders kept traveling northward because they were evidently unwilling to return and report that, after some five months in the field, no Indians could be found. This would have been hard to explain to authorities at Monterrey and Saltillo.

Another question is whether or not the Spanish party crossed the Rio Grande before encountering the Cacaxtle. In the account of the 1665 expedition it is said that the Rio Grande was crossed, and some historians have assumed that the expedition of 1663 must also have crossed that river. This is going beyond the recorded evidence, and it seems best to assume that the expedition of 1663 did not cross the river into present-day Texas. Approximately 180 miles due north of Monterrey is the modern town of Guerrero (northeastern Coahuila), which was the site of Presidio San Juan Bautista, founded shortly after 1700. Guerrero is about five miles from the Rio Grande, on which there is a closely spaced series of fords that later Spanish expeditions used for crossing into Texas (Weddle 1973:137n). As will be pointed out again later, a

remnant group of Cacaxtle Indians was seen in the Guerrero locality in 1693, suggesting that this was in the area originally ranged by the Cacaxtle.

Still another question is why, if other Indian groups evaded the Spaniards, the Cacaxtle did not also evade them. It may have been because the Cacaxtle had never been involved in frontier raiding, although this appears unlikely. They may have believed that they were so far from Monterrey and Saltillo that the Spaniards would not come that far. Apparently the earlier and smaller Spanish military parties had not gone that far north. On the other hand, the Cacaxtle may have felt confidence in their numbers and in their ability to withstand a Spanish attack. Unfortunately, there is no information that helps to explain why the Cacaxtle chose to stand their ground in 1663 and again in 1665.

#### Expedition of 1665

The expedition of 1663 seems to have had little effect on the number of raids made on the Spanish frontier; for in 1665 another expedition was sent out from Monterrey with the same objective as the first expedition. This was led by Fernando de Azcué of Saltillo and involved 103 Spaniards, 73 from Saltillo and 30 from Monterrey. The party had 800 horses and 70 pack loads of provisions and supplies. This expedition was accompanied by 300 Bobol Indians from Coahuila. It is not certain that all of the Bobol were males; some may have been women. The Bobol had heard of the expedition and had asked the Spaniards if they might go along. Azcué seems to have had doubts about Bobol motives and reliability, but finally agreed to their proposal. Thus the expedition of 1665 consisted of at least 400 individuals. Nothing is said about time of the year or how long this Spanish-Bobol party was in the field.

In the account of the 1665 expedition there is again no specific statement about the direction of travel, but there can be no doubt about northerly movement because mention is made of crossing the Rio Grande. Unfortunately, the distance from Monterrey to the Rio Grande crossing is not recorded by Chapa. All we know is that, after crossing the river, the party in six days traveled 24 leagues, or about 60 miles, to find the Cacaxtle. Again nothing is said about encountering other Indian groups along the route. As Chapa wrote both accounts, and says nothing about a different route being taken, it seems reasonable to conclude that the expedition of 1665 followed essentially the same route as that of 1663.

It may be assumed that the Cacaxtle knew of the Spanish approach, because they had taken refuge in a dense thicket of thorny vegetation and had built a rudimentary defensive structure. It is not clear whether or not the Cacaxtle had dug trenches, but the account plainly describes a rampart that had been constructed around their position. This consisted of piled-up tree trunks, tree branches, and quantities of prickly-pear pads. The Spaniards and their Bobol allies found it difficult to approach the Cacaxtle, and it took an entire day to breach the defenses and subdue the Cacaxtle. It is said that while the Cacaxtle men were fighting, an elderly woman encouraged them by playing on a flute (*flauta*). The account refers to 100 Cacaxtle killed and 70 captives taken. No allusion is made to the number of Cacaxtle who managed to escape or to what was afterward done with the captives. In this battle 22 Spaniards were wounded. It is mentioned that two Bobol Indians were killed, but nothing is said about the number wounded.

The role of the Bobol in the expedition of 1665 is of some interest. One wonders if perhaps the Bobol and Cacaxtle were traditional enemies. It is possible that the Bobol knew where the Cacaxtle were and led Spaniards to them. This presumed enmity may be reflected in Chapa's description of a post-battle episode. The Bobol asked that the flute-playing woman be turned over to them for use in a victory ceremony that involved cannibalism. This request was refused by the Spaniards, but the Bobol learned that one of the boy captives was a relative of the flute-playing woman. This boy was spirited away and some of his flesh was eaten in the ceremony.

Chapa's account is apologetic about this turn of events, but says nothing could be done about it, implying awareness of the fact that the Spaniards were greatly outnumbered by their Bobol allies. This episode shows that ceremonial cannibalism was present in the area and suggests that, under similar circumstances, the Cacaxtle might have eaten a Bobol captive.

There is not enough recorded information to determine just where the Cacaxtle were encountered by the Spanish expedition of 1665. We know only that they were found 60 miles beyond the Rio Grande in what is now Texas. If we assume that the Rio Grande was crossed somewhere in the vicinity of Guerrero, northeastern Coahuila, where some of the Cacaxtle were seen later (1693) and where were easy crossings of the river, and if we further assume that the Spaniards traveled on due northward, this would place the Cacaxtle encampment in the southern part of what is now Kinney County, Texas (see Figure 1). If, however, there was a change in travel direction more to the northeast, the Cacaxtle may have been found in either Zavala or La Salle County. Or if there was a change in travel direction more to the northwest, the Spaniards would have traveled up the valley of the Rio Grande, which does not seem to be implied by the record. It would have helped if Chapa had mentioned whether or not the Spaniards had crossed another river (the Nueces) before finding the Cacaxtle.

The Kinney County location does not significantly contradict the views of historians who have been interested in determining where the Cacaxtle were when attacked by Spaniards in 1665. These historians are in general agreement on two points: (a) that both Spanish expeditions traveled more or less due northward from Monterrey, and (2) that the expedition of 1665 crossed the Rio Grande in the vicinity of modern Eagle Pass, Texas, which is about 30 miles up the Rio Grande northwest of Guerrero (Bolton 1916:284; Brewster 1903:340; Castañeda 1931:9 and 1936, I:211; Forbes 1960:155; Horgan 1954:257-258; Steck 1932:1; Weddle 1968:5). In their writings, however, these historians do not pause to comment on deficiencies in the documentary record or to specify the evidence that led them to their conclusions.

Some writers have taken small liberties with the facts recorded about Cacaxtle in the two Chapa accounts. They sometimes state that the Cacaxtle were the dominant raiding people on the frontier north of Monterrey, and that both expeditions were sent out with specific orders to find the Cacaxtle and punish them. It is even said that in 1663 the Cacaxtle were "pursued" for a distance of 180 miles before being attacked. It is further said that, after being soundly trounced by Spaniards in 1663, the Cacaxtle continued their raiding, which led to the expedition of 1665. These statements make good narrative reading but cannot be confirmed when one closely inspects the Chapa accounts. Actually what seems to have happened is that the expeditions of 1663 and 1665 were sent out to find some of the raiding Indian groups and punish them, and in both instances the Cacaxtle happened to get caught. The Cacaxtle have been made to appear more important than they really were.

#### CACAXTLE AFTER 1665

There can be little doubt that the expeditions of 1663 and 1665 discouraged the Cacaxtle from further raiding, assuming that they had indeed participated in raids; but these expeditions seem not to have had the desired exemplary effect on various other raiding "nations of the north." This is indicated by Griffen (1969: 155-169), who cites a series of documents in the Parral Archives naming 34 Indian groups said to have been raiding Spanish settlements in Coahuila and Nuevo León shortly before 1670. As perhaps might be expected, the name Cacaxtle does not appear, but most of the names can be recognized as referring to Indian groups who, after 1670, were recorded as living in northern Nuevo León, northeastern Coahuila, and the adjoining part of Texas (see Figure 1, A). Among these one recognizes such names as Aguapalam, Catujan, Heniocane, Hierbipiame, Hume, Milijae, Ocana, Payuguan, Pomulum,

Sampanal, and Siaguan. The list of 34 groups probably includes many of the raiding "nations of the north" that the expeditions of 1663 and 1665 had set out to find and punish but could catch only the Cacaxtle.

Later documents prove that some of the Cacaxtle survived the severe population losses of 1663 and 1665. In a Coahuila document of 1674 the name "Cacastes" is found on a list of Indian groups said to be living in northeastern Coahuila and vicinity (Alessio Robles 1938:232). The Cacaxtle were last recorded in 1693 by Gregorio de Salinas Varona, governor of Coahuila, in his diary describing a journey from Monclova to eastern Texas (Gómez Canedo 1968:280, 289, 306). In May of that year, when he was just south of the Rio Grande in northeastern Coahuila, evidently near the site of present-day Guerrero, Salinas Varona was visited by three groups of Indians identified as Cacaxtle, Ocana, and Piedras Blancas. The diary does not indicate whether these three groups were sharing the same encampment or were living in separate encampments. Salinas Varona thus saw Cacaxtle not far from where it appears that they were first attacked by Spaniards in 1663. Little is known about the Piedras Blancas, but the Ocana are frequently recorded in documents that pertain to northeastern Coahuila and the adjacent part of Texas just north of the Rio Grande (Campbell 1979:26).

Two weeks later Salinas Varona saw five Cacaxtle males, presumably hunters, between the Guadalupe and Colorado rivers east or southeast of present-day San Antonio, Texas (see Figure 1, C). He did not mention seeing a Cacaxtle encampment in that area, and we therefore cannot determine if the five men were hunting out of a local or a more distant encampment to the southwest near the Rio Grande. It is known that Indians from surrounding areas went to grasslands along the Guadalupe and Colorado rivers to hunt bison, and that some of these Indians came from northeastern Coahuila and vicinity (Campbell 1983b).

After 1693 the name Cacaxtle disappears from known documents that are equivalent to eyewitness accounts. Except for one vague reference to Coahuila (Revilla Gigedo 1966:60), no documents have been found that record the presence of Cacaxtle individuals at any Spanish missions of northeastern Mexico and Texas. This seeming reluctance of Cacaxtle to enter missions is understandable when we consider the rough treatment they received from Spaniards in 1663 and 1665. The Cacaxtle who survived after 1693 probably lost their ethnic identity by merging with one or more Indian groups who had survived in greater numbers. This loss of identity must have occurred prior to 1708, for in that year a missionary, Isidro Félix de Espinosa, compiled a list of 49 Indian groups said to be living at various localities north and east of present-day Guerrero, Coahuila. No recognizable variant of the name Cacaxtle appears on this list (Maas 1915:36-37).

#### INTERPRETATION OF THE CACAXTLE RECORD

##### Territorial Range

The available evidence, both positive and negative, seems to indicate that during the period 1663-1693 the Cacaxtle were associated with the large lowland area to the north and east of the mountain front that passes diagonally across the Mexican states of Nuevo León and Coahuila. This lowland area extends from the mountain front northward across the Rio Grande to the southern margin of the Edwards Plateau of Texas. Within this large lowland area the Cacaxtle can best be linked with a more restricted area on both sides of the Rio Grande in which today one finds the communities of Guerrero, Coahuila, and Eagle Pass, Texas (see Figure 1, A). As has been argued above, the Spanish expeditions of 1663 and 1665 traveled directly northward from Monterrey and encountered Cacaxtle at two localities in this restricted area. The key to association of the Cacaxtle with this section of the Rio Grande is provided by Salinas Varona, who met Cacaxtle encamped near modern Guerrero in 1693. The significance of this bit of evidence has gone unrecognized.

During the past 40 years several scholars have compiled maps that place the Cacaxtle much farther west than seems to be indicated by Chapa's accounts of the Spanish military expeditions and by the few documents that record later Spanish contacts with Cacaxtle Indians. As the maps are not supported by commentaries, it is hard to assess the reasoning involved in these more westerly placements.

Jiménez Moreno's map (1944) shows Cacaxtle on both sides of the Rio Grande in extreme northern Coahuila and the adjoining part of Texas, and in Texas the Cacaxtle are placed well to the west of the lower Pecos River (see figure 1, B). On his map a dot-dash line indicates presumed Cacaxtle movement southeastward to make attacks on Spanish settlements near Saltillo, Pesquería Grande (present García, Nuevo León), and Monterrey. Driver and Massey's map of 1957 follows the lead of Jiménez Moreno and shows Cacaxtle in northwestern Coahuila immediately east of the Texas Big Bend region. Maps by Swadesh (1959) and by Griffen (1969) closely follow Driver and Massey. It should be noted that only the map of Jiménez Moreno specifically indicates the extension of Cacaxtle territory northward into present-day Texas.

All four maps place the Cacaxtle far to the northwest of Monterrey, and at least 200 miles farther west than presently known documents seem to indicate. If we apply a yardstick provided by Chapa's account of the 1663 expedition, namely, 180 miles of travel from Monterrey to the Cacaxtle, and assume (as the mapmakers do) that the Spaniards traveled northwestward instead of northward, the Spanish expeditionary party would have traveled little more than half the distance to the Cacaxtle as shown on these maps. Griffen (1969:88, 157), who has reviewed ethno-historic data from western Coahuila and eastern Chihuahua, found the Cacaxtle mentioned only in documents that pertain to northeastern, not northwestern or extreme northern, Coahuila. If the Cacaxtle were so far to the west, one wonders why the expeditions of 1663 and 1665 did not leave from Saltillo instead of from Monterrey. If the Spaniards followed a northwestward route, one also wonders why Chapa's accounts of the two expeditions say nothing about rugged, mountainous terrain that would have been traversed to reach the Cacaxtle. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the compilers of these four maps paid little attention to the topography of northern Mexico, ignored Chapa's references to direction and distance, and placed the Cacaxtle in the wrong area.

### Population

If we take at face value the obviously round numbers given in the two expedition descriptions, and assume that all, or at least most, of the Cacaxtle were encamped together at that time, it would seem that prior to 1663 the Cacaxtle had a population not greater than 500. This is near the upper limit recorded for hunting and gathering groups of their area (Campbell 1983a:350). In 1663 the Cacaxtle population was reduced by 225 (100 killed, 125 captured and removed from the area), and in 1665 the population was reduced by another 170 (100 killed, 70 captured and presumably removed as in 1663). These figures account for a total of 395 Cacaxtle, but during both attacks some of the Cacaxtle must have managed to escape. Later documents (1674, 1693) confirm survival of some of the Cacaxtle.

Some modern writers, who seem not to have read the Chapa accounts thoughtfully, have made it appear that the Cacaxtle were responsible for all the Indian raids on the frontiers of Coahuila and Nuevo León in the mid-17th century. If the Cacaxtle numbered no more than 500, including women and children, it is hardly realistic to think of them as terrorizing such a large area. Other Indian groups must also have been involved in these frontier raids.

The case of the Cacaxtle has certain demographic implications. If the Spanish figures can be trusted, during a period of three years the Cacaxtle population was reduced by approximately 80 percent in two pitched battles. This suggests that, under unusual circumstances, the population of a hunting and gathering group could be drastically reduced in warfare with Europeans. So far as the records go, no



other Indian population in the same area seems to have been substantially reduced in pitched battles with Europeans. Hence it is not possible to cite armed conflict with Europeans as a major factor in the decline of other hunting and gathering populations in this area.

### Language

As no identified samples of Cacaxtle speech have been found in documents, there is no satisfactory basis for determining what language the Cacaxtle spoke. Some writers, noting that the Cacaxtle seem to have lived in an area where the Coahuilteco language was widely spoken, have suggested that the Cacaxtle may have spoken that language (Newcomb 1961:36; Ruecking 1955:286; Swanton 1940:134). It is now known, however, that other languages were spoken in the same general area, and it is also clear that Coahuilteco was not as widely spoken as was once believed (Campbell 1983a:348; Goddard 1979:355-356, 380-381). Thus it seems best to leave the Cacaxtle language unclassified. Some writers have followed this course (Driver and Massey 1957:map; Jiménez Moreno 1944:131 and map; Swadesh 1959:25, 35), but this was probably a consequence of their mistaken belief that the Cacaxtle lived much farther to the west, where no Coahuilteco-speakers have been recognized.

It is of some interest to note that with Azcué in 1665 was a man said to know most of the languages spoken by Indians living northward from Monterrey and Saltillo. Thus Spaniards of the time appear to have been aware that more than one language, or at least more than one dialect, was spoken in that relatively large area.

### Culture

Very little is definitely known about Cacaxtle culture patterns. The account of the Spanish expedition of 1665 refers to defensive ramparts and flute-playing in connection with warfare, and it may be noted that these items are not recorded for any other Indian group of the same area. The known meaning of the name Cacaxtle suggests that these people made and used a special device for transporting loads on their backs. Beyond this it may be inferred from a larger context that the Cacaxtle were hunters and gatherers and used the bow and arrow in hunting and warfare. One indirect clue suggests that cannibalism may have been involved in ceremonies connected with warfare. Forbes (1959:205-206) asserts that the Cacaxtle had acquired horses by the year 1663, which seems plausible in the light of the frontier raiding described by Chapa. Yet Chapa says nothing about horses among the Cacaxtle. Perhaps they had some horses but not enough for use in fighting or for evading the Spaniards. The acquisition of horses by Indians in northeastern Mexico and southern Texas needs further study.

Through error the index to Vol. 10 of the new *Handbook of North American Indians* has entries identifying various categories of Cacaxtle culture, such as adornment, ceremonies, clothing, religion, social organization, structures, subsistence, technologies, and warfare. This is regrettable. The page citations in the volume index refer to generalized cultural information for an area in which Griffen (1983) mistakenly placed the Cacaxtle. At present no documents can be cited that demonstrate linkage of this cultural information with the Cacaxtle Indians.

### THE CAICACHE QUESTION

Caicache has long been regarded as the name of a specific Indian group that lived in what is now extreme southern Texas, that is, within the angle formed by the lower Rio Grande and the coastline of the Gulf of Mexico. This name has been rendered in slightly different ways: Caikache, Carcache, Kaicache, Kaikache, Kankache, Kankacche, and Kaskache. It is puzzling to find that no one has ever called

attention to the fact that the names Caicache and Cacaxtle are phonetically similar. Is it possible that the name Caicache actually refers to the Cacaxtle?

When this question is posed, doubts begin to arise about a separate ethnic status for the Caicache. One striking fact soon emerges: no document has yet been found that records any European having seen a Caicache Indian in southern Texas, or anywhere else. Spaniards of Coahuila and Nuevo León saw and fought the Cacaxtle, but there is no record of their contact with another group known as Caicache. No eyewitness accounts of Indians known by the name Caicache, or by some recognizable variant of that name, have been found in any documents--Spanish, French, or Anglo-American--that pertain to travel and settlement along the entire Gulf coast of Texas and Mexico; nor do the surviving registers of Spanish missions in Mexico and Texas have entries for individuals identified as Caicache Indians.

Where, then, does the name Caicache appear? It appears on various European maps that were compiled between the years 1717 and 1840 (Table 1) and thus has a purely cartographic history. The name appeared first on a French map of 1717 produced by Vermale (Wheat 1957, I:Map 98). Another and more widely known French map, compiled in 1718 by Delisle (Tucker 1942:Plate XV), copied Caicache information from the Vermale map, and later cartographers copied from the Delisle map. The Caicache question boils down to determination of where Vermale obtained his information on the Caicache. The further this matter is pursued, the more likely it appears that Vermale's Caicache refers to the Cacaxtle of the Spaniards. Here it becomes important to note that Caicache, when pronounced by a speaker of French, is not greatly different from Cacaxtle when it is pronounced by a speaker of Spanish.

When the map of Vermale is closely examined, several recorded details strongly suggest that his Caicache were the Cacaxtle of the Spaniards. Along the southern coast of Texas, south of either Baffin Bay or Corpus Christi Bay, the name "Kankache" is written twice, one name placed due north of the other, and with space between them. As no other Indian group name shown in lower Texas is duplicated in this way, Vermale seems to be indicating that the more southerly name refers to the Cacaxtle of 1663 and the more northerly name to the Cacaxtle of 1665. The most telling indication is a note, written along the shoreline, stating that these people made war against the Spaniards (*font la guerre aux Espagnols*). The Vermale map also indicates how the French must have obtained information from Spaniards about the Cacaxtle. It shows the routes of two trips (1714, 1716) made by Louis Juchereau de St. Denis from Natchitoches in Louisiana to Presidio San Juan Bautista on the Rio Grande (Bridges and De Ville 1967; Swanton 1942:52-55). Wheat (1957, I:65-67) has pointed out that Vermale was the first French cartographer to make use of information derived from the French outpost of Natchitoches, which was established in 1714.

The Delisle map of 1718 made certain alterations. The group name, rendered as "Kaikache," was written only once, and it was placed farther inland just north of the Rio Grande (see Figure 1, D). Delisle repeated Vermale's note about these people having made war against Spaniards. It seems clear enough that Delisle copied from Vermale, and it is also clear that later cartographers followed Delisle rather than Vermale. The later cartographers made slight alterations in the name Caicache, corrected stream courses, and moved the name Caicache a little farther to the north, making it appear that these Indians ranged over much of the area lying between Baffin Bay and the delta of the Rio Grande.

Recognition of the Caicache as a separate Indian group was codified by the original *Handbook of American Indians*, but this was done on the basis of surprisingly little research. The brief entry for the Caicache is quoted below in its entirety.

Caicache. A tribe said to have lived on the coast of Texas, but to have become extinct by 1850. Bollaert in Jour. Ethnol. Soc. Lond., II, 265, 280, 1850 (Hodge 1907, I:186).

The sole source of information is William Bollaert, an Englishman who traveled extensively in the Republic of Texas in 1842-1844 (Hollon and Butler 1956) and who later

<u>Cartographer</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Name Variant</u>	<u>Published Copy</u>
Vermale	1717	Kankache	Wheat 1957, I
Delisle	1718	Kaikache	Tucker 1942
Jeffreys	1775	Kaifache	Martin and Martin 1982
Collin	1802	Caikache	Baudry des Lozières 1802
Pichardo	1811	Carcache	Hackett 1934, II
Brué	1840	Kaskache	Leclerc 1950

Table 1. Maps Bearing the Name Caicache.

wrote an article on its Indians. In the article Bollaert said of the Caicache that

...These roamed at a very early date on the shores of Texas.  
At present none exist (Bollaert 1850:280-281).

This vague statement does not tell us where Bollaert got his information, but he undoubtedly obtained it from one of the maps listed in Table 1. We know of no other source he could have seen, and it is doubtful if he was told of the Caicache by anyone he met in Texas in the 1840s. That Bollaert learned nothing new about the Caicache is revealed by his absurd statement that the Caicache, along with several other Indian groups (he specifies Adai, Aranama, and Tejas), were probably remnants of the Natchez Indians

...formed after the dispersion of the greater part of that nation in 1528 when Narvaez, one of the lieutenants of Fernando Cortez, who, after crossing the Rio Grande, marched easterly through a part of the Natchez country...to the banks of the Mississippi.

Pánfilo de Narváez led no such expedition across Texas and never saw the Natchez, who maintained their ethnic integrity until the French-Natchez wars that began in 1716 (Swanton 1911:186-257).

In retrospect, it would appear that, although phonetically similar, the names Cacaxtle and Caicache have not been linked or equated because of the circumstances under which each name was initially recorded. Cacaxtle became known from Spanish accounts of Indian raids on the northern frontiers of Coahuila and Nuevo León, and Caicache became known from a French map that recorded it for an Indian group thought to be associated with an area in extreme southern Texas near the Gulf coast. Recording of the name in two different European languages and an apparent geographic separation tended to compartmentalize thought. Further geographic separation was introduced by certain modern writers who mistakenly placed the Cacaxtle in northwestern Coahuila and the adjacent part of Trans-Pecos Texas. Thus early maps placed the Caicache too far to the east, and recent maps have placed the Cacaxtle too far to the west. It now seems appropriate to merge the two names and rejoin what has been put asunder.

#### CACAXTLE SYNONYMY

If the preceding interpretations are accepted, the 20 names listed below in alphabetical order can be regarded as synonyms of the name Cacaxtle. These name variants have been taken from maps and from handwritten or printed documents that originated between the years 1663 and 1983. Some name variants taken from printed secondary sources are clearly the result of modern clerical and typographical errors. If new primary sources come to light, additional name variants may be expected.

Cacaste	Caxcaxtle
Cacastle	Cocaxtle
Cacaxte	Escabaca-Cascaste
Caicache	Kaicache
Caikache	Kaikache
Carcache	Kakahtle
Casastle	Kakaxtle
Cascaste	Kankache
Cascastle	Kankacche
Cataxtle	Kaskache

## CONCLUSIONS

The recorded information, although limited, confirms the Cacaxtle as one among many hunting and gathering groups of their area. When first seen in 1663, the Cacaxtle seem to have had a population about as large as that recorded for any of their neighbors. This population was drastically reduced in two pitched battles with Spaniards. The Cacaxtle never recovered from this shock, and their ethnic identity was lost, sometime between 1693 and 1708, by merging with remnants of other Indian groups. As the record now stands, they were the only people of their area to be virtually wiped out in warfare with Spaniards.

Very little descriptive detail on Cacaxtle culture was recorded, but two distinctive features (construction of defensive ramparts and flute-playing during battles) have not been noted in documents that refer to other Indian groups of their area. Although it seems likely that the Cacaxtle had at least some horses taken in raids on the Spanish settlement frontier of northeastern Mexico, the absence of firsthand observational records makes it impossible to determine to what extent this animal may have been integrated into their culture. The language spoken by the Cacaxtle remains unknown.

This critical review of documentary evidence and interpretive opinion concerning the Cacaxtle Indians reveals some of the difficulties connected with study of specific ethnic units in a large area dominated by hunting and gathering populations, all of whom have long been extinct and, when known, were sparingly recorded.

It now seems reasonably clear that much of the confusion concerning the Cacaxtle stems from misconceptions about where these Indians were living when attacked by Spaniards in 1663 and 1665. The information recorded by Chapa and Salinas Varona indicates that the Cacaxtle were encountered in an area lying along both sides of the Rio Grande more or less due north of Monterrey. Two early French cartographers, Vermale and Delisle, who apparently relied on poorly understood information obtained orally from Spaniards of northeastern Mexico, placed the Cacaxtle some 200 miles farther down the Rio Grande in what is now extreme southern Texas. This erroneous placement, along with French renditions of the name Cacaxtle, eventually led to recognition of a spurious ethnic group in that area. Maps produced in the present century have placed the Cacaxtle some 200 miles farther up the Rio Grande than the area indicated by Chapa and Salinas Varona, making it appear that these Indians ranged over an area in northwestern Coahuila and the adjoining part of Trans-Pecos Texas. This more westerly placement has caused the Cacaxtle to be linked with a different complex of hunting and gathering Indians, and this in turn has skewed speculative thought about their linguistic and cultural affiliations.

When scholars try to determine where a poorly documented Indian group was living at a particular time, it is evident that error may sometimes arise from hasty judgment. Positive statements about location may be made that cannot be confirmed when the available sources of information are rigorously analyzed, evaluated, and cross-checked for consistency. Such a test may indicate that the sources of information were not properly assessed. An error resulting from this procedural laxity may be perpetuated if it is accepted without question by later scholars.

For well over a century Caicache was not recognized as a variant of the name Cacaxtle, and this illustrates how complications may arise when information about one ethnic group was recorded by individuals from two different European nations. In this case one set of name variants was recorded in Spanish documents, another set on French maps. The equation of the two name sets is revealed by detailed analysis and comparison of successively dated early European maps, supplemented by information compiled by historians of North American cartography. One ethnic unit, through error, came to be regarded as two different ethnic units. Fictive proliferation of Indian groups is not uncommon for the region, but most of it is connected with especially numerous orthographic variants of the same name in Spanish documents. Badly distorted variants of the same name have sometimes been mistaken for names of separate

Indian groups (Campbell 1977). The net result of confusion about names has been unwitting recognition of more Indian groups than actually existed in northeastern Mexico and southern Texas.

Acknowledgments. Valued critical comment and helpful stylistic suggestions were received from T. J. Campbell, W. W. Newcomb, D. A. Story, and B. Stross.

#### References

- Alessio Robles, Vito  
1938 *Coahuila y Texas en la Época Colonial*. Mexico.
- Baudry de Lozières, Louis Narcisse  
1802 *Voyage a la Louisiane, et Sur de Continent de l'Amérique Septentrionale, fait dans les Années 1794 à 1798*. Paris.
- Bollaert, William  
1850 Observations on the Indian Tribes in Texas. *Journal of the Ethnological Society of London* II:262-283.
- Bolton, Herbert E., ed.  
1916 *Spanish Exploration in the Southwest, 1542-1706*. New York.
- Brewster, Betty F.  
1903 Expedition into Texas of Fernando des Bosque. *The National Geographic Magazine* 14(9):339-348.
- Bridges, Katherine, and Winston De Ville  
1967 Natchitoches and the Trail to the Rio Grande: Two Early Eighteenth-century Accounts by the Sieur Derbanne. *Louisiana History* 8(3):239-259.
- Campbell, T. N.  
1977 Ethnic Identities of Extinct Coahuiltecan Populations: Case of the Juanca Indians. *Texas Memorial Museum, Pearce-Sellards Series* 26. Austin.  
1979 Ethnohistoric Notes on Indian Groups Associated with Three Spanish Missions at Guerrero, Coahuila. *Archaeology and History of the San Juan Bautista Mission Area, Coahuila and Texas, Report 3*. Center for Archaeological Research, The University of Texas at San Antonio.  
1983a Coahuiltecas and Their Neighbors. In: William C. Sturtevant, General Editor, *Handbook of North American Indians* 10:343-358. Smithsonian Institution, Washington.  
1983b Espinosa, Olivares and the Colorado River Indians, 1709. *La Tierra: Journal of the Southern Texas Archaeological Association* 10(2):3-12.
- Castañeda, Carlos E.  
1931 Earliest Catholic Activities in Texas. *Preliminary Studies of the Texas Catholic Historical Society* 1(8). Austin.  
1936 *Our Catholic Heritage in Texas, 1519-1936, Vol. I*. Austin.

- Driver, Harold E., and William C. Massey  
 1957 Comparative Studies of North American Indians. *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, n.s. 47(2):165-456. Philadelphia.
- Forbes, Jack D.  
 1959 The Appearance of the Mounted Indian in Northern Mexico and the Southwest, to 1680. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 15(2):189-212.  
 1960 *Apache, Navaho, and Spaniard*. University of Oklahoma Press. Norman.
- Goddard, Ives  
 1979 The Languages of South Texas and the Lower Rio Grande. In: Lyle Campbell and Marianne Mithun, Editors, *The Languages of Native America: Historical and Comparative Assessment*:355-389. University of Texas Press, Austin.
- Gómez Canedo, Lino  
 1968 *Primeras Exploraciones y Poblamiento de Texas, 1686-1694*. *Publicaciones del Instituto Tecnológico y de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey, Serie Histórica* 6. Monterrey, Nuevo León.
- Griffen, William B.  
 1969 Cultural Change and Shifting Populations in Central Northern Mexico. *Anthropological Papers of the University of Arizona* 13. Tucson.  
 1983 Southern Periphery: East. In: William C. Sturtevant, General Editor, *Handbook of North American Indians* 10:329-342. Smithsonian Institution. Washington.
- Hackett, Charles W., ed.  
 1934 *Pichardo's Treatise on the Limits of Louisiana and Texas*, Vol. II. University of Texas Press. Austin.
- Hodge, F. W., ed.  
 1907, *Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico*. *Bureau of American Ethnology*, *Bulletin* 30, 2 Volumes. Smithsonian Institution. Washington.  
 1910
- Hollon, W. Eugene, and Ruth L. Butler  
 1956 *William Bollaert's Texas*. University of Oklahoma Press. Norman.
- Horgan, Paul  
 1954 *Great River: The Rio Grande in North American History*. 2 Volumes. New York.
- Jiménez Moreno, Wigberto  
 1944 Tribus e Idiomas del Norte de México. In: *El Norte de México y el Sur de Estados Unidos*:121-133. Tercera Reunión de Mesa Redonda sobre Problemas Antropológicos de México y Centro América, Sociedad Mexicana de Antropología, México.
- Leclerc, Frédéric  
 1950 *Texas and Its Revolution*. Translated from the original French by James L. Shepherd, III. Houston.

- León, Alonzo de, Juan Bautista Chapa, y el Gral. Fernando Sánchez de Zamora  
 1961 *Historia de Nuevo León, con Noticias sobre Coahuila, Tamaulipas, Texas y Nuevo México*. Estudio Preliminar y Notas de Israel Cavazos Garza. Centro de Estudios Humanísticos de la Universidad de Nuevo León, Biblioteca de Nuevo León. Monterrey, Nuevo León.
- Maas, P. Otto  
 1915 *Viajes de Misioneros Franciscanos á la Conquista del Nuevo México*. Sevilla.
- Martin, Robert S. and James C.  
 1982 *Contours of Discovery: Printed Maps Delineating the Texas and Southwestern Chapters in the Cartographic History of North America, 1513-1930*. Texas State Historical Association. Austin.
- Newcomb, W. W., Jr.  
 1961 *The Indians of Texas: From Prehistoric to Modern Times*. University of Texas Press. Austin.
- Revilla Gigedo, Conde de  
 1960 *Informe sobre las Misiones, 1793, e Instrucción Reservada al Marqués de Branciforte, 1794*. México.
- Ruecking, Frederick H., Jr.  
 1955 *The Coahuiltecan Indians of Southern Texas and Northeastern Mexico*. M.A. Thesis, University of Texas at Austin.
- Santamaría, Francisco J.  
 1974 *Diccionario de Mejicanismos*. Editorial Porrúa, México.
- Steck, Francis B.  
 1932 *Forerunners of Captain De Leon's Expedition to Texas, 1670-1675*. *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 36(1):1-28.
- Swadesh, Mauricio  
 1959 *Mapas de Clasificación Lingüística de México y las Américas*. *Cuadernos del Instituto de Historia, Serie Antropológica* 8. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México.
- Swanton, John R.  
 1911 *Indian Tribes of the Lower Mississippi Valley and Adjacent Coast of the Gulf of Mexico*. *Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin* 43. Smithsonian Institution. Washington.  
 1940 *Linguistic Material from the Tribes of Southern Texas and Northeastern Mexico*. *Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin* 127. Smithsonian Institution. Washington.  
 1942 *Source Material on the History and Ethnology of the Caddo Indians*. *Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin* 132. Smithsonian Institution. Washington.
- Tucker, Sara J., compiler  
 1942 *Indian Villages of the Illinois Country*. *Scientific Papers of the Illinois State Museum* II (Pt. I, Atlas). Springfield.



Weddle, Robert S.

1968 *San Juan Bautista: Gateway to Spanish Texas.* University of Texas Press. Austin.

1973 *Wilderness Manhunt: The Spanish Search for La Salle.* University of Texas Press. Austin.

Wheat, Carl I.

1957 *Mapping the Transmississippi West, 1540-1861.* Vol. I. Institute of Historical Cartography. San Francisco.