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Executive Summary

The Camino Real de los Tejas (also El Camino Real) and its offshoots extended from the United States-Mexico international border at the Rio Grande to the eastern boundary of the Spanish province of Texas in Natchitoches Parish, Louisiana. It was along this road that American Indian groups encountered the Spanish and the French—this is where history happened.

In 2009, the Historic Sites and Structures Program received a $30,000 grant from the National Park Service to investigate the route of El Camino Real through four parks and historic sites that it operates: Fort Boggy State Park, Mission Tejas State Park, Bastrop State Park, and McKinney Falls State Park. The primary effort was archival research with select focused archeological investigations.

Assisted by “the dean of Spanish colonial historians,” Robert S. Weddle, TPWD has determined that the main manifestation of El Camino Real likely passed through both Mission Tejas State Park and McKinney Falls State Park. Archival research documents that the road also passed nearby Bastrop State Park, but there is no evidence to support its route intersecting with what is now Fort Boggy State Park.

In support of Weddle's archival research, the Texas Archeological Research Laboratory assisted TPWD during 2011 in an attempt to confirm the presence on Mission Tejas State Park and McKinney Falls State Park. TARL's magnetometer survey at Mission Tejas State Park revealed “an intriguing linear feature in a relatively flat, low-lying area that may represent a dry-weather segment of the Camino Real.” The area was also traversed by those engaged in historical agricultural or timber harvesting activities and this feature might also be associated with later activities. Clearly some level of excavation would be necessary to seek the subsurface presence of artifacts relating to the contact period. At McKinney Falls State Park, the very land forms and water features that serve as easily recognizable landmarks for the archival research process make it difficult for magnetometry or other geophysical sensing techniques; the area near TPWD headquarters was easier to investigate but yielded only what was interpreted as modern debris.

The unfortunate fire at Bastrop State Park during Labor Day weekend 2011 caused staff archeologists to investigate the park’s landscape, noting cultural features newly exposed. The preliminary results of those investigations are included here as an appendix as they were not part of the Task Agreement.
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PART I

An Overview of the Camino Real de los Tejas

From the capital city of Mexico the trail pointed northward, meandering through the rugged mountains of the Sierra Madre Oriental, out across the tablelands of the Central Plateau. Ever lengthening, its forward extremity advanced like the head of a long snake—the tail remaining stationary while the head reached out onto the arid plains of the North, ringed by mountains whence came ... los indios rebeldes of many tribes and cultures. Across the desert country the serpentine trail writhed its way northward until it reached a gateway on the Río Grande del Norte, the Great River of the North (fig. 1).¹

It was a French interloper who provided both the incentive and the primary destination for this trail into the tierra incógnita beyond the Great River: to a tribe of Indians whose name was understood to be something like Techas or Tejas. Through captured pirates and bare-knuckled diplomacy, the Spaniards soon knew the Frenchman’s identity: René Robert Cavelier, sieur de La Salle. It was La Salle who, by his foolhardy attempt to plant a French colony on the Texas coast, in

¹ Adapted from Weddle, San Juan Bautista, p. 3.
Spanish territory, who had inspired—and unwittingly contributed to—the Spaniards' road called El Camino Real de los Tejas.

The Indians called Tejas actually were the Hasinai of Caddoan linguistic stock. The southern branch of the Caddoan speakers to which the Hasinai belonged also embraced the Kadohadachos and Caddos proper, as well as the Nanatsoho, upper Natchitoches, and Cahinio Indians of Arkansas. The Hasinai included eight tribes: the Hainai, Neches, Nacogdoche, Nacono, Namidish, Nasoni, Anadarko, and Nabedache. By and large, these were the Indians of the three Caddoan confederacies: Hasinai, Kadohadacho, and Natchitoches.²

The Spaniards first focused their interest on the Nabedaches with a short-lived mission in 1690, for it was among the Nabedaches that La Salle's remnant had appeared, just a few years previously, as it sought a path to the Mississippi. Thus, the amorphous Camino Real first directed itself toward the Nabedache village, situated between the Trinity and Neches rivers. Beginning in 1716, missionary endeavors would be directed at other tribes of the Caddoan confederacies as well.

The term Camino Real has been translated into English in various ways: Royal Road, King's Highway, and even—as novelist/historian Hodding Carter titled his book—Doomed Road of Empire. Yet, by whatever name, as Carter wrote, "No geographic designation in the New World is more evocative than the Spanish Trail. None is more misleading. For the Spanish Trail never was. Instead, there were many."³

Many trails, yes: trails weaving through the wilderness to the various missions and presidios wherever they arose, altering course when necessary to avoid deep ruts or silted-up river crossings; hostile Indians or impenetrable forests. Sometimes the trails were simply loops off the Camino Real's main course; in other instances they led to far-off settlements and ended there, simply spurs off the main camino. And, ultimately, more than one road could, by restrictive definition, claim the title and status of "Camino Real."

The original Camino Real de los Tejas may be seen as a length of rope frayed at both ends, a strand pulled apart here and there in departures from the main stem. By definition, a Camino Real or "royal road," in Spanish America or elsewhere, linked two Spanish capitals or other important destinations. Thus, the road that ran from Santiago de la Monclova, the colonial capital of Coahuila province, to Los Adaes (capital

---

2 Magnaghi, "Hasinai Indians."
3 Carter, Doomed Road of Empire, p. 1.
of the Spanish Province of Texas from 1729 to 1773) qualified for the title. Off-shoot trails to Presidio de San Sabá near present-day Menard or Presidio de San Agustín de Ahumada on the lower Trinity River did not. When the capital of Texas was moved from Los Adaes to San Antonio in 1773, San Antonio became the eastern terminus of the Camino Real. This overview, however, concerns itself primarily with the Camino Real de los Tejas in its greater length, limiting definition notwithstanding.⁴

No Spanish trail would have greater significance in the shaping of North America’s destiny than the road that trudged northward from the Mexican interior to find its gateway to Texas on the Rio Grande at present-day Guerrero, Coahuila (fig. 2). At its peak the gateway settlement, bearing the generic name San Juan Bautista—thirty-five miles downriver from present-day Eagle Pass, Texas, and Piedras Negras, Coahuila—comprised three missions and a presidio. Nearby were five river crossings that afforded passage to the tierra incógnito beyond the Great River. Each of these crossings served, but the most used—therefore the most-often mentioned—was Paso de Francia (“French Crossing”), so named because of the French interlopers.⁵

Figure 2.
The Gateway. The main street of Guerrero, Coahuila, named Calle Real, became the Camino Real at the edge of town. The town plaza in colonial times was the Plaza de Armas of Presidio de San Juan Bautista de Rio Grande.

⁴ For clarification of the definition, see El Camino Real de los Tejas, p. 7; hereafter cited as Feasibility Study.
⁵ The other four crossings, all within four or five miles of Guerrero, are Paso de las Islas, a short distance below Paso de Francia; Paso de los Pacuaches, some five miles farther upstream; Paso del Nogal and Paso de Diego Ramón. On April 8, 1967, the late John F. Woodhull and the author waded across the river at Paso de las Islas in water never more than knee deep.
There at the point of its Texas entry, the crossing known as Paso de Francia, the trail is still visible. On the Tovar Ranch in southern Maverick County, one may yet find where caravans bound for the Tejas climbed the Rio Grande bank. A deep gully—the result of 150 years of heavy traffic and another 150 years of water erosion—marks the entry of the Camino Real into Texas. From the head of the wash, a distinct swale winds its way up the first low hill: an enduring marker of the historic pathway. Considering the numbers of hooves and cartwheels that have marked the earth along the way, one might expect a broad swale; yet it is hardly wider than a cattle path made by animals following one behind the other (fig. 3).

Alonso de León, accompanied by fray Damián Massanet, crossed at Paso de Francia in 1689 on a journey seeking the French interloper La Salle. León traveled northeastward to the Frio River, establishing the first link in what was to become the Camino Real. At the Frio his objective dictated turning east toward “the Bay of Espíritu Santo” (the Matagorda Bay complex). León found La Salle’s ruined settlement on Garcitas Creek above the head of Lavaca Bay, an offshoot of Matagorda Bay. León followed a similar course the next year, when he proceeded to Hasinai (Tejas) territory to officiate with fray Massanet in the founding of Mission San Francisco de los Tejas on San Pedro Creek in present Houston County. By León’s account, the mission was placed eighteen
leagues northeast by east of his Trinity River crossing. In both 1689 and 1690, León returned the way he had come, with some variation.6

In response to Massanet's glowing descriptions of the Tejas country and its people, the viceroy named Domingo Terán de los Ríos the first governor of Texas and sent him on a vital mission. Accompanied by fifty soldiers, ten priests, and three lay brothers—with Father Massanet heading the religious contingent—Terán was to explore the country, ascertain any further French activity, and establish eight additional missions, extending all the way to the Kadohadacho on the Red and Sulphur rivers in extreme northeastern Texas.

From the Río Grande crossing Terán followed León's track as far as the Frio River. Thence, Terán continued northeast to the San Antonio River, adding a second link to the Camino Real. This link became known as the Camino Abajo, or Lower Road, from San Juan Bautista de Río Grande to San Antonio de Béjar. Terán, after naming the site of the future city of San Antonio (San Antonio de Padua), turned east to reach the Colorado River well below present Bastrop. He continued down the Colorado to a point almost due north of the La Salle settlement site. After setting up camp there on the lower Colorado, he sent Captain Francisco Martínez to the bay to look for the ships bringing reinforcements and supplies from Veracruz. Martínez, who was fluent in French, had served as translator with León in both 1689 and 1690. He was therefore familiar with the bay area, but the ships were not to be found. He returned to Terán's camp twenty days later, and Terán continued toward the Tejas mission.7

On reaching Mission San Francisco, Terán learned that a second mission, Santísimo Nombre de María, had been founded on the Neches River. At last making contact with the reinforcements led by Gregorio de Salinas Varona that had come by ship, Terán proceeded with his reconnaissance of Kadohadacho country in extreme northeastern Texas. The delay proved costly. A severe ice storm beset the march, causing the loss of horses and putting his men afoot. Then came floods, forcing the men to wade or swim across swollen streams. The outlook for the entire missionary enterprise grew increasingly dim. In January 1692 the flooding Neches River destroyed the nascent Mission Santísimo Nombre

6 See “Diario y derrotero de Alonso de León (1689),” in Gómez Canedo, Primerasexploraciones, pp. 97–104; “Diario de Alonso de León en su entrada a Texas (1690),” in ibid., pp. 131–51.
7 “Diario del general Domingo Terán de los Ríos en su expedición a Texas (1691–1692),” in ibid., pp. 229–54; “Diario del viaje del capitán Francisco Martínez,” AGN, Historia 17, transcript, Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, University of Texas at Austin, 2Q176; hereafter abbreviated CAH.
Mission San Francisco was hard-pressed for provisions, and the Indians were showing signs of mounting hostility. Under such circumstances, the founding of new missions became impossible. Terán withdrew in failure. The governor, with Salinas Varona’s troop, boarded the vessels waiting at Matagorda Bay early in the new year (1692) to return to Veracruz. Martínez conducted Terán’s own troop to Coahuila. Terán’s interest in Texas had faded. Soon after the expedition returned to Mexico, Salinas Varona succeeded Terán as governor of Coahuila.

A few months later Salinas received orders to mount a relief expedition to the troubled Mission San Francisco de los Tejas. Salinas had served with both León in 1690 and Terán in 1691-92; he therefore had his own idea of how to reach the eastern missions. As the first to travel a direct route from the Rio Grande crossing to Mission San Francisco, Salinas has occasionally been credited with establishing the lasting route of the Camino Real. In truth, he deviated only slightly from previously marked trails most of the way. Leaving Monclova on May 3, 1693, he crossed the Rio Grande a week later at one of the established fords near San Juan Bautista and set an easterly course that closely paralleled León’s of 1689 and 1690. When Salinas’s path intersected the trail León had blazed from La Salle’s settlement to the Tejas—which Salinas had previously traveled with both León and Terán—he followed it thence to the Tejas mission.8

Salinas reached San Francisco on June 8 and found illness and death rampant among the Indians; one of the missionaries had died. The natives, having come to believe the baptismal waters fatal, blamed the padres and refused to congregate in the missions. The supplies Salinas brought were far short of the need. When he departed six days later, two more of Massanet’s friars went with him. Conditions worsened after his departure. The following October (1693) the friars buried the cannon and bell, packed the vestments, and set fire to the picket structure of the mission.9

Stalked by hostile natives, the friars trudged through the wilderness to reach Monclova on February 17, 1694. Franciscan missionaries would be absent from eastern Texas for twenty-three years before resuming their work among the Tejas, or Hasinai, in 1716. Yet the hope of returning

---

8 Salinas’s journey is treated comprehensively by Foster and Jackson, “The 1693 Expedition of Gregorio de Salinas Varona,” pp. 264-311. Included with this article is Ned Brierley’s translation of Salinas’s “Diario del viaje del capitán Salinas Varona al este de Texas (1690),” in Gómez Canedo, Primera exploraciones, pp. 277-307.
9 Weddle, “San Francisco de los Tejas Mission.”
to convert the Hasinai was not allowed to die, thanks to the efforts of one missionary: fray Francisco Hidalgo.

Not until 1709 was an excursion made that would lay down a new segment of the Camino Real. This was the Espinosa-Olivares-Aguirre expedition, made in response to rumors that the Tejas had moved west to the Colorado River. Fray Isidro Félix de Espinosa of Mission San Juan Bautista kept the diary. Espinosa was accompanied by fray Antonio de San Buenaventura y Olivares, also of San Juan Bautista. Captain Pedro de Aguirre, who was in temporary command of Presidio de San Juan Bautista, with fourteen soldiers from San Juan Bautista Presidio, escorted the two friars. Though Hidalgo was not a part of the expedition, he surely had an ear tuned.

Departing from San Juan Bautista, the expedition followed the route traveled by Terán in 1693 as far as the future site of San Antonio. After discovering and naming San Antonio's San Pedro Spring, the travelers followed the Balcones Escarpment, the outer rim of the Texas Hill Country. The Spaniards called this landscape feature Lomería Grande, or great range of hills (fig. 4). Its slopes poured forth abundant fresh water from numerous springs. The path crossed the Comal River, then the Guadalupe, at present-day New Braunfels, and the San Marcos River near its headwaters. Then came a spring called San Isidro, and Arroyo de las Garrapatas (ticks), identifiable as Onion Creek just south of Austin. The Colorado River marked the terminus of the 1709 expedition's contribution to the future Camino Real. There the travelers turned downstream (southeast) in a futile search for the Tejas. They found only a

Figure 4.
Lomería Grande, the extended range of hills now known as the Texas Hill Country, provided abundant spring water for travelers along its outer rim, the Balcones Escarpment.
band of Yojuanes whose chief assured them that the Tejas remained where they had always been, far to the east.

Hidalgo, meanwhile, remained at his post as president of the San Juan Bautista missions, much aggrieved at being unable to take up what he saw as his unfinished task among the Hasinai. Aware that the French were pushing in from the east, he at last contrived a plan that interpreters have ascribed to questionable motives. On January 27, 1711, Hidalgo wrote a letter to the governor of the French Louisiana colony, inviting French participation in establishing a Hasinai mission. To assure delivery he dispatched three copies, each by a different route. Three years later Hidalgo learned that his letter had reached its intended receiver.

Antoine de La Mothe, sieur Cadillac, had recently been named governor of Louisiana to manage the French colony as a commercial enterprise. Rebuffed in his attempt to open a maritime trade with New Spain through the port of Veracruz, Cadillac saw opportunity in the friar’s letter: a Spanish mission among the East Texas Indians might offer the possibility of overland trade for the French. The French governor issued a passport to Louis Juchereau de Saint-Denis and sent Saint-Denis to make contact with Father Hidalgo.10

Saint-Denis was guided across Texas by Pierre and Robert Talon, who as children had survived the massacre of La Salle’s colonists to be rescued from the Indians by León and Terán. Two other Frenchmen, Medard Jallot and Pierre Largent, also accompanied Saint-Denis. Fray Hidalgo had long since returned to the missionary college at Querétaro. Hidalgo received news of the Frenchmen’s arrival at San Juan Bautista in letters from both Saint-Denis and Captain Diego Ramón. Ramón did his official duty and detained the visitors while he reported to the viceroy, then, on the viceroy’s order, sent Saint-Denis to Mexico, escorted by don Diego’s son Domingo. The Talon brothers, meanwhile, slipped back across the Rio Grande to carry Saint-Denis’s report to Cadillac.

While waiting for Saint-Denis’s return, Diego Ramón pondered the French emissary’s message: the Tejas Indians had a deep respect for the Spaniards; hoping for their return, they had preserved the livestock herds, which had increased to thousands. Among eleven villages related to the Hasinai, there still were some who honored the Catholic religion and kept its tenets. As for the French, they had traded with the

---

10 Gerardo Mora, “Relación hecha por Dn Luis de Sn Dionis y Dn Medar Jalot del viaje que ejecutaron desde la Movila hasta el Presidio de Diego Ramón,” AGN, Provincias Internas 181 (transcript, CAH).
Natchitoches Indians fourteen years for agricultural produce, peltries, and salt.\textsuperscript{11}

The impact of Saint-Denis’s subtle pitch was not lost on the Spanish officer: Spaniard and Frenchman could live side by side, as close as the Hasinai to the Natchitoches, and reap the benefits of a prosperous contraband trade beyond the purview of restrictive Spanish laws.\textsuperscript{12}

The viceroy’s advisers in Mexico, meanwhile, saw a different message: the French had learned the route to the Rio Grande; they could with impunity introduce their merchandise into the northern provinces of New Spain. To circumvent this illicit trade, officials on the frontier should be alerted; friars Olivares and Hidalgo, with a company of soldiers, should proceed to establish a mission among the Hasinai. Domingo Ramón, who had escorted Saint-Denis to the capital, would lead this new entrada. Saint-Denis, who seemed to know the road to the Tejas much better than the Spaniards, should join the expedition as commissary officer.\textsuperscript{13} Thus, they played into Saint-Denis’s hands; the viceroy and his trusted advisers, in trying to avert the Frenchman’s contraband trade scheme, did the very thing that made it possible.

Domingo Ramón, after gathering his expedition at Saltillo, reached the Rio Grande mission settlement of San Juan Bautista on April 18, 1716, and bivouacked in some cornfields near Mission San Bernardo. Two days later Ramón and company crossed the river “at the pass called Francia, as it was the best.”\textsuperscript{14} Finding the river at low ebb, the soldiers pointed the drove of livestock into the water. A thousand goats plus sheep and cattle for seed-stock and meat along the way; oxen drawing two-wheeled carts conveying women and children; and as many as four thousand horses and pack mules all plunged into the stream, swam or waded across, and clawed their way up the steep bank on the other side of the Rio Grande del Norte. The expedition leader proclaimed it an occasion of “extreme happiness.”\textsuperscript{15}

Encamped above the crossing, the captain held up the march for a soldier named José Galindo to return to Presidio de San Juan Bautista

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{12} Spain, as the discoverer, forbade other nations from trading with its colonies. France sought to evade this restriction by trading with the farthermost Spanish outpost, establishing a trade relationship with frontier Spaniards not too concerned with the letter of the law. Such was the nature of contraband trade.

\textsuperscript{13} Report of fiscal; report of Junta, AGN, Provincias Internas 181 (transcript, CAH).

\textsuperscript{14} Ramón’s Diary, p. 8.

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid. Hereafter, this source will be cited only when it is necessary to distinguish it from Espinosa’s diary.
to be married. In the meantime he drew up a list of all those on the expedition, a total of sixty-five persons. Among the nine religious was fray Francisco Hidalgo, whose plan to return to the Hasinai had precipitated the whole affair. There were also the twenty cavalrmen furnished him for the enterprise by the viceroy. Except for Saint-Denis and his two French companions, the rest had come to settle. Presumably, they were from the vicinity of Saltillo, where Ramón had begun his diary of the march; or Monclova and other communities passed on the way north. There were three Indian guides and three Indians in charge of the goats; a boy six years old and a girl four; and one black man by the name of Juan de la Concepción. Only the names are told; otherwise, nothing is known of any of them—except Ana Guerra, a young *mestiza* servant girl.

Ana had come to the captain at night, in his camp northeast of Saltillo, too timid to state her purpose until pressed. She had come, she said, to see if the captain “desired to send or to take her to Texas, because her master had abused her.” “Moved by charity,” wrote Captain Ramón, “I placed her with my family.” The next day a soldier of Ramón’s company, Lorenzo Mercado, came to the captain and asked if he might have Ana in marriage. The soldier’s request changed the plan; Ramón now took Ana into his company bound for the Tejas.

As the captain completed his list, he named the six married women: María Antonio Longoria, Antonia de la Cerda, Antonia Vidales, Ana María Jiménez, Juana de San Miguel, Josefa Sanches—and: “Ana Guerra to be married.”

The various factions ascribed to the expedition different objectives. To the missionary friars, the purpose was converting the native peoples to Christianity and rendering them subject of His Catholic Majesty, King Carlos III. To the government officials who had ordered the enterprise, it was an emergency measure to hold back the French and save the vast land of the Tejas for Spain. But for those who actually guided the march toward its destination—Frenchman and Spaniard—it was a commercial enterprise to be carried on outside Spanish law.

The expedition’s *lasting* importance lies in the fact that it was the first full-scale colonizing venture into the Spanish Province of Texas. Previous *entradas*, both military and religious, while marking parts of the trail that would become known as El Camino Real de los Tejas, had proved to be only temporary. This time there were settlers. Ramón brought married couples—and children even—all now safely landed on Texas soil and ready to march.
Although Paso de Francia was deemed the best crossing, the path ahead offered insufficient fresh water. Having crossed, Ramón took the expedition upriver to Diego Ramón Pass—a maneuver that required traveling five leagues: three northwest and two west—to get on a path with water sources along the way.\textsuperscript{16}

Thence, across the Rio Grande plain the caravan stretched, motley in appearance, monotonous in movement, cacophonous in sound. Above the lowing of oxen, the clank of horns, the bleating of goats, the groaning of cart wheels and the epithets of mule-skinners rang the shouted commands of officers directing the snail-like advance. Beneath it all was the muffled thud of hooves hammering the Texas earth as varas stretched slowly into leagues.

From Paso de Diego Ramón—the name perhaps commemorating the elder Ramón’s use of this pass when pursuing Indians in 1707 and 1715—the 1716 expedition set march along the general route marked by the previous \textit{entradas}. After crossing San Pedro Creek at San Antonio’s future site, the march followed the springs of the Balcones Escarpment, past the Guadalupe River near the Comal River’s mouth to cross the San Marcos River below the headsprings.

Thence to Onion Creek near present Buda, identified by Espinosa as the \textit{Arroyo de las Garrapatas} (ticks), remembered from the 1709 expedition. The caravan now traveled down the left bank of Onion Creek, which follows the western edge of McKinney Falls State Park to its juncture with Williamson Creek (figs. 5 and 6). After crossing Onion Creek just above the confluence, it set a northeasterly course to reach the Colorado River in the Montopolis area of Austin. From the noontime sun Espinosa computed latitude of “thirty degrees and some minutes”—actually very close to 30°15’.

\textsuperscript{16} As stated, Diego Ramón I (1641–1719) was commandant of Presidio de San Juan Bautista. Domingo Ramón (?–1723) was his son, as was Diego Ramón II (1677–?), the \textit{alférez} on his brother Domingo’s expedition of 1716. Diego Ramón III (birth and death dates unknown), Domingo’s son, assumed command of Presidio de la Bahía (at the La Salle settlement site) upon Domingo’s death in 1723 in an Indian uprising. Apparently unsuited for command, this Diego was removed, as he was later from command of Presidio de San Francisco Xavier de Horcasitas in present-day Milam County. In the late 1750s he was sent to Mexico City in irons from Presidio de San Sabá near present Menard, his offense not known. Eventually, he returned to the family Hacienda de Santa Mónica, eight kilometers west of San Juan Bautista.
Thenceforth, as far as the record goes, the Ramón expedition was marking new trail; don Domingo sent his brother, Alférez Diego Ramón II, with two companions to scout the way. As the caravan entered the Blackland Prairie, the next two days’ travel brought it to the creek Espinosa named Arroyo de las Ánimas, today’s Brushy Creek in Milam County. The travelers soon encountered Yerbipiam and Mescal Indians from the notorious Ranchería Grande of east-central Texas and enlisted them as guides. On June 1, the march reached the river called San Francisco Xavier: today’s San Gabriel River.
Soon lost in the maze of the Post Oak Savannah ("Monte Grande"), Ramón felt his way cautiously through the unknown territory, going northeast, then southeast, misled by an Indian who himself claimed to be lost. At last emerging from the timber, the march turned southeast, then east to reach the Brazos River, probably near present Mumford in southeastern Robertson County. After crossing the Brazos, then the Little Brazos, the caravan set a northeasterly course: twenty leagues to the Navasota River, which Espinosa named San Buenaventura. A league beyond was Santa Ana Lake, also named by Espinosa, an enduring landmark on the road to the Tejas (unknown today). Still on a northeasterly course, twenty leagues in three days brought the travelers to the bank of the Trinity River at Kickapoo Shoals, just below Hall’s Bluff, a short distance above the present Highway 7 crossing (figs. 7 and 8).

Figure 7. The early Camino Real crossed the southeast corner of Leon County to reach the rock-bottom ford known as Kickapoo Shoals.

Figure 8. James E. Corbin believed "that the crossing of the Trinity for much of the Colonial period was on...that section of [the river]," meaning Kickapoo Shoals and Hurricane Shoals just downstream. Distances given in expedition diaries support his conclusion.
Crucial to understanding this route traveled by expeditions for years to come is Ramón's departure from what became the Old San Antonio Road, defining the present-day Leon-Madison county line: a turn in the road that has long been overlooked. South of present-day Leona the expedition angled east-northeast, following the open terrain of the Leon Prairie. After passing Boggy Creek at Grass Lake, "the road crossed the large grassy terrace between Boggy Creek and Lower Keechi Creek and turned to the northeast, following Clapp's Prairie out onto the uplands west of Beaverdam Marsh." Bending back to east-northeast, the expedition crossed the Trinity River at Kickapoo Shoals, thus accounting for the long-term use of this natural ford where the river widens and flows at shallow depth over rock bottom.17

The Ramón expedition halted on June 29, 1716, to mark the feast of Saint Peter (San Pedro). Thenceforth, to the end of the colonial period, this place called San Pedro de los Nabedaches was a prominent campground; it was noted in expedition diaries as the site of the first Texas mission, San Francisco de los Tejas, fourteen leagues from the Trinity River crossing.18 From this place, the march advanced four leagues by Ramón's count, three by Espinosa's, to the reestablishment of Mission San Francisco de los Tejas on the Neches River, with fray Francisco Hidalgo in charge. The distances given here—fourteen leagues from the Trinity and four leagues from the Neches—are keystones for determining the general area of San Pedro de los Nabedaches and the 1690 Mission San Francisco.19

Ramón went on to establish a presidio and six missions beyond the Neches River, the last being San Miguel de Linares de los Adaes, founded early in 1717 at the site of present-day Robeline, Louisiana. The road that would become the Camino Real de los Tejas reached out to connect the new Spanish settlements. The road would be refined and altered as circumstances demanded.

One of the first to embark on the new road to the Tejas was fray Miguel Núñez de Haro, who, in December 1717, set out from San Juan Bautista with fifteen soldiers and a mule train carrying supplies for the missions. On finding his way barred by the flooding Trinity River, Núñez encamped at Laguna de Santa Ana until March 1718. Still unable to cross the Trinity, he cached the supplies and began the return trip

---

18 The distance Ramón gives from the Trinity River crossing (*Ramón's Diary*, p. 19) is often miscalculated as thirteen leagues rather than fourteen; the one league traveled after the crossing on May 24 is easily overlooked.
19 Ibid., pp. 19–22; *Espinosa’s Diary*, pp. 19–22.
to San Juan Bautista. On reaching the Medina River, Núñez met the expedition of Governor Martín de Alarcón. Núñez turned back with the governor to San Antonio, where Alarcón officiated with fray Olivaures in the founding of Mission San Antonio de Valero. Afterward, Alarcón went about his inspection of the Province of Texas; he began by unraveling the confusion of river names that had arisen from the early assumption that each river had its mouth in the Gulf of Mexico. After returning to San Juan Bautista for supplies, Alarcón sent fray Pedro Muñoz, president of the Rio Grande missions, to recover the cache at Laguna de Santa Ana.

Alarcón proceeded to the major part of his inspection tour, accompanied by both fray Espinosa and Domingo Ramón, who had come to San Antonio for supplies. The governor explored the Matagorda Bay complex, then turned north to connect with the trail Ramón had marked in 1716. Alarcón went on to Los Adaes, visiting the other East Texas missions on the way. At the site of the 1690 Mission San Francisco—“the place called San Pedro de los Navidachos”—he sent his soldiers to find the church bell that had been buried by the departing missionaries in 1693. The bell having been found, the governor claimed the bell for the Villa de Béjar (San Antonio).20

Whereas Ramón had marked the general course of the amorphous and incipient Camino Real, later expeditions contributed their own variations according to their particular needs. The Marqués de San Miguel de Aguayo, for example, followed Ramón’s route for a great distance before departing on a tack of his own, due in part to the circumstance that was responsible for his march. That circumstance stemmed from a feeble French move against Mission San Miguel de los Adaes at the outbreak in Europe of the War of the Quadruple Alliance. With Spain and France on opposing sides, the conflict reached out to the American colonies, bringing to the Texas frontier an episode that has become known as the Chicken War. When soldiers from the French fort at Natchitoches raided the church and the henhouse at the nearby Spanish mission of San Miguel, the Spaniards, fearing a widespread invasion, withdrew from the entire East Texas region. Missions and presidio, left unmanned, would remain so until Aguayo came in 1721.21

The Camino Real linking San Antonio with the eastern missions, like the missions themselves, would fall to disuse during the next three years.

20 Célix, Diary of the Alarcón Expedition, p. 84. For a concise summary of the Alarcón diary, see Weddle, The French Thorn, pp. 233–34.
Aguayo, on succeeding Alarcón as governor of Coahuila and Texas, made elaborate preparations for a military campaign against the French. By the time Aguayo had assembled his force, the war had ended. Saint-Denis, however, assuming French ownership of eastern Texas as the spoils of war, had extended his trading operation accordingly and must be dealt with. Aguayo completed the crossing of the Rio Grande on March 24, 1721, with five hundred men and more than 14,000 livestock—the largest force yet to enter Texas. Having sent Domingo Ramón with forty men to reoccupy La Salle’s old site on Garcitas Creek above the head of Lavaca Bay, Aguayo proceeded up the Camino Real to the task of reclaiming Spanish territory and reestablishing the missions.

The Aguayo expedition followed the established trail as far as the San Gabriel River. Contemplating the forbidding Post Oak Savannah and the unsuitable river crossings against the size of his force and its drove of livestock, Aguayo detoured north almost to the Waco area. Only when he was far up the Brazos River did he find a ford to his liking. Thence, the caravan traveled south between the Brazos and Navasota rivers, seeking “the road to Texas ordinarily traveled.” At last the Navasota was crossed on a hastily built bridge; the march resumed “along a cleared path, leaving to our right the Santa Ana Lake, also known as Las Cargas....”

Espinosa, who had given that landmark its name in 1716, was one of the missionaries returning to their posts with Aguayo. Like the other friars, Espinosa had withdrawn from the East Texas missions by this route when the French threatened in 1719; the friars’ familiarity with the route surely proved helpful to Aguayo.

From the Navasota River Aguayo’s army traveled east-northeast twenty-three leagues (about 60 miles) to reach the Trinity River at Kickapoo Shoals, where Ramón had crossed in 1716 (refer to fig. 7). After spending sixteen days in the crossing, the army covered fourteen leagues in three days to arrive at “San Pedro, the place where the presidio and mission had been built in 1690.... ”

Next day Aguayo’s army followed the established road along the south bank of San Pedro Creek, which leads through today’s Mission Tejas State Park. In four leagues the road came to the Neches River near the site of the 1716 Presidio de los Dolores. Like Ramón, Aguayo gives fourteen leagues from the Trinity River to San Pedro, four from San Pedro to the Neches: a clue to the location of Mission San Francisco de los Tejas.

---

22 Peña’s Diary, pp. 18, 33, 34.
23 Ibid., pp. 39-40. There was no presidio associated with the 1690 mission.
There on the bank of the Neches River on August 1, 1721, Saint-Denis paid a visit to Aguayo. The Frenchman came to make an announcement: if the Spanish governor was “willing to do likewise, he [Saint-Denis], as commandant of the forces on that entire frontier would observe most amicably the truce” between France and Spain. Aguayo replied that, in compliance with his own orders, he would observe the truce “provided that the French commandant immediately evacuate the entire province of Texas and remove all his soldiers to Natchitoches.” Saint-Denis saw that he had no choice but to evacuate the Spanish province—including Los Adaes. The matter settled, Aguayo’s men, with the friars, went about restoring the six ravaged missions.

In December Aguayo began withdrawing from Tejas country. His drove of livestock much reduced after restocking the missions, he now chose to cross the Monte Grande on the road Ramón had opened. Aguayo reached San Antonio in March—a year after crossing the Rio Grande. After establishing at San Antonio the short-lived Mission San Francisco Xavier de Nájera for the Indians of Ranchería Grande, he started for the bay to begin building Presidio de Nuestra Señora de Loreto de la Bahía. The new bastion rose on the La Salle settlement site occupied by Domingo Ramón the previous year. Mission Nuestra Señora del Espíritu Santo de Zúñiga was built nearby.

When Aguayo withdrew from Texas in May 1722, he left ten missions where there had been eight; four presidios where there had been two; and 268 soldiers instead of the 60 or 70 found in the province before 1719. And he had confirmed an addition to the Spanish road system, from San Antonio to La Bahía. After Domingo Ramón lost his life in an Indian uprising, both mission and presidio were moved. By 1726 they were situated in what is now called Mission Valley, on the Guadalupe River above present-day Victoria. Juan Antonio Bustillo y Ceballos, who recently had laid out a road linking the first site with San Juan Bautista de Río Grande, was named to succeed young Diego Ramón, who had held the post but briefly, as captain of Presidio de la Bahía.24

Much of Aguayo’s work in reestablishing the East Texas missions fell away under the recommendations of Brigadier Pedro de Rivera y Villalón. Rivera crossed the Río Grande on August 1, 1727, for the Texas phase of his inspection, pointed toward economizing and eliminating abuses in the frontier presidios. After traveling the Camino Real from

24 Bustillo to viceroy, June 18, 1726, AGN, Provincias Internas 236, part 1, (transcript, CAH 2Q235).
San Juan Bautista to Los Adaes, Rivera called for suppression of Presidio de los Dolores, causing the three missions that depended on Dolores for protection to withdraw to San Antonio. Rivera next traveled to Presidio de La Bahía via San Antonio.²⁵

Rivera’s military inspection (1724-1728), like that of the Marqués de Rubí (1766-1768), covered the entire northern frontier of New Spain. Visiting presidios primarily, both inspections were concerned with abuses—which seem to have been inherent in the system—as well as economy and defense. Rivera’s primary concern was economy; Rubí’s would be defense.

The Camino Real de los Tejas laid out by Domingo Ramón in 1716 had been traveled, in one direction or both, by Alarcón, Aguayo, and Rivera.²⁶ Successive governors, as well as supply trains, traveled the road to reach the capital at Los Adaes. Yet the Apache menace was making the route hazardous for travelers with scant means of protection.

From their founding, La Bahía presidio and mission were linked by road with San Antonio. Soon a road also ran northeast from La Bahía to connect with the established Camino Real at the Trinity River crossing, a necessity for bringing produce from Los Adaes. (It was over this route—La Bahía to Nacogdoches and Natchitoches and on to Opelousas—that Texas cattle were driven from 1779 to 1782 to feed Bernardo de Gálvez’s army as he campaigned against the British during the American Revolutionary War.)²⁷ As the danger of Indian attack increased along the northern route, travelers between San Antonio and the eastern missions began taking the southern alternative, via La Bahía. A date of 1731 is often attached to this sequence, possibly because Apache hostility around San Antonio accelerated with the coming of the Canary Islanders and removal of the three missions from East Texas.

Affirmation of the Bahía route is given by Texas Governor Thomas Phelipe de Winthuysen in submitting to the viceroy a description of his jurisdiction in 1744. “At a distance of sixty leagues from this presidio [San Antonio de Béjar], to the south,” the governor wrote, “the presidio of Bahía Sancto [sic] is situated on the banks of the Guadalupe River. ... the

²⁵ Pichardo’s Treatise, pp. 334–36. Rivera’s diary in the original Spanish is published as Diario y derrotero de lo caminado, visto y observado en el discurso de la visita general de presidios situados en las provincias ynternas de Nueva España. It is translated by David McDonald in Jackson, Imaginary Kingdom.

²⁶ That Alarcón and Aguayo used “the old San Xavier road” is denied by Foster (Jackson, Imaginary Kingdom, 123–24n69). Careful study of the diaries shows otherwise.

²⁷ Thonhoff documents, with citations to the Bexar Archives and other sources, the sending of cattle to Gálvez as he fought the British during the Revolutionary War (The Texas Connection, pp. 48–51ff.)
point of departure for the presidio of Los Adaes, the capital of said province. The distance between the two (La Bahia and Adaes), Winthuysen added, was about 140 leagues, generally in an east-northeast direction.28

The northern route, however, was not completely abandoned. While approval was still being sought for creating the San Xavier missions near present Rockdale, successive governors—probably including Melchor de Mediavilla y Azcona but certainly Juan Antonio Bustillo y Ceballos and Pedro del Barrio y Espriella—traveled from Los Adaes to inspect the proposed site on the San Gabriel River. Barrio visited San Xavier in May 1748 and again in July 1749 before reluctantly allowing a presidio to be established there.29

With the renewed activity around the middle eighteenth century, other roads and trails were blazed to other destinations within the Province of Texas. As the San Xavier missions, begun in 1746, died in the midst of scandal in the next decade, the effort was diverted to the San Sabá Mission for the eastern Apaches (1757-1758) and its presidio (1757-ca. 1768) near present-day Menard. At first the road to San Sabá ran up from San Antonio, but after scandal-ridden Felipe de Rábago y Terán was reinstated to command in 1760, he traveled directly north from Coahuila to avoid San Antonio.30

Even more pressing than the northern frontier and its Indian problem was that of the upper Gulf Coast, which lay unguarded and virtually unknown, fully exposed to French and English intrusion. In 1745 soldiers from La Bahía, seeking approaches to the area east of the lower Trinity River in response to rumored French activity, withdrew in failure. La Bahía Captain Joaquín de Orobio Basterra then set out up the southern course of the Camino Real to Los Adaes to confer with Governor Francisco García Larios. García Larios ordered the captain to make a personal reconnaissance to the mouth of the Trinity. In compliance, Orobio obtained the first Spanish information on the Akokisa, or Orcoquisac, in almost three quarters of a century. Ten years later (1756) Mission Nuestra Señora de la Luz del Orcoquisac and Presidio de San Agustín de Ahumada came into

---

28 Winthuysen to viceroy, Aug. 19, 1744, Bexar Archives, vol. 15 (CAH). This document and others pinpoint the omission of a Camino Real route from Goliad northeastward in the map “United States Portion of El Camino Real de los Tejas,” Feasibility Study, p. 10. True, theshortcut eight leagues north of Goliad was instituted later, but Presidio de la Bahía was never “out of the loop.” See also sources cited in note 31, especially Orobio Basterra.

29 Chipman and Joseph, Spanish Texas, pp. 152-55.

30 For the scandal surrounding Felipe de Rábago’s tenure at the San Xavier and San Sabá missions, see Chipman and Elizondo, “New Light on Felipe de Rábago y Terán,” pp. 161-81.
being on the lower Trinity River in present Chambers County. During its tumultuous life, the Oroquisac settlement was more closely linked to Los Adaes, by means of a road that connected it with the Camino Real, than to La Bahía.

The year 1745 marked another turning point in the history of the Camino Real de los Tejas. A detachment from Presidio de San Juan Bautista de Río Grande discovered a crossing, previously unknown to Spaniards, far down the Río Grande. This crossing, named Paso de Jacinto, in a few years would rival San Juan Bautista as the gateway to Spanish Texas. A catalyst to such a change was the conquest of the “Costa del Seno Mexicano.” This coastal strip, comprising the present-day Mexican state of Tamaulipas and a portion of southern Texas, had long been held by barbarous Indians who constantly preyed on shipwreck castaways, plundering the ships and murdering the crews. These troublesome natives also raided the missions along the border of the neighboring province of Nuevo León, whose governor repeatedly petitioned authorities to curb this menace. Private entrepreneurs besieged authorities with plans to conquer the territory with a view to possessing the land and exploiting its people and natural resources, not the least of which were the salt mines that lay along both sides of the lower Rio Grande. Because of the untamed nature of this coastal strip, the Mexican portion of the Camino Real, carrying travelers to and from Texas, had been forced to make a wide detour around what might have been the shortest route to Presidio la Bahía in Texas. Instead of following the coast, travelers had to cover twice the shortest distance, going by way of San Luis Potosí, Saltillo, Monclova, and San Juan Bautista.

The multifaceted problem festered for want of the right leader; none of the petitioners viewed the problem in its entirety, failing to take into account the territory north of the Río Grande. Then attention focused on the sargento mayor of Querétaro who had been commissioned in the previous decade to curb native hostilities in the southern Sierra Gorda (Sierra Madre Oriental). This man, native of Soto la Marina, Santander, Spain, had rounded up the offenders and established missions in a way that won the admiration of his soldiers, the respect of the natives, and the plaudits of the Crown. His name was José de Escandón.

32 The history of the Texas-Tamaulipas coast from 1745 to 1755, including José de Escandón’s conquest, is covered in Weddle, The French Thorn, pp. 244-85.
Escandón began in 1746 by inspecting the territory between the Río Pánuco (Tampico) and the San Antonio River in Texas, the region to be known as Nuevo Santander. In January 1747 he began the conquest by sending seven divisions into the area and offered his colonization plan the following October. As Escandón began establishing towns along the Río Grande, he was named governor and captain-general of Nuevo Santander.33

Two of the new settlements arose on the left bank of the Río Grande, within the present state of Texas. In 1753 José Vázquez Borrego established the community of Nuestra Señora de los Dolores Hacienda, twenty-one miles below present-day Laredo, and began operating a ferry on the river. Soon the main road from the Mexican interior began to turn away from San Juan Bautista in favor of Dolores. In 1755 Tomás Sánchez founded Villa de Laredo at Paso de Jacinto and began operating a ferry there also. Within three years, the road that connected Laredo with Monclova also ran to San Antonio de Béjar and La Bahía, which had been moved to present-day Goliad in 1749. The Monclova-La Bahía road ran northeast from Laredo to connect with the original Camino Real de los Tejas at the Trinity River. In essence, the Province of Texas now had three caminos reales instead of one.34

Further changes soon followed. Whereas Indian raids had played a part in shifting the course of the Camino Real southward, multiple factors shuffled the travel pattern overall. As France was ousted from the continent by the outcome of the Seven Years’ War and the 1763 Treaty of Paris, giving Spain possession of Louisiana, Texas became an interior province. The English, taking Pensacola and West Florida, cast a shadow over the Gulf of Mexico, long recognized as an exclusive Spanish sea. The military inspection by the Marqués de Rubí, concerned with the state of defenses all across the northern frontier of New Spain, shortly ensued, bringing drastic change to the Spanish Province of Texas.

Rubí entered Texas some distance above present Eagle Pass in early August 1767 and proceeded to the missions of El Cañon at present-day Montel and Camp Wood on the upper Nueces River. He traveled thence to San Sabá, then to San Antonio. Both Rubí and his engineer, Nicolás de Lafora, kept diaries of the march.35

---

33 García, “Escandón, José de.”
34 I.e., the original, from Monclova (capital of Coahuila) to Los Adaes via San Juan Bautista and San Antonio; from Monclova to Los Adaes via Laredo and San Antonio; Monclova to los Adaes via La Bahía, reaching Los Adaes by joining the original Camino Real at the Trinity River.
35 Kinnaird, The Frontiers of New Spain; Rubí diary in Jackson, Imaginary Kingdom.
By August 25, Rubí's inspection of San Antonio de Béjar was complete and the inspection team was on its way to Los Adaes, traveling east-southeast along the left bank of the San Antonio River. On the 26th it turned northeast to cross the Guadalupe River at Paso del Gobernador, missing La Bahía by eight leagues.36

This north-northeast course took the Rubí expedition across the upper Lavaca and Navidad rivers to a crossing of the Colorado near La Grange; of the Brazos, a short distance above its confluence with the Little Brazos. After "the arroyo called El Atascoso" (Boggy Creek, Leon County), the road swung north to the Trinity River crossing at Kickapoo Shoals, near Hall's Bluff, the main Camino Real crossing since 1716. Thenceforth, the expedition traveled the original Camino Real de los Tejas, finding San Pedro at 14½ leagues, the Neches River three leagues beyond San Pedro.37

After inspecting the presidios of Los Adaes, San Agustín (Orcoquisac), and La Bahía, the Rubí entourage recrossed the Río Grande at Laredo on November 19, 1767, and proceeded up the right bank to San Juan Bautista. Rubí's inspection is often mentioned in connection with the inspection of the Zacatecan missions carried out the following year by fray Gaspar José de Solís, guardian of the missionary college of Guadalupe de Zacatecas. Yet another historic journey through Texas about the same time is often neglected: that of Pierre Marie François de Pagès, an officer of the Royal French Navy.

The Pagès diary is mentioned here by way of suggesting that the writer's observations as he traveled down the Camino Real from Los Adaes make for an interesting comparison with those of Rubí, La Fora, and Solís. Traveling with the deposed governor Ángel de Martos y Navarrete, Pagès commented freely on the Spanish settlements and their inhabitants, as well as the Indians and their life ways. After visiting San Antonio, the French visitor left Texas at Laredo to continue his four-year world tour.38

36 The crossing used by Alonso de León in 1689-90. This was the shortcut that missed La Bahía at Goliad. The Camino Real still looped by La Bahía, giving it access to the East Texas missions and Los Adaes.
37 Kinnaird, Frontiers of New Spain, pp. 162-65.
38 Sibley, "Across Texas in 1767," pp. 593-622. In tracing Pagès's course along the "Old San Antonio Road," Sibley acknowledges that the trail was subject to some variations but assumes the river crossings were "stable" and his Trinity River crossing was at "Robbins' Ferry"—a common misconception (609n). The crossing in 1767 more likely would have been at Kickapoo Shoals; near 1800 it might have been at the point on the Trinity at which Robbins' Ferry was established in 1821.
Fray Solís, on his 1768 inspection of the Zacatecan missions in Texas, followed Rubí's route from San Antonio to Los Adaes. The Solís diary, however, gives a different set of place names while omitting distances altogether. Having crossed the Rio Grande at the Nuevo Santander settlement of Dolores on February 13, 1768, the mission inspector withdrew the following August 25, this time crossing the Rio Grande at Laredo—a clear signal that the gateway at San Juan Bautista was narrowing and the main course of the Camino Real in Texas was changing.39

The change was accelerated apace with the royal order known as the New Regulations for Presidios, based on Rubí's recommendations, issued in September 1772. The order, aside from establishing a new line of defense along today's international border, mandated abandonment of all missions and presidios in Texas excepting those at San Antonio and La Bahía (Goliad). All soldiers and settlers were to be removed from eastern Texas, including that part of Louisiana then within the borders of the Province of Texas. San Antonio would be the new provincial capital. Thus (by definition), the Texas portion of the Camino Real laid out in 1716, with its subsequent alterations, was to be considerably abbreviated.

Without people, there would be no need for a road. Some of the settlers in the eastern part of the province, however, chose to remain—at their own risk—with their traditional homes. Others abided by the order to leave but set up such a clamor of protest that, by compromise, they were permitted to establish in 1774 the Villa de Nuestra Señora del Pilar de Bucareli. The little settlement, at the Trinity River crossing of the Camino Real, was beset by Indian attack, epidemic, and flood. It endured until 1779, when the settlers removed themselves to the Nacogdoches site to lay the foundation of the present city. It is a safe bet that the road established for a nobler purpose continued to serve the contrabandistas through it all.

The only conclusion to be drawn concerning the Camino Real at this time seems to be that it played a reduced role but was never completely abandoned.

Confusion over the changing course of the Camino Real renders it unclear just where Villa de Bucareli was located. The site has never

39 The Solís Diary of 1767 [sic]. The Solís journey is generally treated as having occurred in 1767, the same year as the Rubí inspection. Although the mission inspector left the College of Guadalupe de Zacatecas on November 15, 1767, he did not enter Texas until February 1768, as his diary clearly shows. Countless studies, oblivious to the actual date, have placed it in 1767 as Forrestal does.
been found. The 1767-68 journeys of Rubí/Lafora and fray Solís, while following a southerly route from San Antonio to East Texas, still used the time-honored Hurricane Shoals/Kickapoo Shoals crossing of the Trinity. Was this the crossing at which Villa de Bucareli was established? James E. Corbin has offered persuasive argument in the affirmative. With Bucareli on the flood-prone west bank of the Trinity, Corbin believed, Trinidad de Salcedo (1806-1813) stood just across the river on the higher ground of Hall's Bluff. The late founding date of Salcedo, however, suggests a different location. Whereas it is generally placed at the Camino Real crossing of the Trinity, by 1806 the Trinity crossing may have shifted downstream.

Multiple problems and diverse objectives had brought forth new travel routes in Spanish Texas. Some of these, despite grand intentions, fell short of designation as caminos reales. Throughout the 1770s, Athanase de Mézières y Clugny, a former French infantry officer and former lieutenant governor of Spanish Louisiana, served as Indian agent for the Spanish Province of Texas. In that capacity de Mézières traveled extensively among Texas Indians until his death in 1779 (fig. 9).

After de Mézières’s time came the quest, begun in the late 1780s, of a direct route linking the capitals of Texas and New Mexico by making peace with the Comanches. The Taovaya villages on both sides of the Red

40 Corbin, “Retracing the Camino de los Tejas from the Trinity River to Los Adaes,” pp. 205-8. The Villa de Bucareli’s inhabitants apparently had already resolved to move to Nacogdoches when the Trinity River overflowed its banks, drowned remaining livestock, and rose to half the height of the houses that remained from a recent fire. Bolton, Texas in the Middle Eighteenth Century, p. 437.
41 See Bolton, Athanase de Mézières.
River near present Spanish Fort, Texas, were a key provisioning point. Ultimately the plan failed, but not before Pedro Vial and José Mares led explorations in both directions, raising high hopes for its success. In 1808 Francisco Amangual led 200 men on a march from San Antonio to Santa Fe through Comanche country, traveling a more direct route than either Vial or Mares. Amangual returned by way of El Paso.42

The multiplicity of problems facing New Spain at the dawn of the nineteenth century was compounded many times over by the Louisiana Purchase. Accommodation could be attained with commercial-minded Frenchmen; not so with expansion-hungry Americans, whose aims were accentuated by the “filibustering” forays of Philip Nolan and the spying expedition of Zebulon Pike. Into this tense situation came Manuel Antonio Cordero y Bustamante as acting governor of Coahuila and Texas from September 1805 until near the end of 1808. Cordero arrived in Texas with orders to reinforce Nacogdoches, Los Adaes, and the moribund settlement of Orcoquisac on the lower Trinity River. To hold back the tide of Anglo-American immigrants, he planned to establish Spanish settlements on the Guadalupe, San Marcos, Colorado, and Brazos rivers, as well as the Trinity. The middle section of the Camino Real, a compromise between the northern route laid out by Domingo Ramón and the southern route of a later time, was put in place about this time, or shortly before. This was the Camino Arriba (fig. 10).43

Figure 10. Félix María Calleja’s 1808 map of the Spanish Province of Texas was drawn to show Spain’s claims following the Louisiana Purchase by the U.S. No indication of Arroyo Hondo (far right), defining the “Neutral Ground” set aside while the eastern boundary was being determined. Otherwise, note route of the Camino Real (indicated by faint dots), linking La Bahía with the camino at both the Brazos and Trinity rivers. The presidio symbol at the Trinity River designates the fortified settlement of Trinidad de Salcedo. On order of Nemesio Salcedo, commandant of Interior Provinces, Calleja mapped the eastern provinces while Juan Pedro Walker mapped the western. Courtesy of Archivo Histórico Nacional, Madrid.

42 Weddle, *After the Massacre*, pp. 91–95; Loomis and Nasatir, *Pedro Vial*.
43 Described in detail in McGraw et al., *A Texas Legacy*, p. 221.
Of the river settlements that Cordero planned, only two were established: San Marcos de Neve, on the San Marcos River four miles below the present town of San Marcos; and Santisima Trinidad de Salcedo on the east bank of the Trinity River, probably at Hall’s Bluff. The Colorado River, however, had “a guard of dragoons stationed on its banks” when Zebulon Pike passed in 1807. From the “actual returns of the troops,” which Pike claimed to have seen, 988 soldiers were stationed in the province at the time, including 388 at San Antonio, 100 on the Trinity River—doubtless Trinidad de Salcedo—and 100 at Nacogdoches. There were also 400 at a cantonment that Pike failed to name.44

With the seeds of revolt against Spanish rule sprouting all around, the old Camino Real during these times became the conduit for men of diverse cultures and divided loyalties. In 1812 the Magee-Gutiérrez expedition, bent on wresting Texas from Spain, captured Nacogdoches. It occupied Trinidad de Salcedo, made it a rallying point, and went on to capture La Bahía and San Antonio. Severely defeated in the Battle of Medina in August 1813, these republican forces scattered and fled eastward up the Camino Real. Pursued as far as Nacogdoches by Ignacio Elizondo—who in 1811 had captured the revolutionary leader Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla and sent him to Chihuahua City to face a firing squad—many were ruthlessly murdered. New Spain could not long withstand the tide of revolt, especially after Agustín de Iturbide brought forth his Plan de Iguala to unify the contrary forces of mestizos and criollos and make himself emperor of Mexico.

Finding itself in need of settlers for its vast territory, Mexico instituted a liberal land policy that brought Anglo-Americans in droves. The instrument for this wave of immigration was the empresario system, whereby land agents, or empresarios, contracted to bring immigrants and settle them on free land.45 One might easily imagine the erstwhile Camino Real, its offshoots and laterals jammed with immigrants’ wagons drawn by horses, mules, or oxen. Not all those who accepted grants of land, however, abided by the commitment they had made to Mexico. And when Mexico changed leaders, the rules changed.

Mexico, after sending out an appeal for immigrants, soon found itself in danger of losing Texas to the influx of Americans. Into the picture came the Comisión de Limites, or Boundary Commission, headed by General Manuel de Mier y Terán. At Mier y Terán’s instigation, the

44 Jackson, The Journals of Zebulon Montgomery Pike, 2:76, 80.
45 Concerning the empresarios, see Henderson, “Minor Empresario Contracts,” pp. 1–28.
borders of Texas were closed to Americans by the Law of April 6, 1830; but, much to his sorrow, the law was later repealed. In poor health and subject to depression, Mier y Terán perceived that the loss of Texas was inevitable. He was so aggrieved by this turn of events, as well as by Mexico’s continuing political turmoil, that he took his own life by falling on his sword on July 3, 1832.46

In the turmoil of the early 1830s, Antonio López de Santa Anna abolished the Constitution of 1824, which had embodied the rights of immigrants. As for Texas, tensions continued to escalate, as did oppression, with violent outbreaks. In 1835, Texans laid siege to Béxar, chasing General Martín Perfecto de Cos and his soldiers back across the Rio Grande after exacting from Cos a promise never to return to Texas. All the same, Cos would soon be returning with his brother-in-law Santa Anna.

The Camino Real—or caminos reales—in the Texas Revolution conveyed not only Santa Anna’s armies but scores of fleeing Texans in the two-faceted episode known as the Runaway Scrape: noncombatants fleeing for their lives; and General Sam Houston’s army, seemingly in flight but in reality leading Santa Anna into the trap known as San Jacinto.

San Jacinto, however, was not the end; the fight went on After San Jacinto, as Joseph Milton Nance titled his book dealing with the unsettled state of the Texas-Mexican frontier during the next five years. Nance dealt with the tumultuous year of 1842 in a second volume, appropriately titled Attack and Counter Attack.47

With the annexation of Texas, the United States, possessed of ideals of Manifest Destiny, took on the fight with Mexico. In that contest an American force known as the Army of Chihuahua made its way down the traditional Camino Real to San Juan Bautista, the historic gateway on the Rio Grande, and thence to interior Mexico. And the rest, as they say, is history.

The Camino Real de los Tejas, first and last, felt the imprint of many feet: first, those of native peoples, of many tribes and diverse cultural orientation; the desperate souls of the Frenchman La Salle’s tragic colony; then the barefoot Franciscan friars, their faces aglow with spiritual zeal for bringing the light of the Gospel to the indios gentiles; then the Spanish soldiers, to tame the wilderness by force when the Gospel failed to do so; and settlers who, having failed to find opportunity elsewhere, sought it in this unlikely place. There were also smugglers

46 Henson, “Mier y Terán, Manuel de.”
47 Nance, After San Jacinto and Attack and Counter Attack.
and filibusters; and revolutionaries, some bent on claiming the King's Highway and the territory it served for a new nation with ideals of Manifest Destiny. Such were the processions of history that traversed the Camino Real de los Tejas.
PART II

The Camino Real and the Texas State Parks

In Part I an overview of the Texas Camino Real and the network of caminos reales was presented, emphasizing that various routes within the Spanish province were, by technical definition, deserving of designation as caminos reales. The discussion in Part II will be confined to the Camino Real de los Tejas in its original context with emphasis on its passage through certain Texas state parks. The parks considered are McKinney Falls, Fort Boggy, Mission Tejas, and Bastrop. Itineraries of early expeditions marking the Camino Real and ancillary published sources and original documents have been studied to determine whether they might have passed through the parks. The four parks have been visited and studied on the ground for evidence of the early trails. Outstanding features have been photographed.

McKINNEY FALLS STATE PARK

Espinosa and Ramón, 1709 and 1716

Fray Félix Isidro de Espinosa, as diarist of the 1709 Espinosa-Olivares-Aguirre expedition, gives few details by which the route to the Colorado River can be definitely identified; yet it seems evident—through Espinosa's 1709 diary and Espinosa's and Ramón's of 1716—that the line of march followed closely the Balcones Escarpment. This outer rim of the Texas Hill Country, which the Spaniards called Lomería Grande, offered abundant fresh-water springs for watering people and livestock. On April 16, 1709, Espinosa relates, "We crossed the San Marcos River very near its source, the crossing being two harquebus shots from where the river rises."48

Traveling this same stretch with Domingo Ramón on May 22, 1716, Espinosa wrote, "In this direction of northeast we came to a little spring of water which, years ago [i.e. in 1709], I named San Isidro. From thence we advanced to the hills and found some arroyos with pools of water [leading to] the Arroyo of the Garrapatas...."49 The Arroyo de las Garrapatas, named for its abundance of ticks, has been identified as

48 The Espinosa-Olivares-Aguirre Expedition of 1709, p. 56.
49 Espinosa's Diary, p. 12. The name Arroyo de las Garrapatas ("Tick Creek") still applies; the author carried off four of the little critters from the visit, April 7, 2010.
present-day Onion Creek. Rising in eastern Blanco County, Onion Creek courses northeeastward across Hays County to form the western perimeter of McKinney Falls State Park. Upon encountering the creek above Buda, the Ramón expedition, like that of 1709, crossed it and continued its march northward to encounter the creek again farther down.

After camping that night on the creek bank, the entourage advanced next morning the distance of “three shots of a harquebus” and came to a creek flowing into the Arroyo de Garrapatas from the northwest: today’s Williamson Creek. “From here,” says Espinosa, “we went half a quarter to the east, and the remainder by north-northeast” to reach the Colorado River—a course that would have taken the march across McKinney Falls State Park near the Lower Falls. The wide limestone outcropping that extends from the falls on the right side still shows faint swales that indicate the passage of multiple large-scale expeditions. The marks on the limestone in the Google Earth image extend from Onion Creek, pinpointing the crossing. There is even the shadow of a road on the opposite bank to show where expeditions entered the creek (figs. 11 and 12).

If the line of march from that point was northeast as Espinosa says, it would have passed near the present site of Texas Parks and Wildlife Department headquarters. An advance of three leagues in that direction brought the caravan to the bank of the swollen Colorado River (fig. 13).

50 Espinosa’s Diary, p. 13; Ramón’s Diary, p. 13.


**Marqués de San Miguel de Aguayo**

On visiting McKinney Falls, we walked up and down the right bank of Onion Creek near the Upper Falls, looking for some depression in the land that might signal a path left long ago by a caravan such as Aguayo's. There were swales enough; but were they caused by Aguayo's cavalry battalion and his immense drove of livestock? Or were they simply the path of erosion caused by a flooding Onion Creek? The answer came...
days later—while looking at maps, reviewing the diaries, pondering all possibilities.

It was Espinosa’s diary, in all its vagueness, that provided the answer: the path that terminated at Onion Creek’s juncture with Williamson Creek was down the left bank, not the right. At that point a crossing was called for to get on course for the Colorado River: an easy crossing, apparently, in 1716; hence the casual manner in which Espinosa and Ramón treat it in their diaries.

For the Marqués de San Miguel de Aguayo, five years later, it was not so easy, even with Espinosa in Aguayo’s company to show the way. Staying close to the escarpment to take advantage of the water that flowed in little streams from the heights, the trail proceeded between the hills and Onion Creek. On May 21, 1721, Aguayo’s caravan set out under threatening skies. It had traveled only a quarter league when the thunderstorm broke, creating havoc among the horses and cattle. The march ground to a halt in a heavy downpour that lasted half the day. The front of the caravan made camp near the Arroyo de las Garrapatas, but the livestock and the drovers were strung out far back along the trail.

The next day was given to celebrating the feast of the Ascension and gathering in the animals; and doubtless to giving the floodwaters time to subside. “Tick Creek,” however, was still on a rampage the second morning, evidently renewed by another heavy shower. The crossing at first seemed hopeless, and would have been, the diarist averred, but for “a ribbon of stones” that crossed the stream, making a beautiful waterfall the whole year long (figs. 14 and 15).51

At least two previous interpreters have linked this account in Peña’s diary to “McKinney Falls on Onion Creek.” The first to do so evidently was Eleanor Claire Buckley, who in 1911 declared, “... In the Peña diary, at least, the location is definitely identified by the description of the well-known falls on Onion Creek [i.e., McKinney Falls.]” Forrestal, in his 1935 translation, says he himself had visited the falls and found the description to be “exact.”52

Exactly so; but how could more than 14,000 head of livestock be crossed on this strip of rock? Consider first that the cattle, sheep, goats, horses, and mules had been handled daily since they were gathered

---

51 Peña’s diary in AGN, Mexico, entry for May 23, 1721 (transcript, CAH, 2Q177). The original Spanish phrase is “cinta de piedras, which Forrestal (Peña’s Diary, p. 23) translates as “row of stones.” In 2010 the flow of water over the ribbon of stone was intermittent rather than year-round, the result of ground-water depletion by modern land use.

52 Buckley, “The Aguayo Expedition into Texas,” p. 38, 38n; Peña’s Diary, p. 23, 23n.
below the Rio Grande and were quite used to being forced through difficult places. Second, if they shied from entering the water flowing over the stone, there were 500 experienced and well-mounted cavalrymen to force the issue. There is no hint in the written account to indicate the maneuver was other than routine. By the end of the day the caravan had covered the three leagues to the Colorado River for another “routine” crossing.

Figure 14. The “ribbon of stones” by which the Marques de San Miguel de Aguayo crossed his 14,000 animals over a flooding Onion Creek is still in place: The Upper Falls of McKinney Falls State Park. (Photo by Tim Weddle)

Figure 15. The “beautiful falls” no longer last the entire year, as shown by these two photographs. (Photo by Cynthia Brandimarte)
After crossing Onion Creek over the rock formation at the Upper Falls, the Aguayo expedition would have joined the trail marked by Ramón’s 1716 entrada. To do so it would have climbed the hill just above the falls, then pointed north by northeast to take up the marked trail extending from the Lower Falls. Indeed, Aguayo’s trail, or part of it, may now lie beneath the Smith Visitor Center, which stands on the hillside overlooking the falls (figs. 16 and 17).

As already mentioned, the road that Ramón had marked in 1716 had become the principal road to eastern Texas and Los Adaes and remained so for several years to come. Those who traveled it followed it in its entirety and therefore traversed McKinney Falls State Park. These travelers included fray Miguel Núñez de Haro, whose effort to take supplies to the eastern missions in 1717-1718 was stalled by the flooding Trinity River; fray Pedro Muñoz, who later recovered the goods left concealed by Núñez at Santa Ana Lake; and Governor Alarcón, returning from an inspection of his jurisdiction in 1718. At least some
of the missionaries and soldiers withdrawing in the face of the 1719 French threat surely came this way. Brigadier Pedro de Rivera, inspecting presidios in 1727, did also, at least from San Antonio to the Colorado River. Routine supply or reinforcement expeditions conceivably could have effected improvements on the route, crossing the park at a different place or missing it altogether. What can be said with some degree of certainty, however, is that at least half a dozen expeditions crossed McKinney Falls Park, with the likelihood that the number is much higher.

The significance of these facts is that they suggest a vital need for archeology, including Aguayo’s track as well as Ramón’s; the area between the two; and the point at which the two join. A likely starting place would be, first, Ramón’s trail where it emerges from Onion Creek; and, second, the vicinity of the Upper Falls and the Smith Visitors’ Center. Investigation of these two places might be followed by a search for the route suggested by the swale on the rock outcropping beside the Lower Falls.

FORT BOGGY STATE PARK

The Four Paths

When the blockhouse of Fort Boggy arose on Boggy Creek in 1837, its location was so remote it almost seems to have been hiding from the threads of history that surrounded it. To the northeast, in what is now neighboring Houston County, was San Pedro de los Nabedaches, the oft-mentioned site of Mission San Francisco de los Tejas, 1690-1693. Just to the south of Fort Boggy and forming the present county line of Leon and Madison counties, ran the Old San Antonio Road (Camino Real de los Tejas). An early departure from the OSR angled across the southeastern corner of Leon County to reach the fords near Hall’s Bluff. Over this route had passed the mission-founding expeditions of 1716 and 1721—a trail, marked by the footprints of Franciscan friars and soldiers of the king, as well as smugglers, filibusters, and revolutionaries. These processions found pass on the forbidding Trinity River at the rock-bottom fords known as Kickapoo Shoals and Hurricane Shoals (fig. 18).
Quite near Fort Boggy, at a spot frequently mentioned in travelers’ diaries but still unknown, was Santa Ana Lake, otherwise known as Laguna de las Cargas. It was here in 1718 that fray Miguel Núñez de Haro and his mule train, carrying sustenance for the starving missions, was stalled by the flooding Trinity River; after months of waiting, fray Núñez cached the supplies and turned back toward distant San Juan Bautista.

Fort Boggy, the nucleus of Fort Boggy State Park, as of the surrounding territory, has a history all its own, but seeking documentation for any connection it might have with the Camino Real turns into an exercise in futility. Whereas leaders of the earliest entradas almost always left diaries or itineraries to describe their travels; those who passed in pursuit of everyday business seldom did so. We therefore are left to hypothesize concerning the pattern of north-south swales through the wilderness of Fort Boggy State Park that suggest a very old road used intensively over a long period. This is the trail known locally as the DCD (“Ditches, Curves, and Dugouts”) road (fig. 19).

In certain stretches of the DCD road there are four parallel tracks, indicating that when one path became too rutted, eroded, or boggy for use, travelers simply moved over a few yards and made a new path. From the Old San Antonio Road (OSR) marking the Leon-Madison County line, it served as the main north-south road through Leon County until U.S. Highway 75 was built in 1929. It has been described as a link between the main Camino Real, or OSR, on the south, and the Camino Real’s more
Figure 19.
Route of the DCD road and remnants of other old trails inside Fort Boggy State Park.
northerly east-west path. Yet, despite the several reasons for supposing that such a northern route existed, documentation is lacking.

On the north, the DCD road comes from Centerville, entering Fort Boggy Park at the northeast corner. At that point the single swale is 1.5 meters deep. Thence, it runs south along the eastern park boundary until it levels out on the Boggy Creek flood plain. As it starts the descent toward the creek, the road shows evidence of having been moved a few yards to the right three different times as each section in turn became unfit for use; the four parallel paths are eroded one to four meters (yards) deep before leveling out and exiting the park (figs. 20 and 21).53

Those who have studied the road deem it “at least as early as the Camino Real and ... probably an aboriginal trail.” The idea also is expressed that it was used by Spanish colonials, but to what purpose remains unclear.54 One possibility: during the life of the San Xavier missions, a more northerly route to the capital at Los Adaes, taking advantage of the more open country, would have made sense, as the primary crossing on the Trinity River, Kickapoo Shoals, lay almost due east of present Centerville. A more northerly east-west road, indeed, might have been useful to any number of travelers, for any number of reasons. One such traveler was Athanase de Mézières, who as Indian agent traveled in many parts of the province among numerous Indian tribes (refer to fig. 9). An example is his journey of 1778-1779 journeys

53 Park manager Wes Hamilton led the author on a tour of “DCD road.” Further details are from Corbin et al., Fort Boggy State Park, pp. 78–80, Figure 10, p. 53 (inserted here as Figure 19); telephone interview with Jeffrey Williams, July 21, 2010.
54 Corbin et al., Fort Boggy State Park, p. 78.
among the Quitseis that took him in a more-or-less straight westerly direction from San Pedro and the Kickapoo Shoals crossing of the Trinity. Less apparent are reasons that Spaniards of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries might have had for traveling between the OSR and the northern east-west road.

Although any connection of the DCD road with the Camino Real must, for the moment, remain hypothetical, the evidence is strong enough to warrant further investigation. Additionally, there are bits and pieces of other ancient roads still visible within the park that also may deserve study.56

MISSION TEJAS STATE PARK

The Trinity Crossing and the Early Camino Real

The road that Domingo Ramón laid out across the southeastern corner of present-day Leon County has much to do with traces of the Camino Real visible today in Mission Tejas State Park (refer to fig. 7). This road led directly to the point at which the Trinity River spreads itself

55 See frontispiece map in Bolton, Athanase de Mézières; also see “Travels of Athanase de Mézières.” See fig. 9.
56 See fig. 19.
over rock-bottomed Kickapoo and Hurricane shoals, wider and shallower than at any other point on the river for miles in either direction. Most itineraries of expeditions from Salinas Varona in 1693 to Rubí and Lafora in 1767 record the distance from their Trinity crossing to the site of Mission San Francisco de los Tejas (called San Pedro de los Nabedaches) as 13 or 14 leagues. The distance from San Pedro to the Neches River is most often given as four leagues.

Although these figures fall short of proving the site of the first Texas mission, they do show that the route most often traveled during the first hundred years of Spain's occupation of Texas was other than present State Highway 21. Apart from the expedition diaries, an early nineteenth century map by Juan Pedro Walker depicts this early travel pattern. Even before V.N. Zivley's landmark achievement of identifying segments of Spanish travel routes that have become integral parts of a trans-Texas road, assumptions were made that the latter-day Camino Real had always been the route to eastern Texas.57

The Juan Pedro Walker map at hand, dated c. 1806, is a copy, so judged in part because the labeling is in French—which Walker is not likely to have used—and it is not of finished quality. It is captioned “Route de Nacogdoches au Rio Trinidad,” above the initials J.P.W. (fig. 22 a and b).

57 For example, Bolton misidentified the site of Mission San Francisco because of an assumption that the Camino Real of the early nineteenth century (later the route of State Highway 21) had always been the prevalent route (“The Native Tribes about the East Texas Missions,” pp. 263–64). See also the foregoing discussion of the travels of Captain Pagès and n. 31.
Figure 22a.
Thought to be Juan Pedro Walker map, c. 1806.
Figure 22b. Thought to be Juan Pedro Walker map, c. 1806.
The map’s importance is twofold. On the north bank of San Pedro Creek, near what appears to be a loop off the main road following the south bank, the minute symbol for a church is labeled “Ancienne Mision de San Pedro” (that is, Mission San Francisco de los Tejas). In the lower left corner, the note (translated from the French) reads: “At two leagues, following this same direction [southwest], one enters a plain, in the middle of which is a gully [brook or cattle path]. This plain extends about three leagues farther.”

In the opposite direction, the road crosses San Pedro Creek and joins (or rejoins) the main road, the early Camino Real de los Tejas. Aside from marking the location of Mission San Francisco, the map indicates the course of the Camino Real through Mission Tejas State Park, where its track still can be seen. That this is so is due in large measure to the efforts of John Tatum, who retired as park ranger in July 2010. Earlier, Tatum cleared a portion of the path, which follows the terrace above the San Pedro Creek flood plain (fig. 23 and 24). This level expanse of flood plain, however, is not the valley mentioned in the source documents as the location of the Nabedache village, which is placed farther from the Neches River.

Figure 23.
Trail through the pines: a portion of the Camino Real on the self-guided tour in Mission Tejas State Park.
(Photo by Tim Weddle)
The path that Tatum has marked bears a striking similarity to what one may envision from studying the Walker map, even though Tatum had formed his conclusions independently of the map. Tatum has indicated a foot path alongside the vehicular and livestock trail. The cart road, he says, “is marked by berms of earth where teamsters dug their wagons and carts out of the mud.” He has noted also that wild animals shy away from the well traveled camino, perhaps because the ground has been so heavily impacted by large expeditions over an extended period.  

Beyond the park, intermittent traces of the road can be seen toward the Neches River and, farther on, along Weeping Mary Road. The Walker map indicates the Neches crossing just past a beaver pond (labeled Laguna de Castor). Then comes the Caddoan Mounds, now Caddoan Mounds State Historic Site, which the mapmaker labeled Monuments Indigenes, or “Native Monuments.” At that point the road divides again. The upper road is designated Ancienne route de Bexar a Nacogdoches, or “Old Road from Béxar to Nacogdoches,” although both went to Nacogdoches.

Although the Walker map indicates a location for Mission San Francisco de los Tejas, it is difficult to determine the mission’s location in relation to other features because of the uncertainty of scale. It is

---

Figure 24.
The Camino Real, John Tatum explains, followed the terrace above the flood plain to stay out of the mud as much as possible. Visitors to Mission Tejas State Park may actually walk on portions of the original trail. (Photo by Tim Weddle)
generally acknowledged that the mission was not within the present 
park, but opinions vary widely as to where it actually was. Corbin, 
using the Walker map, concluded that the mission was on Silver Creek, 
which enters San Pedro Creek from the north two miles or more south 
of Augusta. Corbin did not reveal his reasons for such a conclusion, 
but my own calculations tend to support him to some degree for the 
following reasons: (1) Walker's map places the mission about half as far 
from the Neches River (straight-line measurement) as the Neches from 
the Angelina, i.e., ten to twelve statute miles from the mouth of San Pedro 
Creek; (2) this distance seems to reconcile roughly with distances given 
by a preponderance of the early itineraries that place San Pedro de los 
Nabedaches (the Mission San Francisco site) 13 or 14 leagues from the 
Trinity River crossing near Hall's Bluff and four leagues from the Neches; 
and (3) the Silver Creek flood plain, though not as wide as that of the 
lower San Pedro, seems adequate for a sizable Indian village.

The location of the early mission has been confused by a number of 
factors. Probably the most dominant one is the assumption that the route 
of Highway 21, not widely used until late in the colonial period, was the 
path Spaniards traveled from the beginning. That one aside, artifacts 
have been found along San Pedro Creek, much nearer the Neches River 
than the actual mission location. Perhaps the find that has attracted 
the most attention is a cannon, or a piece of a cannon, or just a breech 
block, found by George A. Moore of Augusta while plowing on his farm 
on Liberty Hill Road just north of San Pedro Creek, reportedly in 1923. 
Details are confused and confusing.

Much of the confusion arises from the different ways the object has 
been described. Corbin tells of "the breech block from the Spanish swivel 
gun ... housed at the San Jacinto museum." That much is correct. But is 
there more? Archeologist Alex D. Krieger, in his field notes pertaining 
to site testing on the Moore farm in 1944, mentions "a cannon found by 
G.A. Moore 4 years ago while plowing. This cannon given to a friend who 
wanted to put it in museum. Now supposedly on display in San Jacinto 
Battlefield Monument near Houston." In a 1935 article Dr. Albert Woldert, a Tyler physician, described 
the cannon—or whatever it was—as Moore had described it to him.

"About four and a half miles southwest of the Kennedy crossing, near 

59 Corbin, "Mission Tejas State Park."
60 Ibid.; "Notes taken by A.D. Krieger with H.B. Stenzel in Houston Co." (Emphasis added in 
this and the following paragraphs.)
the southeast corner of what is now the M. Ryan survey,” Woldert wrote, Moore, while plowing “about ten or twelve years ago ... discovered a cannon of obsolete design buried in about ten inches of soil.” The cannon, Woldert goes on to say, was about eighteen inches long, “had a diameter at the breech of about five inches and at the tip [muzzle] of about three to three and a half inches.” It tapered gradually from the breech to the muzzle, was round, and had no trigger. It weighed about thirty to thirty-five pounds.” About an inch from the muzzle it had “a screw-thread ... that another barrel could be attached ... to make it longer.” Near the breech, Woldert says, a small tube “through which powder could be poured” extended down into the barrel. (Nothing is said about a breech block.) “The cannon, now lost, evidently was of a type known as rabadoquines.” Woldert further describes the iron piece as being almost destroyed by rust.61

The item in San Jacinto Museum of History (fig. 25) is described this way:

![Figure 25. Catalogue information for Artifact #1859 at the San Jacinto Museum of History includes this statement: “Found at the site of Mission San Francisco de los Tejas. It was unearthed in 1923 by George A. Moore.” It was donated by Mr. and Mrs. George A. Hill, Jr. in 1940.](image)

1859 [artifact number]
Hand Cannon
8¼" long x 3½" diameter
[Bore (measured upon request) 4.2 cm (1.65")]
Iron interchangeable breech block from a Spanish swivel mounted hand cannon.
Hill, Mr. and Mrs. George A., Jr. (Gift, 1940)
Found at the site of Mission San Francisco de los Tejas.
It was unearthed in 1923 by George A. Moore.62

61 Woldert, “Location of the Tejas Indian Village,” p. 207. Rabadoquines is defined online as a light artillery piece easily moved and repositioned in case of surprise attack—probably a type of swivel gun.
62 Elizabeth Appleby, curator of San Jacinto Museum of History, to R.S.W., e-mail, July 10, 2010. She says that George A. Hill, Jr., was one of the museum’s founders. “How he got [the breech block] from Mr. Moore is a mystery as ... he provided the museum with oodles of artifacts with no provenance.”
Whereas the museum has received many and diverse opinions as to the identification of the object, it appears from the image to be the breech block of a small-bore artillery piece, such as a swivel gun. This weaponry is so designed that any number of breech blocks can be loaded before firing begins so a loaded one can be quickly inserted after each firing. The tapered end appears to be designed to fit snugly into the barrel. The breech block has a touch hole at the base; no need for a tube through which to pour powder. The term “hand cannon” seems inappropriate, perhaps belonging to an earlier century.

Obviously, the piece in the San Jacinto Museum is not the cannon that Moore described to Woldert. What happened to the cannon itself, supposedly given to “a friend” for placement in a museum, remains a mystery. Since it is described as being almost destroyed by rust, it may have been discarded. Or it may yet be hidden away in some private collection. Whether this breech block in San Jacinto Museum pertains to the piece that Moore described to Woldert seems doubtful. It is natural to assume that the cannon, supposedly buried by fray Damián Massanet upon abandoning the mission enterprise in 1690, would indicate the mission site. However, the mission bell was buried also, and the two were found miles apart: the cannon just east of the Liberty Hill road, three to four miles from the Neches River; the bell, unearthed by Governor Alarcón’s men in November 1719, at San Pedro de los Nabetaches, “the place where the Spaniards settled in the year '90,” said to have been four leagues (10.5 miles) from the Neches.

The site of the first Mission San Francisco de los Tejas remains unknown, though many seemingly likely places have been investigated. Many false clues have been brought forth and clung to despite every contrary indication. Krieger in 1944 found sites on the Moore farm that yielded beads and various other items that led him to believe they were in the immediate area of the mission site. Timothy Perttula, almost sixty years later, studied the same sites and artifacts from those sites and others in the same area, concluding that “the 1690 Mission San Francisco de los Tejas is not at the same place ... but is farther upstream along San Pedro Creek, since these sites are less than one mile from the Camino de los Tejas crossing of the Neches River favored by Corbin” in 1991.

63 Celiz, Diary of the Alarcón Expedition, p. 84. The bell “having been found, his Lordship designated it for the said villa de Bejar. It weighs six arrobas” (150 pounds). Ibid.
64 Perttula et al., “41HO64/41HO65, Late 17th to Early 18th Century Caddo Sites,” pp. 100-101.
Archeology has yet to reach into other areas that look even more promising, such as the Silver Creek area. Perttula, of Archeological and Environmental Consultants, Austin, was refused access to that area when working on a National Park Service project. Theories, including one that the stone used to floor the mission replica in Mission Tejas State Park came from the original mission site, have persisted. The late James E. Corbin, after checking the location from which the stones came, was confident that they were from a nineteenth century farmhouse, not a mission site: in all likelihood, the mission would have had a dirt floor. The Caddo had no experience with working, dressing, or using stone in their buildings; if they worked with the Spaniards in building the mission, they would have used wood. There is no known quarry in the immediate vicinity from which the stone might have come.

Identification of the original site of the 1690 Mission San Francisco de los Tejas would strengthen the historical appeal of Mission Tejas State Park. It would also enlighten the historical landscape to which the first Texas mission belongs and clarify for all time the pattern of the Camino Real de los Tejas. Until such a discovery is made, however, there is room to build and grow on what is already known: that the Camino Real did pass through Mission Tejas State Park and left its enduring mark.

BASTROP STATE PARK

The Lost Pines Forest and the Gotier Trace

State Highway 21, the designated route of the Camino Real’s final phase, passes along the west side of Bastrop State Park; surely, before all the twists and turns of the King’s Highway were ironed out to make a modern highway, it entered the park area in some meaningful way. If so, however, it has been difficult indeed to find a swale left on that sandy, at times gravelly soil.

The Bastrop State Park Site Abstract contains this statement: “Two significant historic corridors lie within the park: the El [sic] Camino Real de los Tejas National Historical Trail and Gotier Trace.” Gotier Trace, yes. Camino Real? Well, maybe.

65 Timothy K. Perttula to R.S.W., e-mail, August 2, 2010.
66 Todd McMakin to R.S.W., e-mail, August 2, 2010.
67 Perttula to R.S.W.
A persistent misconception has it that Terán de los Ríos, on his expedition across Texas in 1691, encountered the Lost Pines Forest: that he described it or that he was forced to detour around it. Neither Terán’s itinerary nor that of fray Damián Massanet mentions the Lost Pines. Terán, having reached the Colorado River somewhat farther downstream, describes the land and the timber as being “like those at San Juan Bautista”—a place noted for its pecan trees but not for pines. After traveling six leagues down the Colorado, he observes, “The banks were adorned by the same kind of woods and pecan trees.” Still no mention of pines.

When Mexican General Antonio Gaona arrived at San Antonio after the Alamo had fallen, Santa Anna ordered him with 725 men to proceed up the Camino Real toward Nacogdoches to head off the exodus of settlers in the Runaway Scrape. By the time he reached Bastrop, Gaona received new orders directing him to San Felipe instead. The general therefore turned off on the Gotier Trace, a feebly marked trail through the pine forest. The general became lost in the Lost Pines, thereby failing to make it to San Jacinto as he had to the Alamo, perhaps a saving grace for Texas—or maybe for Gaona.

CONCLUSIONS

Of the four Texas state parks included in this study, we are able to offer conclusive evidence that the original Camino Real de los Tejas passed through two of them: McKinney Falls State Park and Mission Tejas State Park. Whereas further documentary, and perhaps archeological, evidence is needed to place in historical context the curious road remnants within Fort Boggy State Park, Bastrop State Park offers a different kind of challenge. State Highway 21, following as closely as possible the route of the Camino Real as it was redrawn near the end of the Spanish Period, passes along one side of Bastrop State Park. The colonial road assuredly did not follow such a direct course as the modern highway; surely, at some point, the road deviated into the present-day boundaries of the park.

A sandy, gravelly soil in Bastrop State Park makes it difficult to identify ancient trails visually. There are several trails through the park.

68 See Williams, “Lost Pines Forest.”
69 Diario del general Domingo Terán de los Ríos.
that suggest the possibility of colonial travel, although the nature of the soil has prevented deep erosion such as occurred in the DCD road of Fort Boggy State Park. Magnetometer surveys along these trails might suggest likely areas for archeology that could disclose their history.

The documentary evidence of the early Camino Real's passage through McKinney Falls and Mission Tejas state parks is strong. The ultimate proof of the historical record, however, must come from archeology: as history provides the reason for archeology, archeology must provide the proof of history.
Glossary

alférez: ensign or sub-lieutenant; second lieutenant

arroyo: creek, river, stream; Arroyo de las Garrapatas, “Tick Creek, identified as Onion Creek, coursing Hays and Travis counties

Chicken War: the name applied to an episode on the Texas frontier in the 1719 War of the Quadruple Alliance in which a French officer from Natchitoches sought to raid the nearby Spanish Mission San Miguel, starting with the henhouse. The alarm quickly spread, causing the Spaniards, expecting a full-scale invasion, to abandon East Texas until 1721.

contrabandista: one who engages in contraband trade

Costa del Seno Mexicano: Gulf coast; often used to designate José de Escandón’s colony of Nuevo Santander (New Santander), which comprised a coastal strip extending from the Río Pánuco to the San Antonio River in Texas: ultimately, the present Mexican state of Tamaulipas

criollo: creole; one born in the Spanish colonies of Spanish parents

entrada: entry; expedition (into unexplored or unsettled territory)

harquebus: an ancient portable firearm, firing shot rather than a single ball

indios gentiles: unchristianized Indians

indios rebeldes: unruly Indians

Kadohadacho: Caddo Indians living in an area generally defined as lying between the Red and Sulphur rivers

Laguna de Santa Ana: Santa Ana Lake, between the Trinity and Navasota Rivers, probably in southwestern Leon County; also called Laguna de las Cargas for the mule loads of supplies intended for the East Texas missions, stashed there because the flooding Trinity River prevented delivery

Lomería Grande: great range of hills; specifically here, the Balcones Escarpment
Mescal Indians: the Indians of San Juan Bautista at its first site on the Rio de Sabinas, the Mescales were later associated with Ranchería Grande in east central Texas and with Mission San Antonio de Valero. They spoke a Coahuiltecan dialect but gradually lost their ethnic identity through fragmentation.

mestizo, zo: mixed blood; in America, usually indicating Spanish-Indian mix or Spanish-Negro mix

Monte Grande: “great wood,” or “great wilderness”; specifically, the Post Oak Savannah, a predominantly post-oak thicket extending across Texas in a generally northeast-southwest direction from the state’s northeastern corner, paralleling the Blackland Prairie and ending at the northern edge of the South Texas Plains

Nabedache Indians: a major group of the Hasinai (Caddo) Confederacy living in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries on San Pedro Creek in present Houston County

Nuestra Señora de los Dolores: Our Lady of Sorrows, the name given both José Vázquez Borrego’s settlement (with the word hacienda added), on the left bank of the Rio Grande and the first East Texas presidio, which was abandoned in 1731

paso: pass, ford, crossing

Paso de Francia: French Crossing, on the Rio Grande near San Juan Bautista

Paso del Gobernador: “the Governor’s Crossing,” so named from Alonso de León’s crossing of the Guadalupe River in 1689

Paso de Nogal: Pecan Tree Crossing, a crossing on the Rio Grande near San Juan Bautista (between Paso de los Pacuaches and Paso de Diego Ramón), used by both Mexican invaders in 1842 and American forces during the Mexican War

Paso de los Pacuaches: Rio Grande crossing of the Pacuache Indians; uppermost of five crossings on the Rio Grande near San Juan Bautista

presidio: fort, garrison

Ranchería Grande: a name applied to any large encampment or settlement of Indians; as used here, a specific aggregation on a Brazos River tributary in present Milam County, Texas, component tribes identified by Father Espinosa as Pamayes, Payayes, Cantonas, Mescales, Jarames, and Sijames. There was also a Yerbipiam (Ervipiame, Hierbipiame) chieftain and his following.
Santisimo Nombre de María (Mission): Most Holy Name of Mary, the name of the second 1690 East Texas Mission

San Pedro de los Natedaches: the Natedache settlement identified by Domingo Ramón in 1716 as the location of the first East Texas mission (San Francisco de los Tejas). A major stopping place on the formative Camino Real, it was invariably placed fourteen leagues from the Trinity River crossing and four leagues from the Neches River.

*sargento mayor*: a military designation of different meanings depending on context; *sargento mayor de un regimiento*, major

Seno Mexicano: Gulf of Mexico

tierra incógnita: unknown territory

Yerbipiam Indians: an Indian group most likely linked to the Coahuiltecans, though sometimes identified with the Tonkawas; associated with the short-lived San Francisco Xavier de Nájera Mission in San Antonio (1722) and later with San Francisco Xavier de Horcasitas Mission on the San Gabriel River of Milam County (1748); identity much confused by a wide variety of spellings

Yojuanes (singular, Yojuán): an Indian group of Tonkawan affiliation known mostly from the eighteenth century, when it ranged over a large section of east central Texas extending from the Colorado River east of present Austin north to the Red River; mostly confined to the southern half of that region after mid-century; missionized at San Francisco Xavier de Horcasitas Mission (1748-1756)
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The University of Texas at Austin's Texas Archeological Research Laboratory (TARL) conducted magnetometer surveys at Mission Tejas and McKinney Falls State Parks (including the nearby grounds of Texas Parks and Wildlife Headquarters) as part of an effort to locate segments of the Spanish Colonial-era Camino Real de los Tejas (Figures 1 and 2). Intensive archival research conducted on behalf of the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD) identified probable segments of the historic trail within the parks (Weddle 2010); these areas are the focus of the current investigation. The project was sponsored by TPWD in order to augment the archival research for planning and interpretive purposes.

Field work was conducted in February (Mission Tejas) and April (McKinney Falls and TPWD HQ), 2011 under the terms of Texas Antiquities Permit No. 5860. A total of 4,600 square meters was surveyed during the investigation. No artifacts were collected. The raw data collected during the investigation, in the form of digital files, are archived at both TPWD and TARL.

The investigation was conducted under the direction of Principal Investigator Jonathan Jarvis, with assistance from Dale Hudler (at Mission Tejas) and Dr. Darrell Creel (at McKinney Falls and TPWD Headquarters). TPWD Regional Archeologist Todd McMakin and the local park staff provided support for the survey at Mission Tejas. Likewise, TPWD Cultural Resource Director Michael Strutt and Regional Archeologist Rich Mahoney provided assistance at McKinney Falls and TPWD Headquarters. Dr. Cynthia Brandimarte, Director of TPWD's Historic Sites and Structures Program, initiated the project and facilitated all phases of the investigation.
Methods

The project team conducted the survey with a Geometrics G-858 cesium vapor proton magnetometer. A brief summary of the principles of magnetometry in general, and the techniques employed during this investigation in particular is included below. Many aspects of magnetometry are somewhat complex, or at least well beyond the scope of the current discussion; for a more thorough treatment of magnetometry as it pertains to archeology refer to Aspinall, et al (2008).

Magnetometers measure the total strength of the earth's magnetic field (the "geomagnetic field") at a particular location. As such magnetometers are considered "passive" instruments, unlike common metal detectors ("active" instruments) which create an electromagnetic field of their own to excite the magnetic properties of materials present. At a localized scale, many artifacts, features and even soil disturbances (in this case, the soil compaction and subsequent fill of a well-traveled historic trail) can have a small but measureable effect on the geomagnetic field. Such effects are commonly referred to as geomagnetic anomalies, which can result from either remnant or induced magnetization. Remnant magnetization may occur when a material that contains randomly oriented magnetic particles (for example, iron oxide in clay soil) is heated above its Curie temperature (if, for example, the aforementioned iron oxide-rich clay is formed into a brick and fired in a kiln), causing the magnetic particles to align with the geomagnetic field, which in turn enhances the magnetic signature of the material. Since remnant magnetism is aligned with the geomagnetic field at the time of heating, it does not necessarily reflect the current geomagnetic orientation and is in that sense independent of the geomagnetic field. Induced magnetism occurs when a material has its own inherent magnetic properties (for example, a solid piece of iron) that enhance the ambient geomagnetic field. An object that exhibits induced magnetism may be detected as a dipole, with a strongly positive end and corresponding strongly negative end—essentially the same as an ordinary bar magnet with south and north poles.

There are a variety of magnetometer configurations, and likewise a variety of approaches to collecting magnetometer data. The configuration employed during this survey includes two sensors mounted on a specially constructed cart, which is pulled by the operator along predetermined rows in an arbitrary grid system. Combined, the two sensors mounted on the cart cover a swath one meter wide, thus the rows are spaced one meter apart to allow complete coverage of the collection area. As the operator pulls the cart at a steady pace, the instrument collects readings at a specified time interval (in this case every tenth of a second) and the instrument's position relative to the grid system is recorded at a consistent interval (in this case every 10 meters). The readings that occur between the 10-meter position marks
are interpolated to place them in the appropriate position along the row (in general this works out to a resolution of about 15 centimeters along the row, depending largely on the walking speed of the operator). To assist the operator in maintaining positional accuracy, the collection area's rows and 10-meter position marks are indicated on the ground with ropes and cones.

Magnetometer readings (measured in nanotesla [nT]) collected across an area are typically plotted as a gray-scale or color coded map with strongly positive readings depicted at one end of the spectrum and strongly negative readings at the other. Magnetometer readings are relative to the ambient geomagnetic field; that is to say a positive reading reflects greater magnetic intensity than the background magnetic field, whereas a negative reading indicates magnetic intensity that is less than the background field. The datasets generated by the magnetometer tend to be fairly large (recall that for this survey the instrument was set to collect a reading every tenth of a second) and as a result processing the data is often a tedious exercise. For this investigation, processing was mostly limited to "despiking" the data by removing extreme readings (outliers) from both ends of the spectrum in order to enhance the contrast of the more subtle magnetic variations.

Once the magnetometer readings have been processed sufficiently to produce a visualization, the image must be georeferenced in some way in order to relate the data to on-the-ground (or in the ground, as the case may be) locations. There are a variety of ways to accomplish this task; in this case the coordinates of the corners for each collection unit were recorded using a real-time kinetic global positioning system (RTK GPS). The real-world coordinates captured with the GPS were then used to place the arbitrary grid into the proper map location in a geographic information systems (GIS; specifically ArcGIS) program.
Results

MISSION TEJAS STATE PARK

Previous magnetometer surveys at nearby Caddoan Mounds State Historic Site (41CE19; Creel, et al. 2008:188) have succeeded in locating evidence of a historic roadway thought to be a segment of the Camino Real; as such the Camino Real, if present, would likely produce a similarly recognizable magnetic signature at Mission Tejas State Park. The area selected for survey is situated in a relatively flat, low-lying area between a bluff and San Pedro Creek (see Figure 1). A clearly visible trace at a higher elevation along the bluff is thought to be a segment of the Camino Real (refer to Weddle 2010:41-48); this may represent the wet-weather “high road” of the Camino Real, in which case one could reasonably expect that an easily traversed “low road” on the more level ground along the creek would be used during dry conditions. In any case, within the general area selected for survey, the specific collection unit established for magnetometry was dictated by the area that could be feasibly cleared of brush by park staff.

Ultimately an area measuring 15 x 130 meters was surveyed (Figure 3). The magnetometer data was recorded in two contiguous collection units placed end-to-end. A large portion of the collection unit on the northeastern end of the surveyed area was ‘blown-out’, evidently the result of a fairly significant amount of iron-rich material eroding from the adjacent bluff. An intriguing linear feature that could, conceivably, be interpreted as a historic trail occurs in the southwestern end of the survey area (Figure 3, feature is circled in yellow). This linear feature is similar in width and magnetic appearance to the magnetic anomalies at Caddoan Mounds State Historic Site, thought possibly to be segments of the Camino Real. Interestingly, this feature appears to correspond to a vegetation change that is visible on aerial imagery of the area; but this linear vegetation feature cannot be traced on aerial photography beyond the limits of the forest clearing where the magnetometer survey was done. Thus, while the linear magnetic anomaly could well be the Camino Real in terms of location, width, and magnetic signature, no data collected during this project provide any indication of age that would permit a more confident assessment.
FIGURE 1.
FIGURE 3.
MCKINNEY FALLS STATE PARK AND TPWD HEADQUARTERS

Three collection units (CUs 1-3) were established at McKinney Falls State Park and on the nearby grounds of TPWD Headquarters (refer to Figure 2). The area suitable for survey at McKinney Falls (that is to say, an area that is consistent with Weddle's [2010:33-37] findings, accessible for the equipment, relatively undisturbed and with at least some sediment deposition) was somewhat limited. As such, only one collection unit (CU 1; Figure 4) measuring 5 x 50 meters was placed within the park. No linear features comparable to the feature observed at Mission Tejas State Park are readily identifiable in Collection Unit 1. There is, however, a linear alignment of small magnetic anomalies near the northern end of the collection unit. Acting on a suggestion from TPWD Cultural Resource Director Michael Strutt, some additional analysis of these anomalies was attempted. Since the variation between the highest and lowest readings in Collection Unit 1 is relatively small (approximately 80 nT; refer to the values depicted in Figure 4) an isometric plotting of the data was created with an interval of 5 nT in hopes of finding a recognizable pattern in the pairing of the magnetic flux lines around the anomalies (Figure 5). The results are interesting, but not particularly suggestive of a roadway; however, it should be noted that the approach used (simply using the 'contour' function in Golden Software's Surfer program and the default Kriging method to plot the data) was rather unsophisticated and it is certainly possible that a different approach could yield better results.

Collection Units 2 and 3 (Figures 6 and 7 respectively) were established in open space along the south and west sides of the TPWD Headquarters building. Collection Unit 2 measured 140 x 10 meters, oriented roughly east-west along the building's south side. Not surprisingly, Collection Unit 2 contains dozens of fairly small dipoles which are interpreted as small bits of metal debris resulting from modern land uses—particularly the construction of the adjacent TPWD Headquarters building and repeated use by the public during TPWD's Expo events. Collection Unit 3, measuring 100 x 10 meters on the building's west side, was literally in TPWD's backyard. This area likewise contains numerous small dipoles interpreted as modern debris. No linear features resembling a roadway are present in Collection Units 2 and 3.
FIGURE 4.
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FIGURE 6.
FIGURE 7.
Conclusion

Magnetometer survey of a small area at Mission Tejas State Park revealed an intriguing linear feature in a relatively flat, low-lying area that may represent a dry-weather segment of the Camino Real. An unmistakable trace at a higher elevation along the adjacent bluff is considered to be a segment of the Camino Real; this may represent the wet-weather “high road” of the Camino Real, in which case the linear feature could conceivably be interpreted as an alternate, more easily traversed “low road” used during dry conditions. While certainly plausible, there is no conclusive evidence that this linear feature is a segment of the Camino Real—it could very well be related to (more recent) historical agricultural or timber harvesting activities. Magnetometer survey of a much broader area may provide a clearer understanding of the linear feature; however, such an investigation would involve a significant amount of vegetation removal, which in turn would be potentially detrimental to the landscape and any cultural resources that may be present.

The magnetometer survey at McKinney Falls State Park and the nearby TPWD Headquarters failed to reveal any linear features comparable to the one identified at Mission Tejas. The investigation in this area was, however, more of a “needle in a haystack” affair. Among the areas of interest for the current investigation within McKinney Falls State Park there was only a very limited area suitable for magnetometry or other geophysical sensing techniques. Considerably more ground was available for investigation at TPWD Headquarters, but the route of the Camino Real in this area as determined from the archival material is less definitive (lacking stream crossings or other useful landmarks). In any case, while the presence of the Camino Real cannot be ruled out, the magnetic anomalies observed at McKinney Falls and especially TPWD Headquarters are interpreted as modern debris.
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Appendix

In October and November 2011, TPWD Archeology Survey Team, led by Luis Alvarado and Margaret Howard, surveyed 1,375 acres in Bastrop State Park, in 6 proposed timber harvest areas and a 200 foot wide corridor along 11.3 miles of park roads where hazardous trees needed to be removed. As a result of the survey, the group noted 4 previously recorded and 11 newly recorded sites, and documented numerous retaining walls and culverts built by the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC). While staff and visitor safety was the major concern, protection of the CCC retaining walls and culverts was also a key concern as they are contributing elements of the park, a National Historic Landmark.

Logging was initiated on one tract in November 2011, but soon ended; further harvest is not economically feasible. No archeological sites or CCC features were affected by timber harvest activities.

In the course of the survey, team members located several segments of old State Highway 21, and later used historic aerial photographs to compile the two maps on the following pages.
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