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ARCHAEOLOGY AND ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY
Site SBN-1H, Mission San Juan Bautista, San Benito County, California

By
Rubén G. Mendoza, PhD, RPA
Archaeological & Historical Resources Consultant

Executive Summary

The Parish of Old Mission San Juan Bautista has commissioned this report for the purposes of addressing California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) considerations that must be addressed in the restoration or modification of historic structures, and or in the construction of new buildings on archaeologically and historically sensitive sites. The proposed project in this instance will entail the construction of a new public restroom and gift shop facility immediately south of the Maryknoll Rectory building of 1932-33. As the proposed area of new construction constitutes both an archaeologically and historically sensitive site identified with the Northwest Convento portion of the Mission quadrangle, this historical resources assessment of those archaeological resources identified with Site SNB-1H has been prepared with an eye to addressing the archaeological significance of those historic resources within the area of potential impact. In that regard, this document was prepared so as to contextualize the historical significance of those resources specific the proposed area of impact; and to do so from the standpoint of the overall historic resource base identified with Old Mission San Juan Bautista. In so doing, archaeological investigations spanning a fourteen year period of intermittent study and exploration have been brought to bear in the development of this historic resources assessment and mitigation plan. In addition, any and all pertinent primary resource documents available at the time of this study were reviewed for their implications in addressing the period of significance (ca. AD 1797-1834), and the interpretation of those historical resources bearing on the architectural evolution of the Old Mission quadrangle or casco of San Juan Bautista. Ultimately, this historic resources evaluation has been prepared with an eye toward addressing the nature and extent of those historical resources whose conservation and mitigation must be assured with respect to the proposed Gift Shop/Restroom Facility to be sited immediately south of the Maryknoll Rectory building.

The preparation of this report required archival research with both primary and secondary resources identified from studies undertaken in the Old Mission Archives of San Juan Bautista (OMA), the Archives of the Diocese of Monterey (DOM), as well as a host of scholarly and visual resources generated by the principal investigator in the period spanning 1995 to the present. In addition to primary resource documents collected on behalf of the SJB Mission Conservation Program of San Juan Bautista, pertinent documents from the Archives of the Diocese of Monterey were identified, examined, and scanned or copied when found specifically relevant to the archaeology, and architectural and social history of the Old Mission San Juan Bautista.
Findings from this study support the finding that key archaeological and historical resources are located within the area of proposed impact at Old Mission San Juan Bautista. First, that portion of the Mission quadrangle identified with the Northwest Convento, and first erected in 1797, lies within the proposed area of impact. Second, the area identified with the Olive Grove and Garden necessarily coincides with the conven to cloister and Mission quadrangle, or casco. Third, much of the archaeological and historic resource that lies within the proposed project area does so at a relatively shallow depth, and therefore, project efforts will require due consideration of the archaeological and historical sensitivity of the area so noted. Finally, it should be noted that the aforementioned considerations have been given due consideration by the project planning team, and this effort has included due diligence in both the process of discovery and efforts to assure the appropriate mitigation and protection of those historic resources identified herein.

Given the archaeological sensitivity of those resources under potential impact, the project planning team, including architects, contractors, consultants, and community representatives, have gone to great lengths to accommodate those recommendations advanced by this investigator in order to address those procedural considerations pertinent to the California Environmental Quality Act. Given the extent of the consultation necessitated in this instance, particularly as demonstrated by way of the many revisions proposed and adopted so as to address compliance concerns, it is clear to this investigator that the proposed project is consistent with the Secretary of the Interiors Guidelines for new construction in historically sensitive localities. To that end, it should be noted that the design and engineering advanced for the construction of the Gift Shop/Restroom facility under consideration has been carefully evaluated and weighed against all available alternatives with an eye to mitigating and protecting those archaeological and historic resources under potential impact.

Ultimately, the proposed project has been designed to assure compliance, and thereby avoid, and or minimize, the compromise or destruction of archaeologically and historically sensitive resources. This will be assured via the strategic placement and or deployment of structural elements, the compliance-oriented design of foundation features, the location of utilities, only nominal to no grading, and the integration of construction methods intended to minimize potential impacts. As such, the foundation system for the proposed building is designed to “float” above archaeologically sensitive subsurface resources. To that end, concrete caissons and grade beams will be deployed so as to support a structurally integrated slab foundation, thereby avoiding the need for significant grading or mechanical compaction. Moreover, all utilities, including sewer and water line placements will be aligned in order to avoid subsurface archaeological features and historical resources within the project area. All archaeologically and historically sensitive subsurface resources will thereby be preserved in situ, and for posterity; and a Register of Professional Archaeologists certified archaeologist will be on hand to monitor any and all site preparation, including the installation of concrete caissons and utilities, and any construction specific excavation or earth moving activities pertaining to the project. Should human remains be encountered during project excavations, then all appropriate protocols will be followed to insure both NAGPRA and Secretary of the Interior Guidelines and considerations.
1.0 Introduction

During the course of recent archaeological investigations at Mission San Juan Bautista, California, Site SBN-1H,¹ the Monterey Formation Arkosic shale² and adobe foundation footings, earthen floors, and an attendant layer of roof tile debris pertaining to what is now thought by this investigator to have constituted the original Missioner’s Quarters and Chapel of 1797 were recovered and mapped. The unequivocal archaeological recovery of foundation footings identified with a 42’ long – east-west trending – adobe building once covered by teja roof tiles, and grounded on a hard packed adobe floor, necessarily indicate that the building in question was in fact virtually identical to those descriptions offered in historical accounts pertaining to the Chapel of 1797.³ If this is in fact the case, then clearly the archaeology in this instance has unearthed substantive material revelations deemed key to the interpretation of the earliest history of this 15th founding of a California mission.⁴ In order to more fully assess the broader implications of findings from recent investigations, essential archaeological data and map surveys spanning the period from 1995 through the present are here reviewed for the purpose of reinterpreting the original configuration of the Mission quadrangle of circa 1797-1812. Given

¹ Site SBN-1H is located within the community of San Juan Bautista, San Benito County, California. The site is both a registered state and federal historic landmark (NRHP Reference Number: 69000038), and constitutes a key element within the San Juan Bautista Historic District, which includes San Juan Bautista State Historic Park. The Mission constitutes California State Landmark 195.

² The complex character of those Monterey Formation shale deposits recovered in this instance, including Arkosic sandstones ranging from mudstone to siltstone, precludes precise identification for our purposes here. Rather, we will default to the use of the term siltstone to characterize those deposits recovered at Site SBN-1H, San Juan Bautista, California.

³ Long held perspectives argue that the capilla or first chapel was little more than a crude jacal or pole and thatch structure located just beyond the present casco or quadrangle of the Old Mission. See Barker, 1987.

the fact that Corporal Ballesteros and an escolta or detachment of soldiers from the *Presidio Real de San Carlos de Monterey* erected the earliest buildings within the original Mission quadrangle or casco of San Juan Bautista, an ancillary objective of this report will be to establish the extent to which the architectural footprint of this early California mission drew upon the architectonic inspiration of the influential founding settlement at Monterey.\(^5\) This study will thereby demonstrate that the architectural footprint or model upon which the layout and design of the San Juan Bautista Mission quadrangle was based was in effect that of the Royal Presidio of Monterey. In order to address this latter objective; archaeological findings from other areas of the Mission quadrangle are here reviewed with an eye to interpreting the original layout of the quadrangle as configured in the period between 1797 and 1812.\(^6\) The ultimate significance of the findings in question may well lie in the fact that the recovery of a 60.0 cm wide east-west trending siltstone foundation footing necessarily brings closure to a host of questions regarding the original configuration of the Mission casco or quadrangle of 1797.\(^7\)

---


\(^6\) Mendoza (1999, 2002, and 2009) address a range of issues pertaining to that progress made during the course of varied archaeological undertakings over the course of the past fourteen years. Field reports of that progress had in the interpretation of the architectural history have been addressed by Mendoza (1996), Mendoza and Dudzik (2000), and Mendoza, Lecel, and Thompson (2004). See Mendoza and Torres (1994) for an overview of that terminology specific to the earliest Hispanic architectural traditions of northern New Spain.

\(^7\) Ironically, the recent discovery of those foundation footings here identified with the original Chapel of 1797 at San Juan Bautista were made one year to the day after the discovery of the Chapel of 1771-72 at the Royal Presidio of Monterey. Whereas the Chapel of 1771-72 at Monterey were first identified on July 30, 2008, San Juan Bautista’s Chapel of 1797 was first identified on the evening of July 30, 2009.
2.0 A Contested History

On August 3, 2009, with the exposure of the 42’ long east-west trending Monterey Formation siltstone foundation footing looming large in my efforts to interpret the seemingly anomalous archaeological feature in question, I turned to the Old Mission Archives of San Juan Bautista for possible answers. Upon completing a cursory review of a transcribed version of the original *Informes de Sn. Jn. Bautista* for the period extending from 1797 through 1812, it was soon apparent that the only period structure that remotely approximated the dimensions of those walls exposed during the trenching operation were those erected for the first Chapel of 1797 (see Figure 3, Structure 4). As with that modicum of skepticism forthcoming when archaeological investigations were first undertaken in 1995, a newfound challenge arose with respect to questions regarding the nature of the evidence at our disposal for affirming the fact that long cherished ideas about the original founding and configuration of the quadrangle were in error. Given particularly tentative and or speculative earlier assessments and interpretations...
of the archaeology of the Mission quadrangle by John Martin (1933), Stephen Dietz (1986) and Leo Barker (1987), it is no wonder that area specialists continue to tout the notion that (a) the Mission was originally configured on an “L-shaped” plan consisting solely of church and cloister (Figure 2), and thereby failed to integrate a completed quadrangle enclosure or casco, (b) no architectural remains were likely to be recovered from the archaeology of the Mission quadrangle as these had long ago been fully compromised, and (c) the original enramada, jacal, and or pole and thatched structures of the Chapel and Missioner’s Quarters of 1797 were built outside of the Mission quadrangle in the area of the later Castro-Breen Adobe of 1839-41.

Figure 2: The Herman Ehrenberg mapping of San Juan Bautista, 1849. Note red lines indicating structures identified with Mission. Courtesy Old Mission Archives, San Juan Bautista, CA.

According to Martin (1933: 38), “An old tradition in the village brought down by the Anzar and Zanetta families, who lived in the old hotel building, was that the first buildings of the Mission occupied that ground of the Castro home and the Plaza Hotel.” Martin (1933) then went on to cite the Herman Ehrenberg map of 1849 which appears to depict a long L-shaped range-like building fronting the Plaza Hall, or former monjerio or nunnery building. Significantly, the Hutton illustration of 1847 does not indicate the presence of said structure in that location.

Cited from Personal Communications with Sep Gamper, Edna Kimbro, and Rob Edwards, and from the reports of Barker (1987) and Dietz (1986).
Figure 3: Archaeology base map of the Old Mission Quadrangle, San Juan Bautista, California. Map by Mendoza, James, and Lorentz, 2009. AutoCAD map plot by Jeff Lorentz (WWD Engineering) based on survey data by Joe James (WWD Engineering) and the author. Numbers specify Structures, corrected as follows, (1) Church, 1803-1812; (2) Sacristy, 1803-1809 (Provisional Chapel, 1809-1812); (3) Rectory, 1932; (4) Chapel of 1797; (5) Northwest Perimeter Wall, 1797-1800; (6) Chapel of 1797, Projected North Wall; (7) Chapel of 1797, South Wall; (8) Projected Northwest Convento Wall, 1797-1800; (9) Northwest Convento Wall, 1797-1800; (10) Granary of 1798 (SW Convento), 1798-1800; (11) Granary of 1798 (Courtyard-Oriented) North Wall; (12) Original Perimeter Wall, 1797-1800 (Load-Bearing Center Wall of SW Convento-Granary, 1800-1812); (13) Tower Foundation Footings, 1800-1812; (14) Plaza-Oriented East Façade of Southeast Convento of 1800, and Load-Bearing Center Wall (1810-1812) of SE Convento of 1810-1812; (15) Mission Well, 1797; (16) Southeast Convento Addition, 1810-1812; (17) Southeast Convento of 1800; (18)Projected Northeast Convento of 1797-1803; (19) Northeast Perimeter Wall, 1797-1803; and (20) Southeast Convento of 1797-1800.)
After some consideration, particularly that centered on a secondary review of the original map plans and archaeological data recovered in the period extending from 1995 through 2002, those foundation features exposed during the course of the aforementioned 1996-97 archaeological undertaking in the southwest or “Lost Convento” portion of the quadrangle now took on an added significance as per architectonic relationships with the newly exposed foundation features in question (Figure 4). Whereas the particularly narrow and deflated appearance of the 90.0 cm wide foundation feature exposed in 1996-97 in Trench 1, Units s20w10-s20w8, was initially thought anomalous by virtue of its dimensions and location with respect to the southwest perimeter defensive curtain or foundation footing, the recovery of the east-west trending wall of that area now identified with the First Chapel took on new significance by virtue of the aforementioned feature and its relationship to the original quadrangle configuration.

Figure 4: The late Keith Noburo Iida works to recover evidence from Trench 1, Feature 3, or that portion of the Southwest Convento (See Figure 2, Structure 10, 12). Teja roof tiles are associated with that portion of the building here identified with the Granary of 1798. Photo © Ruben G. Mendoza, 1996.
This new data, when compared with other data from a series of 1980s era auger tests running immediately parallel to the Southeast Convento of 1800, provided indications that the whole of the original configuration of the initial phase of convento-related quadrangle construction had in fact been identified. Drawing on the belief that the symmetry of the site might reveal long hidden truths about the original configuration of the quadrangle, I obtained measurements of the distance between the Old Mission Well, located at the mid-point of the courtyard or casco, and the interior face of the west perimeter defensive curtain first identified in the year 2000, and re-investigated in the summer of 2009. Said measurement was then compared against a similar measure from the center of the Old Mission Well (Figure 3, Structure 15) to the area of the quadrangle complex identified with the Southwest Convento or granary in 1996 (Figure 3, Structures 10, 11, and 12). Each of these measures proved essentially identical, thereby leading to assumptions about what might be anticipated should said measures then be extrapolated to the area both north and east of the well. While working to assemble extant archaeological data into an AutoCAD map plan with Jeff Lorentz of WWD Engineering, the equidistant measurements in question were then conveyed from the mid-point of the Old Mission Well to those areas both east and north of said point, and the resulting map plan proved quite telling in so far as provisioning indications for discerning the original configuration of the Mission quadrangle or casco of 1797-1812.

When provisionally mapped with the indicator lines noted on the plan, it was readily apparent that those areas projected for the northeast and southeast portions of the convento plan, or quadrangle footprint of 1797-1810, were in fact isomorphic with other known archaeological features. The fact that said features in turn remained unexplained as per earlier assumptions and interpretations regarding the later, or second and final, quadrangle or casco,
necessarily led this investigator to reconsider the likelihood that the perimeter convento wall or defensive curtain completed in 1804 was in effect the exclusive product of the final configuration of the quadrangle. If in fact all archaeological data are taken into account, then the “perimeter” or exterior defensive curtain once thought to have framed the compound as an exclusive element of the final configuration, was in effect built to enclose and thereby contain the first casco or Quadrangle of 1797-1800, and then re-tasked for use as the courtyard-oriented interior wall of the retrofit of 1810-1812 (Figure 5). The resulting configuration discerned from the archaeology indicates that the exterior wall of the Granary of 1798 was then redeployed as the load-bearing central wall for the construction of the reconfigured Southwest Convento of 1810-12. This retrofit ultimately served to conjoin the old Granary of 1798 with that of the new Southwest Convento of 1810-1812. Of course, the question remains: What archaeological evidence can be brought to bear in support of this interpretation of the earliest architectural history of Old Mission San Juan Bautista?”

10 This observation stems from the 1997 archaeological investigation of the Torreon (Feature 4) or tower area located at the southern end of the Southeast Convento of 1800 (Figure 3, Structure 13). An examination of the abutment patterns of foundation footings in that sector proved quite revealing, particularly as teja roof tile shards were used as chinking in order to seal the juncture separating the southernmost extension of the original plaza-oriented façade and wall system of the Southeast Convento of 1800 (Figure 3, Structure 14) from those additions resulting from the retrofit of 1810-1812. The original façade as such was converted over to use as the Load Bearing Central Wall of the double-barreled room block resulting from the 1810-1812 retrofit operation, and the juncture so noted separated it from the addition of 1810-1812 (Figure 3, Structure 13). Given the fact that the former plaza-oriented façade of the Southeast Convento of 1800 (Figure 3, Structure 14) was found to continue south beyond the juncture so noted (Figure 3, Structure 12), I contend that said wall served as the original perimeter wall for the industrial area formerly located between present-day Second and Third Streets. A second such wall recovered in 1997 was found to emerge from and extend beyond the front façade of the Southeast Convento retrofit of 1810-1812 (Figure 3, Structure 13); and it is this latter wall that I contend served as the perimeter wall that joined the Southeast Convento retrofit of 1810-1812 with that of the Southwest Convento of 1810-12 (Figure 3, Structure 12).
3.0 The Annual Reports

According to the *Informe* or annual reports, the Chapel of 1797 was constructed by Corporal Ballesteros and five other soldiers who “erected the chapel, a house for the missioners, a granary and a guardhouse” by December 31st of that year. The work of erecting the first chapel and other ancillary buildings of San Juan Bautista was had under the direction of Ygnacio Barrera, Second Carpenter of the frigate *Concepción* (Schuetz-Miller, 1994: 173). Like the 43 year old founding Friar José Manuel de Martiarena, Barrera made his way from the port of San Blas by way of the frigate *Concepción*.¹¹ Upon his arrival with an *escolta* of some seven

---

soldiers, and in the company of Fray Magin Catalá and Fray Jose Manuel de Martiarena, Fray Lasuén dedicated the new Mission site of San Juan Bautista on the titular saint's day of Saint John the Baptist, or June 24th. According to Lasuen's account of that momentous occasion, “On this day I, the undersigned Presidente of the Missions of New California, entrusted by His Majesty to the Apostolic College of the Propagation of the Faith of San Fernando de Mexico, with the assistance of the Rev. Fathers and Preachers Apostolic, Fr. Magin Catalá and Fr. Joseph Manuel de Martiarena, and with the aid of the troops destined to guard the establishment, in the presence of many pagans from the surrounding country, who manifested much pleasure, etc., I blessed water, the place and the great Cross, which we planted and venerated. I immediately intoned the Litany of All Saints, and sang High Mass during which I preached exhorting all to cooperate for such a holy work. I concluded the function by solemnly singing the Te Deum.” Lasuén then assigned the Reverend Fathers Preachers Apostolic Fr. José Manuel de Martiarena (1754-?) and Fr. Pedro Adriano Martínez (1770-?) as the first missionaries of San Juan Bautista. Within a short time the military detachment from the Presidio de Monterey – working in cooperation with area Indians – saw through the construction of the adobe chapel within months of the departure of Fray Fermin Francisco de Lasuén in 1797.

4.0 The Chapel Site

In their first annual report dated December 31, 1797, the capilla or adobe chapel in question is noted to have been completed, and was said to consist of a building fifteen varas long by six varas wide (41.3 x 16.6 feet). Identifying the location of those ancillary buildings that normally accompany the build-out of a chapel structure is therefore critical to the identification of the original chapel site. Such buildings customarily include a cloister or range building that typically shares one or more walls with the chapel proper, as was recently confirmed at the Royal Presidio of Monterey via archaeological investigations undertaken by this investigator at
that site in 2006-08. To that end it should be noted that the Ynformes document the construction of a "dwelling for the missioners" which measured 14 x 5 varas or 38 x 13.75 feet. Significantly, said dimensions for the cloister fall within those projected measurements for that portion of the diminutive range structure noted on the George Black Plat map of 1854 (Figure 6). Whereas the "dwelling for the missioners" measured 38 feet long by 13.75 feet wide, and the building depicted in the 1854 Plat measures some 85 feet in overall length by approximately 13.75 feet in interior width (with 3 ft thick walls on both the east and west sides for a total of 19.75 feet exterior dimensions), then both a kitchen and granary may well have been accommodated within the building recorded in the Plat of 1854. Given the use of said building as a residence for the missionaries, it is likely that the structure fared better than others, and was then converted over for other uses once the main convento building was completed in 1800. According to Martin (1933), said structure was ultimately converted over to use as a hayloft and thereby remained in use through 1915. Given the location, ruined remains, and northernmost configuration of the northwest perimeter wall, I contend that said structure constituted the cloister identified with the original or First Chapel of 1797.
5.0 Conflicting Interpretations

While some confusion persists with respect to the interpretation of historical accounts regarding chapels erected as architectural precursors to the great Church of 1812, period documents consistently cite the 1803 beginnings of that construction that culminated with the completion of the main Church of 1812. Nevertheless, these same documents make no mention of the construction of any Mission era building intended to serve as a second chapel per se. Because no such structure is mentioned or contemplated as such, the former sacristy now identified with the present day Guadalupe Chapel might well be construed in effect as the second, or rather, the interim or provisional Chapel of 1809-1812. This interpretation is
bolstered by the fact that in 1809, the friars acknowledge that “On June 3\textsuperscript{rd} the statue of Our Patron San Juan Bautista was placed on the main altar of the sacristy, which serves as temporary church” [Emphasis Mine].\textsuperscript{12} It was also in the year of 1809 that the “three naves of the temple of Mission San Juan Bautista were also completed this year.” Furthermore, it should be noted that the massive perimeter wall and buildings that ultimately enclosed the complex were completed in 1803, the very year in which construction on the Church of 1812 was launched. So, one can argue that the first Chapel of 1797 was the first such religious structure on site, and that the second such structure deployed for use as a provisional chapel was that of the sacristy constructed in concert with the new church. Said structure, it is argued here, was re-tasked for use as a provisional chapel in 1809,\textsuperscript{13} and the Church of 1812 thereby constitutes the equivalent of the third sanctuary built on site at Old Mission San Juan Bautista. What then constitutes supporting evidence for the building chronology, and therefore, chapel sites, so proposed?

First, John M. Martin (1931: 20-21) has noted by way of his 1931 treatise on the history of the Old Mission that area residents recounted to him that "behind the church proper are two separate adobe structures, one the original chapel later utilized as a school and the other used in 1915 as a hayloft" [Emphasis Mine]. It would appear that the north end of the structure used as the hayloft is depicted in a photograph provided to this investigator by Sister Ana Prieto of the Daughters of the Immaculate Heart of Mary Community. Said structure, I would contend, was in effect the original "dwelling for the missioners" or the "Missionary's Quarters," as per that

\textsuperscript{12} Engelhardt, O. F. M., Zephyrin. 1931. \textit{Mission San Juan Bautista: A School of Church Music}. Santa Barbara: Mission Santa Barbara, p. 11.

\textsuperscript{13} In 1997, the former Sacristy, or Norman Neuerburg’s camarín or church storage area, was restored and dedicated on the Mission’s bicentenary for use as the present Guadalupe Chapel by the Reverend Father Edward Fitz-Henry.
argument made in the aforementioned narrative; particularly if we take into account the influential architectonic layout of the Missionary’s Quarters at the Royal Presidio of Monterey (Figure 7). The former, cited as “the original chapel” I believe serves to reinforce the argument that the long lost Chapel of 1797 was located in the area behind or adjacent the Mission Church of 1812. Martin’s (1931: 20-21) observations are in turn buttressed by Isaac Mylar’s (1929: 21-25) notations of a childhood encounter with the parish priest in 1855; during the course of which the padre conducted the young Isaac about the Mission to the area of the original Chapel. Father Anthony Ubach was in fact the pastor who conducted the tour for young Isaac, and it was during the course of that tour that the kindly pastor “told me that it took fifteen years to build that old mission church and then he showed me the old building that they used as a place of worship during the building of the mission. This old building, I believe, now stands; it was built at right angles to the present church” [Emphasis Mine].

Figure 7: Depiction of the Chapel of 1771-72 at the Royal Presidio of Monterey by Jose Cardero, 1791. Courtesy of the Archives of the Diocese of Monterey, California.

By contrast with those buildings located “behind the church,” and or identified as running at “right angles” or perpendicular to the Church of 1812, perhaps the earliest description to clarify the use life of the Church of 1812 and the ancillary structure now identified with the Guadalupe Chapel was that made by Antonio Buelna and José Antonio Tibúrcio Castro on May 9, 1835. Said description makes clear the secondary use of the provisional second chapel, and in turn acknowledges that two sacristy rooms were installed so as to serve the Church of 1812. According to Buelna and Castro (1935), “there are two sacristies, each eleven varas long and five varas wide, with five glass windows…then there is in the rear of the church another addition for storing church furniture and utensils of every description. It measures twenty-two varas in length and twelve varas in width. It is roofed with tiles, but the floors consist of adobe. It has six
doors with locks and keys” [Emphasis Mine]. The foregoing description acknowledges that in 1835 the present-day Guadalupe Chapel had been re-tasked for use as a camarín, or storage area for church furnishings and religious articles. This latter use is bolstered in Barker’s (1987: 4) transcript of document notes from the Santa Barbara Mission Archives and Norman Neuerburg’s (1987: 64) findings that indicate that “starting at least by 1809 a large room behind the chancel of the church (called sacristy in one document but camarín in another) was used temporarily as a chapel until 1812.” The former sacristy’s use as such is lent further credence by the fact that at “the center of the rear wall a marbleized band between two cut-off beams may have been part of the altar decorations.” Despite this fact, the structure now identified with the Guadalupe Chapel is commonly confused with the original chapel; and that despite the fact that orientation of the foundation footings and walls follow those of the walls of the Church of 1812. Given that the foundation footings and adobe wall system that comprise the envelope and original historic fabric of the church are continuous with those of the Guadalupe Chapel, the weight of the argument falls on the side of their chronological and structural contiguity. The evidence for contemporaneity with the build out of the main church is in my mind far more convincing, and the use of the former sacristy as a provisional or interim chapel in the period

---


16 Despite evidence to the contrary, Barker (1987: 3-4) nevertheless posits that “An earthquake is said to have collapsed one of the walls of the original church, and in this first rehabilitation project at the Mission the smaller original structure was incorporated into the newer and larger. The earlier church is believed to be the building adjoining the north end of the church and sharing a wall with the main altars and sacristies. Some individuals believe that this earlier structure was later a jail for neophytes, and portions of it may still be intact beneath later restorations and maintenance work.” The latter interpretations cited by Barker are necessarily erroneous as the Maryknoll Fathers restored the structure identified with the so-called Indian jail, but identified subsequently as the Guest House, and it is clear that this structure constitutes a separate building that shares its eastern wall with the west wall of the former sacristy now identified with the Guadalupe Chapel.
extending from 1809 to 1812 is supported by way of the aforementioned references to the installation of the statue of Saint John the Baptist in the provisional chapel in 1809.\textsuperscript{17}

6.0 The Chapel of 1797

As previously noted, a limited program of archaeological investigations spanning the period from July 29 through August 3\textsuperscript{rd} of 2009 resulted in the recovery of a 60.0 cm wide east-west trending Monterey Formation siltstone foundation footing. The feature in question was exposed during the course of trenching operations undertaken for the purposes of testing for subsurface architectural and archaeological features along the length of what has been deemed to constitute the perimeter wall of the former Northwest Convento of 1797-1800. During the course of the three day trenching operation the surface of the north-south trending west perimeter wall foundation footing identified with the former Northwest Convento or quadrangle defensive curtain was exposed at a depth of little more than 0.164592 meters or 6.48 inches as measured from existing grade. Said foundation was exposed within the context of multiple trenching operations, including Trench 9, 11, and 15; and previously, during the course of archaeological investigations in Trench 7 undertaken in 1999 (Mendoza and Dudzik 2000). A second east-west trending siltstone foundation footing, originally anticipated to constitute the south end of the former Northwest Convento room block documented in the George Black plat map of 1854,\textsuperscript{18} was in turn exposed by way of continued trenching operations on July 30\textsuperscript{th} of 2009. After the 42' long and 2' or 60.0 cm wide feature was completely exposed, and determined to have been far too “wide” to have constituted the projected end wall of the former 16' wide \textit{convento} structure depicted in the Black Plat of 1854, a review of the \textit{Ynformes} or

\textsuperscript{17} \textit{Ynformes de Sn. Jn. Bautista}, 1797-1833.

Mission register for the period extending from 1797 through 1812 was undertaken on site within the Old Mission Archives of San Juan Bautista. Findings from that review thereby produced the unanticipated revelation that the foundation footing in question was likely to have framed the southern side wall of the original first chapel erected by Corporal Ballesteros and the soldiers of the *Presidio de Monterey* in 1797. As noted in the foregoing narrative, the Chapel of 1797 measured fifteen varas long by six varas wide, or 41.3 feet long by 16.6 feet wide; whereas the adjacent “dwelling for the missionaries” measured fourteen varas in length by five varas in width, or 38.0 feet in length by 13.75 feet in width. Despite the unequivocal evidence for a siltstone foundation footing that once supported a *teja* roof-tiled adobe structure of circa 42’ in length, the identification of the structure under consideration has produced a host of revelations and generated more questions than it can possibly resolve at this juncture. Preliminary interpretations of recent data now afford the opportunity to generate conceptual plans and interpretations specific to the appearance of the earliest structures identified with the architectural history of Old Mission San Juan Bautista (Figure 8).

Moreover, recent archaeological investigations within the area of the Northwest Convento also produced extensive evidence for intrusive deposits consisting of trash middens and burn areas likely identified with activities pertaining to the construction of the Maryknoll Rectory of 1932. Said activities clearly played a role in compromising that evidence needed to identify the interior wall footing of the Northwest Convento observed in those archaeological investigations undertaken between 1999 and 2002. Among other items recovered from Trench 9 (Figure 9) during the course of the July-August 2009 investigation are to be counted a 1930s era metal Caterpillar track section of the type used to propel post-World War I tanks, and that in

---

19 San Juan Bautista. 1797-1833. *Informes de San Juan Bautista, 1797-1834.* Manuscript On file, Old Mission Archives, San Juan Bautista, California.
addition to fire scars and middens associated with 1920s era fire bricks, wire, and white improved earthenware. Unfortunately, the long sought interior or courtyard-oriented wall of the Northwest Convento was compromised by a host of excavated trash pits and dump sites. Despite this fact, sufficient evidence was nevertheless garnered to justify a preliminary projection for the original location of said wall footing (Figure 10).²⁰

Figure 8: Hypothetical reconstruction of the Missionary's Quarters and Chapel of 1797. Note relationship of Chapel to the Mission Well (Feature 1) at right. Diagram © Ruben G. Mendoza, 2009.

²⁰ The year 1999-2000 investigation in Units N0W42, and the northeast quadrant of Unit N10W38 produced more substantive evidence for the original location of said foundation footing; while recent excavations in Trench 9 and 10 produced the deflated remains of massive rough-hewn siltstone boulders precisely where they would otherwise be anticipated in so far as the interior foundation so noted.
Figure 9: Trench plan for the investigations within the Northwest Convento, San Juan Bautista, CA. Map by Mendoza and Lorentz (WWD Engineering), 2009.
Figure 10: Archaeology cross sections of the Chapel of 1797 foundation footings as per current grade at Old Mission Quadrangle, San Juan Bautista, CA. Map by Mendoza, James, and Lorentz, 2009. CAD map by Jeff Lorentz (WWD Engineering) based on survey data prepared by Joe James (WWD Engineering) and the author. Top: Plan view of NW Perimeter Wall and Chapel of 1797, with Maryknoll Rectory of 1932 in upper left; Figure A (Top) designates Northwest Perimeter Wall section depicted in Section Plan A (Center Diagram); and Figure B (Top) indicates location of Section Plan B (Bottom Diagram). Section A: Top of NW Perimeter Foundation lies at 227.53’ above sea level, and Existing Grade measures 228.07’ above sea level. Section B: Indicates top of Chapel of 1797 south wall at 227.37’ above sea level, and Existing Grade at 228.43’ above sea level.
7.0 **The Archaeology**

Beginning in October of 1995, this investigator initiated archaeological investigations in an area long thought to have once constituted the original Mission casco or quadrangle of Old Mission San Juan Bautista. Despite early skepticism by area experts that architectural remains were not likely to be identified within the area so noted, the California State University, Monterey Bay, project team under my direction soon recovered the 120.0 cm wide Monterey Formation shale and siltstone footings and *teja* tile pavements of a Mission era structure that had burned to the ground in the period after Secularization, or circa late 1830s or early 1840s (Figure 11).\(^2\)

Said footing was first exposed by the project team in December 1995, and subsequent excavations within the Trench 1 through 3 areas of the archaeological undertaking so noted produced additional evidence for buried architectural features. Among these, a 90.0 cm wide deflated siltstone foundation footing that first appeared anomalous by comparison with the adjacent 120.0 cm wide footing that ran parallel to this feature at a mere distance of some 3.505 meters or 11.5 feet. Whereas the 120.0 cm wide foundation footing measured some 6.0 cm below grade, the 90.0 cm wide wall by contrast lay at a depth of 58.0 cm below grade. Archaeological investigations centered on Trench 1 (Units s20w18 through s20w8) produced a dark rich midden that overlay a debris field consisting of shattered *teja* roof tiles that capped burned debris thought to date to the destruction of this sector in the period of circa 1840. Units s20w16 through s20w10, or that space spanning the area between the 120.0 cm and 90.0 cm

\(^2\) The evidence for the fire in question took the form of a 5.0 to 10.0 thick stratum of ash, charcoal, and burned wood fragments underlying the shattered remains of the *teja* tile roof that came to rest over the debris in question. The evidence was found to extend over the entirety of the southwest convento, or granary, structure; and subsequently, additional evidence of charred *tablas* or ceiling planks and *vigas* or cross timbers were identified by this investigator at the southern end of the remaining convento structure during conservation efforts undertaken in 2007.
wide foundation footings, produced indications that the interior space of the envelope of the building once defined by the foundation footings in question had been re-tasked for use as trash dump. A dense trash or midden layer consisting of ceramic shards of varying types, including a diversity of Spanish colonial majolica, late 18th and early 19th century British Shell Edge Pearlware, as well as both Annular and Mission wares, and glass shards ranging from free-blown Wine Bottle shards, including basal and neck fragments or shards, to colored apothecary glass fragments. Given the clearly delineated midden, and extant teja roof tile pavements bracketing and thereby capping the intermediate areas, the two wall systems were thereby determined to be directly associated and or contemporaneous with one another. Provisional interpretations indicate that the structure in question was part of a double-barreled room block, and therefore, the 120.00 cm wide siltstone foundation footing is thought to have constituted the load-bearing central wall of the circa 150.0’ long Southwest Convento/Granary of 1798 located in that sector. As such, from the outset it was clear that both foundation features were correlated, but precisely how they were linked to the broader architectural history of the site was not revealed until July of 2009.
8.0 The Old Mission Well, 1797

During the course of anchoring a north-south datum line for establishing the site grid to be used for mapping and locating all archaeological unit excavations within the Mission casco or quadrangle targeted for investigation in 1995, this investigator attempted to drive a metal datum stake at the north end of the datum line, and unwittingly discovered a stone footing (Figure 12). Said footing ultimately proved to constitute the upper rim of the Old Mission Well now thought to have been capped in circa 1930-33. Upon mapping the locality in question (Feature 1; Figure 3, Structure 15), excavations within the well were undertaken through 1996, and intermittently as project personnel became available, in 1997 and 1998. Because the well was backfilled in its entirety, excavations in the confined envelope of the well proved quite taxing, albeit,

---

rewarding. Much of that material recovered was clearly a composite of household refuse and historical materials spanning the Mission period on through to the late 1920s. Materials recovered ranged from cannon balls or cannon shot for a 24-inch gun, and a wide variety of earthenware ranging from *majolica*, Victorian porcelains, through to a commemorative porcelain platter acknowledging a British monarch’s visit to San Francisco in the early 20th century. Construction debris was rather more specific to what would have constituted the original historic fabric of the Mission era buildings of the site, as well as concrete tailings dumped into the well along with rusted hardware screen or “chicken wire” and associated artifacts of 1930s vintage. The particularly eclectic collection of materials provided a glimpse into the history of the Old Mission such that it proved a veritable time capsule of revelations; but the dating of the deposit was ultimately determined to have been culminated with the disposal of an early 1930s era beverage bottle from a Hollister, California, manufacturer. The finding of the bottle was soon complemented by revelations from long time San Juan Bautista residents who recalled playing on or about the Old Well in the 1930s.

---

23 It would appear that some of this latter debris may well have been associated with the diminutive Victorian structure of circa 1908-1932 (formerly located adjacent to the Old Mission Well in the garden) that served as the Mission Rectory until the completion of the cast-concrete Maryknoll Rectory of 1932 (Mendoza, 2009).

24 Raymond Velasco, Personal Communication, San Juan Bautista, California, June 2000.
As to the configuration of the well, it should be noted that once again Monterey Formation siltstone or shale block was used in the fabrication of the tapered walls of the well that in effect follows the configuration of other colonial (American and European) wells of the late 18th and early 19th centuries. In addition, it is clear from the identification of an encircling adobe pavement (with lime plaster coating at a depth below grade of 40.0 to 50.0 cm) that the rim of the well originally projected approximately 40.0 cm above the period grade, and thereby served as an above-grade siltstone perimeter well enclosure or wall. Given the configuration of other Mission era wells, such as those documented at missions San Miguel and San Antonio de Padua, it is likely that the well would have incorporated a wooden armature or other framework that would have anchored a winch or pulley system for handling tethered buckets for drawing water. The period of construction, and its relationship to the original configuration of the quadrangle, otherwise remained a matter of conjecture until the recovery of the east-west
trending foundation footing provisionally identified with the Chapel of 1797 served to shed new light on this central feature of the original Mission quadrangle. In effect, the projected location of the east-west axis of the nave and main façade of the Chapel of 1797 bisects the central axis of the Mission quadrangle, and thereby, central location of the well (Feature 1; Figure 3, Structure 15). Given this fact, and the equidistant measures obtained from the midpoint of the well for the perimeter wall features on the northwest and southwest, this feature appears to have been situated at the very center of the Mission quadrangle. As such, drawing on this assumption, the provisional locations of the Northeast and Southeast Convento room blocks were projected to good effect.

9.0 The Northwest Convento, 1797-1800

In 1999 and 2000, archaeological investigations were undertaken in an area provisionally identified as the Northwest Convento of 1797-1800 (see Figure 3, Structures 5, 8, and 9). However, the initial failure of the project team to recover substantive evidence for an east interior, or courtyard-oriented, companion wall footing to Structure 5 perimeter defensive curtain (i.e., Structures 8 and 9), led to early speculation that the area in question did not incorporate an enclosed range building such as that identified in other areas of the quadrangle. As such, the recovery of heavily rusted metal barrel hoops, iron hinges, nails, and coal slag led to the initial identification of the area as one that likely accommodated an open enramada or lean-to like structure in which the efforts of the village blacksmith were central (Mendoza and Dudzik 2000). Additional investigations produced a dense layer of midden replete with cattle bone, bottle fragments, and several post-1906 trash pits or trenches used for the burning of

25 The dating of this sector of the Mission quadrangle is based on the inclusion of the Chapel of 1797 in this sector, and the likely retrofit of those adobe structures damaged and or destroyed within this area in the period after the earthquake of 1800.
refuse and the burial of debris. Among other items, a host of medicine bottles and coins of circa 1910 were recovered in one such pit or trench, and the terracotta figure of what has been determined to have been a bullfighter or *matador* dressed in early 19th century regalia. As such, whereas the overall area was clearly used for industrial purposes very likely identified with a smith or other metal working activity, the many post-1900 refuse pits clearly served to undermine the unequivocal interpretation of the archaeology within this area of the Mission quadrangle. One such pit or trench identified with Unit n12w44 resulted in the destruction of approximately one-half to three-quarters of the original span of the 100.00 cm wide west perimeter wall at that location (Figures 13 and 14). The refuse pit, clearly identified with the burning of refuse as indicated by both a bright orange fire scar and the in situ recovery of 1930s era fire bricks, was excavated to a depth of 40.0 cm, and this thereby resulted in the compromise of the foundation footing in question.
The compilation of all survey data and map files resulting from recent efforts in the Northwest Convento portion of the site has ultimately resulted in the identification of the courtyard-oriented wall thought lost to the spoils of time (Figures 15, 16, 17, and 18). Ironically, while repeated attempts to identify the Structure 8 foundation footing were seemingly rendered inconclusive as the result of the extent of historic disturbance in this sector of the site, the excavation and mapping of the Trench 7, Structure 9, siltstone foundation footing was in fact mapped and documented by project surveyor Joe James and the principal investigator with an
EDM theodolite in the year 2000 investigation. However, this fact was overlooked until all EDM theodolite generated data and field maps were reprocessed and layered into an *AutoCAD* site plan by Jeff Lorentz of WWD Engineering of Monterey, California. Upon review of all newly acquired data and map plans generated by the project team, the location of the interior or courtyard-oriented second wall that once formed the east envelope of the Northwest Convento of 1797-1800 was finally fixed into the overall site plan and its interpretation. The resulting Archaeology Base Map (Figure 3) has as such proven itself a substantive resource for the ongoing interpretation of the architectural history of the Old Mission quadrangle. Moreover, the Plat map of 1854 makes clear that even at that time the surviving vestiges of the deflated adobe wall ruins of the Northwest Convento permitted the tentative mapping of wall features in that sector by George Black and his survey crew. Using said findings as a guide, the wall footing in question was projected along the length of the area that would have constituted the original Northwest Convento, or Missionary’s Quarters, portions of which were converted for use into a hay loft that continued in that use until 1915.26

---

Figure 15: The backhoe operation in Trench 15 resulted in the recovery of the south wall of a structure here identified with the Chapel of 1797. Photo © Ruben G. Mendoza, 2009.

Figure 16: Foundation footings of the south wall of the structure here identified with the Chapel of 1797. Note juncture with deflated NW Perimeter Wall footing at left margin. Photo © Ruben G. Mendoza, 2009.
Figure 17: View northeast toward the south end of the Maryknoll Rectory of 1932. Note NW Perimeter Wall foundation in foreground. Photo © Ruben G. Mendoza, 2009.

Figure 18: View west toward former orphanage building of the 1860s, Trench 9. Project surveyor Joe James controls stadia rod, Brenna Wheelis monitors the operation. Note deflated foundation footing, foreground. Photo © Ruben G. Mendoza, 2009.

10.0 The Southwest Convento/Granary, 1798-1800

The relatively long and narrow configuration of a buried substructure identified from the 90.0 cm wide foundation footings exposed at the east end of Trench 1, Units s20w10-s20w8, provide some basis for interpreting the location of a “large adobe granary” built within a year of the construction of the first Chapel of 1797 (Figure 19). According to Engelhardt (1933: 7), in their annual report of December 31, 1798 “the Fathers told of the erection of a large adobe granary which measured fifty-three varas in length and eight varas in width, or about 146 by 22
feet in size. The locations of these buildings are not specified, but most of them seem to have been constructed with the view of forming a quadrangle, because in the following year, 1799, without going into details the Fathers reported that the work of closing in the quadrangle had continued.” In this instance, while the length of the building identified with what has been provisionally identified with the Southwest Convento clearly conforms to the approximate length noted for the Granary of 1798, the width of the building recovered archaeologically is only half that noted from the *Ynformes* (i.e., 4 versus 8 varas wide).27

![Field map of the Granary of 1798 and associated Trench 1 excavation units.](image)

Figure 19: Field map of the Granary of 1798 and associated Trench 1 excavation units. Field map © Ruben G. Mendoza, 2002.

---

27 Mendoza and Dudzik (2000) make reference to this feature as the Lost Convento, otherwise known as the Southwest Convento in earlier reports on the archaeology of that sector of the site. Even cursory reviews of the specific dimensions attributed to the Granary of 1798 necessarily coincide with those dimensions identified from the archaeology.
Given that hard-packed adobe and ladrillo tile flooring materials were recovered from two 1.0 x 2.0 meter units excavated adjacent the exterior or south face of the 120.0 cm wide wall footing so noted, it is likely that the “perimeter” wall was used in this instance as a load-bearing central wall for a double-barreled conjoined convento/granary structure; or, the perimeter wall was built subsequent to the demolition of the original granary at this location, and the wall footings were thereby cut through the deposits of what formerly constituted the granary floor. At present, all indications are that the 120.0 cm wide wall in question constituted a load-bearing wall for a double-barreled convento/granary building that underwent retrofitting through the course of its use life which culminated with a fire that destroyed the structure in the period after 1834 and before the preparation of the Black plat map of 1854. Even so, it should be noted that post-Secularization friar Father Anzar penned a complaint to Mexico City in 1840 that detailed the ongoing destruction of the Mission and the loss of its holdings, and the flight of its Indian parishioners. It is after this period that the structures comprising the southwest portion of the Mission quadrangle or casco disappear from the historical record.

11.0 Ancillary Structures

Over the course of the past fourteen years of historic preservation efforts and archaeological investigations undertaken by this investigator at Old Mission San Juan Bautista, a host of inadvertent or secondary discoveries pertaining to foundation features have been had that have a direct bearing on the interpretation of the original locations and dimensions of (a) the Southeast Convento of 1797-1800, (b) Northeast Convento of 1797-1803, (c) St. John’s

---

28 This portion of the investigation was undertaken in the year 2000.

29 My dating of this Southeast Convento of 1797-1800 spans its earliest probable construction date at 1797-98, and culminates with its demolition in anticipation of that building activity that resulted in the erection of the massive new Southeast Convento of 1800.
Asylum and Orphanage of the Daughters of Charity/Immaculate Heart of Mary,\(^3\) (d) the Immaculate Heart Convent of 1860, (e) Torreon or Tower located at the south end of the Southeast Convento of 1800,\(^3\) (f) perimeter wall of the industrial area formerly located in the area of 2\(^{nd}\) Street,\(^3\) and finally (g) the foundation footings of the unfinished bell tower located at the northeast pier adjacent the main façade of the Church.\(^3\) Each of these discoveries has had a bearing on how this investigator has come to visualize the architectural and social history of this home to the largest of the California mission churches. Without extending the discussion

\(^3\) The dating of the Northeast Convento of 1797-1803 follows that identified with the earliest probable dates for the Southeast Convento of 1797-1800, but culminates with the 1803-1804 onset of that construction activity identified with the excavation of foundation trenches intended for the originally proposed 10 vara wide Church, sans side aisles.

\(^3\) The Daughters of Charity Community originally established and built the St. John’s Asylum and Orphanage, and upon their departure, the Congregation of the Daughters of the Most Holy and Immaculate Heart of the Blessed Virgin Mary (Hijas del Inmaculado Corazón de María) arrived from Spain in 1871 and reestablished the asylum.

\(^3\) The Torreon, or Convento Tower, is here provisionally dated as having been installed in concert with one of two other towers known from San Juan Bautista; mainly, that identified with the tower area located immediately over the north end of the Southeast Convento of 1800 (Figure 3, Structure 17). The second such tower, very likely erected as an ancillary structure at the north corner or bastion of the Mission quadrangle of circa 1800, is erroneously identified with the Indian Jail or Maryknoll Rectory Guest House rebuilt in 1932 (see Mendoza 2009). Archaeological investigations in the Tower area produced evidence that the structure was dismantled or destroyed in the mid-1860s. Two mid-19\(^{th}\) century American silver coins, dated to 1864 and 1867, appear to bracket the end dates for the fate of said structure, and the earliest photographic image available at 1870, clearly demonstrates that the structure had since been removed.

\(^3\) Investigations of this feature were undertaken in 1997, and were found to correlate with historic documentation of an extensive enclosure (located immediately adjacent and southwest of the Mission quadrangle). The Ehrenberg map of 1849 includes a depiction of the walls identified with this enclosure that once extended to the area midway between the present day thoroughfares of Second and Third Streets, the latter identified with the former Alameda, or tree-lined boulevard planted in the Mission era.

\(^3\) It should be noted that this investigator, working in concert with trustees and volunteers of the Gabilan Conservation Camp from the State Correctional Facility at Soledad, California, recovered the Monterey Formation siltstone foundation footings of the bell tower in 1997. This feature is projected to have been laid as part of the expanded three-aisled version of the Church of 1812 in the period after 1809. This feature should not be confused with the Monterey Formation siltstone foundation footing recovered by this investigator during a 2005 investigation in an area identified with the Victorian bell tower of 1860.
beyond the original scope of this essay, I hereby review those architectural features most pertinent to an understanding of original Mission quadrangle or casco.

12.0 The Southeast Convento, 1797-1800

In the mid-1980s, archaeologists were called upon to conduct a one-day program of auger testing in an area planned for a host of new olive tree saplings (Dietz 1986). In May of 1986, Archaeological Consulting and Research Services of Santa Cruz conducted an investigation that entailed a program of auger testing that resulted in sixteen 3.5 inch diameter auger holes dropped in the area proposed for the planting of the olive tree saplings (see Figure 3, Structure 20). As a result, the area running parallel to the Southeast Convento of 1800 (Figure 3, Structure 17) produced extensive evidence for a buried substructure in the area of the newly proposed Southeast Convento of 1797-1800 (Figure 3, Structure 20). The resulting data clearly proved problematic for those interpretations advanced by the investigators in this instance, and as such, the otherwise significant primary archaeological evidence for in situ strata comprised of both roof and floor tile debris was discounted as relevant only to a pattern of secondary deposition, and an architectural history identified with the earthquake of 1906.

In this case, the investigators appeared hard-pressed to account for evidence of floors, whereas the layers of teja roof tiles were discounted as little more than slough off from damage to the convento during the 1906 earthquake (Dietz 1986). Interestingly, while the southern end of the Southeast Convento of 1800 collapsed in 1906, thereby producing documentation specific to a collapsed roof system at that portion of the site, no similar such evidence is known for damage to the roof system along the entirety of the length of the structure in question. Interestingly, when the aforementioned equidistant measurements from the mid-point of the Old Mission Well to the western and southern limits of the compound are extrapolated to the area in question, the projected footprint of the Southeast Convento of 1797-1800 is found to bracket the
area within which the 1985 auger tests recovered evidence for both floors and roof tile pavements (Dietz 1986). The latter type of debris has similarly been recovered from both the southwest and northwest areas of the quadrangle, and in each instance proved to have constituted the original historic fabric of buildings no longer standing within the casco of the Old Mission. According to the report in question, “the row of augerings placed adjacent to the monastery corridor encountered an initial disturbed layer of mixed fill. Beneath this is a very thin layer of broken roof tiles which is 1 or 2 tiles thick.”

Stephen Dietz (1986: 3) goes on to interpret the evidence from augers 1 through 6 as likely the result of “debris which may have originated as “roof fall” from the monastery, perhaps as a result of the 1906 earthquake or 1949-1950 restoration efforts.”

Of particular interest in this regard is what Dietz has to say about findings from augers 7 through 13, and 14 through 16. Dietz (1986: 3) reported that augers 7 through 13 produced both a 25.0 cm thick layer of mixed fill or midden, but no roof tiles; whereas, auger 14 produced a “thick layer of roof tiles.” Auger 16 in turn resulted in the recovery of evidence for both roof tiles and a “flat surface” or floor that led the investigator to conclude that “I may have contacted a structural feature in this area” (Dietz 1986: 3). He then goes on to speculate that Henry Chapman Ford’s 1880s era rendering includes a depiction of the St. John’s Asylum and Orphanage built by the Daughters of Charity Community in the 1860s, and that those construction debris recovered were likely associated with said building (Figure 20). Barker (1987: 19) goes on to concur with Dietz, but tempers his assessment with a correction that serves to dispel the idea that the building so indicated had anything to do with the orphanage by arguing that “it appears that Dietz located both roof fall from the convento wing and the hint of

---

an earlier structure, although this author’s interpretation of the Ford drawing would place the noted structure some distance away from the vicinity of the auger testing.”

Figure 20: St. John’s Asylum and Orphanage of the Daughters of Charity Community (1862-1871), and later that of the Daughters of the Immaculate Heart of Mary (1871-1890; photo, circa 1880s). Note corner of two buildings immediately to the left, or northeast, of the three story brick orphanage in foreground. Roof of Plaza Hall is visible beyond Convento cloister on right. Courtesy of Sister Ana Prieto, IHM, Daughters of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, 2009.  

While I would argue that Barker (1987: 19) errs in concurring with Dietz in speculating that the stratum of roof tile was deposited from “roof fall” in 1906; he is nevertheless correct in his assessment that the orphanage was not the structure in question. This latter observation is based on the fact that in 1997 this investigator identified the east-west trending Monterey

---

36 This investigator recovered evidence for the south wall footing of St. John’s Asylum and Orphanage during the course of a monitoring operation in the spring of 1996. Said discovery was mapped as a feature specific to recovery operations in Trench 8 (Mendoza and James, 1997).
Formation siltstone foundations of the 1860s era orphanage building in the area immediately northwest of the First Chapel site (Mendoza 1997; See Figure 3, Structure 4).\(^{37}\) Perhaps the most compelling evidence cited by Barker (1987) is that identified with an effort centered on the archaeological monitoring of a construction trench routed through the area immediately west of the Southeast Convento of 1800 (Figure 3, Structure 17). The combined one-day monitoring efforts of the Santa Cruz Archaeological Society, Gavilan College, and the Monterey Peninsula Community College crews in question resulted in the identification of a host of substantive architectural features in the northern half of that area here identified with the Southeast Convento of 1797-1800 (Figure 3, Structure 20). According to Barker (1987: 18), findings from the monitoring effort coordinated by Charlotte Simpson-Smith in 1985 include “what appear to be four siltstone foundations of previous buildings on the Mission grounds, and a trash pit.”\(^{38}\)

While questions remain regarding the otherwise tentative nature of those findings obtained from the one-day archaeological monitoring effort in question, it is clear that when taken together, both the findings from auger testing by Dietz and monitoring by Simpson-Smith serve to reinforce the argument that the Southeast Convento of 1797-1800 once stood at the location tentatively projected for Structure 20 (Figure 3).

### 13.0 The Northeast Convento, 1797-1803

Within the area of the Archaeology Base Map (Figure 3, Structure 18 and 19) projected as the original location of the Northeast Convento of 1797-1803, landscape modifications

---


inadvertently resulted in the recovery of sizeable rough-hewn Monterey Formation siltstone boulders and foundation footings by maintenance workers in circa 2000 (Figure 3, Structure 19). Cursory probing by this investigator, as well as an inconclusive GPR (Ground Penetrating Radar) survey of the soils in the garden area so noted, produced tentative indications for buried architectural materials and features throughout the area in question. While formal archaeological investigations have yet to be undertaken within said area, all preliminary evidence and indications argue for the presence of a substantial siltstone foundation footing in that area since projected to have included the Northeast Convento structure. If period accounts pertaining to the retrofit of the Southeast Convento of 1800 so as to accommodate the installation of a kitchen or pozolera in 1810 is any indication (Figure 3, Structure 17), then it is likely that the original kitchen was located in that portion of the Mission quadrangle now occupied by the southwest wall of the Church of 1812 (Figure 3, Structure 1). It is precisely this location that has been projected for the Northeast Convento range building known only from the aforementioned inadvertent recovery of foundation footing stones dislodged and recycled for use in the modern garden located at the juncture of the northern end of the Southeast Convento of 1800 and the Church of 1812 (Figure 3, Structure 19). It is nevertheless clear from those reports logged by the missionaries that by December 31st of 1804 the adobe wall enclosing the whole of the Mission quadrangle had been completed; and, the foundations laid for the planned 58.0 by 10.0 vara wide Church. Despite the fact that the original Church plan did not include side aisles, by 1809 the missionaries reported that at years end the “three naves of the temple” or side-aisles were in turn completed, thereby doubling the width of the sanctuary.39

Ultimately, the addition of the southwest side aisle of the Church required the demolition of the Northeast Convento of 1797-1803, and that portion of the perimeter wall completed in

1804 (Figure 3, Structure 18). Given that the “three naves” were brought to completion in 1809, it is likely that both the Northeast Convento and perimeter wall or defensive curtain located in that sector would have remained in use through 1808 or 1809, at which point the former sacristy was re-tasked for use as an interim chapel while the side aisles of the church were pushed to completion in the wake of the demolition of the Northeast Convento of 1797-1803. These episodes in the architectural history necessarily coincide with the move to retrofit the whole of the Southeast Convento of 1800, thereby creating a new kitchen, and doubling the size of the structure in question with the addition of the east half of what now constitutes the double-barreled room block of the only remaining convento building of that time. While still largely a matter of conjecture, I nevertheless contend that the demolition of the Northeast Convento of 1797-1800 necessitated the retrofit and expansion of the Southeast Convento of 1800 in an effort to recapture those facilities lost to the expansion and completion of the Church in the period of 1810-1812. The demolition of what remained of the Northeast Convento may well have eliminated one of the largest remaining portions of the original Mission casco or quadrangle of 1797-1803 remaining to that time, thereby closing a significant chapter in the architectural history of this early California mission.

14.0 Findings from the Quadrangle

As acknowledged from the outset, I maintain that the initial configuration of the Mission quadrangle or casco at San Juan Bautista is based on that of the architectural plan or prototype established at El Presidio Real de San Carlos de Monterey in the period spanning 1770 through 1795. Drawing on those architectural histories and interpretations derived from a now fourteen year effort to document the archaeology and ethnohistory of Old Mission San Juan Bautista, the intent of this paper has been to review all primary evidence bearing on the original architectural configuration of the quadrangle enclosure or casco that constituted the epicenter of early
Mission development. Taken together, these findings now permit a reassessment of an earlier generation of interpretations regarding the architectural history of this early Mission community. Our review has found that while much of what has come before was based on assumptions and speculative scenarios drawn from second hand accounts, or incomplete accounts forthcoming from primary resource documents, limited access to the archaeological evidence to support such interpretations pertaining to the Mission quadrangle has long hampered the interpretation of the architectural history of Mission San Juan Bautista. It is perhaps no surprise therefore, that in the wake of a host of intriguing, albeit inconclusive, findings from tests conducted in the Mission olive grove, Barker (1987: 19) was ultimately prompted to acknowledge that: “This information and the suggestions derived from the 1985 salvage work in the inner courtyard north and adjacent to the convento wing…indicate that there may be much more to learn of the original structures and layout of Mission San Juan Bautista.” Given the long term pattern of intrigue generated by what was long left to learn about the Mission quadrangle proper, I am left to close this narrative with a brief restatement of what precisely has been “learned” during the course of these past fourteen years at San Juan Bautista.

First, the architectural evidence from what was originally deemed to constitute the exclusive domain of the Southwest Convento has been demonstrated to have shared that sector of the compound with the Granary of 1798. The addition of the Southwest Convento, I contend, was part of that sizeable restoration effort intended to replace the convento casco and associated buildings damaged or destroyed in the earthquakes that ravaged the region in the period of October of 1800. Indian depredations in that same year made it imperative that the walls be resurrected so as restore the primary defensive curtain of the Old Mission quadrangle.

Second, the original 120.0 cm wide perimeter wall installed in the area of the Southwest Convento in 1800, while originally thought to have maintained a use life centered on its exclusive role as a defensive curtain, or exterior façade fronting the area today identified with
Second Street; has since been determined to have been converted over to use as the central load-bearing wall of the conjoined Granary of 1798 and Southwest Convento of 1800.

Third, evidence from both auger tests and trenching operations immediately west of the Southeast Convento of 1800 argue for the existence of a sizeable tile-roofed building separate and distinct from the only remaining portion of the cloister that has survived to this day, mainly, that of the Southeast Convento of 1800. As such, I contend that the evidence at hand indicates that the earlier Southeast Convento of 1797-1800 was razed to accommodate those restoration efforts centered on the build-out of the Southeast Convento of 1800, in addition to those efforts targeting the construction of the Southwest Convento of 1800 adjacent the Granary of 1798.

Fourth, with only meager evidence presently available to advance even the most tentative of interpretations regarding the original location of the Northeast Convento of 1797-1803, I here contend that the identification of siltstone foundation footings from the garden area adjacent the north end of the Southeast Convento of 1800 nevertheless bode well for future investigations that seek to identify the location of the Northeast Convento of 1797-1803. Given the lack of specific details documenting the demolition of that portion of the Mission casco or cloister that once stood where the exterior wall of the southwest side aisle is presently situated, I contend that the Northeast Perimeter Wall and Convento at that location was dismantled in the period after 1803, when foundation footings for the originally planned 10.0 vara wide church were initiated; but before 1809 when both the present Guadalupe Chapel, or the former sacristy, were deployed for use as an interim chapel in 1809. In the year of the projected demolition of the Northeast Convento of 1797-1803, a sala room in the Southeast Convento of 1800 was
retrofitted so as to accommodate the installation of a pozolera or kitchen capable of feeding the nearly 700 neophytes then occupying the Old Mission.\footnote{McLaughlin, David J., with Ruben G. Mendoza. 2009. \textit{The California Missions Source Book: Key Information, Dramatic Images, and Fascinating Anecdotes Covering All 21 Missions}. Scottsdale, Arizona: Pentacle Press, and the University of New Mexico Press.}

Fifth, it has been determined from the archaeological recovery of foundation footings and associated debris and midden collections that the Northwest Convento of 1797 was in fact an enclosed range building that served as that precinct identified with the Missionary’s Quarters. The recovery of both teja roof tile and the occasional ladrillo floor tile indicates that the buildings were ultimately equipped with fired tile roofing, thereby suggesting their relative permanence within the compound. Moreover, whereas the Black Plat of 1854 clearly identifies a remaining portion of said portion of the cloister, and only tentatively indicates the remains of ruined walls extending south and west, it is clear from mid to late 19th and early 20th century accounts that what is herein identified with the Missionary’s Quarters remained intact through the period of 1915. The construction of the Maryknoll Rectory of 1932 clearly sealed the fate of those portions of the range structure identified with the Missionary’s Quarters; particularly as grading and excavated trenches were sunk to a depth of 1.5 feet and more for the purposes of pouring the cast concrete foundation footings of the latter structure. Moreover, it should be noted that in their efforts to conform with the extant building plan, the architects of the Maryknoll Rectory elected to run their new building perpendicular to the Church of 1812, which was built askew (3.0 degrees) the orientations of the original quadrangle or \textit{casco}.

Sixth, despite arguments to the contrary, it is clear from early images, as well as survey data from this study, that the so-called Indian Jail or Maryknoll Guest House (reconstructed 1932), conforms to the original orientation of the Northeast Convento of 1797-1803; and therefore constitutes the last remaining feature of that portion of the Mission quadrangle. Given
that the main façade of the Indian Jail lies precisely where the back wall of the Northeast Convento of 1797-1803 is projected from the archaeology to have once stood; I contend that the building in question comprised the third of three, and possibly, four, towers identified with that frenetic pace of construction undertaken in 1800 in the wake of both earthquakes and Indian raids that resulted in the deaths from within the Mission neophyte population.

Finally, I would again like to reiterate that the 41.6’ long east-west trending Monterey Formation Arkosic siltstone foundation footing recovered along the interior face of the Northeast Perimeter Wall and Convento clearly conform to those dimensions used to describe the fifteen-vara long by six-vara wide measure of the original Chapel of 1797. Moreover, I contend that (a) the central location and orientation of the building so indicated, (b) the building’s extant relationship to the Missionary’s Quarters of the Northwest Convento of 1797, (c) 19th and early 20th century accounts describing the location of the original chapel site adjacent to the Missionary’s Quarters, and (d) the structure’s location along the central east-west axis of the centrally-located Mission Well of 1797, thereby posits a relationship with that source of water and life critically important to the earliest inhabitants of Old Mission San Juan Bautista and its missionary program.
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