

Fred also stated Spanish families were here in 1715.

Neither of these statements is proven by positive record (that I know of) while the records available are vague and negative; too much so for history declaration. I have said these are not matters of primary importance. I cannot see, however, how we can get rid of the constant confusions if we must either silently accept them or be forever combating them, and combating misinformation is tedious and deadly.

The word Yanaguana appears but once (p55 Teran diary)--it was the village of the Payaya nation. The word Payaya therefore must be sought for further enlightenment. Espinosa (1709 p4 and 5) clearly places the payayas on the Medina, and recites minor details which suggest he was courteously establishing a correction of Manzanet. Espinosa also says the San Antonio River not having been named we called it San Antonio de Padua. Manzanet, himself, (p55) says a Payaya captain wished to guide them to the village of the Chomanes, and Espinosa places the Chomanes (Chauluames) definitely at San Antonio. Espinosa is clear and unquestioned in his descriptions of the San Antonio site; Manzanet's descriptions fit Medina better than San Antonio... Manzanet does not mention the springs, so important a landmark as they. There is much more; this is enough.

As for families here in 1715. Ramon camped here two ^{nights} days in 1716. Obviously his horsemen were exploring, mapping and hunting. No white people are reported. Moreover, Spanish families, if here, would have known of such a body encamped, and surely have hunted them up. Note records, both of Ramon and Espinosa.

4. The other significance of last night was the spirit of levity that prevailed.

We have conscientious history-minded people here. We must find a way to get them together. There is much written history to be disproved and thrown over. I can disprove important beliefs right here in this "workshop" but I cannot yet clearly prove the truth as I know it; this is why I think of this place as a research library. If we can substitute the thought of "research for basic facts" for the pastime of writing "history" we may get somewhere. I assure you there are wonderful mines here for exploration. (Yet publishing half-digested stuff brings in some money to buy bread.)

Because of the type and character of these commentaries they might be worthwhile for your publications. They were not written with such thought but because they give an unpublished review of those pioneering years and carry Texas information